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ABSTRACT

The intricate use of language is one of the most striking features of Andrej Belyj's work, noticed by native Russian speakers and foreign students alike. Any foreign student, not too sure of the structural potential of the language and attempting a careful reading of Belyj's work, is faced with a prohibitive task. The present study was conceived of as a linguistic commentary to the text.

Initially, the intention was to study Belyj's neologisms throughout his novels. However, upon close analysis, it became evident that the neologisms were, in fact, an organic outgrowth of his use of language generally. The task of analysing this use of language throughout his work exceeded the scope of a thesis and, therefore, the subject had to be limited in some way. It was decided that an exhaustive analysis of the use of language in St. Petersburg would present the most significant results.

However, when all citations were collected, it became obvious that detailed comment on all of them would produce too ponderous a volume and an arbitrary selection was made. Despite the fact that their role
in language structure is superficial, many interesting archaisms and dialectal lexical items were included. At least some examples of all major recurring structural deviations were included in the discussion. Those deviations which contributed to the motif pattern or expanded the themes of the novel were, of course, cited more frequently. Since a precise numerical count of forms and structures can be achieved considerably more efficiently by using a computer, and since it is really the ratio of interrelating forms, rather than the actual number of occurrences that is significant, these ratios are cited here, and the precise counts omitted.
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Andrej Belyj belongs to a generation of Russian authors who reached maturity and became creative in the restless years between the Japanese War and the beginning of World War I. This was a generation which brought new standards of achievement to the arts - the so-called silver epoch of Russian letters, when the Russian genius once more reached a rich and distinctive manifestation before the impending catastrophe of the revolution.

Andrej Belyj is one of the most colorful personalities of this time and is among the most significant of the symbolist writers. He is a romantic figure, the Prince Charming of the Moscow symbolists, idol of high school girls who were willing to spend half a winter night waiting in the snow for a glimpse of him.1 The fascination of his personality extended outside the immediate circle of the symbolist writers and their admirers. Thus, for example, the well-known author Fedor Stepun has recently said of Andrej Belyj:

Of all the people I have met in my life, Belyj is the most remarkable. At times this uniqueness loomed so immense that the almost impossible question occurred to me whether he could be called a man in the same sense of the word as the rest of us. Psychologically, myopic people have often voiced the opinion that Belyj's mannerisms were nothing but play and pose. This was not the case. What appears as play and pose came closer to a St. Vitus dance of a helplessly exposed naked soul.2

The child who was to become Andrej Belyj, the 'undisciplined and erratic Ariel of twentieth century Russia',3 was born Boris Nikolajević Bugaev on the twenty-seventh of
October, 1880, the only son of the well-known professor of mathematics, Nikolaj Bugaev, and his young, beautiful and capricious wife. Biographical studies trace Belyj's dual nature ultimately to the incompatible contrasts of his parents' personalities:

His mother's personality determined his emotional instability as well as his hysterical and capricious temperament. His mother was responsible for his predisposition to intuitive judgement and to music — a factor that determined his striving to express himself vaguely and lyrically, through intangible melody and rhythm, rather than explicitly, through concrete words. Paradoxically, this lyrical nature of Boris Bugaev existed side by side with a scientific nature, which he owed to his father, from whom he inherited a critical intellect and an avid thirst for knowledge. For this reason he loved mathematical precision and scientific systemization: just as much as he did chaos and intuitive perception.

In a broader perspective, these conflicting trends can be said to be characteristic of the general intellectual climate of late nineteenth century Russia. Scientific exactness and religious mysticism are the main features of the Zeitgeist which left its impact on Belyj, and of which Belyj himself was a vivid symbol.

Professor Bugaev, Belyj's father, has been characterized as a scientifically oriented, politically liberal man with some eccentric personality traits which, towards the end of his life,
seem to have brought him closer to his son. The liberalism of the professor's circles, however, did not extend to the arts. At the Moscow University, all literary innovations were looked upon as an insult to the greatness of Russian literature - as a crippled decadence. Even though Belyj joined the 'decadents' very early, in certain respects he remained loyal to the spirit of the university. As Fedor Stepun has said:

A true thirst for knowledge was part of his make-up; and his interests extended with equal intensity to the disciplines of the sciences and the humanities alike, which led him to epistemological questions. His interest in methodology led him to Immanuel Kant whose *Die Kritik der reinen Vernunft* liberated him from the bonds of positivism which dominated the Moscow University,³.

where he had registered in 1899, according to his father's wishes, in the Faculty of Sciences; however, he resolved to complete the curriculum of the Liberal Arts Faculty as well. This implied that, as a student of science, he did not renounce his interests in the arts. In 1903 he completed the prescribed curricula including courses in chemistry, physics, mathematics and geography. Many of his fellow students in the Faculty of Sciences shared his interest in the new trends in the arts and humanities. 'The Argonauts', an exuberant group in search of new values, was formed there. These were chiefly representatives of the new and as yet unformulated movement
which later developed into Russian symbolism.

Intellectual accomplishment was, from its very beginning, a characteristic of this movement. 'No group of contemporary writers in Western Europe could be found to compare with the Russian symbolists in learning and erudition of the most diversified kind'. As Mohrenschildt has said: they were 'refined beyond the point of civilization'.

Belyj's university years reflect the search which was to remain a lifelong characteristic: a rigorous attempt to understand the world by rational means while perceiving it intuitively. It does not seem an overstatement to say that the fascinating richness of all of Belyj's work stems, to a large extent, from his dual nature, and his perceptive imagination constantly subjected to exacting analysis.

Belyj's work may be said to fall into three distinct although interconnected areas, one of which is aesthetic and literary criticism. The most significant outcome of this work is the volume *Symbolism* published in Moscow in 1910. The volume encompasses a variety of studies written at different times. Only very recently has attention again been drawn to Belyj's work in this area. It seems that he can be credited with the first attempts at mathematical analysis of poetry, and the first programme of systematic examination of verse structure by statistical methods. Already in this
volume, Belyj pointed to the necessity to tabulate metrical forms, characteristics of rhyme, assonances, alliterations, interpunctuation, structural forms and the lexicon used by each individual author. 'Only then', he states, 'shall we be able to say that the style of a poet is described in detail, only then we will be able to set up an experiment correctly; only then will the science of poetry stand on solid ground.' Unfortunately, these first broad attempts at objective mathematical analysis of poetic structures were followed by various fantastic deductions.

This approach to poetry was, for almost half a century, surprisingly unproductive in subsequent literary theory. Roman Jacobson has made some use of these quantitative methods in his study of old Czech verse structures but, as is well known, his main work lies in the area of quantitative phonology.

After the revolution Belyj wrote an extensive autobiographical work, the volumes On the Boundary of Two Centuries, At the Beginning of the Century and Between Two Revolutions, all published in the nineteen thirties.

Belyj's main literary significance, which has not received anything like adequate attention, lies in his poetry (the volumes being named in significant progression Gold in Azure, Ashes and The Urn) in his four Symphonies and the novels St. Petersburg, The Silver Dove, Kotik Letajev,
It is to the novels that Belyj owes his reputation of a Russian James Joyce and because of them, he is compared to Marcel Proust. It is especially with Joyce that Belyj meets on common ground in his attitude to prose language and the structure of the novel. Both Belyj and Joyce faced the breakdown of romanticism, realism and naturalism and exercised the same tremendous impact on the creative prose of their respective languages. As George Reavey points out, their verbal innovations are, in places, almost identical. Like Joyce and Proust, Belyj ushers in a new era in literature. In Russia its development was interrupted by the revolution, but his influence in post-revolution Russian literature is repeatedly noted, both favourably and unfavourably.

'Belyj is the founder of a new literary form, a new musically rhythmic prose'. 'There seems to be general agreement that his novel St. Petersburg is one of the most important Russian novels of the twentieth century:' and the 'strongest and artistically most expressive' of all of Belyj's works. The new tonality of symbolist prose was, to a large extent, the result of a certain stylization of language, which was, no doubt, due to Belyj's achievements as a lyrical poet. 'The personal union of a novelist and a lyrical poet which has been an unclaimed achievement since
Pushkin and Lermontov became, once more, a reality with the symbolists.  

Andrej Belyj wrote his first novel, *The Silver Dove*, after he had become known as a lyricist. St. Petersburg was first conceived as a sequel to *The Silver Dove* but soon grew into an independent work.

In 1909 Belyj spent some time in Bobrovka, the country estate of a friend. There he started to work on *The Silver Dove* and later remembered this stay at Bobrovka as a dividing point between two periods in his life:

The one from 1901 stretches over seven years, the other from 1909 to 1916 - another seven years. The first period is a road from pessimism to the problems of Vladimir Solovjev and symbolism; it ends with the attempt to establish the basis of symbolism.

The second period is a road away from symbolism towards the symbols of obscure knowledge on the way to insight into oneself.

The first is the period of the *Symphonies*, the second - that of the novels .... The first seven years I spent in Russia, the second were filled with travels, the first - in the circle of friends, the second with Asja.

In the fall of 1910 Belyj and his wife travelled to Italy, Sicily and North Africa. Later, Belyj wrote of his arrival in Venice that he remembers this moment as the beginning of his wandering: 'Thirty years of my life had been spent in the square which is marked by the dusty Arbat, the Smolenskij Boulevard and the Prečistenka; here I had
tortured myself then Asja came here from the far West, offered me her hand and tore me away.' 26.

The geometrical forms of North-African architecture seem to have made an especially strong impression on Belyj: 'A minaret as an expression ... of what? I don't know, but I do know that it is of much. I am possessed by this form. A whitish cube raised high, from which rises another whitish cube, but smaller in proportion; from it a pyramid ...' 27. This experience may be looked upon as the origin of his extensive use of geometric forms in the novel St. Petersburg.

The first notes for the novel date from the summer of 1911 when Belyj had returned to Russia. In them he is still searching for a thematic connection to The Silver Dove. Senator Ableukhov was first thought of as a marginal character, a friend of Count Todorbe-Graaben (from The Silver Dove). This originally brief appearance of the senator grew into a fragment of an entirely new novel.

In the fall of 1911 Belyj was asked to contribute a new novel to the periodical Russkaja Mysl', but at the request of the publisher Peter Struve, the novel was turned down by the editor V. Br'usov. It was about to be printed by K. F. Nekrasov in Jaroslavl' when Alexander Blok arranged for its printing with the publishing house 'Sirin'. Towards the close
of 1913 St. Petersburg appeared in three parts in the literary year-books of the publishers. In 1916 the novel was published separately with all three sections bound together.

The title St. Petersburg, under which the novel was published, was suggested by Vjaceslav Ivanov to whom Belyj had read the manuscript. Among other titles, Belyj himself had thought of Evil Shadows or The Red Domino.

The novel was re-edited once more by Belyj for the publishing house 'Epocha' in Berlin. Here it appeared in 1922 in its final form. For this edition Belyj revised the entire text and omitted large parts of the original 'Sirin' edition so that the entire volume of the novel was cut by about one quarter. 28.

All passages considered in the present study are taken from the 1922 Berlin edition.
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Linguistic innovations play a greater role in certain historical periods than in others. Massive linguistic changes co-occur, as a rule, with great cultural, social and political changes. New cultural concepts entail new words to name them. Political changes result in shifting social classes and, along with these changes, new language usage and new standards are established.

In Russia, a period marked by intensive word-coining activity was that of the so-called 'second south Slavic influence' during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Many compound neologisms are characteristic of this period. Dimitrij Čiževskij has commented on the frequency of linguistic innovation among the romantics. These innovations do not, however, depend to a large extent on new coinages but are more often reinterpretations and re-evaluations of existing words. Such forms do not stem so much from the necessities of cultural or social development (the terminology of steamships and railroads was not created by poets), they usually belong to the sphere of poetic language and serve the goals of art.

A more recent period of this kind in Russian literature begins with the symbolist movement and continues through futurism where the most pronounced use of linguistic innovation is found in the well-researched works of Chlebnikov and Majakovskij.
The present study is an attempt to establish the corpus of linguistic innovation in Andrej Belyj's novel *St. Petersburg*, and to examine the means by which these innovations were created.

Linguistic analysis of the works of twentieth century writers yields especially fruitful results because of the writers' basic preoccupation with language and its possibilities. But Andrej Belyj's preoccupation with the medium of his art is deducible not only from his literary works; he has repeatedly and explicitly stated his views in a number of theoretical articles as well. Witness the exuberance of his statement:

> The word is the only reality; beyond it there is emptiness: there is neither God nor man, nor nature, there is only the word! It creates the world, lends objectivity to space and time. Creativity is name-giving, that is the magic of incantation and exorcism.

All cognition is a firework of words with which I fill the emptiness surrounding me. In the past the emptiness was lit by the lights of imagery: this was the creation of myth. The word created the figurative symbol - the metaphor appeared as an existential reality; the word created the mythos; mythos gave birth to religion, religion to philosophy ... We are still alive, but we are alive because we have the word ... From the holiest of words our children will forge a new symbol of faith: to them the crisis of knowledge will be only the death of old words. Mankind is alive as long as there is poetry of language. The poetry of language lives. We are alive.

Here the artist's medium is given a completely autonomous quality; more than that, it is seen as the sole basis of human culture. Perhaps not till Heidegger is the omnipotence of
language again given such forceful expression in modern Western thought: 'Words and language', Heidegger writes, 'are not wrappings ... for those who write and speak. It is in words and language that things first come into being and are'.

On a yet broader philosophical basis, exceeding the realm of natural language, Cassirer sees art and science, generally, and all symbolic forms as more than a medium for the expression of something which is initially given; for him, reality is the symbolic medium into which object and subject merge.

A similar merging of subject and object underlies basic concepts of language as early as that of Humboldt, some aspects of which have recently again become fruitful in generative grammars. For Humboldt, language is the mediator between nature and man, it is the form in which man relates to nature; however, the form is never a direct assignment of sound to an object, but always a sign plus an object plus a given perception of the object.

It is in this sense that the use of language in symbolist poetics consciously involves more than is generally understood under the term 'stylistic device.' Charles Feidelson has stated: 'The physics of symbolist literature depends on its metaphysics!' This concept of language echoes from Mallarmé's views of the aims of literature: 'to emphasize, to conserve and to develop the forms of which language is capable.'
It is inherent in Beckett's statement about Joyce, who was born only two years after Belyj: 'his writing is not about something it is that something itself.'

Belyj is acutely aware of the diachronic progression, the vertical dimension of language. He sees the word as a living being - creating, influencing and changing its content: 'A common prosaic word, that is, a word which has lost its portraying imagery, is a putrid, decomposing corpse.' For Belyj, as for Humboldt, language is the means through which he relates to nature, a 'magic formula'; combinations of words, grammatical and expressive forms are, in their essence, magic formulae by which he subdues nature.

Jespersen, too, has noted the magic function of language:

We shall never thoroughly understand the nature of language if we take as our starting point the sober attitude of the scientifically trained man of today, who regards the words he uses as means for communicating, or maybe further developing, thought. To children and savages a word is somewhat very different; to them there is something magical or mystical in a name! The living, figurative speech we hear sparks our imagination with the fire of new creations, that is, of new word creations, which are always beginnings of new insights.

And witness the similarity of Sapir's statement:

The concept does not attain to individual and independent life until it has found a distinctive linguistic embodiment. In most cases the new symbol is but a thing wrought from linguistic material already in existence. The instrument makes possible the product, the product refines the instrument!
It is of interest to note that Belyj's passionate acclamations of the almighty power of the word are only a part of his theoretical output. Some of his theoretical works - accompanied by many statistical graphs - are marvels of sober, exact, quantitative analysis.

Thus we find that the linguistic innovation which is so striking a feature of Belyj's works is by no means accidental, but is an organic part of his general Weltanschauung, his concept of the nature of language and the rights and duties of a writer. Belyj's art and thought is not an isolated phenomenon, but has important parallels and echoes not only in Russian literature but in the general Zeitgeist of twentieth century thought.

Symbolist art, being concerned with internal perception, dispenses with the portrayal of external reality. In literature this tenet is expressed in the equation of the form of the language with the reality of intuitive experience. The formal structure of a work of art is grounded there not rationally but irrationally. Since symbolist art consciously gives up the claim to intelligibility in the traditional sense, an evaluation of its specific character must be based primarily on linguistic principles. Symbolic art is, by its own declaration, formal. The inner organisation of the work is of utmost importance because form has received an absolute value, although it reveals its entire function only in broad individual context.
It is clear that a linguistic analysis of literature conceived in this spirit could hardly, by any criteria, yield pedestrian results. The trends of modern literary criticism have, to a considerable extent, paralleled the basic assumption of the modern writer, 'that content and form cannot be divided into separate components', at least not if it is the literary work as such which is to be explicated. 17.

Witness the parallelism of ideas in a contemporary Continental critic:

'the symbol does not express something, rather it exists by way of meaning something. The characteristic mark of a symbol is the unity of a Sign and a Being. A configuration (Gestalt) of this seems, to my mind, to exist in literature: It has meaning but expresses nothing which could be abstracted from it. 18.

The Russian formalists were among the first to object most vigorously to the old dichotomy 'content versus form', which cuts a work of art into two halves: a crude content and a superimposed, purely external form. 19.

Charles Feidelson notes that the critics' emphasis on Structure corresponds directly to a certain experimentation with language by poets and novelists: 'critical analysis of structure and creative experimentation with language are characteristic of our time because critics and writers tend to conceive of the literary work - the real poem or story or novel - as residing primarily in word arrangements. The strategy of modern criticism is to give 'language' a kind of
autonomy by conceiving it as a realm of meaning, and the structure explored is discovered in the language, not behind the poem in the writer's mind or in front of the poem in an external world.  

Unfortunately, Andrej Belyj's work has not met with this type of criticism recently. Russian critical emphasis on literary form and techniques, which was roughly contemporaneous with Belyj's own critical writings, was subsequently practically eliminated by official policy. But the trend survives outside Russia in the work of such men as Roman Jakobson and Dimitrij Čiževskij. Neither of them, however, has considered Belyj's work to any significant extent. Oleg Maslenikov's study of the Russian symbolist movement appeared in Berkeley in 1952 and, by his own statement, does not adhere to a uniform philosophy or criticism since: 'literature, like all art, like culture itself, is so complex a phenomenon as to demand a many-sided illumination to bring out all its facets.' The work is basically biographical.  

Fedor Stepun's extensive study on five figures of Russian symbolism is grounded in cultural history and sociology. The most thorough study of Russian symbolism and one with an extensive chapter on Andrej Belyj, based on structural principles, is Johannes Holthusen's Studien zur Aesthetik und Poetik des russischen Symbolismus. However, here too, references to
Belyj's linguistic innovations are only sketchy.

Georgette Donchin's excellent work is, as the title indicates, mainly concerned with *The Influence of French Symbolism on Russian Poetry*, and does not consider Belyj's prose work at all.

The only book-length study, bearing Belyj's name as the title, is by K. Močul'skij who, although otherwise sensitive to Belyj's art, takes an extremely negative personal attitude towards his language experiments, witness the statement:

No other Russian writer has attempted such audacious experiments with the word as Andrej Belyj. The likes of his narrative prose cannot be found in the entire Russian literature. Belyj's 'stylistic revolution' may be considered a catastrophic failure *sic!*, but its great significance cannot be denied. The author of *The Silver Dove* and *St. Petersburg* did not leave one stone upon another in the old literary language. He tore the Russian prose on the rack, turned the syntax upside down, overflooded the lexicons with a stream of newly thought-up words. His daring experiments bordering on insanity have left their mark on the whole new Soviet literature: he created a school.

There are, to my knowledge, no works based on specific quantifiable date which consider the language of Andrej Belyj's prose. Professor Humesky's work on Majakovskij's neologisms is among the first attempts to examine a writer's language according to such criteria.

In the previously mentioned philosophies of criticism we find largely intuitive appreciations of the role of language in literature supported, at time, by philosophical considerations. But, so far, there has been no systematic exploitation of inherent
ideas based on detailed examination of the text at hand.

Only in the last ten years, perhaps as a result of growing interdisciplinary communication, both literary critics and linguists have brought their special resources to bear on the nature and characteristics of style in literature. In the study of style, linguistic and literary studies necessarily meet. As has often been pointed out, a writer must necessarily write according to or by reference to a grammar, and the reader must read by reference to the same grammar. Thus, grammatical analysis cannot be escaped; it can only be studied more or less explicitly with more or less valid procedures.

Traditional literary critics and linguists look for structures, for a Gestalt composed of items with stable relationships between them. Grammatical analysis is inevitable since it provides sharper, more comprehensive means for understanding the literary medium. As I. A. Richards has said, referring to the modern writers:

No amount of dictionary grouping seems to help; logical acumen is of no service in deciphering a writer who has abandoned logic. Pertinacity leads only to frustration. The remaining avenue is close syntactic analysis, at any rate, a clear statement of what the syntactic probabilities are.

If literature is approached from an empirical, scientific viewpoint, the results of the investigation need not necessarily be quality judgements or normative statements. A study should,
preferably explain by what structural characteristics the perceived literary effects are achieved. Literary criticism conceived in this way is not a recognition procedure of what features constitute a literary work; it accepts the effects as given and attempts to formulate the rules inherent in the text from which these effects derive. This approach is parallel to descriptive linguistics which does not offer normative prescriptions, but describes the structure of a language.

The obvious difference between linguistic and literary structure is that, while any native speaker has at his command the full structure of his language, literary competence is extremely varied. To the extent that a literary text contains linguistic structures, it can be understood by any speaker of the language; to the extent that these structures are specifically literary, they can be fully understood only by those who have the underlying poetic system at their command. It is of interest to note that omission of definition is common to all disciplines in modern thought. For example, Chomsky makes no attempt to define the sentence. Similarly, the new mathematics consider the number system as a complex of interrelated structures but make no use of definitions in the Euclidian sense.

Analogously the new trend in literary criticism does not attempt to define what literature is, but rather explicates how and on what basis it is derived.
In the study of foreign literatures the importance of linguistic analysis can hardly be overemphasized. One function of the close study of literary texts is to expose the student to extensive experience of linguistic items in context; the aim is to approximate the results that a native speaker achieves naturally because of his environment. Secondly, the student of foreign literatures is expected to respond to the literary values of a given work.

The teaching situation in foreign literature is fundamentally different from native-language literature studies and, as Professor Enkvist has pointed out, there are hardly any methods developed to meet this special demand:

Between grammar and literary history there lies a no-man's-land mapped neither by traditional foreign language textbooks nor by school or university texts designed for first language students.30.

Above everything else, a student of foreign literatures must acquire a sense of style, that is, he has to be able to distinguish between common and rare types of linguistic behaviour in a given context or situation. In other words, in order to be able to contrast a regular and a deviating structure, he has to attain command of the underlying principles of 'poetry' in the language. There seems little doubt that this kind of requirement is best met by a concept of style which makes operationally concrete stylistic analysis possible.

They should be based on those linguistic features that each student, at his particular level of progress, can verify on his own.31.
To quote Professor Enkvist again:

Obviously, to get at style, the investigator must begin with the laborious task of setting up a corpus of references to find the norm or norms from which a given text differs. To establish such frames of reference is one of the basic aims of all linguistic and literary education. 32.

In essence the problems may be restated thus: how can the description of a literary text be combined with the description of grammar? If explicit answers to questions of this kind are a necessity in foreign literature study, it is clear that native students of literature have made implicit use of these relationships all along. A competent native reader functions as a selector for recognition procedures of grammatical structure, poetic structure and their inter-relationships. In an absolute case the native reader would have at his command the entire underlying system which generates literary utterances. These may be of very diversified kinds; they meet the conventions of period and genre, the author's personal style, a character's specific style, and so on; if, on the one hand, their effectiveness depends on deviation from rules governing casual language, on the other hand, such deviations are not random but are regularities specific to the character, and their literary effectiveness depends at least as much on these regularities as on deviation from the casual standard. Thus, while some rules which operate in casual language are suspended in
literary language, others, not operative in casual language, are introduced. In a diversified literary form like the novel many systems are found within the confines of a single work. These systems must be subjected to detailed individual analysis before general rules governing them may be established on the basis of exact quantifiable data. Such a procedure should provide an adequate description of the language under consideration; that is, the resulting grammar will specify on the basis of which features or processes a given effect is achieved.

The theoretical concepts underlying the present attempt to explicate the linguistic peculiarities of the novel *St. Petersburg* are those of generative transformational grammar. Basic to the transformational viewpoint is the creative aspect of language. Noam Chomsky has linked the modern generative concept to Wilhelm von Humboldt's views regarding the essential nature of language and to Humboldt's central, much quoted utterance that language is 'wesenhaft, eigentlich eine Energia', that is to say—essentially a process.

As Noam Chomsky has stated:

> The essence of each language is what Humboldt designates as its characteristic Form. The form of language is that constant and unvarying factor which underlies and gives life and significance to each particular new linguistic act. It is by having developed an internal representation of this form that each individual is capable of understanding the language and using it in a way that is intelligible to his fellow speakers.
This characteristic form determines and inheres in each separate linguistic element. The role and significance of each individual element can be determined only by considering it in relation to underlying form, that is, in relation to the fixed generative rules that determine the manner of its formation. It is this underlying generative principle that the linguist must seek to represent in a descriptive grammar. 

In other words, an adequate linguistic description must explain the native speaker's intuitions as to what kind of utterances constitute a well-formed corpus of a given language.

A grammar of a particular language is in effect an hypothesis about the principles of sentence formation in this language.

Any native speaker has the raw data at his disposal, but he is not aware of the deeper facts of linguistic structure; it is these deeper facts that linguistic analysis attempts to make explicit, and to state the generative rules which will generate any number of utterances in the language above and beyond those observed in advance by the analyst - new utterances most, if not all, of which will pass the test of casual acceptance by a native speaker.

The investigations of generative grammar were partly motivated by an attempt to account for the ability of a native speaker to produce and understand an unlimited number of new sentences and to recognize them as being well formed or deviant in some respect.

In historical perspective, generative transformational grammars represent a departure from those modern scientific grammars which develop precise and consistent methods but, all too often, at the expense of the scope of the grammar.
Chomsky states:

It would not be inaccurate to regard the transformational model as a formalization of features implicit in traditional grammars, and to regard these grammars as inexplicit transformational grammars. The goal of a traditional grammar is to provide its users with the ability to understand an arbitrary sentence of the language and to form and employ it properly on the appropriate occasion. The rich descriptive apparatus of traditional grammar far exceeds the limits of the taxonomic model, though it is largely, and perhaps fully formalizable within the framework of the transformational model.

It should be noted that no conception of language other than a generative model can logically offer an explanation of deviant structures which linguistic innovations necessarily are. Consider, for example, neologisms: they are per definitionem newly generated structures which have hitherto not been part of a given language corpus and, therefore, cannot be accounted for by any linguistic theory based on element inventory. The fact that the native speaker is able to understand a neologism derives, in some way, from his knowledge of the generative principle underlying the new structure. Analogously:

The basic job of a grammar is to provide a description of the structure of each sentence of the language. Such a description is adequate only when the structure assigned to a sentence reveals each grammatical feature speakers employ to understand that sentence.
In other words, a grammar is the derivational pattern of an utterance. A fluent speaker of a language is able to understand any sentence of the infinite set of sentences in that language and recognize some to be well formed and others not.
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The corpus of linguistic material singled out for detailed attention here consists of representative passages from Andrej Belyj's novel *St. Petersburg* which native Russian readers perceived as in some manner deviating from standard Russian usage.

Linguists are often known to work with small samplings of informants if the main interest is focussed on the common features of a linguistic community; a pair of informants is sufficient to cancel out any grossly individually determined perceptions.

The two readers chosen to assist in this study were natives of Russia who had completed secondary education in Russian high schools but had no further formal training in either literary criticism or linguistics. As far as I was able to judge, there were no indications that either had ever been interested in these fields beyond the entertainment function of literary works. Neither had read the novel *St. Petersburg* before and, although they were familiar with the name Andrej Belyj, they did not recall ever having read any of his works.

Both readers had left Russia during the revolution and lived within the Russian emigrant culture in Eastern Europe before coming to Canada after World War II. They had, therefore, practically no contact with Russian language developments.
within Russia since their departure. It was hoped that this factor would be relevant to their perception of deviant structures introduced by Andrej Belyj. Thus, the work has been read by linguistically unsophisticated native speakers of a variety of Russian which is roughly contemporary to Belyj's work on St. Petersburg.

The native speakers were asked to read the novel at their leisure and mark every passage, expression or single form which they intuitively felt not to be standard-language. The extremely small sampling of readers does not, of course, yield data which is representative in any strict scientific sense, but the corpus seems sufficient to indicate structural patterns specific to this work. Except for few marginal items, the two readers generally marked the same passages throughout.

The passages containing deviant structures were then examined by linguistic and also extra linguistic criteria such as have been found relevant to such studies. It should be noted that many methodological objections to traditional terms are not valid if the traditional terms are applied to a closed corpus of linguistic material instead of language universals. Since the first and main purpose of this study is to comprehend the language of Andrej Belyj's St. Petersburg, I used them if they contributed to the understanding of a given structure.
The short prologue introduces, as the actual hero of the novel, St. Petersburg - the city itself: the city which harbours the fathers and the sons, the mystics and the murderers, the dreamers and the provocateurs. The city erected, as the saying goes, by Peter the Great on the bones of men.

We shall now turn to the close examination of a number of representative citations containing unusual linguistic material.

Citation 1. p. 9. Vol. 1. Narrator:

"-----И Русская Империя заключает: во-первых - великую, малую, бедную и червонную Русь; во-вторых - грузинское, польское, казанское и астраханское царство; в третьих, она заключает... Но - прочая, прочая, прочая. ----- из первопрестольного града и матери градов русских." 

In the opening paragraph of the novel, the coupling 'червонная Русь' is foregrounded by being used in a sentence written in elementary textbook style. The simple declarative statement contains a chain of adjectives modifying the proper noun 'Русь': the first three couplings have definitely established referents in the geographical and historical entities of 'Великая Русь, Малая Русь and Белая Русь'. The first two adjectives are clearly antonyms, and the symmetry expected in this type of sentence structure facilitates the perception of 'белая' and 'червонная' as an antonymic pair as well. However, in the environment of 'великая' 'малая'
and 'белая' a more standard form like, for example, 'красная' is expected. Further, contrasting with the first three couplings, the fourth has no established referent. Thus the coupling 'червонная Русь' is also foregrounded by the lack of an objective referent and by the use of a synonymous adjective with a far smaller and more restricted functional load than the others appearing in the sentence. For example, 'червонный' - hearts - in card games - or the collocation 'червонное золото' - pure gold, red gold, are common. This context renders the form 'белая' semantically ambiguous; if grouped into a Gestalt with the first two adjectives, it may refer to the geographical place 'Белая Русь'; if it is perceived as a pair with the fourth adjective, it designates an abstract opposite to the collocation 'червонная Русь'. The foregrounding is achieved by means of the tension arising from the two possible Gestalten. This is further offset by the monotonous listing of items ending with the triple repetition ' - И прочая, прочая, прочая'.

The use of the alternate Slavonic forms 'град' and 'Русь' rather than 'город' and 'Россия' introduce an element of importance or significance to an otherwise particularly banal prose passage.

Citation 2. p. 10. Vol. 1. Narrator:

Петербургъ, или Санктъ-Петербургъ,
или Питеръ (что то же) подлинно
принадлежитъ Россійской Имперіи.
A triple repetition of three synonyms denoting St. Petersburg; first the usual term most commonly used in conversation, then the official name, and finally the affectionate curtailed term 'Питер'. Witness that the closing of (e) to (i) in soft environment is indicated also in the graphic form. The same triplicate is repeated in the paragraph immediately following.

Citation 3, p. 10, Vol. 1, Narrator:

In this passage the parenthesized insert 'не воздуха, например' blends into the general style of informal factual account further marked by interruptions and repetitions; however, it also brings into focus a juxtaposition of 'публика' and 'воздух', the one an animate collective, the other an inanimate mass noun, both relating to the deverbal abstract noun 'циркуляция'. The grammatical structure indicates an equation of the two nouns. This is the first of many instances of a syntactic merging of the animate - inanimate categories with reference to what could be broadly called a mass of people and atmosphere respectively.
The foregrounding is achieved by a collocation of 'только кажется, что он существует' referring to the proper noun 'St. Petersburg' with a clearly established referent.

The affirmation that Petersburg not only seems to but does exist is supported by its graphic representation on the map, not by the actual reality of the city.

Two occurrences of Church Slavonicisms stylistically reinforce the adjective 'немаловажный'.

The foregrounding is achieved by a collocation of 'только кажется, что он существует' referring to the proper noun 'St. Petersburg' with a clearly established referent.

The affirmation that Petersburg not only seems to but does exist is supported by its graphic representation on the map, not by the actual reality of the city.

Two occurrences of Church Slavonicisms stylistically reinforce the adjective 'немаловажный'.
The noun 'пом ' does not seem to have an established figurative use in Russian, (the most common pairing is, perhaps, 'пом пчел'). Neither does the noun collocate with 'поток' or any of the verbal derivations from the base (тек). 'Рой ропить' is the standard verbal collocation. Further, the singular form of the concrete noun 'книга' is used as a collective noun. This is, however, encountered in established usage as 'русская книга' in the sense of 'Russian letters'.

To summarize: already in the prologue to the novel is revealed a linguistic foregrounding of items which can be independently established as the main themes and images of the novel by methods of structural literary analysis. The use of archaisms, besides drawing attention to the form and referent per se, indicates the chronological dimension of language. The foregrounding of 'Russia' and a certain 'redness' by the use of archaic forms indicates the temporal progression of the historical changes which are about to take place. The variations of the form 'Petersburg' reinforce the prominence which it has already been given by its use in the title. Furthermore, the unreal, nightmarish quality which characterizes the entire novel is established in the introductory passage by a syntactic exchange of nominals referring to concrete substantial objects with nominals denoting insubstantial phenomena or abstractions.
The plot of the first chapter can be summarized as follows: the old senator Apollon Ableukhov, descendant of an old Tatar family, and his son Nikolaj live alone. The senator's wife left them some years ago to live in Spain. Young Nikolaj Ableukhov is a student of philosophy with nihilistic leanings. The old senator, who is becoming progressively senile, is at peace in his home with numbered and lettered shelves and drawers, in the black cubicle of his carriage speeding along Petersburg's straight prospects lined with the gray cubes of buildings, and in the ordered bureaucratic calm of his office.

Into this graphic symmetry of his world intrudes a worrisome 'cerebral play' during which asymmetrical strangers emanate out of his brain like gods and genii out of the head of Zeus. A mysterious stranger begins his existence in this way. In his hands he carries a smallish bundle, and in a crowded restaurant he meets a man named Lippenckenko, with salmon colored lips (the yellow kind) and dyed hair. The senator's son Nikolaj Apollonovic also has connections with the mysterious stranger. A red domino is delivered to Nikolaj Ableukhov, who suffers from unrequited love and frightens his beloved by suddenly appearing in the red domino on a dark night.

Citation 7. p. 15, Vol. I, Narrator:

-----Они проживали в киргиз-казацкой ордê, откуда в царствование императрицы
The etymology of the main character's family name foregrounds the merging of Kirghiz and Russian elements: 'Аб-лай Ухов' contracted into 'Аблеухов' is a near homonym of the colloquial form 'оплеуха' a slap in the face, an insult. The passage is not grammatically deviant but the explicit derivation of the name establishes the family as carriers of one of the main themes of the novel - the theme of mongolism.

Citation 8, p. 16, Vol. 1. Servants' dialogue:

—"Самъ-то, вишь, всталъ..."
—"Обираются одеколономъ, скоро покалуятъ къ кофію..."
—"Утрои почтарь говорилъ, будто барину - письмцо изъ Гишпани; съ гишпанскою маркою".

The servants' dialogue reflects social class usage differences: 'самъ то' (he himself), referring to the head of the household, is an archaic form but still fairly common with, for example, the merchant class at the turn of the century. 'Вишь' is a syncopated form of 'видишь' common in peasant speech and often used as an inserted morpheme
with no syntactic function. The verb 'обтираются, похалу́ют' are in the third person plural - a polite form used by servants referring to their masters and still in common use at the beginning of this century.

The first speaker, the senator's valet, does not use this form, he uses: 'встал' not 'встали', but the cook, who has no personal contact with the master of the house and is, perhaps, less urbanized does: 'к кофий' - in standard Russian the noun 'кофе' was neuter in gender, indeclinable, at the time the novel was written. However, especially in lower social class usage, it tended to be assimilated to the masculine paradigm, thus nominative 'кофий', dative 'кофий'. It is of interest to note that vacillation between masculine and neuter forms of this noun occurs throughout the novel, and does not indicate individual speech characteristics of the personage. The alternative forms are also used by the author. 'Почтарь' is used instead of the standard form 'почтальон'. The form with the Russian suffix 'арь' is felt to be archaic or country usage. The forms 'Ги́пани́и, ги́панской' instead of the standard 'Испании, испанской' are archaic. These are adaptations of the Latin 'Hispania'; the velar fricative or aspirate is replaced by the voiced velar stop. This process is still productive in loan words, for example: Hitler - 'Гитлер'. The cluster -sp- rendered as - шп- is due to German influence.
German tolerates only (s) not (s) before (p) and (t) initially and at morpheme sutures. Witness also 'Штиль' in Lomonosoff, for example.

Citation 9, p. 16, Vol. 1, Narrator:

---Аполлонъ Аполлоновичъ Аблеуховъ прошествовалъ въ кабинетъ......
Аполлонъ Аполлоновичъ принялъ намѣренье; придать карандашному острую отточенность формы.

The narrator uses a solemn style to describe the senator's trivial actions 'прошествовать' normally collocates with some important procession; it is not expected to describe a person crossing a room in his own home. Likewise, the sophisticated nominal construction of the second phrase to replace, for example, a simple verbal construction 'отчинил карандаш' appears ironical.

Citation 10, p. 16, Vol. 1. Narrator:

---- въ сей мигъ.....

'В сей миг' is an archaic form replacing the standard 'в этот миг'. The root 'сей' appears in the modern language in compounds and fixed expressions, for example, 'сегодня, до этих пор'. As an unbound freely interchangeable morpheme its use is felt to be archaic. The form appears frequently throughout the novel.
Citation 11, p. 16, Vol. 1. Narrator:

----И прошел в столовую откупшивать кофеи свой.

Archaic construction. The expression 'кушать чай' for example, although obsolete in standard usage, is still quite common among the lower social classes; this particular form is further expanded by the affixes 'от' and 'иу'. The narrator uses the form 'кофеи' as contrasted to the servant's 'кофий' that is, the noun has joined the masculine paradigm but the vowel (e) has not been assimilated to a full (i) before yod, although the phonetic difference between (i) and (e) unstressed before yod is minimal; the difference may be only graphic.

Citation 12, p. 18, Vol. 1. Narrator:

----Если сравнить худосочную, совершенно невзрачную фигуру моего почтенного мужа ....

A solemnly formal use of the noun 'муж' (which pluralizes as 'мужи') and not indicating 'husband' but personage. It is not expected to collocate with 'невзрачную фигуру' the feminine suffix -ка having perjorative overtones.

Citation 13, p. 20, Vol. 1. Servant speaking:

----"Пальто сирое-съ?"

The enclitic morpheme -'съ' is a gradually diminished remnant of the original form 'государь - сударь - сударь - съ'. It had
wide distribution in the speech of the servant class.

Citation 14, p. 22. Vol. 1. Senator Ableukhov speaking:

"Просьба и просьба...
Со временем, потом: как-нибудь...
Конверты из массивной бумаги — и
с вензелем, с печатью на сургуче.
"Мм ... Граф Дубльве ... Что такое?..."
"Ммм..."

A passage lacking verbs and composed of adverbs, nouns
and prepositions. Elliptic utterances of this type are
characteristic of interior monologue. The modifying adverb
becomes the single carrier of the verb function.

Citation 15, p. 25. Vol. 1. Narrator:

Она поливала прохожих: и
награждала их гриппами...

The collocation with the verb 'награждать' animates the
pronoun 'она'(which refers to 'изморозь' - also page 25.)
Also the collocation with 'грипп' is unusual. The noun 'грипп'
does not pluralize in standard language.

Citation 16, p. 27. Vol. 1. Narrator:

чтобы представить читателю
местоимение одной драмы.

'Местоимение', a new nominal compound with a deverbativum
as a second element; this is a productive compounding pattern
in Russian cf. 'местоимение, местоположение'. In this context
the expected standard structure would be a noncompounded string:

Noun nominative + Noun genitive = место действия.

Citation 17, p. 27, Vol.1. Narrator:

-----Потом съ неба на землю спустился – грязноватый, черноватосърый Исаакий...

It is not usual for a proper noun with real estate as its established referent to collocate with verb phrases indicating movement and, if it does collocate with movement verbs, the direction is from the ground upward or horizontally towards the speaker. Исаакий, St. Isaac's Cathedral, a familiar term like Питер.

Citation 18, pp. 28/29, Vol.1, Narrator:

-----Вдохновение овладевало душою сенатора, какъ линію Невскаго разрѣзальн лакированный кубъ: тамъ видѣлася домовая нумерация; и шла, циркуляція; тамъ, оттуда – въ ясные дни, издалека – далека, сверкали слѣпительно: золотая игла, облаха, лучъ багровый заката; тамъ, оттуда – въ туманные дни, – ничего, никого.

'Виднѣлась нумерация' 'шла циркуляція' – here the verb collocation with abstract nouns is perceived as unusual; a structure using a concrete noun, for example, 'виделись номера' instead of 'номерация' and 'шла циркуляція (публики)' with
indication of a group noun would appear to be the expected forms. By the use of the abstract nouns the street and the circulating public are, as it were, deprived of their concrete substance.

'Tам оттуда' - is a special case of reduplication of adverbs. In the first instance a pairing of the position adverb is immediately followed by its motion-indicating counterpart - followed in the second instance by a parallel duplicated structure of adverb of place 'издалека-далека' with archaic overtones. Thus a fourfold foregrounding of a place, in this case the island, is established.

'Сверкали слепительно' - the expected form would be 'ослепительно'; the omission of the prefix reestablishes the dominance of the base etymon 'blind'. The prefix form has undergone semantic widening and the etymology is not very vigorous.

Further in the chain: 'луч багровый заката' - the unexpected inversion of 'багровый луч' once again foregrounds a synonym for 'red'. The reduplication of the adverb of place 'там оттуда' is followed by a parallel structure to 'в ясные дни'. The corresponding verbal element is deleted and the passage ends in yet another reduplication, the inanimate pronoun 'ничего' immediately followed by its animate counterpart.
In this poetic insert the concrete noun 'напус' is modified by an adjectival form of the base morpheme 'тень' which, in all its semantic functions, has the connotation of immateriality. By contrast, the abstract noun 'пространство' is modified by an adjective derived from a concrete mass noun 'свинец'. Thus we again have a crossing of the abstract - concrete and material - immaterial categories, which is reinforced by the following metaphorical use of 'moving clouds' for 'islands.'

The hyperbolical statement cast in mathematical terminology is perceived as strange in describing a city. This rests, of course, on the syntactic blend of concrete and abstract categories.
'Обсвистанный' is unusual in this context. The most common use of the participle is, perhaps, the phrase 'обсвистанный публикой'. If the sentence is interpreted as patterned on the standard phrase, it would give the noun 'линия' animate status. The animation is then reinforced by the following utterance: 'Вы - линия! В вас осталась память петровского Петербурга.'

Citation 22, p. 33, Vol.1. Narrator:

-----Онъ думалъ, что жизнь дорожаетъ;, рабочему люду жить трудно, оттуда вонзается Петербургъ и проспектными стрѣлами и ватагой каменныхъ великановъ.

'Вонзается Петербург' is an unusual coupling. 'Вонзается' is normally coupled with sharp pointed weapons, for example: 'кинжал вонзается'; in this passage the instrumental object of the verb is supplied by 'проспектными стрѣлами и ватагой каменныхъ великанов'.

The noun 'великан' is morphologically animate in this utterance. The animation is emphasized by coupling it with 'батара', a collective noun used to indicate groups of animate nouns, for example: 'батара ребят'. This is an obvious animated metaphor for buildings. Thus, the city is endowed with dynamic characteristics and is capable of action.

Citation 23, p. 34, Vol.1. Narrator:

-----Эти павшие листья - для сколькихъ послѣдніе листья: онъ сталъ - синеватая
The metaphorical equation of 'он = синеватая тень'
at the end of a realistic passage is striking. The base 'тень'
is repeated in each of the following sentences and serves as
the linking element for a chain of unexplained paratactic ut-
terances. Thus, schematically, the kernels are:

1. The stranger is a shadow.
2. The island is crowded with shadows.
3. The shadows swarmed over the bridge.
4. The stranger has a shadow.

By these repetitions the stranger is firmly established
as part of the intangible, bodiless phantom 'тени' of the
islands: this is concretized in the last utterance of the
chapter: 'в руке у него начался не то чтобы маленький, все же
не очень большой узелочек.'

Citation 24, p. 34, Vol. I. Narrator:

'Предтекущей' is a neologism formally compounded from the
prefix 'пред' and the participle 'текущая'. The prefix 'пред'
indicates action taking place in front or before something.
As the Academy grammar points out, the prefix occurs so rarely
in the first sense that it cannot be counted as a proper
derivative means, and the connection with the original etymon is, to some extent, lost; witness, for example, 'представить, предложить'. The same applies to the prefix in the new compound 'предносился'. It is of interest to note that the instrumental object 'предтекущей толпой' corresponds to the coupling 'поток теневой' in the following phrase. The base 'текс' appears in adjectival form in the first instance and is repeated as a noun in the second. This repetition of the base morpheme reinforces the perception of the other two base morphemes 'тень' and 'толп' coupled to them as equal. In the modifying clause there is a deviation from the standard word order which would read: 'Спокойно текущая весть мира'.

There is a structural change involving the noun-genitive which normally immediately follows the noun it modifies; here it precedes the clause.

Citation 25, p. 36, Vol. 1. Narrator:

-----Аполлонь Аполлонович, пролетая по Невскому, пролетает за миллиардами верст от людей многоножек....

Here an adjective derived from the personal animate pluralia tantum 'люди' modifies a non-personal animate noun in the singular; this pair is subsequently used figuratively to replace the same noun from which the adjective was derived, that is 'люди'.
Citation 26, p. 37, Vol.1. Apollon Apollonovic speaking:
(attempted joke)

-----"A скажите, похожайта: кто мужь графини?"
"Какой, я позволю спросить?"
"Нет, просто графини?"
"?"
"Графинь".

'Графин - графиня' are presented as a paronymic pair, as if derived from the same etymon and belonging to a phonetic pattern similar to 'колдун - колдунья'.

Citation 27, p. 38, Vol. 1. Narrator:

-----Откуда уставились: ухо, цилиндръ.

Animation of inanimate nouns by collocation with the verb 'уставились'. A catalogue of body parts and clothing items is a frequently used method of portrayal of persons throughout the novel.

Citation 28, p. 38. Vol. 1. Narrator:

-----Пересёкая столбы разговоровъ, ловиль ихь отрывки, и составлялись предложения.

The figurative coupling 'столбы разговоров' is very unusual. The nominative form of the noun 'столбы'dominates the following abstract noun: in the genitive case thus endowing it with a concrete, tangible quality.

Citation 29, p. 38. Vol. 1. Street noise:

-----"Абл... ейка меня ик... исла... тю... попробуй..."
Fragments of utterances represented by unconnected morphemes: The first two syllables of the name 'Аблеухов' followed by unconnected morphemes. Witness that, connected, these read: 'облейка меня кислотою попробуй', an old fashioned method of revenge.

Citation 30, p. 39. Vol. 1. Narrator:

-----Кругомъ зашепталось.

The subject of the verb is missing. This is a structure on the impersonal verb-construction pattern which is possible with some verbs in Russian. These are mainly verbs denoting processes which are independent of an agent, such as, for example, some nature conditions 'смержается'. These are comparable to the English 'it' constructions, for example, 'it is growing dark'. The verb 'шептать' does not belong to this class in Russian and requires an agent in standard language. This structure gives the whispering a uniquely independent status - like that of an act of nature - 'it whispers' analogous to 'it rains', for example.

Citation 31, P.39, Vol.1. Street noise and Narrator:

-----"Пора... право..."
Незнакомець услышал не "право" а "прово" докончилъ же самъ:
"Прово-каць я!".
Провокация загуляла по Невскому.

After the word 'провокация' is foregrounded by separate listing of its constituent syllables, it is concreticized and
animated by collocation with the verb 'загулять'.

Citation 32, p. 39, Vol. 1. Narrator:

-----0, русские люди!
Становитесь вы тенями клуболетящих туманов...

Here the equation of people and shadows repeatedly indicated by syntactic means is explicitly stated, the verb 'становитесь' receives prominence due to the inverted word order. 'Клуболетящий' is a neologism, compound participial in form: клуб + о + летящий.

Citation 33, p. 39, Vol. 1. Narrator:

-----Только тень - молодой человек -
не сорься и не распался оть выстрля,
безпрепятственно совершая пробьт до Невы.

The identification of the young man with the shadow is achieved by apposition structure.

Citation 34, p. 40, Vol.1. Narrator:

-----И компания тошихъ пиджачниковъ начинала визживать.

'Пиджачник', a neologism presumably designating a person who does not own a coat but goes about in a jacket. Derived from 'пиджак' plus stem consonant mutation (к) - (ч) plus suffix -ник. It may be a slang expression and not Belyj's invention. This is a common productive pattern.
Citation 35, p. 40, Vol. 1. Narrator:

----Петербургская улица осенью — пронизывает, и ледяной костный мозг, и щекочет, как ско ро съ нея попадаешь в помѣщеніе, улица въ хищахъ течетъ лихорадкой.

This is a most unusual context for the concrete noun 'улица'; the abstract noun 'болезнь' used, for example, instead of 'улица' would be one accepted choice in this environment.

Citation 36, p. 40, Vol. 1. Narrator:

----Все то испыталъ незнакомецъ, войдя въ запотѣвшую и парную переднюю, туго набитую: черными, синими, сърыми, желтыми полтами, вислоухими шапками; и — всевозможной калошей...

The French loanword 'палльто' is, in standard language, an indeclinable noun, analogous to 'метро, кино, бюро,' However, in colloquial speech 'палльто' has joined the otherwise unproductive neuter noun pattern with accent shift in the plural and singular paradigms; thus 'палльто - полльта' analogous to 'ведро- вёдра - село - сёла'. Witness the morphophonemic change (a) to (o) concomitant with the stress change. 'Всевозможной калошей.' — the feminine concrete noun with the regular plural 'калоши' is used here as a collective singularia tantum noun denoting a plurality by a form of the singular analogous to collectives 'листва, бельё, старыѣ.'

Citation 37, p. 41 Vol. 1. Conversation in a restaurant:

----"Чаво бы нибудь..."
"Дыньки-съ?"
The non standard orthography seems to indicate dialect speech: 'чего - чаво'. However, in standard Russian the phonetic realization of the vowel in the first syllable is (ə) which could equally well derive from the graphic (a) used here. Likewise, the writing of (ч) in the pronominal desinence does not represent a deviant sound. The (r) is merely an old orthographic convention and in this desinence has not represented the velar stop for about the last five hundred years. Therefore, this graphic sample allows no certain conclusion of phonetic deviation. But the deviant orthography would seem to indicate strong 'akanije' and, possibly drawling speech. The same applies to the graphic form of the second occurrence of the adjectival desinence in 'неприличнава'. The only actual phonetic deviation in the passage is indicated by the graphic form 'фрукт' for standard 'фрукт'. This may be an old form still approximating the German velar fricative (ʦ) in 'Frucht'. Final-кт, ӹт are not Slavic clusters and occur, as a rule, in borrowings.

is, perhaps, the most naturalized of the group of words terminating in this cluster.

Citation 38, p. 42, Vol. 1. Conversation in restaurant:

------"Арбузика-съ?"
"Къ шуту арбузики: все только хрустъ на зубахъ; а во рту — хоть бы что..."
"Ну такъ водочки..."
"Не желаете-ль рюмочку?"
Colloquial dialogue marked by a high frequency of diminutives indicating unsophisticated speech. Witness the formal double diminutives 'водочка, рюмочка'; the etymologies of the first-order diminutives are not alive and the forms have independent meaning. Thus 'водка' is not perceived as a derivative of 'вода' any more, and the base etymon 'римка' denotes a wine glass and 'рюмочка' a liqueur glass. The coupling 'праздно потеющий' is somewhat unusual. 'Потеющий' tends to collocate with antonyms of 'праздно'. 'В моем кумпанействе'—the standard expression is 'в моей компании'. The vowel (o) in the first syllable is assimilated to (u) homorganic to the following (m). A standard adjective form 'компанийский' exists and the form used here replaces the adjectival suffix with the abstract nominal suffix 'ство'.

Citation 39, p. 43, Vol. 1. Conversation in the restaurant:

"Шурины та мой у Кистинтина Кистинтиновича кучером...".

'Tа'—is the inserted emphatic morpheme 'ть'. The (o) in the first syllable of 'Константин' is replaced by (i). This is quite a common rendition of this particular name in the lower social strata and, possibly, arises from assimilation of the secondarily-stressed syllable 'Кон' to the primarily-stressed 'тин'.
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Citation 40, p. 45, Vol. 1. Narrator:

"---Невинная мозговая игра
самопроизвольно вновь вдвинулась
в мозг, то-есть, в кучу бумаг
и прошений..."

In this passage the animation of 'мозговая игра'
is reinforced by the adverb 'произвольно' which collocates
with active agents. 'Мозг' and 'куча бумаг' are syntactically
equated by the insert 'то-есть' and the repetition of the
preposition and case.

Citation 41, p. 46. Vol. 1. Narrator:

"---Черепная коробка его
становилась чревом мысленных
образов, воплощавшихся тотчас
же в этот призрачный мир."

'Чрево' - Church Slavonic word, common in religious,
biblical context. 'Воплощаться' - also common in religious
context. The perfective form is used in the Creed 'И
воплотившийся от Духа Свята'. The term is perceived as
strange when collocated with 'в призрачный мир'.

Citation 42, p. 47, Vol. 1. Narrator:

"---Один такой гений (незнакомец
съ черными усиками), возникая, какъ
образъ, уже забылся въ желтоватыхъ пространствахъ...

'Забыться - a neologism structured from prefix
(за-)+ base morpheme (bytij) plus abstract suffix (-stv-) and
the productive verbal suffix (-ova-). The prefix 'за' usually indicates suddenly beginning a brief action, for example 'закричал'; however, the verb 'зачастить' (to begin coming frequently) exists.

Citation 43, p. 47 Vol. 1. Narrator:

-----О прекрасная лестница!
И - ступени: мягкая, какъ.
мозговая извилины....

The exclamations are followed by a most unusual simile.

Citation 44, p. 48, Vol. 1. Narrator:

-----Мелькнувшее мимо (картины, роль, зеркала, перламутр, инкрустация столиковъ) - все, промелькнувшее мимо,
- было одномъ раздражениемъ мозговой оболочки, если не было недомоганиемъ ...
мозжечка.

This is a syntactic equation by the use of the verb 'to be' of a series of concrete nouns with the abstract nouns 'раздражение' and 'недомогание'.

Citation 45, p. 49, Vol. 1. Narrator:

-----За захлопнутой дверью не оказалось гостины, а мозговая пространства: извилины, сърое и болое вещество, шишковидная железа;
а тяжелыя стьны изъ искристыхъ брызгъ (обусловленныхъ приливомъ) - были свинцовымъ и болевымъ ощущенiemъ: затылочной, лобной,
височной и темяныхъ костей.

Here there is an equation of the concrete nominal 'гостиная' by the near-copula verb 'оказалось' with a series of concrete nouns common in medical context. The verb 'оказалось' usually initiates a clause giving a realistic explanation to a
misconception or an unrealistic perception. Here this structure is reversed. The concrete noun 'гостинная', which is in normal environment in the description of the senator's home, is 'explained' by contextually incompatible lexemes of brain physiology. In the following utterance the transformation is taken one step further. The concrete nouns are equated by collocation with the past tense of the verb 'есть' to the abstract noun phrase 'болезненное ощущение'.

Citation 46, p. 49. Vol. 1. Narrator:

-----Петербургская улица обладает одним несомненнейшим свойством: превращают в тени прохожих.

The concrete noun 'улица' is given the status of an active agent by collocation with the verb 'превращать'. This is a kind of figurative animation. This structure is common, for example, in texts describing chemical reaction.

The noun 'тень' and 'прохожий' are equated both syntactically and by overt statement. The word order deviates; in a standard version the utterance would read: 'превращают прохожих в тени'. By the interchange, both of the nouns achieve foregrounding. This passage is, perhaps, the most striking linguistic foregrounding of one of the main themes.

Citation 47, p. 50, Vol. 1. In this passage the Narrator's part is changed to first person account.

-----Лица не успели увидеть, ибо не удивились огромности бородавки, так лицевую...
The technical philosophical terms are felt to be out of context describing the physical qualities of a person's face.

Citation 48, p. 52, Vol. 1. Narrator in dialogue:

"Вдруг" знакомы тебе. Почему же, как ты страсть, ты прачешься при приближении несторатного "вдруг".

Syntactic nominalization of the adverb 'вдруг' by the incorporation of the lexicon form in a sentence, emphasized by the use of the masculine short form adjective 'знаком'.

Citation 49, p. 53, Vol. 1. Narrator in dialogue:

"Оно" кормится мозговой игрой; все гнусности мыслей оно пожирает охотно; и распухает оно - таешь ты, как свеча; "вдруг", откормленный, но невидимый песь....

'Oно', referring to 'вдруг' is repeatedly animated by collocation with 'eating' verbs and reinforced by the introduction of the adverb 'охотно'. In the utterance 'таешь ты как свеча' there is an exchange of verb and nominal positions. 'Вдруг' is again animated by collocation with the participial adjective and by being placed in apposition with the morphologically animate noun 'нек'. Use of 'оно' + eating verbs also suggests something monstrous, for example 'чудовище поедало, кормилося'.
Citation 50. p. 56. Vol. 1. Dialogue in restaurant:

"Истина - истина..."
"Знаю..."
"А коли знаешь, хватай-ка тарелку,
da щь..."

'Естина' - a blend-neologism probably structured from the verb 'есть' (to eat) plus the suffix 'ина' of the preceding word 'истина'. 'Коли' archaism used instead of the modern standard 'если'. It is the same base which appears in 'с/коль/ко'. 'Хватай-ка' an emphatic morpheme common in colloquial speech.

Citation 51. p. 58. Vol. 1. Narrator:

"Съ соседнего столика кто-то, иная, воскликнул:
"Еркало ты, еркало...
Перед ним сидело просто какое-то "мы"...

'Еркало' - a neologism structured on letter name 'ер' as though a verb 'еркать' (like 'тыкать' - to call someone by the familiar 'thou') - existed. There may also be some influence of such nouns as 'кутила, запевала'. Pejorative colouring is imparted by the use of the graphic neuter (о), for example: 'ты - бревно'.

Citation 52. p. 58. Vol. 1. Narrator:

\[ x_4 \quad x_1 \quad x_3 \quad x_2 \]

"Вся спальня огромная занимала кровать; атласное одёяло её покрывало - сь накидками.

The standard word order is shifted. The expected structure is as follows:
A. Phrase structure \( x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 \).

B. Phrase structure \( x_3 + x_4 + x_1 + x_2 \).

The adjectives ' огромная ' and ' атласное ' are foregrounded by removal from their standard position in the sentence.

Citation 53, p. 60, Vol. 1. Narrator:

"-----Движенья его были стремительны, какъ движенья папашы; какъ Аполлонъ Аполлоновичъ, отличался невзрачнымъ росточкомъ...."

'Росточек' the formal double diminutive is treated here as being derived directly from the noun 'рост'. The diminutive 'росток', however, has undergone semantic shifting and is no longer semantically paired with the base form; thus 'росточек' is a diminutive of 'росток', a shoot, (cf. 'кусочек').

Citation 54, p. 61, Vol. 1. Narrator:

"-----Но едва удалось Николаю Аполлоновичу отставить житейскія мелочи и пучину невнятностей, называемыхъ мрому и жизнью, какъ невнятница опять ворвалась."

'Невнятница' - A neologism structured from the base 'невнят' plus the joining morpheme -н- plus the suffix 'ица' which may designate abstract nouns, for example, 'неурядица, бессмыслица'. Note that the suffix 'ица' in these words is highly charged with emotions such as, for example, helplessness.
Citation 55, p. 61, Vol. 1. Narrator:

The pairing 'тело свое' is a change of standard word order where the pronoun preceeds the noun. 'Тело свое пролитым' is an unusual collocation. A usual example would be 'вино пролитое'. The dimunitive of 'голова' has undergone a broad semantic shift, the connection to the base etymon is weak but, in this instance, the weak connection appears to add to the most unusual metaphorical equation.

Citation 56, p. 63, Vol. 1. Narrator:

Note: here 'шпиц' is a commonly established 'pars pro toto'-'шпиц Петропавловской крепости'. It is animated by collocation with the verb 'убегать'. In colloquial usage the sentence would mean 'the Spitz (dog) ran away'.

Citation 57, p. 63, Vol. 1. Narrator:

Personification of rivers is very common and perhaps accepted as part and parcel of standard casual language. However, the coupling 'кричать свистком пароходика'...
is a newly formed adverbial instrumental coupling, especially unusual because of the direct attribution of this particular sound to the Neva.

Citation 58, p. 63, Vol. 1. Narrator:

----Дальше должны были и воспоследовать следствия....

Reduplication of stem morphemes 'следств'- in verb and noun pairing. The verb is a neologism formed by addition to the prefix 'вос' to the verb 'последствовать'. The prefix 'вос' is unproductive and has no parallel in the modern language. It is a bookish form with connotation of solemnity; in some verb forms it has already merged with the base morpheme and is not removable, for instance 'восхищаться'. The basic meaning here is the indication of beginning an action, for example, 'воспламениться'.

Citation 59, p. 68, Vol. 1. Narrator: describing Apollon Ableukhov speaking:

----"Ты ли..."
Он хотел сказать, "знаете ли", но вышло: "знаешь ли... ти ли ..."

The loss of morphemes is here explicitly pointed out.

Citation 60, p. 69, Vol. 1. Footman speaking:

----"Молодые люди бывають, вашество?"
'Bashestvo' - is a curtailed compound from the pairing only the suffix of the second element is retained. This form was quite common among the servant class at the turn of the century. Compare Spanish *usted* from *vuestra merced*.

Citation 61, p. 71. Vol. 1. Narrator:

----Надь, такъ себя,
петербуржки.....

'Петербуржанка' is the more common form; compare to 'гражданка'.

Citation 62, p. 73. Vol. 1. Narrator:

----Надь сырми перилами, надь
кишащей бациллами зеленоватой
водой пролетъли лишь въ сквозняки
приневскаго вѣтра - котелокъ,
трость, пальто, уши, носъ и усы.

Unusual collocation of the verb 'пролетели' which has established figurative uses but is not usually coupled with a catalogue of separate body parts. Variations of this particular structure constitute one of the main motifs of the novel.
In the first chapter of *St. Petersburg* language deviation consists partly of the use of unusual lexical items. These include neologisms, Church Slavonic words, archaisms and items characteristic of specific dialect and social class usages. Neologisms occur in the lexical classes of nouns, verbs and adjectives.

The syntax is marked by frequent elliptic structures, unfinished sentences, repetitions and sentence fragments added to already complete sentences. Syntactic structures of this type are not necessarily perceived as deviant; rather, they are marks of specific types of discourse and are frequently used by almost all authors to render dialogue and interior monologue.

In *St. Petersburg* these structures are also used by the narrator of the novel. In this way the author imparts an informal, intimate character to the narrative. Reduplication, some non-standard use and the use of diminutives are noted. The majority of deviating language structures consists of word-subclass crossings. Most common of these are inanimate nouns treated as animate. Second in frequency are deconcretizations of concrete nouns as well as the reverse, that is, concrete treatment accorded to abstract nouns. The ratio of occurrence is about ten to one for deviant animation in relation to inanimate treatment of animate nouns, and four
to three for deconcretization of abstract nouns.

The labelling: 'concrete', 'animate', abstract' is used loosely and some bases for a more exact, formal classification may be suggested in the concluding part of this study. The counting of occurrences, in itself, demands a theoretical matrix according to which features specific to a subclass are selected. For example, in standard language animation presupposes concreteness, a feature which need not necessarily be adhered to in poetic language.
The second chapter of *St. Petersburg* begins with newspaper excerpts which report mysterious appearances of a red domino. The domino has frightened a lady in a dark doorway. Sofja Petrovna Likhutina is introduced: her appearance, her apartment, her visitors, her husband and Nikolaj Ableukhov, who was best man at her wedding.

A flashback tells of an incident where Sofja Petrovna called Nikolaj Ableukhov a red clown. A stranger pays Nikolaj Ableukhov a visit. The visitor, like the shadow from the islands, carries a smallish, damp bundle, and leaves it with his host. The stranger is introduced to senator Ableukhov as Alexandr Ivanović Dudkin. It is fall. There is unrest in the factories. Dudkin has a visionary experience on the fate of Russia, and his neighbour St'opka tells of prophecies about a new Messiah. 'The sword nears, the Mongol gains the crown, Come O Lord!'

Citation 74, p. 82, Vol. I, Narrator:

-----Софья Петровна Лихутина отличалась чрезмáрной растительностью......

The abstract noun 'растительность' does not collocate with human animate nouns but is standard usage in descriptions of flora. Here it refers to Mme. Likhutina's extraordinarily long hair and her generous forms.
The abstract noun 'пополнение' is unusual in description of the human figure, although the base 'полн-' is common in such context, for example, 'полная дама'. The noun used here is perhaps most commonly used in the coupling: 'пополнение запасов'.

Syntactic equation of a human-animate noun with a chain of inanimate nouns denoting furniture. Witness, in addition, the parallelism of surface derivational patterns: 'в ванной - ванна, в столовой - стол, мужиной - муж'.

The form is used four times in the sentence in which it first appears. The base of this word is explicitly pointed
out 'от слова "фи"'. It is derived by reduplication of the interjection 'фи', truncation of the second vowel and nominalization by addition of the suffix '-ка'. Some Russian hypocoristica are derived on this pattern, for example, 'Вовка' from 'Bo/лода (Владимир).

Citation 78. p. 87. Vol. I. Narrator:

----Посътители Софьи Петровны естественно распадались на двѣ категории: на категорию свѣтскихъ гостей и на гостей такъ сказать.

The fixed expression 'так сказать' here appears in adjectival function which is not too common but it is, nevertheless, used as a 'cover word' in colloquial Russian. The expression is repeated three times in the paragraph.

Citation 79. p. 87. Vol. 1. Narrator:

----"Революція - эволюція". И опять: "Революція - эволюція;" то была ни золотая, ни даже серебряная, а мѣдная, бѣдная молодежь.....

The rhyming nouns 'революція - эволюція' are fixed into a single unit, and are used from now on in this way throughout the novel. The coupling 'мѣдная молодежь' is coined on the pattern 'золотая молодежь' which is an established pairing. The expression 'учился на мѣдные деньги', seems to have been established usage, referring to poor students and may have influenced the coupling.
Citation 80. p. 88. Vol. 1. Narrator:

-----Можно было без риску ей познакомить.....

Witness the /м/ genitive in a comparatively recent loanword.

Citation 81. p. 89. Vol. 1. Narrator:

-----Свѣтсіе люди его называли армейчиком.....

'Армейчик' a neologism structured from the adjective base 'армей-' plus the suffix '-чик'. The adjective 'армейский' can be used as a noun analogous to 'полицейский' but the usage is not fully established. The suffix '-чик' is a productive means of derivation, for example, 'аппаратчик, политпросветчик'.

Citation 82. p. 90. Vol. 1. Narrator:

-----Был еще посѣтитель: хохоль-
малороссъ Прилппанченко, или просто Липпанченко;.....

'Хохол' is a pejorative term denoting a Ukrainian. It is a pars pro toto figure, deriving from the traditional Cossack haircut, with only one long tuft left on a shaven head. The explicit derivation of the curtailed form of the surname 'Липпанченко' foregrounds the base morpheme
'лип - прилип - прилипать' - to stick (to). The suffix is a very common ending for Ukrainian surnames. Names of persons derived from characterizing base morphemes have a long tradition in Russian literature.

Citation 83, p. 90, Vol. 1. Narrator:

-----Звалъ Софья Петровну не ангеломъ, а ... душканомь...

'Душкан' - a neologism, structured from the base 'душ-' plus the diminutive suffix '-ка' plus the expressive suffix '-ан'. The suffix has limited productivity and is used to derive human animate nouns, usually from bases indicating a quality or characteristic, for example, 'пузан, губан, политикан'.

Citation 84, p. 91. Vol. L. Narrator:

-----Еще въ первый день 'дамства', когда Николай Аполлонович держалъ надъ Сергеемъ Сергеевичемъ высокоторжественный венецъ.....

'Дамства'-neologism structured from the base 'дам-' with the bookish collective suffix '-ство'. The coupling 'высокоторжественный венец' is perceived as somewhat unusual. This adjective, as a rule, does not collocate with concrete nouns. 'Высокоторжественный день' or 'прием' are examples of standard pairings.
The derivation of the two following neologisms may be only speculated upon. The first syllable 'бран-' could be a curtailment of the German form "Brand" which is very common in compound loanwords, for example, 'брандмауэр, брандвахта, брандмауер' thus suggesting fire. The element 'кук-' may derive from 'кукла' which appears in the surrounding context. In that case, it is an unusual abbreviation with the truncation of a liquid cluster in the second element. The liquid is normally preserved in Russian abbreviations, thus 'кукл-' would be the expected fragment. '-ан' and '-ашка' are common suffixes. '-ан' has limited productivity whereas '-ашка' is not productive in modern Russian.

'Bибабо' is a Japanese doll. Separately the syllables are commonly used in elementary Japanese language teaching.

This is an unusual coupling. 'Прокуренная комната', 'прокуренный голос' are examples of standard couplings.
'Мокрому' - is a deviant structure. The expected form in this context would be 'намокшему', a participal form from the verb 'мокнуть'. The form used here is, as it were, obtained from an intransitive verb 'мокреть', derived from the noun 'мокрота'; however, the verb form does not exist, although noun-verb pairings on this or similar patterns are common, for instance, 'свет - светлеть, тусклость - тускнеть.' It is interesting to note that a standard adjective 'мокрый' is available, the deviant form is also functionally and morphologically an adjective, based on what amounts to a deep-structure verbal element.

The pairing 'халат продолжается' is unusual. The verb usually collocates with abstract nouns as 'музыка', 'шум'. Nouns denoting space like 'улица', 'лес', 'сад' may also collocate with this verb, which is, however, unexpected when paired with a garment.
The antonymic elements 'autumn' and 'spring' are foregrounded by the sudden switch to the politically figurative use of 'весна'. Although this type of figurative use is thoroughly established, the juxtaposition with the preceding pastoral autumn imagery achieves foregrounding. Retrospectively, the context of autumn takes on figurative political connotations as well. These are, perhaps, anticipated by the somewhat unusual figurative coupling 'ядовитый октябрь'. A usual coupling with a concrete noun is 'ядовитый гриб'. Figurative use is also established: 'ядовитое письмо', 'ядовитая насмешка'. Witness too the synonyms for red: 'багрец', 'желто-красный'. These are repeated in political context in the following paragraph, for example, 'обагренной Маньчжурии'. 'Мерзлой поступь' is another unusual collocation which concreticizes the noun 'поступь'.

Citation 91. p. 108. Vol. 1. Narrator:

-----Сыпавал ли ты октябревскую эту пьесну....
The regular adjectival derivation is 'октябрьская' without the inserted 'ев' morpheme. However, similar derived forms, including the morpheme, are common for instance: 'Мифистофелевский' 'Николаевский', usually on animate noun bases. The pronoun 'эту' usually precedes the adjective in casual structures, thus 'эту октябрьскую песню' would be the expected form.

Citation 92, p. 109. Vol. 1. Narrator:

----Аполлонъ Аполлоновичъ Аблиуховъ за городскою стѣною засѣлъ много лѣтъ, ненавидя уѣздныя сиротливья дали, дымокъ деревенекъ; и — галку.....

The singular form 'галку' in the environment of plural nouns is used here as a collective abstract term denoting the entire species. The singular form of the noun 'птица' is used in this way in standard language.

Citation 93, p. 109. Vol. 1. Narrator:

----Неизмеримости летѣли на встрѣчу.
Русь, Русь!

The expression 'летѣть на встрѣчу' is commonly used with animate nouns and occasionally with reference to landscape seen from a moving train or free moving objects swept towards one by the wind. It is somewhat strange collocated with the plural abstract noun 'неизмеримости'. The use of the archaic form 'Русь' reinforces the foregrounding. This passage is a recurring motif in the novel.
Citation 94. p. 117. Vol. 1. Narrator:

-----Отъ гирляндскаго потолка....

This is a neologism structured from the noun 'гирлянда' plus the adjective suffix '-ский'. The suffix is especially productive on foreign and Slavic bases alike, for example, 'Московский' 'солдатский'. The expected form here would be a nominal structure, for instance, 'потолок в гирляндах'.

Citation 95. p. 118. Vol. 1. Narrator:

-----Изъ льпного плодового круга спускалась стекляшками люстра,... и дрожала хрусталиками.

Usually the verb 'спускаться' collocates with an adverb such as 'ошупью' or appears in such constructions as 'волосы спускались'. 'Дрожать' sometimes appears with 'мелкой дрожью.' 'Плодоватого' a new adjective similar to 'розоватый'. The regular adjective formed from this base is 'плодовитый' - fruitful. The expected construction would be 'изъ круга льпных плодов'.

Citation 96. p. 119. Vol. 1. Narrator:

-----Татары, японцы или восточные человкки....

The noun 'человек' pluralizes by the heteroclytic 'люди'. Here it is treated as belonging to the regular pattern 'мальчик - мальчики'.
"Енфраншиш" - is a neologism which does not permit any kind of speculation regarding its constituent morphemes. It is an anagram of the name of a character appearing in the second part of the novel. ' Каковское' replaces the expected pronoun 'какое'. The form is common in country usage, and the expression 'по каковски' is generally current.

The standard genitive of the pluralia tantum noun ' обои' is ' обоев', compare ' герои' (Nominative singular) with ' героев' (Genitive plural).

An unlikely pairing of the lexical items ' череп' and ' уши'.

"Что вы сделал съ мышкой?" "Повыпускали на набережную..."
The expected verb form would be 'вымустили', since it answers the perfective verb 'сделали' in the preceding question. The additional prefix 'по-' is non-standard for a single action.

Citation 101. p. 127. Vol. 1. Narrator:

----Къ мрачному зданію съ багрянующимъ верхомъ.......

The participle 'багрянующий' is unusual paired with 'здание' and 'верхом'. The most common pairing is 'багрянующие листья'.

Citation 102. p. 127. Vol. 1. Narrator:

----Отъ мъчанина Ивана Ивановича Иванова, отъ супруги, Иванихи....

The derivation of a feminine surname with the feminine suffix '-иха' is not standard but it is encountered in country usage.

Citation 103. p. 127. Vol. 1. Narrator:

----Въ съренькомъ пальцео.......

The form 'пальцео', like the indeclinable base form 'пальто' is not declined here despite its expansion with the Russian suffix, which could readily take desinential endings.
This passage is marked by a series of repetitions: the triple repetition of 'тел' followed by a fourfold variation of the base '-гнут-'. The verb 'обсеть' is most commonly used with insects, for example, 'мухи обсели'. The new verb 'обстали' is structured on the same pattern. Note also the juxtaposition of 'тела' to 'шафранная муть', which is a synonymic variation of the recurring motif 'тень = человек'. 'Шафран' usually collocates with 'крендель'.

In current Russian usage the coupling 'Всадниково лицо' would be rendered in a nominal construction 'лицо всадника'. The capitalization emphasizes that the referent is 'Медный всадник', the statue of Peter the Great. The form belongs to a group of now rapidly disappearing possessive adjectives for example, 'отцово ружье'.
The standard adjective derived from 'день' is 'дневное'. However, the compound form 'полуденный' exists and 'денно и нощно' is a popular phrase for 'day and night'.

Citation 107. p. 130. Vol. 1. Narrator:

-----Самые горы обрушатся от велкаго труса.....

'Tрус', repeated twice in the passage, is an archaic Slavonic form: 'землетрясение' is standard modern usage.

Citation 108. p. 131. Vol. 1. Narrator:

-----Земнородный существа вновь опустятся къ дну океановъ - въ прародимые, въ давно забытые хаосы...

'Прародимые' is a neologism formed analogously to 'прадед, прародители'. The adjective 'родимый' is standard.

Citation 109. p. 133. Vol. 1. Narrator:

-----И мазалась ядовитая гарь; и на гари щетинились трубы; труба поднималась высоко; она - присѣдала.....

'Mазалась гарь' is an unusual coupling: the reflexive verb normally collocates with nouns which are replaceable by the noun 'мазь'. Thus 'гарь' is given a substantial quality which is reinforced in the following clause in a very similar manner by the coupling with the verb 'щетинились'.
Citation 110, p. 134, Vol. 1. Shoemaker speaking:

-----"Это все оттого, что у нихь
п'ять понят'евъ" .......

In standard usage the genitive plural of this word is formed with a zero ending: 'понятия'. The deviant form is repeatedly used in the following paragraph. It is the general pattern of the substantive paradigm that nouns which have a real desinence in the Nominative Singular have the bare stem as the Genitive Plural form. There are few exceptions to this pattern. Nouns with bare stems in the Nominative Singular take a real desinence in the Genitive Plural, thus: 'гений' - 'генієв'.

Citation 111, p. 134, Vol. 1. Narrator paraphrasing St'opka's speech.

-----И что у мудреньых людеи выходило:
они на сел' возв'яшали рожнье дитяти,
аслапаженье всеобщее; скоро, моль,
обудется.

'Аслапаждение' is an approximation to the abstract noun 'освобождение'. There is no obvious phonetic reason for the replacement of intervocalic /sv/ by /sl/ or /b/ by /p/. In St'opka's speech this replacement is encountered only in this word.

It seems that in this instance Belyj introduces comic relief by indicating the speaker's lack of comprehension of this subject
matter by obscuring the common Russian component morphemes. 'Мол' is a quite commonly used insert in country usage; it is a curtailed form of the now archaic verb 'молвить', and is used to indicate reported thought or speech, somewhat comparable to the modern impersonal use of the third person Plural 'говорят'.

Citation 112. p. 134. Vol. 1. Narrator reporting St'opka's speech;

-----Что на колпинской фабрикъ получали они цидули.....

'Записки' would be the normal modern usage instead of 'цидули', which may derive from German 'Zettel'. Intervocalic 't' is not consistently voiced in loan word adaptations but it does occur sporadically. Compare, for example, the Latvian adaptation of this form 'Cedele! Intervocalic geminated / t / is voiced in some varieties in German; / i / alternation in unstressed position is common. The final German diminutive morpheme / el / may be Volksetymologized to the Slavic suffix '-уля' which is not too common in Russian. Vinogradov (page 131) classifies it as a hypocoristic diminutive, compare 'капризуля, актрусяля'. In dialects the slightly pejorative form 'писуля' (letter) is found. It appears later in the passage.
Citation 113. p. 135. Vol. 1. Songs sung by St'opka:

-----Ты не трошь питушка:
Воть тибъ манета.
- - - - - - - - - -
Надъ саблазнамъ да надъ бидою
Андель сталъ са златой трубой -
Свѧте, Свѧте.
Безсмѣртный Свѧте!
Асѣни насъ безсмѣртный Свѧте -
Предъ Табою мы, ровно дѣти:
Ты - Еси
На Небеси!

In St'opka's song the standard form 'ангел' is rendered as 'андел'; this is a progressive assimilation of the foreign cluster [ŋ]. Russian does not have the [ŋ] sound and in some standard borrowings it is rendered as the dental 'н', the following voiced velar stop is then replaced by its dental counterpart. Compare the standard form 'Kringel' (German) - 'крендель' (Russian). 'Златой' is a Church Slavonic form used instead of the modern plenophonic form 'золото'. 'Еси'-Church Slavonic second person singular of the verb 'быть' (иже еси на небеси'- Lord's Prayer). Also note the graphic representation of 'аканије' and 'иқаније'.

Citation 114. p. 136. Vol. 1. St'opka speaking:

-----"А Левъ Николаевичъ - книжечку его изволили читать? - ефто самое говорить".

'Изволили' is an archaic form now surviving only in exaggeratedly-polite or sarcastic speech. 'Читать' now survives mainly in emotionally significant negative
expressions similar to 'не видывал' - for example, 'таких книг мы раньше не читывали'.

Citation 115, p. 136, Vol. 1. St'opka speaking:

"Про японца такъ водится: про японца всѣ знают... Изволите помнить: ураганъ-то вотъ надъ Москвою прошелъ; сказывали — какъ моль, что моль; души моль убіенныхъ; съ того, значитъ, свѣта; безъ покаянія, значитъ; и значитъ: быть бунту".

'Японца' collective use of the singular. The forms 'монгол, китаец' are used in the same manner throughout the novel. Compare Lermontov's 'Бородино': "Скажи-ка дядя, ведь не даром Москва, спаленная пожаром французы отдане..." Repeated use of 'изволите' (see above). Triple repetition of the inserts 'моль' (see above) and 'значит' here, except for the last occurrence: reduced from its full meaning of 'that is to say'.

Citation 116, p. 137, Vol. 1. No clear indication of speaker, but presumably it is St'opka:

"Перво-на-перво убіенія; апосля — всеопчее недовольство: апосля же болѣни всякия — морь, голодъ; ну тамъ, говорять, умишліе люди — волненія: китаец встанетъ на себя самого: мухамедане взволняются; только етта не выйдетъ". "Все прочее соберется къ исходу ------- Одно пророчество есть: воньемъ де ... на насъ де клинок... во что вѣнецъ японцу: и потомъ — рождение строка новаго. И еще: у анпиратора прусскава, моль ... ------- Ей, гряди, Господи!"
'Убиенных' - is a Church Slavonic form for 'убитых'.

'Апосля' is a graphic representation of the pairing 'а после', with probable indication of 'акание'. 'Мухамедане' the standard modern form is 'магометане': the velar stop in St'opka's speech is replaced by the corresponding fricative and the voiceless dental by its voiced counterpart. This may represent a more archaic form closer to West European usage, 'Mohammed'.

'Етта' which is quite common in country usage, replaces the standard 'это'. 'Вонжем' is a Church Slavonic form 'let us hear' and is part of the Liturgy.

'Де', a curtailed form from the archaic 'дескаль'. 'Отрок' an archaic form, not deviant in a context referring to an awaited Messiah.

The standard form 'императора' is replaced by 'анператор'. The initial French nasalized vowel is replaced by /а/ plus /э/. The graphic (и) replacing (е) does not reflect a phonetic change in pretonic position.

'Гряди' is a Church Slavonic form which is rare as a finite verb form in modern Russian: however, the participle 'грядущий' is used. The remainder of deviations occurring here have been explained in previous explications of dialect usage.
Nominal neologisms are the predominant type of unusual language structures in the second chapter of *St. Petersburg*. This type of deviation occurs in a two to one ratio to the combined group of archaisms and Church Slavonic forms. A small number of neologisms are adjectives and verbs in about equal proportion. In this chapter there is a large number of dialect items. Many of them arise from phonetic deviation of standard forms. Most of the dialect features occur in the speech of St'opka and his friends, although there are some in the language of the Narrator. As in the first chapter, the most frequent syntactic deviation feature is animation. The ratio of inanimate nouns treated as animate to the reverse is two to one, but both types occur only about half as frequently as in the first chapter.

Concreticizing versus deconcreticizing treatment stands in a ratio of two to one. Combined, these two types of deviance have about the same frequency of occurrence as deviant animation. In the same ratio, in this chapter, occur forms which are standard per se but are used in extremely deviant context. Numerous synesthetic references belong to this group. Nouns, verbs and adjectives are used in this way. As in the first chapter, there are numerous occurrences of reduplicated forms. Deviations in phrase structure consist of scattered instances of reversed subject and object positions, post-positioned adjectives and demonstrative pronouns.
The informal style of dialogue and narrative, marked by elliptic sentence structure, is maintained.
In the following chapter the relationship between Nikolaj and Apollon Ableukhov is described. Nikolaj Ableukhov concludes that his father is a scoundrel. The senator goes to parade—a spectacular event performed by little old men in splendid uniforms.

The revolutionary Varvara Jevgrafovna leaves a letter with Sofja Petrovna. This letter is to be given to Nikolaj Ableukhov at a masquerade. On the envelope Sofja Petrovna recognizes Lippančenko's handwriting. Sergej Likhut' in forbids his wife to attend the masked ball. Senator Ableukhov falls asleep: states of consciousness between waking and sleep are described. The senator has a dream in which the 'Mongol' has the features of his son Nikolaj.

Citation 117. p. 141. Vol. 1. Narrator:

----- И по этому поводу въ упомянутомъ мѣстѣ явились въ расшитыхъ мундирахъ и, такъ сказать, - оказались на мѣстѣ...

This is a most unusual elliptic sentence lacking a subject: 'Who appeared?' In this way, a lack of content to the splendid outer shell is foregrounded.
The adjective 'чрезвычайный' collocates most commonly with nouns derived from adjectives and which, therefore, are intrinsically comparable, for example 'чрезвычайная глупость'. Pairings like 'чрезвычайный советник' and 'чрезвычайная комиссия' also presuppose a comparable series. The adjective is perceived as unusual paired with 'утро'; 'особенное утро' is a possible collocation in this context.

The noun 'крухмал' is used here instead of the standard pairing 'крухмальная рубашка'. The stiffness is further emphasized by collocation with the verb 'затянулся' which is part of the common expression 'затянулся в корсет'. 'Омовение' is a Church Slavonic form; it is used to refer to the washing of disciples' feet by Christ.
Citation 120. p. 144. Vol. 1. Narrator:

The variety of beards and chests decked with medals is used as a 'pars pro toto' figure to indicate government dignitaries. 'Златогрудая кучечка' is an inanimate metaphor used to describe the dignitaries. 'Златогрудая' is a neologism patterned on the model 'белогрудая (женщина)'. To enhance the effect of dignity the Slavonic form 'злато' is used in the compound rather than the plenophonic Russian 'золото'. Compounds with 'злато' are common in old Church Slavonic, for example, 'златоуст' referring to John Chrysostomos.

Citation 121. p. 146. Vol. 1. Narrator:

This is a synesthetic coupling of auditory and optical imagery within a single syntactic unit.
The reflexive verb 'багрился' is perceived as unusual collocated with buildings. In standard usage it is commonly paired with plants, for example: 'леc багрился'.

This is an unusual synesthetic collocation; the new compound colour adjective 'светлобагровом' modifies the noun 'удар' (usually modified by an adjective like 'сильный') subsequently modified by the noun phrase 'последних лучей'.

'Кипарисовым кулаком' is a non-standard coupling. The expression 'железным кулаком' is common, but Belyj uses wood-imagery to refer to Likhut'in.
A new word 'вдавлины' is used here where standard language expects, for example, 'углубления' or 'трешин'. The neologism is derived from the verbal stem 'вдавливать' analogous to 'впадать - впадины'.

The new adjective 'умопостигаемый' here replaces a standard nominal pairing 'уму достигаемый'. The negative counterpart of the adjective 'уму не достигаемый' is part of the standard language.

The pairing is somewhat unusual; the verb 'тяжелеть' lends the abstract noun a concrete quality. Compare, for example, the standard pairing 'белё (намокая) тяжелет'. However, the verb has established figurative uses as, for
example, in the impersonal construction 'тяжелее на душе'.

Citation 128. p. 163. Vol. 1. Narrator:

----- Набережная была пуста;
проходила тьма полицейского,
вычерняясь в туман и опять
расплываясь; пропадали в туман
занесенные здания; Петропавловский
шпиц бросил вылеска...

'Вычерняясь' is a new reflexive gerund form. The coupling 'чернея в тумане' would be standard in this context. The prefix 'вы' is added analogously to such standard forms as 'выкрасить'. 'Шпиц бросил вылеск' replaces standard verbal couplings as, for example, 'шпиц засветел' or 'блеснул'. In the nominalized form 'вылеск', the prefix indicates action progressing outward.

Citation 129. p. 164. Vol. 1. Narrator:

----- Татамъ: тамъ, тамъ...

The onomatopoetic form 'татам', approximating a bugle call or signal drum, is interpreted as if derived by merging from the reduplicated adverb of place 'там'. This structure and variations of it are repeated in the text of the following passages.
This is perceived as a somewhat unusual collocation, although the form 'теня' may be treated as an animate noun, even morphologically, in standard language; but shadows are not, as a rule, endowed with the ability to speak.

The first name 'Николай' is not declined to indicate the animate Accusative; this is not uncommon in colloquial Russian.

The equation of the 'Mongol' to the senator's son is repeated twice.
The verb 'воздать' is common in religious context, for example, 'воздать глаза к небу'. The positions of the subject and verb are inverted. The noun 'зрачки' is expanded to 'пространство зрачков своих' where it appears as a genitive noun modifying 'пространство'. The pronoun 'свои' precedes the noun it modifies in standard language. 'Телесность' is a new abstract noun formed from the Slavonic stem (teles) - plus the abstract suffix 'ность'. The negative counterpart of the noun is established in religious context, for example, 'бестелесность'.

Here the adjective form 'скверный' is functioning as a noun. Elliptic structures, where the adjective is the sole carrier of the nominal function, are common in Russian and are also, to some extent, productive. Compare, for
example, 'искоаемое' 'содержимое'. Here a noun such as 'скверность' would probably be acceptable. The form used here may also be an adaptation of the Church Slavonic 'скверна' - filth.

The foregoing chapter contains lengthy passages describing the senator's sensations before falling asleep, and his dreams. These passages are rich in metaphorical equations of concrete nouns and nouns referring to sensory states, synesthetic references and a great variety of strange similes. But since they seem to be perceived as acceptable because there is clear indication in the text that they describe a state between waking and sleep, or else a dream, they do not appear in the citations. This fact affects the qualitative relationships of the deviant forms but conforms to the native speaker's perception of what is acceptable. Syntactic animation of inanimate nouns is again the most frequent type of deviation and is found in a two to one ratio to inanimate nouns referring to animate nouns. The majority of the latter are 'pars pro toto' structures used to indicate persons. About the same number of combined occurrences of concretizations of abstract nouns and vegetative treatment afforded to concrete - non-vegetative nouns was found.
Neologisms are in approximately one to one ratio with syntactic animations. Most of the neologisms are nouns and adjectives in about equal proportion, but there is a small number of verbal structures. In the same ratio stand a variety of standard forms employed in unusual contexts. About half of these are synesthetic references.
Anna Petrovna Ableukhova, the senator's wife returns to St. Petersburg. The masquerade takes place. Senator Ableukhov attends. Sofja Petrovna, dressed as Mme. Pompadour, hands the letter over to Nikolaj Ableukhov. Nikolaj lifts his mask in order to read the letter and is generally recognized as the 'Red Domino'. A man tells senator Ableukhov of the 'Red Domino's' identity. In the letter, Nikolaj Ableukhov is asked to eliminate his father. He thinks of the smallish damp bundle, which Dudkin left with him. A man takes Nikolaj Ableukhov to a restaurant. Voronkov, alias Morkovin, informs the senator of the plan to assassinate him. Sergej Likhut'in attempts to commit suicide but fails.

Citation 134. p. 191. Vol. Narrator:

----- Хмурился летний сад...

Personification of 'летний сад' is achieved by coupling it with the verb 'хмуриться'.

Citation 135. p. 192. Vol. 1. Narrator:

----- И поздними временами, подъ фигурною позой Иреляевской статуи, простирающейся персты въ вечерней день раздавались шопоты, вздохи, блистали бурмитска верны гуляющихъ фрейлинъ...
'Брумитские зерна' used to be a common expression with reference to Burmese pearls, which had the reputation of being of the best quality.

Citation 136. p. 195. Vol. 1. Narrator:

"----- будто из тъхъ вонь деревьевъ нахмуренность трепетно озарится зеленоватымъ огнемъ...

'нахмуренность' is a new abstract noun formed from the adjective stem 'нахмуренный' plus the abstract suffix 'ность'.

Citation 137. p. 198. Vol. 1. Narrator:

"----- Надъ Невою съжало огромное и багровое солнце; и петербургскія зданія будто затаяли, обращаясь въ легчайшія, ametistоводяная кружево; а отъ стеколъ прорываляся златои фаменный блескъ; и отъ шпицевъ высокихъ рубился блескъ; и уступы, и выступы - усажали въ горячую пламенность: каріатиды, карнизы кирпичныхъ балконовъ...

'бежало солнце' - is a coupling which effects animation of the noun 'солнце' but which is hardly perceived as non-standard because pairings of the 'sun' with going-verbs are well established. The comparison of buildings to lace is felt to be unusual even though the comparison is introduced in a conditional phrase. The conditional effect is weakened by the second verb form, a gerund of the near
copula verb 'обращаться'. 'Аметистоводымный' is a new compound adjective, replacing here a standard nominal construction, as, for example, 'аметистоводымчатого цвета'. 'Златопламенный'—a new compound adjective (see Citation 113 for first component). The verb 'прорезался'—cutting through, is perceived as strange in collocation with 'отолек'—note the clash of the prefixes of the two forms 'про-' and 'от-'. 'Рубинился' is a new verb derived from the noun 'рубин'. Here it replaces a nominal structure as, for example, 'горел как рубин'. 'Пламенность' is a new noun formed from the adjective base 'пламен-' plus the abstract suffix 'ность'.

Citation 138. p. 198. Vol. 1. Narrator:

----- Кровавился рыже красный дворец...

'Кровавился' is a new verb form derived from the base of the adjective 'кровавый'. 'Рыже красный' is a new compound adjective formed on the productive pattern of double colour adjectives, that is: base morpheme of the first element plus joining morpheme '-о-' and full adjective form of the second element. The new compound is used twice in the paragraph.
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Citation 139. p. 199. Vol. 1. Narrator:

----- Отемнялась медленно
вереница изъ линий и стьнъ на
сиреневомъ погасающемъ небѣ...

Structured by addition of the prefix 'о-' and the
reflexive particle. 'Темнѣло' is the standard verbal
form derived from this base.

Citation 140. p. 199. Vol. 1. Narrator:

----- зарѣло тамъ прошлое...

'Зарѣло' is a new verb derived from the noun 'заря',
analogous to the productive adjective-verb derivational
pairings, for example 'красный - краснѣть'.

Citation 141. p. 200. Vol. 1. Footman speaking:

----- 'Какими судьбами?
Аткелева?'...

'Аткелева' replaces the standard 'откуда'. It is
a cognate to the forms 'отсель/отселе' (hence). 'Откудова'
and 'скелова' are quite common in country usage.
Citation 142. p. 202. Vol. 1. Narrator:

----- размахались пушистыми вёрами на экономку, на горничную, на гостяющего Земского д'ятеля мастодонтообразных разм ровь...

'Mастодонтообразных' a new compound adjective formed on a productive pattern: Noun base\textsuperscript{1} plus joining morpheme (-o-) plus Noun base\textsuperscript{2} plus adjectival desinence.

Citation 143. p. 203. Vol. 1. Narrator:

----- и громозвучный аккорд: сотрясть стьны...

'Громозвучный' is a new adjective structured on the same pattern as the neologism in the previous citation. Here it replaces the kernel: 'аккорд звучит как гром'.

Citation 144. p. 203. Vol. 1. Narrator:

----- Николай Петрович Цукатовъ, растопыривалъ пальцами серебристое кружево бакъ...

A metaphorical equation of the nouns 'бак' (an abbreviation of 'бакенсов/бакенсбард') and 'кружево' is achieved by the genitive structure.
This passage may be called: variations on the theme 'танцовать'. The base appears at first in the fairly established figurative coupling 'протанцовывать жизнь'.

In the pairing 'дотанцовал жизнь' the base can be thought of as replacing the stem 'живать' of the standard pairing 'доживать жизнь'. The prefix 'до-' indicates completion of a norm or the attainment of a goal. 'Всему вытанцовывалось' is a fairly established figurative use of the verb comparable to 'дело вытанцовывалось'. Reflexive verb forms prefixed with 'вы-' are vigorously productive in contemporary Russian. The form 'наташовались' patterns on the form 'намились'.

'Отплясывать' is, in this passage, the single occurrence of a synonymous form to 'танцовать'. The productive
prefix 'ot-' here implies 'to get something from somebody', comparable to, for example: 'отвоевать'. In the string 'протанцował он имя' the form 'протанцовал' is used analogously to, for example: 'пропивать имя'. Structures of this type furnish a splendid example of how ambiguous linear concatenated morpheme analysis may be. Comparing the two occurrences of 'протанцовать', the surface structure is identical, and differences may be found only in the deep structure. It would be possible to substitute two standard expressions with like surface structures 'прожить жизнь' and 'пропить имя'. Only the deep structure reveals the contrast: 'he lives his life' and the two kernels: 1. he drinks; 2. the estate pays for it.

Citation 146. p. 205. Vol. 1. Narrator:

---- И пока ее мужъ заплетал контредансь, въ безразлично радушной гостиной оплеталась не разъ конькюнктура...

The verb form 'заплетать' unlike its reflexive counterpart, has no established figurative uses; thus we have, literally, 'to braid a dance'.
The verb 'отвалилась' is unusual in this context. It would be standard usage in a sentence such as: 'от проказы у него отвалился нос'.

'Cветоч' is an archaic form referring to a lamp or light.

'Упал в пляску' is an unusual collocation. The verb followed by the preposition 'в' usually collocates with definite descriptions of place as, for example, 'упасть в воду'.
The verb 'бодать' does not collocate with nouns denoting humans but with nouns denoting animals: thus, 'коza бодается' is a standard coupling. Further, the recipient object of the action expressed by the verb is expected to be a concrete noun not an abstraction like, 'пространство'.

In the standard word order the instrumental phrase 'c подбородком' would precede the verb form 'падающим'. However, the verb in this context need not necessarily be followed by an accusative of place. The addition appears as an after-thought following a sentence which is complete in itself. This heightens the comic effect. Structures of this type are a mark of informal narrative and are frequent in this novel; as a rule they are not perceived as deviant.
The double diminutive 'фигурочка' is not common and is especially unusual with pejorative overtones as a reference to a noun-human, that is, to Apollon Apollonovich. The indefinite adverbial expression, 'где-то там', which is reduplicated, and repeated again further in the passage, serves as a link to the motifs of 'islands' and the 'immensity of Russia'; the impending event is still undefined and far away.

The noun 'хребет' does not, as a rule, collocate with nouns-human, but is commonly used with reference to animals. 'Спина' is the corresponding form used with nouns-human. 'Заплясал коком' is a deviating adverbial instrumental construction. 'Рулады льющие пальцы'—in
this chain the form 'пальцы' is animated by collocation with the participle 'льющие'. The nouns 'дискант' and 'бас' are animated by being paired to the verb forms 'пустился' and 'тронулся'.

Citation 154. p. 215. Vol. 1. Narrator:

----- Изъ выръзаннаго корсажа, дыша, притуманились груди, изъ узкихъ рукавчиковъ зыбились валансьенные кружева; вокругъ вырыва, ниже вырыва - кружева эти зыбились...

'Притуманились' is a new prefixed verb form. The 'при' indicates 'a slight degree' therefore 'lightly shrouded, covered', analogous to 'прикрылись'. Note also the natural phenomena type verb-bases 'туман'; 'эхо'. The coupling 'зыбились кружева' is repeated with variations twice in the passage. The second time it appears with deviant word order:'кружева эти зыбились' < x1+x2+x3 >

Citation 155. p. 216. Vol. 1. Narrator:

----- Что то въдьмовское...

The adjective is a deviant structure derived with the masculine possessive affix 'об-' added to a feminine base which would regularly be combined with the corresponding
feminine morpheme '-ин-' thus, according to the regular pattern, the word should be 'вёдminsterское'.

*Citation* 156. p. 218. *Vol. 1. Narrator*:

----- схватили всъ тонкие тали гелиотроповых, гридеперлевых, шелестящих танцорок...

'Гридеперлевый' is a French loan word - 'pearl grey' with the added Russian adjective ending '-ый' comparable to the common form 'бежевый'.

*Citation* 157. p. 224. *Vol. 1. Narrator*:

.----- выясняясь туманно изъ хлопьевъ табачного синеватаго дыма...

'Хлопьевъ дыма' is an irregular pairing replacing a more standard pairing 'клубь дыма'.

*Citation* 158. p. 231. *Vol. 1. Narrator*:

.----- Ужъ они проходили въ передний: невыразимое окружало ихъ: невыразимое туть стояло вокруг...

This is an elliptic nominalization of the neuter adjective 'невыразимое' which appears alone without a nominal. Furthermore, it is concreticized by collocation with the verb 'стоять'.
The abstract pairing 'неизвестное очерчание' is animated by the nominal coupling 'возвышало голос'.
Triple repetition of the verb 'креп'. The abstract noun 'молчание' is animated by pairing with the verb 'кидалось'.

This is a slightly unusual abstract noun and verb pairing but note that a noun like, for example, 'тенъ' may collocate with the verb 'наползать' in standard language.

'Быкобоец' is a new compound word formed on a productive pattern. Very similar forms, 'скотобоец' and 'свинобоец', are standard and, therefore, the form 'быкобоец' is hardly perceived as deviant. Note that the
change 'быкобоец - быкобойца' is morphophonetically loss of the inserted vowel. The apparent change results from the graphemic representation of the phoneme: intervocically no grapheme, but <н>: between a vowel and consonant.

Citation 162. p. 244. Vol. 1. Narrator:

---- Домикъ непроста; непроста и все, все смёстилося въ немъ, сорвалось; самъ съ себя онъ сорвался...

The verb 'сорвалось' is foregrounded by a lack of clear syntactic connections in the first clause and by the unusual collocation with 'сам с себя' in the second clause. One of the most common uses of the verb is in sentences of the type: 'собака с цепи сорвалась' or 'он сорвался с места'.

Citation 163p. 245. Vol. 1. Narrator:

---- На минуту пытался онъ вспомнить о томь, что события бренного мира не посягаютъ нисколько на мысль и что мыслищий могъ лишь феномен сознанія...

The pairing 'бренный мир' is unusual, the adjective is a Church Slavonic word which occurs most commonly, perhaps, in the pairing 'бренные остатки'. 
The genitive of the noun 'тротуар' is an unusual modifier to the noun 'струя' which usually collocates with nouns denoting liquids, while the verb 'лепетать' is usually encountered in description of a child's speech. However, compare Lermontov: 'лепечет мне таинственную сагу про мирный край откуда мчится он'. Here the verb refers to a stream. This is similar to English 'babbling' brook or child.

Here the personal pronoun 'я' by use of the near copula verb 'оказалось', is equated to the inanimate nouns 'вместилище' and 'чулан'.

Animation of the noun 'спина' by collocation with the...
archaic poetic verb 'внимать'. The noun is used here as a 'pars pro toto' figure.

Citation 167. p. 250. Vol. 1. Apollon Ableukhov speaking:

----- 'я---знаемь - тилицу'...

Intrusion and exchange of morpheme order marks this deviation from the standard utterance 'знаете ли'.

Citation 168. pp. 251-252. Vol. 1. Narrator:

----- Онь старался бодриться, къ нему прикоснулась рука ледянная, взяла его за руки; и в. повела мимо лужъ: и онъ шеф, шефъ и шефъ: за ледяною рукою; пространства летали навстрѣчу...

In the first phrase the adjective 'ледянная' is post-positioned in relation to the noun it modifies: 'ледянная рука' is the standard order of the pairing. Triple repetition of the verb form 'шёлъ' offers a semantic link to the leitmotif phrase: 'пространства летели навстречу', which otherwise seems out of context following a realistic utterance concerned with avoidance of puddles.
This is a variation of a recurring motif. The coupling 'предметы вокруг' replaces the 'distant islands' of the earlier construction: similarly, the adverb of place 'дальше' is now replaced by its antonym 'ближе'.

In standard language the verbs 'лепетать' and 'шептать' do not collocate with the neuter pronoun 'все'. Although some figurative uses are established, they usually demand an animate subject. In this context the verbs are used analogously to the such standard uses as, for example: 'все кругом зеленело' or 'темнело'.

This type of construction is common with reference to natural phenomena. The base 'осень' and synonyms thereof now have strongly established connotations of revolution. The abstract noun 'очертание', used with reference to Apollon Ableukhov, reduces the 'old in dirt sitting
person' to a substanceless phenomenon.

Citation 171. p. 256. Vol. 1. Narrator:

----- Лопа онъ стоялъ передъ стьною, онъ видѣлъ: стьна - не стьна: проницаема; тамъ, за стьною - какой-то невидимый свѣтъ...

The semantic contradiction expressed by the unusual coupling 'стена проницаема' is repeated in the highly unusual negative form 'невидимый свѣтъ'. In standard usage a pronoun usually follows the colon, thus what is expected is 'она проницаема'.

Citation 172. p. 259. Vol. 1. Narrator:

----- на лицѣ совершенная бритость...

'Бритость' is a new abstract noun structured from the base 'брит-' and suffix '-ость'. The new noun replaces a standard verbal structure, for example: 'лицо совершенно выбрито' and achieves a very strong effect.

Citation 173. p. 261. Vol. 1. Narrator:

----- Онъ очнулся; и понялъ, что не возвсталъ, а возсѣлъ на какой-то предметности (на полу)...

The use of a new verb 'воссел' formed on the pattern of the preceding verb 'возвстал' by exchange of the base
morphemes, has a distinctly comic effect intensified by the lofty religious connotations of the verb 'возстановь'.

The comic intent is repeated in the new abstract noun form 'предметность' which is given a parenthesized explanation as referring to the floor.

Citation 174. p. 261. Vol. 1. Narrator:

'Недоповесился' is a new verb formed by insertion of the prefix 'до' in the standard negative construction 'не повесился'. The prefix 'до-' functions as indicator of completed action including the attainment of a goal, for example, 'ехать - доехать'. Note the graphic joining of the negative particle 'не' to the verb. This represents the actual phonological unity of the particle and the verb base but has not found representation in standard orthography.

Citation 175. p. 262. Vol. 1. Narrator:

'Протелефонят' is a curtailed verb replacing the standard form 'протелефонируют', perhaps influenced by the synonym 'звонят'.
'Одставала' is a new verb form which is used here in an unusual adverbial construction. 'Предстала голосом' is an unusual adverbial instrumental structure. In standard use the noun 'голос' does not modify verbs of the base 'стать'; 'кричать, петь голосом' are examples of some standard collocations.

Here, a new verb form 'восчувствовал' replaces the expected 'почувствовал'. The prefix 'вос-' is not derivationally productive in modern Russian, and verbs formed with this morpheme have bookish and stilted connotations.

Repeated animation of the leitmotif coupling 'мозговая игра' by collocation with the verb 'воздвигала'.
Here the noun 'мгла' is given a concrete substantial quality by collocation with the verb 'таять'. Some standard couplings are, for example, 'снег тает', 'свеча тает'. 'Просерела' is a new prefixed verb form. The prefix often adds a connotation of thoroughness of the action indicated by the verb base; for example: 'продумать'. The noun 'свет' does not pluralize in standard Russian. It is further equated to 'точки' by use of the near copula verb 'стать' and also animated by the verb and adverb pairing 'удивленно глядевшими' which, however, need not be perceived as deviant. Coupling of lights with seeing-verbs are quite established figures and may be said to be part of standard language.

'Петель' is an archaic form for 'cockerel'. It is perhaps most commonly encountered in the Biblical phrase: 'три раза не пропоет петель'.

Here the noun 'мгла' is given a concrete substantial quality by collocation with the verb 'таять'. Some standard couplings are, for example, 'снег тает', 'свеча тает'. 'Просерела' is a new prefixed verb form. The prefix often adds a connotation of thoroughness of the action indicated by the verb base; for example: 'продумать'. The noun 'свет' does not pluralize in standard Russian. It is further equated to 'точки' by use of the near copula verb 'стать' and also animated by the verb and adverb pairing 'удивленно глядевшими' which, however, need not be perceived as deviant. Coupling of lights with seeing-verbs are quite established figures and may be said to be part of standard language.

'Петель' is an archaic form for 'cockerel'. It is perhaps most commonly encountered in the Biblical phrase: 'три раза не пропоет петель'.

Here the noun 'мгла' is given a concrete substantial quality by collocation with the verb 'таять'. Some standard couplings are, for example, 'снег тает', 'свеча тает'. 'Просерела' is a new prefixed verb form. The prefix often adds a connotation of thoroughness of the action indicated by the verb base; for example: 'продумать'. The noun 'свет' does not pluralize in standard Russian. It is further equated to 'точки' by use of the near copula verb 'стать' and also animated by the verb and adverb pairing 'удивленно глядевшими' which, however, need not be perceived as deviant. Coupling of lights with seeing-verbs are quite established figures and may be said to be part of standard language.

'Петель' is an archaic form for 'cockerel'. It is perhaps most commonly encountered in the Biblical phrase: 'три раза не пропоет петель'.
A metaphorical equation of lace and St. Petersburg is suspended by means of the near copula verb 'обернуться'. The first part of the novel ends with the neologism 'засапел' which summons up ideas of something new and something red.

In the fourth chapter the predominant type of linguistic deviation is new word formation. The occurrence of neologisms is in the ratio seven to five to such prevalent deviations as syntactic animation. Two thirds of the neologisms are adjectives, almost all of them compounds. There are only two new words in the noun category and only two instances of animate nouns entering an inanimate collocation. Syntactic concretizations of abstract nouns are in one to four ratio to the neologisms occurring in this chapter. About equal numbers of archaisms and Church Slavonic forms were counted. Pejorative diminutives were found to be numerous in this chapter. In four instances nouns—human entered syntactic collocation with forms which are commonly paired
with nouns referring to animals. Deviations of standard word order occur about as frequently as in the previous chapter.
Nikolaj Apollonovič has a conversation with the double agent Morkovin.

Markovin explains the dead-end situation Nikolaj is in: his choice is restricted to murder, suicide or arrest. Arriving home, Nikolaj learns that his mother has returned to St. Petersburg. The senator shouts at Nikolaj and calls him a scoundrel. Nikolaj sets the bomb which begins to tick. Exhausted, Nikolaj falls asleep and has a dream of nihilism, mongolism, the reign of Saturn and the Last Judgement. He awakes and sets the bomb to go off in twenty hours' time.

Citation 182. p. 9. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- Вспыхнуло святло ябліко-----
линя электрическихъ яблокъ уже
обильна Невский проспектъ, где
вся ночь ресторанчики кажуть кровавы
выбьески, подъ которы ми шнуряютъ
пернать дами...

Metaphorical use of 'ябліко' for electrical lights achieved by coupling with the verb 'вспыхнуть'. The coupling 'кровавые выбески' is somewhat unusual because the adjective, although it does have some figurative uses, as a rule, refers to literally 'bloody' things, for
example, 'кровавый бифштекс'. 'Пернатый' is an adjective
which, in standard language, refers to birds. In this
context a nominal construction, for example: 'дамы в
шляпах с перьями' is the expected form.

Citation 183. p. 10. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- Конь кидался копытом...

The verb 'кидать' is unusual in this context. It
is standard in collocations like 'кидаться камнями',
'бить копытом' is the standard pairing.

Citation 184. p. 10. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- Густоватый, болеющий пар
блннаго запаха...

(See first scene in restaurant). 'Пар запаха' is
an unusual inverted collocation; 'запах пара' would be
a standard pairing.

Citation 185. p. 11. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- Иванъ Иванычъ Ивановъ...

Note the deviant spelling with geminated <вв>. 
The abstract noun 'старина' is animated by collocation with the verb form 'крепла'. The noun 'зало' here has neuter gender, whereas the standard forms are 'зал' or 'зала' with a slight difference in referents. However, the neuter form had currency among the lower social classes at the beginning of this century.

The noun 'громада' is formally animated by pairing with the verb 'опуститься'. However, the noun, which in this context refers to a person, becomes depersonalized by the use of the modifying phrase 'из камня'.

'Bражничал' is an archaic form, 'Пьянистовал' is
the standard modern synonym.

**Citation 189. p. 13. Vol. II. Narrator:**

- Павелъ Яковлевичъ - оплывалъ, оживалъ: здѣсь - мягкому; здѣсь - сосочкомъ; здѣсь - боло ордановочком...

The verb 'оплывал' occasionally collocates with nouns-human when combined with 'жиром'. 'Свеча оплывает' is one standard collocation. 'Оживал' the standard verb form of the base is 'жиреть'; the prefixed form shown here does not seem to be attested anywhere else. Note the unusual adverbial use of the instrumental.

**Citation 190. P. 15. Vol. II. Narrator:**

- Павелъ Яковлевичъ подвязалъ салфеткою, кончился въ салфеткѣ, какъ трупный червяк...

This is a most unusual simile to describe the use of a napkin, the effect produced being the dwarfing of P. Yakovlevich.

**Citation 191. p. 18. Vol. II. Narrator:**

- громада--- повернулась...

Repeated animation of the noun 'громада'.
**Citation 192. p. 20. Vol. II. Narrator:**

----- разорвавший без смеха свой рот...

The verb 'разорвать' is unusual in this context. 'Открывший рот' is an example of a standard coupling. The verb 'разорвать' usually indicates violent physical severance.

**Citation 193. p. 20. Vol. II. Narrator:**

----- Рыжий свёты свёчки затеплился; стены - истаяли...

'Стены исчезли' is the standard phrase in this context, although the coupling 'тени тают' is common.

**Citation 194. p. 21. Vol. II. Narrator:**

----- и, какая-то зеленая - раззеленая муть...

Here an unusual reduplication 'зеленая - раззеленая' is used to vary a recurring motif. The prefix 'раз' indicates thoroughness as, for example, 'прекрасная - распекрасная'. It is predominantly a verbal prefix and is not productive compounded with adjectives; its use here suggests a verbal form "раззеленеть - раззеленен".
Citation 195. p. 21. Vol. II. Narrator:

---- многосотхудовая рука - погрозила...

'Mногосотхудовая' is a new compound adjective replacing a possible nominal construction, for example, 'много сотен пудов'. The neologism is repeated twice in rapid succession.

Citation 196. p. 22. Vol. II. Narrator:

---- Петербургъ, Петербургъ!
Осядаясь туманомъ, меня ты преслѣдовалъ мозговою игрою...

Personification of 'Петербургъ' is achieved by direct address using the personal pronoun 'ты'. It is further reinforced by collocation with the verb 'преслѣдовать'. Use of 'ты' is usual in addressing towns; for instance, in the song of the Venetian guest in 'Sadko' (opera by Rimskij-Korsakov): 'над морем синим царствуешь кротко'.

Citation 197. p. 22. Vol. II. Narrator:

---- призракъ: годё на меня напалъ:...

This appears to be a concretization of the abstract noun 'призрак' by collocation with the verb 'напасть'. If, however, 'годё' is meant to be plural, there is violation of number agreement between the plural noun and the singular verb form.
Citation 198. p. 24. Vol. II. Narrator:

--- Перед той молчающей кучкой выражал свои мнения — о глухом отвращении к барским засохшим ушам; вплоть... до шеи... съ подкожной жилкой...

The initial sentence is not structurally deviant although the content of the string 'к барским засохшим ушам' is startling. This foregrounding draws attention to the following fragmentary utterances indicating a vulnerable area of the human body.

Citation 199. pp. 25-26. Vol. II. Narrator:

--- Глаза неприятно виши, увидавши его, стали шириться, шириться, шириться: полным ужасом взором, который преследовал: чаще и чаще; да: там самым взором взглянули; и там самым блеском расширились; а извозчик его обогнавши, подпрыгивал на камнях; и — мелькал номер бляхи: тысяча девятьсот пятьти...

The motif verb 'шириться' is foregrounded by triple repetition, to be repeated once more in the following clause. The paragraph is a variation of the recurring motif of a stranger looking at senator Ableukhov. The relative pronouns 'тем самым' serve as a motif link and thus far exceed the usual boundaries within which the referent and the relative pronoun
function. Note also the number of the carriage '1905'.

Citation 200, p. 26, Vol. II, Narrator:

------ Аполлонъ Аполлоновичъ, проживавший за порогомъ той двери, и есть - прободаеный рыцарь...

The present participle 'прободаеный' is a rarely used form; present participles are generally rare outside technical writings. In this context the present tense marker of the form foregrounds the actuality of Apollon Apollonovič's precarious position.

Citation 201, p. 27, Vol. II, Narrator:

------ Николай Аполлоновичъ соскочил со ступенекъ крыльца: переваливался по-утиному онъ обжала неизбѣжно навстрѣчу родителю съ избѣгающимъ взглядомъ...

Note the massed repetition of the base 'бер' in the sentence. The repetition foregrounds the base, which is not too vigorous in the well established derived forms.

Citation 202, p. 27, Vol. II, Narrator:

------ ключовидная пасти...

An unusual pairing, since the base 'ключ' collocates with 'птица' and 'пасть' with 'зверь'.
Citation 203. p. 28. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- Двери разорвались...

An unusual pairing, unless the reference is violent action. 'Двери открылись' or 'растворились' are two standard choices.

Citation 204. p. 21. Vol. II. Footman speaking:

----- 'Да-съ, изъ Гимпане, въ Петербургъ возвратились'...

'Петербургъ' - the terminal phoneme written as the velar fricative <x> instead of the stop <r> may be an approximation to the historically German pronunciation of the name. In North and Middle German (very consistently in Baltic German) this phoneme is realized as the voiceless yod or 'ich-Laut'. This is quite common in Petersburg dialect.

Citation 205. p. 21. Vol. II. Servant speaking:

----- 'Родительница'...

Derived non-standard feminine counterpart to 'родитель'.
Citation 206. p. 31. Vol. II. Servant speaking:

'Письмо то съ посланникъ
прислали-съ: остановили въ
gостиницъ...потому - сами знаете'...

Note the use of the third person plural as polite reference of a servant speaking of his master.

In the next utterance even the pronoun in the coupling 'их высокопревосходительство' is pluralized.

Citation 207. p. 32. Vol. II. Footman speaking:

'Почитай, не прошло еще часу,
какъ Богъ ты мой: заились вдругъ
сами-съ!...съ ей-ей, съ достоверностью:
видно, имя было извѣстно, что нѣтути на дому никого-съ'...

'Почитай' is an attention-drawing filler word which was common usage in the lower social classes. 'Заявились' is a use of an archaic form replacing a standard one such as, for example, 'приехала'. 'Ей-ей'-reduplicated emphatic morphemes: compare, for example, the expression 'ей Богъ'.

'Нетути на дому' is a dialect expression replacing the standard 'нет дома'.
The pairing 'павший воздух' is unusual. The verbal element, although it has established figurative uses, for instance, 'павшая женщина', collocates with concrete nouns. In the last clause the noun 'human' is metaphorically equated to the inanimate noun 'столб'.

Citation 209. p. 32. Vol. II. Servant speaking, reporting Anna Petrovna's speech:

----- Митрий Семенчих, али - не узнаешь? ...

'Али' - archaic form synonymous to 'разве', 'неужели'.

Citation 210. p. 32. Vol. II. Servant speaking:

----- 'не пускать'...

Replaces the standard 'не пускать'; note the regular alternation <ck> - <ш>.

Citation 211. p. 34. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- заело, тамъ я ...

This is a substantivization of the personal pronoun
'я' by syntactic collocation with a verb in the third person. Abstract use is emphasized by the neuter verb form 'саксо'. Figurative uses of the pronoun 'я' in the dictionary form sometimes appear in sophisticated standard language, for example, 'мой второй я'.

Citation 212. p. 38. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- Рояль, стильно, желтый: коснулся паркета колесиками...

Note the postpositioned adjectives. The verb 'коснулся' is unusual referring to a heavy instrument. It is frequently encountered in such phrases as 'едва коснулся ее пальчиков' and indicates light fleeting touches.
Dudkin is delirious; he goes for a walk and meets Nikolaj Ableukhov. They have a long conversation; it becomes clear that Dudkin has been unaware of the full significance of the bundle he gave Nikolaj. He advises Nikolaj to throw the bomb in the Neva, and promises to talk to Lippančenko. Lippančenko admits to having written the fatal letter. Dudkin's hallucinations continue: the Bronze Horseman is persecuting him. St'opka visits Dudkin: 'The green snake will get Russia'. Dudkin buys a pair of small scissors.

Citation 213, p. 39. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- перед нимъ выясняясь, подпрыгивалъ эластичный комочек не то - изъ резины, не то - изъ материі очень странныхъ мировъ...

Note the genitive modifier phrases to 'комочек' and the parallel treatment given to 'резины' and 'материі очень странныхъ мировъ'. The noun 'комочек' is related to the bomb motif. The abstract modifier is probably a symbol for explosive material.
'Лаковый звук' is an unusual pairing; the adjective usually modifies concrete nouns, for instance, 'лаковые туфли'. The passage is marked by massed occurrence of the onomatopoeic syllable 'пепп', which is personified by the derivational suffix '-ович'. Note that the syllables 'пепп' occur earlier, (p. 17. St. Petersburg, Vol. II), closing a series of names of revolutionaries. Also note the metaphoric change from noun-concrete inanimate to noun-person to noun-inanimate with abstract connotations: 1. комочек - принимал видимость господина. 2. Господин став шаром... Triple repetition of the verb 'шириться'.

----- взвыгав на поле тихий лаковый звук пепп - пеппепп; и опять пепп - пеппепп; разбухая до ужаса, принимал часто видимость шаровидного толстяка-господина; господин же толстяк, став томительным шаром, - все ширился, ширился, ширился и грозил - навалиться:

- 'Пепп'
- 'Пепповичь'
- 'Пепп'
'Он - ноль'- this pairing is standard figurative usage in Russian, a synonym for 'he is insignificant'; here it is used in a concrete sense linked to the verb form 'окрупляться' in the preceding clause. 'Нохлилось' is a neologism on the base 'ноль' with addition of the verbal suffix thus, roughly: 'zeroing itself'.

Citation 216. p. 40. Vol. II. Governess speaking:

----- 'Ти, малюшка Колюшка'...

The graphic form 'малинка' is a rendition of 'маленька(я)', indicating foreign accent; however, the graphic 'е' is realized as 'и' in standard Russian. The gross deviation occurs in the use of the feminine desinence in formal agreement with the diminutive of Nikolaj. Although diminutives are formally feminine, adjectives modifying them are always masculine. The deviant spelling yields the standard form for 'raspberry'.

Citation 217. p. 40. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- карлилась: карлилась карли...

'Карлилась'- a new verb from the nominal base of 'карлик': a standard choice would be: 'уменьшалась'.
Note the alliteration of '6' in the listing.

'Произвольный' is an unusual adjective to modify a concrete thing-noun 'шпиц'. An example of a standard pairing is 'Произвольный голос'.

Metaphorical equation Apollon Apollonovich's leitmotif 'уho' and 'слиянь', which is another recurring motif.

'Sардинница' - a neologism structured on the pattern of 'пепельница', 'сахарница' (a container for ashes, sugar, sardines).
Citation 222. p. 52. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- и грянулось тело с паркетом пола в нуль градусов...

Witness the syntactic coupling of a concrete noun with an abstract accusative phrase.

Citation 223. p. 52. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- а в открытую дверь коридора глядилось бездонное...

The adjective 'бездонное' is nominalized by ellipsis which is not standard with this particular form. 'Бездонная бочка' or 'бездонное море' are common couplings.

Citation 224. p. 52. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- в склеротических жилах наследственность была миллионами шариков...

Witness the coupling of the abstract noun 'наследственность' (replacing 'кровь') to the adverbial instrumental modified by the concrete genitive 'шариков'. This latter is a diminutive of the recurring motif 'шар'. 
Citation 225. p. 61. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- ночь была событием исполинских размеров...

Syntactic equation of 'ночь' to 'событие'.
'исполинский' - a relative adjective 'giant' derived from 'исполн'.

Citation 226. p. 62. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- почувствовал снова прилив ерунды...

Concretization of the noun 'ерунда'. 'Прилив' is usually coupled with concrete nouns: 'прилив моря', 'прилив крови' are standard couplings.

Citation 227. p. 63. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- желание (Дудкина) пронизаться туманом и в нем утонуть стрекотающую въ мозгахъ ерунду...

The equation of Dudkin and the fog is achieved here by the instrumental structure 'пронизаться туманом'.

Citation 228. p. 66. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- до полнаго опьянения мозга чтобы не снились мброки; отправить Петербургъ...
'Онемения' is somewhat unusually paired with 'глаз'. 'Онемение нор' is a common coupling. The noun 'морок' does not form a plural in standard language but is pluralized here. Note that the stress is indicated in the text, to specify that the word used by the author is not 'морока'. The verb 'отшагать' is usually part of an 'от-до' phrase or else it collocates with measures: 'отшагали тридцать верст'. 'Пройти весь Петербург' could be used instead.

Citation 229. p. 70. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- то - вы, просто, шаечка интригантовъ...

This is a non-standard pejorative diminutive from the noun 'шайка'.

Citation 230. p. 74. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- Незаветный же требовал...

Elliptic nominalization of the adjective 'незаветный' which is further foregrounded by capitalization. The form is used very frequently throughout this long dialogue. Compare to the following citation:
Citation 231. p. 75. Vol. II. Narrator:

---- Невыразимое что-то струилось...

The adjective 'невыразимое' is elliptically nominalized in standard language, thus the indefinite referential 'что-то' is grammatically superfluous. Also note the concretization by collocation with the verb 'струилось'.

Citation 232. p. 76. Vol. II. Narrator:

---- Будьте, будут кровавые,
полные ухаса дни; и потом — все
провалится; о, кружитесь, о, вейтесь,
последние дни!
О, кружитесь, о вейтесь по воздуху вы,
последние листья!...

Personification of the noun 'дни' by the vocative structure and also its metaphoric merging with autumn imagery by use in an almost fixed context for 'листья'.

Citation 233. p. 77. Narrator:

---- С улицы покатились на встречу
им многотысячные рой котелков;
pокатились на встречу: цилинды;
заполнилось: страусовое перо.
Отовсюду высаживалъ нось...

Recurrence of the 'pars pro toto' motif 'рой котелков - цилинды'. The final phrase appears to be a direct
tribute to Gogol': 'Нос: орлиный и петушиний; утиний и курий'. Compare this to Gogol's story 'Нос'.

Citation 234. p. 78. Vol. II. Narrator:

A variation of the recurring linguistic metamorphosis of individuals into mass: 'тело' coupled by the near copula verb to 'общее тело' and further equated by apposition to 'икрму икры'. (Note the singular infix -ин' in the 'икра' derivative). Further, the same relationship is repeated in the pairing 'мысль - мыслительность' and comes to a close in the concrete singular noun 'существо'. Variations of this theme are repeated in the passage.

Citation 235. p. 79. Vol. II. Narrator:

A newly derived noun: the standard nominal from this base is 'многоразличность' which, however, is perceived as a direct derivative of the adjective 'многоразличный'; the form found here is a deverbal derived from 'различать'.
Citation 236. p. 79. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- Стоял черный дым небылиц...

Syntactic merging of concrete and abstract categories 'дым небылиц'.

Citation 237. p. 82. Vol. II. Nikolaj Apollonovič and Dudkin conversing:

----- 'Николай Аполлонович, логика проведенная в кровь'...

A deconcretization of Nikolaj by apposition to 'логика'. The participial phrase 'логика проведенная в кровь' is not perceived as deviant, probably because of the parallelism of the fixed expression 'вошло в плоть и в кровь'. The entire dialogue is rich in concretely treated abstractions and figurative forms.

Citation 238. p. 85. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- Рось я, знаете ли, в неизмеримость, со мною росли всё предметы...

Note the merging of the personal abstract and concrete categories.

Citation 239. p. 86. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- 'Господи, да ведь по 'какъ странно' былъ онъ специалистъ'...
Syntactic nominalization of the adverbial interjection 'как странно'. Standard usage would expect a morphological nominalization, for example, 'специалист по странности', analogous to established pairings like 'специалист по механике'.

Citation 239. p. 89. Vol. II. Narrator:

---- течenie многоножки панели, где мертвенно шелестнне пробегающих ног и где зелены лица; не видно по ним, что события где-то гремят...

Note the deviant linkage of the concrete noun 'многоножка' to 'течение' and 'панели'. The short form adjective 'зеленый' is used here in attributive position and, in this way, achieves strong foregrounding.

Citation 240. p. 89. Vol. II. Narrator:

---- в университетах России шел митинг...

The singular form 'митинг' is used as an abstract collective coupled with the plural locative phrase 'в университетах'.

Citation 241. p. 89. Vol. II. Narrator:

---- закочеврижились пермяки...

The reflexive verb 'закочевряжиться' belongs to
factory jargon. Standard usage expects a verbal phrase such as, for example, 'выламывались'.

Citation 242. p. 90. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- в рев грохотномь разорвался он роть...

'Грохотный' is a new relative adjective derived from the noun 'грохот'. The standard adjective derivation from this base is the participle 'грохочущий' from the verb 'грохотать'. Compare, however, the deverbal 'письменный стои'.

Citation 243. p. 91. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- контурь кареты и абрись треугольки лакей и крылья шинели туть врьзались въ косматую гущу...

The adjective 'косматый' usually modifies concrete nouns. Here it is coupled with the mass noun 'гуша'. The coupling functions as a metaphor for a crowd of people.

Citation 244. p. 91. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- 'Mais j'espere que oui' - дзенкнула рѣчь иностранца...

'Дзенкнула' is a new onomatopoeic verb; it replaces a standard form such as, for example, 'прозвучала'.
The new compound adjective 'многоглазое' animates the noun 'взморье'. Note the instrumental construction: 'щенястилось тростником' patterned on 'шёл вежком'.

Here the neologism 'шишмарфис', which appeared in the first part of the novel, is personified by addition of the derivational morpheme '-ев'. 'Сидеть бирюком' is an unusual instrumental structure: standard usage would expect an analytic string 'сидит как бирюк'. However, compare the standard fixed expressions 'смотреть бирюком' and 'сидеть в девах'.

A new adjective 'вечеровое' is used here as a qualitative adjective to modify the concrete noun 'судно'; 'темное' would be one standard choice in this context.
The standard neuter adjectival form derived from 'вечер' is 'вечернее'.

Citation 248. p. 94. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- тело грузного толстяка,---
обремененное полудюжиной свертковь....

The standard passive participle from this base is 'обременённое'. The adjective 'обремененное' may not be prefixed by the perfective aspect marker.

Citation 249. p. 96. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- и чрезмерные перси ея
заходили подъ лифомь...

Here the archaic form 'перси' replaces the contemporary standard 'груди'. Later the noun is modified by the adjective 'чрезмерное' which is usually paired with abstract nouns such as 'чрезмерная любознателность'. The coupling of the body parts with the going verb 'заходили' is also non-standard.

Citation 250. p. 97. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- дуческ любил онъ...

The French loan-word 'дучес' ('duchesse', a pear variety) is not declined in standard language, but is pluralized here.
Citation 251. p. 99. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- затаились пытливо сверлящие глазки, перепархивающие от предмета к предмету...

The verb 'перепархивать' is most commonly paired with 'бабочки'. Here it achieves animation of 'глазки'.

Citation 252. p. 99. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- отращение и необъяснимо лицо складываясь в странное целое...

'Необъяснимо' is a new participial form emphasized by being used after the noun, (it modifies).

Citation 253. p. 101. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- химера росла - по ночам: на кусок темножелтых обой - настоящим монголом...

Merging of motifs: 'химера' equated to 'монгол' by use of the instrumental structure.

Citation 254. p. 102. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- Он пытался ее поразить своим кредо и утверждением, что Революция - Воприть...

Note the interspersed Latin type set 'credo', the
capitalization of 'Революция' and its equation to godhead (hypostasis).

Citation 255. p. 110. Vol. II. Dudkin speaking:

----- собирается де отца ужомить...

The argot 'укожить' replaces the standard 'убить'. The form is probably related to 'кокати' - to give a blow.

Citation 256. p. 116. Vol. II. Moržov speaking:

----- 'Маненечка забавляемся'...

'Маненечко' is quite a common replacement in country usage for 'немножко'. Here the ' l ' of the base is assimilated to the surrounding nasals.

Citation 257. p. 117. Vol. II. Moržov speaking:

----- 'штомп'...

'Штомп' replaces the graphic 'что же'.

Citation 258. p. 122. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- выберенный рухляк...

'Рухляк' is a new form replacing the standard 'рухлядь' - old trash. The suffix '-як' is most commonly
used with collective terms denoting groups of trees, for example, 'ивняк'.

Citation 259. p. 127. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- Биологія тіни ще не
изучена; потребаній ея не поймешь;
она входить бациллами, проглатуваними
водопроводної водою...

An unusual coupling 'биологія тіни' collocated with
the adverbial instrumental 'ходити бациллами'. Compare:
'ходити арлекиною'.

Citation 260. p. 137. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- корень болівни: в узнанні...

'Узнанні' is a new noun. In standard language there
is no nominal derivation from the verb 'узнать'.

Citation 261. p. 139. Narrator:

----- Туескости продивалися
дымними, розселенями клубами...

'Tуескости' is a new noun derived from the adjective
'туеслий'; most of the nouns derived with the abstract
suffix '-ость' do not pluralize in standard language.
Pairing of the concrete noun 'комната' with the abstract accusative phrase 'в неизъяснимости'.

'Dо трубы' is an elliptic reference to the 'Last Judgement'; compare the standard expression 'мертвые снят до трубного гласа'.

'Гаскалившийся' is unusual coupled with 'луна'; it is expected to collocate with 'на солнце'.

'St'opka's speech is characterized throughout by 'akanije' and 'ikanije'. Here, in the standard form 'алкоголя', the velar stop is replaced by the corresponding
fricative. Also note the use of the 'у' genitive attesting to productivity of this form: 'до белого'... is an unfinished utterance, eliding 'горячк'. The deviant orthography, 'у' following 'у', corresponds to the standard phonetic realization of the form.

Citation 266, p. 143. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- что за дверь его поджидало:
исконно - знакомое...

The adverb 'исконно' is unusual paired with 'знакомое'; it appears most commonly, perhaps, in the pairing 'исконно русское'.

In the foregoing chapter syntactic animation, concretization and deconcretization occur in approximately equal proportions. In descriptions of delirium, dreams, hallucinations, which are numerous in this chapter, the occurrence of this type of syntactic deviance exceeds standard collocations.

There are very many occurrences of elliptic utterances lacking subjects or objects. Although such structures do occur in descriptive passages, the majority of them are found in dialogue which is understandable because such ellipses are not necessarily deviant in oral usage. Among the neologisms in this chapter are a number of
onomatopoeic structures. A striking feature in the use of adjectives is a number of deviations with the hyperbolical prefix 'pa3'. Also, some attributive uses of short form adjectives were found. Their predicative association lends the attributive a strongly dynamic quality.
Nikolaj Ableukhov meets Likhit'in. They go to Likhit'in's apartment and have a long, absurd conversation. Nikolaj thinks of the details, of how he might place the bomb in his father's bed.

Apollon Apollonovič feels lonely. He does not go to his office. In his son's room he finds a sardine tin which makes a ticking sound and takes it with him. The senator is persuaded to retire from service.

Lippančenko 'sings his swan song'. He is killed. A figure with a small pair of scissors is found sitting on the dead man.

Citation 267a. p. 149. Vol. II. Narrator:

---- чудовищные Гауризанкапры событий обрушились...

'Гауризанкап' is a mountain peak in the Himalayas (Nepal). In this passage there may be some connection with the popular expression: 'гора с плеч'.

Citation 267b. p. 150. Vol. II. Narrator:

---- мгновение, как-то прытко раскинувшись по кругам, превращалось медлительно в разбухающий шар...

Syntactic concretization of the non-concrete noun 'мгновение', further equated by the near copula verb 'превращаться' to 'разбухающий шар'. The collocation is part of the ticking bomb motif.
An unusual instrumental construction incorporating an abstract noun; 'часы тикали механизмом' is an example of a standard use of this construction.

'Sвистопляска' is a compound neologism - approximately 'whistle dance'. 'Жиловатые' is a new adjective; the standard adjective from this base is 'жилистые'. However, forms in '-оватый' are common, for example, 'глуповатый, зеленоватый'.

'Кляканья' - a new onomatopoeic noun derived with the Slavonic deverbal suffix '-нье'.
'Ливенной' is a new adjective from the noun 'ливень'. The standard adjective from this base is 'ливневый'. Compare previous citation for a reverse treatment.

The standard locative phrase is 'с пола'. The noun 'пол' is an old u-stem and does have u-desinences in standard language, for example, 'на полу'.

'Акафист' is a type of Church singing, for example, 'Акафист Бородице'. Here it is paired with a concrete adverbial instrumental.

----- и сжимать въ болтайковыхъ пальдахъ фуражку...
'Белолаўківых' is a new compound adjective. Note also the direct coupling to 'палычах'. An expected standard structure is: 'в бёлых лаўківых перчатках'.

Citation 275. p. 170. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- Когда Коленьку называли отцовским отродьем, ему было стыдно; 'отродьё' открылось через наблюдение над замашками жизни животных...

There are massed occurrences of the form 'отродьё' in the entire paragraph from which this citation was selected. This is a strongly pejorative term in standard language. Here, the frequent repetition of the form in various contexts, and the use of other deviations from the base 'род-' achieves a foregrounding of the component morphemes. Thus, an intricate relationship is foregrounded: approximately an equation of 'offspring' and 'freak'.

Citation 276. p. 172. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- Кажыдый посухівайць, переводзіць---растэньне
'верхесь' происходить ад 'верешання...'

Use of false etymology. The form 'верешання' is a new noun derived from the verb 'верешчаць'; 'вереск'
is an unrelated morpheme.

Citation 277. p. 176. Vol. II. Narrator:

—— И валила зевота...

The verb 'валить' achieves a concretization of the noun 'зевота'. An example in standard usage is 'валит снег'.

Citation 278. p. 179. Vol. II. Narrator:

—— Не по барчукски....

The adverbial phrase 'по барчукски' is unusual. It is derived from the diminutive form 'барчук' — young master. The common form 'барски' is derived from 'барин'.

Citation 279. p. 179. Vol. II. Servant speaking:

——'Да хамлеты какие-то... Господи...

Compare to page 180: 'сын то хамлетист'. This is a word play based on Volksetymologie. In standard Russian 'Hamlet' is adapted to 'Гамлет' but, as was seen earlier, one of the dialect features Belyj uses is to render the aspirate 'h' as <x> rather than <r> (compare Мухамед). However, the context in which these
forms are used associates them with the Russian noun 'хам' and 'хамлеты' appears as a derived form. The second element is associated with the agential suffix '-ист'.

Citation 280. p. 180. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- Аполлонъ Аполлоновичъ, какъ и всегда, въ каламбурахъ выказывалъ просто настырство какое-то...

'настырство' is a neologism formed from the adverb 'настырно' plus the abstract noun suffix '-ство'.

Citation 281. p. 184. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- поговорило молчание о чемъ-то забытомъ...

The deverbal noun 'молчание' is animated by collocation with the verb 'поговорило'. The verb base of the noun and the verb of the sentence are antonyms, thus 'поговорить - молчать' are coupled in a regular surface-structure noun plus verb pairing.

Citation 282. p. 185. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- сползь, пустится дробью по направлению къ лестниц ...
'Пуститься дробы' is an unusual adverbial instrumental use. The pairings 'стрелять дробы' and 'пуститься бежать бегом' are standard.

Citation 283. p. 187. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- Туманитый войлок...

'Tуманитый' is a new adjective derived from 'туман'; the regular derivation is 'туманный' which, however, does not modify concrete nouns.

Citation 284. p. 189. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- Изъ нотабенъ, вопросительныхъ знаковъ, параграфовъ, черточекъ, поднималась мертвая голова....

'Нотабен' is the Russian adaptation of 'nota bene'. 'мертвая голова' is very unusual in this context.

Citation 285. p. 192. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- Бравъ накраулъ при проходѣ золотогрудаго генерала...

The standard coupling is 'на караул'. Here the phonological unity of the preposition and noun is represented graphically. Note also the loss of the second syllable vowel.
The neologism 'губастые' replaces a standard compound adjective 'толстогубый'. However, many similar forms are found in standard language, for example, 'зубастый', 'очкастый'.

'Белоку́дерьных' is a deviant adjective form.
The standard derivations from this base are 'кудреватый' or 'кудря́вый'. Note the intruding vowel in the base terminal cluster.

Witness the clash in pronoun correspondence, 'кто' is the interrogative form used with reference to animate nouns. The neuter form 'такое' does not refer to animates. Standard choices are 'кто - такое' or 'что - такое'. In this context the neuter form achieves deanimation.
As it has already been noted, the diminutive 'росточек' has undergone semantic shift. Here there is further deviation in the use of the 'u' - genitive which is productive in contemporary Russian with mass-nouns. Historically, the form belongs to u-stem nouns only.

'Bа́дыхатель' is a rarely used form calqued on the French 'soupirant'; 'ухажер' is a more common synonym.

The 'pars pro toto' structure 'усики' has been established as Dudkin's emblem and here it summarizes Nikolaj's revolutionary connections.
Here the verb 'страдал' is collocated with a concrete phrase of place. The double prepositions 'из-за' are also deviant in this context. 'Смотрел из рамы' is standard usage, whereas 'из-за' appears in phrase such as 'из-за угла'.

Lengthy passages and strange subject matter marked by frequent unconnected utterances are acceptable here since they describe Likhutin's attempted suicide.

The form 'сроенный' of the conditional phrase is a passive participle from the reflexive verb 'поиться' but the base is not used as a transitive verb in standard language.
The noun 'тётка' is used as a synonym to 'собачка'. However, in this context it appears to be a new formation derived from the verb 'тёткаться' to show unnecessary concern over something.

'Mногожерстистые' is a neologism formed with the base 'жердь' comparable to 'шерстистый'; 'много' - as a prefixed form is very common. Note also the syntactic animation of 'руки'.

'Tеренькали' is an onomatopoeic neologism approximating the sound of a vibrating string.
Citation 298. p. 226. Vol. II. Lippančenko singing:

----- 'Не ил-скуу-шаай---
Меняя беезъ нууу-ууу...
подхватили скрипичными струны.
'Хыы' - пъль на-бокъ Липпанченко!'..

This is an attempt to indicate singing of Glinka's famous romance 'Не искушай меня без нужды'. Note the especially heavy repetition of the 'u' - sound, which was used earlier in the novel, connected to revolutionary autumn images and the unrest in factories. This is Lippančenko's last appearance in the novel before he is killed. Witness further the unusual coupling 'нел на бочек'; 'лес' is the expected verb collocating with 'на бочек'.

Citation 299. p. 227. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- Нъть, лобная кость не знала..

The coupling 'лобная кость' is treated as a noun-human in collocation with the verb 'знать'.

Compound adjectives and syntactic animation remain the most prominent features of the language used in the foregoing chapter. An increased use of false etymologies deriving from homophonic base morphemes was noted. This device is occasionally used to blend
motifs. Many occurrences of original adverbial instrumental structures were noted.
Anna Petrovna returns to the Ableukhov household. Nikolaj looks for and is unable to find the bomb. He decides that Likhut'in must have taken it with him. Towards morning the bomb explodes but nobody is injured. The senator hides from his son in the washroom. He has a serious heart attack. Nikolaj is confined to bed with a nervous disorder. Later he leaves Russia. The senator retires to his country estate.

Citation 300. p. 239. Vol. II. Narrator:

----- Аполлонъ Аполлоновичъ былъ старикомъ, но...въ немъ было бездышное; выглядѣлъ — мужем..."

'Бездышное' is a neologism replacing a standard phrase, for example, 'неопределенность возраста'. The form is patterned on 'бессмертное'.

Citation 301. p. 250. Vol. II. Footman speaking:

-----'авантахность посбросили'...

'Авантахность'- a new noun derived from the adjective 'авантажный'.
Citation 302. p. 250. Vol. II. Footman speaking:

-----'Не плети белиндрысовъ!'...

'Белиндрысовъ' is the basic form and the 'e' > 'i' change indicates 'ikanije'. It is a colloquial expression, approximately: 'a tall tale'.

Citation 303. p. 253. Vol. II. Apollon Apollonovich and Footman speaking:

-----'Ведь жена то халдея---
       -'Халдейка-съ'
       -'Нять - халда!'...

This is another of the senator's word plays based on the Biblical 'Халдея'.

Citation 304. p. 257. Vol. II. Narrator:

-----'ребенкины взоры
       шестидесятивосьмилетняго старика...

'Ребенкины' is a neologism derived from the stem 'ребенок'. This noun does not have a possessive form derived with the morpHEME '-ин', although many semantically close nouns do. Standard synonyms are 'ребяческий' or 'детский'.

The name of Mme. Ableukhova’s lover is approximated to 'миндалына'.

This is a colloquial expression for a mental institution.

'Tондур' is a type of native Arab dress and 'чёчья' is an Arabian fez.

The verb is derived from the Slavonic stem 'среб-'.
The standard stem is 'серебр-'.

The standard stem is 'серебр-'.

...
The final chapter of the novel is very rich in deviant structures, most of which, however, have appeared in earlier chapters. This results from the motif pattern of the novel. Most of the themes, leitmotifs and emblems are brought together in the closing chapter.

The epilogue shows Nikolaj Ableukhov travelling in Egypt. He returns to Russia after his parents' death, and leads a solitary life in the country. He wears dark glasses because the red sun has damaged his eyes. In the epilogue, in sharp contrast to the prologue, there are no deviant language structures.

It should be noted that the graphic type-set of St. Petersburg is varied. Some passages have double spacing between letters, some are set on only half of the regular line. Unexpected uses of majuscule, great frequency of colon and dash, and elliptic utterances
following complete sentences, seem to be an attempt to supply the narrative with a sort of cadence characteristic of informal oral speech. This tendency is in contrast to the bookish lexicon, frequent nominal constructions and abundance of compound forms. Frequently post-positioned adjectives and inversion of object and subject-positions add a very formal note to the narrative, since these forms are especially associated with poetic language.

Some structures may appear deviant in respect to literary or oral usage conventions while preserving the regular grammatical features of the language system. Many full reflexive forms and long instrumental desinences are found in the novel. These appear to relate to the stress pattern of the sentences in which they occur. This feature was not considered in this study.
Symbolism, as a literary movement, is an antithesis to realism and naturalism and, as such, denounces objective description and realistic means of portrayal. Symbolism is, of course, inherent in all literature; as Goethe has said, it is actually 'the nature, the essence of literature'. But, whereas in earlier epochs a symbol had some kind of content-function, in much of twentieth century literature it has lost its clear-cut means-end relationship to the idea behind it, and becomes a creative aim in itself. Thus, the question 'what does it symbolize' becomes irrelevant. The symbol is rather an expression of subjective perception which does not, as a rule, seek to be substantiated by objective phenomena. Lyrical poetry is the art form most commonly associated with subjective experience. Most of the symbolist writers have been accomplished masters of this genre and the language devices which are associated with poetry have been used in symbolist novels. Characteristic of the language of poetry is a special unity of structure. Indeed, the most common statement employed in literary criticism of poetry is that:

'in poetry the form of the discourse and its meaning are fused into a higher unity.... Form, in fact, embraces and penetrates message in a way which constitutes a deeper and more substantial meaning than either abstract message or separate ornament'.

This 'special kind of unity' penetrates into prose with the symbolist novel and, as in poetry, becomes a major
structural principle. Valéry has said that the primary characteristic of ordinary language is that as soon as it is understood it vanishes, to be replaced by the impressions, ideas and actions which it conveys. The language itself does not last. On the other hand, the particular quality of poetic language is that it does last; it is memorable and as S. R. Levin has shown in his study, this permanence is, among others, a function of textual unity. In contrast, a novel cannot generally be said to have this kind of permanence. According to Lubbock, 'As quickly as we read, (the novel) melts and shifts in memory; even at the moment when the last page is turned: a great part of the book is already vague and doubtful.' This is not to say that novels lack unity; any text, to the extent that it is a text, possesses some kind of unity, and literary texts do so to a high degree. But, if only because of its length and multitude of its components, the unity of a novel is more complex. It follows that, by consciously abandoning logical progression and causal relationships, writers of symbolist novels must to an increased extent, rely on ordered structures to achieve the kind of unity necessary to render the text meaningful. As E. K. Brown has said: 'To a writer who is not so confident that life is perfectly intelligible, and who is impelled to render the part of life that
eludes his clear and convinced understanding, the symbol, fixed or expanding, is a chief resource. The fixed symbol is almost entirely repetition, the expanding symbol is repetition balanced by variation, and that variation is in progressively deepening disclosure.'

In the artistic movements prevalent at the turn of the century can be found an especially acute awareness of the 'principles of variation within a unity' in all art forms. Picasso, Braque, Stravinsky, Joyce and Belyj, all of whom were born within the two years 1880 - 1882, reach maturity at this time. As Roman Jakobson has described it, the atmosphere of early twentieth century Moscow was filled with: 'A unique feeling for the dialectic tension between the parts and the uniting whole', that 'everything is based on relationships, on interrelation between parts and wholes'.

Leitmotifs, parallelisms and even such devices as Lautmalerei and metrics, which are traditionally associated with poetry, belong to the primary structural elements of the symbolist novel, and their function is to unify and clarify relationships which the writer chooses not to report directly or to which he may point only because of their essentially evasive character - because they lie in an area 'which can be glimpsed, never surveyed'.
The elusiveness of the subject matter must be compensated for by an increased precision of the novel's formal pattern. Motifs, thematic or linguistic, at times become the single carriers of continuity. The often maintained claim that the function of these devices is ornamental no longer applies, for they have become architectonic mainstays of the structure. The traditional division of 'verse' and 'prose' in their etymological sense of 'versus' - signifying a turning back, a beginning again in like manner - as opposed to 'proversus' - signifying straight ahead - is not applicable. This is often pointed out and well understood with reference to free-form poetry, but modern prose is making much use of traditionally poetic devices. The claim that 'there is nothing magical in reading: it is in rereading that some magic may lie' applies to poetry and the novel alike.

In St. Petersburg hallucinations, nightmares and phantoms blend into the realistic sequence of events. The unity and progression of the novel depend mainly on recurrent passages, motifs and images. In a sense, the dramatic plot has only marginal significance and the main dramatic highlight, the actual explosion of the bomb, has only a comic effect.

In the novel the various factions are interconnected by recurring motifs, and the entire work is an unfolding of an all-pervading lethal theme. The damp cold pervading the
streets and prospects is part of Dudkin's miserable existence, and has invaded the Ableukhov home as well. The yellow, peeling wallpaper and damp bugs, the lacquered coldness and greenish mirrors are but variations of the same theme. In the crowded restaurants and in Likhutin's apartment the dampness is a sickening warm humidity.

Mongol blood is part of the Ableukhov heritage. Lippančenko looks like a Mongol, Sofja Petrovna is called a Japanese doll, and Dudkin says that there is Mongol blood in all Russians. Nikolaj Ableukhov wears a Tatar robe, and Kant is a Turanian.

The setting and rising sun over St. Petersburg is red like the glow of fires. Nikolaj Ableukhov's red domino, reflected in the polished floors, looks like pools of blood. The leaves turn red. A red carpet leads to Nikolaj's rooms in the Ableukhov house, and Dudkin leaves wet footprints on the carpet. The senator feels that his heart palpitations are expansions of a little red ball. As a child Nikolaj had a little red ball bouncing on the lacquered floors and sounding: pepp-peppety-pepp.

Peppovič is a revolutionary. In Nikolaj's childhood nightmares, the red ball expands and threatens to swallow him up. The double agent, persecuting Nikolaj, is a round, repulsively fat man. When the bomb finally does explode,
nobody is hurt and the only harm the senator suffers comes from the expanding red ball within him: he suffers a heart-attack. The blood which is shed is not the senator's but Lippančenko's, and it is his visionary fellow-revolutionary Dudkin who causes his death.

The recurring, rhythmical elements of the novel are foregrounded by linguistic deviation. A deviant structure is a culturally unexpected stimulus capable of attracting the reader's special attention by its form and, furthermore, of making the reader a participant in the process that Roman Jakobson calls 'etymological thinking'. It is an inherent characteristic of Russian that it lends itself more readily than, for example, English to a kind of etymological awareness because of the transparent quality, the motivation of its morpheme structures.

The 'symbol' is the binding element which not only interconnects the parts of the novel, but also serves as a link joining the reader and the author, to the extent that they both function in the same cultural tradition, and are part of what Northrop Frye calls the 'cultural memory'. This is, of course, a very important factor in the study of foreign literature, where the reader and author belong to different cultures. To take a concrete example, no exhaustive study of the distributional patterns of the images of
mongolism in St. Petersburg, no amount of explication of the linguistic finesse of the syntactic relations the images enter, will yield a complete appreciation of their significance. One has to know something of the circumstances which contributed to the semantic widening of such terms as 'татаршына'. Otherwise, a basic literary element, such as an image, may fail even to be recognized.

In this study, emphasis placed on distributional and relational internal meaning is not intended to deny external referential meaning. It is hoped that the patterns of linguistic elements described here will indicate some relationships which are ordinarily called semantic, and thus will provide compelling illustrations of the view that grammatical structure and semantic structure may be different in degree, but not necessarily in kind. It is especially the study of deviant language that contributes to the development of more refined structural descriptions which, in turn, lead towards insights into the interpretation of utterances. As Chomsky has pointed out:

'given a grammatically deviant utterance, we attempt to impose an interpretation on it, exploiting whatever features of grammatical structure it preserves, and whatever analogies we can construct with perfectly well formed utterances. We do not, in this way, impose an interpretation on a perfectly grammatical utterance, it is precisely for this reason that a well chosen deviant utterance may be richer and more effective.' 10.
In the foregoing chapter of this study representative deviances found in St. Petersburg were cited, and a systematic attempt was made to interpret the utterances in which they occur by exploiting whatever standard systematical features the structure preserves.

The regularity of patterns of the most frequently recurring deviances was noted in the summaries following analysis of representative citations from each chapter. In the calculation of occurrence ratios, not only the citations selected for detailed analysis, but all citations marked by the native readers were taken into account.

I shall now attempt to indicate the position of the most frequent patterns of deviating structures in some types of generative transformational theory.

On the surface, one of the most noticeable features of the language of St. Petersburg is the great number of archaisms and Church Slavonic forms (many of them occurring in St'opka's speech). The use of lexical items, which are not current in contemporary standard language, or which are reserved for special contexts, does not represent a structural deviation of language. Such use indicates that, in generating the utterances under consideration, a larger, more inclusive lexicon than is customary in standard language was drawn upon. This feature does not affect the internal system of language,
but is merely a choice of usage relating to the social context in which it occurs. The foregrounding of such forms derives from the reader's awareness that the forms belong, as it were, to a different code of the language. Attention is attracted by contrasting an archaic form to its more contemporary environment. The forms are perceived as belonging to another intruding lexical system. As is well known, the Church Slavonic element in literary Russian allows for subtle nuances of usage which are only remotely comparable to the contrasting uses of Romance and Germanic elements in English. In Russian the contrasting forms are both Slavonic and closely related, and their interrelation can be subtle and intricate. It is usually thought that Slavonic forms are restricted to abstract, bookish, exalted usage but there are instances where they are more colloquial than their Russian counterparts. 11.

Transformational theory has not yet reached a stage in its development where rules can be assigned indisputable order. The generative rules which develop the phonemic, or in the case of written literature, the graphic shape of sentences are generally thought to be on the surface level. If one understands certain spelling traditions such as, for example, the significance of the double series of vowel symbols in Russian, the graphemic shape of standard Russian may be looked upon as a generative level deeper than its phonemic level. It can be shown to coincide largely with
the morphophonemic level; that is to say, the graphemic shape of Russian does not, as a rule, indicate predictable phonetic variations. As has been pointed out earlier, Belyj's attempt to graphically represent phonetic variation in dialect speech does not permit clear conclusions as to the nature of the phonetic deviance: this must, rather, be induced from the literary tradition used to indicate such features as broad 'akanije' and 'ikanije'. The graphic indication of the latter is the most prevalent feature of deviant speech indication in the novel and is used as a stylizing device in representing the speech of the least educated characters, servants, and small tradesmen. It should be noted that 'akanije' is a feature of the Moscow dialect, the basis of the modern standard language, while 'okanije' is a feature of the northern Petersburg dialect. A further characteristic of dialect speech is morphophonetic deviation. This, for the most part, seems to be a diachronic dimension reflecting older usage conventions. A few items are distorted on the morphophonemic level for a comic or ironic effect.

Frequently, deviation on the morphophonemic level consists of a selection of morphophonemically incompatible base and derivational morphemes, that is to say, the abstract form marker is in accord with the standard system, but its phonemic shape is not. This type of deviation effects a relatively surface structure. However, in standard Russian,
some such morphophonemic selections are restricted to specify word classes, and reflect deep level deviation. Thus, it appears that some morphophonemic restrictions must be introduced along with word selection.

One recurring characteristic of Belyj's language is a deviation from the selectional rule which determines the categories of the subject and object of a verb. Within the Chomskian framework of phrase structure rules, the deviation consists of crossing the subcategory divisions of the rule N $\rightarrow$ man, ball, etc.\textsuperscript{12}. The introduction of concrete lexical items at this point in the grammar has been criticized, and there has been voiced the need to distinguish more sharply between lexical representation and grammatical symbols.

I assume that the lexical items 'man, ball, etc.' are introduced here as representative examples of finer subcategories of the general category of nouns. The members of one subcategory are interchangeable for any given level of context sensitivity. As the selection rules of a grammar become more and more detailed, the categories tend to converge with the logical grammar, that is to say, each small subcategory is characterized by some kind of semantic feature. The introduction of the concrete lexical item is a low level expansion of the grammatical rules. Thus the rule N $\rightarrow$ man,
ball, etc. may be modified to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rewrite Noun as choice of:</th>
<th>Noun - abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noun - animate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noun - human</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noun - vegetative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noun - substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noun - count</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The syntactic characteristics on the basis of which these subcategory divisions are made are the syntactic features of a given noun. The six syntactic features introduced here are established on the basis of standard collocations. For illustration, for each syntactic feature introduced in this matrix, one noun is paired with a representative member from other parts of speech.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abstract</td>
<td>любовь проходит</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concrete</td>
<td>хлеб печётся</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animate</td>
<td>рыба плавает</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inanimate</td>
<td>стул складывается</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human</td>
<td>мальчик говорит</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-human</td>
<td>коза бодается</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vegetative</td>
<td>лес багровеет</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-vegetative</td>
<td>камень лежит</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>substantial</td>
<td>бумага режется</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsubstantial</td>
<td>ветер продолжается</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>count</td>
<td>сон снится</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-count</td>
<td>золото блестит</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each noun is specified by a set of syntactic features. The latter may be represented in a syntactic feature matrix, analogous to the one developed by Roman Jakobson for phonological distinctive features. If a noun is characterized by a particular syntactic feature then, by convention, the feature is preceded by '+'. If the noun is characterized by the absence of a particular feature, it is preceded by '-'. If a noun is characterized without taking that feature into account, then the feature is preceded by '0'.
Especially in standard language, a noun may frequently be indentified by a single feature. Thus, for example, ' + Noun-human' automatically implies correct choices of the remaining features. Since poetic language derives one of its special effects from irregular bundles of syntactic features, this implication is not necessarily automatic. For example, in the collocation: 'зеркала глотали пространство', the transitive verb may be thought of as assigning a set of syntactic features to its subject and object. The actual nouns which function as the subject and object in a given word chain have already established features which coincide in standard language with those governed by the verb in the sentence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>- 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The syntactic feature discord in this word chain occurs within the animate-inanimate opposition for the subject and in the
abstract-concrete opposition for the object.

Syntactic features, like all elements of language, are subject to diachronic changes. Shifting of syntactic features may take place in a relatively short period of time: a feature may start out as a unique metaphor, become established figurative usage, and cease to be perceived as figurative within a single generation of speakers.

Noun subclass crossings permeate the entire novel. In this way, the expressive power of the work derives not only from the referential content but from a deeper, sublexical structure as well. Explication of the grammatical relationships involved in the use of language provides an exact and ultimately quantifiable substantiation to impressionistic judgement, which may be perceptive, but is frequently esoteric.

Thus, Fedor Stepun advises students of Belyj's art to keep in mind that, all his life, Belyj has seen and described lampshades and shirts in the precise moment when these turn into death heads and funeral shrouds. 15.

I have attempted to indicate, within a syntactic feature matrix, some of the linguistic means by which Belyj achieves this conversion.
In standard language there is no known limit to the number of lexical items by which we refer to distinct objects, characteristics or functions. All these items cannot be listed, because a great number of them have never yet been used. Poetic language can, at times, be especially rich in new lexical structures. One of the tasks of an explanatory grammar is to reveal the rules according to which such complex structures are composed. It is, as a rule, discovered that these structures are contracted surface shapes of deep level utterances or sentences.

A transformational grammar attempts to formulate rules for deviation of sentences and, furthermore, for the conversion of these sentences into functionally single units. The surface shape represents the grammatical relationships of the underlying deep structure. To some extent, the formal indication of these relationships may be suspended, so that two distinct source structures may have a homomorphic surface structure. The mechanism is analogous to the concept of phonemic 'Aufhebung' developed by Trubetzkoy: two distinct morphophonemes may have, under special conditions, a single phonemic replacement: for example, in Russian the phonemic opposition of voiced and unvoiced consonants is suspended in word-terminal position. Analogously, the surface structures of the instrumental constructions, 'резать ножом' and 'пастъ камнем' are identical only in their contracted
form. In the deep structure the distinction of syntactic relationships becomes apparent. I would tentatively suggest that, in the first instance, the instrumental desinence is developed within the kernel, whereas the second is a transform of 'падает как камень'.

In Russian, the adverbial instrumental serves as a surface shape to a large number of source structures - all of which cannot be considered here. Many of the instrumentals used by Belyj are transforms of 'как' source sentences, that is, of the type 'пасть камнем — падает как камень'. In standard language, the productivity of this transform is restricted. Basically similar, although quite different in surface shape, are newly derived relational adjectives; although in standard language not every noun serves as a donor to a new adjective form, (nor does every 'как' structure contract into an adverbial instrumental).

Since Saussure, there have been distinguished two contrary forces in language systems: the tendency towards complete autonomy of the linguistic sign freed from all outside motivations, and the opposite tendency towards motivation of linguistic structures. Both arbitrary and motivated structures are contemporary components of a given language system, but their frequency and relative significance differ among languages. Thus, in English, arbitrary structures are common,
whereas Russian has a strong tendency to motivate its structures. Affixation plays a very important role and the etymologies of compounds tend to remain vigorous. Long lexical structures may, as a rule, be broken down into motivated morphological units. It is this linguistic feature inherent in Russian which Belyj capitalizes upon in the formation of his neologisms.

We have seen that, at times, he adheres so closely to the general principles governing new derivations in Russian, that a native speaker is not positive whether he is confronted with a neologism at all. Such neologisms are comparable, on a phonological level, to permitted phoneme sequences which conform to the phoneme distribution rules operative in a given language, but are nonsense words because of some configuration in the cultural history. 18.

Neologisms derived on principles that are still fully productive in the language are perceived as the least original and many of Belyj's compound adjectives fall into this category. Another type of identity transform 19. (that is, derivation of a word within the same general class), found in the novel, is a noun plus noun-genitive pairing contracted into a compound noun, for example: 'место действия -> местодействие'. This type of compound transform is also
fully productive in modern Russian, compare: 'место жительства —> местожительство'.

In Russian, to the abundance of derivative affixes there corresponds an equally large number of transforms which develop source string relationships into bound morphemes.

Abstractly, a generator is independent of the word concept, as Saumjan has stated.

'We can see no fundamental difference between small book and book-let — — . Of course, not every noun derived from another noun can be represented as the phrase (adjective plus noun), but there is an unquestionable analogy between adjectives and suffixes forming nouns from nouns.'

Since the language in St. Petersburg abounds in diminutive forms, some implications of diminutive derivation will be examined. The English diminutive example used by Saumjan is somewhat misleading: 'small book' and 'booklet' are not grammatical synonyms as are the Russian 'книга' and 'книжка'. The diminutive 'booklet' refers to a special type of printed matter and the etymology linking it to 'book' is not even very vigorous. Semantic shifts of this kind also occur with some diminutive forms in Russian, for example: 'рост', 'росток', 'росточек'. Perhaps it can be said that diminutives which are semantically linked to their base nouns are transforms
incorporating quantifying or qualitative adjectives, for example:

'маленький стол -- столик'

'ничтожный рыцарь -- рыцарёк'.

Diminutives which have undergone semantic shift, however, incorporate a relational element as well, thus: 'маленький рост (ростка) → росточек'. Thus, when Belyj uses this particular diminutive form with reference to Nikolaj Ableukhov, he is disregarding the human-vegetative division on the generation level.

A more complex derivational pattern, which is not a single level identity transform, is represented by participle structures which, in Russian, are morphologically adjectives. Significantly, traditional grammars are inconsistent in their classification of participles. Some include them in the category of adjectives (Vinogradov), others (Šahmatov) hold, on semantic grounds, that participles are not to be separated from verbs. In generative transformational terms, the conflict here is between classification by the criteria of deep or surface structure.

In Russian, adjectives are synchronically underived forms (although this cannot always be maintained diachronically). They can be compared, have morphological adverbial counterparts and serve as bases for verbal derivations. The possessive and relational forms are, by contrast, derived from nouns.\(^{21}\).
A group of Belyj's verb neologisms disregard this adjective division and derive from relational adjectives, and some even derive directly from nouns which do not have an adjective relating to them in standard language. Thus it can be said that, in this type of derivation, Belyj disregards a deep-deep level distinction of quality and substance.

Developments in linguistic theory may ultimately make possible an exhaustive formal statement of the entire linguistic system of a literary work. It is hoped that this study has proposed and supported the claim that an analysis of linguistic structures reveal the essential quality of a literary work and that this kind of criticism may enhance the reader's appreciation. This emphasis does not deny the value and validity of other, more traditional, approaches; however, it does claim that the intricate motif patterns of St. Petersburg lose much of their unity, intensity and comprehensiveness if the linguistic foregrounding is overlooked.

On the other hand, the focus on the original, the unexpected, the innovatory aspect of language emphasised in literature, tests the explanatory limits of a language theory. Entirely new elements are very seldom encountered; the novel effect derives from the functional patterns into
which elements combine, and it is obvious that these cannot be explicated by the addition of the linear sequence of morphemes, but that their formation and comprehensibility depend on intricate, deep structure relationships.

*St. Petersburg* belongs to the books which cannot just be read. Rather, a reading of it is achieved. In this reading the logic of language has been shown to capture some of the novel's elusive essence.
NOTES TO CONCLUSION


Phrase Structure:

[F: 1. Sentence ——> NP + VP] (13i)

2. VP ——> Verb + NP (13iii)

3. NP ——> {NPsing} [NPpl} (p.29, fn.3)
4. NPsing → T + N + Ø   (p.29,fn.3)
5. NPpl' → T + N + S'   (p.29,fn.3)
6. T → the   (13iv)
7. N → man, ball, etc.   (13v)
8. Verb → Aux + V   (28vi)
9. V → hit, take, walk, read, etc.   (28iv)
10. Aux → C(M) (Have + en)(be + ing)   (28vii)
11. M → will, can, may, shall, must   (28viii)

15. F. Stepun, quoted after J. Holthusen, *op.cit.*
17. C. Bally, see for example: *Linguistique générale et linguistique française*, Paris, 1932.
18. I believe R.B. Lees has made this comparison.
22. It should, however, be noted that the formal divisions are not too rigid in standard language either; for example: 'каменеть'.
SOURCES CONSULTED


Belyj, Andrej. Simvolizm, Moscow: Musaget, 1910.


Čiževskij, D. Über die Eigenart der russischen Sprache, Halle (Saale): Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1948.


Ivanov, V.V. Историческая Грамматика Русского Языка, Moscow: Просвещение, 1984.

Ives, S., Richards, I.A. On Linguistics and Language Studies, Georgetown University Press.


Jespersen, O. Mankind, Nation and Individual from a Linguistic Point of View, Oslo, 1925.


Vinogradov, V. V. *Русский язык*, Moscow: Учпедгиз, 1947.
