

Contextualization and its Discontent

1 – A text perforce reflects the psychogenetical and sociogenetical context under which it is produced. The context determines what the textual whole is to accomplish through signification of its underlying object of desire. The direct emissaries of the object are disseminated in content (metalingual function). That is what content is. Form is there only supplementarily and dispensably to make the content inherently communicative (evocative poetic function).

2 – The text is proximally recontextualized to its original context of production if the content is deciphered in the process of reading in ways so as to signify the same object. If there is nothing outside the text, the original context is free from commitment to contextual proximity and paves the road to signification of slightly or strikingly different object by re-assigning significance to the constituents of the textual whole. Diachronism of the text as speech act is collapsed into a exploitable synchronism.—That per Russian formalism form and content are the same to a degree in which it is proclaimed that everything is form announces the death of the *original* signification and its underlying genesis.

3 – Reading the text is the process of its re-signification if that which is originally intended as content is exchanged in its capacity to signify the object of desire with that which originally presumed the supplementary communicative role. The exchange implicates a displaced object of desire. Various signs are drawn into the text communicatively (aesthetic content) and not based on their direct role in the signification (semiotic content). The upshot is surplusage of the signs in the text enabling re-signification: semiotic-aesthetic rebalancing.

4 – Because the text is destined to be an instrument of knowledge and power and deployable in speech acts, not under control of the original, its semiotic content is varied circumstantially—the constituent parts originally intended as form (*aesthetic* content) substitute the original content as the semiotic content.

5 – To produce a text is to make a decision, to pour authorial intention into a speech act, a temporal unfolding, targeting a critical audience. The text beholds varieties of horizon. The horizon delineates the audience it ever admits of incorporating into the merger because this much authority must be granted to its author for facing the instant of decision.

6 – The *proximal* critical audience is that with which the text attempts to merge horizons *immediately* for which it undergoes only *proximal* recontextualization. The signification is *immediately* directed towards its optimal proximal audience taking for granted the abilities of the audience to distinguish the form and to inculcate the content. This audience adumbrates the diachronism of speech act rather than synchronism of what it is trying to achieve terminally.

7 – The *distal* critical audience is that with which an acute merger of horizon is achieved—the text disseminates semiotic content (as itself originally inextricable fusion of aesthetic and semiotic contents) capable of being excavated during the merger *crucially* in ways to clinch *discursive dominance* across a historical abyss.

8 – If form is present content is bound to get eclipsed. The eclipse means there is an unfulfillable task of overcoming obstacles to decipher the ultimate content.—By utilizing forms they depict vastly different strands of reality tailored to circumstances, neither lying nor imitating a single strand of reality, poets obscure content and dodge criticisms of the referential aspect of the work.