



## Manifestation of Shklovsky's Defamiliarization and Derridian Différance in the Poetry of Keats and Sipihrī

Nasser Maleki<sup>1,\*</sup>; Maryam Navidi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>English Department, Razi University, Kermanshah, Iran

<sup>2</sup>Sama Center, English Department, Azad University, Kermanshah, Iran  
 Email: Maryam\_navidi58@yahoo.com

\*Corresponding author.

Address: English Department, Razi University, Kermanshah, Iran  
 Email: maleki\_n5@yahoo.com

Received 23 June 2011; accepted 23 July 2011

### Abstract

It seems that there is a demonstration of Shklovsky's defamiliarization in some of Keats's and Sipihrī's poems; in them they tried to avoid the traditional logics and conventional ways of looking at the world in order to make difference in the locus of their observations. Amazingly, the function of these differences or contrasts can transparently be equated and aligned to what Derrida asserted as *différance* or to differ and defer. However, these dualistic ways of looking at the world, pave the way for new artistic perceptions which are not revealed promptly, instead, challenge and penetrate the reader's mind to discover them. Considering such a perspective in mind, this article is to foreground the manifestation of these terms in some of the poems by Keats and Sipihrī which does not seem to have received a significant attention by the researchers. The authors of this paper believe that the essence or the motifs in most of the artistic works of these two poets respond to a dualistic notion which is – or might be – an ongoing process in literary criticism.

**Key words:** Keats; Sipihrī; *Différance*; Defamiliarization; Contrast; Dualism

Nasser Maleki, & Maryam Navidi (2011). Manifestation of Shklovsky's Defamiliarization and Derridian *Différance* in the Poetry of Keats and Sipihrī. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 3(1),30-36. Available from: URL: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/sll/article/view/j.sll.1923156320110301.315>  
 DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/j.sll.1923156320110301.315>

### INTRODUCTION

Coined and introduced by the Russian Formalist Victor Shklovsky, the term defamiliarization can be equated with the Derridian '*différance*'. The latter refers to the dual meanings of the French word '*différance*' which means both to 'differ', postpone, or delay and 'to defer', to be different from. Defamiliarization, on the other hand, indicates the use of common language in such a way that it delays one's perception of an easily understandable object or concept. Crawford specifically believes that, "defamiliarization both differs and defers because the use of the technique alters one's perception of a concept (to defer), and forces one to think about the concept in different, often more complex way (to differ)" (Crawford, 2008: 209-219). And Shklovsky claims that, "the aim of art is to create the sensation of things as they are perceived not as they are known" (Shklovsky, 1917: 2). This artistic strategy, paves the way for the innovative perception which struggles to come to the fore in the reader's mind. In this strategy, the innovative perception differentiates the previous perception (differ) challenging the observer to find out the conception which already lingers in the new perception (defer), therefore it is assumed that defamiliarization and *différance* can transparently be aligned in the same way. Keeping such a new perspective in mind, a comparative parallelism can be traced and extrapolated between the progress and application of these terms in the poetic vocations of the Iranian poet Sohrab Sipihrī and John Keats.

Scholars, however, have so far not been able to try their hands in drawing a comparative parallelism between the progress and application of the terms, *différance* and defamiliarization (as presumed one) in the poetic vocations of the Iranian poet Sohrab Sipihrī and John Keats. The modern issue of these terms which Keats and Sipihrī advocated in their poems is firmly grounded in their power to deviate the general process of the reader's

perception and to direct it to a new kind of perception. Whereas most researchers, in comparative studies, try to explore the influence of a text or philosopher on a specific text, we intend to show parallels between the underlying usages of the terms *différance* and defamiliarization in two kinds of poetry having entirely different cultures. The parallels are explored through analyses, but the question of manifestation remains in the realm of speculation because cross-pollination of thoughts can never be proven conclusively.

## 1. DISCUSSION

Derrida insists that the great dream and delusion of metaphysics is that meaning is a matter of reference to some transcendental signified – to some intuitively grasped and immediate presentation of extra linguistic reality. Meaning is not present outside words and language, and inside objects, thoughts, mind, ideas, or mental images; rather it is a function of the system of signs, in the language itself. Sign is viewed as a structure whose structurality has always offered a fixed position which limits its freedom, and is the disruption of presence. The presence of an element is always a signifying and substitutive reference inscribed in a system of differences and the movement at a chain. Freeplay is always an interplay of absence and presence. The deferment which implies the constant postponement of the present, allows the finality to be inconceivable. In this connection, Derrida claims that:

Speech is a form of writing, where the speaker's meanings and intentions are always deferred. Therefore, speech is studied as a form of writing, and dissemination, where meaning is continually being reinscribed and reinterpreted in different contexts (1982, p. 49).

Considering the above hypothesis, Keats's various literary vocations simultaneously reveal many examples of *différance* and defamiliarization, beginning with his *Ode to a Nightingale*. As Keats hears the nightingale's song in the darkness, he remembers how on many occasions in his life he has wished for death that would bring a release from the burden of existence. More than ever before, he now feels a desire to die, though he likes to die a painless death:

Darkling I listen; and, for many a time  
I have been half in love with easeful Death,  
Call'd him soft names in many a mused rhyme,  
To take into the air my quiet breath;  
Now more than ever seems it rich to die  
To cease upon the midnight with no pain  
While thou art pouring forth thy soul abroad  
In such an ecstasy!  
Still wouldst thou sing, and I have ears in vain  
To thy high requiem become a sod (pp. 51-55).

Here, in the second line, death is personified, and Keats synecdochically implores death, to take into the air

his quiet breath, this implies the hasty appearance of the death. In the next line, the oxymoron 'rich to die' points to a kind of dying that is ultimately led into a newer life. Similarly in the line, In such ecstasy! /Still wouldst thou sing and I have ears in vain, Keats associates his own death, without naming it – apparently this unusual pairing defamiliarizes the issue of death. He actually constructs a synecdochic pattern that is 'I have ears in vain', since ears stand for one's soul. Here, a kind of uniqueness can be traced between the issue of death being shown by Keats in the forgoing discussion and the one presented in the following lines taken from Sipihrī's *The Water's Footsteps*, where he says:

Life flies as big as death...Death dwells in the pleasant climate of mind. Death speaks of dawn in the nature of village night. Death goes into the mouth with a bunch of grapes. Death sings in the larynx of red throat. Death is responsible for the beauty of butterflies' wings (pp. 345-350).

This is one of the most dramatic and pictorial poems ever written by Sohrab Sipihrī. The death embodiment, in this poem, apparently implies metamorphose or the newer life. When Sipihrī says, life flies as big as death ..., he shows 'life' as a bird, possessing wings; the bird is also an implicit metaphor, because Sipihrī does not declare directly that 'life is death', he associates life with a flying thing, and in this way delays it's concept in the reader's mind. In another line, emphasizing the vital question of death and life, Sipihrī defamiliarizes them by saying, our hands would search something, if death did not exist.... In some other parts, he invites the reader not to follow the habitual or traditional ideas, we should not be afraid of death, it is not the end of pigeon, implying that death accompanies life again, shedding more light on this issue, Shamisa declares "Sipihrī chooses a pigeon, since it flies, and is elegant, so it is a living death" (2007, p. 220). Contemplating on this notion, Northrop Frye says "the unity of life and death is everlasting" (Frye, 1963, p.68); this idea being used by Keats and Sipihrī raises a question in our mind: why have they personified death? Most probably, the answer to this question can be equated with Frye's ideas. Since death is a part of life, Sipihrī collates death in the living creatures, the death is not an inverted cricket. Death is flowing in the mind of locust tree..., here, he personifies the locust tree whose mind is overwhelmed with death. In the same poem Sipihrī says death inhabits in the good weather of reflection, in spite of the people's disgusting ideas about death, here a paradox reveals that death lives in good weather. Personifying the idea of death, Sipihrī says, death speaks with the essence of village night about mourning, paradoxically, much against people's ideas about the correlation of death and darkness, it turns out to convey brightness and light, here once again, Sipihrī defamiliarizes the common concept about death in order to create the new perception and to challenge the reader's mind taking on both meanings

simultaneously and foregrounds the term *différance*. In the subsequent line, death is tasted with the bunch of grape in the mouth, the poet becomes synaesthetic, as it is impossible for the death to be tasted in the mouth; here he associates the sweet taste of death with the grape, providing ambiguity. It is worth pointing out here that the poet uses *gapes*, in order to associate the senseless mood resulting from wine and death. Therefore, he conveys the dual meanings of the pain and sweetness of death, and this is how they are defamiliarized to foreground *différance*. Similarly, in the next two lines, death sings in the larynx of red throat, the poet ambiguously uses dichotomy, since most people believe that the idea of death is ugly. On the contrary, and in a paradoxical bend, death collates with joy, like the lungs of pleasure abound with the death oxygen. It seems that these lines are pregnant with the union of oppositions and dualistic concepts, and the credit goes to Keats as he calls death, soft names in many a mused rhyme, and being, half in love with an easeful Death. However, both of the poets humanize death, they describe it like a placid and beautiful thing, much in contrast with common belief, hence they have actually defamiliarized the previous concept of death and created a rethinking of a new different perception. In fact, the prime process of rethinking postpones the reader to get the new concept, and that foregrounds *différance*. However, the idea and the question of the cyclic changes of human life and death appear in Sipihrī's *The Water's Footsteps* where the poet says:

Do not fear death;  
Death is not the end of pigeon;  
Death is flowing in the mind of canary;  
Death is responsible for the beauty of garden (pp. 345-349).

Taking into consideration De Saussure's concept of differing, the idea of death is something, that is, not like life, and that something which is not life, in fact, can be any other thing. This difference is one of the two forces of every sign around our intellectual surroundings. The other force of the sign is its power of deferment that is the capacity to postpone. Here, death is viewed as a structure whose structurality has always offered a fixed position which limits its freedom and that is a disruption of presence. The presence of life is always a signifying and substitutive reference inscribed in a system of differences and movement at a chain where the free play is always an interplay of absence – with this justification in mind, death becomes an ingredient of life.

In another sense, a poem which is created artistically makes a perception that is impeded and the greatest possible effect is produced through the slowness of its perception. As a result of this lingering, the object is perceived not in its extension in space, but in its continuity; consequently, this poetic language results in giving satisfaction. This lingering is the focal element of *différance* originated in the poet's new and precisely unbiased perception. Justifying the foregoing assumption,

one can aptly exemplify it in the following lines by Sipihrī:

I do not know;  
Why some people say; Horse is a noble animal,  
Pigeon is beautiful  
Why does nobody keep a vulture in cage?  
The flower of clover is not as degrading as the red tulips.  
The eyes should be washed; we should observe in the other way  
(pp. 12-30).

This is Sipihrī's observation, and his perception of an object -- that are important means to make one hesitate about one's observation and linger to find a new perception, in fact he defamiliarizes the old perception. In another poem, Sipihrī considers death as an ingredient of life taking on its both meanings simultaneously and foregrounds the term *différance*:

Do not say, night is a bad thing;  
Do not say, night cannot tolerate the insight of garden;  
We should know, if no worm exists; life would lose something;  
If death did not exist; our hands would search something (pp. 25-28).

The next parallelism can be traced and extrapolated between Sipihrī's *Simple Colour* and Keats's *Ode To Autumn*. Here is Sipihrī's vocations:

Sky, bluer,  
Water, bluer.  
I'm on the veranda, Ra'na is near the bond.  
Ra'na is washing clothes.  
Leaves are falling.  
It is a forlorn season, my mother said in the morning:  
Life is an apple, said I, it should be bitten by its peel....  
It's full sunshine.  
The starlings came.  
Ladanums appeared recently.  
While I crack a pomegranate says aside:  
I wish the seeds of these people's hearts were visible.  
The pomegranate juice spurts into my eyes; I become tearful.  
My mother laughs.  
Ra'na does too (pp. 1-14).

Here, in this scene, autumn is shown by various pictorial images, like 'the starlings' and 'Ladanums', these flowers usually bloom in the autumn, additionally, the poet is eating the special fruit of autumn, 'pomegranate', all these images are the defamiliarized pictures of autumn. In actuality, Sipihrī invites the reader to the laps of the autumn by the pictorial scene-making and natural objects, and in a Derridaian way, he illustrates a multicolored picture of autumn in the poem for a clever reader to discover.

In some other parts of the poem, Sipihrī depicts life to be, an apple, which should be bitten with its peel, he evokes defamiliarization through the combination of bitterness, and sweetness in life. Metaphorically, Sipihrī imagines 'life' as 'an apple' and reveals its suffering and enjoyment; the good taste of life is embodied in the sweet flash of the apple, and its suffering is found in the bitterness of the peel. Additionally, here, defamiliarization indicates the capacity to live with binary oppositions, not

to act or to identify the moods and modes of sufferings of the others, or one's own, though it is the way of translating into more easily apprehended tongue. The line, I wish the seeds of these people's hearts were visible, is pregnant with strangeness and meanings which further foregrounds both defamiliarization and *différance*. What is made clear from this sentence is Siphri's longing for people to be honest, like the shining seeds in 'the pomegranate' which are so clear and visible. The next line, pomegranate juice spurts into my eyes, alludes to Siphri's dramatic interest – and tends to put the reader in the scene.

While Siphri alludes to autumn by natural objects, Keats describes it as a harvester, he personifies a concept, and he asks the reader actually to visualize the literal term in the human form. He opens his poem, *Ode to Autumn* in:

Season of mists and mellow fruitfulness,  
Close bosom- friend of the maturing sun;  
Conspiring with him how to load and bless  
With fruit the vines that round the thatch- eyes run;  
To bend with apples the mossed cottage-trees,  
And fill all fruit with ripeness to the core;  
To swell the gourd, and plump the hazel shells  
With a sweet kernel; to set budding more,  
And still more, next flowers for the bees,  
Until they think warm days will never cease,  
For summer has o'er-brimmed their clammy cells (pp. 3-11).

Much against the people's beliefs about the grieving nature of autumn, Keats violates this transcendental signified and describes it as a pleasant season, so he nullifies the common beliefs of autumn. Keats's poem is characterized by complete objectivity. The poet keeps himself absolutely out of the picture, nor does he expresses any emotion whether of joy or melancholy. He gives the objects of feeling, not the feeling itself; and this is the snow white concern in defamiliarizing the different entities and emotions. Though the reader is brought face to face with nature in all its grandeurs of tint and form, yet *To Autumn* is a lyric of Keats's objective and unbiased sense of creativity.

Autumn is described as the season during which there is a lot of mists in the air and during which fruits come to maturity. In the line, close bosom-friend of maturing sun, Keats personifies the 'sun and autumn' as two collaborators who work together to bring about the ripening of fruits. In other words, the season of autumn helps the sun in bringing the fruits to maturity. In the subsequent line, conspiring with him how to load and bless, Keats provides a dualistic concept by the word 'conspiracy', whose aim is not evil or wicked. On the contrary, it has been reasonably wrought as the gateway to the mystic realm of nature (the season and the sun). Keats has introduced and suggested the change as the law of nature. Commenting on this, Wheelwright states, "Seasons are archetypes; there is a mystical and ambiguous submersion into cyclical time, a kind of immortality to the mysterious rhythm of Nature's eternal cycle, particularly

the cycle of the seasons" (Wheelwright, 1962: 114).

In the next line, with fruit the vines that round the thatch-eyes run, Keats provides the tactile images; this is a picture of the vines becoming loaded with grapes. The vines run round through the edges of thatched roofs. It is the sun which brings the grapes to maturity. Autumn cooperates with the sun in this process, here, again, the collaborative fortification of the natural objects and their association to the season is a way of defamiliarizing an invisible scene to be discovered by the readers. Henceforth, this sense dominates in the next lines, to bend with apples the mossed cottage-trees, here, the branches of the apple trees are bowed nearly to the ground under the weight of apples. The apple-trees growing in the cottage-gardens are covered with the moss and are weighed down with fruit; this quite strangely implies a sense of respect towards humanity. In the next line, Keats in collaboration with Siphri's pomegranate uses a special vegetable in autumn called 'gourd', as he says:

To swell the gourd, and plump the hazel shells  
With a sweet kernel; to set budding more,  
And still more, next flowers for the bees,  
Until they think warm days will never cease (pp. 7-11).

The hazel nuts are filled with a sweet kernel. Certain flowers also bloom in autumn. The bees suck the sweetness of these flowers in order to make honey. To the bees, the autumn flowers represent summer; however, the reader is not totally familiar and ignorant of that. Here, again, in spite of the fact that Keats's natural objects represent autumn and the man's weakness of understanding, he never mentions autumn and human directly in this ode, he has actually defamiliarized things and concepts in a different mood, manner and meanings. In the other parts of *Ode to Autumn*, Keats personifies autumn as a woman, performing different tasks associates with that season. It opens as Keats apostrophizes autumn by asking her, who hath not seen thee oft amid thy store? Autumn may often be seen in the fields in the midst of her treasures of corn which has been harvested. However, Keats doesn't wait for an answer, and says further, sometimes whoever seeks abroad may find/ thee sitting careless on a granary floor. Devoid of natural objects, Keats, here in order to make a humanized picture, implores his readers to substitute their sense and sensibility by a dramatic one - so, again applying strangeness and multiplicity of meanings. It is true since autumn is seen as a woman who performs various tasks implying different concepts. In the other parts of the poem, Keats entreats that, if anyone wants to see autumn, he may go into the fields, and there he will see the women engaging in the winnowing operations while the breeze ruffles their locks of hair. Autumn may be seen as a reaper who in the course of her work is so overcome by the sleep inducing smell of poppies that she falls asleep, with the result that the next row of corn remains un-reaped. Autumn may be seen in the figure of a woman who is crushing the ripe apples in the wooden



press to obtain their juice from which cider is to be made. This woman sits by the cider - press and watches patiently the apple juice flowing out of the press, drop by drop. Here we might observe that, autumn has been given a concrete personality, different guises, corresponding to the different occupations of the autumn that indirectly represents humanity, and this is not familiar and different to the readers with layers of meanings.

In the next line, then in a wailful choir the small gnats mourn, Keats dramatically humanizes the 'gnats' by their 'wailful mourn'; since the poem abounds with movement, the appearance of dramatic term has the effect of drawing one's attention to the devices performed by the pensive gnats. On the other hand, it is important to note why, in spite of the pleasant environment of the poem, are the tiny gnats willful? Ironically, here, Keats reminds the reader that all these are not everlasting, since autumn is followed by winter. In addition to the melancholic music of the gnats, Keats speaks about the overflowing bleating of full-grown lambs from the hills. All these dualistic tendencies of the poem in its form and concept make the reader to brood and at the same time enjoy its everlasting charm. The poem ends by 'the red-breast whistling from a garden-croft; and gathering swallows twittering in the skies; here again a parallelism can be highlighted between Keats' 'the red-breast' and Sipihrī's bird, in his poem *The Water's Footsteps*, where Sipihrī says that, death sings in the larynx of red-throat. These phrases illustrate their mutual genius in their rare gift of defamiliarizing the ordinary objects of nature and the world around them. Maintaining the same tendency of subject and style Sipihrī in *A Pending Message* says:

I will dedicate a pair of earrings to a beautiful leprous woman:  
I will tear cloud:  
I will tie both eyes and sun; heart and love,  
Both shadow and water; branches and wind.  
I will dedicate a Paine to every crow,  
I will tell a snake: How much a frog is bombastic!  
I will eat light;  
And will like..... (pp. 17-24).

Here Sipihrī, in order to tarry the reader's perception, adds those perceptions which are not normally acceptable. This kind of dichotomy tends to privilege deferral, and hence the meaning is continually being reinterpreted in different contexts – this may consequently raise a set of questions in the reader's mind that contains, if not all, the following: How Sipihrī dedicates a pair of earrings to a beautiful leprous woman? How a leprous woman can be considered as beautiful? How he ties both eyes and sun; since eyes are opacious to the sun? What is this kind of concatenating such images? These and other similar questions will make reader hesitate; as a result of this lingering, the object is perceived not in its space extension, but in its continuity and dualism, which is the function of *différance*.

In other respect, something of this deferral of presence

is suggested in Sipihrī's *A Pending Message*. In it, there is a sense that the non-being and being are one, that the thought, though non-existent has the force of a 'thing', and simultaneously nothing. This implies that there is something which is determined only by its reappearance and repetition. It returns not to be repeated, but to show its existence. The poem speaks is aware, so to speak, of the undecidable question of being and non-being: it deconstructs itself by forestalling any movement towards a definite hierarchy of the term (*différance*) all these are present in Keats's *Endymion* and Sipihrī's *Always*. In a psychoanalytic turn, and with special reference to Jung's Anima, the two poets indirectly describe their Animas in these poems. Anima is an archetype or myth which is originated in the collective unconscious. The archetype of Anima is spiritual, everlasting, immortal, strange and human psyche has special proclivity for desiring all the centers of longed immortality since the time of Plato. Grounded in that, poets like Keats and Sipihrī are in quest of immortality; therefore they describe their wishes for immortality in the forms of spiritual quest, and celestial female; all these spring from a sense of difference, not sameness; from defamiliar and not familiar. In Keats's *Endymion*, the female figure (Keats's Anima) appears in the dreamlike shape of a goddess maiden, and for Sipihrī, she is the 'primitive nymph of speech'. In reality, both Keats and Sipihrī produced these allegoric female figures in order to let their Animas appear indirectly; and in the same way ambiguous and different to the readers. Keats has demonstrated this literary fact in the following lines taken from his *Endymion*, as he says:

Sinks adown a solitary glen,  
Where there was never sound of mortal men,  
Now, if this earthly love has power to make  
Men's being mortal, immortal; to shake  
Ambition from their memories, and brim  
Seems all this poor endeavor after fame,  
To one, who keeps within his steadfast aim  
A love immortal, an immortal too (pp. 841-849).

By this kind of self destruction or loss of personal identity, and through his imaginative identification with a beloved person outside himself, Keats escapes from the known and present limits and self-centered condition of ordinary experience, to achieve a 'fellowship with essence'. It seems neither of them, Keats or Sipihrī, does mention Anima directly in their poems, however, through the dramatization of the scenes they create a rather estrangement and multiplicity in the form and concept of their poetic vocations. In this sense, Wardburg suggests,

The goddess visits Endymion in sleep, and when he awakes he resolves to seek her through the world. After numerous confusing adventures he meets an Indian maiden who is sad and home sick, lamenting a lost love. He is sorry for her, and because of this, he falls in love with her, and for a time he forgets his goddess. This seems an infidelity, but it is not really so, for in the end Diana and the Indian maiden turn out to be the same. That is to say, ideal beauty can only be achieved by love

and sympathy for the beauty immanent in human life. Endymion succeeds in his quest, but only by apparently compromising his love for a goddess by his love for a mortal (Wardburg, 1963: 142).

Indeed, the poet sets up and seeks to solve the basic opposition between the inevitably of the mortal pleasures in this life and the conceived possibility of immortal delight. Thus, it can be said that Endymion's wanderings become the quest of the poetic soul for communion with the ideal, and his agonized vacillation between the maiden and goddess, and the final change of one into the other are taken to indicate the seeming conflict and ultimate harmony of the actual beauties of this world with the ideal beauty.

In another similar occasion, Siphri in *Always* encounters the celestial figure; this nymph inspires all Siphri's poetic vocations. Hosseini explains that "this nymph or celestial figure is immortal, leading the poet to the everlasting truth" (Hosseini, 2006: 231). It is plausible here to say that, both Siphri's *Always* and Keats's *Endymion* turned out to be dramatic, which ultimately lent a sense of dualistic estrangement to the poems. Indeed, these dramatic descriptions are inscribed in an absolutely defamiliar way to foreground a sense of Derridian différance, in a way to associate the poet's quest for ultimate harmony of the actual beauties of this world with ideal beauty. The poets are in their pursuit of ideal beauty, in order to be immortal, because immortality is one of the human's longing.

In other cases, Keats puts lyric poetry into the mouth of the supposed Indian maiden, as she tells her story. The pensive Indian maiden who laments for the lost love, is personified with tender invocation to sorrow, then conjure up the image of a deserted maiden. Keats says:

Come then, Sorrow!  
Sweetest Sorrow!  
Like an own babe I nurse thee on my breast:  
I thought to leave thee,  
And deceive thee,  
But now of all the word I love thee best (pp. 881-886).

By defamiliarizing the subject, Keats personifies sorrow, and uses the oxymoron 'sweetest sorrow' in order to mix the two different senses. Indeed both the poets endeavor to extend the resources of the language, and to make them adequate to the range and freshness of their imagery.

Adding to the above justifications, Derrida says "For there is always a logic of the supplement inscribed in any pretense toward clear conceptual identity. There is always something which escapes and subverts the logic of binary opposition" (Derrida, 1987: 123). The paradox is that, the metaphysical reduction of the sign needs the opposition it is reducing. However, the opposition is a part of the system, along with the reduction.

Considering the above hypothesis, Keats's various

literary vocations reveal many examples of différance, like his touchstone *Ode to a Nightingale* whose essential locus is the contradiction between the immortality of the nightingale (as symbolized by its song) with the mortality of human beings. It also contrasts the happiness and joy of the bird with the suffering, sorrows and afflictions of the human world, as Keats says that, youth, beauty and love are all short lived, and he goes on saying that:

Thou wert not born for death, immortal bird!  
No hungry generations tread thee down:  
Here, where men sit and hear each other groan;  
Where palsy shakes a few, sad, last gray hairs,  
Where youth grows pale and specter-thin, and dies (pp. 24-28).

It is quiet significant, as noted by Mayhead that, All such statements embodying apparent contradictions seem to arise from the fundamental duality of world of senses and passions on the one hand (human's world) and the world of imagination or contemplation on the other, which leads us to the quality of transience and essential immortality (Mayhead, 1967: 681).

There are other lines, in the same poem by Keats, that are structured by an underlying dualism – for instance the line "now more than ever seems it rich to die" (61, 26-27) contains oxymoron, and différance; the phrase 'rich to die' which points to the gain resulting from the loss, that is, a kind of dying into a newer life. Many antinomies are in play around this tension, that is, between life and death; however, they are summed up in the poem's final question 'do I wake or sleep?' revealing the Derridian union of the opposites, and Shklovsky's defamiliarization. Similarly, Keats's *Ode on a Grecian Urn* foregrounds the artistic duality, as Keats says,

What leaf-fringed legend haunts about thy shape  
Of deities or mortals, or of both,  
In Tempe or the dales of Arcady?  
What men or gods are these? What maidens loth?  
What mad pursuit? What struggle to escape?  
What pipes and tumbrels? What wild ecstasy? (pp. 5-10).

All these lines illustrate the beautiful pictures of the urn, the pictures of turbulent passion, and convey the pulsating life depicted on it. Then the urn appeals to the poet not merely because of its permanence or long age, but due to the life that it suggests; it is a life of passion and ecstatic music. Here again he draws upon the dualistic ambivalence between the permanence of urn and the life of passion carved on it. And Keats's goal is to uncover the immortality of art and its timelessness, though he continues to toy with its concept, but he neither asserts nor implies that lasting permanence is superior to transient reality. There are many other lines of the same poem that foregrounds Derrida's différance, as Keats says:

Heard melodies are sweet, but those unheard  
Are sweeter; therefore, ye soft pipes, play on;  
Not to the sensual ear, but, more endearing,  
Pipe to the spirit ditties of no tone:  
Fair youth, beneath the trees, thou canst not leave  
Thy song, nor ever can those trees be bare;

Bold lover, never, never canst thou kiss,  
Though winning near the goal-yet, do not grieve;  
She cannot fade, though hast not thy bliss,  
For ever wilt thou love and she be fair! (pp. 10-24).

These lines may consequently raise a set of basic questions in the reader's mind that contains the following: how can an unheard music be sweet? How an unperformed music be heard? How the happy boughs do not shed their leaves? How the scenes on the urn can remain young forever? Why the bold lover can never kiss his mistress? Why the beloved can never kiss the lover? Why does the lover win near goal? All these plus many other possible questions create the different perceptions in the reader's minds, and this is one of the forming elements of the term, *différance*, however, the other element of the *différance* traps the lover to postpone the kissing of his mistress.

---

## CONCLUSION

For the mirage of traditional interpretation, which vainly undertakes to determine what an author means, Derrida proposes the alternative with which we deliver ourselves over to a free participation in the infinite and free play of signification opens out by the signs in a text. This further shows a world-view of the free and unceasing play of language which inescapably implicates the entire metaphysics of presence this view replaces because of defamiliarization. The term, defamiliarization provides a background to create the new different conception and perception, this difference makes readers brood upon the new conception. The process of thinking postpones the reader to get the new perception, and this is a pleasurable challenging exercise of human soul. This article has reasonably demonstrated the manifestation of these hypotheses in Keats's and Sipihrī's poems. Both the poets have aptly incorporated, in most of their poems, the technique of shifting worldly ideas to the readers by challenging their thoughts through estrangement and dualism—and this is where the modern and postmodern pleasure of reading literature lies. They feel assured that they should write from the mere yearning and fondness they have for the objective beauties of the world. They

may not represent their own subjective voices, somehow they express the unheard voice of the other characters in whose souls they dwell. Through their poetic vocations they somehow coin their impersonality, and through an active imagination as their highest faculty they could make themselves empty in order to receive the outside world rather than the inside world. In this way they could, selflessly and simultaneously, sympathize and empathize with other creatures. In their poems, they tend to glean and dramatize the worldly pictures in a strange and ambiguous way, and this aptly foregrounds both defamiliarization and *différance*. However, we hope we have said enough so that we may suggest, in termination, that both Keats's and Sipihrī's vocations are indeed a celebration and manifestation of seemingly strange and the infinite possibilities of interpretation when employing Derridian's *différance* and its cousin sister that is Shklovsky's defamiliarization.

---

## REFERENCES

- Blackburn, S. (2005). *The Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Crawford, L. (2008). Victor Shklovskij: Difference in Defamiliarization. *Journal of Comparative Literature*, 3(36), 209-219.
- Derrida, J. (1987). *Psyche: Invention de l'autre*. Paris: Chicago.
- Frye, N. (1963). *The Archetype of Literature (Fables of Identity)*. London: Harcourt Press.
- Heidegger, M. (1973). *The End of Philosophy* (J. Stambaugh, Trans.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hosseini, S. (2006). *The Flowers of Prayer, the Poems and Criticism on Sohrab Sipihrī's Poems*. Tehran: Niloofar Press.
- Mayhead, R. (1967). *John Keats*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Sipihrī, S. (1974). *Eight Volumes*. Tehran: Tahoori.
- Shklovsky, V. (1917). *Art as Technique. A Collection of Essays*. Leipzig: Meiner.
- Wardburg, A. (1963). *John Keats's: the Making of a Poet*. London: Secker and Warburg.
- Wheelwright, J. (1962). *Metaphor and Reality*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.