

RHYTHMICAL IMPULSE: NOTES AND COMMENTARIES

Whereas the aesthetic and theoretical categories of Russian formalism and Prague structuralism (e.g. poetic language, function, actualization, concretization) have been for years subject to critical study and have given rise to further theories, the less general concepts and hypotheses of Slavic poetics have seldom been considered. Their confrontation with contemporary theory may undoubtedly reveal numerous stimuli for further study.

A prerequisite for such a confrontation is textual and heuristic study devoted to the analysis, mutual comparison and conceptual coordination of various works, as well as to the exploration of genetic relations, internal contradictions and unifying factors of theoretical systems. A tangle of theses and copious terms - especially in Russian formalism - cannot be unraveled without such unrewarding work.¹

The present study attempts to fulfill, at least partially, the obligation the author feels to result from such circumstances. It contains reflections on the category of rhythmical impulse and the phenomena related to it. Rhythmical impulse was chosen as the author considers it to be the pivot point of the formalist and structuralist understanding of verse. This concept refers to a certain action of a student and - mutatis mutandis - a recipient in general, against the rhythmical structure of the text, which - in the approach marked by this category - cannot be conceived of as a mere set of sensual phenomena, but is integrated both into the immaterial structures of general literary consciousness and into the totality of the poem.

The study aims at the confrontation of some opinions of Russian formalist critics with the ideas of Jan Mukařovský, whose conception of rhythmical impulse provides a starting point for our analysis.

1. Rhythmical impulse and the category of "set" ("Einstellung")

In the introduction to the theoretical synthesis of the history of Czech modern verse (1934), having characterized the metre as the norm creating a kind of background for our reception of verse

rhythm, Mukařovský writes:

In this connection, the phenomenon called by the Russian verse theoreticians "metrical impulse" ought to be mentioned. This concept is very close to that of metrical norm and may even be called its energetic conception. The metrical impulse means that the context perceived and evaluated as verse is approached with an expectation that after a specifically organized unit (verse line), another unit of similar structure will follow. This expectation, appearing repeatedly after every line, sustains the whole poem.

For Mukařovský, as we can see, the essence of metrical impulse does not only consist of the presence of organized sensual stimuli in the units (lines), but in the approach of the subject to the context. This, however, does not mean just another formulation of the generally accepted notion that the constitution of rhythm from the outer sense stimuli is possible only on the basis of the integrating participation of subjective consciousness: in such case, the full set of corresponding stimuli still remains a necessary condition of the perception of rhythm. The case, pointed out by Mukařovský, is different: "Only after the metrical impulse starts operating, are we apt to consider an utterance as verse. The regularity of internal organization plays then just a secondary role." (ibid.) Consequently, an artefact is completed by an active perceiving subject; this has been taken into account even at the time of its creation. The expectation may even not be met, without weakening the activity of metrical impulse.

Such a conception is characteristic of formalist and structuralist approaches towards any system participating in artistic creation. Here, the functional determination of a component is more important than its definition on the basis of its substance. The category of rhythmical impulse then appears as a specific form of the general category of "set" ("Einstellung", or Husserl's "Intention") which had a key role in the noetic foundation of phonology (Holenstein 1975).

In Mukařovský's case, the inspiration by the ideas of Russian formalists is evident both from direct quotations and from the comparison with the works (e.g. 1925) he wrote before his encounter with formalism. Apart from the quoted work by Tomaševskij, he was influenced by Juriĭ Tynjanov's views (1924, pp. 53 and 54) about the minimum conditions of rhythm: "factors (of rhythm) may be given not as a system, but as signs of a system", and by similar ideas.

Tynjanov uses the term metrical impulse for a kind of residue to which the metre is reduced in free verse: "a tendency to metre, an equivalent of metre". Mukařovský uses it far more broadly, but he also characteristically directs his attention to the problems of "vers libre" (for further treatment of this topic see chapter 3).

The idea of the subject, who is able to derive a general rhythmical "set" of a text from the signs of a system and can complete (in its direction) a fragmentary ensemble of sensual signals of a rhythmical pattern, contains, however, further problems, which have not been sufficiently formulated by formalists and early structuralists. Such an operation may be performed only by the individuals who are at an historically determinate stage of rhythmical sensitivity; the prerequisite for attaining such a stage is a general development of rhythmical norm in the consciousness of a specific collective (free verse is possible only from a certain stage of literary development). In the course of the ontogeny of rhythmical consciousness, the individual memory stores the results of this development. This enables an adequate understanding even of complex rhythmical patterns. The approach to text via rhythmical impulse does not then depend on a voluntary decision of a single person. It may, for instance, even be influenced by the fact that the text is presented in a special sphere of communication: its rhythmical tendency may even be indicated by its appearance in the volume of a familiar poetry series or estimated from its recitation at a usual place and time by a familiar performer etc. The advertisement text written in free verse is difficult to imagine, for the unspecialized communicative situation demands fuller rendering of rhythm for the sake of its mere identification. The graphic form of the text, i.e. its being written in lines leaving some space on the right-hand side of a page, has its place between the intra- and extratextual signals of rhythm.

Jakobson (1923, p. 17), however, speaks about the category of "set" ("ustanovka") in a different sense: not as a "rhythmical set", but, on the contrary, as a "set impressed" on the utterance and on recipient's experience "by the rhythm": a bearing on speech time, which may be considered a means of relieving the speech of its automatism. Both the realization and the nonrealization of rhythmical impulse in the linguistic material may, according to Jakobson's, cause the deformation of speech and its disautomatization. The for-

mer case (the realization) is characterized as follows:

..if a syllable in strong position is even objectively more stressed in comparison with a syllable in weak position, then - in rhythmical speech - the former syllable will be stronger and the latter weaker, their difference being inevitably augmented.

The latter case, the non-realization of metre in the actual distribution of rhythmproducing elements, includes two alternatives: either the absence of a stressed syllable in the strong position or the presence of stress in metrically weak position. Consequently, here the deformation no longer pertains to speech, but to the expected distribution itself. This conception of the disautomatization of rhythm effects is influenced by the great emphasis the early Russian formalism had put on the category of "ostranenie" ("making strange", i.e. consciously thickening language within the system of individual work to heighten perception). Speaking about disautomatization even in the case of the realization of rhythmical impulse, we should assume a process of continuous direct confrontation of rhythmically organized speech with the absence of rhythm in other types of speech. More correct, however, seems to be such a solution, according to which the application of metrical norm (which, indeed, compared to prose, indicated the markedness of verse utterance as a whole) is accompanied by the growing expectation that the norm will be realized. The fulfillment of this expectation (Jakobson's first instance) leads to speech automatization. Only in this context, may the cases of non-realization be interpreted as disautomatization, here connected merely with the breaking of metre. Moreover, the distinction of rhythmical constants and tendencies, introduced later (e.g. 1930) also by Jakobson, must be considered: the non-realization of metrical constant (the presence of stress in metrically weak position) apparently produces a far more intense disautomatization effect than the lack of fulfillment of a mere tendency (the absence of stress on the ictus, which in Slavic verse is a current phenomenon within the limits of the norm). And it was Jakobson's book on Czech verse that for the Czech theory had opened the way towards the exact delimitation of the above differences.

2. Rhythmical impulse and psychology of time perception

At the time Jakobson produced his book (1923), the term of rhythmical impulse had not yet been defined (Jakobson spoke about

the inertia of rhythm etc.). In this work, however, all the substantial content of this term is already present. It especially stresses the moment of expectation, which, after all, is required in terms of the above view of rhythm as the means of disautomatization. In this respect, Jakobson refers to the book entitled *Psychologie der Zeitauffassung* (1913) by the Austrian psychologist Vittorio Benussi, which had thus achieved a popularity hardly expected by its author: it was quoted even by widely used literary theory manuals (Wellek-Warren 1949) as the source of the idea of the specific time of verse utterance as "the expectation time" ("Erwartungszeit"). The significance of Benussi's study for linguistics was also pointed out by the annotation of Ginneken's bibliography in the *Indogermanisches Jahrbuch* (1916; see Jakobson 1923, p. 17), but it is concerned neither with the verse nor with the general problems of the rhythm. Based on a large number of statistically processed experiment results, it provides an interpretation of psychic processes, which may influence subjective perception and qualitative evaluation of the length of time periods between the sensual stimuli, especially simple sound signals. One of the factors influencing the subjective shortening or lengthening of the space of time between these impulses is, according to Benussi, also the length of expectation time, i.e. the space between the moment when the attention of the experiment subject was drawn - by means of the word "jetzt" - to the beginning of the experiment, and the first limit signal (see also Benussi 1908). The experiment subject then actually, in Jakobson's words, "expects a specific signal after a certain period of time"; this expectation, instead of arising from his experience with the periodicity of forthcoming impulses, is rather due to his previous acquaintance with the course of the experiment. "Erwartungszeit", in Benussi's theory, is purely a technical concept, only in Jakobson's work has it become a means of rhythm specification, though obviously after a substantial revision of its content.

According to Benussi's intention, the perception of rhythm should have been analysed in a special study (see 1913, p. 422). In the work quoted by Jakobson there are only various remarks on this subject, pointing out, for instance, that segmentation is more important for the rhythm than stress (e.g. p. 111; in Jakobson 1923, quoted on p.30). In other cases, Benussi tends to consider rhythm

to be a factor distracting the subject's attention from the time periods between the stimuli and drawing it to the "Gestalt" of higher order and hence to the "present time" ("Gegenwartszeit") closely connected with this phenomenon.² As his investigation was focused on the time intervals, Benussi strove to limit the impact of rhythmical phenomena on his test persons to a minimum. His conception of rhythm as a phenomenon turning the attention from time to "Gestalt" is quoted by Mukařovský (1943, p. 170) more adequately with respect to the content of Benussi's study.

The relation of structuralism and formalism to "Gestaltpsychologie" is a problem relevant for both schools which has lately again become the subject of theoretical considerations (Holenstein 1975) and discussion (Schmid 1977, Jankovič 1982).

It might have been just Benussi's book that, at the outset of the Prague school, happened to mediate some awareness of nascent ideas of the gestalt psychology.³ From its representatives Benussi quotes Koffka (his studies on rhythm) and also the common predecessor, von Ehrenfels. Benussi himself, whose preceding book had dealt with the problems of gestalt qualities ("Gestaltqualitäten") in special fields, did not however belong to the group of Karl Stumpf's students, who later conceived these qualities to be the central problem of psychology (Müller-Freienfels 1937). He was the disciple of Brentano's follower Meinong. Of course the stimuli of different schools did penetrate, the contacts between analogous trends in different fields could be indirect, and misunderstanding had also played some role.

3. Rhythmical impulse and metrical impulse

In the quotation at the beginning of this article, Mukařovský refers to Tomaševskij. Even though his rendering of Tomaševskij's views is hardly exact (for an explanation of the difference between the metre and the rhythmical impulse see below), he is right when he refers to him. Tomaševskij was the most innovating and profound rhythmical impulse theoretician among Russian formalists.

In his early works on Puškin's iambic verse (1917, 1919) the genesis of the formal category of rhythmical impulse can be followed step by step. According to his own words, the purport of the study on the iambic tetrametre in *Evgenij Onegin* was to char-

acterize "the rhythmical habit" of the poet (p. 131); in the analysis of pentametre he speaks about "rhythmical inertia"; "scheme of expected accentuation". The inertia develops in the recipient as a result of his perceiving a long series of lines. In the poet's case it is defined as "rhythmical task in the creative process" ("zadanie", p. 142). Consequently, Tomaševskij links rhythmical impulse to the individual character of rhythm in a specific text or in a whole work of a poet. He is concerned with an individual (Puškin's) selection from various possibilities of the realization of metrical norm. In Russian, as well as in other Slavic verse, possibilities of such selection may be found, especially in the realization of strong positions; as their accentuation is a mere tendency, different combinations of stressed and unstressed ictuses may arise without breaking the metre. Of course, this phenomenon had not escaped the notice of the predecessors of the formalists, e.g. of Andrej Belyj (1910), but Tomaševskij was the first to find an approach to its objective treatment, having turned from accent configurations and their combinations (hardly recognizable just because of their plentitude) to the statistical investigation of ictus realization. This was a landmark in the rhythm study: a level has been found, on which the rhythmical contour of the verse ceases to be treated as a sequence of segments and may be derived from the whole of the text. The entire process of the constitution of rhythmical impulse may then appear as follows: in the course of perception the reader integrates individual groupings of stressed and unstressed syllables into a unified rhythmical experience, on the background of which (and not on that of an abstract metrical pattern) he realizes and classifies every following elementary rhythmical unit. His rhythmical experience is at the same time being constantly remodelled in the course of his perception of new units up to the last verse-line.

In this sense Tomaševskij interpreted and generalized the results of his analyses in his following, more theoretical works (1922, 1923, 1925). The first of them contrasts the rhythmical impulse both with the "actual sound configurations, which are subordinated to it and generate it within the longer period of perception" of many verse lines (p. 25ff.) and with the metre which is a "canonical law". Compared to the metre, rhythmical impulse a) is less rigorous, as "it does not determine an absolute dominance of

of individual forms", but "only the preference for one kind of form to others" - i.e. the opposition of determinist and statistical types of norm (in this context, the necessity of the study of typical verse variants and derivations from these types is also emphasized); b) "it regulates not only the phenomena in the sphere of clear consciousness..., but also the whole complex of unclearly felt, but unquestionably aesthetically effective elements of poetic speech" (this is a new motive to which we shall return); c) it implies "rather than the preservation of traditional 'rules', the organization of the utterance according to the laws of speech rhythm".

Hence, the rhythmical impulse is constituted in the process of the recipient's abstraction from individual phenomena which had occurred in the syntagmatic axis, in which the phenomena here arising permanently participate. It is a typical intra-textual norm: unlike the metre it cannot exist before the text but arises from it, being permanently applied to it and completed by it.

Not all the features of rhythmical impulse, however, are connected with a single text or an author's individuality. Tomaševskij himself (1920, p. 265) speaks about poetic "manner" ("manera"), i.e. a historically formed poetic school or tradition. At least with respect to the distribution of accents, the extensive study of Tomaševskij's direct successor Taranovski (1953) has, besides the individual features, also shown the rhythmical tendencies common to the authors of several periods of literary history, which cannot be described in terms of the deterministically conceived metrical norm. Contemporary comparative study of Slavic verse (Pszczołowska and Kopczyńska 1978) has revealed even the elementary tendencies operating in verse systems in several literatures, investigating - mainly in Jakobson's line - which verse features may result from the interaction between the metrical norm and systemic qualities of a language as well as statistical characteristics of speech, and which of them are products of individual creativity.

Supraindividual aspects of rhythmical impulse may be held for such rhythm factors that are not generated only a posteriori in (a poet's or recipient's) dealing with an individual text. They may be said to arise already in the ontogeny of rhythmical sensitivity and the recipient (the poet) approaches the text with an a priori expectation of their existence. In spite of this they are

not part of a metrical norm and the departure from them is therefore not felt to be the violation of the norm. (As an example we may mention the generally very low frequency of accents on the last strong position in Czech verse-lines with oxytonic closure, which is due to initial position of the Czech stress in the word as well as to the low frequency of accentuated monosyllables. Even in this situation, a poet's individuality may become manifest, namely to the extent to which the actual rhythm of a poem succumbs to, or rebels against this general determination by means of violating the current speech usage.)

Mukařovský, especially in his synthetic study of the Czech verse (1934), also makes frequent and successful use of Tomaševskij's statistics of stresses⁴, both for the characteristics of an individual and generation style. Thus the picture of Czech verse has become much more vivid. In some cases, Mukařovský's results are disputable, chiefly if such statistics have to aid in determining the metrical principle controlling some text of indistinct rhythmical patterns (as e.g. the poem *Zdhořovo lože* by Karel Jaromír Erben). In such events, the statistical description of stresses in individual positions of a verse-line appears to be over-mechanical. The investigation of rhythmical impulse by means of stress statistics may be reliable only after the metrical norm has been identified; only on its basis are we able to determine which features could have been the matter of free choice where the metre had left undetermined spaces, and which are relevant for the realization of an actual rhythmical contour. In verse text different from the classical syllabic-tonic pattern, a statistical approach is to be applied to other phenomena than the number of accents in certain positions.

This mingling of rhythmical impulse research with the attempts to determine hidden metre again recalls the already mentioned shift of the meaning of Tomaševskij's ideas in Mukařovský's definition of the impulse which controls the verse text. Referring to Tomaševskij, Mukařovský speaks - in contrast to Tomaševskij's *rhythmical impulse* - about *metrical impulse*. If we remember Tomaševskij's minute distinction between metre and rhythm, this shift appears rather dubious. Among Mukařovský's precursors, Žirmunskij (1925) used to speak about metrical impulse, or rhythmical impulse reduced to the metre (in his theory, rhythmi-

cal impulse thus becomes a mere synonym of the metre, p. 67). For Žirmunskij, the impulse (without an attribute) is equal to the metre, which is viewed from the perspective of the poet or verse reader (on the part of the recipient, the impulse is paralleled by the "inertia"). The impulse supersedes all linguistic material, so that all the strong positions appear to be "essentially occupied by stress" (p. 71). Obviously, Mukařovský has nothing to do with this virtually academic conception, as he had welcomed - with the idea of the existence of unstressed ictuses revealed to him by Jakobson - the possibility of studying the verse in its variety.⁵

In the passage discussed Mukařovský proceeds in the identification of metre and rhythm to the extent that he describes the metrical impulse as an "energetic conception" of metrical norm. This rather unclear term may express the active nature of the perception in his theory: the expectation is not understood as a passive attitude but as a way of managing, evaluating and transforming the sounds of speech.

In the following text Mukařovský uses the terms "rhythmical impulse" and "metrical impulse" rather promiscuously. The latter, for instance, occurs even in the passages dealing with forms which lack metre altogether, such as the free verse. Here, the influence of Tynjanov's usage (see below) may be traced. For Tynjanov, metrical impulse was a relict, the minimum condition of rhythm functioning in free verse. In Mukařovský's work, both the terms vanish at the moment when he ceases to consider the elementary condition of verse as such (which he defines as a specific, autonomous verse intonation, independent of the syntax) and turns to the investigation of rhythmical pattern given by the stress and ictus distribution (that is the same situation when Tomaševskij works with the term most systematically). This does not mean that Mukařovský would share Tynjanov's view of rhythmical impulse as a phenomenon limited to forms with minimum organization; its explicit definition and its specification prove that, in the rhythmical (metrical) impulse, he sees an essential feature of any verse rhythm. In spite of this we may say that in Mukařovský's analyses of classical regular verse, the category of rhythmical impulse is virtually forgotten. In lieu of this, terms connected with the idea of "materialization" appear: rhythmical motion of a certain text is

being explained as a materialization of an abstract metrical pattern. Nor does this notion, obviously, imply a mechanical nature of the process, which, on the contrary, is characterized by the emphasis on the free creativity which prompts the poet to depart from the norm in individual rhythmical variations. The dynamic process of materialization results, according to Mukařovský, in the "living reality of the verse" (p. 23), which is incomprehensible in terms of academic metre theories superimposing fictitious processes of its absolute realization (Král's theory of subsidiary accents, 1923), but, on the other hand, has been made accessible by the theoretical discovery of whose light the differences between the norm and materialization have become distinctly contrasted (i.e. Jakobson's proof of the irrelevance of subsidiary stresses as non-phonological concepts, 1923).

Such terminological differences may thus reflect a certain nuance in the conception of the thing as such: while Tomaševskij is especially concerned with the summing up of individual rhythmical configurations into a united rhythmical expression, Mukařovský concerns himself with the permanent tension between the metre and rhythm, i.e. the norm and its realization (which, however, is not totally predestined by it) and their mutual penetration.

The same difference in the attitudes of both critics may also be recognized in Tomaševskij's exact distinction between the metre and rhythm and, on the other hand, in Mukařovský's interchangeable use of both terms (which, apart from the compatibility of the attributes "rhythmical" and "metrical", may be noticed in many other contexts). Since the attempts of the symbolists, and more distinctly in connection with the poetic practice of futurism, the problems of metre-rhythm relations in Russian verse had become increasingly acute, the formalist theory of verse striving at their conceptualization. In Czech literature, however, where the revolution against normative metrics had been successfully accomplished before the turn of the century and where, on the contrary, it was necessary to protect the verse theory from vague and irrationalist notions of rhythm (Sedláček 1929), the above problems were not thought to have such importance. The above mentioned study of Mukařovský conceives the metrical norm as "a pattern of various kinds of verse creating a background which reflects the actual movement of rhythm in its multiple departures from the norm". Before his encounter

with formalist theory, in the defence of his early dissertation (1923), Mukařovský however had held rhythm to simply be identical with metre. He believed it to consist of the regular repetition which breaks a chronological sequence into segments, so that in regular verse-lines just the elements standardized by means of metre are repeated (Mukařovský 1924). In accordance with this view, he thought the individual differences between various sound patterns of verse to exist outside the sphere of rhythm.

4. Communication model and the birth of phonological theory of verse

If the rhythmical impulse is conceived of as the expectation that after a segment organized in a certain way another analogously structured segment will follow, and if the theory speaks of the integration of experience from whole sequences of verse-lines as well as of the general notion of the rhythmical character of a poem (Tomaševskij 1923, p. 65), the critic accepts recipient's perspective. The opposite attitude, based on poet's perspective, has found its expression in the idea of "rhythmical task" ("zadanie"): Tomaševskij explains it as a poet's feeling of the rhythmical contour of a yet uncreated text which is more or less faithfully embodied in words in the course of the creation (ibid.).

Since his early works on Puškin's iambic verse (1919, p. 142) Tomaševskij strove to find a balance between both (producer's and receiver's) perspective. The attempt to reflect both attitudes has also been noted in Žirmunskij's theory. For Žirmunskij, the poet's attitude is connected with the "impulse", while the recipient's state is described as the "inertia".

Tomaševskij, however, does not leave anything unsolved in this respect. In his synthetic manual of verse theory (1923) he produces a whole "model" (in nowadays terminology) of rhythmical communication:

Creating the design of a poem, the poet has stored in his mind a metrical scheme, which he feels to be a kind of rhythmical-melodical contour, a framework into which words are 'inserted'. During its realization in words, rhythmical impulse finds an expression in the actual rhythm of individual lines. Before its being embodied in words, the abstract, formal metrical scheme goes through a stage of a sensed 'general' shaping in the rhythmical-intonational 'tune'. The listener perceives the rhythm in the inverted order. First he is confronted with the actual verse-line rhythm. Then (...) due to his perception of a sequence of verse-lines, he grasps the

rhythmical impulse and, having got used to it, he evaluates the individual rhythmical configurations ("chody") in comparison with the general tune of the poem. At still higher degree of abstraction of the rhythmical pattern he grasps the metrical scheme which he had uncovered by scanning. (p. 83)

The last lines of this passage are controversial, for according to experience, we cannot deem the recipient's identification of the metrical scheme to happen solely at the utmost end of the communicative process. Tomaševskij could have been prompted by a tendency - which, by the way, is current even in contemporary communication models - to form an ideal symmetrical scheme. But, as a rule, the metrical scheme in question already appears in recipient's mind upon his first contact with the verse text, at least in case the metre is current in the given culture. The metre, as it had been constituted in the recipient's consciousness as result of his preceding experience with the verse text and - possibly - of some elementary (school) instruction about literary norms, may be said to form - from the very beginning of text perception - a background, on which the recipient's idea about the individual treatment of metre and about the rhythmical impulse of the poem is developed. In the opposite case the recipient would not have got even a foundation for his distinguishing between the metre and rhythmical impulse of the poem. Tomaševskij seems after all to consider also this instance: in an earlier study (1919, p. 142) he described the case of a listener being completely unacquainted with the rhythm of the poem as a "Robinson-like situation", which may occur quite rarely. This comparison to the "natural" condition in the sense of Adam Smith's elementary economic schemes, and the awareness of their expectation nature shows that Tomaševskij did not neglect the supraindividual cultural traditions and norms as the agents of literary communication. And perhaps it need not be emphasized that these traditions may operate even in such cases, when poet and/or reader are not able to label them by means of specialized terms and when they do not consciously analyze the relation between the metre and rhythmical impulse.

The theory describing the function of rhythm in both phases of poetic communication is opposed by the unilateral linking of rhythm with its creative phase - with the speaker's or poet's attitude. Such reasoning was taken to excess by another formalist critic, Osip Brik, who maintained that "rhythmical impulse, rhythmical

tendency of verse movement may exist in consciousness even before its materialization" (1920, p. 170).⁶ Brik's theory is based on the poet's experience, as it was, for instance, described in a later essay by Majakovskij (1926, p. 97)⁷ about the origination of his poem at Sergej Esenin's death. From Brik's familiarity with the creative experience of his futurist friends a number of temporary and programmatic features of his study on rhythm and syntax may be explained. The significance of this study, however, consists in something other than a theoretically consistent interpretation of the general categories of rhythm with which it works. Yet it is interesting that in spite of his insight into the poetic practice, Brik does not postulate the question of the individual character of rhythmical impulse - at least in case of traditional verse - and uses general terms, such as iambic, trochaic impulse etc. Nor is he interested in the process of the origination of rhythmical impulse outside the poet's consciousness. This his theory cannot give a clear answer, from which source some person other than the poet can get hints how to understand the rhythm of a text. In Brik's theory, the reader cannot obtain from the actual distribution of stressed and unstressed syllables the information about rhythm which could be considered decisive, for - according to Brik - "this one as well as the other strength of a syllable cannot be its natural virtue, but are just results of its processing ("obra-botka") by rhythmical impulse" (p. 184). This is a willful generalization of the idea, whose less radical formulation has been accepted also in the first part of his study - namely, that the presence of rhythmical set is more important for the production of rhythm than the regular pattern objectively present in the text. Brik, however, carries his judgement further, for he does not answer the question whether the rhythmical set must find some affirmation in the sound qualities independent of rhythmical impulse, which can be gathered from the text.

The opposition between the poet's and recipient's attitudes is - in the methodology of verse theory - reflected in the conflict between the articulatory and acoustic views of rhythm. Before formalism, the acoustic view, claimed also by Sievers' school, used to prevail. In his polemics with it, Tynjanov (1924, p. 43) argued that a theory oriented only to the reduction of the scope to the sound impression cannot lead to an understanding of all the pheno-

mena essential for verse rhythm, dealing at the same time with other irrelevant data. (This latter objection will be discussed in the account of other formalist controversies with the "Ohrenphilologie"). The investigation limited to the data of hearing a priori excludes the equivalents of rhythmical segments, both the "omitted" passages distinguished graphically (i.e. the sections which, though they cannot be realized in speech, are considered to be abstract structural wholes, having their respective metre, sound patterns etc.) and the texts, imperfectly structured with respect to the traditional norm, yet sufficient as the indices of rhythmical set (free verse). These are the reasons, why Tynjanov (see especially his note 38), unconsciously accepting Brik's idea of the absolute nature of speaker's attitude, puts - in contrast to the acoustic approach - an excessive emphasis on the "motoric-energetic" (i.e. essentially articulatory) principle. Doing so he does not intend to exclude the recipient, rather to establish even him as a kind of creator or a participant in the creation of verse rhythm. Tynjanov's one-sided preference for the motoric-energetic principle might have been caused by the attraction this concept had for him as the supporter of the dynamic, "energetic" view of artistic form whose individual factors are in a state of constant conflict and tension. It should not, however, be necessarily linked with his unparalleled ideas about the semantic modifications of utterance, produced by its rhythmical organization, for Tynjanov's semantics of verse can find a sufficient foundation in the mere fact that the utterance is, in any possible basis, being segmented into rhythmical units. It is certain explicitly stated consequences of Tynjanov's "energetic" conception of rhythm that raise doubts - especially his attempt at reducing the importance of time in his notion of rhythm experience, replacing it by the idea of energy exertion. (As we have seen, Jakobson, in contrast to Tynjanov, took the explanation of the foregrounding produced by the rhythm in a more intense experience of its temporality.) The concept of energy, however, does not denote anything specific in poetry; it may as well be applied for instance to the pictorial (spatial) arts, while poetry, similarly to music, is inconceivable without the idea of time as the most general equivalent of the sound nature of the latter art varieties.

In his impassioned discourse in favour of the motoric conception of rhythm, Tynjanov resorts several times to Tomaševskij's study (1922). His references, however, are not fully justified, which can be seen in their confrontation with Tomaševskij's effort to create a balance between production and reception perspectives (see above). This may also be proved by Tomaševskij's review of Tynjanov's *Problema slokotvornogo jazyka* (Tomaševskij 1924), pointed out aptly by Rudy (1976). Tomaševskij agrees to the criticism of a purely acoustic approach as being incapable of grasping rhythm equivalents, yet adding that the same objection holds for the motoric-energetic (articulatory) interpretation. To suppose the existence of some potential energy in the equivalents may be justified as little as to suppose potential sound in them.

Apparently, we must abandon both the physical and the physiological treatment of verse rhythm and view these acoustic and motoric-energetic moments only as results of some other relations, results which come into effects in certain definite conditions (of traditional verse, for instance)."

What Tomaševskij meant by the phrase "some other relations" had already been explained in his methodological essay (1922, p. 30f.)

Communicativity is present in the process of speech itself. The speech is what connects the speaker with the listener. The speaker not only utters words, but also listens to them. The listener is not limited to the passive state of listening: the speech is perceived because the listener masters it; therefore the sounds entering his ear are for him signals, in which he distinguishes the speech he himself could utter. The most passive listening is always accompanied by the active element - an inward speech. The act of speech thus indistinguishably includes both the constituting elements of perception and those of speech creation. And only characteristics of speech are essential, which are present both in its pronunciation and in its perception. ... Therefore the range of the phenomena covering the concept of poetic utterance does not - on the other hand - coincide with isolated uttering or isolated listening, and is - on the other hand - markedly narrower than the set of all constituents of pronunciation, or the total image of subjective perception.

This passage, too, is aimed against the one-sided acoustic approach, but, instead of merely shifting the emphasis to the opposite principle, it proceeds to reveal deeper assumptions of both methods. The consistent application of the communication perspectives leads Tomaševskij to the conclusion that in studying the sound pattern of the poem we must concentrate on the constituents common to both participants. Consequently, he implicitly assumes the presence of a generally accepted system which operates as a criterion for dis-

tinguishing all the relevant components of the sound level of the poem. The decision as to which component is part of the system is made according to its ability to differentiate within its limits. This, by the way, also makes it possible to involve potential (neither acoustically nor articulatorily materialized) speech phenomena in the process of rhythm.

Thus we can see that even Tomaševskij has contributed at the very early stage of the formalist school development to the elucidation of the use of phonology for the theory of verse. In this sense his achievement has, after many years, been evaluated by Jakobson (1959), who even much earlier (1923, p. 22; see also 1936a, p. 148) preferred phonological metrics to the kinetic⁸ and acoustic ones.

The limitation to the exclusive position of the speaker or the receiver is - in terms of phonological metrics - transcended in the consciousness of the system common to both participants of communication. With respect to this it is not quite suitable to define, with Mukařovský, the rhythmical impulse as expectation, for the term pertains rather to the recipient. Nor can even the terminological pair "expectation - task ("zadanie")" express that, which is essential for both the attitudes (speaker's and recipient's) and common to them. To express it, the term "set", used at the beginning of this study, suggests itself again.

Its specification for the area of verse rhythm has been made possible to a considerable extent by Tynjanov's ideas about the function of the metre as a "progressive" factor, assigning the speaker the task to connect another equivalent segment to the sequence of forthcoming segments and evoking the recipient's expectation of such a segment (1924, p. 54). In developing Tomaševskij's conception of rhythmical impulse, Tynjanov describes its function as an anticipative metrical "preparation". This "preparation" imposes a metrical "solution": the ensuing segment is organized so that the expectation (or the task) might be fulfilled; at this moment the attraction turns backwards. This regressive component of the rhythmical impulse is no longer specific for the rhythm, as it always appears with our reverse and additional realization of the relation of equivalence between successive segments of the text (i.e. also in case of repeating euphonic sound patterns).

Another problem is that of the relationship of these ideas of Tynjanov to Husserl's analysis of the constitution of temporal objects and, especially, to the categories of protention and retention.⁹

5. Complex view of rhythmical impulse

Rhythmical impulse conceived as "the principle which unifies the instruments of sound organization" (Tomaševskij 1922, p. 25) became the means of identification of individual characteristics of a sound pattern typical of a text or of a poet's personality. This interest in the individual shows itself in formalist works aiming at the creation of systems and invites us to ask questions which have already seemed to be solved. If the individuality is to be discerned not only in the structure of the whole work as a sum of a large number of components, but already in a single component itself (in rhythm), it is necessary to treat such a unit as a complex structure. Should such a component be determined only by a few exactly defined and even mutually implied factors, the set of possible combinations of such factors would be too small to allow the projection of its individual realizations. The question about the individual character of the rhythmical impulse thus necessarily produces the effort in a theory aimed at the multiplication of factors participating in the creation of verse rhythm.

Such factors are by no means interconnected and harmonized in advance. Only the assumption of a relative autonomy of every factor may open the way to inner contradictions within the sound structure of text and thus reveal its individual dynamics. Tynjanov, who placed major stress on the conflict between work components, in spite of his disagreement with the "Ohrenphilologie" as a whole, quoted with delight Saran's passage about possible counteraction of different rhythm factors, illustrating it with a number of Russian examples (1924, p. 53 and 29n).

But the idea of rhythm as a complex phenomenon was not the actual core of Tynjanov's interest. It was rather the problems of mutual influences of rhythm and semantics that he concentrated on: a dynamic relation which the rhythm enters into as an already constituted unit, after all its factors have been integrated for the performance of their common function - to create the secondary division of the speech. Such function may even be performed by the

rhythm maintained exclusively by the organization of word stresses or even - in free verse - by its mere equivalent. Therefore, too, Tynjanov starts from the "minimum conditions" of rhythm, leaving its "maximum conditions" (that is the rhythm as a sum of different factors) to a specialized research of verse theory.

It was namely to this research, that Tomaševskij had made his decisive contribution, when he, in the quoted study, conceived the unified category of rhythm as also including - together with the regular distribution of word stresses - "the rhythm based on sentence intonation" and even "the harmonic rhythm", i.e. the configuration of speech sounds according to their qualitative characteristics (euphony). Thus for him the rhythmical impulse becomes "the principle of the unification of the instruments of sound organization" of various origin, as shown above. This synthesis does not represent a mere harmonization for Tomaševskij either. The intonation itself is a complex phenomenon having numerous links with word meanings, thematic and syntactic structure of text and with the style and genre of the whole of the utterance. Modes of intonation correspond even to diverse types of speech usage (in other functions than aesthetic), as in public speaking or private talk, as well as to individual types of poetic language (melic, declamatory and others). Thus, becoming more complex by inclusion of intonation, the rhythmical impulse may bear stylistic markers (in a broad sense of the word) which become components of a poem's semantic structure. The combination of these markers as well as their different relation to the accentual rhythm and euphony, give rhythmical impulse an individual (acoustic and stylistic) character. Similarly, "the type of author's language thinking" - as it was termed by Tomaševskij - enters this sphere and is projected into the varying relation between the constituents of rhythmical impulse, which thus gains a multiple connection to the poet's linguistic consciousness and, more widely, with his individuality. The selection of these means is further influenced by the means of text communication supposed typical (private reading, recitation, etc.). These influences cause one of the three components of rhythmical impulse (accentual rhythm, intonation, configurations of speech sounds) to become a dominant characteristic of the rhythm of a poem. This also forms a basis for a typology of rhythm.

These reflections of Tomaševskij have the character of a programme, many of whose theses - let us name just the one of dominance¹⁰ - require further elaboration. After a brief period of time (1923, p. 64) Tomaševskij himself revised his opinion that the rhythm components also include euphony: "It is evident that not all pronunciation components may be said to create verse rhythm. [...] Rhythm is given only by basic quantitative relations in verse pronunciation." These quantitative relations are then specified as accent and intonation. In spite of its general relation to rhythm, which forms a basic structure within which the sound configurations operate, euphony is perceived only regressively, it lacks the progressive "set" (in Tynjanov's terms, see above) inseparable from the rhythmical impulse.

6. Rhythmical impulse and "phonic line"

In the quoted passage, Tomaševskij also emphasizes the fact that the sound phenomena creating the rhythm must be generally obligatory. The sphere of rhythm does not include "particular pronunciation features, which change from one performer to another". It remains unclear, however, what elements of the intonation structure of the text (whose relation to rhythm has been generally confirmed) can fulfil the condition of general obligation and thus be accepted as rhythmical factors. This unanswered question leads to the core of the problem discussed in the last chapter.

Integrating the intonation among the factors of rhythm, Tomaševskij described the problems of its study in the following way:

In the verse of any poet, there is a specific intonation contour ("rasspev") independent of his style, which gets in one way or the other into relation with its metrical segmentation. The question of the position of sentence stresses in the verse line, of the relation of the syntactic and rhythmical boundaries and of speech tempo, if connected with rhythmical motion, determine the main content of this part of rhythmics.

This extensive programme, in which the intonation study becomes an essential contribution to the definition of the rhythmical individuality of a text, must necessarily have coped with the problem of the general obligatory nature of the investigated phenomena, of their invariability "from one performer to another". The same question remained unsolved in the attempts of another school of verse theory, whose aims had resembled Tomaševskij's programme

so strongly that it could not have escaped the notice of his contemporaries - in the research of verse melody practised by Eduard Sievers (1912). It is not accidental that Tynjanov mentioned Tomaševskij's aiming at a complex view of rhythm just at the beginning of his polemic debate with Sievers' school (Tynjanov 1924, p. 177). Having mentioned the enlargement of the category of rhythm at its achievement, Tynjanov simultaneously objects to its dealing with phenomena irrelevant to rhythm. (B. Ejchenbaum, the author of the monograph on the melodics of Russian verse, has welcomed Tomaševskij's achievement without any objection; see 1923, p. 164).

In the reception and later criticism of the opinions of Sievers and his school among the Russian formalists (cf. Erlich 1955, p. 187; Stempel 1972, p. XXXIVff.; Hansen-Löve 1978, pp. 105 and 312) we can encounter the most important and, even to the present day, stimulating problems of the work of this secluded circle of scholars, who gathered around its founder and often used less than serious methods (Ungeheuer 1964). These were especially the questions of the individual character of verse "melody" and of the methods of their study. With them, Sievers introduced something entirely new in verse theory, so far absorbed in the normative approach of the traditional metrics; this had greatly impressed Russian formalists, at least at the beginning of their development (B. Šklovskij 1917). Sievers, himself exceptionally sensitive to the tinges of human voice, derived his theory from the assumption that all these nuances are in their complexity predetermined by the poet and "inserted" into his work. Every line and every text were thus assumed to have the only correct intonation. The question of the linguistic basis of such intonation, however, was not considered at all. Apart from an inexplicit comment about the choice of words, Sievers did not analyze the supposed causal relations which he believed create a necessary link between the written form of the text and its realization in voice. Instead, he judged *ex eventu*: by means of experiments with performers he supposed to prove the coincidence between the majority of them in reciting the same text, and he dismissed all the varying realizations as mere inventions of the "Selbstleser" - individualists distorting the poem. It appears that the disciplined "Autorenleser" could realize the supposed author's intention to such a detail and in such a unity only because of their similar training or their ability to succumb

willingly to the idea of performance imposed on them by the experimenter. Subjectivity was also characteristic for the other proof of the necessary relation between the text and its performance, based on the assumption that any other realization than the one prescribed by the text may lead to breath insufficiency, articulatory and other troubles.

Under these circumstances Sievers' opponents (Heusler 1912) had not found any difficulties in proving that the phenomena he studied as qualities of a poem were in fact properties of a recitation performance unconditioned by the text. Russian formalists, however, have proceeded further in their criticism¹¹, for they managed to discern, in the basis of the argument about the subjectivity or objectivity of the method, an opposition in the studied object itself, namely the contrast between the phonological sound qualities which represent the general obligatory repertory of linguistic means shared by the poet, the performer, as well as by the recipient and the non-phonological variations produced anew and in the different process of creation, reception and performance of the poem, which do not influence poet's and recipient's "set". Jakobson's achievement, consisting especially in his analysis of the relations between the phonological systems of various languages and the systems of versification (1923), has already been made fairly known (Ruďy 1976). The questions of verse melody have been treated phonologically by Sergej Bernštejn (1921, 1927; see also Kovarskij 1928), whose approach was based on the pioneer works by L.V.Ščerba and Baudouin de Courtenay. Bernštejn also attempted to apply Christiansen's views of the relation between aesthetic object and artefact (Christiansen 1909) to the analysis of the interdependence of the poem and performance. He had eliminated all the non-phonological components of the sound level from the sphere of text data, acknowledging them only as results of the performer's free creativity.

Further research of sound components of language has shown the excessive strictness of such a distinction. It was apprehended by Mukařovský at the beginning of the thirties (1931, see also 1940). According to him even some non-phonological qualities may more or less be predetermined by the text. Apart from such phenomena as timbre and speech tempo, which either to some extent result from the thematic level of the text (e.g. alternation of tim-

bres in a dialogue), or are marked in the properties directly related to its realization (changes of tempo depending on the variable distance between language or rhythm boundaries), there are also some language system elements, which, though lacking their own phonological function, are evidently and obligatorily connected with other elements possessing it (Czech word stress; for a more detailed account see Červenka 1968, 1981b).

Bernštejn's radicalism became evident even in other fields of verse theory. Only the further development of phonology, especially in the work of Jakobson and of Prague school in general, has made the idea of phonological phenomena rather dubious, and mainly of the phoneme (the speech sound considered as a member of system, identical in all instances of its occurrence, irrespective of its pronunciation variants), as mere sets of abstract oppositions which may be realized on any possible substance (typical of Hjelmslav's school for instance). It was this notion that became idiosyncratic of Bernštejn's understanding of the phonological nature of a poem's components. Due to this idea he came to consider the work of art as a purely "extramaterial" phenomenon (in comparison to its recitation performance). The way in which not only spoken and written utterances, but also phonological system relations are realized, evidently depends on the sound character of the substance formed by the language. This has momentous consequences even for the status of a literary work as an artefakt (Červenka 1981a).

Eventually, Bernštejn had eliminated - due to the early stage of development of his discipline - some phenomena that are also, totally or partially, parts of the phonology and the whole language system. This became manifest in his criticism of Ejxenbaum's book on the melodics of Russian verse (Ejxenbaum 1922), in which Bernštejn treated even the intonation cadences connected with expressly systemic relations, e.g. the question-exclamation opposition - as non-phonological recitation aspects. (In Bernštejn's opinion, Ejxenbaum did not study the intonation of the "melodious" type of lyric poetry, but a mere syntactic organization of respective texts.) Though these cadences may be realized in various ways, the corresponding intonation patterns (which should not be confused with complex melodic structures in real pronunciation) are indisputably of a systemic character (Jakobson 1963).

Obviously, there can be no doubt that the application of pho-

nology in the study of the sound organization of the poem had an immense importance for its further development. Because of it the discipline could overcome its pre-scientific stage, characterized by the normative approach subjectivistically adapting language conditions to the demands of the utmost realization of the metre and abounding for poetic practice, or by the similarly subjectivistic confusion of the sound level of the poem with individual intuitive notions about its only correct realization.

The systemic nature of sentence intonation was stressed by Tomaševskij, when he - in his last major theoretical study written from the formalist standpoint (1925) - expressed his attitude to the debate on verse theory, which had already continued for some years. In this he had even used the results of Jakobson's application of phonology to solve the problems of prosody. "Semantic system of the sentence intonation, in no less extent than the system of word-differentiating elements, belongs to every single language." (p. 236). When he (possibly under Tynjanov's influence) separates the problem of the constitution of the whole of verse-line, subordinating to it the question of its inner organization, he links this process of constitution with sentence phonology, especially with intonation, while the inner verse-line organization is connected with the word phonology. Thus he approaches the thesis that a specific verse intonation is a basic factor of verse rhythm, though he still regards it as a kind of idealized sentence intonation. In this direction, Mukařovský had proceeded further (1933). Behind the general problem of verse intonation as such, Tomaševskij loses sight of the question of an individual melodic form, characteristic for a text (or single author's work). Having probably been acquainted with the unpublished works of Bernštejn, he comes to the conclusion that the textual indices of the obligatory realization of intonation qualities, which are more minute than the elementary signals of sentence structure, cannot be unambiguous, and that they may therefore provide greater interpretative freedom than the components of the phonological organization of a word (p. 240). Experimental research may study only the individual recitation performances; from them only the "aesthetically valid" intonation must be "picked out". The contrary procedure proceeding from syntax analysis (here Tomaševskij means Šjxenbaum's analysis of verse melody) also meets

with difficulties. "The reconstruction of the aesthetically relevant verse information may nevertheless be possible, though only due to the fact that the speech in the verse-line is built on it, so that it (the intonation) really exists." In a rather unclear formulation, Tomaševskij seems to have expressed that he was expecting some help from the study of metrical form of verses from the point of view of sentence structure. (p. 242) Consequently, he does not share Bernštejn's scepticism about the possibilities of an objective study of the sound level of the poem in its individual as well as obligatory nature; yet, he is at a loss as far as the methods of such a study are concerned. Today, we have not proceeded much further beyond this point.

Here, as far as we know, the effort of Russian formalists to produce an individual, complex characteristics of verse comes to an end. The first applications of phonology which have made an epoch in the solution of the problems of prosody, were a kind of ground clearance for the analysis of the sound form of verse. An end was put to confusing the obligatory voice of the work with subjective fancies, which, though not lacking the richness of inner discriminations, could not be proved in the text. In the following years, however, obstacles, rather than new stimuli, came to the fore. Only the development of phonology itself, especially in the research of the intonation signals of the suprasegmental structure of utterance and intonation nuances connected with its semantic and stylistic levels could have prepared the way for the solution of such an attractive problem.

This development has not been completed in the field of linguistics either. Theory of verse, however, has made only little use of its results.

The effort of some formalists to grasp the sound contour of verse-line in its fullness and individuality - obviously only if obligatorily imprinted on the text and representing a kind of norm for its performance - has been resumed in highly stimulating and independent studies of the early period of Prague structuralism. For Mukařovský's verse theory, the individuality of sound norm has become a central problem. He strove to solve this from its first published work (1923) through his pre-structuralist study which remains in manuscript, up to his university lectures in the thirties. One of his first structuralist studies (1929) discovers a new way of

determining the category of "the phonic line of verse". It is based on the achievement of the phonological criticism of Sievers' work and, simultaneously, attempts to demonstrate the possibility of the solution to its problems. Mukařovský proceeds far beyond the just mentioned general formulations of Tomaševskij, for he strives - by means of an experiment (whose subject, unlike Sievers' performers, is the text itself) - to discover objectively determinable factors of the text conditioning stress and sentence intonation. His chief methodological thesis is the structuralist idea of the complex interrelationship of the various components of the work. It is interesting that his research is focused on the same intonation components, which Tomaševskij wanted to become the subject of his study, namely sentence stress position, cadences and the relation of sentence and verse division.

Mukařovský returns to these problems in his comments in later stages of his scholarly development up to the forties. Yet he cannot arrive at the answer to one of the most intricate questions of modern verse theory either and is searching for the way. But the analysis of his achievement already appears to be beyond the scope of the present study. It is because Mukařovský did not consider the phonic line to be immediately connected with the rhythmical impulse, our present subject (yet we may distinguish such a connection quite easily). This aspect of Mukařovský's verse theory has been discussed in our separate study (1982); one of the aims of the present one had been to make it possible.

The category of rhythmical impulse is used even now in accordance with Mukařovský's original and less exacting definition. While it has ceased to determine the whole set of the sound qualities of verse, it remains in use as a term for the rhythmical contour resulting from the distribution of stressed and unstressed syllables and especially from the different degree of the relative frequency of accents on individual ictuses in concrete texts (see e.g. Červenka 1973). This dynamic intratextual norm, which sums up stress patterns in long sequences of verse-lines, is characteristic of the whole group of texts (poetic schools, traditions) as well as for particular poets. Its metamorphoses may be considered one of the most important indices of the historic development of verse rhythm. In this context the rhythmical impulse is analyzed in many works of Slavic verse scholars.

Notes

1. Basic - and nowadays already classic - study delineating theoretical problems within the whole body of Russian formalist thought was written by Erlich (1955), W.D.Stempel (1982) treated, in depth, the formalist theory of poetic language in the context of contemporary thought about this topic. A more detailed account on various problems of formalism (including verse theory), in a broad, developmental view revealing even the knowledge of some less accessible texts, was given by Hansen-Löve (1978). Rudy wrote an important monographic chapter (1976) from the history of formalist verse theory.
2. In relation to this view, Jakobson's unclear remark (1923, p. 19) "the possibility of disappointed expectation itself may intensify subjective perception of the phenomena called by German psychologists *Gegenwartigkeit*" can be said to convey the meaning that the possibility of a disappointed expectation created by the rhythmical pattern is connected with the act of setting the attention on the *Gestalt*.
3. Peter Steiner has drawn my attention to the Moscow seminar of Professor G.J.Čelpanov on the modern trends in Western psychology. Jakobson (1936b) recalls its atmosphere of fruitful discussions, for instance between "ardent psychologists and aggressive Husserlians" and stresses Čelpanov's aversion to Sečenov's biologism, Pavlov's reflexology and all the phenomena of mechanistic materialism in psychology. His brief obituary however contains no detailed information about gestalt psychology in Čelpanov's seminar.
4. It was already introduced into Czech theory of verse by Jakobson (1925).
5. On this occasion, the point should be made that Tomaševskij has nothing in common with Žirmunskij's thesis about the essentially stressed nature of ictuses, though some of his terminologically not very felicitous formulations about scanning, which should always be present in perceiving verse-lines (Tomaševskij 1922, p. 12; 1925, p. 254), have led some students (Hansen-Löve 1978, p. 307) to such an interpretation. Tomaševskij however does not have in mind the adaptation of the material to metrical norm, but the permanent presence of metrical principle in the recipient's consciousness, its outcome being the perception of difference between the scheme and the real sound of the line and not their neutralization. It can also be proved by Tomaševskij's reference to Jakobson's work, namely to the emphasis on the potential linguistic phenomena operating in the perception of verse utterance without the necessity of realization.
6. "Materialization" here does not mean reproduction of a poem by means of recitation, as it was interpreted by Hansen-Löve (1978, p. 306), but the realization of the rhythmical impulse given in advance, in the creation of poem's text.
7. See Schiller's similar confession quoted by Sievers (1912, p. 59) and also Mukařovský (1923, p.5) reproducing an analogous opinion of the Czech poet J.S.Machar.
8. Criticizing the kinetic theory of verse Jakobson obviously does

not have Tynjanov's views in mind (*Problema* had not been published at that time), but the more dated "physical" theories of Westphal's school.

9. Husserl's analysis was published after Tynjanov's book (Husserl 1928). Even in this case, Husserl's Russian disciple Gustav Špet might have been the mediator. In other relations, the proximity of Husserl's analysis to the analysis of the dynamics of literary context (i.e. in Mukařovský's model of the accumulation of meaning) was pointed out by P. and W. Steiner (1976).
10. It seems that the dominance of some of the given components in the rhythm pattern may only mean a shift and nuancing on the basis given by the hierarchy, which has once and for all placed in its centre a component inevitable for the sole existence of (verse) rhythm, namely the distribution of word accents on the traditional Russian verse, intonation in free verse etc.
11. The criticism of Sievers by Boris Ejkenbaum (1922, p. 321) had different motivation. For the prominent Russian formalist critic Sievers represents a philologist disinterested in the aesthetic aspect of the problem, i.e. in the artistic use of sound configurations. As it had been aptly shown by Žirmunskij (1922, p. 97f.), this judgement is a variance with the actual meaning of Sievers' argument: (Among the Russian formalists, Žirmunskij used to acknowledge Sievers' authority perhaps most persistently.)

R e f e r e n c e s

Works which appeared in print a considerable time since they had been presented to the narrower scholarly public are listed under the date of this first presentation.

- BELYJ, A.
1910 *Simvolizm*, M.
- BENUSSI, V.
1908 "Zur experimentellen Analyse des Zeitvergleiches II. Erwartungszeit und subjektive Zeitgröße", in: *Archiv für die gesamte Psychologie* 13, 71-139.
1913 *Psychologie der Zeitauffassung*, Heidelberg.
- BERNŠTEJN, S.
1921 "Stix i deklamacija", in: *Russkaja reč' (Nov. serija)*, L., 2, 9-41.
1927 "Estetičeskie predposylki teorii deklamicii", quoted after STEMPEL (ed.) 1972, 338-384.
- BRIK, O.
1920 "Ritm i sintaksis" (first printed 1928), quoted after STEMPEL (ed.) 1972, 162-220.
- CHRISTIANSEN B.
1909 *Philosophie der Kunst*, Berlin.
- ČERVENKA
1968 "Jiří Levý's Comparative Study of Verse", in: *PTL* 4 (1980), 587-599.

- M.ČERVENKA
 1973 "Ritmické impul's českého stíxa", in: JAKOBSON et. al. (eds.), *Slavic poetics. Essays in Honor of K. Taranovskí*, The Hague-Paris, 79-90.
- 1981a "The Literary Artifact", in: W. STEINER (ed.), *The Sign in Music and Literature*, Austin, 86-102.
- 1981b "Der versologische Band von Jakobson's Selected Writings. Bemerkungen eines Bohemisten", in: *Wiener Slavistischer Almanach* 7, 259-275.
- 1982 "'Foničeskaja linija' Mukaržovskogo i intonacionnyj analiz stíxa", in: *RL* 12, 227-266.
- ĚJXENBAUM, B.
 1922 "Melodika ruského liričeského stíxa", quoted after BAKOŠ (ed.), *Teória literatúry. Východ z "formálnej metódy"* vyd. Bratislava 1971, 315-331.
- 1923 "Anna Akmatova", quoted after ĚJXENBAUM, *Skice o prozie i poezji*, Warszawa 1973, 125-208.
- ERLICH, V.
 1955 *Russian Formalism. History - Doctrine*, s'Gravenhague.
- VAN GINNEKEN, J.
 1916 "Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft", in: *Indogermanisches Jahrbuch*, Jahrbuch 4, data No.124.
- HANSEN-LÖVE, A.
 1978 *Der russische Formalismus*, Wien.
- HEUSLER, A.
 1912 "E. Sievers und die Sprachmelodie", in: *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 33, 24, 1477.
- HOLENSTEIN, E.
 1975 *Roman Jakobsons phänomenologischer Strukturalismus*, Frankfurt a.M.
- HUSSERL, E.
 1893-1917 *Zur Phänomenologie des inneren Zeitbewusstseins* (ed. M. Heidegger), 1928.
- JAKOBSON, R.
 1923 *O češském stíxe preimúšestvenno v sopostavlení s ruskím*, Berlin.
- 1925 "Staročeské stíxotvorení složenými odnořymennými četverostiřijami", in: *Slavia* 3, 272-315.
- 1930 "O překládání veršů", quoted after JAKOBSON 1979, 131-4.
- 1936a "Metrika", quoted after JAKOBSON 1979, 147-159.
- 1936b "Památce G.J. Čelpanova", in: *Psychologie* 2, 41-43.
- 1959 "Boris Viktorovič Tomaševskij", quoted after: JAKOBSON 1979, 549-556.
- 1979 *Selected Writings, V. On Verse, Its Masters and Explorers*, The Hague.
- JANKOVIČ, M.
 1982 "Die Inhaltsfunktion der künstlerischen Form als offenes Problem", in: STEINER et al. (eds.), *The Structure of*

- the Literary Process*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, 243-284.
- KOVARSKIJ, N.
1928 "Melodika stixa", in: *Poëtika*, 4, 26-44.
- KRÁL, J.
1923 *O prozodii české I*, Praha.
- MAJAKOVSKIJ, V.V.
1926 "Kak delat' stixi", quoted after ŠKLOVSKIJ-MAJAKOVSKIJ, *Jak dělat prózu a verše*, Praha 1940, 81-120.
- MATEJKA, L. (ed.)
1976 *Sound, Sign and Meaning. Quinquagenary of the Prague Linguistic Circle*, Ann Arbor.
- MUKAŘOVSKÝ, J.
1923 *Přispěvek k estetice českého verše*, Praha.
1924 "Odpověď na recenzi dra J.V.Sedláka", in: *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 10, 312.
1925 "O volném verši českém", offprint from the journal: *Časopis Národního muzea*.
1928 "O motorickém dění v poezii" (in MS)
1929 "Souvislost fonické linie se slovosledem v českých verších", quoted after MUKAŘOVSKÝ 1948, 1, 186-207.
1931 "La phonologie et la poétique", in: *TCLP* 4, 278-288.
1933 "Intonace jako činitel básnického rytmu", quoted after: MUKAŘOVSKÝ 1948, 1, 170-185.
1934 "Obecné zásady a vývoj novočeského verše", quoted after MUKAŘOVSKÝ 1948, 2, 9-90.
1940 "O jazyce básnickém", quoted after MUKAŘOVSKÝ 1948, 1, 78-128.
1948 *Kapitoly z české poetiky*, 1-3, Praha.
- MÜLLER-FREIENFELS, R.
1937 *Psychologia přítomnosti*, Praha.
- PSZCZOŁOWSKA, L.-KOPCZYŃSKA, Z. (eds.)
1978 *Słowiańska metryka porównawcza*, Wrocław.
- RUDY, S.
1976 "Jakobson's Inquiry into Verse and the Emergence of Structural Poetics", in: MATEJKA (ed.) 1976, 477-520.
- SEDLÁK, J.V.
1929 *K problémům rytmu básnického*, Praha.
- SCHMID, W.
1977 *Der ästhetische Inhalt*, Utrecht.
- SIEVERS, E.
1912 *Rhythmisch-melodische Studien*, Heidelberg.
1924 "Ziele und Wege der Schallanalyse", in: *Festschrift Streitberg*, Heidelberg.
- STEINER, P. a W.
1976 "The Relational Axes of Poetic Language. Postscript", in: MUKAŘOVSKÝ, *On Poetic Language*, The Hague.

- STEMPEL, W.-D.
 1972 "Zur formalistischen Theorie der poetischen Sprache",
 in: STEMPEL (ed.) 1972, IX-LIII.
 ed. 1972 *Texte der russischen Formalisten*, 2, München.
- ŠKLOVSKIJ, Boris
 1917 "O ritmikomelodičeskich opytach prof. Siversa", in:
Sbornik po teoriji poetičeskogo jazyka 2.
- TARANOVSKI, K.
 1953 *Ruski dvodelni ritmovi*, 1-2, Beograd.
- TOMAŠEVSKIJ, B.
 1917 "Ritmika četyrexstopnogo jamba po nabljudenijam nad
 stixom Evgenija Onegina", first printed 1923, quoted
 after TOMAŠEVSKIJ 1929, 94-137.
 1919 "Pjatistopnyj jamb Puškina", first printed 1923, quo-
 ted after TOMAŠEVSKIJ 1929, 138-253.
 1920-1921 "Ritm prozy (po 'Pikovej Dame')", quoted after TOMA-
 ŠEVSKIJ 1929, 254-318.
 1922 "Problema stixotvornogo ritma", first printed 1923,
 quoted after TOMAŠEVSKIJ 1929, 3-36.
 1923 *Russkoe stixosloženie. Metrika*, Pg. .
 1925 "Stix i ritm. Metodologičeskie zamečanija", quoted
 after STEMPEL (ed.) 1972, 222-270.
 1929 *O stiche*, L.
- TYNJANOV, J.
 1924 *Problema stixotvornogo jazyka*, quoted after TYNJANOV,
Problema stixotvornogo jazyka. Stat'i, M. 1965.
- UNGEHEUER G.
 1964 "Die Schallanalyse von Sievers", in: *Zeitschrift für
 Mundartforschung*, 31, 97-124.
- WELLES, R. - WARREN, A.
 1949 *Theory of Literature*, New York.
- ŽIRMUNSKIJ, V.
 1922 "Melodika stixa", quoted after ŽIRMUNSKIJ, *Problémy
 poetiki*, Bratislava 1969.
 1925 *Vvedenie v metriku. Teorija stixa*, L.