

“Сколько стоятъ въ Лондонъ галоши”: Quasi-trochees in Nabokov’s prose

Grigori Utgof

Institute of Slavonic Languages and Cultures, Tallinn University
29 Narva Road, S-326, Tallinn 10120, Estonia
e-mail: utgof@tlu.ee

Abstract. Summing up the ideas expressed in the most influential articles on the semantic halo of the Russian trochaic pentameter, scholars tend to avoid one particularly tricky question: how many units – and what kind of units – are needed to detect extra layers of meaning in a particular text? While the article of Kiril Taranovsky “О взаимоотношении стихотворного ритма и тематики” had implied that the source of these meanings (e.g. the dynamic theme of the *journey*) should be sought in a line starting from the 3- to 4-syllable structure, incorporating a verb of motion and an anapestic anacrusis (*Выхожу* [verb of motion, last syllable stressed] *один я на дорогу*), later research objected to this principle as an oversimplification. At the same time two later contributions on the subject (Kirill Vishnevsky’s “Экспрессивный оргол пятистопного хоря” and Mikhail Gasparov’s “The semantic halo of the Russian trochaic pentameter: Thirty years of the problem”) proposed the idea of operating with whole texts as potential sources of meanings, thus calling into question a micro-level approach to the origin of the phenomenon. In my article I propose an empirical model that makes it possible to evaluate some limitations of both practices: I concentrate on some quasi-trochaic pentameters culled from the prose text of *Подвиг* (*Glory*) by Vladimir Nabokov (Sirin), and examine these quasi-verse incidents in the framework of both approaches.

In this paper I aim to propose an empirical model that would make it possible to evaluate some limitations of the existing approaches to the thematic repertoire of the Russian trochaic pentameter. To achieve this goal, I shall make use of the technique of close reading, focussing on isolating trochaic pentameters from a text unrelated to poetry with the purpose of studying these quasy-lines in comparison with trochees proper. Such a comparison can lessen the tension between two influential approaches to the problem of verse form and memory: M. L. Gasparov’s approach vs that of R. O. Jakobson and K. F. Taranovsky. These approaches diverge from each other in one aspect:

Gasparov's approach is essentially inductive, while the other – competing – approach is deductive *par excellence*.

1

In his article on Macha's verse "*К popisu Máchova verše*" Jakobson (1938: 433–485) made an *en passant* comment on the mutual interrelation of the Russian trochaic pentameter and a certain thematic repertoire¹ "interspersing the dynamic motif of the road with the sorrowful, static motifs of lonely existence robbed of aspirations and leading to extinction" (Jakobson 1979: 465). He had also proposed the idea that the abstract dimension of verse can potentially generate meanings – thus becoming a part of the symbolism of a given poetic text.

Not unlike Jakobson, Taranovsky was intrigued by this rare phenomenon, yet unlike him he believed it was caused by the actual use of the pattern. Taranovsky maintained that a verse line of the Russian trochaic pentameter can recover meanings derived from a corpus of matching antecedents, which is centred on one major theme – the dynamic theme of the *journey*. Being lexically manifested through the usage of verbs of motion and the paradigm of the *road*, this dynamic theme can be altered by the static theme of *existence* – manifested by less distinct features, yet deducible from the text. Prompted in part by the article by S. P. Bobrov "*Займствования и влияния*" (1922: 72–92)² as well as his own pioneering research in *Руски дводелни ритмови* (1953), Taranovsky had shown that the rhythm of the Russian trochaic pentameter motivates verbs of motion to favour the initial half of the line. He supported his argumentation by a whole list of verse lines beginning with an anapestic

¹ I prefer the notion of the thematic repertoire (*тематический репертуар*) to the notion of the semantic halo (*семантический ореол*) of the metre due to the fact that the former term feels more precise than the latter (while the *репертуар* is an attribute of the text, the *ореол* is an attribute of the context, i.e. potentially infinite and indefinite textual matter). At the same time, I have no objections against the actual usage of *семантический ореол* or closely related notions in versification studies. For the history of the notion, see Shapir 1991: 36–40; see also an essay correcting one of M. I. Shapir's oversights: Ronen 2009: 214. For a comprehensive bibliography of major works on the subject see Gasparov 1999: 294–297; see also Aizlewood 1989: 308–309.

² Taranovsky also relied on this article in his *Essays on Mandel'shtam* (1972). The second subtextual class Taranovsky had singled out – *займствование по ритму и звучанию* or "borrowing of a rhythmic figure and the sounds contained therein" (1972: 18; Taranovsky 2000: 32) – is in itself a borrowing from "*Займствования и влияния*" (Bobrov 1922: 72–92).

anacrusis (“Выхожу || один[ъ] я на дорогу” – Lermontov (1954 [1843]: 208); “Вот[ъ] ид[у] я || вдоль большой дороги” – Tyutchev (1966 [1903]: 203)), which are reproduced in the body of poems he referred to as the Lermontov cycle (Taranovsky 2000 [1963]: 372–403).

In Gasparov’s view, these conjectures had been flawed from the very beginning. Lines are elements of a poem, and the poem is also an element of a larger set – such as all poems in the trochaic pentameter. So, without any statistical data on this larger set, it is useless to make guesses about the actual preferences of the metre. What can be reconstructed, however, is a nexus of certain features that prevails over a short span of time. For the Russian trochaic pentameter this period is something more than half a century, and, during this time, the theme of the *journey* is a theme that the metre avoids. Introduced in a poem by Lermontov, this particular theme constitutes just a minor statistical share overshadowed by more frequent elements (such as *night*, *landscape*, *death*, and *love*). From Gasparov’s viewpoint, the development of the Russian trochaic pentameter is subordinate to the development of the literature as such, and should not be seen as generated by a certain deep, inherent structure³ (Gasparov 1996: 191–214; Gasparov 1999: 238–265). All in all, his suggestions were aimed at making obsolete those of his peers who had argued that the form *is* responsible for the trochee’s thematic repertoire.⁴

2

In what follows I shall focus on extracting quasi-trochaic pentameters from Chapters 12 and 23 of Vladimir Nabokov’s *Подвиг* (*Glory*). The choice of this novel – a story of an émigré from Soviet Russia preparing himself for an illegal 24-hour trip to a land, where “a smell of burning and putrefaction permeates

³ In this respect, Gasparov’s reservations coincide very closely with those of the most positivistic critique of the Taranovsky approach to the problem of verse form and memory: Vishnevsky 1985: 108.

⁴ To my knowledge, Gasparov’s approach to the Russian trochaic pentameter has been challenged so far only twice. It has been suggested that treating equally poems that employ different stanzas and rhyme schemes is a somewhat schematic approach to the problem of verse form and memory (Seeman 2001: 210–221). It has also been argued that statistical proof of the *journey* theme’s minor importance “does not exclude the possibility that individual poets sensed and cultivated such a link in their own verse. [...] Statistical evidence, in short, does not outweigh actual poetic practice, even if this practice concerns only a very small number of poets” (Wachtel 1998: 302).

the air" (G: 150) – was prompted by one formal factor: the novel's semantic structure realizes the title's polysemy (*подвиг* as 'a bold or daring feat' and as 'an act of changing physical location' – Dahl 1903–1909 [1861–1867]: 418–419)⁵ with the help of a whole list of references to the paradigm of the *road* (Utgof 1999: 122–128; Dolinin, Utgof 2000: 716, 718) and several appropriate subtexts (including at least four allusions to the poem initiating the Lermontov cycle in literature – “*Выхожу один я на дорогу...*” – Dolinin, Utgof 2000: 720, 724–725, 738; Dolinin 2004: 173).⁶ The choice of Chapters 12 and 23 was prompted by their proximity to the thematic repertoire of the Russian trochaic pentameter (*journey–existence* in the Jakobson-Taranovsky interpretation, or *road–night–landscape–death–love* in Gasparov's interpretation) making them a potential source for relevant quasi-trochees.⁷

To separate formally relevant quasi-trochaic pentameters from other metrical patterns, I stuck to the following rule: a valid instance of the quasi-trochaic pentameter must be 9 to 10 syllables long, and border at least one syntagma (such as *...сколько стóять въ Лондонѣ галóши...* in the sentence “*Ушелъ онъ за-полночь, и уже съ порога вдругъ обернулся и спросилъ, сколько*

⁵ In the framework of the *Подвиг* scholarship, this polysemy was noticed in a year's time by three critics: Buhks (1998: 59); Dolinin (1999: 207, 214); Utgof (1999: 122).

⁶ The most apparent reference is as follows:

«Какъ-то въ Кембриджъ онъ нашелъ въ номеръ мѣстнаго журнала шестидесятихъ годовъ стихотвореніе, хладнокровно подписанное “А. Джемсонъ”: “Я иду по дорогъ одинъ, мой каменистый путь простирается далеко, тиха ночь и холодень камень, и ведется разговоръ между звѣздой и звѣздой”» (P: 187).

“Once, in Cambridge, he discovered in a sixty-year-old issue of the local review a poem coolly signed: A. Jameson. It began:

*I walk along the road alone.
My stony path spreads far,
Still is the night and cold the stone,
And star talks unto star.*

and was a shameless paraphrase of Lermontov's greatest lyrical poem” (G: 162–163).

Note the difference between the original and the English text of the segment. For a comparative reading of *Подвиг* and *Glory* see Grayson 1977: 119–124.

⁷ On the novel's syntactic structure, which in itself can be seen as promoting the principle of equivalence “to the constitutive device of the sequence” (Jakobson 1981 [1960]: 27), see my doctoral dissertation *Проблема синтаксического темпа* (2007: 33–42, 94–96, 101–115, 120–123) available for download from <http://e-ait.tlulib.ee/> or <http://tallinn.academia.edu/GrigoriUtgof/Books/271451/>. See also Utgof 2009: 106–110.

стоять в Лондонъ галоши” – P: 106). In other words, I disregarded 1) quasi-trochaic lines with a dactylic clausula (such as ... и другіе образы изъ английскихъ... in the sentence “Онъ видѣлъ черныя кэбы, хлюпающіе въ туманъ, полицейскаго въ черномъ блестящемъ плащѣ, огни на Темзѣ – и другіе образы изъ английскихъ книгъ” – P: 60); 2) quasi-trochaic hexameters (such as ... анекдотомъ о студентѣ и кузинѣ ... in the sentence “Было очевидно, что единственное, чего онъ полонъ, единственное, что занимаетъ его и волнуетъ, – это бѣда Россіи, и Мартынъ, съ содроганіемъ представляя себѣ, что было бы, если бѣ взять да перебить его бурную, напряженную рѣчь анекдотомъ о студентѣ и кузинѣ” – P: 105–106); 3) 9-syllable lines that can be extended to iambic pentameter with the inclusion of a neighbouring syllable (such as ... погода, ушелъ наверхъ, къ женѣ... vs ... и, погода, ушелъ наверхъ, къ женѣ... in the sentence “Когда закрылась за нимъ дверь, Зилановъ остался нѣкоторое время стоять въ раздумьи и, погода, ушелъ наверхъ, къ женѣ” – P: 106); 4) quasi-trochaic instances unsupported by outer syntagmas (such as ... голубыя бабочки, въ кустахъ... in the sentence “Скрытые листвою, журчали ручьи, съ мокрыхъ мѣстъ на дорогѣ вспархивали голубыя бабочки, въ кустахъ возились птицы, – все было до грусти солнечно и безопасно” – P: 58). I also discarded all instances of overlapping patterns (such as ... какъ всегда, въ гостиной, дверь была... overlapping with an instance of the quasi-iambic tetrameter ... сидѣли, какъ всегда, въ гостиной... in the sentence “Вечеромъ, послѣ обѣда, сидѣли, какъ всегда, въ гостиной, дверь была широко открыта на террасу, и, такъ какъ испортилось электричество, горѣли въ канделябрахъ свѣчи: изрѣдка пламя ихъ наклонялось, и тогда изъ-подъ всѣхъ креселъ вытягивались черныя тѣни” – P: 58–59) unless the pattern occurring in the earlier part of the text was the trochaic pentameter. As a result, I succeeded in extracting 34 quasi-trochees (330 syllables) from 179 sentences of prose (5,948 syllables). Having done this, I started to group the quasi-trochees extracted.

Some quasi-trochees can be termed as reader-oriented, while other trochees can be termed as rereader-oriented. The reader-oriented quasi-trochee is a quasi-line, which is embraced by syntagmas at either end (see Appendix 1):

[1.1.] II “Онъ вообще выходитъ очень рѣдко” | [1.2.] VI Онъ устáвился глазами въ небо... |
 [1.3.] VII Изабѣлу, Нину, Маргариту... | [1.4.] XI За художника, за моряка... | [1.5.] VII ... онъ
 отлично вымылся подъ душемъ... | [1.6.] IX Свѣтлыхъ, привлекательныхъ кафѣ... |
 [1.7.] II ... какъ въ ея глазахъ бѣгутъ огни... (P: 59–62); [1.8.] V ... сколько стоятъ въ
 Лондонѣ галоши... | [1.9.] VI ... и спустился во второй этажъ | [1.10.] III “Можетъ быть,

вотъ-вотъ – подасть мнѣ знакъ?" | ^[1.11.] II ... и Мартынь не сразу могъ отвѣтить ... | ^[1.12.] VII "Отчего вы, Соня, босикомъ?" | ^[1.13.] II ... и вокругъ прелестной голой шеи ... | ^[1.14.] IX "Крѣпкая", – сказала она съ грустью (P: 106–109).⁸

The rereader-oriented quasi-trochee is a quasi-line that is supported by one outer border only (see Appendix 2):

^[2.1.] VII ... широко открыта на террасу ... | ^[2.2.] IV Дядя Генрихъ, отложивъ газету ... | ^[2.3.] IX ... чувствовала дорожную усталость ... | ^[2.4.] VII ... и пошелъ по утреннимъ просторнымъ ... (P: 58–63); ^[2.5.] VI Иоголевичъ оказался толстымъ ... ^[2.6.] VII ... какъ дойти до станции подземной ... | ^[2.7.] V ... днемъ, среди обычныхъ своихъ дѣлъ ... | ^[2.8.] V Вь этой свѣтлой комнатѣ спала ... | ^[2.9.] II А вѣдь странно: если бродятъ души ... | ^[2.10.] IX ... съ дикой безнадежностью вотъ эту ... | ^[2.11.] II Тишина лилась, лилась – и вдругъ ... | ^[2.12.] III ... что-то заскочило въ горлы. Соня ... | ^[2.13.] VII ... постояла нѣсколько мгновений ... | ^[2.14.] VIII вытаскилъ изъ-подъ себя подушку ... | ^[2.15.] V ... можно было только угадать ... | ^[2.16.] IX ... выпустила дымъ и отдала ... | ^[2.17.] III "Знаете, Мартынь, она всегда ..." | ^[2.18.] VI ... замолчала, и Мартынь замѣтилъ ... | ^[2.19.] VI ... гдѣ Зилановъ, широко разставивъ ... | ^[2.20.] IV "... слава Богу, дали, наконецъ ..." (P: 105–112).

From a purely rhythmical standpoint, all these quasi-lines are fairly usual (the otherwise rare rhythmic form realized in such instances as ^[1.6.] IX *Светлых, привлекательныхъ кафе...* or ^[2.16.] IX *... выпустила дымъ и отдала...* is natural for the Russian language).⁹ On the other hand, once integrated into the rhythmical whole, the quasi-trochaic pentameter is remarkably light (in comparison with the 19th-century trochee):

⁸ A superscript denotes the group that the instance belongs to (1 or 2), and the quasi-trochee's position on the axis of combination (1, 2, 3, etc.). A figure in subscript denotes the rhythmic form (I, II, III, etc.) or the *ритмичка фигура* in Taranovsky's taxonomy (see Taranovsky 1953: 293; Taranovsky 2010: 287).

⁹ The rhythm of natural language encourages two forms of the Russian trochaic pentameter (VII and IX) to appear more often than others (Gasparov 1984: 195). At the early stage poets preferred the seventh form due to the influence of the Russian trochaic tetrameter (Taranovsky 1953: 278–279; Taranovsky 2010: 273–274; see also Gasparov 1984: 195–196), so the rate of the ninth form was lower than the language model predicts. On the Russian trochaic pentameter of some 20th-century poets see Gasparov 1974: 108–115; see also Taranovsky 1953: 367; Taranovsky 2010: 359.

Table 1. The rhythm of Nabokov's quasi-trochaic pentameter in comparison with the rhythm of Lermontov's trochaic pentameter¹⁰

	1 st ictus	2 nd ictus	3 rd ictus	4 th ictus	5 th ictus	Stresses realized
Quasi-trochee	44.1%	73.5%	76.5%	50.0%	100.0%	68.8%
Trochee	58.8%	95.7%	95.0%	51.3%	100.0%	80.5%

The quasi-lines found are a challenge for Taranovsky's approach. They incorporate 6 verbs of motion – *бѣжать*, *бродить*, *выходить* (in figurative meaning), *дойти*, *пойти*, and *спуститься* – and these motion verbs can be met in whatever place within a line. Three of them occur in the second half ([1.7.] II ...какъ въ ея глазахъ бѣгутъ огни... | [2.9.] II А вѣдь странно: если бродятъ души... | [1.1.] II “Онъ вообще выходитъ очень рѣдко”), while the other three occur in the first half, i.e. the first and second foot ([2.6.] VII ...какъ дойти до станціи подземной... | [2.4.] VII ...и пошелъ по утреннимъ просторнымъ... | [1.9.] VI ...и спустился во второй этажъ). Three incidents can be described as employing the rhythmical formula singled out by Taranovsky (...какъ дойти... ...и пошелъ... ...и спустился...), and – in principle – can bring to mind their journey-related antecedents. The quasi-line [2.9.] II А вѣдь странно: если бродятъ души... is likely to trigger the process of recollecting, involving Tyutchev's “Накануне годовщины 4 августа 1864 г.” (“Ангел[ъ] мой, гд[ѣ] б[ѣ] души ни витали...” – Tyutchev 1966 [1903]: 203) – an evidence in support of the argument of Taranovsky.¹¹ On the other hand, this is the only

¹⁰ The data concerning the rhythm of Lermontov's trochaic pentameter (80 lines) is taken from *Руски дводелни ритмови* (Taranovsky 1953: 288, Табела XIV: Петостопни трохеј; Taranovsky 2010: 280, Таблица XIV: Пятистопный хорей).

¹¹ In my view, it is very unlikely that Nabokov intentionally alluded to “Накануне годовщины 4 августа 1864 г.” in the sentence the quasi-line comes from: “А вѣдь странно: если бродятъ души покойниковъ [note the shift of the logical stress on the души покойниковъ], то все хорошо, есть, значитъ, загробныя движенія души, – почему же это такъ страшно?” (P: 108). Yet what might seem to be a byproduct of the process of interpretation is a formally relevant case of intertextual referencing: the anapestic anacrusis ([2.9.] II А вѣдь странно: || если...) plus the lexically manifested theme of life after death (...бродятъ души...) make the form itself ‘recollect’ an analogous instance. On the quasi-

case where such a connection is established: other quasi-lines are independent from each other and from trochees proper. The most obvious reason why quasi-lines do not interact with prior meanings is the virtual absence of members of the paradigm of the *road*: quasi-trochees like ^[1.8.] V ...*сколько стоятъ въ Лондонѣ галоши...* | ^[1.12] III “*Отчего вы, Соня, босикомъ?*” ^[2.3.] | IX ... *чувствовалъ дорожную усталость...* can refer to the road metonymically, yet this referencing still fails to cover the metaphorical meaning of the road as *life*, i.e., the essence of the *journey* theme in Russian literature.

From the viewpoint of literariness, the quasi-lines found are a challenge for the Gasparov approach, since they cannot be seen as belonging to a coherent poem (such semantically interrelated quasi-lines as ^[2.2.] IV *Дядя Генрихъ, отложивъ газету...* | ^[2.3.] IX ...*чувствовалъ дорожную усталость...* or ^[2.12.] III ...*что-то заскочило въ горлы. Соня...* | ^[2.13.] VII ...*постояла ньсколько мгновений...* fail to outweigh the initial incoherence of the assemblage). Thus, in other words, individual quasi-lines struggle with fitting into the (otherwise working) paradigm of the themes, which Gasparov adduced in the framework of his approach to the subject (*road – night – landscape – death – love*).

3

So, the metre itself – or the rhythm as its actual manifestation – does not generate meanings, although certain words may indeed have an innate potential to resonate with the form. This is something that such a pre-structuralist as Yu. N. Tynyanov proposed in his study *Проблема стихотворного языка* (Tynyanov 1924), and this *something* is what both approaches to the problem of the repertoire of the Russian trochaic pentameter try to solve – each in its own way. Each approach has its own limitations, and yet neither of the two should be seen as a mere *trouvaile* that resembles “the neat formula a physicist finds to keep people happy until [...] the next chap snatches the chalk” (Nabokov 1974: 253).¹²

trochaic pentameter, which is following similar norms (“*Колыбель качается над[ъ] бездной*” – Nabokov 2000 [1954]: 145) while referring to a whole series of Lermontovian echoes, see Dolinin 2004: 173. On some quasi-trochaic, quasi-iambic, and quasi-dactylic instances culled from the text of *Дар* (*The Gift*), see Lotman 1999: 71–76.

¹² I am indebted to Kirill Golovastikov, Erik McDonald and my anonymous readers for their thoughtful response to an earlier version of this article. I would like to express my gratitude to the Estonian Science Foundation for awarding me a postdoctoral fellowship (JD 190 “Tölke süntaktiline analüüs”) that encouraged me to finish this article in its present form.

References

- Aizlewood, Robin 1989. *Verse Form and Meaning in the Poetry of Vladimir Mayakovskii*. London: The Modern Humanities Research Association.
- Bobrov, Sergey 1922. Заимствования и влияния (попытка методологизации вопроса). *Печать и революция* 8: 72–92.
- Buhks, Nora 1998. Приобщение к таинству. *Эшафот в хрустальном дворце: О русских романах Владимира Набокова*. Москва: Новое литературное обозрение, 57–86.
- Dahl, Vladimir 1903–1909 [1861–1867]. Подвигать. *Толковый словарь живого великорусского языка* III. П.-Р. С.-Петербург, Москва: Вольф, 418–419.
- Dolinin, Alexander 1999. Clio laughs last: Nabokov's answer to historicism. In: Connolly, Julian (ed.). *Nabokov and His Fiction: New Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 197–215.
- 2004. Истинная жизнь писателя Сирина: Маленькая монография. *Истинная жизнь писателя Сирина: Работы о Набокове*. С.-Петербург: Академический проект, 23–174.
- Dolinin, Alexander; Utgof, Grigori 2000. Примечания [к “Подвику”]. In: *Набоков, Владимир. Собрание сочинений русского периода в 5 томах* III. 1930–1934. С.-Петербург: Симпозиум, 714–742.
- G = Nabokov, Vladimir 1991 [1971]. *Glory*. New York: Vintage International.
- Gasparov, Mikhail 1974. *Современный русский стих: Метрика и ритмика*. Москва: Наука.
- 1984. *Очерк истории русского стиха. Метрика. Ритмика. Рифма. Строфика*. Москва: Наука.
- 1996. The semantic halo of the Russian trochaic pentameter: Thirty years of the problem. *Elementa* 2: 191–214.
- 1999. *Метр и смысл: Об одном из механизмов культурной памяти*. Москва: Российский государственный гуманитарный университет.
- Grayson, Jane 1977. *Nabokov Translated: A Comparison of Nabokov's Russian and English Prose*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jakobson, Roman 1938. К popisu Máchova verše. In: Mukařovský, Jan (ed.). *Torso a tajemství Máchova díla: Sborník pojednání Pražského lingvistického kroužku*. Praha: Borový, 207–278.
- 1979. Toward a description of Mácha's verse. In: *Selected Writings V. On Verse, Its Masters and Explorers*. The Hague, Paris, New York: Mouton, 433–485.
- 1981 [1960]. Linguistics and poetics. In: *Selected Writings III. Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry*. The Hague, Paris, New York: Mouton, 18–51.
- Lermontov, Mikhail 1954 [1843]. Выхожу один я на дорогу. In: *Сочинения в шести томах* 2. *Стихотворения 1832–1841*. Москва, Ленинград: Издательство Академии наук СССР, 208–209.
- Lotman, Mihhail 1999. “А та звезда над Пулковом...”: Заметки о поэзии и стихосложении В. Набокова. *Вышгород* 3: 63–77.
- Nabokov, Vladimir 1974. *Look at the Harlequins!* New York, etc.: McGraw-Hill.

- 2000 [1954]. *Другие берега. Собрание сочинений русского периода в пяти томах V. 1938–1977*. С.-Петербург: Симпозиум, 141–335.
- P = Sirin [Nabokov], Vladimir 1932. *Подвигъ: Романъ*. Парижъ: Современныя Записки.
- Ronen, Omry 2009. Плагиат. *Звезда* 3: 214–221.
- Seeman, Klaus Dieter 2001. Несколько соображений по теории семантического ореола (на материале пятистопного хоря). In: Гаспаров, М. А.; Прохоров, А. В.; Скулачева, Т. В. (eds.) *Славянский стих: Лингвистическая и прикладная поэтика*. Москва: Языки славянской культуры, 210–221.
- Shapir, Maksim 1991. “Семантический ореол метра”: Термин и понятие (историко-стиховедческая ретроспекция). *Литературное обозрение* 12: 36–40.
- Taranovsky, Kiril 1953. *Руски дводелни ритмови: I–II*. Београд: Научна књига.
- 1972. *Essays on Mandel'shtam*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- 2000 [1963]. О взаимоотношении стихотворного ритма и тематики. In: *О поэзии и поэтике*. Москва: Языки русской культуры, 372–403.
- 2000. Очерки о поэзии О. Мандельштама. In: *О поэзии и поэтике*. Москва: Языки русской культуры, 13–208.
- 2010. *Русские двусложные размеры. Статьи о стихе*. Москва: Языки славянской культуры.
- Тунуанов, Yury 1924. *Проблема стихотворного языка*. Ленинград: Академия.
- Tyutchev, Fyodor 1966 [1903]. Накануне годовщины 4 августа 1864 г. In: *Лирика I*. Москва: Наука, 203.
- Utgof, Grigori 1999. К проблеме интерпретации романа В. Набокова “Подвиг.” *Русская филология: Сборник научных работ молодых филологов* 10: 122–128.
- 2007. *Проблема синтаксического темпа*. Tallinn: TLÜ Kirjastus.
- 2009. Süntaktilise tempo probleem. In: Ansaar, Leelo (ed.), *Tallinna Ülikooli üliõpilaste 2007/2008. õppeaasta parimad teadustööd: Artiklite kogumik*. Tallinn: TLÜ Kirjastus, 106–110.
- Vishnevsky, Kirill 1985. Экспрессивный ореол пятистопного хоря. In: Тимофеев, Л. И. (ed.). *Русское стихосложение: Традиции и проблемы развития*. Москва: Наука, 94–113.
- Wachtel, Michael 1998. *The Development of Russian Verse Form: Meter and Its Meanings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix 1

Reader-Oriented Quasi-Trochees

«Послѣдній разъ онъ у меня вышелъ въ Россіи, – проговорила Софья Дмитриевна. – ^[1.1.] Онъ вообще выходитъ очень рѣдко» (P: 59).

^[1.2.] Онъ уставился глазами въ небо, какъ нѣкогда, когда въ коляскѣ, темной лѣсной дорогой, возвращались во-свояси изъ имѣнія сосѣда, и совсѣмъ маленькой, размазанный, готовый вотъ-вотъ уснуть, Мартынъ откидывалъ голову, смотрѣлъ на небесную рѣку, между древесныхъ клубьевъ, по которой тихо плавалъ (P: 60).

Оставивъ багажъ на вокзалѣ, онъ шелъ мимо безчисленныхъ освѣщенныхъ Дрюсовъ и, волнуясь, искалъ ^[1.3.] *Изабеллу, Нину, Маргариту*, кого-нибудь, чьимъ именемъ назвать эту ночь (P: 60).

^[1.4.] *За художника, за моряка, за джентльмена-взломщика?* (P: 60).

На вокзалѣ ^[1.5.] онъ отлично вымылся подъ душомъ въ веселенькой чистой каморкѣ, вытерся теплымъ, мохнатымъ полотенцемъ, которое принесъ краснощекой служитель, надѣлъ чистое бѣлье, лучший костюмъ, оставилъ оба чемодана на храненіи и теперь былъ гордъ, что такъ толково устроился (P: 61).

^[1.6.] *Свѣтлыхъ, привлекательныхъ кафе*, какъ въ Афинахъ или въ Лозаниѣ, тутъ не было, а въ барѣ, гдѣ онъ выпилъ стаканъ пива, оказались одни мужчины, воспаленные, лупоглазые, съ красными жилками на бѣкахъ (P: 61).

“The last time this patience came out was in Russia,” said Sofia. “In general it comes out very seldom” (G:48).

He fixed his eyes on the sky as, once upon a time, when they were driving home in the victoria from a neighbor’s estate along a dark forest road, a very small Martin, rocking on the brink of slumber, would throw back his head and watch the heavenly river, between the amassments of trees, along which he was floating (G: 49).

He had left his luggage at the station and was walking past innumerable illuminated English shops, excitedly looking for Isabel, Nina, Margaret – someone whose name he could give that night (G: 49).

An artist, a sailor, a gentleman burglar (G: 49).

At the station he had taken an excellent shower in a cheerful, clean cubicle, dried himself with a warm, fluffy towel brought by a ruddy-cheeked attendant, put on clean linen and his best suit, and checked both his bags, and now he was proud that he had managed so sensibly (G: 50).

Inviting cafés such as in Athens or Lausanne did not exist here, and in the pub where he drank a glass of beer he found only men, inflamed, morose, with red veins on the white of their prominent eyes (G: 50).

Мартынь увидѣлъ, ^[1.7.] *какъ въ ея глазахъ бѣгутъ огни, переливы, блескъ дождя, и хриплымъ шопотомъ пожелалъ ей добраго вечера* (P: 62).

Ушелъ онъ за-полночь, и уже съ порога вдругъ обернулся и спросилъ, ^[1.8.] *сколько стоятъ въ Лондонѣ галоши* (P: 106).

Онъ накиннулъ халатъ ^[1.9.] и спустился во второй этажъ (P: 107).

«^[1.10.] *Можетъ быть, вотъ-вотъ – подастъ мнѣ знакъ?»* (P: 108)

«Спите?» – раздался вопросительный шопотъ черезъ дверь, ^[1.11.] и Мартынь не сразу могъ отвѣтить, что-то заскочило въ горлѣ (P: 109).

«^[1.12.] *Отчего вы, Соня, босикомъ? – про-бормоталъ Мартынь. – Хотите мои ночныя туфли?»* (P: 109)

Отъ Сони шло нѣжное тепло, ^[1.13.] и вокругъ прелестной голой шеи была тонкая цѣпочка (P: 109).

«^[1.14.] *Крѣпкая», – сказала она съ грустью* (P: 109).

In her eyes Martin saw the sparkling lights, the play of reflected colors, the shimmer of rain, and hoarsely muttered “Good evening.” (G: 51)

He left after midnight and suddenly turning around on the threshold asked how much *kaloshi* (rubbers) cost in London (G: 90).

He pulled on his dressing gown and walked down to the second floor (G: 91).

“Perhaps – now, this instant – she will give me a sign?” (G: 92).

“Are you asleep?” came the whispered question through the door, and for an instant a constriction in his throat prevented Martin from replying (G: 92).

“Why are you barefoot, Sonia? Want my slippers?” (G: 93)

A waft of delicate warmth emanated from her; a thin chainlet of gold surrounded her adorable neck (G: 93).

“Too strong,” she said sadly (G: 93).

Appendix 2

Rereader-Oriented Quasi-Trochees

Вечеромъ, послѣ обѣда, сидѣли, какъ всегда, въ гостиной, дверь была ^[2.1.] широко открыта на террасу, и, такъ какъ испортилось электричество, горѣли въ канделябрахъ свѣчи: изрѣдка пламя ихъ наклонялось, и тогда изъ-подъ всѣхъ кресель вытягивались черныя тѣни (P: 58–59).

^[2.2.] Дядя Генрихъ, отложивъ газету и подбоченясь, смотрѣлъ на карты, которыя раскладывала на ломберномъ столѣ Софья Дмитриевна (P: 59).

Онъ едва ^[2.3.] чувствовалъ дорожную усталость: была только звонкость, волненіе (P: 61).

Когда же онъ вышелъ изъ гостиницы ^[2.4.] и пошелъ по утреннимъ просторнымъ улицамъ, то ему хотѣлось прыгать и пѣть отъ счастья, и, чтобы какъ-нибудь облегчить душу, онъ взобрался на лѣсенку, прислоненную къ фонарю, изъ-за чего имѣлъ долгое и смѣшное объясненіе съ пожилымъ прохожимъ, грозившимъ снизу тростью (P: 63).

^[2.5.] Иоголевичъ оказался толстымъ, бородастымъ человѣкомъ въ сѣромъ вязаномъ жилетѣ и въ потрепаномъ черномъ костюмѣ, съ перхотью на плечахъ (P: 105).

Черезъ три минуты раздался звонокъ: Иоголевичъ вернулся; оказалось, что онъ не знаетъ, ^[2.6.] какъ дойти до станиціи подземной дороги (P: 106).

That evening after dinner they sat as usual in the drawing room; the door to the piazza was wide open, and, since there had been a power failure, candles burned in the chandeliers. From time to time their flame would slant, and black shadows reach out from under the armchairs (G: 48).

Uncle Henry had laid down his newspaper and, arms akimbo, considered the cards that Sofia was laying out on a green-baize table (G: 48).

He hardly felt fatigued by his journey; there was only buoyant excitement (G: 50).

When he went out of the hotel and started walking the spacious morning streets, he felt like jumping and singing with joy and, to give release to his spirits, climbed a ladder leaning against a lamppost, and as a result had a long and comical argument with an elderly passerby, who from below gestured threateningly with his cane (G: 51).

Aleksandr Naumovich Iogolevich turned out to be a fat bearded man in a knit gray waistcoat and shabby black suit, with dandruff on his shoulders (G: 89).

The doorbell rang three minutes later: Iogolevich had come back; it turned out he did not know the way to the tube station (G: 90).

Такой человекъ, вспомнивъ случайно ^[2.7.] *днемъ, среди обычныхъ своихъ дѣлъ*, что на ночномъ столикѣ, въ полной сохранности, ждетъ книга, – чувствуетъ приливъ неизъяснимаго счастья (P: 107).

^[2.8.] *Въ этой свѣтлой комнатѣ спала годъ назадъ Нелли, а теперь ея нѣтъ* (P: 107).

^[2.9.] *А вѣдь странно: если бродятъ души покойниковъ, то все хорошо, есть, значитъ, загробныя движенія души, – почему же это такъ страшно?* (P: 108)

Онъ увидѣлъ себя стоящимъ у стѣнки, вобравшимъ въ грудь побольше воздуха и ожидающимъ залпа, и вспоминающимъ ^[2.10.] *съ дикой безнадежностью вотъ эту, вотъ эту нынѣшнюю минуту, – свѣтлую спальню, пухлую ночь, безопасность, безопасность* (P: 108).

^[2.11.] *Тишина лилась, лилась – и вдругъ перелилась черезъ край: кто-то на цыпочкахъ босикомъ шель по коридору* (P: 108).

«Спите?» – раздался вопросительный шопотъ черезъ дверь, и Мартынь не сразу могъ отвѣтить, ^[2.12.] *что-то заскочило въ горло. Соня, войдя, тихо опустила съ пальцевъ на пятки* (P: 109).

Такъ она ^[2.13.] *постояла нѣсколько мгновений, моргая спутанными рѣсницами* (P: 109).

Мартынь ^[2.14.] *вытащилъ изъ-подъ себя подушку и подложилъ ей за спину* (P: 109).

«Спасибо», – сказала она совершенно беззвучно, – очертаніе слова ^[2.15.] *можно было только угадать по движеніямъ блѣдныхъ мягкихъ губъ* (P: 109).

Such a person, upon happening to recall, amidst routine occupations, that on his bedside table a book is waiting for him, in perfect safety, feels a surge of inexpressible happiness (G: 91).

Only a year before, in this room, Nelly had slept, and now she was dead (G: 91).

Yet how strange: if ghosts exist, then all is well for it proves that souls can move after death – why then is it so frightening? (G: 92).

He saw himself placed against a wall, standing there with as much air in his lungs as he could inhale, waiting for the volley of rifle shots and recollecting with wild despair this present minute, this bright room, the soft night, unconcern, safety (G: 92).

The level of silence kept rising, and all at once poured over the brim: someone on tiptoe was coming barefoot along the passage (G: 92).

“Are you asleep?” came the whispered question through the door, and for an instant a constriction in his throat prevented Martin from replying. She slipped in, she softly shifted from tiptoe to heel (G: 92).

Thus she remained standing for a moment or two blinking through matted lashes (G: 93).

Martin pulled out the pillow from under his head to place it behind her back (G: 93).

“*Spasibo* (thanks),” she said quite soundlessly: the outline of the word could only be guessed from the movement of her plump pale lips (G: 93).

Она затянулась и, шурясь, ^[2.16.] *выпустила дымъ и отдала* папиросу Мартыну (P: 109).

«^[2.17.] *Знаете, Мартынь, она всегда говорила, что самое главное в жизни – это исполнять свой долг и ни о чемъ прочемъ не думать*» (P: 110).

Она ^[2.18.] *замолчала, и Мартынь замьтиль, что она дрожить в легонькой своей пижамъ* (P: 110).

Утро выдалось неудачное: онъ опять некстати влетѣлъ в ванную комнату, ^[2.19.] *гдѣ Зилановъ, широко разставивъ короткія ноги в черныхъ штанахъ, наклонивъ корпусъ в плотной фланелевой фуфайкѣ, мылъ надъ раковиной лицо, до скрипа растиралъ щеки и лобъ, фыркалъ подъ бьющей струей, прижималъ пальцемъ то одну ноздрю, то другую, яростно высмаркиваясь и плаюясь* (P: 111).

«Папа сегодня уѣзжаетъ в Бриндизи, – ^[2.20.] *слава Богу, дали, наконецъ, визу*», – проговорила она, недоброжелательно глядя на плохо сдержанную жадность, съ которой Мартынь, всегда какъ волкъ голодный по утрамъ, пожиралъ глазунью (P: 112).

She inhaled, slitting her eyes, and handed the cigarette to Martin (G: 93).

“You know, Martin, she always maintained that the most important thing in life was always to do one’s duty and think of nothing else” (G: 93).

She paused, and Martin saw her shiver in her light little pajamas (G: 94).

He had an unfortunate morning: when he rushed in to take his bath, there, at the washstand, was Zilanov, his short legs in black trousers set wide apart, his torso in a thick flannel undershirt bent forward, dousing his face over a basin, rubbing cheeks and forehead until the skin squeaked, snorting under the spouting faucet, pressing each nostril in turn, fiercely relieving his nose, and expectorating (G: 95).

“Papa is leaving today for Brindizi,” she said, “thank goodness they did give him a visa at last.” She contemplated with disapproval the poorly contained greed with which Martin, who always felt ravenous in the morning, was devouring his fried eggs (G: 96).

«Сколько стоят в Лондонг галоши»: квази-хореи в прозе В. Набокова

В работах, посвященных изучению семантического ореола русского пятистопного хорей, нет единства по одному существенному вопросу: сколько именно единиц – и какого именно рода – требуется для обнаружения в тексте дополнительных горизонтов значений. В статье К. Ф. Тарановского «О взаимоотношении стихотворного ритма и тематики» высказывалось предположение, что в тех случаях, когда стиховая строка начинается с 3–4-сложной структуры, содержащей глагол движения и анапестическую анакрису («Выхожу [глагол движения; ударение на третьем слоге] одинь я на дорогу»), пятистопный хорей раскрывает свой семантический потенциал; в позднейших работах – и прежде всего в статьях К. Д. Вишневого («Экспрессивный ореол пятистопного хорей») и М. Л. Гаспарова («*The semantic halo of the Russian trochaic pentameter: Thirty years of the problem*») – подчеркивалось, что источником дополнительных горизонтов значений является не отдельная хореическая строка, а стихотворение в целом. В данной статье предлагается эмпирическая модель, позволяющая специфицировать основания обоих подходов: в ней рассматриваются квази-хореические вкрапления, выделенные из прозы («Подвиг» В. Набокова-Сирин), и доказывается, что поздний подход не отменяет раннего.

«Сколько стоят в Лондонг галоши»: kvaasitrohheused Vladimir Nabokovi proosas

Võttes kokku vene trohheilise pentameetri semantilisele oreoolile pühendatud artiklites väljendatud ideid, kalduvad uurijad vältima üht kimbatusse ajavat küsimust: kui palju üksuseid – ja milliseid üksuseid – on vaja, et määratleda tähenduse lisakihte tekstis? Kui Kirill Taranovski artikkel “*О взаимоотношении стихотворного ритма и тематики*” andis mõista, et vastavaid tähendusi (s.t dünaamilist teekonnateemat) peaks otsima värsirea alguse anapestilises anakruusis olevast liikumist väljendavast tegusõnast (“*Выхожу [лиikumist väljendav tegusõna, viimane silp rõhuline] одинь я на дорогу*”), siis hilisemad uurimused on loobunud sellest põhimõttest kui liigsest lihtsustusest. Samal ajal on hilisemad teemaarendused (Kirill Višnevski “*Экспрессивный ореол пятистопного хорей*” ja Mihhail Gasparovi “*The semantic halo of the Russian trochaic pentameter: Thirty years of the problem*”) pakkunud välja idee käsitleda terviktekste kui potentsiaalseid tähendusallikaid, nõnda ümber fokuseerudes empiirilisemalt ja struktuurikeskselt lähenemiselt nähtuse algupärale. Oma artiklis pakun välja empiirilise mudeli, mis lubab hinnata mõningaid piiranguid mõlemas praktikas: keskendun mõningatele kvaasitrohheilistele pentameetritele, mis on välja võetud Vladimir Nabokovi (Sirin) proosatekstist *Podvig* (*Kangelastegu*), ning analüüsin neid kvaasivärsilisi juhtumeid mõlema lähenemise raamistikus.