

Title: Historical observations on defectiveness: the first singular non-past

Author: Matthew Baerman

Running head: Historical observations on defectiveness

## 1 Introduction\*

A number of second conjugation verbs in Russian are commonly cited as being defective in the 1SG non-past, such as убедить:

Table 1: non-past paradigm of убедить

	SG	PL
1	∅	убедем
2	убедишь	убедите
3	убедит	убедят

It is generally agreed that there is no semantic explanation for this gap. As Družinina writes (Дружинина 1962, 14), ‘Это традиция.’ Indeed, she even suggests a set of classroom exercises for teaching defective paradigms.

Nevertheless, these gaps are not entirely random, in as much as the verbs affected are second conjugation verbs whose stem ends in a consonant which, as a rule, should undergo an alternation in the 1SG. Zaliznjak’s list of defective second conjugation verbs is given in Table 2 (Зализняк 1977), along with a token count of non-past forms from the Russian National Corpus (RNC), to give some impression of their distribution in the lexicon.

---

\* Thanks to Greville Corbett for comments on this paper. This research has been funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council (UK) under grant number AH/D001579/1. Their support is gratefully acknowledged.

Table 2: Verbs with defective 1SG per Зализняк (1977), with RNC count of non-past tokens (queried 4.07)

expected alternation		RNC non-past tokens
т ~ ч or щ	очутиться	105
	претить	106
д ~ ж	бдеть	78
	-бедить(-ся) (по-, у-, у-...-ся)	1571
	чудить (на-, по-, от-)	69
	дудеть (по-, про-)	23
	ерундить (на-)	2
	галдеть (за-, по-)	70
	лихорадить	55
	обезлошадить	0
	сбондить	0
	сбрредить	6
	шкодить (на-)	7
	зд ~ зж ([жжь])	угораздить
с ~ ш	чудесить (на-)	2
	кудесить (на-)	1
	-лесить (об-, обез-)	0
	лисить	2
	ляпсить	0
	обрусить	2
	парусить	6
	пылесосить (про-)	20
рысить (за-, про-)	4	

з ~ ж	бузить (на-)	27
	дерзить (на-)	31
	лямзить	1
	мерзить	14
	обуржуазить(-ся)	0
	угобзить	0
ст ~ щ	шелештеть (за-, по-, про-)	167
	шерстить (пере-)	4
м ~ м[л']	тмить(-ся) (за-)	35

---

Given that the defective verbs appear to belong to the alternating stem type, it is tempting to seek an explanation for the gap in some problem engendered by the (potential) alternation. But it is far from clear what that problem might be. Three possibilities come to mind:

- a) The application of the regular inflectional rules would produce a phonologically unacceptable form.
- b) The expected form is acceptable in raw phonological terms, but violates some other condition. For example, Es'kova (Еськова 1989, 98) observes that the columnar end stress of a-stem nouns conflicts with the stress shift occasioned by the null genitive plural null ending. On this interpretation, \*мечт-Ø is defective because it cannot realize post-stem stress (see also Pertsova 2005 for a recent treatment).
- c) The speaker is unable to decide between competing alternation patterns (Дружинина 1964, 13, cited in Бахтурина 1966, 115; Albright 2003 suggests a similar approach to defective verbs in Spanish).

None of these has any obvious application here:

- a) Phonologically, the expected 1SG forms would be unexceptionable, with the possible exception of \*ТМЛЮ, since [C<sub>stop</sub>ml'] is an otherwise unattested consonant cluster.
- b) The only explanation along these lines that has been suggested (at least, that I am aware of) is homophony avoidance: the expected 1SG forms of *бузить*, *дерзить* and *лсить* would coincide with those of other, more frequent verbs (*будить*, *держать*, *лишать*). But this would affect only a handful of verbs.
- c) The alternations listed in Table 2 are exceptionless in the standard language, so it is hard to see how serious morphological competition could be involved. The one stem type where there is a degree of uncertainty, namely stems in -т (which can alternate with ч or with щ), does not incline towards defectiveness any more than stems ending in other consonants.

However, these observations apply only to the contemporary normative standard. Earlier periods permitted variant 1SG patterns. Thus *убедить*, defective in the contemporary language, not only displays 1SG forms in earlier texts, but displays variant forms:

- (1) Ну, да я зна-ю, что я не убеж-у вас...  
well yes I know-1SG that I not convince-1SG you  
'Well yes, I know I won't convince you...' (RNC/Tolstoy, *Letters* 1894)

(2) Вряд ли я вас убежд-у в моем взгляде...

hardly Q I you convince-1SG in my view

‘I’m hardly going to convince you of my view...’ (RNC/ Dostoevsky, *Diaries* 1887)

This suggests that the original motivation for defectiveness might be found in the paradigmatic relationships which obtained in the past. Problems that arose under prior morphological conditions were ultimately lexicalized to yield the defectiveness of contemporary paradigms. That is, defectiveness is a matter of arbitrary lexical specification, but nonetheless can be motivated diachronically. In the ensuing sections I pursue this line of inquiry, using the list in Table 2 as a point of reference, and observe that there is indeed evidence that a number of these verbs formerly had aberrant 1SG alternations. The conclusion is two-fold: for some verbs it seems clear that defectiveness is lexicalized, for others it is possible that the original motivation is still in force.

## **2 Variant alternations.**

Evidence for prior variation in the 1SG can be recovered both through synchronic evidence and from the historic record. Synchronically, it is revealing to look at other stem-final consonant alternations within the verb paradigm, since these bear a relationship to what happens in the 1SG. In the second conjugation, the past passive participle (PPP) typically undergoes the same alternation as the 1SG.

Table 3: Usual correspondence of 1SG alternation and past passive participle alternation

INF	1SG	PPP	INF	1SG	PPP
бросить	брошу	брошенный	запретить	запрещу	запрещенный
поразить	поражу	пораженный	разбудить	разбужу	разбуженный
истратить	истрачу	истраченный	пустить	пущу	пущенный

Those defective verbs that have a PPP (most do not) display a stem-final consonant which would not be permitted as a 1SG alternant. *-бедить* has *жд*, while the others are non-alternating.

Table 4: Infinitive stem/past passive participle correspondence among defectives

INF	1SG	PPP	INF	1SG	PPP
-бедить	∅	-бежденный	пылесосить	∅	пылесосенный
сбондить	∅	сбонденный	обуржуазить	∅	обуржуазенный
облесить	∅	облесенный	лямзить	∅	лямзенный
ляпсить	∅	ляпсенный			

Projecting the behaviour of the PPP onto the 1SG leads us to expect both *д ~ жд* and non-alternation in the 1SG.

The historic record confirms that both types were once admitted into the normative standard, and that these ultimately bear a relationship to defectiveness. Table 5 lists those defective verbs from Zaliznjak's list for which information is provided in pre-Revolutionary sources on the standard written language (grammars, style guides and dictionaries). The sources earlier than Lomonosov (Ломоносов

1755) are, strictly speaking, Church Slavonic, but are nonetheless relevant to the history of the written language.

Table 5: Defective verbs (from Table 1) with pre-Revolutionary citations

	Чернышев 1915	Огиенко 1914	CS/Russian dictionary 1867-68	Павский 1841	Востоков 1831	Греч 1827	Puchmajer 1818	1st Academy dictionary 1789-94	Барсов с. 1785	Ломоносов 1755	Поликарпов 1704	Славинецкий XVII в.	Смотрицкий 1619
бдеть	∅		•	∅	•			•	•		•	•	•
-бедить	N/жд		жд	жд				жд/•	жд	жд	жд	жд	
дудеть	N		•	∅	•	•	•	•			•		
кудесить	∅		•		•		•	•			•		
-лесить	N												
мерзить	∅		•		•			•	•			N	
обрусить	N												
очутиться	∅/•	N				•		•					
тмить			•		•		•	•					
угобзить			N				•	•			•		
чудесить	∅		N		•			•					
чудить	∅		жд	∅	•			жд/•	жд			жд	
шкодить			N										

• = non-alternating 1SG

∅ = defective 1SG

N = normal alternation in the 1SG



Two verbs are attested with 1SG д ~ жд, and both these and twelve of the remaining thirteen verbs have a non-alternating 1SG attested or implied. The verbs -лесить and обрусить are mentioned by Černyšev specifically as not being non-alternating, implying someone else claimed that they were, though I have not found this in any of the sources I consulted. (The one verb which stands apart is the Ukrainian borrowing шкодить, which is also found with the Ukrainian 1SG within the gloss for вреждаю in Беринда 1627.) Thus, our diachronic investigation can focus on д ~ жд on the one hand, and non-alternating verbs on the other.

### 3 The д ~ жд alternation

The Church Slavonic reflex of Common Slavonic *\*dj* was once accepted in the 1SG of verbs in -д of Church Slavonic origin, particularly in elevated style. The fullest list of verbs optionally taking 1SG жд comes from Barsov (с. 1785; p. 555 in the 1981 edition), who cites -бедить, будить, видеть, водить, вредить, градить, кадить, нудить, радить, садить, сладить, судить, трудить, ходить, цедить, чредить, чудить and щадить,. The list was clearly not meant to be exhaustive (in as much as it ends with ‘etc.’), but, if we add to this упредить, the list includes nearly all the verbs cited in older grammars and style guides as possibly taking 1SG жд.

From this list, only two verbs, -бедить and чудить, have been cited as defective, so it is clear that there is no simple correlation between the prior admissibility of 1SG жд and defectiveness. As first step, Barsov’s list can be pruned somewhat if we look at the statements of later observers. Grot (Грот 1885, 368) gives as a rule of thumb that the Church Slavonic alternation occurs only with prefixed forms. By the early 20th century, we find Černyšev (Чернышев 1915, 306-7)

allowing 1SG жд as an option only for the prefixed verbs -бедить, -градить (пре-, возна-), насадить, насладить, -нудить (вы-, при-), упредить (пред-), учредить. Likewise, corpus evidence suggests that use of the 1SG жд was limited. Table 6 gives figures from the Russian National Corpus, based on Barsov's list (plus упредить), contrasting 1SG forms in Church Slavonic жд versus 'normal' Russian ж.

Table 6. 1SG *ж* versus *жд*. Token count from the RNC (queried 3/2007)

	18th-19th c.		20th c.	
	ж	жд	ж	жд
-бедить (по-, у-, переу-, разу-, у-...-ся)	3	4	4	2
будить (воз-, про-...-ся)	7	0	1	0
видеть <sup>1</sup>	3,000	4	10,000	0 <sup>2</sup>
водить (в-, вз-, воз-, воспроиз-, выпро-, до-, за-, из-, на-, от-, пере-, по-, под-, препро-, при-, про-, произ-, раз-, руко-, с-, у-)	293	0	1287	0
вредить (на-, по-)	6	0	23	0
градить (о-, на-, возна- за-)	15	1	20	0
кадить	0	0	0	0
нудить (при-)	3	0	1	0
-предить (у-, преду-)	18	4	28	0
-садить (на-)	0	0	3	0
сладить (на-...-ся)	3	1	5	0
судить (за-, об-, о-, рас-, с-, от-)	121	0 <sup>3</sup>	169	0
трудить	0	0	0	0
ходить (до-, ис-, нис-, об-, оби-, от-, пере-, по-, под-, пре-, превос-, при-, про-, проис-, с-, у-, в-, вос-, вс-, вы-, за-)	1060	10 <sup>4</sup>	4270	0
цедить	0	0	0	0
-чредить (у-)	0	1	0	1
чудить	0	0	0	0
щадить (по-)	21	0	25	0

From Table 6 it is evident that 1SG *ѡѡ* was not much used even in the 18th-19th centuries, and by the 20th century it had all but disappeared. What particularly stands out from these figures is that *-бѣдѣтъ* is the only verb to evince serious competition between the two alternatives, and that this competition seems to be retained into the 20th century. (The data for *учредѣтъ*, which shows *o n l y* *жд*, are intriguing, but too scanty to say much about.) The fact that the verb in which the *д ~ жд* alternation was most robust is also the one which ended up defective makes a causal connection seem more plausible.

### 3.1 Elimination of *жд*

The Church Slavonic alternation *д ~ жд* met different fates in the different areas of verbal morphology where it plays a role. The alternation is firmly established in derived imperfectives and past passive participles (*убѣдѣтъ ~ убеждать ~ убежден*). But in the non-past, it was clearly resisted from the outset, and ultimately rejected. The data in Table 6 are too scanty to give much indication as to what was going on, but the behaviour of the parallel alternation in the first conjugation may give some further clues.

The first conjugation Church Slavonic verbs *страдѣтъ* and *жадѣтъ* originally had the *жд* alternant in the non-past. Both verbs lost this alternation, but in two different ways. In the case of *страдѣтъ*, following a development familiar from other verbs, the stem-final *-a* was retained in the non-past paradigm, eliminating the conditions for the alternation (Table 7). In the case of *жадѣтъ*, the infinitive stem was back-formed on the basis of the non-past, thus extending stem-final *жд* to the whole paradigm (Table 8).

Table 7: Changing paradigm of страдать

<i>18th c.</i>		<i>later</i>	
INF страдать		INF страдать	
SINGULAR	PLURAL	SINGULAR	PLURAL
1 стражд-у	стражд-ем	страда-ю	страда-ем
2 стражд-ешь	стражд-ете	страда-ешь	страда-ете
3 стражд-ет	стражд-ут	страда-ет	страда-ют

Table 8: Changing paradigm of жадать/жаждать

<i>18th c.</i>		<i>later</i>	
INF жадать		INF жаждать	
SINGULAR	PLURAL	SINGULAR	PLURAL
1 жажд-у	жажд-ем	жажд-у	жажд-ем
2 жажд-ешь	жажд-ете	жажд-ешь	жажд-ете
3 жажд-ет	жажд-ут	жажд-ет	жажд-ут

Two conclusions can be drawn from this. First, жд was rejected not just from the 1SG, but from the non-past as a whole. Second, the behaviour of жадать shows that whatever the problem with жд was, it was not phonological, since жд is maintained in the non-past. The problem was evidently morphological: having жд as the product of an ALTERNATION was rejected, though жд as such was acceptable.

This raises two further questions. First, why was the other characteristicly Church Slavonic alternation, т ~ щ, not rejected? Second, why was the жд alternation allowed in some parts of the paradigm but not others? The answer to the first seems

fairly clear: щ exists natively as the alternant of ст, so щ was already established as a morphological alternant; the fact that Church Slavonic and native alternations involve a different base consonant seems to have been immaterial. The second question likely involves the distinction between inflection and derivation, broadly construed, with the жд alternant rejected from the core inflectional paradigm but admitted in more peripheral areas with quasi-derivational status, such as participles.

### **3.2 Particular characteristics of -бедить**

It was suggested above that the defectiveness of -бедить was connected with the fact that the 1SG д ~ жд was better established with it than with other verbs (see Table 6). Why should this have been the case? One clue comes from reading between the lines of Barsov's description of this class (Барсов с. 1785; p. 555 in the 1981 edition). He characterizes 1SG жд as Church Slavonic and ж as its native Russian equivalent, illustrating the contrast with two lists of corresponding verbs, e.g. бужду versus бужу. What Barsov is contrasting here are not so much morphological differences as lexical doublets, which may differ in other features as well, e.g. Church Slavonic гражду versus Russian горожу. Significantly, some verbs on the first list are missing from the second, namely -бежду, слажду, чрежду and чужду. These are all Church Slavonic verbs with no (semantically equivalent) corresponding Russian form. Thus one reason for the particular status of the жд alternation with -бедить may be that, originally, it was the only option for this particular verb (and similarly for чудить). Clearly, this in itself is an insufficient explanation, as the same might be said of -чредить and сладить (as well as упредить, not on Barsov's list), which were readily adapted to the native Russian pattern.

Another feature that might be said to set -бедить apart is that it is invariably prefixed -- recall Grot's (Грот 1885, 368) rule of thumb, cited above, that the Church Slavonic alternations only occur with prefixed verbs. But again, there are verbs that fit this description which did adopt ж, namely учредить (given as чредить by Barsov) and упредить.

These two features (lack of semantically equivalent East Slavonic counterpart, and being a bound stem) thus single out three verbs as being especially prone to take 1SG жд, namely -бедить, учредить and упредить, but they fail to distinguish -бедить from the other two. Yet there is evidence that, even at an early date, something set -бедить apart. In the first Academy dictionary (1789-94), the entry for -бедить gives as 1SG forms -бежду or non-alternating -бедю (likewise for чудиться). Упредить and учредить on the other hand are given with 1SG жд only (all other verbs allegedly with 1SG жд have only жд, or a choice between жд and ж). It is unclear how to interpret the non-alternating pattern in this context, but at the very least, it would seem to be an acknowledgment of the non-acceptability of the normal 1SG alternation.

One can imagine the following scenario for the genesis of defectiveness in -бедить (and, by analogy, for чудить). The word was adopted as a Church Slavonicism, with 1SG жд as part of its profile. But overall, 1SG жд never met with more than a lukewarm reception, and was already on its way out by the 19th century. -бедить ended up stuck between the non-acceptability of the normal alternation and the dwindling acceptability of 1SG жд. The non-acceptability of the normal alternation may also explain the persistence of 1SG жд into the 20th century: 1SG жд may have been bad, but apparently no worse than 1SG ж. Table 9 gives data from the RNC for the complete non-past paradigm, which show that by the 20th century, neither жд nor

ж is much used. The question remains as to why the normal alternations should never have been fully acceptable for -бедить, but the historic record sheds no light on this.

Table 9. Nonpast tokens of -бедить, full nonpast paradigm (RNC, queried 2/07)

	<1900	>1900
1SG жд/ж/д'	4/3/0	2/4/1
2SG	35	89
3SG	126	520
1PL	28	230
2PL	53	235
3PL	42	170
2SG IMPV	20	54
total	311	1304

Note: 2PL figures include 2PL imperative

#### 4 The т ~ щ alternation

As noted above, this originally Church Slavonic alternation has been maintained in Russian, so one should not expect the same problems. Nevertheless, one verb which had this alternation turns up on Zaliznjak's list of defectives, namely претить. The reason for this is probably because it violates Grot's rule of thumb on the correlation of the Church Slavonic alternation with prefixation, as Grot himself notes. The other exception is святить, which Zaliznjak does not treat as defective. What sets претить apart may be the fact that this verb is essentially impersonal (note that even Поликарпов 1704 portrays it this way), i.e. problems with the formation of the 1SG are compounded by the fact that there is little need to form it.



## 5 Non-alternating dental stems

Recall from Table 5 that most of verbs from Zaliznjak’s list for which there is a pre-Revolutionary citation are attested at some point as being non-alternating in the 1SG. To this list we can add further items cited as defective by Ušakov (Ушаков 1935-40); all four of those that have pre-Revolutionary attestations are cited as non-alternating:<sup>5</sup>

Table 10. Additional defective verbs from Ушаков (1935-40) with pre-Revolutionary citations

	Чернышев 1915	Огиенко 1914	CS/Russian dictionary 1867-68	Востоков 1831	Греч 1827	Puchmajer 1818	1st Academy dictionary 1789-94	Ломоносов 1755	Поликарпов 1704	Славинецкий XVII в.	Смотрицкий 1619
-гнездить(-ся) (в-/у-)			N				N			ждж	•
слезить(-ся)	∅	•	•	•	•	•	•	ж	•	•	•
смердеть (на-)			N				N	N	•	•	
соседить(-ся)			N			•	жд				

• = non-alternating 1SG

∅ = defective 1SG

N = normal alternation in the 1SG

The class of non-alternating stems in the history of Russian is something of a philological mystery. In principle, there is nothing strange about such a pattern, in as much as it simply involves the generalization of a single stem shape throughout the

whole nonpast paradigm. Indeed, non-alternation in the 1SG turns up in various Russian dialects (Обнорский 1953, 109-13; Бернштейн 1974, 106-8), and is certainly present, at least sporadically, in the spoken language: Вахтурина (Бахтурина 1966) and, more recently, Alley et al. (2006) report experimental data showing a not inconsiderable tendency for speakers to produce non-alternating forms, and of course a quick internet search will easily yield examples in informal writing. But there is no recognition of this in the normative standard. Nevertheless, as is clear from Table 5 and Table 10, there was once a tradition whereby certain verbs were acknowledged to be non-alternating, though the full extent of this tradition seems not to be fully appreciated.

The point of reference for most commentators is the list in Vostokov's grammar (Востоков 1831, 75): the dental stems *бдю, ддю, чдюсь, ощу(сь), борзюь, мерзю, слезю, скользю, тзю, кудесю, чудесю* and *обезопасю*, and the labial stems *каймю, клеймю* and *тмю*. Many later observers have rejected outright the idea that such forms exist, or ever could have existed. For example, Павский (Павский 1841 [1850], 160) writes that they 'относятся к грамматическим вымыслам'. Обнорский (Обнорский 1953, 113f) and Kiparsky (1967, 217) reiterate Павский's assessment, in effect accusing Vostokov of having made them up.<sup>6</sup> Miklosich (1876, 325) and Černyšev (Чернышев 1915, 291-93), treat Vostokov's list with less scepticism, and Černyšev further notes that some of these forms may be found in the 1st Academy dictionary. In fact, Vostokov's entire list comes from either the first (1789-94) or second (1806) Academy dictionary<sup>7</sup> (with the exception of *ощю*, for which *очуюсь* may have been intended (see fn. 13 below). Vostokov's fault must simply have been to gather these entries up in one place.

But such forms predate even the Academy dictionary by a considerable margin. The earliest overt discussion of non-alternating verbs that I am aware of comes from Barsov (Барсов с. 1785; p. 554f in the 1981 edition), who allows for non-alternating stems in д and з, with the observation that both are quite rare, and that the type in з is a Church Slavonicism. The latter is a surprising assertion, since non-alternation is as unexpected in Church Slavonic -- or rather, in Old Church Slavonic -- as it is in Russian. But there is evidence for such a class in late Church Slavonic, though there appears to be no scholarly consensus as to their significance or extent. Polikarpov's dictionary (Поликарпов 1704) contains a particularly large number, at least 48 (I cannot guarantee to have caught them all). Keipert (1988: XXII) attributes a fair amount of influence to this list, at least in the period prior to Lomonosov's grammar, and in turn traces its origins to Smotryc'ky's (Смотрицкий 1619) influential grammar of Church Slavonic. Let us address Keipert's two points in turn.

First, *pace* Keipert, there is no clear evidence that later citations of non-alternating verbs are directly traceable to Polikarpov. Keipert (1988: XXII) notes that in the period after the publication of Polikarpov's dictionary, the first Bible concordances appeared (Кантемир 1727, Ильинский 1761 [1737] and Богданов 1737), and that these likewise contain non-alternating verbs. He ascribes these forms to the influence of Polikarpov's dictionary. But in fact there appears to be no direct relationship. Kantemir's and Il'inskij's concordances together (I have not been able to consult Bogdanov's) contain eight entries corresponding to Polikarpov's non-alternating verbs, but only three of them are given as non-alternating in these later sources. Of these three, two are found in sources prior to Polikarpov: Slavineckij (Славинецкий XVII в.) has бдю (as well as смердю, agreeing with Polikarpov but not Kantemir or Il'inskij), while Smotryc'kyj has both бдю and дождю. Thus, the non-

alternating forms of these concordances seem to represent an independent manifestation of the same tradition evidenced in Polikarpov, and not a direct emulation of Polikarpov's practice.

Table 11. Non-alternating verbs from Polikarpov (Поликарпов 1704) compared with the catechisms of Kantemir (Кантемир 1727) and П'inskij (Ильинский 1761 [1737])

Polikarpov	Kantemir	П'inskij
бдю	<i>same as Polikarpov</i>	<i>same as Polikarpov</i>
чуждуюся, чюдуюся	<i>lacking</i>	<i>same as Polikarpov</i>
дождю	<i>same as Polikarpov</i>	<i>same as Polikarpov</i>
гордуюся	горжуся	<i>lacking</i>
кадю	<i>lacking</i>	кажду
нудю(ся)	<i>lacking</i>	нуждуюся
постуюся	<i>lacking</i>	пощуюся
смердю	смержу	смержу

On the other hand, Keipert does appear to be correct that non-alternating 1SG forms cannot be traced back before Smotryc'kyj. Smotryc'kyj gives the forms бдю, слезю, гнѣздю and дождю in his grammar. The major grammar which preceded it, the parallel Greek and Church Slavonic *Adelphotes* (published in Lviv, 1591), contains no non-alternating verbs.

Where did such forms come from? Horbatsch (1974: vi) attributes them to the spoken dialect of either Smotryc'kyj or his typesetter,<sup>8</sup> in as much as similar forms are attested in some Ukrainian and Belorussian dialects.<sup>9</sup> While it cannot be excluded that this played a role, the fact that such forms are absent from Smotryc'kyj's vernacular

writings (Pugh 1996, 252) makes this explanation not entirely satisfying. Nor were these forms changed in subsequent editions of Smotryc'kyj's grammar that were published elsewhere, which otherwise contain a number of corrections and alterations to grammatical forms (Horbatsch 1964). What is more, three of the four forms cited by Smotryc'kyj are in direct contrast with the corresponding ones found the Ostrog Bible (снабжу in Ezekiel 34:16, одожду in Exodus 16:4 and elsewhere, and слежу in Job 3:24). Since Smotryc'kyj drew much of his material directly from the Ostrog Bible (Horbatsch 1974: vi), these are unlikely to have been mere oversights. Rather, they appear to be deliberate innovations or corrections. One can only guess what the motivation was, but it is worth speculating.

Дождити is set apart from other verbs by its morphological ambiguity in the 1SG. Earlier sources (Adelphotes, the Ostrog Bible) have the expected Church Slavonic form (о-)дожду. Morphophonologically this involves a self-cancelling stem alternation: жд → жжд → жд (with degemination of жж as the last step), so that the alternation is not overtly manifested. What Smotryc'kyj might have done was reinterpret дожд- in the 1SG as the unmodified basic stem, and apply the default 1SG ending -ю of the 2nd declension (on the assumption that he restricted 1SG -y in the 2nd declension to the outcome of the д ~ жд alternation). This proposal is given some support by the fact that he appears to have given бежати a similar treatment, normalizing the 1SG ending to бегю in place of the correct but anomalous бегу. The treatment of гнѣздити, whose expected 1SG was presumably гнѣжду, may have been on analogy with дождити; note that 1SG forms of -дождити turn up at least four times in the Bible, giving it a certain salience. In addition, it may be significant that even the Ostrog Bible has a non-alternating imperfect form of this verb (угнѣздохуся in Daniel 4:18). Since the imperfect and 1SG normally display the same stem-final consonant

alternation, this may indicate a tendency towards non-alternation prior to Smotryc'kyj.<sup>10</sup>

For бѣти I know of no reliable attestations of the Church Slavonic 1SG. The Ostrog Bible has the etymologically related снабжу, with a clearly East Slavonic version of the consonant alternation, in place of \*снабжду. It may be that Smotryc'kyj's бдю was meant to correct this vulgarism, and that the expected form \*бжду was somehow (phonotactically?) unacceptable.

Слезю is the only example from Smotryc'kyj which does not involve stem-final д. One intriguing hint is given by the fact that in one of the three citations of this form, the grapheme Smotryc'kyj uses for з is not the normal one, but rather s (s), which was originally a distinct phoneme (the palatal affricate *dz*). Whether this s is etymologically justified is uncertain,<sup>11</sup> but the striking fact is that the one verb where it is certain that stem-final s is etymologically justified, namely гобъсѣти, is one which later turns up both as non-alternating and defective (as угобзѣтъ; see Table 5). It is not implausible that s was non-alternating in the 1SG, just as the other palatals.<sup>12</sup> Had this been maintained even after  $s > з$ , non-alternation would represent a lexical archaism.

Smotryc'kyj's text represents the earliest attestations of non-alternating dental stems within a literary tradition which, while not 'Russian' strictly speaking, is nevertheless part of its heritage. The forms proposed by Smotryc'kyj duly found their way into the 18th century reworking of the Church Slavonic Bible (the Elizabeth Bible, 1751), with надождю, одождю, слезю and снабдю replacing the forms cited above from the Ostrog Bible. However, it is unlikely that Smotryc'kyj was the sole inspiration for such innovations. Consider the imperfect of чудитися, which is found in the Ostrog Bible with the expected жд (чуждахуся) but in the Elizabeth Bible with

no alternation (чудяхуся) (Классовский 1867, 97). Since Smotryc'ckij discusses neither this verb in particular, nor the alternations of the imperfect in general, his grammar cannot have been the source of this switch. (Likewise, it further calls into question the role of vernacular influence, in as much as the imperfect was already long absent from the spoken language.) Later Church Slavonic gives evidence of still more non-alternating verbs; Jovanović's grammar lists quite a few (Йоаннович 1851, 112).

Within the context of pre-20th century literary Russian, non-alternating stems seem largely to be Church Slavonicisms, as pointed out by Barsov. The most prominent exception to this generalization is the decidedly East Slavonic *очутиться*. A possible explanation for its behaviour was implied by Družinina (Дружинина 1962, 14), namely dissimilation of the second ч in \*очучусь.<sup>13</sup> (A comparable dissimilation analysis is also applicable to labial stems, discussed below.)

Still, even with a clearer picture of the historical background of the non-alternating type its relationship to defectiveness remains unclear. At one level there is an obvious parallel with the behaviour of stems with 1SG жд: an aberrant pattern was adopted by a handful of verbs and subsequently eliminated, leaving defectiveness in its wake. But where stems in жд represent a closed class with a discrete historical origin and circumscribed stylistic range, the origin and extent of the non-alternating class is quite diffuse. A look at Dolopčev's (Долопчев 1909) dictionary is telling. A number of entries deal with non-alternating 1SG forms. Most involve an injunction to avoid non-alternation and use the regular form instead. These include time-honoured non-alternating verbs of the type discussed above (гнѣздюсь, and also побѣдю, for which Dolopčev recommends побѣжду), uncommon or obscure verbs, some of which later observers cite as defective (обезлещю, обезсмертю, суетю(сь)), alongside forms

which appear simply to be substandard variants of relatively common verbs (встречюсь, гордюсь<sup>14</sup> заблудюсь, зависю). On the other hand, he recommends non-alternation for прослезюсь and скользю (as in the first Academy dictionary). Thus, there is historical evidence for non-alternation in various layers of the lexicon and in various registers, but only a subset of this bears a relationship to defectiveness.

## 6 Labial stems

Second conjugation stems ending in labial consonants also undergo an alternation in the 1SG, but are conspicuously absent from Zaliznjak's list of defectives, the only instance being *тмить*. If defectiveness is somehow related to the possibility of a 1SG alternation, why are labial stems not affected? There is historic evidence for non-alternating labial stems, so given the correlation discussed above between non-alternation and defectiveness, this absence is even more puzzling.

However, the historic record does show that the status of non-alternating labial stems appears to have been somewhat different from that of dentals. As with the dentals, the first overt mention comes from Smotryc'kyj. He characterizes the epenthetic *l* as optional, thus *славлю* or *славю*, *сплю* or *спю* etc. (sheet 157, obverse). In the same passage, he likewise describes 1SG *жд* as optional (alongside *ж*), thus *рожду* or *рожую*, *хожду* or *хожую* etc. This contrasts with the treatment of non-alternating dentals. These are not discussed at all -- the forms simply turn up as such, without comment. Thus, we can distinguish two types of 1SG variation in Smotryc'kyj's presentation:

- i. The optional application of an overtly Church Slavonic alternation type. In the case of *жд* versus *ж*, this is fairly clear: *жд* is Church Slavonic while *ж* is East



Slavonic. On analogy with this, we can suppose that labials with epenthetic *l* were construed as Church Slavonic, though how to characterize those without is not entirely clear. As Horbatsch notes, non-alternation is a Ukrainian dialect feature, but as Pugh (1996) points out, this feature is absent in Smotryc'kyj's vernacular writings.

- ii. A small handful of dental stem verbs appear simply to lack a 1SG alternation.

From this perspective, non-alternation among the labial stems is a quite general stylistic choice, while among the dental stems, it is lexically specified.

Polikarpov (Поликарпов 1704) cites 11 (by my rough count) non-alternating labial verbs, alongside (about) 20 alternating ones. Interestingly, there is no overlap with Smotryc'kyj's list, i.e. the verbs for which Smotryc'kyj actually cites a non-alternating 1SG form are given by Polikarpov as alternating (скорблю, славлю, сплю, терплю). This lack of correspondence further supports the idea that non-alternation among labial stems was not lexically specified in the way it appears to have been for dentals. Later authors converge on a list of four: каймить (the first attestation I know of in the first Academy dictionary), клеймить (cited in Lomonosov's grammar, §378), дмиться and тмить (the last two appearing in the first Academy dictionary). In the contemporary language, the first two now have normal 1SG forms, дмиться is obsolete and тмить is construed (by Zaliznjak) as defective.

The membership of this tiny class may well originally have had a phonological motivation. The case of тмить was discussed above (§1). With клеймить, a possible explanation is dissimilation of the second [l']. Note that, as with the defective dental stems described above, this root never displays a stem-final consonant alternation, having a non-alternating PPP, клейменный. (This analysis parallels the one offered above for очутиться.) A different explanation must be sought for каймить, since

dissimilation is obviously not an issue. One possibility is that its (former) lack of alternation was due to analogy with the vastly more frequent *клеЙмитЬ*; the RNC (queried 4/07) records roughly 500 instances of *(за-)клеЙмитЬ* but only seven of *(о-)каЙмитЬ* (which occurs here solely in the PPP). The basis for this analogy would have been their phonological similarity: they are the only 2nd conjugation verbs whose stems end in *-Vjm*.

In sum, the virtual absence of defective labial stem verbs coincides with the virtual absence of lexically specified non-alternating labial stem verbs in earlier periods.

## **7 Conclusion**

A substantial number of the verbs identified by Zaliznjak as defective in the 1SG can be traced back to verbs which in earlier periods were characterized by anomalous patterns of alternation in the 1SG, which fall into two classes. Verbs which once had the Church Slavonic 1SG *жд* provide evidence that defectiveness is lexicalized, and not due to synchronic problems in the grammar. Verbs which once had non-alternating 1SG forms are more difficult to interpret. On the one hand, non-alternation enjoyed a limited degree of acceptance in the literary language in earlier periods, whereas now it is excluded outright, which suggests a parallel with *д ~ жд*. On the other hand, non-alternation remains a viable non-standard option, whose influence on the standard language probably ought not to be dismissed.

Further, the nature of the diachronic and synchronic relationship between non-alternation and defectiveness is open to diverse interpretations. One extreme would be to view defectiveness as the surface manifestation of underlying non-alternation, as

does Bernštejn, when he writes ‘...мощная тенденция выравнивания ярко проявляется не только в диалектном, но и в литературном языке. Здесь она отражается главным образом в том, что глагольная парадигма не знает 1. л. ед. ...’ (Бернштейн 1986, 8). That is, defective verbs are really non-alternating verbs whose production is aborted by the superficial constraints of the literary standard. At the other extreme, we might see non-alternation as a reaction to defectiveness. This is what Pavskij seems to have in mind when he writes, commenting on the list of non-alternating verbs found in Vostokov’s grammar (Востоков 1831), ‘Правда, не терпимо в сих глаголах и правильное производство [...], но все это не дает права вводить неслыханные: бдю, дудю. А лучше сказать, что глаголы бдеть, дудеть, чудиться в 1-м лице не употребляются, и вместо себя берут 1-е лице других однозначных глаголов.’ (Павский 1841 [1850], 160f). That is, these verbs are really underlyingly defective, and should they appear with non-alternating 1SG forms, this is simply a last resort, a sign of desperation, as it were. This is also the conclusion one might draw from the fact that for -бедить the first Academy dictionary gives -бедю as an alternative to -бежду, but not \*-бежу. Non-alternation is also recorded for this verb (though not approved of) by Dolopčev (Долопчев 1909), and, of course, pops up in later sources as well. Here it looks as if non-alternation were the reflection of problems engendered by the problematic status of the prescribed 1SG жд, and not a motivating factor in itself.

The data from Бахтурина (1966) suggest that both forces may be at work. Compare the figures given for the two verbs in Table 12. At one extreme, сдобить tends to be treated as defective and only rarely as non-alternating, while пылесосить tends to be treated as non-alternating and more rarely as defective (and only by linguists at that).<sup>15</sup>

Table 12: Two extremes from Бахтурина (1966): 1SG forms from 64 subjects

	alternating	non- alternating	both	defective	other
сдобить	38	2	0	24	0
пылесосить	24	29	2	8	1 <sup>16</sup>

Thus, пылесосить looks as if it is essentially a non-alternating verb whose 1SG form is rejected by some speakers (who happen to be particularly conscious of the literary norm), while the defectiveness of сдобить appears to stem from other causes, non-alternation being only seldom resorted to.

In sum, the present study has found evidence that at least some verbs have conventionalized, lexicalized gaps, whose origins lie in now-obsolete morphological conditions. Other verbs have since been added to the class of defectives, either on analogy with the existing class, or they may be derivable from currently operating constraints (e.g. rejection of non-alternation). Teasing apart these factors at a synchronic level will require psycholinguistic experimentation, for which the diachronic background explored here is a useful prerequisite.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> The figures for видеть are only for the unprefixd verb. As the counting of hits through the interface of the RNC becomes more approximate as the numbers get higher, there is little point adding to this the figures from the much less frequent prefixed forms. However, the prefixed forms were searched for, and none of them evince instances of 1SG жд.

<sup>2</sup> Factoring out five instances of Church Slavonic material and works on historical linguistics.

<sup>3</sup> The RNC yields four instances of жд, but these all involve the same Bible citation, and represents Church Slavonic rather than Russian: Якоже слышу, сужду, и суд Мой праведен есть, яко не ищу воли Моея, но воли пославшего Мя Отца (John 5:30).

<sup>4</sup> Eight of these involve repetitions of the same Bible citation.

<sup>5</sup> These are бомбить, вверзиться, (в-/у-)гнездиться, завязить, звездиться, каверзить, капризить, куститься, насмердеть, обезлюдить, окрыситься, пороситься, слезиться, соседить, стрекозить, умилосердить. In addition to those listed in Table 10, note the non-alternating умилосердюся from the Elizabeth Bible (1751) in Jeremiah 13:14.

<sup>6</sup> Obnorskij (Обнорский 1953) writes of verbs such as дудить, чудиться and бдеть, ‘...которые выделяются иногда нашими грамматистами, выставляющими для них совершенно искусственные формы без чередования согласного основа...’ (p. 113) and comments similarly on non-alternating verbs in -с and -з (p. 114), in both cases citing only Vostokov. Kiparsky (1967) speaks of Vostokov as having ‘normalized’ various of these verbs; p. 218 he offers the same explanation for каймить and клеймить.

<sup>7</sup> There are some interesting discrepancies between the two editions. *Обезопасить* is given a regular 1SG in the first edition, but a non-alternating one in the second. *Борзить* is completely lacking from the first edition, and *скользить* is said to be impersonal; both are given non-alternating 1SG forms in the second edition.

<sup>8</sup> It seems unlikely that the typesetter could have been responsible. Horbatsch offers this proposal to explain non-alternation in both dental and labial stems, but, as pointed out below, Smotryc'kyj expressly allows non-alternation in labial stems.

<sup>9</sup> Of course, in the context of Ukrainian, this involves levelling of the 1SG solely with the 3PL, since Ukrainian lacks stem-final palatalization in the other non-past forms. Thus the term 'non-alternation' that I have been employing would be a misnomer.

<sup>10</sup> In fact, other verbs that have been cited as having non-alternating 1SG forms can be found with non-alternating imperfects in the pre-Smotryc'kyj period, e.g. *мерзаше*, *смердяху* (both from *Житие Андрея Юродивого*, XV century text), *слезаше* (*Сказание о мамеевом побоище*, XVI century text) and *снабдяше* (*Повесть о взятии царьграда турками*, XVI century text); these texts were consulted through the online *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси*. Of course, too much faith should not be put on the testimony of imperfect forms. Even Old Church Slavonic texts show non-alternation in the imperfect, a result of a specifically Bulgarian/Macedonian innovation (Vaillant 1964, 245).

<sup>11</sup> Most Church Slavonic texts have *з*, but some have *с* (*Slovník jazyka staroslověnského*). The Lower Sorbian *tdza* 'tear' suggests *dz* and many Bulgarian dialects also have *dz*, but the evidence here is ambiguous, as affricitization of *z* does also occur as a secondary development.

<sup>12</sup> The root is a Germanic borrowing originally ending in *-g*; compare Gothic *gabig-s* 'rich'. The verb must have been denominal, based on a noun such as Church Slavonic

гобьсь (see Трубачев 1979, though, curiously, the form is reconstructed here with *z* rather than *dz*).

<sup>13</sup> In discussing the defectiveness of *очутиться*, she suggests it is due to the fact that the sequence *\*чучу* is ‘uncharacteristic’ for Russian (though note that a similar sequence in *чучело* is fine). Vostokov (Востоков 1831, 75) gives the Church Slavonic etymological equivalent likewise with a non-alternating 1SG, *ощутюсь*. This may well have been a mistake. As was pointed out above, Vostokov’s list is drawn from the first and second Academy dictionaries, and this is the one discrepancy between them: Vostokov fails to list the dictionaries’ *ощутюсь*, while the dictionaries have the regular 1SG for *ощутиться*. One suspects that Vostokov really meant to be referring to *очутиться* and not *ощутиться*.

<sup>14</sup> Though note that Поликарпов (Поликарпов 1704) has *гордюся* (see Table 11).

<sup>15</sup> Baxturina divides her study group (all professionals of some sort) into linguists and and non-linguists.

<sup>16</sup> One respondent gave *пылесослю*.

## References

- 1st Academy dictionary: 1789-1794 = *Словарь Академии Российской*, Санкт-Петербург [Reproduced in 2001-2006, Moscow].
- 2nd Academy dictionary: 1806 = *Словарь Академии Российской, по азбучному порядку расположенный*, Санкт-Петербург.
- Барсов (с. 1785) = *Российская грамматика Антона Алексеевича Барсова*, 1981, Тоболова, М. П., и Успенский, Б. А. (ред.), Москва.
- Бахтурина, Р. В.: 1966, 'Морфонологические условия образования отыменных глаголов с суффиксом -Ø-/-и-(ть)', *Развитие словообразования современного русского языка*, Москва, Земская, Е. А. и Шмелев, Д. Н. (ред.), 113-26.
- Беринда, П. : 1627, *Лексикон Словенороський* [facsimile published 1961, Киев].
- Бернштейн, С.: 1974, *Очерк сравнительной грамматики славянских языков*, Москва.
- Бернштейн, С. : 1986, 'Размышления о славянской диалектологии', *Славянское и балканское языкознание*, 3-10.
- Библиотека литературы Древней Руси*, Институт русской литературы РАН, <http://lib.pushkinskiydom.ru> (accessed 5.2007).
- Востоков, А. Х.: 1831, *Сокращенная русская грамматика*, Санкт-Петербург.
- Греч, Н. И.: 1827, *Пространная русская грамматика*, Санкт-Петербург.
- Грот, Я.: 1885, *Филологические разыскания* (3rd edition, volume 1), Санкт-Петербург
- Долопчев, В.: 1909, *Опыт словаря неправильности в русской разговорной речи* [2nd edition], Варшава.



- Дружинина, А. Ф.: 1962, 'Глаголы, не имеющие формы 1 лица ед. ч.' *Русский язык в школе* **1962/4**, 13-16.
- Еськова, Н. А.: 1989, 'Механический акцентный сдвиг как причина дефектности парадигм в русском литературном языке', *Проблемы структурной лингвистики* **1985-87**, 96-103.
- Зализняк, А. А.: 1977, *Морфологический словарь русского языка*, Москва.
- Ильинский, И.: 1761 [first published 1737], *Симфония или согласие на Священное Четвероевангелие и Деяния Святыяж Апостоль*, Москва.
- Йоаннович (Jovanović), Е.: 1851, *Грамматика церковно-славянскаго языка*, Vienna.
- Кантемир. А.: 1727, *Симфония, или согласие на богодухновенную книгу псалмов царя и пророка Давида*, Санкт-Петербург.
- Классовский, В. И.: 1867, *Грамматика славяно-церковного языка нового периода*, Санкт-Петербург.
- Ломоносов, М. В.: 1755, *Российская грамматика*, Санкт-Петербург.
- Обнорский, С. П.: 1953, *Очерки по морфологии русского глагола*, Москва.
- Огиенко, И. И.: 1914, *Словарь неправильных, трудных и сомнительных слов, синонимов и выражений в русской речи*, Киев.
- Павский, Г. П.: 1841, *Филологические наблюдения над составом русского языке* [part 3: *О глаголе*]. Санкт-Петербург. [Page references are to 1850 edition, where the cited passages are identical.]
- Поликарпов, Ф. П.: 1704, *Лексикон трехязычный*, Москва [Facsimile published 1988 as *Specimina philologiae Slavicae* **79**, Munich].

- Славинецкий, Е. XVII в. = *Лексикон латиньский* [Reproduced in В. В. Нимчук (ред.), 1973, *Лексикони Е. Славинецького та А. Корецького-Сатановського*, Киев].
- Смотрицкий, М.: 1619, *Грамматики славенския правильное синтагма*. [Reproduced in Кузьминова, Е. А. (ред.): 2000, *Грамматики Лаврентия Зизания и Мелетия Смотрицкого*, Москва].
- Трубачев, О. Н. (ред.): 1979, *Этимлогический словарь славянских языков: праславянский лексический фонд* (т. 6), Москва.
- Ушаков, Д. Н. (ред.): 1935-40, *Толковый словарь русского языка*, Москва.
- Чернышев, В. И.: 1915, *Правильность и чистота русской речи* [part 2: *Части речи*], Санкт-Петербург.
- Adelphotes = Horbatsch, O. (ed.): 1988, *Adelphotes: die erste gedruckte griechisch-kirchenslavische Grammatik, L'viv-Lemberg 1591*, Frankfurt.
- Albright, A.: 2003, 'A quantitative study of Spanish paradigm gaps', *West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics 22*, G. Garding and M. Tsujimura (eds), Somerville, 1-14.
- Alley, M., B. Brookes and A. D. Sims: 2006. 'On Russian verbal gaps and non-optimality in language', Paper presented at the First Conference of the Slavic Linguistics Society in Bloomington, September 8-10.
- CS/Russian dictionary: 1867-68 = *Словарь церковно-славянскаго и русскаго языка*, Санкт-Петербург [Facsimile published 1974, Leipzig].
- Horbatsch, O.: 1974, [Introduction to edition of M. Smotryc'kyj's *Grammatiki slavenskija pravilnoe syntagma*, Frankfurt.]
- Horbatsch, O.: 1964, *Die vier Ausgaben der kirchenslavischen Grammatik von M. Smotry'ckyj*, Wiesbaden.

- Keipert, H.: 1988 [Introduction to 1988 edition of Поликарпов 1704.]
- Kiparsky, V.:1967, *Russische historische Grammatik, Part 2: Die Entwicklung des Formensystems*, Heidelberg.
- Miklosich, F: 1876, *Vergleichende Wortbildungslehre der slavischen Sprachen* [vol. 3 of *Vergleichende Grammatik der Slavischen Sprachen*], Vienna.
- Pertsova, K.: 2005, 'How lexical conservatism can lead to paradigm gaps', *UCLA Working Papers in Linguistics* **11**, Los Angeles, 13-38.
- Puchmajer, A. J.: 1818, *Lehrgebäude der russischen Sprache*, Prague.
- Pugh, S.: 1996, *Testament to Ruthenian: a linguistic analysis of the Smotryc'kyj variant*, Cambridge.
- RNC = *Russian National Corpus* (Национальный корпус русского языка), <http://www.ruscorpora.ru/>.
- Slovník jazyka staroslověnského*: 1966-97, Prague.
- Vaillant, A.: 1964, *Manuel du vieux slave*, Paris.

Surrey Morphology Group

University of Surrey

Guildford, Surrey

United Kingdom