

Pospíšil, Ivo

A new work by Milosav Čarkić on the background of his preceding writings

Slavica litteraria. 2021, vol. 24, iss. 1, pp. 119-129

ISSN 1212-1509 (print); ISSN 2336-4491 (online)

Stable URL (DOI): <https://doi.org/10.5817/SL2021-1-9>

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/144039>

License: [CC BY-SA 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/)

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.

A New Work by Milosav Čarkić on the Background of His Preceding Writings

Ivo Pospíšil (Brno)

Abstract

The author of the present outline analyzes some of the crucial works by a prominent Serbian theoretician of verse and of poetic language Milosav Čarkić with the core in his recent book *A Dictionary of Rhyme Terms* (2020). On the basis of a thorough analysis he characterizes this set of works accompanied by those going back to the 1990s and published mostly in Serbian as key contributions to the world theory of verse. The present treatise analyses several books written by Milosav Čarkić in Russian, Serbian and English in the three recent decades, including *Phonics of Verse* (Фоника стиха, 1992), *Phonostylistics of Verse* (Фоностилистика стиха, 1995), *The Glossary of Rhyme* (Појмовник рима, 2001), *The Stylistics of Verse* (Стилистика стиха, 2006), *On Poetic Language* (2010), *Models of Rhyme* (2017), and *The Rhyme in Serbian Verse* (Рима у српском стиху, 2017) and predominantly his new book mentioned above *A Dictionary of Rhyme Terms* (2020). His main scholarly contribution consists in the investigation of the sphere on the boundary of phonics, stylistics, and poetics of verse and of the semantics, structure, function, and terminology of rhymes in European context.

Key words

Milosav Čarkić; *A Dictionary of Rhyme Terms*; comparative lexicological and lexicographical work; the background of verse and poetic language research, the sphere on the boundary of phonics, stylistics, and poetics of verse and of the semantics, structure, function, and terminology of rhymes in European context

Abstrakt

Nové dílo Milosava Čarkiće na pozadí jeho předchozích spisů

Autor přítomného přehledu analyzuje některá stěžejní díla prominentního srbského teoretika verše a básnického jazyka Milosava Čarkiće s jádrem v jeho nejnovější knize *A Dictionary of Rhyme Terms* (2020). Na základě důkladné analýzy charakterizuje tento soubor děl doprovázený těmi z 90. let 20. století a publikovanými většinou srbsky jako klíčové příspěvky k světové teorii verše. Přítomné pojednání analyzuje několik knih, které Milosav Čarkić napsal rusky, srbsky a anglicky v posledních třech desetiletích, včetně *Foniky verše* (Фоника стиха, 1992), *Fonostylistiky* (Фоностилистика стиха, 1995), *Glosáře rýmu* (Појмовник рима, 2001), *Stylistiky verše* (Стилистика стиха, 2006), *O básnickém jazyce* (On Poetic Language, 2010), *Modely rýmu* (Models of Rhyme, 2017) a *Rým v srbském verši* (Рима у српском стиху, 2017) a zvláště jeho nové, výše zmíněné knihy *Slovník rýmových termínů*

Tento výstup vznikl na Masarykově univerzitě v rámci projektu *Mezislovanské kulturní a literární vazby* číslo MUNI/A/1331/2020 podpořeného z prostředků účelové podpory na specifický vysokoškolský výzkum, kterou poskytl MŠMT v roce 2021.

(A Dictionary of Rhyme Terms, 2020). Jeho hlavní badatelský přínos spočívá ve zkoumání sféry na hranici foniky, stylistiky a poetiky verše a sémantiky, struktury, funkce a terminologie rýmu v evropském kontextu.

Klíčová slova

Milosav Čarkić; *A Dictionary of Rhyme Terms*; srovnávací lexikologické a lexikografické dílo; pozadí výzkumu verše a básnického jazyka, sféra na hranici foniky, stylistiky a poetiky verše a sémantiky, struktury, funkce a terminologie rýmu v evropském kontextu

Prof. Milosav Ž. Čarkić, PhD., is the author of several books and an enormous number of studies and articles. His main field of interest is the research of the poetic language of Serbian poetry and the poetic code of poetry in general. He is the founder of the international journal STIL. His creative and inventive research and attempts at (at least) partial syntheses including phonetic-phonological structure of poetry as such rank among the best verse studies and theories as well as the most significant examples of the analysis of the style in the world. This highly respected university professor who gave lectures at the universities in Moscow, Banja Luka, Niš, Tuzla, Opole, Brno and others, who participated in significant international conferences and symposiums, a brilliant theorist of verse, and the author of extensive books, among others, *Фоника стиха* (1992), *Фоностилистика стиха* (1995), *Појмовник риме* (2001), *Стилистика стиха* (2006), *On Poetic Language* (2010), *Models of Rhyme* (2017), *Рима у српском стиху* (Међународно удружење „Стил“, Београд, 2017), now produced a brand-new book of key international significance.

In the very beginning, let us have a look at least at some of his preceding books and outputs.

*Стих и језик*¹ (Београд, 2013) is even more compact than some of his books going back to the 1990s dealing with crucial problems of the state, status and development of poetic language. I can just repeat the words used in one of my reviews of Čarkić's preceding book that there are only a few specialists who so systematically as Čarkić analyze the problems linked to the linguistic aspect of verse theory.

The author divided his work into three main chapters completed by English conclusion (summary), list of abbreviations, quoted literature, index of names and subjects. In its very beginning there stands a substantial general explanation of the principal theses of the work. The author assumes that linguistics as the study of language structure in general includes poetics as its integral part. He quotes the works of many of his predecessors including not only Russian ОРОЈАЗ and the whole formalist school (Shklovsky, Jakobson), but also A. A. (O. O.) Potebnya with his *Thought and Language* (1862), which became the real basis of the considerations about the relations of the language, spiritual activity and the poetic language. He did not omit the Russian symbolist poet and theoretician A. Bely and, of course, the founder of the historical poetics A. Veselovsky not speaking about the French semiological-structuralist school headed by Roland Barthes.

1 ČARKIĆ, Miloslav: *Stich i jezik*. Beograd: Institut za srpski jezik, 2013.

The poetic text cannot be properly understood without taking into account the significance of its linguistic layer (e. g. the phenomenological stratification of the literary work by R. Ingarden, i. e. the layer of sounds and sound patterns and characters of a higher order; the layer of semantic units: the meaning of individual sentences and the meaning of whole sentence structures; the layer of schematized aspects through which various objects described in the literary work are manifested; the layer of the objects described, which manifest themselves in the international circumstances created through sentences).

The author stresses the generally accepted fact that the literary work has been realized in language and existed only through language being filled with the poet's personal poetic content. The language of the poetic work contains both the conventional, generally understood meanings and the new or newly created innovated poetic meanings. When the author tried to define the specificity of the verse itself, he speaks about a strictly organized language segment, a condensed poetic discourse with a specific graphic, as well as specific rhythmic and sound organization. Though he deals with this aspect later on, nevertheless I would prefer to define the verse, as the Czech theoretician of verse Josef Hrabák put it, as an entity *sui generis* which can be identified neither with the word or a word group nor with the sentence or a compound or a complex sentence with specific syntax patterns. Based on the very definition there are rather the three components: the verse represents the specific phonetic-phonological, graphic and syntactic-semantic entities. I also would not accentuate the music/musical quality of the verse, rather the "beaux arts quality" derived from Muses (visual arts and music): therefore the quality of the verse is linked not so much with music though with its phonological quality which is close to the musical one, but still different.²

The second basic starting point of Čarkić's reflections concerns the function and role of repetitions in the poetic language and the language of the verse as such: which is – according to him – grounded in a large number of repetitions: the repetition of sounds and sound sequences, rhyming sound clusters, stressed and unstressed syllables, compositional elements etc. One objection: though the frequency of repetitions and their key-role in the formation of the poetic language of the verse is dominant, it also occurs in prose and dramatic texts – the same concerns the figures and tropes.

When the author constitutes his main theses on the immanentist presuppositions, he states that the poetic language implies a certain degree of paradox, combining maximum organization with maximum informative value. The co-existence of two extremes in a literary (poetic) text is possible owing to the existence of two conflicting tendencies: towards automation and towards disautomation.

2 HRABÁK, Josef: *Úvod do teorie verše*. Praha: SPN, 1978, and other editions; see also POSPÍŠIL, Ivo: *K tradicii brnenského stichovedenija i specifice ruskoj poezii*. Novaja rusistika 2, 2009, 1, p. 55–65. See two investigations by Roman Jakobson: JAKOBSON, Roman: *Novejšaja russkaja poezija. Nabrosok I*. Praha: vydavatel neznámý, 1921; JAKOBSON, Roman: *O češskom stiche, preimuščestvenno v sopostavlenii s russkim*. Berlin: OPOJAZ – MLK, 1923. See also the two volumes of Brno symposiums on verse: *Teorie verše I. Theory of Verse I. Teorija sticha I*. Ed. Jiří Levý. Brno: Universita J. E. Purkyně, 1966; *Teorie verše II. Theory of Verse II. Teorija sticha II*. Eds. Jiří Levý – Karel Palas. Brno: Universita J. E. Purkyně, 1968. See also a specific continuation of this tradition in: PAVELKA, Jiří: *Anatomie metafory*. Brno: Blok, 1982.

Thus, the main task the author states is to discover the underlying pattern of the substance of the verse as such rooted in the quality of the poetic language as a specific type of communication containing both the ordinary means of everyday interpersonal contact and the specific reflection of the man-and-the-world complex, the language as a specific tool how to understand and to grasp the world or cosmos and the position of human in time in their complexity.

The important aspect of the author's *opus magnum* is the verification on the material of Serbian poetry since the spiritual, medieval verse up to Serbian modernism.

There are, however, two more questions: first, the degree of generalization of such a research limited to the national and language material, second, the Serbian spiritual (religious) poetry is linguistically heterogeneous with a substantial layer of Old Church Slavonic contaminated with the traces of spoken Serbian language and the continual synthesis gradually going on to modern Serbian both everyday and poetic language. Another problem consists in the fact that it would be necessary to distinguish more strictly the language of various kinds or genres of literature (*genera*), their common denominators (*loci communes*, *topoi*) on the one hand and their gaps and contradictions on the other.

In spite of this, the complex, imposing and inspiring research of M. Čarkić represents the most elaborate attempt at the new definition of poetic language in general and the language of verse in particular. His general assumptions are being illustrated by an array of immense, vast Serbian material in a huge span of time from the Middle Ages up to the beginning of the 20th century.

The first chapter Српска духовна поезија (Serbian Spiritual Poetry) includes five sections: "Pletenie sloves" [„Word Weaving" or – as I would say – "interlacing" which is commonly used in American and British English in various meanings]; Homoiarkton and Homeoteleuton; The Models of Rhyme; Dichotomies and The Structure of Acathist. According to the author the Serbian religious poets used the "pletenie sloves" style, thus confining themselves within the bounds of the word. They made use of the sound figures that did not reach the level of the word: "... *assonance, alliteration, the assonance-alliteration relation, homoiarkton, homeoteleuton, paronomasia, rhyme, the etymological figure*, or otherwise used whole words producing: *anaphora, epiphora, anadiplosis, symploce, polyptoton, internal lexical repetitions, composite lexical repetitions* – thus producing a dual effect. By means of repeating identical sound structures which was realized by connecting words with the same beginnings or endings (sometimes with both), the words, regardless of their positions in the context, came into direct contact with each other and were catenated into complex (occasional) signs, which could only function in the given contexts [...] The sublimity and expressiveness of the style of "pletenie sloves" derived from the religious inspiration used in writing and speaking which, being essential elements of human spirituality, could in no way be commonplace or ordinary" (see the author's English summary).

As the "pletenie sloves" was typical of the whole Orthodox Slavonic world, it should be useful to confront this research with the book by Světa Mathauserová.³

3 MATHAUSEROVÁ, Světa: *Drevnerusskije teorii iskusstva slova*. Praha: Univerzita Karlova, 1976.

The main result of this part of the work consists in the fact that it demonstrated the permeation of various sound patterns, i. e. rhyme, alliteration and other phonic qualities. He even showed the different area and contextual realisations of the sacral language of spiritual, poetry. This part of his research is closely connected with the role of the language as in ancient sacral texts including Old Hebrew (Torah, Old Testament) containing the enigmatic substance of the language (magic, numerology) as a cipher which needs to be deciphered.

The author is completely right if he assumes that one of the aims of the poetic language including the language of the verse is to demonstrate its sacral functions isolating it from the everyday communicative reality, to show the language as a powerful tool of a deep grasp of existence. He is also right if he connects the medieval spiritual poetry with that of Romanticism (though the double structure of the medieval Serbian is evident) and Modernism as all the three developmental epochs were mutually connected based on the **estrangement** as a tool of a more profound understanding of man and his world. **Two epochal** streams, however, stand aside: realism and postmodernism. While realism accentuated the minimizing of the interval between art and reality, postmodernism confronted the literariness and reality: literature (belles lettres) and art in general are based on a chain of repetitions, on intertextuality. But the difference between the former periods and streams under scrutiny and the latter ones (as there is also realist and postmodernist poetry) is not immense. The main aim is the same: to fill the gap between language and reality, to minimize the interval between them (in the Czech context of the 1970-1980s it was the so-called Šabouk's team which dealt with this⁴), to revitalize the poetic language on the basis of reality itself (e. g. the prosaisation of poetry) and to restore the past language layers. So, there is another task for future researchers to involve also realism and postmodernism, possibly the avant-garde, if we take it into consideration as a poetically independent and autonomous phenomenon, into a complex analysis: realist and postmodernist poetry does exist and though it proclaimed rather non-poetic theses it represented only another method of how to develop the language of the verse further. Čarkić masterpiece is the analysis of the acathist with all the Serbian contextual circumstances.

In the second chapter on Serbian Romantic poetry Čarkić analysed the poetry of B. Radičević, J. Jovanović Zmaj, Đ. Jakšić and L. Kostić. One of the most attractive parts of his research concerns Serbian interjections in poetry. The usage of interjections in Serbian romantic poetry serves the author as a litmus paper of the boundary between common and poetic language.

The third chapter deals with Serbian modernism. Here the author cannot omit the idealist and neo-idealist philosophy as a source of this poetry including *Ornamental Phonic Structures, Anagramming, Stress and Rhyme, The Distortion of Adjectives* and *Topic, Form, Content, the titles of subchapters of the final part of the book*. The material for this study was represented by the poetry of J. Dučić, M. Rakić, V. Petković Dis, S. Pandurović, and A. Šantić.

4 See *Krátký slovník koncepce pražského týmu pro studium vyjadřovacích a sdělovacích systémů umění*. Vedoucí týmu Sáva Šabouk. Praha: ČSAV, 1977.

The poetry of those poets – according to Čarkić – contained several types of aesthetic information conveyed by ornamental phonic structures, the most prominent being the following: *hedonistic information*, *code-verse information*, *phono-motivational information* and *textual cohesion information*.

Čarkić's phenomenal book represents an array of textual analyses trying to synthesize the linguistic, poetological, stylistic, comparative, semiological and – as an understatement – a philosophical conception of the language of the verse as a key to a more detailed and elaborate understanding of poetry as a means of grasping the totality of human existence. Though he should take into account more books and studies from various fields of humanities and from the verse theory in different languages especially, which is, of course, extremely difficult and even utopian, his approach gave immense results. I would even say that the theory of the verse language might be divided as “before and after Čarkić”: his knowledge of literary style enabled him to demonstrate that the literary and linguistic studies form one continuous space.

In the context of contemporary verse research Čarkić's book represents a book of supreme quality. His perfect knowledge of poetry in general and Serbian poetry in particular confirms him one of the leading world experts in verse investigation.

One of his crucial monographs called *On Poetic Language*⁵ consists of ten more or less autonomous chapters dealing with crucial problems of the state, status and development of poetic language. There are only a few specialists who systematically analyze these problems linked to the linguistic aspect of verse theory.

The first chapter called “*Verse as a Specific Linguo-Stylistic Discourse*” continues the author's research concerning the phonic aspect of verse theory; the preceding books published in Serbian in the period 1992–2006 (*The Phonics of Verse*, *The Phonostylistics of Verse*, and *The Stylistics of Verse*) are regarded as mere preparations for the crucial question the author permanently asks: “*The poetic code and how it functions in a poetic text*” (p. 7). The material the author works with is left in Serbian original and the reasons for this decision are clear and logical, as well as the author's explanation.

Čarkić's views of the specific features of poetic language are very close to my idea of any poetic text: his conceptions are based on the widened theory of classical structuralism with the semantic, semiotic, and stylistic constructions; I especially appreciate his regard for literature or, more precisely, genre theory. The starting point lies in the introductory chapter with its identification of lyric poetry concentrating on the elements of verse (specific graphic organization, specific rhythmical and specific sound organization). I have already quoted Josef Hrabák's definition according to which the verse is a unit *sui generis*, and we sometimes tend to define it as a specific graphic, phonetic-phonological, and, last but not least, semantic-syntactic and stylistic entity not identical with any similar language structure. Though the author focuses on some of the famous quotations from Mukařovský and Jakobson going back to the Aristotelian generic classification, I would like to accentuate the neoclassicist division based on the graphic, readers' concept of the

5 ČARKIĆ, Milosav: *On Poetic Language*. Saarbrücken: Lambert, 2016.

genres linked to the problems of verse as well as the boundary between prose and verse which is not very transparent even in the research of recent times.

The second chapter called “*On One Kind of Reduplication in Old Sacral Poetry*” connected with Serbian syntax is quite representative though it would be useful to apply the comparison and a wider cultural and poetological background. The methodology of Čarkić’s approach is acceptable as well as his division of the whole problem (the syntactic aspect, the semantic aspect, the stylistic aspect with many subdivisions and the plurality of samples covering all kinds of syntactic, semantic, and stylistic phenomena, such as reduplicated subject, predicate, and attribute, synonym reduplications, reduplications of different meaning, figures of fiction, such as anaphora and others as well as its specific types). The research of Serbian sacral poetry manifested the structuring of the poetic language taking it out of the ordinary real, everyday contexts transferring it into a radically new phenomenon. The chapter “*Combination of Tense Forms in Folk Poetry*” is rather specific because it even more needs the knowledge of Serbian poetic language, but he who knows some Russian and its medieval Old Church Slavonic tradition could grasp the basic meaning of this analysis. I would even say that this quite detailed investigation based on the solid statistical data is one of the best parts of the whole monograph though I would recommend the author to take into account also the axiological use of the tenses.

The study of the Romantic poetological invariant leads Čarkić to the study of the poetic language of some of the Serbian romantic poets. His conclusions confirm also my conviction based not only on the material of European Romanticism that the link to folk poetry is rather complicated, in no case spontaneous, sometimes very artificial and stylized, which is the very core of the author’s cognitive background.

Brilliant is the following study “*On Interjections in Romantic Poetry*” especially because it explicates the intrinsic language quality of Romantic poetry in general. Why Romanticism is so often the object of Čarkić’s interest can be answered by pointing out the South-Slavonic poetic tradition, the role of a specific type of Romanticism as well as Romanticism as a decisive moment in the evolution of the poetic genre system.

The verse is based on the permanent repetitions in all its modes of existence; the study “*Lexical Repetitions Functioning as Connectors in Verse Discourses*” is a model research in the same sphere Čarkić tends to prefer (organizational, rhythmical, semantic, and stylistic functions).

Probably most inspiring is the author’s treatise “*On Some Stylistic and Semantic Aspects of the Distortion of Adjective in Poetic Structures*” though it is also very specific regarding the Serbian poetic material. The terms “deformation” or “distortion” were used to manifest the importance of the change in the function of these words (adjectives).

In the next chapter “*On the Semantic Structure of One Kind of Complex Poetic Signs*“, Čarkić very profoundly demonstrates the formation of the indivisible meaningful unit characterized by the semantic features (semes) of synonyms and antonyms.

In his contribution on the creativity and originality of verse discourses the scholar studies the active poets’ attitude towards canons, conventions, norms and stereotypes which had been formed in the framework of various periods of literary history, genre systems, aesthetic movements or literary currents or streams. The final chapter deals

with rhyme and puts forward a number (ten) of quantitative models of rhymes on the material of Serbian poetry stressing the liberal attitude of Serbian poets towards the rhyme conventions.

I fully agree with the author's conclusions (*Instead of Conclusion*) in which he tries to delimitate the poetic language using some other approaches than his predecessors. Nevertheless, to delimitate the specific features of poetic language from the standpoint of the disciplines the author prefers for their importance (semantics, stylistics, poetology etc.) is a hard work, a permanent process, a real work in progress.

The problem of the monograph consists in the material which is purely Serbian: probably some comparison with other poetries would show the many-sidedness and relativity of some of the conclusions and aspects. On the other hand, I agree with his method of high degree of concentration which led to perfect and exact results. Especially the precise work with poetry, Čarkić's ability to think of poetry across several linguistic and literary disciplines and interdisciplinarity are a real success. As a literary scholar and critic I would appreciate a more expressive link connecting this research with comparative and genre studies which stand on the genuine boundary of linguistics and poetics or poetology though the aim to gradually form a new, modern and sophisticated philological synthesis is obvious.

In the context of contemporary verse research Čarkić's book represents a solid, reliable, serious work with high creativity opening a new space in contemporary verse research. His ability to dispute, his art of verification hypotheses, his perfect knowledge of poetry in general and Serbian poetry in particular confirm him one of the leading world experts in verse investigation.

The monograph *Models of Rhyme*⁶ is probably the most elaborate, full of concrete analyses, examples and case microstudies dealing with possibly the most important versological factor – the rhyme. After Zhirmunsky's famous formalist treatise going back to the early 1920s and after many partial attempts of several specialists, Čarkić's book is more fundamental, more prolific, going beyond the boundaries of the existing knowledge of this phenomenon; moreover, exploring several languages and poetries on the basis of rigorous consultations with linguists and literary scholars dealing with these problems in the national poetries they investigate.

I do not want to give the whole, detailed outline of the monograph including all the minute chapters and examples; I hope it was better done by my colleagues, the reviewers who were more in the picture in this sphere of philological research; it is nearly impossible and non-functional to evaluate all the author's hypotheses, theories, suggestions and original concepts and, I have to admit, I have not enough knowledge to compete with the author's brilliance.

The pathos of his monograph is linked to the strictly scholarly approach consisting of the firmly permeated methodology and terminology, trying to transcend the usual, traditional terms which are typical of various national poetries and theories of the verse to reach the general classification or typology and detailed characteristics of this phe-

6 ČARKIĆ, Milosav: *Models of Rhyme*. Saarbrücken: Lambert, 2017.

nomenon. Probably one of the most brilliant ideas Čarkić brings is the classification based on the sound more than on the syllable or the word. It is radically connected with the early ideas formulated by Andrey Bely in his *Glossolalia* very often criticized by famous literary theoreticians. I am convinced that this idea is really productive, prolific, and brings many relevant results. The classification itself, the typology of rhymes is – in my view – too complicated; the whole attempt should have been anchored to a concrete conceptual node, but it is very hard and even utopian.

Milosav Čarkić is one of the theoreticians of the verse who grasped the holistic idea of the general image of the verse on the basis of permanent comparison, with regard to the national features of poetry the specific verse belongs to. That is possibly the problem concerning not only the topical state and situation of the poetry composed in a national language, but mainly the whole poetic and sound tradition which has been created for centuries.

The somewhat philosophical problem connected with Čarkić's conception of the eye rhyme leaves me doubtful. The discussions move close to the question of what comes first: the hen or the egg. To quote the author himself: "*Being a work of art produced by using words, and not a product of visual arts, such as painting, sculpture, etc., I think that: first, every written text is to be read, not looked at, for visual enjoyment; second, it is undeniable that rhyme belongs to the sound elements, rather than to the visual elements of poetry; third, when reading poetry, even silently, the sound components of the text are realized, which indicates that a written text is understood not by visual observation, but only through the realization of its sound elements. A written text cannot possibly be understood before its articulation, i.e. before receiving and interpreting its acoustic realization (and not visual form), by means of which its meaning is conveyed to the reader. Fourth, besides the plane of expression, rhyme also covers the plane of content of a poetic text, given that rhyming words carry a certain semantic value. Considering all the aforesaid, we can state with full conviction that the term eye rhyme is superfluous, and in my opinion such rhyme does not exist. This phenomenon can only be defined as a **moment of disappointed expectations***"⁴⁷ (p. 10).

It is not precise enough, because we fuse Russian reductions with the evolution of English pronunciation, not speaking about the complex psychological model of perception.

Čarkić's attempt at the radical vision of the rhyme in poetry in general – no matter how impressive – should be, of course, related to more poetries, because the book concerns just the kernel of European poetic tradition, but it would have been a task for a numerous team of first-class scholars. I myself know just several significant theoreticians of the verse in the world; so this project is hardly to be realised in the near future.

While the pathos of his preceding monograph *Models of Rhyme* is linked to the strictly scholarly approach consisting of the firmly permeated methodology and terminology, trying to transcend the usual, traditional terms which are typical of various national poetries and theories of the verse to reach the general classification or typology and

7 ČARKIĆ, Milosav: *Models of Rhyme*. Saarbrücken: Lambert, 2017, p. 10.

detailed characteristics of this phenomenon, this one⁸ is based on various criteria of typology of rhymes, on several aspects of rhyme identification and definition as well as the designation and the generally acceptable denomination and classification and, as he puts it, the universality of rhyme which is based on the four principles of the universal code of nature: *duality* (parallelism), *interaction* (interrelatedness), *dynamicity* and *repetitiveness*.

The richness of his material is given by the diversity of poetry and its languages, also in their diachrony (American, Czech, English, French, Italian, German, Polish, Russian, Serbian, and Spanish). It is always the most complicated task to deal with terminology which differs a lot in each national language. Probably the author should and could pay more attention to a more general theory of terms, especially literary. Each term has its background of literary artefacts and the anatomy of the language is closely linked with the core of the artefacts. No general dictionary can bring us exact translation and interpretation and is not reliable. Therefore the scholar focused on various realisations of rhyme types with the relevantly stable structure of each entry consisting of the definition, statistics, i.e. a quantitative as well as the qualitative analyses and one or more illustrations or demonstrations in several languages. The author is, fortunately, very sensitive to the national realisation of each type of rhyme taking into consideration a wide poetic context. The “philosophy” of this both research and dictionary of rhymes is connected with the prevalent conviction that the rhyme like the whole of poetry complex came into being from the general mass of magic-mythological structures linked with rhythmical units corresponding to biological, vital or vitalizing movements characteristic of the human body and soul though developed in a more elaborate intellectual entities. As I wrote before, Milosav Čarkić is one of the theorists of verse who grasped the holistic idea of the general image of the verse on the basis of permanent comparison, with regard to the national features of the poetry the specific verse belongs to.

Not only the core of his research, but also its accuracy including a list of special literature in many languages, remarks and abbreviations make his new work a useful, both theoretical and practical tool for the cognition of European poetry in general.

Analysing his preceding book on rhyme, I mentioned that his attempts at the radical vision of the rhyme in poetry in general should have been related to more poetries, because the book concerned just the kernel of European poetic tradition, but it would have been a task for a numerous team of first-class scholars. I think that this *Dictionary of Rhyme Terms* represents one of the decisive steps towards the realisation of a more or less utopian vision of the complex synthesis of the theory of verse as such.

Literature

ČARKIĆ, Milosav: *A Dictionary of Rhyme Terms*. Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing, 2020.

ČARKIĆ, Milosav: *Models of Rhyme*. Saarbrücken: Lambert, 2017.

ČARKIĆ, Miloslav: *On Poetic Language*. Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing, 2016.

8 ČARKIĆ, Milosav: *A Dictionary of Rhyme Terms*. Saarbrücken: Lambert, 2020.

ČARKIĆ, Miloslav: *Stich i jezik*. Beograd: Institut za srpski jezik, 2013.

HRABÁK, Josef: *Úvod do teorie verše*. Praha: SPN, 1978.

JAKOBSON, Roman: *Novejšaja ruskaja poezija. Nabrosok I*. Praha: nakladatel neznámý, 1921.

JAKOBSON, Roman: *O češskom stiche, preimuščestvenno v sopostavlenii s ruskim*. Berlin: OPOJAZ – MLK, 1923.

Krátký slovník koncepce pražského týmu pro studium vyjadřovacích a sdělovacích systémů umění. Vedoucí týmu Sáva Šabouk. Praha: ČSAV, 1977.

MATHAUSEROVÁ, Světa: *Drevnerusskije teorii iskusstva slova*. Praha: Univerzita Karlova, 1976.

PAVELKA, Jiří: *Anatomie metafor*. Brno: Blok, 1982.

POSPÍŠIL, Ivo: *K tradicii brnenskogo stichovedenija i spificife ruskij poezii*. *Novaja Rusistika* 2, 2009, 1, p. 55–65.

Teorie verše I. Theory of Verse I. Teorija sticha I. Ed. Jiří Levý. Brno: Univerzita J. E. Purkyně, 1966.

Teorie verše II. Theory of Verse II. Teorija sticha II. Eds. Jiří Levý – Karel Palas. Brno: Univerzita J. E. Purkyně, 1968.

prof. PhDr. Ivo Pospíšil, DrSc.

Ústav slavistiky

Filozofická fakulta, Masarykova univerzita

Arna Nováka 1, 602 00 Brno, Česká republika

ivo.pospisil@phil.muni.cz



This work can be used in accordance with the Creative Commons BY-SA 4.0 International license terms and conditions (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/legalcode>). This does not apply to works or elements (such as image or photographs) that are used in the work under a contractual license or exception or limitation to relevant rights.

