

DOI: 10.24412/2470-1262-2026-1-2-22-44

УДК 81-11 81'44

Mitsushi Kitajo,
Kyoto Sangyo University,
Kyoto, Japan

<https://orcid.org/iD-0009-0008-3118-8284>

*For citation: Mitsushi Kitajo. (2026)
The Peculiarity of Literary Works of the First Half
of the 20th Century From the Perspective of Compound Verb Predicates.
Cross-Cultural Studies: Education and Science,
Vol. 11, Issue 1-2 (2026), pp. 22-44 (in USA)*

Manuscript received: 18/02/2026

Accepted for publication: 15/03/2026

The authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

CC BY 4.0

THE PECULIARITY OF LITERARY WORKS OF THE FIRST HALF OF THE 20TH CENTURY FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF COMPOUND VERB PREDICATES

СПЕЦИФИКА ЛИТЕРАТУРНЫХ ПРОИЗВЕДЕНИЙ ПЕРВОЙ ПОЛОВИНЫ XX ВЕКА С ТОЧКИ ЗРЕНИЯ СОСТАВНЫХ ГЛАГОЛЬНЫХ СКАЗУЕМЫХ»

Abstract:

This paper examines the frequency with which a word is inserted into compound verb predicates and analyzes how this frequency changes across historical periods. The analysis shows that Russian literary works from the first half of the 20th century exhibit the lowest rate of word insertion into compound-verb predicates over the 200 years from the late 18th century to the late 20th century. Moreover, the fluctuation in insertion rates during this period is remarkably uniform. This uniformity can be attributed to the political circumstances of the time.

I.V. Stalin used literature as an instrument for building a socialist state and granted significant authority to M. Gorky, who became the central figure of Soviet literary policy. In Gorky's works, the rate of word insertion into compound verb predicates consistently remained low. Writers of that era, compelled to accommodate the demands of the authorities, often imitated Gorky's expressive methods. This imitation appears to be a major factor behind the low insertion rate of words into compound verb predicates in literary works of the first half of the 20th century.

Keywords: insertion of words into compound verbal predicates, first half of the 20th century, I. V. Stalin, Union of Soviet Writers, M. Gorky

Аннотация:

В данной работе рассматривается частота вставки слов в составные глаголы-сказуемые и анализируется, как эта частота меняется в зависимости от исторического периода. Наш анализ показал, что частота вставки слов в составные глаголы-сказуемые в русских литературных произведениях первой половины XX века была самой низкой за 200-летний период — с конца XVIII до конца XX века. Более того, колебания этой частоты в первой половине XX века отличались заметной равномерностью. На это существенно влияла политическая ситуация того времени.

И. В. Сталин использовал литературу как инструмент построения социалистического государства и наделил М. Горького значительной властью, сделав его центральной фигурой литературной политики. В произведениях Горького частота вставки слов в составные глаголы-сказуемые неизменно оставалась низкой. Писатели той эпохи, вынужденные учитывать требования властей, нередко подражали выразительным приёмам Горького. Именно этим, по-видимому, объясняется низкая частота вставки слов в составные глаголы-сказуемые в литературных произведениях первой половины XX века.

Ключевые слова: вставка слов в составные глагольное сказуемое, первая половина XX века, И.В. Сталин, Союз писателей СССР, М. Горький

*“I am only sure that all people can be very good people
if they want it and have free time for it.”*

Maxim Gorky

1. Purpose of the article

Kitajo (2025) proposed using the frequency with which words are inserted between the verb and the infinitive as a criterion for examining the degree of cohesion between the verb and the infinitive in compound verb predicates found in 46 Russian novels from the late 18th to the late 20th century. The study revealed that this frequency varies depending on the meaning of the verb within the compound verb predicate.

While Kitajo (2025) examined the degree of cohesion between verbs and infinitives in compound verb predicates, the present paper focuses on the frequency with which words are inserted between them and explores how this frequency relates to the historical background.

Much research has examined the relationship between historical background and writers’ linguistic choices (e.g., L. I. Eremina (1974); M. B. Khrapchenko (1975); V. V. Vinogradov (1982); N. A. Kozhevnikova (1994); S. Layton (1994); N. V. Karimova (2021); A. Bogdanova (2025)). However, studies specifically addressing the relationship between historical background and the use of compound verb predicates—the focus of this paper—remain scarce.

2. What Kitajo (2025) Revealed

In considering the purpose of this paper—namely, the relationship between the frequency of insertions between verbs and infinitives in compound verb predicates and the historical background—it is useful to restate what Kitajo (2025) has shown.

The verb–infinitive combination (hereafter “verb + infinitive”) refers to a type of adjunction in which the dependent element (the infinitive) is invariable, isolated from the case

system due to its part-of-speech characteristics, and whose dependence on the main element (the verb) is expressed semantically.

Let us briefly explain what it means for a word to be inserted between a verb and an infinitive. In examples (1) and (2), no word intervenes between the verbs (*khotel* / *nachala*) and the infinitives (*prodolzhit'* / *rasskazyvat'*) that constitute the compound predicates. (The bold portions represent “verb + infinitive”. INF stands for infinitive.)

- (1) Mark Aleksandrovich **khotel prodolzhit'** doklad. (*Deti Arbata*, A. Rybakov)
 Mark Alexandrovich wanted continue-INF report
 [Mark Alexandrovich wanted to continue the report.]

- (2) Dar'ja Mikhajlovna **nachala rasskazyvat'** o kakoj-to neobyknovennoj sobake
 Dar'ja Mikhajlovna began talk-INF about some extrsordinary dog
 ee druga. (*Rudin*, I. S. Turgenev)
 her friend

[Dar'ja Mikhajlovna began to talk about an extraordinary dog of her friend.]

But in examples (3) and (4), a word (*dal'she* / *emu*) is inserted between the verbs (*khotel* / *nachala*) and the infinitives (*prodolzhat'* / *rasskazyvat'*).

- (3) Ivan Petrovich **khotel dal'she prodolzhat'**. (*Chtenie*, A.P. Chekhov)
 Ivan Petrovich wanted further continue-INF
 [Ivan Petrovich wanted to continue further.]

- (4) Dar'ja Mikhajlovna **nachala emu rasskazyvat'** o sebe. (*Rudin*, I. S. Turgenev)
 Dar'ja Mikhajlovna began him tell-INF about herself
 [Daria Mikhailovna began to tell him about herself.]

To analyze compound-verb predicates, Kitajo (2025) selected 46 literary works in Russian from the late 18th century to the late 20th century. We then examined these works by dividing them into four periods: the late 18th to the mid-19th century (Table 1), the second half of the 19th century (Table 2), the first half of the 20th century (Table 3), and the second half of the 20th century (Table 4). The capital letters on the left side of each table represent abbreviations of the titles of the works.

Table 1. 12 works of the late 18th century to the mid-19th century

[POD]	<i>Pochta dukhov (Spirit Mail) (I. A. Krylov, 1789)</i>
[PPM]	<i>Puteshestvie iz Peterburga v Moskvu (Travel from St. Petersburg to Moscow), A. N. Radishchev, 1790)</i>
[CPD]	<i>Chistoserdechnoe priznanie v delakh moikh i pomyshlenijakh (A sincere confession of my deeds and thoughts) (D. I. Fonvizin, 1791)</i>
[BEL]	<i>Bednaja Liza (Poor Lisa) (N. M. Karamzin, 1792)</i>
[MPN]	<i>Marfa-posadnitsa, ili pokorenie Novagoroda (Marfa the Mayor, or the Conquest of Novgorod) (N. M. Karamzin, 1803)</i>
[PFM]	<i>Pis'ma iz Frantsii k odnomu vel'mozhe v Moskvu (Letters from France to a</i>

nobleman in Moscow) (<i>D. I. Fonvizin, 1806</i>)
[PID] <i>Pikovaja dama (The Queen of Spades)</i> (<i>A. S. Pushkin, 1834</i>)
[NOS] <i>Nos (nose)</i> (<i>N. V. Gogol', 1836</i>)
[KAD] <i>Kapitanskaja dochka (The Captain's Daughter)</i> (<i>A. S. Pushkin, 1836</i>)
[GNV] <i>Geroj nashego vremeni (Hero of Our Time)</i> (<i>M. Yu. Lermontov, 1840</i>)
[MED] <i>Mertvyje dushi (vol. 1) (Dead Souls)</i> (<i>N. V. Gogol', 1842</i>)
[KTV] <i>Kto vinovat? (Who is guilty?)</i> (<i>A. I. Gertsen, 1846</i>)

Table 2. 12 works of the second half of the 19th century

[DET] <i>Detstvo (Childhood)</i> (<i>L.N. Tolstoj, 1852</i>)
[RUD] <i>Rudin (Rudin)</i> (<i>I. S. Turgenev, 1856</i>)
[SEK] <i>Semejnaja khronika (Family Chronicle)</i> (<i>S. T. Aksakov, 1856</i>)
[OBL] <i>Oblomov (part 1) (Oblomov)</i> (<i>I. A. Goncharov, 1859</i>)
[OBO] <i>Obojdennye (circumvent)</i> (<i>N. S. Leskov, 1865</i>)
[PIN] <i>Prestuplenie i nakazanie (part.1-2) (Crime and Punishment)</i> (<i>F.M. Dostoevskij, 1866</i>)
[OBY] <i>Obryv (The cliff)</i> (<i>I.A. Goncharov, 1869</i>)
[GOG] <i>Gospoda Golovlevy (Gentlemen Golovlevs)</i> (<i>M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin, 1880</i>)
[CEM] <i>Chernyj monakh (The black monk)</i> (<i>A.P. Chekhov, 1894</i>)
[ZAI] <i>Za ikonoj (Behind the icon)</i> (<i>V. G. Korolenko, 1895</i>)
[VOS] <i>Voskresenie (Resurrection)</i> (<i>L.N. Tolstoj, 1899</i>)
[DAS] <i>Dama s sobachkoj (The lady with the little dog)</i> (<i>A.P. Chekhov, 1899</i>)

Table 3. 11 works of the first half of the 20th century

[SKR] <i>Shtabs-kapitan Rybnikov (Staff Captain Rybnikov)</i> (<i>A. I. Kuprin, 1905</i>)
[MAT] <i>Mat' (part 1) (Mother)</i> (<i>M. Gorky, 1906</i>)
[KPM] <i>Khozhdenie po mukam (book 1)(The Road to calvary)</i> (<i>A.N.Tolstoj, 1920</i>)
[MY] <i>My(We)</i> (<i>E. I. Zamjatin, 1924</i>)
[ZHP] <i>Zheleznyj potok (Iron Stream)</i> (<i>A. Serafimovich, 1924</i>)
[TSE] <i>Tsement (Cement)</i> (<i>F. V. Gladkov, 1925</i>)
[MIM] <i>Master i Margarita (The Master and Margarita)</i> (<i>M.A. Bulgakov, 1928</i>)
[CHE] <i>Chelovek-amfibija (Amphibian Man)</i> (<i>A. Beljaev, 1928</i>)
[POT] <i>Podnjataja tselina (vol. 1) (Virgin Soil Upturned)</i> (<i>M.A.Sholokhov, 1932</i>)
[KLS] <i>Kladovaja solntsa (Pantry of the Sun)</i> (<i>M.M. Prishvin, 1945</i>)
[PER] <i>Pervye radosti (Early Joys)</i> (<i>K.A. Fedin, 1945</i>)

Table 4. 11 works of the second half of the 20th century

[DOZ] <i>Doktor Zhivago (book 1) (Doctor Zhivago)</i> (<i>B. Pasternak, 1957</i>)
[DIN] <i>Dinka (Dinka)</i> (<i>V. A. Oseeva, 1959</i>)
[TIP] <i>Teni ischezajut v polden' (Shadows disappear at midday)</i> (<i>A. S. Ivanov, 1963</i>)
[LJU] <i>Ljubaviny (Lubavin's)</i> (<i>V. Shukshin, 1965</i>)
[PAS] <i>Paslednij srok (Deadline)</i> (<i>V.G. Rasputin, 1970</i>)
[RAK] <i>Rakovyj korpus (book 1) (Cancer ward)</i> (<i>A.I. Solzhenitsyn, 1966</i>)
[DEA] <i>Deti Arbata (part 1) (Children of the Arbat)</i> (<i>A.N. Rybakov, 1984</i>)
[ZBV] <i>Zavtra byla vojna (Tomorrow was war)</i> (<i>B. L. Vasil'ev, 1984</i>)
[APT] <i>Aptekar' (Pharmacist)</i> (<i>V. V. Orlov, 1988</i>)
[SLP] <i>Shest'sot let posle binvy (Six hundred years after the battle)</i> (<i>A.A. Prokhanov, 1990</i>)
[UKS] <i>Ukradennyj son (Stolen Sleep)</i> (<i>A. Marinina, 1994</i>)

Rather than randomly selecting and analyzing “verb + infinitive” from the 46 works, we examined only those that appear consistently across all of them. This approach was adopted because the frequency of certain verbs can change drastically over a span of approximately 200 years, making uniform statistical analysis difficult. We therefore focused on verbs forming “verb + infinitive” combinations that have been used relatively consistently as compound predicates in literary works over the past two centuries. These verbs were classified into five lexical-semantic groups (A–E), from which three frequently used verbs were selected for analysis in each group.

A) phase verbs

nachat' (start), *prodolzhat'* (continue), *perestat'* (stop)

B) verbs expressing attempts at realization

starat'sja (try), *smet'* (dare), *sobirat'sja* (get ready)

C) verbs combining abstract lexical meanings with a clearly expressed evaluative connotation

prijtis' (must), *izvolit'* (deign), *sledovat'* (should)

D) verbs expressing thought and desire

khotet' (want), *zhelat'* (wish), *ljubit'* (love)

E) verbs indicating possibility and ability

umet' (can), *moch'* (can), *uspet'* (succeed)

Table 5 summarizes the percentage of cases in which a word is inserted into “verb + infinitive” for the five lexical-semantic groups described above. The leftmost vertical column lists the five verb groups. The numbers in the horizontal columns indicate the rate at which a word is inserted into “verb + infinitive” in works from each of the four periods. The rightmost vertical column shows the overall insertion rate for each group.

Table 5. The insertion rate in works from the late 18th century to the late 20th century

	Late 18th century -mid-19th century	the second half of the 19th century	the first half of the 20th century	the second half of the 20th century	Total
A	19.9% (40/201)	19.2% (84/438)	15.0% (51/340)	17.1% (54/315)	17.7% (229/1294)
B	36.9% (55/149)	32.4% (80/247)	26.5% (39/147)	31.7% (58/183)	32.0% (232/726)
C	16.1% (14/87)	25.6% (32/125)	22.5% (20/89)	27.8% (30/108)	23.5% (96/409)
D	36.8% (196/533)	35.2% (237/673)	23.8% (92/387)	30.3% (165/545)	32.3% (690/2138)
E	33.0% (285/863)	37.1% (466/1257)	28.7% (210/731)	32.4% (220/680)	33.4% (1181/3531)

$\chi^2=6.09064$. $v=16$. $p<0.995$

Kitajo (2025) analyzed 8,098 verb–infinitive combinations and demonstrated that the strength of the verb–infinitive bond can be represented on the following scale, based on the likelihood of word insertion within “verb + infinitive”:

phase verbs > verbs combining abstract lexical meanings with a clearly expressed evaluative connotation > verbs expressing attempts at realization, verbs expressing thought and desire,

and verbs indicating possibility and ability. (Here, “>” means “forms a stronger connection with the infinitive than.”)

In this way, Kitajo (2025) identified differences in the degree of binding between verbs and infinitives across the five verb groups, based on the frequency with which a word is inserted into “verb + infinitive”. In contrast, the present paper does not focus on the degree of cohesion between verbs and infinitives, but rather on the frequency of word insertion itself, examining how this frequency varies across historical periods.

3. The Relationship Between the Frequency of Word Insertion in “Verb + Infinitive” and Period Classification

Table 5 can be reorganized to illustrate the relationship between historical period and insertion frequency, as shown in Table 6.

Table 6. The insertion rate in works from the late 18th century to the late 20th century

	Late 18th century -mid-19th century		the second half of the 19th century		the first half of the 20th century		the second half of the 20th century
A	19.9% (40/201)	→	19.2% (84/438)	→	15.0% (51/340)	→	17.1% (54/315)
B	36.9% (55/149)	→	32.4% (80/247)	→	26.5% (39/147)	→	31.7% (58/183)
C	16.1% (14/87)	→	25.6% (32/125)	→	22.5% (20/89)	→	27.8% (30/108)
D	36.8% (196/533)	→	35.2% (237/673)	→	23.8% (92/387)	→	30.3% (165/545)
E	33.0% (285/863)	→	37.1% (466/1257)	→	28.7% (210/731)	→	32.4% (220/680)
Total	32.2% (590/1833)		32.8% (899/2740)		24.3% (412/1694)		28.8% (527/1831)

$$\chi^2=6.09064. v=16. p<0.995$$

The arrows in Table 6 indicate how the frequency of word insertion in compound verb predicates changes across periods. An upward-right arrow represents an increase in insertion frequency, while a downward-right arrow represents a decrease.

The following observations can be made from Table 6.

1) Frequency of insertion in compound verb predicates from the late 18th to the first half of the 19th century, compared with the second half of the 19th century

Group A (phase verbs):

The frequency of word insertion was 19.9% in the late 18th to early 19th century and 19.2% in the first half of the 19th century—virtually the same.

Group B (verbs expressing attempts at realization):

The frequency decreased, from 36.9% in the late 18th to early 19th century to 32.4% in the first half of the 19th century.

Group C (verbs combining abstract lexical meanings with a clearly expressed evaluative connotation):

The frequency increased from 16.1% to 25.6%, indicating a notable rise.

Group D (verbs expressing thought and desire):

The frequency decreased, from 36.8% to 35.2%.

Group E (verbs indicating possibility and ability):

The frequency increased from 33.0% to 37.1%.

As shown above, when comparing the frequency of word insertion in compound verb predicates between “the late 18th to the first half of the 19th century” and “the second half of the 19th century,” some groups show little change, others show a decrease, and still others show an increase.

2) Frequency of insertion in compound verb predicates in the second half of the 19th century and the first half of the 20th century

Group A (phase verbs):

The frequency of word insertion decreased from 19.2% in the second half of the 19th century to 15.0% in the first half of the 20th century.

Group B (verbs expressing attempts at realization):

The frequency decreased from 32.4% to 26.5%.

Group C (verbs combining abstract lexical meanings with a clearly expressed evaluative connotation):

The frequency decreased from 25.6% to 22.5%.

Group D (verbs expressing thought and desire):

The frequency decreased from 35.2% to 23.8%.

Group E (verbs indicating possibility and ability):

The frequency decreased from 37.1% to 28.7%.

As shown above, when comparing the second half of the 19th century with the first half of the 20th century, the frequency of word insertion in all verb groups decreases uniformly.

3) Frequency of insertion in compound verb predicates in the first and second halves of the 20th century

Group A (phase verbs):

The frequency of word insertion increased from 15.0% in the first half of the 20th century to 17.1% in the second half.

Group B (verbs expressing attempts at realization):

The frequency increased from 26.5% to 31.7%.

Group C (verbs combining abstract lexical meanings with a clearly expressed evaluative connotation):

The frequency increased from 22.5% to 27.8%.

Group D (verbs expressing thought and desire):

The frequency increased from 23.8% to 30.3%.

Group E (verbs indicating possibility and ability):

The frequency increased from 28.7% to 32.4%.

As shown above, when comparing the first and second halves of the 20th century, the frequency of word insertion in all verb groups increases uniformly.

Table 6 shows that the frequency of word insertion between the verb and infinitive in compound predicates decreases uniformly across all verb groups in the first half of the 20th century, compared with the 19th century, and increases uniformly in the second half of the 20th century, compared with the first half. In other words, only in the first half of the 20th

century do all five verb groups exhibit the same behavior with respect to the frequency of word insertion in compound verb predicates.

Furthermore, the total rates of word insertion in compound verb predicates for the four period divisions listed at the bottom of Table 6 are as follows: 32.2% from the late 18th to the early 19th century, 32.8% in the late 19th century, 24.3% in the early 20th century, and 28.8% in the late 20th century. Among these four periods, the early 20th century shows the lowest rate of word insertion.

To summarize, the frequency of word insertion in compound verb predicates in Russian literary works of the first half of the 20th century is both uniformly low across all verb groups and the lowest overall in the 200 years from the late 18th to the late 20th century. This suggests that the compound verb predicates used in literary works of this period may have been influenced by some strong constraining force, resulting in a reduced rate of word insertion. This issue will be examined in greater detail in the next chapter.

4. Discussion

4-1. The Union of Soviet Writers and M. Gorky

Why is it that the frequency of word insertion in compound verb predicates across the five verb groups is not uniform from the 18th to the late 19th century, while in the first half of the 20th century, all five groups show a similar trend? To address this question, this paper turns to the historical context of Russia in the first half of the 20th century.

This period was one of profound upheaval. Following the revolutionary movements beginning in 1905, the world's first socialist state—the Soviet Union—was established in 1922. After the death of V. I. Lenin, leader of the Russian Revolution, I. V. Stalin came to power and imposed strict ideological control over society. Recognizing the importance of culture in state-building, Stalin involved himself deeply in all matters of cultural policy.

In 1934, Stalin established the Union of Soviet Writers as an instrument of cultural governance. The Union became integrated into Stalin's repressive system as its cultural arm. As Titareva notes, "literature became one of the means of propagation of a socialist way of life" (L. D. Titareva 2010, 166). The first head of the Union was M. Gorky, the most authoritative literary figure in Russia at the time. No other writer wielded comparable influence. Stalin (1936) himself declared, "Gorky is the greatest artist of the revolution, our teacher". As J.Allan observes, "to the extent that Gorky's cultural authority became the state's cultural authority, it had to be justified and protected at all costs" (J. Allan 2023, 231). Stalin intended to use Gorky to further consolidate the state system.

Imitating Gorky in the first half of the 20th century was not merely a literary trend—it became a norm, an almost obligatory model of behavior for Soviet writers. Even after Gorky died in 1936, Stalin continued to use his name as a political tool, a symbol of ideology, discipline, and the strengthening of his repressive regime. Many writers understood that without adopting a "Gorky style," they would not be published, admitted to the Union of Soviet Writers, paid, or might even be accused of formalism. Imitation became a means of survival. Refusing to emulate Gorky often meant sacrificing one's career—and at times even one's life.

Writers expressed extraordinary admiration for Gorky. At the First All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers in 1934, many praised him: "Gorky is the sun of our literature" (L. M.

Leonov); “Gorky gave us the courage to speak about the people in a way no one had spoken before” (V. V. Ivanov); “Gorky is the greatest artist of the revolution, our teacher” (A. A. Fadeev). M. A. Bulgakov (1931) acknowledged Gorky as a master: “Gorky is a huge talent, and I have always recognized this.” M. A. Sholokhov (1936) publicly emphasized Gorky’s role as a singer of the proletarian struggle. K. A. Fedin (1977), who regarded Gorky as his mentor, wrote: “I wanted to use my personal example and the example of the literary biographies of Soviet writers with whom I began working to speak about the role of A. M. Gorky in my fate and in theirs.” Gorky’s influence on Soviet literature in the first half of the 20th century was immense.

Gorky enjoyed Stalin’s favor and occupied a central position in Soviet literary circles during this period. Many writers imitated his style in their novels. This raises an important question: Did Gorky’s influence also extend to the use of compound verb predicates? To explore this possibility, let us examine the frequency with which a word is inserted between the verb and the infinitive in the compound verb predicates found in Gorky’s novels.

4–2. The Rate of Word Insertion in “Verb + Infinitive” According to the Lexical Meanings of Verbs in M. Gorky’s Works

Several linguistic studies have examined Gorky’s literary works. N. A. Kozhevnikova (1974) analyzes asyndeton, rhythm, parallelism, and phrase dynamics; L. V. Semenova (1975) investigates rhythm, intonation, and syntactic figures; M. N. Kozhina (1981) studies rhetorical constructions, syntactic expressiveness, and declarativity; and T. P. Ivanova (1982) explores the evolution of Gorky’s syntactic features over time. These previous studies, however, focus primarily on stylistic characteristics and do not address compound verb predicates.

M. Gorky is widely regarded as the founder of Socialist Realist literature. His works consistently depict the suffering of society’s lowest strata, their struggle for liberation, and the restoration of human dignity. For the present study, 31 literary works by Gorky were selected (see Table 7). The capital letters on the left side of each table represent abbreviations of the titles of these works.

Table 7. 31 works of M. Gorky

[MC]	<i>Makar Chudra (Makar Chudra, 1892)</i>
[EP]	<i>Emel’jan Piljaj (Emel’jan Piljaj, 1893)</i>
[DL]	<i>Ded Arkhip i Len’ka (Grandfather Arkhip and Lyonka, 1894)</i>
[SI]	<i>Starukha Izergil’ (Old Izergil, 1894)</i>
[GP]	<i>Goremyka Pavel (Poor Pavel, 1894)</i>
[CH]	<i>Chelkash (Chelkash, 1894)</i>
[MS]	<i>Moj sputnik (My Fellow Traveller, 1894)</i>
[OO]	<i>Odnazhdy osen’ju (One Autumn Night, 1895)</i>
[PS]	<i>Pesnja o Sokole (The Song of the Falcon, 1895)</i>
[OS]	<i>Oshibka (A mistake, 1895)</i>
[SO]	<i>Suprugi Orloby (The Orloff Couple and Malva, 1897)</i>
[DS]	<i>Dvadsat’ shest’ i odna (Twenty-six Men and a Girl, 1899)</i>
[FG]	<i>Foma Gordeev (Foma Gordeev, 1899)</i>
[MT]	<i>Mat’ (part 1) (Mother, 1906)</i>
[ZN]	<i>Zhizn’ nenuzhnogo cheloveka (The life of an unnecessary person, 1908)</i>
[SK]	<i>Skazki ob Italii (Tales of Italy, 1911)</i>

[DE]	<i>Detsntvo (The Childhood, 1914)</i>
[VL]	<i>V ljudjakh (In the World, 1916)</i>
[OT]	<i>Otshel'nik (The Hermit, 1923)</i>
[RO]	<i>Rasskaz ob odnom romane (A story about one novel, 1923)</i>
[KA]	<i>Karamora (Karamora, 1923)</i>
[RB]	<i>Rasskaz o bezotvetnoj ljubvi (Unrequited Love, 1923)</i>
[MU]	<i>Moi universitety (My Universities, 1923)</i>
[RE]	<i>Repetitsija (The Rehearsal, 1924)</i>
[AN]	<i>Anekdot (An Enigma, 1924)</i>
[GO]	<i>Golubaja zhizn' (The Sky-Blue Life, 1924)</i>
[RG]	<i>Rasskaz o geroe (The Story of a Hero, 1924)</i>
[RN]	<i>Rasskaz o neobyknovennom (A Story About the Unusual, 1925)</i>
[DA]	<i>Delo Artamonobykh (The Artamonov Business, 1925)</i>
[ZS]	<i>Zhizn' Klima Samgina (The Life of Klim Samgin, 1927)</i>
[PS]	<i>Po sojuza Sovetov (According to the Union of Soviets, 1929)</i>

Following the analytical method used in Kitajo (2025) for compound verb predicates in 46 works from the late 18th to the late 20th century, we also classify the compound verb predicates found in Gorky's 31 works into the following five verb groups.

A) phase verbs

nachat' (start), *prodolzhat'* (continue), *perestat'* (stop)

B) verbs expressing attempts at realization

starat'sja (try), *smet'* (dare), *sobirat'sja* (get ready)

C) verbs combining abstract lexical meanings with a clearly expressed evaluative connotation

prijtis' (must), *izvolit'* (deign), *sledovat'* (should)

D) verbs expressing thought and desire

khotet' (want), *zhelet'* (wish), *ljubit'* (love)

E) verbs indicating possibility and ability

umet' (can), *moch'* (can), *uspet'* (succeed)

Tables 8 through 22 share the following structure.

The letters in the top row represent the titles of the literary works, while the leftmost vertical column lists the verbs that form the “verb + infinitive”. In each cell, the numerator indicates the number of instances in which a word is inserted between the verb and the infinitive, and the denominator indicates the total number of “verb + infinitive” examples. The resulting fraction shows the degree to which a word is inserted between the verb and the infinitive.

A) phase verbs

nachat' (start), *prodolzhat'* (continue), *perestat'* (stop)

Let us explain the numbers shown on each table. For example, the fraction 5/29 next to *nachat'* in the second table of Table 8 indicates that “*nachat'* + infinitive” appears 29 times in the work FG, and that a word is inserted between the verb and the infinitive in 5 of those instances.

Similarly, the number 638 on the right side of the third table for *nachat'* represents the total number of occurrences of “*nachat'* + infinitive” across all 31 works, while 87 represents the total number of cases in which a word is inserted between the verb and the infinitive. The percentages shown on the right side of the third table indicate the frequency of word insertion for the compound verb predicates formed by the three verbs.

All other fractions follow the same format: they show, for each work, the total number of occurrences of the verb in the “verb + infinitive” and the number of instances in which a word is inserted between the verb and the infinitive.

Table 8. The insertion rate in 31 Gorky’s works

	MC	EP	DL	SI	GP	CH	MS	OO	PS	OS	SO	DS
<i>nachat'</i>	0	0/1	0/2	0/2	2/11	1/4	2/11	0/2	0	0/1	1/10	0/6
<i>prodolzhat'</i>	0	0	0/3	0	0/2	0/1	0	0/1	0	0/2	0/4	1/2
<i>perestat'</i>	0/1	0	0/3	0/1	1/3	0	0	0	0	1/1	0	0

	FG	MT	ZN	SK	DE	VL	OT	RO	KA	RB
<i>nachat'</i>	5/29	6/33	5/35	1/22	5/38	8/53	1/4	0/2	0/7	9/80
<i>prodolzhat'</i>	1/4	1/2	0/5	0	1/5	0/8	0	0	0	3/11
<i>perestat'</i>	1/6	0/4	0/2	0/2	0/4	1/8	0	0/2	0	2/12

	MU	RE	AN	GO	RG	RN	DA	ZS	PS	Total
<i>nachat'</i>	7/32	9/91	0/5	3/15	0/4	2/9	7/31	11/86	2/12	87/638 (13.6%)
<i>prodolzhat'</i>	0	3/15	0	0	0/1	0	2/8	2/12	0/4	14/90 (15.6%)
<i>perestat'</i>	0/4	2/24	0	0	0/4	0	1/5	2/26	0	10/113 (8.8%)
Total										111/841 (13.2%)

Here are several examples of “phase verb + infinitive” that include the insertion of a word. The bold portions represent the “verb + infinitive” structure, and INF stands for the infinitive. The abbreviated letters at the end of each example indicate the titles of Gorky’s works.

- (5) On **nachal** chasto **khodit'** v banju. [RB]
 him started often bother -INF to bathhouse
 [He started going to the bathhouse often.]
- (6) Djadja **prodolzhal** nastojchivo **sejat'** neveselye zvuki. [DE]
 uncle continued persistently sow-INF sad sounds
 [Uncle continued to persistently sow sad sound.]
- (7) Foma **perestal** na minutu **sledit'** za razgovorom Majakinykh. [FG]
 uncle continued for a moment follow-INF to conversation Mayakins'
 [Foma stopped following the Mayakins' conversation for a moment.]

As shown by the total counts for the three verbs in Table 8, the frequency of word insertion in “phase verb + infinitive” is 13.6% for “*nachat'* + infinitive”, 15.6% for “*prodolzhat'* + infinitive”, and 8.8% for “*perestat'* + infinitive”.

Let us now compare the frequency of word insertion in Gorky’s “phase verb + infinitive” with the corresponding frequencies in literary works from the first half of the 20th century analyzed by Kitajo (2025).

The literary works from the first half of the 20th century analyzed by Kitajo (2025) include works by Gorky himself. To compare Gorky's usage with that of other authors, this paper uses the works of ten authors from Kitajo's (2025) list, excluding Gorky (see Table 9).

Table 9. 10 works of the first half of the 20th century

[SKR] <i>Shtabs-kapitan Rybnikov (Staff Captain Rybnikov) (A. I. Kuprin, 1905)</i>
[KPM] <i>Khozhdenie po mukam (book 1)(The Road to calvary) (A.N.Tolstoj, 1920)</i>
[MY] <i>My(We) (E. I. Zamjatin, 1924)</i>
[ZHP] <i>Zheleznyj potok (Iron Stream) (A. Serafimovich, 1924)</i>
[TSE] <i>Tsement (Cement) (F. V. Gladkov, 1925)</i>
[MIM] <i>Master i Margarita (The Master and Margarita) (M.A. Bulgakov, 1928)</i>
[CHE] <i>Chelovek-amfibija (Amphibian Man) (A. Beljaev, 1928)</i>
[POT] <i>Podnjataja tselina (vol. 1) (Virgin Soil Upturned) (M.A.Sholokhov, 1932)</i>
[KLS] <i>Kladovaja solntsa (Pantry of the Sun) (M.M. Prishvina, 1945)</i>
[PER] <i>Pervye radosti (Early Joys) (K.A. Fedin, 1945)</i>

The frequency of word insertion in the “phase verb + infinitive” used in these works is summarized in Table 10. Table 10 can be interpreted in the same way as Table 8.

Table 10. The insertion rate in 10 works of the first half of the 20th century

	SKR	MAT	KPM	MY	ZHP	TSE	MIM	CHE	POT	KLS	PER	Total
<i>nachat'</i>	0/1	6/33	2/36	0/1	1/3	0	2/17	14/83	4/11	0/3	3/20	26/175 (14.9%)
<i>prodolzhat'</i>	0/1	1/2	3/17	0/1	0/2	0/3	0/1	6/31	1/1	0	2/8	12/65 (18.5%)
<i>perestat'</i>	0/1	0/4	3/11	0/5	0/4	0/2	1/9	2/15	0/1	0/6	0/7	6/61 (9.8%)
Total	0/3	7/39	8/64	0/7	1/9	0/5	3/27	22/129	5/13	0/9	5/35	44/301 (14.6%)

The total frequency of word insertion in the “phase verb + infinitive” used in the ten works is 14.9% for “*nachat'* + infinitive”, 18.5% for “*prodolzhat'* + infinitive”, and 9.8% for “*perestat'* + infinitive”.

The results of the comparison between 31 Gorky's works and the 10 works from the first half of the 20th century regarding the frequency of word insertion in “phase verb + infinitive” are summarized in Table 11.

Table 11. Frequency of word insertion in “phase verb + infinitive” + infinitive” in 31 Gorky's works and in 10 works from the first half of the 20th century

A	31 Gorky's works	10 works of the first half of the 20th century
<i>nachat'</i>	87/638 (13.6%)	26/175 (14.9%)
<i>prodolzhat'</i>	14/90 (15.6%)	12/65 (18.5%)
<i>perestat'</i>	10/113 (8.8%)	6/61 (9.8%)
Total	111/841 (13.2%)	44/301 (14.6%)

$$\chi^2=0.03947. v=3. p<0.995$$

The following points can be drawn from this table.

The rate of word insertion in “*nachat'* + infinitive” is 13.6% in Gorky's works, compared with 14.9% in works by authors from the first half of the 20th century. For “*prodolzhat'* + infinitive”, the rate is 15.6% in Gorky's works and 18.5% in the works of these authors. For “*perestat'* + infinitive”, the rate is 8.8% in Gorky's works and 9.8% in the works of the same period. Although chi-square tests show no statistically significant differences, Gorky's works consistently exhibit slightly lower values than the ten works from the first half of the 20th century.

Next, let us examine the frequency with which a word is inserted into “verb + infinitive” formed by verbs expressing attempts at realization.

B) verbs expressing attempts at realization

starat'sja (try), *smet'* (dare), *sobirat'sja* (get ready)

First, let us explain each table in the same way as we did for the phase verbs. For example, the fraction 3/10 written next to *starat'sja* in the third table of Table 12 indicates that “*starat'sja* + infinitive” appears 10 times in the work MU, and that a word is inserted between the verb and the infinitive in 3 of those instances.

Similarly, the number 169 on the right side of the third table for *starat'sja* represents the total number of occurrences of “*starat'sja* + infinitive” across all 31 works, while 35 represents the total number of cases in which a word is inserted between the verb and the infinitive.

All other fractions follow the same pattern: they show, for each work, the total number of occurrences of the verb in the “verb + infinitive” and the number of instances in which a word is inserted between the verb and the infinitive. The percentages on the right side of the third table indicate the frequency of word insertion in the compound verb predicates formed by the three verbs.

Table 12. The insertion rate in 31 Gorky's works

	MC	EP	DL	SI	GP	CH	MS	OO	PS	OS	SO	DS
<i>starat'sja</i>	1/1	0	0/1	0	3/12	0	0/2	0/1	0/1	1/4	0	0
<i>smet'</i>	0	0	0	0	0/1	0/2	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>sobirat'sja</i>	0	0	0	0	1/5	1/3	0/1	0	0	0	0	0

	FG	MT	ZN	SK	DE	VL	OT	RO	KA	RB
<i>starat'sja</i>	0/9	9/22	1/3	2/4	2/10	5/28	0	0/2	0/1	0/8
<i>smet'</i>	0	0/1	0/4	0/1	1/1	0	0	0	0	0
<i>sobirat'sja</i>	0/1	2/4	1/6	0/4	0/3	0/6	0	0	0	0

	MU	RE	AN	GO	RG	RN	DA	ZS	PS	Total
<i>starat'sja</i>	3/10	1/4	0/1	0/1	0	1/2	6/17	0/22	0/3	35/169 (20.7%)
<i>smet'</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	2/2	0/2	0/1	3/15 (20.0%)
<i>sobirat'sja</i>	1/7	0/1	0/1	0	0	0	2/5	0/5	0	8/52 (15.4%)
Total										46/236 (19.5%)

Here are several examples of “verbs expressing attempts at realization + infinitive” that include the insertion of a word. The bold portions represent the “verb + infinitive” structure, and INF stands for the infinitive. The abbreviated letters at the end of each example indicate the titles of Gorky's works.

- (8) Ja **staralsja** vozmozhno men'sha **videt'** ee. [MU]
 I wanted as little as possible see-INF her
 [I tried to see her as little as possible.]

- (9) Ja prikazhu ej, chtoby ne **smela** ona **govorit'** s toboj. [DE]
 I order her that not dare she speak-INF with you

[I will order her not to dare speak to you.]

(10) Ja vse **sobiralsja** sam ego **zadavit'**. [MT]

I always was going to oneself him crush-INF

[I was always going to crush him

.....161

As shown in Table 12, the total frequency of word insertion in “verbs expressing attempts at realization + infinitive” is 20.7% for “*starat'sja* + infinitive”, 20.0% for “*smet'* + infinitive”, and 15.4% for “*sobirat'sja* + infinitive”.

As with “phase verb + infinitive”, let us now examine the frequency of word insertion in “verbs expressing attempts at realization + infinitive” in the ten works from the first half of the 20th century (see Table 13).

Table 13. The insertion rate in 10 works of the first half of the 20th century

	SKR	KPM	MY	ZHP	TSE	MIM	CHE	POT	KLS	PER	Total
<i>starat'sja</i>	1/1	0/8	0/1	2/8	0/4	3/6	5/22	0	2/6	5/15	18/71 (25.3%)
<i>smet'</i>	1/1	1/4	0/3	0/2	0/1	0	2/5	0	0	1/2	5/18 (27.8%)
<i>sobirat'sja</i>	0/1	0/2	0	0/1	0	0/6	3/15	0/4	1/1	1/2	5/32 (15.6%)
Total	2/3	1/14	0/4	2/11	0/5	3/12	10/42	0/4	3/7	7/19	28/121 (23.1%)

The total frequency of word insertion in the compound verb predicates formed by the three verbs in the ten works is 25.3% for “*starat'sja* + infinitive”, 27.8% for “*smet'* + infinitive”, and 15.6% for “*sobirat'sja* + infinitive”.

The results of the comparison between 31 Gorky’s works and the 10 works from the first half of the 20th century regarding the frequency of word insertion in “verbs expressing attempts at realization + infinitive” are summarized in Table 14.

Table 14. Frequency of word insertion in “verbs expressing attempts at realization + infinitive” in 31 Gorky’s works and in 10 works from the first half of the 20th century

B	31 Gorky’s works	10 works of the first half of the 20th century
<i>starat'sja</i>	35/169 (20.7%)	18/71 (25.3%)
<i>smet'</i>	3/15 (20.0%)	5/18 (27.8%)
<i>sobirat'sja</i>	8/52 (15.4%)	5/32 (15.6%)
Total	46/236 (19.5%)	28/121 (23.1%)

$$\chi^2=0.60858. v=3. p<0.975$$

The following points can be drawn from this table.

The rate of word insertion in “*starat'sja* + infinitive” is 20.7% in Gorky’s works, compared with 25.3% in works by authors from the first half of the 20th century. For “*smet'* + infinitive”, the rate is 20.0% in Gorky’s works and 27.8% in the works of these authors. For “*sobirat'sja* + infinitive”, the rate is 15.4% in Gorky’s works and 15.6% in the works of the same period.

Although the difference for “*sobirat'sja* + infinitive” is minimal, overall, the rate of word insertion in “verbs expressing attempts at realization + infinitive” is lower in Gorky’s works than in the works from the first half of the 20th century.

Next, let us examine the frequency with which a word is inserted into “verb + infinitive” formed by verbs that combine abstract lexical meanings with a clearly expressed evaluative connotation.

C) verbs combining abstract lexical meanings with a clearly expressed evaluative connotation

prijtis' (must), *izvolit'* (deign), *sledovat'* (should)

The method of reading this table is the same as described above. For example, the fraction 1/2 written next to *prijtis'* in the second table of Table 15 indicates that “*prijtis'* + infinitive” appears twice in the work FG, and that a word is inserted between the verb and the infinitive in one of those instances.

Similarly, the number 69 on the right side of the third table for *prijtis'* represents the total number of occurrences of “*prijtis'* + infinitive” across all 31 works, while 12 represents the total number of cases in which a word is inserted between the verb and the infinitive.

All other fractions follow the same pattern: they show, for each work, the total number of occurrences of the verb in “verb + infinitive” and the number of instances in which a word is inserted between the verb and the infinitive. The percentages on the right side of the third table indicate the frequency of word insertion in the compound verb predicates formed by the three verbs.

Table 15. The insertion rate in 31 Gorky's works

	MC	EP	DL	SI	GP	CH	MS	OO	PS	OS	SO	DS
<i>prijtis'</i>	0	0	0	0	1/4	0	1/2	0	0	0	0	0
<i>izvolit'</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>sledovat'</i>	0	0	1/2	0	0	0	0	0/1	0	0	1/3	0

	FG	MT	ZN	SK	DE	VL	OT	RO	KA	RB
<i>prijtis'</i>	1/2	0/1	1/6	0/1	0/3	0/4	0	0	0/1	3/12
<i>izvolit'</i>	0/3	0	0	0/1	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>sledovat'</i>	1/5	0	1/3	0/2	1/3	0	0	0	0	2/16

	MU	RE	AN	GO	RG	RN	DA	ZS	PS	Total
<i>prijtis'</i>	1/2	0	0/1	0/1	0	1/2	1/9	1/14	1/4	12/69 (17.4%)
<i>izvolit'</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0/4 (0%)
<i>sledovat'</i>	0/4	1/5	0	1/3	1/1	0	0/4	3/20	2/11	15/83 (18.1%)
Total										29/150 (19.3%)

Here are several examples of “verbs combining abstract lexical meanings with a clearly expressed evaluative connotation + infinitive” that include the insertion of a word. The bold portions represent the “verb + infinitive” structure, and INF stands for the infinitive. The abbreviated letters at the end of each example indicate the titles of Gorky's works.

- (11) Emu ne **preishlos'** osobenno **khlopotat'** ob etom. [GP]
 him not had to especially bother-INF about this
 [He didn't have to bother much about it.]

- (12) Emu by **sledovalo** v opere **sluzhit'**. [ZS]
 him should in opera serve-INF
 [He should be serving in the opera.]

As shown in Table 15, the total frequency of word insertion in “verbs combining abstract lexical meanings with a clearly expressed evaluative connotation + infinitive” is 17.4% for “*prijtis*’ + infinitive”, 0% for “*izvolit*’ + infinitive”, and 18.1% for “*sledovat*’ + infinitive”.

As with “phase verb + infinitive”, let us now examine the frequency of word insertion in “verbs combining abstract lexical meanings with a clearly expressed evaluative connotation + infinitive” in the ten works from the first half of the 20th century (see Table 16).

Table 16. The insertion rate in 10 works of the first half of the 20th century

	SKR	KPM	MY	ZHP	TSE	MIM	CHE	POT	KLS	PER	Total
<i>prijtis</i> ’	0	1/5	1/9	0	0/1	4/9	11/43	0	0/2	0/1	17/70 (24.3%)
<i>izvolit</i> ’	0/1	1/1	0/1	0	0	0/1	0/2	0	0	0/1	1/7 (14.3%)
<i>sledovat</i> ’	0/1	0	0/1	0	0	0/4	1/4	0	0	1/1	2/11 (18.2%)
Total	0/2	2/6	1/11	0	0/1	4/14	12/49	0	0/2	1/3	20/88 (22.7%)

The total frequency of word insertion in the compound verb predicates formed by the three verbs in the ten works is 24.3% for “*prijtis*’ + infinitive”, 14.3% for “*izvolit*’ + infinitive”, and 18.2% for “*sledovat*’ + infinitive”.

The results of the comparison between 31 Gorky’s works and the 10 works from the first half of the 20th century regarding the frequency of word insertion in “verbs combining abstract lexical meanings with a clearly expressed evaluative connotation + infinitive” are summarized in Table 17.

Table 17. Frequency of word insertion in “verbs combining abstract lexical meanings with a clearly expressed evaluative connotation + infinitive” in 31 Gorky’s works and in 10 works from the first half of the 20th century

C	31 Gorky’s works	10 works of the first half of the 20th century
<i>prijtis</i> ’	12/69 (17.4%)	17/70 (23.9%)
<i>izvolit</i> ’	0/4 (0%)	1/7 (14.3%)
<i>sledovat</i> ’	15/83 (18.1%)	2/11 (18.2%)
Total	29/150 (19.3%)	20/88 (22.7%)

$$\chi^2=11.66907. v=3. p<0.010$$

The following points can be drawn from this table.

The rate of word insertion in “*prijtis*’ + infinitive” is 17.4% in Gorky’s works, compared with 23.9% in works by authors from the first half of the 20th century. For “*izvolit*’ + infinitive”, the rate is 0% in Gorky’s works and 14.3% in the works of these authors. For “*sledovat*’ + infinitive”, the rate is 18.1% in Gorky’s works and 18.2% in the works of the same period.

Although the difference for “*sledovat*’ + infinitive” is minimal, overall, there is a tendency for the rate of word insertion in “verbs combining abstract lexical meanings with a clearly expressed evaluative connotation + infinitive” to be lower in Gorky’s works than in the works from the first half of the 20th century.

Next, let us examine the frequency with which a word is inserted into “verb + infinitive” formed by verbs expressing thought and desire.

D) verbs expressing thought and desire

khotet’ (want), *zhelat*’ (wish), *ljubit*’ (love)

The method of reading this table is the same as described above. For example, the fraction 1/2 written next to *khotet*’ in the first table of Table 18 indicates that “*khotet*’ +

infinitive” appears twice in the work MC, and that a word is inserted between the verb and the infinitive in one of those instances.

Similarly, the number 633 on the right side of the third table for *khotet'* represents the total number of occurrences of “*khotet'* + infinitive” across all 31 works, while 108 represents the total number of cases in which a word is inserted between the verb and the infinitive.

All other fractions follow the same pattern: they show, for each work, the total number of occurrences of the verb in “verb + infinitive” and the number of instances in which a word is inserted between the verb and the infinitive. The percentages on the right side of the third table indicate the frequency of word insertion in the compound verb predicates formed by the three verbs.

Table 18. The insertion rate in 31 Gorky’s works

	MC	EP	DL	SI	GP	CH	MS	OO	PS	OS	SO
<i>khotet'</i>	1/2	2/6	1/4	0/4	7/24	1/8	2/5	0/1	0/1	0/8	3/7
<i>zhelat'</i>	0	1/1	0/3	0/3	1/7	1/3	0	0/1	0/2	0/1	1/4
<i>ljubit'</i>	0/1	0	0/1	0/5	4/11	0/1	0/1	0	0	0	0/2

	DS	FG	MT	ZN	SK	DE	VL	OT	RO	KA	RB
<i>khotet'</i>	0/1	13/32	6/26	8/31	4/22	1/23	8/37	0/5	0/9	2/7	16/144
<i>zhelat'</i>	0	0	1/10	3/25	0/6	0/3	1/10	0	0	0	3/24
<i>ljubit'</i>	0	1/13	0/1	1/9	0/5	1/7	1/13	0/2	1/1	0/1	6/15

	MU	RE	AN	GO	RG	RN	DA	ZS	PS	Total
<i>khotet'</i>	2/4	1/6	3/5	2/21	1/6	6/12	4/47	12/105	2/20	108/633 (17.1%)
<i>zhelat'</i>	1/6	1/5	1/3	1/2	0/1	0	0/10	1/4	0/4	17/138 (12.3%)
<i>ljubit'</i>	0/1	1/2	1/2	1/10	2/6	0/5	4/13	2/13	1/3	27/144 (18.8%)
Total										152/915 (16.6%)

Here are several examples of “verbs expressing thought and desire + infinitive” that include the insertion of a word. The bold portions represent the “verb + infinitive” structure, and INF stands for the infinitive. The abbreviated letters at the end of each example indicate the titles of Gorky’s works.

(13) On **khochet** gody nazad **povernut'**. [RN]

he wants years back turn-INF

[He wants to turn back the years.]

(14) Vtorye **zhelajut** tol'ko **skryt'** sebja. [ZS]

the latter wants only turn-INF oneself

[The latter only want to hide themselves.]

(15) Il'ja Artmonov **ljubil** po prazdnikam besedovat' so starymi tkachami. [DA]

Il'ja Artmonov loved on holidays talk-INF with old weavers

[Ilya Artamonov loved to talk with old weavers on holidays.]

As shown in Table 18, the total frequency of word insertion in “verbs expressing thought and desire + infinitive” is 17.1% for “*khotet'* + infinitive”, 12.3% for “*zhelat'* + infinitive”, and 18.8% for “*ljubit'* + infinitive”.

As with “phase verb + infinitive”, let us now examine the frequency of word insertion in “verbs expressing thought and desire + infinitive” in the ten works from the first half of the 20th century (see Table 19).

Table 19. The insertion rate in 10 works of the first half of the 20th century

	SKR	KPM	MY	ZHP	TSE	MIM	CHE	POT	KLS	PER	Total
<i>khotet'</i>	0/7	12/36	9/26	1/9	3/9	2/11	26/123	12/23	0/2	11/53	76/299 (25.4%)
<i>zhelat'</i>	0	2/6	0/1	0/1	1/2	0/3	1/16	0	0/1	1/5	5/35 (14.3%)
<i>ljubit'</i>	0	0/1	0	0	0	0	3/8	0/1	0	1/6	4/16 (25.0%)
Total	0/7	14/43	9/27	1/10	4/11	2/14	30/147	12/24	0/3	3/64	85/350 (24.3%)

The total frequency of word insertion in the compound verb predicates formed by the three verbs in the ten works is 25.4% for “*khotet'* + infinitive”, 14.3% for “*zhelat'* + infinitive”, and 25.0% for “*ljubit'* + infinitive”.

The results of the comparison between 31 Gorky’s works and the 10 works from the first half of the 20th century regarding the frequency of word insertion in “verbs expressing thought and desire + infinitive” are summarized in Table 20.

Table 20. Frequency of word insertion in “verbs expressing thought and desire + infinitive” in 31 Gorky’s works and in 10 works from the first half of the 20th century

D	31 Gorky’s works	10 works of the first half of the 20th century
<i>khotet'</i>	108/633 (17.1%)	76/299 (25.4%)
<i>zhelat'</i>	17/138 (12.3%)	5/35 (14.3%)
<i>ljubit'</i>	27/144 (18.8%)	4/16 (25.0%)
Total	152/915 (16.6%)	85/350 (24.3%)

$$\chi^2=0.29950. v=3. p<0.975$$

The following points can be drawn from this table.

The rate of word insertion in “*khotet'* + infinitive” is 17.1% in Gorky’s works, compared with 25.4% in works by authors from the first half of the 20th century. For “*zhelat'* + infinitive”, the rate is 12.3% in Gorky’s works and 14.3% in the works of these authors. For “*ljubit'* + infinitive”, the rate is 18.8% in Gorky’s works and 25.0% in the works of the same period.

Thus, the rate of word insertion in “verbs expressing thought and desire + infinitive” is consistently lower in Gorky’s works than in works by authors from the first half of the 20th century.

Next, let us examine the frequency with which a word is inserted into “verb + infinitive” formed by verbs expressing possibility and ability.

E) verbs indicating possibility and ability

umet' (can), *moch'* (can), *uspet'* (succeed)

The method of reading this table is the same as described above. For example, the fraction 2/11 written next to *umet'* in the third table of Table 21 indicates that “*umet'* + infinitive” appears 11 times in the work MU, and that a word is inserted between the verb and the infinitive in two of those instances.

Similarly, the number 260 on the right side of the third table for *umet'* represents the total number of occurrences of “*umet'* + infinitive” across all 31 works, while 44 represents the total number of cases in which a word is inserted between the verb and the infinitive.

All other fractions follow the same pattern: they show, for each work, the total number of occurrences of the verb in “verb + infinitive” and the number of instances in which a word is inserted between the verb and the infinitive. The percentages on the right side of the third table indicate the frequency of word insertion in the compound verb predicates formed by the three verbs.

Table 21. The insertion rate in 31 Gorky's works

	MC	EP	DL	SI	GP	CH	MS	OO	PS	OS	SO
<i>umet'</i>	1/1	1/1	1/4	1/5	3/13	0/1	0/4	0	0	0/1	1/4
<i>moch'</i>	1/3	4/6	1/3	4/10	29/74	2/10	1/8	1/5	2/2	1/4	8/21
<i>uspet'</i>	0	0	0/1	0	3/13	0/3	0/1	0	0	0	1/2

	DS	FG	MT	ZN	SK	DE	VL	OT	RO	KA	RB
<i>umet'</i>	1/2	4/19	2/7	2/13	0/12	0/2	3/26	2/4	3/10	3/6	4/14
<i>moch'</i>	1/7	19/95	9/34	16/62	8/53	9/39	13/51	4/9	7/19	8/14	49/198
<i>uspet'</i>	0/1	1/4	1/5	3/5	0/7	2/11	1/8	1/1	0/1	0/2	2/20

	MU	RE	AN	GO	RG	RN	DA	ZS	PS	Total
<i>umet'</i>	2/11	0/4	1/4	0/3	1/4	1/1	4/20	4/55	0/9	44/260 (16.9%)
<i>moch'</i>	3/21	0/12	4/10	4/19	2/19	4/12	17/76	29/110	11/57	271/1063 (25.5%)
<i>uspet'</i>	2/6	0/1	1/1	1/3	0	0/2	0/7	2/19	3/5	24/129 (18.6%)
Total										339/1452 (23.3%)

Here are several examples of “verbs expressing possibility and ability + infinitive” that include the insertion of a word. The bold portions represent the “verb + infinitive” structure, and INF stands for the infinitive. The abbreviated letters at the end of each example indicate the titles of Gorky's works.

(16) Ja **umeju** smychok v rukakh **derzhat'**. [MC]
 I can bow in hands hold-INF
 [I can hold a bow in my hands.]

(17) Eto ne **mozhet** nichego **izmenit'** vnutri menja. [KA]
 this not can nothing hold-INF inside me
 [It can't change anything inside me.]

(18) Solntse **uspelo** sil'no **sogret'** zemlju. [GP]
 the sun succeeded greatly warm-INF the earth
 [The sun managed to warm the Earth considerably.]

As shown in Table 21, the total frequency of word insertion in “verbs expressing possibility and ability + infinitive” is 16.9% for “*umet'* + infinitive”, 25.5% for “*moch'* + infinitive”, and 18.6% for “*uspet'* + infinitive”.

As with “phase verb + infinitive”, let us now examine the frequency of word insertion in “verbs expressing possibility and ability + infinitive” in the ten works from the first half of the 20th century (see Table 22).

Table 22. The insertion rate in 10 works of the first half of the 20th century

	SKR	KPM	MY	ZHP	TSE	MIM	CHE	POT	KLS	PER	Total
<i>umet'</i>	0/2	1/4	0/1	0/1	2/7	0/2	2/17	0	0	1/1	6/35 (17.1%)
<i>moch'</i>	3/9	27/60	24/65	1/14	17/51	13/29	54/258	10/21	7/18	18/61	174/586 (29.7%)
<i>uspet'</i>	2/3	0	2/3	1/4	3/5	2/10	4/18	4/14	0	0/7	18/64 (27.5%)
Total	5/14	28/64	26/69	2/19	22/63	15/41	60/293	14/35	7/18	19/69	198/685 (28.9%)

The total frequency of word insertion in the compound verb predicates formed by the three verbs in the ten works is 17.1% for “*umet'* + infinitive”, 29.7% for “*moch'* + infinitive”, and 27.5% for “*uspet'* + infinitive”.

The results of the comparison between 31 Gorky’s works and the 10 works from the first half of the 20th century regarding the frequency of word insertion in “verbs expressing possibility and ability + infinitive” are summarized in Table 23.

Table 23. Frequency of word insertion in “verbs expressing possibility and ability + infinitive” in 31 Gorky’s works and in 10 works from the first half of the 20th century

E	31 Gorky’s works	10 works of the first half of the 20th century
<i>umet'</i>	44/260 (16.9%)	6/35 (17.1%)
<i>moch'</i>	271/1063 (25.5%)	174/586 (29.7%)
<i>uspet'</i>	24/129 (18.6%)	19/69 (27.5%)
Total	339/1452 (23.3%)	198/685 (28.9%)

$$\chi^2=0.72986. v=3. p<0.975$$

The following points can be drawn from this table.

The rate of word insertion in “*umet'* + infinitive” is 16.9% in Gorky’s works, compared with 17.1% in works by authors from the first half of the 20th century. For “*moch'* + infinitive”, the rate is 25.5% in Gorky’s works and 29.7% in the works of these authors. For “*uspet'* + infinitive”, the rate is 18.6% in Gorky’s works and 27.5% in the works of the same period.

Although the difference in the rate of word insertion for “*umet'* + infinitive” is minimal, the rates for “*moch'* + infinitive” and “*uspet'* + infinitive” show that Gorky’s works generally exhibit a lower frequency of word insertion in “verbs expressing possibility and ability + infinitive” than the ten works from the first half of the 20th century.

Table 24 summarizes the percentage of cases in which a word is inserted into “verb + infinitive” across the five lexical-semantic groups discussed above, comparing Gorky’s works with the ten works from the first half of the 20th century.

The leftmost vertical column of this table lists the five verb groups, while the horizontal columns show the rate at which a word is inserted into “verb + infinitive” for each group in the respective works.

Table 24. Frequency of word insertion in “verb + infinitive” in 31 Gorky’s works and in 10 works from the first half of the 20th century

		31 Gorky’s works	10 works of the first half of the 20th century
A	<i>nachat'</i>	87/638 (13.6%)	26/175 (14.9%)
	<i>prodolzhat'</i>	14/90 (15.6%)	12/65 (18.5%)

	<i>perestat'</i>	10/113 (8.8%)	6/61 (9.8%)
B	<i>starat'sja</i>	35/169 (20.7%)	18/71 (25.3%)
	<i>smet'</i>	3/15 (20.0%)	5/18 (27.8%)
	<i>sobirat'sja</i>	8/52 (15.4%)	5/32 (15.6%)
C	<i>prijtis'</i>	12/69 (17.4%)	17/70 (23.9%)
	<i>izvolit'</i>	0/4 (0%)	1/7 (14.3%)
	<i>sledovat'</i>	15/83 (18.1%)	2/11 (18.2%)
D	<i>khotet'</i>	108/633 (17.1%)	76/299 (25.4%)
	<i>zhelat'</i>	17/138 (12.3%)	5/35 (14.3%)
	<i>ljubit'</i>	27/144 (18.8%)	4/16 (25.0%)
E	<i>umet'</i>	44/260 (16.9%)	6/35 (17.1%)
	<i>moch'</i>	271/1063 (25.5%)	174/586 (29.7%)
	<i>uspet'</i>	24/129 (18.6%)	19/69 (27.5%)
	Total	675/3600 (18.8%)	376/1550 (24.3%)

$$\chi^2=13.90255. v=15. p<0.975$$

Table 24 clearly and concisely summarizes the findings presented in this chapter. Across all five verb groups, the rate of word insertion into “verb + infinitive” is lower in Gorky’s works than in those of his contemporaries. This tendency is accurately reflected in the total values at the bottom of the table: the average insertion rate in Gorky’s works is 18.8%, whereas the corresponding rate in the ten works by his contemporaries is 24.3%.

As shown earlier, the rate of word insertion into “verb + infinitive” in literary works across four historical periods (late 18th–early 19th century, late 19th century, early 20th century, and late 20th century) is lowest in the first half of the 20th century (see Table 6). Moreover, within this already low-insertion period, Gorky’s works consistently exhibit an even lower rate of word insertion than those of other authors from the same era.

Taken together, these observations allow for the following inference.

When the Soviet Union was established in the first half of the 20th century, the Union of Soviet Writers was created as part of the broader project of building a socialist state. Gorky stood at the center of this organization and was celebrated as a model for writers of the early Soviet period. Authors of his generation often shaped their writing in ways that aligned with the politically influential Gorky.

This study highlights one syntactic feature characteristic of Gorky’s works: the notably low rate of word insertion into compound verb predicates. While early 20th-century writers undoubtedly possessed their own stylistic preferences, it is plausible that their writing was influenced—directly or indirectly—by Gorky in ways that resonated with the ideological aims of the time. The desire among writers to retain their own style to some extent rather than completely imitate Gorky’s technique may be reflected in the difference in the frequency of the insertion of words into “verb + infinitive” between Gorky’s works and those of writers in the first half of the 20th century.

5. Conclusion.

This paper examined the frequency with which a word is inserted into compound verb predicates and analyzed how this frequency varies across historical periods. The analysis revealed that Russian literary works from the first half of the 20th century exhibit the lowest rate of word insertion into compound verb predicates within the 200 years from the late 18th century to the late 20th century. Moreover, the fluctuation in insertion rates during this period

is remarkably uniform. This uniformity can be attributed to the political circumstances of the time.

I.V. Stalin employed literature as an instrument for constructing a socialist state and granted significant authority to M. Gorky, who became the central figure of Soviet literary policy. Throughout Gorky's works, the rate of word insertion into compound verb predicates consistently remained low. Writers of that era, compelled to conform to political expectations, often imitated Gorky's expressive techniques. This imitation appears to be a major factor behind the overall low insertion rate observed in literary works of the first half of the 20th century.

Under Stalin, Gorky was elevated to the status of a symbol and the "father" of socialist realism. After Stalin died in 1953—and especially following the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1956—Gorky's influence on Soviet literary circles changed noticeably. It did not disappear, but it became far less monolithic and ideologically prescriptive. His figure ceased to function as an "untouchable canon," creating space for a re-evaluation of both his works and the broader role of literature in society. Correspondingly, the frequency of word insertion into compound verb predicates in literary works began to rise.

References:

1. Allan J. (2023) Maxim Gorky and the Politics of Rapprochement: Political Life in the Pre-Terror] PhD Thesis, University of Glasgow College of Social Sciences Department of Central and East European Studies
2. Bogdanova A.(2025) Russkaja literatura - istorija, epokhi i ključevye pisateli [Russian Literature: History, Eras, and Key Writers]. vc.ru
3. Bulgakov M. A (1931) Письма 1910–1940 [Pis'ma. 1910-1940]. 1910–1940. Moskva: 1997.
4. Eremina L.I. (1974) Predikativy kak sredstvo izobrazitel'nosti v sisteme jazyka khudozhestvennoj literatura [Predicatives as a means of figurativeness in the language system of fiction]. Russkij jazjke v shkole. pp.73-76
5. Fadeev A.A. (1934) Pervyj vsesojuznyj s''ezd sovetskikh pisatelej. Stenograficheskij otčyot [The First All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers. Verbatim report. Moskva. Izdatel'stvo «Khudozhestvennaja literature».
6. Fedin K.A. (1977) Gorkiy sredi nas [M. Gorky is among us. Moskva. Izdatel'stvo «Sovetskij pisatel'».
7. Ivanova T. P. (1982) Sintaksicheskie osobennosti khudozhestvennoj prozy M. Gor'kogo [Syntactic features of M. Gorky's fiction]. dis. ... kand. filol. nauk. Moskva. 185 s.
8. Ivanov V.V. (1934) Pervyj vsesojuznyj s''ezd sovetskikh pisatelej. Stenograficheskij otčyot [The First All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers. Verbatim report. Moskva. Izdatel'stvo «Khudozhestvennaja literature».
9. Karimova N. V. (2021) Russkaja literature [Russian literature]. Ekonomika i sotsium. No.12 (91) -2
10. Khrapchenko M.B. (1975) Tvorčeskaja individual'nost' pisatelja i razvitie literatury [The creative individuality of the writer and the development of literature]. Moskva. Sovetskij pisatel'.
11. Kitajo M. (2025). The combination of verbs and infinitives in Russian literary works from the end of the 18th to the end of the 20th century," The American scholarly journal Cross-Cultural Studies: Education and Science (CC&ES) Vol. 10, Issue 1, pp.40-60.
12. Kozhevnikova N. A. (1974) Sintaksicheskie osobennosti prozy M. Gor'kogo [Syntactic features of M. Gorky's prose]. Filologičeskie nauki. № 2. pp. 45–56.
13. Kozhevnikova N.A. (1994) Tipy povestovovanija v ruskoj literature XIX-XX vv. [Types

- of narrative in Russian literature of the 19th-20th centuries]. Moskva. Institut russkogo jazyka RAN.
14. Kozhina M. N. (1981) Oratorskie elemente v proze M. Gor'kogo [Oratorical elements in the prose of M. Gor'kogo]. Russkaja rech'. № 4. pp.32-41.
 15. Layton S. (1994) Russian Literature and Empire. Conquest of the Caucasus from Pushkin to Tolstoy. Cambridge University Press
 16. Leonov L.M. (1934) Pervyj vsesozjuznyj s'ezd sovetskikh pisatelej. Stenograficheskij otchyt [The First All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers. Verbatim report. Moskva. Izdatel'stvo «Khudozhestvennaja literature».
 17. Semenova L. V. (1975) Ekspressivnyj sintaksis v proizvedenijakh M. Gor'kogo [Expressive syntax in the works of M. Gorky]. avtoref. dis. ... kand. filol. nauk. Leningrad. 24 s.
 18. Sholokhov M.A. (1936) Iz rechi o M. Gor'kom [From a speech about M. Gorky]. («Molot», 1936, 23 ijunja, № 4519.)
 19. Stalin I.V. (1936) Pamjati Maksima Gor'kogo [In memory of Maxim Gorky]. Pravda, 20 ijunja 1936 g.
 20. Titareva L.D. (2010) Literatura kak sredstvo ideologicheskogo kontrolja v sovetskoy kul'ture dovoennogo perioda [Literature as a means of ideological control in pre-war Soviet culture]. Zhurnal: Gumanitarnyj vektor. Serija: Pedagogika, psikhologija.
 21. Vinogradov V. V. (1982) Oчерki po istorii russkogo literaturnogo jazyka XVII-XIX vv. [Essays on the history of the Russian literary language of the 17th-19th centuries]. Moskva. «Vysshazh shkola»

Information about the Author:

Kitajo Mitsushi (Kyoto, Japan) – Ph.D. The owner of the Medal of Pushkin (Russian Federation National Award), professor, Head of the department of European languages, Faculty of Foreign Studies, Kyoto Sangyo University.

<https://orcid.org/iD-0009-0008-3118-8284>

e-mail: kitajo@cc.kyoto-su.ac.jp

Acknowledgments: The author thanks the reviewers for their consideration of the manuscript.

Authors' contribution: The work is solely that of the authors.