

On Creativity and Originality in Verse Discourses

MILOSAV Ž. ČARKIĆ
(Belgrade)

0.0. In verse discourses, as probably in no others, there is a large number of stereotypes¹ (canons, conventions, norms²) imposed by a specific period of time, a specific genre, a specific literary movement (school), specific literature, the struc-

- 1 The concept of *stereotype*, which is defined as a trite, banal, fixed expression or act, is most often felt as if conveying a negative connotation, and directly associated with *cliché* (routine stylistic and structural acts which have lost their artistic significance and expressiveness, but are still used like a mechanical pattern: in linguistics, clichés include: *idioms*, all ossified *phrases, sayings, proverbs* (Petkovic 1995: 95) and *platitudes* (unchangeable, ready-made patterns which many adhere to blindly, a trite, banal phrase or such a way of thinking and expression). Contrary to such attitudes, there are other opinions at least as regards the scholarly style (Kottorova 1998). It is therefore that in this case, especially regarding literary-artistic style, the concept of *stereotype* conveys positive connotations and is to a certain extent equated with *canon* (as a set of aesthetic rules, patterns dominating poetic structures), *convention* (deriving from the long-standing tradition of a method of literary creation offering its expressive potentials even to later artists) and *norm* (as a preset rule or a set of rules committing the artist to certain literary methods, but not restraining poetic personality development, since a poetic work emerges either in compliance with a norm or in departure from it, but in any case dialectically surpasses the norm with its individuality and inimitability). In view of all this, the concepts of *canon, convention, norm* should hereinafter be understood as synonyms of the concept of *stereotype*.
- 2 «Нормы общелитературного языка не могут иметь непосредственной связи с теми особенностями художественной речи, которые присущи или стилистике отдельного произведения, или индивидуальной писательской манере в целом» (Винокур 1974: 267).

ture of spoken language, personal choice³. As a result, in the shaping of language material various kinds of stereotypes produce certain restrictions which the artists (poets) are to observe. However, within each stereotype there is enough space for the artist's (creator's) creativity and originality. It is then no wonder that the concept of creativity and the concept of originality are separately dealt with by the psychology of creativity. In part of psychological research dedicated to artistic creation, special attention is focused on the concept of creativity. With that in mind, many psychologists have attempted to formulate and define creativity (Barron 1968; Guliford 1957: 110-117, Ghiselin 1963: 30-43; Mac Kinnon 1963: 166-174; Rogers 1959; Simon 1967: 43-53; Torrance 1972: 203-218). Thus the American psychologist Taylor (Taylor 1959: 51-82), analysing over a hundred various definitions, arrived at the conclusion that creativity varied more in depth and scope than in diversity. He established five basic forms of creativity: *expressive, productive, inventive, innovative* and *emergent*. Each type of creativity has a share in the act of creation which is also impossible to realise without originality. As a result, the psychology of creativity assigns a notable role to this concept (Barron 1955; Kvascev 1976). By originality is most often meant a relatively rare and unusual behaviour for certain conditions, and it is stressed that originality is essential, but not sufficient for creativity. As creativity is affected by many other factors, such as flexibility, creative fantasy, imaginative behaviour, tolerance to vagueness, openness to experience, a fluency of ideas.

I.0. A usual occurrence in verse creation, depending on the extent of creativity (even originality), are minor or major interventions on established stereotypes which occur in the form of precedent texts (Karaulov 1987: 54) of a certain culture⁴, namely a non-compliance with the accepted norm, convention, canon. The poet can, within the established convention, adhering to its basic principles, express his artistic creativity. But he must, for example, abide by certain rules of the writing of verses and their composing into a poem. This implies that a poet should

3 As regards personal choice, the most distinctive have been the psychological (intellectual, emotional, spiritual) and social aspects of poetic personality, as well as the functional-stylistic and emotional-expressive aspects of language use, then the specific qualities of text structure, the way it is experienced and understood, and the effect it has on the reader.

4 Karaulov uses the concept of precedent texts, among other things, in the sense of generally known texts of individual authors of a certain language community, which a poet as an artistic (creative) personality uses in the form of stereotypes, complying with their patterns, thus showing his familiarity with the spiritual culture (preserved in the language), as well as his belonging to that culture.

bear in mind the basic stocks of formative schemas (stereotypes) as a basis on which the structure of poetic creations emerges and from which arises the morphology of individual literary genres. If, in creating a poetic work (either a single poem or a whole collection of verses), the poet employs the principles of classic versification (quantitative, syllabic, syllabic-tonal), he can depart from those principles in individual elements, but cannot go that far as to disintegrate or negate them. Thus a creator, without denying the established norms, conventions, canons, depending on the depth and width of operational ventures marked by artistic potency, succeeds in actualising an old form, activating an ossified structure, in introducing a new set of changes into the very system of stereotypical means of expression, creating somewhat different internal relations between the elements used, and in realising their additional functions. Only then can one tell that the author has achieved a certain degree of creativity, and in turn a certain degree of originality and individuality.

1.1. Even though there are many stereotypical (traditional, canonised) forms which should be discussed with reason, on this occasion we shall direct our attention to the form of metrical rhymed verse and the sonnet form. The reason is simple: these two forms imply observance of strict (stereotypical) rules manifested in the choice of meter, verse type, stanza, the way of rhyming, the standard form of a poem. From the historic point of view, the occurrence of such, tectonically strict compositions, compared to previous ones (with fairly free structures and forms), is a result of the authors' creativity and originality⁵. A consistent observance of traditional (stereotypical) poetic forms, established in a certain period of time, at a later stage of verse forms development, would not only indicate the emergence of structural and formal isomorphism, but also the creation of total rhythmic monotony. As a result, with the passage of time, the stereotypical form (of verses and poems alike) lost much of its topicality, as well as informative potential. Consequently, every creative author introduced, in the existent form, part of his individuality and originality, as "the most informative is what is the most original, and in turn the worthiest" (Petković 1990: 37). It was one of the reasons why there were, minor or major, departures from the stereotypical form, whereby a shift took place from the easier (automatic) to the more difficult (non-automatic) form. All this was happe-

5 "The principle of originality in literature goes hand in hand with the prevalence of the personal-individual creative principle. In European literature both these principles were increasingly gaining in importance following classicism, and took full precedence at the time of the literary avant-garde" (Petković 1990: 37-38).

ning only at individual poetic structure levels, which in turn brought about changes in syn-function, as it altered the relation of one element to other elements in a system. Thus the stereotypical form was marred, without any threat to its existentiality. However, through historic development, the standard (stereotypical) forms evolved, by frequent interventions, into other forms, later also to become stereotypical. Stanzas were, as a result, freed from strict architectural forms and translated into strophoid, and then astrophic structures.

1.2. A similar thing took place on the plane of verse forms. Metrical verse, formed by the repetition of certain elements within constant, stereotyped, methods, was first brought into a condition of slight, then of complete disintegration. That was how its new forms took shape, which in the historical continuity of verse development moved from the structure of released to the structure of free verse (Gasparov 1989). Although free verse preserved the basic elements of metrical verse (the verse rhythm and graphically incomplete lines), in certain elements it came seriously close to prose. The fact of incomppliance with strict principles, required by the metrical verse form, led to an internal dynamization of the verse string through the creation of a large number of new tonal and rhythmic values. Interventions within canonised verse structures were generally restricted to the shifting of the caesura, the omitting of ictuses, the transferring of stresses from strong to weak verse times. Such methods did not disintegrate the existent rhythm, as the basic rhythmic inertia (trochaic or iambic) was kept.

1.3. Since the Middle Ages⁶, rhyme was developing in many European literatures into one of the main features of verse expression. Thus, as one of the constant elements of the outer metrical verse rhythm, it gained stability at the time of baroque. However, with the advent of symbolism, when free verse released traditional poetry of old versification laws, a more flexible treatment of rhyme followed (Gasparov 1979: 39). Poets departed from the strict rules of its use. Rhyme was thus gaining an ever freer appearance, to finally cease, from a casual and accidental poetic aid, to exist as the rhythmic factor of verse.

1.4. Something similar was happening with the canonized lyric form, the sonnet. At the time of Petrarchism, and immediately following it, the sonnet was internationally recognized and developed as the commonest form of lyrical poems. The

6 Introduction of rhyme into poetry is attributed to father Ambrose from the fourth century (Golombek 1939: 729). Even Aristotle in his *Rhetoric* points to the occurrence of rhyme, but it did not function as a conscious method. "Rhyme can also be found in old Greek poets and in Ovid, but only as an accidental and fortuitous method of rhythmic organization" (Petković 1975: 146).

sonnet gained its constant, stereotypical form: four stanzas—two with four and two with three hendecasyllabic lines each, a fixed rhyme arrangement: *abba abba cdc dcd*. With this the sonnet gained the status of a final form, and as such became an obligatory lyrical form. The strict compliance with the dominant stereotypical form was suppressing the artists' individuality and originality and inhibiting their potential creativity. Therefore individual poets, who possessed unfettered creative energy, began to express their active attitude to the sonnet form. Such behaviour of individual authors is a reflection of the intellectual and psychological qualities, that is the motivation and ambition levels of their creative personalities. It is well-known that some of these authors, in using the sonnet, made certain poetic obstructions within the set scheme. The result was the linking of quatrains and triplets: 8+6, 8+3+3, 4+4+6; the separation of couplets at the beginning 2+4+4+4 and at the end 4+4+4+2, the creation of the monostrophic sonnet: 14, which caused a break in the usual way of rhyming⁷. With these ventures, the sonnet was gaining various composition shapes within the same form. However, a method is also known from the history of sonnet development which led to changing its outer form, which developed from the standard 14 into 15 or 16 verses, thus forming a sonnet of extended duration⁸. Verse types were also frequently changed, instead of hendecasyllabic, poets used enneasyllabic, decasyllabic, dodecasyllabic, thirteen-syllable lines. Not rarely, even combinations of different verse types were used within the same sonnet.

1.5. Thus, whenever a certain form or metrical-rhythmic structure, which was gaining the status of an obligatory element, was stereotyped, a period followed, after a certain time, of departure from that form or structure, but one most often remained within the current limits. Sometimes those departures were such that not

7 However, at the very outset, there were multiple variations to this manner of rhyme ordering in triplets: *cdc, cdc; cdd, cdc*, and from the beginning of the 14th century even three rhymes were allowed: *cde, cde; ccd, eed; cde, edc, cde, dce; cde, ced*—bearing in mind that in French and German poetry one can even come across four rhymes used in quatrains: *abba, cddc, efg efg*. Variations are also frequent in the English sonnet, which consists of three quatrains with crossed rhyme, and the final paired rhyme: *abab, cdcd, efef, gg*. There are as well other deviations from the common rhyme sequence and combination of stanzas.

8 Extensions can be different. Eg.: a sonnet with a tail, with the addition of a separate hendecasyllabic verse, which rhymes with the final line of the last triplet. From the 16th century a sonnet occurred with more triplets, with the seven-syllable line as a rhyme extension to the last line with a new seven-syllable pair (in August Wilhelm Schlegel), then a sonnet where a seven-syllable verse is put in after each uneven line in the triplet (in G.M. Hopkins, etc.).

only did they mar the stereotypical form or structure, but led to their disintegration until a new (another) form or structure was created. It is fairly easy to perceive various forms of departure, either from the traditional structure of a certain (metrical) verse, or from the common lyrical form (sonnet) – but it is very difficult to find out good reasons for such poets' acts. We find there are two primary reasons which encourage artists to break traditional and canonized forms or structures.

1.6. One of the reasons comes from the fact that certain poets were not skilled at fully utilizing such a form or structure, and at correctly fitting their poetic (artistic) material, which they offer to the reader, to the set framework. As a result, they more or less abandoned them, depending on their skill to sufficiently master their language material and the necessary poetic methods. The other reason lies in the fact that in the process of shaping poetic material, most often for creative (artistically valid) reasons, poets occasionally deviate from the formal or structural stereotype. They act in such a way so as to, on the one hand, make the canonized form or structure more exposed, visible, concrete (a form of stylistic information, telling of the form, structure itself), and, on the other hand, to draw the reader's attention to a significant detail, peculiarity or quintessence of their text⁹, which the reader should not miss, as they would thus remain deprived of a considerable quantity of semantic information.

2.0.0. On the formal-semantic structure of three poems taken from modern Serbian poetry, we will try to demonstrate how creativity and originality are manifested in verse discourses.

2.1.1. In the poem *Material Revision* by V.Lukic the verbal material is arranged in

	verse types	
Док цветају нове риме	(8)	4//4
И док нов се цезар јавља	(8)	4//4
Дрипац жели своје име	(8)	4//4
Да у књигу пише славља	(8)	4//4
А робови као увек	(8)	4//4
У тамном се куту смеју:	(8)	4//4
Нема спаса ни за лек –	(7)	4//3
Тиранаина опет сеју.	(8)	4//4

9 „Текст можно определить как сообщение в письменной форме, характеризующееся смысловой и структурной завершенностью и определенным отношением автора к сообщаемому“ (Лосева 1980: 4)

Холи силник је на трону	(8)	4//4
И усправно главу држи.	(8)	4//4
У тишини клици тону	(8)	4//4
Освешћене јеца пржи...	(8)	4//4
Застава се вије бола,	(8)	4//4
Старе сузе, гробља нова!	(8)	4//4

(ЛВ Б: 135).

the form of a sonnet, which is composed of rhymed symmetric octosyllabic verses arranged into two quatrains and two triplets. The arrangement of rhymes resembles the strictest sonnet schemes. The rhythm is organized into trochees, as 39 of 43 accents fall on odd, and only 4 (or 9.30%) on even syllables. Judging by the presented facts, the analysed poem was composed in compliance with the strict rules which the sonnet form and the structure of metrical rhymed verse require. However, this was not fully achieved throughout the poem. In the second stanza (a quatrain) in the third verse, in the place of the clausula acting as rhyme, a monosyllabic word occurs instead of an expected disyllabic one, thus transforming an acatalectic symmetrical octosyllable verse (4//4) into a catalectic octo- or seven-syllabic verse of the type (4//3): “*Nema spasa ni za lek*” (= Don’t hope for remedy). A moment of disappointed expectations can provoke the recipient to ask himself, why did that happen? Is that an omission or intention of the poet to point out something significant? If the idea behind the poem’s creation is revealed, its formal and substantial structure will also emerge in their true sense. The aforesaid method had the aim, on the one hand, to “restrain” the reader’s perception, to “take them back” to the read part of the text, so as to make visible, through their constant “stumbleings” and “falteringings” all elements of the poetic structure¹⁰; and, on the other hand, to completely expose the standard form of the poem and point to its potentials which become apparent in shaping linguistic material¹¹. Only by fully experiencing the total content

10 М. Кожина points out a complex approach to text interpretation: «Естественно, что при реализации комплексного подхода необходимо привлечь данные, как указывалось, не только теории информации и общей теории коммуникации, психолингвистики, но и гносеологии, логики, психологии, науковедения и некоторых других смежных дисциплин» (Кожина 1992, 44)

11 «Искусство создания художественных образов заключается в том, чтобы актуализировать в сознании читателя (слушателя) лингвистическими средствами систему таких экстралингвистических образных отношений, которые на оставят его равнодушным, разбудят его эмоции, привлекут внимание и сформируют интерес к изображаемому» (Винарская 1989: 27).

of *Material Revision* can one grasp all its essential features, which have, as formative means, an exclusive stylistic function, as they indicate the formal aspect of verbal material, the manner of its selection and distribution within the accepted poetic structure.

2.1.2. When one proceeds from the plane of expression to the plane of content, one can easily see that the line "*Nema spasa ni za lek*" (= Don't hope for remedy) directly causes an alteration to the rhythmic succession, which on the semantic plane results in a new quantity of information, as it subsequently reveals the linguistic code structure. In the same sense the lexeme *lek* (= remedy) as the only monosyllabic word in a continuous string of rhymed disyllabic units: "*rime, ime, javlja, slav-lja, uvek, lek, smeju, seju, tronu, tonu, drži, prži, bola, nova*", gains a peculiar meaning in the context of the overall semantic level of the poem. Two words (*uvek* = always and *lek* = remedy), coming through rhyme into an equivalent vertical position, establish a firm lexical-syntactic bond "*uvek lek*" = "remedy always", where they as a complex poetic sign signify a concept (not explicitly stated in the text of the poem), whose meaning can be associated with the semantics of the words "hope", "faith" etc. However, at the syntactic level, the lexeme "*lek*" enters the verse construction "*Nema spasa ni za lek*" which in Serbian has the meaning of the phrase "*nema (spasa) ni za lek*" (= There is no (rescue) whatever, at all). For expressing his idea of the impossibility of any rescue whatsoever, or any hope of rescue at all, the poet (most likely unconsciously, on his creative impulse), on the most apparent constructive line boundary (on the clausula), marred the poem's formal and structural isomorphism. Thus he drew attention to the semantic value of verse material, which is the centre, focal point of information of the overall poetic content. In this way, the poet embedded into the pessimistically coloured expression, based on the reiteration of associations expressed by the relation "Caesar – the slaves", a *line-idiom*, which tells that any thought of change of the ever present dichotomy – *those who rule : those ruled over* – is absurd, that it is a pure utopia, unrealistic hope. Yet, with the inauguration of any new ruler, false expectations arise in his subjects, which disappear in an instant, as the man becoming the ruler ("Caesar") transforms, as all his predecessors, into a "scoundrel", "tyrant", "oppressor". The poet's intervention is therefore clear in the form of a creative poetic method, whereby he wants to draw the reader's attention to the stylistic and particular semantic value of both the lexeme "*lek*" (= remedy) and the whole *line-idiom*: "*Nema spasa ni za lek*".

2.2.1. In the poem *The Stony Lullaby* by Stevan Raickovic, verbal material is

	verse types	
Успавајте се где сте затечени	(11)	5//6
По свету добри, горки, занесени,	(11)	5//6
Ви руке по трави, ви уста у сени,	(12)	6//6
Ви закрвављени и ви заљубљени,	(12)	6//6
Зарастите у плав сан камени	(10)	4//6
Ви живи, ви сутра убијени,	(10)	4//6
Ви црне воде у беличастој пени	(12)	6//6
И мостови над празно извијени,	(11)	5//6
Заустави се биљко и не вени:	(11)	5//6
Успавајте се, ко камен, невини,	(11)	5//6
Успавајте се тужни, уморени.	(11)	5//6
Последња птицо: мом лику се окрени	(12)	6//6
Изговори тихо ово име	(10)	4//6
И онда се у ваздуху скамени	(11)	5//6

(РС П: 239).

also arranged in the form of a sonnet, which is built of a different type of metrical verse (decasyllabic, hendecasyllabic, dodecasyllabic lines), apparently arranged with no specific system in mind.

However, if we focus on the poem structure itself, we start to discover certain laws which fully permeate its verbal area. Even though the external sonnet structure, two quatrains and two triplets with the use of rhyme, has apparently been kept, departures follow in the use of verses. Namely, there is an established rule that a sonnet is usually written in one verse type, most frequently hendecasyllabic. Here, as we have already noted, the poet utilized three verse types: the trochaic decasyllabic verse of the type 4//6, the iambic hendecasyllabic verse of the 5//6 type, and the trochaic dodecasyllabic verse of the type 6//6. Of 14 lines, 7 are hendecasyllabic (making up a half). The other half consists of deca- and dodecasyllables. Each of the four stanzas contains in its structure hendecasyllabic verses, whereas the third stanza, the first triplet, solely consists of hendecasyllables, and the first has two, the second one and the third one hendecasyllabic verse. These three verses are interrelated in such a way as to make a kind of plait establishing an uninterrupted continuity from the first to the last stanza. The sonnet begins with two hendecasyllables, also ending with a hendecasyllabic verse. Each stanza has a different verse structure: the first consists of two hendecasyllables and two dodecasyllabic verses, the se-

cond of two decasyllabics, one hendeca- and one dodecasyllable, the third consists of three hendecasyllables, and the fourth of one dodecasyllable, one deca- and a hendecasyllable verse. According to this verse arrangement, a certain correlation is established between the second and fourth stanzas: they comprise all the three verse types used in this poem (decasyllabic, hendecasyllabic, dodecasyllabic verses), being a kind of repetition of the poem on a smaller scale (in one stanza). The first stanza has minus one element compared to the sonnet, as it consists of two hendecasyllables and two dodecasyllabic verses. The third stanza, in this sense, has a two-elements minus – it consists of three hendecasyllables. All this indicates that, on the plane of the poem, stanzas have a certain autonomy, and represent independent units with their own architectonics, being at the same time parts of the whole they are subordinated to. As a full correlation is established between the even-syllabic (deca- and dodecasyllabic verses = 7) and the odd-syllabic verses (hendecasyllables = 7), the highest possible correlation was achieved in accent positions, too, as out of their total number – 55 – 28 (or 50.91%) fall on even-syllabic, and 27 (or 49.09%) on odd-syllabic verses. If we add to this total the number of syllables in the sonnet, amounting to 155, and calculate how many belong to even-syllabic, and to odd-syllabic verses, we will see that here the correlation is at its highest too. Namely, the seven hendecasyllabic verses have 77 syllables, four dodecasyllabics amount to 48 syllables, and three decasyllabics make up 30, which amounts to 78 syllables. The proportion of odd-syllabic to even-syllabic verses is 78:77 (or 49.09 : 50.91%). When we add these numbers to those expressing the presence of accents on even and odd syllables, we can see an absolute balance: 50.00% : 50.00%, which only serves as proof of the even-syllabicity and odd-syllabicity of verses in this poem by Raickovic. In view of all this, we could conclude that in his sonnet *The Stony Lullaby* S. Raickovic was dealing with mathematical calculations, and not the writing of poetry. The general harmony of the elements constituting the rhythmic structure of this poem is certainly supported by the metrical constant realised in the form of the second half-line as a six-syllable verse. As regards the level of expression, the rhyming method is an important aspect. It appears at first glance that the rhyme is realised in accordance with the canonical principles of verse rhyming in a sonnet. However, that is not so. This principle was marred two times. First, with the realisation of monorhyme: *zatečeni – zaneseni – seni – zaljubljeni – kameni – ubijeni – peni – izvijeni – veni – neveni – umoreni – okreni – ime - skameni*, where all the lines are interrelated. This rhyming method spans the sonnet's stanzaic organization. Actually, the stanzas do and do not exist. It is obvious they do, as they are presented as graphical units, but it is also obvious they do not, as the

rhyming system threatens the stanzaic organization of the text, as all the lines, except the penultimate, are linked by rhyme into an unbroken string, thus making the impression that this sonnet was written in the monostrophic form.

2.2.2. When we proceed from the plane of expression to the plane of content, it is clear that the sonnet was written according to the principles of antonymic parallelisms, which sometimes have oxymoronic meanings. The title *The Stony Lullaby* suggests, as a combination of the two words, an antonymic quality expressed in weight and concreteness (*stone*) on the one, and lightness and abstractness (*lullaby*) on the other hand, which can also be understood as an oxymoronic construction, as it conveys notably different, not easily expressible meanings. The first word in the phrase *the stony lullaby*, as an adjectival, suggests by its semantic potential the irrational, mystic substance of the basic word – the word *lullaby*. However, we are not interested in the complete semantic structure of Raickovic's sonnet, but only in one aspect (or element) which is directly related to his creativity (which we are dealing with here), and that is the rhymed paradigmatic sequence realized in the form of monorhyme. The monorhyming method itself implies an equalization of all the rhymed units, thus underlining their synonymy. In other words, all words within the monorhyme make up a complex poetic sign consisting of 13 simple language signs (elements): *zatečeni* (=found) – *zaneseni* (=starry-eyed) – *seni* (=shadows) – *zaljubljeni* (=enamoured) – *kameni* (=stony) – *ubijeni* (=murdered) – *peni* (=foam) – *izvijeni* (=bent) – *veni* (=wither) – *neveni* (=marigolds) – *umoreni* (=weary) – *okreni* (=turn) – *skameni* (=petrify). The semantics of a poetic sign constructed in this way can be sought somewhere between two extremes marking the relations of two entirely polarized concepts: *being – non-being*, *life – death*, *dynamics – statics*. The only non-rhyming word *ime* (= name), which belongs to the paradigm of *being*, *life*, *dynamics*, also fits into the thus established semantic relations. Of special importance to overall sonnet semantics is an obvious elliptical rhyme¹² method, which on the sonnet's semantic plane stresses the contrast of the word *ime* (= name; as a non-rhyming concept) to all other words on line clausulas (as rhymed concepts). This poses a logical question: why did the poet make use of this method? The reason is certainly "semantic in nature"¹³. In the rhyme paradigm, the rhyme : non-rhyme proportion expressed in numbers amounts to 13 : 1. For a semantic balance to be achieved on these two planes, the word *ime* (=name) should possess

12 On the concept of *elliptical rhyme* you can find more in *Pojmovnik rime* (Čarkić 2001: 67-69).

13 An interesting opinion on the reasons of departure from rhyme on the last verse clausula is stated by A. Jovanovic (Jovanovic 1997: 192-193).

such semantic potential as to match the semantic potential of the thirteen rhyming words. It is therefore clear how significant this word is for the overall context of the poem, as it represents its focus, its information core. If we suppose that *this name* is the *name* of the poet, we can claim with certainty that he as a creator is opposed (probably even exposed) to all that stands between eternity (symbolized by the *stone*) and the moment (symbolized by the *lullaby*). In fact, he (the poet) himself is at the same time the moment (as he created the *lullaby*) and eternity (as by creating a moment of eternity he himself becomes eternity), which is conveyed by the last two lines of the sonnet: *Izgovori tiho ovo ime / I onda se u vazduhu skameni* (=Pronounce this name softly / And then petrify in the air). Thus, in order to illustrate really poetically (and not prove scientifically) that each creation, each creative act leads to eternity, Raickovic abandoned the established monorhyme principle, thus marring a canon, a norm which he himself at first adopted for achieving a certain degree of creativity and originality.

2.3.1. In the poem *The Word of Grigorije Dijak* by Alek Vukadinovic, the verbal

	verse types	
Свуд около време звера	(8)	4//4
Звер се смрти не помера	(8)	4//4
Ја сред своје	(4)	4//0
Слике, даљине, куће, боје –	(9)	5//4
Ја сред своје	(4)	4//0
Све реч по реч у покоје	(8)	4//4
Свуд около време мрака	(8)	4//4
(Крепи крилом Бог дијака)	(8)	4//4
Боже, зло је!	(4)	4//0
Златну искру душе своје	(8)	4//4
Утках овде _	(4)	4//0
Ето то је.	(4)	4//0

(BA P: *Ружа језика*, 34).

material is not so strictly organised as in the previous two analysed sonnets. But, here we are also dealing with a certain stereotype, i.e. a type of rhymed symmetric octosyllabic verse (4//4) which the poet, in fact, sometimes breaks up and transforms into a quadrisyllabic one.

A part from that, the stanza type is not stable: we come across a monoverse¹⁴, two couplets, a triplet and a quatrain¹⁵. The rhythm is organized on trochaic basis, as 25 (or 75.76%) of 33 accents fall on odd syllables, whereas 8 (or 24.24%) on even ones. The raised number of accents on even syllables indicates that some ictuses have shifted from strong to weak verse time. Rhyme is also present in the poem. And it takes part, as one of the more obvious poetic methods, both in the rhythmic organization of the lines, and in stanzaic structure composition. Only in view of the stated facts, obtained in an exact way, can we say for the poem in question that it was written in classical verse in stanzaic form. But, by thorough reading and tracing the rhythmic segmentation of its text, one can see that the rhythmic succession is broken in the second line of the quatrain, as the caesura is placed after the fifth syllable (“*Slike, daljine, // kuce, boje*” with accents on the 1st, 4th, 6th and 8th syllables). From the initial trochaic inertia, in the above line, a shift was made to a iamb, only to be succeeded by the reestablished trochaic sequence. Thus, on the rhythmic plane, the verse “*Slike, daljine, // kuce, boje*” is brought into contrast with other verses of the poem. This method was aimed at slowing down, inhibiting our perception, so as to draw our attention to the stylistic function of the form which, primarily, affects the selection of linguistic material and its specific arrangement in the chosen poetic structure. In other words, the poet was, dependent on the inner and outer form, compelled to choose only the lexical units which would, through their proper arrangement in the verse, superpose a large number of accents on odd syllables, keep the constant position of the word boundary behind the fourth syllable (the caesura), maintain an even number of syllables per line (eight or four), preserve the constancy of rhyme and consistently conform to the even-syllabicity of

14 The stanza in the monoverse form (“Oh, God, it’s bad”) is, and is not a stanza. According to the rhyming system applied in the poem, it is the first line of the last stanza (a quatrain). But the blank dividing the first line from the whole (realized by rhyme) makes it still a separate structure (ranking as a stanza, as it is placed between two absolute pauses - blanks) which adds to the verse itself (as a stanza) particular poetic potential. Such structural shifts directly cause the occurrence of a certain semantic shading of the context and contribute to the enhancement of the sonnet’s semantic merit.

15 However, judging only by the rhyming system, the structure of the poem’s stanzaic composition would be entirely different from this affected by functional blanks. A one-verse stanza would have become, as we have said, a constituent part of the last stanza, whereby four stanzas would be formed with a completely defined structure, which is manifested in the following alternation (a couplet – a quatrain – a couplet – a quatrain): couplet – rhyme: *zvera – pomera*: quatrain – rhyme: *svoje – boje – svoje – pokoje*: couplet – rhyme: *mraka – dijaka*: quatrain – rhyme: *zloje – svoje – ovde – to je*.

accentual groups. And all this is imposed by the nature of the verse form which, as a functional instrument, assumes a special role, both in shaping certain text segments and in constructing the poem's overall text structure.

2.3.2. The perceived departure from the established norm, when transferred to the plane of content, reflects pragmatic, communication-action needs (needs for the establishment of contact, for information, for action), and it has, in fact, its semantic justification. In other words, in the context of the poem *The Word of Grigoriје Dijak*, dominated by even-syllabic words (20 proper and 7 improper disyllabic, and 5 improper quadrisyllabic words), there occurs one real trisyllabic word – *daljine* (distance), with accent on the internal syllable. This structural (formal) element of the word *daljine* clearly dissociates it from the other used lexical units (and accentual groups), thus indicating its special importance in the realized poetic discourse. If we exclude, for a moment, the lexeme *daljine* from the narrowest context, the resulting utterance will take on a form resembling a commonplace, conversational structure, conveying poetic shifts only in nuances (“*Ja sred svoje slike... kuce, boje*” = Me amidst my picture... house, colour). If we return to the realized poetic text, “*Ja sred svoje slike, daljine, kuce, boje*”, we are immediately struck by its full poetization: both on the plane of form and content, as the primary meanings of all the meaningful words are thoroughly changed. The indirectly established connection of two lexemes, *usred daljine* (= amidst a distance), obtaining the third element, *usred svoje daljine* (= amidst my (own) distance), loses its discursive meaning and becomes the conveyor of poetic information. Surrounded by other lexemes (“*slika*”, “*kuća*”, “*boja*” = picture, house, colour, respectively), jointly modified by “*svoj*” (or attribute “*svoja*” = my own), the lexical unit *daljina* assumes an entirely antonymic meaning¹⁶ to its primary meaning (in other words, it becomes an indicator of nearness), which is not recorded in the semantic structure of the Serbian language. Thus the lexeme *daljina*, as the key word of the analysed text, having performed the role of a stylistic and semantic signal (“switcher”), was fully adapted to the verse context and associated with words-concepts “*svoja slika*”, “*svoja kuća*”, “*svoja boja*” (= my picture, my house, my colour). In this way the line “*Slike, daljine, kuce, boje*”, apart from a particular rhythmic, acquired a di-

16 Here we are dealing with a type of enantiosemy: «Способность языкового знака (лексемы /л/, морфемы и т.д.) выражать противоположные значения. Энантioseмия в первую очередь характерна для лексических единиц, в связи с чем ее по иному называют внутрисловной антонимией. Антонимия при этом рассматривается в широком смысле слова, как любой тип противоположности по значению» (Бурханов 1995: 184).

stinct semantic structure, most easily perceived in the context of the poem, as it is the only part of the utterance introducing optimistic tones into the rather pessimistically coloured discourse.

2.3.3. A. Vukadinovic made use of yet another creative method, which on the formal and semantic planes has connotative values similar to the previous one. Namely, in the rhyming system, the poet used, except in one case, a type of isomorphic rhyme, a rhyme whose sound patterns are completely identical: (*zvera – pomera: -era/-era; svoje – boje – svoje – pokoje; -oje/-oje/-oje/-oje; mraka – dijaka: -aka/-aka; zloje – svoje – ovde – toje: -oje/-oje/-oje*). With this rhyming manner, only the lexeme “*ovde*” (=here), with its different sound structure, stayed outside the rhymed chain¹⁷, which is, to an extent, a departure from the accepted norm, the accepted principle of rhyming. It is therefore that this lexeme, not only in relation to all clausulas (rhymes) in the poem, but to all other language material, acquired a specific functional markedness, due to which it was totally equated with the word “*daljine*”. Although the two lexemes (“*daljine*” and “*ovde*”) are not in direct syntactic contact and a close semantic relation, through this method (the moment of disappointed expectations having a stylistic value) the poet brought them to the same semantic level, which is expressed as a contrast (“*daljine*” = there: “**here**”). If we embarked on analysing the semantic structure of the whole poem, we would easily prove that it is founded on antonymic relations, contrasts of the type: here – there, near – distant, down – up; rest – restlessness, light – dark, evil – good, etc. It is sufficient to note that on the plane of the microcontext (“*Ja sred svoje / slike, daljine, kuce, boje*” = Me amidst my own / picture, distance, house, colour) the word “*daljine*” by means of enantiosemy has turned into its antonym (distance – nearness = there – here), and that on the plane of the macrocontext (the context of the whole poem) the words “*daljine*” (=distance) and “*ovde*” (=here) have also established an antonymic (spatial) relation: there – here, which introduced a new quantity of meaning into the poem’s information structure.

4.0. Conclusion: our research has shown that there exists in verse discourses a large number of stereotypes (canons, conventions, norms) imposed by a specific

17 It should be noted that the lexeme “*ovde*”, even though without the rhymed pattern of the other rhymemes, is not excluded from the rhyming system (is not a non-rhymeme), as it is, with its consonant structure, linked with other words, thus forming a subsequent, qualitatively new type of rhymed relation, based on vocalic unification: *zloje – svoje – ovde – toje* (oe/oe/oe/oe). The nuances achieved on the plane of expression have a corresponding value on the plane of content. But that could be the subject of a separate, meticulous analysis.

period of time, a specific genre, a specific literary movement (school), specific literature, the structure of spoken language, personal choice. Thus, in shaping linguistic material, different kinds of stereotypes result in certain restrictions that creators (poets) are to observe. Strict compliance with the imposed stereotypes has inhibited the creators' individuality and originality and annulled their potential creativity. As a result individual poets (creators), who possessed unfettered creative energy, began to voice their active attitude to various stereotypical forms. Consequently, this short analysis of a minor part of the textual structure of three poems (*Material Revision, The Stony Lullaby, The Word of Grigorije Dijak*) has showed that all the three poets, while using certain poem and verse forms, apply creative poetic methods with which they undermine these stereotypical forms at their weakest points (on constructive boundaries: the position of the clausula and the position of the *caesura*), for indicating the chosen (canonised) poetic methods by which the poem's structure is built, and thus calling attention to the additional part of the stylistic-semantic information it offers to the recipient (reader or listener).

Abbreviations and Sources

- ВЈ П: Вукадиновић Алек, *Ружа језика*, Београд, 1992.
ЛВ Б: Лукић Велимир, *Будне сенке таме*, Београд, 1994.
РС П: Раичковић Стеван, *Песме*, Нови Сад – Београд, 1972.

Literature

- Barron, F., 1955, *The disposition toward originality*, The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, vol. 51.
Barron, F., 1968, *Creativity and Personal Freedom*, New York.
Бурханов, И., 1995, *Учебный словарь системы понятий лингвистической семантики*, Rzeszów.
Винарская, Н.Е., 1989, *Выразительные средства текста (на материале русской поэзии)*, Москва.
Винокур, Г.Т., 1974, *К вопросу о норме в художественной речи*. – СИНТАКСИС И НОРМА, Москва.
Гаспаров, Л.М., 1979, *Рифма Блока*, Тарту.
Гаспаров, Л.М., 1989, *Очерк истории европейского стиха*, Москва.
Голомбек, Ј., 1939, *Слик и његова функција*, XX век, 5, Београд.
Guliford, J., 1957, *Creative abilities in the arts*, Psychological review.

- Ghiselin, V., 1963, *Ultimate criteria for two levels of creativity*, New York.
- Јовановић, А., 1997, Мисао тешка као камен. Над сонетом *Камена усавнака Стевана Раичковића*. – С. Раичковић, *Камена усаванка и друге песме* (приредио: А. Јовановић), 187–197, Београд.
- Караулов Ј. Н., 1987, *Русский язык и языковая личность*, Москва.
- Квашчев Р., 1976, *Психологија стваралаштва*, Београд.
- Кожина М., 1992, *Интерпретација текста в функционално-стилевом аспекте*, Stylistyka I, Opole.
- Котурова М., 1998, Многоаспектност јављених стереотипности в научних текстах. – *ТЕКСТ: Стереотип и творчество*, Пермь.
- Јосепа М. Л., 1980, *Как строится текст*, Москва.
- Mac Kinnon D., 1963, *Identifying and developing creativity*, Journal of Secondary Education, 38.
- Петковић Н., 1975, *Језик у књижевном делу*, Београд.
- Петковић Н., 1990, *Огледи из српске поезике*, Београд.
- Петковић Н., 1995, *Елементи књижевне семиотике*, Београд.
- Rogers C., 1959, *Toward theory of creativity*, New York.
- Simon H., 1967, *Understanding creativity*, New York.
- Taylor J., 1959, *The nature of the creative process*, New York.
- Torrance P., 1972, *Un resumé historique du développement des textes de pensée creative de Torrance*, Revue de Psych. Appl., 22.
- Чаркић М., 2001, *Појмовник риме (са примерима из српске поезије)*, Београд.

О креативности и оригиналности в дискурсе поетским

Аутор артикула przeprowadza analizę strukturalną trzech wierszy (*Powtórka materiału*, *Kamienna kołysanka* i *Słowo Grigorija Dijaka*) z punktu widzenia ich wersyfikacyjnej oryginalności. Na tych przykładach pokazuje ważną rolę stereotypów rozumianych jako kanony, normy oraz konwencje obowiązujące w określonych epokach i w poszczególnych gatunkach. Podkreśla ich wpływ na kształt dyskursu poetyckiego i wykorzystywanego materiału językowego. Uznaje, że potencjalna kreatywność poetów ograniczana jest przez stereotypy, które wpływają na stopień indywidualizacji i oryginalności poszczególnych tekstów. We wszystkich analizowanych tekstach twórcy naruszają wersyfikacyjne konwencje by zwrócić uwagę odbiorcy wiersza na niesione przez nie dodatkowe informacje stylistyczne i semantyczne.