

Sus, Oleg

Poetry and music in the psychological semantics of Otakar Zich : (from the history of the Czech formal method and pre-structuralism)

Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity. H, Řada hudebněvědná. 1969, vol. 18, iss. H4, pp. 77-96

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/111961>

Access Date: 10. 12. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

OLEG SUS

**POETRY AND MUSIC IN THE PSYCHOLOGICAL
SEMANTICS OF OTAKAR ZICH**

(From the History of the Czech Formal Method and Pre-Structuralism)

I

For a considerable period many research workers abroad have been turning their attention to the history and theory of Russian formalism. Not only this: what has been termed the formal method of Russian (Soviet) provenance is considered to have been the fundamental pre-requisite for the development of Czech structuralism in the theory of literature and aesthetics, as for example Victor Erlich has shown in his compendious work.¹ From the viewpoint of the inner history of modern Czech aesthetic thought it is of course an exceedingly simplified genetic schema, even a one-sided one. That is to say, the genetic line quoted, "*Russian formalism* → *Czech structuralism*" does not take into account the interconnecting developmental factors as a whole. It ignores the important and indispensable part played by the native school of Czech formalism in the origin of structuralism. In this way the historically functioning intellectual impulse, the role of initiator, and the position of intermediary (with regard to Russian formalism) of what we have so far termed very generally Czech formalism, he has been forgotten. More accurately we should speak of the entire current of development of the aesthetics of form, or of what was called in the older term, "formism". It was constituted and developed in the last third of the 19th century, mainly in the works of Josef Durdík (1837–1902) and Otakar Hostinský (1847–1910). In these theoreticians of "formalism" we already find a differentiation of opinions and methods; Czech aesthetics then possessed a "consciousness of its own possibilities for development" and did not need to pick up crumbs from foreign tables as it was well put in 1935 by Jan Mukařovský.² The current in question then underwent a considerable transformation in what was termed the school of Hostinský, in which the original methodological and noetic points of de-

¹ Victor Erlich, *Russian Formalism, History Doctrine*, 's-Gravenhage, 1955; German translation; Victor Erlich, *Russischer Formalismus*, Munich, 1964 (from which we quote).

² Jan Mukařovský, *Vztah mezi sovětskou a československou literární vědou (The Relationship Between Soviet and Czechoslovakian Literary Scholarship)*, Země sovětů (Land of the Soviets), 4, 1935, p. 14.

parture of classical Czech "formism", which had appeared under the aegis of Herbartian aesthetics, was already beginning to change and disintegrate, or else there was emerging a direct criticism of these points of departure, leading to their being abandoned.

In this connection we must then call to mind the importance of the works of *Otakar Zich* (1879–1934), the Czech aesthetician of music and literature. For in these works, even before World War I as well as during the course of the War there appeared a new productive transformation of the native autochthonous "formism". Zich combined this with an experimental empirical psychology of aesthetic perception and enriched it with the first Czech version of the semantics of art. It was of course a semantics in its preparatory phase (we might say: pre-semantics), *in statu nascendi*, as yet ignorant of and incapable of knowing the important linguistic information. This psychological semantics developed in Zich from the category of the so-termed *significatory image* („die Bedeutungsvorstellung“), which the Czech theoretician took over in his pioneering study *The Aesthetic Perception of Music*³ from the German philosopher Johannes Volkelt (cf. Volkelt's category of the „Bedeutungsvorstellung“).⁴ According to Zich works of art are structures of specific "things" – objects, situations, groupings, motives, etc. – which we can distinguish from each other even although we have no verbal designation for them. Each work "means" something or other specific, bears its own "significances" (those above-mentioned "things"), which Zich determines psychologically as what are known as significatory images, for example of music, fine arts, later poetry or drama. This theory is important from yet another aspect: for directly within it attempts arise to find a typology for the theory of art, on the one hand an experimental and imperfect classification of semantic functions, on the other hand a systematically conceived typology, classifying the psychological processes in aesthetic reception, and even in creative aesthetic activity. Let us only call to mind that both kinds of typological investigation appear in Zich really intermingled, which is most typical for him (the model for this intermingling of aspects is provided by the "significatory image" itself, which *ex definitione* is to be constituted both psychologically and semantically). In this connection of course Zich's work on the aesthetic perception of music is not isolated, for it has its independent partner, and at the same time logical continuation in another branch of aesthetics, namely in poetics, and more specifically, in the investigation of what have been called poetic types. For this very reason we cannot ignore from the historical aspect Zich's attempt, which to this

³ Otakar Zich, *Estetické vnímání hudby, Psychologický rozbor (The Aesthetic Perception of Music. A Psychological Analysis)*, Věstník Královské české společnosti nauk (Bulletin of the Royal Bohemian Society of the Sciences, from which we quote), Philosophical-historical-linguistic section, annual volume 1910, Prague, 1911, p. 1–97 (Zich had already presented his work on 23rd May, 1910). It is in fact the independent second part of a larger work, the first part of which had been published under the title *The Aesthetic Perception of Music, A Psychological Analysis on an Experimental Basis*, in *Česká mysl (Czech Thought)*, 11, 1910, p. 6–22, 250–265, 330–347, 389–421.

⁴ Johannes Volkelt, *System der Ästhetik*, Bd. 1, Munich, 1905.

day is of historical importance (undoubtedly so in Czech aesthetics, while in the context of European aesthetics it is one of the first appearances of "psycho-semantic"). For it is an attempt to combine the investigation of the semantic functions with a psychological analysis of the types of aesthetic perception of musical works (or of works of poetry).

The typological investigation contained in *The Aesthetic Perception of Music* is distinguished however in addition by an original methodological step; here Zich *de facto* constructed the first project for combining a semantic-psychological analysis with the procedures of the exact deductive sciences, to speak more specifically, with a certain, although possibly rudimentary, incompletely thought-out system of symbolizing. It is the very first document showing co-operation between semantic analysis in the field of the formal school with a symbolic, or more accurately, a semi-symbolic or quasi-symbolic written recording *sui generis* in modern Czech aesthetics and one of the first attempts of this kind in the aesthetics of the world. It is true that here too Zich received his first impulse from Johannes Volkelt, who in his book *System der Ästhetik* employed certain abbreviations indicating particular aesthetic concepts and arranged them — by a mere juxtaposition — in more complex schemata. However, Zich developed this rather primitive "system" and gave it within his own conception a certain logical structure. It is of course natural that Zich's model of the perception of musical structure with regard to content and relations keeps in its fundamentals to the principles of the empirical association psychology of the 19th century. Its principles and methods have quite clearly been projected into the construction of Zich's formulae; let us compare for example the initial schema: the musical percept expanded, transformed and supplemented by musical reproductions — the signifiatory image homogeneous with it — extra-musical or heterogeneous images, feelings and moods. So for example Zich assigns to the types of intrinsic (genuine) aesthetic perception of music what is called the image type:

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} \text{H.V.} \\ \text{V.P.} \end{array} \right) \longrightarrow P_1 \longrightarrow P_2 \longrightarrow \text{etc.}$$

Here H.V. stands for the musical percept, V.P. is the signifiatory image. The bracket () indicates the specific whole of the percept plus the signifiatory image, i.e. the specific musical unit in the sphere of its autonomous character. What are termed the extra-musical images P_1 , P_2 , etc. are then according to Zich sharply separated from that homogenous whole (and stand outside the bracket) and originate through the individual evocations of the perceiver, who for example calls up the idea of running water when listening to the Bach Prelude in C Major.⁵

It will now be appropriate to sum up at least in a short survey the theses which Zich took as the starting-point of his theoretical programme, as they appeared in 1910 in his psychological-semantic typology of musical perception.

⁵ O. Zich, *Aesthetic Perception of Music*, Bull. Royal Bohemian Soc., p. 68.

Music (we must understand: absolute music) has according to Zich also its specific function of "being meaningful", it means something definite. It is provided with "significatory images", which of course Zich considers, in the rigid frame of the disjunction between absolute and programme music, to be purely autonomous, to be objects ("things") which are purely musical.

In Zich we can find a characteristic mingling of the methods of psychology with emerging semantics — which is documented clearly by the terminology itself; the image is, to be sure, significatory, but it remains a image conceived according to the theses of the empirical association psychology of the 19th century. The ontological problem of his "significatory image", its mode of existence, was thus resolved by Zich fundamentally in a positivistic way. (Although Husserl's *Logische Untersuchungen* had previously carried out a fundamental critique of just this solution, pointing out the characteristic psychological reductions in the conception of signification.) The emphasis which Zich placed on the psychological existence of musical images, bearing signification, results in the simultaneous deformation of his inchoate semantics; it is in fact isolated, for *de facto* it exists as a fragment, still without any developed theory of communication in art, more specifically, without a theory of signs, without semiotics. We must however be just: Zich took as his point of departure the Czech aesthetics of music of that time and did not seek the support of modern linguistics. His priority in creating the first steps in semantic analysis in the contemporary Czech theory of art is in fact identical with the exposed advance position of the research worker who simply could not have at his disposal the results of scientific disciplines not developed until later, disciplines which were productive precisely from the viewpoint of the aesthetic semiotics of art. Here too lies the considerable difference affecting the methodological aspects of form analysis in Otakar Zich at the beginning of the 20th century and later in Jan Mukařovský. It is the difference between Zich's "pre-structuralism" and the theory of Mukařovský, of psychological semantics (we may say, too, of a psychology dealing in semantics) in the pupil of Otakar Hostinský and semantics itself — symptomatically bound up with a critique of psychologism! — in Mukařovský, Zich's successor in the Chair of Aesthetics at the University of Prague.

Zich, in *The Aesthetic Perception of Music* undoubtedly makes a theoretically important differentiation of what would today be termed specific significations borne by the artistic material (motivated by structure), and the accessory concretizations, i.e. the "complementing" of these structurally motivated significations in the individual consciousness of the perceiver (Zich here introduces only associated images and states of feeling, moods). The difference between the "significatory intention" and the "fulfilment (realization) of significations" — the terms are Husserl's — exists and in fact has a fundamental significance for general aesthetics as well as for the theories of the separate arts. Zich of course took as his starting-point the view of empirical psychology — not phenomenology — and at the point where he should have separated the semantic moments from the purely psychological, he gave a psychological colouring even to his significatory image, precisely when he characterized it as an image. In this

way, however, his strict, rigid boundary between the psychologized "signification", alleged to be purely musical, and the allegedly a-semantic (from the purely musical aspect) perceptive processes, arising in the subjective operations of the perceiver, become problematical and relative. By the way: in the case of those "supplementary" concretizations Zich, however, also finds a certain motivation in them, by means of the aesthetic, i.e. the musical object, for example in conventional associations: he compares fanfares on the brass instruments with the image of solemn celebration bound up with them.⁶ With what are called the direct emotions aroused by music he states that they "cling" to the musical percept, when their content is the musical percept along with the signifiatory image.⁷ If we examine not only Zich's interpretation of the individual types of the aesthetic perfection of music, but also his typological schemata, then of course we ascertain that the associated images as well as the induced moods are always deliberately situated in relationship only with the independent fundamental whole ("musical percept" plus "signifiatory image") and in fact are them beyond it. In other words: they are to exist outside the musical structure, here formulated psychologically. Zich grants them no immanent aesthetic "signifiatory value", not even a rudimentary one, and does not at all reflect that some of the structurally motivated associations and moods might in music be the bearers of certain aesthetic significations *sui generis*. The stiff distinction between "musical" and "extra-musical" — the result of the split between absolute music and programme music, vocal and melodramatic — leads Zich to create his basic construction, in which the actual musical semantic function ascribes itself only to autonomous, pure music. No such semantic function is then attributed to the subjective supplementary operations, what are known as the extra-musical images, feelings, moods, divided into particular types. The semantized musical image is then confronted with non-semantic associations and the feelings and moods aroused. For example, the concepts "signifiatory association", "signifiatory mood" are simply not known to Zich, although by analogy he could have created them. In the background here there was obviously at work the remnants of aesthetic intellectualism, which in various guises accompanied the entire theory of images in the formal aesthetics of the 19th century from Herbart right through the Czech aesthetics of the form school of Josef Durdík and Otakar Zich; fertile soil was provided for this by the justified critique of the hedonistic conceptions, emotional aesthetics and expressive aesthetics (*Ausdrucksästhetik*) in general. The theoretical antiirrationalism which was traditionally in Bohemia played its part here too. All these factors together obviously form one of the reasons why Zich's conception of the semantics of music knows only the signifiatory character of images.

The logical result of the isolated position of the semantic function of the signifiatory images in music is Zich's typology of musical perception. It is based on different types of receptivity, that is, its starting-point —

⁶ O. Zich, *Aesthetic Perception of Music*, p. 61.

⁷ *ibid.*, p. 69.

as can be clearly seen from Zich's "schemata" — is the subjective operations, those accessory psychological concretizations, after their being deprived of the quite programmatically specific significatory (musically significatory) functions. And this is actually a further limitation, or even a real inner paradox of what we have termed *semantic typology* in Zich: types of perception, cut off from the semantic function supported by the musical work itself (it is characteristic that Zich's unchangeable musical object, "musical percept" plus "significatory image" is continually repeated in the individual schemata) remain "sharply" separated from the musical structure as a whole, even although at times Zich merely by means of examples indicates that nevertheless they do have some kind of motivation in the artistic object. In other words: on the one hand there is the separated musical unit with its building-up significatory images regarded "from within", immanently, on the other hand there exists a region of psychological types of musical receptivity, classified types of intellectual processes deprived of specific musical significatory value. The relations introduced between the two independently constituted regions — the psychologized artistic structure and the psychology of "perception" — cannot bridge this antinomy. The psychological semantics of Zich in *The Aesthetic Perception of Music* is based rigorously on the immanence of the musical form („Gestalt") and results finally in an inner contradiction (in 1910 of course not realized) of a kind of autonomous significance, which winds back upon itself. Form analysis of the significatory notions can then be structural only within the narrow bounds indicated by the specific "meaningfulness" of absolute music. Beyond these bounds it becomes non-structural, for here analysis is determined by the introducing of the postulates of the association psychology of perception. Apparently the ambiguous constitution of the "significatory images" could in the concrete formalism of Czech musical aesthetics have only these results. The problem however remained; in dealing with it Zich now continued further just because of the support provided by other material analysed, namely the language of poetry.

Zich's "significatory images" in music are, as we know, strictly *autonomous*, deliberately divested of any contact whatever with extra-musical reality. This conception then corresponds to Zich's basic thesis of the relation between art and reality in general. Opinions regarding the illusory non-reality of art, producing self-deceptions, even deliberate self-deceptions, are rightly rejected. According to Zich, works of art merely create a world different from the world of our life, the world in which we move. Thus the theory of two different worlds arises, the theory of the real extra-artistic world and the artistic world, which however also has its own independent reality, as soon as it is accepted, perceived and experienced. If this is so, then surely music (absolute music) has in the relationship art: world a position of its own. In this Zich remains still the advocate of the original positions of the formal aesthetics of the 19th century. For the other, shall we say thematic arts certain correspondences in the wide sense of the world are valid between the world of art and the world of reality. These correspondences of course Zich on the other hand does not want to take

too literally and turn them into standard norms for creative art. He cannot however deny the "mutual intrusion" of art and the world of the experience. This noetics of art of Zich's naturally has one fundamentally exception, namely music, completely removed beyond any reach of the real world, for its world is allegedly created altogether artistically. The construction of the absolute artificiality of music art then *de facto* once more eliminates noetics, to put it otherwise, interrupts the significatory "transcendence", the trend towards noted objects ("object" here means not only the material object, it is the field of the "signifié" that is in question). But not even with Zich could the work of music remain in this situation without context. If on the one hand the significatory intentionality was being eliminated, the semantic "transgression", on the other hand the work — a work moreover allegedly created entirely artificially — could not remain without a creator. And here Zich forsook the rigid dogmatics of the principles of the formal school, seeking a substitute for the noetics he has argued away in what we could term a genetic regression. In the chapter on the aesthetic pleasure judgment and critical evaluation, that is on the ground of aesthetic axiology, Zich seeks for an objective criterion of value for works of art and music — as the expression of a new and strong creative individuality.

*"Such a sign of the objective worth of a work of art exists if the artist's work is in its own way an expression of a new and strong individuality. 'In its own way', and so for example an expression in music. Both attributes, 'new' and 'strong', really say the same thing, for an individuality is the stronger, the more original it is, the more it in fact presents what is new in its own special field."*⁸

The reference to the individuality of the creator, to the original artistic personality, thus only confirms the ambiguity of Zich's aesthetic conception of the year 1910 and his interpretations of significatory images. After they had been deprived of any kind of substantial relationships to the realm of "extra-musical" objects, nothing else remained but to have recourse to a none-too-new explanation, such as in any case was already offered by the theories of biographic psychology. Thus personalistic aesthetics became an accessory of Zich's autonomous semantics; the so-called personality was to be transformed into the guarantee not only of value in general, but precisely of that artistic value which is contained in the work itself, that is, the value "given" by the significatory images themselves. Czech formalism was thus transformed, its principles were on the one hand both retained and changed, and on the other hand loosely adjoined to the processes of aesthetic psychologism. (Zich was not alone here; another pupil of Hostinský's, namely Zdeněk Nejedlý, attempted to resolve the crisis of aesthetics of the time — including form aesthetics — by means of an inclination towards the work of art "*in concreto*" and towards its concrete creator, the creative personality. The programmatic conclusion of Nejedlý's *The Crisis in Aesthetics* of 1913 has this tendency.)

Mention is due to Zich's lack of thoroughness, important for the com-

⁸ *ibid.*, p. 95.

prehension of his psychological semantics: the signficatory images, specifically musical, autonomous, purely artificial, without relationship to the real world, are suddenly brought by Zich into a vital connection with the so-called individuality of the artist. (They are important for him from the axiological aspect, for the new currents which create the value of the work are carried along by their means.) Nevertheless in this way he unconsciously relinquishes the explicit autonomy of his signficatory images — and does so paradoxically, precisely because for a second time and to a greater extent he psychologizes them, when he attributes them to the individuality of the artist. It is enough to notice what is in fact meant by a none too exact terminology such as: the work of art is the expression of a new and strong individuality, novelty and strength are given by the signficatory images, new moments in the work are proof of the original individuality of the artist. What does it mean, what is it precisely that Zich in this connection does not realize, what has escaped his analysis? Really a very simple thing: namely that he himself makes of his signficatory images, apparently entirely selfsufficient and referring to purely musical “things” — for this is what their semantic autonomy is — something which in the end is non-autonomous, which has a further hidden and unrecognized function, in which the so-called individuality of the artist expresses itself (“manifests”, “documents” itself). Whether it is an expressive function in the wider sense, or only a “documenting” one in a sense not stated more exactly, Zich could not retain — although he did not realize it — the pure immanence of his signficatory images, when he created a directly typical semantic relationship between them and the artist as creator. (The fact that he did not recognize that this relationship was precisely a semantic one, is another question.) Whether he wanted to or not Zich is really saying, although he does not state it explicitly, that musical signficatory images in their originality “express” a new and strong individuality; however, by this he indicates simultaneously — and again fails to say so openly — that they cannot only “mean” purely musical things, since they are the bearers of relationships to certain artistic personalities, relationships which we distinguish and evaluate.

II

This is the situation in which for the present the relationship artist-signficatory images remained in *The Aesthetic Perception of Music*. Nor was it without influence on the interpretation of the relation between poet and poem in Zich's study *On Poetic Types* (published in the years 1917–1918 during World War I), but it did not remain without specification or without correction.

Zich's poetics of the art of poetry is for the first time, at least fragmentarily, indicated in *The Aesthetic Perception of Music*. This placing of it — without for the present taking into account other contexts — already points to a profounder affinity between the methodology of Zich, the theoretician of music, and Zich, the theoretician of poetry, while of course there can still be found in him a dependence on certain fundamental assert-

ions of the Czech formal school, relating to poetic designation. The inner link between the aesthetics of music and poetics can then be supported by a comparison of Zich's work published in the Bulletin of the Royal Bohemian Society of the Sciences and the treatise on the poetic types, which began to be published a few years later in the Journal of Modern Philology.⁹ The psychological-semantic and typological investigation contained at first in the analysis of the aesthetic perception of music, creates on the one hand a model which supports the planning of the material and the progress of Zich's poetics, while on the other hand it is here applied to new material and undergoes a transformation. This leads to a shifting of the position of the original model and specifically literary-theoretical points of departure are created. In the highly individual dual aspect of Zich's aesthetic theory — which is to combine both psychological and formal dispositions — the musicological "impulse" also played an specific part: it was as if at a certain phase of development it took the place of a fertile contact with modern linguistics and so in fact by a roundabout way brought the modern Czech theory of poetry (roughly at the time of the first appearance of the Russian formalists) to accept qualities of sound and rhythm as the substantial, not the subsidiary values of a poetic work. Alongside this *The Aesthetic Perception of Music* contains a further equally important methodological model. According to this the study *On Poetic Types* of the years 1917–1918 is constituted, on the theory of significatory image, on the typology of the so-termed poetic experience, and, in a new form, on the attempt to unify the psychological aspect with the structural, in other words to combine the analysis of the poet ("the features of the artist's soul") with the analysis of the qualities of the work of art. In this experiment then Zich of course already goes beyond the original noetic boundary of his preceding work on the aesthetics of music.

Let us first of all note Zich's poetics *in statu nascendi*, i.e. the few occasional remarks scattered through *The Aesthetic Perception of Music*. Certain not unimportant principles can be distinguished in them:

a) Zich has no doubt whatever of the existence of his "significatory images" in the perception of poetry. However this is not all — he places his ambiguous "psycho-significations" directly in the centre of his poetics, for he considers them *expressis verbis* to be the aesthetic object proper.¹⁰ By this of course, and even before the transfer of interest of the Russian formalists "from phonetics to semantics" — as Erlich characterized it¹¹ — he sets up a semantic analysis, however psychologized it still may be, as being fundamental both for the theory of poetry, and for the ascertaining of the specific character of poetry itself. In the year 1910, of course, Zich did not develop this conception of his, it remained *in margine*. Therefore

⁹ Otakar Zich, *O typech básnických (On Poetic Types)*, Časopis pro moderní filologii a literaturu (Journal of Modern Philology and Literature), VI, 1917–1918, p. 1–19 (no. 1, 1917), p. 97–112, (no. 2, 1918), p. 202–214 (no. 3, 1918). Published in book form (reprinted from the journal): O. Zich, *O typech básnických*, Prague, 1937. (Further quotations from the volume edition of 1937.)

¹⁰ O. Zich, *Aesthetic Perception of Music*, p. 37.

¹¹ V. Erlich, *Russischer Formalismus*, p. 204.

in the history of Czech formal poetics, and thus at the same time in the pre-history of Czech structuralistic school, there actually lacking that fully developed phase of early radicalism, which we can still find without difficulty in the first works of the Moscow and Leningrad theoreticians at the period of World War I. The half provocative, half programmatic formulations of the word perceived only as a word, of the suppression of the communicative function and the autonomy of word structure (Tomáševski), of verbal activity (Jefimov), of the emphasis on the medium, etc.,¹² are in the atmosphere of the sober empiricism of the Czech theoreticians of form from Durdík through Hostinský down to Zich, softened down in advance or even rejected, although it may be at the cost of various kinds of disparity and lack of thoroughness in the application of the formal method to the literary work. Besides, Josef Durdík had already founded here a separate tradition for Czech poetics: this is the tradition of simultaneous corrections, to which the Herbartian dogma of the aesthetic function of "relations" (i.e. "forms") must be subjected whenever it comes up against linguistic message employed poetically.

b) According to Zich, in poetry the word, is the "starting point"¹³ – according to the formulation of 1910 – that is, it is no mere vanishing intermediary, which would pragmatically only aid the attainment of what lies beyond the "Wortkunstwerk", which would perhaps be only a secondary means for expressing a "content". To put it more exactly: in the undeveloped parallelism of Zich's inchoate poetics the poetic language has two independent functions simply laid alongside each other: its special semantic function (in its "meaningfulness" it induces significant images) and as autonomous material in addition it has a sound function. For this reason Zich accords the "purely" sound aspect of poetic words an aesthetic significance of a kind,¹⁴ as he says directly, speaking elsewhere of the purely sound and above all the rhythmical qualities of a poem.¹⁵ To this basically corresponds the distinction, documented in detail, of intellectual values and sound values as independent aesthetic qualities in the work *On Poetic Types*.

c) Along with Josef Durdík and Otakar Hostinský, Zich treats poetic designation from the aspect of the theory of the oscillation of aroused images. For example in Durdík the "outline" images flicker round about the "main" sense, in Hostinský we have an aggregate image, in which numerous attributes pile up, a poetic "atmosphere".¹⁶ According to Otakar

¹² *ibid.*, p. 202.

¹³ O. Zich, *Aesthetic Perception of Music*, p. 38.

¹⁴ *ibid.*, p. 37.

¹⁵ *ibid.*, p. 64, cf. footnote n. 115.

¹⁶ Cf. Josef Durdík, *Všeobecná estetika (General Aesthetics)*, Prague, 1875, p. 260; further O. Hostinského *Esthetika*, díl I., *Všeobecná estetika (O. Hostinský's Aesthetics, Part I, General Aesthetics)* by Zdeněk Nejedlý, Prague, 1921. For more detailed treatment of this problem see the study by Oleg Sus, *Anfänge der semantischen Analyse in der tschechischen Poetik (Josef Durdík und seine Theorie der dichterischen Sprache)*, *Zagadnienia rodzajów literackich*, VII, 1964, no. 1 (12), p. 52–53 and also in Czech in the paper by Oleg Sus, *Zárodky sémantiky básnického jazyka v Durdíkově poetice (The Beginnings of the Semantics of Poetic Language in Durdík's Poetics)*, *Journal of Studies of the Philosophical Faculty, Brno*

Zich, then, there exists a poetic aesthetic object in our imagination and this consists of the whole complex of images called up by the word (the creation of these oscillating image-significations is in Zich *de facto* homogeneous with the play of imagination).¹⁷ This "oscillation" theory remained in various modifications a firm traditional element of modern Czech poetics in the 19th and 20th centuries and was newly constructed in a more systematic way in the structural theory of poetic denomination by Jan Mukařovský.

Partially, then, the basic line of thought of Zich's work *On Poetic Types* is anticipated in a few digressions by the psychological study on *The Aesthetic Perception of Music* (Bulletin of the Royal Bohemian Society of the Sciences). From this, from the whole study, it is possible to exact what we have called the methodological model of Zich's poetics, sketched out during the course of the War years. (It is a "model", of course, only in the sense that it implies simultaneously both the transformation, and adaptation of method and of terminology to material *sui generis*, which cannot be transferred to tonal structure.) And so Zich's sketch of poetic typology of the years 1917 to 1918 practically brings to a close one long stage in the development of Czech form poetics and at the same time leads to the transition necessary for development to structuralistic conceptions. However: "leads to" and "transition" — these are very abbreviated terms to describe the place of Zich's psychological-semantic typology between the world of ideas of the school of Hostinský and the first background signals announcing the phase of structuralism. From both aspects Zich's position is highly individual, in the context of both Czech and European aesthetics, for here on the one hand the experiment is being made of integrating form analysis with empirical investigation of a psychological-typological nature, and in addition with regard to semantic problems *sui generis*. On the other hand this partial integration, partial hybridization again has an equalizing and integrating effect with its search for a structure analysis directed towards the aesthetic object, in this case the work of poetry and its inner, inherent traits.

III

In the year 1916 the first collected volume of the Russian Formalists appeared, the *Miscellanies for the Theory of the Poetic Language*, I, in which, immediately after the introductory study of Viktor Shklovski on "zaumny" (artificial) language and poetry there appeared the paper of L. P. Jakubinski on a theme much favoured by the school, the acoustic side of the poetic language (*On the Sounds of Verse Language*).¹⁸ In 1917 Zich's pioneer-

University, 9, Brno, 1960, literary scholarship series (D), no. 7, p. 11–12.

¹⁷ O. Zich, *The Aesthetic Perception of Music*, p. 64.

¹⁸ Л. Якубинский, *О звуках стихотворного языка*, *Сборники по теории поэтического языка I* (L. Jakubinski, *On the Sounds of Verse Language*, *Miscellanies for the Theory of the Poetic Language*, I), Petrograd, 1916, p. 16–30. (Slovak translation, L. P. Jakubinski, *O zvukoch básnického jazyka*, in the collection *Teória literatúry, Výbor z „formálnej metódy“* (Theory of Literature. Selection from the „Formal Method“), ed. Mik. Bakoš, Trnava, 1941, p. 182–194.

ing work on poetics, *On Poetic Types* (1917–1918) began to appear in Prague in periodical form. The Czech pupil of Otakar Hostinský, educate in the tradition of the Prague formal school and tending towards the psychological analysis of empirical aesthetics, does not of course know the first theoretical manifestos of the Russian school. The points of departure of Jakubinski and of Zich are also different: the first bases himself on a poetics consistently *linguistically* constituted — thence the fundamental distinction he draws between practical language and poetic language — the second progresses from the transformed observations of his *musical aesthetics*, or to put it more exactly, the semantic typology of the aesthetic perception of music, a typology based on psychological experiment. If Zich's poetics do not have a systematically linguistic orientation, this does not mean that they entirely lose either a direct, or even a latent relation precisely to the linguistic aspects of the work of poetry. Jan Mukařovský observed in 1933 in his review of Zich's systematic work *The Aesthetic of Dramatic Art* (1931) this indirect relationship to linguistics, which here according to Mukařovský consisted precisely in the consistent stress laid on the semantics of dramatic art and the signifiatory aspects of its elements.¹⁹ This observation can eventually with modification be applied also to Zich's work *On Poetic Types*. The terminology of empirical association psychology there actually tends, in the analysis of the "poetic thought", to the meaning of words, sentences, and also higher textual units, so *de facto* to the semantics of the poem, even although here the sense (signification) is interpreted according to the old psychological conception as a recalled image (Zich, *Poetic Types*, p. 42). This psychological semantics of Zich however does not separate the language as the mere "cloak" from the thought as the "core", does not operate with that artificial distinction between the outer and inner form, which caused so much difficulty in the poetics of Josef Durdik, a poetics of the "duality" of language, poetics of old, abstract formalism. Zich's theoretic position could be termed a pre-structuralist one. (It would suffice perhaps to remove the psychologically biased "images", formulate it linguistically and then it could be directly compared to the work of Jan Mukařovský, for example to his study of Mácha's *Máj*, as a kind of early variant of neoformalism-structuralism.) Even the principle of the identity of the thought (sense) and the word is formulated here:

"Generally speaking: the word must be embodiment of the thought, not its 'cloak', as is often said. Poetic speech must be such, that we have the impression that a certain thought has directly and uniquely (i.e. for the occasion in question) created it.

I have said that we must have this impression, for here indeed it is merely an illusion that is in question. For in reality the bond is still closer, in fact it is not even a 'bond'. With a true poet, in a true poem, the thought and its verbal expression are the same in time and in word, so that any distinction into 'thought' and 'verbal expression' is merely an artificial scientific abstraction." (*Poetic Types*, p. 49.)

So, then, writes Otakar Zich. In comparison with the Russian context,

¹⁹ J. Mukařovský, O. Zich: *Estetika dramatického umění* (O. Zich: *The Aesthetics of Dramatic Art*), *Journal of Modern Philology*, 19, 1933, p. 318 and elsewhere.

with the first studies appearing in the Petrograd *Miscellanies on the Theory of the Poetic Language*, we can quite well extract from the poetics of Zich and of Jakubinski a certain structural connection, naturally perhaps not a direct affiliation; structural in that both theoreticians independently of each other and with methodological processes differently constituted reveal in the work of poetry sound values as values *sui generis*. The concentration on the "phonological" plan is not accidental; in it there appears — both in the Czech and in the Russian theoretician — an eidographic method, concentrating on the artistic artefact itself and at first disregarding in a strongly puristic way the relationships which bind the work to extra-artistic phenomena. But here too a certain not unimportant difference can be distinguished between the poetics of Zich and that of Jakubinski. The latter adheres along with the other representatives of the Russian formal school to the immanent character of the poetic structure, while Zich tries to find the aesthetic functional relationships between it and the psychological type of the poet-creator (or else he relates it to the types of its reception). This is however from the view-point of integral formalism undoubtedly a transgression of the bounds, something which could be called psychologism. Along with this Otakar Zich renders equal two entire levels of the poetic work, on the one hand the signifiatory (the "thought" level), on the other, the sound-rhythmical. The structural relation between the two layers of autonomous values is not, it is true, examined by him in detail, yet he does not set up any disjunction between them which would detach the poetic thought from the verbal expression. The attraction of attention "to the thing itself" does not, then, according to him as early as 1917—1918, mean merely the elevation of the "make-it-strange" sound aspect, to which in the first phase of development Russian formal poetics attached its interest, and by means of which even the poetic innovations of the Russian futurism of the time are also introduced by the theory as well as the tendency to experimental world-formation and "zaum" — artificial language (in which of course the "normal" semantics are distorted or destroyed, when the "desemantization" of the word takes place). We actually do not find any parallel to this equalization of the signifiatory level and the sound-rhythmic level in the early stage of the Leningrad-Moscow school. And it is just here that the position of Zich is quite exceptional, and characteristic precisely for the Czech native theoretical tradition of form analysis, which seeks to preserve the balance between extremes, between the pole of preference of the "thought" (inorganically isolated, over-estimated in the so-called aesthetics of content) and the pole of actualized "material" (the linguistic medium in the new formalism). Therefore Zich circumspectly and at the same time with a certain sympathy evaluates one of the rising currents of modern poetry (French, but otherwise not more closely defined), which ranged itself against the flattening down of poetic stylization and the degradation of specific linguistic values. This poetry appears to him to be a reasonable but of course one-sided reaction, as a serious trend in poetic creation. And highly symptomatic for Zich is again his assumption of a central, intermediary position between the extremes, which thus becomes typical for his poetics of literary art:

"I have not in mind here poets and works in which flat and worthless thoughts are veiled in an artificial cloak of words, even if they attain virtuosity, but that serious and keen trend which has proclaimed that the single considerable value of a poem lies in its sound values (according to us: its sound speech values) and so ranking poetry with music, has denied the fundamental character of thought in the poem, has even expelled it from the poem. This device was of course on the other hand a one-sided one, but it had a very healthy effect and here and there it would still be required. If we wish to straighten a bent rod, we must bend it in the opposite direction. The truth lies in the middle." (*Poetical Types*, p. 65.)

Otakar Zich in his theory of poetry set out from psychological typology, but, aware of the limits of every psychological reduction of artistic creative work, he fashioned for himself a method which might be called "psycho-poetic", which was to reveal such a standpoint as would be suitable for combining "types of poets" and "types of poems", in other words a psychology of literary creation with a typology of the objective traits of the poetic form. In this then he did not at all follow the extreme anti-psychological approach of the Russian formal school, on the contrary, in the spirit of certain reforming traditions of Czech form poetics he seeks for what is really some kind of intermediary position between "subjective" (psychological) and "objective" (the work of poetry and its features). These attempts at joining two methodological aspects in aesthetics and poetics are then characteristic especially for Otakar Zich, who interprets the theory of form aesthetics (aesthetics of relations) in his teacher Hostinský as well as in its founder Johann Friedrich Herbart as an empirically based teaching of special relationships between intellectual phenomena, so far of course as it is a question of the aesthetic function of these relationships in the complex artistic whole. This is how Herbart is interpreted in 1910 and later in 1922 in the aesthetics of Hostinský; the latter directly as "psychological formalism."²⁰

Zich states: "The spiritual nature of the artist is reflected in many aspects in his works, on the other hand again many qualities of the work of art are documents of certain features of the artist's spirit. In order to determine our types let us then select only those qualities of the poet and only those qualities of the poems which correspond to each other [...] and the types so discovered will have (given the correctness of our analysis) simultaneous validity in both directions, objective and subjective." (*Poetic Types*, p. 1.) Let us leave aside here the problems of the correspondent theory of the relationships of the poet's "spirit" and his work,

²⁰ On Herbart cf. O. Zich, *The Aesthetic Perception of Music. A Psychological Analysis on an Experimental Basis*, Czech Thought, 11, 1910, p. 20; on the "psychological" character of Hostinský's aesthetics cf. O. Zich, *Otakara Hostinského Estetika (The Aesthetics of Otakar Hostinský)*, Czech Thought, 18, 1922, p. 46.

²¹ Zich, *On Poetic Types*, p. 63-64. Zich of course is operating also with what he calls *values III*, but he does not consider them fundamental, or necessary or always present in the work. According to him they are imaginative values, pictorial, which he defines psychologically as notions called up by the sense of words and sentences, l. c., p. 66. Fundamentally then Zich retains the dual-value model of poetic structure.

which could be judged critically. Important is the fact that Zich seeks to discover psychological types not of any kind, but only and precisely the aesthetically, poetically relevant ones, motivated by their function in the poetic structure. He also goes beyond the dogmas of the old form poetics not only in applying the psychologically motivated types but also especially where he sets up basic values of the poem as *values I*, i.e. sound and rhythmic, and concurrently with them *values II*, i.e. intellectual, "contentual" values in their verbal expression (sense of words and sentences along the moods which are aroused by them). Both these values — I plus II — are according to Zich *equally fundamental*, incapable of being discarded and or non-present in the poem, and at the same time they are objectively derivable from the "nature" of the works of poetry.²¹ This then holds good also of sound and rhythmical values: we cannot ascribe them to any merely "exterior" beauty, accordingly they cannot be assigned to the "inner" beauty of poetry. Here Zich appears to carry on polemic with Durdík's Poetics of the year 1881. For it is not possible at the same time to support the mistaken opinion of the dualism of "content" — the so-called poetic thoughts — and their cloak in the shape of an exteriorly approaching "form", which is perhaps in some way subsidiary, secondary, less important, not fundamental: "[...] *precisely in poetry it is not possible to separate thought from its verbal expression, and on the other hand the qualities of sound and rhythm mentioned are not merely the form, but also possess a content, although, as for example in melodiousness, this content simply consists of phonemic sounds.*" (Poetic Types, p. 63.) Here Zich anticipates that rejection of the false disjunction between "content" and "form", which Jan Mukařovský a decade later laid down at the outset of his analysis of Mácha's *Máj*, seeking support in the terminology of the Russian formal school; Zich anticipates too inquiry into the phonic structure of *Máj* in that work of Mukařovský's, of course without yet being able to offer a consolidating basic principle, the principle of the integrating structural "construction" which finds a structural connection between the sequence of sounds and other elements of the poem, so too, then, the significatory.²² For Zich limited his "sound values" to a kind of autonomous content of the sounds themselves, and did not seek their "transcending" semantic function. This limitation clearly arises from his original conception of the aesthetics of music, from the setting up of pure musical significatory images, separated from all that is extra-musical. This "pure", absolute musicality would seem to leave behind a certain parallel in Zich's conception of the "sound values" of a poem.

L. P. Jakubinski of course in comparison with Zich selected a different point of departure, paradigmatic for Russian formalism. The functional classification of linguistic phenomena according to their purposeful intent led him the fundamental differentiation between *the poetic language* and the system of what was called *the practical language*, in which "linguistic

²² J. Mukařovský, *Máchův Máj, Estetická studie* (The „May“ of Mácha. An Aesthetic Study [originally 1928]), reprinted in *Kapitoly z české poetiky III* (Chapters from Czech Poetics), 2nd edition, Prague, 1948, p. 87–89 („princip sjednocující strukturní výstavby“ — the principle of unifying structural construction).

images" (sounds, morphological particles) function only as a means of communication, having the while no independent value and thus not drawing the attention of the perceiver or his emotional capacity. From this "language" Jakubinski very sharply separated — as was the custom at that time — the system of the poetic language, in which sounds enter the clear field of consciousness, attract attention, concentrate attention on themselves and so acquire a special value: "In practical language the attention of the speaker is not concentrated on sounds; sounds do not enter the clear field of consciousness and do not have an independent value, when they are merely the means of communication. [...] In poetic language things are different: we can assert that sounds in the poetic language enter the clear field of consciousness and that attention is concentrated on them; in this respect the self-observation of poets, which is confirmed by several theoretical studies, is of importance. Actually, the very fact of the *rhythmical structure* of speech points to the *conscious experiencing of sounds* in the course of poetic linguistic activity."²³ The actualized acoustic side of the work of poetry calls up in its course an emotional relation on the part of the perceiver — and here it may even be a case of the sounds of incomprehensible words, of words without meaning — as the linguist Charles Bally had already ascertained and as was emphasized by Viktor Shklovski.²⁴ Thus even expressions deprived of a normal semantic function become peculiarized. This "make-it-strange" is described by Jakubinski from a rather narrow viewpoint. For he seeks mainly a motivation of the emotional relationship to sounds in the poetic language, however he does note on the other side the existence of connections between the sound and the signficatory side of the poetic language. The "stripping bare" of the word in Jakubinski thus is not to remain at the point of concentration of a completely isolated sounds component of the word, which should be deprived absolutely of its intentional, transcendent sense even although in fact Jakubovski has progressed from this borderline position of the desemantization of the language of poetry. The rendering independent of the sound side of poetry as an autonomous value can be found naturally with a different motivation also in Otakar Zich in his work *On Poetic Types*, where Zich stresses the "pure sound quality" of verse and finally defines verse musicality as a sound quality "of the unit" — a kind of "Gestaltsqualität" which is given by a certain organization, by the structural arrangement of sounds according to certain rules (*Poetic Types*, p. 27). Zich then in distinction to Jakubinski operates in this case already with a broader, more structural conception of the sound aspect as an organized sequence of sounds, from which the arrangement of the so-called speech qualites in rhythmical wholes differ (according to Zich acoustic values in general are distinguished by duality: the sound moment and the speech moment).

On the other hand, however, the comparatively narrow starting position of the poetic language did not prevent one of the representatives of the Russian formal method, L. P. Jakubinski, from considering — even although very generally — the mutual relationship of sound and signification in the

²³ Jakubinski, Russian, l. c., p. 16–17; Slovakian trans., p. 182, 183.

²⁴ *ibid.*, Russian, p. 21, 22; Slovakian, p. 187, 188.

poetic language, the connections of the sound side and what he himself called with a certain degree of aloofness the "content", or to speak more exactly, the signifiatory side.²⁵ Zich did not note more closely those sound semantic connections. The line of his important work on poetics is given just by the emphasis on the independence of certain concurrent values, contained in works of poetry and open to objective investigation, empirical verification from the aspect of poetics plus psychological typology (that is from the aspect of that "psycho-poetics" of Zich, to which we have already referred). At the same time Zich was obliged to oppose the old school poetics and the conventional fetishes of the old so-called contentual aesthetics. He justified the independent artistic value of the sound qualities of poetry — along with the values termed intellectual — even if need be at the cost of stressing excessively for example the autonomous character of sound sequence. "I endeavoured in this study to demonstrate how many and what varied values are contained in the works of poets, *regardless* [underlined by Zich himself] of the thoughts expressed in them." (*Poetic Types*, p. 92.)

The work of poetry as an assembly of two values is at the same time conceived by Zich not yet in all its structural complexity, but basically according to the model of the general duality of language as a whole and so too of poetic language. Here then Zich carries into his poetics a new principle, the linguistic principle, even although he himself does not build up a special conception of the so-called poetic language and practical language. The influence of the methodological basis of 1910 is to be sure still active (the influence of musicology!) but the new material of the investigation demands the co-operation of psychological typology with linguistics. The linguistic material has two aspects, sound and signifiatory; their close union is interpreted by Zich psychologically (they cannot be separated without disturbing the fundamental basis). The same holds good of language, which is the material for the work of poetry; and hence according to Zich it again arises that it is necessary to accept two basic, self-contained and mutually equal poetic values (*Poetic Types*, p. 65, 66). This undoubtedly simplified "dualvalued" model of Zich's theory of poetry has its inner problems — precisely at the spot where the question arises of how to specify the relationship between the two plans and whether it is possible to be satisfied with just such a dual aspect, whether it exhausts all the possibilities and grasps the entire structure of the poem. In any case, however, Zich demonstrably rid poetics of the old disorientating disjunction of the "inner" (dominant) aspect and the "outer" (subservient) aspect. For this reason too, a decade later Jan Mukařovský could more easily provide proof of the fact — in his aesthetic analysis of Mácha's *Máj* — that of the main elements of the work of poetry one of them is not in some *a priori* way necessarily and always "more important", the other again always of less importance; he could argue more easily and on a better foundation not only because he had learnt from the Russian formalists, but also because the way towards a new structural conception had already been prepared by Otakar Zich.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, Russian, p. 24, 30; Slovakian, p. 190, 194.

POEZIE A HUDBA V PSYCHOLOGICKÉ SÉMANTICE OTAKARA ZICHA

(Z dějin české formální metody a prestrukturálního)

Delší dobu se již soustřeďuje zájem mnoha zahraničních badatelů na dějiny a teorii ruského formalismu. A nejen to; tzv. formální metoda ruské (sovětské) proveniencce se považuje za základní vývojový předpoklad českého strukturalismu literárněvědného i estetického, jak to dokládá například obsáhlá práce Victora Erlicha. Z hlediska vnitřních dějin českého estetického myšlení jde ovšem o genetické schéma silně zjednodušené, ba i jednostranné. Uvedená genetická linie „*ruský formalismus – český strukturalismus*“ totiž nepřihlíží k celku vývojových souvislostí. Vynechává důležitý a neodmyslitelný podíl domácí školy českého formalismu na vzniku strukturalismu. Tak se zapomíná na historicky fungující myšlenkový impuls, na iniciátorskou roli i zprostředkující postavení (vzhledem k formalismu ruskému) toho, co jsme zde zatím velmi obecně označili za český formalismus. Přesněji by se mělo mluvit o celém vývojovém proudu *formové estetiky*, nebo tzv. *formismu*, jak zněl starší termín. Konstituován a rozvinut byl v poslední třetině XIX. století, a to hlavně pracemi Josefa *Durdíka* (1837–1902) a Otakara *Hostinského* (1847–1910). Již u těchto teoretiků „formismu“ nacházíme diferenciaci názorů a metod; česká estetika měla tehdy „vědomí vlastních vývojových možností“ a nemusila sbírat cizí droby, jak výstižně napsal roku 1935 Jan Mukařovský. Podstatným transformacím byl pak uvedený proud podroben v tzv. škole Hostinského, v níž se již začala měnit a rozkládat původní metodologická i noetická východiska klasického českého „formismu“ vzniklého pod patronátem herbartovské estetiky, anebo docházelo přímo ke kritice těchto východisek, aby byla nakonec opuštěna.

V této souvislosti je pak třeba připomenout význam prací Otakara Zicha (1879 až 1934), českého estetika hudby, literatury a dramatického umění. V nich totiž dochází ještě před první světovou válkou a během ní k nové produktivní transformaci domácího, autochtonního „formismu“. Zich jej spojil s experimentální psychologíí estetického vnímání a obohatil o první českou verzi sémantiky umění. Byla to ovšem sémantika ve své přípravné fázi (mohlo by se říci: presémantika), in statu nascendi, neznaná ještě a nemožná znát poučení z lingvistiky. Tato *psychologická sémantika* vyrůstala u Zicha z kategorie tzv. *významové představy*, již český teoretik přejal ve své pionýrské studii *Estetické vnímání hudby* od německého estetika Johannese Volkelta (srov. Volkeltovu kategorii „*Die Bedeutungsvorstellung*“). Umělecká díla jsou podle Otakara Zicha struktury specifických „věcí“ – předmětů, situací, seskupení, motivů atd. – jež můžeme rozeznat, i když pro ně nemáme žádné slovní označení. Každé dílo cosi specifického „znamená“, nese své zvláštní „významy“ (ony zmíněné „věci“), jež Zich určuje psychologicky jakožto tzv. významové představy, například hudební, výtvarné, později básnické nebo dramatické. Tato teorie je důležitá i po jiné stránce: přímo uvnitř ní se totiž vytvářejí pokusy o uměnovědnou *typologii*, a to jednak o první a nedokonalé třídění *sémantických funkcí*, jednak o systematicky pojatou typologii, klasifikující psychologické pochody při *estetickém recipování*, případně *tvoření*. Připomeňme jen, že oba druhy typologických zkoumání vystupují u Zicha vlastně smíšeně, což je pro něj nanejvýš typické (model pro toto míšení aspektů poskytuje již sama „významová představa“, která má být ex definitione konstituována jak psychologicky, tak sémanticky). V této souvislosti není ovšem Zichova práce o estetickém vnímání hudby osamocena, nýbrž má svůj samostatný protějšek a zároveň logické pokračování v jiném uměnovědném oboru, totiž v poetice, konkrétněji ve zkoumání tzv. básnických typů. Již z tohoto důvodu nelze z historického hlediska prominout Zichův pokus dodnes historicky významný (v české estetice bezpochyby, v kontextu estetiky evropské pak patřící k prvním projevům „psychosémantiky“). Jde totiž o pokus spojit zkoumání sémantických funkcí s psychologickou analýzou typů estetického vnímání hudebních děl (resp. děl básnických).

Zichova poetika umění básnického je zprvu aspoň torzovitě naznačena v *Estetickém vnímání hudby* (1911). Již toto její situování – nehledíc zatím k jiným souvislostem – ukazuje na hlubší afinitu mezi metodologií Zicha hudebního estetika a teoretika básnického, přičemž ovšem stále u něho trvá závislost na některých základ-

ních zjištěních české formální školy, týkajících se básnického pojmenování. Vnitřní spojnice mezi estetikou hudby a poetikou pak může doložit komparace Zichovy práce otištěné ve Věstníku Královské české společnosti nauk s pojednáním *O typech básnických*, jež začíná vycházet o několik let později v Časopise pro moderní filologii (1917–1918). Psychologicko-sémantické a typologické zkoumání uložené zprvu do rozboru estetického vnímání hudby tvoří jednak opěrný model pro rozvržení látky a pro postupy Zichovy poetiky, jednak je zde aplikováno na nový materiál a podrobena transformaci. Tím dochází k posunu původního modelu a vytvářejí se výchozímská speciálně literárněvědná. Při svérázné dvojstrannosti Zichovy estetické teorie — má spojoval založené jak psychologické, tak i formové — sehrál i muzikologický „impuls“ svou svébytnou roli: jako by v určité vývojové fázi suploval produktivní styk s moderní lingvistikou a tak fakticky přivedl oklikou českou moderní teorii básnictví (zhruba v době prvního nástupu ruských formalistů) k přijetí *zvukových a rytmičtých kvalit* jakožto podstatných, ne vyšších hodnot díla básnického. Vedle toho obsahuje *Estetické vnímání hudby* další stejně důležitou metodologickou předlohu. Podle ní je i studie *O typech básnických* konstituována na teorii významové představy, na typologii tzv. básnického prožitku a v nové podobě na pokusu o sjednocení hlediska psychologického se strukturálním, jinými slovy analýzy básníka („rysů umělcovy duše“) s rozbořením vlastností uměleckého díla. V tomto pokusu pak ovšem již Zich překračuje původní noetické hranice své předchozí práce hudebněestetické.

Částečně je tedy základní myšlenková linie Zichovy práce *O typech básnických* předznamenána v několika krátkých odbočkách psychologické studie o *Estetickém vnímání hudby* (VKČSN). Odtud, z celé studie, je také možno vypreparovat to, co jsme nazvali metodologickým modelem Zichovy poetiky, koncipované ještě uprostřed válečných let. („Modelem“ ovšem jenom v tom smyslu, že jde zároveň o transformaci a přizpůsobení metody i pojmosloví materiálu sui generis, nepřevoditelného na tónovou strukturu.) A tak Zichův nárys básnické typologie z let 1917 až 1918 prakticky uzavírá jednu celou dlouhou etapu ve vývoji české formové poetiky a zároveň vyústuje ve vývojově nutný přechod ke koncepcím strukturalistickým. Tedy: „*vyústění*“ i „*přechod*“ — tak by se dalo hodně zkratkovitě označit položení Zichovy psychologicko-sémantické typologie mezi myšlenkovým světem školy Hostinského a mezi prvními signály z pozadí, ohlašujícími fázi strukturalní. Z obou aspektů je Zichova pozice velmi svérázná, a to v kontextu estetiky české i evropské, neboť se tu na jedné straně provádí pokus o integraci formové analýzy s empirickým zkoumáním psychologicko-typologickým, a nadto ještě hledicím k sémantickým problémům sui generis. Na druhé straně se tato dílem integrace, dílem hybridizace opět vyrovnává a sjednocuje úsilím o strukturální analýzu zaměřenou k estetickému objektu, v našem případě k básnickému dílu a k jeho vnitřním, imanentním vlastnostem.

V roce 1916 vychází první sborník ruských formalistů *Sborníki po teorii poetičeskogo jazyka I* a v něm se objevuje hned za úvodní studií Viktora Sklovského o „zaumném“ jazyku a poezii stať L. P. Jakubinského věnovaná preferovanému tématu školy, zvukové stránce básnického jazyka (*O zvukach stichotvornogo jazyka*). Roku 1917 začíná v Praze časopisecky vycházet pionýrská Zichova práce z poetiky *O typech básnických* (1917–1918). Český žák Otakara Hostinského vyšel z tradice pražské formální školy a zaměřený k psychologické analýze empirické estetiky nezná ovšem první teoretické manifestace ruské školy. Liší se i východiska Jakubinského a Zicha: první se opírá o poetiku důsledně konstituovanou *lingvisticky* — odtud jeho základní diference mezi *jazykem praktickým a básnickým* — druhý navazuje na transformované poznatky své hudební estetiky, přesněji řečeno sémantické typologie estetického vnímání hudby, typologie opřené o psychologický experiment. Není-li Zichova poetika orientována systematicky lingvisticky, neznamená to, že zcela ztrácí přímý i latentní vztah právě k jazykovým aspektům básnického díla. Jan Mukařovský si povšiml roku 1933 ve své recenzi Zichova systematického spisu *Estetika dramatického umění* (1931) onoho nepřímého vztahu k lingvistice, jenž zde podle něho záležel právě v soustavném zdůrazňování sémantiky dramatického umění a významových stránek jeho složek. Toto zjištění lze nakonec v obměně vztáhnout i k Zichově práci *O typech básnických*. Pojmosloví empirické asociační psychologie tam vlastně míří při rozboru „básnické myšlenky“ k *smyslu* slov, vět i vyšších textových útvarů, tedy de facto k sémantice básně, třebaže je tu smysl (význam) vykládán podle staré psychologické koncepce jako vybavená *představa*. Tato Zichova psychologická

sémantika ovšem neodděluje jazyk jakožto pouhé „roucho“ od myšlenky jakožto „jádra“, neoperuje s oním umělým rozlišením vnější a vnitřní formy, jež činilo takové potíže poetice Josefa Durdíka, poetice starého *abstraktního formalismu*. A tady ovšem Zich již přímo aplikuje hledisko lingvistické, aspekt „dvojstránkovosti“ jazyka. Zichova teoretická pozice by se tu mohla označit za *prestrukturalistickou*. (Stačilo by ji třeba zbavit psychologismu „představ“, konstituovat ji lingvisticky a mohla by být přímo porovnávána s pracemi Jana Mukařovského, například s jeho studií *Máchův Máj*, jako jakási raná varianta neoformalismu-strukturalismu.) Dokonce je zde formulována zásada identity myšlenky (smyslu) a slova.

Při srovnání s ruským kontextem, s prvními pracemi vycházejícími v petrohradských *Sbornicích o teorii básnického jazyka*, můžeme docela dobře vypreparovat z poetiky Zichovy a Jakubinského určitou strukturní souvislost, přirozeně ne snad přímo filiační vazbu. Strukturní v tom, že oba teoretikové nezávisle na sobě a s metodologiemi různé konstituovanými odhalují v básnickém díle hodnoty zvukové jakožto hodnoty sui generis. Zaměření na „fonetický“ plán tu není náhodné; projevuje se v něm – jak u českého, tak u ruského teoretika – *eidografická* metoda, soustřeďující se na sám umělecký artefakt a odhlížející zprvu v ruské škole silně puristicky od vztahů, jež poutají dílo s jevy mimouměleckými. Ale i zde lze rozeznat jistou ne nedůležitou diferenci mezi poetikou Zichovou a Jakubinského. Jakubinskij dodržuje spolu s jinými představiteli ruské formální školy *immanentnost* básnické struktury, Zich se však snaží najít esteticky funkční vztahy mezi ní a mezi *psychologickým typem tvůrce-básníka* (respektive ji vztahuje i k typům jejího *recipování*). To je však z hlediska integrálního formalismu nepochybné překročení hranic, něco, co by se mohlo označit za „*psychologismus*“. Spolu s tím zrovnoprávňuje Otakar Zich celé dvě vrstvy básnického díla, jednak významovou („myšlenkovou“), jednak zvukově-rytmickou. Strukturní relace mezi oběma vrstvami *svéprávných uměleckých hodnot* sice nezkoumá podrobněji, nenastoluje však mezi nimi disjunkci, která by odtrhla básnické myšlení od jazykového vyjádření. Stržení pozornosti „na věc samu“ neznamená tedy podle něho již v letech 1917–1918 pouze vyzdvihování ozvláštněné stránky zvukové, k níž se v první vývojové fázi upíná zájem ruské formální poetiky a skrze níž se do teorie dostávají i básnické výboje tehdejšího ruského futurismu i tendence k experimentující slovo tvorbě a „zaumu“ (kde se ovšem narušuje nebo i likviduje „normální“ sémantika, kde dochází k „desémantizaci“ slova). Paralelu k tomuto zrovnoprávnění významové vrstvy se zvukově-rytmickou v rané etapě leningradsko-moskevské školy vlastně nenajdeme. A právě zde je postavení Zichovo zcela zvláštní, příznačné právě pro českou domácí vědeckou tradici tvarového rozboru, jenž chce udržet *rovnováhu* mezi extrémny, mezi pólem preferované „myšlenky“ (neorganicky izolovaným, nadhodnoceným v tzv. obsahové estetice) a mezi pólem aktualizovaného „materiálu“ (jazykového média v novém formalismu).