

# Russian Binary Meters

## Part One

Kiril Taranovsky\*

### Translator's Foreword

Walter N. Vickery (1921–1995), a prolific scholar with interests ranging from literary history to poets' biography to Russian versification, conceived the idea of translating Kiril Taranovsky's *Ruski dvodelni ritmovi* while teaching at the University of Colorado in the late 1960s. By the time he moved to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 1969, to assume the chairmanship of the newly created Slavic Department, he had completed most of the work on the introductory chapters. As a recent Ph.D. in Slavic linguistics and poetics (Taranovsky had chaired my dissertation committee), I joined Vickery at UNC in 1970, having previously been his colleague at Colorado, and we began working together on the translation. By the late spring of 1971, thanks in no small part to a trio of graduate student Research Assistants who diligently typed text and reproduced tables and diagrams – even passing up a night's sleep to meet a deadline (“essential workers” we would call them today) – we had a completed typescript. All that was missing was the author's imprimatur.

Taranovsky was outwardly supportive of our project (which had the enthusiastic backing of Roman Jakobson), and was prompt and courteous in corresponding with us. We would send him completed chapters, and he would usually respond in a way that suggested we were all working toward the same end. He was no longer comfortable with the phrase “rhythmic inertia” (*ritmičeskaja inercija*), preferring “rhythmic drive” (*ritmičeskoe dviženie*),<sup>1</sup> so we incorporated that change into our translation. Yet it soon became apparent that his misgivings ran deeper. He plainly had reservations about publishing a translation of a 1953 book based on his 1941 doctoral dissertation, which he had written when he was barely out of his 20s. So much had changed in the interim – the statistical studies of Gasparov, Kolmogorov and Prokhorov, in

---

\* Translated by Walter N. Vickery and Lawrence E. Feinberg. Translator' address: Lawrence Feinberg, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Department of Germanic and Slavic Languages, Dey Hall 426, Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27599, USA, e-mail: lfeinber@email.unc.edu.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Taranovsky 1971: 427.

particular, had provided stimulating new perspectives from which to revisit his earlier ideas. When Walter and I conferred with him during a visit to Cambridge, he casually remarked that he would write a whole new book if he had the time and inclination. We suggested that he might append an afterword to each chapter; his own preference was to have James Bailey review our translated chapters and contribute revisions and commentary as needed. That would not have been conducive to timely completion, and it would have made our translation more like a team effort. Taranovsky also wanted transliterated Russian text put back into Cyrillic, which would have required major reworking, given the 1970s state of the art. The upshot was that our project fell by the wayside just short of finding a publisher. In a 1977 letter to Mihhail Lotman, Taranovsky noted that his book had “long since been translated into English” (“*uže davno perevedena na anglijskij*”).<sup>2</sup> That was technically correct, but it would have been truer to say that the manuscript was by then gathering dust on my office bookshelf.

Over the years I’ve sometimes wondered if it was worth holding on to a moldering typescript unlikely ever to see the light of day. I’m grateful that in this instance inertia proved stronger than the urge to free up space and move on – as Taranovsky might have said, the static principle overcame the dynamic. Taranovsky’s book, in the original Serbian, and more recently in Russian translation, has had a far-reaching influence on studies of Russian verse, and potential applications of its major principles to other verse systems have not been overlooked. Yet its readers have so far nearly all been Slavists. Though I would not have chosen to wait 50 years to see it in print, this could be just the right moment for an English translation that will make Kirill Fedorovich’s classic available to the widest audience.

*Lawrence Feinberg*

## Russian Binary Meters

### 1. Introduction

According to the formulations of recent theoreticians, poetic rhythm is based on the reader’s anticipation (in verse lines) of the recurrence, at specified intervals, of prescribed rhythmic signals which in practice may or may not occur; when these signals fail to occur, our expectations are frustrated. It is precisely

---

<sup>2</sup> Taranovsky, Lotman 2014: 376; qtd in Wachtel 2015: 1, fn. 1.

in this matter of frustrated expectation that poetic rhythm differs from automatic or mechanical rhythm. Omissions of rhythmic signals, or – as it used to be expressed in traditional metrics — deviations from the metrical scheme, are not some sort of “poetic license”, nor are they in any way shortcomings in the rhythm, as they were at one time considered in traditional metrics; on the contrary, it is in these very omissions of the anticipated signal that the wealth and beauty of poetic rhythm are manifest.

It is from this approach to poetic rhythm that the basic principle of contemporary verse theory derives. According to this principle, not the abstract metrical scheme which preoccupied traditional metrics, but the concrete rhythm must be the object of our study. In describing verse structure, contemporary theory distinguishes between the following categories: *metrical constants and dominants* (when the recurrence of a given phenomenon is found in 100% of the lines or when our expectation of its recurrence is frustrated only very rarely) and *rhythmic tendencies* (when the recurrence of a phenomenon is only more or less probable). The basic rhythmic unit is that of the line; it is no mere chance that the line is graphically marked off as a separate and individual sequence of words: the recurrence of the basic, primary rhythmic impulse is expected even within a single line. At the same time, individual lines combine together to form larger secondary rhythmic sequences (rhythmic periods and stanzas): and in these, too, we witness the recurrence of certain phenomena – first and foremost, of certain modulations of the phrase intonation. These two types of rhythmic factor must be distinguished. Finally, contemporary verse theory differentiates between the linguistic structure of poetic rhythm (potential rhythm) and its implementation in speech (phonetic rhythm). Thus verse theory may be subdivided into versification (*stixosloženie, Verslehre*) and diction (*stixoproiznesenie, Versvortragslehre*).

By studying rhythmic phenomena as elements of language and by exploring their different potential acoustic implementations, verse theory has made deep inroads into the field of linguistics. The present state of verse theory renders invalid Tomaševskij's onetime complaint against dilettantism; if Tomaševskij is correct in asserting that up to quite recently the study of rhythmic phenomena was a neglected field in linguistics (“*plelas' v xvoste lingvistiki*”), due to the lack of enthusiasm in philological circles for specific problems relating to poetic language,<sup>1</sup> this is today no longer the case. But rhythmic phenomena are not the concern exclusively of the linguist; they also very much belong in the domain of the literary historian. The student of rhythmic phenomena attempts in the first place to arrive at an objective description of a given rhythmic structure (for an individual poet, an epoch, or a language etc.). He then seeks to establish the connection between the individual rhythms and the poetic language, and – finally – the

connection between rhythm, language and theme. Thus his ultimate aim is to embrace poetry in its entirety, i. e. to demonstrate and explain dialectically the unity of form and content in poetry. Thus, in any examination of questions relating to poetic form, linguistics and literary history are, of necessity, inseparable. “Whether our starting-point is that of the literary historian or the linguist”, Professor Belić states,<sup>2</sup> “our questions must be one and the same. In stylistics or metrics, if our work is to be scientific, there can be neither a literary standpoint nor a linguistic standpoint – in the sense of their functioning in isolation. The two disciplines must be fused. The literary historian must also be a linguist, and if the work is to be properly carried out, the linguist must also be an esthetician and literary historian”.

Guided, then, by the theoretical approach and understanding of our objectives outlined above,<sup>3</sup> we shall endeavor to provide a description of the structure of the Russian binary meters (trochees and iambs). Starting with Lomonosov’s and Trediakovskij’s first attempts, our study will continue on through the second half of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century to embrace Puškin and the outstanding pleiad of Russian poets known as “the poets of the Puškin era”, covering also certain of their direct successors. As for the range of phenomena to be investigated, we have limited ourselves to the primary factors of poetic rhythm (stress and the boundaries between stress unities), for these are in effect the basic rhythmic impulses which are characteristic of any given rhythm. The larger, secondary rhythmic sequences (rhythmic periods and stanzas) and all the elements which go to make these up (namely the rhythmic organization of the phrase intonation, phraseological stress, the sound harmony, rhymed and unrhymed line endings): all such questions have been deliberately omitted from our investigation, since they can only be studied in conjunction with all other rhythms characteristic of the poetry of a period, and not merely for a single type.<sup>4</sup> For the same reasons we will not touch on problems relating to different types of intonation and the poetic language characteristic of the different types of intonation, nor will we go in depth into the connection between individual rhythms and specific literary genres. We shall, therefore, be studying rhythm without reference to meaning or to emotional and conceptual overtones – the primary rhythm in pure form.

Traditional metrics distinguishes in Russian poetry between the so-called syllabotonic meters, in which the intervals between icti consist of a constant number of syllables, and so-called free or tonic verse, in which the number of syllables between stresses varies. The syllabotonic meters are divided into binary and ternary meters. They are generally represented schematically as follows:

Trochee:     - ∪ | - ∪ | - ∪ | - ∪ | ...  
 Iamb:       ∪ - | ∪ - | ∪ - | ∪ - | ...  
 Dactyl:     - ∪ ∪ | - ∪ ∪ | - ∪ ∪ | ...  
 Amphibrach: ∪ - ∪ | ∪ - ∪ | ∪ - ∪ | ...  
 Anapest:    ∪ ∪ - | ∪ ∪ - | ∪ ∪ - | ...

Traditional metrics placed all these meters in a single category (syllabotonic), although the difference in respect to the tonic basis of the rhythm is far greater between binary and ternary meters than between ternary and free (tonic) meters.

If we take any poem written in a binary meter, we shall see that its rhythm does not coincide with the metrical scheme:

Duxóvnoj žáždoju tomím  
 V pustýne mráčnoj já vlačílsja  
 I šestikrýlyj serafím  
 Na perepút'i mné javílsja.

Obviously, syllables which, according to our metrical scheme, should carry a stress, often fail to do so. We can substitute another approximate scheme as follows:

∪ ≃ | ∪ ≃ | ∪ ≃ | ∪ - | .

But this scheme is excessively vague and inexact. For one thing, it, too, fails to account for certain phenomena, e. g., the stressing of metrically weak syllables:

Dúx otricán'ja, dux somnén'ja...  
 Slová: bór, búrja, vóron, él'...  
 I v mýsljax mólvila: vót on...

Furthermore, this scheme makes no distinction between stresses, which are all treated as equal, whereas in fact some stresses are much stronger and more stable than others. If, for example, in Puškin's *Mednyj vsadnik*, written in four-foot iambs, we count up the percentages of stresses for all syllables, we obtain the following picture:

Syllables:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
% of stresses:	8.8	85.5	1.3	96.4	1.1	40.7	0.4	100
Icti:		I		II		III		IV

We have here only one metrical constant: the eighth syllable is invariably stressed. The odd syllables are the metrical dominants: they come close to achieving a complete absence of stress: only the first syllable does not quite fit into this pattern of behavior. On the odd-syllable positions we find either monosyllabic words or the unstressed syllables of polysyllabic words. The even syllables must be regarded as no more than rhythmic tendencies: they lean strongly toward stress, but in markedly differing degrees: for example, the second ictus is nearly two and a half times stronger than the third. Only 32% of the lines have all four icti stressed. This means that in 68% of the lines our expectations are somewhere frustrated. On the other hand, about 90% of the lines omit all stresses on the odd syllables. Consequently, in the iamb it is the odd, metrically weak syllables which constitute the tonic basis of the rhythm. Ščerba was among the first to point this out: "...by *iambic* I understand only the fact that there is an absence of stress on the odd syllables".<sup>5</sup> The same, *mutatis mutandis*, is also valid for the trochee.

The ternary meters present a completely different picture. In the ternaries all metrical icti are as a rule stressed. Omissions of stress are very rare. An example of such omission is seen in the following Nekrasov anapests:

Rusokúdraja, goľuboókaja,  
S tíxoj grúst'ju na blédnyx ustáx.

Only in the dactyl do we find fairly frequently the stress omitted on the first syllable:

Sáša poprávilas' – bóg ej pomóžet.  
Okoldováť nikogó on ne móžet...  
Blágo nasléďe bogátyx otcóv  
Osvobodílo ot mályx trudóv...

In Nekrasov's *Sáša*, from which the above lines are quoted, the first syllable is stressed in only 88.9% of the lines, whereas the other metrically strong syllables (the fourth, seventh, and tenth) are without exception stressed (i. e. in 100% of the lines).<sup>6</sup>

As for the metrically weak syllables in ternaries (unstressed according to the metrical scheme), these too may carry stress – either a stressed monosyllable or the stressed syllable in a disyllabic word:

Dúmaet Sáša: *čtò pét' bǔdut ptícy?...*  
 S golovój *bǔrjam* žízni otkrýtoju...  
 Na detěj *milost'* bóga zvalá...  
 I plámja tvoë uznajú, *sòlnce* mira...

Here we have examples in which the interval between two icti is filled by a disyllabic trochaic word. The interval can equally well be filled by a disyllabic word of the iambic type:

V okné *togdà* čtò-to belélo...  
 Togó *gljadi* kósy padút...  
 Čtò *včerà* szál to segódnja i s'ěst...  
 Ja tebé, *mojù* pésnju poslédnjuju,  
*Mojù* gór'kujú pésnju spojù...

In Lermontov we even find a three-syllable word with a hypermetrical stress on the third syllable – in a dactyl in which the first ictus is without stress:

Okruží sčástiem sčást'ja dostójnjuju,  
 Dáj\_ej sopútnikov pólnyx vnimánija...

Especially common is the stressing of the first syllable in the anapest, even more common than in the iamb:

Úm, bezdėjstvujá, vjáló toskúet...  
 Mýsli svěži, vynóslivy nógi...  
 Sóvest' pésnju svojú zapeváet...

Thus in Nekrasov's *Rycar' na čas* the first syllable is stressed in 42% of the lines, 20.1% of the stresses occurring in disyllabic words and 21.9% in monosyllables. This poem shows the following figures for stress distribution:

Syllables:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
% of stresses:	42.0	1.4	100	6.8	7.3	99.5	2.3	2.7	100
Icti:			I			II			III

The metrically strong syllables are here constants, while the metrically weak syllables are metrical dominants or rhythmic tendencies: we thus have almost the reverse picture of that obtained in the binary meters. Here it is the metrically strong syllables which form the tonic basis of the rhythm. The overall

abundance of constants and dominants in the ternaries make these latter somewhat monotonous, because our expectations are frustrated much less frequently than in the binary meters. For this reason poets began in the ternaries to introduce lines with an irregular number of syllables by omitting on occasion an unstressed syllable, e. g., in Baratynskij's dactyls:

Díkoju, gróžnoju láskoju pólny,  
 B'júť v naš korábl' sredizémnye vólny;  
 Vót nad kormóju <sub>^</sub> stál kapitán...

In Fet we find this device employed throughout entire poems, especially in translations from Heine, where he was imitating the original. It was widely used by the Symbolists and came to be known as a *pauznik*, although actually no pauses are involved.<sup>7</sup>

It is thus clear from the foregoing that the traditional approach which regarded Russian meters as based on the alternation of stressed and unstressed syllables is not completely accurate. In the binary meters, unstressed syllables as a rule alternate with syllables which are not mandatorily stressed. In the ternary meters, stressed syllables as a rule occur at regular intervals, separated by two syllables which are not mandatorily unstressed.<sup>8</sup> In free tonic verse the intervals between metrical stresses consist of a variable number of syllables which are not mandatorily unstressed.<sup>9</sup> Ternary meters, therefore, have in common with binaries regularity in the number of syllables, and with free verse they have in common the tonic basis, i. e. regularity in the number of prescribed stresses. Binary and free tonic meters share no common basis.

We thus arrive at the most precise possible definition of binary meters. The true picture cannot be conveyed by either of the horizontal straight-line schemes here offered above, nor by any other such scheme. Tomaševskij was perfectly correct in insisting that rhythm should be represented by means of stress diagrams; it goes without saying that the statistics needed to compile such diagrams should be based on a sufficiently large number of lines as to eliminate the possibility of mere chance. The statistical study of the distribution of stresses on the different syllables is based, therefore, on the mathematical law of large numbers. And the distribution of stresses (i. e. the *rhythmic drive*) can be characteristic of a single poet, a whole poetic school or, finally, the entire poetry of a given language.

"But", as Tomaševskij points out,<sup>10</sup> "rhythm – and especially the individual rhythm of different poets and different lines of verse – is not determined solely by the alternation of stressed and unstressed syllables. A line of verse is made up not of an alternation of syllables, but of a sequence of words. It is the word

which is the concrete material, and any experimental study of verse must take into account the study of words, their accentual configuration and their boundaries. The study of word boundaries and of the relationship between word boundaries and the position of the stresses in the line: this is the second priority in any investigation". Tomaševskij's assertion can be illustrated by the simplest of examples: two verse lines with the same number of stresses, but with entirely different word boundaries (or, to be more exact, different stress units), i. e. with different *phrasing*:

- 1) Odním dyšá, odnó ljubjá...
- 2) Čužógo tólka xítryj lírik...

In the first example the boundaries between the stress units occur immediately after the stress, which imparts to the rhythm a rising intonation. In the second example the phrasing produces a falling intonation, which is due to the fact that the boundaries between stress units occur after the unstressed syllables. Depending on which type dominates, the phrasing will to a greater or lesser degree produce a rising or falling intonation.

It would be erroneous to regard these boundaries between stress units as pauses, since the break is never sufficiently long to be perceived by the ear. But the boundaries are always present in our consciousness – in normal speech as differentiating markers or signals which indicate to which stress unit a given syllable belongs. In verse this signal may be a metrical constant, in which case we will always be expecting it at a specific place in the line (as in, for example, the five-foot iamb with caesura). Just as with the distribution of stresses in the line, so also a specific type of phrasing may be characteristic of individual poets, whole epochs and even the entire poetry of a given language. Therefore, phrasing or phrase intonation becomes a second object of study for the investigator. Phrasing is also here represented in diagram form.

## 2. Metrical Constants in Russian Binary Meters

In regard to prosody Russian binary meters have as a rule only one constant: the final ictus in the line is always stressed, regardless of whether the syllable is rhymed or not. There have, however, been attempts to undermine this constant.

In Puškin we find lines with the final ictus unstressed only, it would seem, in rejected pieces, as for example, in the “Ograda monastyrskaja” scene, written in trochees, which he excluded from his *Boris Godunov*:

Dén' proxódit, dén' proxódit – vídno, slýšno vsě odnó:  
Tól'ko vídiš' čěrny rjásy, tól'ko slýšiš' kólokol.

Or again in the first redaction of his 1826 monolog “Kak ščastliv ja...” (in five-foot iambs):

O, skóro li oná iz lóna vóln  
Podýmetsja i výdet ná\_bereg...<sup>11</sup>

In other poets, violations of this constant are very rare, and occur almost exclusively in five-foot iambs with masculine unrhymed endings:

Ne káždyj li iz vášix rátnikov...  
Egó eščě zdes' nět... *Korínfjane*...  
(Kjuxel'beker: *Argivjane*)

I dúmaja, čto cép' *obmánčivyx*  
Vidénij mnój razrúšena, ja vdvóe  
Obmánut byl voobraženem...  
(Lermontov: “*Smert*”).

Vsegdá dobró drug drúgu *délajut*...  
Ty mnógo trébueš, *Emílija*...  
Kogdá o mně žaléet *žénščina*...  
(Lermontov: *Ispancy*)

Nu, sumasbródnij dúx, čto *nóvogo*?  
...Dve nedeli  
My proveděm v različnyx *prázdnestvax*...  
(Satin: *Son v Ivanovu noč*)

Iz étogo... Nu, čtó ž iz *étogo*?...  
Pitě, pitě... Onó *otrávleno*!  
(Kroneberg: *Gamlet*)

Vaš vrág ušël i *vosstanóvleno*...  
 Ja govorjú tebé – ves' v *zólote*...  
 (A. Družinin: *Koriolan*)

Gotóvit' íx dlja *interlúdium*...  
 (Ostrovskij: *Komik XVII stoletija*)

Mír vám i blágo... *Benedícite*...  
 (F. Miler: *Mera za meru*)

...Búd'te dóbrym  
 Sovétnikom emú – *Dostátočno*  
 Sovétoť lúčšix búdet u negó...  
 (Vejnberg: *Konec vsemu delu venec*)

Mne býlo strášno; ja *bojálas'* by...  
 Ogó! Dolžnó byť don-*Jerónimo*...  
 Kák? Čtót? Tepér'? Pri mné? Ty *znáeš'* li...  
 (A. K. Tolstoj: *Don Žuan*)

S umá sošlí! Viš, so *Mstislávskimi*  
 Xotját sčitát'sja...  
 Syn Fědor! tý v tjažělyj, trúdnyj čas  
 Vosxódiš' na prestól – ty *dúmal* lí,  
 Čto búdeš' délat', kak menjá ne stánet?  
 (A. K. Tolstoj: *Smert' Ioanna Groznogo*)

Velíkij Cėzar' pál. O, *strášnoe*  
 Paděně éto býlo!...  
 (P. Kozlov: *Ju. Cezar*)

We found similar examples in the unrhymed five-foot iambs of Ševyrěv (*Romul*) and Polonskij (*Bol'noj pisatel'*). In all these examples we are dealing with five-foot iambs with masculine endings. The only example of a feminine ending was found in Ostrovskij's drama *Tušino*:

Iz vedunóv – vedún. Vot *vrémjačko-to!*

In all these poets, the lines with omitted final stresses do not even amount to 0.5% of the total lines in the work (or in Lermontov's case, the total lines in

his 1830 lyric poetry); to be more precise, the percentages range between 0.1% and 0.4%. These insignificant figures merely confirm the quite exceptional character of such lines.

We also find omissions of the final stress in the so-called “iambic trimeter”. The following examples are taken from Xolodovskij’s translation of *Faust* (Part II):

Xvalój odníc, xulój drugíc *proslávlena*,  
 Javljájus’ já, Eléna, prjámo *s bérega*,  
 Gde výšli mý na súšu, i tepér’ eščě  
 Morskój živóju zýb’ju *op’janěnnaja*...

Xolodovskij is here deliberately imitating the rhythm of the original. Žirmunskij has pointed out that “following the example of classical verse, which permits the final (twelfth) syllable to be either a long or a short syllable, German and Russian imitators sanctioned the practice of omitting the stress on the twelfth syllable; in this way the ‘iambic trimeter’ in Russian and German poets becomes indistinguishable from the five-foot iamb with dactylic endings.”<sup>12</sup>

A quite exceptional example of a violation of the metrical constant occurs in Meĵ’s four-foot trochees:

Éto vót – *Amérika*.  
 Éto nóvyj svét besspórno...

In all the examples cited so far the endings have been unrhymed. Examples of unstressed rhymes are even rarer; Russian verse does not admit them, as does, for example, Serbian or Czech verse. We did find the following rhyme in Trediakovskij (three-foot iambs):

Potóm *rassmátrivaj*  
 Postúpki v néj kakíe;  
 Vse sklónnosti poznáj  
 Iz téx vnutr’ vsé l’ dragíe...

Similarly, in Vjazemskij (two-foot anapests):

Poklonís’ ty emú  
 Izuvéčennomu  
 V poedínke s grozój...

And again in Ryleev\* (also two-foot anapests):

Tak v nenástnye dní  
Sobiráliš' oní  
Částo.  
Gnúli – bóg ix prostí –  
*Ot p'jatidesjati*  
Ná sto...

Such lines are, however, absolute rarities. The best proof of this is the mere fact that one example was found in Trediakovskij, who was well known for his experimentation, while the other two examples are taken from humorous verse.<sup>13</sup>

Among twentieth-century poets unstressed rhymes occur more frequently. We find, for example, in Vološin:

Eščě tomít, ne pokidája,  
Skvoz' žárkij bréd i són – tvojá  
Mečtá v stradán'jax izžitája  
*I neosuščestvlěnnaja...*

But even in the twentieth century such rhymes are extraordinarily rare.

While the final, metrically strong syllable in Russian binary meters is as a rule always stressed, any syllables which may follow it are as a rule always unstressed. An exception is the unrhymed four-foot trochee with dactylic endings. Following the example provided by the clausula in the *bylina*<sup>14</sup> of folk poetry which has the following metrical pattern: ... – ∪ – (the musical equivalent is normally | ♩ ♩ | ♩), the four-foot trochee may have the ninth syllable stressed, along with the seventh syllable which is the constant:

Mý ne vérim, čtoby bóg *Satúrn*  
Móg ljubéznogo rodítelja  
Prevratít' v uróda žálkogo...  
(Karamzin: *Il'ja Muromec*)

---

\* *Translators' note:* This excerpt is from 12 lines of light verse that served as an epigraph to the first chapter of Puškin's *Pikovaja dama*. Although Taranovsky ascribes these lines to Ryleev, most scholars today believe that they were composed by Puškin himself.

Of special interest is the trochee in Xeraskov's *Baxar'jana*, in which a stress on the ninth syllable is combined with a violation of the metrical constant, i. e. the fixed stress on the seventh syllable:

Vobrazí rekú širokúju,  
Po reké plyvúšču lódočku:  
Rýcar' v máloj lódočke sidít...

Thus in Xeraskov the four-foot trochee with a dactylic ending is actually combined with the five-foot trochee with a masculine ending.

Besides these constants involving the clausula, certain meters also have their own special constants: for example, the five-foot iamb can have an obligatory caesura before the fifth syllable; the six-foot iamb and the six-foot trochee can have an obligatory caesura before the seventh syllable; and in the caesural six-foot trochee not only the eleventh but also the fifth syllable is always stressed. In some cases rhythmic tendencies can become metrical constants: for example, in the four-foot trochees of Puškin (1829–1835 lyrics), Jazykov, Nekrasov, Mej, A. K. Tolstoj or Fet, the third syllable is invariably stressed along with the seventh. Or again in Poležaev's four-foot iambs (1823–1833) we find the fixed stress not only on the eighth but also on the fourth syllable. All these are special cases which will be examined in due course.

Finally, since the lines in binary meters are composed of an equal number of feet, it follows that the number of syllables is another constant. For this reason theoreticians normally refer to binary meters as syllabotonic. However, Russian verse also admits a combination of lines in which the number of feet varies. This is especially true of the iamb (so-called "free iambs"). In our present study we will be dealing exclusively with verse in which the number of feet is constant.<sup>15</sup>

### 3. Metrical Dominants in Russian Binary Meters

The metrically weak syllables in binary meters (the even syllables in trochees and the odd syllables in iambs) show a strong tendency to avoid all stress whatever. They are the metrical dominants in binary meters. Most often the metrically weak positions are occupied by the unstressed syllables of polysyllabic stress units. There are two possible deviations from this rule: 1) the shifting of the stress from a metrically strong syllable to a metrically weak syllable; 2) the use in a metrically weak position of a stressed monosyllable. We will examine separately these two phenomena.

Fairly common in the trochee is the shifting of the initial stress in the line from the first to the second syllable. In caesural trochees the same shift can occur at the beginning of the second hemistich (e. g., in the six-foot caesural trochee from the seventh to the eighth syllable). A shift of this kind is less common in the middle of the line. Let us give some examples:

*Venéc mirtovoj spletálsja...*  
*Grexón xítrogo sofízma...*  
 (Radiščev)

*Xodjá v róščice tenístoj*  
*Vídel tám Eróta já...*  
 (Deržavin)

*Któ sej rýcar? Il'já Múromec...*  
*Emú xóčetsja gláza ee...*  
 (Karamzin)

*Vojská ídut dén' i nóč'...*  
 (Puškin)

*Krasávica zór'ka*  
*V nébe zagorélas'...*  
*Ja sam drúg s tobóju*  
*Slugá i xozjáin...*  
 (Kol'cov)

*V tēmnom lése, za rekój,*  
*Stoít dómik nebolšój,*  
*S dvumjá svétlymi oknámi,*  
*S raspašnými vorotámi...*  
 (Kol'cov)

*Pribežáli tój porój*  
*Jamščík i vožátyj...*  
*Zavoróčalsja v sanjáj*  
*Mixájlo Iványč...*  
 (Nekrasov)

V sebé zaključálo | éto vyražéne...  
 S vétrom iz tumána | k *nemú* donosílsja...  
 (Polonskij)

This stress shift is particularly common in trochee-type folk lyrics intended for singing, as, for example, in Russian *častuški*, whose musical rhythm is based on a trochaic beat (two-four time):

Text:	Na	go-	ré	sto-		ít	ap-	té-	ka
	Lju-	bóv'	sú-	šit		če-	lo-	vé-	ka
Musical									
Measure:	♪	♪	♪	♪		♪	♪	♪	♪

It is interesting to note what happens to the shifted stress when the line is sung. “In this case,” Trubeckoj points out,<sup>16</sup> “one feels, as it were, two consecutive stresses. The voice involuntarily stresses the first syllable because of the rhythmic drive; but the word stress demands a stress on the second syllable also. The two stresses are in competition with each other, and the second stress, reinforced by the meaning, i. e. by the normal word stress, is the stronger. We thus have something akin to syncopation. Consequently the word in which the stress occurs receives special emphasis:

A tepér' *mojá* kosá  
 V pučók (!) izmotálasja”.

This interpretation is valid only when singing is involved.<sup>17</sup> When this is not the case, i. e. when the text is read or recited, there is normally only one stress – the second, i. e. the one demanded by the sense.

The fact that the shift of stress from the first to the second syllable became fairly popular in the trochee in the literary tradition can only be explained by the influence of trochee-type folk rhythms. We may note, in this connection, that the Russian iamb does not admit a shift of stress from the metrically strong to the metrically weak syllable – unlike, for example, the English iamb, where this is fairly common.

It is true that Sumarokov, who was something of an experimenter, does shift the stress in one poem written in three-foot iambs. But this experiment was not repeated in Sumarokov's other iambic poetry, and in the poem in question the stress is shifted in only two lines:

Byť dólžno ljúdjam v vlásti  
 I ták véru ljubít'...  
 Slóvom tebé skazáti  
 On čéstnyj čelovék...

This example shows clearly how Sumarokov was feeling his way, as it were, from the binary meters to a type of meter roughly the equivalent of what later came to be known as *dol'niki*; an example of this type of verse in Sumarokov was given in Section I.

One of the rare attempts to shift the stress consistently in the iamb is found in a poem by I. M. Dolgorukij,<sup>18</sup> which contains lines of the following type:

Rýcar' vloží v nožný svoj méč  
 I pozavíduj nášej dóle...  
 Skaží carjú – mír kónčil brán',  
 Vóin na ródinu javílsja...  
 No ruká síl'naja tvorcá...  
 Ščást'e isčézlo v néj moě...  
 Sólnce vzojdět, menjá ne búdet...

As Tomaševskij rightly observes, it is inconceivable that Dolgorukij, who elsewhere wrote perfectly correct iambs, was in this poem guilty of gross errors; it is obvious that he was deliberately “disrupting the rhythm.”

In the same way Ševyrëv, in his translation of the seventh canto of Tasso's *Gerusalemme Liberata*, sometimes replaces an iambic foot with a trochee:

Dívny m propál Tankréd isčeznovén'ëm...  
 Tól'ko šléma emú nedostaválo...  
 No púšče vséx Rajmónd gnévom trepěščet...  
 Sémja vétra oná vosprinimála...

Ševyrëv was clearly imitating the Italian hendecasyllable. He also attempted to introduce into his Russian verse other characteristics from the Italian meter, e. g., elision:

No  $\overset{\sim}{i}$  tám grozá v gonénii žestókom...

The relatively small extent to which this “Italianization” was pushed can best be measured by the following statistics: out of a total of 984 lines, 948 are perfectly normal five-foot iambs, and only 36 contain deviations of one type or another.

The shift of stress from the strong to the weak syllable is inadmissible in the Russian iamb both in the eighteenth century and throughout the entire nineteenth century. Isolated examples of stress shift which may be found among the hundreds of thousands of perfectly regular iambs must be regarded as experimental.<sup>19</sup> Experiments of this nature assume greater proportions in the twentieth century, especially with the Symbolists, but this question lies outside the sphere of our investigation.

Although it is obvious that the Russian iamb does not admit a genuine shift of stress from the metrically strong to the metrically weak syllable (i. e. shift of a stress that *must* be realized), considerable confusion has been caused in Russian verse theory by the so-called apparent shift of stress from the strong to the weak syllable. By *apparent* we have in mind the following two cases: 1) when an iambic foot consists of a two-syllable word in which the stress falls on the metrically weak position and the unstressed syllable on the metrically strong position, but where the two-syllable word in question *either* can lose its stress entirely in the context of the clause to which it belongs *or* has a stress which is very markedly subordinated to the stress in another word; 2) when the metrically weak position is occupied by a monosyllable and the following strong position is occupied by an unstressed syllable of a polysyllabic word (the so-called choriambic type  $\acute{\text{v}} \text{ } \text{v} \text{ } \acute{\text{v}} \text{ } \dots$ ; e. g., *Cár' zanemóg. Cár' umiráet. Bóže!*). We shall for the present discuss only the first type; the second will be discussed at the end of this section in connection with the question of monosyllabic words occurring in metrically weak positions.

In speaking of apparent stress shift of the first type, we have in mind certain disyllabic prepositions and conjunctions, some adverbs and pronouns, and the subordinate parts of compound words.

The disyllabic prepositions (*prótiv, króme, méždu, péred, čérez* etc.) and conjunctions (*ili, áli, čtoby* and others) are used throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries with their potentially stressed syllable falling either on the metrically strong or metrically weak position. And this remains the practice today. For example:

Meždu Onéginym i mnój...  
 Grozý ne čúja méždu tém...  
 Protiv užásnyx iskušénij...  
 Rvalásja k mórju protiv buri...  
 Pered pomérkšimi domámi...  
 I pered sínimi rjadámi...

Perebralás' čerez ručěj...  
 Za vorotámi. Čerez děn'...  
 Velíku skórb' ili velíkij prázdnik...  
 Gitána ili p'jányj muzykánt...<sup>20</sup>

We must bear in mind that all these words are used proclitically and are therefore usually unstressed. In normal speech they carry stress only under special conditions and, to the extent that they are stressed, the stress falls today on the first syllable. However, in the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth many of these words could carry stress on either syllable. Thus, along with *króme* we also find *kromé*, along with *ili* we find *ilí*, along with *pró-tiv* – *protív* etc. In the work of eighteenth-century poets there is confirmation of the fact that these prepositions and conjunctions could carry stress on either syllable and, furthermore, that these poets showed a preference for the stress on the second syllable. This is attested in the following line from Lomonosov:

Ilí už stálo íl'; kolí už stálo kól'...

Similarly, Sumarokov asserts that the *pró-tiv* in a Lomonosov line should by rights have been stressed *protív*.<sup>21</sup> That *meždu* could be stressed either way is confirmed by Trediakovskij:

Ráznymi *meždú* | vídim tja cvetámi...

For this line Trediakovskij himself marked the stress so that no one would make the mistake of reading it *měždu*. The line occurs in one of his odes specially written as an example of the “trochaic pentameter”, in which Trediakovskij with typical pedantry implements his rule requiring a constant stress on the (fifth) syllable before the caesura.<sup>22</sup>

In the literary language of the nineteenth century the stress became stabilized on the first syllable, but in poetry past tradition continued to govern the stress on these words. This dual-stress arrangement is perfectly understandable if we remember that all these proclitics were originally atonic and, as “allegro forms”, they can undergo change in a way that would not be possible for “slower-tempo” words.<sup>23</sup>

As has already been noted, in the contemporary spoken language disyllabic prepositions are more often unstressed than stressed, and any pause between them and the word with which they form a syntagma is fairly unusual; we always feel any such pause as an emotive or rhetorical effect. Furthermore, in certain prepositions, when they are unstressed, there are changes in the quality of the

vowels (e. g., in *čerez* and *pered*)<sup>24</sup>. For these reasons disyllabic prepositions in binary meters behave as metrically neutral words. When in contemporary diction the natural stress of any of these prepositions coincides with the metrical ictus, the preposition may be stressed or unstressed without disrupting the rhythm; but when the preposition's stress falls on a metrically weak syllable, the preposition must be unstressed; otherwise it would be felt as a disruption of the rhythm. This is equally true for the above-mentioned conjunctions.

Pronouns (particularly possessives, precisely because together with the noun they form a syntagma) have, in the same fashion as the prepositions, been treated by poets as metrically neutral words – but much more rarely and more cautiously. We find an example in A. K. Tolstoj's three-foot iambs:

Zemljá *naša* bogáta,  
Porjádka v néj liš' nét.

In Puškin's iambs we can find, it seems, only one such example:

Ja predlagáju výpit' v *egò* pámjat'...<sup>25</sup>

Similar examples are found more often in eighteenth-century poets, as in, for example, Radiščev, who is apt to take liberties with the meter:

Ispólni sérdce *tvoim* žárom...  
Bljustí vsjak búdet *svoju* čést'...  
Veščáj, zloděj, *mnòju* venčánnjy...<sup>26</sup>

Or again in Osipov:

Lomál on s górja *svoji* rúki...  
I ne spuskáli *egò* s gláz...

In the same category we have an unusual example from Lermontov (unusual because the personal pronoun *oni* is separated from the verb):

Sadjátsja. Dólgo *oni* tám...

Undoubtedly, however, Lermontov felt this pronoun to be unstressed or so lightly stressed as not to disturb him.

Very rarely in iambic verse do we find certain adverbs treated as metrically neutral words:

Isxódit s vídom *vsegdá* zlóbnym...  
(Radiščev)

Primérov vídel *užě* svét...  
(Deržavin)

No vrémja *eščě* ne *ujdět*...  
(Krylov)

Svojú uzděčku *eščě* bóle...  
(Lermontov)

I švéjskij korolévič *užě* *prézde*...  
(Ostrovskij)

It is clear that these adverbs, too, were perceived by poets as atonic; otherwise, they would have permitted the use in these positions of obligatorily stressed words (as, for example, Dolgorukij), yet this is not the case. As for the adverb *eščě*, it can be pronounced in two ways: with a final *o* sound it is always stressed, but with a final *e* the stress is weak, if not entirely absent.<sup>27</sup> Extremely rare are examples of unstressed or minimally stressed forms of the verb *byt'*:

Mne pét' *bylo* o Tróe...  
(Lomonosov)

Nel'zjá *bylo* tut síle  
Protívit'sja níkák...  
(Deržavin)

Ix obnažit' *bylo* b *ne* zál'...  
(Vjazemskij)

And equally rare is the following use of the numeral *odin*:

Odním udárom, v *odin* *míg*...  
(Lermontov)

It is possible that Lermontov read this as a line with only two strong stresses and was thus undisturbed by the weakened stress on the seventh syllable:

*Odnim* udárom, | *v odin* míg...

Let us note also that in *Gore ot uma* Griboedov positions the word *brátec* so that its natural stress fails to coincide with the metrical ictus:

Ox, *nét*, *bratec*, u nás rugájut  
Vezdé, a vsjúdu prinimájut...

Štokmar expresses surprise that the word *bratec* is used five times in this way, and in this way only.<sup>28</sup> However, the explanation is simple. In the Moscow literary language the words *brat* and *bratec*, when they do not indicate kinship and do not occur at the beginning of a clause, are always atonic (*nét brat*, *nét bratec*).<sup>29</sup> Griboedov was simply reproducing this Moscow pronunciation.

A complete analogy with the disyllabic prepositions is provided by compound words in which the first element has an attributive function. In these words, in the spoken language, the strong dynamic stress falls on the most important (the second) part of the word, while in the subordinate part the potentially stressed syllable (i. e. the syllable which is stressed when the word stands on its own) normally loses its dynamic stress. It is rare in these compounds to hear the two stresses. This happens only when the delivery is intentionally slow and deliberate; and even then the second stress is always stronger than the first. Compounds are positioned in the line in such a way as to make the stress in the second part of the word coincide with the metrical ictus, while the potentially stressed syllable of the subordinate part may occur either in a metrically strong or metrically weak position. For example:

Temnozelěnymi sadámi.  
Blagouxájušče slězy...  
Est' v óseni pervonačáľnoj...  
V jarkoblestjáščeľ pýšnoj zále...  
Na *temnogolubóm* éfire...  
S očámi *temnogolubými*...  
S *temnokudrjávój* golovój...  
Vse zvúki žízni *blagodátnoj*...

Particularly common are compounds in which the first, subordinate part is *polu-*:

Dlja *polugorodskíx* poléj...  
Čto ž mój Onégín? *Polusónnyj*...  
*Polužurávl'* i *polukót*...  
*Polumilórd*, *polunevéža*...

What was noted above concerning disyllabic prepositions is equally valid, *mutatis mutandis*, for the first part of compound words.

As for monosyllables occurring in metrically weak positions, these can be subdivided into monosyllables which *may* go unstressed and monosyllables which the sense requires us to stress, e. g.:

Kogdá na jazyké ljubóvnom  
*Nét* búdet *nét*, *dá* búdet *dá*...  
 Švéd, rússkij, kólet, rúbit, réžet...  
 Rús' obnjalá kičlívogo vragá...  
 Slová: *bór*, *búrja*, *vóron*, *él*...  
 Drugój!... *Nét*, nikomú na svéte...  
 Vše póлно ím: *vsě* déve míloj...  
 I v mýsljax mólvila: *vót* ón!

The monosyllables in question often carry the logical stress, and sometimes in dialogue may even stand alone:

*Baron:* Xot' znáju tó, čto pokušálsja ón  
 Menjá...  
*Gercog:* Čtót?  
*Baron:* Obokrást'.  
*Al'ber:* Barón, vy lžěte!

The following rule holds for the spoken language: monosyllables can most easily be unstressed or very lightly stressed when they come immediately adjacent to the stressed syllable of another word, in which case they become enclitic or proclitic; the further they are from the other stressed syllable, the more difficult it becomes to weaken them or deprive them of stress. Their degree of stress or unstress is determined by the role played by stress in Russian. The Russian dynamic stress marks the independence of a stress unit as a semantic entity. In so doing, it is playing a dual role – as the stress marking an independent word, and as one stress in a syntagma; all the words forming a syntagma tend to cluster around one stress which in intensity is stronger than the others and falls usually on the dominant word of the syntagma. When monosyllables are part of a syntagma, they can quite easily reduce stress without changing the quality of the vowel which has lost its dynamic stress. For example: *Knjaz' Ígor'* (i. e. kn'as'ígor'), *luč\_sólнца* (lučsónca), *stal\_délat'* (stald'élət'), *moj\_dóm* (mojdóm), *sem'\_dněj*, *sto\_lét* etc. Some types of words reduce stress more easily than others. Most resistant to stress reduction are substantives and verbs, clearly

because these types are in the main dominant words in the syntagma: less resistant are adjectival, pronominal and adverbial words, also simple numerals which, in Professor Belić's view, are merely "modal (quantitative) auxiliaries of a specific type".<sup>30</sup> This class of words can more easily undergo stress reduction precisely because these words are in the main subordinate words in the syntagma. Personal pronouns with a verb, when they occur immediately next to the verb's stressed syllable, as a rule always form a single stress unit with that verb, e. g.: *on znáet*. Here the loss of stress is possible because the personal pronoun used in conjunction with the verb essentially adds nothing to the meaning over and above what is conveyed by the personal suffix of the verb; it can be left out without changing the meaning: it is really one and the same thing whether we say *ja znáju* or *znáju*. If, however, instead of *on znáet* we have the substantive *brat* as the subject, stress reduction is no longer possible: *brát znáet*. Monosyllabic exclamations present a special problem since they are not actually genuine words with a specific meaning. They can lose their stress when the emotion they express is extended to the following word, e. g.:

Adriatíčeskie vólny!  
 O Brénta! nét, uvížu vás...  
 Ax, nóžki, nóžki, gdé vy nýne...

When an exclamation stands independently, it has a full dynamic stress, just like any other monosyllable under similar conditions. E. g.:

Ů! Kák tepér' okružená  
 Kreščénskím xólodom oná...  
 Í, póлно, Tánja! V éti léta  
 My ne slyxáli pro ljubóv!...

Prosodically non-independent fixed forms (prepositions and conjunctions) are as a rule always atonic and usually undergo vowel-reduction.<sup>31</sup> It is true that these words also can carry stress and be separated by a pause from the word with which they are connected, but in such cases the entire clause takes on a new emotive nuance; the word which thus stands in isolation comes close in function to an exclamation, i. e. apart from its primary meaning it indicates some thought or emotion which is not clearly defined. For instance, in Puškin:

Poljúbite vy snóva. Nó...  
 Učíte' vlástvovat' sobóju...  
 S nej réč' xotél on zavestí  
 Í – i<sub>ne</sub>móg...

Or in Lermontov:

Da oxranjúsja já ot múšek,  
 Ot dév, neznájuščix ljubví,  
 Ot drúzby slíškom néžnoj í...  
 Ot romantíčeskix starúšek.

Prepositions, too, may stand independently, but in that case they are substituting for a complete syntagma: “*Vy zá ili prótiv?*”. “*Zá*” (i. e. in the sense of agreement, concurrence or the like). These are all rare and special cases which are either marked by punctuation or are obvious from the sense.

As may be seen from the foregoing, the stressing of monosyllabic words is not entirely determined by their grammatical form, but is dependent on their function in the clause. We cannot therefore regard as convincing Žirmunskij's attempt to link the strength of their stresses directly to their grammatical categories, for – as we have seen – even substantives can undergo stress reduction, though according to Žirmunskij they are invariably stressed.<sup>32</sup>

The pronunciation of monosyllables occurring in metrically weak positions in binary meters is also determined by the special demands of the rhythm. A monosyllable may be subordinated to the preceding word:

Ja ne deržú tebjá, no gdé<sub>ty</sub>  
 Svojí provódiš' večerá?  
 Probíl<sub>mne</sub> šlém i mímó proskakál...  
 Právda<sub>li</sub>, sprosíl<sub>on</sub>, – slúx idět iz nívy,  
 Búdto<sub>by</sub> v maéstro strásto vljubléný<sub>vy</sub>...

or to the following word:

Gde<sub>tý</sub>? Pridí – svoi pravá  
 Peredajú tebé po právu...  
 Nad ním luč<sub>sól</sub>nca zolotój...  
 Pod néj sneg<sub>útrennij</sub> xrustít...  
 Mež tém cel'<sub>ódy</sub> vysoká...

Such words may be stressed, but in that case there must be a pause after the preceding word in order to avoid disruption of the rhythm. Important in this respect is the relationship formulated by Tomaševskij<sup>33</sup>: the stronger the pause,

the stronger the stress on the monosyllable may be, even to the point of outweighing the stress on the polysyllabic word which follows. For example:

Mež tém – || *cél'* ódy vysoká...

We know that pauses always produce a break in the phrase intonation. This being so, a stressed monosyllable separated by a pause from the preceding word actually forms the beginning of a new segment of the phrase melody (*membre de phrase*, as Karcevskij calls it<sup>34</sup>). In speech, as we know, segments of the phrase melody may, though this is by no means mandatory, be separated by pauses; when this occurs, the pause is perfectly spontaneous and is in no way perceived either as a rhetorical device or as an unmotivated break in the speech. And indeed in the example given above, the pause occurs after a half cadence and therefore cannot in any way be regarded as unnatural. For the moment we wish simply to point out this relationship between the stressed monosyllable and the preceding pause. We will shortly return to this question.

The question is seldom raised as to how – within the possible limits just noted – a line of verse should be read. Normally the text clearly indicates the only logical interpretation. However, sometimes the text admits of more than one interpretation. Let us examine one example:

*Gercog:* Ne ón li?  
*Al'ber:* Tá k, ón, gosudár'  
*Gercog:* Podíte  
 V tu kómnatu. Ja klíknu vas... Barón...

We have here the possibility of basically two different interpretations of the actual role of the duke, and either one of these interpretations will determine how these lines should be spoken. The actor can play the duke as a youthful, energetic, brisk character, with abrupt gestures, who speaks fast, in a vigorous, energetic manner. In this case he will divide up the speech roughly as follows:

Podíte | v tu kómnatu. || Ja klíknu vas...

A completely different interpretation is also possible. The duke can be a young, energetic person who speaks in a dignified, authoritative manner, emphasizing each individual word. In the latter case the text will look roughly as follows:

Podíte | v tù kómnatu. || Já klíknu vás...

Puškin did not define very clearly the duke's character. Either of these two interpretations of the role can be equally well justified, This is, moreover, perfectly natural: the printed text does not provide a system of annotated instructions laying down precisely the author's interpretation.<sup>35</sup> For this reason any statistics relating to stressed monosyllables in metrically weak positions in binary meters must inevitably be to some extent subjective.

However, a careful reading of a considerable number of lines makes us aware that stressed monosyllables occur more often in some metrically weak positions than in others. Tomaševskij<sup>36</sup> gives the following percentage figures for the weak syllables in Puškin's iambic meters:

Syllables:	1	3	5	7	9	11
2-ft. iamb:	11.7	1.3	–	–	–	–
3-ft. iamb:	11.2	0.5	–	–	–	–
4-ft. iamb:	7.9	0.4	0.5	0.4	–	–
5-ft. iamb						
with caesura:	12.6	0.4	5.6	0.4	1.0	–
5-ft. iamb						
without caesura:	12.8	1.1	3.7	1.4	1.5	–
6-ft. iamb:	11.4	0.6	0.2	5.4	1.1	1.3

In verifying Tomaševskij's figures we obtained very similar results<sup>37</sup>:

Syllables:	1	3	5	7	9
4-ft. iamb:	8.8	1.3	1.1	0.4	–
5-ft. iamb					
without caesura:	12.1	1.3	3.5	1.6	0.5

In the iamb monosyllabic stress units in metrically weak positions may occur either at the beginning of the line or after the caesura. As the above figures indicate, it is at the beginning of the line that they occur most often. This is perfectly understandable if we bear in mind what has already been said concerning the special conditions under which monosyllabic stress units may occur in metrically weak positions in binary meters. As we know, a line of verse as a rule ends with an intonational unit (anticadence or cadence); thus the first syllable of a line is always also the beginning of a new intonational segment and follows a perfectly natural and justifiable pause. Hence the fact that the largest number of stressed monosyllables in weak positions occurs at the

beginning of the line. The same principle holds good, though to a lesser degree, for the beginning of the second hemistich in lines with the caesura (five-foot and six-foot iambs). Here we have very frequently, though not invariably, a first hemistich which forms a separate segment of the phrase melody; and hence, in the same way, we find a fairly large percentage of monosyllabic stress units at the beginning of the second hemistich (in the caesural five-foot iamb 5.6%, and in the caesural six-foot iamb 5.4%). Here are some typical examples:

- a) Potrēm glazá. – *Nét*, ja sljuněj pomážu...  
 Borís, Borís! *Vsě* pred tobój trepěščet...  
 Viná eščě. *Nú*, gósti dorogie...  
 Dimítrija?... *Kák?* Étogo mladénca!  
 Kljanús' tebé... *Nét*, Šújskij, ne kljanís'...  
 Reší; ja ždú. *Vstán'*, bednýj samozvánec...  
*Cár'* zanemóg. *Cár'* umiráet. Bóže...  
 Naród, naród! *v Krém!* v cárskie paláty...
- b) “Ja Klávdiju sestrá”. – “*Nét*, právo? óčen' rád...”  
 “Somnén'ja nám vragí”, *tót* s žárom otvečáet...  
 “...O tóm gotóva já  
 Molít'sja dén' i nóč”. “*Nét*, výslušaj menjá...”  
 Otšél'nica vošlá: “*Mír* vám!” – očnúlsja ón...  
 Monáx ostávil íx. “*Čtó* ž, mílaja sestrá...”  
 Ne osužďáj egó. *Ón* (skól'ko mné izvéstno,  
 I kak ja dúmajú) *žil* právedno i čéstno...

As we see, in almost all these examples the stressed monosyllable occurs not merely at the beginning of a new segment of the phrase melody, but at the actual beginning of a new phrase melody, i. e. it follows immediately the preceding cadence.

Among other iambic meters, we note the fairly high percentage figure for the fifth syllable in the non-caesural five-foot iamb (according to Tomaševskij 3.7% and according to our figures 3.5%). This is explained by the fact that in the non-caesural five-foot iamb a high percentage of lines (in Puškin's short drama *Skupoj rycar'* over 60%) have a word boundary before the fifth syllable (which is simply a carry-over from the caesura, as we will observe in due course). Consequently, in the non-caesural five-foot iamb a large number of lines divide up into two hemistichs – with the first hemistich often forming a separate segment of the phrase melody. Therefore, in such cases, in the five-foot iamb without caesura monosyllabic stressed words on the fifth syllable

coincide with the beginning of a new segment of the phrase melody, before which, as we know, a pause is justified. For example:

*Saleri:* Tý, Mócart, bóg, i sám togó ne znáeš';  
 Já znáju, já. ||  
*Mocart:* Bá! právo? móžet být..

If we reckon up the percentage of lines having a word boundary before the fifth syllable and also having a stressed monosyllable on the fifth syllable, we in fact obtain almost the same percentage as for the caesural five-foot iamb, i. e. about 6%.

The question may be raised as to whether in the iamb there exists a direct relationship between the percentages of monosyllabic stress units in any given metrically weak syllable and the percentages for the word boundaries preceding that syllable, i. e. whether, if the percentages for the word boundaries are high, the percentages for stressed monosyllables will also be high and, *vice versa*, whether low percentages for the word boundaries go hand in hand with lower percentages for the stressed monosyllables. The five-foot iamb would seem to confirm that this is indeed the case:

a) five-foot iamb with caesura (*Boris Godunov*):

Syllables:	1	3	5	7	9
Preceding word boundaries (%):	100	30.2	99.9	23.9	41.8
Mon. stress units (%)	12.6 (12.6)	0.4 (1.3)	5.6 (5.6)	0.4 (1.7)	1.0 (2.4)

b) five-foot iamb without caesura (*Skupoj rycar'*):

Syllables:	1	3	5	7	9
Preceding word boundaries (%):	100	36.3	61.2	40.7	43.7
Mon. stress units (%)	12.8 (12.8)	1.1 (3.0)	3.7 (6.0)	1.4 (3.5)	1.5 (3.4)

As we see from these figures, a high percentage for the word boundary<sup>38</sup> does go hand in hand with a correspondingly high percentage for the monosyllabic stress units. This is particularly evident when we examine the figures

in parentheses; these figures represent the percentage of monosyllabic stress units calculated solely on the basis of lines having word boundaries in the appropriate position. If monosyllabic stress units occurred on all the weak syllables with an equal degree of probability, the percentages in parentheses would have been approximately equal. An exception from the general rule is found in the caesural five-foot iamb; here the percentage of monosyllabic stress units on the third syllable is lower than might have been expected in view of the strength of the word boundary preceding this syllable. The reason for this will be explained shortly.

Meanwhile, the four-foot iamb presents an entirely different picture:

a) *Evgenij Onegin*:

Syllables:	1	3	5	7
Preceding word boundaries (%):	100	36.6	28.7	46.5
Mon. stress units (%):	7.9 (7.9)	0.4 (1.1)	0.5 (1.7)	0.4 (0.9)

b) *Mednyj vsadnik*:

Syllables:	1	3	5	7
Preceding word boundaries (%):	100	40.7	25.4	46.7
Mon. stress units (%):	8.8 (8.8)	1.3 (3.2)	1.1 (4.3)	0.4 (0.9)

As we note, here the highest percentage figure, excluding the first syllable, for monosyllabic stress units occurs after the weakest word boundary (before the fifth syllable), while the lowest percentage for monosyllables occurs after the strongest word boundary (before the seventh syllable). The explanation lies in the fact that the word boundary before the fifth syllable<sup>39</sup> coincides much more frequently with a break in the phrase intonation as in, for example, the following lines:

...Čtó búdet vzeját? || *V tót gróznij gód...*  
 Volšébnij kráj! || *Tám v stáry gódy...*  
 Kák Grandisón? || *á, Grandisón...*

than does the word boundary before the third syllable:

Uvjál... *Gdé žárkoe volnénè...*  
 Drugój? *Nét*, nikomú na svéte...

or before the seventh:

U névskoj přístani. *Dní léta*  
 Klonílis' k óseni...  
 I v mýsljax mólvila: *vót ón!*  
 Ja vám ne nrávilas'. *Čtót ž nýne*  
 Menjá presléduete vý?

In the five-foot iamb with caesura the percentage of monosyllabic stress units on the third syllable is relatively low because the break in the phrase melody only rarely coincides with a boundary before the third syllable (thanks to the caesura before the fifth which most frequently marks a break). Rare, therefore, are lines of the following types:

On smél, || *vót vsě*, || a mý... No póлно. Vídiš'...  
 Smešný? || *á?* Čtót? || Čtót ž ne smeššja tý?

If in the five-foot iamb without caesura there exists a correspondence between high percentage figures for the word boundaries preceding the different syllables and high percentage figures for the monosyllabic stress units on those syllables, this is due to the fact that the phrase intonation shifts readily from one line to another and the breaks in phrase intonation coincide with different word boundaries in the line. It is true that in the non-caesural five-foot iamb the most common break in the phrase intonation is that occurring before the fifth syllable; but the break also occurs quite commonly before the third syllable:

Menjá... || *Čtót?* || Obokrást'. || Barón, vy lžěte...

or before the seventh:

No čtót že sdělal ón? || *Ón...* ón menjá...  
 Dáj rúku. || *Vót oná...* || Ó, tjaželó  
 Požát'e kámennoj egó desnícy...

or before the ninth:

Čto tý segódnja pásmuren? || Já? Nét!  
 Ili\_vam\_stýdno za negó? || Dá... stýdno...

In the trochee both the lines and the hemistichs begin with a metrically strong syllable. This means that stressed monosyllables in weak positions occur only in the body of the line, i. e. before word boundaries which coincide with the end of a foot. According to our figures,<sup>40</sup> in the examples here given the monosyllabic stress units are distributed on the metrically weak positions as follows:

Syllables:	2	4	6	8	10
Deržavin's four-foot trochee:	0.3	1.4	1.1	–	–
Majkov's five-foot trochee:	0.5	2.1	1.0	1.8	–
Polonskij's six-foot trochee:	0.2	0.3	–	0.1	0.3

Thus, monosyllabic stress units can occur in the trochee in any metrically weak position except the sixth syllable of the six-foot trochee (i. e. the last weak syllable of the first hemistich). For example:

Soprotívnika dnés' nét...  
 Búd'te, ángely, vék s námi...  
 Čtó\_tut dívno? Nú, vót...  
 Ja pojú, – Pínd stála Zvánka...  
 Ja tam býl: mēd, pívo píl...  
 V tēmnyj ád. Tám, bliz čertógov Gélly...  
 Pál mlád knjáz, pál xrábryj Vjačeslávič...  
 Po Rosí, Sulé vrág grády délit...  
 Govorít Donéc: "Óx, knjáz\_ty, Ígor'..."  
 Ot zarí, do večera, dén' célyj...  
 Tēmnyj óbraz vsádnika. Tó Kónung...  
 Na goráx, zdés' v Kíeve, óx, čěrnym  
 Odeváli s večera pokróvom...  
 Á! bá! któ\_tam? čtó\_tam? – slýšalosja v sónnom  
 Cárstve...  
 Otvečál: Nét lésu, i ne ždí – ne búdet...  
 Kolosítsja žátva i serpá ždět kólos...

In regard to the relationship between the percentage of monosyllabic stress units in weak positions and the percentage strength of the preceding word boundary, the trochee behaves in similar fashion to the iamb. For example, Deržavin's four-foot trochee offers the following picture:

Syllables:	2	4	6
Preceding word boundaries (%)	30.6	33.5	49.9
Mon. stress units (%)	0.3 (1.0)	1.4 (4.2)	1.1 (2.2)

As we note, the highest percentage of monosyllabic stress units occurs on the fourth syllable, and not on the sixth, which is the one coming after the strongest word boundary. This is particularly evident when we examine the figures in parentheses: these figures represent the percentage of monosyllabic stress units calculated solely on the basis of lines having word boundaries immediately preceding the syllable in question. This is due to the fact that breaks in the phrase melody (cadences or more often half-cadences, since cadences occur very rarely within the line in the four-foot trochee) coincide much more frequently with the fourth syllable:

Ja pojú, – || *Pínd* stála Zvánka...  
 Po očám || *ógn'* Pávlov v néj...  
 Čtob eě || *vést'* v Pónta dvéri...  
 Ja tam býl: || *měd*, pívo píl...

than with the sixth:

Čtó\_tut dívno? || *Nú*, vót!

or with the second:

Dněm || *svét* bóžij zatmeváet,  
 Nóč'ju || *zém*lju osveščáet...

This general rule holds good to a lesser extent for the five-foot trochee:

Syllables:	2	4	6	8
Preceding word boundaries (%)	13.4	52.9	26.0	49.8
Mon. stress units (%)	0.5 (3.6)	2.1 (3.9)	1.0 (3.7)	1.8 (3.6)

As in the case of the five-foot iamb, the five-foot trochee does at first glance reveal a relationship between monosyllabic stress units on the weak syllables and the strength of the preceding word boundary. But here again this is due to the fact that the breaks in the phrase melody occur at different places in the line and very frequently coincide with the word boundary before the fourth syllable:

...V tĕmnyj ád. *Tám*, bliz čertógov Gélly...

or before the sixth syllable:

Govorít Donéc: “Óx, knjáz’\_ty, Ígor’...”

or before the eighth syllable:

Tĕmnyj óbraz vsádnika. *Tó* Kónung,  
Na putí zastígnut búrej, édet...

However, in the five-foot trochee the break in the phrase intonation coincides more frequently with the word boundary before the fourth syllable than with that before the sixth or eighth syllable. Hence the higher percentage of monosyllabic stress units on the fourth syllable (as can be clearly seen from the figures given in parentheses).

The same principles are valid for the six-foot trochee. The strongest word boundaries here are those before the fourth and tenth syllables, and those boundaries more often than the others coincide with a break in the phrase melody. For example:

Uxodjá, || *dén’* jásnyj plákal za goróju...  
Otvečál. || *Nét* lésu, i ne ždí – ne búdet...  
Sočiní\_l\_on éti dvá stixá; || *v níx* býlo  
Stól’ko tákta, stól’ko něžnosti igrívoj...

Consequently the monosyllabic stress units occur more frequently on the fourth and tenth syllables than on the second and eighth.

On the basis of the materials analyzed in the foregoing pages we can now formulate the following rules governing the use of monosyllabic stress units in weak positions in Russian binaries:

1) In the iamb the highest percentage of stressed monosyllables occurs at the beginning of the line and the next highest – in meters with a caesura – at the beginning of the second hemistich;

2) As for the metrically weak syllables within the body of the line, stressed monosyllables are most likely to occur immediately after stress units whose final word boundaries coincide with breaks in the phrase melody.

Corresponding to differences in the phrase intonation, there may be differences in the treatment of stressed monosyllables as between one poet and another and between different literary genres. But since stressed monosyllables are used infrequently in weak positions in the body of the line, the differences are insignificant and will not here be studied in detail. Let us simply note those differences that are revealed by careful reading and without the help of statistics. Monosyllabic stress units in weak positions are, for example, far rarer in the lyric genres than in the epic, and are most common in drama. This is due to the fact that in the lyric the segments of the phrase melody coincide as a rule with the boundaries of the line or hemistich, whereas in epic or dramatic verse the phrase intonation is far freer and more flexible from one line to another. This explains why in the examples analyzed above the highest figures for stressed monosyllables in weak positions were found in the non-caesural five-foot iamb, i. e. the typical meter of drama. In drama the use of monosyllabic stress units is increased because in everyday speech monosyllables occur more frequently than, for example, in literary prose. Just as in everyday speech, so also in drama we often find fragmented dialogue with a large number of monosyllables:

*Gercog:* *Kák sméli vý?*

*Baron:* *Tý zdés'! tý, tý mne smél,*

*Mné, mné... il' už ne rýcar' ja?*

*Al'ber:* *Vý – lžéc!*

Disregarding differences between literary genres, it is obvious that monosyllabic stress units in weak positions are much more common in the eighteenth than in the nineteenth century. Let us illustrate this by comparing Puškin with Deržavin and Osipov<sup>41</sup>:

a) four-foot trochee:

Syllables:	2	4	6
Puškin:	0.3	0.9	0.3
Deržavin:	0.3	1.4	1.1

## b) four-foot iamb:

Syllables:	1	3	5	7
Puškin:	8.8	1.3	1.1	0.4
Osipov:	10.8	1.8	3.5	0.6

Generally the more frequent use in the eighteenth century of monosyllabic stress units in weak positions can be quite easily perceived with careful reading. For example the line from Deržavin:

*Býl krokodíl, vól'xv, knjáz', žréc, vóžd'...*

would have already sounded unusual by Puškin's time. Thus, in the parlance of traditional metrics, the Russian trochee and iamb are in the nineteenth century "smoother" than in the eighteenth.

It remains for us to examine one further instance of apparent shift of stress from a metrically strong to a metrically weak syllable. We have in mind the case of the metrically weak position occupied by a monosyllabic stress unit, while the following strong position is occupied by an unstressed syllable belonging to another stress unit, i. e. the so-called first choriamb ( $\acute{\text{—}} \text{ | } \text{ \grave{—}} \text{ \grave{—}} \text{ \acute{—}} \text{ ...}$ ). For example in Puškin's four-foot iamb:

*Grammátiku, dvé Petriády...*

As we already know, if we wish to give a strong stress to *dve*, we must emphasize the preceding pause:

*Grammátiku, || dvé | Petriády...*

"If we emphasize this boundary", Tomaševskij points out, "we may also to a corresponding degree emphasize the hypermetrical stress on *dve*, and the line will remain 'acceptable' as an iamb". At the same time, the second word boundary can be deemphasized to a point where the ear no longer perceives a pause, but the boundary will remain constantly present in our consciousness as a rhythmic signal. "In spite of being pronounced in the same fashion, the following line will not be an iamb:

*Grammátiku, || dvésti | tetrádej...<sup>42</sup>*

Just how significant the word boundary between stress units is – as a mental concept rather than as an acoustic phenomenon – is demonstrated by the pair of examples created ad hoc by Jakobson:

- a) Góst' izbežál užásnoj káry...
- b) Gósti sbežáli ot Makára...

“The first four syllables in both lines”, Jakobson points out, “sound absolutely identical:

'gōst'izb'i'žā...

However, the first line is normal, whereas the second line is not found at all in poets of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, i. e. a stressed syllable may occur in a weak position (first syllable of line *a*) and, at the same time, an unstressed syllable may occur in the first metrically strong position (second syllable of line *a*), but on condition that these syllables do not belong to the same word (as is the case in line *b*). In other words, there can be no rhythmical shift of stress within the limits of a given word.”<sup>43</sup>

The foregoing discussion shows clearly that metrically weak syllables, when they are stressed, do not have the same character as stressed metrically strong syllables, except for the case of a genuine shift of stress in the trochee: in other cases we are dealing with two different categories of syllables. The special conditions under which metrically weak syllables may be stressed are such that these syllables are not, in our rhythmic perception, equal in strength to stressed metrically strong syllables; accordingly, we always perceive them as being weak in the context of the line.<sup>44</sup>

#### 4. Rhythmic Tendencies in Russian Binary Meters

Metrically strong syllables in binary meters (uneven syllables in trochees and even in iambs) tend naturally to receive greater stress. This is in accordance with the inherent rhythmic tendencies of binary meters. We expect a strong syllable to carry stress; if it does not do so, our expectations are frustrated. Metrically strong syllables, then, may be: 1) monosyllabic stressed words, 2) stressed syllables of polysyllabic stress units, and 3) unstressed syllables of polysyllabic stress units. This last case, which produces what is known in traditional metrics as the pyrrhic foot, has been a constant problem to theoreticians

of Russian verse. Having assumed a priori that all stresses in a metrical scheme should be implemented, they have treated the pyrrhic foot as a poetic license, and therefore, somehow inferior. This attitude originates with the first theoreticians of Russian verse and has survived practically to the present day.

As early as the end of 1739 or the beginning of 1740, Lomonosov, breaking away from the so-called syllabic system and formulating the first theory of so-called Russian tonic verse, writes as follows: "I consider verses in which pyrrhic feet can replace iambic or trochaic feet to be irregular and free. I only use such lines in poems in which a regular number of syllables is always required. For example, in the following line a pyrrhic foot is used in place of an iambic foot:

Cvětý rŭmjānĕc ůmnŏžājtĕ.

and here instead of a trochee:

Sŏlncĕvĕ sĕstrĕ zĕbŷlĕ".<sup>45</sup>

Trediakovskij was of the same opinion: "The pyrrhic foot must be added to those mentioned because it can be used to replace a trochee in a trochaic meter, an iamb in an iambic meter, and also can replace an iamb in the anapestic-iambic meter. This kind of license is indispensable because of our many-syllable words without which it is impossible to compose a single line".<sup>46</sup> "First I will mention the versatility of the pyrrhic", Sumarokov wrote. "The writer does not have to concern himself with when a pyrrhic is a trochee or when it is an iamb; surrounded by trochaic feet, it automatically becomes a trochee, and by the same token, among iambs it becomes an iamb. But writers should know that pure trochees and pure iambs are superior to pyrrhics, and this is especially so at the caesura. The length of our words is the excuse and justification for the use of pyrrhics, for without this license it is impossible to compose verses. One can of course achieve a pedantic virtuosity by avoiding pyrrhics, but such unnecessary exactness should be condemned, for it steers the poet away from good taste, leading him to seek fame where it does not exist and causing him to take pains over something which ultimately will bring him ridicule. There are numerous examples of pyrrhic feet, but the fewer there are, the purer the verse – especially at the caesura. Yet at times, beauty of poetic expression itself requires them; thus it is better to have a beautiful line of verse with a pyrrhic foot at the caesura than to avoid the pyrrhic foot and weaken the sense and feeling of the line".<sup>47</sup> Sumarokov gradually retreats from the view that the pyrrhic is some sort of mistake. This can be clearly seen from the following: "Neither in my iambic nor my trochaic verses do the pyrrhic feet create even

the slightest deformity of style, *but on the contrary, they add beauty*”.<sup>48</sup> This last statement by Sumarokov is very important for us; we shall return to it later on.

The formulations of the first Russian theoreticians have found an echo more recently in the theory of the resistance of the concrete linguistic material to the ideal metrical scheme. Thus Žirmunskij considers that “the actual phonetic shape of verse is determined by its metrical structure only in part and its poetic rhythm is always a compromise resulting from the resistance shown by the linguistic medium to the rules of artistic composition”.<sup>49</sup> Tomaševskij takes an opposing view: “The resistance of the material is adduced to explain so-called rhythmical phenomena, for example the presence of pyrrhics. The reasoning goes roughly as follows: the iambic frame is too cramped for Russian words; the poet would have to make too great an effort in the choice of words in order to produce pure iambs; he would have to choose only words of the following rhythmical types: monosyllabic (*svét*), trochaic (*slóvo*), iambic (*požár*) and amphibrachic (*načálo*); other types of words are unsuitable, e. g., dactylic (*dórogo*), anapestic (*xorošó*), etc. In order to avoid such constraints, poets have allegedly permitted themselves certain liberties, etc. This whole argument is based on a misunderstanding. In actual fact, the types of words involved amount to approximately 56% of the vocabulary; i. e. the number of ‘defective’ words from the pure iambic standpoint is not large enough to make pure iambic speech an impossibility. Under the normally accepted technical procedures of versification, the two-foot iambic meter, for example, permits the use of no more than 60% of the total vocabulary; nevertheless, poets have used two-foot iambs:

Igráj, Adél’  
Ne znáj pečáli...

Moreover, it is often forgotten that the rhythmic organization of lines of verse itself does such great violence to the natural language that the question of limiting the vocabulary becomes of secondary importance. The iambic tetrameter, for example, allows the use of no more than 8 to 10% of all possible word combinations – which makes for a far more difficult process of ‘selection’ than one based on 50–60% of the vocabulary”. “In general”, Tomaševskij concludes, “one cannot speak of the resistance of the linguistic medium in speech which possesses its own inherent specific type of deformation and in which the very techniques of deformation are in reality artistically motivated... Obviously, pyrrhic feet are permissible not because the language renders impossible the metrically pure form, but because the retention of all stresses in binary meters *is in no way felt as a necessity by the poets*”.<sup>50</sup>

Even many of the more modern theoreticians hold steadfastly to the axiom that rhythm is a product of the alternation of stressed metrically strong syllables and unstressed syllables. Thus we find theories aiming to show that a metrically strong syllable is realized even when it coincides with an unstressed syllable of a polysyllabic word. These theories are based on the belief that there exist in spoken Russian half-stresses in polysyllabic words, and that in verse these half-stresses adapt themselves in such a way as to fall on the metrically strong syllables. This theory was first formulated by Korš in his study “On the Verse System of Russian Folk Poetry”.<sup>51</sup> According to him, every Russian word which has more than two syllables (except for trisyllabic words with a stress on the middle syllable) has also a secondary stress. In all such words, if the stress is not on the penultimate or on the last syllable, a secondary stress falls on the last syllable, as for example in the words *výnesti*, *pjatídesjati*.<sup>52</sup> Korš notes the same phenomenon at the beginning of words, too, in case the first syllable is separated from the stress by at least one syllable: e. g., *pèrepisát’*, *pèrenočevát’*. Therefore, according to Korš, in spoken Russian the secondary stress tends to fall either at the beginning or at the end of the word, in contrast to Czech where secondary stresses usually fall on every second syllable following the primary stress: *‘pomi, luje, me, ‘obvi, nite, levi*. Korš allows for a certain deviation from his rules at the beginning of the word in cases when the first syllable is separated from the stress by at least two syllables. In such cases, according to Korš, the secondary stress may fall either on the first or on the second, e. g., *perèpisát’*, *perènočevát’*. Applying his observations to Russian binary meters, Korš maintains that “a line can be metrically correct only when the secondary stress falls on the end of the word. Therefore, a correct line is: ‘Vzleléjannýj v tení dubrávnoj’ (Puškin, *Poltava*, I), but the following is not correct: ‘Pričúdlivýe, kàk mečtý’ (Lermontov, *Mcyri*, VI)”. According to Korš, the following line by Puškin is also incorrect: “Tixá ukráinskaja nóč.” In a later treatment of the question of secondary stress in verse, Korš states that it is “a purely rhythmical stress which is more understood than pronounced”.<sup>53</sup>

On the basis of this theory, which Korš formulated, so to speak, *en passant*, Georgij Šengeli<sup>54</sup> developed a whole system of Russian versification. He uses a single term, *intense*, for both primary and secondary stresses and insists that in Russian verse every metrically strong syllable must have an *intense*, i. e. either a primary or secondary stress. The pyrrhic foot in Russian binary meter fits into only four possible arrangements in respect to word boundaries: 1) ... ≡ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ≡; 2) ... ≡ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ≡; 3) ... ≡ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ≡; 4) ... ≡ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ≡.<sup>55</sup> In the second and third categories, according to Šengeli, the *intense* falls respectively either on the anapestic beginning or on the dactylic ending of the word. Therefore it occupies the metrically strong syllable. In Russian verse 80–90%

of all pyrrhics conform to this pattern, while the first and the fourth categories account for the remaining 10–20%. This 10–20% Šengeli is not, however, prepared to call irregular; he prefers to speak of a shift of the *intense* from the first to the second syllable at the beginning and from the last to the penultimate at the end of the word. According to him, the line “Tixá ukráinskaja nóč” constitutes a variant of the *intense*  $\cup \prec | \cup \prec \cup \cup | \prec$ ) and therefore is regular. To this extent his argument differs from that of Korš. According to Šengeli, poets nevertheless show a preference for lines with natural *intenses* rather than irregular ones, since on the basis purely and simply of the language *per se*, the second and third categories of the pyrrhic should occur in verse approximately only twice as frequently as the first and the fourth, whereas in fact they are approximately six times as frequent. But this phenomenon can be explained quite simply without any reference to a secondary stress. As was noted by Broch, in Bulgarian the expiration tends towards a trochaic, more rarely a dactylic distribution of strong and weak syllables.<sup>56</sup> This means that the tendency to have a secondary stress on the last syllable is completely foreign to the Bulgarian language. Yet in the Bulgarian iambic pentameter we have the same picture as in Russian. Jakobson<sup>57</sup> estimated that the second and third categories of the pyrrhic give the following figures: 85.6% in the second foot, 79.1% in the third and 83.1% in the fourth. The fourth category (...  $\prec \cup \cup \cup | \prec$ ) is the least common; yet it alone has a secondary stress on a strong syllable in the line. These figures coincide almost exactly with the figures for the Russian iamb. Šengeli estimated that in Puškin’s iambic pentameter, the second and the third categories give 89.3% in the second foot, 72.2% in the third and 80.3% in the fourth.<sup>58</sup> Jakobson rightly concludes that the poet is not at all concerned to have a metrically strong syllable coincide with a secondary stress.<sup>59</sup> According to Jakobson, we have here a clear-cut tendency to avoid having the boundaries between stress units coincide with stressed syllables: in both Bulgarian and Russian the basic prosodic opposition is the opposition between the stressed and unstressed syllables within the same stress unit; the opposition between a stressed syllable in one stress unit and an unstressed syllable in another is not as strongly felt. Therefore, verse which is based on the prosodic opposition between stressed and unstressed syllables within the stress unit avoids the first and the fourth categories of the pyrrhic. Consequently, a secondary stress is not needed to explain the pyrrhic foot.

The basic weakness of the theory of the *intense* lies in the fact that it ignores the difference between the real and the so-called secondary stresses. Every Russian word has only one dynamic stress which is attached to a definite syllable. Normally a shift in stress involves a change of meaning (for example, *rúki*, n. pl.; *rukí*, g. sg.). There are instances in Russian when the stress may be

on either of two syllables (*mólodec* and *molodéc*, *dévica* and *devíca*, *ídut* and *idút*), but normally one of the alternatives is either archaic or provincial or it has a special stylistic connotation (e. g., in folk poetry). While for example, in Czech, a shift in stress from the first syllable to the second is determined by the nature of the second syllable (e. g., *‘tři ška’tulky ‘zápalek*) and causes no changes in meaning, in Russian, shifts of this nature are very limited: they are used only for emotive or other special effects. Words in such cases are divided into two beats, as for example in the commands *na lé-vó*, *na prá-vó*, or in calling: *Má-njá*.<sup>60</sup> This accounts for Puškin’s line in the poem *Domik v Kolomne*:

Nú, žénskie i múžeskie slógi!  
 Blagoslovjás, popróbuem: slúšáj!  
 Rovnjájtjesja, výtjágivajte nógi  
 I pó\_tri v rjád v oktávu zaezžáj.

We find the same example at the beginning of Xomjakov’s play *Ermač*, where the Cossacks shout to each other:

Slušáj!  
 Slušáj!  
 Slušáj!  
 Slušáj!  
 Slušáj!

Xomjakov’s meter here is iambic pentameter.

In the linguistic consciousness of a Russian the stress therefore is always present as a linguistic element and serves as a differentiating semantic mark. This is the decisive factor marking the difference between the main dynamic stress and secondary stresses. Secondary stresses evoke no response in the linguistic consciousness of a Russian, and should such a stress be moved, as was suggested by Korš and Šengeli, not even the slightest nuance is added to the meaning of the word. “Generally speaking”, says Žirmunskij, “the *intense* theory is beset with difficulties because in Russian pronunciation (as compared, for example, with German or even English) the secondary stresses themselves have no significance whatsoever; they have no connection with the meanings of the various morphological elements (as in German), they depend solely on the mechanical conditions of speech, and consequently in the majority of cases they do not enter our consciousness”.<sup>61</sup>

The notion of secondary stresses itself is not well formulated by Korš and Šengeli – even if we overlook their differences of opinion on this topic. Unstressed syllables in Russian differ in strength. The strongest is the syllable immediately preceding the stress. “As is known”, says Broch,<sup>62</sup> “it stands out (quantitatively, but also in terms of expiration) more than the other unstressed syllables. The question arises whether this occurs as a result of a single expiratory wave affecting it and the following traditionally stressed syllable or whether it happens as a result of an independent expiratory impulse”. The strength of a given syllable is in general determined by its distance from the stressed syllable. “In respect to this”, says Professor Košutić, “the following rules apply: 1) the vowel that stands immediately before the stress is weaker than the stressed one, but is clearer and stronger than all other unstressed vowels in that word; 2) the vowel in the second syllable before the stress as well as the vowel in the first syllable after the stress is weaker than and less clear than the vowel in the syllable immediately preceding the stress, and is in fact the weakest in the word, but the vowel in the third syllable preceding the stress and in the second syllable after the stress is somewhat clearer and stronger than the vowel in the neighboring syllable”.<sup>63</sup> The weakest syllables (the second preceding the stress and the first following the stress) may quite easily lose their vowel: for example, instead of *týsjaca* one also often hears *týšča*. Such examples can also be found in poetry:

Pod sólncem v'jútsja *žávronki* [žavoronki]...

Kudá? – K *prik máxeru* [parikmaxeru]. – Bog s ním – Ščipcy prostúdit...

If we designate the strongest vowel by the largest number (4), the following relationship between syllables will result:

pe<sub>2(1)</sub>re<sub>1</sub>ne<sub>3</sub>stí<sub>4</sub>;

vý<sub>4</sub>ne<sub>1</sub>stí<sub>2(1)</sub>.

In addition, it is worthwhile to keep in mind the fact that syllables after the stress are always weaker than the syllables before it.<sup>64</sup> In the case of trisyllabic dactylic words, “attention must also be directed to the last syllable; if that syllable is open, it is somewhat stronger than the syllable before it, and if it is closed, its intensity is not increased and both syllables are weak”.<sup>65</sup> E. g.:

stá<sub>4</sub>ro<sub>1</sub>sta<sub>2(1)</sub>;

stá<sub>4</sub>ro<sub>1</sub>stoj<sub>1</sub>.

In all these examples, the number 2 was used to mark syllables which are somewhat more prominent than the adjacent syllables; these can be therefore felt as

half-stressed. But one cannot actually speak of real secondary stresses such as we find, for example, in German. Anapestic words usually have a very weak first syllable which makes it out of the question to speak of any secondary stress, e. g.:

xo<sub>1</sub>ro<sub>3</sub>šó<sub>4</sub>;                      go<sub>1</sub>lo<sub>3</sub>vá<sub>4</sub>.

From this it can be seen that dactylic and anapestic words usually do not have a secondary stress, and yet these words are all-important for the pyrrhic in binary meters, because in them the first or the third syllable always coincides with the metrically strong position.

In regard to the question of the strength of the syllables in hyperdactylic endings, Korš and Professor Košutić are not in agreement. While Korš thinks that the secondary stress falls on the final syllable, the penultimate syllable is, according to Professor Košutić, stronger than either the antepenultimate or the final syllable. This disagreement shows us how problematic in general secondary stresses are in the Russian language.

The theories concerning the relative strength of the different syllables formulated by Professor Košutić are valid for ordinary conversational Russian. In emotive speech, this relationship can change. We can hear, for example, both:

xo<sub>2</sub>ro<sub>3</sub>šó<sub>4</sub>;                      čto<sub>2</sub> \_ ka<sub>1</sub>sá<sub>4</sub>e<sub>1</sub>tsja<sub>2(1)</sub>,

and in rapid, careless speech even *štaksájca* or, when emphatic, *xaršó*. Literature abounds in such examples, e. g., in Turgenev (*Vešnie vody*): “Éto ‘xorošo’ Mar’ja Nikolaevna uže s namerenijem vygovarivala sovsem po meščanskomu – vot kak: xeršóo”. Or in Ostrovskij’s *Voevoda*: “Bladárstvujte. My lošadej posmotrim...” (instead of *blagodárstvujte*). In these examples, the second strongest syllable, i. e. the syllable which precedes the stressed syllable, has disappeared.<sup>66</sup> Moreover, even in words like *perepisát’*, the second syllable can become stronger than the first. Therefore, Korš is right when he notes *pèrepisát’* and *perèpisát’*, but he forgets that the second version is less common than the first. Yet it is, of course, the second version which *could* produce an *intense* in the line.

As we can see, the theory of the *intense* is justified neither on the basis of the language nor on the basis of the demands of the rhythm. Korš took his point of departure from studies of folk poetry, but he did not differentiate musical rhythm from poetic rhythm. Singing, however, is peculiar to itself in its handling of the acoustic properties of a language, with which it commonly takes liberties and which it often distorts. In song, for example, no account is taken of vowel reductions or of the natural relation between long and short

syllables,<sup>67</sup> and finally, particularly in folk poetry, the musical ictus does not have to coincide with the natural word stress (i. e. we have so-called transaccenuation, which in the spoken language, as we have seen, is very limited). In songs with quick tempos all icti must be realized even when they fall on an unstressed syllable of a polysyllabic word. In verse, if the style is declamatory, such realization of all icti may be found if the lines are scanned; however, scanning is felt as an unnatural violence done to the language. That is why Korš did not accept pure scanning, and for this reason he characterized the secondary stress in binary meters as “a purely rhythmical stress which is more understood than pronounced”. Šengeli tends rather toward scanning. He simply allocates secondary stresses to those syllables which according to the metrical scheme should be stressed. The line “Nepotopljáemye korablí”<sup>68</sup> he reads as follows in order to fit it into the scheme of the iambic pentameter:

Nepòtopljáemyè kòrablì  
 ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ | ˘ ˘ ˘

Yet he also finds it possible to change the distribution of the *intense* syllable in order to create a dactyl:

Nèpotopljáemyè korablì  
 ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ | ˘ ˘ ˘

A tendency to scan could be justified if in binary meters there existed only the primary oscillation between the stressed syllable and the stressless (trochee) or between the unstressed and the stressed (iamb). However, in all binary meters there are also oscillations of another kind: stable icti alternate with unstable icti – metrically strong syllables which are, however, less often stressed than the stable icti. The careful reading of even a small number of lines will suffice to demonstrate this. The following are taken from Puškin’s *Skazka o zolotom petuške*, written in four-foot trochees:

Petušók s vysókoj spícý  
 Stal steréč’ egó granícý.  
 Čút’ opásnost’ gdé vidná,  
 Vérnyj stórož kak so\_sná  
 Ševel’nětsja, vstrepenětsja,  
 K tój storónke obernětsja,  
 I kričít: “Kiri-ku-kú,  
 Cárstvuj, lěža na\_bokú.”

*I sosédi prismiréli,  
 Voevát' užé ne sméli:  
 Takovójim cár' Dadón  
 Dál otpór sovséx storón...*

It is not difficult to observe that in these four-foot trochees the strong icti are the third and the seventh syllables, while the first and the fifth are often unstressed. If we count in terms of percentages the number of stresses falling on each individual syllable, we obtain the following figures for Puškin's fairy tale:

Syllables	1	3	5	7
% stressed	49.6	98.2	54.5	100
Icti:	I	II	III	IV

As we see, the second and the fourth icti are throughout the entire poem very stable, while the first and the third are weak. It is as if the line oscillates between these two strong points and the oscillation is almost symmetrical. There is no justification whatever for scanning the verse in such a way as to conceal this oscillation. On the contrary, the oscillation can justifiably be intensified. The icti may be implemented by stresses belonging to monosyllabic and bisyllabic words, and these words, when they are subordinate parts of a syntagma, can – as we have seen in the preceding section – when spoken aloud, be subordinated either to the preceding or the following word. In the spoken language, we often hear *skazála<sub>ej</sub>*, *skazí<sub>emu</sub>* almost as a single stress unit (in this case one can really speak of a genuine secondary stress). When such words (i. e. those capable of being subordinated to a dominant stress) are found in the first or the fifth syllable of a four-foot trochee, their stress can be weakened in order to emphasize the bipartite oscillation of the line. For example, the line “Pirovál u néj Dadón” can also be read with two strong stress:

*Pirovál<sub>nej</sub> Dadón.*

If we weaken the first and the fifth syllables in this way, we arrive at the following figures for the whole poem:

Syllables	1	3	5	7
% stressed	36.6	98.2	34.4	100

This deemphasizing of the unstable icti in reading aloud is suggested by, for example, Žirmunskij. It “often lends a very characteristic emphasis to the

general rhythmic tendency of the line, e. g., the lightening of the stress on the first syllable of the dactyl, or the omission of the stress on the third foot of the iambic tetrameter, on the first and third foot of the trochaic tetrameter, and on the second and fourth foot of the iambic hexameter. Yielding in such cases to the general rhythmic tendency, we readily weaken such stresses in our reading. Cf. in Puškin's iambic hexameter: 'Poslédnie listý / s nagíx svoix vetvéj... Žurčá ešče bežít / za mélnicu ručéj... No prúd uže zastýl / soséd moj pospešáet... Ljubíl ee snegá; / v prisútvii luný...' and so on. And, vice versa, in a more stable position (e. g., on the second foot of the iambic tetrameter) we are inclined to increase the stress in accordance with the overall rhythmic drive of the line, e. g., 'Brožú li já vdol' úlic šúmnyx...'"<sup>69</sup> This shows us how elastic the rhythm of the line is. Žirmunskij's reading is not absolutely binding on anyone; we can, according to the demands of the text, slow down or accelerate the tempo of speech and in this way either weight the line with stresses or lighten it by weakening the stresses on the unstable icti.<sup>70</sup> It is quite clear, in any case, that there is no need whatsoever to scan the verse. Tomaševskij is quite right when he says that realization of all metrical stresses "is in no way felt as a necessity by the poets". Precisely for this reason we took special note of Sumarokov's statement that pyrrhics actually add beauty to the verse. Quite right, too, was the poet and theoretician Belyj when, in his book *Simvolizm*, he broke away from traditional metrical theories that considered a pyrrhic to be some sort of poetic license, hence a defect. Indeed, there is no good reason for justifying pyrrhics either as "the resistance of the linguistic material to the metrical pattern" or as some sort of fictitious secondary stress. On the contrary, pyrrhics give variety and richness to binary meters. While metrical dominants and constants do not offer a great number of variations, the rhythmic tendencies of different poets and in different meters can differ markedly. These rhythmic tendencies can, by virtue of their various distinctive traits, be characteristic of individual poets, whole schools of poetry and, finally, Russian poetry in general. Therefore, a study of the history of Russian binary meters must begin with the study of their rhythmic tendencies, i. e. with the rhythmic drive of the line, and it is to this problem that the second part of the present work is devoted.

## Notes

(1. Introduction)

<sup>1</sup> Tomaševskij 1929: 28.

<sup>2</sup> Preface by A. Belić, chairman of the Executive Committee of the Third International Congress of Slavists, in the fourth volume of abstracts for the Congress (Belić 1939: 18).

<sup>3</sup> For a more detailed treatment of these questions see my article “Metode i zadaci savremene nauke o stihu kao discipline na granici lingvistike i istorije književnosti” (Taranovsky 1939).

<sup>4</sup> Phrase melody is discussed in this work only insofar as it is needed to explain other phenomena.

<sup>5</sup> Ščerba 1923: 39.

<sup>6</sup> Generally speaking, the beginning of the line, i. e. the first foot, is different in character from the remaining feet. We have seen that even in the iambic line the first syllable carries a notably larger number of stresses than the other odd syllables. More will be said on this and related phenomena later.

<sup>7</sup> This type of line first occurs in Russian poetry of the eighteenth century, in Sumarokov:

Tý nas, ljubóv', prostí.  
 Nímfy tvoí krásny  
 Strély svoí vnestí  
 V náši pirý ne vlástny.  
 Tý utéx ne umnóžiš.  
 V brátstve u nás ljubóv' –  
 Tól'ko liš' vostrevóžiš  
 Révnost'ju drúzno króv'.

<sup>8</sup> Since metrical stresses are omissible in binary meters, the average length of the word will be somewhat greater than two syllables, whereas in ternary meters it will be less than three syllables. Here we note a general tendency of

the Russian literary language. According to Tomaševskij's calculations, the average length of the word in artistic prose is 2.8–2.9 syllables (1929: 168).

<sup>9</sup> Similar distinctions are drawn, with varying degrees of precision, by recent investigators of Russian verse, e. g.: Tomaševskij 1923: 41 and 1929: 51–52; Jakobson 1979 [1935]: 156–159; Trubeckoj 1987 [1937]: 360–362.

<sup>10</sup> Tomaševskij 1929: 143.

## (2. Metrical Constants in Russian Binary Meters)

<sup>11</sup> For the relevant data see Tomaševskij 1929: 205–206 (fn.). The example cited by Tomaševskij from Puškin's short drama *Kamennyj gost'* is a doubtful one:

*Don Guan:* Čtoby menjá ostávila v pokóe  
Sem'já ubítogo...  
*Leporello:* Nu, tó-to že!

It is possible that we have here an incomplete verse, for in some editions (e.g., that of Brockhaus and Efron, 1909, vol. III, p. 148) we read: “Nu, to-to ž!”<sup>11</sup> Granted the latter interpretation, an entire foot would be missing – a situation not without parallel elsewhere in Puškin, e. g. in *Skupoj rycar'*:

*Gercog:* I tý, tigrënok! póлно. Brós'te éto;  
Otdájte mné perčátku.  
*Al'ber:* Žál!

<sup>12</sup> Žirmunskij 1925: 149.

<sup>13</sup> An example from Krylov which could be interpreted as an unstressed rhyme, and is cited as such by Štokmar (1928: 149), turns out in fact no to be one:

A múxa na ščeké; sognál, a múxa snóva  
U drúga na nosú  
I neotvjázcivej čas *ót\_času*.

In the contemporary literary language, to be sure, one says *ót\_času*. Proceeding from this fact, Štokmar calls the rhyme in question an “indisputable shift of accent”. It would seem, however, that in the eighteenth century the accent

fell on the final syllable; this is where Trediakovskij, writing prose (*Sposob*, 1735), marks the accent in the given expression: “Stixi naši... ot časú v bolšém soveršenstve v Rossijskij svet izdavat” (Kunik 1865, I: 19). We find the same accentuation in Trediakovskij’s verse:

Ne lúčšu mýsl’ Sofókl iméja ot časú  
Umnóžil víd i sónm, obogatíl krasú...

and also in Sumarokov’s:

I zrzá, sxodjásja v dóm, vsegdá eě krasú,  
Razgorjačálisja oní s časá k časú...

In Krylov’s case we are probably dealing with an archaism or provincialism, not with an incorrect stressing, much less with an unstressed rhyme.

<sup>14</sup> On the meter of the “bylina” see Trubeckoj’s article “W sprawie wiersza byliny rosyjskiej” (Trubeckoj 1937).

<sup>15</sup> We limit ourselves to citing the following literature on the free iamb: Timofeev 1928; 1931: 156–205; Štokmar 1928.

### (3. Metrical Dominants in Russian Binary Meters)

<sup>16</sup> Trubeckoj 1987 [1926]: 386.

<sup>17</sup> Šengeli cites a similar mode of delivery. A workman from the village of Svetličnja sang his lines:

Krestý zolotýe  
V nébe golubóm...

in such a way that the word *kresty* received a secondary stress on the first syllable and a sharp rise in pitch on the second.

<sup>18</sup> Quoted from Tomaševskij 1929: 189.

<sup>19</sup> On the basis of Puškin's line:

*Ámen. Kto tám? Skazát': my prinimáem...*

Šengeli attempted to show (1923: 49) that Puškin admitted "the replacement of an iamb with a trochee." However, this is the only example of its kind in Puškin, and the word whose accent falls on the first weak syllable of the five-foot iambic line is not Russian; its Russian equivalent stresses the second syllable: *amín'*. In the speech of the Pretender (a former Orthodox monk) this word may also have been pronounced *amén*. It is true that we find *ámen* in Puškin's short drama *Skupoj rycar'*:

Pošlí vam bóg skorěj naslédstvo. Ámen.

Nevertheless, it is possible that Puškin perceived this word as an accentual doublet; foreign words in Puškin may have two different stresses, as for example in his *Pir vo vremja čumy*:

- 1) Gímn v čést' čumý. Prekrásno! brávo! brávo!
- 2) Bravó! bravó! dostójnyj predsédátel'.

In any case, nothing can be proven on the basis of a single line.

<sup>20</sup> Italics denote a metrically strong syllable.

<sup>21</sup> Sumarokov 1787 [1771–73]: 76. The only trace of this accentuation in the modern literary language is the form *suprotív*.

<sup>22</sup> Trediakovskij 1865 [1735].

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Jakobson 1923: 11.

<sup>24</sup> On the literary pronunciation of disyllabic prepositions and conjunctions see Košutić 1919, I: 42–43, 56–57.

<sup>25</sup> In the trochee (*Bova Korolevič*), under the influence of folk poetry and probably also that of Karamzin, Puškin allows similar stress shifts: *S togò svéta prividéniem... Ne otvérgnut' segò slúčaja...*

<sup>26</sup> In some editions this last line has been corrected (apparently by an editor) to read: *Veščáj, zloděj, mnoj uvenčánnj...*

<sup>27</sup> Košutić 1919, I: 472.

<sup>28</sup> Štokmar 1928: 155.

<sup>29</sup> Košutić 1919, I: 227.

<sup>30</sup> Belić 1941: 117.

<sup>31</sup> On the pronunciation of monosyllabic prepositions and conjunctions see Košutić 1919, I: 41–61.

<sup>32</sup> Žirmunskij 1925: 102 ff.

<sup>33</sup> Tomaševskij 1929: 41.

<sup>34</sup> Karcevskij 1931: 190, 199.

<sup>35</sup> All that we have said concerning monosyllabic words on the metrically weak syllables of binary meters pertains to ternary meters as well, except that in the latter case the rules given above will also cover disyllabic words which occupy metrically weak syllables. True, dissyllabic words tend to resist complete unstressing; their stress may be subordinated, however, to that of a following accentual unit with which they form a syntagma, especially if they are words of the iambic type:

Ja tebé mojù\_pésnju poslédnju,  
Mojù\_gór'kuju pésnju spojú...

In the case of a trochaic-type word, the tonic syllable may to a significant degree lose its expiratory force, attaining prominence through a mere rising in tone, e. g.:

Pojavís' | lègkoj\_tén'ju | na míg...

If the given word also receives dynamic stress, then a pause must precede:

Pojavís' || l é g ko j | té n' ju | na mí g...

Dynamic stressing of such words (monosyllabic or dissyllabic) is made easier if they stand at the beginning of a line, i. e. the beginning of a new segment of the phrase melody. Hence the large percentage of initial dissyllabic words of the trochaic type in anapestic verse, e. g.:

S ó v e s t' p ésnju svoju zapeváet...

<sup>36</sup> Tomaševskij 1929: 190.

<sup>37</sup> For the four-foot iamb our sample was Puškin's narrative poem *Mednyj vsadnik*, and for the five-foot iamb his short drama *Skupoj rycar'*.

<sup>38</sup> The percentages for the caesura are given according to Tomaševkij (1929: 243).

<sup>39</sup> In addition to the word boundary before the fifth syllable, those before the fourth and sixth syllables also coincide frequently with breaks in the phrase melody.

<sup>40</sup> For Deržavin our sample was 1,000 lines taken from different periods, for Majkov *Slovo o polku Igoreve*, and for Polonskij *Kuznečik muzykant*.

<sup>41</sup> For Puškin our sample was his fairy-tale *Skazka o care Saltane*, for Osipov the first canto of his translation of the *Aeneid*.

<sup>42</sup> Tomaševskij 1929: 41.

<sup>43</sup> Jakobson 1923: 29. Cf. the examples given by Tomaševskij (1929: 52):

1) Brát uprosíl nagrátu dát'...

2) Brátu prosíl nagrátu dát'...

Hence the change (probably made by an editor) in the line form Radiščev quoted above:

1) Veščáj, zloděj, mnóju venčannyj...

2) Veščáj, zloděj, mnoj uvenčannyj...

Only in the twentieth century, under the influence of German poetry, do lines of the second type begin to appear in Russian iambic verse: such lines are designated as the second (◌ ◡ | ◡ ◌ ...) and third (◌ ◡ ◡ | ◌ ...) choriamb:

T á j n a? Ax, vót čto! Kak v románe? Ja... (Brjusov)  
 Ž í z n i cvetúščie zabóty...  
 V ó i n, moí prezrévšij grómy... (S. Bobrov)

To the extent that such lines occur in earlier poets, they are purely experimental, as for example in Deržavin's three-foot iamb:

G ó s p o d i! vossylájut  
 K tebé svoí mol'bý.

<sup>44</sup> This distinction was overlooked by V. Brjusov (1924), who was at pains to show that Russian verse possessed spondees, choriambes, ionics, etc. Apart from a needless complication of terminology, our science gained nothing from Brjusov's efforts; Jakobson's sharp critique is quite to the point (see his "Brjusovskaja stixologija", Jakobson 1922). The issue was already clear to the theoreticians of the eighteenth century: "In our verse", writes Sumarokov, "a spondee is sometimes a trochee, sometimes an iamb" (1787 [1771–73]: 52).

#### (4. Rhythmic Tendencies in Russian Binary Meters)

<sup>45</sup> Lomonosov 1895 [1739]: 7.

<sup>46</sup> Trediakovskij 1849 [1752]: 131.

<sup>47</sup> Sumarokov 1787 [1771–73]: 55.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid.: 56 (emphasis supplied).

<sup>49</sup> Žirmunskij 1925: 18.

<sup>50</sup> Tomaševskij 1929: 48–49.

<sup>51</sup> Korš 1896: 5, 23–25, fns. 6, 22.

<sup>52</sup> Korš's second example is not ideal, since we are dealing with a compound whose second component, when independent, carries a stress on the final syllable (*desjatí*).

<sup>53</sup> Korš 1898: 726.

<sup>54</sup> Šengeli 1923: 31–63.

<sup>55</sup> At the beginning of a line or hemistich only one configuration is possible – for the trochee:  $\cup \cup \sphericalangle \dots$ ; for the iamb:  $\cup \cup \cup \sphericalangle \dots$

<sup>56</sup> Broch gives the following notations:  $cí_{1g}ga_{3}ni_{2}n'$ ,  $krá_{1}sta_{3}vi_{2}ca_{3(4)}$ ,  $krá_{1}sta_{3}vi_{2}ci_{4(5)} - te_{2(1)}$  (Broch 1910: 224).

<sup>57</sup> Jakobson 1979 [1933]: 141.

<sup>58</sup> Šengeli 1923: 56.

<sup>59</sup> Jakobson 1979 [1933]: 112.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Jakobson 1923: 23.

<sup>61</sup> Žirmunskij 1925: 123. Žirmunskij's statement is especially noteworthy since he himself leans somewhat toward the theory of the “intense”.

<sup>62</sup> Broch 1910: 225.

<sup>63</sup> Košutić 1919, I: 63; cf. Tomaševskij 1923: 72.

<sup>64</sup> This is quite easily verified by means of an experiment suggested by Ščerba. If we take, for example, two forms of the same word – *golová* and *gólovu*, *molodój* and *mólodost'* – and attempt to pronounce them by lengthening or drawing out each syllable, no difficulties arise with the end-stressed pair (*ga-la-vá*, *ma-la-dój*); however, if we attempt to pronounce the initially stressed pair in this manner (*gó-la-vu*, *mó-la-dast'*) the result will be quite unusual and awkward; substitution of *o* (*mó-lo-dost'*) is in no way better (Ščerba 1923: 42).

<sup>65</sup> Košutić 1919, I: 63.

<sup>66</sup> In cases such as these length also plays a decisive role. Stressless syllables, short as a rule, are quite often drawn out in emphatic speech, e. g.: *prašú*, *pažálsta*. A change in the relative length of syllables does not entail any semantic change in Russian, as it does, for example, in Czech (*drahá* ‘dear’ vs *dráha* ‘road’). In such cases as *xaarašó*, where the length of the first stressless syllable surpasses that of the tonic syllable, the former receives also a greater expiratory force; the following syllable is reduced, and may even be fully or partially elided, as happens to the post-tonic syllable in *pažálsta* (*požálujsta*) and *zdráste* (*zdrávstvujte*).

<sup>67</sup> Herein lies the basic difference between musical and poetic rhythm. In spoken rhythm length is a concomitant, dependent element, whereas in musical rhythm it becomes autonomous. In other words, the text regulates the stresses and the melody the length of syllables. Ancient Greek verse shows the reverse picture: the text regulates length and the melody stress (cf. Trubeckoj 1987 [1926]: 372–373).

<sup>68</sup> Šengeli 1923: 44.

<sup>69</sup> Žirmunskij 1925: 127–128.

<sup>70</sup> What we have said does not exclude the possibility of deemphasizing the stress on a stable foot where this is required by the meaning. Even the third syllable in the four-foot trochee may, for example, be read to carry a secondary rather than a primary stress; this syllable simply shows a much greater resistance to stress modulation than do the stressed syllables of unstable feet: in 95.1% of the lines in our example this syllable belongs to a word whose meaning requires a stress, in 3.1% its stress may be subordinated to that of another accentual unit, and in the remaining 1.8% it is a stressless syllable belonging to a polysyllabic accentual unit.

## References

- Belić, Aleksandar 1939. Uvodna reč (mesto pozdravnog govora na Kongresu). In: *III Međunarodni kongres slavista (slovenskih filologa). Govori i predavanja / III<sup>ème</sup> Congrès International des Slavistes (philologues slaves). Discours et conférences. (Izdanja Izvršnog odbora / Publications du Comité d'organisation 4)*. Beograd: štamp. Mlada Srbija, 5–27.
- Belić, Aleksandar 1941. *O jezičkoj prirodi i jezičkom razvitku: lingvistička ispitivanja*. Beograd: Srpska kraljevska akademija; štamp. Mlada Srbija.
- Belyj, Andrej [Belyi, Andrei] 1910. *Simvolizm: Kniga statej*. Moskva: Musaget.
- Brjusov, V. [Briusov, Valery Yakovlevich] 1924. *Osnovy stikhovedenija. Kurs V.U.Z. Chasti pervaja i vtoraja: Obshchee vedenie. Metrika i ritmika*. Izdanie 2-e. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo.
- Broch, Olaf 1910. *Očerk fiziologii slavjanskoj reči (Enciklopedija slavjanskoj filologii 5/2)*. Izdanie Otdelenija ruskogo jazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk. Sankt-Peterburg: tip. Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk.
- Jakobson, Roman 1922. Brjusovskaja stikhologija i nauka o stikhe. In: *Akademicheskij tsentr Narkomprosa. Nauchnye izvestija*. Vol. 2: *Filosofija. Literatura. Iskusstvo*. Moskva: GIZ, 222–240.
- Jakobson, Roman 1923. *O cheshskom stikhe preimushchestvenno v sopostavlenii s ruskim*. Moskva, Berlin: Opojaz – M.L.K.
- Jakobson, Roman 1979 [1933]. Bolgarskij pjatistopnyj jamb v sopostavlenii s ruskim. In: Jakobson, Roman. *Selected Writings*. Vol. 5: *On Verse, Its Masters and Explorers*. The Hague, Paris: Mouton, 135–146.
- Jakobson, Roman 1979 [1935]. Metrics. In: Jakobson, Roman. *Selected Writings*. Vol. 5: *On Verse, Its Masters and Explorers*. The Hague, Paris: Mouton, 147–159.
- Karcevskij, Serge 1931. Sur la phonologie de la phrase. In: *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague* 4, 188–227.
- Korš, F. E. [Korsh, Fedor Evgen'evich] 1896–1897. O ruskom narodnom stikhoslozhenii. In: *Izvestija Otdelenija ruskogo jazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk* 1(1), 1–45; 2(2), 429–500. [Reprinted in *Sbornik Otdelenija ruskogo jazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk* 67(8). Sankt-Peterburg: tip. Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk, 1901, 1–121.]
- Korš, F. E. [Korsh, Fedor Evgen'evich] 1898–1899. Razbor voprosa o podlinnosti okončanja “Rusalki” A. S. Puškina po zapisi D. P. Zueva. In: *Izvestija Otdelenija*

- ruskogo jazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk* 3(3), 633–785; 4(1), 1–100; 4(2), 476–588.
- Košutić, Radovan 1919. *Gramatika ruskog jezika: I. Glasovi. A. Opšti deo (Književni izgovor)*. Drugo izdanje. Petrograd: štamp. Ruske akademije nauka.
- Kunik, A. [Arist Aristovich]. 1865. *Sbornik materialov dlja istorii Akademii nauk v XVIII veke. Chasti I–II*. Sankt-Peterburg: tip. Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk.
- Lomonosov, M. V. [Mikhail Vasil'evich] 1895 [1739]. Pis'mo o pravilakh rossijskogo stikhotvorstva. In: *Sochinenija M. V. Lomonosova*. T. 3. Sankt-Peterburg: tip. Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk, 1–11.
- Ščerba, L. V. [Shcherba, Lev Vladimirovich]. 1923. Opyty lingvisticheskogo tolkovanija stikhotvorenij. I: "Vospominanie" Puškina. In: *Russkaja rech'* I. Shcherba, Lev Vladimirovich (ed.). Petrograd: Izdanie foneticheskogo instituta prakticheskogo izuchenija jazykov, 13–56.
- Šengeli, G. [Shengeli, Georgy Arkadieovich] 1923. *Traktat o russkom stikhe. Chast' 1: Organicheskaja metrika*. Izdanie 2-e, pererabotannoe. Moskva, Petrograd: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo.
- Štokmar, M. P. [Shtokmar, Mikhail Petrovich] 1928. Vol'nyj stikh XIX veka. In: *Ars Poetica II: Stikh i proza*. Petrovsky, Mikhail Aleksandrovich; Yarkho, Boris Isaakovich (eds.). Moskva: Izdanie GAKhN, 117–167.
- Sumarokov, A. P. [Aleksandr Petrovich]. O stoposlozhenii 1787 [1771–73]. In: *Polnoe sobranie vseh sochinenij, v stikhax i proze, pokojnogo ... Aleksandra Petrovicha Sumarokova*. Izdanie vtoroe. Chast' 10. Moskva: tip. N. Novikova, 50–77.
- Taranovsky, Kiril [Kirill Fedorovich] 1939. Metode i zadaci savremene nauke o stihu kao discipline na granici lingvistike i istorije književnosti. In: *III Međunarodni kongres slavista (slovenskih filologa). Govori i predavanja / III<sup>ème</sup> Congrès International des Slavistes (philologues slaves). Discours et conférences. (Izdanja Izvršnog odbora / Publications du Comité d'organisation 4)*. Beograd: štamp. Mlada Srbija, 108–132.
- Taranovsky, Kiril [Kirill Fedorovich] 1953. *Ruski dvodelni ritmovi I–II*. Beograd: Naučna knjiga.
- Taranovsky, Kiril [Kirill Fedorovich] 1971. O ritmicheskoi strukturi russkikh dvuslozhnykh razmerov. In: Alekseev, Mikhail Pavlovich (ed.), *Poetika i stilistika ruskoj literatury: Pamjati akademika Viktora Vladimirovicha Vinogradova*. Leningrad: Nauka, 420–429. [English translation: Taranovsky, Kiril 1980. The rhythmical structure of Russian binary metres. Translated by Gerald Stanton Smith. In: *Russian Poetics in Translation* 7, 20–30.]

- Taranovsky, Kiril [Kirill Fedorovich] 2010. *Russkie dvuslozhnye razmery. Stat'i o stikhe*. Son'kin, Viktor Valentinovich (tr.). Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury.
- Taranovsky, Kiril [Kirill Fedorovich]; Lotman Mihhail 2014. Perepiska. In: Scherr, Barry P.; Bailey, James; Johnson, Vida T. (eds.), *Poetry and Poetics: A Centennial Tribute to Kiril Taranovsky*. Bloomington, Ind.: Slavica, 373–421.
- Timofeev, L. I. [Leonid Ivanovich] 1928. Vol'nyj stikh XVIII veka. In: *Ars Poetica II: Stikh i proza*. Petrovsky, Mikhail Aleksandrovich; Yarkho, Boris Isaakovich (eds.). Moskva: Izdanie GAKhN, 73–115.
- Timofeev, L. I. [Leonid Ivanovich] 1931. *Problemy stikhovedenija. Materialy k sotsiologii stikha*. Moskva: Federatsija.
- Tomaševskij, B. V. [Tomashevsky, Boris Viktorovich] 1923. *Russkoe stikhoslozhenie: Metrika*. Petrograd: Academia.
- Tomaševskij, B. V. [Tomashevsky, Boris Viktorovich] 1929. *O stikhe*. Leningrad: Priboj.
- Trediakovskij, V. K. [Trediakovsky, Vasily Kirillovich] 1865 [1735]. Novyj i kratkij sposob k slozheniju Rossijskikh stikhov s opredelenijami do sego nadležashchikh znanij. In: Kunik, Arist Aristovich, *Sbornik materialov dlja istorii Akademii nauk v XVIII veke*. Chast' I. Sankt-Peterburg: tip. Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk, 17–74.
- Trediakovskij, V. K. [Trediakovsky, Vasily Kirillovich] 1849 [1752]. Sposob k slozheniju Rossijskikh stikhov, protiv vydannogo v 1735 gode ispravlenyj i dopolnennyj. In: *Sochinenija Tred'jakovskogo*. Izdanie Aleksandra Smirdina. T. 1. Sankt-Peterburg: tip. Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk, 121–178.
- Trubeckoj, N. S. [Trubetzkoy, Nikolai Sergeevich] 1987 [1926]. O metrike chastushki. In: Trubetzkoy, N. S., *Izbrannye trudy po filologii*. Moskva: Progress, 371–390.
- Trubeckoj, N. S. [Trubetzkoy, Nikolai Sergeevich] 1987 [1937]. K voprosu o stikhe "Pesen zapadnykh slavjan" A. S. Pushkina. In: Trubetzkoy, N. S., *Izbrannye trudy po filologii*. Moskva: Progress, 359–370.
- Trubeckoj, N. S. [Trubetzkoy, Nikolai Sergeevich] 1937. W sprawie wiersza byliny rosyjskiej. In: *Prace ofiarowane Kazimierzowi Wóycickiemu*. Kridl, Manfred (ed.). (*Z zagadnień poetyki* 6). Wilno: [s. n.], 100–110.
- Wachtel, Michael 2015. Charts, Graphs, and Meaning: Kiril Taranovsky and the Study of Russian Versification. In: *Slavic and East European Journal* 59(2), 178–193.
- Žirmunskij, V. M. [Zhirmunsky, Viktor Maksimovich] 1925. *Vvedenie v metriku: Teorija stikha*. Leningrad: Academia.