

## NOTES AND REFERENCES

### NOTES TO PREFACE

1. For a metrical handbook of Russian verse, see Barry P. Scherr, *Russian Poetry: Meter, Rhythm, and Rhyme* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, California, 1986); Scherr uses the terms 'strict accentual verse' and 'loose accentual verse' instead of 'taktovik' and 'accentual verse' (pp. 160–61), while the term 'taktovik' usually covers what is here called 'udarnik' (concerning the history of these two terms, see M. L. Gasparov, *Sovremennyyi russkii stikh. Metrika i ritmika* (M, 1974), pp. 295–99; *Sovremennyyi russkii stikh* is subsequently referred to as *SRS*).

### NOTES TO INTRODUCTION

1. Vladimir Maiakovskii, 'Kak delat' stikhi' (1926), in his *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v trindtsati tomakh* (M, 1955–61), xii (1959), *Stat'i, zametki, i vystupleniia. Noiabr' 1917–1930*, 81–117 (p. 101); all quotations from Maiakovskii's works are taken from this edition and further references to it are given in the text, citing volume and page numbers only.
2. The original intention was to cover the major civic works as well, and preliminary studies were made of *Voina i mir*, *Misteriia-buff*, *150000000*, *Vladimir Il'ich Lenin*, and *Khorosho*.
3. I. P. Smirnov, *Khudozhestvennyi smysl i evoliutsiia poeticheskikh sistem* (M, 1977), p. 103.
4. Roman Jakobson, *O cheshskom stikhe preimushchestvenno v sopostavlenii s russkim* (Berlin, 1923), pp. 101–13; M. L. Gasparov, 'Vol'nyi khorei i vol'nyi iamb Maiakovskogo', *Vla*, 1965, no. 3, 76–88, superseded by *SRS*, pp. 372–97; M. L. Gasparov, 'Aksentnyi stikh rannego Maiakovskogo', *UZTGU*, 198, *Trudy po znakovym sistemam*, 3 (1967), 324–60, superseded for the most part by *SRS*, pp. 398–468; M. L. Gasparov, 'Russkii trekhudarnyi dol'nik XX veka', in *Teoriia stikha*, edited by V. E. Kholshevnikov and others (L, 1968), pp. 59–106, reprinted in shortened form in *SRS*, pp. 220–40; M. L. Gasparov, 'Taktovik v russkom stikhoslozhenii XX veka', *Vla*, 1968, no. 5, 79–90, superseded by *SRS*, pp. 294–351; M. L. Gasparov, 'Cheterekhiktnyi dol'nik', *SRS*, pp. 245–93. For a survey of the various approaches to Maiakovskii's versification, see B. P. Goncharov, 'Ob izuchenii stikha Maiakovskogo', in *Poet i sotsializm. K estetike Maiakovskogo*, edited by V. O. Pertsov and others (M, 1971), pp. 233–66 (pp. 233–45).
5. For an account of this category of words, see V. M. Zhirmunskii, *Vvedenie v metriku. Teoriia stikha*, *Voprosy poetiki*, 6 (L, 1925), pp. 90–130; for a partial refinement of the criteria involved, which are not necessarily absolute, see *SRS*, pp. 131–37.
6. For Gasparov's criteria of stressing, see *SRS*, pp. 407–09.
7. This distinction between 'light' and 'heavy' stresses is proposed by Gasparov in 'Legkii stikh i tiazhelyi stikh', *UZTGU*, 420, *Studia metrica et poetica*, 2 (1977), 3–20 (p. 4).
8. There is a view, originally put forward by Jakobson and recently taken up by Mikhail Lotman, that stress strength is equalized in Maiakovskii's verse (Jakobson, *O cheshskom stikhe*, pp. 103–04; Mikhail Lotman, 'Problema vol'nykh dvuslozhnykh metrov v poezii Vladimira Maiakovskogo (prosodiia i metrika)', *UZTGU*, 683 (1986), *Trudy po russkoi i slavianskoi filologii, Literatura i publitsistika. Problemy vzaimodeistviia*, 66–78 (p. 73)); for an alternative view, see, however, V. M. Zhirmunskii, 'Stikhoslozhenie Maiakovskogo', *RusL*, 1964, no. 4, 3–26 (p. 18).
9. *SRS*, pp. 409–10.
10. The principal reference works consulted are *Tolkovyi slovar' russkogo iazyka*, edited by D. N. Ushakov, 4 vols (M, 1935–40); and *Russkoe literaturnoe proiznoshenie i udarenie. Slovar'-spravochnik*, edited by R. I. Avanesov and S. I. Ozhegov (M, 1959).
11. A. N. Kolmogorov, 'K izucheniiu ritmiki Maiakovskogo', *Vla*, 1963, no. 4, 64–71 (pp. 64–65); *SRS*, p. 30.
12. The presence of the hexameter or something like it has been noted before in Maiakovskii's verse, but never studied in detail: Burgi noted its use in *150000000* (Richard Burgi, *A History of the Russian Hexameter* (Hamden, Connecticut, 1954), pp. 172–74), Gasparov notes its presence in *Oblako v shtanakh* and some early poems ('Aksentnyi stikh', pp. 345, 351), while

- Ivanov distinguishes a kind of hexameter metrical form in *Chelovek* (V. V. Ivanov, 'Ritm poemy Maiakovskogo *Chelovek*', in *Poetics. Poetyka. Poetika*, 2, edited by R. Jakobson and others (Warsaw, 1966), 243–76 (pp. 255–57)).
13. This method provides a more refined rhythmical description than that used by Gasparov (see *SRS*, pp. 416–26).
  14. P. A. Rudnev, 'O printsipakh opisaniia i semanticheskogo analiza stikhotvornogo teksta na metricheskou urovne', *Voprosy istorizma i khudozhestvennogo masterstva* (L), 1 (1976), 170–90 (pp. 173–75).
  15. Kolmogorov and Kondratov suggest that in the *dol'nik* the powerful rhythmical expressiveness of the stress and length of intervals makes the role of word boundaries less noticeable (A. N. Kolmogorov and A. M. Kondratov, 'Ritmika poem Maiakovskogo', *Vla*, 1962, no. 3, 62–74 (p. 67)), and by extension it would be even less so in accentual verse.
  16. The study of polymetric composition has been especially developed by Rudnev: for a general account of polymetric composition and its typological characteristics, see P. A. Rudnev, 'Metricheskii repertuar A. Bloka', in *Blokovskii sbornik*, 2, *Trudy Vtoroi nauchnoi konferentsii, posviashchennoi izucheniiu zhizni i tvorchestva A. A. Bloka*, edited by Z. G. Mints and others (Tartu, 1972), 218–67 (pp. 229–31); P. A. Rudnev, 'Metricheskii repertuar V. Briusova', in *Briusovskie cheniia 1971 goda*, edited by K. V. Aivazian (Erevan, 1973), pp. 309–49 (pp. 323–27); P. A. Rudnev, 'Polimetrichekiskie kompozitsii Nekrasova', in *N. A. Nekrasov i russkaia literatura. Vtoroi mezhvuzovskii sbornik*, vypusk 40, edited by N. N. Skatov (Yaroslavl, 1975), 159–77 (pp. 159–62); concerning macro- and micro-polymetricity, see M. L. Gasparov, *Ocherk istorii russkogo stikha. Metrika. Ritmika. Rifma. Strofika* (M, 1984), pp. 214–17; concerning different types of polymetric composition, see also L. L. Bel'skaia, 'O polimetrii i polimorfnosti (na materiale poezii S. Esenina)', in *Problemy teorii stikha*, edited by V. E. Kholshchevnikov and others (L, 1984), pp. 99–109 (pp. 100–01).
  17. Two substantial studies are those by Ivanov of *Chelovek* ('Ritm poemy') and by Kolmogorov and Kondratov of *Liubliu* (Kolmogorov and Kondratov, pp. 62–67); other studies, including Gasparov's account of the major pre-revolutionary works ('Aktsentnyi stikh', pp. 342–47, Table 13), are far more cursory and/or partial.
  18. Jiří Levý, 'The Meanings of Form and the Forms of Meaning', in *Poetics. Poetyka. Poetika*, 2, edited by R. Jakobson and others (Warsaw, 1966), 45–59 (p. 58).
  19. Derek Attridge, *The Rhythms of English Poetry*, Longman's English Language Series, 14 (London, 1982), pp. 285–315 (pp. 287–306). Attridge also goes on to consider those functions of the patterning of linguistic properties in verse which are not specifically related to the articulation of meaning, but which nevertheless contribute to the total working of the poem: in particular he contrasts the traditional view, that this patterning helps to establish the satisfying cohesion and unity which characterizes or defines a work of art, and an alternative view, deriving from the Russian Formalists, that sees the patterning as a means of unsettling fixities and foregrounding the linguistic properties themselves (pp. 306–14). For an earlier general approach, see Victor M. Hamm, 'Meter and Meaning', *PMLA*, 69 (1954), 695–710; for an approach based on information theory, see V. A. Zaretskii, 'Ritm i smysl v khudozhestvennykh tekstakh', *UZTGU*, 181, *Trudy po znakovym sistemam*, 2 (1965), 64–75.
  20. Concerning 'rhythmical disruptions', see V. E. Kholshchevnikov, 'Pereboi ritma', in *Russkaia sovetskaia poeziia i stikhovedenie. (Materialy mezhvuzovskoi konferentsii)*, edited by K. G. Petrosov and others (M, 1969), pp. 173–84.
  21. See Attridge, p. 287.
  22. For a study of stanza forms and their associations, see B. V. Tomashevskii, 'Strofika Pushkina', *Pushkin. Issledovaniia i materialy*, 2 (1958), 49–184; for a study of the associations of rhyme in the trochaic tetrameter, see M. L. Gasparov, 'K semantike daktilicheskoi rifmy v russkom khoree', in *Slavic Poetics: Essays in honor of Kiril Taranovsky*, edited by Roman Jakobson and others, SPR, 267 (The Hague, 1973), pp. 143–50; for a study of the relationship between rhythmical and thematic trends, see K. F. Taranovsky, 'Chetyrekhstopnyi iamb Andreia Belogo', *IJSLP*, 10 (1966), 127–47.
  23. Kiril Taranovsky, 'O vzaimootnoshenii stikhotvornogo ritma i tematiki', in *American Contributions to the Fifth International Congress of Slavists*, Sofia, September 1963, 1, *Linguistic Contributions*, SPR, 46 (The Hague, 1963), 287–322; for a criticism of certain aspects of Taranovsky's study, see K. D. Vishnevskii, 'Ekspressivnyi oreol piatistopnogo khoreia', in *Russkoe stikhoslozhenie. Traditsii i problemy razvitiia*, edited by L. I. Timofeev and others (M, 1985), pp. 94–113; for another criticism, see Wladimir Weidle, *Embrigiologia poezii. Vvedenie v fonosemantiku poeticheskoi rechi*, Bibliothèque russe de l'Institut d'études slaves, 4 (Paris, 1980), pp. 214–25; for an early, general consideration of the 'titling' function of measures, see John Hollander, 'The Metrical Emblem', *Kenyon Review*, 21 (1959), 279–96.

24. Gasparov, 'K semantike daktilicheskoi rifmy'; M. L. Gasparov, 'Metri i smysl. K semantike russkogo trekhstopnogo khoreia', *ISLJa*, 35 (1976), 357–66; M. L. Gasparov, 'Semanticheskii oreol metra. K semantike russkogo trekhstopnogo iamba', in *Lingvistika i poetika*, ed. V. P. Grigor'ev (M, 1979), pp. 282–308; M. L. Gasparov, 'Semanticheskii oreol trekhstopnogo amfibrakhiia', *PSL* 1980, 1982, pp. 174–92; M. L. Gasparov, "'Spi, mladenets moi prekrasnyi". Semanticheskii oreol raznovidnosti khoreicheskogo razmera', *PSL* 1981, 1983, pp. 181–97; M. L. Gasparov, 'Tynianov i problema semantiki metra', in *Tynianovskii sbornik. Pervye Tynianovskie chteniia*, edited by M. O. Chudakova and others (Riga, 1984), pp. 105–13; Taranovsky, 'O vzaimootnoshenii'; Marina Tarlinskaja and Naira Oganessova, 'Meter and Meaning: The Semiotic Function of Verse Form', in *In Memory of Roman Jakobson: Papers from the 1984 Mid-America Linguistics Conference*, edited by Gilbert Youmans and Donald M. Lance (Columbia, Missouri, 1985), pp. 75–93; Marina G. Tarlinskaja and Lawrence K. Coachman, 'Text–Theme–Text: Semantic Correlation between Thematically Linked Poems (Seven Sonnets by Shakespeare)', *Language and Style*, 19 (1986), 338–67; for an approach of reasoned caution to the study of semantic aureoles, see K. D. Vishnevskii, 'K voprosu ob ispol'zovanii kolichestvennykh metodov v stikhovedenii', *Kontekst* 1976, 1977, pp. 130–59 (pp. 145–59); see also Vishnevskii, 'Ekspressivnyi oreol'; for a criticism of Gasparov's whole enterprise, see Leonid Timofeev, *Slovo v stikhe* (M, 1982), pp. 151–59; for a semiotic approach to semantic aureoles, see Iu. I. Levin, 'Semanticheskii oreol metra s semioticheskoi tochki zreniia', in *Finitis duodecim lustris. Sbornik statei k 60-letiiu prof. Iu. M. Lotmana*, edited by S. G. Isakov and others (Tallinn, 1982), pp. 151–54.
25. 'Tynianov', p. 105.
26. R. A. Papaian, *Sravnitel'naia tipologiiia natsional'nogo stikha (russkii i armianskii stikh)* (Erevan, 1980), pp. 81–136; Michael Shapiro, 'The Meaning of Meter' (forthcoming).
27. Attridge, p. 288.
28. Samuel Johnson, *The Rambler*, no. 94 (9 February 1751), in *The Rambler*, 1 (London, 1753), 557–62 (p. 560).
29. See Attridge, pp. 295–96.
30. G. W. F. Hegel, *Aesthetics: Lectures on Fine Art*, translated by T. M. Knox, 2 vols (Oxford, 1975), II, 1019–20.
31. 'O printsipakh', pp. 170–73, 175–78.
32. Of Maiakovskii's major works only *Pro eto* has been studied in any detail, most notably by Taranovsky and also by Loktev (Taranovsky, 'O vzaimootnoshenii', pp. 310–15; K. F. Taranovsky, 'Poema Maiakovskogo *Pro eto*. Literaturnye reminitsentsii i ritmicheskaia struktura', *Slavica Hierosolymitana*, 4 (1979), 114–25; N. F. Loktev, 'Nekotorye printsipy ritmicheskoi organizatsii poemy V. V. Maiakovskogo *Pro eto* (k probleme romanticheskoi stilistiki)', in *Zhanrovo-stilevye problemy v sovetskoi literature. Mezhvuzovskii tematicheskii sbornik*, edited by A. V. Ognev and others (Kalinin, 1978), pp. 21–36). The most extensive work in the Russian field more generally has been that of Rudnev himself: for examples of the comprehensive analysis of a short text on the metrical level, see P. A. Rudnev, 'Stikhotvorenie A. Bloka "Vse tikho na svetlom litse"'. (Opyt semanticheskoi interpretatsii metra i ritma)', in *Poetika i stilistika russkoi literatury. Pamiati akademika V. V. Vinogradova*, edited by M. P. Alekseev and others (L, 1971), pp. 450–55; 'O printsipakh', pp. 178–90; for examples of the analysis of polymetric composition in longer works, see P. A. Rudnev, 'O stikhe dramy A. Bloka *Roz'a i krest'*', *UZTGU*, 251, *Trudy po russkoi i slavianskoi filologii*, 15 (1970), 294–334; P. A. Rudnev, 'Opyt opisaniia i semanticheskoi interpretatsii polimetrichekoi struktury poemy A. Bloka *Dvenadtsat'*', *UZTGU*, 266, *Trudy po russkoi i slavianskoi filologii*, 18 (1971), 195–221; for a detailed analysis of a longer monometric text, see S. I. Gindin, 'Ritmika, intonatsiia, i smyslovaia kompozitsiia v poeme Vl. Lugovskogo *Kak chelovek plyn s Odisseem'*', *PSL* 1978, 1981, pp. 230–65.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER I

1. Compare Gasparov's definition of the 'metrical word', which may consist of one or more phonetic words, as a group of syllables subordinate to one metrical stress (SRS, p. 145); compare also Jakobson's definition of the rhythmical unit in Maiakovskii's verse as 'the word or word group united under one dynamic accent'. As Jakobson's examples show, however, his definition effectively involves expanding the category of stress-ambiguous words to include fully-stressed words, such as 'книги', 'легко': 'Я раньше думал — книги делаютя так: // пришел поэт, легко разжал уста' (*O cheshskom stikhe*, p. 103). But none of the syllable groups here correspond to such broadly defined word groups, and for a more thorough criticism of this aspect of Jakobson's theory, see SRS, p. 407.

2. Zhirmunskii, 'Stikhoslozhenie', p. 24 (for a similar interpretation, see also Kolmogorov, 'K izucheniiu', p. 71); M. Lotman, 'Problema', pp. 73–77; by means of this explanation Lotman seeks to reconcile earlier, differing approaches to Maiakovskii's versification. The presence of a dual metrical structure could account for the role of light stresses: they may not necessarily be defined in the tonic base but are engaged by the syllabo-tonic metre; it would not therefore seem necessary to argue, as Lotman does, that stresses are either equally strong or reduced to nothing (p. 76).
3. See M. Lotman, 'Problema', pp. 70, 76; concerning this anomalous phenomenon, see also James Bailey, 'The Aims and Accomplishments of the Russian Linguistic-Statistical Method for Studying Poetic Rhythm: A Reply to B. P. Goncharov', *SEEJ*, 23 (1979), 251–61 (p. 258); for a detailed study of the rhythm of Maiakovskii's free trochee and iamb, see *SRS*, pp. 382–90; for a statement of the prosodic laws of Russian binary metre, see K. F. Taranovsky, 'O ritmicheskoi strukture russkikh dvuslozhnykh razmerov', in *Poetika i stilistika russkoi literatury. Pamiaty akademika V. V. Vinogradova*, edited by M. P. Alekseev and others (L, 1971), pp. 420–29 (p. 421).
4. 'O ritmicheskoi strukture', p. 424, Table 1; concerning the schematic rhythm of Maiakovskii's classical verse, see *SRS*, pp. 453–54. For an account of the history, theory, construction, and application of a theoretical (language or discourse) model, see *SRS*, pp. 21–24, 79–88; see also A. V. Prokhorov, 'O sluchainoi versifikatsii (k voprosu o teoreticheskikh i rechevykh modeliakh stikhotvornoj rechi)', in *Problemy teorii stikha*, edited by V. E. Kholoshevnikov and others (L, 1984), pp. 89–98; A. N. Kolmogorov and A. V. Prokhorov, 'Model' ritmicheskogo stroeniia russkoi rechi, prispособlennaiia k izucheniiu metriki klassicheskogo russkogo stikha', in *Russkoe stikhoslozhenie. Traditsii i problemy razvitiia*, edited by L. I. Timofeev and others (M, 1985), pp. 113–34.
5. *SRS*, pp. 255–57, Table 1.
6. M. L. Gasparov, 'Ritm i sintaksis: proiskhozhdenie "lesenki" Maiakovskogo', *PSL* 1979, 1981, pp. 148–68; see also *SRS*, pp. 391–93, 431–41; for an exposition of his theory that a system of syntactico-intonational and rhythmical pauses manifested in the graphical division of the line is a dominant in Maiakovskii's verse, see, for example, B. P. Goncharov, 'O pazukh v stikhe Maiakovskogo', *RusL*, 1970, no. 2, 47–61; for a criticism of Goncharov, see Gasparov (as above) and also Bailey, 'The Aims and Accomplishments', pp. 258–59; for more general studies of the significance of this graphical form of verse, see A. L. Zhovtis, 'V rassypannom stroiu. . . (Grafika sovremennogo russkogo stikha)', *RusL*, 1968, no. 1, 123–34; Herbert Eagle, 'The Semantic Significance of Step-Ladder and Column Forms in the Poetry of Belyj, Majakovskij, Voznesenskij, and Rozhdestvenskij', *Forum at Iowa on Russian Literature*, 1 (1976), 1–19; Melchior de Wolff, 'Rhythm, Syntax, and Typography: V. V. Majakovskij's *lesenki* Reconsidered', in *Miscellanea Slavica: To Honour the Memory of Jan M. Meijer*, edited by B. J. Amsenga and others (Amsterdam, 1983), pp. 497–533; Gerald Janacek, *The Look of Russian Literature: Avant-Garde Visual Experiments, 1900–1930* (Princeton, New Jersey, 1984), pp. 207–47.
7. Laferrière's account of the teleology of rhythm in the terms of experimental psychology leads him to interpret the rhythmical *gul* as a defence mechanism which distracts Maiakovskii, allowing 'some other, less conscious part of his mind . . . to grapple with the morbid thoughts associated with Esenin's suicide' (Daniel Laferrière, 'The Teleology of Rhythm in Poetry: With Examples Primarily from the Russian Syllabotonic Meters', *PTL: A Journal for Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature*, 4 (1979), 411–50 (p. 440)). While not necessarily disputing Laferrière's general thesis, the studies undertaken here show that the rhythmical *gul* engages deep semantic levels rather than distracts from them. In 'Sergeiu Eseninu' itself the free trochee can be seen as a medium, not a defence, because it is used by Maiakovskii in communications across time; moreover, the trochaic theme is intimately connected with suicide and resurrection in *Pro eto* (see Taranovsky, 'O vzaimootnoshenii', pp. 312–14).
8. Maiakovskii is not the only poet to have indicated the pre-eminence of rhythm, nor the only poet in whom this pre-eminence may be observed, though not necessarily in a systematic way. To give just two examples: Lotman cites a line from Pushkin which keeps the same distinctive rhythmical form in successive, verbally quite different, versions (Iu. M. Lotman, *Analiz poeticheskogo teksta. Struktura stikha* (L, 1972), p. 58), while Eliot states more generally 'that a poem, or a passage of a poem, may tend to realize itself first as a particular rhythm before it reaches expression in words, and that this rhythm may bring to birth the idea and the image' (T. S. Eliot, *The Music of Poetry* (Glasgow, 1942), p. 28); compare, however, Tvardovskii's contrasting account: 'размер должен рождаться не из некоего бессловесного "гула", о котором говорит, например, В. Маяковский, а из слов, из их осмысленных, присущих живой речи сочетаний' (A. Tvardovskii, 'Kak byl napisan *Vasilii Terkin*. Otvet chitateliam' (1951–62), in his *O literature* (M, 1973), pp. 324–60 (p. 335)). Concerning the mechanisms

- by which rhythm may be generated, see, among other works by this author, M. A. Krasnoperova, 'Model' vospriiatiia i porozhdeniia ritma', in *Voprosy kibernetiki. Obshchenie c EVM na estestvennom iazyke*, edited by V. Iu. Rozentsveig (M, 1982), pp. 124–40. The role of the rhythmical *gul* can also be related to the ideas of Russian Formalism: Tynianov, for example, held that rhythm in verse creates a dynamization of the linguistic material and a deformation of lexical sense (Iu. Tynianov, *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka*, *Voprosy poetiki*, 5 (L, 1924), pp. 40–41); concerning the Formalist approach to metre and rhythm, see Victor Erlich, *Russian Formalism: History — Doctrine*, SPR, 4, fourth edition (The Hague, 1980), pp. 212–29; Peter Steiner, *Russian Formalism: A Metapoetics* (Ithaca and London, 1984), pp. 172–241; concerning the role of Futurism as the model for Formalist theories, see Krystyna Pomorska, *Russian Formalist Theory and its Poetic Ambiance*, SPR, 82 (The Hague, 1968), pp. 77–118.
9. This gives rise to enjambement (which, however, is not common in Maiakovskii's verse). For a theoretical account of enjambement, see Harai Golomb, *Enjambement in Poetry: Language and Verse in Interaction*, Meaning and Art, 3 (Tel Aviv, 1979); for a survey of aspects of enjambement, see M. S. Lobanova, 'K voprosu o stikhovom perenose (fr. enjambement)', *Vestnik Leningradskogo universiteta*, 36 (1981), no. 2, *Istoriia, iazyk, literatura*, 1, 67–73; concerning the role of syntax in Russian verse, see Zh. A. Dozorets, 'Russkii stikh', in *Słowińska metryka porównawcza*, 2, *Organizacja składowa*, edited by Zdzisława Kopczyńska and Lucylla Pszczółowska (Wrocław, 1984), 81–131; see also, though not specifically in relation to enjambement, Gasparov, 'Ritm i sintaksis', pp. 148–53; Zh. A. Dozorets, 'Sintaksicheskaia struktura stroki i ee chlenenie na sintagmy', in *Aktual'nye voprosy grammatiki i leksiki russkogo iazyka. Sbornik trudov*, edited by L. Iu. Maksimov and others (M, 1978), pp. 79–96.
  10. This dialectic was highlighted by Belyi in relation to *Mednyi vsadnik* (Andrei Belyi, *Ritm kak dialektika i 'Mednyi vsadnik'. Issledovanie* (M, 1929)).
  11. M. P. Shtokmar, 'O stikhovoi sisteme Maiakovskogo', in *Tvorchestvo Maiakovskogo. Sbornik statei*, edited by L. I. Timofeev and L. M. Poliak (M, 1952), pp. 258–312 (pp. 296–312).
  12. For a summary of the most important features of Maiakovskii's accentual verse in descending order as factors of organization, see *SRS*, pp. 466–68.
  13. For Gasparov's account of line length in Maiakovskii's accentual verse, see *SRS*, pp. 410–16.
  14. B. V. Tomashevskii, *Stikh i iazyk. Filologicheskie ocherki* (M–L, 1959), p. 47; concerning a normal line length of seven to ten syllables and the special status of long and short lines, see also Zhirmunskii, *Vvedenie*, p. 159.
  15. For Gasparov's account of rhythmic organization in Maiakovskii's accentual verse, see *SRS*, pp. 416–26.
  16. A comparison of the theoretical and actual frequencies of metres leads Baevskii to a similar statement of the dialectic interaction of language norms and verse conventions: 'в наиболее общих проявлениях стих "подчиняется" языку и следует его закономерностям; в частности же он "преодолевает" языковые нормы' (V. S. Baevskii, 'Vzaimootnoshenie i vzaimodeistvie iazyka i stikha s tochkoi zreniia veroiatnostnoi modeli stikhovogo metra', in his *Stikh russkoi sovetskoi poezii. Posobie dlia slushatelei spetskursa* (Smolensk, 1972), pp. 37–43 (p. 42)).
  17. Gasparov's figures for oral tales, plays, and prose fiction are respectively 1:2.634, 1:2.716, and 1:2.975 (*SRS*, pp. 83, 86), and his tables include the calculations of others for comparison (*SRS*, pp. 79–86, Tables 1–7); Gasparov has also calculated that the average interval between stresses in a four-stress line in Maiakovskii's early accentual verse is 1.88 syllables, and in his later accentual verse — 1.96 syllables (*SRS*, p. 422).
  18. Concerning the 'naturalness' of ternary and binary metre, and earlier approaches to this question, see *SRS*, pp. 128–29, 146–48; although ternary metre corresponds closely to the theoretical inertia of the language, its verbal capacity is much less than that of binary metre (with its reader omission of stress), and so in this respect binary metre can be considered more 'natural'.
  19. In confirmation of this significance the theoretical frequency of a fully-stressed iambic tetrameter is a tenth of that of the same measure allowing for omission of stress, and a fifth of that of a fully-stressed amphibrachic trimeter, its equivalent in terms of syllabic length (see *SRS*, pp. 147–48).
  20. Compare Belyi's theory of the genesis of metre: 'метр — многообразные стабилизации ритма, этой первичной интонации' (*Ritm*, p. 21).
  21. Concerning the Futurist conception of spatial time and the temporal interpretation of space, see Smirnov, *Khudozhestvennyi smysl*, pp. 120–28.
  22. For Gasparov's account of anacrusis, see *SRS*, pp. 426–29, Table 9.

23. For Gasparov's account of clausula, see *SRS*, pp. 426–31, Tables 10, 10a; for the major study of Maiakovskii's rhyme, see M. P. Shtokmar, *Rifma Maiakovskogo* (M, 1958); for an account of the rhyme of the period and Maiakovskii's role in it, see Gasparov, *Ocherk*, pp. 239–50.
24. *Khudozhestvennyi smysl*, pp. 103–04.
25. See Smirnov, *Khudozhestvennyi smysl*, pp. 103–44. Concerning Maiakovskii and the pictorial arts, see especially Juliette R. Stapanian, *Mayakovsky's Cubo-Futurist Vision*, Rice University New Series, 5 (Houston, Texas, 1986); see also Nikolai Khardzhiev, 'Poezia i zhivopis'. (Rannii Maiakovskii)', in *K istorii russkogo avangarda* (Stockholm, 1976), pp. 7–84; V. Al'fonsov, *Nam slovo nuzhno dlia zhizni. V poeticheskom mire Maiakovskogo* (L, 1984), pp. 156–201; more generally concerning Cubism and the poetry of the avant-garde, see Mojmir Grygar, 'Kubizm i poezia russkogo i cheshskogo avangarda', in *Structure of Texts and Semiotics of Culture*, edited by Jan van der Eng and Mojmir Grygar, SPR, 294 (The Hague, 1973), pp. 59–101.
26. M. V. Matiushin, 'Futurizm v Peterburge. Spektakli 2, 3, 4 i 5-go Dekabria 1913 goda', in *Futuristy. Pervyi zhurnal russkikh futuristov*, 1–2 (M, 1914), 153–57 (p. 157).
27. *Russian Formalist Theory*, pp. 110–11, 114–15.
28. Smirnov, *Khudozhestvennyi smysl*, p. 106; G. Vinokur, *Maiakovskii – novator stikha* (M, 1943), p. 77.
29. This weakening of syntactic links was first highlighted by Jakobson, who relates it to the rhythmical character of Maiakovskii's verse (*O cheshskom stikhe*, pp. 104–11).
30. *O cheshskom stikhe*, pp. 102–03.
31. Among recent studies of Khlebnikov's approach to the word, see especially V. P. Grigor'ev, *Grammatika idiositila. V. Khlebnikov* (M, 1983); V. P. Grigor'ev, *Slovotvorchestvo i smezhnye problemy iazyka poeta* (M, 1986); Ronald Vroon, *Velimir Xlebnikov's Shorter Poems: A Key to the Coinages*, Michigan Slavic Materials, 22 (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1983); Denis Mickiewicz, 'Semantic Functions in *Zaum*', *RL*, 15 (1984), 363–464; Amy Mandelker, 'Velimir Chlebnikov and Theories of Phonetic Symbolism in Russian Modernist Poetics', *Die Welt der Slaven*, 31 (1986), 20–36; on Kruchenykh's approach to the word, see Rosemarie Ziegler, 'Poetika A. E. Kruchenykh pory "41"'. Uroven' zvuka', in *L'avanguardia a Tiflis*, edited by Luigi Magarotto and others, *Quaderni del Seminario di Iranistica, Uralo-Atlaistica e Caucasologia dell'Università degli Studi di Venezia*, 13 (Venice, 1982), pp. 231–58; Rosemarie Ziegler, 'Aleksei E. Kruchenykh', *RL*, 19 (1986), 79–103.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER II

1. Boris Pasternak, *Okhrannaia gramota* (1931), in his *Sochineniia*, edited by G. P. Struve and B. A. Filippov, 4 vols (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1958–61), II (1961), *Proza 1915–1958. Povesti, rasskazy, avtobiograficheskie proizvedeniia*, 203–93 (p. 273).
2. Benedikt Livshits, *Polutoraglaznyi strelets* (L, 1933), pp. 184–85; for a similar interpretation, see also Viktor Shklovskii, *O Maiakovskom* (M, 1940), p. 55. For an account of the theory of monodrama, see N. Evreinov, *Vvedenie v monodramu* (P, 1909); concerning the links between Evreinov and the Futurists, see T. Baikova-Poggi, 'La théâtralité chez Evreinov et les futuristes russes', translated by Gérard Abensour, *RSI*, 53 (1981), fascicule 1, *Nicolas Evreinov: L'apôtre russe de la théâtralité*, 47–57.
3. See Rudnev, 'O stikhe dramy', pp. 295–97.
4. V. V. Khlebnikov, 'Pesni 13 vesen. (Boltovnia okolo krasoty)' (1913), in his *Sobranie sochinenii*, edited by Vladimir Markov, Slavische Propyläen, 37, 4 vols (Munich, 1968–72), IV (1971), *Neizdannye proizvedeniia* (1940), 338–40 (pp. 338–39).
5. K. Tomashevskii, 'Vladimir Maiakovskii', *Teatr*, 1938, no. 4, 137–50 (p. 142); for a compilation of this and other accounts of the original production, see B. Rostotskii, *Maiakovskii i teatr* (M, 1952), pp. 32–48.
6. Concerning the use of micro-polymetricity, see Gasparov, *Ocherk*, pp. 215–17.
7. For his account of the play's metrical composition, see Gasparov, 'Aktsentnyi stikh', pp. 342–43, 345, Table 13; Gasparov, however, does not fully account for the polymetric composition either here or in *Oblako v shtanakh* and *Chelovek*.
8. For a history of the Russian hexameter, see Burgi; concerning experimentation with the hexameter in the nineteenth century, see Gasparov, *Ocherk*, pp. 126–27.
9. Concerning Pushkin's use of two as well as one caesura, see S. Bondi, 'Pushkin i russkii gekzamet'r' (1943), in his *O Pushkine. Stat'i i issledovaniia* (M, 1978), pp. 310–71 (pp. 329–31).
10. Concerning the use and development of accentual verse in this period, see Gasparov, *Ocherk*, pp. 220–22; for a more detailed account of the accentual verse of other poets, see *SRS*,

- pp. 454–66; for an account of Khlebnikov's *Zhuravl'*, see Vladimir Markov, *The Longer Poems of Velimir Khlebnikov*, University of California Publications in Modern Philology, 62 (Berkeley and Los Angeles, California, 1962), pp. 60–64; for an account of the poetry of Shershenevich and Bol'shakov at this time, see Vladimir Markov, *Russian Futurism: A History* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, California, 1968), pp. 104–07, 110–11.
11. Concerning the possible interpretation of five-stress lines as four-stress lines with an additional stress, see *SRS*, p. 412.
  12. Free accentual verse is understood (for the purposes of this study) to be verse which forms part of Maiakovskii's system of accentual verse but in which there is no regulation of line length at all; as such it may fit some definitions of free verse, but since it clearly forms part of Maiakovskii's accentual system, this term is avoided (for an account of Russian free verse (definitions and history), see Scherr, pp. 175–83; for a more detailed study, see O. A. Ovcharenko, *Russkii svobodnyi stikh* (M, 1984)).
  13. For a general study of these measures, see James Bailey, 'Russian Binary Meters with Strong Caesura from 1890 to 1920', *IJSLP*, 14 (1971), 111–33 (pp. 116–19; for figures showing Severianin's especial development of the dactylic caesura, see p. 118, note 18); for an account of Severianin's use of such measures, see Lenie Lauwers, 'The Metrical Typology of Igor'-Severjanin's Poetry', *IJSLP*, 28 (1983), 67–108 (pp. 81–83, Tables VIIIa and VIIIb, pp. 97–98); Lauwers, unlike Bailey, does not recognize the iambic tetrameter with dactylic caesura and classifies it as iambic pentameter (Lauwers, p. 70, note 17), but Maiakovskii's use of the dactylic caesura alongside the feminine implies that he recognizes it; concerning Maiakovskii and Severianin, and for an account of the latter's poetic practice, see Nikolai Khardzhiev, 'Maiakovskii i Igor' Severianin', *RL*, 6 (1978), 307–46; for a summary appreciation of Severianin's poetry, see Markov, *Russian Futurism*, pp. 92–94.
  14. Concerning the use and development of the *dol'nik* in this period, see *SRS*, pp. 245–47.
  15. For a history of this measure, see *SRS*, pp. 395–97.
  16. See Taranovsky, 'O vzaimootnoshenii', pp. 312–14.
  17. For the definitive study of the three-ictus *dol'nik*, see Gasparov, 'Russkii trekhudarnyi dol'nik', or, in shorter form, *SRS*, pp. 220–44.
  18. See *SRS*, p. 224, Table 2.
  19. N. A. Nekrasov, *Polnoe sobranie stikhotvorenii v trekh tomakh*, edited by K. I. Chukovskii, Biblioteka poeta. Bol'shaia seria, second edition (L, 1967), I, 170–71, II, 144. The derivation from Nekrasov finds an interesting echo in the reported words of Chekrygin to Maiakovskii in 1913: 'Ведь ты Некрасов, в тебе невыплаканная слеза есть' (quoted in V. Pertsov, *Maiakovskii. Zhizn' i tvorchestvo*, third edition, 3 vols (M, 1976), I, 1893–1917, 101).
  20. Mikhail Matiushin, 'Russkie kubo-futuristy. (Vospominaniia Mikhaila Matiushina)', prepared and with an introduction and notes by Nikolai Khardzhiev, in *K istorii russkogo avangarda* (Stockholm, 1976), pp. 129–58 (p. 153).
  21. Livshits, p. 185.
  22. Vladimir Maiakovskii. *Tragediia*, in I, 151–72; further references to the verse text within this chapter will give graphical line numbers only.
  23. See Gasparov, 'Aktsentnyi stikh', p. 345.
  24. Concerning the use of religious imagery throughout this passage, see Barbara Lönnqvist, *Khlebnikov and Carnival: An Analysis of the Poem 'Poet'*, Stockholm Studies in Russian Literature, 9 (Stockholm, 1979), pp. 20–21.
  25. See I. P. Smirnov, 'Prichinno-sledstvennye struktury poeticheskikh proizvedenii', in *Issledovaniia po poetike i stilistike*, edited by V. V. Vinogradov and others (L, 1972), pp. 212–48 (p. 246); Vinokur defined the word in Maiakovskii's verse as above all 'loudly spoken' (*Maiakovskii*, p. 111).
  26. The same words are further highlighted by elevation to the title of Maiakovskii's major pre-revolutionary collection of verse *Prostoe kak mychanie* (1916), and it is interesting to note the repetition even in 'Kak delat' stikhi' of 'simple' which thus acquires a rather special association for Maiakovskii with material form.
  27. The ideal of a common language is an important tenet of Futurism; it was often proclaimed by Kruchenykh, but expounded and explored more substantially by Khlebnikov (concerning Khlebnikov's theory and practice of a universal language, see Grigor'ev, *Grammatika idiosilia*, pp. 74–83).
  28. See Smirnov, 'Prichinno-sledstvennye struktury', pp. 245–46.
  29. Concerning this characteristic reverse order composition, see Smirnov, *Khudozhestvennyi smysl*, p. 125.
  30. 'Maiakovskii i Severianin', p. 339.
  31. Igor' Severianin, *Stikhotvorenii*, compiled by E. I. Prokhorov, Biblioteka poeta. Malaia seria, third edition (L, 1975), p. 214.

32. Concerning Maiakovskii and things, see R. V. Ivanov-Razumnik, *Vladimir Maiakovskii* ("Misteriia" ili "Buff") (Berlin, 1922).
33. See, for example, Rostotskii, pp. 54–62; Lawrence Leo Stahlberger, *The Symbolic System of Majakovskij*, SPR, 14 (The Hague, 1964), pp. 35–37; Angelo Maria Ripellino, *Maiakovski et le théâtre russe d'avant-garde* (1959), translated by Mario Rossi (Paris, 1965), pp. 68–69.
34. See Rudnev, 'O stikhe dramy', p. 330, Table 2.
35. Aleksandr Blok, *Sobranie sochinenii v vos'mi tomakh*, edited by V. N. Orlov and others (M–L, 1960–63), iv (1961), *Teatr*, 15.
36. Stahlberger, pp. 38–39.
37. Concerning the transformation of reality through the renaming of things and the poet's role as Adam, see Smirnov, *Khudozhestvennyi smysl*, pp. 103, 143; the erosion or erasure of distinctions also recalls the Cubist technique of *passage* (see Stapanian, p. 61).
38. Gasparov cites this stanza as an example of weakened rhyme leading to difficulties of interpretation and suggests, without firm conviction, two couplets with 'немного' — 'темно' and 'человек' — 'Э-э-э-э' as the rhymes (*SRS*, p. 404).
39. As subsequently with segments of 'prose', a normal rhythmical description is given but without a clausula.
40. For a study of causality in Maiakovskii's poetry, see Smirnov, 'Prichinno-sledstvennye struktury', pp. 238–47.
41. Concerning the Poet's role as martyr and scapegoat, see Stahlberger, pp. 27–31, 64–79; Stahlberger relates the reversal in the Poet's fortunes and the cathartic acceptance of suffering to Greek tragedy (pp. 27–31).

#### NOTES TO CHAPTER III

1. Concerning the biographical background to the poem and its Maria(s), see Edward J. Brown, *Mayakovsky: A Poet in the Revolution* (Princeton, New Jersey, 1973), pp. 132–36.
2. For Gasparov's account of the poem's metrical composition, see 'Aktsentnyi stikh', pp. 343, 345, Table 13; see also A. M. Kondratov, 'Evolutsiia ritmiki V. V. Maiakovskogo', *Via*, 1962, no. 5, 101–08 (pp. 106–07, Table 3).
3. For a comparison, both of line length and rhythm, with broadly similar figures for Maiakovskii's early accentual verse generally, see *SRS*, pp. 451–52, Table 18 (the long lines of hexametrical verse, however, are included in Gasparov's figures).
4. Concerning the importance of compensation as a mechanism in verse, see *SRS*, p. 469.
5. For a comparison, both of anacrusis and clausula, with broadly similar figures for Maiakovskii's early accentual verse generally, see *SRS*, p. 427, Tables 9 and 10.
6. See K. F. Taranovsky, *Ruski dvodelni ritmovi*, Posebne izdanija srpske akademije nauka, 217 (Belgrade, 1953), Table 6.
7. Pertsov, *Maiakovskii*, i, 297; for similar judgements, see also K. G. Petrosov, 'Stilevoe novatorstvo Maiakovskogo v poeme *Oblako v shtanakh*', *FilN*, 1979, no. 3, 20–27 (p. 24); Markov, *Russian Futurism*, p. 310.
8. *Oblako v shtanakh*, in i, 173–96; further references within this chapter will give graphical line numbers only.
9. Concerning the normative role of opening lines, see V. S. Baevskii, 'Struktura liricheskogo stikhotvoreniia i granitsy stikhovedeniia', in his *Stikh russkoi sovetskoi poezii. Posobie dlia slushatelei spetskursa* (Smolensk, 1972), pp. 22–36.
10. Both the role of the prologue as 'overture' and the presence of 'stanza tirades' (passages), held together by a 'rhythmical impulse or movement', were noted by Zhirmunskii in the Romantic *poema* (V. M. Zhirmunskii, *Bairon i Pushkin. Iz istorii romanticheskoi poemy* (L., 1924), pp. 64, 56); a parallel between these features and the composition of *Pro eto* is suggested by Loktev (Loktev, pp. 32, 27).
11. The crucial importance of love is emphasized by the noun's appearance no less than ten times in the poem. The exploration of the theme of love is matched by a linguistic exploration of the word itself, generally in the direction of making it more concrete: Maiakovskii turns it into a concrete noun ('Будет любовь или нет? // Какая — / большая или крошечная' (l. 61)), uses two different forms of the genitive plural ('любвей' (l. 229); 'любовей' (l. 599)), and twice neologizes through the addition of suffixes ('любёночек' (l. 66); 'любят' (l. 600)).
12. Concerning 'opened form' in early modernist art and Maiakovskii's orientation towards it, see Stapanian, pp. 8–15.
13. Concerning Maiakovskii's poetry as the expression of inner speech, both stylistically and in its exposition of such taboo themes as rebellion and sexual love, see Smirnov, *Khudozhestvennyi smysl*, p. 140, note 73.

14. Roman Jakobson, 'O pokolenii, rastrativshem svoikh poetov', in Roman Jakobson and D. Svyatopolk-Mirsky, *Smert' Vladimira Maiakovskogo* (Berlin, 1931), pp. 7-45 (pp. 11-15).
15. Concerning the role of the game motif in Futurism, see Smirnov, *Khudozhestvennyi smysl*, pp. 131-32.
16. *Okhrannaia gramota*, pp. 292-93; Boris Pasternak, *Sochineniia*, edited by G. P. Struve and B. A. Filippov, 4 vols (Ann Arbor, 1958-61), 1 (1961), *Stikhi i poemy 1912-1932*, 333-34 (p. 334).
17. *O cheshskom stikhe*, p. 103.
18. Curiously, these two lines were chosen by Jakobson to illustrate the four-stress character of Maiakovskii's (accentual) verse (*O cheshskom stikhe*, p. 103).
19. Concerning the role of such constructions in the poetry of Futurism, see Smirnov, *Khudozhestvennyi smysl*, pp. 127-28.
20. Concerning the broad associations of ternary metre, see K. D. Vishnevskii, 'Metrika Nekrasova i ee zhanrovo-ekspressivnaia kharakteristika', in *Problemy zhanrovogo razvitiia v russkoi literature XIX veka*, edited by V. V. Shakhov and others (Ryazan, 1972), pp. 242-54 (p. 251); see also Nikita Struve, 'Valeur expressive des mètres ternaires', in *Communications de la délégation française, VII<sup>e</sup> Congrès international des slavistes*, Warsaw, 21-27 August 1973 (Paris, 1973), pp. 335-40.
21. Concerning these hardly Golgothan appearances, see N. I. Khardzhiev, "'Veselyi god" Maiakovskogo', in *Vladimir Majakovskij: Memoirs and Essays*, edited by Bengt Jangfeldt and Nils Åke Nilsson, *Stockholm Studies in Russian Literature*, 2 (Stockholm, 1975), pp. 108-51.
22. Concerning Severianin's relations with the Cubo-Futurists, see Markov, *Russian Futurism*, pp. 92-94; and concerning the Futurists' appearances at the 'Brodiachaia sobaka', the famous café and night club for artists and poets in Petersburg, see Markov, *Russian Futurism*, pp. 277-78.
23. Concerning concentration and magnification as characteristic functions of the organization of time and space in Maiakovskii and in Futurism generally, see Smirnov, *Khudozhestvennyi smysl*, pp. 120-28.
24. It is interesting to note Maiakovskii's relative evaluation of the faculties of speech and smell here: it is the animal faculty of smell that is able to discern the nature of the soul, while the human faculty of speech is unreliable and superficial. Elsewhere it is generally the faculty of sight that is invoked when the poet wishes to draw attention to the reality of things, especially at moments of crisis or breakdown, for example: 'Видели, // как собака бьющую руку лижет?!' (l. 340); 'Видите — / небо опять иудит' (l. 488).
25. Igor' Severianin, *Wiktoria Regia. Chetvertaia kniga poez* (M, 1915), p. 32.

#### NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

1. For Gasparov's account of the poem's metrical composition, see 'Aksentnyi stikh', pp. 344-46, Table 13.
2. *Fleita-pozvonochnik*, in 1, 197-208; further references within this chapter will give graphical line numbers only.
3. This and the other line with a displaced rhyme (in the penultimate stanza) are not classified for *clausula*, hence the absence of a symbol.
4. *Rifma*, p. 96.
5. Gasparov even interprets this stanza as a five-line stanza (*SRS*, pp. 404, 450).
6. *SRS*, pp. 408-09.

#### NOTES TO CHAPTER V

1. The date of *Chelovek* has been the subject of some debate. In 'Ia sam' Maiakovskii himself dates it under the heading '16-i god' (1, 24), but by his own admission he treats chronology freely (1, 9); other evidence suggests that it was completed some time in the second half of 1917 (see E. A. Dinershtein, 'Maiakovskii v fevrale-oktiabre 1917 g.', *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 65 (1958), *Novoe o Maiakovskom*, 541-70 (pp. 555-56); G. S. Cheremin, *Put' Maiakovskogo k Oktiabriu*, second edition (M, 1975), pp. 140-41; R. Jakobson, 'Novye stroki Maiakovskogo', in *Russkii literaturnyi arkhiv*, edited by M. Karpovich and Dm. Chizhevskii (New York, 1956), pp. 173-206 (pp. 181, 203, note 3).
2. 'Ritm poemy', pp. 250-57, 262-76.

3. For Ivanov's account of the poem's metrical composition, see 'Ritm poetry', pp. 243–62; for Gasparov's account, see 'Aktsentnyi stikh', pp. 344, 346–47, Table 13.
4. *Chelovek*, in I, 243–72; further references to the verse text within this chapter will give graphical line numbers only.
5. Stahlberger identifies the theme of the poet hero's 'bondage' as a dominant motif in the poem and relates it, through the symbol of the martyr, to both Prometheus and Christ as 'culture-heroes' (Stahlberger, p. 14).
6. The relevant rhythmical forms of the iambic tetrameter are as follows: I — 1111, II — 311, III — 131, IV — 113, and VI — 33; the relevant forms of the iambic trimeter are as follows: I — 111, II — 31, and III — 13.
7. The mixing of iamb and trochee is altogether exceptional in Russian verse, although this is not the only example in Maiakovskii; concerning this and other anomalous rhythmical effects in Khlebnikov's iamb, see Markov, *The Longer Poems*, pp. 76–77.
8. For more detailed figures, both theoretical and actual, see Taranovsky, 'O ritmicheskoi strukture', p. 424, Table 1.
9. 'Ritm poetry', p. 244, notes 5 and 6; in this connection Ivanov points out that Tynianov had long since noted a certain similarity between Maiakovskii's poetics and the ode tradition of the eighteenth century (see Iurii Tynianov, 'Promezhutok' (1924), in his *Arkhaisty i novatory* (L, 1929), pp. 541–80 (p. 553)). A certain return towards the rhythms of the eighteenth century is in fact a more general feature of early twentieth-century verse (see *SRS*, pp. 88–125).
10. Concerning the possible interpretation of this metrical scheme as a logaoedic *dol'nik* metre (when there is no caesura), see G. S. Smith, 'Logaoedic Metres in the Lyric Poetry of Marina Tsvetaeva', *SEER*, 53 (1975), 330–54 (pp. 336, 343–44).
11. Tsvetaeva characterized Maiakovskii's rhythms as 'физическое сердцебиение — удары сердца' (Marina Tsvetaeva, 'Epos i lirika sovremennoi Rossii. Vladimir Maiakovskii i Boris Pasternak' (1931), in her *Izbrannaia proza v dvukh tomakh. 1917–1937*, edited by A. Sumerkin (New York, 1979), II, 7–26 (p. 21)).
12. Concerning the influence of the Orthodox liturgy on Maiakovskii, see Boris Pasternak, 'Liudi i polozheniia. Avtobiograficheskii ocherk' (1957), *Novyi mir*, 1967, no. 1, 204–36 (p. 229).
13. For a study of stanza forms and their compositional significance, see V. A. Nikonov, 'Strofikā', in *Izuchenie stikhoslozheniia v shkole*, edited by L. I. Timofeev (M, 1960), pp. 96–149.
14. Concerning Maiakovskii's use of the Christian myth, see Stahlberger, pp. 69–73.
15. 'Ritm poetry', pp. 253–54.
16. 'Ritm poetry', p. 267.
17. The three hairs are a folkloric motif, associated with the devil, but Petrosov identifies the particular model here as Hoffmann's story *Little Zaches* in which Zaches's three golden hairs give him the magic power to wrest from the poet Balthazar his fame and his beloved (K. G. Petrosov, *Poeziia Maiakovskogo. Lektsii spetsial'nogo kursa dlia studentov-filologov* (Kolomna, 1971), p. 173). Hair is an important motif in Maiakovskii's poetry. Its significance can probably be related to Slavic and pagan mythology; the Slavic deity *Veles* (*Volos*) combined the roles of patron of the arts and guardian of the flocks, and the motif of hair also leads to animals, to dogs and bears in particular. For a study of Maiakovskii's poem 'Vot tak ia sdelalsia sobakoi' along these lines, see I. P. Smirnov, 'Mesto "mifopoeticheskogo" podkhoda k literaturnomu proizvedeniiu sredi drugikh tolkovanii teksta (o stikhotvorenii Maiakovskogo "Vot tak ia sdelalsia sobakoi"')', in *Mif-Fol'klor-Literatura*, edited by V. G. Bazanov and others (L, 1978), pp. 186–203.
18. Shtokmar shows that Maiakovskii's relatively rare use of dissonance rhyme is generally well supported in the support consonants and through the rest of the word, and his examples are nearly all from the 1920s (*Rifma*, pp. 42–44).
19. Taranovsky relates this image to Zhukovskii's *Gromoboi*, in which the hero contemplates suicide while sitting above the Dnieper ('Poema Maiakovskogo', p. 117).
20. See Ivanov, 'Ritm poetry', p. 269.
21. This line, which is interpreted as having a displaced rhyme, is not classified for clausula, hence the absence of a symbol.
22. Ivanov gives only 'вначале' — 'ни чаю' as a possible second rhyme ('Ritm poetry', pp. 270–71); Gasparov, on the other hand, cites 'угла' — 'уклад' as an example of a displaced rhyme (*SRS*, p. 404).
23. This 'prose' segment is excluded from the numbering of lines in the *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*.
24. Compare one of Maiakovskii's examples of rhythm as a model of existence in 'Kak delat' stikh': 'Ритм может принести . . . шум повторяющегося моря' (XII, 101).

25. See Dinershtein, p. 556.
26. This fundamental hatred of coercion and constraint, which is said to inform his verse, is asserted by Maiakovskii in a most important (unsent) letter written to Lily Brik at the time of *Pro eto* (V. V. Maiakovskii i L. Iu. Brik: *Perpiska 1915–1930*, edited, with an introduction and commentary, by Bengt Jangfeldt, Stockholm Studies in Russian Literature, 13 (Stockholm, 1982), pp. 111–15 (p. 115), Letter 113, 1–27 February 1923).

## NOTES TO CHAPTER VI

1. For their study of the poem, see Kolmogorov and Kondratov, pp. 62–67.
2. *SRS*, pp. 254–72.
3. *SRS*, pp. 255–57, Table 1.
4. Kolmogorov and Kondratov, p. 67.
5. Kolmogorov and Kondratov, p. 65.
6. *Liubliu*, in iv, 83–94; further references within this chapter will give graphical line numbers only.
7. Kolmogorov and Kondratov, p. 66.
8. Kolmogorov and Kondratov, p. 66.
9. See *SRS*, pp. 255–57, Table 1.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER VII

1. *Maiakovskii i Brik*, pp. 91–115, Letters 81–113 (pp. 100–01, Letter 81, beginning of January 1923).
2. See Z. S. Papernyi, ‘Maiakovskii v rabote nad poemoi *Pro eto*’, *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 65 (1958), *Novoe o Maiakovskom*, 217–84 (p. 264).
3. For his summary (and incomplete) account of the poem’s metrical composition, see Loktev, p. 23.
4. Loktev interprets the four-ictus *dol’nik* as a ‘relatively “neutral”’ background against which the “‘rhythmical conflict”’ of iambic verse (the hero and his beloved) and ‘dismetric’ accentual verse (other characters) takes place, but in so doing he relegates the medium for the poem’s central conflict to the background (Loktev, pp. 24–25).
5. Loktev relates both these measures to the lyrical epistolary genre (Loktev, p. 31).
6. Nekrasov, II, 107–41; Anna Akhmatova, *Stikhovoreniia i poemy*, edited by V. M. Zhirmunskii, Biblioteka poeta. Bol’shaia seriia, second edition (L., 1976), pp. 73–74.
7. Pasternak, *Sochineniia*, I, 52–53.
8. ‘Poema Maiakovskogo’, p. 118; concerning the role of the iambic ‘leirhythm’, see also V. V. Trenin, *V masterskoi stikha Maiakovskogo* (M., 1937), pp. 98–99.
9. Concerning the relationship of this basic measure to a ballad tradition deriving from Zhukovskii’s *Gromoboi*, see Taranovsky, ‘Poema Maiakovskogo’, pp. 117–19.
10. *Pro eto*, in iv, 135–84; further references within this chapter will give graphical line numbers only.
11. Concerning the features common to the various metrico-stanzaic forms found in the ballad genre, see K. D. Vishnevskii, ‘Vvedenie v strofiku’, in *Problemy teorii stikha*, edited by V. E. Kholshchennikov and others (L., 1984), pp. 35–57 (pp. 52–53); for a more detailed account, see K. D. Vishnevskii, ‘Balladnaia strofa’, in *Poetika i stikhovedenie. Mezhvuzovskii sbornik nauchnykh trudov*, edited by K. D. Vishnevskii and others (Ryazan, 1984), pp. 10–29.
12. See *SRS*, p. 238, Table 14.
13. ‘Maiakovskii v rabote’, p. 230.
14. *Maiakovskii i Brik*, pp. 102–03, Letter 86, 19 January 1923. The identification with Oscar Wilde is at odds with Maiakovskii’s public image; in the first issue of *Lef* (March 1923), in the editorial article ‘V kogo vgryaetsia *Lef*?’ *Lef* promises to purge itself of all those who would indulge in Oscar Wilde aesthetics (xii, 46).
15. R. Jakobson, ‘Za i protiv Viktora Shklovskogo’, *IJSLP*, 1/2 (1959), 305–10 (p. 307).
16. For a study of the historical *raeshnik*, see L. S. Sheptaev, ‘Russkii raeshnik XVII veka’, *UZ Leningradskogo GPI imeni A. I. Gertsena*, 87 (1949), 17–43; for a study of this kind of form, see also B. I. Iarkho, ‘Rifmovannaia proza russkikh intermedii i interliudii’ (from the late 1920s), in *Teoriia stikha*, edited by V. E. Kholshchennikov and others (L., 1968), pp. 229–79; for a study of Kirsanov’s use of the *raeshnik*, see V. I. Dogalakova, ‘“Vysokii raek” S. Kirsanova (k probleme stikhovoi organizatsii)’, in *Zhanr i stil’ khudozhestvennogo proizvedeniia (mezhvuzovskii sbornik)*, edited by Kh. A. Adibaev and others (Alma-Ata, 1982), pp. 81–91.

17. See M. Shtokmar, 'Stikhotvornaia forma russkikh poslovits, pogovorok, zagadok, pribautok', *Zvezda vostoka*, 1965, no. 11, 149–63 (pp. 156–57, 155).
18. Concerning the possibility of an alternating rhyme scheme and local metrical organization in the *raeshnik*, see Dogal'akova, pp. 84–85; concerning the development in this period of a two-ictus *taktovik* form deriving from the *chastushka*, see Gasparov, *Ocherk*, pp. 268–69.
19. See Shtokmar, 'Stikhotvornaia forma', p. 155.
20. 'O vzaimootnoshenii', pp. 311–12.
21. See Taranovsky, *Ruski dvodelni ritmovi*, Table 14.
22. See Taranovsky, *Ruski dvodelni ritmovi*, Table 15, lines 12, 13, and 14.
23. For more detailed figures, see *SRS*, pp. 109–11, Table 12.
24. 'O pokolenii', p. 25.
25. For a detailed study of Maiakovskii's free trochee and a history of the measure, see *SRS*, pp. 372–97.
26. 'O vzaimootnoshenii', pp. 312–14.
27. As discussed earlier (see Chapter I, p. 11), the light stresses of stress-ambiguous words should not be discounted, although in the generation of 'Sergeiu Eseninu' they may not be primarily distinguished in the structure of the rhythmical *gul*; in these circumstances it is still most satisfactory to count stresses in accordance with accepted practice.
28. *SRS*, p. 388.
29. Figures based on Taranovsky, *Ruski dvodelni ritmovi*, Table 15.
30. See Taranovsky, *Ruski dvodelni ritmovi*, Table 14.
31. See Taranovsky, *Ruski dvodelni ritmovi*, Table 15.
32. *SRS*, p. 386, Table 8.
33. *SRS*, pp. 386–87, 390, Tables 6, 7, and 10.
34. *SRS*, p. 389.
35. See *Maiakovskii i Brik*, p. 115 (Letter 113, 1–27 February 1923).
36. Krystyna Pomorska, 'Majakovskij's Cosmic Myth', in *Myth in Literature*, edited by Andrej Kodjak and others, New York University Slavic Papers, 5 (Columbus, Ohio, 1985), pp. 170–87; or see Krystyna Pomorska, 'The Utopian Future of the Russian Avant-Garde', in *American Contributions to the Ninth International Congress of Slavists*, Kiev, September 1983, 11, *Literature, Poetics, History*, edited by Paul Debreczeny (Columbus, Ohio, 1983), 371–86; see also Krystyna Pomorska, 'Majakovskij and the Myth of Immortality in the Russian Avant-garde', in *The Slavic Literatures and Modernism*, edited by Nils Åke Nilsson, Konferenser, 16 (Stockholm, 1987), pp. 49–69; concerning Maiakovskii and time, see Stahlberger, pp. 113–45; Victor Terras, 'Majakovskij and Time', *SEER*, 13 (1969), 151–63; R. D. B. Thomson, 'Mayakovsky and his Time Imagery', *SEER*, 48 (1970), 181–200.
37. Loktev, basing himself on Mann's study of Russian Romanticism, links the '*polizhanrovost*' of *Pro eto* to that of the classical Romantic *poema* (Loktev, pp. 31–33); Mann in fact identifies a 'rudimentary' basis of the Romantic *poema* in two genres, the elegy and the epistolary genre (Iu. V. Mann, *Poetika russkogo romantizma* (M, 1976), p. 151).
38. See Papernyi, 'Maiakovskii v rabote', p. 242.
39. Concerning the factors governing the alternation of measures in relation to Romantic poetics, see Loktev, pp. 28–30, 33–34.
40. For a comparison of the chapters with the 'stanza tirades' noted by Zhirmunskii in the Romantic *poema*, see Loktev, p. 27; see also Zhirmunskii, *Baironi i Pushkin*, p. 56.
41. 'Promezhutok', p. 554.
42. L. Iu. Brik, 'Maiakovskii i chuzhie stikhi', *Znamia*, 1940, no. 3, 161–82 (p. 166).
43. Concerning paronymous attraction, see V. P. Grigor'ev, *Poetika slova. Na materiale russkoi sovetskoi poezii* (M, 1979), pp. 251–303.
44. In the latest *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* the second half of the third line is not inset, but in the original edition, followed here, it is (Maiakovskii, *Pro eto* (M–P, 1923), p. 7).
45. On the drum lines in *150000000*, see Roman Jakobson, 'The Drum Lines in Majakovskij's *150000000*', *California Slavic Studies*, 6 (1971), 39–41.
46. Brown suggests that, given the precise location (Petrovskii Park), this episode may be based on one of Maiakovskii's own early suicide attempts (Brown, p. 242); concerning these suicide attempts, see Jakobson, 'Novye stroki', p. 191.
47. Zhirmunskii suggests punctuating the third line with a full stop in the middle, not at the end as in the *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* ('Stikhoslozhenie', p. 21, note 56), but, in view of the romance intonation, it has been decided to keep the original punctuation.
48. See Taranovsky, 'O vzaimootnoshenii', p. 311.
49. The literature on the subject of Dostoevskii and Maiakovskii is now extensive: see, for example, Jakobson, 'Za i protiv', pp. 306–07; L. Iu. Brik, 'Predlozhenie issledovateliam', *VL*, 1966, no. 9, 203–08; I. Corten, 'The Influence of Dostoevskij on Majakovskij's Poem *Pro*

*eto'*, in *Studies Presented to Professor Roman Jakobson by his Students*, edited by Charles E. Gribble (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1968), pp. 76–83; Brown, pp. 248–53; Neil Cornwell, 'V. F. Odoyevsky's Ridiculous Dream About That? Themes and Ideas in Works by V. F. Odoyevsky, Dostoyevsky and Mayakovsky', *Quinquereme*, 2 (1979), 75–86, 246–55; Taranovsky, 'Poema Maiakovskogo', pp. 114–16, 120–21.

50. The basic principle underlying the metrical composition of this chapter was originally outlined by Kolmogorov ('K izucheniiu', pp. 65–66, note 1), while Smirnov cites this chapter as an example of a cinematic alternation of silent visual images and titles (*Khudozhestvennyi smysl*, p. 112). Concerning analogies with cinematographic technique in Maiakovskii's poetry, including a certain analogy between polymetric composition and montage, see I. Gazer, 'S. M. Eizenshtein i V. V. Maiakovskii (k voprosu o iazykakh poezii i kino)', in *Quinquagenario. Sbornik statei molodykh filologov k 50-letiiu prof. Iu. M. Lotmana*, edited by A. Mal'ts and others (Tartu, 1972), pp. 174–201; Vlada Petric, 'Dziga Vertov and the Soviet Avant-Garde Movement', *Soviet Union*, 10 (1983), 1–58 (pp. 21–38); Brown, pp. 319–20.
51. In the *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* the last graphical line is not inset, but in the original edition (followed here) it is (Maiakovskii, *Pro eto*, p. 35).
52. Brown, for example, writes that 'the poet's being is torn with suffering and broken into shreds, but in the process he nonetheless triumphs' (Brown, p. 248), while Pertsov also talks of the hero as 'victor' (Pertsov, II, 1918–1924, 237).
53. Concerning the whole complex of metaphysical and taboo themes associated with the word 'это' in Dostoevskii, and hence perhaps here too, see Taranovsky, 'Poema Maiakovskogo', p. 115.
54. Concerning this influence, see Brown, pp. 253–56; Pomorska, 'Majakovskij's Cosmic Myth', pp. 173, 183.
55. 'Majakovskij's Cosmic Myth', pp. 183–84.