

Enjambment in Poetry

Language and Verse in Interaction

Harai Golomb

Meaning and Art

A Series of Books on Poetics
&
Communication in Culture

3

PREFACE

1. This book is largely based on a Ph.D. dissertation written in 1973/76 under the supervision of Prof. B. Hrushovski. Preparatory research work, including collecting bibliographical material, was carried out at the British Museum Library in London in 1972, so that systematic bibliographical coverage stopped in 1973, with the commencement of actual writing. Strict limitations of time and space imposed on the present publication have made it impossible to bring the bibliographical material up to date; however, several revisions and additions in my original material have been incorporated in this volume. Hopefully, in a future revised edition the bibliographical time-gap will be closed.

2. The text of this volume is written in English throughout. For the reader's convenience non-English texts mentioned and discussed are not actually quoted.

3. For the sake of methodological clarity a distinction is observed between "lingual," as the adjective of "language", and "linguistic", as the adjective of "linguistics". This practice, though not widely accepted, is in accordance with some leading dictionaries (e.g., the *SOD*).

4. Underlining is used for content-emphasis made by me, in my own and others' texts; CAPITALISATION is used for "block emphasis" (rules, definitions) and for "italics supplied" in quotations from the literature; *italics* are used for non-English words and names of books and periodicals.

5. References to the Bibliography are made by giving the number of the entry in square brackets, followed by page-number when necessary. Poetic examples are referred to the List of Poetic References (p.ii) through italicisation of the poet's surname, followed by page-number.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Professionally, I am most indebted to my teacher and colleague Prof. Benjamin Hrushovski for everything that I have acquired in poetics in general and in prosody in particular through his overall theoretical inspiration. I am likewise grateful to him for encouraging me to publish this book. I am also indebted to Dr. S. Rimmon for providing an underlying structure for a large part of my work; to all my friends at the Department of Poetics and Comparative Literature for their encouragement; and to Prof. Ruth Nevo, the late Prof. Lea Goldberg, Prof. E. Levenston, Prof. S. Malmström, and Dr. R. Tsur, who made helpful suggestions concerning earlier versions of this study.

Invaluable moral and material support was extended to me by senior colleagues who served terms of office as Chairmen of my university department (Professors Hrushovski, I. Even-Zohar, the late J. Haephrati and Dr. M. Sternberg), as well as by Professors D. Fineman, S. Perlman and H. Shaked as Deans of the Faculty of Humanities. Mrs. Hanna Shlomi, former Secretary of the Faculty, did humanly everything possible to make my working-life as human as possible. I am likewise grateful to Lesley Birtles, Rachel Shabaton and Shoni Hanft for their assistance, particularly in connection with preparing the manuscript.

Members of my family have given me indispensable help and support: Mrs. Shifra Cohen, the late Mrs. Leah Pekeris and Mr. Harry Rosen. Above all I am grateful to my wife, Abigail, without whose devotion and active partnership my entire work would be inconceivable.

*Tel-Aviv University,
Spring 1979*

H.G.

C O N T E N T S

1. INTRODUCTION: TOPIC, OUTLINE AND SCOPE OF THE PRESENT STUDY

1.1. A STATEMENT OF THE TOPIC	1
1.2. THE VERSE-LINE: PRELIMINARY REMARKS	1
1.2.1. The Verse-Line as an Auditory Unit	2
1.2.2. Poetic Lineation and Lingual Intonation	3
1.2.3. Comparability of Poetic and Lingual Segments	5
1.2.4. Poetic Lineation and Syntactic Segmentation: Congruity and Discrepancy	7
1.2.5. Cases of Discrepancy: Enjambment and Caesura	8
1.3. SCOPE, PROCEDURE AND OUTLINE OF THE PRESENT STUDY	11
1.3.1. Topics and Contexts Pertaining to the Study of Enjambment	11
1.3.2. Delimiting the Topics Directly Relevant to the Study of Enjambment	14
1.3.3. The Aims of a Comprehensive Theory of Enjambment	14
1.3.4. Limitations Imposed on the Present Study: The Syntactic Focus	16
1.3.5. A General Structural Outline of the Present Study	19
1.3.6. A General Thematic Outline of the Present Study	20

2. THE NATURE OF ENJAMBMENT: A SURVEY OF DEFINITION PROBLEMS

2.0. AN EXPOSITION OF THE PRESENT CHAPTER	22
---	----

2.0.1. Preliminary	22
2.0.2. The Present Chapter in the General Framework of the Study	22
2.0.3. The Major Questions Discussed in the Present Chapter	23
2.1. MAJOR APPROACHES TO THE DEFINITION OF ENJAMBMENT	23
2.1.1. A Selection of Definitions of Enjambment	23
2.1.2. A Schematised Condensation of the Definitions	25
2.1.3. The Concepts of Metre and Verse-Line in the Definitions	26
2.1.4. The Concepts of Syntax and Meaning in the Definitions	27
2.1.5. Intonation in the Definition	28
2.1.6. The Quoted Definitions: Conclusion	30
2.2. INTONATION AND ITS CONTRIBUTION TO THE DEFINITION CONFUSION	30
2.2.0. A Note about the Use of the Term "Intonation" in the Present Study	30
2.2.1. Intonation: An <i>ad hoc</i> Working Definition	31
2.2.2. Intonation as an Obstacle to a Definition of Enjambment	32
2.2.2.1. <i>Structural and Functional Complexities in Intonation</i>	32
2.2.2.2. <i>Intonation in the Written Text: Chatman's "Oral Performance Fallacy"</i>	34
2.2.3. Intonation in Enjambment Definition: Concluding Remarks	37

2.3. HOW TO DEFINE ENJAMBMENT?	38
2.3.1. Geoffrey N. Leech's Breakthrough	38
2.3.2. A New Definition of Enjambment	41
2.3.3. Implications of the Proposed Definition: Questions and Perspectives	41
<u>3. A "STATIC" AND FUNCTIONAL VIEW OF THE SYNTACTIC COMPONENT OF ENJAMBMENT: CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE PROFESSIONAL LITERATURE</u>	
3.0. EXPOSITION OF THE PRESENT CHAPTER	43
3.0.1. Preliminary	43
3.0.2. The Professional Literature and Pause-Desirability: Problems of Applicability	44
3.0.3. Major Questions Discussed in the Present Chapter	45
3.1. THE SYNTACTIC MICRO-UNIT	46
3.1.1. Definitions and Distinctions	46
3.1.2. The SMIU-SMAU Dichotomy: Implications and Reservations	47
3.1.3. Conclusion	49
3.2. SYNTACTIC-INTONATIONAL COHESION (<i>SIC</i>)	50
3.2.1. Approaches to the Concept of Cohesion	50
3.2.2. A Target-Theory of Syntactic-Intonational Cohesion: Major Aims	55
3.2.3. A Target-Theory of SIC: Problems and Perspectives	57
3.2.4. The "Static" Nature of SMIU and SIC: Concluding Remarks	59

3.3. POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTION OF SYNTACTIC THEORIES TO A THEORY OF <i>SIC</i>	60
3.3.0. Preliminary	60
3.3.1. Traditional Grammar	61
3.3.2. Immediate Constituent (IC) Analysis	63
3.3.3. "The Chomskyan Revolution" and Enjambment, or: "Why Generative Grammar Does Not Help"	65
3.3.4. Conclusion	68
3.4. INTERRELATIONS BETWEEN LINGUISTICS AND POETICS: IMPLICATIONS CONCERNING THE STUDY OF ENJAMBMENT	68
3.4.1. The Tasks of Linguistics and the Needs of Poetics: The General Problem	68
3.4.2. A Particular Problem: "Static" versus "Dynamic" Approaches to Syntax	70
3.4.3. Conclusion	75
3.5. POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTION OF SOME STUDIES IN POETICS TO A THEORY OF <i>SIC</i>	76
3.5.0. Preliminary	76
3.5.1. Roger Fowler's "Scale for Enjambment"	77
3.5.2. Kiril Taranovski's Treatment of Enjambment Classification	83
3.5.3. Poetics and <i>SIC</i> Theory: Concluding Remarks	92
3.6. THE STATIC AND FUNCTIONAL VIEW OF SYNTAX: A BRIEF RECAPITULATION OF FAULTS AND MERITS	92
4. <u>SYNTACTIC LENGTH (<i>SL</i>) AND ENJAMBMENT</u>	
4.0. EXPOSITION OF THE PRESENT CHAPTER	95

4.0.1. Preliminary	95
4.0.2. Basic Problems in Discussing SL	96
4.0.3. Major Questions Discussed in the Present Chapter	98
4.1. FROM STATIC TO DYNAMIC: BEYOND THE TRADITIONAL APPROACH	98
4.1.1. The Concepts of <i>rejet</i> and <i>contre-rejet</i> , Their Advantages and Limitations	98
4.1.2. A Dynamic Complementary to a Static Distinction: The PR/PCR Dichotomy	101
4.2. SMIU-TENSION AND SL'S CONTRIBUTION TO IT	103
4.2.1. SMIU-Tension: A Preliminary Presentation of the Concept	103
4.2.2. The Contribution of SL to SMIU-Tension	104
5. <u>A "DYNAMIC" VIEW OF THE "FUNCTIONAL-SYNTACTIC"</u> <u>COMPONENT OF ENJAMBMENT</u>	
5.0. EXPOSITION OF THE PRESENT CHAPTER	107
5.0.1. Preliminary	107
5.0.2. Nature and Scope of the Discussion in the Present Chapter	108
5.0.3. Problems of Bibliographical References and Poetic Illustrations in the Present Chapter	109
5.0.4. Major Questions Discussed in the Present Chapter	110
5.1. TOWARDS A PARAMETRIC THEORY OF SMIU-TENSION	110
5.1.1. Tension: A Psychointonational Feature of all Utterances	110
5.1.1.1. <i>The Nature of Intonational Tension</i>	110

5.1.1.2.	<i>A Preliminary Mapping of the Field of Intonational Tension: The Main Parameters Operating in All Lingual Utterances</i>	113
5.1.1.3.	<i>Further Mapping of the Field: Parameters Operating in Poetic Texts Only</i>	115
5.1.1.4.	<i>Concluding Remarks on the List of Parameters</i>	116
5.1.2.	SMIU-Tension and its Major Parameters	119
5.1.2.1.	<i>Syntactic Expectation: Anticipation vs. Openness</i>	119
5.1.2.2.	<i>Introducing the Concept of SMIU-Anticipation</i>	123
5.1.2.3.	<i>Towards a Theory of SMIU-Anticipation</i>	125
5.1.3.	SMIU-Tension: A Tentative Conclusion	130
5.2.	PSYCHOLINGUISTICS AND THE STUDY OF SMIU-TENSION AND ENJAMBMENT	130
5.2.0.	Preliminary	130
5.2.1.	Psycholinguistic Research and Its Relevance to the Study of Tension	131
5.2.2.	The Psycholinguistic Approach to Guessing and Predictability and the Proposed Concept of SMIU-Anticipation	134
5.2.3.	The Psycholinguistic Study of Hesitation Pauses and the Concept of SMIU-Tension	136
5.2.4.	The Psycholinguistic Concept of Sentence Depth and its Relevance to the Study of SMIU-Tension	140
5.2.5.	Psycholinguistics, Psychopoetics and Interdisciplinary Research: A Note on Prospects and Perspectives	147
5.2.6.	Conclusion	150
5.3.	A SKELETON-THEORY OF SMIU-TENSION	151

5.3.1. The Problem: A Recapitulation	151
5.3.2. The Skeleton Theory of SMIU-Tension	152
5.3.3. Hierarchies and Interrelationships among Types of Syntactic Expectation: An Illustration	153
5.3.4. SMIU-Tension Theory: Concluding Remarks	157
5.4. SMAU-TENSION AND ENJAMBMENT: THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE FUNCTIONAL PARAMETER OF SMAU-ANTICIPATION	158
5.4.1. Anticipation-Governed SMAU-Tension as a Background for Enjambment: A Preliminary Theoretical Presentation Based on an Illustration from a Poem by John Donne	158
5.4.1.0. <i>The Poem Introduced</i>	158
5.4.1.1. <i>First Enjambment</i>	159
5.4.1.2. <i>Second Enjambment</i>	161
5.4.1.3. <i>Third Enjambment</i>	162
5.4.1.4. <i>SMAU-Anticipation as a Three-Phase Phenomenon</i>	164
5.4.1.5. <i>The Poem's Third Enjambment Against the Background of Its SMAU-Anticipation Design</i>	168
5.4.2. SMAU-Anticipation: A Further Characterisation of the Phenomenon, with an Illustration from a Poem by Walt Whitman	171
5.4.2.0. <i>SMAU-Anticipation in the Present Study</i>	171
5.4.2.1. <i>An Example, A Poem by Walt Whitman, Introduced</i>	173
5.4.2.2. <i>The Nature and Location of SMAU-Anticipation: A Skeleton Theory</i>	174
5.4.3. Conclusion	178
5.5. THE CONTRIBUTION OF SL TO SMAU-TENSION	178
5.5.0. SMAU-SL: An Introduction	178

5.5.1. The Anticipational Curve: "The Parabola Principle"	179
5.5.2. "Initial Syntactic Completeness": The Straight Descending Line	182
5.5.3. Conclusion	183
5.6. PUNCTUATION, SYNTACTIC INTONATION, SEGMENTATIONAL AMBIGUITY, AND THE PERCEPTION OF ENJAMBMENT	184
5.6.1. The Syntactic Function of Punctuation and Syntactic Intonation	184
5.6.2. Segmentational Ambiguity and the Theory of Literature: An Excursus on Simultaneity and Jakobson's "Poetic Function"	189
5.6.3. Segmentational Ambiguity and Punctuation- Manipulation at Work: An Illustration from a Poem by T.S. Eliot	192
5.6.4. Punctuation in the Service of Syntax and Intonation: The Practice of Walt Whitman	203
5.6.5. Interrelations between Word-Sequence and Punctuation and the Problem of Syntactic Anticipation: A Further Whitman Example	208
5.6.6. Conclusion	212
5.7. <i>SMAU</i> -TENSION AS A PROSPECTIVE-DYNAMIC CONCEPT: CONCLUDING REMARKS	214
5.8. THE RETROSPECTIVE ASPECT OF THE DYNAMIC APPROACH	215
5.8.0. The Retrospective and the Prospective as Complementary Aspects of the Dynamic Approach to the Syntax of Enjambment	215
5.8.1. Prospective and Retrospective Enjambments and End-Stopped Lines	216

5.8.2. Retrospective Recognition of Segmentational Ambiguity and the Integrity of the Line-Unit	221
5.8.3. Conclusion	230
5.9. SYNTACTIC TENSION AT LINE-END: CONCLUSION	230
5.9.1. The Syntactically Incomplete Poem: An Excursus	230
5.9.2. Summarising the Dynamic Approaches to the Syntactic Dimension of Enjambment: A Schematic Table of Syntactic Tension at the End of a Poetic Segment	233
6. <u>NONSYNTACTIC DIMENSIONS OF ENJAMBMENT: A SURVEY</u>	
6.0. AN EXPOSITION OF THE PRESENT CHAPTER	236
6.0.1. Preliminary	236
6.0.2. The Major Questions Discussed in the Present Chapter	236
6.1. PROSODIC ASPECTS OF ENJAMBMENT	237
6.1.1. Nonmetrical Rhythmical Aspects	237
6.1.2. Concerning the Metrical Aspect of Enjambment	238
6.1.2.1. <i>The Contribution of Metrical Regularity at the Transition between Lines to Enjambment</i>	238
6.1.2.2. <i>"Straddled Lines" and Enjambment</i>	240
6.1.3. A Note on Rhyme and Sound Pattern in Relation to Enjambment	241
6.2. ENJAMBMENT, INTONATION, AND THE PROBLEM OF ORAL RENDITION	243
6.2.1. The "Purely Intonational" Aspect of the Oral and/or Auditory Interpretation of Enjambment	243

6.2.2. "The Residue Theory": The Hierarchy between Syntactic and Semantic Roles of Intonation	24
6.2.3. "The Residue Theory" and Enjambment	25
6.2.4. A Note on the Problem of Tempo in the Oral Rendition of Poetry and a Survey of Its Treatment in the Professional Literature	25
6.3. SEMANTIC ASPECTS OF ENJAMBMENT	25
6.3.1. Semantic Tension: Semantic Contribution to SMIU-Tension	25
6.3.2. The Interaction between Enjambment and Literary Interpretation	25
6.3.3. Enjambment and Literary Semantics: Wider Semiotic Perspectives	26
6.4. CONCLUSION	26
7. <u>A SYNTACTICALLY-ORIENTED APPROACH TO LINE-END INTONATIONAL TENSION AND ENJAMBMENT: A THEORETICAL OUTLINE</u>	
7.1. THE NATURE OF ENJAMBMENT: A PRELIMINARY OVERVIEW	26
7.2. A "STATIC" AND FUNCTIONAL VIEW OF THE SYNTACTIC COMPONENT OF ENJAMBMENT	27
7.3. SYNTACTIC LENGTH (<i>SL</i>) AND ENJAMBMENT	28
7.4. THE DYNAMIC APPROACH TO ENJAMBMENT: SMIU-TENSION AND RELATED CONCEPTS	28
7.5. <i>SMAU</i> - TENSION: AN ACTIVE BACKGROUND FOR ENJAMBMENT	28
7.6. PUNCTUATION, SYNTACTIC INTONATION AND ENJAMBMENT	29
7.7. THE RETROSPECTIVE ASPECT OF THE DYNAMIC APPROACH	29
7.8. SYNTACTIC TENSION AT LINE-END: CONCLUSION	29

7.9. PROSODIC ASPECTS OF ENJAMBMENT	295
7.10. INTONATION AND ORAL RENDITION	296
7.11. SEMANTIC ASPECTS OF ENJAMBMENT	298
7.12. ENJAMBMENT BETWEEN POETRY AND PROSE	299
7.13. WIDER PERSPECTIVES: CONCLUDING REMARKS	300

8. APPENDIX: SOME EFFECTS AND FUNCTIONS
OF ENJAMBMENT IN SHAKESPEARE'S *KING LEAR*

8.1. ACCELERATION AND RETARDATION	301
8.2. ORGANISATION OF EMPHASES	303
8.3. LEVELLING OF STRESSES AND PAUSES	304
8.4. ENJAMBMENT AND DRAMATIC EXPRESSION	304
8.5. NONFUNCTIONAL ENJAMBMENTS	306
8.6. ENJAMBMENTS AND CHARACTERISATION	307
8.7. ENJAMBMENT SUBTLETIES	308

BIBLIOGRAPHY

LIST OF POETIC REFERENCES	ii
ENGLISH BIBLIOGRAPHY	iii
RUSSIAN BIBLIOGRAPHY	xxxviii

<u>INDEX</u>	xliii
--------------	-------

1. INTRODUCTION:¹ TOPIC, OUTLINE AND SCOPE OF THE PRESENT STUDY

1.1. A STATEMENT OF THE TOPIC

The present study is concerned with the run-on line, or enjambment, as a central phenomenon in the relationships between intonation, syntactic segmentation and lineation (i.e., line-division) in poetry. It attempts a systematic analysis of the major theoretical and methodological aspects of this phenomenon, with the purpose of proposing a theory of enjambment, inasmuch as such a theory can be proposed in view of both the inherent complexity and evasiveness of the relevant phenomena and the limitations of contemporary linguistic and literary scholarship. For reasons given below (see 1.3.4), the approach of the present study to the theory of enjambment is predominantly syntactic; however, all matters relevant to the investigation of enjambment, syntactic and nonsyntactic alike, are surveyed in outline at some point in the study.

1.2. THE VERSE-LINE: PRELIMINARY REMARKS

The importance of the verse-line as a uniquely characteristic feature of poetry has been recognised by many a scholar.² For some, lineation — i.e., the division of poetic texts into verse-lines — is the *differentia specifica* of poetry; at any rate, it is considered by broad scholarly consensus as the most obvious distinctive feature of poetry, common to virtually all texts that are traditionally accepted as "poetic". It is a basic premise of the present study, then, that any contribution to a theory of

¹ The introduction inevitably abounds in basic truisms, that cannot be traced and attributed to any scholar in particular.

² E.g., Beardsley ([39], 233-235); Hrushovski ([247], 186); Stutterheim [486]; Tomaševskij ([574], 71-73; [577], 297-299; [576], 21); Smith ([465], 88).

lineation is a contribution to a theory of "poeticalness" ("poet" in this study refers to "versified" poetry).

1.2.1. The Verse-Line as an Auditory Unit.

The term "verse-line" refers to a graphic phenomenon, perceived by the reader's eye; yet, like most other graphic phenomena in written language, it is a visual symbol standing for an auditory phenomenon, perceivable by a listener's ear. This contention is not invalidated by the existence of poems, particularly modern ones, in which visual properties of verse-lines play a structural role in the organisation of the text (e.g., in some famous poems by Cummings; see Babcock [25]). Such "visual" organisation, interesting and provocative as it may be, is definitely the exception rather than the rule in relation to the mainstream of poetic history; and since the present study is concerned with the employment of line-division as a characteristic feature of poetry, verse-lines will be regarded here as graphic-visual representations of auditory-intonational segments, rather than as graphically viable units.

This view of the verse-line is prevalent in the literature. Thus, for instance, Tomaševskij ([577], 297) describes the verse-line as "an intonational segment". He and some other Russian formalists,³ backed by later scholars,⁴ stress the potential influence of line-division on the intonation-curve of the entire text of a poem; most of them, however, lay special stress on the changes in intonation that take place at one, or both, of the ends of a poetic line as a result of the specific line-division chosen by the poet.

³ E.g., Žirmunskij ([551], 176-178; English translation in [537], 164-166); Ėjxenbaum ([588], 6); Tynjanov ([578], 102-103

⁴ E.g., Hrushovski ([247], 186); Nowotny ([382], 21); Kell ([278], 342-344); Leech ([303], 124); and many others.

In reading or analysing a poem, one can study the workings of lineation either by altering it, juxtaposing the original text with hypothetical alternative lineations of the same word-sequence, or by ignoring it, i.e., by regarding the text as if it were written as prose. The latter practice is describable as reconstructing the "raw-material" of poetic lineation; this raw-material will henceforth be called "the unversified text" or "the preversified text". The juxtaposition of the versified poem with its preversified text isolates the contribution of lineation to the total effect of a poem; this contribution may result in "striking" differences (see Hrushovski [247], 186).

1.2.2. Poetic Lineation and Lingual Intonation.

All scholars agree that the intonational changes caused by poetic lineation are not uniform. These changes may appear as pauses, emphases, prolongations of (usually stressed or word-final) syllables, pitch variations, etc.; but varied as they are, they can all be labelled as "junctures" (see Trager & Smith [501] for a linguistic presentation of the term; Chatman [78], Childs [88], Stoehr [483] and Whitehall [523] can be cited as some of the attempts to apply this term to poetic analysis).

Junctures and intonation contours are closely linked with syntax.⁵ In fact, they are the only means at the speaker's disposal (in the course of oral communication) to signal syntactic structures and relationships. The main, basic junctures occur in ordinary speech as a result of syntactic structures, and are almost automatically decoded by the addressee as conveying the division of the text into syntactically determined segments. Poetic lineation, then, by adding and changing junctures and

⁵ This statement is so much of a truism that it need not be supported by references. Suffice it to say that any study of the topic either makes such a statement or takes it for granted. (See, for instance, Hans Kurath ([292], 126).

affecting intonation contours, invades a predominantly syntactic territory.

Intonation, however, is not determined by syntax alone. It also reflects semantic properties of the text, notably the speaker's emotions and attitudes. Indeed, this capacity of intonation is one of the main advantages of actual speech, compared to written language.

The relationships between syntactic structures and intonation contours are quite complex even when viewed in isolation, and all the more so when the semantic dimension is added to complicate the picture. In fact, if intonation appears to be a complicated, obscure and evasive phenomenon, and its study an almost Sisyphean task (see 2.2.2.1 below), it is mainly because of its semantic dimension.⁶

Poetic lineation, through its influence on intonation, sometimes affects the semantic message of the poem. This is achieved either by suggesting changes in syntactic segmentation and the hierarchies of immediate constituents, compared to the same text written as prose (such changes are invariably semantic as well as syntactic), or by suggesting deviations from the "normal" distribution of junctures within the sentence without any change in syntactic relationships between its constituents (such changes are purely semantic). Lineation, then, can be regarded as a device which helps written language approach spoken language in its capacity to convey syntactic structures, cognitive meanings and emotive attitudes through intonation. The flow of rhythm and intonation is segmented in poetry, just as in all other utterances, according to the laws of grammar; but, in addition, it is also segmented into verse-lines. The latter type of segmentation

⁶ In recent years a few serious attempts have been made to come to grips with this complex problem. See Chapters 2 and 6 for a fuller discussion.

is determined by the poet's own decision, and for poetic and aesthetic purposes; but it is often subject to conventions determined by genre, and/or period, and/or "trend" or "school" of poetry, etc.

Lineation, then, does not supplant syntactic segmentation, but rather supplements it, sharing with it the domain of intonation in some sort of dynamic coexistence.⁷ The present study sets out to examine the nature of this coexistence, which is a crucial factor in the specificness of poetry.

1.2.3. Comparability of Poetic and Lingual Segments.

Verse-line/syntax relationships are part of the hierarchy of the rhythmical relationships between comparable lingual and poetic segment-units. The term "comparable" refers to the approximate size of the unit in question, implying thereby that segmental units of rhythmical organisation in poetry are similar in size to certain segmental units in ordinary language. Schematically, the

⁷ Such a line of argument as offered here concerning lingual vs. poetic levels of organisation is encountered with increasing frequency in the literature. Thus, for example, Hrushovski ([246], 119): "[...] metrical structure (like other poetic devices) may or may not utilize a distinction made by the language, but it must not run counter to such a distinction"; or, more directly relevant to our particular topic, Fowler ([154], 143):

Verse is language with additional formal constraints; it is nevertheless language and embodies not only the formal restrictions of metre, [and, we may add, of lineation] but also characteristics which are necessary to the syntax and vocabulary of the occurring sentences whether or not the sentences are contrived to make a poem.

A similar, though much more general, point is made by Chatman ([84], xi): "[Poetry] is a message, an act of language, and [...] like other messages it follows the ordinary rules".

Statements in the same vein can be found in Russian scholarship as well (e.g., Timofeev [571], 29; Tomaševskij [576], 27-29). See also Fenyo [137].

following table can summarise the matter:

Lingual Units	Comparable Poetic Units
Word	Foot
Clause or sentence	Verse-line
Paragraph ⁸	Stanza

Poetic segments are often arbitrarily cut and separated from each other within the continuum of the text, so that it is incomparably easier to talk about them in theoretical and analytical contexts than to show if and how they actually exist in a poem. This reservation applies especially to the foot,⁹ although the verse-line itself is not always easily established as a nongraphic unit.

⁸ This is perhaps an unfortunate term and "period" might be preferable. Any language-unit larger than the sentence is very difficult to describe and discuss, because linguistic science has so far dealt inadequately with the complicated problems posed by such units.

The whole "size-comparability" concept is in basic agreement with Fowler's line of thought in [150], especially pp. 84-85. Similar ideas were expressed much earlier in some Russian works (e.g., Žirmunskij [551] and Tomaševskij [577]).

⁹ This traditional concept has been subject to much controversy, and no less confusion, at least in Anglo-American scholarship of the last two decades. It came under heavy attack, especially from linguistic quarters, both from the "Trager & Smith camp" (e.g., Whitehall [523], Hawkes [223], Nist [378] and other and the "Generative-Transformational camp" (e.g., Halle and Keyser [207]), each faction of linguists using their typical argumentative weapons. The "foot" concept was also defended, with no less vigour and fighting spirit, by some scholars, and taken for granted by others (e.g., Wimsatt and Beardsley [533], Wimsatt [532], Gross [196], Fowler [152] and [154], and many others). While not subscribing to each and every argument of the latter group, I recognise the usefulness of the foot as a theoretical construct, that has a definite reality in actual poetry because of the conscious and unconscious habits and expectations of poets and readers alike. Therefore, the term will be used in the present study whenever necessary.

At any rate, at least as far as the speaker's consciousness is concerned, whenever a discord occurs between a lingual segmentation and a poetic one, the former generally gets the upper hand. This is a direct consequence of its being of a more "natural", "primary" character, as opposed to the comparatively "artificial", "arbitrary" nature of its poetic counterpart.¹⁰ An educated reader would hardly ever pause in his reading in the middle of a word just because it happens to be a foot-boundary, but would not hesitate to ignore the foot as a unit and make a pause, when necessary, at the end of a word. Basically, the same applies to the relations between syntactic segmentation and poetic lineation, but much more loosely, as will be seen below (see 6.2.1); traditionally, lineation (in its conflict with syntax) is much more influential than division into feet (in its conflict with the word-unit), as far as the oral interpretation of poetry is concerned: "outside interference" with the curve of syntactic junctures and emphases is much more tolerable than such interference with the discreteness and integrity of the single word.

1.2.4. Poetic Lineation and Syntactic Segmentation: Congruity and Discrepancy.

Poetic lineation and syntactic segmentation, being two independent systems of segmentation operating simultaneously on the same text, can produce identical or nonidentical segments.

¹⁰See note 7 above. The situation in actual literary texts, however, may be much more complex. It is the invariably-unique interaction of diverse, heterogeneous factors at a given point in a given text which determines which of the conflicting systems of segmentation will be dominant in that particular instance.

Moreover, the very concept of dominance in this context is problematic. Dominance of one type of segmentation over the other does not work in terms of a binary opposition but in terms of a polar one, where a given instance can be anything between the two extreme poles of total subordination of one segmentation to the other.

In the former case we can speak of congruity, in the latter — of discrepancy. Cases of complete congruity are of limited interest for the purpose of this study, because perceiving units as different and distinct from each other is a precondition for any study of their interrelations. One cannot weigh verse-lines against syntactic segments and analyse their interactions unless one can clearly differentiate between the separate workings of the two. It seems more instructive, then, to study discrepancy rather than congruity.¹¹

1.2.5. Cases of Discrepancy: Enjambment and Caesura.

Theoretically, there are two basic types of discrepancy: either the syntactically determined segmental unit is broken by a line-end, or vice-versa. For the former case the French term *enjambement* is usually used (the accepted Anglicised form, "enjambment", is used throughout this study); in English it is also commonly referred to as "run-on line".¹² The latter case is usually termed "caesura".¹³

The middle of a poetic line, other things being equal, is as

¹¹Cases of congruity, to be sure, may well be very interesting, both in their own right and in comparison to cases of discrepancy. Some striking effects of totality and finality, or of abruptness and incompleteness, or of still some other nature, may result from the joint forces of the various systems of segmentation working together. But in a scholarly study that attempts, as does this one, to investigate the features of the poetic line as such, discrepancy is much more useful as a focus of interest.

¹²I have deliberately described enjambment loosely for the purpose of the Introduction (see note 1 above). Problems of definition of this phenomenon will be discussed more rigorously in Chapter 2, and my own position will become clearer and more committed. I should like to make it absolutely clear from the start, however, that the exclusively syntactic view of enjambment implied here is an oversimplification of this complex phenomenon.

¹³I am using the term in the "English", i.e., the broadest, sense (any intralinear break), rather than in the narrow, "French" one.

a rule "weaker", or less prominent, than its boundary: the most telling point of a line as a discrete unit is its boundary. This hierarchy is absolute, regardless of the degree of integrity or autonomy of any particular line: whether a line is "strong" (i.e., strictly organised prosodically, articulated syntactically, self-sufficient semantically, etc.) or "weak" (i.e., devoid of these centripetal forces), in the "trial of strength" between the boundary and the middle the former is always relatively stronger. In the process of formal recognition of line units, line boundaries are first to be noticed, last to be ignored.

This hierarchy is not unique to the poetic line: it is a general feature of the "framing effect" as discussed by Barbara Herrnstein Smith [465]. In comparison with the boundaries of other segmental units in nonpoetic language, however, line boundaries have an additional function: more than any other type of single point in the text, they demonstrate the "arbitrary", man-made nature of the poetic line and the creative and organising presence of the poet. Line boundaries are, then, extremely important exponents of the poetry-making nature of verse-lines.

To recapitulate: "other things being equal", (a) boundaries of segmental units are more prominent than their middle, and (b) lingually-determined segmental units (and, of course, their boundaries) are more dominant than poetically- or aesthetically-determined ones (see 1.2.3 above). Therefore, it is the study of enjambment, rather than the study of caesura, which is methodologically preferable as an approach to the investigation of the verse-line as a unit. In the caesura the strong point (the boundary) of the stronger unit (the syntactic segment) is balanced against the weak point (the middle) of the weaker unit (the verse-line). In enjambment, of course, the reverse happens: it is the weak point (the middle) of the strong unit (the syntactic segment) which is balanced against the strong point (the boundary)

of the weaker unit (the verse-line).¹⁴ In the case of the caesura the line is quite likely to fall apart, or disintegrate, unable to resist single-handed the centrifugal forces of syntax. If it does hold together, in spite of an intralinear syntactic break, this invariably happens because of some additional factor or factors working together with the line against the strong centrifugal pressures of syntax. In assessing the resistance of a line to the centrifugal force of a syntactic caesura,¹⁵ then, what we are really testing is not the cohesiveness of the line unit as such, but rather its metre or some other form or convention of repetition, parallelism, patterning of sound or grammar, and the like. That is why in irregular, "free" verse, if the line is both broken by caesura¹⁶ and lacking line-rein-

¹⁴I am dealing here with the theory of formal relationships between syntactic segments and verse-lines, and am fully aware of the oversimplified nature of my argument as compared to any full description of what actually happens in an actual "verse-instance" (to use Roman Jakobson's term; see [260], 364). At this stage I have deliberately ignored several important inertia-making and inertia-breaking factors and variables at all levels of perception and analysis (e.g., metre and rhyme, segment-length, functional syntactic relationships, semantic content and structure, etc.; see a tentative list of relevant parameters in 5.1.1.2 and 5.1.1.3). Most of these are actively present, in one form or another, in all poetic texts, contributing greatly to the characteristic "semantic density" and complexity of poetry. Ignoring them almost renders my argument meaningless, but not quite. The argument is correct as regards the isolated workings of the line-units and the syntactic segments; these workings are always there in actual instances, but the variables just mentioned often modify, or even reverse, the total effect.

¹⁵The formidable question of whether and how this "resistance", and similar phenomena, can be objectively assessed and tested will be discussed in greater length at various points throughout the present study, especially in Chapters 3 and 5.

¹⁶I am referring here to caesuras distributed freely, and hence unexpectedly, in the text. Regular caesuras (in the strict, "French" sense of the word), being predictable at a specific point in the line, tend to work at cross purposes with themselves, as it were. They both weaken the line by splitting it and strengthen it by their regularity, establishing a hierarchy

forcing devices of any kind, its cohesiveness is close to nil. To sum up, the study of caesura is an unsafe approach to the study of the uniqueness of the poetic line, since by adopting it one runs the risk of mistaking line-reinforcing devices for the line which they reinforce.

No risk of this nature, however, is posed by the study of enjambment. Here it is the line as such, represented by its most prominent exponent, its boundary, which is in operation against the stronger forces of syntax. Enjambment, then, is the most genuine "trial of strength" for the verse-line. Any theory of enjambment is a theory of the verse-line in a nutshell; and any theory of the verse-line must ultimately be focused on a theory of enjambment.

Working on these premises, the present study is almost exclusively confined to the theoretical and methodological investigation of enjambment. It is postulated, however, that the implications of such an investigation are bound to transcend the limits of its narrow topic and contribute to the understanding of the specificness of poetry. Enjambment is viewed as a test case for the general problem of interrelationships between rules and units of language on the one hand and the forms and conventions of poetry on the other.

1.3. SCOPE, PROCEDURE AND OUTLINE OF THE PRESENT STUDY

1.3.1. Topics and Contexts Pertaining to the Study of Enjambment.

Enjambment appears to be a very narrow and limited phenomenon. This impression is due to several reasons: (1) Like rhymes, enjambments constitute a "minority group", being confined, by defi-

of regular units and subunits. This point is discussed at somewhat greater length in Golomb and Perry [190].

dition, to line-ends. Line-ends are, of course, a statistically negligible minority of the poem's phonetic material. (2) It is never obligatory to employ enjambments in any specified number in a poem, nor is there a poetic form (like the sonnet, for instance) which requires the distribution of enjambments according to a predetermined scheme (such as the distribution of metrical accents in metre, or the distribution of rhyming words in many rhyme schemes). (3) The frequency of enjambments in literary texts varies from work to work, from poet to poet, from genre to genre, and from period to period. Only in a certain number of cases can they be regarded as a locally significant phenomenon, rather than as a norm or convention of a genre, period, etc.

Enjambment is, then, a quantitatively insignificant phenomenon in poetry as a whole; whenever it does occur, it occupies a short span of printing space and reading time. Its significance lies not in its size or frequency, but in its very nature, as described by Roman Jakobson ([260], 365): "[...] even a vehement accumulation of enjambments never hides their digressive, variational status; they always set off the normal¹⁷ coincidence of syntactic pause and pausal intonation with the metrical limit."

Roman Jakobson's brief and suggestive remarks were made

¹⁷Jakobson's use of the word "normal" calls for the reader's attention: it implies the hierarchy between lingual and poetic segmentations as outlined in 1.2.3. Compare with similar uses of the word "normal", such as Hollander's "normal correspondence" between syntax and line structure ([239], 119), and Leech's statement: "congruity [between verse-line and syntactic units] is treated as the normal, and enjambment as the marked, or abnormal state of affairs" ([303], 123).

This approach is in general agreement with quite a few additional statements, such as Žirmunskij's "artistically planned dissonance" ([537], 164; Russian original [551], 178). The attitude underlying all these statements was perhaps most strikingly expressed by Roman Jakobson ([594], 16), describing poetry as "organised violence committed on ordinary speech" (translated and quoted by Victor Erlich [132], 219).

within a specific context; his reference to enjambment is clearly designed to serve as a demonstration or illustration of his ideas about the nature of poetic structures and devices in general. In the present context, though, where enjambment is the central topic of discussion and investigation, Jakobson's remarks deserve some elaboration.

Jakobson mentions the concepts of syntax, intonation and metre in relation to enjambment. To this one can, or rather must, add the concepts of verse-line (which is much more essential and obligatory than metre) and meaning. Enjambment, just like rhyme, is a classical example of what Benjamin Hrushovski terms "A junction of heterogeneous contexts".¹⁸ Narrow and limited as it is, enjambment tests the relative strength of extremely wide and complex components of poetic language by making them collide and interact; and it has to be borne in mind that each of these components — poetic lineation, rhythm and (frequently but not obligatorily) metre, intonation, syntax, and, above all, meaning — has quite a few contexts and aspects of its own.

Indeed, all the components and aspects of poetic language just mentioned operate and interact, to a greater or lesser extent, everywhere in a poetic text; but enjambment throws them into relief and focuses the investigator's attention on their interaction.

The compactness of enjambment makes these interactions more intense and concentrated, and more easily observable; thus the theory and analysis of enjambment can benefit from, as well as

¹⁸In his courses and lectures, delivered in the Universities of Tel-Aviv and Jerusalem during the last two decades, he used this specific metaphor to describe an important aspect of the typical complexity of rhyme, developing and elaborating the views of Viktor Zirmunskij [549] on the subject. The more general notion of "junction" was applied by him to quite a few complex phenomena in literature.

contribute to, the theories of syntax, semantics, prosody (including metrics and all other branches of the study of sound and rhythm), intonation, and literary thematics and interpretation.

1.3.2. Delimiting the Topics Directly Relevant to the Study of Enjambment.

Paradoxically, some of the major difficulties inherent in enjambment as a subject for theoretical and analytical investigation result from the very same junction-like quality that makes it easily observable. Because of the disproportion between the "smallness" of enjambment and the enormous scope of each of its aspects and components, long excursions into the fields of syntax, prosody, intonation, and semantics appear almost inevitable in its study. Indeed, all these fields are indispensable to a theory of enjambment (if all of them are totally removed from the study of enjambment, the investigator is simply and literally left with nothing to investigate); yet a study of enjambment must include only those portions of syntactic, semantic, prosodic and intonational theory and research, that are directly relevant to the theory and analysis of enjambment.

1.3.3. The Aims of a Comprehensive Theory of Enjambment.

Ideally, the entire gamut of the phenomena explicitly and implicitly connected with enjambment should be enumerated, and then interrelationships described and explained, within the framework of a comprehensive theory of enjambment. The theory would ideally explain how enjambment is structured (i.e., how its various elements combine and interact to produce it), how it functions (i.e., how single enjambments interact with other components of a text to produce local effects in their vicinity and total effects of poems, and how enjambment in general, as a characteristic device in poetry, affects the nature of poems and poetry as a whole), and how its structure and its function have developed historically.

More specifically, some of the major aims of such a theory are as follows:

1. If cause-and-effect relationships between enjambment structures and functions can be found, the theory should trace functions and effects to their structural causes; if no such relationships can be found, the theory should explain why they cannot be found.

2. The theory should classify enjambments according to different structural and functional criteria (e.g., enjambments occurring where a syntactic break is more, or less, acceptable; enjambments accelerating or retarding the pace of reading; etc.), and account for the theoretical validity of these criteria.

3. It should supply the principles and criteria for classifying works and groups of works (works of a given period, genre, trend or school, the output of a poet, a single work) according to their characteristic employment of enjambment (this can be complemented by the reverse typology, classifying enjambment structures and/or enjambment functions according to their characteristic employment in works belonging to a period, a genre, etc.).

4. The theory should classify enjambments according to their thematic functions, whenever applicable (e.g., their use for comic effects, for characterisation in poetic drama, etc.).

5. The theory should describe and explain the historical traditions and practices in the oral interpretation of enjambment in reading poetry.

6. The theory should explain the history of enjambment against the background of the theories of the history of literature and the history of language.

7. The theory should account for constants and variables in the employment of enjambment in different literatures and languages, taking into account the influence of differences

between languages in this respect (with the application of the theory of translation).

8. Finally, the theory should explain how, and to what extent, the theoretical and analytical study of enjambment can contribute to the theoretical and analytical study of poetry and literature in general.

1.3.4. Limitations Imposed on the Present Study:
The Syntactic Focus.

My work on the present study can be described as a steady process of gradual realisation of the impracticability of the far-reaching ambitions of a comprehensive theory of enjambment as outlined in 1.3.3. The more acquainted I became with the professional literature and with poetic examples that I tried to analyse for the specific purposes of this study, the more certain I became that, at least in the present state of knowledge in literary, linguistic and psycholinguistic scholarship, most of the goals of a comprehensive theory of enjambment are unattainable (the reasons for this conclusion are spelled out in detail throughout the study). One by one the functional and historical implications of the theory of enjambment had to be abandoned. These implications are so extremely intricate and entangled, requiring so much pilot research, "making forays into unknown territory" (see Nowotny [382], 18), that each of them separately is a proper subject for a full-fledged theoretical, analytical and methodological inquiry, that is likely to be larger in scope than the present study. Moreover, the functional and historical aspects of enjambment theory cannot be studied systematically without a prior investigation of its structural aspects.

As in the case of almost any other systematic theory, it is a natural and direct approach to enjambment theory to begin by asking what enjambment is, what it is made of, what makes it what it is, etc., and only then to ask what roles it performs. Con-

centrating on the structural aspects of enjambment commits the theorists to an approach, that is less "purely and properly literary" and, relatively, more linguistically oriented. In a functional or historical study the object of investigation is the working of enjambment as an artistic device within a literary framework; in a structural study, however, the object of investigation is the way in which a poetic device is produced by the interaction between its components, that are in themselves lingual, rather than literary or poetic, phenomena.

Among these lingual components of enjambment the central focus of attention is syntax. Enjambment, as defined and described by most scholars (see Chapter 2 below), has an obvious and prominent syntactic aspect. Enjambment always gives the impression that line-end occurs at a point of syntactically motivated resistance to pause, i.e., at a point where the utterance has not met the minimal requirements of syntactic completeness and self-sufficiency (the validity and implications of this impression will be discussed in detail throughout Chapters 5 and 6). Moreover, syntax is a purely structural component of enjambment, whereas in semantics and intonation structural and functional considerations are almost inseparable.

There is a *prima facie* case, then, for beginning the theoretical investigation of the structure of enjambment with a discussion of its syntactic aspects, with special reference to problems of syntactic cohesion between words in sentences, syntactic tension sensed at different points along an utterance, etc. Since, to the best of my knowledge, such an investigation has never been carried out systematically, the study of the syntactic aspect of enjambment theory is not merely the beginning, or the point of departure, of this theory. The immediate and obvious relevance of syntax to any theory of the structure of

enjambment and the intensive treatment of syntax in the linguistic literature (however inapplicable to enjambment-theory this treatment may be) have made the investigation of the syntactic contribution to the structure of enjambment a full-fledged complicated study in its own right.

Another restriction imposed on the present study is that it tries to cope with the general theory of syntactic contribution to the single enjambment, rather than the "enjambmental" patterning of complete texts.

The present study, then, is a pilot-study in enjambment-theory. Its focus is inevitably syntactic: only after the basic syntactic problems of enjambment have been systematically studied and clarified (i.e., only after several investigations like the present one have been carried out) can the other aspects of enjambment theory be meaningfully investigated. The state of affairs in the professional literature makes it impossible to produce a definitive theory even in the narrow field of syntactic contribution to the structure of the single enjambment, which is relatively the most studied and the least complicated aspect of the general theory of enjambment.

The main practicable goals of the present study are: (a) to contribute to the mapping of the entire field; (b) to ask hitherto unasked questions (usually this is done without being able to supply the answers); (c) to appreciate the achievements and to expose the shortcomings of approaches to relevant topics in the professional literature; and (d) to suggest further perspectives in the pursuit of enjambment theory in the future. It is mainly within the context of the goal (d) that the nonsyntactic aspects of the topic are surveyed in Chapter 6. The main bulk of the study — Chapters 3-5 — consists of a syntactically-oriented investigation of the structure of enjambment and is usually approached with goals (a)-(c) in mind.

The verse-line is viewed as an intonational phenomenon, defined and articulated against the background of syntax which, through syntactic intonation, is the most directly relevant exponent of "ordinary (nonpoetic) language" in this context. The nonsyntactic aspects of enjambment and the verse-line are treated as complements to the central discussion of the syntactic ones; however, although they are marginal in relation to the present study's syntactic focus, their indispensability for the phenomena of verse-line and enjambment and for their "ideal", presently unattainable theory, is fully recognised. Whereas in the central syntactically-oriented discussion I have tried to cover the ground step by step, at least by asking questions, my treatment of the nonsyntactic aspects constitutes an overview, surveying important points, and pointing at perspectives of future research, without attempting to turn the isolated theoretical insights into a systematic theory that claims a complete coverage of its subject-matter.

1.3.5. A General Structural Outline of the Present Study.

All the chapters in the present study, except Chapter 1 (the present Introduction), are organised according to one master scheme. Every chapter begins with an Exposition, invariably numbered as Section 0 of the chapter (e.g., the Exposition of Chapter 3 is Section 3.0). This Exposition outlines the topics subsequently discussed in the chapter proper and always concludes with a subsection that enumerates the basic questions that the chapter tries to answer. These questions are numbered, and each section in the chapter is designed to answer the question that is numbered correspondingly in the preceding Exposition (e.g., in Chapter 5, Section 5.1 is designed to answer Question 1 posed at the conclusion of 5.0, which is the chapter's Exposition; Section 5.2 is supposed to answer Question 2 posed in 5.0, etc.).

1.3.6. A General Thematic Outline of the Present Study.

The study begins (in Chapter 2) with a discussion of the problem of defining enjambment, based on a detailed comparative analysis of several definitions prevalent in the literature. This discussion is concluded by a new definition of enjambment, adopted throughout the present study as a point of departure and as a constant frame of reference. The central concepts of the new definition are major landmarks in the thematic structure of the entire study: one of the aims of each chapter is to clarify one or more of these central concepts from the specific angle of the subject of that chapter.

As I have explained (in 1.3.4), the syntactic contribution to the structure of enjambment is the focus of the present study. Most of the substantive discussion of this central topic is carried out in Chapters 3, 4 and 5. These chapters mainly discuss syntactic potentials in the preversified text, although poetic examples are occasionally analysed in detail in order to juxtapose these potentials with the final effects of poetic organisation.

The discussion of syntactic contribution to enjambment is closely linked with the concept of readers' reaction to syntactic and intonational information conveyed through the written text. The dynamic approach to poetic syntax, developed primarily in Chapter 5,¹⁹ tries to reconstruct the syntactic and intonational

¹⁹The concepts "static" and "dynamic", as used in the present study (see explanations of the distinction in 3.0.2 and 3.4.2 below), are used within the conceptual framework introduced by the Russian Formalist and Czech Structuralist schools (especially in the work of Tynjanov and Mukařovský). This general approach, stressing the temporal, successive ("dynamic") nature of the perception of literature, was further developed and systematically applied to the theory and analysis of literary texts by Israeli Structuralist scholars, notably in the theoretical and analytical works of B. Hrushovski (see [246]-[251a]; see especially [251a]) and subsequently in various studies by I. Even-Zohar, M. Perry,

components of the process of reading, characterised by predictions, expectations and hindsight-readjustments along a temporal axis. Enjambment is thus considered as a point of collision between various forces of prediction, recognition, reaffirmation, surprise, etc.

Problems of semantics, prosody and intonation are surveyed in the concluding chapter, with sporadic theoretical insights especially in the latter two fields.

The entire discussion is structural-theoretical, with poetic examples analysed for the sole purpose of illustrating some of the theoretical points.

Characteristically, it begins with the most basic question: What is enjambment? How should it be defined?

M. Sternberg and others (see Ben-Porat and Hrushovski [45a] for a survey of Israeli contributions to this approach; see also Kaufman [277a] for a bibliography). The present study's insistence on the distinction between the static and the dynamic approaches to poetic syntax should be viewed with reference to these Russian-Czech-Israeli trends in structuralist literary scholarship. As for Anglo-American views on these matters, see note ii to Chapter 3.

2. THE NATURE OF ENJAMBMENT:

A SURVEY OF DEFINITION PROBLEMS

2.0. AN EXPOSITION OF THE PRESENT CHAPTER.

2.0.1. Preliminary.

The present chapter approaches the concept of enjambment by discussing the problem of defining it. It is difficult to observe the borderline between discussing a definition and analysing what it defines; the more concrete and illustrated the discussion, more it concerns the defined phenomenon. Therefore, the discussion will be quite abstract, with references to theoretical, analytical and critical texts rather than poetic ones.

2.0.2. The Present Chapter in the General Framework of the Study.

Enjambment is not a newly invented term, whose "inventor" feel free to choose the definition by which it is first introduced. It is a familiar term, and its definition must meet the requirements of the intuitive consensus that underlies its employment by scholars. Therefore, the new definition proposed in the present chapter is based on such a consensus which, in its turn, is derived and abstracted from previous definitions, theoretical statements and analyses of individual enjambments in poetic texts (I must assume that this intuitive consensus is shared by the reader of this study through his very acquaintance with the concept of enjambment)

Once established, the new definition serves as a point of departure for a fuller investigation of the structure of enjambment. This is done in subsequent chapters by breaking up the definition into its major components, asking what each of them means in its own right.

2.0.3. The Major Questions Discussed in the Present Chapter.

There are several alternative definitions of enjambment, and the differences between them may give the impression that they define different things. Yet it is precisely the sameness of the thing defined and the variety of the ways to define it which is characteristic of the state of affairs in enjambment definition: it often happens that the same two scholars who, as theorists, propose two incompatible definitions, intuitively agree, as analysts, in identifying a given textual example as an enjambment or as an end-stopped line. It is my assumption that there must be something evasive about the phenomenon itself that causes such a contrast between its intuitive perception and the cognitive conceptualisation of that perception.

The present chapter will try to overcome this evasiveness by discussing the following questions:

Question 1: What are the major existing approaches to the definition of enjambment?

Question 2: What are the reasons for these differences in approach, and how (if at all) can they be reconciled?

Question 3: What is the definition of enjambment proposed in the present study, and how does it relate to the previous definitions?

2.1. MAJOR APPROACHES TO THE DEFINITION OF ENJAMBMENT.

2.1.1. A Selection of Definitions of Enjambment.

The following are seven definitions, chosen to illustrate the gamut of prevailing views in the literature of enjambment-definitions:¹

¹ I am aware of the existence in the literature of other definitions. But since most of them add no new dimension to

1. Kenneth M. Abbott [1]: "The completion, in the following poetic line, of a clause or other grammatical unit begun in the preceding line; the employment of 'run-on' lines which carry the sense of a statement from one line to another without rhetorical pause at the end of the line".
2. A.C. Bradley ([59], 386): "A line may be called 'end-stopped' when the sense, as well as the metre, would naturally make one pause at its close; 'run-on', when the mere sense would lead one to pass to the next line without any pause".
3. Seymour Chatman ([81], 167): "A possible definition of run-on or enjambment is 'the occurrence in performance of a phonemic clause (or negatively, the absence of a terminal juncture) across what is represented in the text as line-end'".
4. John Hollander ([239], 119): "In the most general sense, an enjambment is any lack of alignment between syntax and line-structure, but it is usually considered where a normal correspondence between the two is violated".
5. Roman Jakobson ([260], 365): "They [enjambments] always set off the normal coincidence of syntactic

the overall picture that emerges from the comparative analysis of the seven definitions chosen (see, for instance, Fowler [150], 87), I have decided not to expand the already overcrowded table of definitions. In several cases, however, my reasons for omission are more specific; e.g., Kreuzer's definition ([291], 235), which is loose and vague to the point of insusceptibility to rigorous analysis, or Leech's more recent breakthrough ([303], 123-125), which deserves separate treatment (see below, 2.3.1).

Information concerning Russian Formalists' views on the subject is supplied in a nutshell in Erlich [132] and Pomorska ([406], 31).

pause and pausal intonation with the metrical limit".²

6. J.T. Shipley ([460], 139):³ "The carrying of the sense (grammatical form) in a poem past the end of a line [...]".
7. Viktor Žirmunskij ([537], 161): "When the metrical and syntactic divisions do not coincide, what results is the so-called 'run-on line' (enjambment)".

2.1.2. A Schematised Condensation of the Definitions.

If we disregard personal and stylistic differences in these definitions and concentrate on the conceptual ones, we can propose a table, based on the words I underlined above. Enjambment, then, is described as a discrepancy between

1. Grammatical unit, sense and rhetorical pause	&	The line unit (Abbott-Preminger)
2. Sense and pause	&	Metre and line (Bradley)
3. Phonemic clause in performance	&	Line-end in the text (Chatman)
4. Syntax	&	Line structure (Hollander)
5. Syntactic pause and pausal intonation	&	Metrical limit (Jakobson)
6. Sense (grammatical form)	&	Line-end (Shipley)
7. Syntax	&	Metre (Žirmunskij)

² Roman Jakobson's is the only quotation here which is not originally offered as a definition: he states what enjambments "always do" rather than what they are; and, as far as his wording is concerned, they could "do" other things as well. But since his statement is based on concepts pertaining to the structure, rather than the effects, of enjambment, it can assume the role of a definition, for all practical purposes.

³ Since the item "Enjambment" in Shipley's *Dictionary* is not initialled, I have no choice but to ascribe it to Shipley.

If we analyse these definitions vertically (referring to the above graphic layout), two groups of terms will emerge: the left-hand column consists of terms pertaining to language in general, whereas the right-hand column consists of terms pertaining to the rhythmical organisation of poetry. Since all these are definitions of the same phenomenon, one would expect each group to consist of synonymous, virtually interchangeable terms. But this is not the case. If we eliminate the vestiges of stylistic nuance in the schematic table above, we are left with the concepts of syntax, meaning and intonation in the first column, and the concepts of metre and verse-line in the second. In no way can the terms in each column be considered synonymous.

2.1.3. The Concepts of Metre and Verse-Line in the Definitions.

Let us first consider the second group, in the right-hand column. The concepts of metre and lineation are hardly identical, but their confusion in this particular context can be clarified. Broadly speaking, it is a genus-and-species kind of problem: the concept of verse-line beyond doubt serves the purposes of a definition of enjambment better, since it is equally applicable to metrical and nonmetrical poetry (and it is an empirical fact that enjambment exists in nonmetrical verse). What Bradley, Žirmunski and Jakobson seem to have had in mind is enjambment in metrical poetry, where line-end and "metrical limit" are identical.

To sum up, "verse-line" is better in a short definition, since it covers all cases of the thing defined. Yet, since metrical enjambments constitute a distinct and important group that has certain qualities of its own, notably the higher degree of autonomy, cohesion and integrity of metrical lines as compared to nonmetrical ones, the concept of metre cannot be ignored in any full-fledged discussion of enjambment. It can be dispensed with, however, in a single-sentence definition.

2.1.4. The Concepts of Syntax and Meaning
in the Definitions.

Moving on to the left-hand column, let us take the concepts of syntax and meaning (the concept of intonation will be treated separately in 2.1.5). The problem of meaning-syntax interrelations is one of the most formidable ones in modern linguistics; in literature in general and in poetry in particular it takes on added dimensions which make it far more entangled. The definitions just cited attest to a great deal of confusion among scholars about the nature of the unit of language that collides with the verse-line in enjambment: is it a unit of meaning, or a unit of syntax, or both, or are the two concepts interchangeable in this context?

It is of special interest that the two definitions quoted from encyclopaedias or dictionaries — Shipley's and Abbott-Preminger's — are the most indecisive in their wording: the doubt as to whether enjambment should be defined in terms of syntax or in terms of meaning, which in the case of the other definitions emerges only from their comparative juxtaposition, is reflected in each of these encyclopaedic definitions separately. Shipley's parentheses and Abbott's somewhat awkward double-definition show reluctance to prefer either term, meaning or syntax, to the other. Moreover, both these definitions do not say clearly that enjambment always involves both syntax and meaning, or that it involves either one at a time. Their loose treatment of the problem seems to imply that, at least in the present context, syntax and meaning are almost interchangeable. Such an implication, though, whether or not intended by the authors, cannot be accepted in this oversimplified form, since it is common knowledge in linguistics that there is no automatic congruity or coextensiveness between segmental units defined by formal syntax and those defined by semantics.

Therefore, we are back where we started, facing such questions as: What is broken by line-end in enjambment — a unit of

syntax or a unit of meaning? Why is it so difficult to choose between a semantically-oriented and a syntactically-oriented approach to enjambment?

It is my contention that the clue to the "meaning vs. syntax" tangle, as far as enjambment is concerned, is provided by the concept of intonation, as reflected in the third group of terms in the left-hand column of the table of definitions (namely, the terms "intonation", "pause" and "phonemic clause"). The discussion and substantiation of this contention are the purpose of the ensuing subsection.

2.1.5. Intonation in the Definitions.

Four out of the seven definitions include some direct or indirect reference to intonation. Bradley regards it, by implication, as a by-product of the text's meaning ("sense"); Jakobson, again by implication, regards it as a by-product of its syntax; Chatman regards it as an autonomous feature of oral performance, totally independent of either meaning or syntax; and Abbott is vague about the degree of autonomy he attaches to intonation. The other three scholars (the author of Shipley's item, Hollander and Žirmunskij) exclude intonation from their definitions altogether (however, the latter two, despite their own definitions, attach crucial importance to intonational aspects of enjambment in the course of their actual textual analyses; see 2.0.3 above).⁴

Numerous additional discussions and analyses of enjambment, such as the relevant sections in Žirmunskij [537], Tomasevskij ([574], [576], [577]), Tynjanov [578], Kell [278], Xolševnikov [585], Timofeev [572] and many others, analyse enjambments as intonational phenomena without labelling them as such in formal definitions. Of special interest is Kiril Taranovski's article [494], which is to be discussed in the next chapter. This article is entirely dedicated to the description and characterisation of enjambment, based almost exclusively on intonational observations, without dedicating as much as a single sentence to a definition. At any rate, the practice of most scholars strongly indicates that enjambments are almost invariably identified and recognised intonationally but not as readily defined intonationally.

The definitions as described here must suggest intonation both as the most reasonable cause of this confusion and as the clue to its solution. This conclusion is based on the following considerations: (1) According to the various definitions, the unit of language divided by line-end in enjambment is either syntactic or semantic or intonational (see 2.1.2). (2) The former two are not identical, whereas the latter is closely correlated with both (these are truisms, and can be found in any theoretical discussion of syntax, semantics and intonation in linguistics; see below, 2.2.2.1); therefore, mistaking intonation for syntax and/or meaning is more likely than confusing the latter two. (3) Intonation is, at least implicitly, the central concept in most analyses of enjambment cases and in most methodological discussions of the subject (see note 4). (4) Since a verse-line is a conventional graphic representation of "an intonational segment" (see Tomaševskij [577], 297), and since most forms of syntactic and semantic segmentation in language communication have intonational correlates, any collision between the two is likely to have some intonational aspect.

Yet it is not the mere existence of such an aspect that concerns the present discussion, but its unique centrality to enjambment. This centrality results from the fact that intonation is the only common denominator for all cases intuitively recognised and identified as enjambment (see Chatman, [81], 167 for a convincing demonstration of this fact;⁵ see also Taranovski's intonationally determined differentiations between enjambments and non-enjambments [494]). In other words, enjambment is ontologically primarily an intonational phenomenon.

⁵ While sharing Chatman's rejection of semantic and syntactic definitions and his preference for intonational ones, I take strong exception to some of his central arguments and conclusions, to which I shall return later, in 2.2.2.2.

2.1.6. The Quoted Definitions: Conclusion.

The discussion of the selection of definitions offered in 2.1.1 can be concluded, then, with the emergence of intonation as, logically and intuitively, the most central concept in the "lingual half" of enjambment definition. Yet, this is ignored in several existing definitions, so that there is a flagrant contradiction between scholarly consensus and my own presentation of the problem. Or, rather, there is a contradiction between the consensus in analysis and the consensus in theory, with my own presentation striving to make the latter conform with the former.

The nature of this contradiction cannot be properly understood without a more detailed examination of intonation in language in general⁶ and its poetic and "enjambmental" implications and applications in particular.

2.2. INTONATION AND ITS CONTRIBUTION TO THE DEFINITION CONFUSION

2.2.0. A Note about the Use of the Term "Intonation" in the Present Study.

The field of intonation in linguistics abounds in controversies and confusions (a survey of the literature and an extensive multi-lingual bibliography are supplied in Crystal [104]), including terminological ones. However, I am not taking sides in these controversies (see note 6). My employment of the terms "intonation" and "intonation contours", in preference to alternative terms prevalent in the literature (e.g., "tunes", "suprasegmental phonemes", "intonation patterns", "prosodic features", "distinctive pitch contours", etc.), does not imply adherence to

⁶ It is my clear intention in this study to make the most out of being a nonlinguist whose treatment of linguistic matters is that of an outsider, or, at most, that of an interested neighbour. It is my legitimate privilege to stay out of purely linguistic polemics, confining myself to questions of their possible literary implications and relevancies.

a specific school of thought in linguistics. On the contrary, this is simply a preference for the most "nonpartisan" terminology which is also the most frequently used by nonlinguists. The same reservation applies to the following definition of intonation.

2.2.1. Intonation: An ad hoc Working Definition.

I shall henceforth take the term "intonation" to mean, for the purpose of this study: "THE SUM-TOTAL OF ALL PHENOMENA OF PITCH, DURATION (INCLUDING PAUSES) AND LOUDNESS, AS PRODUCED AND PERCEIVED IN ORAL COMMUNICATION AND AS SUGGESTED AND IMAGINED IN WRITTEN COMMUNICATION, PROVIDED THAT THESE PHENOMENA DO NOT RESULT FROM THE INNER STRUCTURE OF SEPARATE WORDS, BUT CONVEY SYNTACTIC AND/OR SEMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN WORDS AND/OR GROUPS OF WORDS."⁷

I am fully aware of the difficulties of applying the distinction between prosodic properties of single words as such (which are regarded here as nonintonational) and prosodic properties of syntactic units. These difficulties are so great mainly because the actual intonation contour always includes intralexical, as well as interlexical (junctural), manifestations of pitch, duration and loudness. Yet the latter are clearly more important for syntactic functions, so that the distinction is generally valid. It can function, *inter alia*, in differentiating between intonation and rhythm: a definition of rhythm would omit the last reservation from the proposed definition of intonation.

⁷ This definition is structural and nonfunctional in character, deliberately ignoring such distinctions as between "grammatical" (or "syntactic") vs. "emotive" (or "expressive") intonation. In fact, it is not dissimilar to some other definitions to be found in the literature, implicitly or explicitly. It is almost identical with Mukařovský's concept of the "prosodic line" [370] (he uses the term "intonation" in a narrower sense, pertaining to pitch alone).

A solution to the practical problems just mentioned might be based on the concept of "residue" (which I propose later in this study, see 6.2.2 and 6.2.3), whereby changes in intonation which exceed a certain optimum required for conveying a certain kind of information (e.g., intralexical stress) are interpreted as conveying a different kind of information (e.g., syntactic).

2.2.2. Intonation as an Obstacle to a Definition of Enjambment.

2.2.2.1. *Structural and Functional Complexities in Intonation.* The complex nature of intonation itself and its interrelations with its heterogeneous syntactic and semantic functions, referred to above (2.1.5), is the main cause for the meagre results achieved in its description and analysis. "It is regrettable that this part of phonetic and linguistic description has often lagged behind the rest", says Robins ([430], 153). Similar scepticism is expressed by other scholars, such as Gleason ([185], 169-170) and Malmberg ([346], 163), who regards it as "one of the most difficult fields of phonetic analysis", characterised by "confusion of functions and levels". However, there is growing confidence among scholars in this field. Thus, Crystal dismisses the denial of "one-to-one relationship between form and function in intonation" as "nonsensical criticism" ([104], 192), arguing that the trouble with intonation is "lexical in nature", caused "by labels" ([104], 193), and not by intonation itself. Yet even Crystal, perhaps the boldest and most optimistic among intonation theorists, concedes the difficulty and complexity of the phenomenon itself (e.g., [104], 196-201); and even his book, despite its theoretical and methodological insights and breakthroughs, leaves unanswered some of the questions most relevant to the study and definition of enjambment.

What is the nature of this difficulty in intonation research?

According to all linguistic descriptions of intonation (including the definition proposed here in 2.2.1), intonation is a

complex phenomenon, both structurally and functionally. Structurally, it is the end-result of intricate configurations and interactions of independent parameters, as described in the literature (see especially Crystal's book [104] for a thorough up-to-date survey of the literature and for an original parametric approach). Functionally, it interacts with various features of formal syntax and attitudinal meaning, and even if there are cases of "one-to-one relationship between form and function" (Crystal [104], 192), the exact nature of the relationships between the functions themselves is far from being adequately described.

Intonation research has not done enough to describe the mechanisms connecting and/or separating, in perception and interpretation, between the various functions that intonation performs simultaneously (e.g., how a certain pause or rise in pitch is interpreted syntactically, attitudinally, or both).⁸

At any rate, the very fact that intonation research as such has achieved much less than other branches in linguistics bears witness to some evasiveness inherent in the phenomenon itself. Crystal is at least partially substituting effect for cause when he argues that regarding intonation as "fluid and formless is a misconception which seems to derive solely from the lack of research and published material on the subject" ([104], 191). This simply begs the question: Why is there such a lack? Is it not because intonation at least appears to be "fluid and formless", even if this impression can be disproved by factual findings?

Logically and intuitively this last question should be answered in the affirmative, and this is what counts for my purpose (in accordance with my reservation in note 6): in the con-

⁸ For a more thorough account of the problem the linguistic-proper literature can be consulted, e.g., Crystal [104], especially chapter 6; Crystal and Quirk [105]; Halliday [212]; Kurath [292]; and many others.

text of enjambment definition it is sufficient to state that intonation, for whatever reason, has always appeared to be more evasive and less tangible than syntax, or even meaning (as indicated by the achievements of the respective branches of linguistics dealing with these phenomena), with which it is closely correlated. The confusion between the concepts of meaning and/or syntax and the concept of intonation in the definition of enjambment, then, fits into the general picture of the problems of intonation and its scientific treatment.

2.2.2.2. *Intonation in the Written Text: Chatman's "Oral Performance Fallacy"*. Another reason for the fact that intonation's role in enjambment is not fully and unanimously recognised by scholars is connected with the question of the status of intonation in written texts.

Oral communication, quite understandably, has been the focus of interest in intonation research, and questions concerning intonation contours inherent in a written text and their role and effect in the process of reading have hardly been asked, let alone answered (compare most discussions of intonation in the literature — e.g., Robins' typical reference to it as "an essential part of spoken utterance" ([430], 153) — with my definition in 2.2.1). It is quite possible that intonation functions in oral and written communication similarly, but this is not self-evident. Until methods are devised and research carried out to examine intonation's role in reading, the findings of intonation research based on recordings of spontaneous speech cannot be automatically applicable to the study of poetic intonation and enjambment.

The problem can be summarised from the standpoint of enjambment-definition by the following three statements, that can be indirectly inferred from most definitions and analytical discussions quoted and mentioned above: (a) enjambment is a feature of the written text and not of its oral delivery; (b) it is an into-

national phenomenon (this, once again, is implied in analyses more than in definitions); (c) intonation is a feature of spoken, not written, communication through language.

If all three statements were correct, there would be no way out. But, in accordance with my definition of intonation (2.2.1), I reject the view that it is a "purely oral" phenomenon. Consequently, (c) is the weak point in the argument, and by attacking it I shall try to break the impasse and propose a definition for enjambment.

It is this view of intonation as a purely oral phenomenon that is shared, probably unwittingly, by all seven scholars whose definitions were quoted in 2.1.1: six of the scholars regard enjambment as a feature of the text as written by the poet, and therefore would not define it as an intonational phenomenon (which is supposedly oral by definition). The seventh scholar, Chatman, draws a diametrically opposed conclusion based on the same premises: to him, since enjambment is intonational, and since intonation is oral, enjambment is oral as well; and Chatman, very consistently, defines it in terms of its oral performance. Thus, to him it is Sir Alec Guinness (or, for that matter, any oral interpreter), and not Shakespeare, who makes a Shakespearean line run-on or end-stopped, "regardless of the meaning or the grammar or what somebody else's interpretation may be", because "caesura, end-stoppage, and enjambment can only come into existence in actual performance, since they are phonological, not orthographic, phenomena" ([81], 167).⁹

As I suggested in note 5, I strongly reject Chatman's approach as reflected in his definition of enjambment. My main

⁹ In his *A Theory of Meter* ([82], 156-157), Chatman still insists that caesura and enjambment are "pure performance features" and that "the poet or his editor may suggest enjambment by the presence or absence of punctuation [the only means of "suggestion" mentioned!], but whether it occurs or not is necessarily a feature of performance".

reasons, underlying my definition of intonation, can be summarised as follows:

1. The written or printed text projects sounds, and through them meanings, syntactic structures, ideas, etc., activating generally accepted conventions. These conventional processes of relating graphic symbols to the entities projected by them are, in varying degrees, automatic. Without them the communicability of written sentences would be inconceivable.

As a matter of convenience, we can (and usually do) regard all immediate, convention-conditioned projections, as inherent properties of the written text.

2. Intonation, then, is a property of the written text itself (in the sense of point 1 above), and an integral and inseparable dimension of the sentence as a meaningful utterance (see Robins [430], 191).

In making these points I am in basic accord with a large number of scholars whose views are incompatible with Chatman's, whether published before or after his.¹⁰ This broad consensus makes it superfluous for me to rephrase views already published

¹⁰ See, for instance, Wimsatt and Beardsley [533], Wellek and Warren ([519], 145), Hrushovski ([247], 181-182), Fowler ([152], 164 and [150], 84) and many others. On a larger scale one can juxtapose Chatman's general outlook, attaching excessive importance to the oral delivery of poems ([82], 16; *ibid.*, 96; [78], 84; and practically all his publications on prosody cited in the Bibliography) with the views of such scholars as Žirmunskij ([551], 14; English translation in [537], 19), and Bernštejn ([541], 25), who advocate the separation between the study of written texts and the study of their oral renditions. Jakobson's distinction between "verse-design" and "verse-instance" on the one hand and "delivery design" and "delivery instance" on the other hand ([260], 364-367), elaborated by Fowler ([154], 142-144), can also be quoted in support of this separation. See also Chatman's controversies with other scholars (e.g., Chatman [78] vs. Levin [308]; Chatman [78] and [83] vs. Loesch [325] and [326]; Chatman [81] and [82] vs. Fowler [150] and [152]; see

and successfully worded. Nevertheless, the "oral performance fallacy", which is rooted in the old "acoustic" approach dating back to Sievers (see Wellek & Warren [519], 168-169), shows remarkable vitality: after the blows it sustained from various scholars, including Russian formalists (see Èjxenbaum [588], 12-13; Žirmunskij [548]; Erlich [132], 217-218), its voice is still heard in Anglo-American scholarship.¹¹ Yet, for reasons already given (see note 10), only by rejecting the acoustic approach can the challenges of complex phenomena be met.

2.2.3. Intonation in Enjambment Definition:
Concluding Remarks.

The solution to the problem of intonation in enjambment definition, as just proposed, lies in the employment of such a definition of intonation as proposed above (2.2.1), whereby intonation is a feature of written as well as oral communication through language, and in the application of this definition to enjambment. Thus, enjambment can be primarily intonational and

also another balanced and lucid discussion by Fowler ([154], especially 174, note 25). See also Chapter 6, note 2.

In fact, the achievements of such scholars as Hrushovski [248], Mukařovský [370] and Spitzer [469] in analysing the mode of oral delivery inherent in written poems, without any recourse to the analysis of recorded performances, implicitly contradict and, in my opinion, disprove Chatman's main points.

To be fair to Chatman one has to admit that, in theory, he is all for the distinction between the text and its performance (see, for instance, [82], 96); yet he seems to be unaware of the fact that he does not practise what he preaches (as can be seen from his publications just cited).

¹¹ Fortunately enough, Anglo-American scholarship seems to have broken with these tendencies, and the whole superfluous controversy appears to have died down. Vestiges of the "oral performance fallacy", though, are to be found here and there in the more recent literature (e.g., Barbara H. Smith's reference to metre as "not a property of the text itself but only of its performance"; see [465], 10).

yet a feature of the written text.¹²

The answer to Question 2 in 2.0.3, then, is simply that the difficulty in defining enjambment in generally agreed terms results from its being ontologically a feature of the intonation-potential of the written text. As such, even compared to the complexity and evasiveness of "oral intonation" itself, enjambment is doubly complex and evasive, being connected with intonation's most obscure and least tangible, and therefore its least studied, aspect.¹³ Once this source of the problem has been spotted and eliminated, the way is paved for a new definition of enjambment as an answer to Question 3 in 2.0.3.

2.3. HOW TO DEFINE ENJAMBMENT?

2.3.1. Geoffrey N. Leech's Breakthrough.

A significant departure from the definition-confusion is offered by G.N. Leech in his *A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry* [303]. Leech's book is designed to be an undergraduates' textbook, and as such it makes no claim for theoretical innovation. In fact, Leech does not even go so far as to formally propose a definition of enjambment; rather, he supplies two descriptions, one at the beginning, and the other at the end, of his discussion

¹² Fowler's finer distinction, or trichotomy, between "oral rendition", "written text", and "linguistic form" — the latter one underlying the former two ([154], 144) — is unnecessarily overcomplicated, because "the written text" in the sense of the series of black spots and figures printed on a sheet of paper is irrelevant to the study of enjambment, and it must be actualised in a manner which makes it virtually inseparable from "linguistic form". My "written text", then, is Fowler's "linguistic form".

¹³ This is only a glimpse of one dimension of the complexity of enjambment, namely, its structural complexity. Far more intricate and entangled is its functional complexity, and particularly the semantic aspect of that complexity. These will be treated in outline in Chapter 6 (see 6.3).

His first description ([303], 123) reads as follows:

Commonly a distinction is drawn between 'end-stopped lines', in which the last syllable coincides with an important grammatical break, and 'run-on lines' in which there is no congruity of this kind. For the second case, in which there is a grammatical overflow from one line to the next, we may use the term ENJAMBMENT [...]

There is nothing new about this description (which is, for all practical purposes, a definition), being once again solely confined to the concepts of grammar (or syntax) and the verse-line.

Leech's second description (which can also be regarded as a definition), is quite different, however. The two definitions are separated in the book by less than two pages, but they are quite obviously different, and consequently incompatible if regarded as definitions of the same phenomenon. Leech's apparent unawareness of these differences is in itself significantly symptomatic of the scholarly climate of definition-confusion. The second description ([303], 125) reads as follows:

We may describe enjambment as the placing of a line boundary where a deliberate pause, according to grammatical and phonological considerations, would be abnormal; that is, at a point where a break between intonation patterns is not ordinarily permitted.

As a definition this is not flawless; its main weakness lies in the exclusion of semantic considerations, and in the employment of such terms as "deliberate", "abnormal", "ordinarily permitted", which are loosely defined in this context. Yet it has something genuinely new to offer. Furthermore, this is, I think, the best definition hitherto proposed, at least for the following reasons:

- (1) For the first time the link between intonationally oriented definition and the "oral performance fallacy" is severed.
- (2) Intonation contours are regarded as oral manifestations of

the grammatical rules by which they are governed; and since rules are in operation here, concepts like "permitted" (or, for that matter, "forbidden") are not out of place, contrary to Chatman's reliance on the performer's whim.¹⁴ (3) Enjambment is clearly given a specific location in the text, namely, line-end. (4) Undoubtedly, though implicitly, a reference is made to the "arbitrary", man-made nature of the poetic line, and the creative and organising presence of the poet. Leech's definition begins with "the placing of a line boundary [...]"; that is, someone deliberately "placed" it where he decided to "place" it.¹⁵

Leech went a long way from his conventional and misleading partial first definition to the almost perfect solution of the whole problem in his second definition. A careful examination of the latter can account for everything that has been discussed so far in this chapter: it is not difficult to see why, in the prevailing climate of obscurity in the theory and research of intonation in linguistics and poetics, a phenomenon whose true definition is something like this one has caused such confusion.

¹⁴ This, again, is in basic accord with such statements as Wellek and Warren's "[...] the reading of a poem [aloud] may be either right or wrong" ([519], 145), or Henry Lee Smith's correct reading, or "'basic' reading", which can be arrived at after the elimination of alternative readings which he labels as "impossible" and "improbable" (see [466], 71).

¹⁵ Theoretically, it is an important point in its own right, yet I question its relevance to the specific purpose of enjambment definition. One cannot exaggerate the importance of the man-made nature of all artistic devices, and the role of such devices as exponents of the artist's presence in his work; yet there is nothing specific to enjambment in this idea that should warrant its inclusion in its definition. Moreover, there is something inappropriate in the use of a gerund ("the placing") as the directly defining element of enjambment, as if enjambment were an action and not a phenomenon. For these reasons my definition in 2.3.2 does not repeat Leech's beginning.

2.3.2. A New Definition of Enjambment.

Very little is needed, then, to improve on Leech's second definition. The following is my suggestion for defining enjambment:

ENJAMBMENT IS THE OCCURRENCE OF A LINE BOUNDARY AT A POINT WHERE THE STRUCTURE OF THE PREVERSIFIED TEXT, FOR REASONS OF SYNTAX, LINGUAL MEANING AND/OR LITERARY INTERPRETATION, DOES NOT PERMIT THE ORAL EXECUTION OR THE AURAL IMAGINATION OF A PAUSAL JUNCTURE.

2.3.3. Implications of the Proposed Definition:
Questions and Perspectives.

My definition (henceforth "the Definition" with a capital D) begs quite a few questions, the most important of which are:

(1) How are the central terms in the Definition (syntax, meaning, literary interpretation) distinguishable and correlated in a poetic text? (2) What is the meaning of "does not permit" in this context and how is such a "permission" identified and tested? (3) Is this really the right definition? Or, in other words, is the Definition compatible with the intuitions we are likely to have about the concept of enjambment?

The first question, which is central to a general theory of literature and not only to enjambment, will be discussed in Chapter 6 (only inasmuch as it concerns enjambment).

As for the second question, which concerns enjambment more directly, most of the remainder of the present study will be devoted to the close investigation of the details which make up the answer to its syntactic aspect. Here, as in the case of the first question, the results attainable by such an investigation are severely restricted by the modest achievement of the pertinent branches of scholarship, as will be seen below. At any rate, the second question can be considered as a point of departure for the greater part of the substantive discussion of the present study.

As for the third question, the Definition can be abstracted from most discussions of enjambment (see 2.1.5 above, and especially note 4, for a selection of references) as the general criterion for distinguishing between enjambments on the one hand and nonenjambments (end-stopped lines) on the other hand. One reservation, though, concerns the many borderline cases, where the reader may be in doubt whether, and to what extent, the structure of the preversified text permits a pausal juncture (in the sense used in the Definition). Actually, we can speak here of "polar opposition", or "scale of contrastivity" (see Crystal [104] 272, 289), rather than "binary opposition". Pausal junctures can often be described as comparatively "more permitted" in certain cases and "less permitted" in other cases, depending on their position on the imaginary line stretching between the two extreme poles; in other cases, however, they can be described as "totally permitted" or "totally forbidden". The Definition, then, is not invalidated by the borderline cases: a given case is an enjambment inasmuch as its structure forbids pausing at line-end, as described in the Definition. In other words, whenever the degree of pause-desirability at line-end in a given poetic text cannot be assessed with certainty, it is difficult to decide whether that case is an enjambment or not.

3. A "STATIC" AND FUNCTIONAL VIEW OF THE SYNTACTIC COMPONENT OF ENJAMBMENT: CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE PROFESSIONAL LITERATURE

3.0. EXPOSITION OF THE PRESENT CHAPTER.

3.0.1. Preliminary.

In 2.3.2 enjambment was defined as the occurrence of line boundary where pause is not permitted. The notion that pauses can be "permitted" or "forbidden" (or, in more relative terms, "desirable" or "undesirable" in varying degrees — see the very end of Chapter 2) is linked in the Definition with considerations of syntax, meaning and literary interpretation. This begs the question: How can the desirability of pauses in a text be affected by its syntactic, semantic, or literary structure? This question can be split into three subquestions, each referring to syntax, meaning and literary interpretation separately. The present study, as presented in the Introduction (see 1.3.4), is primarily concerned with the syntactic aspects of this central question, and the present chapter is confined to a survey of problems derived from the relevant professional literature.

Syntax has always received a fair share of scholarly attention in linguistics (and this share seems to have grown considerably since the inception of the "generative-transformational" school in syntactic theory). Under these circumstances one cannot undertake any research of a syntactic problem without resorting to the work of linguists in syntactic theory.

The present chapter is therefore primarily devoted to the examination of the relevance of the professional literature (both in linguistic and in literary scholarship) to the central question or, at least, to its main aspects. The scope and structure of the chapter result from a process of mutual elimination of irrelevancies: in this chapter, the professional literature is cited only inasmuch as it bears upon the subject

of syntactic contribution to pause-desirability, and this subject is discussed only inasmuch as it can be studied in the light of the professional literature.

3.0.2. The Professional Literature and Pause-Desirability:
Problems of Applicability.

The major difficulty in applying the linguistic literature to the study of enjambment results from the apparent lack of interest on the part of most linguists in the question of pause-desirability and syntactic contribution to it. Most writings in syntactic theory are designed to answer totally different questions, and their potential contribution to the topic of this study is accordingly marginal. This impression emerges from reading the literature (I am referring to the mainstream in all major trends in the syntactic theory of the last few decades) for two reasons: (1) the "static" approach adopted by most linguists engaged in syntactic description; (2) their almost total adherence to the analysis of structural-functional syntactic relationships — and mainly syntactic subordination — within the framework of the single sentence.

In the present expository section the terms and distinctions just proposed will be explained tentatively as follows:

1. In the distinction between "static" and "dynamic" approaches to syntax, the latter term means viewing syntax as a process, as a structure unfolding in time and characterised by the movement of expectations being aroused, and then fulfilled or frustrated; the former means viewing it as a complete "spatial" structure characterised by the functional relationships between its components (see above, Chapter 1, note 19, and below, 3.4.2).

2. In the "static" approach, one can distinguish (for the purpose of the present discussion) between two types of syntactic phenomena: (a) syntactically nonfunctional relationships and

- 75 -

phenomena, such as the actual size or length of syntactic segments, or the order of words, phrases, etc. (wherever order is optional), or the nature and number of repetitive or variational patterns (e.g., the use of many adjectives for each noun, the accumulation of appositions, etc.) and (b) syntactically functional relationships between and within syntactic segments of whatever size, order, pattern, etc. (e.g., the relation between subject and predicate, NP and VP, immediate constituents). In the latter type a subject, for instance, can be long or short, obey or defy conventions of word-order, include repetitive patterns, be part of such patterns or be devoid of them, and still remain a subject according to the criteria of functional analysis.¹ Linguistics, it is argued, has been much more preoccupied with phenomena of the latter type. This preference, as we shall see, has been counter-productive at least as far as the ability of linguistics to deal with the central problems of pause-desirability is concerned.

The present chapter will observe the restrictions imposed by scholars' approach as just described.

3.0.3. Major Questions Discussed in the Present Chapter.

Bearing in mind this chapter's aims, the major questions to be discussed in it are:

¹ This distinction may appear as analogous to accepted linguistic distinctions between parataxis and hypotaxis and between coordination and subordination. This analogy is partial and misleading, though. All forms of syntactic hypotaxis and subordination do belong to type (b) in my dichotomy (syntactically functional relationships), but so do most types of syntactic coordination (e.g., subject-predicate relationships). Moreover, phenomena like syntactic length, word order, repetition patterns, etc., are not covered by the linguistic distinctions. In fact, my distinction is between relationships identifiable by asking questions (who, where, why, etc.) and relationships where such questions are inapplicable. See Robins ([430], 234-238) and Lyons ([336], 178-179).

Question 1: What is a pause-resistant syntactic segmental unit (which is relevant to the study of enjambment)?

Question 2: What holds such a unit together in the prever-sified text?

Question 3: What is the potential contribution of existing syntactic theories to the study of the syntactic aspect of pause-desirability?

Question 4: How is the study of the syntactic structure of enjambment dependent upon linguistic theory and research?

Question 5: What have been the major contributions of scholars in poetics to the study of the syntactic aspect of pause-desirability?

Question 6: What, in conclusion, is the present state of affairs in the relevant branches of linguistic and literary scholarship?

3.1. THE SYNTACTIC MICRO-UNIT.

3.1.1. Definitions and Distinctions.

I shall henceforth refer to the syntactic segmental unit divided between two lines in enjambment as SYNTACTIC MICRO-UNIT (SMIU), in contradistinction to the syntactic macro-unit (SMAU), which is anything larger than SMIU within the confines of a single sentence. Since these are virtually new terms (in this precise sense), I define them without recourse to any scholarly consensus (unlike the case of the definition of enjambment itself, see 2.0.2), using the following definitions:

1. A SYNTACTIC MICRO-UNIT (SMIU) IS AN UTTERANCE, CONSISTING OF TWO OR MORE CONSECUTIVE WORDS, THAT IS FOLLOWED, AND NOT DIVIDED, BY A SYNTACTICALLY-DETERMINED PAUSAL JUNCTURE (TERMINAL OR NONTERMINAL).

2. A SYNTACTIC MACRO-UNIT (SMAU) IS AN UTTERANCE, CONSISTING OF TWO OR MORE SYNTACTIC MICRO-UNITS, THAT IS: (a) DIVIDED BY ONE OR MORE SYNTACTICALLY-DETERMINED NONTERMINAL PAUSAL JUNCTURES; (b) NEVER DIVIDED BY A SYNTACTICALLY-DETERMINED TERMINAL PAUSAL JUNCTURE; (c) FOLLOWED BY A SYNTACTICALLY-DETERMINED PAUSAL JUNCTURE, TERMINAL OR NONTERMINAL.²

In other words, both types of units may be either smaller than, or identical with (but never larger than), one complete sentence.

3.1.2. The SMIU-SMAU Dichotomy:
Implications and Reservations.

Certain unavoidable shortcomings are inherent in this distinction in the present "state of the art". I am referring especially to the notion of "a syntactically-determined pausal juncture", which requires some comment.

² The distinction between terminal and nonterminal pausal junctures is self-explicit, and it is commonly used in the linguistic literature. However, because of some terminological differences (e.g., compare Pike [402a], 68-72, with Robins [430], 152-153), I would like to clarify my own terminological usage.

In the present study, "pausal junctures" or "pauses" (in contradistinction with nonpausal interlexical junctures, often called "plus-junctures") may be either "terminal" or "nonterminal". The former are described phonologically as "falling", and are usually characterised syntactically by structural completeness and graphically by a full-stop period at their end, whereas the latter are phonologically "rising" or "sustained", syntactically structurally incomplete (at least retrospectively), and graphically they usually end with a comma or a semicolon. Since in enjambment, by definition, line-boundary contradicts all pausal junctures, terminal and non-terminal alike, the distinction between these two types of pauses has no bearing on the actual identification of enjambments or end-stopped lines. However, the distinction may, and often does, play a role in producing the specific "dynamic" effects of individual enjambments during the process of reading (see below, 3.4.2, and Chapter 5; see especially 5.8.1).

In connection with this notion I once again postulate, in agreement with linguistic consensus, that syntactic relationships usually play a decisive role in determining the occurrence or absence of pausal junctures. The fact that this begs the questions of why, when and how exactly this happens (questions that are as yet unanswerable) does not invalidate the basic proposition. The definition, then, is unsatisfactory inasmuch as it relies on unsubstantiable contentions, but it cannot be accused of circularity: thus, SMIU is not defined as terminating with a pausal juncture that always marks the end of SMIUs, but, rather, as terminating with a phonologically detectable pausal juncture which, through conventional intonational-syntactic correlation, reflects or represents a syntactic feature. Such syntactic features, however, cannot be defined or identified *a priori* in terms of syntactic terminology, but only *a posteriori* in terms of their junctural exponents.

Another reservation concerns the range of applicability of these definitions. Whenever the exact location and identification of a pausal juncture is syntactically debatable, the boundaries of the SMIU or SMAU are equally in doubt and cannot be unequivocally determined. There are degrees of certainty in these matters, and the applicability of the definition is directly proportional to the degree of certainty with which the relevant features of the defined object can be identified and described (see my reservation concerning the terms "permitted" and "forbidden" in the Definition, at the end of 2.3.3).

The distinction between SMIU and SMAU obviously tends to cover the entire gamut of word groupings within the single sentence, ranging from the most cohesive word to the most endless, loosest, sentences, comprising tens of clauses (as in some poems by Whitman, for instance; see below, 5.6.4). In fact, as far as this distinction is concerned, there are only two basic types of sentences: those consisting of one SMIU (e.g., "He is there") and those consisting of several SMIUs. A sentence of the latter

type is an SMAU, although it may be segmented into smaller SMAUs.

Now syntactic theories have devised finer and more sophisticated sets of distinctions, such as between morphemes, words, compounds, phrases, clauses and sentences, and, with a more functional outlook, the distinctions between principal and subordinate clauses or between paratactic and hypotactic and between coordinative and subordinative constructions. While fully aware of these and other linguistic distinctions, I contend that they do not contribute substantially to the identification and analysis of correlations between syntactic and intonational patterns. And since this correlation, for reasons already explained, is the most crucial concept in any syntactically oriented theory and/or description of enjambment, I had no choice but to propose this dichotomy (between utterances that are split by a syntactically motivated pause and those that are not) as the simplest and most relevant syntactic distinction for the purpose of this study. In the absence of adequate linguistic explanation of the relevant syntactic-intonational correlations I shall often have to resort to intuition and introspection in order to establish the boundary of an SMIU. Whenever possible, however, I shall try to benefit from the achievements of linguistics.

3.1.3. Conclusion.

The answer to Question 1 in 3.0.3 has already been given: the pause-resistant syntactic segmental unit relevant to the study of enjambment is SMIU, as defined in 3.1.1. This unit can be intuitively sensed by most readers of poetry and, in language in general, by most speakers. However, regrettably but inevitably, its definition is based on a mixture of syntactic and intonational terminology (which amounts to a confusion of cause and effect; see 3.2.1), because nothing neater and more solid concerning this unit can be extracted from the literature.³

³ An interesting point is made by Ann Tukey [504] concerning the French language in this connection. According to her

At this point I shall go on to explore linguistic contributions to the description and understanding of the force that holds an SMIU together making it into a unit. This force can be called "cohesion".

3.2. SYNTACTIC-INTONATIONAL COHESION (*SIC*)

3.2.1. Approaches to the Concept of Cohesion.

Unlike SMAU and SMIU (see 3.1.1 and 3.1.2), the concept of syntactic cohesion has been in some circulation in the linguistic literature, and should therefore be first examined in the light of that literature.

description, in French the situation is quite simple: the "minimal unit of French verbal syntax coincides with the so-called breath-group. It is a phonetic, semantic, and morphological unit, definable in terms of pause, meaning conveyed, and the grammatical rules governing interior and exterior composition. Phonologically a breath-group is a cluster of syllables between pauses. Since there is no so-called plus-juncture in French, the single term 'pause' is functional and meaningful" ([504], 118).

As far as I know, no suggestion has been made that any neat unit of this kind exists in English. Quite to the contrary, English linguistic description has always been aware of the complexity of the phenomena involved.

Thus, even Crystal, who is often optimistic and self-confident, makes the following observation ([104], 257): "It would certainly be most convenient if there were a normal co-occurrence of tone-unit with clause [...] but while the evidence does show a certain relationship of this kind, it can hardly be called a norm in a very strong sense". See also Halliday ([211], 162-163) for a view that stresses the role of the individual speaker in this connection; see also Stockwell's more recent reservation: "We have not achieved a coherent theory of intonation in relation to syntax yet" ([482a], 107; quoted also in Hirst [234a], 5).

At any rate, even if the French situation is as simple as all that, there still must be a further, finer hierarchy of tighter and looser links within that minimal unit; such a hierarchy has, to the best of my knowledge, never been described. See also Johnson [264].

Robins ([430], 234) describes the phenomenon as follows:

The principal criterion for the grouping of words into constituents is their COHESION, that is to say, the possibility of syntactic substitution of a single word for the whole group while preserving the rest of the sentence structure intact.

For the moment I should like to isolate the concept of syntactic cohesion more strictly, disregarding Robins' reference to immediate constituent analysis (the latter concept will be discussed separately in 3.3.2).

Robins' definition of syntactic cohesion is typical of many linguists (see, for instance, Leech [303], 125). This definition can be characterised, in the context of the present discussion, as static and as purely syntactic and nonintonational: the criterion of substitutability is static because it deals with relationships that obtain within the completed utterance and not with the process of its perception in time, and it is purely syntactic and nonintonational because it is not concerned at all with the possible intonational implications of syntactic cohesion as defined.

What the present investigation seeks is the discovery of rules or criteria that govern the contribution of syntax to the degree of desirability (or undesirability) of pauses. The word "cohesion", by its very dictionary-meaning, must be interpreted in this context as inversely proportionate to pause-desirability. "Syntactic cohesion", by the same token, would be a reasonable "lexical label" (see Crystal [104], 193; 294-308) to denote the contribution of syntax to pause-resistance. Yet, syntactic cohesion, as actually described by linguists, and the contribution of syntax to pause-resistance are two different, though not necessarily unrelated, phenomena. Thus, for instance, in Ophelia's line in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* (III, i, 154):

"The Courtier's, soldier's, scholar's, eye, tongue,
sword".

the pauses (as represented by the commas) are not merely acceptable but obligatory. Yet, according to the principle of syntactic substitutability as explained by Robins, this utterance is very cohesive, because it can easily be replaced by a single word in terms of syntactic function (see Robins' discussion of the concept of substitutability, [430], 224-225). While this is an extreme and somewhat irregular (though not grammatically inadmissible) phrase, no such claim can be made against "The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune" (*Hamlet* III, i, 58), where once again the syntactic cohesion of the phrase as a whole is quite considerable if tested by syntactic substitutability (i.e., by reducibility to a single word in terms of syntactic function), while in intonational terms cohesion is much weaker, since pause is tolerable (though not essential) after "slings" and even more so after "arrows".

In another Shakespearean passage (*King Lear* I, i, 96-97), Cordelia says:

You have begot me, bred me, lov'd me. I
Return those duties back as are right fit.⁴

Here the least cohesive transitions, according to the principle of syntactic substitutability, are between "you" and "have", and

⁴ I am aware of the fact that the enjambmental lineation in this example cannot be traced back to the original Folio. However, the metrical structure of the text strongly suggests this line-arrangement, which is preferred in most leading modern editions. For my immediate purpose it makes no difference, since at the moment I am concerned with the preversified text. Yet the analysis of this example as a structurally and functionally interesting enjambment is fully justified even if the lineation is editorial: the present version has a long reputation in its own right, and if we are not concerned with "the intentional fallacy" we can simply ask how the text, as handed down to us, affects us as readers. See also Chapter 5, note 31.

between "I" and "return"; yet at these very points pause is inadmissible according to the intuitive curve of pause-desirability, while it is acceptable after "back", or even after "duties" (in the second line), although cohesion there is definitely stronger; moreover, pauses are mandatory where the commas occur in the first line (after "begot me" and after "bred me"), although cohesion (according to the same substitutability principle) at these points reaches one of its peaks. It should be emphasised that the commas are the result, and not the cause, of the intonational necessity to pause there.

From this short discussion one may get the impression that the two criteria for determining cohesion — syntactic substitutability and pause-resistance — are not merely different but operate as diametrically opposed and inversely proportionate features of an utterance. Such an impression, however, is wrong. Thus, for instance, each pair of words enclosed between two commas in the first line ("begot me", "bred me", and "loved me") is very cohesive according to both criteria, and cases regarded as noncohesive according to both criteria are just as frequent and self-evident. In short, all four possible combinations between high and low syntactic substitutability and high and low pause-resistance exist in literary and nonliterary texts and can easily be invented "on demand" for purposes of illustration and analysis.

It is a linguist's job to define, describe and analyse the exact nature of the correlation between the two types of cohesion. The question is, basically, one of interrelations and interactions between heterogeneous parameters, including nonfunctional ones like repetition, length of segments, word order, etc. Such features affect the degree of correspondence or discrepancy between syntactic substitutability and pause-resistance considerably; yet, they have hardly received scholarly attention in linguistics (see 3.0.2). The fact that linguists have often disregarded these problems does not make the problems themselves nonlinguistic;

and in purely linguistic matters I cannot go beyond pointing out the difficulties and asking the questions (see Chapter 2, note 6). In this particular case, therefore, I can only state that syntactic resistance to pauses is different from the phenomenon of syntactic substitutability generally labelled by linguists as "syntactic cohesion", and no simple and easily discernible and describable correlation obtains between the two. The difference, as just demonstrated, is so great that it is inadvisable to apply the same term, "cohesion", to both phenomena.

I would like to distinguish, then, between purely syntactic cohesion, determined by syntactic substitutability, and "Syntactic Intonational-Cohesion" (SIC) that must be defined by a mixture of syntactic and intonational terms. SIC, then, is the inadmissibility of a pausal juncture (whether in oral performance or in auditory imagination) for reasons of formal syntactic structure; or, in more relative terms, SIC is the degree of syntactically determined resistance to pausal juncture.⁵ If we connect this term with the concept of SMIU (3.1.1), SIC may be described as the most essential intra-SMIU feature: by definition, SIC should be present at all interlexical transitions inside an SMIU (though not always with the same strength) and absent from its boundary; the absence of SIC from an interlexical transition inside a sentence marks the end of one SMIU and the beginning of the next one within an SMAU.

⁵ By such phrases as "reasons of formal syntactic structure" or "syntactically determined resistance" I refer, in this context, to cases where the acceptability or unacceptability of pauses can be traced to the formal syntax of an utterance rather than its semantic content. Thus, in the *Lear* example just quoted, the three pairs of words "begot me", "bred me", and "loved me" are "cohesive" because each of them consists of a transitive verb and its object and not because of their specific semantic content. By juxtaposing any given instance with a semantic alternative that retains the syntactic structure (e.g., "starved me, hated me, killed me" instead of the Shakespearean original) one can isolate the workings of formal syntax in producing SIC.

Once again, as in the case of SMIU, considerations of "theoretical purity" were overridden by considerations of practical necessity in the present "state of the art" when, in the definition of SIC, syntactic and intonational terms were mixed (see my reservations in 3.1.2 and 3.1.3). This is one of the reasons why SIC often depends upon the reader's intuition and common sense for its identification and description. Indeed, SIC has been defined clearly as far as the mere wording is concerned; but, in the absence of a fuller linguistic description of the interrelations between syntax and intonation, the recourse to the intuitive outlet is the only safeguard against tautology or circularity in the description of SIC. Circularity is the result of describing SIC as something that occurs whenever pauses are forbidden because of syntactic relations that forbid pauses (see 3.1.2). Since we do not possess a complete detailed list of all the syntactic structural relationships that enhance (or weaken) pauses, our intuitive acceptance, or rejection, of a pause at a given point is the safest and the broadest common denominator for all the relevant cases, provided that this intuition is based on syntactic and not on semantic considerations (see note 5). In short, we have to reconstruct the syntactic cause by relying on the more tangible intonational effect; however, this reversal of procedure, due to a methodological deadlock, does not mean that the phenomenon itself is circular.

So much for the concepts of SMIU and SIC. Their relevance, and potential contribution, to the study of enjambment will be discussed in 3.2.2.

3.2.2. A Target-Theory of Syntactic-Intonational Cohesion: Major Aims.

As we have seen, no positive theory of syntactic-intonational cohesion can be proposed at the present stage of linguistic scholarship. The aims of such a theory can be outlined, however. In other words, one can ask the questions that such a theory should

ideally answer; but since answers to these questions are not forthcoming, there is no theory of SIC to propose.

I shall henceforth refer to an outline of the questions that a proper theory should answer as a "target-theory". The major aim of a theory of SIC is to describe, explain, and arrange logically (preferably hierarchically) the correlations between syntactic relationships on the one hand and the degree of pause-desirability on the other hand. This major target should be approached systematically, with a parametric outlook (see Crystal [104], 195-196). A theory of SIC should ask and answer the question: What are the parameters of SIC? The list of parameters proposed here is tentative and probably incomplete: it is only because of the lack of material in the linguistic literature that this study ventures to propose such a list.

Any list of SIC-parameters must include at least the following items:

1. Functional syntactic relationships (including all types of syntactic subordination) present in a given syntactic segment.
2. Length of the given syntactic segment.
3. Internal organisation of the given syntactic segment in terms of repetition patterns, linear development, parallelism, etc. (subdividable according to level of organisation, e.g., sound morphology, syntax), wherever applicable.
4. The given segment's position in relation to longer syntactic segments in terms of each of the preceding parameters (e.g., an SMIU being a subordinate clause within an SMAU; its distance from the SMAU's beginning and/or end; its similarity and/or dissimilarity with other SMIUs in the same SMAU; etc.).

Having identified and logically arranged the entire list of SIC parameters (which may include additional items), the proposed theory should describe the specific contribution of each parameter to SIC. Thus, for instance, the isolated contribution

of the parameter of length to SIC is one of inverse proportion (see details in Chapter 4), whereas the workings of most other parameters are not so simple. In certain cases the theorist can strive to construct hierarchical scales ranging from the largest to the smallest contribution to SIC of specific phenomena or relationships belonging to a parameter. For instance, within the framework of the parameter of intra-SMIU functional syntactic relationships (parameter 1), such a hierarchical scale should arrange the various relationships (e.g., between subject and predicate, a transitive verb and an object, a preposition and a noun, an adjective and a noun, etc.) according to the hierarchy of their potential isolated contributions to SIC, other things being equal.

The number of relevant factors is perhaps unmanageable, so that the very notion of a comprehensive theory of SIC may be impracticable. In any event, linguists could enhance the prospects of such a theory by working on the more modest tasks of partial theories for each parameter. For example, length in isolation is relatively manageable (see Chapter 4), and the same goes for basic types of syntactic repetition-patterns. Each parameter should be studied independently and described according to its own characteristics.

Any given utterance can be viewed as an intersection of several parameters in different combinations and doses. As in many other aspects of language and literature, so in the analysis of SIC the uniqueness of each given example inheres in combinations and structurations, rather than in isolated constituent-elements, parameters, etc. The more we know about the features of the separate parameters, the easier it becomes to analyse their unique combinations, making up each individual textual example.

3.2.3. A Target-Theory of SIC: Problems and Perspectives.

If and when a linguist tries to construct a theory of SIC along the lines suggested in 3.2.2, he is likely to face for-

midable difficulties, at least when trying to answer two major questions.

Question A: How can we determine and measure the contribution of a single syntactic parameter to SIC?

Asking this question, rather than asking about SIC in general, is little more than replacing an unknown X by an unknown Y, though this Y is simpler and more limited.

In trying to answer this question with regard to each parameter, a methodological choice has to be made: the investigator can either trust his own intuitive responses, sensibilities and judgements as a native speaker, or else he can resort to experimental psychology, or rather psycholinguistics, in search of objectively verifiable evidence. This decision should be made both in determining where and to what extent pauses are acceptable, and in determining the contribution of the parameter under discussion to pause-desirability. If he decides in favour of intuition, he is likely to find it difficult to devise safeguards against arbitrariness and partiality, and his conclusions must be tentative pending verification. If he decides to approach the problem through experimental psycholinguistics, he has to devise a new set of methods and procedures to carry out his plan. There are reasons for and against every alternative; but the difficulties and obstacles are quite apparent in both. The problem of the applicability of psycholinguistic research to the present study will be discussed in greater detail in 5.2. My only purpose at this stage is to point out that the most formidable obstacle in constructing a theory of SIC is a methodological one: the difficulty of translating clear intuitions into the rigorous language of linguistic theory, description and analysis. The intuitions are there, to be sure; but just as their present insusceptibility to a scientifically convincing and verifiable analysis does not negate their existence, so their existence is not sufficient to make them susceptible to scholarly discussion.

As long as the gap remains unbridgeable, a theory of SIC is more a wish than reality.

Question B: What can determine the relative importance of each parameter in relation to the other ones?

Let us assume that, in answering Question A, linguists have already devised the one and only fool-proof method to determine the workings of each parameter separately. Now a given SMIU (e.g., "I know") may be cohesive in terms of one parameter (say, length) and relatively "loose" in terms of another parameter (say, the functional syntactic relationship between its constituents), while the reverse may be true of another SMIU (e.g., "with or without his not-too-bright girl friend"). Taking two such complete SMIUs, what is the basis to compare them in terms of SIC? Which of them, as a whole, is more resistant to being divided by a pause? Can one determine the overall, or absolute, SIC of any given SMIU in isolation, or the relative SIC of one SMIU in comparison to another? How can the relative importance of length *vis-à-vis* syntactic function, for instance, be weighed? Is this relative importance of one parameter compared to other parameters a constant or a variable? How can each of the preceding questions be answered logically, convincingly, irrefutably?

I cannot answer any of these questions satisfactorily, but by asking them I hope to have a better understanding of the problems and ramifications of the concept of SIC in this context and the difficulties in investigating it systematically.

3.2.4. The "Static" Nature of SMIU and SIC:

Concluding Remarks.

The concepts of SMIU and SIC are firmly rooted in the static approach. A syntactic micro-unit is a completed utterance, not a potential to be realised or an expectation to be fulfilled, and syntactic-intonational cohesion is its central, distinctive feature. In other words, I have so far adopted one of the main

constraints imposed by prevalent predilections and preferences in linguistics. The proposed SIC theory, whose aims have been outlined (in 3.2.2), is a static one, dealing with complete utterances. Linguistics today is not equipped to answer the static questions in the target-theory; yet even if a static theory of SIC were arrived at, the complete answer to the questions posed by the Definition (2.3.2) could not be given by it alone (Chapter 5 will deal with the problems of the dynamic approach to these questions).

The answer to Question 2 in 3.0.3 has been given in the present section inasmuch as it can be given now: the force that holds the unit of SMIU together is SIC, as defined and described above. Having outlined a static target-theory of SIC, consisting of questions that should be answered, my contention concerning the inability of linguistics to answer these questions will be tested in the ensuing section.

3.3. POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTION OF SYNTACTIC THEORIES TO A THEORY OF SIC.

3.3.0. Preliminary.

The present section tries to examine the major existing trends in syntactic theory and methodology in terms of their potential capacity to turn the SIC target-theory, consisting of questions, into a full-fledged theory supplying the answers.

My procedure will be to apply the prevailing methods of syntactic description and analysis to enjambment specimens (in this section all examples are taken from Shakespeare's *King Lear*) in order to test the usefulness of these methods, including their typical categories and distinctions, for the purpose of SIC analysis. Logically, it is not imperative to use enjambments, or even poetic examples, for this purpose, since SIC is a feature of all utterances in language in general, and not only of poetic ones. But the choice of enjambments for illustration tightens

the bond between the central topic of the entire study and the specific subject of the present section.

The linguistic approaches to syntactic analysis that will be examined to determine their applicability to the analysis of SIC, and hence to the study of enjambment, are: (1) Traditional Grammar ("School-Grammar"); (2) Immediate Constituent (IC) Analysis; (3) Transformational-Generative Grammar.

3.3.1. Traditional Grammar.

Let us apply the terms and concepts of traditional grammar to the following enjambments:

You have begot me, bred me, lov'd me. I
Return those duties back as are right fit.
(I, i, 96-97)

[...] My son
Came then into my mind [...] (IV, i, 33-34)

[...] Gloucester's bastard son
Was kinder to his father than my daughters
(IV, vi, 117-118)

Traditional grammar will put all three together as enjambments separating a subject and a predicate, but will fail to account for the striking differences between their effects in terms of the degree of pause-acceptability at the point of line-end; nothing in traditional terminology can account for the fact that, intuitively, these enjambments are arranged in descending order of pause-resistance (or ascending order of pause-acceptability). The reason for this failure is that traditional grammar ignores syntactically nonfunctional phenomena that influence SIC (see my comments on the next quotation).

Similarly, a traditional classification cannot cope with the strong similarity between the degrees of pause-acceptability in the following two successive enjambments:

[...] You have seen
Sunshine and rain at once: her smiles and tears
Were like a better way (IV, iii, 18-20)

Traditional grammar cannot detect this similarity. It can only note that the first enjambment separates a verb and an object and the second separates a subject and a predicate.

These are just two examples which show that neither the terms nor the procedures employed by traditional grammar can contribute directly and significantly to SIC analysis. As for the SIC-similarity between the two enjambments just quoted, one should read the entire passage from which the last quotation was taken (IV, iii, 18-23) in order to realise that the influence of the functional syntactic relationships described by traditional grammar over SIC experienced in reading this particular passage is negligible. SIC here is influenced by nonfunctional parameters more than by functional ones: it "behaves" similarly under the different functional circumstances of the different interlinear transitions because of repetitive patterns of length distribution (line boundaries occurring in comparable positions in terms of distance from intralinear caesuras and not in terms of function, in all sentences).

Traditional grammar cannot account fully for a number of syntactic-intonational phenomena. Often syntactic factors, other than those susceptible to traditional analysis, affect the intonation of the sentence in such a way that sameness in terms of traditional grammar coincides with differences in terms of pause-acceptability, or the other way around. These factors are syntactic, because they are features of syntactic segmental utterances as such; they are real because they exist in speakers' (and listeners' and readers') consciousness and intuition; and they are insusceptible to traditional grammar.

3.3.2. Immediate Constituent (IC) Analysis.

IC analysis appears to be a much more promising method for my purpose than traditional grammar. The analysis of a sentence into "successive layers of immediate constituents" (see Gleason [185], 133), with substitutability serving as a basis for determining where IC boundary should be placed, is bound to produce a hierarchy of syntactic cohesion. Moreover, intonation contours in general, and pausal intonation in particular, are closely related to, in fact inseparably linked with, IC analysis. As Gleason puts it ([185], 135) "One of the systems which assists the native speaker in determining immediate-constituent cuts is suprasegmentals [...] or intonation patterns". What Gleason is describing from the point of view of the decoder, or the addressee, can be reversed and restated from the point of view of the encoder, or the addresser, as follows: "One of the systems which determines the speaker's selection of intonation contours (or suprasegmentals) in uttering a given sentence is his recognition of where 'IC cuts' are most appropriate for that sentence". At any rate, one would expect that an IC-oriented classification of enjambment could indeed produce that hierarchy of SIC which is so vital for enjambment classification.

Yet, this is not the case, because IC techniques can produce a single type of question: Does the line boundary coincide with IC boundary, or else does it split one of the constituents? This question can then be repeated for every "successive layer" of IC, and with every new step in this analytical procedure syntactic cohesion would increase.

As we have seen, this leads us to a purely syntactic, substitutability-determined hierarchy of cohesion, which is not at all identical with SIC (see 3.2.1). Moreover, there is a methodological weakness in this procedure as such: the entire system of IC analysis can work only within the confines of a given single sentence. IC analytical techniques are not as yet

furnished with a set of principles from which an ever-valid hierarchy could be abstracted (i.e., establishing constant categories like "IC grade 1, 2, or 3", having the same degree of absolute meaning as traditional grammar's "object" or "predicate", or transformational grammar's NP or VP). These techniques can provide the investigator with important clues for a syntactically-oriented enjambment classification within a single sentence or, at most, within the comparative analysis of structurally identical sentences, where IC boundaries would be placed at exactly analogous points in both sentences. These methods are capable of detecting the unique acuteness of the following enjambments:

That by thy comfortable beams I may
Peruse this letter [...] (II, ii, 164-165)

My snuff and loathèd part of nature should
Burn itself out [...] (IV, vi, 39-40)

In both cases enjambment involves separating two members of very tightly-linked constructions, unanalysable into separate ICs. But such cases are rare; furthermore, the same mechanism would fail to respond to numerous differences, such as demonstrated by the following enjambments:

[...] In my true heart
I find she names my very deed of love (I, i, 70-71)

Thou hast her, France; Let her be thine, for we
Have no such daughter [...] (I, i, 262-263)

Suspend thy purpose if thou didst intend
To make this creature fruitful. (I, iv, 285-286)

[...] these things sting
His mind so venomously [...] (IV, iv, 46-47)

IC procedures can, of course, account for the specific syntactic nature of each of these enjambments against the background of the complete sentence in which it appears. These procedures fail, however, to account for the differences between these examples in

terms of SIC, because of the absence of a criterion for a comparative analysis. In other words, a hierarchical analysis of IC can be carried out syntagmatically but not paradigmatically, since there is no IC paradigm independent of single sentences. Attempting a comparative analysis of this kind by means of the available IC techniques is comparable to attempting a rearrangement of a sequence of random fractions according to size without being acquainted with the concept of the common denominator.⁶

3.3.3. "The Chomskyan Revolution" and Enjambment, or:
"Why Generative Grammar Does Not Help".⁷

Generative-transformational theory of syntax has no doubt revolutionised the scientific approach to language in general and to syntax in particular. No discussion of syntactic problems, be it sympathetic or unsympathetic to transformational-generative grammar (TG) and its conceptual outlook, can ignore this outlook and speak in pre-TG terms. Yet the purpose of this brief subsection is precisely to show why TG is essentially irrelevant to my topic.

⁶ A notable exception to this description of linguistic achievements is an article by E.R. Gammon [177], published in 1963. If I interpret his argument correctly, I take his "syntactic distance" and "degrees of grammatical relatedness" to be the general paradigm of IC, or the hierarchical scale of syntactic cohesion, that is almost the scale of SIC which I am after. The article is highly specialised and difficult for nonlinguists to follow. It certainly does not provide the complete scale, but it is an important breakthrough in the right direction.

It is therefore strange, to put it mildly, that this line of thought has (to the best of my knowledge) remained an isolated beginning, never taken up and further developed in more recent studies.

⁷ "Why Generative Grammar Does Not Help" is the title of a witty article by I.A. Richards [428a]. By using it for my own purposes and out of its original context I am not taking a position on the specific claims made by Richards in that article.

The attempt to study syntactic structures as reflecting the mental processes generating them, challenging as it is, has had its negative effects as well. Perhaps inevitably, as happens all too often with novel ideas and theories, TG has not discredited older theories and methodologies alone: the very notion of "surface structures" as a subject of separate study has become unfashionable, almost obsolete. Whatever the reason, the very neglect of the study of "surface structures" in linguistics is indicative of the loss of interest in this "old-fashioned" material.⁸

An oral remark by Robert DiPietro in a congress of linguists ([10], 92) is symptomatic of this state of affairs:

I detected in the talk that surface structure and deep structure somehow had the connotation of superficial and profound, and I think this should be avoided.⁹

A more outspoken remark was made by M.A.K. Halliday ([211], 145):

The study of language in relation to the situations in which it is used - [...] i.e., the study of language as 'text' - is a theoretical pursuit, no less interesting and central to linguistics than psycholinguistic investigations relating the structure of language to the structure of the human brain.

⁸ I am referring almost exclusively to Anglo-American scholarship, and superficially at that. I am fully aware of the existence of "dissident" literature, both in the Anglo-American world (e.g., Householder [244], Oliphant [388], Richards [428]) and elsewhere (e.g., Šaumjan [444]), most of which is not cited in my Bibliography. By and large, much of this literature is engaged in polemics and apologetic statements, almost without any fresh alternative approaches to "surface structure" analysis.

⁹ I am indebted to Dr. E. Levenston of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem for this reference.

It has been observed by several scholars (e.g., Fowler [154], 144) that literature imposes its artistic structures and manipulations on what TG terms the "surface structure" of the "text-as-language".

It is far beyond the scope and purpose of this study to go deeply into the extremely complex and complicated problems involved in relating TG techniques and, more significantly, conceptual outlook, to literary theory.¹⁰ Suffice it to state that, to the best of my knowledge, no attempt has been made to account for SIC in TG terms. At any rate, two cases of enjambment where line-end separates NP from VP, for instance, may differ greatly in terms of SIC at line-end; and there can be cases of similar degrees of SIC at line-end that are very dissimilar in terms of TG analysis. A TG-oriented analysis of the specimens already quoted could substantiate this claim.

There is no need to actually demonstrate the point by carrying out such an analysis here. The TG methods and procedures of syntactic analysis, with their "trees", arrows, and other typical features, are very famous by now, and anyone suitably trained can apply them to the examples cited in the present section. What concerns us is that, as far as the segmentation of an utterance into SMIUs is concerned, a TG-oriented analysis would not differ significantly from the other systems of syntactic analysis (traditional and IC): all systems would place boundaries between the main segmental units at the same points. As we have seen, however, these boundaries do not always coincide with SMIU boundaries and no rules governing the correlations between the two types of segmentation principles have been discovered.

¹⁰ Several attempts have been made, though, to apply TG techniques to the study of literature (one may mention in this connection, *inter alia*, Richard Ohmann's contributions to the analysis of prose fiction or Halle and Keyser's generative theory of metre [207]).

3.3.4. Conclusion.

This survey of the principal trends in syntactic theory and methodology today leads to a very simple answer to Question 3 in 3.0.3: linguistics at its present stage is incapable of coming to grips with the analysis of SIC. Therefore, it cannot make a decisive contribution to the study of enjambment. Since my entire discussion in the present chapter sticks to a static view of syntax, the present state of affairs in linguistics is described as unsatisfactory on two counts: (a) linguistics strongly prefers the static approach to syntax to the dynamic one, to the point of ignoring the latter; (b) within the confines of the static approach, linguistics fails to do justice to some features of syntax that are definitely static in character (e.g., SIC and the segmentation of an utterance into SMIUs; see 3.2.2).

3.4. INTERRELATIONS BETWEEN LINGUISTICS AND POETICS: IMPLICATIONS CONCERNING THE STUDY OF ENJAMBMENT

3.4.1. The Tasks of Linguistics and the Needs of Poetics: The General Problem.

One may allege that my criticism of linguistics (especially in 3.3) is unfair, because one cannot blame certain linguistic methods and procedures for failing to perform tasks they were never designed to perform. Such an allegation is true only inasmuch as it applies to specific methods and studies in linguistics, which may, or indeed should, legitimately confine themselves to a specific subject. However, so far as linguistics as a whole is concerned, my criticism is valid. If linguistics is the science of language, it should at least deal with all the features and phenomena of language that do not result from its artistic or aesthetic organisation. SIC and the division into SMIUs, for instance, are features of all utterances in language, not only of poetic and literary ones, and therefore it is the task of linguistics to investigate, describe and analyse them. This

demand is more modest than that of Jakobson ([260], 377), who would like to see linguistics dealing with poetry as a whole: "[...] the linguist whose field is any kind of language may and must include poetry in his study".

Without going into the whys and wherefores, I take the failure of linguistics to live up to these standards as a fact that, at least as far as poetics is concerned, has been detrimental to progress in the study of several subjects including poetic syntax.

Poetry, as all literature, is an art of language, and its special devices of language-organisation almost invariably derive their effectiveness, indeed their very meaningfulness, from their juxtaposition with rules, norms and usages of nonliterary language.

The description of the language-material of a poem as such is often a prerequisite for analysing the contribution of a poetic device or technique to the total effect of that poem. In the case of enjambment this has to be done, of course, by suspending line division for the purpose of analysis, treating the text as prose. The concepts and distinctions proposed above (i.e., SMIU, SIC, etc.) belong, then, to linguistic description, even if Jakobson's appeal for the inclusion of poetics *in toto* in linguistics is rejected. It is precisely the nonpoetic or prepoetic nature of these phenomena that makes them a proper object of study for linguistics rather than poetics.

In a certain sense, though, the phenomena under discussion can be regarded as features of literary or poetic syntax. Syntax in literature in general, and in poetry in particular, is not essentially different from syntax in ordinary language. Genuinely separate "literary (or poetic) syntax" does not exist, then; the term "literary (or poetic) syntax" can be justified only if used for short to signify one of two things: (a) occasional syntactic devices employed most typically, or most frequently, in literature (or in poetry, respectively); (b) indispensable features of syn-

tax of language in general that are made functional or effective only, or almost only, in literature (or in poetry).

The main difference between these two meanings is that (a) refers to optional and sporadic patterns (e.g., word-order manipulations, repetition patterns of syntactic relationships, device proportions between principal and subordinate clauses, etc.), whereas (b) refers to features of all utterances in language (e.g., SMIU, SIC, etc.). However, for my limited purpose, their similarities are more important than their differences: both groups of phenomena can hardly be "foregrounded", or made conspicuous, in utterances where "the poetic function" is not "dominant" in Jakobson's sense ([260], 357). Thus, for instance, syntactic length and SIC, present in all utterances in language, are hardly ever made conspicuous in nonliterary language. The strong bond between these features and literature is probably one of the main reasons for the fact that most scholarly attention these features have received came from literary scholars rather than "proper" linguists. Yet, the literary analyst, whose training is to investigate the artistic treatment of lingual givens, is not equally trained to study these givens in their own right. He can be described as someone trained to do a job but untrained to make the tools required for doing it. And since the tool-maker, in this case the linguist, does not provide him with the tools, the job simply cannot be done (this comparison is made, of course, from the selfish and self-centred standpoint of the literary scholar; indeed, it is not linguistics' task to serve poetics, but in making these "tools" the linguist would serve a genuine linguistic purpose).

3.4.2. A Particular Problem:

"Static" versus "Dynamic" Approaches to Syntax.

The distinction between "static" and "dynamic" approaches to syntax, introduced and briefly outlined in 3.0.2, deserves further elaboration here, both because of its centrality to the present

study, and because it can expose a major weakness in linguistic and literary scholarship from the standpoint of the study of enjambment.

It is trivially obvious that syntax, in all forms of communication through language, is both produced and perceived not in units of static, spatial and completed structures ("deep", "surface", or otherwise), whose constituent elements coexist simultaneously next to each other, but rather as a dynamic succession of such constituent elements appearing one after the other in time. It is very strange that linguistics has hardly done anything, in terms of practical research or theoretical thinking, to investigate syntactic utterances as a dynamic chain, or succession, of lingual events.

Let me make two points clear from the onset:

1. The distinction between the "dynamic" and the "static" is a distinction between two methodological approaches to syntax, or two ways of looking at it, rather than between two features of syntax itself. In language syntax is only dynamic; in linguistics it is, or at least has been, predominantly static. Certain theoretical and analytical statements about syntax in particular and language in general cannot be made without looking at syntax statically; but it has to be borne in mind that the static approach to syntax is an abstraction aimed at serving theoretical and methodological purposes, not a description of the way language is actually communicated.

2. Consequently, my criticism of the static approach as a whole is levelled against its exclusiveness in linguistic and, to a great extent, literary scholarship, rather than against its own *raison d'être*. The achievements of the static approach are too impressive to be brushed aside (centuries-long work of linguists is basically static), so that the two approaches to syntax (including poetic syntax and enjambment) should be regarded as mutually complementary rather than mutually contradictory.

The dynamic dimension can be described as a feature of "literary syntax" in sense (b) proposed in 3.4.1, and this may be the reason why complaints about its neglect in linguistics and in poetics have come mainly from scholars of the latter discipline. Indeed, "positive" contributions to dynamically oriented syntactic research, in linguistics or in poetics, are rare to the point of nonexistence. Most of the few exceptions that refer to the problem are confined to the important, though limited, task of calling attention to the supreme importance of this dimension and criticising its neglect in the professional literature. In this connection it is interesting to note the growing awareness of "literary syntax" in Anglo-American scholarship which, as in some other topics, lags behind East European scholarship.¹¹

A.S.D. Fowler (in an article reviewing Donald Davie's *Articulate Energy* [111] and quoted by Mrs. Nowotny in [382], 21), makes the following observation ([149], 87):

[...] it may be questioned whether we yet sufficiently recognize how sensitive is the complex of anticipations which is set up at each point in a sequence of words and phrases, and which enables the

¹¹ Among English-writing scholars who have drawn attention to this problem one could mention Warfel ([515], esp. 252) and Nowotny ([382], 21). An especially powerful case against the neglect of this aspect is made by Davie ([112], 74 and [113], 205-206). Similar views were expressed, or at least implied, much earlier in the work of such Russian and Czech scholars as Ějxenbaum [588], Tynjanov [578], Tomaševskij ([575], [577]), Brik [543], Žirmunskij [551], Mukarovský [370] and others.

It is true that this East-European tradition was "transplanted" into Anglo-American soil by several "Slavic"-born scholars through their English writings, e.g., Erlich [132], Pomorska [406], Jakobson [260], Hrushovski [247] and Levý ([312], [314]); yet Hollander ([238], 244) and Utley ([509], 327) have a point when they lament the widespread ignorance of East European scholarship in scholarly circles in the English-speaking countries.

- 13 -

reader to select the appropriate elements of connotation from the words following.

Donald Davie himself, in an article published later than his aforementioned book (*Articulate Energy* [111]), powerfully attacks the disregard of time-dimension in Anglo-American literary criticism (see especially [113], 205-206). He goes on, much in agreement with A.S.D. Fowler's view quoted above, to say ([113], 213-214):

[...] any work in any discourse has two contexts — first, what leads up to it, second, what leads away from it [...]. Thus syntactical manipulations [...] at the same time as they make of the present only a moving limit between past and future, also make the present time something to be dwelt upon and dwelt in, something lived.

The two quotations describe the extremely dynamic, ever-restless nature of the process of literary perception. Both scholars are virtually agreed in characterising this process by the rapid, incessant changes which take place in "the complex of anticipations" (A.S.D. Fowler's term), or in the make-up of each of the "two contexts" of each word (Davie's term). These changes usually occur at a word-by-word pace: with the perception of every new word a new "complex of anticipations" emerges, modified by its interaction with "the complex of anticipations" which preceded that word; and every new word, when perceived, withdraws from the context "leading away from" the previous word to join the context "leading up to" the next.¹²

¹² If taken as a full account of what happens in the reading process, this is an extreme reduction and oversimplification of a complex phenomenon. The process of reading, and particularly the reading of literature, is not confined to the dimension of the linear succession of elements actually perceived from the visual stimuli on the printed page or from the auditory stimuli produced by someone reading the text aloud. Reading is charac-

The dynamic approach as such is the subject of Chapter 5 in the present study. The purpose of the present subsection is only to point out that the scarcity of research on the dynamic aspects of language and literature, just as the scarcity of material on SIC and SMU, can demonstrate the dependence of certain developments in poetics on the achievements of linguistic research. As long as these achievements in this particular field are as meagre as they are, severe restrictions are imposed on the potentialities of the study of the nature and function of enjambment in poetry.

The acceptability or unacceptability of pauses for syntactic reasons, which is the most essential feature of the syntactic aspect of enjambment as defined above, is sensed dynamically while the text is being read from line to line, and not only determined statically after the entire process has been completed

A full-fledged static theory of SIC, as outlined in 3.2.2, cannot be proposed at the moment; but one can visualise its potential contribution to a better understanding of the nature

terised by a permanent process of "semantic integration" (B. Hrushovski's term; I am also indebted to his university lectures and to his views in [45a], [251a] and [251b] for the line of thought proposed here; the responsibility for the actual presentation is totally mine). In this process heterogeneous semantic elements, originating from diverse sources (e.g., continuous and discontinuous patterns in the text; allusions and associations invoking literary and nonliterary extratextual contexts; etc.) are interwoven into the seemingly simple step-by-step linear flow of words actually perceived by the eye or the ear.

However, for the purpose of the study of enjambment's syntactic aspect the linear syntactic-intonational approach proposed here is adequate, since enjambment and the line unit as such generally operate within the confines of their most immediate vicinity. This linear description may be inadequate, though, for the analysis of enjambment's semantic structure and function (see below, Chapter 6).

and functions of enjambment. It would provide solid and irrefutable criteria for a hierarchical scale rating enjambments according to their relative acuteness. It would translate vague intuitive and impressionistic generalisations, characterising the typical practices of poets, genres, schools and periods, into the language of tangible facts. Thus, for instance, it would account for the similarities and differences between the enjambments cited in 3.3 in objective terms, a task that the existing linguistic theories fail to perform. However, being a static theory, it could not provide the tools for analysing enjambment "at work". Even if and when the questions of the target-theory are answered and a real theory established, it is beyond the potential reach of this theory to account for the interaction between the structure of enjambment and the process of reading. Every single enjambment can be viewed both statically, asking how acute it is (i.e., what is the degree of SIC between the words separated by line-end), and dynamically, asking what the syntactic expectations at the end of the first line are, and how these expectations are treated by the beginning of the second line. Neither of these questions can be answered satisfactorily by modern linguistics.

3.4.3. Conclusion.

The answer to Question 4 in 3.0.3 is that the study of the syntactic structure of enjambment is almost totally dependent on linguistic theory and research. Since the vital linguistic tools are missing or deficient, it seems that poetics has to choose between two courses of action: it can either suspend its efforts until better results are supplied by linguistics, or it can venture intuitive guesses and tentative observations about the relevant language phenomena in order to proceed from there in its own task of studying the poetic functions and effects of enjambment.

In fact, the choice is not clear-cut, and a compromise can be made: a study in poetics can venture some observations of linguistic nature, yet stop short of an attempt to propose a full theory of the relevant language phenomena.

Such a compromise is actually adopted in the practice of the studies discussed in the next section and in the present study. This combination of the need to describe facts and phenomena in language, on the one hand, and the partial and somewhat superficial and oversimplified nature of these descriptions, on the other hand, is the result of the combination of the dependence of poetics on linguistics and the failure of the latter to meet the requirements of the former.

3.5. POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTION OF SOME STUDIES IN POETICS TO A THEORY OF *SIC*.

3.5.0. Preliminary.

After surveying the work of linguists (in 3.3) and the general problem of poetics' dependence on linguistics in matters relevant to the study of enjambment (in 3.4), I propose in the present section to examine studies in poetics and their ability to contribute to a theory of *SIC*, and hence to a theory of enjambment.

The basic principle adopted in these studies is outlined in very broad terms by John Hollander as follows ([241], 131, n.):

An enjambment may be said to be 'stronger' or 'weaker' according to the grammatical level at which it cuts apart the syntax. A hyphenation of a word, or the splitting of a phrase across a line break is 'stronger' than a mere clausal continuation, for example.

Two other scholars, Roger Fowler and Kiril Taranovski, develop more detailed hierarchical scales on similar principles,

introducing finer and more accurate distinctions. Both scholars approach the problem directly: they ask questions about the classification of enjambment and answer them forthwith, hardly bothering about linguistic preliminaries. However, as we shall presently see, short-cuts into enjambment classification that ignore gaps in linguistic theory are bound to miss some of the subtlest and most complex features of enjambment.

3.5.1. Roger Fowler's "Scale for Enjambment".

Roger Fowler's article "'Prose Rhythms' and Metre" [150] is one of the rare studies largely devoted to enjambment and the problem of its classification. In an overall evaluation of this article's contribution to the study of enjambment, its approach can be characterised as one-sidedly syntactic: Fowler makes some allowance for the relevance of metre to the study of enjambment (his treatment of metre is very brief, almost abrupt), but he virtually ignores the specific roles of meaning and intonation in this context. My criticism is not levelled at Fowler's decision to deal with one aspect of enjambment and not with the phenomenon as a whole (the present study is also focused on the syntactic aspects of enjambment), but at his lack of reference to other relevant aspects; such a reference could place his syntactically oriented approach in proportion. Having made this reservation, I shall discuss Fowler's syntactic approach as such, and on its own merits.

In direct reference to the problem of enjambment classification Fowler says ([150], 87-88):

Enjambment, by which a grammatical unit overflows a line-end, produces one sort of counterpoint [...]. There are degrees of enjambment, degrees of tension between the metre, wanting to make a break, and the grammar, wanting to be continuous. It seems that the smaller the grammatical unit concerned, the greater

its resistance to being stretched over a metrical boundary. Similarly, there are metrical boundaries of different weights [...]. One might construct a scale for enjambment, ranging from cases where the greatest grammatical break (between sentences) coincides with the firmest metrical rest (end of a set of rhymed lines) to cases where the smallest grammatical juncture (between the components which make up words, morphemes) is forced to coincide with a compelling metrical break (e.g., between stanzas).

This statement makes a very reasonable point; however, close scrutiny reveals certain shortcomings, which do not invalidate the basic approach:

1. With special reference to the words and phrases which I have underlined in the quotation, Fowler is wrong in equating "line-end" with "metrical boundary" (for reasons already given; see 2.1.3).

2. Fowler is also wrong in proposing the smallness of the grammatical unit as a sole criterion for its "resistance" to enjambment. He does not explain what exactly is meant by "small": is it a concept of length or of syntactic cohesion, depending on syntactically functional relationships? Does it cover only the relationship between the two words separated at line-end, or a larger segment? How is "smallness" measured, assessed, delimited?

Thus, for example, in Cordelia's lines already quoted (*King Lear* I, i, 96-97)

You have begot me, bred me, lov'd me. I
Return those duties back as are right fit,

what is the "grammatical unit concerned", according to Fowler? Is it "I return", or "I return those duties", or "I return those duties back", or "I return those duties back as are right fit"?

The problem itself is very complex, and no clear-cut solu-

tions can be proposed (see my discussion of SMIU boundaries, 3.1.2). However, it seems impossible to ascertain Fowler's position on the subject, because the question of how to determine the size of the syntactic segment relevant to the study of enjambment is not asked (let alone answered) by him. It is also clear from the entire discussion in the present chapter that the mere size or length of these "grammatical units" cannot serve as the sole criterion for the degree of their "resistance to being stretched over" a line boundary. For instance, a hypothetical enjambment like "They are nice/Men" is quite different, in terms of grammatical "resistance" to line-division, from a hypothetical enjambment like "They went to/School": although they are perfectly identical as far as any conceivable quantitative segmentation into relevant "grammatical units" is concerned. As we have seen (in 3.3), functional relationships cannot always account by themselves for SIC peculiarities; the same goes for nonfunctional phenomena (such as length): in the hypothetical example just given functional differences (between adjective/noun and preposition/noun relationships) account for SIC differences under identical length conditions.

The point is trivially obvious; in fact, I am convinced that Fowler himself never meant what is unfortunately implied by his wording: his "smallest grammatical juncture" is certainly less misleading than his "the smaller the grammatical unit", etc.; and the actual scale that he proposes ([150], 88-89, see below) is based on functional relationships rather than length.

3. Since Fowler's article is an aesthetically-oriented study in poetics, rather than a study in linguistics, his totally static approach is particularly regrettable. An aesthetically-oriented classification of enjambment¹³ cannot just

¹³ The point is that while all sorts of criteria for enjambment classification may exist, such as the number of T's or

ignore such concepts of "literary syntax" (see 3.4.1) as time, expectation, etc.

4. The very purpose of Fowler's "scale" is to reflect the interrelations between two separate subscales: one consisting of degrees of syntactic cohesion (I grant that this is what he actually means), and the other consisting of degrees of "weight" of "metrical boundaries". The structure of the argument implies that each of these subscales covers a range of possibilities stretching between two polar opposites. But, in fact, Fowler recognises only one subscale, the syntactic one, ranging as it does between "the greatest grammatical break" and "the smallest grammatical juncture". As for the metrical subscale, it is virtually nonexistent, since it is supposed to range between "a firmest metrical rest" and "A compelling metrical break", which amount to the same thing.

There is not much point in completing Fowler's scale by introducing the possibility of a weak line-boundary coinciding with a strong syntactic break, since the category can hardly exist (a strong syntactic break at line-boundary simply makes this boundary strong). However, in the case of enjambment which combines a cohesive syntactic structure forbidding pausal intonation with a weak line-boundary, the syntax would "have its way" more easily than in the case of enjambment combining such a cohesive syntactic structure with a "strong" line-boundary, and less easily than in a case of complete congruity (other things

B's in the lines and/or sentences concerned (to give an absurd example), the only classification that is relevant to enjambment as a phenomenon is a poetically- or aesthetically-oriented one. A classification of that kind should at least be able to make some kind of contribution to the investigation of such phenomena as the various structures, functions and effects of enjambments within a poetic context, or the characterisation of a certain period, genre, poet, or single work, in terms of its typical employment of enjambment.

being equal, of course). Yet it should be borne in mind that Fowler keeps speaking about metrical rests; and those can be studied in their own right (see 6.1.2), a study which Fowler does not carry out.

To conclude, in the quotation above Fowler does focus the reader's attention on correct and crucial questions, like How can enjambments be classified in terms of their syntactic cohesion? His basic notion is a sound one, despite all the wording defects. His "scale for enjambment" is not a full-fledged scale for enjambment, but a perfectly legitimate purely syntactic scale, ranging from unequivocally "end-stopped" lines, via borderline cases, to cases of syntactically poignant enjambment,¹⁴ with line boundary taken as a constant. However, Fowler does not seem to realise how partial his description is: alongside his total disregard of intonation, semantics and the dynamic aspect of language, and his limited treatment of metre, even his relatively extensive treatment of static syntax yields modest results. His scale is based on the premise that line-boundaries may coincide with the boun-

¹⁴ The most poignant enjambments occur, of course, when line boundaries are placed intramorphemically (that is, splitting a word, or a bound morpheme, in two). Fowler ([150], 89) cites a few examples of this practice, and his list can, of course, be extended. Such cases are rare and marginal as much as they are extreme (see Taranovski, [494], 84); strictly speaking, they are not covered by my definition of enjambment, and I shall not analyse textual examples of word-splitting enjambments.

The only comment I would like to make about such enjambments is that, theoretically, they can be roughly classified according to the following scheme: (a) cases where the first part of the split word (prior to the line boundary) is, potentially, a separate word (e.g., "spin/Ster"); (b) cases where the second part of the split word (beginning the next line) is, potentially, a separate word (e.g., "re/Veal"); (c) cases where both of the above occur (e.g., "stale/Mate"); (d) cases where none of the above occurs (e.g., "spe/Cial"). Each of these cases offers different possibilities of manipulating the reader's senses of expectation and recognition. See Chapter 5, note 33.

daries of (1) sentences; (2) clauses of a sentence; (3) phrases of a clause; (4) words of a phrase; (5) morphemes of a word (similar observations can be found elsewhere in the literature; e.g., Hollander [241], 131, see above; Leech [303], 125; Taranovski [494], 83-84, see below). Fowler's scale is obviously one of ascending purely-syntactic cohesion.¹⁵

Fowler sounds quite self-confident when he declares that "one might construct a scale for enjambment", and goes on to demonstrate this scale. The trouble is that this scale is based on substitutability and the time-honoured sentence-clause-phrase-word-morpheme hierarchy, which is by now syntactically trivial and intonationally inadequate. His discussion is a step in the right direction, but quite a small one. Fowler's contention that "a scale for enjambment" is a theoretical possibility makes sense; nevertheless, in the present state of affairs in both literary and linguistic scholarships one might not as yet "construct a scale for enjambment" that could do real justice even to the static view of the syntactic aspect of the phenomenon (let alone the interrelations between this and other aspects of it). Such a scale must be based on SIC theory; Fowler's scale correlates with this unattainable, SIC-based scale to the extent that substitutability-based syntactic cohesion correlates with SIC. Fowler's main achievements are: asking right questions, supplying

¹⁵ See 3.2.1 for a short discussion. Thus, Ophelia's line quoted there ("The courtier's, soldier's, scholar's, eye, tongue, sword") is a single phrase which is less cohesive in terms of SIC than many clauses (e.g., Lear's "If she must teem" [*King Lear* I, iv, 290], which is a perfect clause, and yet a pause between its phrases is less acceptable than a pause between the words of a phrase like Ophelia's in the line just quoted). Moreover, important differences exist between the various potential intraphrase breaks.

See also Johnson [264] for a psycholinguistic experiment pointing to the importance of intraphrase, in addition to interphrase, transitions.

illuminating examples, and focusing attention on crucial problems. His answers, however, sometimes oversimplify these complex problems. Moreover, as far as the dynamic dimension of syntax is concerned, Fowler's main weakness is not his failure to solve the problems but his failure to notice them.

3.5.2. Kiril Taranovski's Treatment of Enjambment Classification.

In the process of compiling my Bibliography the only study that I came across whose title included a direct reference to enjambment was Taranovski's article [494]. It is unique not only in being concerned with enjambment as its major topic, but also in its characteristic combination of subtle analysis of poetry, generally lucid theoretical thinking, and economical presentation of its argument. This last merit, however, is also a disadvantage, since some phenomena are too complex to be discussed briefly.

Taranovski's scale of descending syntactic cohesion is partially similar to Fowler's, though not identical with it in terminology and in fine detail. He proposes six potential syntactic possibilities and relates them to enjambment ([494], 83-84):

Theoretically, the following cases are possible:

- (1) the line boundary coincides with a syllable boundary and divides a word into two parts;
- (2) the line boundary separates a porclitic or an enclitic from a stressed word and divides a word-unit into two parts;
- (3) the line boundary divides a syntagm¹⁶ into two parts;

¹⁶ This term is explained by Taranovski in a special footnote, which runs as follows ([494], 82, n. 4):

(4) the line boundary separates a part of one syntagm from a word which is a part of another syntagm (in the case of syntactic inversion);¹⁷

(5) the line boundary separates two different syntagms;

(6) the line boundary coincides with the end of a sentence.

The first two cases pertain to so-called rare enjambments in all European versification. Here the enjambment is always present, however the verse is pronounced: without any emphasis at the end of the line, with a slight marking of its end by agogical means, or, in some cases, by a rhetorical pause. Also in the third case the enjambment is always present, and in the fourth and fifth cases it is conditioned by a strong intonational break inside the line.

In the sixth case the enjambment to the next line is simply excluded.

The scale proposed by Taranovski, just as the one proposed by Fowler, is undoubtedly correct, being based on an elementary,

In this paper the term *syntagm* is used in the meaning which it has in the Yugoslav linguistic school of Prof. Belić. According to Belić, the syntagm is a group of words representing an inner unity of meaning or function. However, the syntagm does not express a subject-predicate relation; it differs in that from a sentence.

As far as I can gather from this vague explanation, as well as from the way this term is used in context, "syntagm" covers virtually all cases described as "phrases", and some cases described as "clauses", in English traditional description.

¹⁷ This special category is closely linked with Taranovski's whole line of argument. It deals with deviant sentence structures, and I shall ignore it at the moment.

obvious hierarchy. In both cases it is not the correctness of the scales that can be challenged but their adequacy and their degree of refinement and sophistication.

If the term "syntagm", introduced here by Taranovski, were something equivalent to my SMIU, and if it were defined with clarity and precision, it could constitute a very important contribution to a theory of enjambment. However, at least to anyone unacquainted with the writings of Prof. Belić and his school the term is vague and obscure (see note 16), and I cannot see how it can make Taranovski's scale more refined and sophisticated than Fowler's (see 3.5.1).

It is easily demonstrable that clauses, phrases, etc., can differ greatly from each other in terms of SIC, sometimes to the extent that one phrase, for instance, may resemble a word, or a clause, more than it resembles another phrase (see 3.2.1 and note 15 for examples). Furthermore, finer distinctions between various types of intraphrase or intracause pauses are significant for a functional analysis of enjambment, but Taranovski's scale as such does not supply such distinctions.

Taranovski's textual analyses abound in stimulating insights; his distinctions in these analyses, though inevitably intuitive, are invariably convincing and illuminating. But he always sticks to the same analytical procedure of comparing genuine enjambment specimens with hypothetical alternatives, while the actual enjambment under inspection remains intact, as a constant (i.e., the same two words always flank the line boundary on both sides), with potential alternative locations of caesuras before and/or after it treated as variables. This method proves fruitful, to be sure; but it had rather be complemented by the reverse procedure, namely, by treating the location of enjambment as a variable, offering several hypothetical alternatives for dividing the same sentence between lines. The latter procedure (as adopted by Tynjanov [578], 102-103, and by Kell [278], 342-344) must in all

cases make the investigator aware of obvious, though occasional subtle, differences of enjambment acuteness with every possible division compared to all the other alternative divisions of the same text between lines. As an example to demonstrate the two procedures I would like to cite the following text from the last three lines in Part II of T.S. Eliot's *Ash-Wednesday* (Eliot, 86)

[...] This is the land which ye
Shall divide by lot. And neither division nor unity
Matters. This is the land. [...]

Taranovski's method of analysis in [494] would test the structure and effects of the first enjambment against the background of such hypoethical alternatives as:

- A. This is the land. Ye
Shall divide it by lot.
- B. This is the land; and we and they and ye
Shall divide it by lot.
- C. [...] I shall, ye
Shall, we shall all divide this land by lot.
- D. This is the land, and in the future even ye
Shall, for so ye must, divide it by lot.

Similarly, the second enjambment (originally: "And neither division nor unity/Matters") would be tested, according to Taranovski's method, against the background of such hypothetical alternatives as

- E. And neither division nor unity
Matters for us any more
- F. [...] Unity
Matters no more than division
- G. Division can hardly matter; unity
Matters a lot.

Of course, there can be other variants, but the principle demonstrated is clear: all the alternatives retain the two words flanking line-end on both sides as a constant, while manoeuvring with the SMIU boundaries and treating them as variables.

Taranovski's achievements through this method are very impressive: he manages to isolate the specific contribution of the relative length of the relevant segments (stretching between the line boundary and the nearest intralinear pauses preceding and/or following it) to the nature and effect of enjambment. He is likewise convincing in demonstrating that, in certain cases, the distance between such intralinear pauses and the line boundary is the sole factor determining whether we have an enjambment or an end-stopped line while the words separated by the line boundary, and the syntactic functional relationship between them, remain intact. So much for Taranovski's method.

Now the complementary method of analysis, as I have just said, is adopted by Tynjanov ([578], 102-103) and Kell ([278], 342-344). In the Eliot example it would mean testing the original first enjambment against the background of such hypothetical alternatives as

- H. This is
 The land which ye shall divide by lot
- I. This is the
 Land which ye shall divide by lot
- J. This is the land which
 Ye shall divide by lot
- K. This is the land which ye shall
 Divide by lot
- L. This is the land which ye shall divide
 By lot
- M. This is the land which ye shall divide by
 Lot

Similarly, the second Eliot enjambment would be analysed against the background of such hypothetical alternatives as:

- N. [...] And
 Neither division nor unity matters.
- O. And neither
 Division nor unity matters.
- P. And neither division
 Nor unity matters.
- Q. And neither division nor
 Unity matters.

There is no need to carry out here the actual detailed analyses of the Eliot examples against the background of each of the hypothetical alternatives: the achievements of Taranovski in his study [494] amply demonstrate the potentialities of the first method, and those of Tynjanov ([578], 102-103) and Kell ([278], 342-344) are likewise impressive with regard to the second method. Both scholars' analyses are based on theoretical hypotheses that can be abstracted from their discussions of the specific texts chosen by them and reapplied to additional texts, provided that the individual features of each text, notably its semantic content, are cautiously taken into account. By a thorough textual analysis of the real and hypothetical examples just proposed, I can add no new theoretical insights to those already proposed in the two works just cited. The two types of hypothetical alternatives are presented here only to illustrate the two complementary goals of the two analytical procedures: Taranovski's procedure (as demonstrated in alternatives A-G) isolates the factor of length as its primary object of study, by varying the distance between one or both of the boundaries of the relevant SMIU (the caesuras) on the one hand and the enjambmental interlinear transition on the other hand, without altering the structure of the latter; the procedure adopted by Tynjanov

and Kell¹⁸ (as demonstrated in alternatives H-Q) isolates the factor of functional relationships between any two consecutive words in the given SMIU as its primary object of study, by varying the location of the line boundary and the structure of enjambmental transition while clinging to the original locations of the caesuras. Each of these procedures, then, isolates the workings of one of the major parameters of SIC; employing both of them in an integrative, complementary manner must make one realise the complex nature of the interaction between the various parameters.

In fact, Taranovski practised another type of complementary discussion: while his textual analyses demonstrate some contributions of length to enjambment structures and effects, ignoring functional relationships, his theoretical scale is concerned with the hierarchy of functional relationships between words separated at line-end in enjambment. In discussing the latter subject he remains on the theoretical level and does not test his scale with textual analyses based on "the Tynjanov-Kell procedure". Taranovski's theoretical argument quoted above is convincing and illuminating inasmuch as it makes the point that the presence or absence of enjambment is dictated by length in cases that are middle-of-the-road in terms of cohesion, whereas cases that are syntactically extremely cohesive are "enjambment-generating" and those at the other extreme are "enjambment-repellent", regardless of length conditions. However, the syntagm as a unit is as inadequate as "phrase" or "clause", and for the same reasons

¹⁸ To the best of my knowledge the two scholars, Tynjanov and Kell, were not acquainted with each other's work: the former for obvious chronological reasons, the latter, probably, for reasons of English insularity (I may be wrong in this particular case, but his lack of reference to his East-European predecessors is *prima facie* evidence; see note 11). In view of the unlikelihood of influence on either side it is of special interest that their observations and methods of analysis are so similar.

(namely, its lack of correspondence with SMIU). But even if my suggested SMIU were used instead of "syntagm", subtle intra-SMIU differences could not be accounted for by Taranovski's scale. It is fair to note, however, that the scale is not designed to account for these differences in the first place.

A glance at my alternatives H-M and N-Q will demonstrate the inadequacy of this scale for the purpose of a full account of SIC subtleties. Although I could not gather from Taranovski's explanation what exactly a "syntagm" is, I understand the term within rough limits, enough to enable me to make the following points: (a) at least alternatives H, I, J, K and M to Eliot's first enjambment (and perhaps the other alternatives as well) belong to category 3 in Taranovski's scale ("the line boundary divides a syntagm into two parts"); (b) alternatives I, K and M are definitely more acute, in terms of SIC, than H and J; (c) this difference of acuteness is primarily accounted for by differences in functional syntactic relationships rather than differences of length; (d) consequently, these functional differences are too subtle for Taranovski's scale.

These are intuitive observations; but I am certain that they can stand any test of psycholinguistic experimental verification. Taranovski's scale (unlike his textual analyses) is strictly syntactic and nonintonational, and therefore it fails to respond to such syntactic-intonational subtleties as reflected in the differences between the alternatives just mentioned. Such differences matter a great deal when it comes to literary questions, such as the characterisation of poets, schools, trends, and periods in poetry, or even single works, in terms of their typical stylistic preferences in the employment of enjambment (see, for instance, Chatman's juxtaposition of seventeenth-century metaphysical poetry with eighteenth-century neoclassical poetry in this respect [81]).

Thus, for instance, a poet (or a work, or a school of poets)

may be characterised as favouring "type-3 enjambment" in Taranovski's scale, but this would be a very broad characterisation. There are significant differences between the "enjambmental styles" of poets like Marianne Moore, whose works abound in extremely acute enjambments (e.g., separating an article and a noun), on the one hand, and poets like T.S. Eliot, who tend to prefer more moderate enjambments, on the other hand; yet as long as Taranovski's scale is not made more refined, it would label both practices as preferring "type-3 enjambments".

To recapitulate:

1. Taranovski's scale is a hierarchy of functional syntactic relationships arranged according to the degree of purely syntactic cohesion.

2. The purpose of this scale is to determine where, between the poles of maximum and minimum syntactic cohesion, the presence or absence of enjambment depends on considerations of segment-length.

3. While the abstract idea that such a hierarchical scale exists is intuitively convincing, its application in the actual scale proposed is inadequate: this scale's central concept, "syntagm", fails to bridge the gap between purely syntactic cohesion and SIC; therefore, while most "syntagms" comply with the role assigned to them in this scale, others do not (see 3.2.1 and note 15 for illustration of this point).

4. Taranovski's scale cannot be blamed for failing to perform tasks that it does not undertake in the first place; however, one can still note that, as far as SIC theory is concerned, this scale does not carry us beyond the points already reached with previous linguistic and literary scholarship.

5. The present study, for reasons already given, cannot solve some of the major problems, but it is hoped that by asking questions hitherto unasked and exposing some of the inadequacies

of existing theories and analyses it can suggest in what direction one should look for answers and solutions.

3.5.3. Poetics and SIC Theory: Concluding Remarks.

The present section explored the possibility that studies in poetics directly concerned with problems of enjambment hierarchies and classifications might have gone beyond the point reached by linguistics as far as applicability to the study of SIC and the syntactic classification of enjambment are concerned. The detailed discussion of the two most prominent studies known to me that fit the above description, by Fowler and Taranovski, has reaffirmed my contention (see 3.4.3 and 3.5.0) that any positive breakthrough in SIC theory is preconditioned by progress in linguistic theory. Studies in poetics, because of their direct interest in the problem, have asked questions about matters that many linguists have overlooked; they have also supplied the kind of textual examples and analyses that illustrate the most complex theoretical problems. Reading the best discussions on enjambments in poetic texts one can often get the impression that, at least in this field, theoretical poetics lags behind descriptive poetics.

3.6. THE STATIC AND FUNCTIONAL VIEW OF SYNTAX:

A BRIEF RECAPITULATION OF FAULTS AND MERITS

The prevailing trends in contemporary scholarship have provided the basic frame of reference for discussion in the present chapter. In concluding it I would like to emphasise once again that the static and functional approach to syntax is indispensable for a complete view of enjambment.

The main advantage of the "static" approach is its reliance on "solid facts", with all the relevant evidence at the investigator's disposal. Enjoying the luxury of dealing with known entities and quantities, this approach can yield relatively tangible results. The proposed aims of a static theory of SIC were

outlined in 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 above.

As I have been trying to show, the modest achievements in theorists' efforts to produce a hierarchical scale for SIC is not solely the result of their neglect of the dynamic approach; some of the more challenging aspects of the "static" approach have been just as neglected as the "dynamic" approach as a whole. The sentence/clause/phrase/word/morpheme distinction, for instance, leaves much to be desired in terms of refinement and sophistication even in dealing with the complexities and subtleties of completed utterances.

In short, a way should be found to refine the existing hierarchies of syntactic functional cohesion and to discover the rules governing the correlations between these hierarchies and the intonational cohesion in enjambment. This is the main goal of static functional contribution to enjambment theory, and no such theory can be complete without it. The present study has not achieved this goal.

There is no harm in a theory being exclusively static and functional as long as it is presented as such, with the theorist openly admitting that the same material has other aspects which he deliberately chooses not to investigate. The trouble with most theorists, though, is that by ignoring the very existence of the dynamic and nonfunctional aspects of the problem they turn an otherwise legitimate methodological preference into a major theoretical oversight.

The answer to Question 6 in 3.0.3 has in fact been given clearly, though piecemeal, throughout the chapter, and there is no point in repeating it here. The state of affairs in the relevant scholarship is not satisfactory; but without its conceptual achievements and intellectual efforts no discussion of the subject would be conceivable, not even a discussion like this one, which is critical of previous scholarship. My predecessors' efforts and achievements are an indispensable point

of departure for my endeavours to study nonfunctional parameters as length and the dynamic aspect of syntax and to stress their importance. These endeavours will dominate the next two chapters of the present study.

4. SYNTACTIC LENGTH (SL) AND ENJAMBMENT

4.0. EXPOSITION OF THE PRESENT CHAPTER

4.0.1. Preliminary

The present chapter is concerned with the concept of syntactic length (SL) and its relevance to enjambment. SL is a feature of all utterances in language; it is measurable by, and proportionate to, the actual number of segmental surface-structure elements (e.g., syllables, morphemes, words, phrases, etc.)¹ that make up any given syntactically significant segment (e.g., phrase, clause, sentence, Taranovski's [Belić's] syntagm, my own SMIU and SMAU, etc.).

The question of whether SL is a genuinely syntactic phenomenon depends on how the term "syntax" is understood. If "syntax" refers to everything that resides in the interrelations, combinations and structurations of words in utterances and not in these words' inner structure, SL belongs to syntax. If, however, the term "syntax" refers exclusively to functional relations between

¹ In comparisons between two syntactic segments one segment may be longer than the other if SL is measured by words, while the reverse is true if SL is measured by syllables. Thus, for instance, in Act III of Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* Antony begins his famous speech with the line "Friends, Romans, countrymen, lend me your ears". In the first part of this line ("Friends, Romans, countrymen") the number of words is three and the number of syllables is six; in the second part of the same line ("lend me your ears") both the number of words and the number of syllables is the same (four). Thus, if SL is measured by words, the first part of the line is shorter than the second, and if it is measured by syllables the first part is longer than the second.

Such discrepancies are rare, and may occur only in short segments; and even when they do occur, the precise nature of SL, whether based on words or on syllables, can be clarified in each instance. Thus, there is no need in the present study for a full theoretical subdistinction between two types of SL, word-SL and syllable-SL.

words in sentences, SL is not included in syntax.

Syntactic theory tends to define syntax in the latter, narrower sense, (i.e., it has practically excluded SL from syntax by ignoring it almost completely). The point is, however, that SL is ignored in linguistics as a whole, not only in syntactic theory, and this in itself is not reason enough to exclude it from language; by the same token, it cannot be excluded from syntax simply because most theorists of syntax have overlooked it. In terms of linguistics, SL must be regarded as a syntactic phenomenon, at least by elimination, since it does not fall within the province of morphology, phonology, or semantics. If syntax cannot cope with SL, a new subdiscipline may have to be introduced into linguistics. As long as this has not been done — and it is up to linguists alone to decide whether it should be done — SL must be regarded as an aspect of syntax, which is why I coined the term "syntactic length"; the initials SL, however, can also stand for "segmental length", meaning the same thing in the context of the present discussion: SL is the length of surface-structure segments whose identity and discreteness are determined syntactically.

4.0.2. Basic Problems in Discussing SL.

There are three basic problems in discussing SL in the context of the present study: (1) the almost total lack of published linguistic material on the subject; (2) the difficulty in observing the methodological demarcation lines between static and dynamic aspects of syntax; (3) the difficulty in observing the differences between SMIUs and SMAUs.

1. As for the absence of linguistic literature, I shall simply have to state my own views, sometimes based on common sense and intuition alone. However, in poetics the concept of SL is not as ignored as in linguistics: it is implicitly incorporated into traditional enjambment classification, to be examined in 4.1.1.

2. As for the confusion between static and dynamic aspects of syntax, my contention is that the distinction between the two is particularly problematic in the case of SL, more so than in the case of functional syntactic parameters. Indeed, since this distinction (as introduced above in 3.0.2 and 3.4.2) offers two complementary ways of looking at the same phenomenon, the demarcation between the static and the dynamic is often fluid, in functional parameters and in SL alike. However, in the case of functional syntactic relationships an exclusively static approach can yield valid and significant results (as can be found in centuries of syntactic theory and analysis). Even the static theory of SIC, though unattainable as yet, can still be formulated as a significant target-theory. Contrary to this situation, discussions of SL's contribution to enjambment are likely to be insignificant if they adhere to its static aspect.

This difference results from the fact that functional relationships (subject/predicate, verb/object, adjective/noun, subordinate clause/principal clause, etc.) are too diverse and heterogeneous to enable one to order them hierarchically on a scale of degrees of cohesion (see 3.2.2, and especially 3.2.3). A hierarchical scale of degrees of SL, on the other hand, can automatically and unequivocally be established by simple counting (e.g., a segment comprising two words is longer than one comprising one word and shorter than one comprising three words). It follows, then, that in the case of SL a purely static approach is doomed to triviality, and the integration of the two approaches, the static and the dynamic, is imperative for a meaningful discussion. The present chapter, then, will study SL's contribution to enjambment both statically and dynamically; therefore, it can serve as a transition between the discussion of the static aspect of functional syntactic relationships (in Chapter 3) and the discussion of their dynamic aspect (in Chapter 5). A few basic dynamic concepts, which will be discussed in detail in Chapter 5, will be introduced in the present chapter very briefly in order to make

the dynamic discussion of SL possible.

3. As for the distinction between SMIUs and SMAUs, it is primarily based on SL considerations: manoeuvring with SMIU boundary location amounts to undermining its integrity and discreteness and obscuring the distinction itself. The present chapter, however, will stick to the study of intra-SMIU SL. Inter-SMIU relationships within SMAUs are also influenced by SL and its interactions with other parameters. However, the characteristic workings of SL in SMAUs are almost unanalysable in isolation. Unlike their smaller-scale intra-SMIU counterparts, they have to be explained in close connection with the analysis of the functional syntactic relationships with which they interact. For this reason the discussion of SMAU-SL will be deferred to a special section in the next chapter (see 5.5).

4.0.3. Major Questions Discussed in the Present Chapter.

The chapter will discuss the following major questions:

Question 1: What is the inadequacy of the static approach to SL in the traditional poetics of enjambment, and how can it be improved by a more dynamic approach?

Question 2: What is the contribution of SL to SMIU tension and how relevant is this question to the study of enjambment?

4.1. FROM STATIC TO DYNAMIC: BEYOND THE TRADITIONAL APPROACH

4.1.1. The Concepts of *rejet* and *contre-rejet*, Their Advantages and Limitations.

Rejet and *contre-rejet* (henceforth R and CR, respectively) are units of SL directly and inseparably linked with the concept of enjambment (see Engstrom-Preminger's definition [130]). The employment focuses the analyst's attention on a very important aspect of enjambment, namely, its location (in terms of SL rather than in terms of functional syntactic relationships) within the

SMIU which it splits.

This distinction is firmly rooted in the "static" approach to enjambment. According to Engstrom-Preminger's definition ([130], 687), R occurs "when the lesser part of a grammatical phrase-unit flows over from one line to the next", while CR occurs "when the greater part of a grammatical phrase-unit overflows in this way". Whether the part of the "grammatical phrase-unit" (=my SMIU) which precedes the end of the line is "greater" or "lesser" than the one following it cannot be determined until that unit has been completed: only then can the two parts be compared and their relative sizes established.

Kiril Taranovski puts the distinction between R and CR in different terms. To him, the most common type of enjambment is characterised by "the presence of a strong intonational break [...] inside a line [...] which is opposed to a weaker intonational break [...] at the end of the same line (in the case of *contre-rejet*) or of the previous one (in the case of *rejet*)" ([494], 80-81). Taranovski's position at this point is somewhat vague, since it very frequently happens — as it does in his own first Russian example ([494], 81) — that the "weaker intonational break" at line-end is both preceded and followed by intralinear stronger breaks, in which case it is impossible to judge which one of the two is "opposed" to it. On the next page, however, his position becomes clearer: he implies that the "weaker intonational break" at line-end is always "opposed" to the nearest strong intralinear break. While I take some exception to this hypothesis in its present form,² what concerns the present

² Taranovski makes his point as if it were too obvious to bother about substantiating it. The matter is not so simple, however: a more complex, parametric approach could deal with it more adequately by conceding the existence of variables — notably, of course, semantic ones — whose interference might modify the overall picture and make the farther "strong intralinear break" function as "opposed" to the end of the line more than the nearer

discussion is that, despite the wording differences, by adopting it Taranovski is in complete accord with the acceptable definition and description of the R/CR distinction quoted above (it should be noted that both Taranovski and Engstrom draw on the same classical authority — Maurice Grammont's *Le vers français* [Paris, 1913] — for defining the R/CR distinction). Taranovski simply "translates" the accepted SL-oriented definition into intonational terms.

It follows that regardless of whether the distinction between R and CR is directly (with Engstrom) or indirectly (with Taranovski as described in terms of SL, it is a purely static distinction. Thus for example, in the course of his analysis Taranovski [494] never asks whether a given specimen is to be labelled R or CR, but, rather, whether it is an enjambment or not. Once its status as an enjambment has been established, it is readily and automatically subclassified as R or CR or neither (where the distances between the end of the enjambed line and the two intralinear breaks preceding and following it are equal, or where no such breaks occur in its nearest vicinity).

This employment of the distinction can hardly contribute to theoretical progress: a *rejet* is an enjambment where line-end is placed nearer to the end of the SMIU than to its beginning and wherever we spot such an enjambment we should label it as *rejet*... Yet it is difficult to see how else the distinction can be used, given the definitions of R and CR. According to these definitions, as I have argued, R and CR are static concepts, quite unsusceptible to the interplay between expectation and its subsequent fulfilment or frustration, or, in other words, to the

one (for instance, if there is some semantic analogy between the word at the end of the line and the word preceding that farther pause). Rhythmically speaking, however, Taranovski's case is very convincing. The trouble is that rhythm is not the only factor in a poetic text, a fact that is not given its due weight in his argument.

interplay between the known and the unknown during the process of perception. The distinction thus used offers little more than a self-centred and self-sufficient taxonomy; unlike the case of static functional concepts, the only hierarchy of R and CR is based on SL, i.e., on counting words and/or syllables before and/or after the line boundary. The potential contribution of the R/CR distinction to a static SIC theory is also negligible.

The rule governing the isolated contribution of SL to pause-desirability in SMIUs, when viewed statically, can be formulated as follows: OTHER THINGS BEING EQUAL, PAUSE-DESIRABILITY INCREASES TOWARDS THE MIDDLE OF THE *SMIU* AND DECREASES TOWARDS BOTH ITS ENDS. This rule implicitly underlies Taranovski's analyses in [494]. It is the manifestation of a universal of human speech, namely, the tendency to avoid pausing too soon after a previous pause. In other words, statically speaking, SL works for mid-SMIU pauses and against pauses occurring nearer to the beginning and the end of the SMIU (other things being equal, of course). Consequently, R and CR have, in principle, the same potential for pause-desirability (and pause-resistance). The comparability of pause-resistance at both ends of the SMIU, when viewed statically, neutralises the traditional R/CR distinction as such for the purpose of SIC analysis; it has no bearing on the understanding of syntactic expectation, cohesion, etc.

4.1.2. A Dynamic Complementary to a Static Distinction: The PR/PCR Dichotomy.

The R/CR distinction has much more to it than hitherto suggested, in spite of its defects. To make use of its neglected potentialities one should adopt a more "dynamic" approach, in addition to (and not instead of) the "static" one: one should first describe things as they actually happen in the process of reading, step by step, each step characterised by the pendulum-movement of guessing the future and reassessing the past; this kind of dynamic reading should then be juxtaposed with the static

view of the complete utterance. Such a combined procedure of analysis would render the R/CR distinction much more significant and fruitful by making it more attentive and responsive to the surprises of the poetic text; but to achieve this goal the R/CR distinction has to be supplemented by an additional, finer distinction during the "dynamic" stage of analysis.

I propose, then, to introduce a distinction between "potential *rejet*" (PR) and "potential *contre-rejet*" (PCR), which is based on the assumption that SMIUs tend to have a limited range of optimal SL.³ When this SL optimum is greater than the distance between the intralinear beginning of an SMIU and the syntactically unjustified boundary of the same line, what results is PCR; however, this is a tentative description, which may later be confirmed as a real CR or contradicted by what emerges as R (or as neither R nor CR). When SL optimum is less than that distance, what results is PR, which may later be confirmed or contradicted in the same way. Thus, for instance, a line terminating with the words "He is" preceded by a full stop is likely to be perceived as PCR, since the optimal SL for an SMIU is certainly greater than these words, both because they are only two words and because they are monosyllables (see note 1 above), so that the reader is likely to expect a CR here (e.g., "He is/A totally untrustworthy man"). Yet this expectation may be frustrated by turning the PCR into R rather than CR (e.g., "He is/ There").

In PR a conflict exists between the combined forces of the verse-line and SL, both working for a pause, on the one hand, and the forces of functional-structural syntactic relationships,

³ I am indebted to B. Hrushovski for suggesting this notion to me in a personal communication. He puts this optimum at about 2-4 words or major stresses per colon, and every larger unit breaks up into subunits ("colon" in traditional poetics is roughly equivalent to my SMIU). This is one of the principles underlying his discussion in [248]; however, since I am quoting a personal communication, I am fully responsible for the presentation in this footnote.

forbidding such a pause, on the other hand. The reverse happens, of course, in PCR, where SL combines forces with functional-structural aspects of syntax in opposing the pause enhanced by line-end.

It is precisely what happens in the transition from PR or PCR to R or CR (all four possibilities exist) which enables SL to contribute to the uniqueness of different enjambments. PR and PCR are expectational phenomena; and here as elsewhere in literature much of the total effect of a given text results from, and depends on, how expectations are aroused and manipulated. The employment of PR and PCR during the dynamic stage of analysis gives genuinely nontrivial significance to the R/CR distinction and the static stage of analysis: only a combined, integrated static-dynamic procedure can be receptive to the unique inter-relations between SL and the process of reading in each instance.

This is, in fact, the answer to Question 1 in 4.0.3.

4.2. *SMIU*-TENSION AND *SL*'S CONTRIBUTION TO IT

4.2.1. *SMIU*-Tension: A Preliminary Presentation of the Concept.

With the introduction of the PR/PCR dichotomy the discussion has moved from the relatively solid ground of static omniscience, where all the syntactically relevant data are supplied, into the less solid ground of dynamic guesswork, where the syntactic data supplied up to a given point serve as a basis for predicting the temporarily missing or suspended ones. The main discussion of the dynamic view of enjambment will follow in the next chapter, where the dynamic aspect of functional syntactic relationships will be analysed. Here, in the context of SL's dynamic aspect, a brief introduction anticipating the main discussion will suffice.

The central term of the dynamic approach to the syntax of enjambment is "syntactic tension". "Tension" as employed in the

present study is basically an intonational phenomenon. It is the psychological, or rather psycholinguistic urge felt at a given point to continue an utterance without some kind of a pausal juncture. More strictly, it can be defined as the predictability at a given point of a pause-resistant continuation. It can further be subclassified into SMIU-tension and SMAU-tension: the former occurs whenever the very next textual element expected at a given point cannot be preceded by any kind of pausal juncture, terminal or nonterminal; the latter occurs whenever the very next element expected is a nonterminal pausal juncture.

SMIU-tension, which is more directly relevant to enjambment, is the dynamic equivalent of SIC: it relates to SIC as PR and PCR relate to R and CR, respectively (it is only for reasons of brevity and simplicity that I have adopted this term and not "potential syntactic-intonational cohesion").

The sense of tension may result from semantic considerations as well as syntactic ones; however, the terms "SMIU-tension" and "SMAU-tension" will henceforth exclusively refer to the contribution of formal syntactic relationships (see 4.0.1 and Chapter 3, note 5) to the overall intonational tension as just described.

A much fuller discussion of intonational tension and its various parameters, notably syntax, will be given in the next chapter; the present section's exposition of the term is sufficient, however, as an introduction to a discussion of SL's contribution to SMIU-tension.

4.2.2. The Contribution of SL to SMIU-Tension.

In any discussion of SL in SMIUs the concept of "SL optimum" is of primary importance. It is mainly, perhaps even exclusively, through the operation of this optimum as a norm that the parameter of SL makes its influential contribution to the nature and intensity of SMIU-tension.

This contribution can be described as follows: it is an actively positive contribution, enhancing tension, at the beginning of the SMIU (a premature pause is bound to meet resistance); it weakens gradually until neutralised around SL optimum boundary; then it gradually becomes an actively "negative", anti-tension contribution as the prolonged SMIU is dragged on (when a pause is overdue it is not merely tolerated, but eagerly awaited). Theoretically, the number of SL possibilities for SMIUs appears to be endless, but in reality it is very difficult, at least because of the urge to breathe in speech (which mentally affects silent reading as well), to suspend pauses for too long. Practically speaking, then, SMIU-SL can vary within relatively narrow limits.

SL's contribution to the overall effect of SMIU-tension is linear and one-way. Its influence may, of course, be overridden in any given text by the adverse action of other parameters.

The basic formula of SL in SMIU-tension, then, is simple: OTHER THINGS BEING EQUAL, THE FARTHER A GIVEN WORD FROM THE BEGINNING OF ITS *SMIU*, THE LESS *SMIU*-TENSION IT CARRIES.⁴ But other things are seldom equal, and the functional syntactic expectations at any given point determine the nature of SMIU-tension

⁴ An integrated static-dynamic procedure of analysis should juxtapose this dynamic rule with its static counterpart (i.e., with the rule formulated and capitalised in the last paragraph of 4.1.1): while the dynamic rule captures a given moment in the process of reading and assesses its SMIU-tension according to its distance from the beginning of the SMIU, the static one takes both distances from the beginning of the SMIU and from its end into account. In other words, while the dynamic rule proposes an opposition between the beginning of an SMIU and a given word which functions as an end of an *ad hoc* segment, the static rule proposes an opposition between the middle of a segment on the one hand and both its beginning and its end on the other hand. Thus, in the case of PCR that turns into an unexpected R, the dynamic rule can account for SL enhancement of line-end tension, while the static one can account for SL's enhancement of pause-desirability at line-end. The two rules can thus be brought into harmony or into discord, depending on the SL proportions between three factors: (a) the pre-line-end part of the SMIU; (b) the post-line-end part of the SMIU; (c) the extratextual norm of SL optimum.

through their interaction with SL.

It follows that in PCR, where SL's contribution to SMIU-tension is greater, potentially less cohesive functional relationships may be sufficient to make enjambment predictable. Thus, for instance, in Cordelia's lines quoted from *King Lear* I, i, 96-97 ("You have begot me, bred me, loved me. I/ Return those duties back as are right fit"; see 3.2.1), the first line ends with the word "I" preceded by a full stop; it is the extreme shortness (the monosyllable "I") of the part of the SMIU preceding line-end that causes a strong urge to continue, although in terms of functional relationships "I" does not necessarily anticipate a pause-resistant continuation. In PR, on the other hand, an end-stopped line is much more likely to be expected, and a strong functional incompleteness (e.g., ending the line with a preposition or an article) is needed to suggest the likelihood of enjambment.

In comparing different types of enjambment in search of enjambment classification the simple nature of SL contribution to SMIU-tension is of special value. It serves as a solid, reliable basis for comparison, neutralising the obvious hierarchies based on simple counting, and focusing attention on the difficult and complex hierarchies based on functional syntactic relationships. It can easily be determined, then, whether a given similarity or dissimilarity between two enjambments, in terms of SIC or SMIU-tension, results from SL or functional relationships, because the former is so readily describable and measurable.

The answer to Question 2 in 4.0.3 has been given, then. It now remains to be seen how the functional syntactic relationships affect enjambment when the whole topic is viewed dynamically, i.e., when the process of reading is closely watched and assessed step by step. The contribution of SL to SMAU-tension will be discussed in connection with SMAU functional syntactic relationships (see 5.5).

5. A "DYNAMIC" VIEW OF THE "FUNCTIONAL-SYNTACTIC"

COMPONENT OF ENJAMBMENT

5.0. EXPOSITION OF THE PRESENT CHAPTER.

5.0.1. Preliminary.

The present chapter approaches the problem of "syntactic permission" of pausal junctures, as implied in the Definition (see 2.3.3), through a dynamic view (see Chapter 1, note 19; see also 3.0.2 and 3.4.2) of functional syntactic relationships: in the process of poetry-reading the presence and absence of this type of "syntactic permission" are dynamically sensed as potentials before they are established or negated statically. The concept of SMU-tension as introduced in 4.2.1 is central to this discussion in the same manner that its static counterpart, SIC, was central to the discussion in Chapter 3.

The application of the dynamic approach to textual analysis involves two complementary procedures: (a) the "prospective" or "anticipatory" procedure, whereby forward-directed tensions and expectations are established, or at least suggested, at any given point on the basis of the syntactic information supplied up to that point; (b) the "retrospective" procedure, whereby tensions and expectations are reviewed, reassessed and reinterpreted from the standpoint of the end of an SMU (or a longer unit) on the basis of fresh evidence supplied by later material. Thus, when all the material has been supplied, one can decide whether, how, when, and to what degree, tensions were relaxed and expectations satisfied. The backward-directed movement of the latter procedure is not to be confused with the static approach. Both procedures just described are dynamic, since they attempt a step-by-step reconstruction of the syntactic component of the reading process. The static approach, however, looks spatially at the confirmed SL data and at the functional relationships between the components

of complete syntactic units. Whereas both the prospective and the retrospective procedures of the dynamic approach are based on syntactic and/or intonational trial-and-error, the static approach is based on syntactic and/or intonational omniscience. In no textual analysis can such omniscience be established until both procedures of the dynamic approach have supplied the necessary evidence for it.

5.0.2. Nature and Scope of the Discussion in the Present Chapter.

"Tension" (both on the SMIU and the SMAU level), as used in the present study, is a prospective-dynamic concept by definition; towards the end of the chapter, however, the retrospective procedure will be outlined as an indispensable complement. The chapter will be concluded with a demonstration of the applicability of the prospective and retrospective procedures to the discussion of one of the present study's most crucial questions — the integrity and self-sufficiency of the single poetic line.

Tension can also be described as a basically intonational, or rather psychointonational, phenomenon (see below, 5.1.1.1), consisting of syntactic and semantic components. While the parametric approach adopted in the present chapter puts the syntactic discussion in its wider intonational perspective, the more specific discussion will focus on syntactic tension alone, i.e., on the syntactic contribution to intonational tension.

In order to place SMIU-tension in perspective within the wider context of verse-line/syntax relationships, it is compared with SMAU-tension. The latter phenomenon, although peripheral in relation to enjambment in the narrow sense of the Definition, functions in poetic texts as an active background in producing enjambment effects, and its impact is particularly powerful in borderline cases when the text does not supply adequate clues for preferring one type of tension (SMIU or SMAU) to the other in advance ("prospectively").

In the entire discussion an attempt will be made to analyse the separate workings of different parameters and signalling systems (such as syntactic intonation and punctuation) which interact within the poetic text to constitute the syntactic component of verse-line/syntax relationships in general, and enjambment in particular.

5.0.3. Problems of Bibliographical References and Poetic Illustrations in the Present Chapter.

Since the professional literature, both in linguistic and in literary scholarship, has little to contribute to a dynamic approach to intonational tension, my bibliographical references in the present chapter are very sparse, especially in comparison to chapter 3. A notable exception is the field of psycholinguistics, which comes nearer than any other relevant discipline to asking questions about the temporal dynamics of syntactic perception. A special section (5.2) will try to examine the validity and relevance of the potential contribution of psycholinguistic investigation to the study of enjambment.

As for textual examples to illustrate the theoretical categories and distinctions, my practice is somewhat different in SMIU-tension and SMAU-tension analysis. To illustrate intra-SMIU functional syntactic relationships (e.g., between verbs and objects, prepositions and nouns, etc.), very short examples are usually adequate, and any theoretical statement made about such relationships can easily be abstracted from the specific example and reapplied to comparable cases, poetic and nonpoetic alike. Therefore, the use of "invented", nonpoetic examples seemed simpler and more to the point in certain cases. However, since most SMAU-tension problems have to be illustrated by complete texts, and often long ones, poetic texts seemed the most natural choice whenever illustrations are required in the latter part of the chapter.

5.0.4. Major Questions Discussed in the Present Chapter.

The major questions discussed in the present chapter are:

Question 1: What is the nature of SMIU-tension and its main functional parameters, and how can it be studied by linguistic methods?

Question 2: What is the potential contribution of psycholinguistic scholarship to the study of SMIU-tension and enjambment?

Question 3: What, in conclusion, can be proposed as a dynamic-prospective theory of SMIU-tension?

Question 4: What is the nature of SMAU-anticipation as the main (syntactic-functional) parameter of SMAU-tension, and how does it contribute to enjambment?

Question 5. What is the contribution of SL to SMAU-tension?

Question 6: What is the contribution of the systems of punctuation and syntactic intonation to the perception of the various forms of syntactic expectation and enjambment?

Question 7: How can SMAU-tension be characterised, in conclusion?

Question 8: In the analysis of poetic syntax, how can the retrospective procedure affect the perception of line-ends and complete lines?

Question 9: What, in conclusion, is the typology of syntactic tension at line-end?

5.1. TOWARDS A PARAMETRIC THEORY OF *SMIU*-TENSION.

5.1.1. Tension: A Psychointonational Feature of all Utterances.

5.1.1.1. *The Nature of Intonational Tension.* In any given utterance, the presence or absence, and the type and degree, of tension can be checked and assessed at any postlexical point

chosen at random (henceforth "point of assessment").¹ In the subdivision between SMIU- and SMAU-tension, the former negates the probability of any pausal juncture, terminal or nonterminal, as the very next syntagmatic occurrence after the point of assessment, whereas the latter is the predictability of a non-terminal pausal juncture immediately after the point of assessment.

The distinction will be further elaborated and refined in 5.4, especially 5.4.1.4. At the moment the following schematic table can summarise the matter as viewed from any given point of assessment and in relation to that point:

	Utterance Syntactically Incomplete		Utterance Syntactically Potentially Complete
	SMIU-tension	SMAU-tension	No tension
Terminal pausal juncture	-	-	+
Nonterminal pausal juncture	-	+	-

As I said in 5.0.2, in the present chapter attention is focused on the syntactic contribution to the psychointonational

¹ The existence of SMIU-tension may be brought home to the reader by way of a simple introspective experiment, based on the analytical practices of Tynjanov and Kell (see 3.5.2): let the reader read any sentence S consisting of n words (granted that n is more than 2), and repeat his reading for n-1 times, making a single pause in every reading, and placing this pause after a different word each time, thereby changing the "point of assessment". Striking differences of pause-desirability inherent in the structure of the sentence must be foregrounded and thrown into bold relief by this simple experimental procedure.

phenomenon of tension ("SMIU-tension" and "SMAU-tension" will henceforth stand for short for this contribution alone, unless otherwise stated), while the present subsection is proposed as a preliminary mapping of the entire phenomenon of tension.

My view of intonational tension is that it is the product of intricate interactions between several independent parameters. There is no set of consistent rules governing the outcome of these interactions, but each of them separately does "behave" according to fairly consistent rules. Any given "point of assessment" is an intersection between these parameters, describable in terms of each of them in isolation: the point of assessment occupies a certain position in relation to each parameter (e.g., its distance from SMIU-beginning in terms of SL, its being after a preposition in terms of a functional parameter) and a system of mutual reinforcement, weakening, and checks and balances between them determines the final resultant tension-curve. The isolated contribution of each parameter can enhance tension by accelerating the pace of reading, or weaken it by retarding reading-pace, and enjambments may differ from each other because of the identity of the colliding forces in every instance. The same applies to the "emphatic" or "expressive" stress or emphasis of single words: this phenomenon is also the result of interactions between the various parameters.

I would like, therefore, to introduce the main parameters of intonational tension operating in all lingual utterances, and then those operating only in poetic texts. The parameters are described from the standpoint of any word (in a given syntactic context) chosen at random to function as a point of assessment.

For the purpose of the present study the relevant parameters fall into two major categories: (1) parameters operating in all lingual utterances: this category is subdivided into syntactic and nonsyntactic (chiefly semantic) parameters; (2) parameters pertaining exclusively to the poetic organisation of texts and absent from nonpoetic texts.

5.1.1.2. *A Preliminary Mapping of the Field of Intonational Tension: The Main Parameters Operating in All Lingual Utterances.*

I postulate that the main parameters² affecting the amount of tension carried by any single word chosen as a point of assessment in any given utterance are:

1. The word's length and its patterns of sound, vowel-length and stress: other things being equal, pauses are more likely (a) after longer words than after shorter ones; (b) after words with a "denser" or "thicker" sound-texture (e.g., clusters of consonants, or diphthongs) than after words with a "thinner" one; (c) after words with longer vowels than after words with shorter ones; (d) after words with a "heavier" stress than after words with a "lighter" one; etc.

2. Syntactic length (see Chapter 4) — that is, the distance of the word from the beginning of the relevant SMIU. The word's position in relation to the intonation contour of that SMIU (measured from its beginning and up to the word),³ is classified here together with SL for reasons of schematic symmetry (see table below).

3. The word's classification in terms of the distinction between parts of speech (for instance, after nouns and verbs, other things being equal, pauses are more desirable than after prepositions).

² Since I am not acquainted with any previous attempt to construct a similar list of parameters, I had, so to speak, to start from scratch. Although I am confident of the basic principles underlying this list, it can no doubt be modified and improved, at least in its finer details, as a result of further research and theoretical thinking. At the moment, however, my list of "main parameters" makes no claim for exhaustiveness.

³ A "prospective" procedure such as proposed here cannot take into account the distance from the end of the unit, since the end of the unit has not been uttered and perceived at the time of tension-assessing.

4. Syntactic expectation, that is, the degree of certainty based on syntactic rules and conventions, with which a member (or members) of a specific syntactic paradigm (or paradigms) can be expected to appear after the point of assessment, whether immediately or somewhat later (e.g., a noun being expected after a preposition or, less specifically, a main clause being expected after a subordinate clause which begins a sentence).

5. Semantic content, that is, what the word at the point of assessment means or may mean in isolation and in relation to the context leading up to it (and not away from it; see note 3).

6. Semantic expectation, that is, the degree of certainty with which a specific semantic content can be expected after the point of assessment, whether immediately or somewhat later.

All the parameters listed above operate on the same principle of polar opposition as the scales of contrastivity proposed by Crystal (e.g., [104], 272 and 289). The following is a schematised table summarising the parameters proposed so far.

A Schematised Table of Parameters Affecting Intonational Tension of Words Within Any Given Syntactic Context

Nature or "Mode of Existence" of Parameter Level of Linguistic Analysis	The Word in Isolation	The Word in Context
"Formal" (nonsemantic) and syntactically-nonfunctional features	1. Length, sound- and stress-pattern of word	2. SL from SMIU-beginning; word's position in intonation contour preceding it
"Formal" (nonsemantic) and syntactically functional features	3. Part of speech	4. Syntactic expectation
Semantic features ⁴	5. Semantic content	6. Semantic expectation

5.1.1.3. *Further Mapping of the Field: Parameters Operating in Poetic Texts Only.*⁵ In poetry, several additional parameters may affect a word's intonational tension. The following parameters can be considered whenever applicable:

7. Formal rhythmical organisation (subdividable into such subparameters as stanza, period, line, hemistich, as the case may be), that is, the word's intonational tension as affected by its position, in terms of structure and/or length, within the unit of formal rhythmical organisation.

8. "Free" rhythmical organisation (structures of sporadic rhythmical parallelism, repetition and the like), that is, the word's intonational tension as affected by its position within units of this kind.

9. Sound patterns (how the word's intonational tension is affected by its relation to the free or sporadic patterning of sound).

In rhymed poetry one can add:

10. The parameter of rhyme (as a factor affecting the word's intonational tension), subdividable (at least) into the subparameters of (a) rhyme-scheme (the position of the word in relation to it), (b) distance (from rhyming words), and (c) the

⁴ The semantic dimension of utterances can be segmented, and the length of these segments is measurable; yet many words belong simultaneously to numerous and heterogeneous semantic segments. Delimiting semantic segments, then, is so much more complex and controversial than delimiting syntactic ones, that I have deliberately excluded "semantic length" from my table.

⁵ Most parameters operating in poetic texts, perhaps with the exception of the parameters of metre and rhyme, can also operate, though very rarely, in nonpoetic ones. The question is one of dominance in Jakobson's sense ([260], 353-358). "Poetic parameters", then, enjoy a status analogous to that of "poetic syntax" as explained in 3.4.1.

presence or absence of affinity or contrast between the word in question and (one or more) rhyming words in terms of sound pattern grammar, meaning, etc.

In metrical poetry one can add:

11. The parameter of metre which is a cluster of more partial parameters (or subparameters). The following seem to be the main ones: (a) "Metrical design" (see Jakobson [260], 364-367 and Fowler [154]), or metrical scheme (that is, how the point of assessment's position in relation to a metrical scheme affects its intonational tension); this is further subdividable into at least two relevant subcategories, where applicable: general verse-design (e.g., iambic pentameter) and specific verse-design (e.g., the metrical scheme of Poe's "The Raven"). The idea is that in the latter case there is a more definite set of expectations that may affect intonational tension. (b) Metrical length (that is, the actual distance between the given word and the preceding line- or stanza-beginning). (c) Metrical regularity (that is, the nature and degree of regularity as a factor affecting a word's intonational tension).⁶

5.1.1.4. *Concluding Remarks on the List of Parameters.* The list of parameters just proposed can be reduced to fewer items, some of which would thus enjoy a wider range of applicability.

⁶ Contrary to my practice at the conclusion of 5.1.1.2, I refrain from condensing the material of the present subsection into a schematised table. These poetic parameters, through the extreme intricacy of their interrelationships, through their fundamental heterogeneity and their almost total dependence on specific contexts in given poetic works, seem to defy schematisation of the kind offered at the end of 5.1.1.2.

The only scheme that emerges from this discussion is a hierarchy, based on the genus and species principle, whereby some parameters pertain to all poetic texts and others enjoy a more restricted range of applicability, e.g., those applicable only to metrical and/or rhymed verse, or to poetic texts that have a "specific verse design" of their own, etc.

Thus, for instance, parameters 6 and 9 can be merged, because most rhymed texts are organised in formal rhythmical patterns and most texts with formal thymhical organisation are rhymed; moreover, the rhyming words mark the boundaries of the rhythmical segments, so that rhyming is the most typical and conventional exponent of formal rhythmical organisation. Rhyme can also be grouped together with parameter 8 (sound pattern), and the latter can be grouped together with parameter 7 ("free" rhythmical organisation). The point is, however, that no parameter in my list is totally inseparable from another: thus, for instance, a poem may be unrhymed and yet be divided into formal stanzas, or the other way round. And since my methodological purpose is to isolate and characterise the separate workings and contributions of the various components of intonational tension, this potential separability justifies the list as proposed.

One can ask about every word in a poem how, and to what degree, its psychointonational tension is affected by the various parameters. The influence of each parameter can be described as either accelerating (enhancing tension) or retarding (weakening tension), and the degree of acceleration or retardation can also vary from one case to another. Thus, in Edgar Allan Poe's "The Raven", all the "poetic" parameters (nos. 7-11) listed in the present subsection are demonstrably applicable to many single words; in other cases some parameters may be neutralised, or at least not particularly effective.

Take for instance the word "dreaming" in the second line of stanza 5 (I am quoting the stanza in full from *Poe*, 34):

Deep into that darkness peering, long I stood there
wondering, fearing,
Doubting, dreaming dreams no mortal ever dared to dream
before;
But the silence was unbroken, and the stillness gave
no token,

And the only word there spoken was the whispered word,
"Lenore!"

This I whispered, and an echo murmured back the word
"Lenore!"

Merely this and nothing more.

The word "dreaming" is accelerated by parameter 7 — its position in relation to the tight stanza- and line-structure of the poem, which creates definite sets of expectations of partial and final pauses and their locations; this parameter works against pause after "dreaming", because the word is placed where no pause is expected for reasons of formal rhythmical structure. Parameter 8 is represented in the fact that "dreaming" is the last in the chain of initially-stressed disyllables followed by commas (wondering, fearing, doubting, dreaming); this has a retarding effect, because the longer such a chain, the more likely its break. Parameter 9 is represented in the word's position in the sound-pattern governed by D- and DR-sounds, dominating the first two lines (deep, darkness, wondering, doubting, dreaming, dreams, dared, dream); this parameter's effect is more complex: prospectively it retards the word "dreaming" because of its distance from the beginning of the sound-pattern, but retrospectively it contributes to tension because the sound-pattern goes on beyond "dreaming". Parameter 10b is represented in the word's position in a chain of semi-rhymes (-ing endings) out of which only one ("fearing") is a prosodically full and a structurally valid rhyme; this parameter retards the word both prospectively and retrospectively, because the "chain" stops with it. Parameter 10a is represented, as in all other words, in the word's relation to the general rhyme-scheme of the stanza; here the effect is accelerating (enhancing tension). Parameter 11 also accelerates this word, because all the sets of expectations produced by 11a, 11b and 11c do not call for pause at "dreaming". However, this parameter's specific

influence would be more characteristically sensed in a word like "into" in line 1, where parameter 11c (metrical regularity) is foregrounded by the slight "trochaic" or "pyrrhical" irregularity generated by the special nature of the clash between parameters 1, 3 and 11c: while each of them, separately, accelerates the word "into", their clash retards it because the penultimate stress of "into" as a word runs counter to the ultimate stress demanded by the smooth regularity of metre (parameter 11c).

This brief illustration does not exhaust the subject, theoretically or textually. My only purpose here is to offer a glimpse of the complexity of tension: I have shown that all the "poetic" parameters (nos. 7-11) can potentially affect a single word, without specifying the precise nature of their influence (i.e., without showing how and how much each of them retards or accelerates the pace of reading at the chosen point of assessment — the word "dreaming" in the Poe example). It goes without saying that "dreaming" in this example, as any other word in any utterance, is also subject to the influence of the semantic and syntactic parameters of language (nos. 1-6).

Ideally, the characteristic contribution of each parameter should be reducible to a simple scale (i.e., a scale between two polar opposites), as has actually been done in the case of SL in 4.2.2; however, because of the limited accomplishments of the relevant linguistic and literary scholarship, this cannot be done nearly as neatly and convincingly in the case of other parameters.

5.1.2. SMIU-tension and its Major Parameters.

5.1.2.1. *Syntactic Expectation: Anticipation vs. Openness.* Utterances are either syntactically complete or syntactically incomplete, and both completeness and incompleteness can be either identifiable as such in advance or not. The former case is called prospective (potential) and the latter retrospective (actual).

Potential completeness can prove to be actual incompleteness, but potential incompleteness remains incomplete retrospectively. Thus, in "And make us rather bear those ills we have/Than fly to others that we know not of" (*Hamlet* III, i, 26-27), the utterance is "prospectively complete" after "know", and before "not of" (because, strictly syntactically, it could be followed by a full-stop period at that point, omitting the last two words). When we know the complete lines, however, a hindsight view of the part of the utterance preceding "know" tells us that it is retrospectively incomplete at that point. The part of the utterance up to "those" or "than", however, is prospectively incomplete, and no potential continuation could make it retrospectively complete.

Since tension, by definition, is a prospective concept, syntactic contribution to it is preconditioned by syntactic expectation, as introduced within the context of the following definitions:

1. SYNTACTIC PREDICTION IS ANY RESTRICTION IMPOSED AT A GIVEN POINT OF ASSESSMENT ON THE NUMBER OF CATEGORIES OF FORMAL SYNTAX LIKELY TO APPEAR AFTER THAT POINT, ON THE BASIS OF FORMAL SYNTACTIC RELATIONSHIPS THAT APPEARED PRIOR TO THAT POINT. PROSPECTIVE COMPLETENESS AND PROSPECTIVE INCOMPLETENESS, THEN, ARE BOTH SYNTACTIC PREDICTIONS.

2. SYNTACTIC EXPECTATION IS THE SYNTACTIC PREDICTION OF A CONTINUATION THAT IS INDISPENSABLE FOR SYNTACTIC COMPLETENESS (i.e., the kind of prediction sensed in cases of prospective syntactic incompleteness).

3. SYNTACTIC ANTICIPATION IS A SPECIFIC SYNTACTIC EXPECTATION. IT IS THE SYNTACTICALLY-BASED PREDICTABILITY OF A VERY SMALL NUMBER OF SYNTACTIC CATEGORIES (IDEALLY ONLY ONE) THAT ARE LIKELY TO OCCUPY THE NEXT SYNTAGMATIC POSITION AFTER THE POINT OF ASSESSMENT.

4. SYNTACTIC OPENNESS IS A VAGUE, NONSPECIFIC, SYNTACTIC EXPECTATION: IT IS THE DIFFICULTY TO LEARN FROM THE SYNTACTIC DATA SUPPLIED UP TO THE POINT OF ASSESSMENT WHAT SYNTACTIC CATEGORY, OTHER THAN A FULL-STOP PERIOD, IS LIKELY TO OCCUPY THE NEXT SYNTAGMATIC POSITION.

All types of syntactic prediction come as a result of the perceiver's "innate" abstract idea of what is minimally required from a "surface-structure" utterance in order to be syntactically complete.⁷ The perceiver thus compares a tangible utterance with a potential whole: the two are congruent in potential syntactic completeness, generating the syntactic prediction of a full-stop, whereas the former is only a part of the latter in potential syntactic incompleteness, generating syntactic expectation.

The distinction between syntactic anticipation and syntactic openness cannot be described as a binary opposition but as a polar one: syntactic continuations expected to appear after a given point are predictable with a greater or a lesser degree of certainty, and not necessarily with either a 100% or a 0% degree of certainty. "Syntactic anticipation" will henceforth refer to syntactic expectation approaching the pole of syntactic certainty of prediction, and "syntactic openness" will similarly refer to

⁷ Since I occasionally resort to terms borrowed from TG jargon, the reader may be misled to assume that the phenomena which I describe as the potential or abstract idea of a complete syntactic structure and the actual utterance perceived up to a given point are analogous to "deep structure" and "surface structure", respectively. This, however, is not the case. Whereas the TG distinction is between two complete structures, mine is between a complete structure and its initial part. It is assumed that "the minimal complete surface structure" is ingrained in the native speaker and makes him distinguish between the complete and the incomplete just as, according to TG theorists, his innate knowledge of deep structures makes him distinguish between the grammatical and the ungrammatical. "This is the" is thus simply incomplete rather than ungrammatical, since it is potentially grammatical, unlike *"this the is".

syntactic expectation approaching the pole of syntactic uncertainty of prediction. The two are, of course, inversely proportionate, but they are both the product of prospective syntactic incompleteness: only when some kind of syntactic expectation is sensed does the question of the nature and degree of certainty of that expectation have any meaning at all.

For the purpose of the present study I propose a simple distinction between two subcategories of syntactic anticipation: SMIU-anticipation and SMAU-anticipation.

The following are tentative working definitions, to be modified and refined in the light of the ensuing discussion:

1. SMIU-ANTICIPATION AT A GIVEN POINT OF ASSESSMENT IS THE LIKELIHOOD, BASED ON CONSIDERATIONS OF FUNCTIONAL SYNTACTIC RELATIONSHIPS, THAT THE VERY NEXT SYNTAGMATIC ELEMENT (AFTER THE POINT OF ASSESSMENT) WILL NOT BE A PAUSAL JUNCTURE OF ANY KIND.

2. SMAU-ANTICIPATION AT A GIVEN POINT OF ASSESSMENT IS THE LIKELIHOOD, BASED ON CONSIDERATIONS OF FUNCTIONAL SYNTACTIC RELATIONSHIPS,⁸ THAT THE VERY NEXT SYNTAGMATIC ELEMENT (AFTER THE POINT OF ASSESSMENT) WILL BE A NONTERMINAL PAUSAL JUNCTURE.

3. SYNTACTIC OPENNESS AT A GIVEN POINT OF ASSESSMENT IS THE DIFFICULTY IN CHOOSING BETWEEN *SMIU*- AND *SMAU*-ANTICIPATION, PROVIDED THAT THE NEXT PREDICTABLE SYNTAGMATIC ELEMENT IS ANYTHING BUT A TERMINAL PAUSAL JUNCTURE.

Syntactic expectations, whether characterised by anticipation or by openness, result from the interaction between several fac-

⁸ SMIU-anticipation and SMAU-anticipation as defined here are strikingly similar to SMIU- and SMAU-tension, as introduced in 4.2.1 (respectively, of course). The difference lies in the phrase underlined in the present definitions: tension can be motivated by nonfunctional factors, notably SL, while anticipation, by definition, resides in functional syntactic relationships that enhance tension. Anticipation is tension's most immediate and most influential component, but not the only one.

tors, mainly the syntactic structure of the given word-sequence, and/or syntactic intonation (juncture distribution) in oral communication, and/or punctuation practices (both in terms of paradigmatic selection and syntagmatic distribution) in written communication. The latter factors will be virtually ignored throughout sections 5.1-5.5; the contribution of punctuation and intonation to syntactic tension and expectation will be the main subject of section 5.6.

5.1.2.2. *Introducing the Concept of SMIU-Anticipation.*

Theoretically, as I implicitly argued in 5.0.2, SMIU-anticipation is the only type of syntactic prediction that is directly relevant to the structure of enjambment, since enjambment is, by definition, an intra-SMIU phenomenon. However, in fact all types of syntactic prediction are potentially relevant to enjambment, at least for two reasons:

1. There are "surprise", retrospective enjambments, where terminal or nonterminal pausal junctures are reasonably expected to coincide with line-end, and yet this expectation is frustrated when SIC emerges as a syntactic-intonational bond across that line-end (see below, 5.8); in such cases it is either syntactic openness, or SMAU-tension, or even prospective syntactic completeness (which negates syntactic expectation altogether), rather than SMIU-anticipation, which accounts for the structure and function of enjambment.

2. SMIU-tension, by definition (see 4.2.1 and 5.1.1.1), is based on probability and predictability rather than certainty; therefore, a certain element of syntactic openness is at least latent in all cases of syntactic expectation. It follows that even from a purely prospective standpoint clear-cut SMIU-anticipation is not the only type of syntactic expectation relevant to the study of enjambment.

Yet, although SMIU-anticipation at line-end and enjambment

are not totally preconditioned by each other, their co-occurrence is frequent and likely. Whenever SMIU-anticipation marks the end of a line, a sense of virtual enjambment is inevitable.

It follows from the position of SMIU-anticipation as a parameter of SMIU-tension (see 5.1.1.2) that two major questions are pertinent to the present study:

Question A: What is SMIU-anticipation? (i.e., How is it structured?)

Question B: What is its contribution to SMIU-tension and to enjambment? (i.e., How does it function?)

Full answers to these questions amount to a theory of SMIU-anticipation and its contribution to enjambment. Such a theory should specify the necessary and sufficient conditions for the generation of SMIU-anticipation; wherever justified, it should propose a hierarchical scale of these conditions, based on falsifiable considerations, ranging from factors enhancing SMIU-anticipation to those weakening it. It should also characterise the effects produced by every type of anticipation in poetic texts. Unfortunately, the prospects of arriving at such a theory in the present "state of the art" do not look promising any more than the prospects of arriving at a theory of SIC (see 3.2.2 and 3.2.3). Quite the contrary, in the case of SMIU-anticipation the odds are even more against a successful breakthrough, because of the scarcity of treatment of the dynamic dimension of syntactic-intonational perception in the professional literature (see 3.4.2). This applies to a great extent even to psycholinguistic scholarship (see 5.2).

It is against this background that the following remarks in 5.1.2.3 should be considered: sporadic and partly intuitive insights and observations inevitably replace the unattainable systematic and comprehensive theory. In 5.1.2.3 I shall try to examine problems connected with Question A; Question B will be tackled in 5.3.

5.1.2.3. *Towards a Theory of SMIU-Anticipation.* SMIU-anticipation can be characterised as follows:

1. SMIU-anticipation is based by definition upon a combination of two distinct factors: (a) "paradigmatic predictability", that is, the predictability of one specific syntactic category, or at most a very limited number of syntactic categories, in clear preference to all others; (b) "immediate syntagmatic predictability", which in this case means the unlikelihood that any kind of a pausal juncture should occupy the next position after the point of assessment.

2. SMIU-anticipation is directly proportionate with each of these factors: it is enough either to narrow down the range of predictable syntactic possibilities, or to make them more pause-resistant, in order to strengthen SMIU-anticipation; and yet, only the combination of both factors makes SMIU-anticipation possible.

This last statement is demonstrated in points 3 and 4.

3. No matter how obviously predictable a syntactic category after a given point of assessment is, SMIU-anticipation in my narrow sense is not generated at that point unless the absence of all types of pausal juncture in the next syntagmatic position is part and parcel of the prediction. Thus, for instance, after "no sooner had he gone", "than" is very predictable, yet a non-terminal pausal juncture preceding it is an integral part of that prediction, which makes the word "gone" carry SMAU- rather than SMIU-anticipation. The anticipation of a past-participle after the word "he" in the same example, on the other hand, is SMIU-anticipation.

4. Similarly, no matter how strong the SIC-bond between two consecutive words proves to be once the utterance is completed, if this bond is not predictable in advance SMIU-anticipation is not generated. Thus, after "he has" nothing specific can be pre-

dicted (a clear case of syntactic openness). If the next word is "been", for instance, when the completed transition is viewed retrospectively, it is characterised by strong SIC; yet, prospectively, "he has" carries no, or little, SMIU-anticipation.⁹

5. It follows that in describing or delimiting any type of syntactic anticipation one has to adhere to the strictest prospective procedures, and not be deluded by the temptations of hindsight. At any given point of assessment in a verbal utterance one has to ask such questions as: What do I know so far, syntactically? Can I, on the basis of this knowledge, predict one syntactic category and rule out another as the next word (or one of the next words)? Can I, on the basis of that knowledge, predict not only what syntactic category should appear at some near point (paradigmatic predictability), but also when it should appear (syntagmatic predictability)?

6. Trying to answer these questions without squinting in the direction of the supposedly unknown continuation, one must come to the conclusion that the subclassification of syntactic anticipation as unequivocally SMIU- or SMAU-anticipation is virtually impossible. At almost any given point of assessment, in any given text, one can supply alternative grammatical continuations that would join that point in the text either with or without a pausal juncture: syntactic anticipations may be (but do not have to be) based on paradigmatic certainties, but they are usually based on varying degrees of syntagmatic probabilities.

⁹ For obvious methodological reasons I have chosen examples that are extreme and clear-cut rather than characteristic and representative of most utterances. This applies especially to the rather collocational nature of the example in point 3. Yet the difference between the strong anticipation in the "no sooner" type and weaker cases is, in terms of syntactic anticipation, a question of degree, not of substance. Unlike idioms and real collocations, here it is only the grammatical structure, rather than the actual words, that can be reliably anticipated.

7. It is of utmost importance, though, that there are varying degrees of syntagmatic probability. The more probable the immediate fulfilment of some type of anticipation, the more prominently that type of anticipation figures at the point of assessment (which immediately precedes the expected fulfilment).

8. In English,¹⁰ total SMIU-anticipation (i.e., the absolute predictability of a pause-resistant immediate continuation) is exceptionally rare, and total SMAU-anticipation (i.e., the absolute predictability of a nonterminal pausal juncture) is simply nonexistent.

9. As for total SMIU-anticipation, there is a *prima facie* impression that it is generated by (a) a preposition and an article (definite or indefinite) anticipating a noun and (b) a "to" anticipating an infinitive. However, in prepositions and articles this is not the case, simply because the appearance of the noun after a preposition is quite certain on the paradigmatic level, but only highly probable on the syntagmatic level. In other words, "syntactic wedges" can separate a preposition or an article from a noun, thereby introducing a pausal juncture between them, as in the following examples (the "wedges" are underlined): (a) "He was actually speaking for, and not against, the new candidate" (preposition and noun); (b) "This is the best, but by no means the most expensive, plan proposed so far" (article and noun).

There is a relevant difference between the two examples just given: whereas a pause-involving wedge can be introduced immediately after a preposition, it is hardly acceptable, perhaps with

¹⁰Generally speaking, I have limited my discussion to English, and not everything is applicable to other languages. In Hebrew, for example, total SMIU-anticipation is generated by prepositions (wedges are not permitted) and the *nismakh* (the Hebrew possessive case, known in the Latin terminology of the traditional European schools of Biblical-Hebrew grammarians as *status constructus*).

the exception of a clumsy use of a parenthetical statement, to introduce such a wedge (i.e., a wedge preceded and /or followed by a mandatory pausal juncture) immediately after an article, and even less so between "to" and an infinitive. The two latter cases are, then, the nearest one can get to "total SMIU-anticipation" in English.

Wedges not involving a pausal juncture, however, can always be directly inserted between SMIU-anticipation-generating words and the fulfilment of the anticipation (e.g., "This is the not so brilliant man I met this morning"; "The idea is to thoroughly and carefully examine the details").

10. As for total SMAU-anticipation, its nonexistence can be demonstrated very simply: any SMIU can be extended virtually endlessly by adding the conjunction "and" to its last item. Such additions always join the same SMIU, so that the predictability of a pausal juncture at any given point as the very next syntagmatic occurrence can never reach the level of certainly. To sum up: some degree of syntactic openness is present in all cases of prospective syntactic incompleteness, with the possible exception of the two cases of total SMIU-anticipation.

Unfortunately, nothing more specific and precise can be contributed to a theory of SMIU-anticipation. A neat classification of all potential syntactic relationships in terms of their contribution to syntactic anticipation, or at least an outline of the basic principles that underlie such a neat classification, is a minimum without which such a theory is inconceivable. Such a classification should ideally answer questions concerning paradigmatic predictability (e.g., Other things being equal, is an object after a transitive verb more or less predictable than a noun after an adjective?) as well as questions concerning immediate syntagmatic predictability (e.g., Other things being equal, is the predictability of an object after a transitive verb more or less pause-resistant than the predictability of a noun after

an adjective?).

I doubt whether a comprehensive theory of SMIU-anticipation is even potentially attainable: the psycholinguistic and "psycho-poetic" phenomena (see 5.2.5 below) are very complex, and the methodological difficulties in devising the appropriate research procedures to study them are very great. A theory of SMIU-anticipation should explain findings that cannot be reached without solving these methodological problems. However, the difficulty or inability to describe the hierarchical scales of paradigmatic and syntagmatic predictabilities and their interrelations does not invalidate the proposition that such scales exist: every reader senses differences between various syntactic relationships in terms of syntactic predictability. Such differences affect the nature of enjambment greatly: it is my contention that the type of tension at line-end is determined both by the prospective syntactic incompleteness up to line-end and by the nature of syntactic anticipation of what is likely to follow.

Since the situation in linguistics is as described, one cannot go beyond the observations and suggestions just proposed in the ten points (in the present subsection) in attempting a theory of SMIU-anticipation. Once the terms have been introduced, defined and explained, these ten points can be reduced to a short summary:

- A. SMIU-anticipation is characterised by a combination of varying degrees of paradigmatic and syntagmatic probability.
- B. The latter can never reach the level of absolute certainty.
- C. The degree of syntactic predictability is a decisive factor in the structure and function of enjambment.
- D. It is determined in relation to a hierarchical scale ranging from the highest to the lowest degree of certainty in syntactic prediction.

E. This scale cannot be proposed here because of lack of research, but its existence is postulated as an integral part of syntactic-intonational perception.

5.1.3. SMIU-Tension: A Tentative Conclusion.

The nature of SMIU-tension at a given point of assessment is mainly determined by the interaction between its main parameters: the functional parameter of syntactic expectation and the non-functional parameter of SL. The former "behaves" as partially described in the present section; the latter behaves as described in Chapter 4.

Since a large portion of the discussion has so far been inevitably intuitive, Question 1 in 5.0.4 has been answered not by solving the problems but by diagnosing them. Metaphorically, the answers that I have supplied can be compared to an algebraic formula without the actual numbers.

In 5.2 I shall try to see how and to what extent my discussion can be less speculative with the help of the experimental discipline most relevant to this discussion, namely, psycholinguistics. In the light of 5.1 and 5.2 I shall make my final suggestions for a theory of SMIU-tension in 5.3.

5.2 PSYCHOLINGUISTICS AND THE STUDY OF *SMIU*-TENSION AND ENJAMBMENT.

5.2.0. Preliminary.

Common sense, experience, introspection, intuition, etc., rather than any kind of experimentally verified evidence, have almost invariably been the chief source for my conclusions, and quite often the only one. While this in itself is no longer considered malpractice in modern linguistic and literary scholarship,¹¹ I do not regard it as an asset either. Theoretical

¹¹In fact, developments in literary and linguistic research

thinking in such a discipline as poetics should not be dependent on, or preconditioned by, the availability of relevant experimental evidence. It is often sufficient that a theoretical hypothesis or speculation intuitively makes sense and is not contradicted by such evidence. Nevertheless, the search for experimental support is in itself legitimate and understandable, and almost any theory has much to gain (at least in reputation) and nothing to lose by the support of experimentally verified "solid facts", if shown to be relevant.

It is in this light that I should like to view my investigation into the relevance of psycholinguistic theory and experimental research to the study of SMIU-tension. The very concept of tension as used in the present study is psycholinguistic in nature (introducing this concept in 4.2.1 I used the terms "resistance" and "urge", whose psychological implications are obvious); moreover, the ever-growing activity in psycholinguistic theory and experimentation makes it impossible to investigate a concept like "tension" without at least trying to resort to psycholinguistics for supporting evidence.

5.2.1. Psycholinguistic Research and Its Relevance to the Study of Tension.

I would like to make it clear from the start that I have had no training in psycholinguistics or in experimental psychology; and since psycholinguistics is peripheral to my study, I could afford to draw most of my information from textbooks,

have been only partially similar. Briefly and superficially, the main difference can be stated as follows: while in linguistic research the activity of intuitive theorising has regained much of its once lost reputation, this reputation was never genuinely lost in literary scholarship. See Lyons ([337], 7-8) for a brief and very lucid exposition of the nature of the problem in modern linguistics.

anthologies and secondary sources, such as Osgood [393], Lyons & Wales [338], Rosenberg [436], and Leont'ev ([558], [560], [562]).

Reading this literature gave me the impression that, although psycholinguists have naturally been preoccupied with psychological aspects of syntax, very few of their concepts and procedures are relevant to SMIU-tension. Among the topics investigated by way of psycholinguistic experimentation one can find the generation of sentences, sentence recall and memory, hesitation pauses, and the influence of redundancy (in semantic and syntactic information on memory and guessing. Some of these topics somehow relate to problems of SMIU-tension; but in most psycholinguistic studies, though not in all of them, the questions asked (and consequently the answers given) are hardly relevant to SMIU-tension.

The main reason for this state of affairs is perhaps that psycholinguistic research seems to have divided its attention between two kinds of topics: (1) psychological and psycholinguistic implications of TG theories and (2) the investigation of oral communication.

1. Many psycholinguists have naturally found Chomskyan theoretical models and hypotheses stimulating and challenging, particularly in their psychological implications. They have consequently been doing their best to put these theories to the test of experimental verification. As I have already argued, Chomskyan models deal with completed utterances, so that most TG-oriented psycholinguistic studies have little or no relevance to the study of SMIU-tension, being indifferent to the temporal perception of syntax.

2. Most psycholinguistic studies whose conceptual frame of reference is not (or not exclusively) Chomskyan (this does not necessarily imply anti-Chomskyanism) have been concerned with psychological aspects of oral communication; in other words, the subject-matter of these studies is the psychology of the production and/or the perception of "spontaneous speech" (the term most

widespread in these studies). Such studies investigate actual speech-events, taking into account not only the lingual structure of the spoken utterance, but also extralingual, psychological factors pertaining to the context of the situation in which it was uttered that affect the manner of its production and perception.

This division in psycholinguistics is, in very broad terms, analogous to such distinctions as the Saussurean "*langue* vs. *parole*" or the Chomskyan "competence vs. performance". Against the background of such distinctions the parametric study of syntactic or intonational tension (and, indeed, most problems in which systematic poetics might be interested) is in no-man's-land. In an oversimplified way — which, however, I believe to be basically correct — the matter can be summarised as follows: while *langue*- or competence-oriented studies try to discover the general psychological rules behind the constants of lingual structure, *parole*- or performance-oriented studies try to discover the general psychological rules behind the variables of speech-situations. However, there is one type of psycholinguistic research, that could give the best results in terms of its contribution to the parametric study of SMIU-tension; this type of research would try to discover the general psychological rules behind the variables of lingual structure. Unfortunately for poetics and literary theory, psycholinguistics has so far hardly engaged in this kind of research (a possible exception is the study of syntactic depth; see below, 5.2.4).

In this "state of the art" SMIU-tension can be seen as no more than tangent in relation to the mainstream of current practice in psycholinguistics. In using the concept of "tangency" two interrelated points are being made: (a) that some kind of contact between the mainstream of psycholinguistics and the concept of SMIU-tension does exist occasionally, however rarely; (b) that, whenever that happens, this contact is very restricted.

As far as I know, three topics in psycholinguistics can claim this modest amount of relevance to the study of tension: (1) the study of guessing processes concomitant with the perception of language; (2) the study of hesitation-pauses made by speakers in the course of "spontaneous speech"; (3) the study of what psycholinguists term "depth" or "degree of embeddedness" (see below, 5.2.4). The three topics — (1) mainly involving the perceiver, (2) mainly involving the speaker and (3) involving them both equally — are interrelated, though not identical.

There is an obvious *prima facie* connection between these three phenomena and SMIU-tension, since they are all "dynamic" by nature: all of them are properties of isolated points along the utterances and not of the syntactic structure as a whole. The psycholinguistic study of these phenomena inevitably involves analysing utterances along their "temporal axis".

This "dynamic" common denominator gives rise to the expectation that procedures and results of psycholinguistic experimental research in the study of guessing, hesitation and depth would be clearly and significantly applicable to the theory of syntactic tension. However, as I have already argued, this is not the case.

5.2.2. The Psycholinguistic Approach to Guessing and Predictability and the Proposed Concept of SMIU-Anticipation

As far as I could gather from the literature, guessing is hardly ever treated by psycholinguists separately, in its own right; rather, it is employed as an experimental method ("guessing games") to test redundancy: a direct proportion is postulated between redundancy and predictability, and the latter is ascertained and tested experimentally by subjects' ability to guess "target"-sentence correctly (see, for example, Rommetveit [435], especially pp. 67-70).

Syntactic redundancy and predictability are obviously closely

to the concept of anticipation which I proposed as a parameter of SMIU-tension. However, there seem to be three main reasons for the negligibility of the contribution of the study of the former to the understanding of the latter:

1. Psycholinguistic research is apparently more interested in the investigation of meaning-redundancy (as reflected in lingual semantics and extralingual context-of-situation) than in the investigation of syntax-redundancy.

2. While most studies of redundancy investigate the ability to guess correctly (asking what makes a correct guess possible), the concept of SMIU-tension requires the investigation of the necessity or urge to guess at all (asking what, syntactically, makes guessing desirable). The possibility to guess correctly as reflected in the concept of SMIU-anticipation is viewed here as an active psychointonational driving force, not as passive information-data waiting indifferently to be guessed.

3. A crucial difference between most psycholinguists' focus of interest and mine lies, quite characteristically, in the relative significance attached to intonation within our respective conceptual and methodological frameworks. To the best of my knowledge, psycholinguists have hardly been concerned with the interrelationships between predictability and pause-desirability in written texts, a problem which is quite central to the analysis of syntactic anticipation in my sense.

From all the aforesaid one can see why psycholinguistic studies of guessing and redundancy cannot make a significant contribution to the understanding of SMIU-anticipation, which is the syntactically determined predictability of a pause-resistant continuation. In fact, the distinction between SMIUs and SMAUs is nonexistent in psycholinguistic treatment of predictability; moreover, questions of formal syntactic predictability, and even more so questions of pause-predictability, have remained virtually unasked, and consequently unanswered, in the psycholin-

guistic literature. Since none of the two basic constituent elements of SMIU-anticipation (see 5.1.2.3, point 1) is studied in psycholinguistic investigations of predictability, SMIU-anticipation itself can hardly benefit from these investigations.

It follows that the psycholinguistic study of syntactic predictability still has a long way to go in order to qualify as a useful tool in the analysis and classification of SMIU-anticipation and tension, and consequently in the analysis and classification of enjambment. Vital links are missing from the chain connecting the interests and achievements of the psycholinguistic study of syntactic predictability with the concepts of SMIU-tension and enjambment, and the applicability of psycholinguistic achievements to the kind of research I am trying to undertake here is considerably restricted.

5.2.3. The Psycholinguistic Study of Hesitation Pauses and the Concept of SMIU-Tension.

It is a known observable fact that people sometimes hesitate or grope for a word in spontaneous speech, and that pauses are the main symptom of this fact. One of the leading psycholinguists who have investigated this phenomenon, Frieda Goldman-Eisler, says that spontaneous speech, even when fluent, is a "highly fragmented and discontinuous activity" and that "[...] pausing is as much part of speech as vocal utterance" (both quotations are from [189], 31).

Hesitation pauses occur almost exclusively in "spontaneous speech". In reading a written text they occur very rarely and under special circumstances (e.g., illegible handwriting, ambiguous or over-complicated syntax, unfamiliar words, etc.); at any rate, psycholinguistic research of hesitation pauses has been primarily preoccupied with their occurrence in spontaneous speech.

Most of the work done on hesitation has naturally been

concerned with the speaker (alias encoder, alias addresser) rather than with the listener (alias decoder, alias addressee). "Naturally", that is, from the point of view of the psycholinguist as a psychologist. It is the speaker who actually pauses and hesitates, and it is through the investigation of his conduct in this respect that light can be thrown upon much wider areas of human communication and behaviour. A great deal of the work done in psycholinguistics amounts to using linguistic data in psychological research. Thus, in studying the phenomenon of hesitation, the ultimate purpose of psycholinguists is often purely psychological and nonlinguistic (e.g., to learn under what conditions, in what situations, and in what states of mind a speaker is likely to hesitate). Such problems are very interesting for the psychologist and the psychologically-oriented psycholinguist, but are none of our business here.¹² However, even more strictly linguistic questions (e.g., At what points along a syntactic segment are hesitation pauses more likely to occur?) have been primarily studied from the speaker's standpoint, again for the simple reason that he is the one who actually does the pausing and the hesitating, and not from the standpoint of the listener, who can seldom predict the speaker's pauses and evaluate their reasons. At any rate, listeners' reactions to speakers' hesitation pauses have hardly been the subject of psycholinguistic inquiry.

¹²Questions of such psychological and nonlinguistic nature may, and often do, very legitimately arise in the process of a poem's interpretation. An argument concerning questions of whether, where and how to pause at a given point in a poem can thus be decided according to such psychological questions (e.g., Is it likely that the speaker in a particular lyrical poem, or the character speaking on the stage in a poetic drama, should hesitate at this point? Is such a hesitation compatible with his nature, or his state of mind, or with the work's general line of argument? etc.). While at the present stage of my argument I adhere to the strictly linguistic level of analysis, this note is a reminder that extralinguistic considerations are sometimes indispensable in the final analysis.

It is precisely this kind of inquiry, however, than can best serve the study of SMIU and enjambment. This is the case simply because writing poetry (or writing in general, for that matter) is not a spontaneous activity in the sense, and to the extent, that spontaneous speech is. Hesitation pauses conveyed through written texts are, so to speak, planned hesitation-pauses, calculated and designed to create the illusion of spontaneous hesitation. The deliberate nature of inducing hesitation-pauses in writing makes it different from the production of hesitation pauses in speech; however, the perception of such pauses through listening and through reading are much more similar. The study of listeners' reactions to various types of hesitation pauses, if undertaken, could consequently be quite relevant to the investigation of enjambment as the main form of nongrammatical pause in poetry. Yet, to the best of my knowledge, such a line of research hardly exists.

The nature of the potential contribution of existing research on hesitation pauses to the study of enjambment can be learned from Goldman-Eisler's book [189]. The following points in it are of special relevance:

1. Pauses in spontaneous speech may coincide with grammatical junctures, or else they constitute "nongrammatical breaks" Goldman-Eisler proposes here a clear-cut binary dichotomy ([189], 13), rather than a "scale of contrastivity" or a polar dichotomy of the type suggested by Crystal (e.g., [104], 289). She does not supply clear criteria for applying the distinction to all conceivable cases.

2. Grammatical junctures constitute a relatively small majority in hesitant speech, and a larger majority in fluent speech ([189], 82-83). It was similarly shown by experiment that, in reading written texts aloud, subjects' performance occasionally reached the 100% target in breathing at grammatical junctures only, whereas in fluent speech the figure was about 70%

([189], 97).

3. "[...] hesitancy in speech was shown to be closely related to uncertainty of prediction, and fluency of utterance to redundancy" ([189], 48). Hesitation was also found to be connected with semantic decisions, rather than syntactic competence ([189], 79-80).

It follows from these observations and findings that, statistically speaking, in spontaneous speech a majority of "nongrammatical breaks" occurring at points of semantic decision-making are hesitation-pauses. If we reverse this statement to suit the listener's standpoint, we can say that pauses of this kind (i.e., occurring at syntactically pause-resistant points of semantic decision-making) are likely to be taken as conveying hesitation, provided that the specific semantic content, and/or context-of-situation, is compatible with such an interpretation.

As a native speaker of a language in which a poem is written, the reader confronted with an enjambment, which is a "nongrammatical break" by definition, would get the message that the speaker is hesitating, groping for the appropriate word, reluctant to spell it out, etc. (unless the specific content of the text contradicts such an impression), because he has learned to interpret syntactically unmotivated pauses as likely to convey hesitation.

Enjambment, when placed in a point of potential semantic decision-making, then, can contribute to a momentary or protracted effect of a hesitant tone of reading: however, depending on the specific semantic content of any given instance, the same technique of "withholding information" (until the next line) may give either the impression of dissatisfaction with the word chosen or the opposite impression, that the one and only right word was found at last. In both cases enjambment gives the reader the illusion of being taken into the poet's confidence, witnessing his doubts and searches.

However, hesitancy is not the only effect of enjambment. It is a question of semantics and literary interpretation, not of syntax, whether or not enjambment promotes hesitancy in any specific case.

To sum up: because of the semantic and extralingual predilection in the psycholinguistic study of hesitation pauses, a syntactically oriented study of the structure of enjambment, such as this one, can hardly benefit from it. It could benefit much more from the study of reactions to hesitation. A semantically oriented study of the effects of enjambment, however, can benefit much more from this psycholinguistic investigation. After interpreting given poetic texts, it can juxtapose types of hesitation effects produced by enjambments with the types of hesitation pauses found to be characteristic of spontaneous speech.¹³ Such study, however, deserves a separate treatment; it is too complex to be undertaken here as a by-product of a syntactic study, and it may well require team-work and an interdisciplinary approach.

5.2.4. The Psycholinguistic Concept of Sentence Depth and its Relevance to the Study of SMIU-Tension.

The last psycholinguistic concept that will be examined in terms of its relevance to SMIU is the concept of "sentence depth" proposed by Yngve and elaborated by Rommetveit [435].¹⁴ Rommetveit's discussion of this concept will serve as a basis for mine.

¹³See, for instance, Xolševnikov's comparison ([585], 67) between the effects produced by enjambment and those produced by the employment of dots (or dashes) in prose to convey pauses caused by hesitation or anxiety.

¹⁴Trying to stay out of linguists' controversies as much as possible, I shall ignore the Yngve-Chomsky controversy concerning the concept of depth and related concepts (see Lyons, [338a], 90-93, for a lucid "layman's guide" to this controversy). It is perfectly sufficient for my purpose to ask whether the concept of sentence-depth has any bearing on SMIU-tension without questioning its merits and faults from the standpoint of linguistic theory.

Although the applicability of the concept of depth and Rommetveit's discussion of it to the study of SMIU-tension is my focus of interest, I shall comment briefly on his analysis as such.

"Depth" is described by Rommetveit ([435], 89-91) as follows (the sentence that he uses as a specimen is "WHEN VERY CLEAR PICTURES APPEARED, THEY APPLAUDED"):

[The] notion of sentence depth may perhaps be best understood by proceeding from left to right, asking at each step what commitment has implicitly been made by the speaker as he utters each successive word. The commitment, furthermore, is assessed in terms of chunks of words which have to be stored in immediate memory. At the moment "When" is uttered, the speaker has committed himself to the two clauses only [...]. The required memory load at that stage is hence two more encoding operations, and this number [...] is then a measure of sentence depth. When "very" is being uttered, however, the speaker has committed himself to some adjective, a noun completing a noun phrase, a verb phrase completing the first clause, and a second clause.¹⁵ The number of additional encoding operations to which he is committed is hence four. We may in this way derive the depth of the sentence at each stage of encoding until the speaker, when uttering "applauded", has no more commitment at all.

¹⁵Rommetveit makes here at least two mistakes within his own framework, and according to his own definition of "depth":

1. At the moment "When", alone, is uttered the commitment is not necessarily to two clauses, since it could be the beginning of an interrogative sentence like "When was that?";

2. The commitment at "very" is described by Rommetveit in a confused manner, analogous to an attempt to add up fractions

The approach looks quite promising from the standpoint of SMIU-tension. Nothing in research, psycholinguistic or otherwise, has come so near to the conceptual outlook that made me propose the concept of SMIU-tension. Consider, for example, the incessant reassessment of "commitment" taking place at a word-by-word pace; the very notion of forward-oriented (prospective) commitment; and the purely syntactic and nonsemantic nature of all the considerations (e.g., in the quotation above, Rommetveit says that "the speaker has committed himself to some adjective", not to a specific adjective with a specific meaning): all these features of "sentence depth" appear to be exactly reproduced in the central features of SMIU-tension. Superficially it appears that there is a direct proportion between sentence depth and SMIU-tension, and that anything said about sentence depth is automatically applicable to SMIU-tension.

The truth of the matter is different, though. Sentence depth, as treated by Rommetveit, is demonstrably different from SMIU-tension, because there is no discernible simple or direct correlation (such as direct or inverse proportion) between the number of "coding steps" to which the speaker has committed himself and the syntactically motivated urge to continue. My discussion will attempt to demonstrate the discrepancy between the two phenomena.

I would like to begin by dissociating the notion of depth as

without reducing them to a common denominator: if the "coding operations" are counted by single-word units, the number of commitments is at least five (the second clause consisting of at least two words), but if a phrase or a clause can be considered as a single commitment, the number of such commitments is three or even two (the rest of the subordinate clause is the first commitment, and the main clause is the second).

These mistakes, however, have no bearing on the applicability of the concept of sentence depth, if employed correctly, to the study of SMIU-tension.

defined by Rommetveit from a major fault in his discussion. I am referring to a practice that may be termed "the hindsight fallacy", whereby information derived solely from the sources of "static" and "retrospective" procedures of analysis is "projected backwards", as it were, and supposedly incorporated into the concept of sentence depth, although this concept is "prospective" by definition.

Implicitly, I have already referred to this fallacy, since it accounts for Rommetveit's mistakes described in note 15. Here once again my criticism is levelled at his practice from the listener's standpoint. Compare, for instance, his proposed analysis of the degrees of depth in the last six words of a sentence (quoted from [435], 211, and given on top of the text) with my alternative analysis (given below the text):

	4	4	3	2	1	0
"I saw the boy whom the girl who cried met".						
	2	2	1	2	1	0

Whereas Rommetveit's analysis is based on what actually happens in the sentence, it is my contention that depth, according to his own definition, should always be determined at the lowest number of "coding steps" predictable at any given point (i.e., the depth-figure should always reflect the shortest way to syntactic completeness that can be envisaged at each interlexical position). Thus, I maintain that "whom" could be followed by something like "I like", and is therefore embedded to the depth of 2, not 4. "The" could similarly be followed by, say, "girl met", and "girl" could be followed by "met", thereby attaining syntactic completeness much more simply and much earlier than in the actual sentence. It is only through the hindsight made possible by being acquainted with the sentence as a whole that Rommetveit can arrive at his analysis.

This fallacy seems to result from Rommetveit's position (implied by his practice though never explicitly stated), that depth is first and foremost a term relating to the process of

encoding rather than the process of decoding. However, his practice is wrong even if considered as a description of encoding.

His position on the relationships between encoding and decoding in this connection is somewhat vague (however, it must be admitted that the problem is objectively difficult). Rommetveit makes several references to "asymmetries between encoding and decoding" (e.g., [435], 91, 93, 223) but they are all too brief and casual, and do not seem to come to grips with the complexity of the problem. Thus, he quotes previous authorities (Martin and Roberts) as saying that "the listening task" is "strictly analogous to the task of speaking. The number of expectations in the listener, they argued, will at each stage be the same as the number of commitments incurred by the speaker" ([435], 222-223). It is entirely unclear whether, and to what extent, Rommetveit accepts this view, and his attempt to reconcile it with his own view of "asymmetry" seems to leave much to be desired in terms of clarity. In "asymmetry between encoding and decoding" Rommetveit refers, in fact, to an exact mirror-image, or inverted, symmetry between them ([435], 91; the idea is that in "left-branching patterns" short-term memory load increases in decoding inasmuch as it decreases in encoding along a temporal axis).

While this is a misuse of the word "asymmetry", my view is that there is a genuine asymmetry in certain cases, as in the sentence just quoted ("I saw the boy whom the girl who cried met"). Here the speaker, knowing what he is about to say, makes certain commitments; yet, these commitments do not necessarily correlate with the listener's expectations which lingual structure alone may elicit in him: he cannot resort to information stored in the speaker's mind concerning what he is going to say next. The difference between my analysis and Rommetveit's, then, appears to result from this difference between speaker's commitments and listener's expectations.

On second thought, however, the validity of Rommetveit's

analysis is theoretically questionable even when applied to encoding. No matter how you look at this type of analysis, something unsatisfactory about it remains. As for lingual structure, it definitely yields the analysis proposed by me (written below the analysed sentence), rather than the one proposed by Rommetveit (written above it). As for the speaker's real, mental commitments regarding what he is about to say, these may well be independent of lingual structure, since the speaker may have committed himself, subjectively, to the whole sentence before he has uttered the first single word. Subjective commitment is a mental phenomenon, not a lingual one, and it must be studied, if it can be studied at all, by psychological rather than linguistic methods: linguistic data alone cannot possibly give the listener a clue to the speaker's subjective syntactic commitment. Rommetveit tries to use linguistic methods and concepts to describe subjective commitment, and that is a major deficiency in his analysis.

SMIU-tension is inseparably linked with the process of perceiving (or decoding); it cannot be properly analysed in analogy with sentence depth as long as the process of decoding is not integrated into the description of the latter phenomenon.

Suppose, for the sake of argument, that psycholinguistic science has adopted my approach to the problem, whereby sentence depth is considered first and foremost in terms of perception and decoding. It is my contention that, even under these "favourable" conditions, sentence depth can contribute very little to a better understanding of SMIU-tension (an understanding which is a prerequisite for a comprehensive theory of enjambment). Thus, for instance, let us consider a sentence analysed by Rommetveit (following Yngve) and already quoted above, "WHEN VERY CLEAR PICTURES APPEARED, THEY APPLAUDED". In the following depth analysis my listener-oriented method is used instead of Rommetveit's allegedly speaker-oriented analysis (every word is followed in

parentheses by a number indicating its lowest possible depth):
"When (2)¹⁶ very (5)¹⁶ clear (4) pictures (3) appeared (2),
they (1) applauded (0)".

The curve of SMIU-tension analysis, however, is not as simple and unequivocal as that; it has to be drawn in approximate, relative terms, according to intuitively or introspectively determined¹⁷ degrees of pause-desirability and pause-resistance. This curve would start at quite a high point at "When", would rise at "very" and then drop steadily and gradually until the word "appeared" appears. So far this curve is by and large compatible with the depth curve just described; but at "they", where the depth-curve drops from 2 to 1, the SMIU-tension curve rises considerably. Although it is difficult to assess the exact relative strength of SMIU-tension at "they" (where depth is 1) as compared to "very" (depth 5) or "clear" (depth 4), it is obvious that "they" (depth 1) carries much more SMIU-tension than "appeared" (depth 2) and most probably more than "pictures" (depth 3) as well. The curve of degrees of depth and the curve of degrees of SMIU-tension, then, show remarkable divergency in their separate courses. Tension and depth do have something in common: they are both by-products of prospective syntactic incompleteness. Zero depth and zero tension always coincide; but once there is some degree of depth and tension, the two curves work independently both in terms of direction and in terms of degree.

¹⁶See my remarks concerning Rommetveit's analysis of this sentence (in note 15 above). Contrary to Rommetveit's practice, I am making here an attempt to find a common denominator for all depth units, and the most natural and convenient one is the single-word unit.

¹⁷Appropriately conducted psycholinguistic experiments could perhaps yield more reliable results; but, for reasons already explained, in the absence of such experiments I once again feel free to use common sense, intuition and introspection as legitimate sources of evidence in my analysis.

To sum up: depth and SMIU-tension, though superficially very similar, are in fact two distinct phenomena, both preconditioned by syntactic incompleteness. Their divergency results from the fact that they draw on different, autonomous sources: whereas the SMIU-tension of a word in context is influenced by the type of syntactic categories expected (or unexpected) immediately after it, its syntactic depth is influenced by the number of syntactic categories that can legitimately be expected after it (see reservations from an additional angle in 5.4.1.4 and note 23 below).

It may well be that more precise rules governing the interrelationships between depth and SMIU-tension can be discovered. I for one, however, have so far failed to discover these rules. Sentence depth, the psycholinguistic concept showing the greatest *prima facie* kinship with SMIU-tension, has proved almost totally irrelevant to the study of the latter concept. The lack of systematic study of the connection between depth and intonation also contributes to this state of affairs.¹⁸

5.2.5. Psycholinguistics, Psychopoetics and Interdisciplinary Research: A Note on Prospects and Perspectives.

To conclude my excursus into the field of psycholinguistics I would like to make a short statement concerning the general

¹⁸Rommetveit makes a brief, almost casual reference to the question of the interrelations between sentence depth and intonation ([435], 223). His contention is that intonation contours "serve as perceptual cues by which the listener may anticipate, e.g., CONTINUATION VERSUS STOP and even more subtle structural patterns of not-yet-spoken parts of the utterance". While this statement is totally uncontestable, it can hardly be praised for doing justice to the complexity of the subject. Thus, the real problem arises precisely where Rommetveit leaves it: namely, with the question of how intonation can elicit the anticipation described, what "subtle structural patterns" can or cannot be suggested by intonation, and under what conditions, etc. Once again, the reason for my criticism is not in Rommetveit's failure to solve problems but in his failure to notice them.

problem of the applicability of psycholinguistic theory and research to the study of literature.

I believe that the time has come for a more balanced distribution of efforts in psycholinguistics, which could give the study of lingual expectation its due share in the overall activity in the field. Such a development must broaden the horizons of psycholinguistics itself, but what concerns me as a student of literature is the existence of topics in literary theory which cannot be fully investigated without recourse to psychological testing. Thus, for instance, literary theory and research abound in implicit hypotheses and explicit statements concerning the behaviour of "the reader". Some of these statements and hypotheses are indispensable for any satisfactory description of literary structure, and should be susceptible to verification by means of psychological experimentation. Yet, to the best of my knowledge, experimenters in psychology and psycholinguistics have hardly bothered to devise the appropriate methods and procedures for the experimental investigation of readers' reactions.

As for prosodic research, several isolated attempts have been made to apply experimental methods and laboratory-like techniques to some of its aspects (see, for instance, Chatman's [78] and Murdy's [373] analyses of oral recitations of poems as a means to establish their prosodic structures). Although some electronic equipment has been used in such studies, this has been done in order to investigate acoustic and phonetic aspects of the oral performance of poems, and not in order to substantiate psychological hypotheses concerning readers' reactions to prosodic structure.

¹⁹What I mean here is a full-fledged application of experimental psychology, with laboratory techniques, control groups, etc., and not studies like I.A. Richards' *Practical Criticism: A Study of Literary Judgment* (London, 1929), or Norman Holland's psychoanalytically-oriented *The Dynamics of Literary Response* [237].

I believe that appropriate methods and procedures can be devised for controlled research into readers' and listeners' responses to various aspects of literary works of art. I am indebted to my friend and colleague Menakhem Perry of Tel-Aviv University for the basic idea underlying this proposition, as suggested by him in an unpublished lecture. He proposed the establishment of a separate discipline or subdiscipline called "Psychopoetics", which would relate to poetics in a manner respectively analogous to the way psycholinguistics relates to linguistics. It would require interdisciplinary thinking and training, and would promote an atmosphere of reciprocal feedback among scholars of the different relevant disciplines. Psychopoetics cannot and should not supplant the existing methods of theory and analysis in poetics any more than psycholinguistics should supplant nonpsychologically-oriented theory and research in linguistics. Furthermore, the status of psychopoetics *vis-à-vis* poetics is more questionable than the status of psycholinguistics *vis-à-vis* linguistics in several respects, mainly because of the formidable question of selecting subjects or informants (practically anyone can qualify as a "native speaker", but who is the "native reader"?). These problems, difficult as they are, should not deter scholars from embarking on this enterprise, provided that research procedures and results are treated with the necessary caution.

In the summer of 1971, while on a short visit to Stockholm, I had the privilege of meeting Prof. Sten Malmström of Stockholm University, and I am much obliged to him for the opportunity I had to discuss an in-progress research-project conducted under his supervision. This project is being conducted and published in Swedish and, to the best of my knowledge, it is quite unparalleled by most work done in English.

Prof. Malmström's project, which is part of a larger research project in which several scholars investigate "methods of studying

literary experience", is aimed at studying "components and processes in the experience of verse rhythm". Among the problems tackled in this project, I would like to mention the problem of correlation between stress and tempo, problems of the awareness, prediction and assessment of stress, and the general problem of a poem's overall "rhythm" and how it can be described. The project is a pilot-study in "psychopoetics" (though it is not defined or labelled as such by those conducting it), since it combines hypotheses on literary structure (taken from poetics and literary theory) on the one hand with methods of interviewing subjects and studying their reactions (taken from experimental psychology) on the other hand.

Although problems of syntax and intonation are not studied in this project in their own right, it is not difficult to see how the project's methods can be applied to their investigation.

In his study of the experience of verse rhythm Prof. Malmström is the head of a team comprising scholars from various related disciplines. Similarly, I think that literary theorists and analysts, linguists, psycholinguists, psychologists, and perhaps students in other related fields, have to collaborate in order to achieve that kind of genuine conceptual and methodological give-and-take that is a precondition for any real breakthrough in the study of the manifold aspects of literary experience.

5.2.6. Conclusion.

Until progress is made in the directions outlined throughout 5.2 (especially 5.2.0, 5.2.1 and 5.2.5) the concluding answer to Question 2 in 5.0.4 must be that the potential contribution of psycholinguistics to SMIU-tension is quite negligible, because of the differences between the questions that should be asked and answered in connection with SMIU-tension on the one hand and those that are being discussed in psycholinguistics on the other hand.

5.3. A SKELETON-THEORY OF *SMIU*-TENSION.

5.3.1. The Problem: A Recapitulation.

The problems confronting any theory of *SMIU*-tension, as outlined above, can be recapitulated as follows:

1. The nature of *SMIU*-tension is primarily determined by the structural-functional parameter of *SMIU*-anticipation and by the automatically- and autonomously-determined parameter of *SMIU*-SL.

2. Since the contribution of linguistics and psycholinguistics to a theory of *SMIU*-tension, or to a descriptive analysis of each of its parameters and their interrelationships, is almost negligible, fresh theoretical and methodological approaches should be developed in these disciplines in order to make the necessary progress possible.

3. Under these circumstances, the only course open to the investigator of *SMIU*-tension is, once again, to resort to his own intuition and introspection as a major source of evidence (though not the only one), however unsatisfactory or unreliable this source may be.

It is in this light that I should like the following theoretical principles, abstracted from the above discussion, to be viewed. They constitute my suggestion for a skeleton-theory of *SMIU*-tension.

It is a "skeleton" theory simply because a full-fledged theory is not possible at present for reasons already given. It deals with interrelations between such features as *SMIU*-SL and *SMIU*-completeness, as if each of them separately had an established theoretical status, which is not the case. As things now stand, anything said about separate factors as well as about their interrelationships should be taken as tentative.

These reservations, however, do not invalidate my skeleton

theory, but simply stress my awareness of its limited scope and lack of nonintuitive verification-mechanism. Within these confines I do submit (a) that it is a correct theory and (b) that little more can be done at the moment to make it less tentative and more comprehensive.

5.3.2. The Skeleton Theory of SMIU-Tension.

SMIU-tension is a direct and automatic manifestation of syntactic incompleteness. Consequently, the following rules constitute the skeleton-theory:

1. SL in SMIUs functions as described above (see 4.2.2): other things being equal, the distance of a given word from the beginning of its SMIU is inversely proportionate to the degree of SMIU-tension it carries.

2. SMIU-anticipation is directly proportionate to SMIU-tension (provided that "SMIU-anticipation" is taken in my strict, narrow sense of "the predictability of a syntactically pause-resistant continuation"). This direct proportion applies to both components of SMIU-anticipation: the degree of paradigmatic predictability, and the strength of the anticipated resistance to pause.

3. Syntactic openness, contrary to syntactic anticipation, defies any subclassification into SMIU- and SMAU-openness (it is precisely the difficulty in selecting the most predictable continuation at a given point which creates syntactic openness). Syntactic openness is incompatible with syntactic completeness, and invariably carries a certain amount of syntactic tension; but, on the other hand, it is inversely proportionate to SMIU-anticipation and, consequently, to SMIU-tension.

4. Schematically, the following four types of syntactic prediction are arranged in a descending order of contribution to SMIU-tension: (1) SMIU-anticipation; (2) Syntactic openness; (3) SMAU-anticipation; (4) Prospective syntactic completeness.

5.3.3. Hierarchies and Interrelationships among Types of Syntactic Expectation: An Illustration.

Let us return to the example already quoted from Shakespeare's *King Lear* I, i, 96-97, where Cordelia says to Lear:

You have begot me, bred me, Lov'd me. I
Return those duties back as are right fit.

The end of the first line is very clearly syntactically open, since it is incompatible both with syntactic anticipation (syntactically, almost anything may happen at the beginning of the second line after the first one has been completed — except, perhaps, an adjective) and with syntactic completeness (a terminal pausal juncture is inadmissible at the end of the first line). Yet, in apparent contradiction to my statement that syntactic openness and SMIU-tension are inversely proportionate, there is a definite sense of acute SMIU-tension here.

This is undoubtedly true, yet it does not necessarily shake my contention: generally speaking, similar effects can be produced by different causes. In this case, it is not openness but SL which accounts for the poignancy of tension. The following three hypothetical "alternatives" (A, B and C) to Shakespeare's original (0) can illustrate this statement:²⁰

- A. You have begot and loved me. Therefore I
Return those duties back as are right fit.
- B. You have begot me, bred me, loved me, nurtured
Me.
- C. You have begot me, bred me, loved and nurtured
Me.

²⁰Here as elsewhere in this study all "alternatives" are proposed in order to isolate a certain component by making it a variable against a background of constants. The inevitable lexical (and consequently semantic) changes which occur in the process of constructing these "alternatives" are totally immaterial (compare this practice with Mukařovský's in [370]).

In A the original syntactic openness at line-end is preserved, treated as a constant, while SL is treated as a variable. As for B and C, which obviously deviate from O more radically in several respects, the only change relevant to the present discussion is that at the end of the first line anticipation-governed tension (AGT) has replaced the original openness-governed tension (OGT), with B resembling O and C resembling A in terms of SL-structure. Schematically, the four versions relate to each other as follows:

	Minimal SMIU-SL	Longer SMIU-SL
OGT	O	A
AGT	B	C

Let us compare the horizontal pairs first. The end of the first line in A is, syntactically, just as open as in O; and yet line-end SMIU-tension (as sensed intuitively) in A is weaker than in O, because of SL differences (this is the result of the way SL functions in SMIUs; see above, 4.2.2). Similarly, SMIU-tension in C is weaker than in B: here the common denominator is that an object, and very probably the pronoun "me", is syntactically anticipated after a transitive verb (which is the fourth in a series of transitive verbs followed by "me"), and the difference is one of SL, once again.

In each of the vertical pairs, however, SL is the constant factor, and the type of SMIU-tension is the variable. It is in this comparison, where the element of SL is neutralised and the functional-syntactic dichotomy of "openness vs. anticipation" is isolated, that attention can be focused on the latter: the inevitable reservation "other things being equal" is almost fully adhered to. Thus, the first vertical comparison corroborates my statement about the nature and origin of the acute tension in the

original Shakespearean lines (O).

I have just argued that SMIU-tension at the enjambment between those lines is characterised by openness rather than SMIU-anticipation and yet it is very acute; I have also argued that this example does not contradict my contention that syntactic openness is inversely proportionate to SMIU-tension, because it is SL, rather than functional relationships, that accounts for SMIU-acuteness in this case. And, indeed, SMIU-tension in B is greater than in O (under similar SL-conditions), and it is similarly greater in C than in A.

The situation within the framework of each parameter separately is clear, then: in terms of SL, the nearer a given point to the SMIU-beginning, the more SMIU-tension it carries, and in terms of syntactic expectation, the nearer a given postlexical point to the pole of SMIU-anticipation, the more SMIU-tension it carries (in the context of syntactic expectation, syntactic openness occupies an intermediary position between SMIU- and SMAU-anticipation, where the latter naturally weakens SMIU-tension more than openness). Complexity increases, however, where the relative strengths of the parameters themselves are compared (in the diagonal pairs in terms of the above schematic table). One diagonal juxtaposition (A vs. B) yields obvious results: A is relatively "slow" or "opposed to tension" both because of its SL position and its syntactic openness, while B is "fast" or "pause-resistant" on both counts, so that B is by far a more poignant enjambment than A. The other diagonal juxtaposition (O vs. C), however, is very unclear. Here it is the strength of each parameter as such that is isolated: O is "slow" because of openness and "fast" because of SL, whereas C is "slow" because of SL and "fast" because of anticipation. If the functional parameter is more dominant than SL, C should be "faster" than O as an overall effect, whereas if SL is more dominant, O should be faster than C.

By this presentation I have deliberately oversimplified the

problem: in theory there can be numerous functional syntactic relationships, some of which may be weaker, while others stronger, than SL; but even a convincing hierarchy applicable only to the four specific examples just proposed can isolate the problem of the relative "strength" of each parameter and contribute to its investigation on a larger scale.

In this connection, my entire discussion in 3.2.3, with particular reference to Question B, is applicable here. While my statements concerning the "horizontal" and "vertical" pairs separately are based on some kind of common denominator, it is precisely such a common denominator that is missing from the "diagonal" juxtaposition of O with C. Personally, I tend to arrange the four versions in descending order of SMIU-tension as follows: B, O, C, A (in other words, the extreme shortness of SL in O strikes me as causing a more urgent demand for completeness than the functional anticipation in C). However, I can find no reason against the alternative ordering of B, C, O, A.

Moreover, as I have just argued, it is oversimplified to assume that a particular example (in this case B or C) can represent so complex a parameter as syntactic expectation, or even SMIU-anticipation (SL is simple enough to be represented by a single example, because its effect can be assessed by simple counting). Thus, another hypothetical alternative, ending with a preposition —

D. You have begot me, bred me, loved and lived with
Me

— would be placed before O even according to my preference. This alternative, just as C, is an intersection of "longer SMIU-SL" and "AGT". The difference is that the anticipation of a noun (or a pronoun) after a preposition is stronger than the anticipation of an object after a transitive verb (see above, 5.1.2.3, especially point 9). Consequently, if D replaces C the descending order of SMIU-tension would be B, D, O, A; and, if D is added

on to the existing four versions as a fifth one, I would order them B, D, O, C, A, but I could not meaningfully object to B, D, C, O, A.

It follows that, as I argued in 3.2.3, there is no way to compare the relative strengths of the parameters as such, and this difficulty is added to the impossibility of constructing a hierarchical scale of degrees of syntactic expectation.

There is a great difference between two types of intuitive insights: those based upon our obvious consensus, at least implicitly postulated by scholars, on the one hand; and those devoid of such a consensus, on the other. Thus, for instance, Bernštejn's analyses in [542], Hrushovski's in [248], Mukařovský's in [370], and Spitzer's in [469], to mention just a few, draw heavily, though usually implicitly, on this kind of obvious consensus of readers concerning the connection between lingual structure and patterns of stress, pitch and pause in oral reading. The contents of such a consensus can be postulated or taken for granted without recourse to phonetic or psychological experimentation. My observations concerning the internal relationships within each parameter (the "vertical pairs" and the "horizontal pairs") are also based on an obvious consensus of this kind. My views concerning the overall hierarchy of the four versions, and particularly the "diagonal" relationships between O can C, however, are devoid of such an obvious consensus as a basis. Therefore, I cannot defend my preference of B, O, C, A against B, C, O, A, but any arrangement that would not place B and A at the two extremes does violate a consensus or a universal of the psycho-intonational component of reading.

5.3.4. SMIU-Tension Theory: Concluding Remarks.

The answer to Question 3 in 5.0.4 was given, so to speak, "in algebra" in the four principles of the skeleton theory of SMIU-tension in 5.3.2; in 5.3.3 I tried to turn this formula

into "arithmetic" and "actual numbers" by an illustration which clarified the meaning of the formula and, perhaps more than anything else, demonstrated the limitations of translating intuitions, however certain of them one may be, into the language of facts.

5.4. *SMAU-TENSION AND ENJAMBMENT: THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE FUNCTIONAL PARAMETER OF SMAU-ANTICIPATION.*

5.4.1. Anticipation-Governed SMAU-Tension as a Background for Enjambment: A Preliminary Theoretical Presentation Based on an Illustration from a Poem by John Donne.

5.4.1.0. *The Poem Introduced.* As a transition from the discussion of SMIU-tension to the discussion of SMAU-tension (see 5.0.3), the present subsection analyses a case of an acute enjambment (i.e., enjambment characterised by very strong SMIU-tension) in a poem that is organised in its entirety by SMAU-tension governed by SMAU-anticipation. Thus the two types of syntactic tension are compared and juxtaposed in a single text. It is a short poem by John Donne, Poem XXIV from his *The Litanie* (Donne, p. 244; the poem constitutes lines 208-216 in the entire work; my line-numbering is internal):

- (1) That wee may change to evenesse
- (2) This intermitting aguish Pietie;
- (3) That snatching cramps of wickednesse
- (4) And Apoplexies of fast sin, may die;
- (5) That musique of thy promises,
- (6) Not threats in Thunder may
- (7) Awaken us to our just offices;
- (8) What in thy booke, thou dost, or creatures say,
- (9) That wee may heare, Lord heare us, when wee pray.

The poem is a very interesting case of syntactic-intonational

contribution to semantics and thematics, but a full-fledged interpretation of it is not the purpose of the present discussion. Rather, I would like to focus my attention on its enjambments, especially the one between the sixth and seventh line, against the background of its SMAU-tension structure.

The entire poem's grand structure of SMAU-anticipation is generated by the first word ("That") which is repeated anaphorically several times. I shall first ignore this structure and return to it later.

There are three possible enjambments in this poem (between the lines 1-2, 3-4 and 6-7); but the first is doubtful as an enjambment, and only the last is an acute enjambment, based on strong SMIU-tension. Let us first consider each of them separately.

5.4.1.1. *First Enjambment.* First, I would like to propose a prospective-dynamic view of the first enjambment. At the end of the first line syntactic openness is generated by the verb "change", with a slight SMAU preference. This preference results from the possibility that "change" is intransitive, but also from the possibility that "change" is transitive: even as a transitive verb "change" may well produce SMAU-anticipation at line-end, or, at least, syntactic openness. If a transitive "change" were the last word in the line, its transitive potential would mean a clearer case of SMIU-anticipation at line-end (though not an absolute one, of course - see 5.1.2.3, points 8 and 9). As the poem is actually written, however, the inverted word order²¹ makes the line boundary

²¹After studying Mukařovský's celebrated "The Connection between the Prosodic Line and Word-Order in Czech Verse" [370] I decided not to treat word-order in the present study as a separate topic. Mukařovský's article, despite its inspiring combination of methodological rigour, clarity of thought and sensitivity to the subtleties and complexities of poetry, does

syntactically open, since the direct object required for syntactic completeness may come immediately after "evennesse", but it need not necessarily do so once it has already been put off by the syntactic wedge ("to evennesse") inserted between the transitive verb and it (see Taranovski's "case 4" [494], 83; see also my discussion in 3.5.2).

A static view of the "first enjambment" can be described as follows: even though the direct object is supplied at the beginning of line 2, the transition is not clearly an enjambment at all: on the one hand, pause is not desirable at this transition; on the other hand, it is tolerable in context, at least relatively, because all other interlexical transitions in its vicinity are even less hospitable to pauses. Since the transition here belongs to "case 5" in Taranovski's scale ([494], 83-84, quoted above):

not yield a comprehensive theory of word-order manipulations and their effects. It is an inductive and descriptive, rather than deductive and theoretical, study, largely based on Mukarovsky's intuitions as a native speaker of Czech and reader of Czech poetry.

The achievements of this study are quite representative of its potentialities as well as the limitations inherent in its subject matter: the study of word-order's effect on intonation can probably yield illuminating insights rather than theoretical generalisations and ever-valid scales.

It is probably no mere incident that the subject has hardly been taken up by more recent scholars: Mukarovsky's achievement may be unsurpassable as far as his specific subject is concerned. At any rate, I for one found it useless to reproduce or even to modify his results by reapplying his analytical principles to new texts, or to attempt a theory of the intonational effects of the unmanageable number of word-order combinations where even Mukarovsky refrained from such an attempt.

As in my automatic application of the work of Kell and Tynjanov (see 3.5.2), here the reader is referred to Mukarovsky's study [370] and advised to add its contribution to my observations, as an additional constraint, wherever word-order manipulations are prominent.

3.5.2), which "is conditioned by a strong intonational break inside the line" ([494], 84) in order to qualify as enjambment, and since such breaks are missing from the transition's vicinity in both lines, the transition's status as enjambment is questionable.

5.4.1.2. *Second Enjambment.* The transition between lines 3 and 4 is perceived when the reader has already been conditioned by the transition between the first two lines (the analogy between the two transitions is reinforced by the anaphoric "That"s at the beginnings of lines 1 and 3, by their metrical structure and by the rhyme linking their ends). Moreover, the third line in its own right is perhaps even more likely to end with SMAU-anticipation than the first: the absence of a verb deprives the third line from the urgency of expectation generated by the possible transitive interpretation of the verb in the first. Prospectively speaking, then, while the first line-end tends to be characterised by syntactic openness, the third line-end (with the first one as already-supplied information) tends to be characterised by SMAU-anticipation.

Retrospectively, however, the transition emerges as an undoubted enjambment with the type of employment of "and" that makes "total SMAU-anticipation" an impossibility (see 5.1.2.3, point 10). The enjambment is strengthened by the total asymmetry between lines 2 and 4 and the obviously intonationally- (and not syntactically-) motivated comma after "sin"; this comma, by producing a postenjambmental pausal juncture sooner than its syntactically normal occurrence at the end of line 4, creates more favourable conditions for an enjambmental interpretation of the transition between lines 3 and 4 (see Taranovski [494], especially 80-83).

In other words, while in the transition between lines 1 and 2 an unclear expectation, open to enjambment and end-stoppage, is

somewhat fulfilled and somewhat frustrated by the retrospective emergence of borderline end-stoppage, in the transition between lines 3 and 4 SMAU-anticipation at the end of line 3 is clearly frustrated by the retrospective emergence of SIC across the line boundary, so that the end result is a clear case of enjambment.

5.4.1.3. *Third Enjambment.* The most obvious and acute enjambment in the poem is between lines 6 and 7. It is characterised by very strong SMIU-anticipation, based on functional as well as SL consideration: (a) as for functional syntactic considerations, it is highly probable that "may" at the end of line 6 would be an auxiliary verb,²² and, consequently, that immediately after it a pause would be undesirable (this anticipation is confirmed by the beginning of line 7); (b) as for SL-considerations, the word "Thunder" in line 6 ends an SMIU, and the line ends immediately after the beginning of the next SMIU, that is, when nothing more than its first monosyllabic word has been supplied.

This combination of "conventional" factors enhancing SMIU-tension (SMIU-anticipation and extremely short pre-line-end SL)

²²Since this is not a full interpretation or description of the poem, I cannot dwell on most of its major details and patterns, except those directly relevant to my topic. Thus, for instance, an interesting pattern links all the appearances of the word "may" in the poem. While "may" functions as an auxiliary verb, it is quite intriguing to study the differences between the syntactic, prosodic and semantic settings of each of its appearances. Thus, for instance, the enjambmental SMIU-tension in "may/Awaken" (between lines 6 and 7) is reinforced by the previous appearances of "may", which enhance the SMIU-anticipation and foreground the "post-'may'" word, "Awaken", through its contrast with its predecessors ("change" and "die"). Such a contrast can be described both rhythmically (a polysyllable preceded by monosyllables) and semantically (with special reference to the juxtaposition of "awaken" with "die"). Various syntactic, prosodic and semantic patterns, enjambment, and patterns of repetition of key-words are intricately interwoven and subtly contribute to the poem's overall complex effect.

is sufficient for foregrounding the enjambment between lines 6 and 7 against the background of the previous ones: after a doubtful enjambment (between lines 1 and 2) and a "retrospective" enjambment (between lines 3 and 4; see below, 5.8), this enjambment is the only one that is prospective, retrospective and very acute.

The enjambment between lines 6 and 7 is also conspicuous because of its pivotal position in a central process in the poem: the poem is characterised by a gradual increase in the complexity of its texture, especially from line 5 and onwards. This process involves simultaneous intensification and diversification on several levels, among which the following, at least, can be distinguished: (a) semantic density; (b) syntactic "restlessness" (deviant word-order and relatively more loaded subordination-hierarchies in longer "left-branching" structures); (c) asymmetry in line-structure and rhyme-scheme.

For reasons of scope and proportion I cannot go beyond listing the relevant phenomena and their interactions without discussing each of them fully (see note 22). However, even mere enumeration of this kind is adequate to demonstrate the third enjambment's intrinsic poignancy and contextual centrality.

The enjambment between lines 6 and 7 can thus be viewed as an intersection of heterogeneous factors; it is describable in terms of each of them, and its totality is the sum-total of all the interactions between them. In terms of SL the contexts relevant to this enjambment can be viewed as a hierarchy, very roughly resembling a set of concentric circles organised around the enjambment: the relationship between the words directly involved in the enjambment (the words flanking the line-boundary, in this case - "may/Awaken") is the "inner circle", while phenomena that affect the enjambment from a greater distance are "outer circles".

In this particular example the very identification of the

transition between lines 6 and 7 as enjambment is determined with absolute certainty on the basis of the "innermost circle" alone, regardless of what may happen before or after it: in fact it is almost a borderline category between cases 2 and 3 in Taranovski's scale ([494], 83-84), and the difficulty in describing its tension-peculiarities in terms of that scale is another proof of the scale's inadequate subtlety (see above, 3.5.2). At any rate, the "outer circles", though irrelevant to the enjambmental status of the interlinear transition, do influence the overall effect of the enjambment, as I have tried to show on principle: the functions and effects of the same enjambment can differ as a result of different syntactic, and/or semantic, and/or prosodic, "environment".

It is in this "environmental" capacity that the poem's grand architecture of SMAU-anticipation-governed tension can claim relevance to the poem's enjambments, notably the third one: this SMAU-tension structure is the "outermost circle" that can influence the enjambment, since it encompasses the entire poem. Before trying to describe the nature of this influence, an additional statement about the nature of SMAU-anticipation in general is indispensable.

5.4.1.4. *SMAU-Anticipation as a Three-Phase Phenomenon.* SMAU-anticipation as defined above (see 5.1.1.1, 5.1.2.1) is based on the predictability of a nonterminal pausal juncture as the very next syntagmatic element after the point of assessment. In fact, this definition refers to the third phase in a process of perceiving SMAU-anticipation, which potentially consists of three basic phases.

The distinction between these three phases is an integral part of my skeleton-theory of SMAU-anticipation, and as such it belongs in 5.4.2.2 below; however, since it is indispensable for the description of the role played by SMAU-anticipation in

the poem under discussion I shall propose it here.

I propose, then, to make the following schematic distinction between three basic phases in the perception of SMAU-anticipation:

1. Phase 1 is the inception of SMAU-anticipation: it consists of the earliest point where a relevant type of "left-branching" syntactic structure, or "initial syntactic subordination", can be formally identified (see a fuller explanation in 5.4.2). In the Donne poem under discussion this phase consists of the poem's very beginning (the word "That", being the first in the text, suggesting initial syntactic subordination) and, in fact, it is somewhat "boosted" with every new anaphorical appearance of an additional "That".

2. Phase 2 is the entire text from Phase 1 and until syntactic completeness has been attained: it is argued that a certain degree of SMAU-tension, however latent, pervades the entire text and keeps "simmering" until the demand for syntactic completeness has been fully satisfied, at least potentially and prospectively. In the present Donne text, Phase 2 is virtually coextensive with the entire poem, for all practical purposes; however, in a strictly formal manner of speaking, syntactic completeness is attained three words earlier, after "heare us" in the last line.

3. Phase 3 is SMAU-anticipation as defined above (in 5.1.1.1 and 5.1.2.1): it is the predictability of a nonterminal pausal juncture as the very next syntagmatic element, etc. In the present text Phase 3 can be identified, *inter alia*, at the ends of lines 2, 4, 5 and 7, where SMAU-anticipation is fulfilled only as regards the nonterminal pausal juncture, but the anticipated main clause indispensable for syntactic completeness is put off time and time again; finally, Phase 3 is identifiable in line 8 after the clause "That we may heare": here, at last, what follows the anticipated nonterminal pausal juncture is the long overdue main clause and syntactic completeness.

The following points should be made in connection with these phases:

1. The three phases are not necessarily discrete, continuous segmental units of a text, but rather interwoven and partly overlapping patterns in it.

2. They are heterogeneous phenomena: Phase 1 is located at (one or more) particular points in the text and can be described as "long-term" paradigmatic anticipation; Phase 2 is a latent feature pervading an entire segment of the text and is also describable as long-term or paradigmatic anticipation; Phase 3, like Phase 1, is located at (one or more) particular points in the text, but, unlike both Phases 1 and 2, its type of anticipation should be described as "short-term", or simultaneously syntagmatic and paradigmatic.

3. It follows that various degrees of different types of anticipation may exist simultaneously at the same point in the text: thus, for instance, the poem's first word, "That", simultaneously generates SMIU-anticipation and Phase 1 of SMAU-anticipation, and the generation of SMIU-anticipation by the word "may" at the end of line 6 does not cancel the latent, persevering presence of Phase 2 of SMAU-anticipation.

4. Consequently, only Phase 3, which is SMAU-anticipation in the strict and narrow sense of its definition in 5.1.2.1, is incompatible with SMIU-anticipation whereas Phases 1 and 2 usually coincide with SMIU-anticipation. In the present context incompatibility can only be syntagmatic: the anticipation of a pause-resistant continuation and the anticipation of a nonterminal pausal juncture can be generated by the same word simultaneously, if these two intrinsically incompatible syntactic-intonational events are anticipated to occupy different syntagmatic positions after their generation (the latter is thus supposed to occupy some syntagmatically unspecified later position). Phase 3, how-

ever, by being both syntagmatic and paradigmatic, is incompatible with SMIU-anticipation.

5. The possibility of coexistence between long term (Phase 1 or 2) SMAU-anticipation and SMIU-anticipation (which has only one, short-term phase) strengthens my criticism of the psycholinguistic approach to sentence depth, as presented by Rommetveit ([435]; see my discussion in 5.2.4; see especially notes 15 and 16): while Rommetveit measures his "depth" by the number of "coding steps" to which the speaker has committed himself at a given point, he oversimplifies matters by ignoring potential differences in the nature of these "coding steps". Thus, both types of syntactic anticipation generated simultaneously by the first word in Donne's poem (i.e., the SMIU-anticipation and the "Phase 1 SMAU-anticipation") can be described as "coding steps" to which the speaker is committed when that word is uttered; but a commitment to two homogeneous, or even roughly homogeneous, "coding steps" (e.g., single words) generates a type of depth that must be different from the type of depth generated by a commitment to two heterogeneous "coding steps" (e.g., a word and a clause).²³

6. To avoid confusion I would like to stress that, unless a specific reference to Phases 1 or 2 is made, the terms "SMAU-tension" and "SMAU-anticipation" will be used as before in the sense of Phase 3, which can be described as the *differentia specifica* of SMAU-anticipation, through its paradigmatic and

²³The matter is much more complicated: thus, it remains to be seen whether heterogeneous commitments are always translatable into a greater number of homogeneous ones (in which case my criticism loses much of its impact), what is the most meaningful psycholinguistic criterion for "homogeneity" in this context (beyond the oversimplified "single word versus clause" distinction), etc. These are purely psycholinguistic problems and as such they are both marginal to my topic and outside my competence. Once again my practice is to mention matters that are marginally relevant to my topics, to expose inadequacies and oversimplifications in the literature, to offer a glimpse of perspectives that lie ahead, without pretending to solve the problems themselves.

syntagmatic incompatibility with SMAU-anticipation. Self evident exceptions to this practice are references to an entire text's "SMAU-tension-" or "SMAU-anticipation-structure", "-design", "-architecture" and the like: such phrases must refer to all three phases as a part of the process of reading and perception.

The general theory of SMAU-anticipation will be elaborated in 5.4.2.

5.4.1.5. *The Poem's Third Enjambment Against the Background of Its SMAU-Anticipation Design.* The brief theoretical outline of the perception-structure of SMAU-anticipation in general (just proposed in 5.4.1.4) and the analysis of the Donne poem's third enjambment (carried out in 5.4.1.3) are indispensable points of departure for an examination of the influence of the poem's SMAU-anticipation-design over this enjambment (which is the main purpose of the present subsection).

This influence can roughly be assessed by juxtaposing the poem's text with a hypothetical alternative neutralising the SMAU-design of the poem. Thus one can try to isolate the contribution of this design to the effect of the enjambment.

Let us assume, then, that we read a poem consisting of four lines only — the Donne poem's last four lines (6-9):

Not threats in Thunder may
 Awaken us to our just offices;
 What in thy booke, thou dost, or creatures say,
 That wee may heare, Lord heare us, when wee pray.

The poetic merits of this hypothetical "poem" are beside the point here, of course. What matters is that it is syntactically acceptable (though clumsy) and that the enjambment "may/Awaken" remains intact. This enjambment is just as acute as in the original: it is just as predictable prospectively and just as cohesive retrospectively. However, some of the patterns mentioned

in 5.4.1.3 and in note 22 are missing, and so is the entire SMAU-anticipation structure.

It is obvious that in comparing the original enjambment with my "abridged version" the former is more loaded with tension whereas the latter, however acute, is still one-dimensional: the SMIU-anticipation "stands alone" and is not subordinated to any larger syntactic design. In a more moderate and more plausible abridgement

That musique of thy promises,
Not threats in Thunder may
Awaken us to our just offices; [etc.]

some of the original complexity is restored; but the process of building up SMAU-anticipation gradually, creating a repeated pattern of postponing the main clause, is missing even from this version. Moreover, only the original version makes it possible to juxtapose the enjambment under discussion with its predecessors in lines 1-2 and 3-4 (see 5.4.1.1, 5.4.1.2 and 5.4.1.3) and with the end-stopped boundaries of lines 2 and 4, characterised by SMAU-anticipation. This kind of mental juxtaposition, which takes place, at least subliminally, in every reader of the original, contributes considerably to its complexity and density. The present version, then, occupies a midway position between the heavily loaded original and the simple first hypothetical alternative.

The three phases of SMAU-anticipation encompass and dominate the entire original poem through sophisticated manipulation of syntax, lineation, anaphora, etc., and by channelling and manoeuvring the reader's expectations and responses between expected symmetries and surprising asymmetries.

Lines 1 and 6, in different degrees, end with SMIU-anticipation: line 3 is a borderline case (see above); and lines 2 and 4 end with genuine (Phase 3) SMAU-anticipation, which is retrospectively contradicted by the recurrent delays of the main clause.

However, all these line-endings share one common feature: the permanent, "simmering" presence of Phase 2 remains unchallenged throughout the poem, and serves as a constant reminder that the syntactically essential subject and predicate of the main clause have not been supplied as yet. SMAU-tension is thus superimposed on SMIU-tension in the poem's enjambments.

I hope that the hypothetical alternatives have demonstrated that the total effect of the third enjambment in the original text results from this superimposition: once the outer frame of SMAU-anticipation is removed, the enjambment remains as acute but not as complex and loaded.

The "load", of course, is semantic-thematic as well as syntactic-intonational: the various strata reinforce each other in this respect. The syntactic-intonational organisation of the poem produces an effect of long, unresolved tension, divided into several wave-like curves ending with fading mirages of syntactic resolutions, until resolution actually comes about in the poem's last line.

This design reinforces the poem's thematic message and thematic structure in several respects. Thus, for instance, the following interrelationships can be noted:

1. The "wavy" structure is a syntactic-intonational "enactment" (see Nowotny [382], 111-113) of the metaphor "intermitting aguish Pietie" in line 2.

2. Occasional intensifications of syntactic-intonational unrest, as in the third enjambment, are "enactments" of the metaphors "snatching cramps of wickednesse/And apoplexies of fast sin" in lines 3-4.

3. The entire syntactic-intonational design, as just described, is an "enactment" of a central theme in the poem, namely, the long agonised oppression of sin and hope for deliverance and redemption.

4. The effect of the distorted proportion, in terms of SL, between the long unresolved SMAU-tension-design on the one hand and the short disyllabic relaxation of syntactic tension ("heare us" in line 9) on the other hand reinforces the thematic message of disproportion between the extreme poignancy of the agony of mankind on the one hand and the modest supplication for God's mere attention, rather than something like full deliverance and everlasting bliss, on the other hand.

Falling short of a full thematic interpretation of this particular poem, I hope that the foregoing analysis has contributed to the demonstration of two phenomena: (a) the role of active background that may be played by SMAU-tension in relation to enjambment and (b) the function of "enactment" that may be fulfilled by the syntactic-intonational organisation of a poetic text in relation to its thematic structure and message.

5.4.2. SMAU-Anticipation: A Further Characterisation of the Phenomenon, with an Illustration from a Poem by Walt Whitman.

5.4.2.0. *SMAU-Anticipation in the Present Study*: In the previous subsection, 5.4.1, SMAU-anticipation was discussed as a background for SMIU-anticipation and enjambment, taking into account the peculiar features of the Donne poem. In the present subsection focus will be shifted to a demonstration of SMAU-anticipation in its own right, not necessarily in connection with enjambment, with the purpose of improving our understanding of the phenomenon, both as part of the general subject of verse-line/syntax relationships and as a potential background for enjambment. However, I have imposed the following limitations on my discussion:

1. The difference between SMIU- and SMAU-anticipation in terms of relevance to enjambment accounts for my decision to discuss the former both statically and dynamically and the latter

only dynamically: static interrelations between complete SMIUs within SMAUs, or between smaller SMAUs within larger ones, are totally peripheral to the study of enjambment. Dynamically, however, SMAU-anticipation must be studied in connection with enjambment, because in syntactically open cases, and such cases are quite frequent, it is difficult to distinguish between SMIU- and SMAU-anticipation. Against the background of SMAU-anticipation, then, SMIU-anticipation and enjambment can be studied both syntagmatically (through the comparative juxtaposition between different points in any given text in terms of the type and degree of tension in each of them) and paradigmatically (through the construction of a hierarchical scale of potential types and degrees of tension). For reasons already given, such lines of research are proposed here as future perspectives, pending progress in the relevant branches of scholarship.

2. The relevant contribution of linguistics and psycholinguistics to this topic seems to be even more meagre than the two disciplines' relevant contribution to the study of SMIUs. Consequently, I shall try to put forward my own theoretical suggestions without bothering too much about how they relate to the existing (or, rather, the nonexistent) professional literature.

3. The nature of syntactic anticipations and predictabilities varies according to the size of the segments in which they operate. It is difficult, and often impossible, to guess how long a given sentence is going to be; or, in other words, when it is going to end. It is equally difficult, and quite as often impossible, to guess what words, phrases or clauses are going to appear in a given sentence, and in what order; or, in other words, to guess how that sentence is going to end. Other things being equal, the bigger the unit, the more important becomes the role played by expectation in its perception: in bigger units one simply has the time and space to create, develop, modify and reassess one's

expectations in a process concomitant with the process of perceiving the text itself (through reading it or listening to it). Therefore, relatively speaking (and other things being equal), anticipations and predictabilities are established subliminally and automatically on the SMIU level, whereas on the SMAU level they become much more real, with a larger number of probabilities to consider. It follows, then, that the difficulties we already encountered in the attempt to produce a theory of SMIU probabilities should be multiplied in an attempt to produce a theory of SMAU probabilities: SMAU-anticipation can only be characterised in general outline.

5.4.2.1. *An Example, A Poem by Walt Whitman, Introduced.*

As an example of conventional employment of SMAU-anticipation, I have chosen Walt Whitman's "When I Heard the Learn'd Astronomer" (*Whitman*, p. 266). I think that the simplicity and lack of sophistication in this short poem's technical treatment of SMAU-anticipation can make it a useful example for demonstrating some of the theoretical points just made.²⁴

WHEN I HEARD THE LEARN'D ASTRONOMER

- (1) When I heard the learn'd astronomer;
- (2) When the proofs, the figures, were ranged in columns
before me;

²⁴Walt Whitman is generally acknowledged as a poet of end-stopped lines (see, for example, Cory [102], Hollander [242], 304, and Mitchell [358]). Cory pushes the point much too far when he argues that in Whitman's end-stopped lines "all natural pauses midline [are] minimized to the extreme [... and even] where midline pauses might be logical seldom are they permitted to occur" ([102], 75). Mitchell's view that Whitman's end-stoppage enhances rather than undermines the importance of midline breaks (see [358], 1607) is much more to the point. Whitman's typical treatment of single lines and line-sequences is also discussed in a study by Hrushovski, when he compares Whitman with the Russian poet Majakovskij and the Hebrew poet Grinberg in this respect ([248], 196-198).

- (3) When I was shown the charts and the diagrams, to add,
divide, and measure them;
- (4) When I, sitting, heard the astronomer, where he lectured
with much applause in the lecture-room,
- (5) How soon, unaccountable, I became tired and sick;
- (6) Till rising and gliding out, I wander'd off by myself,
- (7) In the mystical moist night-air, and from time to time,
- (8) Look'd up in perfect silence at the stars.

The endings of the first four lines constitute a clear case of SMAU-anticipation: the repeated anaphoric "When"s at the beginnings of these lines make them instantaneously recognisable as temporal clauses, and a nonterminal pausal juncture followed by a main clause is consequently anticipated. This, by definition, is SMAU-anticipation; and at long last, in line 5, it is confirmed with the appearance of the promised main clause.

Now the mere statement that this is a case of SMAU-anticipation is too obvious to be worth making. It is much more significant to discuss the concept of SMAU-anticipation theoretically, though against the background of textual examples, by asking and answering questions designed to clarify this concept. The questions most immediately relevant to such a discussion are: (1) What is the nature of SMAU-anticipation, and when does it occur? (2) How does it relate to SMIU-anticipation?

In the first stage the discussion of these questions will be based on the isolated analysis of relationships between words and word-sequences in written texts, without reference to punctuation marks, which play an essential role in generating syntactic anticipation. The contribution of the system of punctuation will be discussed separately in 5.6.

5.4.2.2. *The Nature and Location of SMAU-Anticipation: A Skeleton Theory.* The following principles, in agreement with 5.4.1.4, constitute a skeleton theory of SMAU-anticipation,

largely based on illustrations from the Whitman poem.

1. Whenever a formally identifiable subordinate clause precedes the main clause in a complex sentence (henceforth initial subordinate clause), the temporarily suspended main clause is anticipated on the SMAU-level. In other words, when an initial subordinate clause is being perceived and identified as such, the nonterminal pausal juncture separating it from the anticipated main clause is as integral a part of the anticipation as the main clause.

2. In certain cases subordinate phrases, not enjoying the full status of subordinate clauses, also generate SMAU-anticipation (the most frequent and obvious examples are gerundial or prepositional phrases preceding the subject and the predicate, such as the beginning of line 6 and the second part of line 7 in the Whitman poem).

3. Although the most typical feature of SMAU-anticipation is its dependence upon initial syntactic subordination, this subordination cannot be described as a precondition for the very occurrence of a nonterminal pausal juncture; however, it can certainly be described as a precondition for such a juncture being predictable in advance. And since anticipation is a prospective-dynamic concept, this total dependence on syntactic subordination is a permanent and indispensable "distinctive feature" of SMAU-anticipation, amounting to its *differentia specifica*.

4. Initial syntactic subordination is a necessary condition for SMAU-anticipation, but not always a sufficient one. It is a sufficient condition only if the initially subordinate item is a clause, or a phrase ending with an obligatory pausal juncture. Otherwise, initial syntactic subordination may generate SMIU-anticipation (rather than SMAU-anticipation). Thus, for instance, in Edgar Allan Poe's "The Raven", "Eagerly I wished the morrow" (Poe, 33) or in T.S. Eliot's *The Waste Land*, "Out of the window perilously spread/ Her drying combinations touched by the sun's

last rays,/ On the divan are piled (at night her bed)/ Stockings, slippers, camisoles, and stays" (*Eliot*, 59), both sentences begin with initial syntactic subordination (underlined by me). Yet it is clear that in the Poe example — and even in the Eliot example, which is more of a borderline case — this initial syntactic subordination does not generate SMAU-anticipation unequivocally, and a pause-resistant, SMIU continuation can legitimately be anticipated (as borne out by a hindsight view of the complete sentence).

5. The three phases described in 5.4.1.4 are a typical feature of SMAU-anticipation. In the Whitman poem Phase 1 can be identified at the beginning of the poem (and, in a weaker form, in the beginnings of lines 2-4); Phase 2 consists of the entire text from the beginning of the poem until the word "tired" in line 5 (or, in actual perception in normal reading-pace, until the end of line 5); and Phase 3 consists at least of the last word in each of the first four lines.

As for Phase 2, it requires some special comment. As I have already suggested, Phase 2 is more latent when SMIU-anticipation is at its highest. This is the case, for example, after the article "the" in the first line, or after the words "were" and "in" in the second. The necessity to complete an SMIU (that is, the anticipation of a pause-resistant continuation) always has about it a quality of urgency with which SMAU-tension cannot compete. Momentarily, then, the demand for the immediate satisfaction of the short-term anticipation aroused at "the" is much more powerful than the demand for the eventual satisfaction of the long-term anticipation aroused at "when". The latter regains the reader's attention once the former is satisfied.

6. Since SMAU-anticipation is based on syntagmatic probabilities (rather than certainties), it can always be frustrated (just as SMIU-anticipation; see 5.1.2.3, points 8-10). Thus, in the Whitman poem the second line could say something like "When

the proofs, the figures, were ranged in, shall we say, columns before me". The probability of such a parenthetical clause being inserted as a wedge between a preposition and the inevitably expected noun is very low, and any employment of this device under similar syntactic circumstances must render the resulting sentence quite awkward. But what counts is that, however improbable, it is grammatically permitted. Conversely, SMAU-anticipation is very strong at the end of line 2 ("When the proofs, the figures, were ranged in columns before me"): it is very likely that "me" would be followed by a nonterminal pausal juncture. Yet, it is very easy to turn the word "me" into a first item in a catalogue by adding, say, "and you and her". Once again, this is clumsy and unlikely, but grammatically acceptable; and in such a hypothetical case the word "me" would not be the last in its SMIU.

7. In short, the main differences between SMAU- and SMIU-anticipation lie (a) in the hierarchical relations between paradigmatic and syntagmatic predictabilities (the three phases of the former as opposed to the single phase of the latter); (b) in the relevance of initial syntactic subordination (which is totally irrelevant to SMIU-anticipation); (c) in the acuteness of the urge to complete the sentence.

8. Once again, the curves of SMAU-anticipation, and SMAU-tension in general, provide an active background for the curves of SMIU-anticipation (when viewed from the latter's standpoint). The former do not determine the inner nature and dynamics of the latter, but the overall effect is influenced by the SMAU "background". The very same SMIU-tensions may function quite differently, with different degrees of "foregrounding", because of the nature and composition of the SMAUs that they belong to. It is in this light that the importance of SMAU analysis for the study of enjambment should be viewed.

5.4.3. Conclusion.

The answer to Question 4 in 5.0.4 has been given — I believe inasmuch as it can be given at present — in theory, by a skeletal theory of SMAU-anticipation; the phenomenon has been described both in isolation and in relation to SMIU-anticipation and enjambment. The theoretical points were illustrated by two poems, by Donne and Whitman, representing SMAU-anticipation with and without interactions with enjambment, respectively. After the discussion of SMAU-anticipation, which is the functional component of SMAU-tension, the next section examines SMAU-SL and its contribution to SMAU-tension as its major nonfunctional component.

5.5. THE CONTRIBUTION OF *SL* TO *SMAU*-TENSION

5.5.0. SMAU-SL: An Introduction.

The contribution of SL to SMIU-tension, as described above (see 4.2.2), is a linear, one-way one: other things being equal, the farther a given word from the beginning of its SMIU, the more desirable it is to pause after it. This statement is correct regardless of the specific syntactic make-up of any given instance; the reservation "other things being equal" (see Nowotny [382], 17) means that the isolated contribution of SL is invariably as described, although the final curve of SMIU-tension may not take the form of a gradually descending line because of the adverse workings of other parameters.

The two major differences between SL in SMIUs and in SMAUs in the present context are:

1. Theoretically, both SMIUs and SMAUs can be extended endlessly (the former, as I said above, mainly by adding items preceded by "and", and the latter by adding SMIUs, notably appositional), but in practice SMIUs are much more resistant to such extensions being carried too far; moreover, the concept of "SL optimum" is much more obscure and less tangible in SMAUs

than in SMIUs.

2. The linear, one-way contribution of SL to SMIU-tension is independent of syntactic structure, word-order, etc., whereas SL contribution to SMAU-tension is affected by the order of the SMIUs and the functional relationships between them within the SMAU.

The limited "life expectancy" of SMIUs, determined by a more or less fixed SMIU-SL optimum, accounts for the linearity of SL contribution to SMIU-tension. The indeterminate and unpredictable "life expectancy" of SMAUs makes SL contribution to SMAU-tension more complex.

There are two distinct curves of SL contribution to SMAU-tension: anticipational and nonanticipational. The former occurs in cases of initial syntactic subordination (or, in TG terms, "left-branching" constructions) and the curve approximately resembles a parabola; the latter occurs after potential syntactic completeness has been attained (i.e., in "right-branching" constructions, after the syntactic essentials — subject and predicate and/or the main clause — have been supplied), and the "curve" is a gradually descending straight line (as in SMIUs).

5.5.1. The Anticipational Curve: "The Parabola Principle".

"The Parabola Principle" governing the behaviour of SMAU-SL in cases of initial syntactic subordination can be explained in terms of a certain SMAU-SL-optimum, or rather SL maximum (since there is no real SL minimum, which falls short of the optimum, in SMAUs). Beyond this maximum an utterance is too long to be consciously perceived as a single sentence, whose entire syntactic structure is "alive" in the reader's mind. It is difficult to describe this maximum systematically and to delimit it objectively, since its actual length may vary from reader to reader, and sometimes from reading to reading. Yet, its very existence is a psycholinguistic and psychointonational universal that can

be studied as an "algebraic", "abstract" number, rather than an "arithmetical", "concrete" one.

Quite unscientifically, this maximum can be described as the limit of active syntactic interest and anticipation, or "the threshold of boredom", for every reader or reading. However, I am certain that "psychopoetic" research (see above, 5.2.5) could fix this maximum within rough limits, that can apply at least to most educated readers.

Thus, for instance, when a sentence begins with a seemingly endless catalogue of, say, temporal clauses which goes on and on for pages, the momentum of the syntactically motivated push forward, or urge to continue (which is the essence of syntactic tension), becomes at first more powerful from line to line in most readers. The reader's eagerness to attain syntactic completeness (i.e., his anticipation of the syntactic essentials required for such completeness) increases steadily and gathers momentum with time: every additional, unexpected obstacle (i.e. every new subordinate clause or phrase) intensifies expectation. Thus expectation becomes more and more eager and impatient, and this gradual process goes on up to a certain point, which is SMAU-SL maximum. Beyond that point the reader gradually abandon hope that a main clause will ever appear, and his memory no longer retains the beginning of his syntactic ordeal.

The curve that graphically depicts this process very roughl resembles a parabola: SMAU tension, inasmuch as it is determine by SMAU-SL, gradually intensifies up to SMAU-SL maximum, or "the threshold of boredom", where it usually reaches a certain platea then it gradually subsides. This is not necessarily a precise, symmetrical parabola; but the basic picture of a curve going gradually up, reaching a turning point with a short plateau and then going back down justifies my contention, that the contribution of SL to SMAU-tension operates according to the parabola principle. In each individual case it is up to the other para-

meters (notably syntactic functional relationships and semantic content, not to speak of sensibilities of individual readers and their changing moods), through their interaction with SL, to determine the final shape of the tension curve. But SL as such operates as described, provided that "the parabola" is allowed enough time to form: given the inevitably intuitive nature of suggesting the location of "the threshold of boredom", which is the turning point of the parabola, it is certain that, within rough limits, in some poems initial syntactic subordination is too short for SL contribution to form a parabola-like curve.

Thus, for instance, in Whitman's "When I Heard the Learn'd Astronomer" (see 5.4.2.1), the initial syntactic subordination consists of four lines only, each line being a single subordinate (temporal) clause. This, to my mind, is not long enough for the "parabola" to take shape. On the other hand, in Whitman's "Song of Myself", Poem 33 (see 5.6.5 below) an 81-line-long passage of initial syntactic subordination precedes the one-line-long main clause in an 82-line-long sentence. This would be accepted by general consent, I should think, as sufficiently long for the parabola to be effective.

Prof. B. Hrushovski, in a short reference to this long sentence ([248], 196-198), notes a number of techniques and devices used in the poem to combat monotony and boredom, such as the careful distribution of anaphoras, the controlled freedom in the length of lines and clauses, the nature and frequency of various paratactic and hypotactic syntactic relationships, etc.: all these devices contribute to the diversity of this colossal sentence.

What happens in this sentence (for our purposes) is complex. The text includes elements and patterns which affect its degree of monotony one way or the other. The factors generating "boredom", or a sense of monotony, are foregrounded because most of them, notably repetition of syntactic structure and sheer length,

belong to the most overt and immediately perceivable components of the text. The parabola-like contribution of SMAU-SL to the overall structure of the text and its perception is prominent among these "boredom-generating" factors: while in the beginning the ascending part of the parabola enhances the urge to continue after a certain turning point (the precise location of which can be determined, if at all, through "psychopoetic" research) its descending part increases the reader's weariness and desire to stop, even at the cost of permanently frustrating his syntactic expectations. If the poet wants to keep the reader's interest alive even in such an "endless" sentence, he may take advantage of the ascending part of the parabola in the beginning of the sentence, but he has to combat the effect of its descending part by making the other parameters maintain the reader's interest and curiosity. The overall result in the poem may be very interesting at least as an object of literary analysis, since the reader is confronted with a poet trying to meet the challenge of reconciling the rather abstract idea of "grand architecture", of endlessness (in thought, syntax and intonation), with the limitations of the human mind and breath.

So much for "the parabola principle" which characterises SMAU-SL contribution to SMAU "anticipational tension" (in cases of "left-branching" initial syntactic subordination).

5.5.2. "Initial Syntactic Completeness":

The Straight Descending Line.

SMAU-SL behaves differently when hypotactic "right-branching" or paratactic phrases and/or clauses are appended to a potentially syntactically complete utterance. This type of syntactic organisation can be called "initial syntactic completeness". It is not incompatible with initial syntactic subordination, since a main clause, for instance, can be both preceded and followed by subordinate ones. Thus, in Whitman's "When I Heard the Learn'd

Astronomer", the label "initial syntactic subordination" is applicable to the relationships between lines 1-4 and line 5, whereas "initial syntactic completeness" is applicable to the relationships between line 5 and lines 6-8.

In the latter type the reader is not motivated, syntactically, to go beyond the point of syntactic completeness. The curve of syntactic tension is allowed, then, to take its normal one-way course, as in SMIUs: the farther a given point from the point of initial syntactic completeness, the less SMAU-tension it carries and the more welcome the terminal pausal juncture (represented graphically by the full-stop period).

Whitman's poem 15 from "Song of Myself" (pp. 76-79; see 5.6.5) is a case in point. The effect of initial subordination in that poem can be traced to intonational and semantic (interpretative), and not syntactic, causes: syntactically, it is a case of initial syntactic completeness. SMAU-tension in cases of initial syntactic completeness can only be produced by punctuation in writing and intonation in oral rendition. A straightforward reading, without resorting to hindsight, must reflect the one-way contribution of SL to nonanticipatory SMAU-tension.

5.5.3. Conclusion.

SMAU-SL, whether contributing to SMAU-tension in a manner comparable to a straight descending line (in "right-branching", "nonanticipational" cases of initial syntactic completeness) or in a manner comparable to a parabola (in "left-branching", "anticipational" cases of initial syntactic subordination), is one of the chief factors governing the curve and the pacing of the reader's breath in reading a poem aloud, or his "mind's breath" in reading it silently. As such, it definitely affects the nature and function of enjambment in any given instance, though not its very status as enjambment.

The distinction between the two forms of contribution, the

parabola-like curve and the straight line, is the answer to Question 5 in 5.0.4.

5.6 PUNCTUATION, SYNTACTIC INTONATION, SEGMENTATIONAL AMBIGUITY, AND THE PERCEPTION OF ENJAMBMENT.

5.6.1. The Syntactic Function of Punctuation and Syntactic Intonation.

My discussion of syntactic tension, anticipation and length has so far been confined (a) to "surface structure" syntactic, and only syntactic, structuration; (b) only to those aspects and forms of syntactic structuration that influence intonation contours, junctures, etc.; (c) to syntactic structuration signalled equally through written and oral channels of communication. Whereas the first two restrictions are self-explanatory as resulting from the general topic of the present study and the logic of its division into subtopics, the third restriction requires some explanation.

Under this restriction I have so far treated pauses, tensions, anticipations, etc., as being signalled by relationships within word-sequences alone, disregarding syntactic intonation in oral communication and punctuation in written communication, as factors generating syntactic and intonational expectation. The fact is, however, that some syntactic relationships are communicated solely through intonation (or, more specifically, syntactic intonation) and/or punctuation (depending on the channel of communication), rather than through the structure of the word-sequence alone.²⁵

²⁵The correspondence between the systems of syntactic intonation in speech and punctuation in writing is far from perfect, the former being much more varied and flexible than the latter. However, for the sake of clarity, simplicity and economy, it is temporarily assumed that the correspondence between the two systems is more perfect than it actually is.

The linguistic and psycholinguistic literature of all schools and trends abounds in examples and discussions of how syntactically and/or semantically ambiguous utterances can be "disambiguated". Intonation, alongside the context, is often mentioned as one of the main systems used in ordinary communication to "disambiguate" certain types of such utterances: adherents of TG usually say that each of the deep structures represented in the same surface structure has its own intonation contour, whereas structural linguists show how alternative segmentations of the same word-sequence into IC are conveyed orally through intonation-oppositions. Since the term "syntactic ambiguity" is commonly used, especially in TG literature, to denote ambiguities not involving segmentation differences (such as the "they are flying planes" type), I have decided to use the term "segmentational syntactic ambiguity", or simply "segmentational ambiguity", to denote potential possibility of different IC analyses of the same word sequence.

The perception of syntactic intonation is, to a certain extent, a process which is self-generating in time: at any given point in an utterance all the preceding syntactic relationships, whether conveyed by the preceding word-sequence alone or by the preceding intonational contour as well, make their decisive impact upon the intonational expectations aroused at that point.

Thus, for instance, Rommetveit ([435], 219-220) cites an experiment in which subjects were asked to supply the missing letter in the sentence "The judge was just -hen passing the sentence" (the two alternative possibilities being, of course, "t" and "w"). In his experiment the sentence was divided between pages at two alternative points, before and after the incomplete word. In the former case, as one would expect, subjects tended to read the word as "when", and in the latter — as "then". Now if that sentence were uttered orally, the speaker would have to

disambiguate the syntactic and semantic ambiguity by choosing the appropriate "tune" for the word "just"; if he uttered it with rising pitch, increased loudness and somewhat protracted duration, the word would be decoded as an adjective meaning something like "right", "fair", "impartial". In this case "when" is the only acceptable possibility for the next word. If, conversely the word "just" were uttered without any pause or emphasis, it would be decoded as an adverb meaning something like "precisely", or "barely". In that case, "then" is the only acceptable possibility for the next word.

The information conveyed by the two incompatible intonation contours is syntactic as well as semantic: any system of syntactic analysis would assign different syntactic roles to the word "just" in the two sentences. Yet in written communication "just" is ambiguous when read, and only the next word, "then" or "when", disambiguates it retrospectively; in oral communication what happens is quite the reverse: "just" is uttered with a "disambiguating" intonation, which rules out either "then-like" or "when-like" words, prospectively. The page-division in Rommetveit's experiment functions like oral intonation and like poetic lineation and punctuation in creating a definite prospective anticipation.

The point is that this sentence, or any sentence for that matter, is inevitably uttered orally with some kind of an intonation contour; and whenever the word sequence as such allows two contours or more, the speaker's selection of one of them and rejection of the other(s) may amount to signalling a specific syntactic structure (e.g., that the sentence is not complete although the word-sequence, if considered in isolation, could be interpreted as a syntactically complete utterance).

My discussion of Whitman's "When I Heard the Learn'd Astronomer" is a case in point. I offered SMIU alternatives to SMAUS and vice versa (see 5.4.2.2, point 6), as if these alternatives

could be expected to replace what was actually written by the poet. The fact is, however, that only the word-sequence as such allows the alternatives that I proposed, but this sequence cannot be uttered orally unless one of these alternatives were proven right and the other one wrong (and not just optionally possible). Thus, one of Whitman's lines is "When the proofs, the figures, were ranged in columns before me". The word-sequence up to "columns" allows a pausal juncture after that word, thereby terminating the SMIU at that point. Similarly, the word-sequence in its entirety does not preclude the possibility that the SMIU would be extended beyond the word "me" (it could be: "When the proofs, the figures, were ranged in columns before me and you"); but the intonation with which the line would be read must limit the range of alternative possibilities or even narrow it down to one basic possibility (I am referring here to syntactic intonation alone).

As in many other areas, poetry achieves the goals of de-automatisation through intonation by twisting and manipulating, rather than by violating and breaking, the rules and conventions of language. The poet's potential for variation of this kind is limited: language maintains here a clear hierarchical order, whereby the word sequence determines whether, which, and how many, different alternative syntactic structures and IC divisions can be legitimately applied to it, and the number of correct syntactic intonations is accordingly limited.²⁶ Thus, for instance, the written word-sequence "He believed that friendship could not last forever" is at least three distinct sentences (i.e., it has three "deep structures" resulting in three semantic-syntactic-intonational interpretations on the surface-

²⁶My presentation here is deliberately oversimplified. I am referring to the intricate relationships within the field of syntactic intonation alone, ignoring the additional complexities of nonsyntactic factors, notably meaning, with their correlatives in "expressive", "emotive" or "emphatic" intonation.

structure level): (1) "He thought that friendship (in general) could not last forever"; (2) "He thought: that (particular) friendship could not last forever"; (3) "He thought that (i.e., that, and no other thought): 'friendship could not last forever'". The word-sequence "His friendship is forever", on the other hand, allows only one basic syntactic intonation. Consequently, in some cases (like the former one) junctural changes (pitch, duration and loudness), that may result from lineation, reveal the potential possibilities of additional IC analyses and are allowed by the word-sequence to have syntactic relevance, while in other cases (like the latter one) any such changes which may be "artificially" introduced by lineation belong to this sequence's system of semantic (including emotive or expressive), rather than syntactic, intonation (the relationships between syntactic and semantic intonation will be discussed at a later stage in the present study; see Chapter 6, especially 6.2.2 and 6.2.3).

Thus, for instance, in the famous "To be or not to be" soliloquy from Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, the sequence "To die, to sleep" is repeated twice. In the first time it is (punctuation is deliberately omitted): "to die to sleep/ No more"; in the second it is "to die to sleep/ To sleep perchance to dream". As a sequence of words, the first "to die/ to sleep" allows two syntactic intonations: (1) "To die, to sleep no more" (i.e., to die and not to sleep any more); (2) "To die, to sleep; no more" (i.e., to die and to sleep, which is no-more-something unspecified). The second, however, allows only one ("to die, to sleep; to sleep", etc.), because a pausal juncture is obligatory between the two consecutive "to sleep"s, while such a juncture is only optional, depending on literary interpretation, between "to sleep" and "no more". In "To sleep no more" it could be unequivocally suggested either that there is no pause between "To sleep" and "no more" (by writing them in the same line and without punctuation) or that there is such a pause (by using punctuation, with

or without lineation). The First Folio version does neither of these; rather, it has the word "sleep" end a line, but without punctuation. This brings the potential segmentational ambiguity to the fore. In "to sleep/ To sleep", however, no punctuation or lineation could cancel the pause dictated by the word sequence. The lineation must be interpreted, then, as offering no alternative syntactic segmentation.

To recapitulate: a word-sequence allows syntactic intonation a certain amount of freedom in certain cases, and no such freedom at all in many others. At any rate, whenever a given word-sequence does allow more than one intonation-involving syntactic analysis, these alternative analyses form a certain scale of probabilities, ranging from the most to the least "probable" or "conventional" or "reasonable" syntactic interpretation of that sequence in its context.²⁷

5.6.2. Segmentational Ambiguity and the Theory of Literature:
An Excursus on Simultaneity and Jakobson's
"Poetic Function".

Syntactic segmentational ambiguity can demonstrate some crucial aspects of literature in general. In most communication-situations in language, potential ambiguities of this kind, whether semantic or syntactic, often pass unnoticed by "addresser" and "addressee" alike: only the most probable, straightforward syntactic organisation is usually relevant to ordinary communication. In poetry, the deliberate manipulation of intonation-

²⁷The criteria for establishing this scale of probability are a separate matter, and an extremely complex one, involving problems of semantics, extralingual context of situation and subjective reactions of different individuals. These problems cannot be seriously investigated without recourse to "psychopoetic" methods, far beyond the aims and possibilities of this study. Therefore, it is only the very existence of the scale of probabilities that is postulated here as if proven, and no attempt is made to suggest theoretically how this type of probability can be assessed.

generating graphic signs and sign-systems — notably punctuation and lineation, but not only these²⁸ — often foregrounds these ambiguities, making the reader aware of "the dark side of the moon" ignored in the "automatising", expediency-motivated process of everyday communication-through-language. It is by the employment of such techniques, and analogous ones in other strata of the literary work of art, that poetry gains much of its "semantic density" and its quality as a message oriented towards itself (Jakobson's famous "poetic function"; see [260]).

Thus Jakobson is right when he asserts that "The poetic function projects the principle of equivalence from the axis of selection into the axis of combination" ([260], 358). But this principle, I believe, would only gain in depth and validity by its extension along the lines that I am about to propose.

Jakobson's very use of the concept of selection is made in accordance with a traditional view of structural linguistics. According to this view, communication-in-language is a process which involves selecting single items from the paradigms of the "correct" potentials which can be proposed at any given point, and combining these selected items into syntagms. It is assumed to be tautologically correct that selecting one item means automatically rejecting all the other members of the paradigm, and disqualifying them from filling that position in the syntagm.

Jakobson's presentation of the poetic functions should be understood against this background. The poetic function, he implies, applies the principle of equivalence to the axis of combination in such a manner, that various elements in the actual syntagmatic material relate to each other as if only one of them

²⁸Occasionally other types of graphic signs are used for similar purposes (e.g., E.E. Cummings' use and misuse of capitalisation, spacing, intralexical punctuation, and other radical deviations from the conventions of writing and printing; see Babcock [25]); but punctuation and lineation are the chief ones.

were actual and the rest — paradigmatic potentials. In other words, the reader can reconstruct an imaginary paradigm consisting of two or more actual syntagmatic events, rather than one actual and one or more unrealised potential events. It is as if the reconstructed paradigm was offered again and again as a source for selecting items to fill different syntagmatic positions, rather than being "disbanded" after the first choice has been made.

The phenomenon described by Jakobson is certainly very typical of literature; yet, I would like to extend his formula so that it could cover the simultaneous organisation of material. Thus, I believe, the formula would account more fully for literary complexities.

My formula, then, reads as follows: "The poetic function treats the axis of selection as a paradigm of equivalents from which more than one item can be chosen. Of course, this can be done in accordance with Jakobson's formula of projecting the principle of equivalence from the axis of selection into the axis of combination (that is, the various items chosen from the same paradigm, or the various occurrences of the same item, appear separately as distinct segments in the syntagmatic continuum). This is indeed the most typical poetic organisation of the phonological level of language. On the higher levels of language organisation — particularly the syntactic and the semantic — the selection of more than one item from the same paradigm may also be done by superimposing the chosen items upon one another, making them thereby into simultaneously co-present alternatives of organising the same material."

This formula is proposed as complementing Jakobson's, not contradicting it. It makes no claim to exhaust the subject of poetic function, nor do I propose it as the only, or even the most important, addition to Jakobson's formula that is likely to make it more comprehensive. The limited aim of my formula is

to extend Jakobson's to include simultaneous analogies and equivalences (such as metaphors, allusions, associations, ambiguities, etc.) in addition to his sequential analogies and equivalences. It goes without saying that the former are as characteristic of the poetic function as the latter. Segmentational syntactic ambiguity, then, is characteristic of "the poetic function" in my extension of the Jakobsonian sense; it is his formula, and not his basic conceptual approach, that needs some adjustment so that it could accommodate *de jure* what I believe it already accommodates *de facto*.

5.6.3. Segmentational Ambiguity and Punctuation-Manipulation at Work: An Illustration from a Poem by T.S. Eliot.

Indeed, patterns of simultaneous copresence of alternative syntactic divisions are conspicuous manifestations of "the poetic function". The use, misuse, over-use and under-use of punctuation and lineation can serve such patterns by making the reader read the text over and over again, trying to find reasons for these deviant and unexpected practices. He may discover in some cases that there is more to the word-sequence than the most "reasonable" or "natural" syntactic interpretation of it; his efforts to have the unconventional punctuation and lineation make sense must make him juxtapose different groupings of words into intonation contours; and these, in their turn, may correlate with alternative IC analyses (as I argued above, this is not always the case, though). Words may thus be syntactically Janus-faced, as it were, interpretable as ending a previous SMIU, as being in the middle of an SMIU or as beginning a new one, according to different alternative segmentations allowed by the word-sequence.

As an example let us consider part I of T.S. Eliot's *Ash-Wednesday* (Eliot, 83-84):

Because I do not hope to turn again
Because I do not hope

Because I do not hope to turn

Desiring this man's gift and that man's scope

5 I no longer strive to strive towards such things

(Why should the aged eagle stretch its wings?)

Why should I mourn

The vanished power of the usual reign?

Because I do not hope to know again

10 The infirm glory of the positive hour

Because I do not think

Because I know I shall not know

The one veritable transitory power

Because I cannot drink

15 There, where trees flower, and springs flow, for there
is nothing again

Because I know that time is always time

And place is always and only place

And what is actual is actual only for one time

And only for one place

20 I rejoice that things are as they are and

I renounce the blessed face

And renounce the voice

Because I cannot hope to turn again

Consequently I rejoice, having to construct something

25 Upon which to rejoice

And pray to God to have mercy upon us

And I pray that I may forget

These matters that with myself I too much discuss

Too much explain

30 Because I do not hope to turn again

Let these words answer

For what is done, not to be done again

May the judgement not be too heavy upon us

Because these wings are no longer wings to fly
35 But merely vans to beat the air
The air which is now thoroughly small and dry
Smaller and dryer than the will
Teach us to care and not to care
Teach us to sit still.

40 Pray for us sinners now and at the hour of our death
Pray for us now and at the hour of our death.

This poem shares with Whitman's "When I Heard the Learn'd Astronomer" the use of initial syntactic subordination as a means of creating SMAU-anticipation, but here the employment of this device is infinitely more subtle and sophisticated. One of the main differences between the syntactic techniques of the two poems is that while Whitman sticks to the same kind of anticipation and repeats it with no substantial change, Eliot varies his types of anticipation syntactically, rhythmically and semantically and adds to this a subtle interplay between various possible syntactic analyses of the same word-sequence. In Whitman's poem, unlike Eliot's, no segmentational ambiguity is produced by SMAU-anticipation.

Another point of relevance for a comparison between the two poems is the employment of punctuation; whereas Whitman's only unconventionality is, possibly, his use of the semicolon at line-ends to indicate intonational equivalence (see below, 5.6.4), Eliot is economical to the extreme in his punctuation. His deliberate omissions of conventionally obligatory punctuation-marks contribute to the sense of vagueness and indeterminacy, contrasted with the "determined" tone projected by the persistent anaphoric "because"s. For reasons of scope and proportion I cannot substantiate my claim that the contrast and tension between certainty and uncertainty, clarity and obscurity, determination and bewilderment, characterises the poem in all its strata (prosody, syntax, thematics, etc.). I shall rather confine my discussion to

the treatment of segmentational syntactic ambiguity in several lines of the poem.

In the first stanza, line 4 ("Desiring this man's gift and that man's scope") is syntactically "a Janus-faced line": it can be interpreted as oriented backward (modifying the verb "turn") and/or as oriented forward (modifying the verb "strive"). This could easily be disambiguated by punctuation; but Eliot seems to be careful to omit punctuation altogether here, which in itself amounts at least to drawing the reader's attention to possible obscurities or irregularities. Without going into problems of literary interpretation (which, I believe, would favour the former alternative), several points can quite safely be made:

1. A comparative analysis of the various parts of this poem shows that Eliot is quite meticulous in his punctuation practice, so that his punctuation (or, in this case, its conspicuous absence) should be taken seriously.
2. Two syntactically and intonationally incompatible interpretations become equally applicable to the given word-sequence because of the omission of punctuation.
3. The two interpretations are definitely different on the semantic level, but they are not totally incompatible (and even if they were, in literature this does not necessarily mean that a choice must be made between them).
4. Consequently, a silent reading of the written poem should help the reader capture its built-in structural complexity, since most oral readings are likely to disambiguate what the poet took care to leave ambiguous through the absence of punctuation.
5. The reader is thus made to return to the text time and again for further guidance. He finally realises that the word-sequence gives rise to two syntactic analyses, so that the same paradigm appears as a source of at least two reasonably legitimate simultaneous selections for the same syntagm.

The two analyses are *prima facie* equally valid: both of them make syntactic and semantic sense, and both of them are structurally reinforced by their vicinity. The backward-oriented one is supported by the general linear direction of the text's continuum (i.e., the reader's normal tendency is, if possible, to interpret every new arrival in terms of, and in relation to, the known context preceding it), while the forward-oriented one is supported by the specific anaphoric pattern in this particular text (the reader's tendency is also to treat the three lines held together by the anaphoric "because"-beginnings as a separate unit, pausing between this unit and the first line that does not begin with the word "because"). Even if the overall interpretation of the poem favours one of the alternatives (and, as I have said, I believe that the backward-oriented one fits in better with the rest of the poem), the reader is encouraged by the structure of the text to go through this process of wondering and pondering before making his mind up regarding his final interpretative preference.

The very awareness on the reader's part that such relationships exist in a text is typically "poetic" in the Jakobsonian sense (with my extension): this kind of text-structure de-automatises the process of reading and can be characterised by such terms as "concentration" and "density".

Similar in principle, though subtler and more complex in detail, are some of the syntactic events in the rest of the poem. Segmentational ambiguities are suggested in several places, though not always with equal force or with equal literary validity for all the syntactically acceptable analyses. Thus, for instance, the transition between stanza 2 and stanza 3 (lines 23-26) can be read with at least three syntactically and semantically contrastive intonations; and since punctuation alone cannot convey these intonation subtleties, I shall resort to

adding words in square brackets where necessary.²⁹ The following are the main alternatives:

Alternative 1: Because I cannot hope to turn again, consequently I rejoice, having to construct something upon which to rejoice. And [now, let us all] pray to God to have mercy upon us [...]

Alternative 2: Because I cannot hope to turn again, consequently I rejoice, having to construct something, upon which to rejoice and [to] pray to God to have mercy upon us.

Alternative 3: Because I cannot hope to turn again, consequently I rejoice — having to construct something upon which to rejoice — and [I] pray to God to have mercy upon us.

All three alternatives are compatible with Eliot's sparse punctuation; yet literary interpretation, for reasons that space does not allow me to spell out, would reject alternative 1 (where "pray" is taken as an imperative), and alternative 2 would also be much less probable than alternative 3. But even here, where literary considerations can guide the reader to select the more plausible intonation, it should be borne in mind that Eliot refrains from incorporating his preference into the text by means of more adequate punctuation.

Moreover, lines 23-26 have just been arbitrarily isolated from their context; but when analysed properly, within this context, a whole chain of conflicting potential segmentations would emerge. Thus, there is no absolute proof against line 23 being interpreted as closing the sentence leading up to it rather than opening a new sentence; furthermore, regardless of how line 23

²⁹The only originally supplied punctuation mark, the indispensable comma in line 24, is retained in all my alternatives: without this comma "rejoice" would become transitive with the phrase beginning with "having" as its object (see a somewhat similar case in Milton, analysed by Davie in [112], 73).

is bracketed in relation to its neighbours, the preceding sentence may be said to begin either at the beginning of line 20, or at its end (starting with "and"), or at the beginning of line 22. At any rate, even if we rule (as I do) that a new sentence begins with the opening of line 23, we still have to remember two points: (a) Eliot himself, by his peculiarly sparse punctuation, encourages his readers at least to notice the different syntactic possibilities and to weigh them against one another before favouring one of them for literary reasons; (b) the discontinuous anaphora linking the lines beginning with "because" works at cross purposes with itself, as it were: on the one hand, every "because" marks a fresh start; on the other hand, it "looks backwards" to the previous "because"s, thereby creating text-units framed and delimited by one "because"-line at their beginning and another one at their end.

Likewise, stanza 3 abounds in syntactic segmentational ambiguities of similar kind. The stanza begins with "and", which may or may not connect it syntactically to the end of the second stanza, and the verb "pray" appearing in its first two lines may or may not indicate their being parts of the same sentence (the pronoun "I", present in line 27 and absent from line 26, may contribute to the separation between the two lines, assuming that "I" is not the subject of "pray" in line 26; but the most probable alternative suggested above for line 26 does assume "I" as the subject of "pray" in that line, connecting it with the "I" in line 24).

Towards the end of the stanza, several interesting and fairly plausible segmentation alternatives can be discovered (let alone evidently ridiculous and far-fetched possibilities, like rendering lines 27-30 as "And I pray that I may forget these matters, that with myself I, too, much discuss, too much. Explain, because I do not hope to turn again," etc.). Thus, one can admit a "Janus-faced interpretation" for line 30, especially

in its context (note the semantic connection between "explain" and "because"). Moreover, "these words" in line 31 may refer to the recurring "because"s, in which case line 30 would be enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks will also be used if "these matters" (line 28) refers to line 30.

The chief probable alternatives for lines 27-31 are, then, the following:

Alternative 1: And I pray that I may forget these matters, that with myself I too much discuss, too much explain. Because I do not hope to turn again, let these words answer [etc.]

Alternative 2: And I pray that I may forget these matters, that with myself I too much discuss, too much explain, [and that is] because I do not hope to turn again. Let these words answer [etc.]

Alternative 3: And I pray that I may forget these matters, that with myself I too much discuss, too much explain [saying:] "because I do not hope to turn again" — let these words [the words that are to follow] answer [etc.]

Alternative 4: And I pray that I may forget these matters, that with myself I too much discuss, too much explain. "Because I do not hope to turn again" — let these words [the words just cited in quotation marks] answer [etc.]

Choosing the correct one from these (and perhaps other) alternatives is a matter dependent on the literary interpretation of the poem as a whole, a task which lies outside my subject. My own interpretative preference, however, is reflected in the way I ordered the alternatives from the most to the least probable. The point is, once again, that all alternatives cannot be totally ruled out and a case can be made for each of them; moreover, most of them complement each other thematically. This type of tension between thematic correspondence and verbal or syntactic incompatibility between the various legitimate inter-

pretations is one of the chief features of this poem in particular and Eliot's poetics in general.³⁰

The foregoing analysis of the various alternatives was based on the methodologically inevitable, yet intrinsically arbitrary, isolation of the analysed lines (27-31) from their context. As for the link between the isolated lines and the preceding ones, I have already shown that the transition from stanza 2 to stanza 3 can be interpreted, syntactically and intonationally, in a variety of ways, and each of these can be combined with each of the alternatives suggested for lines 27-31.

By the same token, lines 31-33 are very complex syntactically. First of all, one may or may not pause at the end of line 31, thereby changing both the syntax and the meaning of the text: it is either "Let these words answer for what is done" or "Let these words answer. For what is done [...]". Now the rarity of punctuation appreciates the value of each punctuation mark that does appear in the text. The single comma in stanza 3 (in line 32) may thus be very meaningful: but unlike its predecessor in stanza 2 (see note 29), this comma's meaning and function is not unequivocally clear. By disjoining the two parts of line 32 the

³⁰Mrs. Winifred Nowotny has characterised Eliot as "[...] a master of all the devices of language that make it possible to show various patterns competing for attention and to show the mind searching for the point of poise or escape from partial patterns into the composure of the master-pattern" ([382], 139). Most of her discussion, including this remark, is concerned with another poem ("East Coker") and with semantic rather than syntactic patterning, yet it is perfectly applicable here. In another reference to Eliot's "East Coker" ([382], 169-170), Mrs. Nowotny analyses syntactic devices which partly resemble the ones I have analysed in *Ash-Wednesday*. In the course of her concluding remarks she observes that "[...] Eliot puts the language machine into reverse, achieving his own meaning by exploiting the weaknesses of language [...]" ([382], 170). Once again, the observation is made *à propos* an argument which does not concern us here, but its applicability to my analysis of *Ash-Wednesday* is self-evident.

comma may suggest a relatively stronger link between the first part of the line and the preceding line (31) and/or between the second part of line 32 and the following one (33). Yet it is not very likely that the comma in line 32 is primarily designed to prefer the uninterrupted "answer for" reading of the transition between lines 31 and 32: had Eliot written "Let these words answer for what is done", in one line, he would have conveyed such a preference much more directly and efficiently (since there is no rigid metrical norm in this poem, lineation could be altered as I have suggested). The inherent ambiguities of the last two lines (hinging on the problem of whether and how line 33 is syntactically subordinated to line 32) can also hardly be disambiguated by this comma. At any rate, each of these alternatives can be combined with each of the alternatives proposed for the previous lines, and the total number of alternative combinations accordingly increases.

In conclusion, it seems that in these parts of the poem, just as in the preceding ones, the structure of the poem is designed to enhance syntactic and semantic ambiguities, densities, complexities, etc. (see note 30). Once again, here as elsewhere it is up to literary interpretation to weigh and consider the various alternatives according to their heterogeneous merits and to determine the final hierarchy of probability and correctness, if possible. My limited task has been to demonstrate the very existence of this type of complexity.

This particular type of syntactic complexity, which I have called "segmentational syntactic ambiguity", belongs to the syntactic background-and-periphery of enjambment. Strictly "enjambmental" ambiguities (such as "answer/For" in lines 31-32 or "drink/There" in lines 14-15) are interwoven into the more general, all-embracing scheme of segmentational ambiguities in the poem. Enjambmental disambiguations of segmentational ambiguities are more intense and restless than SMAU-disambiguations; the

SMIU-tension inherent in the former makes their immediate impact more powerful than the impact produced by the latter. Yet, on principle, the dynamic process of reading one's way through a thicket of segmentational ambiguities is the same on the SMIU- and SMAU-level.

Segmentational ambiguity resides in the interaction between the prospective and retrospective processes of perception. In discussing segmentational ambiguity in the Eliot poem, I found it impossible to observe the distinction between the prospective and the retrospective strictly. This is so because the syntactic openness generated by the omission of punctuation-marks becomes significant only when the potential inherent in this omission is realised. In other words, it is quite pointless to discuss the omission of punctuation strictly prospectively — that is to say, in isolation — without complementing such a discussion by the retrospective view of how this potential is put to use in poetic practice. In order to make a fuller appreciation of what the lack of punctuation does to the poem, then, I had to resort to the hindsight provided by "static" and "retrospective" knowledge. Yet even a purely prospective view, step by step, must make the reader sense some degree of syntactic vagueness and indeterminacy whenever a legitimately predictable punctuation mark fails to appear.

The only prospectively analysable aspect of Eliot's lines is the syntactic openness of the ends of the lines, which could have been continued in a large variety of ways. The lack of punctuation enhances this openness; yet, at least in the beginning, before the omission of punctuation has been established as a norm, this practice paradoxically seems to decrease openness by reducing the predictability of a pause. Judged against the background of the accepted norm, the absence of justified punctuation marks would tip the balance in favour of SMIU (pauseless) anticipation. Only when the norm of sparse punctuation has been established does the lack of punctuation unequivocally enhance openness

5.6.4. Punctuation in the Service of Syntax and Intonation:
The Practice of Walt Whitman.

Eliot's use of punctuation in the poem just analysed from this aspect, is, of course, not the only way that punctuation can be used to suggest alternative syntactic intonation(s) to the "most natural" one(s). Far from pretending to exhaust the numerous and diverse ways in which punctuation can be, and has been, used by poets for syntactic and intonational purposes, I would like to draw attention to one method of punctuation which is of primary importance for the main topic of this study — enjambment. I am referring to the use of punctuation marks to determine whether a given word carries syntactic tension at all, and if it does, whether it is SMIU- or SMAU-tension, when the word-sequence as such allows more than one of these possibilities.

Thus, for instance, Walt Whitman, according to some editions,³¹

³¹My discussion of the punctuation in Whitman's two poems is based on the text of *The Portable Walt Whitman*, which is in agreement with some other editions, but not all of them. The textological problems of the various Whitman editions as such, with the authorised and unauthorised modifications which differentiate one edition from another in various details including punctuation, lie of course far beyond the legitimate interests of the present study. Suffice it to say that, by and large, most editions fall into two groups in their treatment of line-end punctuation in long multi-linear sentences. For simplicity's sake the two groups can be called "the comma editions" and "the semicolon editions". I have admittedly not worked as seriously on Whitman textology as I have on the professional literature in prosodic and syntactic theory in connection with the present study. All that I have managed to gather from oral and written authorities on Whitman amounts to indirect, circumstantial evidence to the effect that Whitman introduced many changes, including changes of punctuation, in the various editions that he authorised during his lifetime. At any rate, I find the semicolon interpretation more interesting from my point of view. My subject at the moment is how the reader's intonation and interpretation are affected by the interaction between punctuation and syntactic structure; consequently, the text as printed and punctuated, whatever its textological merits, is taken as an object of analysis in its own right. Once printed and published, this text affects its reader directly, regardless of the nature of its genesis that led to its presently published form. See also Chapter 3, note 4.

often uses a simple hierarchy — lack of punctuation, commas, semicolons and periods — to support his colossal, "arch-like" syntactic structures. His syntactic "arches" are made, as it were, of graded intonation contours: his use of punctuation is motivated first and foremost by the requirements of his intonation-planning, and only to a lesser degree by the requirements of syntactic segmentation *per se*. Within a certain range of conventional licence, he would choose between the omission (or absence) of punctuation and a comma, between a comma and a semicolon, and between a semicolon and a full-stop period, according to his scheme of intonational, rather than syntactic, subordination. This scheme is used, in the final analysis, to convey semantic relationships under the guise of syntactic ones.

This is what happens both in "When I Heard the Learn'd Astronomer" discussed above and in poem 15 from "Song of Myself" (*Whitman*, 76-79). In both instances it is the use of the semicolon, in its hierarchical relationships with the comma on the one hand and the full-stop period on the other, that deserves special attention. In both poems the following punctuation practices are employed: (a) the semicolon never appears intralinearly; (b) all lines end with a punctuation mark, either a semicolon or a comma; (c) most commas appear intralinearly; and (d) the full-stop period appears only once in the whole poem — at its very end. The basic hierarchy of punctuation marks common to both poems as printed in the edition cited, then, consists of the following five degrees: (1) word-to-word transitions without punctuation; (2) intralinear commas; (3) line-end commas; (4) line-end semicolons; (5) one single poem-end period (in the latter poem the system is more complicated, with the introduction of parentheses and dashes for parenthetical statements and occasional exclamation marks). It is my contention that this system is doubtlessly conceived in intonational terms.

Let us look briefly into the former poem (for the reader's

convenience I am quoting it here once again):

- (1) When I heard the learn'd astronomer;
- (2) When the proofs, the figures, were ranged in columns
before me;
- (3) When I was shown the charts and the diagrams, to add,
divide, and measure them;
- (4) When I, sitting, heard the astronomer, where he lectured
with much applause in the lecture-room,
- (5) How soon, unaccountable, I became tired and sick;
- (6) Till rising and gliding out, I wander'd off by myself,
- (7) In the mystical moist night-air, and from time to time,
- (8) Look'd up in perfect silence at the stars.

The semicolon at the end of the first line appears where a comma is expected according to the rules of punctuation: line 1 is a relatively short subordinate clause, and there is a strong likelihood that the main clause would come next. When this syntactic anticipation is frustrated by the recurring temporal clauses and the resulting postponement of the main clause, a fresh norm is established by a semicolon separating temporal clauses from one another. This norm is violated at the end of line 4, where the first line-end comma appears instead of the already expected semicolon. However, the norm is reaffirmed retrospectively, when line 5 turns out to be the long awaited main clause and not just another temporal clause. The comma ending line 4, then, has an anticipatory function: by frustrating the reader's expectation that the familiar pattern should recur, it arouses his expectation of a different pattern, an expectation which the next line does fulfil. Now at the end of line 5, when syntactic completeness has been reached, the reader is entitled to expect a full-stop. This, however, is frustrated by the appearance of yet another semicolon, thereby equating the syntactically self-sufficient end of line 5, as it were, with the syntactically incomplete endings of lines 1-3. At the end of line 6 the expect-

tation of a full stop is once again syntactically justified, and once again this expectation is frustrated, this time by a comma, which in its turn proves syntactically superfluous when line 7 has been read. As for the comma at the end of line 7, it has a good chance of being syntactically superfluous from the start, and it proves to be just that when the last line has been read.

The difference between the two commas rests in the relation between predictability and the actual event. Whereas the comma at the end of line 6 is weaker than the punctuation mark most probable there (a full stop) and stronger than what turns out to be needed (no punctuation at all), the comma at the end of line 7 is stronger than expected and needed (no punctuation at all). In both cases the comma is the only punctuation mark that could be tolerated by the continuation. Both commas are clearly designed to prevent the reader from reading the interlinear transitions as enjambments, and it is obvious that without these commas these transitions would be perfect enjambments (which proves again, if proof is needed, that enjambment is an intonational phenomenon).

This analysis, I believe, makes a strong case for my contention that the punctuation here is first and foremost intonationally motivated. No common syntactic denominator can be found for all the lines ending with a semicolon or for all the lines ending with a comma. The procedure should then be reversed: rather than looking for a syntactic motive for punctuation, punctuation should be treated as a basis for intonation, and this punctuation-determined intonation, in its turn, should both contribute to the literary interpretation of the poem (by affecting its oral delivery and/or its aurally imagined silent reading) and be confirmed by it.

The process in such cases can be described as a reversed-hierarchy effect: instead of syntactic relationships dictating intonation which, in its turn, is recorded graphically by punc-

tuation, it is punctuation which determines the choice of the intonation contours, which, through conventionalised correlations, simulate syntactic relationships. In this case these "intonationally simulated" syntactic relationships do not necessarily correspond to the real syntactic relationships produced by the word-sequence.

Conventional, automatised links between the two systems are only occasionally adhered to. It is the intonation contour that gives the "final touch" to the poem. Thus, punctuation can be shown to contribute to the poem's effects through its correlation with intonation. The use of the semicolon at the end of line 1 would have given it a title-like quality even without its being an exact and immediate repetition of the poem's title; the use of a comma at the end of line 4 increases the SMAU-tension that "gravitates" towards the main clause; the use of the comma at the end of line 6 plays a complex role as just described, prospectively and retrospectively; and the use of the "superfluous" comma at the end of line 7, by retarding the pace of reading and drawing attention to the various components of the message, contributes to the desired effect of contrasting the relaxed "looking at the stars" with the tense and dense atmosphere of the crowded lecture-room. But above all one should note the unifying function of the one and only full-stop, suspended until the poem's very end. The text creates a hierarchy whereby the comma, the semicolon and the period acquire their respective values relationally: the relative value of each punctuation mark compared to the others in the poem's context matters more than any absolute value that it can independently have. When different syntactic structures end with the same punctuation marks (e.g., lines 1 and 6), while similar syntactic structures end with different punctuation marks (e.g., lines 3 and 4), what results is a sequence of pausal junctures whose hierarchy is not based solely on syntactic relationships. The thematic structure of the text, as reflected in its

punctuation and intonation, clashes with its syntactic organisation as a sequence of language-elements, and the former gets the upper hand in the conflict.

Yet, individual as the punctuation practices just described in Whitman's poem are, they are not too licentious as compared to the punctuation practices of many poets, notably twentieth-century poets. Thus, as I have shown, Whitman's real choice is always between hierarchically adjacent punctuation marks. His ultimate preference may appear surprising and unexpected at first, but it never remains unexplained: on second thought, the reader can always satisfactorily account for it on the most elementary level of interpretation through oral delivery (or aural imagination) without necessarily resorting to a full-fledged literary interpretation (as is often the case in Eliot, let alone poets like Marianne Moore or E.E. Cummings). The difference between the alternative chosen and the alternative rejected (e.g., between a semicolon and a comma in line 5, between a comma and a semicolon in line 4, etc.) never generates anything remotely similar, in complexity or significance, to the ambiguities of the Eliot poem.

5.6.5. Interrelations between Word-Sequence and Punctuation
and the Problem of Syntactic Anticipation:
A Further Whitman Example.

At least one of the aspects of the interrelations between syntactic structure, punctuation and intonation revealed by the Whitman poem is of primary importance for a comprehensive theory of enjambment. I am referring once again to the distinction between syntactic completeness or incompleteness as conveyed in the word sequence on the one hand and as conveyed by intonation and/or punctuation on the other hand. Now if a word-sequence is potentially complete, a punctuation mark other than a period in writing, and/or its oral correlative (terminal pausal juncture), can always make it prospectively incomplete: a word-sequence —

no matter how complete and autonomous it appears to be — can never have a period as the only punctuation mark (and a terminal pause as the only juncture) that is acceptable at its end. However, this statement cannot be reversed: whereas nonterminal junctures (and punctuation marks) are potentially as tolerable at the end of syntactically autonomous utterances as terminal ones, only the former are tolerable at the end of syntactically incomplete utterances. This correlation is required by the rules of language; and while it is true that violating these rules can, and does, happen in poetry, such violations have the unmistakable effect of deviations from the rules that I am trying to describe.

Schematically, the possibilities are as follows: (1) Word-sequence syntactically complete — punctuation and/or intonation terminal; result: syntactic completeness. (2) Word-sequence syntactically complete — punctuation and/or intonation nonterminal; result: syntactic incompleteness. (3) Word-sequence syntactically incomplete — punctuation and/or intonation nonterminal (as dictated by word-sequence); result: syntactic incompleteness. (4) Word-sequence syntactically incomplete — punctuation and/or intonation terminal; result: syntactic irregularity; "segmentational ungrammaticality" (see 5.9.1).

It is the word-sequence, then, which determines what can and what cannot be tolerated in terms of intonation and punctuation. It is true that language cannot be orally communicated without intonation choices being made, nor can written communication take place without punctuation decisions (including omissions) being made; but punctuation and syntactic intonation are definitely secondary to the word-sequence itself as systems signalling syntactic completeness or incompleteness. Whenever a sharp clash occurs between the word-sequence and any or both of the other systems, it is always the latter which can be considered inappropriate in relation to the former, and the former would hardly ever

be altered in order to conform to the latter.

The following example, from Whitman's "Song of Myself" poem 15 (*Whitman*, p. 76) can give further illustration to the theoretical points just made.

The pure contralto sings in the organ loft;
The carpenter dresses his plank — the tongue of his
fore-plane whistles its wild ascending lisp;
The married and unmarried children ride home to their
Thanksgiving dinner;
The pilot seizes the king-pin — he heaves down with a
strong arm;
The mate stands braced in the whale boat — lance and
harpoon are ready;
The duck-shooter walks by silent and cautious stretches;
The deacons are ordain'd with cross'd hands at the altar
The spinning-girl retreats and advances to the hum of
the big wheel;

This is but a short excerpt, 8 lines out of a long, seemingly endless catalogue of 66 long lines, all similar in their syntactic structure. What matters for the purpose of the present discussion is that all the lines — unlike those in Whitman's "When I Heard the Learn'd Astronomer" — are syntactically complete, if judged as word-sequences. They could easily end with a period, as indeed they should by any accepted norm of punctuation. But Whitman, by ending them with a semicolon (or with a comma, as printed in other editions), introduces a definite element of poetically motivated semantic incompleteness under the guise of what usually serves to indicate genuine syntactic incompleteness. These ever-recurring semicolons (or commas) are supported by the catalogue-like nature of the syntactic patterning of the passage as segmented into syntactically parallel poetic lines that relate to each other appositionally. Yet they are not supported by genuine, word-sequence based, syntactic incompleteness. As such,

they pose a difficult problem for performance, oral or silent: it is very tiring to read the text with nonterminal junctures, time and again (even if such syntactic support were forthcoming, e.g., if the sentences were initial subordinate clauses, this would be extremely difficult in so long a poem). But that is exactly what the text's punctuation-design wants us to strive to do; so that all of the enormous 65-line catalogue would be experienced intonationally and syntactically, and not only thematically, as constantly pushing forward, eagerly anticipating the two concluding lines which give meaning to it all, as if the whole poem is incorporated into these lines:

And these one and all tend inward to me, and I tend
outward to them;

And such as it is to be of these, more or less, I am.

Whitman's practice in this poem is at the same time similar, complementary and diametrically opposed to his practice in poem 33 of "Song of Myself" (*Whitman*, 100-109), analysed by Hrushovski ([248], 196-198). In that poem the same technique of numerous end-stopped, anaphorically linked long lines is used once again. Once again the lines end with semicolons (or commas) and the reader has to keep waiting almost endlessly (to be exact, 81 lines, most of them very long) for a full stop to appear. But there is an essential difference between the two poems: in poem 15 each line is a complete and autonomous sentence, and the only evidence to the contrary is supplied by punctuation, though eventually corroborated by the literary interpretation prompted primarily by that punctuation (i.e., the two mutually reinforce each other). In poem 33, conversely, one of the sentences consists of 82 long lines, 81 of which are subordinate clauses and subordinate phrases of different kinds. It is only the 82nd line which provides the main clause, so long awaited that it is probably also long forgotten by now (see 5.5.1). The contrast between the two poems in this respect lies in the importance

attached to the role played by punctuation in producing the effect of syntactic incompleteness: while in poem 33 syntactic incompleteness is inherent in the word-sequence of the text itself, and the punctuation only supports it, in poem 15 it is only the punctuation which suggests that, syntactically, each of the separate lines constitutes anything but complete sentences.

Only a true appreciation of both the similarities and the dissimilarities between the two types of syntactic and intonational organisation can do full justice to the complexity of the problem. What happens here, as I earlier suggested, is that identity in punctuation, through identity in syntactic intonation simulates an identity in syntactic structure, in a process experienced primarily within the single poem but also, when recurrent and typical enough, in the accumulative impression of the entire work of a poet. Whitman is thus characterised as a poet with a strong tendency for intonational subordination and incompleteness usually expressed in long chains of nonterminal pausal junctures. In "ordinary" language, such chains are usually the product of a long series of clauses and/or phrases functioning equivalently, relating to each other more or less appositionally. Here this is not the case, as we have seen, since the nonterminal junctures are not always syntactically justified; but the equal patterns of punctuation make the various syntactic relationships look alike, as if they related to each other as appositions. Their genuine syntactic differences are levelled and flattened, as it were, because they are shaped by a common intonational and punctuational mould. Under these circumstances, it is conscious syntactic analysis, rather than casual reading, which is likely to make these differences perceivable.

5.6.6. Conclusion.

The following points constitute my answer to Question 6 in 5.0.4:

1. A certain amount of syntactic openness, as a syntagmatic phenomenon, oriented towards the very next step, is present at the end of any word-sequence. If the word-sequence up to the point of assessment is syntactically deficient or incomplete, syntactic openness ranges from SMAU- to SMIU-anticipation; if, however, the word-sequence is potentially autonomous, there is always some degree of syntactic uncertainty as to whether the utterance is to remain closed, realising this potential by a full stop, or to become open in spite of its potential autonomy, by appending to it a continuation justifying syntactic expectation retrospectively.

2. Punctuation marks in written utterances and pausal junctures in spoken ones can reduce or increase syntactic openness and uncertainty, depending on how they are made to conform to, or to deviate from, expected norms. Occasionally, as described above, they can also contribute to simultaneous segmentational ambiguity. Moreover, as implied in Taranovski [49] and expressed in the concept of SL optimum, their influence is not limited to the exact spot of their appearance: the location of a juncture or a punctuation mark has a considerable influence on the expectations concerning the next junctures and on the final appreciation of the previous ones.

3. Finally, all factors should be referred to the poet's practice in general and in a given poem in particular: thus, for instance, the presence or absence of a comma at the end of a line in a poem by Walt Whitman may function radically differently from an exactly identical occurrence in a poem by E.E. Cummings. Generally speaking, however, the following suggestion by Geoffrey Leech ([303], 125) can be adopted:

As punctuation marks generally indicate places where a pause is allowable, the identification of enjambment by the absence of end-punctuation is a rule-of-thumb good enough for most purposes.

While this "negative" statement is generally true, its "positive" counterpart is even more convincing: regardless of the degree of syntactic completeness, the presence of line-end punctuation is an almost absolute indication of end-stoppage (according to my intonationally-oriented definition of enjambment). Even stylistic and idiosyncratic punctuation practices usually involve the omission of punctuation when normally expected, rather than the excessive use of punctuation when unexpected or forbidden. At any rate, as I have shown, expectations based on punctuation practices alone are considerably weaker than those based on punctuation as well as on structural relationships inherent in a given word-sequence.

5.7. SMAU-TENSION AS A PROSPECTIVE-DYNAMIC CONCEPT:
CONCLUDING REMARKS.

To conclude the discussion of SMAU-tension the following remarks are a contribution to an answer to Question 7 in 5.0.4.

The parametric approach adopted here is probably the only way to cut through the thick tangle of intonational and syntactic tension, but rather than simplifying matters it makes the investigator more keenly aware of the intricacy of this tangle.

SMAU-tension should be viewed against the background of the virtually endless hierarchy of segmental units of different sizes that may carry, or be affected by, syntactic tension. Theoretically and analytically, SMAU-tension is a manageable interim category between SMIU-tension, residing in the swiftly vanishing moments of transition between single words, on the one hand, and the long "super-syntactic" units, often amorphous and insusceptible to analysis from a syntactic point of view, on the other hand.

SMIU-tension usually does its work in the reader's mind so rapidly that he cannot be fully aware of what is happening, and

it is only the artificially slow pace of reading for analysis that enables us to unearth some of its subtle effects.³² In fact, enjambment can be regarded as a means of slowing the pace of reading at an unexpected point and bringing its otherwise subconscious potential of syntactic tension into the fore, making it more susceptible to conscious awareness. SMAU-tension, on the other hand, does its work much more openly, as it were. It resides at points of rest and pause, where the reader is relatively more aware of his syntactic expectations and their degree of fulfilment. By observing SMAU-tension one can reach a better understanding of how the more hidden SMIU-tension works.

The difference between the two types of syntactic tension is apparently one of size, but, as we have seen, it has wider structural implications. Thus, for instance, segmentational ambiguity can hardly appear inside SMIUs, nor can the SL "parabola" take its shape in "normal-sized" SMIUs. A difference in size thus becomes a difference in essence. The contrastive comparison between SMIU- and SMAU-tension, with the similarities and dissimilarities between them, was shown to be relevant to a fuller understanding of enjambment.

5.8. THE RETROSPECTIVE ASPECT OF THE DYNAMIC APPROACH.

5.8.0. The Retrospective and the Prospective as Complementary Aspects of the Dynamic Approach to the Syntax of Enjambment.

As I have already argued (see 5.0.1), the dynamic approach to the syntactic analysis of enjambment has to combine the prospective, or forward-oriented procedure with the retrospective, or

³²In a similar context Winifred Nowottny says ([382], 9):

[...] since we naturally tend — except when checked by a difficulty — to take in without effort the relationships conveyed by syntax, its operation as a cause of

backward-oriented one. So far I have adhered to "the prospective procedure", but a full-fledged dynamic approach to enjambment must not stop at the end of the line, but follow the syntactic "events" through to the end of the sentence (or, at least, to the end of the relevant SMIU), and look back at the point of enjambment in order to check how the predictions relate to what actually happens. The retrospective procedure is, then, a necessary complement to the prospective one in order to analyse enjambment.

5.8.1. Prospective and Retrospective Enjambments and End-Stopped Lines.

All the aforesaid provides the basis for a seemingly simple distinction between two types of enjambments: prospective and retrospective, or expected and unexpected. The term appears to be self-explanatory: ideally, an enjambment should be classified as prospective, or expected, whenever the first line ends with SMIU-anticipation, and retrospective, or unexpected, whenever the first line could be end-stopped. In the former case the reader's syntactic expectations are fulfilled, whereas in the latter they are frustrated.

In the light of the entire discussion in the present chapter, this distinction appears problematic. Since "total SMIU-anticipation" is a prerequisite for "prospective enjambment", as just defined, and since total syntactic anticipations are virtually nonexistent (at least in English), it seems preferable to describe an enjambment as prospective if a pausal juncture is syntactically unlikely at the end of the first line, and as retros-

poetical pleasure is often the last cause we recognize, if indeed we recognize it at all. The result is that syntax is important to poet and to critic because it produces strong effects by stealth; these remain "inexplicable" so long as the power of the syntax goes undetected.

pective if such a juncture is syntactically likely at the end of the first line. The difference between prospective and retrospective enjambments is very much alive, though often subliminally, in the intuition of most readers of poetry: most sensitive readers' response to syntactically predictable, well-prepared enjambments would differ significantly from their response to syntactically surprising enjambments. Thus, for instance, the following two consecutive enjambments in Gerard Manley Hopkins' "Henry Purcell" (*Hopkins*, p. 41) definitely function as "prospective" enjambments (the numbers between the lines are for reference in my ensuing discussion):

- Let him oh! with his air of angels then lift me, lay
me! only I'll
(1) Have an eye to the sakes of him, quaint moonmarks, to
his pelted plumage under
(2) Wings [...]

The same goes for numerous other lines, like the ones opening Marianne Moore's "In Distrust of Merits" (*Moore*, p. 45):

- Strengthened to live, strengthened to die for
(3) Medals and positioned victories

On the other hand, the following example from T.S. Eliot's "Burbank with a Baedeker: Bleistein with a Cigar" (*Eliot*, p. 34) is a striking case of "retrospective enjambment":

- Princess Volupine extends
A meagre, blue-nailed, phthisic hand
To climb the waterstair. Lights, lights,
She entertains Sir Ferdinand
(4) Klein. [...]

I would like to comment briefly on each of the examples. Enjambment (1) - "I'll/Have" - is one of the rare cases where enjambment is genuinely prospective: if "I shall" (or "I will") were used instead of the contracted "I'll", the insertion of a

syntactic wedge preceded and/or followed by a pause between the auxiliary and the infinitive would be conceivable, however improbable; in the text as actually written, however, such a wedge is unlikely to the extreme, virtually impossible. On the other hand, in enjambment (2) — "under/Wings" — and in enjambment 3 — "for/Medals" — a wedge between the preposition and the noun is syntactically tolerable (see 5.1.2.3), so that these enjambments are not prospective in the strictest sense. Yet a quick glance at enjambment (4) — "Sir Ferdinand/Klein" — is sufficient to show, at least intuitively, that (1), (2) and (3) are all prospective, at least as compared to (4).

Although enjambments (2) and (3) are not based on total SMIU-anticipation, they are definitely highly probable. The introduction of syntactic wedges in these examples is a theoretical possibility, but the actual adoption of such a hypothetical practice would be much more surprising than the use of enjambment. In other words, from the reader's standpoint these are prospective examples, quite as prospective as enjambment (1), simply because enjambment is the most natural thing that the reader can syntactically expect when reading the last words of the first lines. It is only in the meticulous reading of the theorist or the analyst that the distinction between cases like enjambment (1) on the one hand and enjambments (2) and (3) on the other hand becomes apparent; and even when one is aware of this distinction, it is much more valid for linguistic than for poetic analysis. It is true that in enjambments (2) and (3) prospectiveness is not perfect from the theoretical linguist's point of view; yet, regardless of this indisputable fact, an "enjambmental" (i.e., syntactically pause-resistant) continuation is clearly anticipated here, and this mental fact is what matters in a poetic analysis.

As for example (4) — Eliot's "anti-Semitic enjambment" — its main impact is semantic rather than syntactic (see Harvey Gross's discussion, [196], 185-186). Yet it has its syntactic aspect as

well: syntactically, "Ferdinand" could be the end of the sentence, followed by a period (the British custom of omitting the surname after a forename preceded by "Sir" is supported here by prosodic structure: lineation, metre and rhyme). "Klein", then, comes here mainly as a semantic surprise, being an unexpected choice of a particular surname; but the very introduction of any surname at all under the cultural, syntactic and prosodic conditions of the text comes as a syntactic surprise.

The distinction just proposed, by definition, concerns enjambments: either as a confirmation or as a refutation of the reader's previous assumptions. It is only the dynamic questions of expectation versus surprise, rather than the end result, which account for the dichotomy. Now this distinction can theoretically be expanded to incorporate four, rather than two, categories, adding prospective and retrospective "nonenjambments" (i.e., end-stopped lines) to prospective and retrospective enjambments. Since absolute certainty of prediction is demonstrably rare to the point of nonexistence, an end-stopped line can be described as prospective whenever the pausal juncture at its end is predictable in advance, and as retrospective whenever it is not (i.e., the latter occurs whenever enjambment appears at first to be more probable).

Prospective end-stopped lines are self-evident and need no elaboration (virtually all the lines in the Whitman poems cited above can serve as examples). As for retrospective end-stopped lines (expected enjambments that surprise the reader as end-stopped), examples are infrequent, though such cases do occur. Thus, for instance, Marianne Moore's "Nevertheless" (*Moore*, pp. 38-39) — like many other poems of hers (see Beloof [44]) — abounds in strikingly effective enjambments. Most of these enjambments are strongly prospective, "prospectiveness" being often enhanced by line-end hyphens between parts of compound words, a device which produces great tension and offers immediate

relaxation when the compound word started in one line is completed in the next. It is against this background that one reads the interrogative sentence in lines 6-10:

- (6) [...] What better food
- (7) than apple seeds – the fruit
- (8) within the fruit – locked in
- (9) like counter-curved twin
- (10) hazelnuts? [...]

For my present purpose I would like to refer to the transition between lines (8) and (9) only. It is most probable and predictable that "in" at the end of line (8) should function as a preposition and that line (9) should begin with a noun, a pronoun or a noun-phrase. However, the real continuation modifies this probable syntactic expectation retrospectively: "in" is made to function adverbially rather than prepositionally, and a nonterminal pausal juncture after it is called for. In short, an expected enjambment turns out to be an end-stopped line, and this is what I call a retrospective end-stopped line.

Schematically, the four-way distinction can be described in a simple table. In this table A stands for syntactically-determined resistance to any pausal juncture at line-end and B stands for syntactically determined acceptability or likelihood of some pausal juncture at line-end, whether terminal or non-terminal; it is drawn as follows:

	Prospective		Retrospective	
	Prediction	End Result	Prediction	End Result
Enjambment	A	A	B	A
End-stopped line	B	B	A	B

As in my previous attempts at schematisation, there is a certain degree of oversimplification in this presentation as well. There are borderline cases of various types, which defy such demarcation lines. Moreover, the category of end-stopped lines is not subdivided here into terminal and nonterminal (the former characterised phonologically by terminal, or "falling", pausal junctures, psycholinguistically by the absence of syntactic tension and "depth", syntactically by structural completeness and graphically by a full-stop period; the latter is characterised, respectively, by nonterminal — "rising" or "sustained" — pausal junctures, SMAU-tension and some degree of "depth", structural incompleteness, and commas or semicolons). This distinction is important in its own right, but in the present context it would unnecessarily complicate matters, and it is therefore cancelled out in favour of the dichotomy between any juncture and no juncture. See Chapter 3, note 2.

5.8.2. Retrospective Recognition of Segmentational Ambiguity and the Integrity of the Line-Unit.

In the juxtaposition of enjambment with end-stopped lines, attention is naturally focused on the transition between lines: only the words immediately flanking the point of transition, or, at most, words in their nearest vicinity, are likely to receive their share of attention in enjambment analysis. Enjambment is traditionally regarded as a line-weakening device, whose action is focused on line-end. What I am trying to show here, however, is that enjambment may be used, paradoxically, to enhance line integrity through its potential contribution to the retrospective recognition of syntactic segmentational ambiguity. This may happen when a line that looks at first like a prospective enjambment is reinterpreted retrospectively as end-stopped.

A poem by E.E. Cummings (*Cummings*, 38) will serve as an example. I shall quote it in full, since there is no convenient point to stop quoting; but in discussing it I shall deliberately

ignore everything, including interesting techniques of syntax and lineation, that is not directly relevant to the interaction between the retrospective recognition of segmentational ambiguity and the integrity of the poetic line. The full quotation, though, enables the reader to refer the few lines discussed in detail to their context. The poem by Cummings is:

- (1) if i
- (2) or anybody don't
- (3) know where it her his
- (4) my next meal's coming from
- (5) i say to hell with that
- (6) that doesn't matter (and if
- (7) he she it or everybody gets a
- (8) bellyful without
- (9) lifting my finger i say to hell
- (10) with that i
- (11) say that doesn't matter) but
- (12) if somebody
- (13) or you are beautiful or
- (14) deep or generous what
- (15) i say is
- (16) whistle that
- (17) sing that yell that spell
- (18) that out big (bigger than cosmic
- (19) rays war earthquakes famine or the ex
- (20) prince of whoses diving into
- (21) a whatses to rescue miss nobody's
- (22) probably handbag) because i say that's not
- (23) swell (get me) babe not (understand me) lousy
- (24) kid that's something else my sweet (i feel that's
- (25) true)

Whereas the concepts of line division and line boundary focus our attention on the "negative" aspect of the poetic line (what distinguishes and separates it from other lines) the concept of line-integrity focuses our attention on its "positive" aspect (what makes it into one unit). The main question that I propose to discuss, then, with this poem as an illustration, is whether and how one can account for the fact that a number of given consecutive words were put together and presented before the reader as one poetic line. The more convincing this "putting together", the more autonomy, or integrity, the line possesses.

Let us look at each line in the poem separately: no more than four lines (5, 9 and 16, and perhaps, in a very contrived interpretation, line 17) can somehow qualify for potential integrity in isolation and in their entirety. But two or three more lines (4, 7, and perhaps also 18, if we ignore punctuation) are potentially terminal according to the preceding context, but not self-contained if isolated from that preceding context. In other words, these lines are potentially self-contained according to their ends but not according to their beginnings: end-stoppage is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for line integrity. Yet, when all these lines are considered in their full context (both preceding and following), only two of the former group (lines 5 and 16) and one of the latter group (line 4) realise their potential for integrity or terminality. The rest (lines 9 and 17 from the former group and lines 8 and 18 from the latter) prove to be retrospective enjambments (or, inasmuch as the enjambmental interpretation is more plausible from the beginning, they prove to be retrospective end-stopped lines).

So much for the identification of points of interplay between prospective and retrospective enjambment and end-stopped lines in the poem. As for the more specific problem of line integrity, I shall concentrate my discussion on what happens between lines 5 and 11. Here there is one obvious segmentation,

based on semantic, syntactic and idiomatic (collocational) considerations. This segmentation can be transcribed as follows (lineation omitted, punctuation mine):

I say: to hell with that! that doesn't matter. And
if he, she, it, or everybody, gets a bellyful — without
lifting my finger I say: to hell with that! I say:
that doesn't matter! [...]

Now the reading suggested by lineation deviates from the curve of pauses and emphases just proposed, and as a result several segmentation-alternatives emerge, just as in the segmentational ambiguities in Eliot's *Ash-Wednesday* discussed above. But unlike what happens in the Eliot poem, here the placing of line boundaries and the turning of prospective enjambments into retrospective end-stopped lines or vice versa are interwoven with the potential integrity of complete lines. Thus, lineation suggests the following alternative segmentation (allowed by syntax and meaning):

I say: to hell with that! that doesn't matter. And
if he, she, it, or everybody, gets a bellyful without
— lifting my finger I say: to hell! [or: I say to
hell:] with that I say: [or: with that, I say] that
doesn't matter! [...]

Two of the lines quoted here, lines 8 and 9, bring up the question of line integrity. Line 8, taken in isolation, is not self-contained; but the arrangement of the words in sentences and in lines grants line 8 at least a momentary terminality, and even a certain degree of autonomy, so that "bellyful without" (as if opposed to "bellyful within") emerges as an image in its own right. This is achieved both "positively", by making the two words form a line of their own, and "negatively", by forcibly severing the close syntactic ties connecting them with their nearest extralinear contexts: the first word, the noun "belly-

ful", with the indefinite article preceding it, and the second word, the preposition "without" (which is made to function adverbially, as it were, as in the example from Marianne Moore's "Nevertheless" analysed in 5.8.1 above), with the noun following it. In the latter case it is an idiomatic expression ("without lifting my finger") which is dismembered by lineation. The clash between idiomatic cohesion and the line boundary splitting it makes the effect of the peculiar lineation still stronger: it is a sense of "organised violence" (in Jakobson's sense [594], 16, as quoted in Erlich, [132], 219), committed by lineation against syntax twice in a row. This sense works at the same time centrifugally, tearing line 8 apart, and centripetally, holding it together. The latter action is achieved paradoxically by the extremity of this deautomatising peculiar lineation, that seeks some sort of justification. The natural place to look for such a syntactic and/or semantic justification is the focus of the entire process — line 8. Surprisingly enough, this line is not only a receptacle of syntactic residues and leftovers of adjacent lines, but also a syntactically and semantically viable unit.

The reader of the poem may by now be tempted to go on following the instructions of lineation; and, sure enough, the next line (line 9) may also be read as a syntactically self-contained unit, as shown above. This lineation once again undermines the integrity of an idiomatic expression ("to hell with that"). The same expression, incidentally, appeared previously in the poem, in line 5, where it was upheld by lineation. Using two conflicting line divisions for the same idiomatic expression "defeats its own purpose": on the one hand, the repetition encourages the reader to ignore lineation and stick to the familiar idiom when it reappears; on the other hand, the reader is also encouraged to somehow legitimatise the differences in lineation by adapting his reading to the line division.³³

³³In a poem much more complex and interesting than this one

The result is, of course, that according to one reading the speaker is saying whatever he has to say "lifting his finger", while according to the other he is saying it "without lifting his finger"; and according to one reading he is asking what happens "if he she it or everybody gets a bellyful" (which suggests eating), while according to the other reading the question is what happens if everybody gets "a bellyful without" (which suggests quite the opposite of eating, though vaguely). Can these readings or interpretations be described as compatible, or mutually complementary, or are they mutually exclusive, one reading being right and the other wrong?

The obviously deliberate, carefully planned nature of the whole complex of syntactic structure and lineation here, as shown above, leaves little room to suppose that the copresence of various alternative readings is coincidental. It is quite obvious that the ambiguity resulting from the mutual interpenetration of different readings in the same text is a built-in device, and that the hovering tension between them, their simultaneous coexistence in a perpetual state of unresolved conflict, is what really matters in the poem. Any total preference of one of them while rejecting the other misrepresents one of the main features of this poem's composition.

(the first line is "these children singing in stone a", *Cummings*, 47) Cummings uses a word-splitting enjambment similarly. Lines 5-6 (I am quoting from the middle of a sentence, in accordance with lineation) are:

ever these silently lit
tle children are petals

Whereas line 19 consists of the word(s) "lit tle", where spacing is at the same time reminiscent of, and different from, the earlier line-division. Once the potential of the first syllable of "little" to be the participle "lit" has been realised by line division, Cummings reminds us of this potential by demonstrating that lineation is not indispensable for producing this effect. See Chapter 3, note 14.

This does not imply, however, that the various interpretations carry exactly the same thematic weight. The "straight-forward" interpretation (transcribed above first) must be foregrounded on the strictly thematic, paraphrasable level of the poem, while the other readings and their interrelationships with the "straightforward" one are foregrounded on the "textural" or "compositional" (depending on one's favourite terminology) level of the poem, as a hindsight discovery of the hidden potentialities residing in a sequence of words and unnoticed in ordinary expedient reading. Obviously, this is a decisive contribution to the text's poeticalness, deautomatisation, density, etc.; but interplay between the specific semantic messages interwoven here contributes to the interpretation of the text on a higher thematic level as well.

Without attempting a full-fledged interpretation of the text, I can hint at the direction of an interpretation that should try to relate these lines' compositional technique to their thematic message. Such an interpretation should point out that the speaker's attitude to his theme is characterised by "that doesn't matter", "to hell with that", and the interchangeability of "he she it or everybody" and "it her his my". If so, it really doesn't matter, for that matter, whether what anybody gets is a bellyful with or without "within" or "without", or whether the speaker lifts or doesn't lift his finger (what is the great difference, anyway?), or which of the proposed interpretations for lines 9-11 is correct, when it all leads up to yet another "that doesn't matter". In other words, the seemingly irreconcilable semantic contents and their correlative incompatible syntactic segmentations coexist in perpetually unresolved conflict as described, but this very conflict perfectly conforms to the thematic message of the text as a whole.

Finally, this poem — in spite, or perhaps because, of its foregrounding of line units and line divisions — is another proof

of the almost unchallengeable predominance of syntactic over poetic segmentation. Poetic lineation as such — no matter how conventionalised, manneristic and autonomous it has become throughout the ages — cannot by itself give autonomy and integrity to a line of poetry. Lines like "or you are beautiful or" (line 13) and "he she it or everybody gets a" (line 7) are not integral, self-contained units, because they lack the syntactic and semantic cohesion to make them discrete, whereas lines like 8 and 9 could potentially be read as end-stopped not because they are written as poetic lines but because syntactic and semantic legitimation for reading them as end-stopped can be found. On the other hand, a smooth syntactically governed reading (along the lines proposed in the first transcription above) is not pre-conditioned by congruity with lineation. There is no doubt in my mind that most readers, if asked to propose a hierarchy ranging from the most vital and essential to the most dispensable and superfluous elements in their reading of this poem, would place making lingual sense out of the whole muddle much higher up than accounting for lineation. Line integrity is totally dependent on lingual legitimation, while the integrity of lingual units needs no legitimation outside itself. Compositional and formal support may add strength to the integrity and cohesion of units of language; but the absence of this support, and even a clash between the two, can at best offer a set of alternatives, but it can never totally eradicate genuine lingual (syntactic and/or semantic) integrity inherent in a word-sequence as such.

Schematically, three basic types of retrospective confirmation of line division can be distinguished. Lineation can offer (a) a semantic alternative resulting from expressive emphasis and/or unexpected pause without segmentational ambiguity being suggested by the word-sequence; (b) a syntactic alternative resulting from the realisation of potential segmentational ambiguity without affecting the line as a whole; (c) a syntactic alternati

where the segmentational ambiguity gathers strength from, and lends its own support to, the integrity of the line as an autonomous, self-contained unit. Each of these types can be subdivided into the retrospective confirmation of enjambments and end-stopped lines, and a finer distinction can also be proposed by elaborating the relevant ideas already put forward, notably the ones concerning the various parameter interrelationships.

The basic three types just distinguished can be represented by the transitions between lines 7-8, 18-19, and 8-9 respectively.³⁴

The degree of integrity and self-sufficiency of the single poetic line is one of the features characteristic of a poet, school, genre, etc. It is not to be confused with "density", because semantic density, for instance, can transcend the limits of the line, while a self-sufficient line can be devoid of density (as often happens in children's poems). Enjambment, almost by definition, seems to be a direct challenge to the integrity of the poetic line, rather than to its density. The present subsection has shown that, under special circumstances, enjambment can paradoxically enhance the very feature of the poetic line that it is designed to undermine.

The role of lineation in the manipulation of intonation, syntax, word-order, semantic symmetry and parallelism, thematic structure, and many other aspects of the text, is not preconditioned by line integrity: on the contrary, the manifold tasks that have skilfully been performed by the line as a characteristic unit of poetry, even when it is devoid of integrity, have made the reader aware of it as an independent unit, easily recognisable because of its graphic discreteness. This graphic discreteness can then be used as an "empty slot": the reader is

³⁴Cummings' techniques of manipulating line integrity are characteristic of the potentials offered by free verse. The metrical near-equivalent of his practices is the technique of "straddles lines"; see below, 6.1.2.2.

conditioned by the features of many lines he has read to associate the graphic discreteness with these features. Thus, Cummings makes use of this "empty slot" expectation as just described, on the basis of the conventional expectations of the reader.

5.8.3. Conclusion.

The answer to Question 8 in 5.0.4 has been given both in regard to line boundaries and complete lines. This section has completed my presentation of enjambment within the framework of a (prospective-retrospective) dynamic approach to poetic syntax.

5.9. SYNTACTIC TENSION AT LINE-END: CONCLUSION.

5.9.1. The Syntactically Incomplete Poem: An Excursus.

So far, my entire discussion has been concerned with texts that, when viewed statically, can be described as syntactically complete. In "retrospective" analyses this is demonstrably so: such analyses are by definition carried out from the standpoint of completed utterances. But even when the prospective procedure was used, a point of assessment or line boundary was only momentarily isolated from the flow of the text as if it were the last supplied item. The application of this procedure is always based on the understanding that the utterance should eventually meet the minimal requirements of syntactic completeness.

However, in very rare cases one can speak of "segmentational ungrammaticality": the entire text of the poem fails to meet the minimal requirements of syntactic completeness, and the whole poem, rather than a small part of it that is artificially isolated for the purpose of analysis, is syntactically incomplete. In such cases line-end-syntactic-tension at the end of the poem is purely prospective. Here, just as in syntactically regular poems, syntactic expectations can be subclassified as governed by SMIU-anticipation, SMAU-anticipation or indeterminate openness, on the

basis of previous material only; but whereas in "regular" poems such subclassification is tentative, pending verification or falsification, in syntactically incomplete poems expectations remain forever in the status of expectations. Thus, a poem can end with SMIU-tension (e.g., with a preposition, an article, etc.) or with SMAU-tension (e.g., with an initial subordinate clause that is not followed by the syntactically indispensable main clause).

Cases of syntactically incomplete poems are very rare. Reading hundreds of poems, by various poets in the English language, from Shakespeare to Cummings, I found very few examples (e.g., poems in *Cummings*, 35, 49 and 64),³⁵ most of which are borderline cases rather than unequivocally syntactically incomplete poems. Implicitly, as by circumstantial evidence, we can learn that the phenomenon is extremely rare from the following fact: Barbara Herrnstein Smith's *Poetic Closure* [465], which is a richly illustrated book subtitled "A Study of How Poems End", does not refer to syntactically incomplete poems as a separate theoretical category, nor does it cite such poems in the examples (with the possible ambiguous exception of the Cummings poem cited in [465], 256).

³⁵Cummings' way of ending poems is characterised by Barbara Herrnstein Smith ([465], 255) as follows:

[...] Cummings' familiar uses and abuses of grammar, punctuation, typography, lineation, and space conceal fairly conventional thematic structures and — what concerns us here — modes of closure. By placing ordinarily terminal punctuation at the BEGINNING of a concluding line, by ending a poem with a comma or semicolon, by disarranging normal word order or just by leaving sentences and phrases syntactically incomplete, Cummings can avoid the unwanted expressive qualities of strong closure. At the same time, however, through occasional rhyme or systematic half-rhyme, through repetition, closural allusions, and absolute assertions, he usually secures an adequate sense of stability and finality.

Since the phenomenon is so negligible statistically, it can be ignored without doing injustice to the fair sampling of syntactic practices in the work of poets. However, a reference to the theoretical possibility of syntactically incomplete poems is indispensable for the neat schematic mapping of the field of line-end syntactic tension. Such a systematic coverage of this field must be based on distinctions between theoretically possible categories, rather than on a descriptive account of the inventory of frequent or significant line-end tension types that I came across in reading poetry.³⁶ Whatever the reasons for the extreme rarity of "the syntactically incomplete poem", it is only the potential feasibility of the phenomenon that matters for the schematic table.

The logic behind the inclusion of "the syntactically incomplete poem" in the schematic table of line-end tension is simple: laying stress on the dynamic, prospective-retrospective approach to line-end syntactic tension is perhaps the most specific contribution that the present study can hope to make to the study of enjambment. The purely prospective tension, characteristic of the syntactically-incomplete poem, is an indispensable component of a table designed to supply a model of the prospective-retrospective syntactic relationships that can potentially affect line-end tension.³⁷

³⁶In a paper entitled "Tensions between Syntactic Units and the Unit of the Poem as a Whole in Some Modern Hebrew Poems" which I presented at the 6th World Congress of Jewish Studies (Jerusalem, August 1973; English Abstract p. C-94) I analysed several modern Hebrew poems, by Natan Alterman, Lea Goldberg, Natan Zach and Yehuda Amichai, that can be described, partly or entirely, as cases of purely prospective, or segmentationally ungrammatical, texts. For reasons of language and scope I refrain from analysing these Hebrew examples here.

³⁷The syntactically incomplete poem, rare as it is "in the field", has far-reaching theoretical implications that concern a comprehensive theory of literature and even a general theory of art and aesthetics, because it sharpens our perception and

Because of the marginal nature of the phenomenon I have refrained from subclassifying it into different types of permanent and temporary syntactic incompleteness in poetry, and concentrated on the most significant type — the complete poem that fails to meet the minimal segmental "surface-structure" requirements of a regular single sentence.

5.9.2. Summarising the Dynamic Approaches to the Syntactic Dimension of Enjambment: A Schematic Table of Syntactic Tension at the End of a Poetic Segment.

The following is an attempt to condense into a schematised table everything said in this chapter about the various types of syntactic tension which operate at the end of a poetic segment (line, stanza, complete poem). This table is a recapitulation of most of the material presented throughout Chapter 5. It maps the field of line-end syntactic tension in a nutshell, while in 5.1.1.2 and 5.1.1.3 I proposed a mapping of the entire field of intonational tension.

For the reader of this study the table must be self-explanatory by now. It is drawn from the standpoint of the last word of a poetic segment (a line, but also a stanza or a complete poem), provided that it carries some kind of syntactic expectation (i.e., it cannot be a last word of a sentence). The various combinations of "prospectivity" with SMIU- and SMAU-relations are

awareness of the potentialities and limitations of "closure" and "framing effects" (see Smith [465], especially pp. 211-212). In my lecture mentioned in note 36 I showed how the fact that a whole poem is shorter than a single complete sentence works both for and against the perception of the poem as a closed, self-contained "aesthetic object".

These theoretical implications are naturally outside the scope of the present study: I mention them in this footnote as a glimpse of the wide perspectives that this statistically negligible phenomenon can offer for a general theory of literature and art.

arranged schematically to clarify their interrelations and overlappings, discrepancies and congruities.

Syntactic openness is not represented in the table: in this context it is a "negative" category (a low degree of syntactic anticipation). The table, for the sake of schematic neatness, represents clear-cut polar categories (rather than borderline indeterminate ones, like openness).

The table appears on p. 235.

SYNTACTIC TENSION AT THE END OF A POETIC UNIT

<p>The Direction of Perceiving Intonational Nature of Juncture (Pause) in Pre-verified Text</p>	<p>A. Prospective-Retrospective (tension resolved within regular syntax)</p>	<p>B. Purely Retrospective (tension resolved as in A)</p>	<p>C. Purely Prospective (tension unresolved (irregular syntax))</p>
<p>1. Nonterminal pausal juncture: SMAU, end-stopped.</p>	<p>A1. SMAU-anticipation; initial subordination; predictability and anticipation of nonterminal pausal juncture.</p>	<p>B1. No anticipation; poetic unit potentially complete. Prospectiveness possibly created by intonation and punctuation, not syntax; tension unexpected.</p>	<p>C1. SMAU-anticipation probability based. No resolution, no verification. Anticipation never materialised. Text syntactically incomplete.</p>
<p>2. No pausal juncture (SMIU, enjambment).</p>	<p>A2. SMIU-anticipation; syntactic completeness or subordination irrelevant; predictability and anticipation of pause resistance - paradigmatic and syntagmatic.</p>	<p>B2. No anticipation; syntactic completeness or subordination irrelevant; pause-resistant continuation unexpected.</p>	<p>C2. SMIU-anticipation probability based. No resolution, no verification. Anticipation never materialised. Text syntactically incomplete.</p>

6. NONSYNTACTIC DIMENSIONS OF ENJAMBMENT: A SURVEY

6.0. AN EXPOSITION OF THE PRESENT CHAPTER.

6.0.1. Preliminary.

This last chapter is a survey of the nonsyntactic dimensions or aspects of enjambment. Each of these aspects is important, interesting and varied enough to become the legitimate topic of a full-fledged scholarly treatment in its own right. But since the present study is concerned primarily with the syntactic aspects of the theory of enjambment, I shall confine myself to general observations about questions and perspectives of its nonsyntactic aspects. These observations will usually be made without illustrations pretending to do justice to their own structures, functions and ramifications.

It is only in the context of a study like this one, then, that the dichotomy of "syntactic versus nonsyntactic" has any meaning. There is nothing in the nature or structure of rhythm, metre, meaning, and intonation, or in the problems of the oral interpretation of poetry, which turns all of them into a homogeneous group opposed to syntax. It is only because of the predominantly syntactic focus of the present study, and for its limited purpose alone, that the dichotomy between the syntactic and the nonsyntactic is made to function as a dichotomy between the central and the peripheral.

6.0.2. The Major Questions Discussed in the Present Chapter.

Throughout the present study in general, and in the Definition in particular, enjambment has been described as an intersection between syntax, intonation, prosody and meaning. Since a survey of its nonsyntactic aspects is the subject of the present chapter, the major questions discussed in the chapter are:

Question 1: What are the major interrelations and interac-

tions between enjambment and the text's prosodic patterns (rhythm, metre, rhyme and sound-pattern)?

Question 2: What are the major interrelations and interactions between enjambment and the patterns and functions of the text's intonation?

Question 3: What are the major interrelations and interactions between enjambment and the patterns and functions of the text's semantics?

As usual in the present study, sections 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 are designed to answer Questions 1, 2 and 3, respectively. However, since these answers are often general, unsubstantiated observations with no claim for systematic coverage of subjects, there was no point in concluding every section with a recapitulation of how it answers the question (unlike my practice in previous chapters).

6.1. PROSODIC ASPECTS OF ENJAMBMENT.

6.1.1. Nonmetrical Rhythmical Aspects.

The separate analysis of nonmetrical rhythmical components (or parameters) of enjambment will suffer badly from the predominantly syntactic focus of the present study. Some of the main contributions of this parameter have actually been discussed above, since SL and lineation are two very important members in the class of phenomena which make up the nonmetrical contribution to the rhythm of a poem. The only other components that I can think of are word-length and the stress pattern of the sentence. As for the former, its potential contribution to enjambment as such (unlike its potential contribution to the overall rhythm of a poem) is quite limited and therefore it will not be discussed in its own right. As for the latter, it will be dealt with under the heading of intonation, though superficially.

6.1.2. Concerning the Metrical Aspect of Enjambment.

In 2.1.3 I said that "[...] the concept of metre must figure prominently in any discussion of the nature of enjambment [...]". An exposition of the problems and dimensions of the metrical parameter of intonational tension was offered in 5.1.1.3 and 5.1.1.4. The present subsection concludes my presentation of the contribution of the parameter of metre to enjambment (under the limitations imposed on the discussion of nonsyntactic aspects of enjambment in the present study).

The main feature of metre relevant to the present discussion is that it unequivocally strengthens the line unit: other things being equal, a metrical line is more autonomous and cohesive than a line of free verse. Generally speaking, without special reference to the end of the line, the more regular the metre, the less likely it is to be obliterated by enjambment. But at the end of the line the reverse is true: irregularity which is strictly confined to the end of the line makes it more conspicuous and strengthens its resistance to continuous syntax (see below). Metre can thus affect the reader's decisions of how to read and what to emphasise; and such decisions, after all, are the most important *raison d'être* of lineation and enjambment. In this sense the metrical design of the poem plays a decisive role in its oral, and then its overall, interpretation.

Apart from these general, almost trivial statements, I shall confine my discussion to two specific matters, which pertain to enjambment in metrical poetry only: (1) the influence of metrical regularity or irregularity at the transition between lines on intonational tension; (2) the problem of "straddled lines".

6.1.2.1. *The Contribution of Metrical Regularity at the Transition between Lines to Enjambment.* Let us consider the basic scheme of iambic pentameter as representative of metrical poetry (I shall deliberately treat this scheme intuitively, in

broad outline, without getting involved in the theoretical controversies which have lately evolved around some of its details). It is common knowledge that, in the iambic pentameter tradition, the norm of metrical regularity tends to be less exacting at both ends of the poetic line (and near the caesura) than in the middle of the line (if there is no caesura). Within the framework of the present study, however, the focus of interest is the contribution of the degree of metrical regularity at the transition between the lines to the nature of enjambment. In other words, the present study is concerned with the question: How can metre strengthen or weaken each of the two forces colliding in enjambment (syntactic intonation pushing the reader forward and the line unit holding him back)?

In iambic pentameter there are four basic conventional possibilities in this connection, and these possibilities will be the only ones discussed here. An iambic pentameter line can have either a masculine or a feminine ending, and the next line can have either a regular (iambic) or an inverted (trochaic) beginning (first foot). Consequently, there are four possible combinations at the transition:

1. Masculine ending, iambic beginning (iambic transition).
2. Feminine ending, trochaic beginning (trochaic transition).
3. Masculine ending, trochaic beginning (spondeic transition).
4. Feminine ending, iambic beginning (pyrrhical transition).

Since uninterrupted metrical regularity enhances smooth reading and unimpeded transition from line to line, under "iambic circumstances" the four possibilities just listed are arranged in ascending order of enjambment-resistance (or descending order of pause-resistance).

This is the isolated contribution of a single aspect of the parameter of metre; it really works this way only if all other things are equal. But the principle is simple enough, and it can easily be modified and adapted to suit metres other than iambic pentameter.

6.1.2.2. "*Straddled Lines*" and *Enjambment*. In his "'Prose Rhythms' and Metre" [150] Roger Fowler quotes Frank Kermode's reference to "[...] sentences or clauses which start in the middle of the line and end half-way through the next, forming a pentameter within two pentameters" ([150], 90). Fowler, after Kermode, calls this phenomenon by the name of "straddled lines".

In Shakespeare's *King Lear*, for example, the following passage appears in IV, iii, 18-23:

[...] You have seen
Sunshine and rain at once: her smiles and tears
Were like a better way: those happy smilets
That played on her ripe lip seemed not to know
What guests were in her eyes, which parted thence
As pearls from diamonds dropped.

With minimal changes in the first and the third lines the text could be rewritten as follows:

You may have seen sunshine and rain at once:
Her smiles and tears were like a better way
Those happy smiles that played on her ripe lip
Seemed not to know what guests were in her eyes,
Which parted thence as pearls from diamonds dropped.

This is quite a striking example of "straddled lines". As in the Cummings' example in 5.8.2, a hidden potential for two alternative arrangements emerges from the structure of the text. But here the similarity between the two examples ends: in "straddled lines" it is first and foremost metre, rather than syntax or

lineation, that "plays counterpoint" with itself: the units of syntax possess greater metrical regularity than the metrical lines, and produce, as it were, perfect end-stopped pentameter. Metre is thus made, quite paradoxically, to support syntax in its struggle against the line unit, and there seems to be a change of roles between line boundaries and caesuras. But still, the original lineation must be reflected in the reading: "straddled lines", precisely because they are so "easily convertible" into regular end-stopped lines, cannot be accidental.

Metre can contribute in a variety of ways to the structure and effect of enjambment through its interaction with other parameters, notably syntax. Its contribution can be surprisingly versatile. "Straddled lines" are a very interesting case in point: metre lends its support to lineation and to syntax almost equally, both interwoven segmentations being here metrically justified. Metre is thus deeply involved in the "conflict" but, at the same time, it is neutralised by itself, which leaves things as they were: as a conflict between syntax and lineation.

"Straddled lines" give a special meaning to the status of metre as a stable background norm, a home-base that one departs from and returns to. Enjambment is one of the potentially most striking means at a poet's disposal to make the reader more keenly aware of these departures and returns. Enjambment and metre can also be described as "deautomatising" each other: the "organised violence" of metre deautomatises everyday language, while the rebelling syntax deautomatises the steady, monotonous pulse of the metrical scheme.

6.1.3. A Note on Rhyme and Sound Pattern in Relation to Enjambment.

Once again, the two topics deserve separate and independent discussion, but since they are less directly associated with syntax than rhythm and metre, they will be discussed extremely briefly,

just to indicate the direction of further research.

Sound patterns (see Hrushovski [249]; see also Masson, [351]-[353]) — e.g., sound repetitions and sound analogies — may make enjambment more predictable or more surprising; they may strengthen and/or weaken the line unit and/or the syntactic segment; in short, they may contribute to, and interact with, other parameters (and with themselves, as metre does in "straddled lines") in a variety of ways through their distribution in relation to other components of the text. By analysing typical examples one can closely examine their working, notably their interaction with syntax and meaning. Unfortunately, I should leave these perspectives open to future research.

Rhyme (I am referring now to conventional, line-end rhyme) is a more institutionalised sound pattern; it is much more closely linked with syntax, lineation and enjambment. It is one of the most important and most established indications of line end, and as such it is clearly a line-reinforcing factor. Its usual contribution is in this direction; other things being equal, enjambment in rhymed poetry is potentially much more acute than in unrhymed poetry, because the strong resistance of the line to syntax sharpens the sense of conflict. Thus, for instance, in Eliot's "Sir Ferdinand/Klein" enjambment, or in the lines quoted from Hopkins' "Henry Purcell" (see 5.8.1), rhyme plays an important role in producing the special acuteness of enjambment.

Rhyme is a very complex phenomenon (see, for example, Žirmunskij [549] and Hrushovski [250], [251]). Through its direct influence of prospective expectations and retrospective recognition of poetic structuration (lineation, stanza structures, strophic formulae, generic conventions, etc.) it greatly contributes to the creation of intricate nets of forward- and backward-oriented perceptions. Thus, depending on the nature of a rhyme scheme and the specific place occupied by a specific rhymed enjambment in relation to that scheme, rhyme can enhance "pros-

pectivity" or "retrospectivity". The most acute enjambments occur when the schemes of rhyme and metre reach a clear point of terminality with the last word of a line, while the same word starts a very cohesive syntactic unit that ends in the next line (see Fowler [150], 88; see my discussion in 3.5.1).

Finally, if a system of internal rhyme is developed instead of, or in addition to, the conventional system of line-end rhyme, the linking of rhymes may contribute to the strengthening of the internal rhyme caesura against the end of the line.

These are admittedly general and oversimplified remarks concerning a very complex topic, but I cannot go beyond this point in order to adhere to the purposes of the present study.

6.2. ENJAMBMENT, INTONATION, AND THE PROBLEM OF ORAL RENDITION.

6.2.1. The "Purely Intonational" Aspect of the Oral and/or Auditory Interpretation of Enjambment.

This aspect can be described (with a certain necessary amount of oversimplification) as a complex of two basic questions:

- (1) Which of the two forces colliding in enjambment is to get the upper hand in the (actual or imagined) intonation of reading?
- (2) Once the former question has been answered, what is the exact manifestation of this answer in terms of intonation contours?

The two questions are usually discussed together, although they are basically separate.¹ By following the discussions and

¹ See, for instance, discussions by theorists directly or indirectly associated with the "Russian Formalist" and "Czech Structuralist" schools of thought: Žirmunskij ([551], 167-168; English translation in [537], 163-165), Jakobson ([260], 367), Bernštejn ([541], 39-40), Tomáševskij ([577], 441), Mukařovský ([370], 128-129), Hrushovski ([247], 186), Tynjanov ([578], 102-103), Xolševnikov ([585], 68). See also Leech ([303], 123-128), and Kell ([278], 342-344). This list is far from exhaustive, but it gives a fair cross-section of prevalent views on the complex of topics under discussion.

controversies in the literature the reader can get a reasonably comprehensive view of the main questions asked and the reasons and answers given in this connection. On the basis of such a survey of the literature (part of which is cited in notes 1 and 2), I came to my own conclusions concerning these two questions. As can be seen from comparing these conclusions with the literature which prompted them, they are a selection of my preferences of some scholars' views to others', rather than my own original contributions to the theory of the oral interpretation of enjambment.

As for question (1) above, my opinion is that the reader's oral or auditory interpretation should strive to reflect the contrapuntal conflict between the two colliding forces by some kind of compromise. Such a compromise should at least focus the listener's (or the reader's own) attention on the abnormality and irregularity invariably inherent in enjambmental interlinear transitions. In principle, any reading should be instrumental in promoting the listener's (or the reader's) awareness of the potential of enjambment as a complex, carefully calculated artistic device, designed to reshape and replace the mode of reading. What may be termed "a high-fidelity reading" should respond "[...] to the clues which the text provides for the readers for grouping, pausing, emphasis, breathing, etc." (quoted from Hrushovski [247] 181-182). By so doing this ideal reading can convey the complexity of the text and do justice to the fact that its lineation peculiarities, though not always multifunctional (see below), are invariably designed and deliberate. It is my opinion, then, that if the poet took pains to plant enjambmental obstacles on the otherwise smooth path of reading, the reader or reciter should not save himself the trouble of trying to follow the poet's intonational instructions, testing whether and how they make sense. In this respect lineation is not different from any other feature in the text.

Using this general principle of "high fidelity" reading (alias

the compromise or "contrapuntal" reading) as a point of departure, a more specific point can be made: in most cases the two colliding forces are not equal, and generally the syntactic and intonational structure of the text-as-language, though deformed to a greater or lesser extent by lineation (see Hrushovski [247], 186), is never totally obliterated by it.

As for question (2) above, the problem of the exact mode of recitation of a poem does not lie clearly within the domain of poetics (as the science concerned with the analysis of the literary text); it belongs more clearly to the study of declamation or recitation as such.²

At any rate, most scholars (myself concurring) agree, that there is no uniform interpretation of how enjambments should sound (all references in notes 1-3 apply here). Granted that, in principle, enjambments should not be ignored in performance, nobody can ever lay down general rules governing the implementation of this principle (e.g., that a prospective enjambment, PCR, after a caesura in the fourth iamb, should last 1.25 seconds with the pitch rising 1 tone, or similar nonsense, or even that in such a case pitch must rise). What is applicable here is the absence of

² As in other topics in poetics and literary theory, many scholars in the English-speaking world lag behind some of their Russian and Czech colleagues and predecessors in terms of rigour and lucidity. See, for instance, the views and practices of Chatman (especially in [78], [81] and [83]) and his argument in [83] with Loesch ([325], [326]). See also his controversies with Fowler (who challenges in [150] Chatman's [81]) and with Levin (challenging in [308] Chatman's [78]); see also McCormack [341]. Compared to Chatman (and, to a certain extent, even compared to his opponents), one can find in Žirmunskij ([551], 14; English translation in [537], 16), and more specifically in Bernštejn ([541], especially 25) a sharper and clearer distinction between two separate, though interrelated, arts: written literature and its oral rednition. This distinction entails a parallel distinction between separate (though, once again, interrelated) disciplines of theory and research designed to study these arts and analyse them systematically. See Chapter 2, note 10.

any such rule: enjambments can affect pitch, and/or loudness and or duration (tempo) at line-end and at its nearest vicinity; but how this is done, in what proportion and combination between the relevant ingredients, in what relation to the general structure of the text — these and similar questions have to be answered individually in each text according to its unique syntactic, semantic, thematic and rhythmical structure.

I have just said that these questions should be answered according to each individual text, not according to each individual reader. I agree with those scholars who maintain that in matters of oral performance there is a hierarchy, ranging from the least to the most obligatory. It would start, at one extreme with optional inflexions and highly individual, expressive employment of "paralinguistic" voice-productions, and would end, at the other extreme, with the totally mandatory vocal execution, or auditory imagination, of the conventionalised, automatic correspondences between pausal junctures and syntactic segment boundaries. Between the two extremes there are cases of semantic and syntactic clues for intonation, with lingual and/or literary structure allowing varying degrees of leeway for personal interpretation. The legitimate interest of poetics lies in the text, and in that part of intonation that can be shown to reside and inhere in its inner relationships.³

The present study, quite naturally, is concerned with phenomena that are nearer to the "obligatory pole" and can be discussed in relatively objective terms.

³ Many studies tackle the problem of the obligatory versus the optional in the oral interpretation of written texts. See, for instance, Smith ([466], especially 71), Wellek and Warren ([519], 145), Wimsatt and Beardsley ([533], 95-96), and Hrushovski ([247], 181-182). See Gleason ([185], 44) for a linguist's view of the problem. References cited in notes 1 and 2 above and in note 4 below are partly applicable here as well, due to subject-overlapping.

6.2.2. "The Residue Theory":⁴ The Hierarchy between Syntactic and Semantic Roles of Intonation.

Syntactic intonation consists of three basic pausal junctures ("falling", "rising" and "sustained"); these junctures, as indicated by the quoted terminology, are primarily characterised by their pitch-direction. Now some nonsyntactic messages, notably "attitudinal", "emotive" or "expressive" messages, are also conveyed by intonation: basically the same mechanism of voice-production and voice perception is responsible for simultaneously performing (at least) two separate tasks, or conveying (at least) two distinct types of information: information regarding the formal identification of the syntactic segmentation (IC analysis) of the utterance and information regarding nonsyntactic properties of the utterance, notably emotive and attitudinal ones. The basic questions are, then, (a) how this is done and (b) how this concerns the theory of enjambment.

In answering the first question one has to distinguish between the middle of an SMIU and its end. In the middle there can be no problems of copresence of elements of syntactic and elements of nonsyntactic intonation, simply because the former, by definition, appear only at the ends (or boundaries) of SMIUs. As

⁴ Once again, I very reluctantly discuss linguistic problems, as I have done whenever the work of linguists could not supply the necessary tools for my own study. In the present case, the proposed "residue theory" is partly based on a number of writings in the literature. However, I have never come across this theory, as presented here, in the linguistic literature. At any rate, this linguistic theory is a tentative proposal.

As for the relevant references, see Timofeev ([572], 29-30), Kurath ([292], especially 130), and particularly Gantzel ([178]; I could not get hold of the full text). I am indebted to some of the conceptual approaches underlying these works for my "residue theory". I am also greatly indebted to Crystal [104] for anything that I can say about intonation.

several intonation theorists have shown (e.g., Crystal [104], 264; the actual wording and terminology are mine), the introduction of pausal junctures in the middle of SMIUs is likely to be interpreted as changing the syntactic segmentation of the given word-sequence, making the otherwise single SMIU into two SMIUs (e.g., the difference between "John" as an apposition in "My friend John is sick" and "John" as vocative in "My friend, John, is sick"). As shown above, this depends on the word-sequence being susceptible to more than one legitimate syntactic segmentation (IC analysis).

The clearer case, where (to paraphrase Kurath [292], 130) the problem of "the relative share" of syntax, referential meaning and emotive or attitudinal meaning in intonation is much more acute, is the case of the end of the SMIU. Here, by definition, there is an obligatory pausal juncture or a point of syntactic intonation; but, at the same time, intonation conveys "emotive" or "attitudinal" information. Moreover, since the end of an SMIU is a point of rest, where the pace of delivery and reception of language is relatively slowed down, nonsyntactic (just as well as syntactic) information is given more time to capture the perceiver's attention. It follows, then, that while the middle of SMIUs may convey a certain amount of attitudinal information, the main burden of conveying all kinds of information (syntactic and nonsyntactic alike) through intonation rests on the ends of SMIUs.

The interrelations between syntactic and attitudinal (or emotive) components of intonation at the end of SMIUs can at least partly be accounted for by "the residue theory" that I am about to propose.

The theory consists of the following points:

1. The components of intonation which convey syntactic information are first and foremost pitch direction (e.g., falling, rising, sustained) which is mandatory for the given syntactic

relationship, and a characteristic pitch interval, with concomitant characteristic changes in duration (pause) and loudness (emphasis). The latter three factors are characteristic and conventional, but not as mandatory as the pitch direction. Taken together, they constitute the syntactic intonation of any utterance.

2. Observing the strict constraints of the mandatory pitch direction, all prosodic or paralinguistic (see Crystal [104], 128-131) extensions of, departures from, or additions to, the conventional norms of syntactic intonation, as just described in point (1) above, are the components of intonation which convey "emotive" or "attitudinal" information.

This formulation requires some elaboration and clarification. For the sake of clarity and simplicity, I shall concentrate on pitch, which is the crucial factor here. According to the proposed theory, then, syntactic information resides in the mandatory direction of pitch but also in a characteristic pitch-interval, which is not exact, depending as it does upon a large number of heterogeneous variables (e.g., the meaning of the sentence as a whole and the meaning of the words which carry the syntactic intonation; SL considerations; personal idiosyncrasies of individual speakers; etc.) All these differences, however, reflect and preserve a basic norm of pitch-interval. This norm can be described more loosely or broadly when applicable to a general phenomenon (e.g., the characteristic rising pitch interval at the end of initial subordinate clauses in English) and more precisely when applicable to a limited phenomenon (e.g., the characteristic rising pitch interval at the end of short subordinate phrases in the speech of a certain individual); but it is always there, and all other intonation phenomena are referable to it.

Let us suppose, then, for the sake of argument, that within a given frame of reference (e.g., a specific text uttered by an

identified individual) the norm of "neutral" syntactic intonation at the end of initial subordinate clauses is something around a rising minor third (e.g., rising from A to C in musical notes). Now, the speaker (who is generally expected to, and usually does, adhere to this norm) utters a particular instance of syntactic transition with something nearer to a rising fourth than to the expected third (reaching something between C-sharp and D instead of the expected C). The right conventional correlation between pitch direction and syntactic structure is strictly observed in his vocal execution of the sentence; but by raising his voice to a note higher in pitch than required for merely conveying this syntactic information he conveys some kind of semantic, attitudinal information. The emotive or attitudinal information resides, then, in the residue that remains in the actual intonation contour after the minimum required for conveying the syntactic information has been, so to speak, mentally removed. This is, then, the attitudinal residue in intonation. In this case, the attitudinal residue amounts to a rising second.

The same applies to intonational components other than pitch: a characteristic measure of change in loudness and duration is conventionally and automatically correlated with syntactic information, and all the prosodic and paralinguistic phenomena that add in substance or in quantity to this measure are correlated with nonsyntactic semantic information (emotive, attitudinal, etc.).

This principle can also be formalised. If P stands for the sum-total of prosodic and paralinguistic phenomena at a given point terminating an SMIU, S stands for those changes in the curves of pitch, duration and loudness that are necessary for conveying the syntactic relationships at that given point and AR stands for those components of intonation that convey nonsyntactic (mostly "attitudinal" or "emotive") information at that point (the "attitudinal residue"),

$$P = S+AR$$

Consequently

$$S = P-AR$$

and

$$AR = P-S$$

Usually AR has a "positive" value, constituting an addition to, or an extension of, S; but occasionally it may have a "negative" value. In other words, in most cases the pitch interval in the actual intonation contour is larger than what the "neutral" syntactic intonation requires (AR positive, P larger than S); but in some cases the reverse is true and the sentence is uttered in such a way that pitch intervals at inter-SMIU transitions are so minimal that even the general pitch direction is hardly noticeable (AR negative, P smaller than S). In such cases "the residue theory" remains intact: here it is the extent to which the actual contour (P) detracts from, rather than adds to, the norm of neutral syntactic intonation (S) which constitutes the "attitudinal residue" (AR).

To conclude, any departure from the "objective", "matter of fact", "neutral" intonation dictated by correlations to syntactic structure alone, in whatever direction, is charged with "emotive" or "attitudinal" meaning; and whereas large intervals may convey agitation, excitement and strong emotional attitudes of various kinds, extra-small intervals may indicate boredom, apathy and the like. In the latter case, the equations of the residue theory would read: $P = S+(-AR) = S-AR$; $S = P-(-AR) = P+AR$; $AR = S-P$.⁵

⁵ "The residue theory" is nothing more than a general frame of reference. It has nothing to say about the semantics and the syntax of intonation as such, and this is where the real challenges of intonation theory can be met. However, even professional linguists have hardly succeeded in meeting these challenges fully. Thus, for instance, Chomsky *et al.* ([96], 78) simply shrink from studying emotive and expressive intonation. Among linguists

Usually, however, all the factors relevant to the "residue theory" have positive values. In such cases, at the ends of SMiUs, syntactic and nonsyntactic functions of intonation relate to each other hierarchically: the perception of syntactic intonation is a prerequisite for the communicability and intelligibility of the text on the most elementary level. Therefore, if the structure of syntactic intonation (i.e., the curve of juncture-distribution) is removed or deformed, the perceiver's confusion and disorientation makes it impossible for any subtle intonation nuances conveying attitudes to be effective. Yet, paradoxically, if syntactic intonation functions normally, it is so familiar and hackneyed that it is taken for granted, while the nuances of the attitudinal residue, working on the "solid ground" of syntactic intonation, get the lion's share of attention and interest at the expense of that syntactic intonation.

6.2.3. "The Residue Theory" and Enjambment.

Enjambments, in accordance with "the residue theory", may promote either syntactic or semantic-emotive-attitudinal alternatives according to a strict hierarchy. If a syntactic reorientation (alternative IC segmentation) is possible (i.e., is allowed by word-sequence), the functional interpretation of enjambment will be first and foremost syntactic, and only additionally, if at all, semantic-attitudinal. Syntax always gets the lion's share of functional interpretation, and nonsyntactic components have to be contented with the residue (it has to be borne in mind once again, though, that syntactic information is invariably semantic, but the reverse is not always true). If, however, an enjambment occurs at a syntactically irrelevant point, the element of intonational irregularity (unexpected pause, emphasis,

who have tried to come to grips with some of these challenges I would like to mention a bold and intriguing study by F6nagy and Magdics [146], in addition to Crystal's book [104].

etc.) introduced by enjambment is usurped *in toto* for attitudinal, emotive consumption, which in these cases is not satisfied with residues and leftovers.

The entire argument in this section is closely connected with my argument in 5.8.2 concerning line-integrity and the retrospective recognition of alternative IC analyses; the present section is, in fact, complementary to 5.8.2, where the relevant phenomena are viewed from a different angle and in a different perspective.

To take the Cummings example analysed in 5.8.2 once again, the following points can be made: (1) In cases of potential alternative syntactic segmentation (e.g., in the Cummings poem, "lifting my finger i say to hell") the junctural changes at the interlinear transition are interpreted primarily as syntactically motivated, and only "residually" as performing nonsyntactic functions. (2) Contrarily, in cases of the latter type (e.g., "he she it or everybody gets a") interlinear junctural changes introduced by lineation are interpreted exclusively nonsyntactically. This latter case could be described as follows: if syntactic intonation is nonexistent (equals zero), what is otherwise presented as the attitudinal residue usurps the entire intonational event; formally, using the equation symbols of the residue theory, this could be formalised as follows: $S = 0$ (zero); and since $P-S = AR$ according to the residue theory, in these cases $P-S = P-0 = AR$; in other words $P = AR$.

6.2.4. A Note on the Problem of Tempo in the Oral Rendition of Poetry and a Survey of its Treatment in the Professional Literature.

Tension, anticipation, lineation and enjambment are closely connected with the concept of tempo, which is a part of intonation as defined above (2.2.1). A survey of this complicated phenomenon will now conclude the present section.

Poetic tempo, or the speed of reading in poetry, is one of

the most intriguing and evasive among the topics relevant to the study of enjambment. In the literature the concept of tempo looms through a mist of controversies and confusions, with the different lines of thought relating to one another in a large variety of ways. The most crucial question in the study of tempo is whether, how and to what extent tempo results from conventionally compulsory rules of language or from idiosyncratically optional whims of individual speakers. Many scholars are unaware of the fact that this question lies at the core of their disagreements, though these disagreements may explicitly concern something more specific, such as how a given passage should be read. Thus, for instance, two scholars may have conflicting opinions as to whether a given instance should be read fast or slowly, *accelerando* or *ritardando*, while sharing the same opinion about the validity of the various clues according to which tempo is determined, or vice versa. The common ground for two conflicting views may be challenged by a third one, treating the controversy itself as immaterial. See Crystal ([104], especially 152-156), Goldman-Eisler ([188] and [189]), Henderson and Goldman-Eisler [227] and Fonagy and Magdicz ([145] and [146]), for discussions of tempo in (nonpoetic) delivery of speech. Crystal's [104] Index and Bibliography can also be consulted for additional references, in his book and elsewhere, concerning this topic.

See Chatman ([81]-[83]), Childs [88], Gross [196], Kell [278], Lanz [299], Murdy [373], Mussulman [374], for a partial representation of the spectrum of implicit and explicit views about tempo in poetry. See also Smith ([466], 70-71), and Wellek & Warren's discussion ([519], 166-170) of "acoustic" and "musical" theories. Both discussions have a direct bearing on the problem of the "subjective" vs. the "objective" in tempo, although neither of them deals with tempo as such.

In the course of my reading I came across two controversies concerned very specifically with tempo in Shakespearean drama:

between Eliot ([125], 18) and Bateson ([34], 272-273) and between Bayfield [37], Draper [122] and Kökeritz [289], with Flatter ([140], especially p. 158) representing a more balanced approach. I do not presume to represent the professional literature any more than to exhaust the topic itself. While the intricacy of the tempo tangle can partly explain the tendency of some scholars to engage in oversimplified and irresponsible treatments of the phenomenon (e.g., Draper [122], Berry [46]), this did not prevent some other scholars, notably Russian and Czech (e.g., Bernštejn [540]-[541], Mukařovský [370]), from doing more justice to this intricacy. These discussions, though convincingly balanced and full of sensitive and penetrating insights, are a far cry from a full-fledged theory of tempo, nor do they pretend to propose such a theory. Moreover, I have serious doubts that constructing such a theory is practicable, because of the complexity of the relevant parameters. At any rate, in generalising about a text's tempo-structure, it is much safer to speak of acceleration and retardation than of absolute speed (see Flatter [140], 158), just as there is no point in speaking of absolute pitch in language but only of pitch directions and intervals (see 6.2.2 above); and even a comprehensive theory of tempo-tendencies is beyond the reach of the available theoretical and methodological tools. The only way to go about the business of tempo analysis is to isolate the various components and parameters and see how they work and interact in a given instance, locally and contextually, making a distinction between structural clues or guidelines and what is left to the performer's free whim. Any such study must rely on intuition and introspection and the main perspective beyond this limitation is the future development of "psychopoetic" research (see 5.2.5).

Bearing in mind these reservations, the following theoretical observation about the tempo of enjambment can be made. I have already mentioned Jakobson's reference to the "digressive,

variational status" ([260], 365) of enjambment; the concept of "variation" or "digression" invariably implies some kind of a convention, a norm or a rule, from which a given phenomenon digresses. It follows, then, that some act of comparison between the "digressive, variational" enjambment and its more conventional alternative — the latter being an unrealised, hypothetical, potential — must be mentally performed by the reader whenever confronted by an enjambment.

The point is that different enjambments vary, *inter alia*, according to the nature of the unrealised potential alternative that most readily suggests itself to the reader as the conventional, "normal" version supplanted, as it were, by the enjambment that actually appears on the page. Broadly speaking, from a syntactic point of view, there are two types of such rejected potential alternatives: (a) an end-stopped alternative (prospective or retrospective), where enjambmental interpretation conflicts with a syntactically viable alternative segmentation which coincides with line-division; (b) a prose-like alternative where the obliteration of the end of the enjambed line seems to be more plausible. Other things being equal, syntax makes the former case slower in tempo than the latter, so that enjambment, being a "digressive, variational" element, contributes to the acceleration of the former and to the retardation of the latter (i.e., enjambment counterbalances both the swiftness of the prose-like alternative and the slowness of the end-stopped alternative). Yet other things are never really equal, and it is mainly semantics that makes them as unequal as they are. Considerations of semantic nature play a decisive role in suggesting the most "natural" alternative to the reader (in addition to syntactic and prosodic ones, notably the factor of the degrees of regularity in the schemes of metre and rhyme, as described in 6.1.2 and 6.1.3. above). The effect of enjambment on tempo in a poem is decisively affected by the norms of line-end strength

(largely produced by metre and rhyme practices in that poem), from which the enjambment deviates.

6.3. SEMANTIC ASPECTS OF ENJAMBMENT

6.3.1. Semantic Tension

Semantic Contribution to SMIU-Tension.

The problem of semantics, in this or practically in any context, is so complex and so enormous in scope that in dealing with it on the level of theoretical generalisation one has to be either very long or very short. Unlike the prosodic problem, condensed in 6.1, here it is not the focus and scope of the present study but the nature of the topic itself that dictates shortness and oversimplification.

Since the present study is concerned with syntax rather than semantics as its main topic, I shall confine myself to a few observations about semantic tension.

By semantic tension, or semantic contribution to intonational tension, I mean semantically- and non-syntactically-motivated tension (since in all cases of syntactic tension, however formally identifiable, an element of semantic tension is present, but not vice versa). As I argued in 5.1.1.2, a word's intonational tension may be influenced by its own content in isolation and its contextually-determined semantic openness and/or anticipation. But in order that such parameters could contribute to the intonational tension of a sentence (and not to some type of thematic tension, like the kind of tension built up in the plot of the detective novel, for instance) they should somehow be "translated into syntactic language". In other words, in order that a semantic parameter could function on the immediate level as relevant to intonational tension and enjambment, it should be sensed as a semantically-motivated urge for syntactic continuation.

Thus, a given word-sequence may be potentially complete, autonomous, self-sufficient, if judged by formal syntax alone; yet, if considerations of semantic probability (on the level of lingual meaning or on the level of a literary interpretation of the text) are taken into account, this very word-sequence is "open" or "anticipatory" in such a way, and with such urgency, that it almost cannot be a complete sentence. For instance, the word-sequence "He moved from a big house in the city to a cottage in the country because he likes living" is syntactically viable as a complete sentence (and also, in some special contexts, semantically so). But without referring it to such a special context one would anticipate something like "quietly", or "in the fresh air", etc., to complete this semantically incomplete utterance.

A similar thing happens in Shakespeare's *King Lear* (I, iv, 290-292):

[...] If she must teem

Create her child of spleen, that it may live

And be a thwart disnaturaed torment to her.

Here, likewise, "live" could be the last word if syntactic considerations alone were taken into account. The tension experience here is purely semantic; but it has to be reemphasised that the specific type of semantic tension relevant to our topic is the semantic demand for completion within the sentence unit.

Semantic tension can also be described as "open", when the semantic dissatisfaction with the supplied material does not generate the anticipation of a specific semantic continuation in the reader's mind (as in the Shakespearean example) or else it can be described as "anticipatory", when a specific word, or at least a specific type of meaning, is more predictable (as in my example). It can also be subclassified into SMIU- and SMAU-semantic-tension and, likewise, it can be prospective, as in the

examples just proposed, or retrospective. In fact, syntactic tension and semantic tension are quite identical in function and effect, since in both cases tension is sensed within the confines of syntactic units. It is in the rigorous approach of the analyst or the theorist, rather than in "normal" or casual reading, that the differences between the purely semantic and the syntactic-semantic origins of intonational tension becomes conscious. The distinction is thus largely a purely theoretical one, and on this limited level it has little bearing on the poetic manipulation of readers' responses.

6.3.2. The Interaction between Enjambment and Literary Interpretation.

The overall literary interpretation of a given poetic text is both a point of departure and a final destination for almost any structural-functional discussion of a single aspect of that text, however nonsemantic this aspect's own nature may be. Enjambment is no exception, as we have seen. To conclude this study I would like to touch upon some of the ways that enjambment can function in the semantic organisation of the poetic text.

What may, and usually does, happen in enjambment (*inter alia*) is described by Hrushovski ([247], 186) as "[...] the restressing of words at both ends of the line, as compared with their prose positions". "Restressing" in this context may mean a general reshuffle in the entire organisation of stress distribution in a poem; however, for simplicity's sake, we can confine ourselves to the enjambment's most immediate vicinity and focus our scrutiny on the last word in the enjambed line and the first word in the following one (see Hrushovski [247], 186; Tomaševskij [577], 441; Keil [278]; Kopczińska [290]; Unbegaun [508], 124-125). Much in agreement with some of the views prevalent in the literature (e.g., in the studies just cited), my contentions are:

1. Each word, being what it is in isolation and in context,

has a certain semantic potential for being emphasised and/or dwelt upon. This potential, ranging from zero to a maximum, then, is a property of the given particular word in its "prose position" (see Hrushovski [247], 186), regardless of how it is placed in a line.

2. Likewise, all enjambments have a potential capacity to foreground the words in their nearest vicinity by changing their expected pitch, loudness and/or duration. This potential is a permanent property of enjambment as a device, regardless of any particular configuration of meaning, syntax and/or prosody that it may interact with in any given instance.

The two potentials just described interact in all cases of enjambment, this being another example of an interaction between the unique and the recurrent (as a general phenomenon, then, enjambment demonstrates one of the most crucial, fascinating and evasive features of literature to challenge literary theory and research).

It is the individual semantic content of the words in every literary work, and the semantic structure of the text — much more than the text's formal syntactic and/or prosodic structure — that determines which word(s) should be emphasised and what should be the nature and degree of emphasis. According to this statement enjambment's role may appear superfluous: only a word that should anyway be emphasised, because of its own or its contextual semantic value, can be emphasised by being placed at an enjambmental transition. What, then, can be the contribution of enjambment?

This, however, is a misrepresentation of the facts. Indeed, in order to acquire emphasis through enjambment, a word should have a "preversified" semantic potential for being emphasised; but this potential may remain unnoticed and unrealised as long as the "intonational value" of the word, as dictated by its "prose position" in the text's syntactic and semantic structure, remains

unchanged. Enjambment, then, whether or not it suggests an alternative syntactic segmentation, may lend its support to a word's semantic potential, foregrounding its hidden side, as it were. In such cases enjambment affects the semantic structure of the text, by rearranging the hierarchy of the relative importance of words.

Discussing this very topic, and specifically the working of the verse-line as a unit, B. Hrushovski says ([247], 186):

In the framework of the poem, rhythmic and figurative elements, which appear in other frameworks too, are restressed, reorganized, and reinterpreted in our perception, according to their relative locations and functions; they get other perspective and specific gravity and then play an important role in shaping the "world" of the poem [...]

Looking at the same phenomenon from a different, complementary angle, Winifred Nowotny has this to say about poetic syntax ([382], 21):

Upon its successful management depends the placing of a word in a telling position in a line, a telling position in the metrical and rhythmical structure, a telling position in relation to other words in its vicinity.

Both scholars refer to the same phenomenon: Hrushovski's "specific gravity" and Nowotny's "telling position" are very similar. The difference can be described as follows: a poetic utterance is organised simultaneously by syntax, lineation and metrical (and other rhythmical) structures. This complex phenomenon is viewed by Hrushovski from the standpoint of language with poetic structuration superimposed on it, and by Nowotny from the standpoint of poetic structuration with syntactic organisation superimposed on it. In other words, Hrushovski

treats the syntactic parameter as a constant, focusing his attention on lineation as a variable, while Nowotny does the reverse. At any rate, both the similarities and the differences between the two scholars bear witness to the interpenetration and interdependence of the various components of the total poetic effect of enjambment. This intricacy, incidentally, is the main cause for enjambment being regarded by some scholars as a device making poetry more prose-like, and by others as a device working in the opposite direction. Both views are potentially correct, the former being more applicable in some cases and the latter in other cases. Enjambment as a whole, however, is characterised by being capable of performing these two seemingly contradictory tasks.

These theoretical points can be clarified by illustration.

In Eliot's *Ash-Wednesday* Part II (Eliot, 85) we read

[...] And God said

Shall these bones live? Shall these
Bones live?

Here, since conflicting syntactic segmentations are not allowed by the word-sequence "Shall these bones live?", the junctural change introduced by lineation is interpreted as solely semantic-attitudinal (in accordance with the residue theory, as proposed in 6.2.3 above). Intonationally, in the second occurrence of this word-sequence the reader is advised by lineation to make either the word "these" or the word "bones" more conspicuous than in the first occurrence, by making it louder and/or higher in pitch and/or longer in duration. Thus, the first occurrence is uttered with a relatively matter-of-fact, syntactically governed intonation, whereas the second is uttered with a more "expressive" one. As to the question of which of the two words ("these" or "bones") should get the excessive emphasis generated by enjambment, it should be answered on the basis of

semantic-interpretative, rather than syntactic and prosodic, considerations. A semantically-motivated choice has to be made; and no matter how it is made, the text's interpretation is affected by it. In fact, both possibilities cannot be ruled out: one should not find it difficult to supply a context that would make "these bones" (as opposed to "those bones"), or "these bones (as opposed to "these people", for instance) more plausible.

Choosing between these two possibilities is a matter that concerns Eliot's text in particular, and as such it is irrelevant to the present discussion. What is relevant to a general theory of enjambment is that enjambment has achieved its goal, i.e., the realisation of the hidden emphasis-potential of "these" and/or "bones".

This goal is quite unattainable by any other means: thus, when the Biblical quotation "shall these bones live" appears for the first time, unbroken by lineation, both "these" and "bones" hide their pause- and/or emphasis-potential. In the second time, however, the enajmbmental interpretation — regardless of its exact oral rendition — acquires its special effectiveness by the preceding, uninterrupted version. Apparently, the old simple technique of focusing attention on variables against the background of constants never fails. Enjambment thus achieves here its most genuine and permanent goal, namely, the deautomatisation of reading, making the reader slow down his pace and look carefully at the text. Indeed, that much can be said about the goals of many devices in all arts; but in enjambment this quality is very direct and tangible, since its very existence resides in the interaction between tempo-regulating mechanisms in poetry.

Emphasis and pause are not always inseparable. In certain cases enjambment's function is to halt, to hold back, rather than directly to emphasise. In such cases, effective only in prospective enjambments, lineation suggests pausing at a syntactically intolerable point, and as a result a great deal of frustrated

"kinetic energy" transforms into "potential energy" eager to be released (the analogy may be totally unacceptable to the physicist, but it seems clear enough to the layman to convey the idea). As a result, the first word (or one of the very first words) in the second line becomes more prominent because the reader, having held his breath, releases it while uttering this word, as it were.

Thus, for instance, in Part I of Eliot's *Ash-Wednesday*, analysed in 5.6.3, we read

I rejoice that things are as they are and
I renounce the blessèd face

For obvious semantic and syntactic reasons, there is hardly a case for emphasising "and". But if we pause after it, or dwell on it for a short while (as prescribed by lineation, however syntactically irregular such a pause may be), the immediate effect may be one of hesitation, or reluctance to spell out what is to follow (see 5.2.3). Whether enjambment's potential to create a hesitation effect is realised is again a matter of literary interpretation in each individual case. At any rate, this "uneasy" pause creates tension which is supposed to be released on "I". Yet, for literary semantic reasons that I cannot elaborate here, an emphasis on "I" is somewhat contrived (though not impossible). Rather, "renounce" seems to be more qualified to function as the point of tension-relaxation, perhaps sharing the emphasis with the preceding "I".

Once again, then, it is enjambment that deforms and reshapes the curve of pauses and emphases to achieve a result unattainable by different means; but without the semantic potentials inherent in the poetic text in its preversified state enjambment could not have performed the task as actually performed: a potential is wasted if not realised, and a "realising device" is useless if not supplied with a potential to be realised. Thus, in this instance, the unresolved hovering tension, created by the pause

after "and", is looking, as it were, for the nearest point that is appropriate for emphasis, pause and relaxation.

"Nearest" is measurable in terms of SL, but "appropriate" is, in this context, primarily a semantic concept, and thus it is primarily the semantic value of "renounce" in context that suggests it as the word most likely to be emphasised as a result of the enjambmental pause after "and".

In certain cases, though, literary-semantic considerations suggest to the reader emphasising both words flanking the enjambment. In Shakespeare's *King Lear* (III, iii, 23-24) Edmund says:

This courtesy forbid thee shall the Duke
Instantly know, and of that letter too.

Here it is quite obvious that both "Duke" and "instantly" are important enough to warrant an emphasis, as marked in the quotation. Without the line division, however, both words would be much less conspicuous. It must be borne in mind that metre (spondaic enjambment; see 6.1.2.1) and irregular word-order contribute to suggesting this double emphasis; but it is the semantic message of the word in the text which is by far the most important factor determining its suitability for emphasis.⁶

The semantic functions of enjambment are varied and manifold. Because of the semantic uniqueness of most texts, enjambment can be shown to contribute, or to draw attention, to a different type of semantic content and/or semantic structure in each specific textual example. Attempting the construction of a systematic hierarchy of the semantic functions of enjambment is, then, a

⁶ This process of mutual reinforcement between meaning and the rhythmical-syntactic structure of enjambment is reminiscent of sound-meaning relationships as described by Hrushovski [249]. In his English summary (p. 444-X) he maintains that "Only the meaning of the context can evoke or activate particular shades of potential expressiveness of [...] sounds, and these in turn reinforce the tone and the meaning."

futile endeavour.⁷ The main function of enjambment is foregrounding, deautomatisation, focusing attention, etc.; it is therefore the individual semantic content and structure of each text which determines what becomes foregrounded, deautomatised and attention-drawing. The individual semantic and syntactic make-up of each utterance determines not only what is foregrounded by enjambment, but also how this is done. Thus, for instance, enjambment can be sensed as foregrounding a word in its vicinity through acceleration or through retardation (see 6.2.4); it can be sensed as adding excitement and agitation, or as adding calm and serenity, to the text. All the syntactic and intonational components of enjambment discussed at length throughout the study affect the patterns of tempo and emphasis of the text; yet, the semantic considerations of literary interpretation usually outweigh all the rest.

6.3.3. Enjambment and Literary Semantics:
Wider Semiotic Perspectives.⁸

It has to be borne in mind that the semantic impact on the final, overall effect of enjambment is usually made through the contextual configuration of meaning on various levels.

⁷ This view is in agreement with a considerable number of statements in the literature. Particularly explicit in this connection is Timofeev ([572], 48), who stresses the uselessness and hopelessness of any attempt to construct a "scale for enjambments" based on their semantic and expressive effects. Such an attempt is doomed to failure from the start, he maintains, because the possible effects and nuances are "innumerable", ranging between the extremes of the comic and the tragic.

⁸ This brief subsection is largely based on suggestions made by Prof. B. Hrushovski in a personal communication. However, since the actual wording is totally mine, I am fully responsible for any deficiency in the presentation.

Within the dimension of the continuum of the text itself, it is not only the immediate, quasi-syntactic semantic tension (in the narrow sense described in 6.3.1) which determines the semantic contribution to enjambment. Contextually-determined hierarchies of semantic prominence of words also contribute to the relative emphasis and duration of words in the text. Moreover, such semantic hierarchies affect other hierarchies (e.g., syntactic, prosodic, etc.). The semantic value of a word supports (or counterbalances) its prosodic and intonational values, and they in turn reinforce (or counterbalance) its semantic prominence. The specific effectiveness of enjambment in such processes has already been pointed out.

Additionally, the semantic contribution to enjambment may reflect the impact of extratextual systemic influence. I am referring to such systems as conventions of a genre, a period, a general "tone" associated with the chosen vocabulary ("diction"), oral performance traditions (e.g., modes of recitation of Shakespearean drama), etc.

Such systems, which derive their strength from outside any given specific text, may affect the semantic and prosodic hierarchies of words and word-groups in each particular case; moreover, they may contribute to the selection and the hierarchical ordering of the various parameters. Thus, for instance, a generic convention, or a tradition of oral performance, may tip the balance in favour of attaching semantic prominence to one word rather than another. Similarly, these systems can "foreground" an entire parameter and "background" another, and may provide *ad hoc* clues for solving such problems as posed in 3.2.3 (especially Question B) and elsewhere in the present study. It is a matter for further research to describe how exactly this is done, under what conditions, constraints, etc.

6.4 CONCLUSION

The present chapter brings to an end the theoretical discussion of enjambment — and related topics in verse-line/syntax relationships — in the present study. The structure of enjambment has been primarily discussed with reference to the Definition as a point of departure; some of the functions of enjambment have been described in the present chapter, but no claim for exhaustiveness can possibly be made.

It is hoped that the entire field of enjambment has at least been mapped and surveyed, and that whenever answers were scarce at least the questions have clarified problems and supplied guidelines for further research and theoretical thinking. It is also hoped that, despite its predominantly syntactic and "technical" approach, the present study has contributed to a better understanding of the phenomenon of the poetic line as a major distinctive feature of poetry, and, consequently, to a better understanding of poetry and its uniqueness.

7. A SYNTACTICALLY-ORIENTED APPROACH TO LINE-END INTONATIONAL
TENSION AND ENJAMBMENT: A THEORETICAL OUTLINE

7.0. PRELIMINARY.

The present Theoretical Outline is designed to offer the reader an overview of the theoretical argument of the study. It omits all points directly connected with textual analyses and almost all critical references to previous scholarship. The purpose of the Outline is to serve as a substitute for the entire study for anyone exclusively interested in the general theory, rather than as a reminder for those who have read the entire text; therefore complete passages and isolated sentences were copied here without change where necessary.

7.1. THE NATURE OF ENJAMBMENT: A PRELIMINARY OVERVIEW

7.1.1. A New Definition of Enjambment.

The present study proposes to redefine enjambment as follows:

ENJAMBMENT IS THE OCCURRENCE OF A LINE BOUNDARY AT A POINT WHERE THE STRUCTURE OF THE PREVERSIFIED TEXT, FOR REASONS OF SYNTAX, LINGUAL MEANING AND/OR LITERARY INTERPRETATION, DOES NOT PERMIT THE ORAL EXECUTION OR THE AURAL IMAGINATION OF A PAUSAL JUNCTURE.¹

As elsewhere in the study, this definition will be referred to as "the Definition".

¹ This definition is the outcome of a lengthy discussion of previous definitions (see Chapter 2), and is particularly indebted to G.N. Leech's definition ([303], 125).

7.1.2. Direct Implications of the Proposed Definition.

1. Enjambment is an intonational phenomenon: its defining element is the occurrence or absence of pause. In fact, enjambment is ontologically a pattern pertaining to the intonation-potential of the written text.

2. Intonation itself, in its turn, is an oral (and/or auditory) exponent of structural relationships (syntactic, semantic and literary) inherent in the written text. Thus, the Gordian knot between the concept of intonation and the actual physical sound of speech in the oral rendition of language (including poetry) is cut: the term "intonation" covers the oral potential, or the "aural imagination", of the written text (in addition to the actual "intonation tunes" uttered orally).

This non-exclusively-oral view of intonation has made it imperative to redefine intonation itself for the purpose of this study (without presuming to usurp linguists' prerogative to define lingual terms); this *ad hoc* definition of intonation is:

"THE SUM-TOTAL OF ALL PHENOMENA OF PITCH, DURATION (INCLUDING PAUSES) AND LOUDNESS, AS PRODUCED AND PERCEIVED IN ORAL COMMUNICATION AND AS SUGGESTED AND IMAGINED IN WRITTEN COMMUNICATION, PROVIDED THAT THESE PHENOMENA DO NOT RESULT FROM THE INNER STRUCTURE OF SEPARATE WORDS, BUT CONVEY SYNTACTIC AND/OR SEMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN WORDS AND/OR GROUPS OF WORDS."

It is this insistence on viewing intonation as a potential inherent in the written text of poems which underlies my decision to dispense with making use of linguistic descriptions of intonation and the specialised terminology which they have engendered (e.g., the tone-group and its constituent elements): the basic practice adopted in these treatments of intonation is to study actual speech events, the tone group being a phonologically defined phenomenon, with very rough and shaky correspondences and correlations with patterns identifiable in written language. In-

tonation is treated "algebraically", on a higher level of abstraction, without recourse to the "arithmetic" of the actual contours.

3. Pauses do not simply "occur" according to the speaker's free whim; rather, they are necessarily generated by a complex system of heterogeneous factors and rules operating with varying degrees of strictness. Enjambment is the conflict-generating co-occurrence of a pause, as required by one system (poetic lineation, i.e. line-division) with the absence of pause, as required by another system (the structure of the "preversified text", i.e., the text viewed as if not divided into poetic verse-lines).

4. These "positive" formulations can be sharpened and refined by stressing their "negative" implications:

A. Enjambment is neither a semantic nor a syntactic phenomenon, in any direct sense; indirectly, however, it is potentially both syntactic and semantic, but only inasmuch as intonation itself can function as both the cause and the result of syntactic and semantic structures.

B. In no way does the intonational nature of enjambment imply that it is confined to oral renditions of poetry, or that it comes into being as the result of the oral performer's vocal execution of his interpretative decisions. Rather, enjambment is an integral part of the written text: every written text in language possesses an indispensable dimension of intonation-potential, and enjambment, wherever it occurs, is inseparable from that dimension.

7.1.3. Further Implications.

7.1.3.1. *Degrees of Pause-Acceptability.* The phrase "does not permit" in the Definition is a general guideline rather than a precise yardstick: "permission" and "prohibition" do not function here as two members of an exhaustive binary opposition that

imposes a choice between them upon all relevant phenomena, but rather as two poles between which a graded scale is stretched. Thus, pauses can often be described as more, or less, acceptable, and only in rare and extreme cases can they still be regarded as absolutely indispensable or totally inadmissible. The Definition implies, in effect, that a given interlinear transition is an enjambment inasmuch as its "preversified" structure (see 7.1.3.2 below) forbids pausing at line-end. In other words, the measure of assessability of pause-acceptability in a given interlinear transition is tantamount to the measure of its definability as an enjambment or an end-stopped line.

7.1.3.2. *The Notion of the "Preversified Text"*. "The Preversified Text" is a term which renders the Definition applicable to the problem of enjambment's position between poetry and prose. Enjambment is an instance of discord between the (nonartistic) system of language, shared by poetic and nonpoetic lingual texts, and the (artistic) system of poetic patterning and structuration, which is specific to poetic texts (see Lotman's presentation of the interrelations between primary and secondary modelling systems in [563], Chapter 1). The artistic system is superimposed on the lingual one, and they coexist without the one being reducible into the terms of the other: the poetic text is both lingual and artistic, and its elements are simultaneously grouped, patterned and organised to form heterogeneously structured and heterogeneously functioning patterns on different levels, in accordance with diverse requirements emanating from both systems.

Specifically, in the case of enjambment, the exponents of these two major systems are the more partial systems – or, in this context, subsystems – of lingually and poetically motivated international segmentation: the syntactically, semantically and literarily motivated intonational segmentation of the poem as a preversified text and its strictly poetically-motivated intonational segmentation, graphically represented as the poem's division into

verse-lines. It should be noted that "the preversified text" is the raw-material of poetic lineation, as reconstructed from the versified poem by mentally eliminating line-division. Therefore, even that intonational segmentation of the text that is motivated by literary and poetic considerations other than line-division (such as links between thematically related words, patterns of imagery and figurative language, etc.) is included in "the pre-versified text".

To conclude: the concept of "the preversified text" stresses enjambment's status as a pattern typically and inseparably linked with the versifying process, which in its turn is one of the most distinctive components of the phenomenon of poetry.

7.1.3.3. *The "Static-Dynamic" Dichotomy: An Indispensable Implication of the Concept of "Permission" (or Pause-Desirability)*. In view of the way enjambment actually operates in poetic texts, the concept of structural "permission" for pauses, as employed in the Definition (replaceable by the more relative concept of "pause-desirability"), should be studied both "statically" and "dynamically" (whereas both in linguistics and in poetics scholarly practice has adopted an almost exclusively "static" approach).

The distinction between "static" and "dynamic", as proposed here, is based on principles layed down in the work of Tynjanov and Mukařovský, and elaborated to some extent in more recent writings in several languages. Personally, I am particularly indebted to Israeli structuralists (see Chapter 1 note 19).

The distinction can be drawn as follows: "dynamically", any given stretch of text is viewed as a virtual structure becoming an actual one while unfolding in time, along a temporal axis, with expectations being aroused and subsequently fulfilled or frustrated; "statically", it is viewed as a complete, "spatial" structure that is permanently "there" in its entirety, as a simultaneous whole.

The "dynamic" view of the lingual (including the poetic) text, though overlooked in most of the professional literature, is crucial for understanding enjambment in its contextual poetic environment: the characteristic effects of enjambment are often produced by the relation between the type and degree of pause desirability expected at a given point to occur after it on the one hand and the actual subsequent textual events that fulfil or frustrate this expectation on the other hand. It follows that the phenomenon of "permission", because of its intrinsic nature rather than because of some methodological convenience, must be studied both statically and dynamically. The two approaches are distinct yet complementary ways of looking at the same material.

7.1.4. Enjambment as Junction.²

In poetry as a whole the occurrence of enjambment is confined to a small portion of line-ends, therefore it is a quantitatively insignificant phenomenon; moreover, whenever it does occur, it occupies an extremely short span of printing space and reading time. Its significance lies not in its size or frequency, but in its very nature: it is an example of what Hrushovski has termed "a junction of heterogeneous contexts" (see note 2). Enjambment is a point of intersection between extremely diverse and complex components of poetic language: lineation-governed and "preversified" intonation, poetic rhythm (often including metre), syntax and meaning. Indeed, all of them often collide and interact elsewhere in the text; yet, the compactness of enjambment makes these interactions more intense and concentrated, and more easily observable; thus the theory and analysis of enjambment can

²This suggestive, figurative term was coined by Prof. B. Hrushovski (see [251a], 7-12) and applied by him to several instances of structural complexity in literature. I am using the term in a much poorer and narrower sense, as required by my restricted topic

benefit from, as well as contribute to, the theories of syntax, semantics, prosody (including metrics and all other branches of the study of sound and rhythm), intonation, and literary thematics and interpretation.

The junction-like quality of enjambment accounts for the flagrant disproportion between its own "smallness" and the enormous scope of each of its aspects and components. On the one hand, the single enjambment is, relatively, a macrocosm, whose constituent elements — "local" exponents of metre, syntax, meaning, etc. — contribute to its specificity by their mutual interactions; on the other hand, the single enjambment is a microcosm — a constituent element of the text's syntax, meaning, metre, etc. — contributing in its turn to their specificity by interacting with comparable constituent elements. This two-way reciprocity is particularly evident in the case of meaning (a text's semantic structure affects the nature of any given enjambment and is affected by it), but it generally applies to the other (nonsemantic) components as well.

The present investigation, being in many respects an exploratory pilot-study in enjambment theory, is very restricted: it is basically structural (asking how enjambment "as a macrocosm" is structured) rather than functional (asking how it functions "as a microcosm" within larger textual and theoretical contexts). Moreover, its focus is predominantly syntactic, and its chief concern is with the poetics of the single enjambment.

Enjambment must figure prominently in any investigation of the verse-line as a discrete unit. The boundary of a segmental unit is almost invariably that unit's most telling point; the verse-line is no exception, and therefore its boundary is its most appropriate exponent as a formal, discrete unit. And since in enjambment this boundary operates single-handed, unsupported by other pause-generating factors, enjambment is the most genuine "strength trial" for the verse-line, isolating its specific contribution to the text.

A theory of enjambment is a major and indispensable part of any theory of the verse-line, which is regarded by leading scholars as the *differentia specifica* of poetry. Moreover, enjambment is a test-case for the general problem of interrelationships between rules and units of language and the forms and conventions of poetry. Thus, even a syntactically oriented investigation of enjambment is destined to contribute to a theory of "poeticalness".

To conclude: being a "junction", enjambment can be explored and described in terms of each of its intersecting contexts, statically and dynamically. This is how the entire field of enjambment theory is to be mapped. However, throughout this exploratory process enjambment's status as described in this section must be borne in mind.

7.2. A "STATIC" AND "FUNCTIONAL" VIEW OF THE SYNTACTIC COMPONENT OF ENJAMBMENT.

Since the relevant scholarship, both in linguistics and in poetics, has been predominantly "static", the static view proposed here is closely linked with the professional literature, its achievements and shortcomings; although it is impossible to acknowledge every "bibliographical indebtedness" in the Outline (contrary to my practice in the study proper).

7.2.1. "Functional" and "Nonfunctional" Phenomena in Syntax.

Within the static approach, one can distinguish (for the purpose of the present discussion) between two types of syntactic phenomena: (a) syntactically nonfunctional relationships and phenomena, such as the actual size or length of syntactic segments, or the order of words, phrases, etc. (wherever order is optional), or the nature and number of repetitive or variational patterns (e.g., the use of many adjectives for each noun, the

accumulation of appositions, etc.) and (b) syntactically functional relationships between and within syntactic segments of whatever size, order, pattern, etc. (e.g., the relation between subject and predicate, NP and VP, immediate constituents). In fact, this distinction is between relationships identifiable by asking questions (who, where, why, etc.) and relationships where such questions are inapplicable. Linguistics has been much more preoccupied with phenomena of the latter type. This preference has been counter-productive at least as far as the ability of linguistics to deal with the central problems of pause-desirability is concerned. The present study of enjambment resorts to discussion of relevant nonfunctional phenomena, particularly segment-length, in addition to functional ones.

7.2.2. The Syntactic Micro-Unit (SMIU).

The first question that suggests itself is: what is a pause-resistant syntactic segmental unit (which is relevant to the study of enjambment)?

The syntactic segmental unit divided between two lines in enjambment is the SYNTACTIC MICRO-UNIT (SMIU), in contradistinction to the syntactic macro-unit (SMAU), which is anything larger than SMIU within the confines of a single sentence. These terms are defined as follows:

1. A SYNTACTIC MICRO-UNIT (SMIU) IS A STRETCH OF TEXT, CONSISTING OF TWO OR MORE CONSECUTIVE WORDS, THAT IS FOLLOWED, AND NOT DIVIDED, BY A SYNTACTICALLY-DETERMINED PAUSAL JUNCTURE (TERMINAL OR NONTERMINAL).

2. A SYNTACTIC MACRO-UNIT (SMAU) IS A STRETCH OF TEXT, CONSISTING OF TWO OR MORE SYNTACTIC MICRO-UNITS, THAT IS: (a) DIVIDED BY ONE OR MORE SYNTACTICALLY-DETERMINED NONTERMINAL PAUSAL JUNCTURES; (b) NEVER DIVIDED BY A SYNTACTICALLY-DETERMINED TERMINAL PAUSAL JUNCTURE; (c) FOLLOWED BY A SYNTACTICALLY-DETERMINED PAUSAL JUNCTURE, TERMINAL OR NONTERMINAL.

In other words, both types of units may be either smaller than, or identical with (but never larger than), one complete sentence. In fact, as far as this distinction is concerned, there are only two basic types of sentences: those consisting of one SMIU (e.g., "He is there") and those consisting of several SMIUs. A sentence of the latter type is an SMAU, although it may be segmented into smaller SMAUs.

It is true that syntactic theories have devised finer and more sophisticated sets of distinctions, but they do not contribute substantially to the identification and analysis of correlations between syntactic and intonational patterns.

7.2.3. Syntactic-Intonational Cohesion (SIC)

What makes the SMIU resist pauses in the preversified text?

The force that holds an SMIU together, making it into a unit, can be called "cohesion". However, this term is used in linguistics to denote static and nonintonational syntactic substitutability, which is demonstrably different from syntactic contribution to pause-resistance. Therefore, a new term is proposed: SIC (syntactic-intonational cohesion), i.e., the inadmissibility of a pausal juncture for reasons of formal syntactic structure. In more relative terms, SIC is the degree of syntactically determined resistance to pausal juncture. SIC is present at all interlexical transitions inside an SMIU and absent from its boundary. It is a product of interaction between various parameters (e.g., functional relationships, length of segment, etc.).

Having identified the major relevant parameters of SIC, a full-fledged theory of SIC, to be constructed and proposed as a contribution to enjambment theory, should show how each of them contributes to SIC. The two main questions that such a theory should answer are:

A. How can we determine and measure the contribution of a single syntactic parameter to SIC?

B. What can determine the relative importance of each parameter in relation to the other ones?

It is my contention that the present state of affairs in the linguistic literature makes such a theory impossible. Therefore, a "target-theory" of SIC has been proposed, mapping the field by asking a new set of questions, rather than a full theory supplying the answers. The target theory is not dynamic, since it deals with completed utterances; yet even its static questions cannot be answered in the present "state of the art". The concept of SIC thus remains "algebraic" as a kind of "n" or "m", rather than "arithmetical": it undoubtedly exists; it has been defined by its unmistakable effect; it can be sensed intuitively; but it cannot be described in precise, tangible and falsifiable terms. The achievements of linguistic and literary science leave many concepts and phenomena relevant to the study of enjambment in this "algebraic" stage.

7.2.4. Potential Contribution of Studies in Linguistics and Poetics to the Theory of SIC and Enjambment

A detailed textual analysis shows that neither traditional grammar, nor IC analysis, nor TG procedures, can contribute significantly to an SIC theory. All these methods fail to reflect major syntactic-intonational correlations. Linguistics, then, cannot adequately describe universal features of language in general, in its "prepoetic" form. It demonstrably fails to analyse some static phenomena (e.g., SIC) as well as dynamic ones.

Broadly speaking, the same can be said of two leading studies in poetics, directly concerned with the classification of enjambment in terms of cohesion (by Fowler [150] and Taranovski [494]). In spite of impressive achievements, they fail to isolate the type of cohesion relevant to enjambment, namely, SIC;

the scales of cohesion that they propose fail to bridge the gap between purely syntactic cohesion and SIC. Thus these studies demonstrate the dependence of SIC theory upon future progress in linguistic theory that could bridge that gap and make the construction of SIC scales possible. Without it, no solid basis can be found to classify enjambments according to their degree of pause-acceptability.

7.2.5. The Static Approach: Concluding Remarks.

The static and functional approach to syntax is indispensable for a complete view of enjambment: enjoying the luxury of dealing with known entities and quantities, this approach can yield relatively tangible results. There is no harm in a theory being exclusively static and functional as long as it is presented as such. By ignoring the very existence of the dynamic and nonfunctional aspects of the problem some scholars turn an otherwise legitimate methodological preference into a major theoretical oversight.

7.3. SYNTACTIC LENGTH (*SL*) AND ENJAMBMENT.

7.3.1. SL and the Major Problems of Discussing It.

The sense of "permission" and desirability of pauses, whether viewed statically or dynamically, is largely affected by length and size-proportions that obtain between the textual segments involved. "Syntactic length", or "segmental length" (*SL*), is a feature of all utterances in language; it is measurable by, and proportionate to, the actual number of segmental surface-structure elements that make up any given syntactically significant segment.

A basic problem in discussing *SL* in the context of the present study is the difficulty in observing the methodological demarcation lines between static and dynamic aspects of syntax. In

the case of functional syntactic relationships an exclusively static approach can yield valid and significant results. Contrary to this situation, discussions of SL's contribution to enjambment are likely to be insignificant if they adhere to its static aspect: a hierarchical scale of degrees of SL can automatically be established by simple counting.

The rule governing the isolated contribution of SL to pause-desirability in SMIUs, when viewed statically, can be formulated as follows: OTHER THINGS BEING EQUAL, PAUSE-DESIRABILITY INCREASES TOWARDS THE MIDDLE OF THE *SMIU* AND DECREASES TOWARDS BOTH ITS ENDS.

7.3.2. A Transition between the Static and the Dynamic:
Rejet; Contre-Rejet; Potential Rejet; Potential
Contre-Rejet.

Rejet and *contre-rejet* (henceforth R and CR, respectively) are units of SL directly and inseparably linked with the concept of enjambment. Their employment focuses the analyst's attention on a very important aspect of enjambment, namely, its location (in terms of SL rather than in terms of functional syntactic relationships) within the SMIU which it splits.

This distinction is firmly rooted in the "static" approach to enjambment. According to Engstrom-Preminger's definition ([130], 687), R occurs "when the lesser part of a grammatical phrase-unit flows over from one line to the next", while CR occurs "when the greater part of a grammatical phrase-unit overflows in this way". Whether the part of the "grammatical phrase-unit" (= my SMIU) which precedes the end of the line is "greater" or "lesser" than the one following it cannot be determined until that unit has been completed: only then can the two parts be compared and their relative sizes established.

This employment of the distinction can hardly contribute to theoretical progress: a *rejet* is an enjambment where line-end

is placed nearer to the end of the SMIU than to its beginning, and wherever we spot such an enjambment we should label it as *rejet*... Yet it is difficult to see how else the distinction can be used, given the definitions of R and CR. R and CR are quite unsusceptible to the interplay between expectation and its subsequent fulfilment or frustration, or, in other words, to the interplay between the known and the unknown during the process of perception. The distinction thus used offers little more than a self-centred and self-sufficient taxonomy; unlike the case of static functional concepts, the only hierarchy of R and CR is based on SL, i.e., on counting words and/or syllables before and/or after the line boundary. The potential contribution of the R/CR distinction to a static SIC theory is also negligible.

I propose, then, to introduce a distinction between "potential *rejet*" (PR) and "potential *contre-rejet*" (PCR), which is based on the assumption that SMIUs tend to have a limited range of optimal SL. When this SL optimum is greater than the distance between the intralinear beginning of an SMIU and the syntactically unjustified boundary of the same line, what results is PCR; however, this may later be confirmed as a real CR or contradicted by what emerges as R (or neither R nor CR). When SL optimum is less than that distance, what results is PR, which may later be confirmed or contradicted in the same way. With the introduction of the PR/PCR dichotomy the discussion has moved from the relatively solid ground of static omniscience into the less solid ground of dynamic guesswork.

7.4. THE DYNAMIC APPROACH TO ENJAMBMENT: *SMIU* - TENSION AND RELATED CONCEPTS.

The main phenomenon relevant to the dynamic aspect of enjambment, "tension" (see below), is basically intonational, or psychintonational; it consists of syntactic and semantic components. In any given utterance, the presence or absence, and the

type and degree, of tension can be checked and assessed at any postlexical point chosen at random (henceforth "point of assessment"). In the subdivision between SMIU- and SMAU-tension, the former negates the probability of any pausal juncture, terminal or nonterminal, as the very next syntagmatic occurrence after the point of assessment, whereas the latter is the predictability of a non-terminal pausal juncture immediately after the point of assessment.

7.4.1. A Parametric Approach to Intonational Tension

Intonational tension is the product of intricate interactions between several independent parameters. There is no set of consistent rules governing the outcome of these interactions, but each of them separately does "behave" according to fairly consistent rules. Any given "point of assessment" is an intersection between these parameters, describable in terms of each of them in isolation: the point of assessment occupies a certain position in relation to each parameter (e.g., its distance from SMIU-beginning in terms of SL, its being after a preposition in terms of a functional parameter) and a system of mutual reinforcement, weakening, and checks and balances between them determines the final resultant tension-curve. The isolated contribution of each parameter can enhance tension by accelerating the pace of reading, or weaken it by retarding reading-pace, and enjambments may differ from each other because of the identity of the colliding forces in every instance.

7.4.2. Mapping the Field of Intonational Tension: A List of Parameters.

For the purpose of the present study the relevant parameters fall into two major categories: (1) parameters operating in all lingual utterances: this category is subdivided into syntactic and nonsyntactic (chiefly semantic) parameters; (2) parameters pertaining exclusively to the poetic organisation of texts and absent from nonpoetic texts.

The list of the main parameters in Category 1 ("preversified" parameters) is schematised in the following table:

Nature or "Mode of Existence" of Parameter Level of Linguistic Analysis	The Word in Isolation	The Word in Context
"Formal" (nonsemantic) and syntactically-nonfunctional features	1. Length, sound- and stress-pattern of word	2. SL from SMIU-beginning; word's position in intonation contour preceding it
"Formal" (nonsemantic) and syntactically functional features	3. Part of speech	4. Syntactic expectation
Semantic features ⁴	4. Semantic content	5. Semantic expectation

The main exclusively poetic parameters are:

7. Formal Rhythmical Organization; 8. Free Rhythmical Organization; 9. Sound Patterns; and, wherever applicable: 10. Rhyme; and 11. Metre.³

One can ask about every word in a poem how, and to what degree, its psychointonational tension is affected by the various parameters. The influence of each parameter can be described as either accelerating (enhancing tension) or retarding (weakening tension).

7.4.3. Syntactic Expectation as a Major Parameter of Intonational Tension.

Utterances are either syntactically complete or syntactically incomplete, and both completeness and incompleteness can be either

³For detailed definitions and discussion see above, 5.1.1.2, 5.1.1.3 and 5.1.1.4.

identifiable as such in advance or not. The former case is called prospective (potential) and the latter retrospective (actual). Potential completeness can prove to be actual incompleteness, but potential incompleteness remains incomplete retrospectively.

Since tension, by definition, is a prospective concept, syntactic contribution to it is preconditioned by syntactic expectation, as introduced within the context of the following definitions:

1. SYNTACTIC PREDICTION is any restriction imposed at a given point of assessment on the number of categories of formal syntax likely to appear after that point, on the basis of formal syntactic relationships that appeared prior to that point. Prospective completeness and prospective incompleteness, then, are both syntactic predictions.

2. SYNTACTIC EXPECTATION is the syntactic prediction of a continuation that is indispensable for syntactic completeness.

3. SYNTACTIC ANTICIPATION is a specific syntactic expectation. It is subdivided into two types, listed as 4 and 5:

4. SMIÚ-ANTICIPATION at a given point of assessment is the likelihood, based on considerations of functional syntactic relationships, that the very next syntagmatic element (after the point of assessment) will not be a pausal juncture of any kind.

5. SMAU-ANTICIPATION at a given point of assessment is the likelihood, based on considerations of functional syntactic relationships, that the very next syntagmatic element (after the point of assessment) will be a nonterminal pausal juncture.

6. SYNTACTIC OPENNESS is a vague, nonspecific, syntactic expectation: it is the difficulty to learn from the syntactic data supplied up to the point of assessment what syntactic category, other than a full-stop period, is likely to occupy the next syntagmatic position.

7.4.4. The Nature of SMIU Anticipation

SMIU-anticipation is the type of expectation most directly relevant to enjambment: whenever it marks the end of a line, a sense of virtual enjambment is inevitable.

The main points in a theory of SMIU-anticipation are:

A. SMIU-anticipation is characterised by a combination of varying degrees of paradigmatic and syntagmatic probability.

B. The latter can never reach the level of absolute certainty.

C. The degree of syntactic predictability is a decisive factor in the structure and function of enjambment.

D. It is determined in relation to a hierarchical scale ranging from the highest to the lowest degree of certainty in syntactic prediction.

E. This scale cannot be proposed here because of lack of research, but its existence is postulated as an integral part of syntactic-intonational perception.

7.4.5. The Contribution of SL to SMIU-Tension

Alongside SMIU-anticipation, SMIU-SL is the most important factor contributing to SMIU-tension. Unlike SMIU-anticipation, its contribution is very straightforward and easily describable: OTHER THINGS BEING EQUAL, THE FARTHER A GIVEN WORD FROM THE BEGINNING OF ITS *SMIU*, THE LESS *SMIU*-TENSION IT CARRIES.

An integrated static-dynamic procedure of analysis should juxtapose this dynamic rule with its static counterpart (see above, 7.3): while the dynamic rule proposes an opposition between the beginning of an SMIU and a given word which functions as an end of an *ad hoc* segment, the static rule proposes an opposition between the middle of a segment on the one hand and both its beginning and its end on the other hand. Thus, in the

case of PCR that turns into an unexpected R, the dynamic rule can account for SL enhancement of line-end tension, while the static one can account for SL's enhancement of pause-desirability at line-end. The two rules can thus be brought into harmony or into discord, depending on the SL proportions between three factors: (a) the pre-line-end part of the SMIU; (b) the post-line-end part of the SMIU; (c) the extratextual norm of SL optimum.

7.4.6. The Negligibility of the Potential Contribution of Psycholinguistics to SMIU-Tension.

A detailed study of three potentially relevant courses of study in psycholinguistics - (a) the study of guessing; (b) the study of hesitation pauses; (c) the theory of sentence depth - has shown that the potential contribution of psycholinguistics to SMIU-tension is quite negligible, because of the differences between the questions that should be asked and answered in connection with SMIU-tension on the one hand and those that are being discussed in psycholinguistics on the other hand.

7.4.7. The Skeleton Theory of SMIU-Tension

SMIU-tension is a direct and automatic manifestation of syntactic incompleteness. Consequently, the following rules constitute the skeleton-theory:

1. SL in SMIUs functions as described above (see 7.4.5).
2. SMIU-anticipation is directly proportionate to SMIU-tension.
3. Syntactic openness, contrary to syntactic anticipation, defies any subclassification into SMIU- and SMAU-openness (it is precisely the difficulty in selecting the most predictable continuation at a given point which creates syntactic openness). Syntactic openness is incompatible with syntactic completeness, and invariably carries a certain amount of syntactic tension; but, on the other hand, it is inversely proportionate to SMIU-anticipation and, consequently, to SMIU-tension.

4. Schematically, the following four types of syntactic prediction are arranged in a descending order of contribution to SMIU-tension: (1) SMIU-anticipation; (2) Syntactic openness; (3) SMAU-anticipation; (4) Prospective syntactic completeness.

7.5. SMAU-TENSION: AN ACTIVE BACKGROUND FOR ENJAMBMENT

7.5.1. The Contribution of SMAU-Anticipation to SMAU-Tension

SMAU-anticipation – the predictability of a nonterminal pausal juncture as the very next syntagmatic element – is in fact the third phase in a process of perceiving SMAU-anticipation, which potentially consists of three basic phases.

1. Phase 1 is the inception of SMAU-anticipation: It consists of the earliest point where "initial syntactic subordination" can be formally identified.

2. Phase 2 is the entire text from Phase 1 and until syntactic completeness has been attained.

3. Phase 3 is SMAU-anticipation as defined above: it is the predictability of a nonterminal pausal juncture as the very next syntagmatic element.

The three phases are not necessarily discrete, continuous segmental units of a text, but rather interwoven and partly overlapping patterns in it. Consequently, only Phase 3, which is SMAU-anticipation in the strict and narrow sense of its definition, is incompatible with SMIU-anticipation whereas Phases 1 and 2 usually coincide with SMIU-anticipation.

A detailed textual analysis of several poems has demonstrated two phenomena: (a) the role of active background that may be played by SMAU-tension in relation to enjambment and (b) the function of "enactment" that may be fulfilled by the syntactic-intonational organisation of a poetic text in relation to its thematic structure and message (see Nowotny [382], 111-113).

The main differences between SMAU- and SMIU-anticipation lie (a) in the hierarchical relations between paradigmatic and syntagmatic predictabilities (the three phases of the former as opposed to the single phase of the latter); (b) in the relevance of initial syntactic subordination (which is tootlly irrelevant to SMIU-anticipation); (c) in the acuteness of the urge to complete the sentence.

7.5.2. The Contribution of SMAU-SL to SMAU-Tension

The two major differences between SL in SMIUs and in SMAUs in the present context are:

1. Theoretically, both SMIUs and SMAUs can be extended endlessly, but in practice SMIUs are much more resistant to such extensions being carried too far.

2. The one-way contribution of SL to SMIU-tension is independent of syntactic structure, word-order, etc., whereas in SL contribution to SMAU-tension there are two distinct curves: anticipational and nonanticipational. The former occurs in cases of initial syntactic subordination and the tension-curve is similar to a parabola; the latter occurs after potential syntactic completeness has been attained, and the "curve" is a gradually descending straight line (as in SMIUs).

"The Parabola Principle" can be explained in terms of a certain SL-maximum. Beyond this maximum an utterance is too long to be consciously perceived as a single sentence, and the tension-curve, having risen up to this point, begins to subside.

SMAU-SL behaves differently when hypotactic "right-branching" or paratactic phrases and/or clauses are appended to a potentially syntactically complete utterance. This type of syntactic organisation may be called "initial syntactic completeness". In the latter type, as in SMIUs, the farther a given point from the point of initial syntactic completeness, the less SMAU-tension it carries.

7.6. PUNCTUATION, SYNTACTIC INTONATION AND ENJAMBMENT

7.6.1. Opening Remarks

So far, I have treated pauses, tensions, anticipations, etc., as being signalled by relationships within word-sequences alone, disregarding syntactic intonation in oral communication and punctuation in written communication, as factors generating syntactic and intonational expectation. The fact is, however, that some syntactic relationships are communicated solely through intonation (or, more specifically, syntactic intonation) and/or punctuation (depending on the channel of communication), rather than through the structure of the word-sequence alone.

Any sentence is inevitably uttered orally with some kind of an intonation contour; and whenever the word sequence as such allows two contours or more, the speaker's selection of one of them and rejection of the other(s) may amount to signalling a specific syntactic structure (e.g., that the sentence is not complete although the word-sequence, if considered in isolation, could be interpreted as a syntactically complete utterance).

The poet's potential for variation of this kind is limited: language maintains here a clear hierarchical order, whereby the word sequence determines whether, which, and how many, different alternative syntactic structures and IC divisions can be legitimately applied to it, and the number of correct syntactic intonations is accordingly limited. Consequently, in some cases junctural changes (pitch, duration and loudness), that may result from lineation, reveal the potential possibilities of additional IC analyses and are allowed by the word-sequence to have syntactic relevance, while in other cases any such changes which may be "artificially" introduced by lineation belong to this sequence's system of semantic (including emotive or expressive), rather than syntactic, intonation.

7.6.2. Segmentational Ambiguity

In poetry, various potential possibilities may be used simultaneously, with the help of enjambment, lineation and punctuation, to enhance semantic complexity and density. In some cases two syntactically and intonationally incompatible interpretations equally apply to the given word-sequence because of the manipulation of punctuation and lineation. Consequently, a silent reading of the written poem should help the reader capture its built-in structural complexity, since most oral readings are likely to disambiguate what the poet took care to leave ambiguous through the absence of punctuation (demonstrated in a poem by Eliot). Whitman is shown to use punctuation to simulate (false) syntactic subordination through intonational subordination.

7.6.3. Punctuation, Intonation and Word-Sequence

If a word-sequence is potentially complete, a punctuation mark other than a period in writing, and/or its oral correlative (terminal pausal juncture), can always make it prospectively incomplete: a word-sequence — no matter how complete and autonomous it appears to be — can never have a period as the only punctuation mark (and a terminal pause as the only juncture) that is acceptable at its end. However, this statement cannot be reversed: only nonterminal junctures (and punctuation marks) are tolerable at the end of syntactically incomplete utterances.

Schematically, the possibilities are as follows: (1) Word-sequence syntactically complete — punctuation and/or intonation terminal; result: syntactic completeness. (2) Word-sequence syntactically complete — punctuation and/or intonation nonterminal; result: syntactic incompleteness. (3) Word-sequence syntactically incomplete — punctuation and/or intonation nonterminal (as dictated by word-sequence); result: syntactic incompleteness. (4) Word-sequence syntactically incomplete —

punctuation and/or intonation terminal; result: syntactic irregularity; "segmentational ungrammaticality" (see 5.9.1),

To conclude: Punctuation and syntactic intonation are definitely secondary to the word-sequence itself as systems signalling syntactic completeness or incompleteness. Whenever a sharp clash occurs between the word-sequence and any or both of the other systems, it is always the latter which can be considered inappropriate in relation to the former, and the former would hardly ever be altered in order to conform to the latter.

7.6.4. Ambiguity and Determinacy: Conclusion

1. A certain amount of syntactic openness, as a syntagmatic phenomenon, oriented towards the very next step, is present at the end of any word-sequence. If the word-sequence up to the point of assessment is syntactically deficient or incomplete, syntactic openness ranges from SMAU- to SMIU-anticipation; if, however, the word-sequence is potentially autonomous, there is always some degree of syntactic uncertainty as to whether the utterance is to remain closed, realising this potential by a full stop, or to become open in spite of its potential autonomy, by appending to it a continuation justifying syntactic expectation retrospectively.

2. Punctuation marks in written utterances and pausal junctures in spoken ones can reduce or increase syntactic openness and uncertainty, depending on how they are made to conform to, or to deviate from, expected norms. Occasionally, as described above they can also contribute to simultaneous segmentational ambiguity

3. Finally, all factors should be referred to the poet's practice in general and in a given poem in particular: thus, for instance, the presence or absence of a comma at the end of a line in a poem by Walt Whitman may function radically differently from an exactly identical occurrence in a poem by E.E. Cummings. Generally speaking, however, regardless of the degree of syntactic

	Prospective		Retrospective	
	Prediction	End Result	Prediction	End Result
Enjambment	A	A	B	A
End-stopped line	B	B	A	B

7.7.2. Enjambment and Retrospective Line-Integrity

Enjambment is traditionally regarded as a line-weakening device; however, it may be used, paradoxically, to enhance line integrity through its potential contribution to the retrospective recognition of syntactic segmentational ambiguity.

Whereas the concepts of line division and line boundary focus our attention on the "negative" aspect of the poetic line (what distinguishes and separates it from other lines) the concept of line-integrity focuses our attention on its "positive" aspect (what makes it into one unit).

One of the conclusions drawn from the analysis of a poem by Cummings is that line integrity is totally dependent on lingual legitimation, while the integrity of lingual units needs no legitimation outside itself. Lineation can offer (a) a semantic alternative resulting from expressive emphasis and/or unexpected pause without segmentational ambiguity; (b) a syntactic alternative resulting from the realisation of potential segmentational ambiguity without affecting the line as a whole; (c) a syntactic alternative affecting the integrity of the line.

7.8. SYNTACTIC TENSION AT LINE-END: CONCLUSION

The table on page 235 can serve as a condensation of everything said so far in this chapter about the various types of syntactic tension which operate at the end of a poetic segment (line, stanza, complete poem). It is drawn from the standpoint of the last word of a poetic segment (a line, but also a stanza

completeness, the presence of line-end punctuation is an almost absolute indication of end-stoppage.

7.7. THE RETROSPECTIVE ASPECT OF THE DYNAMIC APPROACH.

The application of the dynamic approach involves two complementary procedures: (a) the "prospective" or "anticipatory" procedure, whereby forward-directed tensions and expectations are established on the basis of the syntactic information already supplied; (b) the "retrospective" procedure, whereby tensions and expectations are reviewed from the standpoint of the end of an SMIU (or a longer unit) on the basis of fresh evidence supplied by later material. The backward-directed movement of the latter procedure is not to be confused with the static approach. Both procedures just described are dynamic, since they attempt a step-by-step reconstruction of the syntactic component of the reading process. The static approach, however, looks spatially at the confirmed data.

7.7.1. Prospective and Retrospective Enjambments and End-Stopped Lines.

Enjambment is prospective if a pausal juncture is syntactically unlikely at the end of the first line, and retrospective if such a juncture is syntactically likely at the end of the first line. Similarly, there can be prospective (expected) and retrospective end-stopped lines.

Schematically, the four-way distinction can be described in a simple table. In this table A stands for syntactically-determined resistance to any pausal juncture at line-end and B stands for syntactically determined acceptability or likelihood of some pausal juncture at line-end, whether terminal or nonterminal; it is drawn as follows:

or a complete poem), provided that it carries some kind of syntactic expectation (i.e., it cannot be a last word of a sentence).

A deviant type of line-end syntactic-intonational tension occurs in the syntactically incomplete poem. An entire poetic text may end with an incomplete sentence (i.e., with unresolved SMIU- or SMAU-anticipation). This rare phenomenon in the SMIU case can be described as a permanently prospective enjambment.

7.9. PROSODIC ASPECTS OF ENJAMBMENT

All the nonsyntactic aspects of enjambment are surveyed here superficially, to round off the mapping of the field of pause-desirability as introduced in the Definition and the list of parameters. The study is actually concerned with the foregoing syntactic discussion alone; the other topics serve as background and perspectives.

7.9.1. Metre

The main points relevant to the study of metre in enjambment are:

Metre and Interlinear Transition in Iambic Pentameter.

In iambic pentameter there are four basic conventional possibilities at line-end.

1. Masculine ending, iambic beginning (iambic transition).
2. Feminine ending, trochaic beginning (trochaic transition).
3. Masculine ending, trochaic beginning (spondeic transition).
4. Feminine ending, iambic beginning (pyrrhical transition).

Under "iambic circumstances" the four possibilities just listed are arranged in ascending order of enjambment-resistance.

"Straddled Lines"

In "straddled lines" where iambic pentameter emerges from scanning the text from one caesura to the next ignoring enjambment, metre lends its support to lineation and to syntax almost equally, both interwoven segmentations being here metrically justified. Metre is thus neutralised by itself, which leaves things as they were: as a conflict between syntax and lineation.

7.9.2. Rhyme.

Rhyme is one of the most important and most established indications of line end, and as such it is clearly a line-reinforcing factor. Its usual contribution is in this direction; other things being equal, enjambment in rhymed poetry is potentially much more acute than in unrhymed poetry, because the strong resistance of the line to syntax sharpens the sense of conflict. The most acute enjambments occur when the schemes of rhyme and metre reach a clear point of terminality with the last word of a line, while the same word starts a very cohesive syntactic unit that ends in the next line.

7.10. INTONATION AND PROBLEMS OF ORAL RENDITION.

7.10.1. The Oral Interpretation of Enjambment.

This aspect can be described as a complex of two basic questions: (1) Which of the two forces colliding in enjambment is to get the upper hand in the (actual or imagined) intonation of reading? (2) Once the former question has been answered, what is the exact manifestation of this answer in terms of intonation contours? As for (1), generally the two colliding forces are not equal, and the syntactic and intonational structure of the text is never totally obliterated by lineation. As for question (2), there is no uniform interpretation of how enjambments should sound. I agree, however, with those scholars who main-

tain that in matters of oral performance there is a hierarchy, ranging from the least to the most obligatory.

7.10.2. "The Residue Theory"

The interrelations between syntactic and attitudinal components of intonation at the end of SMIUs can at least partly be accounted for by "the residue theory":

1. The components of intonation which convey syntactic information are first and foremost pitch direction, which is mandatory for the given syntactic relationship, and a characteristic pitch interval.

2. Inasmuch as the overall prosodic or paralinguistic pattern of an utterance (P) departs from the usual norms of syntactic intonation (S), such departures convey "emotive" or "attitudinal" information (AR). Formally: $P = S + AR$; consequently, $S = P - AR$ and $AR = P - S$. AR is the "attitudinal residue" that "remains" in the intonation contour after the intonational minimum required for conveying the syntactic information has been, as it were, mentally removed.

Enjambments may promote either syntactic or semantic-emotive-attitudinal alternatives according to a strict hierarchy. If a syntactic reorientation is possible, the functional interpretation of enjambment will be first and foremost syntactic; if an enjambment occurs at a syntactically irrelevant point, the element of intonational irregularity introduced by enjambment is interpreted as attitudinal (i.e., $S = 0$, $P = AR$).

7.10.3. A Note on Enjambment and Tempo.

Enjambments tend to vary, *inter alia*, according to the nature of the unrealised potential alternative that most readily suggests itself to the reader as the "normal" version supplanted, as it were, by the enjambment. There are two types of such rejected potential alternatives: (a) an end-stopped alternative;

(b) a prose-like alternative. Other things being equal, syntax makes the former case slower in tempo than the latter, so that enjambment contributes to the acceleration of the former and to the retardation of the latter.

7.11. SEMANTIC ASPECTS OF ENJAMBMENT.

7.11.1. Semantic Expectation

By semantic expectation, or semantic contribution to intonational tension, I mean semantically- and non-syntactically-motivated expectation. However, in order that a semantic parameter could function on the immediate level as relevant to intonational tension and enjambment, it should be sensed as a semantically-motivated urge for syntactic continuation.

Thus, a given word-sequence may be potentially complete, if judged by formal syntax alone; yet, if considerations of semantic probability (on the level of lingual meaning or on the level of a literary interpretation of the text) are taken into account, this very word-sequence is "open" or "anticipatory" in such a way, and with such urgency, that it almost cannot be a complete sentence. Semantic expectation can also be described as "open" or as "anticipatory". It can also be subclassified into SMIU- and SMAU-semantic-expectation and, likewise, it can be prospective or retrospective.

7.11.2. Enjambment and Literary Interpretation.

The last factor affecting pause desirability in the Definition is "literary interpretation". To conclude this study I would like to touch upon some of the ways that enjambment can function in the semantic organisation of the poetic text.

My contentions in this connection are:

1. Each word in context has a certain semantic potential for being emphasised and/or dwelt upon regardless of how it is placed in a line.

2. Likewise, all enjambments have a potential capacity to foreground the words in their nearest vicinity, regardless of any particular configuration of meaning, syntax and/or prosody in any given instance.

In order to acquire emphasis through enjambment, a word should have a "preversified" semantic potential for being emphasised; but this potential may remain unnoticed as long as the "intonational value" of the word, as dictated by its "prose position", remains unchanged. Enjambment, then, affects the semantic structure of the text, by rearranging the hierarchy of the relative importance of words.

All the syntactic and intonational components of enjambment discussed at length throughout the study affect the patterns of tempo and emphasis of the text; yet, the semantic considerations of literary interpretation usually outweigh all the rest.

7.12. ENJAMBMENT BETWEEN POETRY AND PROSE: A CONCLUDING OVERVIEW

Enjambment's position between poetry and prose can be summarised in a nutshell as follows: A poetic text is organised simultaneously by syntax, lineation and metrical (and other rhythmical) structures. This complex phenomenon can be viewed from the standpoint of language with poetic structuration superimposed on it, and from the standpoint of poetic structuration with syntactic organisation superimposed on it. In other words, the syntactic parameter can be treated as a constant, with lineation as a variable, and vice versa. At any rate, both practices bear witness to the interpenetration and interdependence of the various components of the total poetic effect of enjambment. This intricacy, incidentally, is the main cause for enjambment being regarded by some scholars as a device making poetry more prose-like, and by others as a device working in the opposite direction. Both views are potentially correct, the former being more applicable in some cases and the latter in other cases.

Enjambment as a whole, however, is characterised by being capable of performing these two seemingly contradictory tasks.

7.13. WIDER PERSPECTIVES: CONCLUDING REMARKS.

Contextually-determined hierarchies of semantic prominence of words also contribute to the relative emphasis and duration of words in the text. Additionally, the semantic contribution to enjambment may reflect the impact of extratextual systemic influence. Thus, for instance, a generic convention, or a tradition of oral performance, may contribute to the prominence of one word or parameter compared to the other(s).

It is hoped that the entire field of enjambment has at least been mapped and surveyed. It is also hoped that, despite its predominantly syntactic and "technical" approach, the present study has contributed to a better understanding of the phenomenon of the poetic line as a major distinctive feature of poetry, and, consequently, to a better understanding of poetry and its uniqueness.

8. APPENDIX: SOME EFFECTS AND FUNCTIONS OF ENJAMBMENT

IN SHAKESPEARE'S KING LEAR

8.0. PRELIMINARY

This Appendix is a revised version of a section of a much earlier study, written in the late '60s, about enjambment in *King Lear*. Its function here is to illustrate some of the points made in 6.1.2.2, 6.2.4 and 6.3, and in Chapter 6 in general. It is textually- and not theoretically-oriented, the analysis of some of the play's enjambments being its main objective; therefore it is offered only as an appendix. Falling short of systematic application of the theoretical argument, it can still demonstrate major possibilities inherent in enjambment in its capacity as a semantically-functioning device, as employed in a major literary masterpiece.

8.1. ACCELERATION AND RETARDATION

One of the main effects produced by enjambments is their obvious influence on the speed of reading. Whenever the line is dominant, holding back syntactic flow, there is a retardation, and whenever syntax seems to smooth over line boundaries, there is acceleration. For example:

- A. (1) Kill thy physician, and the fee bestow
(2) Upon the foul disease... (I, i, 163-164)

The word-order of A (1) adds tension to the last word of the line, and a considerable acceleration ensues, as compared to the alternative which almost suggests itself:

- B. (1) Kill thy physician, and bestow the fee
(2) Upon the foul disease...

The violation of normal word-order, together with the use of enjambment, suggest an intentional acceleration, to match the dramatic situation of the scene. However, no device can make an enjambment work faster than a "smooth" complete line, as seen in yet another alternative:

- C. (1) Kill the physician
- (2) And th' fee bestow upon the foul disease.

The movement here is definitely faster. What is missing is the clash between the two conflicting forces at line-end, which makes all the semantically important words stand out and acquire emphasis through syntactic-intonational restlessness.

A striking example of the retardation potentialities of enjambments is the following passage (already discussed on p.240 in connection with "straddled lines"):

- D. (1)You have seen
- (2) Sunshine and rain at once: Her smiles and tears
- (3) Were like a better way: those happy smiles
- (4) That played on her ripe lip seemed not to know
- (5) What guests were in her eyes, which parted thence
- (6) As pearls from diamonds dropped. (IV, iii, 18-23)

A very important factor in the effect produced by the passage is that with slight changes it can be re-cast as a passage of perfect end-stopped iambic pentameter (except for one possible enjambment), as shown above (p.240):

- E. (1) You must have seen sunshine and rain at once:
- (2) Her smiles and tears were like a better way:
- (3) Those happy smiles that played on her ripe lip
- (4) Seemed not to know what guests were in her eyes,
- (5) Which parted thence as pearls from diamond dropped.

"When we rewrite a poem and arrange the lines in a new way we see a striking difference", says Hrushovski ([247], 186). The difference here, even if not "striking", is no doubt obvious and significant. The idyllic atmosphere is not changed, as it results primarily from the meaning conveyed by the words (and from the contrasting position of the passage within the action of the play). However, it is considerably reinforced by versification. Mrs. Nowotny notes rightly, that the style in *King Lear* "supports the expressiveness by metrical mimesis" ([381], 55). The enjambments create caesuras within the iambic-pentameter sentences. The ensuing regularity of alternating two- and three-foot distances between metrical and syntactic pauses produces a "see-saw effect", or rather a "hammock effect". There is no real feeling of tension or

conflict between metrical and syntactic structures, but rather of two contrapuntally complementary musical lines. This is so for three main reasons: (1) the relaxed meaning; (2) the metrical regularity of the syntactic units, the "straddled lines", "setting up a kind of sub-line", in Hollander's words ([239], 290); and (3) the coincidence, typical of "straddled lines", of the ends of the lines within each sentence with the strongest immediate-constituent boundaries, next in hierarchy to the sentence boundaries themselves. Thus a metrical and a syntactic "equilibrium" is created, keeping the pace slow to enable the reader, the spectator, the actor and the reciter to take notice of these subtle details. The ease with which the passage can be rewritten to comprise end-stopped lines is additional proof, if any is needed, that the lineation is not arbitrary. Whether consciously or unconsciously, Shakespeare must have heard what the lineation reflects. This evidence is of primary importance in a play, as a guide to the performer who wishes to base his actualisation upon "the clues which the text provides for the readers for grouping, pausing, emphasis, breathing, etc." (Hrushovski, [247], 181-182).

8.2. ORGANISATION OF EMPHASES THROUGH ENJAMBMENT

Enjambment "can lead to the restressing of words at both ends of the line" (Hrushovski, [247], 186), often through acceleration and retardation. For example:

- F. (1)Her eyes are fierce, but thine
(2) Do comfort, and not burn (II, iv, 174-175)
- G. (1)You should be ruled, and led
(2) By some discretion that discerns your state
(3) Better than yourself (II, iv, 148-149)

In F(1) the word "thine" acquires prominence by the unexpected pause following it. In the transition G(2) -G(3) the enjambmental transition leads to the emphasis of "Better". The difference is primarily accounted for by the meaning or the semantic potential; yet it is strongly supported by the inversion of the first foot in G(3) (spondaic transition; see p.239). The emphasis at the end of

F(1) would be weakened if there were no line-end and enjambment there. But the beginning of G(3) could not have existed in its present form under different metrical circumstances.

8.3. LEVELLING OF STRESSES AND PAUSES

A similar, though more complex role is played by enjambment in the following instance:

- H. (1) You are not worth the dust which the rude wind
(2) Blows in your face. (IV, ii, 30-31)

Here there is a heavy inversion of metre (a kind of "double-spondaic" transtion) at the end of H(1), the beginning of H(2). These three words would be stressed under any metrical circumstances, for reasons inherent in the English language; however, they are organised by the line-structure so as to separate the first two from the third. Thus they are arranged in granting each its own "specific gravity", according to its relation to each relevant parameter. This is not merely emphasising words, but also "levelling" of stresses and pauses.

8.4. ENJAMBMENTS AND DRAMATIC EXPRESSION

In the following example SMAU-tension and SMIU-tension contribute considerably to the totality of dramatic effect:

- I. (1) [.....] This is most strange,
(2) That she whom even but now was your best object,
(3) The argument of your praise, balm of your age,
(4) The best, the dearest, should in this trice of time
(5) Commit a thing so monstrous to dismantle
(6) So many folds of favour. Sure her offence
(7) Must be of such unnatural degree
(8) That monsters it, or your fore-vouched affection
(9) Fall into taint; which to believe of her
(10) Must be a faith that reason without miracle
(11) Should never plant in me. (I, i, 213-223)

There is a striking correspondence between the metrical and semantic divisions of the passage. The first part, from (1) to the middle of (4), deals with Lear's former love for Cordelia. The lines correspond perfectly with complete clauses and phrases, and therefore no strong enjambment is felt. The seemingly less

tense nature of these lines is balanced by a gradually rising syntactic tension, gathering force from line to line; This is achieved by a long separation of the subject from the predicate, creating SMAU-tension through accumulation of appositions. Then, in the middle of line (4), a sudden change occurs on both levels: enjambments and meaning. The SMAU-tension of the first lines, consisting of heavily charged complete clauses and phrases congruent with the line unit, breaks into SMIU-tension of ecstatic, breathless enjambments. Just as lines (1) - (4) accumulate clauses, lines (6) - (11) accumulate short-lived enjambments, each line relaxing the tension of the previous line and creating a new one for the next line to relax. This excited speech depicts, or rather organises and shapes, the whole atmosphere of the scene as reflected in France's state of mind. In speaking of Lear's abandoned love for Cordelia he is still self-contained, until his emotions overwhelm him when he tries to understand the strange change in Lear's attitude. A change in Lear, having been shown, is discussed; a change in the state of the speaker's mind coincides with the change he discusses; a change in tone and expression depicts the change in the state of mind; and a change in the techniques and structures of enjambment is the main factor in shaping the change in tone and expression.

Literary effects of various kinds are produced by enjambments throughout *King Lear*. Perhaps the following comparison can serve as another illustration of the attitudinal potentialities of enjambment:

- J. (1) Because I would not see thy cruel nails
(2) Pluck out his poor old eyes; nor thy fierce sister
(3) In his anointed flesh rash boarish fangs.
(4) The sea, with such a storm as his bare head
(5) In hell-black night endured, would have buoyed up
(6) And quenched the stellèd fires. (III, vii, 55-60)
- K. (1) Wisdom and goodness to the vile seem vile:
(2) Filths savour but themselves. What have you done?
(3) Tigers, not daughter, what have you performed?

- (4) A father, and a gracious agèd man,
(5) Whose reverence even the head-lugged bear would lick
(6) Most barbarous, most degenerate! have you madded.
(IV, ii, 38-43)

I have compared the two speeches because they are as similar in content as any two different speeches of different characters can be. Yet there is a marked difference: speech J, made by Gloucester is full of enjambments; while only end-stopped lines make up speech K, made by Albany.

There is no need for a detailed analysis of the speeches in order to state that Gloucester's speech (J) is far more ecstatic and powerful than Albany's. There are some features in the diction of the passages that partly account for this fact, but the main reason is definitely the absence or presence of enjambments, or, more correctly, of some sort of syntactic and rhythmical tension. Speech (K) is rhythmically tranquil; its equal, end-stopped lines carry little tension to accelerate them. Speech J, on the other hand, is ever-restless. Its enjambments are the main feature of the "metrical mimesis" it achieves.

This does not imply, of course, that enjambments are the only means for achieving intensity or expressiveness; but they are doubtlessly a major device in the poet's arsenal for achieving this goal, if matched with appropriate semantic, syntactic and rhythmical potentials.

8.5. NONFUNCTIONAL ENJAMBMENTS

Enjambment is by no means a device that always produces the same effect, or works in the same direction. Generally speaking, "Stylistic elements [...] are 'polyvalent'; the same device may produce several effects, and conversely, the same effect may be obtained from several devices." ¹ Moreover, enjambment can some-

¹ S. Ullman, *Style in the French Novel* (Oxford, 1964), p.20.

times be employed simply as a convention, without any apparent cause or effect. The justified interest in the functioning of literary devices need not lead us to an almost mystical function-hunting. All devices, especially those characteristic of a certain tradition, may be employed as sheer poetic conventions.

The following seems to me an extreme case, where the enjambment is not only nonfunctional and unaccounted for, but even defeats its own purpose:

- L. (1) Repose you there, while I to this hard house —
(2) More harder than the stones whereof 'tis raised,
(3) Which even but now, demanding after you,
(4) Denied me to come in — return, and force
(5) Their scanted courtesy. (III, ii, 63-67)

Here the syntactic structure annuls the effect of enjambment. The sentence as a whole is somewhat cumbersome, and one fails to follow the conflicting intonation contours and to perceive their syntactic correlatives even within one's "auditory imagination". All the more so when an actor is confronted with the insoluble problems of this passage. But while such cases are rare in the work of Shakespeare, simple conventional uses of enjambment, where no special effect ensues, are much more frequent.

8.6 ENJAMBMENTS AND CHARACTERISATION

One of the most interesting questions in the analysis of enjambments in plays is whether *dramatis personae* differ in their use of enjambment, as a manifestation of their personal styles and characters. I could find almost no evidence to support an affirmative answer to this question. Shakespeare appears to be primarily preoccupied with the stylistic articulation of dramatic scenes and actions, rather than the stylistic articulation of his characters. Indeed, most effects of the enjambments in *King Lear* are best described in terms of their dramatic function. However, I did find a certain peculiarity in the lines uttered by Goneril and Regan. There is a marked difference, as regards enjambments, between the first passages uttered by each of them

at the beginning of the play. Goneril's first words are:

- M. (1) Sir, I love you more than words can wield the matter;
(2) Dearer than eyesight, space and liberty;
(3) Beyond what can be valued, rich or rare;
(4) No less than life, with grace, health, beauty, honour;
(5) As much as child e'er loved, or father found;
(6) A love that makes breath poor, and speech unable:
(7) Beyond all manner of so much I love you. (I, i, 55-61)

While Regan's first words are:

- N. (1) I am made of that self mettle as my sister,
(2) And prize me at her worth. In my true heart
(3) I find she names my very deed of love;
(4) Only she comes to short, that I profess
(5) Myself an enemy to all other joys
(6) Which the most precious square of sense possesses,
(7) And find I am alone felicitate
(8) In your dear highness' love (I, i, 69-76)

Whatever it may or may not mean as regards characterisation, Goneril's speech is solemn and self-contained, while Regan's is restless and ecstatic. Trying to trace the two ladies' use of enjambments throughout the rest of the play I found a certain discernible tendency. Goneril maintains her preference for end-stopped lines, while Regan maintains her preference for enjambment, until they reverse their preferences in Act IV. After Cornwall's death, Regan becomes aware of her advantage over her sister as regards the prospects of marrying Edmund. Her new self-confidence probably accounts for the increase in the number of end-stopped lines she utters (e.g., IV, v, 28-38). At the same time Goneril becomes frustrated and insecure and uses enjambments much more than she did before.

Indeed, these "preferences" are no more than a tendency. No conclusions can be drawn unless more evidence is considered. However, even if the tendency is well proven it is still more "smoothly" explained in terms of scene and dramatic action than in terms of personal characterisation.

8.7. ENJAMBMENT SUBTLETIES

Last but not least to be quoted here are two of the most famous

passages in the play, both uttered by Lear. It is precisely because they are so great and famous that I use them to demonstrate the part of their greatness shared by their enjambments. The first example is:

- O. (1) You do me wrong to take me out o' th' grave;
(2) Thou art a soul in bliss; but I am bound
(3) Upon a wheel of fire, that mine own tears
(4) Do scald like molten lead. (IV, vii, 45-48)

Here, once again, we have "straddled lines" of iambic pentameter; the enjambments correspond to the immediate-constituent analysis, and serve mainly to level and regulate the emphases and to juxtapose significant syntactic units. This juxtaposition, together with the retardation created by the enjambment, distributes stresses where they are due. The matter will be clear if we compare Shakespeare's lineation with an "alternative" (with an additional word to regulate the metre):

- P. (1) You do me wrong to take me out o' th' grave:
(2) Thou art a soul in everlasting bliss;
(3) But I am bound upon a wheel of fire,
(4) That mine own tears do scald like molten lead.

Nobody would be disturbed by this lineation if it were Shakespeare's; but the differences are obvious all the same, and Shakespeare's lineation is much richer: because of its potential syntactic completeness, line O(2) momentarily juxtaposes "bliss" with "bound", and "thou" with "I". The alternative lineation is poorer because these potential juxtapositions are not realised. Simultaneous patterns are thus flattened into linearity.

More subtle still is the action of the enjambment in the following second and last example:

- Q. (1) Howl, howl, howl, howl! O, you are men of stones:
(2) Had I your tongues and eyes, I'd use them so
(3) That heaven's vault should crack (V, iii, 259-261)

Here the enjambment influences the "auditory imagination" of the reader directly, almost solely, by suggesting a certain intonation contour to be actualised by the actor. Let the reader read the lines carefully, noting the pause and "rising" juncture inherent in the authentic lineation, and compare it to the "sustained" juncture inherent in the "alternative", end-stopped lineation (for metrical reasons I have disregarded the four "howl"s):

- R. (1) You're men of stones: Had I your tongues, and eyes,
(2) I'd use them so that heaven's vault should crack.

The subtle difference in intonation implies, of course, a slight difference in semantic and emotional stress, in the "tone" of the lines. The alternative joins "so" with "that" in a matter-of-fact intonation contour. Such minutiae should never be overlooked, because in literature they are often part of the stuff greatness is made of.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

The Bibliography reflects a process of trial-and error in collecting material for the study. As such it is not confined to studies actually mentioned in my text. The genesis of the present study, which started as a study on enjambment in Shakespeare's *King Lear* and continued as a study on enjambment in poetic translation, has made its strong impact on the Bibliography.

By and large, the style practices, the system of internal reference and the abbreviations used in the Bibliography are those adopted in *The MLA International Bibliography*. The editions of books cited are those available to me at the time of writing. Items marked by an asterisk (*) in the English Bibliography were originally published in Hebrew.

LIST OF POETIC REFERENCES

- Cummings*: e.e. cummings. *Selected Poems 1923-1958*. London, 1971.
- Donne*: *The Complete Poetry and Selected Prose of John Donne*, edited by Charles M. Coffin. New York, 1952.
- Eliot*: T.S. Eliot. *Selected Poems*. London, 1961.
- Hopkins*: Gerard Manley Hopkins. *Poems and Prose*, selected and edited by W.H. Gardner. London, 1972.
- Moore*: Marianne Moore. *Selected Poems*. London, 1969.
- Poe*: Edgar Allen Poe. *Selected Poetry and Prose*. New York, 1951.
- Whitman*: *The Portable Walt Whitman*, edited by Mark Van Doren. New York, 1945.

All Shakespearean examples are quoted from separate volumes of the various plays that appeared in The Arden Edition of the Works of William Shakespeare, published in London by Methuen & Co. under the General Editorship of Harold F. Brooks and Harold Jenkins. The only exception is *Hamlet*, where The Signet Classic Shakespeare edition, edited by Edward Hubler, is used.

ENGLISH BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Abbott, Kenneth, M. "Enjambement". [411], 241.
2. Abercrombie, David, Fry, D.B., MacCarthy, P.A.D., Scott, N.C. and Trim, J.L.M., eds. *In Honour of Daniel Jones: Papers Contributed on the Occasion of his Eightieth Birthday, 12 September 1961*. London, 1964.
3. Abercrombie, David. "A Phonetician's View of Verse Structure". *Linguistics* 6 (1964), 5-13. Reprinted in [4], 16-25.
4. Abercrombie, David. *Studies in Phonetics and Linguistics* (Language and Language Learning, 10). London, 1965.
5. Abercrombie, Lascelles. *Principles of English Prosody*. London, 1923.
6. Abernathy, Robert. "Rhymes, Non-Rhymes, and Antirhyme". [205], 1-14.
7. Abraham, Samuel and Kiefer, Ferenc. *A Theory of Structural Semantics* (Janua Linguarum: Series Minor, 49). The Hague, 1966.
8. Adams, Hazard. *The Contexts of Poetry* (University Paperbacks, 137). London, 1965.
9. Adler, Jacob H. "Pope and the Rules of Prosody". *PMLA* 76 (1961), 218-226.
10. Alatis, James, E., ed. *Report of the Twentieth Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies* (Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics, 22). Washington, D.C., 1970.
11. Alden, R.M. *English Verse*. New York, 1922.
12. Alexander, Peter. "Shakespeare's Punctuation". *Annual Shakespeare Lecture of the British Academy, 1945* (From the *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 31). London, 1945.
13. Angus, William. "Acting Shakespeare". *QQ*, 72 (Summer 1965), 313-333.
14. Anshen, Ruth N., ed. *Language: An Enquiry into its Meaning and Function*. New York, 1957.

15. Armstrong, Chloe and Brandes, Paul D. *The Oral Interpretation of Literature* (McGraw-Hill Series in Speech). New York, 1963.
16. Armstrong, Liliias E. and Ward, Ida C. *Handbook of English Intonation*. Cambridge and Leipzig, 1926.
17. Arrowsmith, William and Shattuck, Roger, eds. *The Craft and Context of Translation*. Austin, Texas, 1961.
18. Arthos, J. *The Art of Shakespeare*. London and New York, 1964.
19. Astley, Russell. "Stations of the Breath: End Rhyme in the Verse of Dylan Thomas". *PMLA* 84 (1969), 1595-1605.
20. Atkinson, Margaret E. *August Wilhelm Schlegel as a Translator of Shakespeare*. London, 1958.
21. Auden, W.H. "Squares and Oblongs". [14], 174-178.
22. Austin, William M., ed. *Papers in Linguistics in Honor of Léon Dostert* (Janua Linguarum: Series Maior, 25). The Hague, 1967.
23. Ayer, James R. "Dylan Thomas in the Aural Dimension". *CSHVB* 1 (1968), 6-9.
24. Aylward, Kevin Joseph. "Milton's Latin Versification: The Hexameter". *DA* 27 (1966), 1331A-1332A.
25. Babcock, Sister Mary David. "Cummings' Typography: An Ideogrammic Style". *Renascence* 15 (1963), 115-123.
26. Bach, Emmon and Harms, Robert T., eds. *Universals in Linguistic Theory*. New York, 1968.
27. Baker, Sheridan. "English Meter Is Quantitative". *CE* 21 (1960), 309-315.
28. Baker, William Edwin. "The Syntax of English Poetry: 1870-1930". *DA* 25 (1965), 4123.
29. Baker, William E. *Syntax in English Poetry: 1870-1930* (Perspectives in Criticism, 18). Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1967.
30. Balliet, Conrad Arthur. "The Verse Technique of Matthew Arnold". *DA* 22 (1962), 2382-2383.

31. Barik, Henry C. "On Defining Juncture Pauses: A Note on Boomer's 'Hesitation and Grammatical Encoding'". *L & S* 11 (1968), 156-159 (see [57]).
32. Barnhill, Viron Leonard. "Poetic Context in the Collected Poems (1909-1935) of T.S. Eliot: A Linguistic Investigation of Poetic Context". *DA* 21 (1961), 2284.
33. Barton, Ruth P. "'The Natural Words in the Natural Order': A Study of W.B. Yeats's Verse Syntax". *DA* 30 (1970), 5438A.
34. Bateson, F.W. A Review of T.S. Eliot's *Poetry and Drama* [125]; *SQ* 3 (1951), 271-273.
35. Bateson, F.W. "Linguistics and Literary Criticism". [117], 3-16.
36. Baum, Paull F. "Sprung Rhythm". *PMLA* 74 (1959), 418-425.
37. Bayfield, M.A. *A Study of Shakespeare's Versification*. Cambridge, 1920.
38. Bazell, C.E., Catford, J.C., Halliday, M.A.K. and Robins, R.H., eds. *In Memory of J.R. Firth* London, 1966.
39. Beardsley, M.C. *Aesthetics: Problems in the Philosophy of Criticism*. New York, 1958.
40. Beaver, Joseph C. "A Grammar of Prosody". *CE* 29 (1968), 310-321.
41. Beaver, Joseph C. "Contrastive Stress and Metered Verse". *Language and Style* 2 (1969), 251-257.
42. Becker, Selwyn W. and Carroll, Jean. "The Effects of High and Low Sentence Contingency on Learning and Attitudes". *L & S* 6 (1963), 46-56.
43. Beeman, Samuel David. "Semantic Scaling of Voice Quality". *DA* 25 (1965), 6820.
44. Beloof, Robert. "Prosody and Tone: The 'Mathematics' of Marianne Moore". *KR* 20 (1958), 116-123.
45. Bennett, Paul E. "The Statistical Measurement of a Stylistic Trait in *Julius Caesar* and *As You Like It*". *SQ* 7 (1957), 33-50.
- 45a. Ben-Porat, Ziva and Hrushovski, Benjamin. *Structuralist Poetics in Israel* (PPS 1). Tel Aviv, 1974.

46. Berry, Francis. *Poetry and the Physical Voice*. London, 1962.
47. Berry, Francis. "The Poet's Voice: The Influence of the Poet's Physical Voice on his Work and its Typical Grammatical Forms". [114], 453-461.
48. Beum, Robert. "Some Observations on Spenser's Verse Forms". *NM* 64 (1963), 180-196.
49. Bierwisch, Manfred and Heidolph, Karl Erich, eds. *Progress in Linguistics: A Collection of Papers*. The Hague, 1970.
50. Blackmur, R.P. *Language as Gesture: Essays in Poetry*. New York, 1952.
51. Blackmur, R.P. "The Language of Silence". [14], 134-152.
52. Blair, John G. *The Poetic Art of W.H. Auden*. Princeton, 1965.
53. Blair, John G. "W.H. Auden: The Poem as Performance". *Shenandoah* 16, iii (Spring 1965), 55-66.
54. Blau, Herbert. "Language and Structure in Poetic Drama". *MLQ* 18 (1957), 27-34.
55. Bode, Carl, ed. *The Great Experiment in American Literature*. London, 1961.
56. Bode, Carl. "E.E. Cummings and Exploded Verse". [55], 79-100.
- 56a. Bolinger, Dwight, ed. *Intonation: Selected Readings* (Penguin Modern Linguistics Readings). London, 1972.
- 56b. Bolinger, Dwight. "Around the Edge of Language: Intonation". [56a], 19-29.
57. Boomer, Donald S. "Hesitation and Grammatical Encoding". *L & S* 8 (1965), 148-158 (see [31]).
58. Bowles, Edmund A., ed. *Computers in Humanistic Research: Readings and Perspectives*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1967.
59. Bradley, A.C. *Shakespearean Tragedy*. New York, 1955.
60. Bregman, Albert S. and Strasberg, Rhona. "Memory for the Syntactic Form of Sentences". *JVLVB* 7 (1968), 396-403.

61. Bridges, Robert. *Milton's Prosody*. Oxford, 1921.
62. Bridges, Robert. "A Letter to a Musician on English Prosody". Reprinted in [197], 86-101.
63. Brik, Osip Markovič. "Ritm i sintaksis". In [64], 49-76. Reprinted in facsimile (in Russian) from [543].
64. Brik, Osip Markovič. *Two Essays on Poetic Language*. (Michigan Slavic Materials, 5). Ann Arbor, 1964.
65. Brooke-Rose, Christine. "Notes on the Metre of Auden's 'The Age of Anxiety'". *EIC* 13 (1963), 253-264.
66. Bross, Addison C. "Alexander Pope's Revisions of John Donne's *Satyres*". *Xavier University Studies* 5 (1966), 133-152.
67. Brower, Reuben A. "Poetic and Dramatic Structure in Versions and Translations of Shakespeare". [114], 655-674.
68. Brown, John Russell and Harris, Bernard, eds. *Elizabethan Poetry* (Stratford-Upon-Avon Studies, 2). London, 1960.
69. Bruhnhumer, Anne Bertha. "Metrical Principles of English Poetry: A Course of Lectures by Professor Ruth Wallerstein". *DA* 21 (1961), 3087.
70. Calderwood, James L. and Toliver, Harold E., eds. *Forms of Poetry*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1968.
71. Campbell, J., ed. *A Shakespeare Encyclopaedia*. London, 1966.
72. Cannon, Garland. "The Language Component of Written Literature". *FQ* 1, iii (Winter, 1968), 59-70.
73. Cardenas, D.N. "Are Intonation Patterns Significant?". *Filologia Moderna* 3, no. 7-8 (1962), 65-74.
74. Carey, Sister Mary Cecilia. "The Poetry of Marianne Moore: A Study of her Verse, its Sources and its Influence". *DA* 20 (1959), 1023-1024.
75. Chancellor, Paul. "The Music of *The Waste Land*". *CLS* 6 (1969), 21-32.
76. Charney, Maurice. *Style in Hamlet*. Princeton, 1969.
77. Chatman, Seymour. "Immediate Constituent and Expansion Analysis". *Word* 11 (1955), 377-385.

78. Chatman, Seymour. "Robert Frost's 'Mowing': An Inquiry into Prosodic Structure". *KR* 18 (1956), 421-451. Reprinted in [226], 83-92.
79. Chatman, Seymour. "Mr. Stein on Donne". *KR* 18 (1956), 421-451. Reprinted in [226], 95-98.
80. Chatman, Seymour. "Linguistics, Poetics, and Interpretation: The Phonemic Dimension". *QJS* 43, no. 3 (October, 1957), 248-256.
81. Chatman, Seymour. "Comparing Metrical Styles". [454], 149-172.
82. Chatman, Seymour. *A Theory of Meter* (Janua Linguarum: Series Minor, 36). The Hague, 1965.
83. Chatman, Seymour. "On 'The Intonational Fallacy'". *QJS* 52, No. 3 (October 1966), 283-286.
84. Chatman, Seymour. *An Introduction to the Language of Poetry*. Boston, 1968.
85. Chatman, Seymour, ed. *Literary Style: A Symposium*. London and New York, 1971.
86. Chatman, Seymour and Levin, Samuel R. "Linguistics and Poetics". [411], 450-457.
87. Chatman, Seymour and Levin, Samuel R., eds. *Essays on the Language of Literature*. Boston, 1967.
88. Childs, Barney. "Articulation in Sound Structures: Some Notes Toward an Analytic". *TSL* 8 (1966), 423-445.
89. Chomsky, Noam. *Syntactic Structures* (Janua Linguarum: Series Minor, 4). The Hague, 1957.
90. Chomsky, Noam. "Topics in the Theory of Generative Grammar". [455], 1-58.
91. Chomsky, Noam. "Current Issues in Linguistic Theory". [143], 50-118.
92. Chomsky, Noam. *Aspects of the Theory of Grammar*. Cambridge, Mass., 1965.
93. Chomsky, Noam. "Some General Properties of Phonological Rules". *Language* 43 (1967), 102-128.

- 1A -
94. Chomsky, Noam and Halle, Morris. "Some Controversial Questions in Phonological Theory". *JL* 1 (1965), 97-138.
 95. Chomsky, Noam and Halle, Morris. *The Sound Pattern of English*. New York, 1968.
 96. Chomsky, Noam, Halle, Morris and Lukoff, Fred. "On Accent and Juncture in English". [204], 65-80.
 97. Clark, Arthur Melville and Whitehall, Harold. "Rhyme". [411], 705-710.
 98. Cobb, Thomas David. "Wordsworth's Style and Versification in *The Prelude*". *DA* 19 (1959), 2948-2949.
 99. Colson, Ted Donald. "An Analysis of Selected Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins for Oral Interpretation and a Study of his Poetic Theories". *DA* 24 (1964), 5604.
 100. Combs, Bruce Elmer. "A Linguistic Analysis of Rime with Studies in Chaucer, Donne and Pope". *DA* 30 (1970), 4936A.
 101. Cook, Albert. "Milton's Abstract Music". *University of Toronto Quarterly* 29 (1960), 370-385.
 102. Cory, Robert E. "The Prosody of Walt Whitman". *North Dakota Quarterly* 28 (1960), 74-79.
 103. Crane, Milton. *Shakespeare's Prose*. Chicago, 1951.
 104. Crystal, David. *Prosodic Systems and Intonation in English* (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics, 1). Cambridge, 1969.
 - 104a. Crystal, David. *Linguistics*. London, 1971.
 105. Crystal, David and Quirk, Randolph. *Systems of Prosodic and Paralinguistic Features in English* (Janua Linguarum: Series Minor, 39). The Hague, 1964.
 106. Cummings, Donald Wayne. "Towards a Theory of Prosodic Analysis for English Metrical Verse". *DA* 56 (1966), 177A.
 107. Cummings, Donald Wayne and Herun, John. "Metrical Boundaries and Rhythm Phrases". *MLQ* 38 (1967), 405-412.
 108. Dane, Peter, ed. *Proceedings and Papers of the Tenth Congress of the Australasian Universities' Language and Literature Association*. Auckland, 1966.

109. Daneš, František. "Order of Elements and Sentence Intonation". [205], 499-512. Reprinted in [56a], 216-232.
110. Daneš, František. "Some Thoughts on the Semantic Structure of the Sentence". *Lingua* 21 (1968), 55-69.
111. Davie, Donald. *Articulate Energy: An Inquiry into the Syntax of English Poetry*. London, 1955.
112. Davie, Donald. "Syntax and Music in *Paradise Lost*". [282], 70-84.
113. Davie, Donald. "The Relation between Syntax and Music in Some Modern Poems in English". [114], 203-214.
114. Davie, Donald, Fónagy, I., Jakobson, R., Likhachev, D.S., Mayenowa, M.R., Steinitz, W., Wyka, K. and Żółkiewski, S., eds. *Poetics - Poetyka - Poètika: Articles and Studies Presented at the First International Conference of Work-in-Progress Devoted to the Problems of Poetics; Warsaw, August 1960*. Warsaw and The Hague, 1961.
115. Davis, Walter R. "Melodic and Poetic Structure: The Examples of Campion and Dowland". *Criticism* 4 (1962), 89-107.
116. De Groot. "Phonetics in its Relation to Aesthetics". [276], 385-400.
- 116a. Delattre, Pierre. "The Distinctive Function of Intonation". [56a], 159-179.
117. Demetz, Peter, Greene, Thomas and Nelson, Lowry, eds. *The Disciplines of Criticism: Essays in Literary Theory, Interpretation, and History (For René Wellek, on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday, August 22, 1968)*. New Haven and London, 1968.
118. Detweiler, Alan G. "Music and Poetry". *BJA* 1 (1961), 134-143.
119. Dinneen, Francis P. *An Introduction to General Linguistics*. New York, 1967.
120. Donoghue, Denis. "Theatre Poetry and Dramatic Verse". *Studies: Irish Quarterly Review*, 47 (1958), 305-323.
121. Draper, Hal. "The Art of Re-Creation: In Defense of Verse Translations". *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 66 (1962), 310-325.

122. Draper, John W. *The Tempo Patterns of Shakespeare's Plays* (Anglistische Forschungen, Heft 90). Heidelberg, 1957.
123. Duthie, G.I., ed. *English Studies Today: Lectures and Papers Read at the Fifth Conference of the International Association of Professors of English, Held at Edinburgh and Glasgow, August 1962*. Edinburgh, 1964.
124. Eaton, Trevor. *The Semantics of Literature* (De Proprietatibus Litterarum, Series Minor, 1). The Hague, 1966.
125. Eliot, T.S. *Poetry and Drama*. London, 1951.
126. Eliot, T.S. *On Poetry and Poets*. New York, 1957.
127. Emma, Ronald David. "Milton's Grammar". *DA* 21 (1961), 2286.
128. Empson, William. "Rhythm and Imagery in English Poetry". *BJA* 2 (1962), 36-54.
129. Engler, Leo F. and Hilyer, Roger H. "Once Again: American and British Intonation Systems". *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 13 (1970), 99-108.
130. Engstrom, Alfred Garwin. "Rejet". [411], 687-688.
131. Epstein, Edmund L. and Hawkes, Terence. *Linguistics and English Prosody* (SILOP 7). Buffalo, New York, 1959.
132. Erlich, Victor. *Russian Formalism: History - Doctrine* (SPR 4). The Hague, 1956.
133. Evans, Ifor. *The Language of Shakespeare's Plays*. London, 1952.
134. Fant, Gunnar. "Models of Speech Perception". *ZPSK* 21 (1968), 5-8.
135. Fay, Warren Henry. "Temporal Sequence in the Perception of Speech". *DA* 24 (1963), 1747.
136. Feldman, Carol Sue F. "Sentence Recall as a Function of Sentence Structure and Interlocutor Context: A Study of Meaning". *DA* 29 (1968), 1186B.
137. Fenyo, Jane Knox. "The Sounds of Poetry". *DA* 28 (1968), 2644A-2645A.

138. Fillenbaum, Samuel and Jones, Lyle V. "The Predictability of Words as a Function of Auditory and Contextual Cues". *L & S* 8 (1965), 182-189.
139. Firth, J.R. *Papers in Linguistics*. London, 1957.
140. Flatter, Richard. *Shakespeare's Producing Hand: A Study of his Marks of Expression to be Found in the First Folio*. London, 1948.
141. Flatter, Richard. "Some Instances of Line-Division in the First Folio". *Shakespeare Jahrbuch* 92 (1956), 184-196.
142. Fodor, J.A. and Bever, T.G. "The Psychological Reality of Linguistic Segments". *JVLVB* 4 (1965), 414-420.
143. Fodor, Jerry A. and Katz, Jerrold J., eds. *The Structure of Language: Readings in the Philosophy of Language*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1964.
144. Folejewski, Zbigniew. "Novelty and Convention in the Poetics of Russian Futurism: Alliteration". [274], 1310-1316.
145. Fónagy, I. and Magdics, K. "Speed of Utterance in Phrases of Different Lengths". *L & S* 3 (1960), 179-192.
146. Fónagy, Ivan and Magdics, Klara. "Emotional Patterns in Intonation and Music". *ZPSK* 16 (1963), 293-326. Reprinted in [56a], 286-312.
147. Forrest, William Craig. "Literary Kinesthesia: The Artistic Import of Sensuous Perception Concerned with the Articulatory Stratum of Literature in the Light of Recent Critical Theory and Poetic Practice". *DA* 21 (1961), 3088-3099.
148. Forrest, William Craig. "The Poem as a Summons to Performance". *BJA* 9 (1969), 298-305.
149. Fowler, A.S.D. "The Purity of Syntax in English Verse" (a Review of [111]). *ETC* 8 (1958), 79-87.
150. Fowler, Roger. "'Prose Rhythms' and Metre". [151], 82-99.
151. Fowler, Roger, ed. *Essays on Style and Language*. London, 1966.
152. Fowler, Roger. "Structural Metrics". *Linguistics* 27 (1966) 49-64. Reprinted in [156], 124-140, and in [87], 156-169.

153. Fowler, Roger and Bateson, F.W. [in Argument]. "Literature and Linguistics". *EIC* 17 (1967), 322-347; *EIC* 18 (1968), 164-182. Reprinted in [156], 43-79.
154. Fowler, Roger. "What Is Metrical Analysis?" *Anglia* 87 (1968), 280-320. Reprinted in [156], 141-177.
155. Fowler, Roger. "Three Blank Verse Textures". [156], 184-199.
156. Fowler, Roger. *The Languages of Literature: Some Linguistic Contributions to Criticism*. London, 1971.
157. Francis, W. Nelson. "Syntax and Literary Interpretation". [87], 209-216.
158. Fraser, Russell A. *Shakespeare's Poetics in Relation to King Lear*. London, 1962.
159. Freeman, Donald C. "Metrical Position Constituency and Generative Metrics". *Language and Style* 2 (1969), 195-206.
160. Freeman, Donald C. "On the Primes of Metrical Style". *Language and Style* 1 (1968), 63-101.
161. Freer, Wilbert Coburn. "George Herbert's Style and the Metrical Psalms". *DA* 29 (1968), 869A.
162. Friedrich, Werner, P., ed. *Comparative Literature: Proceedings of the International Comparative Literature Association* (UNCSCL 22-23). Chapel Hill, 1959.
163. Fry, D.B. "Speech Reception and Perception". [337], 29-52.
164. Frye, Northrop. "Introduction: Lexis and Melos". [165], pp. ix-xxvi.
165. Frye, Northrop, ed. *Sound and Poetry* (EIE 1956). New York, 1957.
166. Frye, Northrop. "Verse and Prose". [411], 885-890.
167. Frye, Northrop. "The Rhythm of Recurrence: Epos". [197], 168-180.
168. Fudge, E.C. "Phonology". [337], 76-95.
169. Fulsom, Ralph Edward. "An Investigation of the Structural Aspects of Free Verse as They Affect the Oral Reader". *DA* 17 (1957), 3120-3121.

170. Fussell, Paul, Jr. *Poetic Meter and Poetic Form*. New York, 1965.
171. Fussell, Paul. "Cadence". [411], 95.
172. Fussell, Paul. "Caesura". [411], 95-97.
173. Fussell, Paul. "English Prosody" [411], 238-240.
174. Fussell, Paul. "Line" [411], 450.
- 174a. Fussell, Paul. "Line Endings" [411], 450.
175. Fussell, Paul. "Meter". [411], 496-499.
176. Fussell, Paul. "Metrical Variations". [411], 500-501.
177. Gammon, E.R. "On Representing Syntactic Structures". *Language* 39 (1963), 369-397.
178. Gantzel, Lars Holm. "The Meaning of Terminal Pitch Patterns". *DA* 27 (1967), 423-6A.
179. Gardner, Helen. *The Art of T.S. Eliot*. London, 1949.
180. Gardner, Helen, ed. *John Donne: A Collection of Critical Essays* (Twentieth Century Views). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1962.
181. Garrett, John, ed. *Talking of Shakespeare*. London, 1954.
182. Garwin, Paul, editor and translator. *A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure, and Style*. Washington, D.C., 1964.
183. Gattiker, Godfrey Leonard. "The Syntactic Basis of the Poetic Formula in *Beowulf*". *DA* 23 (1962), 2114-2115.
184. Gessman, Albert M. "On Translating Poetry". *Language Quarterly* 7, iii-iv (Spring-Summer 1969), 17-40.
185. Gleason, H.A. *An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics*. New York, 1966.
186. Goldberg, Lea. "Certain Aspects of Imitation and Translation in Poetry". [274], 839-843.
187. Goldman-Eisler, Frieda. "The Predictability of Words in Context and the Length of Pauses in Speech". *L & S* 1 (1922-23), 226-231.

188. Goldman-Eisler, Frieda. "Sequential Temporal Patterns and Cognitive Processes in Speech". *L & S* 10 (1967), 122-132.
189. Goldman-Eisler, Frieda. *Psycholinguistics: Experiments in Spontaneous Speech*. London and New York, 1968.
190. *Golomb, Harai and Perry, Menakhem. "Two Cases of Correlation between Rhythmical Pattern and Thematic Structure in Bialik's Poems". *Hasifrut* 2 (1969), 83-84. English Summary, 259 (VI).
- 190a. *Golomb, Harai. "The Problem of Analysing Rhythm in Metrical Verse and Zach's Criticism of Alterman's Prosody". *Ha-Sifrut/Literature* 23 (October 1976), 7-22. English Summary, ii-iii.
191. Goodman, Paul. *The Structure of Literature*. Chicago and London, 1954.
192. Granville-Barker, Harley. "Verse and Speech in *Coriolanus*". *The Review of English Studies* 23 (1947), 1-15.
193. Gray, James Arthur. "The Form and Function of Rhythm in the Versification of *Paradise Lost*". *DA* 28 (1967), 1785A-1786A.
194. Greenberg, S. Robert. "An Experimental Study of Certain Intonation Contrasts in American English". *DA* 30 (1970), 4964A-4965A.
195. Greimas, A.J. "The Relationship between Structural Linguistics and Poetics". *ISSJ* 19 (1967), 8-16.
196. Gross, Harvey. *Sound and Form in Modern Poetry: A Study of Prosody from Thomas Hardy to Robert Lowell*. Ann Arbor, 1964.
197. Gross, Harvey, ed. *The Structure of Verse: Modern Essays on Prosody*. New York, 1966.
- 197a. Gunter, Richard. "Intonational Relevance". [56a], 194-215.
198. Guyol, Hazel Sample. "A Temperance of Language: Goneril's Grammar and Rhetoric". *English Journal* 55 (1966), 316-319.
199. Halamandaris, Pandelis G. "The Role of Grammatical Relations in the Understanding of Sentences". *DA* 29 (1969), 3120A.
200. Halle, Morris. "On the Modern Study of Speech Sounds". *ISSJ* 19 (1967), 17-27.

201. Halle, Morris. "On the Bases of Phonology". [143], 324-333.
202. Halle, Morris. "Phonology in Generative Grammar". [143], 334-354.
203. Halle, Morris. "Žirmunskij's Theory of Verse: A Review Article". *SEEJ* 12 (1968), 213-218.
204. Halle, Morris, Lung, H.G., McLean, H. and Van Schooneveld, C.G., eds. *For Roman Jakobson: Essays on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday, 11 October 1956*. The Hague, 1956.
205. Halle, Morris et al., eds. *To Honor Roman Jakobson: Essays on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday, 11 October 1966* (Janua Linguarum: Series Maior, 31-33 [Three Volumes]).
206. Halle, Morris and Keyser, Samuel Jay. "Chaucer and the Study of English Prosody". *CE* 28 (1966), 187-219.
207. Halle, Morris and Keyser, Samuel Jay. *English Stress: Its Form, Its Growth and Its Role in Verse*. New York, 1971.
208. Halle, Morris and Stevens, Kenneth N. "Speech Recognition: A Model and a Program for Research". [143], 604-612.
209. Halliday, F.E. *The Poetry of Shakespeare's Plays*. London, 1954.
210. Halliday, M.A.K. "Descriptive Linguistics in Literary Studies". [123], 25-40.
211. Halliday, M.A.K. "Language Structure and Language Function" [337], 140-165.
212. Halliday, M.A.K. *Intonation and Grammar in British English* (Janua Linguarum: Series Practica, 48). The Hague, 1967.
213. Halliday, M.A.K., McIntosh, Angus and Strevens, Peter. *The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching*. London, 1964.
214. Hammond, Mac. "Poetic Syntax". [114], 475-482.
215. Hampsten, Richard Franklin. "Studies in Milton's Blank Verse". *DA* 25 (1964), 1210.
216. Hamrah, Elaine P. and Engler, Leo. "Juncture Phenomena and the Segmentation of a Linguistic Corpus". *L & S* 10 (1967), 228-233.

217. Harrison, G.B. "A Note on *Coriolanus*". [343], 239-252.
218. Hasan, R. "Linguistics and the Study of Literary Texts". *Etudes de Linguistique Appliquée*, 5 (1967), 106-115.
219. Hascall, Dudley L. "The Prosody of John Lydgate". *Language and Style* 3 (1970), 122-146.
220. Hascall, Dudley, L. "Some Contributions to the Halle-Keyser Theory of Prosody". *CE* 30 (1969), 357-365.
221. Hatcher, Anna G. "A Semantic Approach to Syntactic Analysis". [463], 634-635.
222. Hawkes, Terence. "The Matter of Metre". *EIC* 12 (1962), 413-423.
223. Hawkes, Terence and Bateson, F.W. [in argument]. "The Matter of Metre". *EIC* 13 (1964), 198-201.
224. Helmick, Joseph Wayne. "An Analysis of Speaker-Listener Competencies in the Communication of Selected Connotative Meanings Dependent upon Supra-Segmental Phenomena". *DA* 30 (1969), 886B.
225. Hemphill, George. "The Meters of the Intermediate Poets". *KR* 19 (1957), 35-55.
226. Hemphill, George, ed. *Discussions of Poetry: Rhythm and Sound*. Boston, 1961.
227. Henderson, Alan, Goldman-Eisler, Frieda and Skarbek, Andrew. "Sequential Temporal Patterns in Spontaneous Speech". *L & S* 9 (1966), 207-216.
228. Hendren, Joseph W., Wimsatt, W.K. and Beardsley, M.C. [in argument]. "A Word for Rhythm and a Word for Meter". *PMLA* 76 (June 1961), 300-308.
229. Herdan, Gustav. "The Mathematical Theory of Verse". *ZPSK* 22 (1969), 225-234.
230. Hepler, Hal W. "The Ability of English Speakers to Respond to the Structural Cues of Written Language". *DA* 27 (1966), 1045A-1046A.
231. Hill, Archibald A. "A Phonological Description of Poetic Ornaments". *Language and Style* 2 (1969), 99-123.
232. Hill, Archibald A. *Introduction to Linguistic Structures: From Sound to Sentence in English*. New York and Burlingane, 1958.

233. Hilles, Frederick W. and Bloom, Harold, eds. *From Sensibility to Romanticism: Essays Presented to Frederick A. Pottle*. New York, 1965.
234. Hindus, Milton. "Notes Toward the Definition of a Typical Poetic Line in Whitman". *Walt Whitman Review* 9 (1963), 75-81.
- 234a. Hirst, D.J. "Intonation and Context". *Linguistics* 141 (1974), 5-16.
235. Hockett, Charles F. *The State of the Art* (Janua Linguarum: Series Minor, 73). The Hague, 1968.
236. Hogan, Donald Joseph. "Structural Design in Thomas Hardy's Poetry". *DA* 20 (1959), 2291.
237. Holland, Norman N. *The Dynamics of Literary Response*. New York, 1968.
238. Hollander, John. "The Music of Poetry". *JAAC* 15 (1956), 232-244.
239. Hollander, John. "The Metrical Emblem". *KR* 21 (1959), 279-296. Reprinted in [87], 115-126.
240. Hollander, John. *The Untuning of the Sky: Ideas of Music in English Poetry, 1500-1700*. Princeton, 1961.
241. Hollander, John. "Experimental and Pseudo-Experimental Metrics in Recent American Poetry". [114], 127-135.
242. Hollander, John. "Blake and the Metrical Contract". [233], 293-310.
243. Householder, Fred W. "On Some Recent Claims in Phonological Theory". *JL* 1 (1965), 13-34.
244. Householder, Fred W. *Linguistic Speculations*. Cambridge, London and New York, 1971.
245. Hrabák, Josef. "Remarques sur les Corrélations entre le Vers et la Prose, surtout sur les Soi-disant Formes de Transition". [114], 239-248.
246. Hrushovski, Benjamin. "The Creation of Accentual Iambs in European Poetry and their First Employment in a Yiddish Romance in Italy (1508-09)". In *For Max Weinreich: On His Seventieth Birthday* (The Hague, 1964), 108-146.

247. Hrushovski, Benjamin. "On Free Rhythms in Modern Poetry: Preliminary Remarks toward a Critical Theory of their Structures and Functions". [454], 173-192.
248. *Hrushovski, Benjamin. "The Theory and Practice of Rhythm in the Expressionist Poetry of U.Z. Grinberg". *Hasifrut* 1 (1968), 176-205. English Summary, XIV.
249. *Hrushovski, Benjamin. "Do Sounds Have Meaning? — The Problem Expressiveness of Sound Patterns in Poetry". *Hasifrut* 1 (1968), 410-420 English Summary, 444(X).
250. *Hrushovski, Benjamin. "The Major Systems of Hebrew Rhyme from the Piyut to the Present Day (500 AD — 1970): An Essay on Basic Concepts". *Hasifrut* 2 (1971), 721-749. English Summary 886-887 (II-III).
251. Hrushovski, Benjamin. "Prosody, Hebrew". In *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (Jerusalem, 1971), Vol. 13, 1195-1240.
- 251a. Hrushovski, Benjamin. *Segmentation and Motivation in the Text Continuum of Literary Prose: The First Episode of War and Peace* (PPS 5). Tel Aviv, 1976.
252. Hulme, Hilda. *Explorations in Shakespeare's Language*. London, 1962.
253. Hulme, Hilda. "Shakespeare's Language". [489], 136-155.
254. Hultzén, Lee S. "Grammatical Intonation". [2], 85-95.
255. Hutchings, P.Ae. "Meaning and Simultaneity in Poetry". [108], 294-300.
256. Hyman, Laurence W. "Paradise Lost: The Argument and the Rhythmic Pattern". *Minnesota Review* 5 (1965), 223-228.
257. Ing, Catherine. *Elizabethan Lyrics: A Study of the Development of English Metres and their Relation to Poetic Effect*. London, 1951.
258. Ingram, R.W. "Words and Music". [68], 131-149.
259. Jakobson, Roman and Halle, Morris. *Fundamentals of Language* (Janua Linguarum: Series Minor, 1). The Hague, 1956.
260. Jakobson, Roman. "Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics". [454], 350-377 (reprinted in [87], 296-322).

261. Jakobson, Roman. "Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry (An English Version of [595]). *Lingua* 21 (1968), 597-609.
262. Jakobson, Roman. "The Role of Phonic Elements in Speech Perception". *ZPSK* 21 (1968), 9-19.
263. Jespersen, Otto. "Notes on Metre" (1900). Reprinted in [197], 111-130, and in [87], 71-90.
264. Johnson, Neal F. "The Psychological Reality of Phrase-Structure Rules". *JVLVB* 4 (1965), 469-475.
265. Johnson, Oliver, Harrab, David, Fuss, Peter and Guleserian Theodore, eds. *The Hidden Harmony: Essays in Honor of Philip Wheelwright*. New York, 1966.
266. Johnson-Laird, P.N. "The Perception and Memory of Sentences". [337], 261-270.
267. Jones, John A. "Line Structure and Sentence Form in Pope's Couplet". *DA* 29 (1968), 872A-873A.
268. Jones, Lawrence Gaylord. "Grammatical Patterns in English and Russian Verse". [205], 1015-1045.
269. Joseph, Bertram. "Verse and Character: The Elizabethan Solution and the Modern Actor". *Shakespeare Newsletter* 7, No. 5 (November, 1957), 39.
270. Joseph, Bertram. "Shakespeare's Poetry in Performance". *Drama* 55 (1959), 34-36.
271. Joseph, Bertram. *Acting Shakespeare*. London, 1960.
272. Joseph, Bertram. "'Scenes Invented Merely to Be Spoken': Towards Standards of Criticism for Elizabethan Drama". *Drama Survey* 1 (1961), 18-33.
273. Joseph, Sister Miriam. *Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language*. New York, 1947.
274. Jost, François, ed. *Proceedings of the IVth International Comparative Literature Association, Fribourg 1964*. The Hague, 1966.
275. Joynes, Mary Lu. "Structural Analysis of Old English Metrics". *DA* 19 (1968), 1076.
276. Kaiser, L., ed. *Manual of Phonetics*. Amsterdam, 1957.
277. Kammann, Richard. "Verbal Complexity and Preferences in Poetry". *JVLVB* 5 (1966), 536-540.

- 277a. Kaufman, Channa. *A Selected Bibliography of Semiotics and Related Fields in Israel in Recent Years*. Tel-Aviv, 1974.
278. Kell, Richard. "A Note on Versification". *BJA* 3 (1963), 341-345.
279. Kellogg, Robert J. "On the Punctuation of Two Lines in *The Faerie Queene*". *PMLA* 78 (1963), 147-148.
280. Kennedy, R.A. and Wilkes, A.L. "Response-Times at Different Positions within a Sentence". *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology* 20 (1968), 390-394.
281. Kennedy, R.A. and Wilkes, A.L. "Analysis of Storage and Retrieval Processes in Memorizing Simple Sentences". *Journal of Experimental Psychology* 80 (1969), 396-398.
282. Kermode, Frank, ed. *The Living Milton: Essays by Various Hands*. London, 1960.
283. Keyser, Samuel Jay. "Old English Prosody". *CE* 30 (1969), 331-356.
284. Kidder, Robert Ralph. "A Theory of the Interpretative Approach to Oral Reading". *DA* 21 (1960), 266.
285. Kingdon, Roger. *The Groundwork of English Intonation*. London, 1958.
286. Kingdon, Roger. *The Groundwork of English Stress*. London, 1958.
287. Klotz, Rose Mosen. "Verbal Counterpoint in the Poetry of Gerard Manley Hopkins". *DA* 27 (1966), 1058A-1059A.
288. Koch, Walter A. *Recurrence and a Three-Modal Approach to Poetry* (De Proprietatibus Litterarum, Series Minor, 2). The Hague, 1966.
289. Kökeritz, Helge. *Shakespeare's Pronunciation*. New Haven and London, 1953.
290. Kopczyńska, Z. and Pszczołowska, L. "Le Rôle de l'Intonation dans la Versification". [114], 215-224.
291. Kreuzer, James R. *Elements of Poetry*. New York, 1955.
292. Kurath, Hans. *A Phonology and Prosody of Modern English*. Heidelberg, 1964.

293. Kurdys, Douglas Bellamy. "Form in the Modern Verse Drama". *DA* 30 (1969), 1139A.
294. La Drière, Craig. "Structure, Sound and Meaning". [165], 85-108.
295. La Drière, Craig. "The Comparative Method in the Study of Prosody". [162], 160-175.
296. La Drière, Craig. "Prosody". [411], 669-677.
297. Laderfoged, Peter. *Three Areas of Experimental Phonetics*. (Language and Language Learning, 15). London, 1967.
298. Landon, George McQueen. "The Contribution of Grammar to the Poetic Style of Wilfred Owen". *DA* 25 (1965), 6610.
299. Lanz, Henry. *The Physical Basis of Rime*. Stanford and London, 1931.
300. Lascelles, Monica. "A Theory of Distributional Syntax: Classes and Constants". *L & S* 3 (1960), 50-59.
301. Le Page, R.B. "The Dramatic Delivery of Shakespeare's Verse". *English Studies* 32 (1951), 63-68.
302. Lee, William R. *An English Intonation Reader*. London, 1960.
303. Leech, Geoffrey N. *A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry* (English Language Series). London, 1969.
304. Lehiste, Ilse, ed. *Readings in Acoustic Phonetics*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1967.
305. Lehto, Leena. *English Stress and Its Modification by Intonation: An Analytic and Synthetic Study of Acoustic Parameters* (Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemia Toimituksia, Ser. B, 164). Helsinki, 1969.
306. Leroy, Maurice. *The Main Trends in Modern Linguistics*, translated from the French by Glanville Price (Language and Style Series, V). Oxford, 1967.
307. Levin, Paul. "The Relation of Order". *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 13 (1970), 109-124.
308. Levin, Samuel R. "Suprasegmentals and the Performance of Poetry". *QJS* 48 (1962), 366-372.

309. Levin, Samuel R. *Linguistic Structures in Poetry* (Janua Linguarum: Series Minor, 23). The Hague, 1962.
310. Levin, Samuel R. "Poetry and Grammaticalness". [87], 224-230.
311. Levin, Samuel R. "The Conventions of Poetry". [85], 177-193.
312. Levý, Jiří. "Rhythmical Ambivalence in the Poetry of T.S. Eliot". *Anglia* 77 (1959), 54-64.
313. Levý, Jiří. "A Contribution to the Typology of Accentual-Syllabic Versifications". [114], 177-188.
314. Levý, Jiří. "On the Relations of Language and Stanza Pattern in the English Sonnet". *Worte und Werte: Bruno Markwardt zum 60 Geburtstag* (Berlin, 1961), 214-231.
315. Lewis, C.S. "Metre". *A Review of English Literature* 1 (1960), 45-50.
316. Liberman, Alvin M. "Some Results of Research on Speech Perception". [443], 142-153.
317. Lieberman, Philip. "Some Effects of Semantic and Grammatical Context on the Production and Perception of Speech". *L & S* 6 (1963), 172-187.
318. Lieberman, Philip. "On the Acoustic Basis of the Perception of Intonation by Linguists". *Word* 21 (1965), 40-54.
319. Lieberman, Philip. *Intonation, Perception, and Language* (MIT Research Monograph, 38). Cambridge, Mass., 1967.
320. Lieberman, Philip. "On the Structure of Prosody". *ZPSK* 21 (1968), 149-163.
321. Lightfoot, Marjorie J. "Prosody and Performance". *QJS* 53 (1967), 61-66.
322. Lightfoot, Marjorie Jean. "T.S. Eliot's *The Cocktail Party*: An Experiment in Prosodic Description". *DA* 25 (1965), 6630.
323. Livnat, William Paul. "Antagonistic Functions of Verbal Pauses: Filled and Unfilled Pauses in the Solution of Additions". *L & S* 6 (1963), 1-4.
324. Loesch, Katherine Taylor. "Prosodic Patterns in the Poetry of Dylan Thomas". *DA* 22 (1962), 3295.

325. Loesch, Katherine T. "Literary Ambiguity and Oral Performance". *QJS* 51 (1965), 258-267.
326. Loesch, Katherine T. "A Reply to Mr. Chatman". *QJS* 52 (1966), 286-289.
327. Loesch, Katherine T. "The Shape of Sound: Configurational Rime in the Poetry of Dylan Thomas". *SM* 35 (1968), 407-424.
328. Lord, John B. "Two Phonological Analyses of Poe's 'To Helen'". *Language and Style* 3 (1970), 147-158.
329. Lotz, John. "Metric Typology". [454], 135-148.
330. Lovell, James Henry, Jr. "Form and Structure in the Poetry of Wallace Stevens". *DA* 24 (1963), 2036-2037.
331. Lukanitsch, Ruth Marion. "The Relationship of the Figures of Sound to the Rhythm in Certain Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins". *DA* 25 (1964), 696.
332. Lunt, Horace, ed. *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists*. The Hague, 1964.
333. Luria, A.R. and Vinogradova, O.S. "An Objective Investigation of the Dynamics of Semantic Systems". *British Journal of Psychology*, 50 (1959), 91-105.
334. Lyford, Roland Hazen. "Grammatical Categories in Robert Frost's Blank Verse: A Quantitative Analysis". *DA* 29 (1969), 4475A.
335. Lyons, John. "Generative Syntax". [337], 115-139.
336. Lyons, John. *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge, 1968.
337. Lyons, John, ed. *New Horizons in Linguistics*. London, 1970.
338. Lyons, John and Wales, R.J., eds. *Psycholinguistics Papers: The Proceedings of the 1966 Edinburgh Conference*. Edinburgh, 1966.
- 338a. Lyons, John. *Chomsky* (Fontana Modern Masters). London, 1970.
339. McAuley, James. "Metrical Accent and Speech Stress". *Balcony* No. 4 (Autumn, 1966), 21-31.

340. McCawley, James D. "The Role of Semantics in a Grammar". [26], 124-169.
341. McCormack, Robert. "Unspeakable Verse". *Canadian Literature* 12 (1962), 28-36.
342. McLeod, Stuart Ramsey. "Problems of Poetry and Dramaturgy in Modern Verse Drama". *DA* 29 (1968), 904A.
343. McManaway, James G. *et al.*, eds. *Joseph Quincy Adams Memorial Studies*. Washington, 1948.
344. McNaughton, William. "Ezra Pound's Meters and Rhythms". *PMLA* 78 (1963), 136-146.
345. Magnuson, Karl and Ryder, Frank G. "The Study of English Prosody: An Alternative Proposal". *CE* 31 (1970), 789-820.
346. Malmberg, Bertil. *Structural Linguistics and Human Communication: An Introduction into the Mechanism of Language and the Methodology of Linguistics* (Kommunikation und Kybernetik in Einzeldarstellungen, Herausgegeben von H. Walter und W.D. Keidel, Band 2). Berlin, Göttingen and Heidelberg, 1963.
347. Marcus, Phillip L. "T.S. Eliot and Shakespeare". *Criticism* 9 (1967), 63-79.
348. Martin, Edwin and Roberts, Kelyn H. "Grammatical Factors in Sentence Retention". *JVLVB* 5 (1966), 211-218.
349. Masson, David. "Free Phonetic Patterns in Shakespeare's Sonnets". *Neophilologos* 38 (1954), 277-289.
350. Masson, David. "The Keatsian Incantation: A Study of Phonetic Patterning". [369], 159-180.
351. Masson, David. "Thematic Analysis of Sounds in Poetry". *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society, Literary and Historical Section*, Vol. IX, Part 4 (September 1960), 133-147.
352. Masson, David. "Sound and Sense in a Line of Poetry". *BJA* 3 (1963), 70-72.
353. Masson, David I. "Sound in Poetry". [411], 784-790.
354. Meyer, Herman. "On the Spirit of Verse". [117], 331-348.
355. Miles, Josephine. "Eras in English Poetry". [87], 175-196.

356. Miles, Josephine. *Style and Proportion: The Language of Prose and Poetry*. Boston, 1967.
357. Miller, Terry. "The Prosodies of Robert Lowell". *SM* 35 (1968), 425-434.
358. Mitchell, Roger. "A Prosody for Whitman?" *PMLA* 84 (1969), 1606-1612.
359. Mitchell, Roger. "Toward a System of Grammatical Scansion". *Language and Style* 3 (1970), 3-28.
360. Moles, Abraham. *Information Theory and Esthetic Perception*, translated by Joel E. Cohen. Urbana and London, 1966.
361. Moloney, Michael F. "The Prosody of Milton's *Epitaph, L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso*". *Modern Language Notes* 72 (1957), 174-178.
362. Montgomery, Lyna Lee. "The Prosodic Techniques of Edward Young and John Keats in Heroic Couplets and Blank Verse". *DA* 23 (1967), 199A-200A.
363. Morgan, Bayard Quincy. "Compulsory Patterns in Poetry". *PMLA* 75 (1960), 634-635.
364. Morris, Jessie Farrington. "Thomas Hardy's Style: A Syntactic Approach to the Poetry". *DA* 29 (1968), 875A-876A.
365. Mosher, Harold F., Jr. "Organic Form in Gerard Manley Hopkins' 'Hurrahing in Harvest': A Linguistic Reading". *Language and Style* 2 (1969), 172-192.
366. Moynihan, William T. "The Auditory Correlative". *JAAC* 17 (1958), 93-102.
367. Moynihan, William T. "Dylan Thomas and the 'Biblical Rhythm'". *PMLA* 79 (1964), 631-647.
368. Muir, Kenneth. "Split Lines in the First Folio". *Notes and Queries* 197 (1952), 271-272.
369. Muir, Kenneth, ed. *John Keats: A Reassessment* (Liverpool English Texts and Studies, No. 5). Liverpool, 1958.
370. Mukařovský, Jan. "The Connection between the Prosodic Line and Word-Order in Czech Verse". [182], 113-132.
371. Mukařovský, Jan. "The Esthetics of Language". [182], 31-69.

372. Murdy, Louise B. "Sound and Sense in Dylan Thomas's Poetry". *DA* 23 (1963), 3382-3383.
373. Murdy, Louise B. *Sound and Sense in Dylan Thomas's Poetry* (Studies in English Literature, 20). The Hague, 1966.
374. Mussulman, Joseph A. "A Descriptive System of Musical Prosody". *The Centennial Review of Arts and Sciences*, 9 (1965), 332-347.
375. Nabokov, Vladimir. *Notes on Prosody: From the Commentary to his Translation of Pushkin's Eugene Onegin*. London, 1965.
376. Nicoll, Allardyce. "Language and Characterization". [71], 449-453.
377. Nist, John. "Sound and Sense: Some Structures of Poetry". *CE* 23 (1962), 291-295.
378. Nist, John. "The Word-Group Cadence: Basis of English Metrics". *Linguistics* 6 (1964), 73-82.
379. Nomachi, Susumu. "Shakespeare's Blank Verse: A Preliminary Inquiry Concerning the Question 'To What Extent the Manner of Reading is Allowed to Influence the Meaning, or Nuance, of the Original Text'". *Shakespeare Studies* 1 (Tokyo, 1962), 33-45.
380. Nowottny, Winifred. "Formal Elements in Shakespeare's Sonnets: Sonnets I-VI". *EIC* 2 (1952), 76-84.
381. Nowottny, Winifred. "Some Aspects of the Style of *King Lear*". *Shakespeare Survey* 13 (1960), 49-57.
382. Nowottny, Winifred. *The Language Poets Use*. London, 1962.
383. O'Connell, Adelyn. "A Study of Rhythmic Structure in the Verse of William Butler Yeats". *DA* 27 (1967), 3057A.
384. O'Connor, J.D. *Teaching English Intonation*. Copenhagen, 1957.
385. O'Connor, J.D. and Arnold, G.F. *Intonation of Colloquial English*. London, 1961.
386. O'Connor, J.D. "Recent Work in English Phonetics". [443], 97-109.

387. Ohmann, Richard. "Literature as Sentences". [87], 231-238.
388. Oliphant, Robert. "The New, New Grammar". *Antioch Review* 27 No. 1 (Spring, 1967), 103-117.
389. Oras, Ants. *Pause-Patterns in Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama: An Experiment in Prosody* (UFMH 3). Gainesville, 1960.
390. Oras, Ants. *Blank Verse and Chronology in Milton* (UFMH 20). Gainesville, 1966.
391. Orr, Peter. "Hear the Voice of the Bard". *A Review of English Literature* 8, i (January 1967), 74-83.
392. Orsini, G.N.G. "Form". [411], 286-288.
393. Osgood, Charles E. and Sebeok, Thomas A., eds. *Psycholinguistics: A Survey of Theory and Research Problems* [with *A Survey of Psycholinguistic Research 1954-1964*, by A. Richard Diebold, and *The Psycholinguists* by George A. Miller]. Bloomington and London, 1965.
394. Osgood, C.E., ed. *Psycholinguistics: A Survey of Theory and Research Problems* (International Journal of American Linguistics: Memoir No. 10). Baltimore, 1954.
395. Ostriker, Alicia. "Song and Speech in the Metrics of George Herbert". *PMLA* 80 (1965), 62-68.
396. Ostriker, Alicia. "The Three Modes in Tennyson's Prosody". *PMLA* 82 (1967), 273-284.
397. Pace, George B. "The Two Domains: Meter and Rhythm". *PMLA* 77 (1961), 413-419.
398. Parrish, Stephen Maxfield. "Wordsworth and Coleridge on Meter". *JEGP* 59 (1960), 41-49.
399. Pattison, Bruce. *Music and Poetry of the English Renaissance*. London, 1948.
400. Perry, John Oliver. "The Relationship between Rhythm and Meaning". *Criticism* 7 (1965), 373-378.
401. Petöfi, S.J. "Notes on the Semantic Interpretation of Verbal Works of Art". *CL* 7 (1968), 79-105.
402. Petöfi, S.J. "On the Structural Linguistic Analysis of Poetic Works of Art". *CL* 6 (1967), 53-82.

- 402a. Pike, Kenneth L. "General Characteristics of Intonation". [56a], 53-82.
403. Piper, William Bowman. "The Inception of the Closed Heroic Couplet". *Modern Philology* 66 (1969), 306-321.
404. Plank, Dale L. *Pasternak's Lyric: Sound and Imagery* (SPR 59). The Hague, 1966.
405. Poggioli, Renato. "Poetics and Metrics". [162], 192-204.
406. Pomorska, Krystyna. *Russian Formalist Theory and Its Poetic Ambiance* (SPR 82). The Hague, 1968.
407. Portnoy, Stephanie. "A Comparison of Oral and Written Verbal Behavior". *DA* 29 (1968), 1191B-1192B.
408. Postal, Paul. *Constituent Structure: A Study of Contemporary Models of Syntactic Description* (International Journal of American Linguistics, Vol. 30, No. 1, Part III). Bloomington, Indiana, and The Hague, 1964.
409. Postal, Paul M. *Aspects of Phonological Theory*. New York, 1968.
410. Pound, Ezra. "Treatise on Metre". [197], 102-108.
411. Preminger, Alex, ed. *Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*. Princeton, 1965.
412. Prince, F.T. "Gravity and the Long Poem". [123], 81-88.
413. Prince, F.T. "The Sonnet from Wyatt to Shakespeare". [68], 11-29.
414. Purves, Alan Carroll. "The Verse Technique of Samuel Taylor Coleridge". *DA* 21 (1960), 190-191.
415. Quirk, Randolph *et al.* "Studies in the Correspondence of Prosodic to Grammatical Features in English". [332], 679-691.
416. Quirk, Randolph and Crystal, David. "On Scales of Contrast in Connected English Speech". [38], 359-369.
417. Raban, Jonathan. "Chance, Time and Silence: The New American Verse". *Journal of American Studies*, 89-101.
418. Ragslade, J. Donald. "Issues in Phonological Theory". *QJS* 53 (1967), 256-263.

- x x x -
419. Rambo, Dorothy Ellen. "An Analysis of *Four Quartets* by T.S. Eliot with Particular Respect to Its Prosody". *DA* 19 (1958), 1476.
 420. Ramsey, Paul. "Free Verse: Some Steps Toward Definition". *Studies in Philology* 65 (1968), 98-108.
 421. Ransom, John Crowe. "The Strange Music of English Verse". *KR* 18 (1956), 460-477. Reprinted in [226], 103-112.
 422. Ransom, John Crowe. "Gerontion". [495], 136-160.
 423. Ransom, John Crowe. "Theory of Poetic Form". *Texas Quarterly* 9, i (1966), 190-201.
 424. Rauch, Irmengard and Scott, Charles T., eds. *Approaches in Linguistic Methodology*. Madison (Wisconsin) and London, 1967.
 425. Redgrave, Michael. "Shakespeare and the Actors". [181], 127-148.
 426. Reibel, David A. and Schane, Sanford A., eds. *Modern Studies in English: Readings in Transformational Grammar*. Englewood Cliffs (New Jersey), 1968.
 427. Rhoads, Kenneth Warren. "The Musical Elements of T.S. Eliot's *Four Quartets*". *DA* 30 (1970), 5454A-5455A.
 428. Richards, I.A. "Rhythm and Metre". Reprinted in [197], 42-51.
 - 428a. Richards, I.A. "Why Generative Grammar Does Not Help". *English Language Teaching* 22 (1967-1968), 3-9; 101-106.
 429. Ridland, J.M. and Bateson, F.W. [in argument]. "The Matter of Metre". *EIC* 14 (1964), 102-106.
 430. Robins, R.H. *General Linguistics: An Introductory Survey*. London, 1964.
 431. Robins, R.H. *A Short History of Linguistics*. London, 1967.
 432. Robinson, Randal Fink. "Shakespeare's Orators: A Study of Shakespeare's Use of Oratory in Eleven Representative Plays". *DA* 27 (1967), 2508.
 433. Rohrman, Nicholas Leroy. "The Role of Syntactic Structure in the Recall of Sentences". *DA* 28 (1968), 3905B.

434. Rogers, Neville. "The Punctuation of Shelley's Syntax". *Keats-Shelley Memorial Bulletin*, 17 (1966), 20-30.
435. Rommetveit, Ragnar. *Words, Meanings, and Messages: Theory and Experiment in Psycholinguistics*. New York, London and Oslo, 1968.
436. Rosenberg, Sheldon, ed. *Directions in Psycholinguistics*. New York and London, 1965.
437. Rosenberg, Sheldon and Koplín, James H., eds. *Developments in Applied Psycholinguistic Research*. New York and London, 1968.
438. Rosenthal, Peggy Z. "Whitman Music: The Problem of Adaptation". *Books at Brown* 20 (1965), 71-97.
439. Rothkopf, Ernst Z. and Coke, Esther U. "Variations in Phrasing, Repetition Intervals, and the Recall of Sentence Material". *JVLVB* 5 (1966), 86-91.
440. Rowley, Brian A. "'Iambic Trochees', or, On Not Being Able to Scan". *Publications of the English Goethe Society, New Series*, 37 (1967), 142-174.
441. Russell, William M. "Poetics and Literary Language". *CE* 31 (1969), 300-308.
442. Sachs, Jacqueline Dene Strunk. "Recognition Memory for Syntactic and Semantic Aspects of Connected Discourse". *DA* 27 (1967), 2900B.
443. Saporta, Sol, ed. *Psycholinguistics: A Book of Readings*. New York, 1961.
444. Šaumjan, S.K. *Problems of Theoretical Phonology*. Translated (from the Russian) by Anthony L. Vaňek (*Janua Linguarum: Series Minor*, 41). The Hague, 1968.
445. Savin, Harris B. and Perchonock, Ellen. "Grammatical Structure and the Immediate Recall of English Sentences". *JVLVB* 4 (1965), 348-353.
446. Schipper, J. *A History of English Versification*. Oxford, 1910.
447. Schlesinger, J.M. *Sentence Structure and the Reading Process* (*Janua Linguarum: Series Minor*, 69). The Hague, 1968.

448. Scholes, Robert J. *Phonotactic Grammaticality* (Janua Linguarum: Series Minor, 50). The Hague, 1966.
449. Schramm, Richard. "The Line Unit: Studies in the Later Poetry of W.B. Yeats". *Ohio University Review* 3 (1961), 32-41.
450. Schwartz, Elias, Wimsatt, W.K. and Beardsley, M.C. [in argument]. "Rhythm and 'Exercises in Abstraction'". *PMLA* 77 (1962), 668-674.
451. Schwartz, Elias. "The Meter of Some Poems of Wyatt". *Studies in Philology* 60 (1963), 155-165.
452. Schwartz, Elias. "Rhythm and Meaning in English Verse". *Criticism* 6 (1964), 246-255.
453. Scott, William O. "Structure and Repetition in Elizabethan Verse". *DA* 20 (1960), 3752.
454. Sebeok, Thomas A., ed. *Style in Language*. New York and London, 1960.
455. Sebeok, Thomas A., ed. *Current Trends in Linguistics, Vol. III: Theoretical Foundations*. The Hague, 1966.
456. Sellers, W.H. "Wordsworth and Spender: Some Speculations on the Use of Rhyme". *SEL* 5 (1965), 641-650.
457. Selver, Paul. *The Art of Translating Poetry*. London, 1966.
458. Seright, Orin Dale. "Syntactic Structures in Keats' Poetry". *DA* 26 (1965), 1033-1034.
459. Shapiro, Karl and Beum, Robert. *A Handbook of Prosody*. New York, 1965.
460. Shipley, J.T., ed. *Dictionary of World Literature*. New Jersey, 1960.
461. Sipe, Dorothy L. *Shakespeare's Metrics*. (YSE 167). New Haven (Connecticut), 1968.
462. Sitwell, Edith. *A Notebook on William Shakespeare*. London, 1962.
463. Siversten, Eva, ed. *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Linguists*. Oslo, 1958.

496. Thompson, Ernest. "Some Effects of Message Structure on Listeners' Comprehension". *SM* 34 (1967), 51-57.
497. Thompson, John. "The Iambic Line from Wyatt to Sidney". *DA* 18 (1958), 1040.
498. Thompson, John. "Linguistic Structure and the Poetic Line". [114], 167-175.
499. Thompson, John. *The Founding of English Metre*. London, 1961.
500. Thompson, John. "Blank Verse". [411], 78-79.
501. Trager, George L. and Smith, Henry Lee. *An Outline of English Structure* (SILOP 5). Buffalo, New York, 1951.
502. Tsur, Reuven. "Metrical Analysis and a Grammar of Tension" [unpublished paper].
503. Tsur, Reuven. "Articulateness and Requiredness in Iambic Verse". *Style*, 6, ii (Spring 1972), 123-148.
504. Tukey, Ann. "A Model for French Syntactic Description". [424], 115-123.
505. Ullmann, Stephen. *The Principles of Semantics*. Oxford, 1957.
506. Ullmann, Stephen. *Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning*. Oxford, 1962.
507. Ullmann, Stephen. *Language and Style: Collected Papers*. Oxford, 1964.
508. Unbegaun, Boris O. *Russian Versification*. Oxford, 1956.
509. Utley, Francis L. "Structural Linguistics and the Literary Critic". *JAAC* 18 (1960), 319-328.
510. Utley, Francis Lee. "Oral Genres as Bridge to Written Literature". *Genre* 2 (1969), 91-103.
511. Vachek, Josef, ed. *A Prague School Reader in Linguistics*. Bloomington (Indiana) and London, 1966.
512. Vachek, Josef. "Phonology Today". *Linguistics* 46 (1968), 77-98.

513. Vanderslice, Ralph Leslie. "Synthetic Elocution: Considerations in Automatic Orthographic-to-Phonetic Conversion of English with Special Reference to Prosodic Features". *DA* 29 (1968), 588A-589A.
514. Walsh, Sister Mary Margaret. "Deep and Surface Structures in Five Poems of Alexander Pope". *DA* 29 (1969), 4477A-4478A.
515. Warfel, Harry R. "Syntax Makes Literature". *CE* 21 (1960), 251-255.
516. Warfel, Harry R. "A Rationale of Free Verse". *Jahrbuch für Amerikastudien*, 13 (1968), 228-235.
517. Weinreich, Uriel. "Explorations in Semantic Theory". [455]. 395-474.
518. Weinstein, Robert J., Feldstein, Stanley and Jaffe, Joseph. "The Interaction of Vocal Context and Lexical Predictability". *L & S* 8 (1965), 56-66.
519. Wellek, René and Warren, Austin. *Theory of Literature* London, 1963.
520. Wells, Rulon. "Is a Structural Treatment of Meaning Possible?". [463], 654-666.
521. Wells, Rulon. "Comments on Meter". Reprinted in [87], 127-131.
522. Whaler, James. *Counterpoint and Symbol: An Inquiry into the Rhythm of Milton's Epic Style*. Copenhagen, 1956.
523. Whitehall, Harold. "From Linguistics to Criticism". *KR* 18 (1956), 411-421. Reprinted in [226], 78-83.
524. Whitehall, Harold. "From Linguistics to Poetry". [165], 134-145.
525. Whiteley, M. "Verse and Its Feet". *Review of English Studies* 9 (1958), 268-279.
526. Whittier, Phyllis Gage. "Syntax and Poetry in Four Old English Elegies". *DA* 29 (1969), 2232A.
527. Wilkes, A.L. and Kennedy, R.A. "Relationships between Pausing and Retrieval Latency in Sentences of Varying Grammatical Form". *Journal of Experimental Psychology* 79 (1969), 241-245.

481. Stockwell, Robert P. "The Place of Intonation in a Generative Grammar of English". *Language* 36 (1960), 360-367.
482. Stockwell, Robert P. "Transformational Grammar in Perspective". [123], 51-66.
- 482a. Stockwell, Robert P. "The Role of Intonation: Reconsiderations and Other Considerations". [56a], 87-109.
483. Stoehr, Taylor, "Syntax and Poetic Form in Milton's Sonnets". *ES* 45 (1964), 289-301.
484. Stokes, Edward, "The Metrics of *Maud*". *Victorian Poetry* 2 (1964), 97-110.
485. Street, John C. "Methodology in Immediate Constituent Analysis". [424], 89-114.
486. Stutterheim, Cornelis F.P. "Poetry and Prose, their Interrelations and Transitional Forms". [114], 225-237.
487. Sumera, Magdalena. "The Temporal Tradition in the Study of Verse Structure". *Linguistics* 62 (1970), 44-66.
488. Sutherland, James. "How the Characters Talk". [489], 116-135.
489. Sutherland, James and Hurstfield, Joel, eds. *Shakespeare's World*. London, 1964.
490. Sutherland, Ronald. "Structural Linguistics and English Prosody". *CE* 20 (1958), 12-17. Reprinted in [197], 181-190.
491. Sutton, Walter. "The Analysis of Free Verse Form, Illustrated by a Reading of Whitman". *JAAC* 18 (1959), 241-254.
492. Taglicht, J. "The Function of Intonation in English Verse". *Language and Style* 4 (1971), 116-122.
493. Tannenbaum, Percy H., Williams, Frederick and Hillier, Carolyn S. "Word Predictability in the Environments of Hesitations". *JVLVB* 4 (1965), 134-140.
494. Taranovski, Kiril. "Some Problems of Enjambement in Slavic and Western European Verse". *IJSLP* 7 (1963), 80-87.
495. Tate, Allen, ed. *T.S. Eliot: The Man and His Work*. London, 1967.

464. Smith, Barbara Herrnstein. "A Study of Poetic Closure". *DA* 27 (1966), 1347A-1348A.
465. Smith, Barbara Herrnstein. *Poetic Closure: A Study of How Poems End*. Chicago and London, 1968.
466. Smith, Henry Lee. "Towards Redefining English Prosody". *SIL* 14 (1959), 68-76.
467. Smith, Paul Royce. "Studies in Spenser's Rimes". *DA* 22 (1962), 3188.
468. Spingarn, Lawrence P. "Poetry and Prose: Verse as a Literary Catalyst". *QQ* 66 (1959), 441-448.
469. Spitzer, Leo. "Language of Poetry". [14], 201-231.
470. Spitzer, Leo. *Linguistics and Literary History: Essays in Stylistics*. Princeton, 1967.
471. Springer, George C. "Language and Music: Parallels and Divergencies". [204], 504-513.
472. Sprott, Ernest S. *Milton's Art of Prosody*. Oxford, 1953.
473. Stankiewicz, Edward. "Linguistics and the Study of Poetic Language". [455], 69-81.
474. Stankiewicz, Edward. "Poetic and Non-Poetic Language in their Interrelation". [114], 11-23.
475. Stein, Arnold. "Donne's Prosody". *KR* 18 (1956), 439-443. Reprinted in [226], 92-94.
476. Stein, Arnold. "A Note on Meter". *KR* 18 (1956), 451-460. Reprinted in [226], 99-103.
477. Stein, Arnold. "George Herbert's Prosody". *Language and Style* 1 (1968), 1-38.
478. Sternfeld, F.W. "The Musical and Rhythmical Sources of Poetry". *English Institute Essays, 1951* (New York, 1952), 126-145.
479. Stevick, Robert. *Suprasegmentals, Meter and the Manuscript of Beowulf* (Janua Linguarum: Series Practica, 71). The Hague, 1968.
480. Stewart, George Rippey. *The Technique of English Verse*. New York, 1966.

528. Willcock, Gladys D. "Language and Poetry in Shakespeare's Early Plays". *Proceedings of the British Academy* 40 (1954), 103-117.
529. William, Joseph M. "Caliban and Ariel Meet Trager and Smith, or: Descriptive Linguistics and Teaching Literature". *CE* 24 (1962), 121-126.
530. Williams, George W. "The Poetry of the Storm in *King Lear*". *SQ* 2 (1951), 57-71.
531. Williams, William Carlos. "Free Verse". [411], 288-290.
532. Wimsatt, W.K. "The Rule and the Norm: Halle and Keyser on Chaucer's Meter". *CE* 31 (1970), 774-788. Reprinted in [85], 197-215.
533. Wimsatt, W.K. and Beardsley, M.C. "The Concept of Meter: An Exercise in Abstraction". *PMLA* 74 (1959), 585-598. Reprinted in [197], 150-168, and in [87], 91-114.
534. Winters, Yvor. "The Audible Reading of Poetry". [197], 131-149.
535. Wolfe, Ralph Haven and Daniels, Edgar F. "Rime and Idea in Donne's Holy Sonnet X". *American Notes and Queries* 5 (1967), 116-117.
536. Wood, James O. "A Special Cadence in *King Lear*". *SQ* 12 (1961), 455-466.
537. Žirmunskij [=Zhirmunsky], Viktor. *Introduction to Metrics: The Theory of Verse* (An English Translation of [551]). The Hague, 1966.

* * * * *

Русская библиография

538. Адмони, В. Г. "Развитие теории **Г**рамматики", [582], 331-349.
539. Бернштейн, С. И., "Звучащая художественная речь и её изучение", Поэтика: Сборник статей 1 (1926), 41-53.
540. Бернштейн, С. И., "Стих и декламация", Русская речь 2 (Ленинград, 1927).
541. Бернштейн, С. И., "Эстетические предпосылки теории декламации", Поэтика 3 (1927), 25-44.
542. Бернштейн, С. И., "Опыт анализа словесной инструментовки: первая строфа стихотворения Тютчева 'Зумерки'", Поэтика 5 (1929), 156-192.
543. Брик, Осип, "Ритм и синтаксис", Новый Леп 3-6 (1927)
544. Виноградов, В. В., Стилистика; теория поэтической речи; поэтика. Москва, 1963.
545. Вышеславцева, С., "О моторных импульсах стиха", Поэтика 3 (1927), 45-62
546. Гальди, Л., "Личность поэта и техника стиха", Вопросы языкознания 16, III (Май-Июнь, 1967), 53-58.
547. Гей, Н. К., Искусство слова: О художественности литературы. Москва, 1967.
548. Жирмунский, В. М., "Мелодика стиха" (рецензия о [588]), Мысль 3 (1922), 109-139.
549. Жирмунский, В. М., Рифма, её история и теория. Петербург, 1923.
550. Жирмунский, В. М., "Задачи поэтики". Задачи и методы изучения искусств, Петербург, 1924.

551. Жирмунский, В. М., Введение в метрику: теория стиха. Ленинград, 1925.
552. Жирмунский, В. М., Вопросы теории литературы. Ленинград, 1928.
553. Жовтис, А. Л., "О способах рифмования в русской поэзии: к проблеме структурных связей в современном стихе", Вопросы языкознания 2, (1969), 64-75.
554. Зиндер, Л. Р., "Фонология и фонетика", [582], 193-231.
555. Иванов, Вяч. Всев., "Метр и ритм в 'Поэме конца' М. Цветаевой", [584], 168-201.
556. Колмогоров, А. Н., "Пример изучения метра и его ритмических вариантов", [584], 145-167.
557. Лазарев, Л., "Когда проза становится поэзией", Вопросы литературы 11, 1 (Январь 1967), 58-72.
558. Леонтьев, А. А., "[Психолингвистические проблемы порождения фразы:] Современное состояние проблемы" [560], 77-89.
559. Леонтьев, А. А., "Исследования поэтической речи", [582], 143-153.
560. Леонтьев, А. А., редактор, Теория речевой деятельности: проблемы психолингвистики. Москва, 1968.
561. Леонтьев, А. А., Слово в речевой деятельности. Москва 1965.
562. Леонтьев, А. А., Психолингвистика. Ленинград, 1967.
563. Лотман, Юрий М., Структура художественного текста. Москва, 1970.
564. Лотман, Юрий М., Анализ поэтического текста. Ленинград, 1972.

565. Лушахина, И.М., "Экспериментальное исследование психолингвистической значимости грамматической структуры высказывания", [560], 90-101.
566. Николаева, Т.М., "О соотношении сегментных указателей и суперсегментных языковых средств", Вопросы языкознания 17, 6 (Ноябрь-декабрь, 1968), 49-57.
567. Павлова, В.И., "Исследование стиха методами экспериментальной фонетики", [584], 211-217.
568. Смирнов, И.П., "О ритмико-фразовых уподоблениях в стихах", [584], 218-226.
569. Степанов, Ю., редактор, Проблемы современной лингвистики. Москва, 1968.
570. Тимофеев, Л.И., Основы теории литературы. Москва, 1963.
571. Тимофеев, Л.И., Проблемы стихотворения: Материалы к социологии стиха. Москва, 1931.
572. Тимофеев, Л.И., Очерки теории и истории русского стиха. Москва, 1958.
573. Тимофеев, Л.И., Проблемы теории литературы. Москва, 1955.
574. Томашевский, Б.В., Теория литературы: поэтика. Москва и Ленинград, 1927.
575. Томашевский, Б.В., "Стих и ритм: методические замечания", Поэтика 4 (1928), 5-44.
576. Томашевский, Б.В., Стих и язык: филологические очерки. Москва и Ленинград, 1959.
577. Томашевский, Б.В., Стилистика и стихосложение. Ленинград, 1959.

578. Тынянов, Ю.Н., Проблема стихотворного языка. Москва, 1965.
579. Федоров, А.В., "Проблема стихотворного перевода", Поэтика 2 (1927), 104-118.
580. Федоров, А.В., "Звуковая форма стихотворного перевода: вопросы метрики и фонетики", Поэтика 4 (1928) 45-69.
581. Федоров, А.В., Введение в теорию перевода. Москва, 1958.
582. Филин, Ф.П., редактор, Теоретические проблемы советского языкознания. Москва, 1968.
583. Филин, Ф.П., редактор, Язык и мышление. Москва, 1967.
584. Холшевников, В.Е., ответственный редактор, Теория стиха. Ленинград, 1968.
585. Холшевников, В.Е., Основы стиховедения: русское стихосложение. Ленинград, 1962.
586. Чуковский, К., Высокое искусство. Москва, 1964.
587. Шервинский, С.В., Ритм и смысл: к изучению поэтики Пушкина. Москва, 1961.
588. Эйхенбаум, Б.М., Мелодика русского лирического стиха. Петербург, 1922.
589. Эйхенбаум, Б.М., Сквозь литературы: сборник статей. Ленинград, 1924.
590. Эйхенбаум, Б.М., "О звуках в стихе", [589], 201-208.
591. Эйхенбаум, Б.М., "Мелодика стиха", [589], 209-214.
592. Эйхенбаум, Б.М., Литература: теория, критика, полемика. Ленинград, 1927.

593. Эткинд, Е., Поэзия и перевод. Москва и Ленинград, 1963.
594. Якобсон, Р.О., О чешском стихе. Берлин, 1923.
595. Якобсон, Р.О., "Поэзия грамматики и грамматика поэзии", [114], 397-417.

INDEX

This Index refers to chapters 1 - 6 only; it covers concepts as well as words; a page where a topic (e.g., syntax) is discussed is recorded, whether the title-word appears there or not. Page numbers in italics indicate major discussions of topics. Literary works, as well as theoretical concepts ascribable to individuals, are indexed under their authors.

- Abbott, K.M., 24, 25, 27, 28
 acceleration, *see* tempo
 addressee (perceiver, listener, decoder), 3, 134, 137, 139, 143, 144, 145, 149, 189, 244
 addresser (speaker, encoder), 134, 137, 139, 141, 143, 144, 145, 167, 189, 254
 adjective, adjective-noun relationships, 57, 79, 97, 128-129, 141, 142, 153, 186
 adverb, 186, 220, 225
 aesthetics, aesthetic considerations, *see* art
 ambiguity: syntactic, 185, 186, 189, 192, 195, 201, 226; segmentational, *see* segmentational ambiguity; semantic, 185, 186, 189, 201
 analysis: analytical procedures, *see* methodology; textual, *see* textual analysis
 Anglo-American scholarship, 6n, 21n, 37, 72, 73, 245n
 appositions, appositional relationships, 178, 210, 212, 248
 art, artistic considerations, 4-5, 9, 68, 70, 79, 80n, 149, 232n-233n, 244, 245n, 263
 article (definite and indefinite), article-noun relationships, 91, 106, 127, 128, 176, 225, 231
 asymmetry, 144, 161, 169
 attitudinal intonation, 4, 29, 31n, 32, 33, 187n, 188, 247-253, 262; interrelations of, with syntactic intonation, 247-253; *see also* residue
 auxiliary verb, 162, 218
 Babcock, M.D., 2
 Bateson, F.W., 255
 Bayfield, M.A., 255
 Beardsley, M.C., 1n, 6n, 36, 246n
 Belić, 84n, 85, 95; *see also* Taranovski, "syntagm"
 Beloof, Robert, 219
 Ben-Porat, Ziva, 21n
 Bernštejn, S.I., 36n, 157, 243n, 255
 Berry, Francis, 255
 Bradley, A.C., 24, 26, 28
 break: intralinear, mid-line, *see* caesura; mid-line; post-linear, interlinear, *see* end-stopped line; enjambment; syntactic, grammatical, intonational, *see* pause
 breath-group, 50n
 Brik, Osip, 72n
 caesura, intralinear breaks and pauses, 8, 9, 10, 11, 35, 62, 84, 85, 87, 88, 89, 99, 100, 102, 161, 173n, 239, 243, 245
 certainty and uncertainty (of prediction), 114, 121, 122, 123, 126, 127, 128, 129, 139, 176, 213, 219; paradigmatic, 126, 127; syntagmatic, 128, 176
 Chatman, Seymour, 3, 5n, 24, 28, 29, 35, 36, 37, 40, 90, 148, 245, 254; "oral performance fallacy", 34-37, 39, 40; "phonemic clause", 24, 25, 28
 Childs, B., 3, 254

- Chomsky, Noam, 65, 132, 140n, 251 n; "competence vs. "performance" distinction, 133, 139
- circularity, 48, 55, 100
- clause (main, and subordinate), 24, 48, 49, 50n, 56, 70, 82, (82n), 84n, 85, 89, 93, 95, 97, 141, 142n, 165, 169, 170, 172, 174, 175, 177, 180, 181, 182, 205, 207, 211, 212, 231, 240, 249, 250; *see also* syntax; syntactic subordination (initial)
- cohesion, syntactic, 17, 50, 51-54, 59, 63, 76, 78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 89, 91, 93, 97, 106, 168, 225, 228, 243; definition of, *see* Robins, R.H.; *see also* SIC
- collocations and idioms, 126n, 224, 225
- colon (a rhythmical-syntactic unit), 102n
- "commitment", syntactic, by speaker, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 167
- communication-through-language, 3, 29, 71, 123, 137, 184, 186, 190; oral, *see* speech; written, *see* written language
- congruity (between types of segmentation), 7-8, 12n, 24, 27, 39, 53, 80, 228, 234, 243
- conjunction, 128
- consensus, scholarly, 22, 30, 36, 46, 48, 157, 181
- constants, 81, 85, 87, 133, 153n, 154, 262, 263; *see also* variables
- content, *see* meaning; semantics
- context(s), textual "environment" and "vicinity", 13, 73, 114, 116, 147, 163, 164, 166, 167n, 177, 178, 185, 189, 196, 197, 199, 200, 207, 221, 222, 223, 224, 246, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 263, 265, 266, 267
- convention, conventionality, 5, 11, 12, 29, 45, 114, 117, 162, 187, 189, 190n, 194, 204, 207, 228, 230, 231n, 242, 250, 254, 256, 267
- correlations between punctuation, intonation and syntax, 205-208, 246, 250
- Cory, R.E., 173n
- Crystal, David, 30, 32, 33, 42, 50n, 51, 56, 114, 138, 247, 248, 249, 252n, 254
- Cummings, E.E., 2, 190n, 208, 213, 221-230, 231, 231n, 240, 253; "if i/or anybody don't", 221-230, 253; "these children singing in stone a", 226n
- Czech structuralism, 20n, 21n, 72n, 243n, 245n, 255
- Davie, Donald, 72, 73, 197n
- "deautomatisation", 187, 196, 225, 227, 241, 263, 266
- decoding, listening, 144, 145
- device, 5n, 13, 14, 17, 40n, 69, 177, 181, 194, 200, 219, 221, 226, 244, 260, 262, 263, 264
- DiPietro, Robert, 66
- "disambiguation", 185-186, 195, 201
- discrepancy (between syntactic and poetic segmentation), 7, 8-11, 53, 234
- Donne, John, 158-171, 178
- Draper, John, W., 255
- duration, 31, 186, 188, 246, 250, 260, 262, 267
- dynamic approach and aspects, 20, 21n, 44, 47n, 68, 70-75, 81, 83, 93, 94, 96, 97, 98, 101, 103, 105n, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 124, 134, 159, 171-172, 175, 177, 215-230, 232, 233
- Éjxenbaum, B., 2n, 37, 72n
- Eliot, T.S., 86, 87, 88, 90, 91, 175-176, 192-202, 203, 208, 218, 224, 242, 262, 263, 264; *Ash-Wednesday*, 86, 87, 90, 192-202, 203, 224, 262-265; "Burbank with a Baedeker",

- etc., 217, 218, 242; "East Coker", 200n; *The Waste Land*, 175-176
- emphasis, 3, 7, 84, 112, 186, 224, 238, 244, 252, 260, 262, 263, 264, 265, 267
- emphasis-potential (of words), semantic, 260, 261-266
- encoding, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 167
- end of poem, 204, 207, 230-233
- end-stopped line (non-enjambment), 24, 29, 35, 38, 42, 47n, 81, 87, 106, 161, 162, 169, 173n, 211, 214, 216, 219, 221, 223, 224, 228, 229, 235, 241, 256; prospective, 216-221, 224; retrospective, 216-221, 223, 224, 229
- English (language), 8, 50n, 84n, 127, 128, 216, 231
- Engstrom, A.G., 98-100
- enjambment: general reference to, 1, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23-30, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 46, 47n, 68, 70, 71, 74, 75, 76, 77, 80, 81, 83-92, 98, 99-103, 106, 108, 109, 110, 112, 123, 124, 129, 136, 138, 140, 145, 161, 162, 171, 177, 178, 183, 201, 203, 206, 215, 216, 219, 221, 229, 232, 233, 235, 236, 237, 238, 241-243, 244, 252-257, 259-268; artistic, "man-made" nature of, 39-40; classification of, types and typology of, 15, 63, 64, 76, 77-92, 96, 98-103, 106, 136, 160-161, 164; differences in the employment of, 90; "digressional"/"abnormal" nature of, 12, 12n, 39, 244, 255-257; effects and functions of, 14, 15, 25n, 38n, 47n, 52n, 61-62, 64-65, 75, 80n, 85, 89, 108, 123, 129, 139, 140, 164, 170, 183, 218, 219, 223-230, 241, 244, 259-266, 268; historical aspects of, 14, 15, 16, 90; intonational nature of, 28-42, 206, 214; intramorphemic, *see* word-splitting enjambment; a new Definition of, 35, 36, 38, 41-42, 43, 48, 60, 81n, 107, 108, 214, 236, 268; ontological status of, 37-38; oral rendition of, 15, 24, 84, 243-257; position of, between poetry and prose, 262; previous definitions of, 22, 23-30, 34, 35; prospective, 216-221, 224, 245, 263; quantitative significance of, 11-12; retrospective, 123, 216-221, 223, 224, 229; semantic aspects of, 257-267; specific cases and "isolated" occurrences of, 22, 47n, 60, 61, 62, 64, 75, 85, 86, 87, 90, 106, 112, 155, 158-164, 168-171, 206, 217, 218, 219, 220, 222, 224, 243; structure and structural aspects of, 14, 15, 16-18, 22, 25n, 38n, 52n, 75, 80n, 88, 89, 123, 129, 140, 183, 241, 268; syntactic contribution to, 1, 8, 9, 17-18, 19, 20, 41, 46, 48, 49, 61-68, 74, 97, 140, 215, 233, 236; theory of, 1, 11, 13, 14-16, 17, 18, 30, 31, 41, 49, 76, 85, 93, 145, 208, 236, 247; "unrealised potential alternative" of, 255-257; word-splitting, *see* word-splitting enjambments
- enjambment-definition, problem of, 8n, 20, 21, 22, 23-30, 33, 35, 37, 38, 41
- Erlich, Victor, 12n, 24n, 37, 72n, 225
- Even-Zohar, Itamar, 20n
- expectations, anticipations (general), 21, 44, 72, 73, 75, 100, 103, 105, 107, 116, 118, 144, 148, 161-162, 172-173, 176, 180, 184, 185, 205-206, 213, 214, 218, 219, 230, 231, 242, 253, 258
- experiments, experimental verification, 185-186; *see also* psycholinguistics

- Fenyo, J., 5n
 Flatter, Richard, 255
 Fónagy, I. & Magdics, K.,
 252n, 254
 foot, metrical, 6, 7, 239; *see also* metre
 "foregrounding", 70, 111n, 163,
 177, 181, 190, 227, 260, 261,
 266, 267
 Formalism, Russian, *see* Russian
 Formalism
 Fowler, A.S.D., 72, 73
 Fowler, Roger, 5n, 6n, 24n,
 36n, 37n, 38n, 67, 76, 77-83,
 84, 85, 92, 116, 240, 243;
 "scale for enjambment", 77-
 83, 84, 85; *see also* scales,
 hierarchical
 "free verse", 10, 229n
 French (language), 49n-50n
 functional relationships, *see*
 syntax, functional relation-
 ships
 Gammon, E.R., 65n
 Gantzel, L.H., 247n
 Generate-transformational
 grammar, *see* TG
 gerund, gerundial phrases, 175
 Gleason, H.A., 32, 63, 246n
 Goldman-Eisler, Frieda, 136,
 138, 254
 Golomb, Harai, 11n, 232n
 grammar, 24, 25, 35, 38, 99,
 116, 231n; *see also* syntax
 grammaticality, 121n; poten-
 tial, 121n
 Grammont, Maurice, 100
 graphic signs, *see* written
 language
 Grinberg, Uri Zvi, 173n
 Gross, H., 6n, 218, 254
 guessing, 101, 103, 132, 134-
 136, 172-173
 Guinness, Sir Alec, 35
 Halle, Morris, 6n, 67n; and
 Keyser, S.J., *English Stress*,
etc., 6n, 67n
 Halliday, M.A.K., 33, 50n, 66
 Hawkes, Terence, 6n
 Hebrew (language), 127n, 232n
 Henderson, A., 254
 hesitation-pauses, 132, 134,
 136-140, 264; perception of,
 138; production of, 138
 hierarchy, *see* scales, hier-
 archical
 hindsight, "hindsight-fallacy",
 126, 143, 183, 202, 227
 Hirst, D.J., 50n
 Holland, Norman, 148n
 Hollander, John, 12n, 24, 28,
 72n, 76, 82, 173n
 Hopkins, Gerard Manley, 217,
 242
 Hrushovski, Benjamin, 1n, 2n, 3
 5n, 13, 20n, 21n, 36n, 97n,
 72n, 74n, 102, 157, 173n, 181
 211, 242, 243n, 246n, 259,
 260, 261, 265n, 266n; "junc-
 tion" (concept of), 13; "se-
 mantic integration", 74n
 hypotaxis, hypotactical con-
 structions, 45n, 181, 182; *see also*
 left-branching; parataxis;
 syntactic subordination
 IC (immediate constituents), 4,
 45, 51, 61, 63-65, 67, 185,
 187, 188, 192, 247, 248, 252,
 253; boundary of, 63, 64
 iambic pentameter, 116, 238,
 239, 240
 idioms, *see* collocations
 imperative, 197
 infinitive, 127, 128, 218
 interrogative, 141n, 220
 intonation: general reference
 to, 1, 3, 4, 13, 14, 20, 21,
 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31,
 32, 34, 49, 50n, 55, 62, 77,
 81, 82, 90, 100, 108, 123,
 135, 147, 150, 160n, 161, 166
 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187,
 189, 195, 196, 200, 206, 208-
 212, 229, 235, 236-237, 243-
 257, 267; an *ad hoc* definitio
 of, 31, 253; as a property of
 written language, 31, 34-37,
 41; contours, 4, 30, 34, 39,
 49, 63, 113, 114 (table), 147
 184, 185, 186, 187, 192, 204,
 207, 249-252; "expressive"

- ("emotive"), 31n, 112, 187n, 188, 262 (*see also* attitudinal intonation); functional aspects of, 32, 33, 34, 247-253; interactions and interrelations of, with other factors, 1, 2, 4, 5, 12, 29, 31, 243-257; nonsyntactic functions of (semantic, attitudinal, expressive, emotive), *see* attitudinal intonation; parameters of, *see* parameters; problems in treatment of, 32-38, 55; structural aspects of, 32, 33; syntactic functions of, *see* syntactic intonation
- "intonational subordination", 204, 214
- intransitivity, intransitive verbs, 159
- intuition, intuitive approaches and considerations, 22, 23, 33, 41, 49, 53, 55, 58, 61, 62, 75, 85, 90, 91, 96, 124, 130-131, 146, 151, 152, 154, 157, 158, 160n, 181, 217, 238, 255
- inversion, *see* metre; word-order
- Israeli structuralists, 20n-21n
- Jakobson, Roman, 10n, 12, 13, 24, 25n, 26, 28, 36, 69, 70, 72n, 115n, 116, 189-192, 196, 225, 243n, 255; "the poetic function", 70, 189-192, 196; "verse-design", "verse instance", "delivery design", and "delivery instance", 10n, 36n, 116
- Johnson, N.F., 50n, 82n
- "junction", *see* Hrushovski
- junction(s), pausal, 3, 4, 7, 24, 25, 41-42, 46, 47, 48, 54, 78, 80, 104, 107, 111, 122, 123, 125, 126, 127, 128, 138, 161, 164, 165, 174, 175, 177, 184, 187, 188, 207, 211, 213, 216, 221, 235, 246, 247, 248, 252, 253, 262; nonterminal ("rising" and "sustained"), 46, 47, 111, 122, 125, 164, 165, 166, 174, 175, 177, 209, 211, 212, 220, 221, 235, 247, 248; "plus-juncture", 47n, 50n; terminal ("falling"), 24, 46, 47, 111, 122, 183, 208, 209, 220, 221, 247, 248; *See also* pause
- Kaufman, Channa, 21n
- Kell, R., 2n, 28n, 85, 87, 88, 111n, 160n, 243n, 254, 259
- Kermode, Frank, 240
- Keyser, S.J., 6n, 67n; *see also* Halle, M.
- Kurath, H., 3, 33, 247n, 248
- language, general reference to, 2, 5n, 9, 15, 16, 19, 26, 27, 30, 49, 57, 65, 68, 69, 70, 71, 75, 76, 95, 96, 119, 133, 144, 145, 187, 189, 191, 209, 212, 241, 246, 248, 254, 261; poetic, *see* poetic language; spoken, *see* speech; written, *see* written language
- Lanz, H., 254
- Leech, G.N., 2n, 12n, 24n, 38, 39, 40, 41, 51, 82, 213, 243n; definitions of enjambment proposed by, 39-40, 41
- "left-branching" constructions, 144, 163, 164, 179, 182, 183; *see also* right-branching; syntactic subordination, initial length, syntactic, *see* SL
- Leont'ev, A.A., 132
- Levenston, E., 66n
- Levin, S.R., 36n
- line, poetic; verse-line: general reference to, 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12n, 13, 24, 26, 39, 78, 80, 84, 102, 108, 115, 117, 118, 171, 173n, 181, 210, 223, 227, 228, 233, 238, 242, 261; as an auditory and/or intonational phenomenon, 2, 19, 29, 84; as *differentia specifica* of poetry, 1, 268; as a graphic and/or visual phenomenon, 2, 29, 229-230; end-stopped, *see* end-stopped line;

- interrelations of, with syntax, 5, 24, 78, 80, 84, 108, 115, 171, 181, 210, 225, 226, 228, 268; run-on, *see* enjambment.
- line-boundary(ies), line-end(s), 2, 8-11, 12, 17, 24, 25, 27, 29, 39, 40, 47, 42, 43, 47n, 61, 62, 67, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 83, 84, 87, 89, 90, 99, 100, 101, 106, 110, 123, 124, 129, 153, 154, 159, 161, 162, 163, 165, 166, 169, 170, 188-189, 202, 203n, 204, 205, 206, 207, 213, 214, 216-217, 219, 220, 221, 225, 230, 232, 238, 242, 243, 246, 256, 259
- line-division, *see* lineation
- line-integrity (line autonomy), 9, 26, 208, 220, 221-230, 253; dependence of, on lingual legitimation, 228
- line-reinforcing (line-strengthening), 10n, 221, 238, 242
- line-weakening 10n, 221, 242
- linearity, 73, 74n, 105, 178, 196; *see also* simultaneity
- lineation (line-division): general reference to, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 13, 26, 52n, 79, 86, 169, 186, 188, 189, 190, 192, 201, 219, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 231n, 237, 238, 241, 242, 244, 245, 253, 256, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265; contribution of, to poetic effect, 3, 222-230; influence of, on intonation 2, 4, 188, 222-230, 261-266; theory of, 1-2
- linguistic analysis, research, theory, *see* linguistics
- linguistics, 1, 6, 16, 18, 27, 29, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47n, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 60, 61, 65, 66, 68, 69-76, 82, 84n, 91, 92, 96, 109, 110, 114 (table), 119, 130, 131n, 140n, 145, 148-150, 151, 172, 185, 218, 247n; limitations and shortcomings of, 1, 16, 32, 40, 41, 45, 55, 56, 60, 61-76, 91, 92, 93, 96, 109, 119, 151, 172; structural, 185, 190
- listener, *see* addressee
- literary interpretation, 41, 43, 137n, 139, 159, 162n, 171, 188, 195, 196, 197, 199, 201, 206, 208, 223, 228, 238, 246, 258, 259-266
- literary research, scholarship theory, *see* poetics
- literary syntax, *see* poetic syntax
- literature (general reference to), 27, 41, 57, 67, 69, 10148, 149, 150, 189, 190, 19195, 246
- Loesch, Katherine T., 36n, 24
- loudness, 31, 186, 188, 246, 250, 260, 262
- Lyons, John, 45n, 131n, 132, 140n
- McCormack, Robert, 245n
- Majakovskij, Vladimir, 173n
- Malmberg, Bertil, 32
- Malmström, Sten, 149-150
- Martin, E., 144
- Masson, David, 242
- meaning, semantic content, 4, 13, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 33, 34, 35, 41, 50n, 54n, 77n, 84n, 114, 116, 139, 14181, 200, 236, 242, 248, 24256, 257-267; *see also* semantics
- memory and recall, 132, 141, 144, 180; *see also* psycholinguistics
- metaphor(s), 192
- methodology, and analytical procedures, 16-19, 29, 32, 47-49, 53-55, 58, 60, 63, 668, 71, 77, 85, 86-91, 93, 96, 103, 111n, 117, 126, 129132, 134, 135, 139, 145, 14150, 151, 159n, 200, 203, 2218, 255
- metre, 5n, 10n, 12, 13, 24, 26, 52n, 67n, 78, 80, 81, 11

- 116, 119, 161, 201, 219, 229n, 236, 237, 238-241, 242, 243, 256-257, 261, 265
- "metrical inversion", 239
- metrical regularity and irregularity, 116, 118, 119, 201, 238-240, 256
- mid-line, intralinear phenomena, 8-11, 84, 88, 89, 99, 100, 161, 173n, 240, 243
- Milton, John, 197
- Mitchell, Roger, 173n
- Moore, Marianne, 91, 208, 217, 219, 225
- morpheme, morphology, 49, 50n, 82, 83, 93, 95, 96
- Mukarovský, Jan, 20n, 37n, 72n, 153n, 157, 159n-160n, 255; *see also* word-order
- Murdy, Louise B., 148, 254
- Mussulman, Joseph A., 254
- NP (Noun-Phrase), 45, 64, 67, 141, 220
- Nist, John, 6n
- noun, 57, 79, 91, 97, 109, 113, 127, 128, 141, 156, 177, 218, 220, 224, 225; *see also* adjective; article; NP; preposition
- Nowotny, Winifred, 2n, 16, 72, 200n, 215n-216n, 261, 262; "enactment", 170-171
- object, 54n, 57, 62, 64, 97, 109, 128, 154, 156, 160, 197; *see also* transitivity
- Ohmann, Richard, 67n
- oppositions and dichotomies: binary, 42, 45, 121, 138; intonational, 185; polar, 42, 114, 119, 121, 138
- oral communication, *see* speech; intonation
- oral interpretation (delivery/performance/rendition), 7, 15, 24, 28, 34, 35, 36n, 40, 41, 54, 84, 148, 157, 183, 186, 195, 206, 208, 211, 236, 238, 243-257, 263; obligatory *vs.* optional, 40n, 246-246n, 248-249, 254-255; traditions of, 267
- Osgood, C.E., 132
- PR & PCR ("potential *rejet*" and "potential *contre-rejet*"), 101-103, 105n, 106, 245
- parabola, "the parabola principle", 179-183, 184, 215
- paradigms, paradigmatics, 65, 114, 123, 125, 129, 152, 167, 172, 177, 190, 191, 195, 235
- paralinguistic phenomena, 246, 249, 250
- parameters, 33, 53, 56, 57, 58, 59, 62, 89, 94, 97, 99n, 104, 105, 108-112, 113-130, 133, 151, 155, 156, 157, 180-182, 214, 229, 237-242, 255, 262, 267; of intonational tension: 112-119 (generally lingual, 113-114; specifically poetic, 115-119); of SIC, 56; of SMIU-tension, 124, 151-158; of tempo, 255
- parataxis, paratactical constructions, 45n, 181, 182; *see also* hypotaxis; right-branching
- parentheses, parenthetical statements, 128, 177, 204
- parts of speech (general), 113-114; *see also* adjective; adverb; article; conjunction; noun; pronoun; preposition; verb
- pausal juncture(s), *see* juncture(s)
- pause(s), break(s), 3, 7, 12, 24, 25, 32, 39, 42, 43, 49, 50n, 52, 53, 55, 58, 78, 80, 82n, 84, 85, 87, 99, 100n, 101, 102, 104, 105, 111n, 113, 118, 136, 137, 139, 157, 160, 161, 162, 173n, 184, 186, 189, 200, 202, 209, 213, 215, 218, 224, 235, 244, 246, 248, 252, 263, 264, 265; interlinear, *see* end-stopped lines; enjambment; intralinear, *see* caesura
- pause-desirability and pause-acceptability, 43, 44, 45, 46, 51, 52, 53, 56, 58, 61, 62, 74,

- 101, 105, 111n, 135, 146, 155, 160, 178, 183, 220
- pause-resistance, 46, 49, 51, 53, 54, 55, 78, 79, 101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 125, 127, 131, 139, 146, 152, 155, 162, 166, 176, 202, 218, 220, 235, 239
- "permission" for pauses, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 48, 53, 55, 80, 103, 107, 177, 188, 213; *see also* pause-desirability, pause-resistance
- Perry, Menakhem, 11n, 20n, 149
- phonetics, phonetic analysis, etc., 32, 50, 148, 157
- phonology, 28, 30, 35, 39, 47, 48, 50n, 96, 185, 191, 221
- phrase(s), 45, 49, 52, 72, 76, 82 (82n), 84n, 85, 89, 93, 95, 99, 142n, 172, 175, 180, 182, 211, 212, 231n, 249
- Pike, K.L., 47n
- pitch, 3, 31, 33, 157, 186, 188, 245, 246, 247-253, 255, 260, 262
- pitch-direction, 247-253, 255
- pitch-interval, 249-253
- Poe, Edgar Allen, 116, 117, 119, 175-176; "The Raven", 116, 117-119, 175-176
- "poetic function", the, *see* Jakobson
- poetic history, 2, 15, 90
- poetic language, 5n, 13, 68-70, 260-261
- poetic line, *see* line, poetic
- poetic (and literary) syntax, 20, 21, 69-70, 71, 72, 80, 110, 115n, 230, 232, 261
- "poeticalness", poetic specificity, 2, 5, 11, 227, 268
- poetics (literary research, theory, scholarship), 1, 6n, 16, 21n, 40, 41, 43, 46, 67, 69, 75, 76, 79, 82, 91, 92, 96, 102n, 109, 119, 130, 131, 133, 148-150, 189-192, 218, 232n-233n, 245n, 246, 260; interrelations with, and dependence on, linguistics, 68-76; limitations and shortcomings of, 1, 32, 40, 41
- poetry, general reference to, 1, 5, 6n, 10n, 12, 13, 14, 26, 27, 49, 69, 74, 83, 100n, 107, 115, 138, 159n, 187, 190, 196, 209, 229, 232-233, 261, 262, 263, 268; metrical, 26, 116, 238; nonmetrical, 26
- "point of assessment" (of tension), 11, 112, 113, 114, 116, 119, 120, 122, 125, 125, 127, 130, 141, 164, 167, 213, 230
- Pomorska, Krystyna, 24n, 72n
- predicate, 45, 57, 61, 62, 64, 97, 170, 175, 179, 180; *see also* subject; syntactic coordination
- predictability, prediction, 22, 104, 106, 111, 119-130, 134, 135, 136, 143, 150, 152, 164, 165, 168, 172-173, 175, 177, 202, 206, 217, 219, 220, 235, 242, 258; paradigmatic, 125, 128, 129, 152, 177; syntagmatic, 125, 128, 129, 177
- Preminger, Alex, 25, 27, 98-99
- preposition, preposition-noun relationships, 57, 79, 106, 109, 112, 113, 127, 156, 175, 177, 218, 225, 231
- preversified (unversified) text, 3, 20, 41-42, 46, 52, 235, 260, 264; predominance of, over poetic segmentation, 228-230, 244-245
- probability, 123, 126, 127, 129, 152, 176-177, 189, 197, 199, 201, 202, 216-218, 219, 220, 235, 258; paradigmatic, 129, 152, 177; syntagmatic, 126, 127, 129, 176, 177
- pronoun, 154, 156, 198, 220
- prose, "prose-position" of words, 3, 67n, 256, 259, 260, 262
- prosodic features (in language and linguistics), 30, 31, 249, 250
- prosody, versification (in poetry and poetics), 14, 21, 36, 148, 162n, 164, 194, 203n, 219, 236-237, 256, 257, 260, 263, 267

- prospectivity (prospective approach), 107, 108, 110, 113n, 118, 119, 120-130, 131-147, 152, 159, 161, 163, 168, 172-173, 175, 186, 195, 196, 202, 207, 215-221, 230, 232, 233, 235, 242-243, 256, 258
 "psychointonation", 108, 111, 117, 135, 157, 179
 psycholinguistics, 16, 58, 66, 82n, 90, 104, 109, 110, 124, 129, 130-150, 151, 167, 172, 179, 185, 221
 psychology, 58, 104, 131, 132, 133, 137, 145, 148, 150, 157
 "psychopoetics", 129, 147-150, 180, 182, 189n, 255
 punctuation, 109, 110, 123, 174, 183, 184-214, 223, 224, 231n, 235; intonationally motivated, 161, 194, 204-206; reversed hierarchy in interrelations with syntax and intonation, 206-207
 punctuation marks: general reference to, 174, 190, 194, 200, 203, 209, 213; comma, 47n, 52, 53, 118, 161, 197n, 200-201, 203-208, 210, 211, 213, 231n; dash, 204; exclamation mark, 204; full-stop period, 47n, 102, 106, 121, 183, 204-210, 213; hyphen, 219; parentheses, 204; quotation marks, 199; semicolon, 47n, 194, 203-205, 207, 208, 210, 211, 231n
 Quirk, Randolph, 33n
 reader, the, 148, 149, 169, 180, 181, 182, 183, 190, 191, 192, 195, 196, 202, 203n, 206, 208, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 222, 223, 225, 228, 229, 230, 238, 239, 241, 244, 246, 256, 258, 259, 262, 263, 264
 reading, process of, 21, 47n, 73n-74n, 75, 101, 103, 105, 106, 107, 168, 172-173, 181-182, 196, 202, 227, 228, 239, 259, 263
 redundancy, 132, 133, 134; semantic, 132, 134, 135; syntactic, 133, 134, 135
rejet and *contre-rejet* (R & CR) 98-103, 105n; *see also* PR & PCR
 "residue", "residue theory", 32, 247-253, 262
 retardation, *see* tempo
 retrospectivity (retrospective approach), 107, 108, 110, 118, 119, 120, 123, 143, 161, 162, 163, 168, 169, 186, 196, 202, 207, 213, 215-230, 232, 235, 242-243, 253, 256, 259
 rhyme, 10n, 11, 13, 78, 115, 116, 117, 118, 161, 219, 231n, 237, 241-253, 256-257
 rhythm, poetic (nonmetrical), 1, 13, 26, 31, 100n, 115, 117, 118, 150, 162n, 194, 236-237, 241, 246, 261
 Richards, I.A., 65n, 148n
 "right-branching" constructions, 179, 182-183; *see also* syntactic completeness, initial; syntactic subordination
 Roberts, K.H., 144
 Robins, R.H., 32, 34, 36, 45, 47n, 51; a definition of syntactic cohesion by, 51
 Rommetveit, Ragnar, 140-147, 167, 185, 186; *see also* psycholinguistics; sentence depth
 Rosenberg, Sheldon, 132
 rules: given, 5n, 40, 50n, 67, 93, 114, 133, 147, 152, 187, 205, 209, 245, 246, 254, 256; proposed and formulated in the present study, 101, 105, 152
 Russian formalism, 2, 5n, 20n, 21n, 24n, 37, 72n, 243n, 245n, 255
 SIC (Syntactic-Intonational Cohesion), 50, 54-59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 67, 68, 69, 70, 74, 75, 76, 79, 82, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 97, 101, 107, 123, 124, 125, 126, 162;

- theory of, 55-59, 60, 74, 76, 82, 91, 92, 97, 101, 124
- SL (segment length, syntactic length), 10, 45, 53, 56, 57, 59, 62, 70, 78, 79, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 94, 95-106, 107, 110, 112, 113, 119, 122n, 130, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 161, 162, 171, 172-173, 178-184, 213, 237, 249, 265; in SMAUs (as a parameter of SMAU-tension), 98, 106, 178-184; in SMIUs (as a parameter of SMIU-tension), 95-106, 112, 113, 130, 151, 152, 153, 154 (table), 178, 179
- SL maximum, in SMAUs, 179-181
- SL-optimum, 102, 104, 105, 178, 179, 213
- SMAU (Syntactic Macro-Unit), 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 56, 95, 96, 98, 106, 109, 128, 135, 152, 158-184, 186, 202, 215, 233, 235; boundaries of, 48, 56; definition of, 47
- SMAU-anticipation, 110, 122, 125, 127, 128, 152, 155, 158-178, 194, 213, 230, 235; definition of, 122; theory of, 164-168, 174-178; three phases of, 164-168, 169, 174-178; total, 127, 128, 161
- SMAU-tension, 104, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 123, 158-184, 203, 207, 214, 215, 221, 231; semantic, 258
- SMIU (Syntactic Micro-Unit), 46, 47, 48, 50, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 67, 68, 69, 79, 85, 87, 88, 89, 90, 95, 96, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 104-106, 107, 109, 112, 113, 123, 135, 138, 140, 152, 162, 169, 171-172, 173, 176, 177, 178, 179, 186, 187, 192, 202, 215, 216, 233, 235, 247, 248, 250, 251, 252; boundaries of, 48, 49, 54, 67, 79, 87, 88, 98, 101, 105n, 107, 113, 177, 178, 187, 192, 216, 247, 248, 250, 251, 252; definition of, 46
- SMIU-anticipation, 122-130, 134-136, 151, 152, 154, 155, 156, 162, 166, 167, 168, 169, 171, 174, 175-176, 177, 178, 202, 213, 216, 218, 230, 235; definition of, 122; function of, 124; structure of, 124; theory of, 124, 128, 129, 178; total, 127, 128, 216, 218
- SMIU-tension, 104-106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 111n, 112, 119-130, 131-147, 150, 151-157, 158, 159, 162n, 178, 179, 202, 203, 214, 215, 231; semantic, 258; theory of, 110, 130, 151-158
- Saussure, Ferdinand de, and the "langue vs. parole" distinction, 133
- scales: hierarchical, 56, 57, 59, 61, 63, 64, 65, 75, 76, 78, 81, 82-92, 93, 97, 101, 106, 116n, 119, 124, 129, 156, 157, 160n, 163, 172, 177, 187, 189n, 201, 204, 206, 207, 208, 214, 228, 246, 252, 261, 265, 267; of enjambment, *see* enjambment, classification of; *see also* Fowler (Roger) and Taranovski, Kiril; of contrastivity, *see* oppositions and dichotomies, polar
- segmentation, segments, segmental units: poetic, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10n, 12, 26, 28, 117, 198, 210, 223-224, 228, 233, 235, 256; semantic, 29, 50n, 115n, 210, 223-224; syntactic 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10n, 12, 24-25, 27, 28, 29, 45, 46, 49, 50n, 56, 62, 67, 77, 79, 80, 95, 96, 97, 99, 105, 115, 137, 166, 172-173, 185, 191, 204, 214, 223-224, 227, 228, 242, 243, 246, 247, 248, 252, 256, 259, 261, 262
- segmentational ambiguity, 185-202, 213, 215, 221-230; retrospective recognition of, 221-230. 253
- "segmentational ungrammatical-

- ity", *see* syntactically incomplete poem
- "semantic density", 10n, 163, 169, 190, 196, 201, 227, 229; in poetic lines, juxtaposed with line-integrity, 220
- semantic incompleteness, 210, 257-259
- semantic openness, 257-258
- semantic tension, expectation and anticipation, 114, 257-259, 267
- semantics, 4, 9, 10n, 14, 17, 21, 27, 29, 31, 38n, 39, 43, 54n, 55, 74n, 81, 96, 99n-100n, 108, 114, 115, 119, 132, 140, 153n, 159, 162n, 164, 181, 183, 187, 188, 189n, 191, 194, 195, 196, 216, 225, 227, 229, 237, 246, 256, 257-267; *see also* meaning
- sentence, 5n, 6n, 17, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 62, 63, 64, 65, 80n, 82, 84, 85, 93, 95, 96, 111n, 132, 134, 141, 143, 144, 145, 172, 176, 177, 180, 181, 182, 185, 186, 187, 196, 198, 203, 210, 211, 212, 126, 224, 226n, 233, 237, 240, 249, 251, 257, 258; "endless", 180, 181, 182, 203n, 210, 231n
- sentence depth, 133, 134, 140-147, 167, 221; introduced, 141; *see also* Rommetveit
- Shakespeare, William, 35, 51, 52, 54n, 60, 95n, 153, 155, 188, 231, 240, 254, 258, 265, 267; *Hamlet*, 51, 52, 82n, 120, 188; *Julius Caesar*, 95; *King Lear*, 52, 54n, 60, 61, 62, 78, 82n, 106, 153, 240, 258, 265
- Shipley, J.T., 25n, 27, 28
- Sievers, E., 37
- simultaneity, 115n, 166, 189-202, 213, 221-230, 247-253, 260-261, 265
- size-comparability (between segments), 5-6, 99, 172-173, 214, 215
- Smith, Barbara H, 1n, 9, 37n, 231, 233n
- Smith, H.L., 3, 40n, 246n, 254; *see also* Trager
- sound, sound-patterns, 56, 113, 114 (table), 115, 116, 117, 118, 237, 241-243, 265n
- speaker, *see* addresser
- speech (spoken language, oral communication), 3, 4, 31, 34, 37, 101, 105, 123, 132, 133, 134, 136-140, 144, 184, 186, 209, 213, 254; spontaneous, 134-140
- Spitzer, Leo, 37n, 157
- stanza, 6(table), 78, 115, 117, 118, 195, 196, 198, 200, 233, 242
- "static" aspects (of syntax, enjambment, etc.), 20, 21n, 44, 51, 59, 68, 70-75, 81, 92-94, 96, 97, 99, 100, 101, 103, 105n, 107, 143, 160, 171-172, 202
- Sternberg, Meir, 21n
- Stockwell, R.P., 50n
- Stoehr, T., 3
- "straddled lines", 229, 240-241, 242
- stress, 3, 32, 102n, 112, 113, 114 (table), 118, 119, 150, 157, 237, 259, 261
- Stutterheim, C.F.P., 1n
- subject, subject-predicate relationships, 45, 57, 61, 62, 97, 170, 175, 179, 180
- subordination, *see* syntactic subordination; *see also* "intonational subordination"
- syllable(s), 3, 39, 50n, 83, 95, 101
- symmetry and parallelism, 144, 161, 169, 180, 229
- syntactic anticipation, 119-130, 152, 153, 154, 156, 166, 172-173, 174, 180, 184, 194, 205, 208-214, 216, 221; definition of, 120
- syntactic categories, 125, 126, 147, 234
- syntactic cohesion, *see* cohesion, syntactic
- syntactic completeness, 17, 47n, 51, 59, 93, 99, 111 (table), 119, 120-130, 132, 143, 151,

- 152, 153, 160, 165, 179, 180,
182-183, 186, 205, 208, 209,
210, 213, 214, 221, 230, 235,
258; initial, 182-183; poten-
tial *vs.* actual, 119-130, 179,
186, 208; prospective, 152,
179, 180, 186, 208
- syntactic contribution (to ten-
sion, enjambment, etc.), 20,
41, 44, 46, 47, 48, 51, 54,
55, 56, 57, 58, 61-68, 74,
85, 93, 111, 112, 128, 178,
181-182, 183, 236
- syntactic coordination, 45n, 49;
see also predicate, subject
- syntactic depth, *see* sentence
depth
- syntactic expectation, 114, 119-
123, 153, 155, 156, 157, 172-
173, 180, 182, 184, 213, 215,
216, 220, 230, 233; defini-
tion of, 120
- syntactic incompleteness, 47n,
106, 111 (table), 119, 120-
130, 146, 147, 152, 186, 205,
208, 209, 212, 213, 221, 230-
233; potential *vs.* actual,
119-130, 208
- syntactic information, 107, 120,
121, 126, 129, 132, 161, 162,
186, 213, 230-231, 247-253
- syntactic intonation, 12, 19,
25, 32, 33, 109, 110, 123,
138, 184-214, 247-253, 262;
interrelations with semantic-
attitudinal intonation, 247-
253
- syntactic openness, 119-123,
128, 152, 153, 154, 155, 159,
160, 161, 172, 202, 213, 230,
234; definition of, 121
- syntactic prediction, 120, 152;
definition of, 120; *see also*
predictability
- syntactic relevance (and irrel-
evance), in segmentation,
188, 251-253
- syntactic segmentation, *see*
segmentation, syntactic
- syntactic structure(s), *see*
syntax
- syntactic subordination, 44,
45n, 49, 56, 70, 97, 142n,
163, 174, 175-176, 177, 180,
181, 182, 183, 194, 201, 205,
211, 231; initial, 163, 164,
165, 175-176, 177, 181, 182,
183, 194, 211, 231, 235, 249,
250
- syntactic substitutability, 51,
52, 53, 54, 63, 82
- syntactic tension, 17, 103, 107,
108, 112, 123, 129, 133, 152,
154, 158, 171, 180, 184, 203,
214, 215, 230, 233, 235, 259;
theory of, 134
- syntactic theory, *see* syntax
- syntactic unit(s), *see* segmen-
tation, syntactic
- syntactic wedge, 127, 128, 160,
177, 218
- syntactically incomplete poem,
the, 230-233
- "syntagm", as used by Belić,
see Taranovski
- syntagm, syntagmatics, 65, 111,
120, 121, 122, 123, 128, 129,
164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 172,
176, 177, 190, 191, 195, 213,
235
- syntax, syntactic theory, 1, 3,
4, 5n, 7, 9, 10n, 11, 12n, 13,
14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 24, 25,
26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 34, 38,
41, 43, 44, 46, 48, 49, 54,
55, 60, 61, 65, 66, 68, 69-
75, 76, 80, 81, 82, 83, 89,
90, 92-94, 95, 96, 97, 102,
103, 108, 109, 114, 119, 123,
125, 126, 132, 136, 142, 150,
154, 162n, 164, 169, 171, 178,
182, 186, 187, 191, 194, 195,
196, 200, 203, 208, 212, 215,
219, 222, 225, 229, 235, 236,
237, 241, 242, 246, 256, 257,
260, 261, 263, 266, 267, 268;
formal, 10n, 27, 33, 54, 54n,
55, 114 (table), 120, 135,
142, 165, 175, 184, 247, 257,
258, 260; functional relatio-
ships in, 10n, 44, 45, 49, 52,
54n, 55, 56, 57, 59, 62, 70,
78, 79, 84n, 87, 89, 90, 91,
92-94, 95, 97, 98, 101, 102,

- 103, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 112, 114(table), 122, 130, 151, 154, 155, 156, 162, 175, 178, 181, 186, 207, 211, 212; non-functional relationships in, 45, 53, 56, 59, 61, 62, 70, 79, 93, 94, 102, 114(table), 130, 178; poetic, *see* poetic syntax; traditional, *see* traditional grammar; transformational-generative, *see* TG systems, systemic factors in enjambment semantics, 267
- TG (transformational-generative grammar/syntax), 6n, 45, 61, 65-67, 121, 132, 179, 185; "deep structures", 66, 71, 121n, 185, 187; "surface structures", 66, 67, 71, 95, 96, 121, 184, 185, 187-188
- Taranovski, Kiril, 28n, 29, 76, 81n, 82, 83-92, 95, 99-100, 101, 160, 161, 164, 213; "syntagm" (Belić's term), 83, 84, 84n (defined), 85, 89, 90, 91, 95
- 'target theory', 56-59, 97
- tempo, reading pace (acceleration and retardation), 112, 117, 118, 119, 150, 155, 176, 183, 207, 215, 244, 246, 248, 253-257, 263, 266; scholarly controversies about, 254-255; theory of, 255
- tension, intonational (psychointonational): general reference to, 104, 108, 110, 112, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 129, 131, 133, 164, 169, 172, 181, 184, 214, 220, 232, 233, 235, 253, 257, 259, 264; parameters of, *see* parameters
- text(s): poetic (poem), 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10n, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 22, 26, 29, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42, 52n, 53, 67, 74n, 100n, 103, 108, 109, 115, 117, 118, 124, 126, 135, 137n, 140, 148, 158-171, 181, 182, 183, 192-202, 204-208, 210-212, 219, 220, 222-230, 231, 233, 237, 240, 244, 246, 256-258, 259, 261, 263, 264, 265; preversified, *see* preversified text; versified, 2, 3; visual organisation of, 2
- textual analyses (actual analyses italicised), 23, 28 (28n), 51, 52, 61-62, 64-65, 78, 82n, 86-91, 92, 108, 117-119, 158-171, 173-177, 192-202, 205-212, 217-221, 222-230, 240-241, 258, 262-266; Fowler's, 82-83; Hrushovski's 37n; Kell's, 88, 111n; Mukařovský's, 37n; Spitzer's, 37n; Taranovski's, 83, 85-92, 101; Tynjanov's, 88, 111n
- themes, thematics, 159, 162n, 163, 170-171, 199, 207, 211, 227, 229, 231n, 246, 257
- theory, linguistic, *see* linguistics
- theory, literary, *see* poetics
- theory, syntactic, *see* syntax
- "threshold of boredom", 180, 181
- Timofeev, L.I., 5n 28n, 247n, 266n
- Tomaševskij, B., 1n, 2, 5n, 6n, 28n, 29, 72n, 243n, 259
- tone-unit, 50n
- "traditional grammar", "traditional syntax", 61-62, 63, 64, 67
- Trager, G.L., 3; and Smith, H.L., *An Outline of English Structure*, 3, 6n
- transformational grammar, *see* TG
- transitivity (of verbs), verb-object relationships, 54n, 57, 62, 97, 109, 128, 154, 156, 159, 160, 161, 197
- translation, theory of, 16
- Tukey, Ann, 49n
- Tynjanov, Ju., 2n, 20n, 28n, 72n, 85, 87, 88, 89, 111n, 160n, 243n
- Unbegaun, B., 259
- Utley, Francis, 72n

- VP (Verb-Phrase), 45, 64, 67
 variables, 85, 87, 99n, 133,
 153n, 154, 249, 262, 263;
see also constants
 verbs, 113, 141, 154; *see also*
 intransitivity; transitivity;
 VP
 verse, *see* line, poetic; po-
 etic language; poetry
 verse-line, *see* line, poetic
 vocative, 248
- Wales, R.J., 132
 Warfel, Harry, 72n
 Wellek, René, & Warren, Austin,
A Theory of Literature, 36n,
 37, 40n, 246n, 254
 Whitehall, H., 3, 6n
 Whitman, Walt, 48, 173-177, 178,
 181, 182-183, 186-187, 194,
 203, 204, 205-212, 213, 219;
 "Song of Myself", poem 15:
 183, 204, 210-212; poem 33:
 181, 211, 212; syntactic-
 intonational "arches", 204;
 "When I Heard the Learn'd As-
 tronomer", 173-177, 181, 182-
 183, 186-187, 194, 204, 205-
 208, 210
- Wimsatt, W.K., 6n, 36, 246n
 word(s), 6, 7, 17, 31, 46, 49,
 51, 52, 53, 72-73, 74n, 75,
 76, 82 (82n), 83, 84, 85, 87,
 89, 93, 95, 96, 97, 100n, 101,
 102, 105, 106, 111n, 113, 114,
 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 125,
 126n, 128, 139, 141, 142n,
 143, 145, 146, 147, 159, 162,
 165, 166, 167, 172, 174, 178,
 185, 186, 187, 192, 203, 204,
 214, 220, 223, 224, 233, 243,
 249, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261,
 262, 264, 265, 267
- word-order, 45, 53, 70, 84, 159,
 159n-160n, 163, 179, 229,
 231n, 265; *see also* Mukařovský
 word-sequence, 3, 72, 123, 174,
 184-189, 192, 194, 195, 203,
 207, 208-214, 227, 228, 248,
 252, 258, 262
- word-splitting enjambment, 81n,
 83, 226n
- written language, written
 texts, graphic signs, 2, 3,
 4, 31, 34, 35, 36, 37, 123,
 135, 136, 138, 174, 184, 186,
 187, 190, 195, 209, 213, 218,
 245
- Xolševnikov, V.E., 28n, 140n,
 243n
- Yngve, V.H., 140, 145
- Žirmunskij, V.M., 2n, 6n, 12n,
 13n, 25, 26, 28, 36n, 37,
 72n, 242, 243, 245n

משמעות ואמנות

סדרת ספרים על פואטיקה

ותקשורת בתרבות

3

הגלישה בשירה

יחסי-הגומלין בין לשון לשורות-השיר

הרי גולומב