Russian and Ukrainian "Voices" in David Guramishvili's Prosody

Tamar Lomidze, Igor Pilshchikov*

Abstract. The article examines the prosody of the eminent Georgian eighteenth-century poet David Guramishvili, whose work introduced an unprecedented diversity of meters into Georgian poetry. This diversity is partly explained by his use of what he called the "voices" (*khmebi*) of Russian and Ukrainian songs in several of his poems. Scholarly interpretations of this practice have diverged: some researchers have argued that Guramishvili directly borrowed the poetic meters of East Slavic songs, while others have maintained that the term *voice* should be understood primarily as denoting a tune rather than verbal prosody. Our comparative analysis demonstrates that in all such cases Guramishvili relied on the melodies of East Slavic songs and, in some instances, reproduced their metrical structures, but not their verbal rhythm. This feature of Guramishvili's verse is closely connected with the traditions of ancient Georgian hymnography and folksongs, whose dependence on melody presupposed the equalization and isochronism of heterometric lines in performance. Only a limited number of the rhythmic forms introduced by Guramishvili in imitation of Russian and Ukrainian sung poetry were subsequently reinterpreted as standard verse meters and incorporated into Georgian metrics as a system through their adoption by later poets.

Keywords: Guramishvili, Russian songs, Ukrainian songs, tune, verse meter, musical rhythm and verse rhythm

Introduction

David Guramishvili was an eminent Georgian poet of the eighteenth century. Born in 1705 in his family estate near Mtskheta, he spent his early years in Georgia. At the age of eighteen, he took part in the battle of Georgian troops against the Ottoman army. Around 1728, he was kidnapped by Lezgin raiders, but escaped captivity a few months later and made his way to Moscow, where

---

*   Authors' addresses: Tamar Lomidze, School of Arts and Sciences, Ilia State University, 45 Ilia Chavchavadze Ave, Tbilisi 0179, Georgia. Email: tamar_lomidze@iliauni.edu.ge; Igor Pilshchikov, University of California, Los Angeles, Department of Slavic, East European and Eurasian Languages and Cultures, 320 Kaplan Hall, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA, email: pilshch@tlu.ee.

he joined the retinue of King Vakhtang VI, who had taken refuge in Russia. After Vakhtang's death, Guramishvili accepted Russian citizenship. He was enlisted as a private in the Georgian hussar regiment and granted an estate near Myrhorod in Ukraine, in the village of Zubovka.

Guramishvili participated in military campaigns against the Ottoman Empire, Sweden, and Prussia. In 1758, during the Prussian campaign, he was seriously wounded, captured near Küstrin, and imprisoned in Magdeburg for about a year. Released in December 1759, he was sent back to Russia, where he retired from service owing to poor health and settled on his estate. Complex political circumstances prevented his return to Georgia. He died in 1792 and was buried in Myrhorod.

Guramishvili is the author of the extensive poetic work *Davitiani*, which comprises two narrative poems ("Woes of Georgia" and "Merry Summer", also known as "Katsvia the Shepherd") and a substantial corpus of religious and mystical poems. Its innovative versification, together with its thematic breadth and rich symbolic imagery, has long been a focus of scholarly discussion. The prevailing view holds that Guramishvili enriched Georgian poetry with new formal means and, in doing so, freed it from the pervasive influence of Shota Rustaveli, which, in a way, had come to constrain its development. The prominent nineteenth-century Georgian poet Akaki Tsereteli wrote in his article "A few words about *Changuri*":

> The first writer to emancipate himself from this form of bondage and pursue an independent course was David Guramishvili. Having acknowledged that "Rustaveli is a sea of wisdom – no one else can compare to him", he then turned away and began composing poems such as "Katsvia the Shepherd". (Tsʼereteli 1950: 87)

It is generally accepted that no Georgian poet of the eighteenth century introduced as many meters as Guramishvili in his *Davitiani*. Akaki Khintibidze estimates that Guramishvili "applied 45 meters and authored 87 verse forms" (Khintibidze 1990: 40). This formal abundance is partly explained by Guramishvili's recourse to what he termed the "voices" (ხმები) of Ukrainian or Russian songs (Lomidze 2024). Guramishvili himself identifies the "voice" (ხმა) in which each poem is composed: "The voice of the Russian song *Netu zlosti nado mnoju, umenʼshitʼ mne pechalʼ moju*"; "The voice of the Russian song *Chto za prichina, vsegda kruchina*"; "The song whose Russian voice is *Uletela zazulinʼko cheres dubinu*"; "David's second praise. The voice of the Russian

song *Ne dam pokoju, pojdu s toboju*"; "The *Reuli*,[1] whose Russian voice is *Polno, polno, ne prel'shchajsja*"; "The voice of the Russian song *Akh, skoliko tsvela vletakh molodykh*"; "Aria ... In Russian: *Akh, kak skushno*"; "The voice of the Russian song *Chuvstvju skorbi ljuti vsiakao minuti*"; "David's song Zubovka, whose Russian voice is *Kazak dusha pravdivaja*"; "In Russian, the voice of this song is called *Vesela vesna*".[2] Three of these songs are of East Ukrainian folkloric origin ("*Kozak dusha pravdyvaja*", "*Ne dam pokoju*", and "*Uletila zozulen'ka*"), while the remaining six belong to Russian "bookish" (literary) song culture. In keeping with eighteenth-century usage, Guramishvili did not distinguish between Russian and East Ukrainian ('Great Russian' and 'Little Russian' in the terminology of the period), subsuming East Slavic folklore under the label "Russian" (Chikovani 1963: 67–68).

Does the term "voice" designate a poetic meter or a melody, as in the Russian *golos* ('1. voice; 2. tune')? Some scholars have argued that Guramishvili borrowed the poetic meters of Russian and Ukrainian songs, interpreting "voice" as a category of versification (see, for example, Gatsereliya 1953: 45–46; Gorgadze 1930: 49; Mikadze 1958: 137; Silagadze 2013: 27). Others have contended that the term refers instead to musical rhythm and that Guramishvili modeled his poems on the melodies of Russian and Ukrainian songs. For example, Sargis Tsaishvili wrote:

> While the form, rhythm, and meter of Georgian folk poetry remained unchanged in Guramishvili's hymns, in this case [that is, when using Ukrainian and Russian "voices"] he was guided solely by the sound, the melody, creating [...] hymns of a religious character. [...] After such observations, one should not, of course, conclude that Guramishvili transcribed Russian [and] Ukrainian folklore materials literally. What drew the poet's attention were the Russian [and] Ukrainian songs – their melodies as performed by choirs or kobzars – rather than the lifeless written materials, in which folk sung poetry had lost its principal attribute: song, melody. (Tsaishvili 1966: 10)

The eminent Georgian poet and researcher Giorgi Leonidze likewise emphasized the melodious and musical nature of Guramishvili's poetry:

---

[1]   On *Reuli*, see Section 2 below.

[2]   The transcriptions of the songs' incipits correspond to their transcriptions with Georgian letters by Guramishvili.

> Guramishvili's poetry was grounded in music. His individual intonation is musical, and its melody is natural. Guramishvili himself sang his poems, and readers recited them in the same manner. That these poems were "singable" within the Georgian tradition is confirmed by Guramishvili's own notes, appended to some of the texts. According to these notes, some lines of his poems were to be repeated because they were intended to be sung. (Leonidze 1966: 511)

Folklorist Mikheil Chikovani also emphasized the musical character of Guramishvili's poetry:

> David Guramishvili takes sound from Russian [and] Ukrainian folklore and, based on this sound and melody, creates an original poetic work of his own. Guramishvili displays this attitude exclusively toward Russian and Ukrainian poetry, explicitly identifying the sources by noting: "The voice of this is Russian". (Chikovani 1955: 4)

Chikovani interprets the meaning of the term *voice* in Guramishvili's poetry:

> In our view, Guramishvili understood "voice" in a broad sense. For him, it denotes a musical sound, a melody, in accordance with which a song-poem acquires its verse meter. In this respect, David Guramishvili goes beyond the concept of "sound" articulated by Mamuka Baratashvili in his famous *Chashniki*.[3] When Guramishvili states that "the voice of [his poem] is Russian", he means that he studied musical folklore and drew from it melody, musical voice rather than verbal material. (1955: 5)

None of the interpretations of Guramishvili's poetry discussed above is supported by sufficiently rigorous argumentation, with the partial exception of Leonidze's observation that, according to Guramishvili's own remarks, the lines of certain poems were repeated "because they were intended to be sung". Therefore, it is necessary to clarify whether Guramishvili's works, at the moment of their composition, were based primarily on the versification meters of Russian and Ukrainian texts, or rather around musical rhythm.

Musical scores for most of the Russian and Ukrainian songs mentioned by Guramishvili have not come down to us, and it is therefore impossible to

---

[3]   *Chashniki* (*A Book of Learning Poetry*, 1731) is Mamuka Baratashvili's poetic treatise that represents the earliest attempt at a systematic study of Georgian verse. The work theorizes the relationship between form and content in poetic composition and examines meters and the structural principles of Georgian poetry.

determine with certainty whether the "voices" to which he refers correspond directly to the meters and rhythms of his poems. In some cases, the syllabic length of the cited "voices" coincides with the syllabic length of Guramishvili's corresponding lines; in others, it does not. It is also worth considering whether East Slavic and Georgian verse lines share comparable patterns of word stresses – either through identical types and numbers of feet in syllabotonic verse or through similar patterns of verbal rhythm in syllabic verse.

Although the binarism of rhythmical structures is generally recognized as a fundamental organizing principle of Georgian verse,[4] different versification systems (such as syllabic and syllabotonic) emerged in Georgian poetry at different stages of its historical development (Silagadze 1987: 50). In the poems Guramishvili composed in accordance with Russian and Ukrainian "voices", features of the syllabotonic versification system – and, consequently, of metrical feet – have been observed.

It is noteworthy that Georgian versification employs only three metrical feet: trochee, dactyl, and paeon II (Gatsereliya 1953: 151). If, in Guramishvili's poetry, the term *voice* were understood strictly as a metrical designation, then the poet would necessarily have selected East Slavic "voices" employing only these feet or their rhythmic equivalents, and the syllabic length of the Georgian imitations would be expected to match that of the Slavic originals. This condition, however, is met in only four of the ten cases analyzed below.

Let us begin with those texts for which the Ukrainian or Russian originals have been identified.

1.

The "voice" of "David's second praise" is "*Ne dam pokoju, pojdu s toboju*". Its incipit appears to form a (5+5)-syllable line with internal rhyme; however, the rhythmic structure of Guramishvili's poem is different:[5]

---

[4]   See, for example, Apolon Silagadze's *On the Principles of Versification Analysis* (1987) and other works by the same scholar.

[5]   Notation: ′ = strong (predominantly stressed); ∪ = weak (predominantly unstressed); × = anceps. Optional positions are bracketed (∪).

′ ∪ ′ ∪ ′ ∪ // ′ ∪ ′ ∪ ′ ∪
′ ∪ ∪ ′ ∪ ∪ // ′ ∪ ∪ ′ ∪ ∪
  ′ ∪ ∪   ′ ∪ ∪

აბრაჰამის ღმერთი, საბაოთი ერთი,
მოქმედი ყოველთა მკვდართა თუ ცხოველთა,
    ყოვლისა მპყრობელი.

Abrahamis ghmerti, // sabaoti erti,
Mokmedi q'ovelta // mk'vdarta tu tskhovelta,
    Q'ovlisa mp'q'robeli.

[The God of Abraham, Sabaoth,
Creator of all living and dead,
    All-Encompassing!]

The Georgian stanza consists of two rhymed 6+6-syllable lines with additional inner rhymes at the caesura and an unrhymed 6-syllable refrain. This structure reproduces that of the East Ukrainian original, which is attested, apart from manuscript sources, in Mikhail Chulkov's songbook (Speranskij 1909: 142; Khakhanov 1909: 99; Peretz 1900, 1: 305–306).[6] The Ukrainian song's stanza comprises two pairs of rhymed hexasyllables and an unrhymed hexasyllabic refrain. Only the opening line, possibly involving a melisma (♪‿♪), is penta-syllabic (cf. Kolessa 1906, LXXII: 83). Setting aside typographical errors, all other lines, including the second line quoted by Guramishvili as pentasyllabic (*pojdu s toboju*), are hexasyllabic in the remaining sources (*pojdu za toboju*):

Не дамъ покою,
Пойду за тобою.
Почто оставляешь,
Совѣсти немаешь,
Пріятель и друже.

Ахъ! какъ присягался,
Бога не боялся,
Что будешь мнѣ вѣрнымъ,
А не лицемѣрнымъ;
Все то отмѣнилось.

---

6   Like other eighteenth-century Russian songbooks, Chulkov's collection contains numerous 'Little Russian' (*malorosskie* or *malorossijkie*) songs (Speranskij 1909; Chulkov 1913: V).

Чи я не вродлива,
Чи не чернобрива,
Чи яжъ не молода,
И панскаго рода.
Огляися друженько...

(Chulkov 1780, IV: 162, no. 179; graphic intervals
after lines 5 and 10 are added, errors corrected)

Ne dam pokoju,
Pojdu za toboju.
Pochto ostavljaesh',
Sovesti nemaesh',
Prijatel' i druzhe.

Akh! kak prisjagalsja,
Boha ne bojalsja,
Chto budesh' mne vernym,
A ne litsemernym;
Vse to otmenilos'.

Chy ja ne vrodlyva,
Chy ne chernobriva,
Chy jazh ne molóda,
I panskoho roda.
Ogljanisja druzhen'ko...

[I will not give you peace,
I will follow you.
Why do you leave me?
You have no conscience,
My companion and friend.

Ah! How you swore,
Not fearing God,
That you would be faithful to me,
And not hypocritical;
All that is now cancelled.

Am I not pretty,
Am I not dark-browed,
Am I not young,
And of noble birth?
Look back, my friend...]

The Ukrainian hexasyllables are isorhythmic with either three trochees or two amphibrachs, and all clausulae are feminine. In the Georgian poem, 6-syllable segments are isorhythmic with either three trochees or two dactyls; consequently, the endings – both at the caesura and in the clausula – may be either feminine or dactylic. The Georgian poem is therefore not equirhythmic with its Ukrainian model, yet equimetrical to it.

2.

"The *Reuli*, whose Russian voice is *Polno, polno, ne prel'shchajsja*", is likewise modeled on a song recorded in Chulkov's songbook. In this case, however, the source is Russian rather than Ukrainian, and authorial rather than folkloric, though anonymous. The song, written in cross-rhymed trochaic tetrameters with alternating feminine and masculine rhymes (*AbAb*), is attributed to an anonymous poet of the Sumarokov school (Pozdneev [1958] 1996: 388). The text is arranged in huitains separated by asterisks, each of which is further subdivided into two quatrains:

′ ∪ ′ ∪ ′ ∪ ′ ∪
′ ∪ ′ ∪ ′ ∪ ′
′ ∪ ′ ∪ ′ ∪ ′ ∪
′ ∪ ′ ∪ ′ ∪ ′

Полно, полно, не прельщайся
Плѣнный духъ свободенъ быть;
А надежда истребляйся:
Мнѣ не льзя въ покоѣ жить.
      Сколько духъ мой ни страдаетъ,
      Сколько мукъ я ни терплю,
      Тщетно кровь во мнѣ пылаетъ
      И безплодно я люблю.

(Chulkov 1770, II: 50; 1780, II: 42, no. 38;
emendations based on Pypin 1858: 302)

Polno, polno, ne preľshchajsja
Plennyj dukh svoboden byť;
A nadezhda istrebljajsja:
Mne ne ľzja v pokoe zhiť.
　　　Skoľko dukh moj ni stradaet,
　　　Skoľko muk ja ni terplju,
　　　Tshchetno krov' vo mne pylaet
　　　I bezplodno ja ljublju.

[Enough, enough, do not be tempted,
Captive spirit, to be free;
And, hope, be destroyed:
I cannot live in peace.
　　　No matter how much my spirit suffers,
　　　No matter how much torment I endure,
　　　My blood burns in vain
　　　And my love is fruitless.]

The *Reuli* or *Rvuli* is a Georgian poetic form consisting of an eight-line stanza with an eightfold monorhyme (Baratashvili 1981: 60). Guramishvili's poem, however, departs from this model: although it comprises eight lines, the rhymes are not uniform, with only one rhyme recurring. Moreover, additional rhymes at the caesura render the poem *de facto* cross-rhymed, as in its Russian source, even though in the Georgian text all rhymes, both external and internal, are feminine (*ABAB*):

```
 ′ ∪  ′ ∪ | ′ ∪∪  ′ ∪      //′ ∪ ′ ∪ | ′ ∪  ′ ∪
 ′ ∪  ′ ∪ | ′ ∪∪  ′ ∪      //′ ∪ ′ ∪ | ′ ∪  ′ ∪
```

კმარა, კმარა, ნუღარა სცოდავ, სულს აგების მიხვდეს შვება,
აწ დასწყნარდი, ნუ შფოთავ-ბორგავ, ნუ გაქვს ზმირინთ ზინზლად
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　ფშვება!

k'mara, k'mara, | nughara stsodav, // suls agebis | mikhvdes shveba
ats' dasts'q'nardi, | nu shpotav-borgav, // nu gakvs zmirint | zinzlad pshveba!

[Enough, enough, do not sin any more, may your soul find relief,
Now calm down, do not worry, do not be so restless!]

Even so, in this text Guramishvili relies on the song's tune rather than its poetic meter, since the first hemistich of each line adds an extra syllable after the sixth syllable, yielding a (9+8)-syllabic line instead of the expected (8+8). Had the poet adhered to the meter and rhythm of the Russian verse, he would have produced a "purely" trochaic line, such as:

    ʹ ∪ ʹ ∪ | ʹ ∪ ʹ ∪   4 + 4 = 8
    კმარა, კმარა, ნუღარ სცოდავ
    k'mara, k'mara, | nughar stsodav

Instead, Guramishvili adds the emphatic vowel -***a*** to the negative particle *nughar*:

    ʹ ∪ ʹ ∪ | ʹ ∪∪ ʹ ∪   4 + 5 = 9
    კმარა, კმარა, ნუღარა სცოდავ
    k'mara, k'mara, | nughar**a** stsodav

A (4+5)- or (5+4)-syllable line or hemistich, as a variant of the more usual (4+4)-syllable line or hemistich, is not uncommon in Ukrainian folksongs, where the additional syllabic position is usually filled by the monosyllabic interjection *ta* (Kolessa 1906, LXXIII: 109–110; LXXIV: 33–36). The discovery of a musical score of "*Polno, polno, ne prel'shchajsja*" would provide decisive evidence.

3.

"The voice of the Russian song *Chuvstvju skorbi ljuti vsiakao minuti*" refers to one of the most popular eighteenth-century songs, attested both in Chulkov's collection and in numerous manuscript songbooks (see, in particular, Peretz 1900, 2: 100; on musical scores, see Keldysh 1984: 167). Nikolai Novikov ascribed this song to Aleksandr Sumarokov, and there is no compelling reason to question Sumarokov's authorship.

The second line varies across sources. In particular, Novikov's posthumous editions of Sumarokov's works misprint it as "*S sámoj tój minúty*" in place of "*S sámoj tojá minúty*" (Sumarokov 1781: 248; the 1787 reprint reproduces the same error).[7] Chulkov, by contrast, prints the correct reading, which conforms

---

[7]   On textual issues in Novikov's editions of Sumarokov's complete works, see Gukovskij 1948; Berkov 1957: 513–515; Lappo-Danilevskij 2020.

to Sumarokov's logaoedic meter – the same meter used throughout the song. Its scheme is ′∪∪′∪′(∪), that is "dactyl + trochee + trochee" (DTT). Within each quatrain, the first rhyme pair is feminine, while the second is masculine:

′ ∪∪ ′ ∪ ′ ∪
′ ∪∪ ′ ∪ ′ ∪
    ′ ∪∪ ′ ∪ ′
    ′ ∪∪ ′ ∪ ′

Чувствую скорби люты
Съ самой тоя минуты,
    Какъ я сталъ знать тебя,
    Вольность на вѣкъ згубя.

Мысль въ оной часъ темнѣла,
Кровь какъ смола кипѣла,
    Взоръ былъ тогда смущенъ,
    Словомъ, я сталъ прельщенъ.

(Chulkov 1780, II: 54, no. 63)

Chuvstvuju skorbi ljuty
S samoj toja minuty,
    Kak ja stal znat' tebja,
    Vol'nost' na vek zgubja.

Mysl' v onoj chas temnela,
Krov' kak smola kipela,
    Vzor byl togda smushchen,
    Slovom, ja stal prel'shchen.

[I feel fierce sorrow
From that very moment,
    When I came to know you,
    Losing my freedom forever.

My thoughts darkened at that hour,
My blood boiled like tar,
    My gaze was then confused,
    In short, I was bewitched.]

It was Sumarokov who made logaoedic songs fashionable; unfortunately, the melodies he and his followers set their texts to are largely unknown today (Gasparov 1984: 67–68). What can be established about the most widespread version of this particular melody is that the poem's even-numbered lines were sung with repetition, and their first words (disyllabic in all even-numbered lines except line 6) were additionally repeated, as indicated in Nikolai Kurganov's celebrated *Pismovnik*:

> Chuvstvuju skorbi ljuty
> S samoj toja minuty,
> S samoj, s samoj,
> s samoj toja minuty.
>   Kak ja stal znat' tebja,
>   Vol'nost' na vek gubja.
>   Vol'nost', vol'nost', na vek gubja.
> (Kurganov 1788: 444)

Once these melody-induced repetitions are taken into account, the syllabic segmentation of each stanza is as follows:

```
     ′ ⌣⌣ ′ ⌣ ′ ⌣          7
     ′ ⌣⌣ ′ ⌣ ′ ⌣          7
             ′ ⌣ ′ ⌣          4
     ′ ⌣⌣ ′ ⌣ ′ ⌣          7

     ′ ⌣⌣ ′ ⌣ ′            6
     ′ ⌣⌣ ′ ⌣ ′            6
   ′ ⌣ ′ ⌣⌣ ′ ⌣ ′          8
```

In his version, Guramishvili preserves the syllabic length of the couplet (7 + 7 = 14) and of the refrain's finale (8), while altering their rhythmic structures:

```
  ′ ⌣ ′ ⌣ ′ ⌣ ′ ⌣ //     ′ ⌣  ′ ⌣  ′ ⌣      8 + 6 = 14
                          ′ ⌣  ′ ⌣⌣ ′ ⌣⌣     8
                          ′ ⌣  ′ ⌣⌣ ′ ⌣⌣     8
```

საყვარელმან სიტყვა ავი   მითხრა გულ-საწვავი:
                          ნეტა რად ვიყო შენია,
                          სახით ავრიგად შვენია.

saq'varelman sit'q'va avi // mitkhra gul-sats'vavi:
                                net'a rad viq'o shenia,
                                sakhit avrigad shvenia.

[My beloved said hurtful words to me and wounded my heart.
                                Why should I become yours?
                                And she looked at me sullenly.]

In the couplet, Guramishvili transforms Sumarokov's logaoedic "DTT+DTT" pattern into a combination of trochaic tetrameter and trochaic trimeter, yielding seven-foot trochee with the caesura after the fourth foot and an internal rhyme. The rhythmic structures of the Russian and Georgian couplets are aligned only partially, coinciding at the beginning and end of the couplet, but diverging in the internal distribution of stresses:

    ′ ∪ ∪ ′ ∪ ′ ∪ // ′ ∪ ∪ ′ ∪ ′ ∪   7 + 7 = 14
    ↓   …   …   …   ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓
    ′ ∪ ′ ∪ ′ ∪ ′ ∪ // ′ ∪ ′ ∪ ′ ∪   8 + 6 = 14

In the refrain, Guramishvili takes the final *sung* line as a model and repeats it twice. The sole difference lies in catalexis – the last ictus of the Russian line transforms into the last position in the dactylic clausula of a TDD logaoedic structure:

    ′ ∪ ′ ∪ ∪ ′ ∪ ′   8
    ↓   …   ↓ ↓ ↓
    ′ ∪ ′ ∪ ∪ ′ ∪ ∪   8

Consequently, in this case as well, the Georgian text is based on the Russian tune and its musical rhythm, rather than on the source poem's meter and verse rhythm.

4.

"The voice of the Russian song *Akh, skoliko tsvela vletakh molodykh*" refers to a widely circulated Russian syllabic song, attested in no fewer than 35 manuscript variants, the earliest dating to the 1740s. The song is also included in Chulkov's collection (Pozdneev [1958] 1996: 388). The original was identified by Mikheil Chikovani (1955: 28; 1963: 67):

Ахъ! сколько цвѣла въ лѣтахъ молодыхъ!
Не знала печали, случаевъ худыхъ,
  Всегда была въ той надеждѣ,
  Не владѣть мною невѣждѣ,
   Слушать не хотѣла!

Ахъ какъ нынѣ вижу случай весь худой,
Что такъ учинилось надо мной бѣдной,
  Прежня радость погибаетъ,
  Красота съ лица спадаетъ,
   Печаль объявляетъ.

(Chulkov 1770, II: 156; 1780, II: 126–127, no. 111)

Akh! skol'ko tsvela || v letakh molodykh!
Ne znala pechali, || sluchaev khudyh,
  Vsegda byla v toj nadezhde,
  Ne vladet' mnoju nevezhde,
   Slushat' ne khotela!

Akh kak nyne vizhu || sluchaj ves' khudoj,
Chto tak uchinilos' || nado mnoj bednój,
  Prezhnja radost' pogibaet,
  Krasota s litsa spadaet,
   Pechal' ob"javljaet.

[Ah! How I blossomed in my younger years!
I knew no sorrow, no misfortune,
  I always hoped
  Not to be ruled by an ignorant man,
   I didn't want to listen to anyone!

Oh, now I see the misfortune
That has befallen me, poor thing,
  My former joy is dying,
  Beauty is fading from my face,
   Revealing sadness.]

The stanza's syllabic structure is as follows. The first two lines each consist of two hemistichs. In both lines, the second hemistich is pentasyllabic with masculine rhyme; its rhythm is almost invariably trochaic: ′ ∪ ′ ∪ ′. The first hemistich is either pentasyllabic with masculine caesura or hexasyllabic with feminine caesura. This variation can only be explained by the presence of a melisma at the masculine caesura in the tune, whereby a single syllable is

rendered isochronous with two. That being the case, the basic unit of the musical rhythm must have been hexasyllabic. Tellingly, both Guramishchvili and several songbooks present the first hemistich of the incipit as hexasyllabic despite its masculine caesura: "*Akh, skoliko tsvela*" (Guramishchvili), "*Akh, skol'ko ja tsvela*" (Bychkov 1891: 166; Zelenin 1914: 235).

Trochaic rhythmization in the first hemistich is less pronounced; where it does occur, the segment sounds as ′ ∪ ′ ∪ ′ (∪). In the second stanza, the tendency toward trochaization is fully realized, so that the metrical scheme

×× ×× ′ (∪) ‖ ×× ×× ′
×× ×× ′ (∪) ‖ ×× ×× ′

is implemented as

′ ∪ ′ ∪ ′ ∪ ‖ ′ ∪ ′ ∪ ′
′ ∪ ′ ∪ ′ ∪ ‖ ′ ∪ ′ ∪ ′

As in the preceding example ("*Chuvstvju skorbi ljuty*"), Guramishchvili's adaptation converts the last ictus of the Russian line into the dactylic clausula's last position:

′ ∪ ′ ∪ ′ ∪ ‖ ′ ∪ ′ ∪ ′   6 + 5 = 11
↓   …   …   ↓ ↓ ↓
′ ∪ ′ ∪ ′ ∪ ‖ ′ ∪ ′ ∪∪   6 + 5 = 11

ვა, რამდენი ყვავის ზაფხულს ახალნი,
არ ვიცოდია ჯავრი დროთა, ავთ ხანი.

Va, ramdeni q'vavis ‖ zapkhuls akhalni,
Ar vitsodi javri ‖ drota, avt khani.

[Oh, just as the young bloom in summer,
I too didn't know the sorrow of the years gone by, the ill-fated times.]

As in the Russian original, the two opening lines of the stanza are followed by two rhymed lines of a different structure and a short unrhymed concluding line. In the Russian poem, these rhymed lines are either octosyllabic with feminine ending or heptasyllabic with masculine ending, while the concluding line is either hexasyllabic (feminine) or pentasyllabic (masculine). The trochaic rhythmization, attested, e.g., in the second stanza, is sporadic; apart from the final stress, other stresses are not systematically regulated:

× × × × × × ′ (◡)   7 (+1) = 8
× × × × × × ′ (◡)   7 (+1) = 8
      × × × × ′ (◡)   5 (+1) = 6

As before, this variability is best explained by the presence of a melisma on masculine clausulae, whereby a single syllable becomes isochronous with two. As a result, the musical rhythm of these endings is effectively convertible to a feminine-ending pattern, rendering differences in catalexis metrically irrelevant.

The syllabic length of the corresponding lines in Guramishvili's poem differs from that of the Russian original:

′ ◡ ◡ ′ ◡ ◡ ′ ◡ ′ ◡ ◡   11
′ ◡ ◡ ′ ◡ ′ ◡ ◡ ′ ◡ ◡   11
            ◡ ′ ◡ ◡ ′ ◡ ◡   7

ყოველთვის მე ვიყავ მისის იმედით,
არასა ჰვპყრობდი ჩემთა სითავხედით,
        სასმენლად არ მინდოდა.

Q'oveltvis me viq'av misis imedit,
Arasa hvp'q'robdi chemta sitavkhedit,
        Sasmenlad ar mindoda.

[I always relied on my own strength,
I possessed nothing because of my impudence,
        I didn't want to hear about anything.]

We may assume, however, that differences in catalexis are again nonessential, and that the dactylic clausula in the Georgian poem is sung to the same melodic segment as the feminine clausula in the Russian song. Accordingly, for the concluding line, the matching rules describing the relations between the two verse meters sung on the same tune are straightforward:[8]

× × × × ′ ◡   Slúshat' ne khotéla! *or:* Pechál' ob"javljáet.
↓   … … ↓   ↓
◡ ′ ◡ ◡ ′ ◡◡   Sasménlad ar míndoda.

---

8   On matching rules as opposed to correspondence rules, see Pilshchikov 2025.

The situation with the two previous lines is more complex. The only plausible solution is to apply the same procedure to the dactylic feet of the two Georgian lines, on the assumption that they were *sung* to the same musical rhythm as the trochaic feet. Under this assumption, the *musical* rhythm of these lines supports an octonary scheme:

```
×   ×    ×    ×    ×   ×   ′   ∪    Ne vladét' mnoju nevézhde.
↓   ↓    ↓    ↓    ↓   ↓   ↓   ↓
′  ∪͜∪  ′  ∪͜∪  ′    ∪   ′  ∪͜∪   Q'ovéltvis me víq'av mísis ímedit,
′  ∪͜∪  ′    ∪    ′  ∪͜∪ ′ ∪͜∪   Árasa hvp'q'róbdi chémta sitávkhedit.
```

We must therefore conclude once more that the Georgian text follows the Russian poem's meter and verse rhythm only loosely, while being based on the Russian tune and its musical rhythm. Particularly telling is the relative length of the first and second distichs. In the Russian song, the syllabic length of the second distich (8+8) is shorter than that of the first (11+11).[9] In the Georgian song, both distichs have the same syllabic length (11+11), but the rhythmic structure of the second is adapted to the musical rhythm, in which each of the four strong positions (S) is followed by a weak position (W), allowing each W position to be filled by *either one or two syllables*. In performance, two syllables may be isochronous with a single syllable.

5.

Chikovani (1955: 26) identified the source of the "Aria", whose Russian incipit is "*Akh, kak skushno*". This is one of the most popular Russian pastoral syllabic songs: 38 variants are attested in manuscript songbooks, the earliest dating back to the 1750s. The song is also included in Chulkov's collection (Pozdneev [1958] 1996: 388; cf. Peretz 1900, 2: 101; Markov 1917: 83). The meter of the poem may be described as either 7-syllable verse with a strong tendency toward trochaization – 21 of the song's 24 lines (87.5%) exhibit trochaic rhythm – or as trochaic tetrameter with sporadic trans-accentuations (three disyllabic words with "iambic inversions" in the first or third foot). The song is characterized by masculine rhymes and a constant stress on the third syllable, as is typical of Russian folksongs and eighteenth-century four-foot

---

[9]   A similar stanzaic structure occurs in Ukrainian folksongs, possibly under Polish influence: (6+6) + (6+6) + (4+4) + (4+4) + 6 (Kolessa 1906, LXXIV: 44, 67–68). The only difference from "*Akh! skol'ko tsvela*" is the consistent use of feminine caesurae and clausulae.

trochaic songs (Bailey 1993: 190–195; 2001: 191, 199, 210; 2004; Gasparov 2006: 491–492, 496):

```
×  ×  ′  ×  ×  ×  ′        7
↕  ↕  ↕  ↕  ↕  ↕
×  ∪  ′  ∪  ×  ∪  ′        7
```

Ахъ какъ скучно мнѣ одной,
Гдѣ дѣвался мой покой;
   Я любила завсегда
   Пасти стадо здѣсь одна.

Ákh kak skúchno mnè odnój,
Gdé deválsja mòj pokój;
   Jà ljubíla zavsegdá
   Pastí stádo zdés' odná.

[Oh, how bored I am alone,
Where has my peace gone?
   I always loved
   To herd the flock here alone.]

In Guramishvili's poem, the lines are octosyllabic with dactylic rhymes. Each line has three stresses; the third syllable may be either stressed or unstressed:

```
′  ∪  ∪  ′  ∪  ′  ∪  ∪       8
′  ∪  ∪  ′  ∪  ′  ∪  ∪       8
′  ∪  ′  ∪  ∪  ′  ∪  ∪       8
′  ∪  ∪  ′  ∪  ′  ∪  ∪       8
```

ვა, რა მაქვს დიდი მოწყენა,
სადა არს ჩემი მოლხენა!
მწარედ სახმილით დაგულსა
ლახვარი დამსმია გულსა.

Va, ra makvs didi mots'q'ena,
Sada ars chemi molkhena!
Mts'ared sakhmilit dagulsa
Lakhvari damsmia gulsa.

[Oh, I grieve beyond measure,
The time when I rejoiced is past!

I am incinerated by the scorching fire,
A sword has pierced my heart.]

Tentative matching rules:

```
 ×  ∪  ′  ∪  ×  ∪      ′        Ákh kak skúchno mnè odnój.
 ↓  ↓  ↓  ↓  ↓  ↓      ↓
 ′  ∪  ′ ∪‿∪ ′  ∪      ∪        Mts'áred sákhmilit dágulsa
 ′ ∪‿∪ ′  ∪  ′  ∪      ∪        Lákhvari dámsmi:á gulsa.
```

This case further confirms that Guramishvili reproduces the musical rhythm of the Russian song rather than its poetic meter and verbal patterns.

6.

The "voice" of Guramishvili's "Zubovka" is "*Kozak dusha pravdyvaja*" (Chikovani 1955: 26). The Ukrainian original is composed in 14-syllable verse with feminine rhymes known as *kolomyjka* verse after the folklore genre to which it belongs. Its structure can be described as (8+6) or (4+4+6) syllables (Kolessa 1906, LXXII: 89, 92–93, 95; LXXIII: 74–75, 98–108; Hnatiukivsky 1988; Chamata 2004: 152–154):

Козак душа правдивая, сорочки не має;
Коли не п'є, то воші б'є, таки не гуляє.   (*a variant:* а все не гуляє)

Kozák dushá | pravdývaja, || soróchky ne máje,
Kolý ne p'jé, | to vóshi b'jé, || taký ne huljáje.   (*a variant:* a vse ne huljaje)

[A Cossack is a truthful soul, he has no shirt;
When he's not drinking, he's beating lice, but not fooling around.]

This ditty was very popular in the eighteenth century and was often used in the speeches of the Cossack character in Ukrainian popular theater, *vertep* (Franko 1906, LXXII: 56; Javorskij 1929: 211 fn. 1). Gogol cites it in his unfinished novel *The Hetman*, written in the 1830s. Russian poets usually syllabotonized kolomyjka into (4+3)-foot trochees with feminine rhymes, sometimes with iambic inversions (Gasparov 1999: 153; Korchagin 2015: 25–28). Guramishvili does the same. Notably, his (4+3)-foot trochees are strict, without trans-accentuation:

′ ∪ ′ ∪ | ′ ∪ ′ ∪ ‖ ′ ∪ ′ ∪ ′ ∪

ზუბოვკიდან მომავალმან ვნახე ერთი ქალი,
მეტად ტურფა, შვენიერი, მასზე დამრჩა თვალი.
შავ თვალ-წარბას, პირად თეთრსა ასხდა შავი ხალი.
მისმან ეშხმან დაცამლეწა, შემიმუსრა ძვალი.

Zubovk'idan | momavalman ‖ vnakhe erti kali,
Met'ad t'urpa, | shvenieri, ‖ maze damrcha tvali.
Shav tval-ts'arbas, | p'irad tetrsa ‖ askhda shavi khali.
Misman eshkhman | datsamlets'a, ‖ shemimusra dzvali.

[One day, walking from Zubovka, I met a maid,
Very beautiful, charming, and I couldn't take my eyes off her.
She had black eyes, a white face, and a black beauty spot.
Her beauty overwhelmed me, crushed my bones.]

The Georgian poem follows the Ukrainian musical rhythm. Its verse is neither equiprosodic nor equirhythmic with the Ukrainian model, but may be conventionally regarded as equimetrical.[10]

7.

The "voice" "*Netu zlosti nado mnoju, umen'shit' mne pechal' moju*" consists of 16 syllables, divided into two hemistichs (8+8), as do the first and second lines of Guramishvili's corresponding poem:

′ ∪ ′ ∪ ′ ∪ ′ ∪   ‖ ′ ∪ ′ ∪ ′ ∪ ′ ∪

რექა: დიდება, ღმერთო, შენდა, ცად და ქვეყნად რაც აღშენდა!
დავით ხმითა ნესტვს აფშვენდა, გიგალობდა, ვითა გშვენდა...

Rkva: dideba, | ghmerto, shenda, ‖ tsad da kveq'nad | rats aghshenda!
Davit khmita | nest'vs apshvenda, ‖ gigalobda, | vita shvenda...

[He said: Glory to you, Lord, for what has appeared in heaven and on earth!
David played the flute, praising you as benefits you.]

---

10   On these three types of equivalence, see Lotman 2012; Polilova, Pilshchikov, Belousova 2022: 137–138.

The first two lines of the Georgian text are written in rhymed eight-foot tro-
chees, with an additional internal rhyme at the caesura in each line. The first
hemistich of the Russian incipit is likewise trochaic with feminine clausula
(*Nétu zlósti nado mnóju*). However, the second hemistich, however, exhibits
an alternative rhythmical variant of East Slavic octosyllable – an anapestic
pattern with dactylic clausula (cf. Bailey 2001: 19–20, 57–58, 62, 137–151,
175–182 et al.): *umen'shít' mne pechál' mojù*. Whether the endings of the two
hemistichs are rhymed remains an open question (most likely they are not);
if they are, however, the internal rhyme in the Russian line is heteroaccentual.
This feature is not reproduced in the Georgian poem, whose meter can, overall,
be described as trochaization of the original syllabic rhythm. Further com-
parison is hindered by the fact that this song has not survived to the present
day (Pozdneev [1958] 1996: 388).

8.

The "voice" "*Chto za prichina, vsegda kruchina*" to a relatively obscure Russian
eighteenth-century song tradition: only three variants are known (the earliest
dating back to the 1760s), and the text remains unpublished (Pozdneev [1958]
1996: 388; cf. Petrovskij 1908: 286). Unfortunately, we were unable to consult
the archival text directly. Nevertheless, the rhythmic structure of the incipit can
be reconstructed with some confidence: it consists of two rhymed pentasylla-
bles, or, equivalently, a decasyllabic line with caesura (5+5) and internal rhyme.

When syllabotonized, such verse can be interpreted as a pair of rhymed
adonics (′ ∪ ∪ ′ ∪). The adonic (a term widely used in eighteenth-century
poetics) may be described as either "dactyl + trochee" or as catalectic two-foot
dactyl with feminine ending. A similar meter – cross-rhymed two-foot dactyls
with alternation of feminine and masculine rhymes – was canonized for liter-
ary spiritual song by Sumarokov and his school (Gukovskij 1927: 164–166;
Gasparov 1999: 285).

Compare the prosodic structure of Guramishvili's poem:

′ ∪ ∪ ′ ∪ // ′ ∪ ∪ ′ ∪	5 + 5
′ ∪ ∪ ′ ∪ // ′ ∪ ∪ ′ ∪	5 + 5
′ ∪ ∪ ′ ∪	5

ისმინეთ, ერნო, გულთ მეცნიერნო,
მე დავასმრავ ბაგებს, მოგითხრობ კარგებს;
        მიგდევით ყურნი.

Isminet, erno, // gult metsnierno,
Me davsdzrav bagebs, // mogitkhrob k'argebs;
      Migdevit q'urni.

[Listen, people who know the human heart,
I will open my lips and tell you fascinating stories;
      Listen to me.]

In the Georgian text, the fourth adonic is followed by an unrhymed adonic refrain. A comparison with Guramishvili's source will show whether this feature, too, was inherited from the Russian original.

9.

The "Russian voice" "*Uletela zazulin'ko cheres dubinu*" is, in fact, not a Russian but a Russified version of a Ukrainian song, with the Ukrainian name of the cuckoo, *zozulin'ka* (a diminutive of *zozulja*), preserved in the incipit (Chikovani 1955: 33). The song, whose incipit can tentatively be reconstructed as "*Oj letila zozulin'ka cherez dubynu*", is attested in numerous variants employing different, though closely related, meters. In all versions, the first hemistich contains eight syllables (*Oj letila zozulin'ka…*), whereas the second hemistich varies in length: it may have six syllables (*…cherez góry-séla*; *…cherez dilovánn'a*; *…cherez sád kujuchí*; *…ta j stála kuváty* – kolomyjka verse), four (*…po Vkraïni*), three (*…da j kujé*; *…cherez sád*), or five syllables, either with masculine ending (*…cherez póle, gáj*; *…cherez témnyj gáj*; *…ponad móre v gáj*) or with feminine ending (*…ta j ponad góru*) (see Maksymovych 1827: 51, № XXIX; Chubyns'kyj 1874: 106, 450, 468, 561; Franko 1883: 38; Chykalenko 1896: 83–84; Holovats'kyj 1878, 100, 650; Borovykovs'kyj 1879: 49; Kolessa 1906, LXXII: 102–103; Korsh 1906: 318; Vasylenko, Hordijchuk 1954: 415; Lys'ko 1964–1994, vol. 1: 173–174; vols. 4–10: nos. 2711, 2721, 2726, 2723, 3179, 4517, 4778, 5807, 6575, 6579, 8027, 8078, 8112, 10594). Guramishvili's source belongs to the latter variation (*…cherez dubýnu*); this particular wording is not attested elsewhere.

    The first hemistich is octosyllabic, and its *musical* rhythm – *but not necessarily verbal* rhythm – is trochaic:

♪ ♪ ♪ ♪|♪ ♪ ♪ ♪

or

♪ ♪ ♩ ♩|♪ ♪ ♩ ♩
× × × ×|× × × ×
Oj le-tí-la   zo-zú-lin'ka

In Guramishvili's poem, octosyllable is syllabotonized into trochaic tetrameter, while the pentasyllabic hemistich is rendered as an adonic:

′ ∪ ′ ∪|′ ∪ ′ ∪ || ′ ∪ ∪ ′ ∪   8 + 5 = 13

ვსთქვათ, რაც ვარდმან თავის თავზედ ქნა საქმე ავი:
შეიძულა მან ბულბული, იყვარა ყვავი.

Vstkvat, rats vardman | tavis tavzed || kna saqme avi:
Sheidzula | man bulbuli, || iq'vara q'vavi.

[We'll tell you how a rose harmed itself:
It became embittered at a nightingale and fell in love with a crow.]

Notably, in the same poem, Guramishvili also uses another realization of the "8+5" meter, in which the pentasyllabic hemistich has masculine ending: ♪♪♪♪♩ rather than ♪♪♪♩ ♪ (Kolessa 1906, LXXII: 91). This is how Guramishvili introduced masculine rhyme into Georgian poetry:

′ ∪ ′ ∪|′ ∪ ′ ∪ || ′ ∪ ′ ∪ ′   8 + 5 = 13

მე გაჭმევდი, მე გასმევდი,   მე გაცმევდი ტანთ,
შენ დახარბდი მცირეს ძღვენთა   სხვისგან მონატანთ.

Me gach'mevdi, | me gasmevdi, || me gatsmevdi t'ant,
Shen dakharbdi | mtsires dzghventa, || skhvisgan monat'ant.

[I fed you, I gave you drink, I clothed you,
But you longed for a little gift from another.]

The basis of Guramishvili's version is, once again, musical rhythm, which remains invariant across verbal rhythmic realizations belonging to different meters and involving different types of catalexis.

10.

Yet another Russian song served as a prototype for Guramishvili's "Merry Summer", a long pastoral poem with bawdy episodes, depicting the love between a young shepherd and a girl set against the backdrop of a radiant summer landscape. The Russian original, "*Vesela vesna*" ("Merry Spring"), is not only indicated as the poem's "voice" but is also explicitly described in its first stanza:

```
′ ∪ ′ ∪ ∪ ‖    ′ ∪ ∪ ′ ∪        5 + 5 = 10
′ ∪ ′ ∪ ∪ ‖    ′ ∪ ′ ∪ ∪        5 + 5 = 10
              ′ ∪ ′ ∪ ′ ∪        6
              ′ ∪ ∪ ′ ∪ ∪        6
              ′ ∪ ∪ ′ ∪          5
```

ერთს ქალს რუსული „ვესელა ვესნა"
ჩემთვის სახმილად ჩამოეკვესნა.
              იმით ჩემი გული
              იქმნა დადაგული,
              მედების ალი!

Erts kals rusuli ‖ "Vesela vesna"
Chemtvis sakhmilad ‖ chamoek'vesna.
              Imit chemi guli
              Ikmna dadaguli,
              Medebis ali!

[One girl sang "Merry Spring"
And burned me like fire.
              With that song, my heart
              Was torn apart,
              It burns in flames.]

The first two lines are divided by a caesura and linked by a rhyme; the third and fourth lines are also rhymed; the concluding line is rhymeless. Note the variation in stress placement in subsequent stanzas:

```
′ ∪ ′ ∪ ∪ ‖    ′ ∪ ′ ∪ ∪        5 + 5 = 10
′ ∪ ′ ∪ ∪ ‖    ′ ∪ ∪ ′ ∪        5 + 5 = 10
              ′ ∪ ∪ ′ ∪ ∪        6
              ′ ∪ ∪ ′ ∪ ∪        6
              ′ ∪ ′ ∪ ∪          5
```

′ ∪ ∪ ′ ∪ ‖ ′ ∪ ∪ ′ ∪   5 + 5 = 10
′ ∪ ′ ∪ ∪ ‖ ′ ∪ ∪ ′ ∪   5 + 5 = 10
              ′ ∪ ∪ ′ ∪ ∪   6
              ′ ∪ ∪ ′ ∪ ∪   6
                 ′ ∪ ′ ∪ ∪   5

Seven variants of the Russian pastoral syllabic song "*Vesela vesna tsvety prinosit*" are attested (Pozdneev [1958] 1996: 389). In at least one manuscript songbook, it appears alongside "*Akh, kak skushno mne odnoj*" and "*Chuvstvju skorbi ljuty*" (Peretz 1900, 2: 100). The only text published in full is a version copied in Ukraine, which is nonetheless titled "A Muscovite Song" in the manuscript (Javorskij 1912: 173–174):

> Весела весна цвѣты приноситъ,
> Пастушекъ въ луга до себя проситъ.
> 　　　Пастушки столь рады,
> 　　　Овечки погнали
> 　　　　Въ тѣи луга.
>
> Пригнали подъ кущи, гдѣ розы бѣлы,
> Тамъ пѣсни запѣли и сами сѣли.
> 　　　Стали рвать цвѣточки,
> 　　　Взяли плѣсть вѣночки,
> 　　　　Всяка себѣ.[11]

Veséla vesná ‖ tsvetу́ prinósit,   5 + 5 = 10
Pastúshek v lugá ‖ do sebjá prósit.   5 + 5 = 10
　　　Pastúshki stol' rády,   6
　　　Ovéchki pognáli   6
　　　　V téi lugá.   4

Prignáli pod kúshchi, ‖ gde rózy bély,   6 + 5 = 11
Tam pésni zapéli ‖ i sámi séli.   6 + 5 = 11
　　　Stáli rvát' tsvetóchki,   6
　　　Vzjáli plést' venóchki   6
　　　　Vsjáka sebé.   4

───────────────

11   Spelling normalized.

[Merry spring brings flowers
And calls the shepherdesses to the meadows.
        The shepherdesses are so happy,
        They drove their sheep
                To those meadows.

They drove them under the thicket, where roses grew,
There they began to sing and sat down.
        They started picking flowers,
        And began weaving wreaths,
                Each one for herself.]

The stanzaic structures are closely parallel: two longer rhymed lines are followed by two shorter rhymed lines and a final, shortest unrhymed line. In both poems, the lines of the first distich are divided by a caesura, and their second hemistich is pentasyllabic. The first hemistich, however, differs: it is consistently pentasyllabic in the Georgian poem, but may contain either five or six syllables in the Russian song. In both texts, the second distich consists of two hexasyllabic lines. The concluding line of the Georgian poem is pentasyllabic, whereas the corresponding line in the Russian song is tetrasyllabic. The meters of the two poems may therefore be specified as follows (with divergences in syllabic length underlined):

"Merry Spring"   "Merry Summer"
× × × × × (×) ‖ × × × × ×   ′ × × × × ‖ ′ × × × ×
× × × × × (×) ‖ × × × × ×   ′ × × × × ‖ ′ × × × ×
× × × × × ×   ′ × × × × ×
× × × × × ×   ′ × × × × ×
× × × ×   ′ × × × <u>×</u>

Here again, the Georgian poem is grounded in the Russian tune, following the song's musical, rather than verbal, rhythm.

Conclusion

Our comparative analysis has established that, in all cases, Guramishvili relied on the tune ("voice") – and thus on the musical rhythm – of the Russian and Ukrainian songs he imitated. In some instances, he also produced equivalents of their metrical structures, but not their verbal rhythm. Only four poems can be described as conditionally equimetrical (but not equirythmical) with respect to their East Slavic originals: his imitations of two Ukrainian songs ("*Ne dam pokoju*" and "*Kozak dusha pravdyvaja*") and two Russian songs ("*Netu zlosti nado mnoju*" and "*Chto za prichina*"). The Russian cases are more hypothetical than the Ukrainian ones, since we lacked access to the full texts of the former.

Verse composed on the basis of a tune is a systemic feature of Guramishvili's poetry, closely connected with the traditions of ancient Georgian hymnography and folksongs: their dependence on music and melody presupposed the equalization and isochronism of heterometric lines in performance (cf. Silagadze 1987: 61). Guramishvili's poetry therefore possesses a synthetic poetic-musical character. Only a limited number of the rhythmic forms he introduced in imitation of Russian and Ukrainian sung poetry were subsequently reinterpreted as standard verse meters and incorporated into Georgian metrics through their adoption by other poets. Most of these forms failed to take root, perhaps because later authors no longer associated poetry with singing and were unable to assimilate or deploy Guramishvili's innovations.

References

Bailey, James 1993. *Three Russian Lyric Folk Song Meters*. Columbus, OH: Slavica.

Bailey, James 2001. *Izbrannye stat'i po russkomu narodnomu stikhu*. Translated from the English, ed. by Mikhail Leonovich Gasparov. Moskva: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury.

Bailey, James 2004. K voprosu o tipologii russkogo narodnogo vos'mislozhnika. In: Pszczołowska, Lucylla; Urbańska, Dorota (eds.), *Krótkie rozmiary wierszowe*. (*Słowiańska Metryka Porównawcza* 8). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Badań Literackich Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 109–150. [Includes a synopsis in English: "Toward a typology of the Russian folk eight-syllable line", 148–150.]

Baratashvili, Mamuk'a 1981. *Sts'avla leksis tkmisa*. Tbilisi: Tbilisi University Press.

Berkov, Pavel Naumovich 1957. Primechanija. In: Sumarokov, Aleksandr Petrovich. *Izbrannye proizvedenija*. (*Biblioteka poeta. Bol'shaja serija*. 2nd edition). Leningrad: Sovetskij pisatel', 511–577.

Borovykovs'kyj, Oleksandr L'vovych [Borovikovskij, Aleksandr L'vovich] 1879. *Zhenskaja dolja po malorossijskim pesnjam: Ocherk iz malorossijskoj poezii*. Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografija A. S. Suvorina.

Bychkov, Afanasij Fedorovich 1891. Svedenija o rukopisjakh Imperatorskoj Publichnoj biblioteki, soderzhashchikh v sebe mezhdu prochim narodnye pesni. In: *Trudy chetvertogo arheologicheskogo s'ezda v Rossii, byvshego v Kazani s 31 ijulja po 18 avgusta 1877 goda*. Vol. 2. Kazan': Tipografija Imperatorskogo [Kazanskogo] Universiteta, 164–192.

Chamata, Nina 2004. 8-skladovyj virsh v ukraïns'kij poeziï (XVI–XIX stolitt'a). In: Pszczołowska, Lucylla; Urbańska, Dorota (eds.), *Krótkie rozmiary wierszowe*. (*Słowiańska Metryka Porównawcza* 8). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Badań Literackich Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 151–188.

Chikovani, Mikheil 1955. *Davit Guramishvili da khalkhuri p'oezia*. Tbilisi: Georgian Academy of Sciences Press.

Chikovani, Mikheil 1963. Rosïs'ki ta ukraïns'ki fol'klorni motyvy v tvorchosti Davyda Guramishvili. In: *Narodna tvorchist' ta etnografija* 3, 65–68.

Chubyns'kyj, Pavlo Platonovych [Chubinskij, Pavel Platonovich] (ed.) 1874. *Trudy etnografichesko-statisticheskoj ekspeditsii v Zapadno-Russkij Kraj, snarjazhennoj Imperatorskim Geograficheskim Obshchestvom: Jugo-Zapadnyj Otdel. Materialy i issledovanija*. Vol. 5: *Pesni ljubovnye, semejnye, bytovye i shutochnye*. Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografija Majkova.

Chulkov, Mikhail Dmitrievich (ed.) 1770. *Sobranie raznykh pesen*. Parts I–II. Sankt-Peterburg.

Chulkov, Mikhail Dmitrievich (ed.) 1780. *Novoe i polnoe sobranie rossijskikh pesen*. Parts I–V. Moskva: V Universitetskoj tipografii u N. Novikova.

Chulkov, Mikhail Dmitrievich (ed.) 1913. *Sochinenija. Vol. 1: Sobranie raznykh pesen. Chasti I, II i III s Pribavleniem 1770–1773 gg.* Izdanie Otdelenija russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk. Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografija Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk.

Chykalenko, Jevhen Kharlamovych [Chikalenko, Evgenij Kharlampievich] 1896. Lirnyk Vasylij Moroz. In: *Kievskaja starina* LII (March), section II, 79–87.

Franko, Ivan 1883. *Zhinocha nevolja v rus[']kykh pisnjakh narodnykh*. Nakladom redaktsiï "Zori". L'viv: Z Drukarni Tovarystva imeni Shevchenka.

Franko, Ivan 1906. Do istoriï ukraïns'koho vertepa XVIII v. In: *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva imeni Shevchenka* LXXI, 22–43; LXXII, 9–79; LXXIII, 5–64.

Gasparov, Mikhail Leonovich 1984. *Ocherk istorii russkogo stikha: Metrika. Ritmika. Rifma. Strofika*. Moskva: Nauka.

Gasparov, Mikhail Leonovich 1999. *Metr i smysl: Ob odnom iz mekhanizmov kuľturnoj pamjati*. Moskva: RGGU.

Gasparov, Mikhail Leonovich 2006. Ritmika russkogo 4-stopnogo khoreja XVIII–XIX vv. In: Moldovan, Aleksandr Mikhailovich (ed.), *Verenitsa liter: K 60-letiju V. M. Zhivova*. Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskoj kuľtury, 487–497.

Gatsʼereliya, Akʼakʼi 1953. *Kartuli kʼlasikʼuri leksi*. Tbilisi: Sabchʼota mtsʼerali.

Gorgadze, Sergi 1930. *Kartuli leksi*. Tbilisi: Sakhelgami.

Gukovskij, Grigorij Aleksandrovich 1927. *Russkaja poezija XVIII veka*. (*Voprosy poetiki* 10). Leningrad: Academia.

Gukovskij, Grigorij Aleksandrovich 1948. Bibliograficheskie zametki k "Polnomu sobraniju sochinenij Sumarokova", izdannomu N. I. Novikovym v desjati tomakh. In: *XVIII vek* [3]. Leningrad, 857–883. Unpublished proofs. https://imwerden.de/publ-9326

Hnatiukivsky, M. [Mušinka, Mikulaš] 1988. Kolomyika. In: Kubijovyč, Volodymyr (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*. Vol. 2. Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press. P. 591–592.

Holovatsʼkyj, Jakiv Fedorovych [Golovatskij, Jakov Fedorovich] 1878. *Narodnye pesni Galitskoj i Ugorskoj Rusi*. Vol. 2: *Obrjadnye pesni*. Izdanie Imperatorskogo Obshchestva Istorii i Drevnostej Rossijskikh pri Moskovskom Universitete. Moskva: V Universitetskoj tipografii (M. Katkov).

Javorskij, Julian Andreevich 1912. Velikorusskie pesni v starinnykh karpato-russkikh zapisjakh. *Izvestija Otdelenija russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk* 12(1), 106–189.

Javorskij, Julian Andreevich 1929. Pesnja-ballada o kozake i Kuline i dukhovnaja pesnʼ greshnykh ljudej. In: *Naukovyj zbirnik tovaristva "Prosvita" v Uzhhorodi* 6: 197–259.

Jefremova, Ljudmyla Oleksandrivna 2009. *Chastotnyj kataloh ukraïnsʼkoho pisennoho folʼkloru*. Vol. 1: *Opis*. Kyïv: Naukova dumka.

Kʼekʼelidze, Kʼorneli 1952. *Dzveli kartuli litʼeratʼuris istʼoria*. Vol. 2. Tbilisi: Tbilisi University Press.

Keldysh, Jurij Vsevolodovich 1984. Pesnija v rukopisnykh sbornikakh. In: *Istorija russkoj muzyki*. In 10 vols. Vol. 2: *XVIII vek. Chastʼ pervaja*. Moskva: Muzyka, 153–183.

Khakhanov, Aleksandr Solomonovich 1909. Iz gruzinskoj literatury po starinnoj malorusskoj pesne. In: *Etnograficheskoe obozrenie* LXXXIII, 99.

Khintibidze, Ak'ak'i 1990. *Tsezura kartul leksshi da Guramishvilis versipik'atsia*. Tbilisi: Metsniereba.

Kolessa, Filiaret 1906–1907. Rytmika ukraïns'kykh narodnykh pisen'. In: *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva imeni Shevchenka*, 1906, LXIX, 7–30; LXXI, 44–95; LXXII, 80–111; LXXIII, 65–118; LXXIV, 33–68; 1907, LXXVI, 64–116.

Korchagin, Kirill Mikhailovich 2015. Nachal'nye pereaktsentuatsii (pereboi) v russkikh dvuslozhnykh razmerakh (tipologija i istorija). *Izvestija Rossijskoj akademii nauk. Serija literatury i jazyka* 74(1), 19–29.

Korsh, Fedor Evgen'evich 1906. Vvedenie v nauku o slavjanskom stikhoslozhenii. In: Lamanskij, Vladimir Ivanovich (ed.), *Stat'i po slavjanovedeniju*. Vol. 2. Izdanie otdelenija russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk. Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografija Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk, 300–378.

Kurganov, Nikolaj Gavrilovich (ed.) 1788. *Kniga Pismovnik, a v nej Nauka Rossijskogo jazyka s sedm'ju prisovokuplenijami, raznykh uchebnykh i poleznozabavnykh veshcheslovij*. Novoe izdanie. Moskva: V tipografii Fridrikha Gippiusa.

Lappo-Danilevskij, Konstantin Jur'evich 2020. N. I. Novikov – izdatel' poezii A. P. Sumarokova. In: *Literaturnyj fakt* 17, 304–342. https://doi.org/10.22455/2541-8297-2020-17-304-342

Leonidze, Giorgi 1966. David Guramishvili. In: *Kartuli lit'erat'uris ist'oria*. Vol. 2. Tbilisi: Sabch'ota Sakartvelo, 480–519.

Lomidze, Tamar 2024. Davit Guramishvilis met'rik'a. In: *K'admosi* 16, 85–109. https://doi.org/10.32859/kadmos/16/85-109

Lotman, Maria-Kristiina 2012. Equiprosodic translation method in Estonian poetry. In: *Sign Systems Studies* 40(3/4), 447–472. https://doi.org/10.12697/SSS.2012.3-4.10

Lys'ko, Zinovij [Lysko, Zenowij] (ed.) 1964–1994. *Ukraïns'ki narodni melodiï / Ukrainian Folk Melodies*. 10 vols. New York, Toronto: Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S. and Canada (UVAN).

Maksymovych, Mykhailo Oleksandrovych [Maksimovich, Mikhail Aleksandrovich] 1827. *Malorossijskie pesni*. Moskva: Tipografija Avgusta Semena.

Markov, Aleksej Vladimirovich 1917. Chulkovskij pesennik i ego znachenie dlja izuchenija velikorusskikh narodnykh pesen. In: *Izvestija Otdelenija russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti Rossijskoj Akademii Nauk* 22(2), 81–126.

Peretz, Vladimir Nikolaevich [Peretts, Volodymyr Mykolajovych] 1900. *Istoriko-literaturnye issledovanija i materialy*. Vol. 1: *Iz istorii russkoj pesni*. Parts 1–2. Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografija F. Vajsberga i P. Gershunina.

Petrovskij, Nestor Memnonovich 1908. Rukopisnyj pesennik XVIII veka. In: *Izvestija Otdelenija russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk* 12(1), 273–294.

Pilshchikov, Igor 2025. New Applications of Jakobson's "Broad Metrics": Sung Poetry and Dual-Metered Verse. In: *Studia Metrica et Poetica* 12(1), 65–109. https://doi.org/10.12697/smp.2025.12.1.03

Polilova, Vera; Pilshchikov, Igor; Belousova, Anastasia 2022. Sravniteľnoe stikhovedenie v Rossii i za rubezhom. In: *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 2, 125–150. https://doi.org/10.31857/0373-658X.2022.2.125-150

Pozdneev, Aleksandr Vladimirovich [1958] 1996. *Rukopisnye pesenniki XVII–XVIII vv.: Iz istorii pesennoj sillabicheskoj poezii*. Moskva: Nauka.

Pypin, Aleksandr Nikolaevich 1858. Narodnye stikhi i pesni (Izvlechenija iz rukopisej). In: *Otechestvennyye zapiski* 116(1), section I, 301–340.

Shanidze, Aḳaḳi 1953. *Kartuli gramaṭiḳis sapudzvlebi. I: Morpologia*. Tbilisi: Tbilisi University Press.

Silagadze, Aṗolon 1987. *Leksmtsodneobiti analizis ṗrintsiṗebis shesakheb*. Tbilisi: Tbilisi University Press.

Silagadze, Aṗolon 2013. *Vepkhisṭq̇aosnis leksi da misi adgili kartuli liṭeraṭuris isṭoriashi*. Tbilisi: Universali.

Speranskij, Mikhail Nestorovich 1909. Malorusskaja pesnja v starinnykh russkikh pechatnykh pesennikakh. In: *Etnograficheskoe obozrenie* 81/82, 120–144.

Sumarokov, Aleksandr Petrovich 1781. *Polnoe sobranie vsekh sochinenij v stikhakh i proze*. Ed. by Nikolaj Novikov. Vol. 8. Moskva: V Universitetskoj tipografii u N. Novikova.

Tsaishvili, Sargis 1966. *Liṭeraṭuruli tserilebi*. Tbilisi: Sabchʼota Sakartvelo.

Tsʼereteli, Aḳaḳi 1950. Ramdenime siṭq̇va "Changuris" shesakheb. In: *Tkhzulebata sruli ḳrebuli 15 ṭomad*. Vol. 12. Tbilisi: Sakhelgami, 80–112.

Vasylenko, Zinaïda; Hordijchuk, Mykhajlo 1957. *Ukraïnsʼki narodni pisni*, vol. 1. Kyïv: Mystetstvo.

Zelenin, Dmitrij Konstantinovich 1914. *Opisanie rukopisej Uchenogo arkhiva Imperatorskogo Russkogo geograficheskogo obshchestva*. Vol. 1. Petrograd: Tipografija A. V. Orlova.