

*A Linguistic History of  
Russia to the End  
of the  
Eighteenth Century*

A. P. VLASTO

CLARENDON PRESS · OXFORD  
1986

- (c) Not normally distinguished graphically from *e*.  
 (d) [ə] has no symbol, being a reduction of various unstressed vowels (6.14). Cf. the phonemic value of the early ESL. jers (§3 above).  
 (e) Stressed vowels are automatically somewhat lengthened but there is no longer any significant contrast of vowel length (§7 above).  
 (f) The iotated vowels also indicate the presence of [j] between vowels: -ая, -ое, -ую [aja, oje, uju].

52 Though the evolution of the jers greatly changed the structure of Russian words, the phonetic changes taken as a whole did not bear on sensitive areas of morphology. There was thus no breakdown of the declensions as in the passage from Latin to Romance; the losses in the paradigm of the verb are otherwise motivated.

## 3

## MORPHOLOGY

*Nominal Declension*

- 1 The Slav languages have been remarkably conservative in the morphology of the noun. None of the seven cases of CSL. has been lost except partly the vocative (§30 below). The Bulgarian-Macedonian region alone is aberrant in having almost completely rejected declension. Of the eight well-defined IE cases gen. and abl. had become conflated in CSL. times: some of the gen. endings are historically abl. and 'ablative' prepositions such as *or* 'from', *из* 'out of', and *с* 'off' all take the gen.  
 2 ESL. inherited from CSL. nominal paradigms in which form and gender were already closely coupled. The gender of a Russian noun is not obvious from the form of the *sg. nom.* only in the following categories:<sup>1</sup>

(i) Masc. *jo*-stems (Type 19) *козь* = fem. *i*-stems (Type 10) *кость*.

(ii) Nouns of 'common' gender—masc. or fem. according to context—belonging to the colloquial vocabulary, with a large variety of suffixes, e.g. *пьяница* 'drunkard', *зевака* 'idler', *бродяга* 'tramp', *забулдыга* 'profligate', *обжора* 'glutton', *непоседа* 'fidget', *соня* 'sleerthead' (соня f. 'dormouse'), *тихоня* 'prig', *пройдох* 'rascal', *плагса* 'cry-baby'. *Сиротá* 'orphan' (an old abstract) and *невѣжда* 'ignoramus' are from ChSl.

(iii) Hurocoristics of *masc.* Christian names: *Сáша* (Алекса́ндр), *Ко́ля* (Никола́й), and the earlier pagan types such as *Добры́ня*, *Госты́ня* (representing *срđ.* names with first component *Добро-*, *Госты-*). It has been suggested that the former were originally neuters of Type 28 but there is no record of their being treated as other than fem. (§27 below). Here too a number of Gk. and biblical names (via Gk.) adopted into Slav, e.g. *Фома* (mod. Р. *Фомá*) 'Thomas', *Илья́* 'Elias', *Никита́* 'Nicetas' (Νικήτας).

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Gk. ὁ ἀνεφύριτος, ἡ νῆφος, τὸ νέφος; Lat. *dominus* m., *nurus* f., *tempus* n.; Ger. *der Esel*, *die Gabel*, *das Rätsel*.



observable from the earliest texts, even if ChSl.: въ пустынь (1096), въ вѣгъсѣ одежѣ (1095), dat. гослужѣ (1095), dat. землѣ (1215).

(b) GDL all -ѣ: rare.

(c) GDL all -ы/-и: characteristic of NW dialect (Novgorod), where the process is as much phonological as analogical since (under certain conditions) ѣ > и (6.12): из земли, к землѣ, в землѣ; (hard) на оной страны.

(d) Gen. -ѣ, DL -ы/и (the reverse of (a)): rare.

2. In the pl. NA the *jā*-stem ending -ѣ undergoes the double influence of Types 2 and 9 and the form is eliminated by the 16th c. The reverse analogy is not found.

3. After these changes Type 7 is an automatic variant of Type 4, 'soft' (palatalized) v. 'hard' stems.

### 5 Other Changes

(i) The disyllabic ending sg. instr. -ою/-ею was shortened colloquially to -ой/-ей, the longer form remaining as a formal or poetic variant down to the present day. In the *i*-stems -ию was probably always an artificial (ChSl.) spelling (2.33) representing an actual -ью. The stressed ending -ей (землѣй) is analogical to женой, рукой (2.45 (3)).

(ii) With the fall of the weak jers the pl. gen. appears as the bare noun stem, but a vowel ('mobile' o/e) may be introduced in certain now final groups of consonants: сестр(ѣ) > сестѣр, земля > земель; see further 2.20-2. Nouns in -ня with a preceding consonant show from the 16th c. a tendency to substitute a 'hard' -н; this is now the rule: башня 'tower', pl. gen. башен; пѣсня 'song', пѣсен; сотня 'hundred', сотен.

Further, the pl. gen. of the *jā*-stems was strongly attracted to that of the *i*-stems (all 'soft' stems show the same tendency, §§8, 11 below). In the 16th c. the pl. gen. is still свѣч(ѣ) as opposed to (*i*-stem) рѣчѣй. The present standard forms are rather arbitrary and there is still some hesitation: няня 'nurse', няней but няня 'bullet', пуль; статья 'article', статей but струя 'stream', струй; дѣянія 'melon', дѣнь; сажень 'fathom' makes сажен or сажёнѣй; пустыня 'desert', пустынь; затѣя 'plot', затѣй.

(iii) The *i*-stem declension (Type 9) remains quite distinct, being a large class of predominantly inanimate nouns in which the

identity of sg. and pl. NA did not cause syntactical ambiguity.<sup>3</sup> Virtually the only recent recruits to it are abstracts in -ость/-естѣ. The pl. LDI have conformed to the *jā*-stems. There are examples from the 16th c. (въ тѣхъ записяхъ (1508), на ихъ лошадахъ (1546)), but written styles of the 17th c. still have predominantly the pl. рѣчи, рѣчѣй, рѣчѣхъ, рѣчѣмъ, рѣчѣмъй (with е < ѣ). The instr. moved relatively late; a few have retained the earlier form: лошадьмѣй, дельмѣй,<sup>4</sup> and some obsolescent combinations, e.g. лечь костьмѣй 'fall in battle', бить плетьмѣй 'flog' (otherwise костѣми, плетѣми).

6 (iv) About twenty *i*-stem nouns have sg. loc. in -й (in contrast to unstressed GD -и). Including adverbialized forms these are: вдали, втиши; на груди, в грязѣ, в двери, в кости, в кровѣ, на мели 'aground', в ночи, на печи, на пылѣ, на рыси 'at a trot', в сети, в степѣ, в связи с + instr. 'in connection with', в тенѣ, в на цепи, в чести; also на Русѣй, which is conventionally stressed on all final -и (but Русью). This is a reflex of earlier pitch contrasts: cf. masc. sg. loc. in -у (§17 below). Here also come the adverbs вблизи, взаперти, внутри, впередѣ; назадѣ, of which the noun is no longer current except possibly in dialect.

7 (v) ChSl. possessed a well-known IE type of fem. in -ī (represented also in the declension of the comparative (Table IX) and the active participles (§§118, 124 below). In ESL the sg. nom. had been regularized as -я by the 16th c.; the rest of the declension was identical. Here belong: судья (masc.), богыня, княгиня, святыня, пустыня, рабыня, твердыня, милостыня 'alms'.<sup>5</sup> It is doubtful whether any of these except княгиня, бѣрыня 'mistress' (< боярыни), and простыня 'sheet' (if it formally belongs) were in colloquial use; the majority are clearly Slavonicisms, including ethnics such as грекини 'a Greek woman'.

(vi) In Type 3 the modification of the stem consonant is eliminated as in the corresponding masculines (§29 below).

(vii) The only notable formal difference in ChSl. is sg. gen. and pl. NA of Type 5 in -ѣ (ESL. -ѣ). No explanation of the difference is wholly satisfactory. Spellings in Russian texts (frequent) such

<sup>3</sup> Many old athematics were reformed in ChSl. in this declension, e.g. ночь (cf. Lat. *nox, noctis*), конь (cf. Gk. *ἄλος*).

<sup>4</sup> Дѣтя is a formally genderless *plurale tantum* linked to singularive f. \**dētī* and n. *dētjā* (§27 below).

<sup>5</sup> Here also мать and дочь, early ESL. мати, дѣчи (§23 below). Polish has preserved a few fems. in -i: *pani* 'lady'; *bogini* 'goddess'.

### 3.7 MORPHOLOGY

as sg. gen. душа and denasalized as душа/душа are therefore Slavonicisms.

(viii) It should be noted that, whereas ночь and вещь remain soft stems, молодѣжъ and вошь, etc., adapt to the depalatalization of *š* and *ž* (2.37): [mɛlad'6š, voš], sg. gen. молодѣжи, виши [mɛlad'6žy, fšy]. The retention of final -ь distinguishes them graphically from masculines such as нож [noš].

#### MASCULINE AND NEUTER NOUNS

##### Commentary to Table VI

#### 8 Neuter

1. The neuter declensions Types 14 and 18 maintain their distinctive sg. NA and pl. NA. Otherwise, apart from some differences of detail, their history is subsumed under that of masculines below.

2. Type 14 maintains its pl. gen.: селъ > сѣл. The soft Type 18, of which there are few, maintained the corresponding ноль until c.1700 but soon after came into line with the majority of soft stems of whatever gender with modern standard нолѣй (§11 (a) below).

#### Masculine

9 The masculine declensions have been drastically remodelled in the plural.

1. The pl. NA tend to conflate from the 13th c. in favour of the pl. acc. The earliest examples are in ChSl. texts but no doubt indicate the change in ESL:

nom. for acc.: идѣмъ въ . . . гради (1215);  
acc. for nom.: чины расставлени быша (1219).

The impulse comes from (a) the fact that pl. NA were identical in all fem. and neut. declensions; and perhaps (b) the replacement in Type 13 of волци/волкы by волки/волки (§29 below).

Here too mistakes appear before the levelling:

correct: одна одолбша греци (RPC s.a. 941);  
wrong: пересбчены быша грекы (ibid. 915).

The distinction in Type 17 кони/конѣ survives a little better, but конѣ is eliminated in the 16th c.

10 2. The original pl. nom. survived into the 16th c. in a few traditional formulae, e.g. на то послуси . . . (послух, Type 13)

TABLE VI. Masculine and Neuter Noun Declensions

f-stem	21	Early ESL	masc.		neut.		masc.	neut.	masc.	neut.	Early ESL	Early ESL	(masc. only)	Early ESL	Early ESL	(masc. only)
			11	12	13	14										
o-stem ('hard')	11	OCS (ChSl)	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o
o-stem ('soft')	12	OCS (ChSl)	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o
o-stem ('hard')	13	Early ESL	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o
o-stem ('hard')	14	Early ESL	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o
o-stem ('hard')	15	Modern	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o	cel-o
o-stem ('hard')	16	OCS (ChSl)	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f
o-stem ('soft')	17	Early ESL	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f
o-stem ('soft')	18	Early ESL	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f
o-stem ('soft')	19	Modern	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f	kon-f
i-stem	20	Early ESL	dom-ъ	dom-ъ	dom-ъ	dom-ъ	dom-ъ	dom-ъ	dom-ъ	dom-ъ	dom-ъ	dom-ъ	dom-ъ	dom-ъ	dom-ъ	dom-ъ
i-stem	21	Early ESL	dom-ъ	dom-ъ	dom-ъ	dom-ъ	dom-ъ	dom-ъ	dom-ъ	dom-ъ	dom-ъ	dom-ъ	dom-ъ	dom-ъ	dom-ъ	dom-ъ

### MORPHOLOGY

5 For animate/inanimate see 4.41 ff.  
6 1.31 (morphological difference); 6.11 (depalatalization of labial).  
7 This distinction is due to a CSL pitch contrast, cf. SCR. dat. *gradu* (falling pitch), loc. *gradu* (rising pitch), from an earlier stressed final -i).  
8 Representing -ie, -fi.  
9 See §11 below.

Note. No account is here taken of stress (stressed sg. instr. -em > (NA pl.) and §29 (palatalized velar stems).  
1 The syllabication is, as always (2.2), *stolŭ, kolŭ*, etc.  
2 So also волк/волци, мѣх/мѣсц.  
3 Similarly stems in -i (*krŭŭ* > *krŭŭ*) and stems in originally soft  
ж, ш, и (нож, отъ > нож, отѣ).  
4 Type знаніе (of ChSl. origin, §135 below) retains sg. loc. знаніи, pl. gen. знаній, in contrast to modern нѣе, поѣи.

'the witnesses thereto . . .'; and for less clear reasons in бѣси, чѣрти 'demons', сосѣди (сусѣди) 'neighbours', and холопи 'serfs' (also холопы).

The old nom. form has persisted in сосѣди and чѣрти but the whole plural has moved to Type 19: gen. сосѣдей, чѣртѣй, whereas the sg. declension has remained 'hard': сосѣд, -а, чорт (чѣрт), -а. In the case of Type 17 the pl. nom. кони could be said to have survived, though the important thing was the parallel to new NA столы/стола in Type 12.

## 11

## 3. Plural Genitive

(a) That of Types 12 and 13 (столъ > стол), identical with the sg. nom. and consisting of the bare stem with the fall of the final *j*, was abandoned soon after in favour of -ов borrowed from the *i*-stems (Type 20). The process started very early, probably in pre-literary times, and occurs in early ChSl. texts: бѣ бо въпрашахъ волхвовъ и кудесникъ (RPC s. a. 912; old and new). In the 'soft' stems (Type 17) there was long hesitation between the parallel -ев and the pl. gen. of the m. and f. *i*-stems -ей. The modern repartition is, with few exceptions:

- (i) stems in -*j*- take -ев: краѣв, сараѣв, воровѣв;
  - (ii) stems in (hardened) -*ч*- take -ов: отцов, мѣсяцев (formerly often written -ов even if unstressed);
  - (iii) all others, including stems in soft *ч*, *щ* and hardened *ж*, *ш*, take -ей: коней, ножей, калачей, товарищей.
- Down to the 16th–17th c. -ев was more widely used: монастыревъ (12th c.); иже ма сихъ днєвъ допровади (12th c.); ножевъ, царевичевъ, рублевъ; also commonly with nouns in -тель (приятелевъ). Some N. dialects in which *ч* remained soft or persisted as soft longer than elsewhere (2.38) have retained -ей in (ii): зайцей, пальцей (standard зайцев, пальцев).

(b) The 'suffixless' pl. gen. survived largely in contexts after numerals or the equivalent where the fact that the form was not a sg. nom. was obvious. In the 16th c. 20 алгынъ, 30 аршинъ, 10 возъ 'cartloads', 5 мѣсяцъ, сколько пудъ were still normal usage. They tend to disappear from c. 1700; Peter the Great writes both восьми футъ and по пяти футов. There remain today: (несколько) человек, (пять) разъ times; (пять пар) чулок, сапогъ (без сапоговъ is not incorrect); certain military terms (even if recent

loan-words): много солдат, 1000 драгун; (один из двух) глаз 'eye'; certain ethnics (cf. Type 23): турок, pl. турки, турак; башкир, pl. gen. башкир, and others; some geographical terms, e.g. pl. Карпаты, Карпат 'Carpathians'; Балканы, Балкан 'Balkans' (if not to be considered fem. pl., following горы, гор). There is some fluctuation of usage in the latter two categories.<sup>6</sup>

## 12

4. The pl. LDI were discarded in favour of the fem. endings -ах, -ам, -амя. This was a gradual and complicated process only completed by the early 18th c. Gender distinctions were virtually eliminated in all plurals (adjective §42 below; verbal past tense §104 below). The older forms may be found more or less intact in more formal texts (even if not strongly ChSl.) in the 16th–17th c. but there can be no doubt that substitutions started in speech at a very early date, both in the masc. and the neut., e.g. съ клобуками (1271), безакониямъ (1271), къ лагинамъ (Type 28) (1284).

One can point to a number of possible morphological catalysts, some of which would not yet have been active in the 13th c.:

- (a) Original masculines of fem. form (§2(iv) above): сугра.
- (b) Early avoidance of stem alteration in Type 13: волцѣхъ > волкахъ.
- (c) The spread of the pl. masc. nom. in -а (§§33–4 below), plus the normal pl. neut. NA in -а (specially if stressed, as мѣста).
- (d) The homonymy of pl. NA and instr. (столы) which became syntactically ambiguous in the 17th c. (4.52).

(e) Moreover, increasing vowel reduction in unstressed syllables after c. 1200 (6.14) made the endings of мѣсяцем and зѣмлямъ scarcely distinguishable phonetically.

It must not be assumed that the process of replacement was uniform with respect to (1) all dialects of Russian, (2) all three cases, (3) both genders, (4) all types of noun. Such statistical information as is available suggests that before the 17th c.:

(i) NW dialect (Novgorod) was less conservative than Moscow.

(ii) In the masculines the loc. led, followed by dat. and instr., whereas in the neuters the new dat. is commoner in the early stages. In both, the instr. only falls fully into line in the 17th c.

<sup>6</sup> ChSl. was somewhat conservative, so that phrases such as отъ востокъ до запагъ remained in use as correct (imitation of the Gk. plural idiom από ἀνατολῶν . . . εἰς δυσμῶν).

(iii) Velar stems and masc. *animates* adopted the new endings relatively early and consistently.

(iv) The soft Type 17 was late in settling down owing to the attraction of the *i*-stems (§18 below). An unstressed dat. -em is still quite common in Peter the Great's time, though -ам was normal; and we have a progression pl. instr. кони > коньмй (*i*-stem) > коньями rather than a shorter route. But individual words and writers often contradict these generalizations. *Domostroj* (mid 16th c.) has few -ами (зубами, домами, с товарищами); the conservative 1649 *Uloženie* equally few; the Учение и хитрость ратного строения (1647) has a majority in -ами. In Kotoshkhin (writing in the 1660s) the new dat. and loc. are less common than the old but -ами/-ями preponderate over the old instr. Smotritsky's *Grammar* (first published in Vilna in 1619 and revised in 1648 in Moscow to take account of some contemporary features), though not dealing primarily with current Russian, accepts -ам, -ах as normal and recommends -ами also (but not -ями). Avvakum (writing 1672-3) has indifferently в поѣхъ and в полах in adjacent sentences. The instr. further shows that all syntactical uses cannot be lumped together: the old ending was often maintained after prepositions, where the case was quite clear (a remnant is seen in the phrase с товарищи 'and Co.', which was still in use in the 19th c.),<sup>7</sup> whereas in predicative use -ами/-ями was becoming obligatory.

The new forms may be considered correct from the time of Peter the Great. Only one old form has survived—in the adverbialized (pl. dat.) поделом 'according to one's deserts' (cf. *RPC s.a.* 986: въздаги комуждо по дбломъ его).<sup>8</sup>

13 The generalization of one plural pattern to all masc. (and *mutatis mutandis* neut.) nouns facilitated the reinterpretation of Types 12 and 17 as 'hard' and 'soft' variants, as in the feminines. In the sg. loc. (на) коня́ is gradually replaced by (на) конь; no other adjustment was required. However, (на) коня́ persists until a very late date, just as fem. (на) землѣ́ did. The pl. gen. remain distinct: hard -ов/soft -ей.

<sup>7</sup> Pososhkov still uses the cliché бить багоги [= багогам] с.1724. Хожение Ф. Котова в Персию (с.1623) has: с кушнина́ и с пьяни́ и с чарки́ и с чашки́ (note the attraction of the fems. to the masc. form).

<sup>8</sup> Polish, though moving in the same direction as Russian, has kept the pl. dat. in -ом (as opposed to -ахъ, -ами). Certain 17th c. Russian texts which largely employ dat. -ом were perhaps influenced by this.

#### 14 Masculine *ū*-stems (Type 20)

This very distinct declension existed in CSI, as a rather small but influential group of masc. nouns with a tendency to expansion. Here belonged for certain: \**wirxū* 'top' (cf. Lith. *viršūs*), \**wolū* 'ox', \**domū* 'house' (cf. Lat. *domus*), \**medū* 'honey' (cf. Gk. μέθυ neut. *ū*-stem<sup>9</sup>), \**polū* 'half', \**synū* 'son' (cf. Skr. *sūnū́k*), \**borū* (original sense uncertain; in Russian бор now = 'coniferous wood'); and with somewhat less certainty: \**darū* 'gift', \**ledū* 'ice', \**pirū* 'feast', \**razū* 'stroke', \**sadiū* 'plantation, garden', \**sanū* 'high position, dignity' (5.10), \**čimū* 'rank'. The now obsolete олъ 'ale' is also clearly a *ū*-stem with exact correspondences in Lith. *aiš* and Ags. *ealu* (i.e. a 'North European' word—5.2). There are no recognizable 'soft' *ju*-stems.

In the above list \**synū* and the less important \**wolū* were the only *animates*. Even in OCS *synū* is partly transferred to Type 11, an acc./gen. *syna* being preferred (4.41), and often also a dat. *synu*. No Slav language has kept Type 20 separate but during the absorption of its members into the dominant Type 12 it has perceptibly affected the latter to different degrees in different languages. In ESL:

15 1. Pl. gen. -ов alone imposed itself as a basic element of Type 12 (see Type 15).

2. Sg. dat. -ови was widely affected in early ESL to *animates*, especially personal names: Петрови, Игорови, Данилови, Кбсареви 'the Byzantine Emperor'; other anim. мужеви, коневи, воробьеви (all in *RPC*). Also occasionally to inanimates: огневи, холмови (*RPC*). This dat. is abandoned by the 15th c. in favour of -у.<sup>10</sup>

3. Pl. nom. -ове shows a similar extension to Type 12 *animates* (especially peoples): грекове, угро́ве (sg. угро́нъ 'Magyar'), жидове 'Jews', фрязове 'Franks', послове, воробье́ве; occasionally to inan.: овоцье́ве (*RPC s.a.* 969), разбо́еве (ibid. 996), боро́ве (ibid. 1092), манастѣ́реве (ibid. 1037). This variant ending similarly dies out in the 15th c.<sup>11</sup> A trace is to be seen still, through

<sup>9</sup> Neuter *ū*-stems (Lat. *cornu*) are not represented in Slav; \**medū* is transferred to the masc. *without change*.

<sup>10</sup> Sg. dat. -ови is normal in Cz. for *animates* (inan. -u) and more or less generalized in Pol. for all masc. In ESL it has persisted in Ukr. and WhR. (Table XX (21)).

<sup>11</sup> Pl. nom. -ове is current in Cz. and Pol. for *animates*, in Blg. for *monosyllables* (ромовѣ, боро́вѣ), and considerably extended in SCr. (e.g. гра́д, pl. гра́дови, гра́дови, гра́дови, гра́дови).

сынове, in the modern hybrid pl. ном. сыновья 'sons', etc. (§34 below) and in хозяйва with *-eva* for *-eve*.

16 The sg. gen. -у (unstressed) of Type 20 invaded the *o*-stems in pre-literary times (inanimates only): вóску, свѣту, льну (11th c.). It continued to extend its range in two contexts:

- (a) as a *partitive* genitive, for which the starting-point among the original *ŷ*-stem nouns could have been (много) мѣду. Further extended to *negative* phrases (нѣтъ мѣду) and comparison (больше году).
- (b) adverbial phrases with the models из дому and съ вѣрху, perhaps also сразу (OCS *sŷrazu* is recorded).

By the 16th c. usage (a) had become so widespread that some grammarians consider it possible to speak of a separate 'partitive case' distinct from the gen. However, this position was never quite reached. Statistics gathered by Unbegaun<sup>12</sup> and others show that by then:

- (i) *most*, but not all, weighable materials took *exclusively* the gen. in -у, e.g. мѣду, вóску, лúку, чесноку́ (but always хлба, овса!);
- (ii) many other nouns, including even some abstracts, used consistently the gen. in -у without partitive sense: e.g. бѣрег, бой, бор, год, лѣс, мост, полк, торг, час; (нѣт) отавбу, (без) приказу, (нѣт) следу.

Conceivably there was some Pol. influence here, at least in the 17th c., since Pol. *inanimates* have in principle sg. gen. in -и.

After a summit of popularity in the 16th-17th c. (being widely reflected in деловой язык) the gen. in -у has receded. Present usage has rather imprecise boundaries. It is still available as a 'partitive' in *contrast to the normal* gen. in -а (много народу/вкус народа, чашка чаю/цена ча́я), but cannot be said to be obligatory. Petrified adverbial phrases survive in some number, but far fewer in standard literary language than in some dialects: adverbs сбоку, свѣрху, снизу, доверху, донизу, слúру 'like a fool',<sup>13</sup> сразу 'at once', сразу́ (= подряд); phrases брать с бою 'take by storm', (умерѣть) с голоду (= от голода), из дому, изо ргу, (нам) не до смѣху 'no laughing matter', ни разу не, ни слуху ни дúху (нет

<sup>12</sup> *La Langue russe au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle. La flexion des noms* (Paris, 1935).

<sup>13</sup> Posting a now non-existent m. \*лур 'fool' (replaced by дурак), current f. дúра.

о + loc.) 'nothing has been heard of', с часу на час and час óт часу 'from hour to hour', ни шáгу (дальше), (смеяться) без удержу 'uncontrollably', без толку 'senselessly', отроду не (видѣл), без рóду и плѣмени 'without kith or kin', (упускáть) из виду 'lose sight of', с бору по сóсенке 'at random', ни складу ни лáду 'neither rhyme nor reason'.

17 The sg. loc. in -ý (stressed) enjoyed similar popularity in the 16th-17th c.<sup>14</sup> It was very general as a true locative, i.e. after в and на, was the exclusive loc. form of бѣрег, бор, крут, лѣс, мост, стан, сад, бóгров, дом, and others, and usual with place-names in -ск (в Пóлодку). At its widest use it was not limited either by the stress pattern of the noun (в списку, в Мцѣнску) or by the preposition (при князи при Борýсу (1369), о кормý), or by the exclusion of animates (на быкú).

It is, like the gen. in -у, absent from ChSl. This procedure has also receded in standard Russian since the 18th c. The forms that remain exclude *animates*, are confined to the locative prepositions в and на, and (with few exceptions) require the stress contrast sg. dat. лѣсу/loc. (в) лесу. The accepted locatives in -ý are now a somewhat arbitrary collection, often tied to a particular sense of the noun: хлеб на корню 'standing corn' (otherwise корне); в дóме (despite *ŷ*-stem дом!) but рáбота на дому 'at home'; в ряде случáев 'in a number of cases' but в трѣтьем рядú 'in the third row'; во вторóм часу́ 'between 1 and 2', but в чáсе; в хóде 'in the course of' but в ходу́ 'current'; в XIX вѣке but на моём вѣкú 'in my lifetime'; в/на ролú but врóде э́того 'something of the kind'; сдѣлан на гончáрном круте́ 'thrown' but в кругу́ любителей; в цветý but в цвѣте лег/сил.<sup>15</sup>

Apart from the above there are about fifty in obligatory literary use, including such adverbialized combinations as нарядú с + instr., навесý 'by weight', внизú, вверхú/наверхú, сон наявú 'day-dream'.<sup>16</sup>

A list is given below; many more are to be found in special vocabularies and country speech (на парý 'fallow', в стору́ 'rick'). It has been applied to a number of recent foreign loan-words: на балú, на боргú, в грунту́ 'in the open ground', на плацу́ 'on (the)

<sup>14</sup> Sg. loc. in -и is generalized to all *masculines* in SCr.

<sup>15</sup> A good example of the idiomatic specialization of alternatives is дух: gen. не хвáтает духа/дúху and example in §16 above; loc. на духú 'at confession' (как на духú 'frankly') but бытъ (he) в духе 'be in a good/bad mood'.

<sup>16</sup> A noun \*яв no longer exists; cf. Pol. *wujśc na jaw*.



parade (ground)', в порту, на посту 'on sentry duty', в шкафу.<sup>17</sup> Полк, пруд, and сук now contradict the stress rule: полк, -а, в полку. -ý has been transferred to the Slavonicism в плену from earlier native в полону.

### 18 The *i*-stems (Type 21)

The original members were not very numerous:<sup>18</sup>

- (i) personal animates: гость, зять, теть ( < тьсть ), дёверь, тать 'thief'; also ChSl. Господь;
- (ii) other animates: голубь, гусь, зверь, лебедь (for лебядь, б.56), моль 'moth', лось 'elk', медведь, рысь 'lynx', червь 'worm', probably also вебрь 'wild boar';
- (iii) inanimates: огонь (< огнь, cf. Lat. *ignis*, Lith. *ignis*), путь, жёлудь (жолудь) 'acorn', уголь (< угля);
- (iv) the *plural tantum* люди (early ESL. pl. nom. людие; the sg. люд is a later back-formation).

This declension lost its separate identity by conflation with the *jo*-stems (Type 17). Путь alone has retained the majority of its *i*-stem forms. The pl. nom. путие had vanished by the 16th c. in favour of pl. НА пути́ (as in the fem. *i*-stems); so also людие > люди. The pl. DIL adopt, as all other masculines, the fem. endings. The rest follow one of two possibilities:

(a) remain *i*-stems but become *fem.*: so моль, рысь (sometimes masc. in dialect). Лебедь is masc. in standard language but widely fem. in dialect (gen. лебеди). Горгань 'throat' and тень 'shadow' have long been fem. *i*-stems and not well authenticated as masc. in ESL. though comparative evidence would seem to require it. (Pol. *gęś* is fem. and SCl. *zviđer* of either gender.) Other possible

<sup>17</sup> Бер, бёрег, бок, бор, быт, воз, глаз, гроб (also в гробе), жар, клей, корм, край, лад, лёд (на льду), лес, лёт (на лету 'in flight'), лоб (на лбу), луч, мел, мех, мост, мось, мыс, нос, паз, паз, пир, повод (на поводу 'on a leash'), под, пол 'floor', пот (but biblical phrase в поте лица), пух, пыл, рай, рот (во рту), сад, снег, сок, счёт (на счету), таз, торг, тыл, угол (в углу 'in the corner', на углу 'on the corner', but math. в угле 'in the angle'), хмель (во хмелю 'intoxicated'), ход (на ходу 'in motion', but в хóде), чад, шар (на каждом шару). Also a few geographical names: Ростова на Дону, в Крыму, в Клинку.

<sup>18</sup> Other ancient *i*-stems can be detected, which had already been reformed in CSL with various suffixes, e.g. IE \**owis* 'sheep' makes masc. \**owinú* > OCS (ChSl) овен 'Aries' (zodiac) (replaced in ESL by the loan-word баран), fem. \**owika* > овна́. *Neut. i*-stems (none in CSL) can be detected in \**stirdi-ko* > сёрдце and \**mar* > море (cf. Lat. *mare* < \**mar*).

masc. > fem. are: боль 'pain', печатъ 'seal', печень 'liver', степень 'degree'.

(b) join the *jo*-stems: all the rest.<sup>19</sup> The process is gradual and is obscured by the fact that the *jo*-stems widely adopted forms of the *i*-stems before the obsolescence of the latter and their eventual reorganization as the 'soft' variant of the *o*-stems. The *i*-stem declension is fairly well preserved down to the 14th c. Thereafter the *sing.* moves over to the *jo*-stems, whereas the *plur.* lags behind. In particular a pl. instr. such as гостьми́ was still current in the 17th c. and as an archaism in the 18th c.

Hesitations between (a) and (b) are not uncommon. In Czech, Ukrainian, and some R. dialects путь is *fem.*, in WhR. and some R. dialects a masc. *jo*-stem (WhR. пудь, пуця). Ivan Grozny writes без пуга.

### 19 Irregularities in Neuter Nouns (Types 14 and 18)

1. The stability of the neuter was never seriously undermined in ESL by any morphological or phonological changes.<sup>20</sup> Gender distinctions are somewhat blurred in many S. dialects (Table XVII (19)) (also WhR.: Table XX (22)), whence no doubt came a certain popularity of pl. НА -ы, gen. -ов for neuters, found from the 15th c. but mostly in the 17th–18th c., e.g. блюды in *Domostroj*. The last examples are probably to be found in Kryl'ov and Gribojedov (мы с вами не ребяты; в эти леты in *Горе от ума*), indicating their presence in the colloquial of Moscow down to the early 19th c.

A few masc.-type pl. gen. have been accepted as the literary standard, e.g. платье 'dress', платье, подмастерьев 'apprentices' (originally neut. collective, now treated as masc. animate).

2. Nouns in unstressed -ко usually had pl. НА in -ка down to the 17th c. Thereafter -ки has been preferred in general, probably by confusion with feminines in -ка, indistinguishable by then in pronunciation (6.24):

яблоко 'apple': pl. nom. яблоки (formerly яблока), gen. яблок, дрёвко ('flag)staff': дрёвки, дрёвков (Slavonicism);

<sup>19</sup> One noun, тёрпеза 'black-cock', has been transferred to the *o*-stems. Till c.1600 the sing. is тёрпеза, -ви. The pl. is now тёрпеза́ (§33 below), -ов or -ей, -ám, etc.

<sup>20</sup> It was lost in Lith. (neut. > masc.) and in the passage from spoken Latin to Romance.

вѣко 'eyelid' (вѣко): вѣки, век (in form this could be an old dual: cf. §32 below);

местѣчко 'spot': местѣчки, местѣчек.

Also stressed очко (various senses): пл. очкѣй, -ов 'spectacles'; but войско 'army': пл. войскѣ, войск 'troops'. Former animate diminutives in -ишко are now written -ишка and treated as fem.: сынѣшка 'sonny'.

The mixture облако 'cloud' (Slavonicism), pl. ном. облакѣ, gen. облаков arose from a change of gender in Russian; cf. ChSl. облак m., Pol. *obłok*, Scr. *oblāk*. Оболок exists in dialect.

#### CONSONANT STEMS

Various old types, in process of dissolution as separate declensions as early as ChSl., preserved a few special features in early ESl.

#### Commentary to Table VII

##### 20 Type 22

The essential peculiarities are sg. gen. -e and pl. nom. -e. Several different sub-types can be distinguished: ChSl. \**kamy* (< *kamōn-s*), stem *kamēn-* (cf. Lat. *homō*, *homin-is*); \**korē* (< *korēn-s*), stem *korēn-*.

Here belong: грѣбень 'comb', день 'day' (original nom. unkown), камень 'stone', корень 'root', кремѣнь 'flint', мишень 'target' (5.21), олѣнь 'deer', пѣрстень 'ring', пламень 'flame', плетѣнь 'hurdle', ревенъ 'rhubarb' (5.21), ремѣнь 'strap', сажѣнь 'fathom', стѣпень 'degree', стрѣмень 'stirrup', шѣршень 'hornet' (\**stržę*), ячмѣнь 'barley' (original form obscure), ясень 'ash'.

The original sg. nom. was discarded early in favour of the acc. Of the above, мишень, сажѣнь, and стѣпень (probably a Slavonicism) became fem. *i*-stems by the 17th c.; пламень and стрѣмень were transferred to the neuters (Type 26) as пламя, стрѣмя. The rest, while at first preserving the two cases in -e, were attracted to the masc. *i*-stems and so with them ended up as *jo*-stems (Type 17), and in the majority of cases the -e- of the sg. NA was reinterpreted as 'mobile', so that we have камень, камня, etc. (but олѣнь/олѣня, ревенъ/ревеня, ячмѣнь/ячменя, ясень/ясеня).

In the 16th c. the declension was still essentially that of пугъ. Then forms such as отъ синего камня (1532) began to appear.

TABLE VII. Consonant-Stem Nouns (Early ESl. State)

Masculine		Feminine		Neuter	
22	<i>n</i> -stem nouns of origin	23	<i>i</i> (- <i>w</i> )-stem	26	<i>n</i> -stem
Сг. N	кам-ы	кам-и	кам-ы	кам-и	кам-и
A	камен-ъ	камен-и	свекр-ъ	свекр-и	свекр-и
G	-е (-и)	-и	-е (-и)	-и	-и
D	-и	-и	-и	-и	-и
I	-и	-и	-и	-и	-и
V	(-и)	(-и)	свекр-ы	свекр-ы	свекр-ы
DAV	камен-и	камен-и	матер-и	матер-и	матер-и
DI	-ы	-ы	-ы	-ы	-ы
PI. NV	камен-е	камен-е	матер-и	матер-и	матер-и
A	-и	-и	-и	-и	-и
G	-ъ	-ъ	-ъ	-ъ	-ъ
I	-ъ	-ъ	-ъ	-ъ	-ъ
L	-ъ	-ъ	-ъ	-ъ	-ъ
D	-ы	-ы	-ы	-ы	-ы
I	-ы	-ы	-ы	-ы	-ы
D	-ы	-ы	-ы	-ы	-ы
I	-ы	-ы	-ы	-ы	-ы
Notes	1. These declensions no longer fully represent their (theoretical) ChSl. form: the pl. LDI have all been reformed in masc. and neut. with <i>i</i> -stem -ы- and in Type 25 with <i>a</i> -stem -а-. Not all cases are recorded. Vocative scarcely required except in fem.				
	2. The ChSl. declensions differ only essentially in the nasals of sg. NA <i>me</i> , fem. sg. instr. - <i>ju</i> , Type 28 stem <i>lejt</i> -.				

Genitives such as дни, из камени, до корени are still found in the 18th c.

День was fully integrated to the *jo*-stem type лень/дня but the old pl. gen. дѣн (< *dñij*) lingered into the 19th c. and is still correct in полдень 'noon', pl. gen. полдѣн. Пополудни 'p.m.' preserves the old loc.

Камень and корень commonly had the neut. collective plurals камѣнь, корѣнь (по каменю (Авв.)), which were reformed as plurals (§35 below) камѣнья 'precious stones', корѣнья 'root vegetables' in these special senses, side by side with the new nominalized камни, корни.

21 In Type 22 may also be put:

(i) A few CSL. *t*-stems visible in локоть 'elbow' (early sg. gen. локте), нѣготь 'nail', дѣготь 'pitch' (5.11), кѣготь 'claw', and perhaps кѣпоть 'soot' (now fem.). They show practically no consonant-stem forms in ESl.

(ii) Nouns in -тель and -арь. The sg. gen. and pl. nom. in -е are quite common in ChSl. but must be accounted Slavonicisms in Russian, as indeed the suffixes are also (5.6 and 18). On this model pl. nom. болгаре, козаре 'Khazars' are usual in RPC.

22 The masc. nouns of origin (Type 23) are essentially the same as Type 22, but here the *plural* is the basic part. Only in this group was the characteristic pl. nom. in -е<sup>21</sup> and pl. gen. in -ъ (without -ов) preserved. The singulars are regular *o*-stem nouns (Type 15) with the singulative suffix -ин.

The original suffix was -ѣн- (-ѣн-), generally reformed as -ѣн- > -jan-. The N. Russian tribe *Slověne* preserved the original form of this native name (still not interpreted with any plausibility) which later became словяне and by learned fancy славяне (6.56). Here belong:

- (i) the still extensible category of ethnics (англичанин, рѣмлянин, etc.);<sup>22</sup>  
 (ii) similar words of social and other distinctions:

<sup>21</sup> Dialect variations in pl. nom. -ан-а (North) and -ан-ы (South) are clearly recent.

<sup>22</sup> In family names the stress is always penultimate: Грекадинов, Турчанинов (the forms гречанин, турчанин are no longer used as ethnics). Рахманинов has suffix -ин-, not -анин-.

pl. nom.	pl. gen.	sg. nom.	
крестяне	крестьян	крестьянин	'peasant'
мещане	мещан	мещанин	'bourgeois' (5.30 (7))
миряне	мирян	мирянин	'Jauman'
южане	южан	южанин	'southerner'
and, by extension:			
бояре	бояр	боярин	'boyar'
татарѣ, нов	татар	татар(ин)	'Tatar'
only татары			
and some others.			

### Notes

(i) A singulative -ин (not -янин) may be combined with a Type 17 (collective) plural: in the Muscovite period there were many of the form тверитинъ 'inhabitant of Tver', pl. тверичи, and нбмичиъ, pl. нбмцы. Москвичи 'Muscovites' had sg. москвитинъ, later learned москвитянин, finally the back-formed москвич.

(ii) Certain early texts show the original consonant-stem forms of the pl. DL, e.g. RPC, *ad init.*: полемъ же жившемъ особѣ поляхъ, а въ деревляхъ свое . . . A later normalization has поляномъ же жившимъ особѣ. Instr. полями is also recorded. These forms represent \**poljan-ий*, -ий, -ий from pl. nom. *poljane*, and are clearly obsolescent in the 11th c.<sup>23</sup>

### 23 Type 24: *r*-stems

Here belong only мать 'mother' and дочь 'daughter', early ESl. маги and дъчи (ChSl. дъши). In the sg. nom. IE \**māter*, \**dhiǵ(h)ǵēr* > CSL. \**māē*, \**dīkīē* (final consonants being lost) > мати, дъчи, probably by attraction to the fem. nouns in -ī (§7 (v) above). ChSl. continued to use nom. мати, асс. матерь; the latter also tended to oust the nom. (as in all these consonant stems): Божия Матерь is common. Similarly with дъщи.

In ESl. the original nom. and acc. are sparingly represented in dialect and Ukrainian has also preserved nom. маги. The standard

<sup>23</sup> Similar forms are authenticated also in the W. Balkans (Scr., Slovene) and above all in the Czech PN (loc.) *Doljas*, *Pol(j)as* with original -sī unchanged to analogical -xī (§58 (7) below).

language preferred a compromise producing NA мать, дочь in conformity with Type 10. The new forms are establishing themselves in the 16th c.:

(ном.) язъ Огавья Семенова дочь (1525)  
(асс.) отпустилъ дочь (1503)

but Ivan Grozny still writes (1574), in a colloquial context, дочьъ своюю датель.

The plurals early join the *i*-stem declension: матерѣи, матерѣи, etc., but дочь has preserved the older instr. дочерѣи (neither дочерѣи nor матерѣи is standard).<sup>24</sup> The sg. gen. -e is early given up in favour of *i*-stem -и.

#### 24 Type 25: *ū*-stems

(a) Fem. only. The sg. nom. has -ы < -ѣ but -ѣв- < -ѣи- before the vowel endings. The type was expanding in late CSI., taking in Gmc. feminines in -ō-. Original members are: свекры 'mother-in-law' (cf. Lat. *socrūs*); the now obsolete \*ятры (\**jetry*) 'daughter-in-law' and \*злыы 'sister-in-law' (husband's sister); кры 'blood' (cf. Lat. *crū-enīus*, *crū-dēlīs*); \*гѣу (ESL. утовъ) 'duck'. Early additions: любы 'love', цѣркы,<sup>25</sup> \*тыкы 'gourd', \*смокы 'fig', буквы<sup>26</sup> 'letter, writing', \*редѣкы 'radish',<sup>27</sup> \*žely 'tortoise', and others not represented in ESL.

Few of the theoretical sg. nom. are recorded in ESL., as with the masc. of Type 22. Even in OCS acc. *krīvī* is normal as nom., though nom. *kry* has survived in Slovene *kri* and is recorded from early Polish.

(b) Two adaptations were available:

(i) NA свекрѣвь, etc., with transference to the *i*-stems (sg. gen. -e > -i very early): so also ятровь (now only dial.), \*золовь > дѣи. золовка, кровь, любѣвь, цѣркѣвь, моркѣвь 'carrot(s)' (presumed < \**mīrky/mīrky*, which may be Gmc.—5.6).

The nom. свекры survives in some S. dialects: любы and цѣркы (церкви) must be considered Slavonicisms. The hybrid nom. цѣрквы persists into the 14th c.

<sup>24</sup> The pl. instr. of дочь is in the nature of things much commoner than that of мать.

<sup>25</sup> From Gmc. *kir(i)kō-* (< Gk).

<sup>26</sup> From Gmc. *bōkō-*.

<sup>27</sup> From Lat. *rādīc-* via Gmc.

(ii) Transference to the fem. *ā*-stems (Type 4), using the oblique stem: гѣква, смѣква (Slavonicism), бѣква (originally a Slavonicism). Рѣдка, утка, and probably бѣчка 'barrel' (< \**būtī* < Lat. *buttis*?) merely adopt a diminutive suffix. Here also probably Москвѣ: acc. Московь, gen. Моск(ъ)ве are attested (but not \*Москы), at first for the river, then for the town.<sup>28</sup> The name is no doubt Finnic.

This solution is commoner in dialect, where цѣрква, свекрѣвѣ, морквѣ, зѣлвѣ<sup>29</sup> are widespread.

Further, one or two words have become masc. Theoretical \**žīlru* > OCS. pl. *žīlruvī* 'hand-mill' (the usual form) but R. жѣрнов 'mill-stone' (pl. now жерновѣ, but probably not a dual, §33 below).

(c) The plurals, where used, follow the *i*-stems, except for цѣрквѣх, etc. (no doubt influenced by ChSl.; dial. often цѣрквѣх, etc.).

A distinction is now made between abstract любѣвь, gen. любѣви and personal name Любѣвь, Любѣви (instr. in both cases любѣвью).

#### 25 Type 26: *n*-stems (neut.)

This small group is well preserved in Russian with its sg. NA in -мя < ?-*mēn*<sup>30</sup> (oblique stem -*mēn*-; cf. similar but not identical Lat. *sēmēn* and Gk. neuters in -*μα* < -*mēn*): брѣмя 'burden', врѣмя 'time', вѣмя 'udder' (\**ūd-mēn*-), знѣмя 'banner', ѣмя 'name', плѣмя 'flame' (§20 above),<sup>31</sup> плѣмя 'tribe, clan', сѣмя 'seed', стрѣмя 'stirrup' (§20 above), тѣмя 'sinciput, crown'. Also a few dialect words, e.g. голомя 'stripped tree-trunk' (\**gol-mēn*-), соломя 'strait' (< Finnic *salmī*), шѣломѣ (a by-form of холм?). The paired plurals (rare in sg.) лиц(ъ)менѣ 'letters' and чисменѣ 'figures, numbers' were Slavonicisms and perhaps not original members of the type.

The sg. now conforms (*mutatis mutandis*) to путь: GLD ѣмени. In early ESL. and in modern dialects the stem may become имѣн-, etc., after sg. NA. This is not literary except for the pl. gen. семѣн, стрѣмѣн (otherwise имѣн, etc.).

<sup>28</sup> На Москвѣ was usual down to the end of the 17th c. With the founding of St Petersburg (в Петербурге), в Москвѣ followed.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. SCr: *čřkva*, *želva*.

<sup>30</sup> See A. Vaillant, *Grammaire comparée*, II/1, §184.

<sup>31</sup> Another form плѣомѣ or плѣомѣ is subliterary, corresponding to the Slavonicism плѣамѣ. For брѣмя, врѣмя see also Appendix.

Тёма has no pl.; зная has penultimate stress in the pl. (знамѣна, знамѣн). This group is widely reformed in dialect either as neut. Type 18: *ймѣ*, gen. *йма*, по *йма*, or Type 14: *именѣ*, pl. *именѣ* (cf. Cz. *jměno*); or rarely as fem. Type 7 (*йма*, acc. *ймаю*). The first will occasionally be found (as colloquialisms) in 18th–19th c. texts; Pushkin once wrote до *врема*.

#### 26 Type 27: s-stems (neut.)

A very small group: *небо* 'sky', *слово* 'word' (the only two *clear* CSI. members), and probably *тело* (дѣло) 'body', *коло* 'wheel'. The type was considerably extended in OCS and ChSl. but not in ESl.

The sg. NA provide the model for dropping the element -*ec-* throughout; only one native word has generalized it: sg. *колесо*, pl. *колеса* (colеса in dialect), no doubt because the word is more frequently used in the pl. But early forms without -*ec-* are also found, especially pl. *кола* 'cart, wheeled vehicle' (cf. SCr. *kōla* 'cart, motor car'): вложиши на *кола* (RPC s.d. 1015). This usage is now obsolete but there remain derivatives based on the preposition *около* 'round' (околоца, окольный).

All forms which include -*ec-* are Slavonicisms: *небеса* 'heavens', *чудеса* 'miracles' (R. pl. *неба* < *небо* 'palate', *чуда* 'wonders'), with derivatives *небесный*, *чудесный* (R. *чудный*), *словесный*, *словесность* 'literature' (common in 18th and early 19th c. before the generalization of *литература*), *телесный*<sup>32</sup> but native *пословица* 'proverb', *нагельный* *крест*.

ChSl. *дѣво* 'tree, wood' forms *древесный*, *древесина*, etc., but the word is not an original *s*-stem; native are only *древянный*, *древенеть*, etc. Occasional other Slavonicisms by extension of the type will be met with from *диво* 'marvel', *дѣло* 'deed', *яго* 'yoke', *око* 'eye', *ухо* 'ear' (pl. *очеса*, *ушеса*; normal ESl. dual > pl. *бѣчи*, *уши*).

#### 27 Type 28: Neuter animate nt-stems

The only large and extensible group, comprising young living beings. Suffix -*ѣt* < -*ent*. In Russian only the pl. is still current: *ребята*, AG *ребят*. The sg. went out of use in the 17th c.,<sup>33</sup> being

<sup>32</sup> Pl. *телеса* in special ironical sense ('corporation') is no doubt also bookish.

<sup>33</sup> The SSL languages have kept the sg. better. Pol. still has *cięta*, pl. *cięta* but a new sg. *cielak* is more usual. Lomonosov still accepted the sg. type *теля* in his *Grammar* (1755) but this already belonged to the 'high style'. Current also in WhR. and Ukr. (Ukr. *руска*, *-ята*).

reformed with another diminutive suffix: *теленок* (AG *теленка* preferable to NA *теля*). *Дитя* 'child' (< *děte*), sg. gen. *дитяте* (later *дитяти*) lost ground in the 16th c. (except as a Slavonicism) in favour of *дѣтина*, *дѣтёныш* (дѣтнш is purely ChSl.), but here the collective pl. was always *дѣти*.<sup>34</sup>

The collective nature of the pl. is strong, leading to such analogical extensions as *внучата* '(all one's) grandchildren' (sg. *внук*; there is no \**внученок*) and, by popular etymology, *опята*, *маслята* 'species of toadstool' (sg. *опѣнок* < *o-pin-ŷkŷ* < *пень*, *пня* 'tree-stump'; *маслѣнок*). Plurals in -ѣнки are subliterary, but in a few cases there has been conflation: *бесенята* 'imps', *волченята*, *лисенята*, *чертенята*.

It is uncertain whether hyposcoristics of the type *Вася* (§2 (iii) above) and *Васята* (< *Васильи*) originally belonged here. At any rate they are treated in all Slav languages as fem.: от *Гостяты* к *Васильеви* (NBG, no. 9, c.1200). So SCr. *Mileta*, acc. *Miletu*, etc.

#### 28 Summary

The net result of all the above changes in declension has been a great reduction of independent types. There now remain only:

- (i) one masc. declension in two variants (hard/soft);
- (ii) one neut. declension in two variants (hard/soft), essentially the same as (i);
- (iii) two fem. declensions, in -*а/я* (variants) and -*ь*;
- (iv) the anomalous groups in Types 23, 26, 28.

Gender distinctions have practically disappeared in the pl., only the pl. gen. being in part a pointer: -*ов/-ев* masc., *nil* fem. or neut., -*ей* 'soft' stem of any gender. *Pluralia tantum* such as *дѣти*, *люди*, *сани* 'sledge', *щи* 'cabbage soup' cannot be said to have a gender, whatever their relationship, if any, to a singular.

#### 29 Nouns with Roots Ending in a Velar (Types 3, 13)

In accordance with 1.16 (Second Palatalization) *к* > *ц*, *г* > *з*, *х* > *с* before *ѣ* in fem. sg. LD, fem. du. NAV, masc. sg. loc., masc. pl. loc., and before -*и* in masc. pl. nom.

In ESl. there was an early tendency to restore the velars in these

<sup>34</sup> In dialects which have retained the sg. it is usually reformed as *дѣтѣ*, gen. *дѣтѣ* (cf. *йма* above) or as *ѣтн*, *дѣтн*.

cases. As the dual went out of use (§31 below) and the masc. pl. nom. was abandoned (§9 (1) above), the restoration must be observed in the locatives and fem. sg. dat.

Restoration depended on the readmission of syllables *кѣ*, *ки*, etc. (2.36). There is some evidence for the view that in the most northerly dialect (Nóvgorod), as is often the case in remote and peripheral areas, the Second Palatalization did not take place, or at least not completely and consistently. The earliest 'new' forms come from this area: рабу своему дѣмъкѣ (Novg. *Miréi*, text no. 8; 1096): кѣ локѣ and на отрокѣ (NBG of c.1100). They may therefore be unchanged rather than new forms.

Elsewhere the changes are considerably later but the chronology is not very clear owing to the inhibiting effect of ChSl. on written texts and the maintenance of many clichés. Statistics suggest that *ц > к* was more precocious than *з > г*. In the 1220s на волоцѣ, у Ризѣ appear to be still regular at Smolénsk. By c.1500 *к* had been generally restored. In 16th c. texts на дорозѣ, во (многихъ) торзехъ *et sim.* are still common, but a single text of 1529 has both *к(ъ) рѣцѣ к(ъ) молозѣ* and *въ рѣкѣ молорѣ*, showing the end of the older situation. The change *с > х* comes in the same century: мой снохѣ, but still occasionally въ мѣсехъ (1549) (мѣхъ). Many clichés, especially ChSl., remain into the 17th c., e.g. кѣ рудѣ, о Велицѣ дни 'on Easter Sunday', во иноцѣхъ 'in religion', во всѣхъ его грѣсѣхъ. The older form is preserved in нельзѣ < не лъзѣ (loc.) < \*лъга (now only лъгота 'privilege'). Russian goes further than any other Slav language in making a complete restoration of the velars; cf. Ukr. and WhR. (Table XX (14)).

### 30 Vocative Case

Only distinct in the sg. masc. and fem. It has been maintained in Ukr. and partly in WhR. but shows early decadence in other ESL. areas. There are mistakes in *Ostr.* likely to be due to the Russian copyist. It ceased to be a living form by the 14th c. It was maintained thereafter only in certain ChSl. words (бѣже, Бѣже, Гбсподи, Христѣ) and common words of address (господи́не, бра́те, кня́же, влады́ко 'bishop').

The Слово о полку Игореве has correctly Бра́тие и дружино́!, о Дѣлре Словутицю́!, Кня́же Иго́рю! Similar formulae remained in oral poetry and were still present in the былины

collected in the 19th c.; in fact the voc. is sometimes used for the nom. for metrical reasons, as also in SCr. oral poetry.

Apparent vocatives in Novg. dialect such as Варламе for nom. Варла́мъ (text no. 15, c.1200) are only orthographical. A phrase such as ту лежитъ с[в]я[т]ый Елифанне in a ChSl. text (Хождение иг. Данила, text no. 11) is a Serbicism of the Second South Slav Influence (5.23): SCr. sg. nom. Елифанѣ.

A certain artificial revival of the vocative is noticeable in diplomatic correspondence of the 16th-17th c. in imitation of Polish.

It should be noted that the voc. was only used if the noun was isolated. The adjective had no voc. forms: a qualified noun always appeared in the nom.: мой брат!

### Dual Number

**31** The dual was used both for natural pairs and for any two like objects, especially in close conjunction with the number 2: самому ему и подружню его Феофанѣ и чадомъ его 'himself and his wife Theophani and their children' (colophon to *Ostr.*; parents are necessarily two).

The correct use of dual forms can best be studied in *RPC*, especially in its more ChSl. portions, e.g. *ad init.* сима же пришоуѣшема, начаста съставлявати писмена . . . и преложиаста Апостоль и Еуангелъ (*s.a.* 898, the story of Cyril and Methodios); *s.a.* 1019: Брата моя! аще еста и гбломъ отошла отсюда но молитвою помозѣта ми . . .; *s.a.* 1022, the story of the single combat (сидѣвъся сама борогъ . . .); *s.a.* 1071, the story of the two wizards (астаста два волѣхва . . .).

Duals can be observed becoming more and more rare in consecutive parts of chronicles, e.g. in the *First Novg. Chron.* during the period 1250-1350.

Incorrect usages appear as early as the 13th c.:

correct: та два была (послѣмъ) (1229)

2 гр[и]ѣшнѣ безъ 2-ю [= двою] ногу (c.1270)

incorrect: помози работѣ своимъ [pl. dat.] . . . написавшема [du. dat.] книги сѣя (1219) (both should be dual)

даю два села (13th c.) (masc. forms for двѣ селѣ).

After the mid 14th c. all examples are probably deliberate archaisms.

32 *Survivals*

A few modern masc. plurals in -á and neut. plurals in -и referring to *natural pairs* would appear to be duals reinterpreted as plurals (the true plural was much less often needed): masc. бока́ 'sides, flanks', рогá 'horns', рукавá 'sleeves'; neut. очи́ 'eyes', уши́ 'ears', колбни́ 'knees', плечи́ 'shoulders'.<sup>35</sup> The fem. duals рудѣ́ 'hands' and ногѣ́ 'feet' were rejected because of their form. Here also (neut.) дѣвѣсти́ '200' (§79 below). Certain other apparently likely cases may not be survivals in fact: берегá 'banks' is not recorded before the 16th c. ног глазá 'eyes' (replacing очи́ in the vernacular) before c.1590. The dual had long been extinct by those dates. Only the *nominative* survived; oblique cases of the dual are extremely rare<sup>36</sup> after the 14th c. except in ChSl. (a common ChSl. cliché was instr. очима́ '(with my) two eyes'). Such old dual forms had perhaps the best chance of surviving if there was a stress contrast with the sg. gen., e.g. in бока́, рогá (sg. gen. бока, рогá). Hence we may tentatively include as duals the combinations 2 часа́, 2 шага́, 2 рядá in contrast to the normal sg. gen. не раньше́ часа́, с пѣрвого шага́, после́ рѣда́ несча́стий.

*Development of the Masculine Plural Nominative in -á*

33 The reinterpretation of such duals as бока́, рогá as *plurals* encouraged the spread of this form. There were other likely convergent factors:

(i) fem. *collectives*, normally taking a pl. adjective or verb and so able to be reinterpreted as plurals, e.g. господá 'masters, gentlemen',<sup>37</sup> сторожá (= ChSl. стража́) 'the guard(s)', Литва́ 'the Lithuanians', братья́ 'the brothers (brotherhood)', дружина́ 'the (Prince's) military retinue'.

Examples: рѣкоша дружина́ Игореви . . . (RPC s.a. 945); гдѣ суть дружина́ наша?; а поидутъ на насъ Литва́ (1386); совокупишася вся́ братья́ (RPC s.a. 1101); предѣть господоу (= советом).

<sup>35</sup> The true pl. колѣна and the collective pl. колѣнья also exist in special senses; the pl. плечá is subliterary. The following descendants of old duals are also found in dialect: neut. мудѣ́ or муди́ 'testicles' (CSl. \**mřdo*), fem. скуле́ 'cheeks' (скупá now = 'cheek-bone'), брылѣ́ 'jowls'.

<sup>36</sup> In some N. dialects the fem. pl. Df are confused (see Table XVII (16)) and the prevailing form is often du. -ама rather than -ам or -ами. Dual forms may have survived longer in outlying parts.

<sup>37</sup> Already present in later OCS: без вола́ господы́ ихъ.

By the 16th c. господá, господѣ́, -ахъ, etc. (new pl. *oblique* cases) is already the normal pl. of the singularive господѣ́ин.

(ii) neuters with the stress-pattern слóво, sg. gen. слóва, pl. НА слóва, identical with the masc. in the oblique cases. There were about a dozen such common nouns, but others were added (местá, летá).

(iii) the gradual generalization of fem. -ах, -ам, -ами to all nouns.

34 The number of masc. pl. in -á recorded up to and including the 16th c. is still small. The formation is virtually unknown in Ukr. and WhR., therefore its inception can hardly be before c.1300. Among the earliest new analogical forms are: городá (1495), мастерá (1509), лугá (1529). But городы́, мастеры́ predominated down to the 17th c. (Pososhkóv, c.1724, has both городы́ and городá). Despite its large vernacular vocabulary there is only one in *Dom.*; the more formal *Stoglav* (1551) and *Uloženie* of 1649 each have only one of these 'vulgarisms' (лбса and лбсы in the latter). They achieved acceptance only in the 18th c. and above all in the 19th c. when they were freely formed in many technical vocabularies and were particularly affected to foreign loan-words, e.g. боргá, веерá 'fans', вексельá 'bills of exchange', катерá 'cutters', номерá, паспоргá, профессорá, соргá, etc., down to contemporary дизельá 'diesel engines'. Дóмы is still fairly common down to the mid 19th c. At the present time they appear to have suffered a certain loss of popularity, инспекторы́, тракторы́ being preferred to инспекторá, тракторá. The total in *obligatory* literary use from *native* words is about forty.<sup>38</sup>

The form apparently entered Moscow town dialect from S. dialects, where it is common even in the feminines (степя́, лошада́). Only one such fem. has any literary standing: зеленя́ 'sprouting corn' (the first signs of growth in the spring) < зéлень f.

The small group in -ья arose from a crossing of the original pl. ном., e.g. князи́, with fem. collectives of the type братья́ (the old collectives княжья́, etc., were fem. sg.: вся́ княжья́ русьская́).

<sup>38</sup> Бер., век (лѣки is ChSl. or poetic), вѣртел, вес (весá 'weights' but весá 'scales'), вѣчер, воз 'cartload', вóрох, глаз, год (also гóды in сороковѣ́е гóды), гóлос, жѣмчуг, зáкром, колокол, короб, кузов, лес, лог, образ (образá 'icons' but otherwise образы́), остров, па́рус, пѣрепел, пóвар, по́рѣз, пóезд, пóяс, прѣстáв, прѣвод, рог, снег, стог, стóрож, счѣт (счѣтá 'accounts' but счѣты 'abacus'), тѣрем, тѣтеревá (п. 19 above), цвет (цветá 'colours' but цветá́ 'flowers'), and those in §32 above.

They are established as plurals in the 17th c. with the oblique cases following rather slowly (брáтьями is recorded in 1517 but з братъю, послал свою братю, etc. are still fairly usual in the 17th c.). They comprise: дядь (pl. gen. дядьёв), друзь, князь, кумовь ( < кум), мужь (‘husbands’, сват(ов)ья, сыновья. The final stress would appear to come from the new plurals in -á.

**35** A small group of masc. plurals in unstressed -ья has come from the neut. collectives in -ье<sup>39</sup> which were giving way to plurals in the 17th c. The *Uloženie* of 1649 has борное дерево side by side with тёмъ борнымъ деревямъ. Аувакум still uses под каменем. Pososhkón writes both то деревье ‘those trees’ and стоящие деревья. The collective sense is still strong in перо ‘feather’, pl. пёрья, less so in крыло ‘wing’, pl. крылья. The following masculines are now included: брусъ, зубья,<sup>40</sup> каменя ( §20 above), клынья, клочья, колосья, колья, комыя, коренья ( §20 above), крычья, листься,<sup>41</sup> лоскутья, лубья, поводыя (< повод ‘rein’), полосья, прутья, стулья, сучья, уголья, хлопья, шурья (< шурин).

### 36 *Indeclinable Nouns*

Foreign nouns which do not conform in their finals to an appropriate gender are usually left undeclined. This applies particularly to personal names: Дюма́ ‘Dumas’, Гёте ‘Goethe’ (cf. Pol. gen. *Goethego*). But there are variations: пальто́ (Fr. *paletot*) and бюро́ (Fr. *bureau*), though capable of being treated as neuters, are in practice indeclinable, and the neuter-shaped кофе is masc.

### *The Adjective*

**37** One of the prominent agreements between Slav and Baltic—therefore no doubt a BSl. innovation—is the possession of two adjectival paradigms: a *nominal*, indeterminate (‘short’) and a *pronominal*, determinate (‘long’), a compound of the nominal forms with the anaphoric pronoun *ji, je, ja* (§§9 below). Thus: новь, ново, нова ‘(a) new’ (cf. Lat. *bonus filius, bona filia, bonum*

<sup>39</sup> Those still in use are predominantly end-stressed: белье ‘underwear’, сыраё ‘raw materials’. This collective type has been particularly favoured in some N. dialects, where комарё may be said to be the normal pl. of комар ‘mosquito’. A few occasionally appear in literature: бабё ‘(gaggle of) old women, дурачнё ‘(pack of) fools’.

<sup>40</sup> Зубы ‘(human) teeth’ but зубья ‘teeth of a saw’.

<sup>41</sup> Листья ‘sheets, pages’ but листься (plant) leaves’ (collective листьва ‘foliage’).

*domum*); новъ-яь, ново-је, нова-ја ‘(the) new’ (already mentioned). See further 4.70–2.

CSl. had, however, only the *declensional* types м. *novŭ*, н. *ново*, f. *нова* (with ‘soft’-stem variants); *i*-stem and *ŷ*-stem adjectives had disappeared or been reformed.<sup>42</sup>

The compound ‘long’ declension was already subject to a number of adjustments in CSl., especially in the pl. where some juxtapositions were awkward, e.g. masc. sg. instr. \**novomŷ-jimŷ* > *novymŷ*, pl. loc. \**novŷŷ-jimŷ* > *novymŷ*, fem. pl. dat. \**novamŷ-jimŷ* > *novymŷ* (the gender distinction disappears). The generalized base *novu-* may come from the fem. pl. nom. *novu-je*.

### *Commentary to Table VIII*

**38** 1. *Sg. masc. nom./voc.* The original structure of this ending is *-ijŷ, -ijŷ*. The phonetic history of the jers before *j* is not entirely clear (2.33). OCS exhibits the alternative spellings *-yŷ (-yŷ)/-ijŷ (-ii)* and *-ijŷ (-ijŷ)/-ijŷ (-ijŷ)*, which surely indicate the same sound sequence perhaps not quite identical with either spelling. Early ESl. texts, whether ChSl. or not, have predominantly *-ymŷ-ни (-ymŷ-ни* probably only if copied from an OCS original). It is doubtful that this ever represented the ESl. phonetic reality but this orthography has remained traditional down to the present day. The expected ESl. forms *-ojŷ-ей* (i.e. the normal treatment of a strong jer followed by a weak final jer) begin to appear from the mid 14th c., e.g. князь великой (1339), and irrespective of stress. That these were the true native forms is supported by the fact that the *pronunciation* (as far as can be ascertained) has always been *stressed [oj]* as in *дорогой, unstressed [ej]* as in *новый* and *синий* (*not* [-yŷ, -ijŷ]), i.e. the normal reductions of unstressed *-ojŷ-ей*. Only recently has the *written* form *новый, синий* begun to influence pronunciation: великий [v’el’ik’ijŷ] is increasingly heard. Stressed *-ojŷ* (there are no stressed *-ей*)<sup>43</sup> early became the regular spelling. There has been considerable variation between the stressed and unstressed models, e.g. standard *толстый* but W. dial. *толстоѷ*.<sup>44</sup>

<sup>42</sup> Lith. still has many *i*-stem adjectives: *kariŷs, saldŷs* (so also Gk. ἡδὺς ‘sweet’); in Slav *i*-stems were given a suffix *-k-* in CSl.: \**ligŷkŷ, \*valdŷkŷ, \*gladŷkŷ, \*mirŷkŷ, \*rizŷkŷ, \*blizŷkŷ, \*redŷkŷ, \*kariŷkŷ* (R. корогкий). *i*-stems are visible in *velŷkŷ* < \**velŷ*, with a number of active forms in OCS but not in ESl. (*velŷimŷ*, prefix *velŷ-*). Similarly \**kolŷ, \*tolŷ* > *колик-, толк-* (Table XII).

<sup>43</sup> Except \**третей* in сам-третей, пол-третья (§§81, 83 below); standard (ChSl.) *третий*.

<sup>44</sup> See also A. Vaillant, *Grammaire comparée*, II/2, §299.



TABLE VIII. Declension of the Long Adjective

		Early East Slav			Church Slavonic		
			Soft			Hard	
		Masc.	Neut.	Masc.	Neut.	Masc.	Neut.
Sg. NV	NOB-и (-и)	NOB-я	сн-е (-е)	сн-и (-и)	сн-е (-е)	нов-а	нов-и (-и)
A	NOB-о (-о)	NOB-я	сн-е (-е)	сн-и (-и)	сн-е (-е)	нов-о (-о)	нов-и (-и)
N or G	NOB-о (-о)	NOB-я	сн-е (-е)	сн-и (-и)	сн-е (-е)	нов-о (-о)	нов-и (-и)
G	-о	-я	-е	-и	-е	-о	-и
L	-омь <sup>1</sup>	-и (-и)	-емь <sup>1</sup>	-и	-емь <sup>1</sup>	-и	-емь <sup>1</sup>
D	-омь <sup>1</sup>	-и (-и)	-емь <sup>1</sup>	-и	-емь <sup>1</sup>	-и	-емь <sup>1</sup>
I	NOB-я	NOB-и	сн-я	сн-и	сн-и	нов-а	нов-и
Du. NAV	NOB-я	NOB-и	сн-я	сн-и	сн-и	нов-а	нов-и
GL	-о (-ю)	-и	-ю (-ю)	-и	-и	-а (-има)	-и (-има)
DI	-има	-и	-има	-и	-и	-а (-има)	-и (-има)
PL. NV	NOB-и	NOB-я	сн-и	сн-я	сн-и	нов-а	нов-и
A	-и	-я	-и	-я	-и	нов-а	нов-и
G	-ихъ	-я	-ихъ	-я	-ихъ	нов-а	нов-и
L	-ихъ	-я	-ихъ	-я	-ихъ	нов-а	нов-и
D	-имъ	-я	-имъ	-я	-имъ	нов-а	нов-и
I	-ими	-и	-ими	-и	-ими	нов-а	нов-и

  

		Early East Slav			Church Slavonic		
			Soft			Hard	
		Masc.	Neut.	Masc.	Neut.	Masc.	Neut.
Sg. NV	NOB-и (-и)	NOB-я	сн-е (-е)	сн-и (-и)	сн-е (-е)	нов-а	нов-и (-и)
A	NOB-и (-и)	NOB-я	сн-е (-е)	сн-и (-и)	сн-е (-е)	нов-а	нов-и (-и)
N or G	NOB-и (-и)	NOB-я	сн-е (-е)	сн-и (-и)	сн-е (-е)	нов-а	нов-и (-и)
G	-о	-я	-е	-и	-е	-о	-и
L	-омь <sup>1</sup>	-и (-и)	-емь <sup>1</sup>	-и	-емь <sup>1</sup>	-и	-емь <sup>1</sup>
D	-омь <sup>1</sup>	-и (-и)	-емь <sup>1</sup>	-и	-емь <sup>1</sup>	-и	-емь <sup>1</sup>
I	NOB-я	NOB-и	сн-я	сн-и	сн-и	нов-а	нов-и
Du. NAV	NOB-я	NOB-и	сн-я	сн-и	сн-и	нов-а	нов-и
GL	-о (-ю)	-и	-ю (-ю)	-и	-и	-а (-има)	-и (-има)
DI	-има	-и	-има	-и	-и	-а (-има)	-и (-има)
PL. NV	NOB-и	NOB-я	сн-и	сн-я	сн-и	нов-а	нов-и
A	-и	-я	-и	-я	-и	нов-а	нов-и
G	-ихъ	-я	-ихъ	-я	-ихъ	нов-а	нов-и
L	-ихъ	-я	-ихъ	-я	-ихъ	нов-а	нов-и
D	-имъ	-я	-имъ	-я	-имъ	нов-а	нов-и
I	-ими	-и	-ими	-и	-ими	нов-а	нов-и

<sup>1</sup> Early depalatalized (6.11); cf. Table VI, n. 6.

MORPHOLOGY

MORPHOLOGY

No vocative forms are found in ESL.; OCS (ChSl.) has occasionally, in the sg. masc. only, *безумие!*, *буди!*, *Фарисею слъбе!*, but already more often the long form: *отъче праведный!*

39 2. *Sg. masc. gen./dat.* The contraction of *-ajego*, *-ijerni* can be followed in OCS (frequent) *-aago*, *-шти*. The ESL. forms *-ого*, *-ому* cannot be phonetic contractions; they are borrowed from pronominal *-ого*, *-ому* (всякому, etc.). The ChSl. spelling *-аро* is usual in early ESL. texts and remained as a Slavonicism in Russian spelling down to 1876 if stressed (*святого* > *святѣго*) and down to 1917 if unstressed (*новаго* > *новѣго*). It has become petrified in a few surnames of ecclesiastical origin, e.g. *Живѣро*, where it is pronounced as written. Native *-ого* is rare before the 13th c.: новгородского (1149), великого (1151), but already normal in the 1229 Treaty (text no. 18): *изъ гочкого брѣва, смольнеского князя, латинеского челоувѣка*. Conversely, ChSl. *-ому* is rare from the start compared with *-ому*: *славъному* (1073).

40 3. *Pronunciation of -ого/-его*. Spellings revealing the modern pronunciation with *-v* occur from the 15th c.: *великово* (1432), *третьево* (1436), *братъ молодшево* (1439), *правово* (1445), *другѣво* (1473). Somewhat later we find *великова* (1553). A purely phonetic explanation is improbable. Most S. dialects with [g] > [y] (Table XVII (1)) have [-оуа]/[-оуѣ], [y] being stable.<sup>45</sup> A few NW dialects (Onéga-Olónets area) which also have [g] > [y] in some contexts show a further weakening of the spirant in intervocalic position, with recorded pronunciations [-oho] or [-oo]. With strong labialization of a final stressed *o*, the latter could clearly lead to [-owó] > [-owó], e.g. in *корѣ*, *торѣ*. But the earliest examples are all unstressed; moreover, some N. dialects have pronominal [toǵo] or [toǵó] but adjectival *-ова*. As these areas do not have *áканье* (6.33 ff.), the final *-a* is genuine. We must suppose therefore at least a strong interference from the possessive adjectives in *-ов*, in universal use till recent times (§43 below). The prototype of [-ovo] is to be sought in the combinations *Ива́нова сы́на*, *Петрѣова дѣма*, *Духова дня et sim.*

The phenomenon is certainly of N. dial. origin in standard

<sup>45</sup> Likewise Ukr. has the normal evolution [-ogo] > [-ojo] or [-oho].

<sup>46</sup> Cf. spoken SCR. over large areas where *x* is weak or dropped, e.g. *kǎhār* > *kǎvār* 'cook', *ǎho* > *ǎo* or *ǎvo* 'ear'; *mǎhi* > *mǎvi* 'flies', *bǎha* > *bǎva* 'flea'. These also show that the development of an intervocalic *v* to remove hiatus is not dependent on a following *o*.

Russian, which has maintained the traditional spelling *-ого* except in a few personal names, e.g. *Дурново*, *Суховѣ* (where the stress is not that of the adj. *дурного*, *сухого*).

41 4. *Sg. fem.* All the forms except the NA have been reformed on pronominal models.

*Gen.* The ending *-ья/-ия* (< *-yě/-iě* for *-jě/jě*) is always a Slavonicism and often written *-ье/-ие*: *изъ московские земли* (1497), *без лишние волокиты* (17th c.).<sup>47</sup> The pronominal endings *-об/-еб* (cf. *тоб*, *себ*, Table XII) are used concurrently and are attracted to the LD *-ой/-ей* from the 15th c.; *-ой/-ей* finally prevailed in the 17th c. There is an early example of *-об* in the *Arch. Ev.* (1092).

*Loc./dat.* *-ви* is similarly supplanted by pronominal *-ои* (*-ой*).

*Instr.* *-ою* is again pronominal (ChSl. *-ѣю*) and was reduced to *-ой* recently, as in the nouns. The presence of *-ою* in *Ostr.* suggests that it was already the normal native form in the 11th c.

42 5. Dual forms disappear early in the adjective. Even in ChSl. *style святыхъ апостолъ Петра и Паула* is more usual than *святую (or wrongly святую) апостолу* . . .

6. *Pl. nom./acc.* The adjectives here conform to the nouns in preferring the pl. acc. (§9 above). Confusion begins in the 13th c. and is frequent in the 14th c. With the general confusion of unstressed *ѣ* and *е* we get masc. and fem. NA *-ые*; *-ья* is a Slavonicism (< *-yě*) and was revived for no good reason in the 18th c. for the neut. and fem. (this anomaly was suppressed in 1917). The neut. *-ая* survived well into the 15th c.; after its decadence there were no longer any gender distinctions in the pl. *Злая дела* in *Avvakúm* is a deliberate ChSl. archaism.

A hybrid masc. *-ым/-ни* occurs sporadically down to the 16th c.: *люди добрыи* (1501). It was not entirely abandoned by 18th and early 19th c. grammarians.

7. *Other pl. forms.* The contracted forms *-ых(ъ)*, etc. (also sg. masc./neut. instr. *-ым(ъ)* and du. *-ыма*) are normal by the 13th c. (always so in the 1229 Treaty), but the uncontracted remain as Slavonicisms. It was not simple contraction but rather adjustment to a generalized base *добръ-*, since intervocalic *j* does not normally fall in Russian. Early ChSl. texts (*Ostr.* and *Novg. Minét*) have about half and half contracted and uncontracted forms.

<sup>47</sup> When written *-об/-еб* it is presumably a cross between native *-об/-еб* and ChSl. *-ьоб/-ня*.

8. The declension of the adjectival participles follows the above changes (§§117 ff. below).

#### Types of Adjective

43 1. *Personal possessive*. Down to the 17th c. the normal formula was of the type Петров дом 'Peter's house', сестрин сын '(my) sister's son'. The gen. of possession had to be used only when there was a qualification: сын твоей сестры. There were two formations:

(a) in -ов/-ев from masculines and -ин/-ын from feminines (or masc. in -а/-я);

(b) in -ий, from masculines.

Being bound by nature to particular persons these adjectives had only the 'short' paradigm.<sup>48</sup> With the decadence of the oblique cases of the 'short' paradigm (§48 below) their nominal were replaced by pronominal endings.

Except in popular speech the whole category became nearly obsolete in the 18th c., only a few 'family' terms remaining in cultivated and domestic usage: сестрин, бабушкин '(my) grandmother's', дядин 'Uncle's' (also from hypocoristics: Кóлин, Тáнин 'Nicholas's', Татяна's).

Meanwhile type (a) had petrified in family names, being either patronymic or the name or nickname of the grandfather.<sup>49</sup> Александр Сергеев сын Пушкина = А., son of Sergej, grandfather of 'Пушка'. Their declension is therefore now mixed: the 'long' pronominal forms have prevailed in the masc. sg. instr. (Пушкиным), all the fem. except the sg. NA (oblique cases Пушкиной), and all the pl. except the nom. (Пушкиных, etc.).

These possessive adjs. likewise became widely fossilized as place-names and are so used from the earliest texts: Кыевь (sc. город), loc. Кыев (1057), the 'short' form being normal as in Нов(ъ)городъ, loc. Новгородъ (4.53). There was thus no deviation from a noun in the sg. (no pl. forms are needed), except sometimes for a 'long' instr. (под Кыевьымъ).

Type (b) in -ий required palatalization of the stem: а от смерти Ярославли до смерти Святополчи лѣтъ 60 (RPC s.a. 852); Мьстиславъ Володимиръ сынъ (text no. 12); князь 'the

<sup>48</sup> Long forms are occasionally found for wives: Всеволожая (1097), Мьстиславья (1122).

<sup>49</sup> See В. Ulbrеганн, *Russian Surnames*, section I, and V. К. Chichagov, *Из истории русских имен, отчества и фамилий* (1959).

Prince's'; митрополичъ 'the Metropolitan's'; and perhaps Царь-градъ (or Царьгородъ) 'Constantinople (the Emperor's city)'.

The formation might be unclear or ambiguous; alternatives in -ов/-ев were early preferred: Иванъ день > Иванов день. They were obsolete by the 16th c. and remained into the 17th c. only in a few set formulae, e.g. на патриаршѣ дворѣ. There are some survivals as place-names: Ярославль, Владимир (earlier Владимиръ, sc. город).

#### Notes

(i) The patronymics developed from these formations—Андреевич, Иванович, Ильич (по -ин-!) and their feminines Ивановна, Арсеньевна, etc.—are *nomis*.

(ii) Surnames of gen. form—Дурновó, Черных—arose by omission of сын, дочь, дѣти, or similar.

(iii) In bourgeois and peasant society the patronymic became the more polite and formal mode of reference to a person: Ludolf (1696) records поди въ поварну и позови Ивано[в]яну; Аввакум always refers to his wife as Марковна (we are only told at the beginning that her baptismal name was Anastasia).

(iv) Surnames (фамиліи) in -ович/-евич are of Polish origin and have Polish penultimate stress: Станкѣвич, Шостакович.

(v) Surnames in -ский (fully adjectival)—Достоевский, Оболенский, Чайковський—appear to belong to the western borderlands; the type is very common in Polish. Some, however, are 'seminary' names (ChSl.): Рождѣственскій, Вознесѣнскій, Успенскій.

44 2. The type in -їй must not be confused with the type in -їи (-ii), e.g. лисий, лисья, лисья 'belonging to or characteristic of foxes'. This type is still current, especially from animals, but the declension is 'long' except for sg. neut./fem. nom., fem. acc., and pl. nom. (волчьє, волчья; волчью; волчьи). Here also belong Божий (OCS *Božii*), a true possessive from *Boží*, and грѣтій (§83 below).

45 3. *Adjectives in -(ь)ск-*. A common formation of *general* relationship or possession: монастырскій 'monastic', женскій 'female' or 'feminine' (not 'my wife's'), грѣцскій 'Greek'. Such adjs. were also derived from personal possessives: отцов(ъ) > \*отцовый > отцовскій 'paternal' (not 'my father's').

The 'short' declension early became obsolete. Short forms survive only in nominalized place-names, e.g. Смоленск.

See also adverbs in -ски (§69 (a) below).

46 *Adjectives lacking the determinate ('long') forms.* The most notable is рад, -а 'glad' (so generally in Slav), of uncertain origin. The old pl. masc. nom. радѣ is still to be found in the 18th c.

Further: горѣзд (a Gothic loan-word, 5.5) 'sarable', now subliterary as an adj. (country speech: онъ горѣзд на всё); there remains the adverb горѣздо, 'very' until the 17th c., thereafter only with comparatives (горѣздо лучше 'much better').

47 *5. Indeclinable adjectives.* There was a small number of these in OCS; all seem to be relics of *i*-stem adjectives. The following may occur in ChSl. texts: различъ 'different'; свобода 'free'; исплънь 'full'; удобъ 'easy'; сугубъ 'double'. Normalized with suffix -н- in most cases.<sup>50</sup>

#### 48 *Survival of the Nominal ('Short') Forms*

1. The complete short declension remained in use until about the beginning of the 13th c., at least in writing. Thereafter only the nom. and acc., singular and plural, were usual, the other cases being replaced by 'long' forms or otherwise avoided. In particular the sg. masc. and neut. instr. and sg. fem. LD disappeared early, the latter no doubt because a stem change was sometimes needed (нага, DL назѣ). ChSl. retained longer the short forms still normal in, e.g., *Ostr.* (1057): мгногамъ д[у]шамъ кр[ѣ]стияньскамъ *et sim.* The pl. NA follow the lead of the nouns and long adjectives in generalizing -ы for all genders: какъ бы сыги были (1493) but незваны (participle) не въздять (1515).

By the 16th-17th c. деловой язык, reflecting the colloquial but not without its own conservative procedures, uses the short forms only as predicates or pseudo-predicates (apposition, etc.); the accusatives have all the appearance of a conventional cliché, including word order:

ея за то казнити живу;  
жена . . . дитя родитъ мертво;  
прислалъ ковшъ золотъ;  
купишь двѣ кобылы, игреню да гдѣду.

<sup>50</sup> Vaillant is of the opinion that the resultant apparent suffix -н- was then isolated and developed to become one of the main adj. suffixes (replacing -н- as in ясный, where there was never any *jer*).

The dat. is not unrepresented in dat. + inf. constructions: ни нагу ни голодну . . . было ему не ходити (1502). But at late dates they will be ChSl., e.g. in Pososhkōv с.1724: ему подобаетъ быть трѣзву. This type of apposition did not entirely disappear from learned language until well into the 19th c.: Dal' in his great Толковый словарь (1863-6) uses formulae of definition such as: . . . сплошь покрываться чем-либо падающим, быть засыпану.

By the 18th c. the pseudo-predicate in such phrases as онъ лежитъ боленъ (1532), та дорога крива лучилась (1515) had in principle gone over to the long form, nom. or pred. instr. (4.52).

There thus now remain only the nominatives as *true* predicates.

#### 49 2. *Relics of the Past*

(a) Oral poetry preserved, since much dependent on fixed formulae, other cases than the nom.:

онъ садился на добра коня.

*Note.* *Aprosorated* forms were much affected by poets in the 18th and more rarely in the 19th c.: мрачна ночь (for мрачная; the short predicative form is мрачна).<sup>51</sup>

(b) Petrified adverbial phrases (NB no instr. and no plural):

срѣдъ бѣла дня 'in broad daylight';  
на босу ногу 'barefoot';  
отъ мала до велика 'of all ages';  
мало по-малу 'little by little'.

*Ass.:* зѣмертво (повалиться), зѣново, зѣсветло, нѣглухо (закрѣтъ), нѣлево/напрѣво, нѣскоро, нѣчерно (писать), нѣчисто (отказаться); *Gen.:* дѣкрасна, дѣсыга, издавна, издалека, изредка, йскоса, and the type изжелта 'yellowish' (йссия зелѣный 'bluish-green'), свысока, сгорячѣ, слегда, снѣва, спервѣ, сполнѣ, неспростѣ;

*Dat.:* помалѣньку, попросту, попусту, поровну;

*Loc.:* вполне, вчернѣ, наготовѣ; вкратцѣ, вообще, and наравнѣ are Slavonicisms.

#### 50 *Adjectives as Nouns*

A frequent process, which only concerns long adjectives in ESl.: русский 'a Russian',<sup>52</sup> портной 'a tailor'; (modern) кривая (sc.

<sup>51</sup> N. dialect shows *contracted* forms: злѣ < злая, маленьки дѣти, в прѣжни годы. See Table XVII (11).

<sup>52</sup> Of long standing. The singularive noun русинъ, from the original collective Русь, had some currency in early centuries (*R.P.*, art. 1; 1229 Treaty) but did not outlive the Muscovite period. Россіянин (and Росс) are learned inventions of the 18th c.

лінія) 'a curve', живіотное 'an animal'. 'Short' are only a few words inherited from CSL: вдова 'widow' (the adj. вдовый exists), дева (дѣва) 'virgin', and no longer felt as adjectives; and a few inherited from OCS usage: благо 'the good', зло, and добро. The latter have, of course, the normal declension of neuter nouns:

мѣньшее из двух зол 'the lesser of two evils';  
не плати́ злом за зло.

Some nominalized adjectives have different stress: жаркое 'roast' (adj. жаркое).

An original noun вожа́тай (cf. ходата́й) has been altered by phonetic confusion to вожа́тый, -ого 'leader' (cf. жена́тый).

Comparison of Adjectives

1. Comparative

51 (a) A relatively small number of common adjectives have preserved an archaic CSL formation in -ѣйс- > -ыш- with palatalization of the stem; an adjectival suffix may be dropped. So:

боли, больш- 'more';  
хужи, хужыш- 'worse' (stem худ-);  
вышии, вышыш- 'higher' } now reformed ortho- { выш-  
нижи, низыш- 'lower' } graphically as { низыш-  
глублии, глублыш- 'deeper' (adj. глубок-) (obs.);  
мьнии, мьныш- 'less(er)' (modern меньш-);  
вячни, вячыш- 'greater'<sup>53</sup> (lost; OCS вѣйш);  
луч(ш)ии, лучыш- 'better' (ESL innovation; also late OCS lucššiluce 'more fitting').

(b) Most have the more evolved formation in -ѣйс- > -ѣш-, which becomes -(j)ajš- regularly after velars and certain palatalized consonants (cf. §87, B2 below): нов-ѣйш-ий; ближ-айш-ий; горьч-айш-ий (adj. stem горьк-).

(c) Comparison with Table VIII will show that only a few adjustments were needed (as in the participles) to bring this declension into conformity with all other 'long' adjectives: the oblique stem in -ѣш- is generalized in the sg. nom. and gender obliterated in the pl. nom.:

новѣйшій, новѣйшее, новѣйшая, новѣйшие.

<sup>53</sup> A CSL form (Sc. vѣst, ChSl. вѣц(ьш)ий) but apparently peculiar to NW dial. (Novg.) in ESL, e.g. Novg. Chr., s.a. 1215: оно тамо измано вачыше муж[б] а мьньшее они розцѣпоша сѧ. Survives in the rare name Вячеслав (Wenceslas), borrowed from Czech.

TABLE IX. Declension of the Comparative

		Long		Short	
		Fem.		Fem.	
Sg.	NV	нов-ѣш-ия	нов-ѣ- <sup>1</sup>	нов-ѣш-и	нов-ѣ- (ѣше) <sup>2</sup>
	A	нов-ѣш-ю	нов-ѣ- <sup>1</sup>	нов-ѣш-и	нов-ѣ- (ѣше) <sup>2</sup>
Pl.	GL	нов-ѣш-и	нов-ѣш-и	нов-ѣш-и	нов-ѣш-и
	DI	нов-ѣш-и	нов-ѣш-и	нов-ѣш-и	нов-ѣш-и
Pl. NV	GL	нов-ѣш-и	нов-ѣш-и	нов-ѣш-и	нов-ѣш-и
	DI	нов-ѣш-и	нов-ѣш-и	нов-ѣш-и	нов-ѣш-и
Pl. NV	A	нов-ѣш-и	нов-ѣш-и	нов-ѣш-и	нов-ѣш-и
	N or G <sup>3</sup>	нов-ѣш-и	нов-ѣш-и	нов-ѣш-и	нов-ѣш-и
Sg.	G	нов-ѣш-а	нов-ѣш-а	нов-ѣш-а	нов-ѣш-а
	L	нов-ѣш-и	нов-ѣш-и	нов-ѣш-и	нов-ѣш-и
Pl.	D	нов-ѣш-и	нов-ѣш-и	нов-ѣш-и	нов-ѣш-и
	I	нов-ѣш-и	нов-ѣш-и	нов-ѣш-и	нов-ѣш-и
Sg.	G	нов-ѣш-ь	нов-ѣш-ь	нов-ѣш-ь	нов-ѣш-ь
	L	нов-ѣш-ь	нов-ѣш-ь	нов-ѣш-ь	нов-ѣш-ь
Pl.	D	нов-ѣш-ь	нов-ѣш-ь	нов-ѣш-ь	нов-ѣш-ь
	I	нов-ѣш-ь	нов-ѣш-ь	нов-ѣш-ь	нов-ѣш-ь

<sup>1</sup> Usually reformed as новѣше.  
<sup>2</sup> Often reformed as новѣш.  
<sup>3</sup> Usually nom. -ѣши; original acc. -ѣшѣ.

The 'short' declension evidently went out of use early in the vernacular (*pari passu* with that of other adj.) and most uses of it are probably Slavonicisms, e.g. желая больша кибня (RPC s. a. 945).

52 However, except for the *four most usual opposite pairs*, spoken Russian early ceased to decline comparatives (cf. the primacy of the invariable 'gerund' in the p. r. a., §§118 ff. below). By the Muscovy period the forms in -ѣйшій/-айшій were considered bookish. The surviving eight were all of the simpler type (a):

большій/меньшій<sup>54</sup> 'greater/less(er)';  
лучшій/худшій 'better/worse';  
высшій/низшій 'higher/lower';  
старшій/младшій<sup>55</sup> 'older (elder)/younger'.

Statistically comparatives (at least in speech) are much more common as *predicates* than as attributes, hence mainly required in the nom. Thus the comparative forms reduced themselves to:

sg. (nom.) новѣи, новѣе, новѣиши;  
pl. (nom.) новѣиши,<sup>56</sup> новѣиша, новѣишѣ.

The *neuter singular* early prevailed as an invariable predicate: it is so found from the early 13th c.:

аже капѣ (f.) льгче будеть (1229);  
не еси богатѣ Давыда (masc. reference).

Formally больше, меньше, лучше appear to be *plurals* (neut. sg. болѣе, мѣнее still available as adverbs);<sup>57</sup> a few fem. sg. forms were common down to the 17th c., but they were not maintained.

The ending -ѣ (-ѣѣ) prevails over -ѣ: свежѣе, ловчѣе (learned свежайшій etc. remain). 'Incorrect' forms in -ѣ/-ѣѣ, not uncommon in the 17th–18th c., appear to be a N. dial. extension:

чтоб поскорѣе отказали (1660).

<sup>54</sup> The comparative большій contrasts with a new positive большоѣ. Меньшоѣ, старшій (dial. only) are new coll. variants of the *comparative* (меньшій replacing ChSl. младшій).

<sup>55</sup> Slavonicism; ESl. молодшій also occurs but failed to survive in Russian: дайта ми дружину свою молопошою (RPC s. a. 1097). The original sense of \**mal-* was 'weak, helpless, infant', still seen in OCS (ChSl.) младенец 'infant'; the OCS for 'young' was юный (1.28).

<sup>56</sup> Properly новѣише (as a consonant stem) but commonly so even in OCS.  
<sup>57</sup> Тем болѣе (что), тем не мѣнее; otherwise the simple active is болѣше, меньше. The same with normal дальше 'further' but in так дѣлее 'and so on'; and рѣньше 'earlier', but зарѣнее 'in advance'.

In the 18th c. Sumarókov favoured -ѣ but Lomonósov advocated the standard -ѣ (-ѣѣ).

The shortened новѣи, сильнѣи, etc., is now mainly poetic.

Most stems in dentals and velars have type (a) comparatives with palatalization: тверд-/твёрже, густ-/гуще, тих-/тише, коротк-/короче, жидк-/жиже, also дешев-/дешевле. Alternatives are occasionally possible: богат-/богаче, less often богатѣе.

After the above reorganization the attributive comparative is made with болѣе (мѣнее) + positive: со всё болѣе рѣдкими исключѣнiями.

## 53 2. *Superlative*

There were no special *superlative* forms (comparison between *more than two*). The comparative sufficed but might be pointed with the intensive prefix наи-. The form appears to be recent in OCS where it is only applied to *adverbs* (*наивѣште*) but it is CSI. and has remained in most Slav languages. Even if native in ESl. too, it became obviously bookish with the obsolescence of the type новѣйшій.<sup>58</sup> By the 17th c. *наиновѣйшій* is either a Slavonicism or a Polonism. Лучшій/худшій and старшій/младшій are still either comparative or superlative according to context. The vernacular superlative with самѣи (§66 (ii) below) is recorded rarely from the 16th c. but may, of course, be considerably older:

да купилъ бы саудалу добрава самова.

Forms in -ейшій/-айшій have a limited currency in the higher literary style and official use: с глубочайшим приискорбiем; кратчайшій путь; крупнейшій поэт; милѣйшая из подруг 'her dearest friend'. They are still occasionally used as *comparatives* in the 19th c.:

вскричала она в ещё сильнѣйшем испугѣ (Dost.).

The comparative sense is preserved in позднѣйшій 'later, subsequent' and дальнѣйшій (в дальнѣйшем).

The intensive prefix прѣ- (not a true superlative) is, of course, always a Slavonicism (4.62 (d)): прѣвеликий 'very great' (cf. прѣмудрость), прѣкрасный (fully acclimatized in Russian); cf. Lat. *per magnus*, Gk. *περὶ μέγας*.

For the predicative and adverbial superlative Russian uses

<sup>58</sup> Dialects show a possibly parallel formation in на- (never literary): строгострога 'very strictly'; Укр. and WhR. still have най-.

(probably has always used) *comp. + всех (people) or всего (things)*, already attested in OCS (*mǫnĭji vǫsĕxŭ* 'least (of all)'): он лучше всех, это лучше всего.

### The Pronoun

#### PERSONAL PRONOUNS

##### First and Second Persons and Reflexive

Table X gives the early forms.

#### 54 Commentary to Table X

1. *1st pers. sg. nom.* Both *язъ* (-язъ) and *я* (-я)<sup>59</sup> are found from the early texts, side by side with ChSl. *азъ*, e.g. in Mstislav's Deed of Gift (text no. 12):

се азъ мьстиславъ . . . (formal opening)  
 а назъ далъ роукою своєю . . .  
 а се на всеволодѣ . . .

Се азъ as a legal formula continued to be used for many centuries. Muscovite деловой язык helped to keep *язъ* alive even into the 17th c. (it is still common in more or less colloquial texts of the 15th–16th c.), perhaps as a compromise between *азъ* and *я*.

In the 17th c. Avvakûm can still make stylistic play with *азъ*: он . . . начал мне говорить: поп ты, или респоп? И азъ отвещал: азъ емь Аввакум протопоп . . .

55 2. *Sg. acc.* The forms *мене*, etc., are replaced by *меня*, etc. (*мене + мя?*)<sup>60</sup> during the 15th–16th c.; they appear to be of N. dial. origin. The genitives conform to this (acc. *мене*, etc., must in fact be gen. forms extended to the personal animate acc. in CSI. times). The enclitic forms *мѧ* (*мѧ*), etc., are syntactically unstressed (whereas *мене*, etc., are emphatic) and freely used as verbal objects:

пустить же мѧ а иную поялъ (NBG, no. 9, c.1100)

and after prepositions:

. . . ихъ же послахомъ по тѧ (*RPS s.a.* 945) 'whom I sent to fetch you';  
 покоривше я под сѧ (*RPS s.a.* 898) 'having brought them under his rule'.

<sup>59</sup> Most Slav languages have alternating *jaz/ja* in the early stages, until the allegro form becomes standard.

<sup>60</sup> Some consider the analogy of animate *jo*-stems more important, e.g. конѧ.

TABLE X. Pronouns of the First and Second Persons

Person	Early East Slav			OCS (Church Slavonic)		
	First	Second	Reflexive	First	Second	Reflexive
Sg. N(V)	КЪ ОТ Я	МЕНЕ, МЯ	ТЕБЕ, ТЯ	азъ	(тебѣ), те	(себѣ), се
A	МЕНЕ	МЕНЕ	ТЕБЕ	мене	тебѣ	себѣ
G	Мѧ	Мѧ	Тѧ	мѧ	тебѣ	себѣ
L	Мѧ	Мѧ	Тѧ	мѧ	тебѣ	себѣ
D	Мѧ	Мѧ	Тѧ	мѧ	тебѣ, ти	себѣ, се
I	Мѧ	Мѧ	Тѧ	мѧ	тебѣ, ти	себѣ, се
Du. N	Вѧ	Вѧ	Вѧ	вѧ	вѧ	вѧ
A	НА	НА	НА	на	на, вы	на, вы
GL	НАЮ	НАЮ	НАЮ	нају	на, вы	на, вы
DI	НАМА	НАМА	НАМА	нама, на	нама, на	нама, на
N(V)	МЫ	МЫ	МЫ	мы	мы	мы
A	НАСЪ, НЫ	НАСЪ, НЫ	НАСЪ, ВЫ	насъ, ны	насъ, вы	насъ, вы
G	НАСЪ	НАСЪ	НАСЪ	насъ	насъ	насъ
L	НАСЪ	НАСЪ	НАСЪ	насъ	насъ	насъ
D	НАМЪ, НЫ	НАМЪ, НЫ	НАМЪ, ВЫ	намъ, ны	намъ, вы	намъ, вы
I	НАМИ	НАМИ	НАМИ	нами	нами	нами

The second forms throughout the Table are enclitic only.

By the beginning of the 16th c. the enclitics had become rare or archaic (or ChSl.), except for *ся* with its special function in the verb (§133 below).

56 3. *Sg. dat./loc.* Though *мѣнѣ* is correct, *мѣнѣ* predominates in early ESl., following instr. *мѣною*. In any case the pretonic *je*s disappear early. A form *мѣнѣ*, paralleled elsewhere in Slav, occurs sporadically in dialects but is likely to be a recent analogical formation to *мѣнѣ*.

*Тобѣ, собѣ* > *тебѣ, себѣ* in the 14th–15th c. under the influence of AG *тебе* and no doubt also of ChSl. *tebě/sebě*. Many dialects, in both N. and S. Russia (also Ukr. and WhR.) have retained *тобе/собе*; conversely *тобе/тобя* were widely used as AG (especially in Moscow) in the period c.1400–1650, but then disappear from standard usage.<sup>61</sup>

In regions where *e* and *b* were early conflated (Table XVII (5)) the final vowel of AGLD fluctuates.

57 4. *Sg. dat. мнѣ, ти, сѣ* are unstressed enclitics, but unlike *мѣ*, etc., never appear after prepositions. They did not survive the 15th c. in the living language; *сѣ* was always rather rare.<sup>62</sup> Certain ChSl. clichés last longer, e.g. как ми Бог поможет (16th c.).

5. The *dual* forms disappear early outside ChSl. usage: *аще на лустити . . . аще ли наю погубиши* (RPC s.a. 1071).

58 6. *Pl. acc./dat.* The enclitic forms *ны, вы* disappear *pari passu* with those of the sg., perhaps rather earlier. Early examples: (acc.) *хочу на вы ити* (RPC s.a. 964); *послю по вы 'I shall send for you'* (ibid. 945); (dat.) *кто ны поможет* (ibid. 971).

7. *Pl. loc.* *Насъ, васъ* are the *only forms* to preserve the original loc. ending *-sŭ*, changed in the fem. *ā-* and *ǰā-* stems to *-axъ/-yaxъ* by analogy with the phonetically correct *-ъхъ, -ѣхъ, -ѣхъ* < *-isŭ, -isŭ, -oisŭ* (the 'iurk' rule: after these four sounds *s* > *x* in ChSl.).

8. *Pl. 2nd pers.* *Вы* becomes the formula of politeness only in the 18th c. under French influence (5.32 *ad fin.*). There are some examples from the later 17th c.: *Покстине, дядюшка, прельщени есте вы* (Житие боярыни Морозовой . . . , 7. 32).

<sup>61</sup> От *тобе, у себе, etc.* are still sparingly attested in dialect. *Тобѣ/собѣ* also occur as AG.

<sup>62</sup> It survives in the Slavonicism *восвойся 'homewards'* (now only used humorously). Short forms *мѣ, etc.*, *дат. ми от ме, etc.*, occur here and there in dialect but are surely recent allegro forms: this is fairly clear in *я те дам! 'I'll give you what for!'*

TABLE XI. Pronoun of the Third Person

	Early ESl.			OCS (ChSl.)		
	м.	п.	ф.	м.	п.	ф.
Sg. N	—	—	—	<i>i (ji)¹</i>	<i>je¹</i>	<i>ja¹</i>
A	и, его	е	ю	<i>i (ji)</i>	<i>je</i>	<i>jo</i>
G	его	его	еб	<i>jego</i>	<i>jego</i>	<i>jeje</i>
L	(н)емь	(н)емь	(ей)	<i>jemi</i>	<i>jemi</i>	<i>jei</i>
D	ему	ему	ей (ей)	<i>jemu</i>	<i>jemu</i>	<i>jei</i>
I	имь	имь	ею	<i>imi</i>	<i>imi</i>	<i>jejo</i>
Du. NA	я	и	и	<i>ja</i>	<i>i (ji)</i>	<i>i (ji)</i>
GL	ею			<i>jeju</i>		
DI	има			<i>ima</i>		
Pl. N	—	—	—	<i>i (ji)¹</i>	<i>ja¹</i>	<i>je¹</i>
A	ѣ	я	ѣ	<i>je</i>	<i>ja</i>	<i>je</i>
G	ихъ			<i>ixŭ</i>		
L	(н)ихъ			<i>ixŭ</i>		
D	имъ			<i>imŭ</i>		
I	ими			<i>imi</i>		

<sup>1</sup> As nominatives only in the relative pronoun *ихже* (4.12).

### Pronoun of the Third Person

#### Commentary to Table XI

59 1. This anaphoric pronoun lost its *nominatives* from the beginning of the ESl. tradition in favour of the short forms of the demonstrative *онъ* (§61 below): *онъ, онѣ, она; онѣ (онѣ)*. The nominatives are in any case sparingly used down to the 15th c., the verbal form sufficing unless emphasis was required. Strict reference to the *last* noun of the right gender (as now) does not apply before the 15th c.

The *accusatives*, however, remained in use as unstressed enclitics (cf. *мѣ, etc.*, above) but finally yield to the AG *его, его, еб; ихъ, etc.* including the *neuter*, both sg. and pl. (the only instance of acc. = gen. outside animates). Examples:

sg. masc. acc.: *то ему за платѣжь оже и били* } и = 'him'  
 то оному вести и по кунамъ }

but also: *оже ли не будетъ кто его мьстя* (all RP, 1282)

fem. acc.: *и вря ю за Ярополка* (RPC s.a. 977). So still *кто коли на ню* *возрять* (1393)



neut. acc.: велѣль есмь бити въ не (1130) (*vŭ-n-ję*)  
but: понесеть его домовъ (1230)  
pl. masc. acc.: покоривше я под ся (RPC s.a. 898; ChSl.).

2. The sg. fem. gen. *ęb* > *ęę* > *ęĕ*. The pronunciation *ęĕ* still exists in some dialects.

The sg. LI lose the final palatalization as in nouns and adjectives (6.11): *moderŭ nĕm*, *im*.

60 3. *Erenthetic* *n-*. This arose from the prepositions \**ŭn* (instr.),<sup>63</sup> \**kŭn* (dat.), and \**vŭn* (acc. and loc.) > *сѣ*, *къ*, *въ*. Normal syllabification of the word-group (the preposition being proclitic) caused transference of the *-n* to the pronoun: \**vŭn jęmŭ* (*vŭ/nję/mŭ*) > *въ* *нѣмъ*. This procedure was early (partly in ChSl.) generalized to *all* true prepositions, to the gen., and partly to the prepositions used as verbal prefixes. After prepositions the old sg. acc. will therefore appear as *нъ* (*nŭ*), e.g.

то 40 грѣ[и]ѣ[н]ѣтъ положиши за нъ (RP, art.1).

With the obsolescence of the enclitics such forms remain only in cpds. such as *занѣ(же)* 'since', *понеже* 'inasmuch as' (both neut. e).<sup>64</sup>

In the case of 'impure' prepositions the *n-* is hardly obligatory before the 19th c.: *между ими* (RPC s.a. 996), *позъ между нѣми*; *мимо егѡ* > *мѣмо нѣгѡ*; *пѡсле нѣгѡ*. Vulgarly the *n-* is attached also in other syntactical contexts: в *пѡльзу нѣѡ*, *горѣздо ширѣ нѣгѡ*.<sup>65</sup>

In free position (not bound to a preposition) forms with erenthetic *n-* are fairly widespread in dialect, e.g. dat. *нѣму* (N. dial.).

<sup>63</sup> \**vŭn* is seen in the alternative form *sp-* (before consonants), e.g. *spĕdŭti* 'neighbour' > *сусѣд*, common in early ESL and elsewhere but now only dialectal in Russian (standard *сосѣд* < *sŭ-sĕdŭ*).

<sup>64</sup> They are better preserved in Pol., e.g. *zaŭ*, *paŭ*, *oŕeŭ*, etc., which, however, are now used also in reference to *plurals*.

<sup>65</sup> Examples from other contexts: *поднимать* (usual) but also *подымать*; *принять*, *отнять* (simple verb *ŭti* obsolete: не яша ся по то 'they would not agree to do so' (Novg. Chr., s.a. 1215)); Slavonicism *предпринять* but *предпрѣтъ* 'undertaking'. A simple verb *нѣти* was sometimes extracted from these dominant forms.

Various mistakes naturally occur: *япрѡ* > *vŭ-n-ĕdra* (n. 95 below), whence a new noun *нѣдра* pl.; *раз-орѣтъ* 'destroy' but *vŭn-orŭti* > depreffixed \**norŭti* > *ронити* (R. *уронитъ*, *ронять* 'let fall'). Cf. Eng. an *adder* < a *nadder* (Ger. *Natter*), an *orange* < a \**norange* (Pers. *narani*).

## DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS

61 ESL inherited a three-member system corresponding to the three persons:

*сѣ*, *се*, *си* (*сѣ*): 'this' (near me; Lat. *hic*);  
*тѣ*, *то*, *та*: 'that' (near you; Lat. *iste*);  
*онѣ*, *оно*, *она*: 'that' (distant; Lat. *ille*).

This system is still active in Русская Правда (1282; original 11th c.): и *се*му платити что у него погыбло; и *се*му платити тому же платити; а что с *нимъ* погыбло, а того *ему* желѣти, а *оному* желѣти *своихъ* *кунѣ*.

For the forms see Table XII.

As a demonstrative *онѣ* dropped out of its special function, the short nominatives becoming 3rd pers. pronouns (§59 above), the long forms *онѣнѣ*, etc., remaining as Slavonicisms and in official use down to the 19th c. Relics are found in a few obsolescent phrases: *намѣдни* 'the other day' (< *loc. ономъ дне*), *об он пол* 'on the far side' (cf. и *ста Володимѣръ об онѣ полъ города*, RPC s.a. 988); во *врѣмя оно* 'in days of yore' (Slavonicism; original sense (in the Gospels) 'in those days'). A binary system sufficed in living speech.

With the fall of the *ŭers*, *сѣ*, *тѣ* are reinforced either as *сей*, *той* or as reduplicated *сеесъ*, *тогъ* (< *сѣсѣ*, *тѣтѣ*). These were regional solutions, with a considerable variety of forms: masc. sg. nom. *той*, *тѣи*, *ог тей* (after *сей*), fem. sg. NA *тая*, *тую* or *та*, *ту*; neut. sg. NA *тоѡ* or *то*; masc. pl. nom. *тѣи*; *et sim.*:

*пр[о] сея мирѣ* (Smolensk, 1229);

*тая правда оузяти роусиноу* (Smolensk, 1229) (side by side with *такова правда, такоу правдоу*);

*тогъ Йволгѣтѣ* *тѣи Йволгѣ* (Pskov, c.1464);

*тоѡ пшво и медѣ* *поимали наши люди* (Pskov, c.1464).

Forms of *той* and *тогъ* are still used more or less indifferently by Pososhkŏn (c.1724).

*Сеесъ* was always rarer than *сей*. The word eventually became bookish (official use or Slavonicism), remaining in a few set phrases: *се азѣ* (§54 above); *сегѡдня* 'today'; *сейчасъ* 'at once'; *до сих пор* 'up till now'; *ни то ни сѣ* 'neither';<sup>66</sup> *сию минуту* 'at once' (bookish); and dial. *днесъ* 'today' (< *днь-сѣ*).<sup>67</sup>

<sup>66</sup> Cf. *там* и *сѣмъ* 'here and there'; так и *сѣкъ* 'thus and thus'.

<sup>67</sup> Also others on this model: *вперѣсѣ*, *лонѣсѣ* 'last year'.



## Notes

- (a) The strengthening suffix -то is almost but not quite universal: OCS has normally *ničtože* 'nothing' but also *ničže*, whence two (ChSl.) verbs *unichtožiti* 'annihilate' and *unicžžati* 'disparage'. So also Pol. *zacz* < \**za-čj* and *čakavic* SCl. *ča* < *čj*.
- (b) AG *koró* is regular and universal from CSI. onwards.
- (c) Къто and чъто are among the earliest words to show loss of pretonic *jer* (2.13).
- (d) Цѣмь early restores the velar as *кѣмь* > *кемь*; *цѣмь* follows *кѣмь(ь)* as *чѣмь(ь)* from the 14th c.
- (e) Чесо (properly чъсо) is a unique survival in CSI. of a well-attested IE gen. in -s-. This and the late analogical forms *чесоро*, *чесому*, *чесомь* must be considered Slavonicisms in ESL.<sup>70</sup>
- (f) Derivatives are of the types: никто 'nobody' (ChSl. usually *никтоже*); нѣкто 'a certain person'; кто-го 'a certain person, someone'; кто-нибудь 'someone, anyone'<sup>71</sup> (generalizing *ни*; 4.30); кто-либо 'anyone' (earlier -любо: *аже пьрьстьгь оутъятьь кьли-любо*, RP, art. 23).
- (g) Кто, что from early times stand for indefinites in conditional clauses: *аже кто кого ударить батою* (RP, art. 23); *оу кого ся избить оучанъ* (1229); *оже ли не боудеть кто его мьстя* (RP, *ad init.*) ('if anyone', 'if anyone's', 'if no one . . .').
- (h) Кто almost always takes sg. agreement but a pl. is occasionally necessary: *кто же должнѣ быть дѣрскими советниками?*
- (i) At the colloquial level *ничего* is used as subject as well as object: *ничего не мешѣет*.

## 63 INTERROGATIVE ADJECTIVES

The simple adj. from the interrogative stem \**ki-jj* > *кьли/кой*, *кѣе*, *каъ* 'what, which'<sup>72</sup> is not rare in ChSl. and remained in деловой язык as a *relative* (4.16); the neuter *кѣе* was widely used therein as a *conjunction* (потому *кѣе* (1576) = потому что). Срps. of *кой* retained a certain currency, especially *никой*: *а со мною нѣтъ ничего*, *никая книга* (Af. Nik., 15th c.); *modern* *ни в кѣем случае 'оп по account'*; *нѣкий* (нѣкий, a Slavonicism) 'a certain' (нѣкий Иванов); and petrified in the срps. *кѣе-кто* (*кой-кто*) 'a

<sup>70</sup> Чъсо is better preserved in Pol. NA *co* < gen. *czso*.

<sup>71</sup> -то indicates ignorance but *no choice* (*кто-то идѣтъ по улице*), *нибудь* (and more literary *либо*) *choice* (*пошлите кого-нибудь*).

<sup>72</sup> Best preserved as an *interrogative* in SSl.: SCl. *кой*, Blg. *кой*.

few people', *кѣе-чтѣ* 'this and that', *кѣе-гдѣ* 'here and there', *кѣе-как* 'somehow or other'. A few other expressions such as *на кой чѣрт* 'what the devil' belong to country speech. It appears also to be concealed as a short neut. pl. in *покамест* < \**po ka mesta* = 'as far as which places (times)'

## 64 RELATIVE PRONOUNS

For the use and chronology of *кто*, *что*, *который*, etc. in this function see 4.12 ff.

As in many languages, the true relative series in *j-* was lost in the vernacular quite early and replaced by the corresponding interrogatives in *k-*; the relative *етерьъ* is unknown in ESL. but occurs in OCS (ChSl.), rarely as a relative, usually in an evolved sense 'a certain' (= *нѣкий*), e.g. in *Ostr.*; cf. *RPC s.a.* 1074: *аще который братъ въ етеро прегрѣшенъ впадше . . .* ('fell into any sin'); *аще братъ етеръ выидше из манастьря . . .* ('if any brother . . . = аще который братъ').

The same applies to *когда*, *какъ* (*како*), *колько* (> *сколько*), *и где*, which replace *егдѣ*, *яко*, *елѣко*, and *иде(же)* (i.e. *jide*). All these became components of ChSl. style at an early date, though *егдѣ* remains fairly frequent in less learned texts (like ChSl. *аще*). See Table XIII. The only living срpd. of *который* is *нѣкоторый* (нѣ-) 'some, certain'; *никоторый* has been replaced by *никакой* (*никоторымъ* *временемъ* его не отстати (1435)).

## 65 POSSESSIVE ADJECTIVES

*Мой*, etc., *наш* (early ESL. *нашь*), etc., and *чей* 'whose' (which is either interrogative or relative<sup>73</sup>) decline according to the 'soft' variants (Table XII): sg. gen. *моего*, *чьего*, etc.; pl. gen. *моихъ*, *чьихъ*, etc. Their history calls for no special comment.<sup>74</sup> Свой 'one's own' has always referred to all persons and numbers as subject. There may be no expressed subject in more popular usage: *свой рубѣшка бѣже к телу* = 'blood is thicker than water'.

In OCS (ChSl.) and literary Russian the possessives of the 3rd person are taken from the pronoun: *его*, *её*, *их* *книга* (immediately before or after the noun). So ChSl. *самому* ему и подружню его

<sup>73</sup> Чья *это* *книга*? 'Whose book is this?' *Сосѣдъ*, *чья* *собака* *убѣжала* 'the neighbour whose dog ran away'. Note also neg. *ничѣй* 'nobody's'; in games *ничьё* = 'a draw' (sc. *сторонѣ*, *партню*).

<sup>74</sup> There is a special stress *по-моему*, etc., 'in my opinion' (dat. *моему*), perhaps after *по-нашему*.

Феофанъ и чадомъ ею (dual gen.) (*Ostr.*, colophon). Slavonized orthography distinguished possessive ея from the fem. acc. pronoun ея down to 1917.

The tendency to create adjectives analogical to мой, etc., is widespread (particularly in SSL).<sup>75</sup> but has been rejected by literary Russian. Such forms as его́вый 'his', ейный 'her', ихний 'their' (also ихий, иховий) have clearly long existed in popular speech, especially in N. dialects, and may be found in texts of the 16th–17th c. There is an exceptional example in *Stoglav* (1551), §101: его́вымъ небрежемъ. An example from popular language: а буде кони [sic] ихны вамъ надобъ на обменю [= обменъ] (1578).

The *dative of possession* is used in OCS (ChSl.) and is often to be accounted a Slavonicism in Russian: отецъ ми бысть священникъ Петръ (followed by отецъ мой); имя ей Анастасия (Avvakúm). See 4.47.

## VARIOUS

66 (i) Identity is shown by adding же: тот же 'the same' (strengthened тот же самый); similarly тоже, также 'also, likewise'.

(ii) Сам(ъ), самó, самá, pl. сами 'self' and the adjective самый 'same, very'. The declension of сам is 'mixed' (Table XII, n. 1): sg. gen. самогó (adj. самогo), but the fem. sg. acc. is either саму́ or newet самоё (by rhyme with её).

(iii) Другой 'other' and the more learned иной are pure adjectives. The reciprocal relation is shown by друг друга, instr. друг с другом *et sim.* (singular forms only), with друг invariable (i.e. no gender distinctions). Друг is here clearly the noun.

(iv) Каждый 'each, every' derives from къ-ждо with invariable suffix (masc./neut. кождо, fem. каждо, masc. sg. gen. кождо<sup>76</sup>). There is an occasional ChSl. variant къ-ждѣ, perhaps the original form (the suffix is obscure). The declension was, as in many numerals, early transferred to the end of the word, the first pronominal element petrifying as ка- (fem. or analogy of ка-к?). Modern forms are found from the 14th–15th c.: каждому (1398).

(v) Весь 'all' (stem vis'-) has mixed declension (Table XII, n. 1). Soft oblique forms всех, etc., also occur. The pl. nom. *vísi, vísjá, víšé* (ChSl. *víšé*) is replaced by genderless в(ъ)сѣб by the 16th c.

<sup>75</sup> e.g. Ср. *нѣгов, нѣшов, нѣшн.*

<sup>76</sup> По голуби [dat.] комуждо 'one pigeon each' (*RPC s.a.* 945).

67 No Slav language except Bulgarian and Macedonian has developed a definite article (один acts as an indefinite one when required). The source of the Big. innovation (a 'Balkanism' triggered by the presence of an article in Greek, Albanian, and Balkan Romance) can be seen in OCS in the frequent postposition of the demonstrative гъ (less often съ), which with the changes in the jers gives (late OCS) домогъ < домъ гъ 'that house, the house'. The same procedure, certainly unconnected with Balkan developments, turns up in ESL. in N. dialects: домог, рекага, селогo. It did not, however, reach the state of a fully systematized article, since declension nowhere completely broke down (though some confusion of cases is widespread; 6.22). The most typical N. dial. system is

sg. N: -от (m.), -то (n.), -га (f.);

sg. A: -от (m.), -то (n.), -ту (f.);

pl. NA (all genders): -ге, -ти, от -ты;

all oblique cases: -го.

In the more rudimentary systems the affix is always -го.

Avvakúm, who came from the region of Níznyi Nóvgorod and therefore spoke a Vladímír-Vólga dialect, occasionally introduces these forms into the most colloquial parts of his narrative, but quite sporadically and without apparent stylistic intention: Увы мнѣ! Какъ доценик-огъ в воду-гу не погрязъ со мною? Стало у меня в гъ поры кости-ге щемить и жилы-гъ тянуть, и сердце зашлось, да и умирать стальъ.

This feature has never entered the spoken or literary standard.

## ADVERBS

68 Adverbs are of three main kinds:

1. Basic adverbs of time and space with suffixes *-de, -da, etc.* (See Table XIII).

2. Petrified case-forms of nouns and adjectives, with or without a preposition: see §49 (b) above.

Here also дома 'at home' and вчера 'yesterday' which may derive from an obsolete sg. instr. or ablative (= gen.).

Forms in the instr. case (all numbers) *without* preposition are particularly numerous, some with differentiating stress: sg. верхом 'on horseback', бером 'at a run', кругом 'around' (noun instr.

> как. Some of the reductions are recorded from the 14th c. The ordinary phonetic laws do not apply. После is probably from *poslěti* (type (c) above).

(e) Тóже and earlier *тáже*<sup>78</sup> 'also' appear to rest on CSL. \**úid-je* (neut. sg. acc.) and \**tó-ge* (neut. sg. instr.) respectively. In other words, in ESL there has been confusion of two suffixes—the *je* of identity and an intensive *же* < \**ge* (cf. Gk. *γε*) which probably also provided the *-g-* of *ko-g-da*, *ko-go*, et sim.

(f) *Miscellaneous formations*. Of verbal origin are: *ведь* < *pres. sg. 1 вѣдѣ* (§93 below) 'I know', *чуть* 'scarcely' < inf. *чути* = *чутья*, and *почтѣ* 'almost', imperat. sg. 2 of *почѣсть* 'reckon' (почтѣ сто = 'count as being 100').

The various pronominal and adverbial series are resumed in Table XIII.

#### 70 Commentary to Table XIII

1. Col. 7 is a more learned synonym of col. 8.
2. Col. 13: see 4.3 (4).
3. *Сиць* 'of this kind'; cf. *Avvakúm* since начало 'beginning as follows'.
4. Яко: various senses, including conjunction (4.20 *ad fin.*) and adverb 'approximately' (об яко подлень).
5. Only in the phrase так и сяз (cf. там и сяз); сязов- also occurs: о сязовых бо Давыдъ глаголаше (RPC s.a. 969).
6. Russian has muddled *inaко* 'otherwise' with *inače* 'in one way'. Other formations of the latter type are ChSl.: *таѣ*, *обаѣ* ('in both ways' > 'however').
7. The series камо originally implied *motion* (= куда);<sup>79</sup> *сѣмо/сѣм* and *там(о)* have become *static* and камо has disappeared. (По)всюду has also become *static*. Камо, тамо = 'whither, thither' are to be presumed in камь его хочеть, тамъ дѣжетъ (1229).
8. Colloquially also the series докуда, досюда, дотуда ('how far?').
9. ChSl. rare отнюдуже (e.g. RPC s.a. 1054) 'whence'.

<sup>78</sup> Та 'and then' as a conjunction may belong here. It is frequent in the colloquial portion of Vladimir Monomakh's *Admonition* (text no. 9) and survives in Ukr.

<sup>79</sup> The type куда originally implied 'by what way?' The final vowel was -и (CSL. \**kaida*), which survives in *всюду*. The same -мо of motion is seen in *мамо* 'past' and *прѣ-мо* < *prě-mo* (2.10). SCr. preserves *оvamo*, *оnamo* = 'hither, thither' and *оvuda*, *оnuda* = 'this way, that way'.

вѣром, бѣгом, кругом); даром 'in vain'; целиком 'wholly'; днём 'by day'; ночью 'at night'; дорóгой 'on the way'; частью 'partly'; *du. весьма* 'very' and some others, all ChSl.; pl. *вельмѣ* 'very', also ChSl. The type in -ы (OCS *malъ, pravu*) has not survived in Russian, except for -ски (see below). Note also the popular intensive type *давным-давно* 'long ago'.

3. Neut. short adjectives—the general living type. CSL. (OCS) used both the neut. sg. acc. *dobro* and loc. ('in some cases instr.) *dobré*.<sup>77</sup> WSl. has favoured the loc., ESL. the acc., but the loc. is present also in many dialects, at least from a restricted number of adjectives. In early texts forms in -ѣ are usually Slavonicisms, e.g. добръ стъвора (NBG, no. 9, c.1200), reproducing a Byzantine epistolary formula (the language is otherwise colloquial). ChSl. tended to enlarge the number of forms in -ѣ.

Adverbs in -о sometimes preserve the original stress while the neut. predicative has an analogical one: adv. мало, pred. малó (after малá).

69 (a) Adjectives in -ский form an adverb in -ски (presumably pl. instr.) either alone or with prefixed по-: *скотъски* 'in a bestial manner' (RPC, *ad init.*), *дружески* 'in a friendly manner', *мертвѣцки* пьян 'dead drunk'. The type по-рус(ь)ски would appear to have arisen by a crossing of рус(ь)ски with the dat. formula по-рус(ь)скому; cf. по-новому 'in a new way', по-разному 'in different ways'.

(b) The colloquial type *стоймѣ* 'upright', *плашмѣ* 'flat', *лежмѣ* (= лёжа) must be founded on the *du. instr. -ма* with a similar development to *дѣвма* > *двумѣ* (§72 below).

(c) An obsolete CSL. sg. loc. in -ѣ is to be traced in such forms as *олять* 'backwards' > 'again'; *прочь* (cf. noun прокъ); (ChSl.) *впередь*; *вдóволь* 'enough'; but the formation is not always clear; *прер.* + fem. noun is certainly component, e.g. *внутрь* (loc. *внутрѣ*), *пообдаль* 'further off', *наземь*, *вплоть* (до), *наискось* 'on a slant'.

(d) Adverbs and similar auxiliary words are particularly liable to abbreviation in speech: *лише* > *лишь*, *сквозѣ* > *сквозь* (preposition); *similarly нѣту* > *нет* (§90 below), *тамо* > *там*, *како*

<sup>77</sup> Not to be confused with the type in -је, already obsolescent in OCS: *таѣ* (= *taiko*), *древѣ*, *прѣздѣ*, *далѣѣ* (= *daleko*), *раѣѣ* (cf. *paiky*), and probably *јѣѣ* (etymology uncertain). OCS forms in -ѣ are few: *dobré, ljude, mrd-ѣ, pravѣ*.

TABLE XIII. Conspectus of Pronominal and Adverbial Series

	1	2	3	4	5	6
who?	кто [нже]	(сей) \$тот (\$61 above)	то	то	(онъ, оны) (\$61 above)	никто
what?	что	[же] (4.12)	\$то	то		ничто
what kind of?	какой (каковой)	[снп, снпъ]	такой (таковой)			никакой (никоторый)
which of a series?	чей	чей	(possessive pronouns)			ничей
whose?	какой (\$63 above)	[яко]	(сам)²	так(о)		никак (никой)
how?	где (камо)³	где [иже]¹⁴	здесь (*st-de-st)	там(о)	ту(т)	нигде
where?	куда (куди)⁵	[уда] [ямо]	сюда (сма) [сбмо]	туда (туди)		ниоткуда
whence?	откуда⁸	(See §70 (9))	отсюда	оттуда	[оногда]	ниоткуда
when?	когда (кошкко)	[гда]	теперь¹⁰	тогда		никогда
how much?	сколько¹¹,¹²	(понеже)	потому	столько¹¹		нисколько, not at all
why? (reason)	почему, отчего	(понеже)		потому, оттого		
why? (purpose)	зачем	(заче)		затем (чтобы)		

	7¹	8²	9²	10²	11	12	13²
who?	[нкто]	кто-то	кто-нибудь/либо	кое-кто	каждый 'each' (\$66 (iv) above)		некто, etc.
what?	[нчто]	что-то	что-нибудь/либо	кое-что	(do.)		ничему, etc.
what kind of?			какой-то	кое-какой	всякий 'every kind of'	никой 'other'	
which of a series?	некоторый	(a) certain, some	чей-то	кое-как	[всячески] 'in every way' otherwise		
whose?	[нкий] а	чей-то	чей-нибудь/либо				
what?		как-то	как-нибудь/либо				
how?		где-то	где-нибудь/либо	кое-где	везде		
where?	(нкуда)	куда-то	куда-нибудь/либо				
whither?		откуда-то	откуда-нибудь/либо				
whence?					отовсюду 'from all directions'		
when?	некогда	когда-то	когда-нибудь/либо	кое-когда	всегда	ниогда	
how much?		некоторко	сколько-нибудь 'to any degree'				
why? (reason)			почему-то				
why? (purpose)							ничему

The forms in square brackets are to be considered *Slavonisms*, those in parentheses antequated or unusual in modern standard Russian. Superior figures refer to numbered paragraphs of commentary in §70.

10. Earliest form *то-перво*<sup>80</sup> (e.g. *RPC s.a.* 988); much variation in dialect. There is no evidence for \**сгда* in ESL.

11. Cpds. *насколькo/настолькo* 'to what extent' and *по-сколькy* (поеліку ChSl.) 'inasmuch as'.

12. The differences between cols. 7, 8, 9, and 10 are given in §62 (f).

13. The adj. *колікъ* is the normal early form. The sg. loc. of the root-word *kolī* (*ī*-stem adj.) has survived in subliterate *колі* 'if, when'; the sg. gen. in *доколіб* (still used by 18th c. poets). *Коль*, *сколь*, and *кольмі* are high literary Slavonicisms. The reduction of the vowel and addition of the prefix of approximation (*c* + acc. 'about') take place in the 15th–16th c. The relative *jelī* is not attested in ESL.; there are only the ChSl. cpds. *do-n-eležē* 'until' and *jelē* (> *эле*) 'hardly, scarcely', now well acclimatized in colloquial (он *эле жив*; *эле-эле* 'barely'). Derivatives of *selī* and *tolī* are also virtually disused: *ot(ū)tolē*, *dotolē*; *ot(ū)selē(va)*, *doselē(va)*.

14. ChSl. *ideže* has the cpd. *do-n-ideže* > *доңдэже* 'as long as'.

15. Also *некамо*: *уже намъ нѣкамо ся дѣти* (*RPC s.a.* 917). Long extinct.

#### Numerals

##### 71 Unity

ESL. *одинъ*, OCS (ChSl.) *jedinū*, is a cpd. of \**jed-i* (cf. OCS *jed(ū)va*, R. dial. *одв́а*) and the true numeral *ин-* (cf. *иной* 'other', *инок* 'monk', *инорог* 'unicorn'), corresponding to Lat. *ūnus* < \**oin-os*. In declension the stem varies between *один-* and *одинъ-*; the latter was generalized (*одиногó*, etc.). It was no doubt a colloquial allegro form since the same variation is found in OCS (standard *jedinago*, etc., later *Supr.*, etc., *jedina*, *jednoje*, *et sim.*). The modern pl. declension has been attracted to the 'soft' pronouns: *одинъ*, *одинихъ*, etc. The pl. is used: (i) with *pluralia tantum*, *одинъ часы* 'a single watch'; hence 'only': в *одинъ* *трусикахъ* *parallel* to в *одной* *рубашке* 'in nothing but a shirt'; (ii) in the alternatives *одинъ . . . другие* 'some . . . others'; (iii) as an adj. 'alone' (extension of (i)): *пастухъ были не одинъ*. All words in *еп-* are Slavonicisms, e.g. *единица* 'unit', *единственный* 'sole', as opposed to

<sup>80</sup> Already present in later OCS *toprivo/toprivo* (in *Supr.*) and current also in WSl. (Cz. *terpiv*, Pol. *dopiero*). Теперь takes over from *ныне* in the 16th–17th c.

R. *одинóчество* 'solitude', *одинáково* 'alike' (мне всё *одинáково* 'it's all the same to me'), etc. (1.29).

##### 72 Two

Dual declension:

	<i>m.</i>	<i>n.</i>	<i>f.</i>
NA	дѣва	дѣвѣ	дѣвѣ
GL	дѣву	дѣвою	дѣвою
DI		дѣвма	

#### Notes

(i) The jer disappears early, being pretonic.

(ii) DI occasionally д(ъ)вома after the *o*-stem nouns.

(iii) GL д(ъ)ву is the commoner (and original). The form is more and more used for *any* oblique case, to which *plural* markers were eventually attached: dat. *двумъ*, GL *двухъ*. The process is only completed by the end of the 17th c.: the *Uloženie* of 1649 still uses gen. *дву*, loc. *двухъ*, dat. *двумъ*. An analogical *двѣмъ* (ъ) (after *дѣвма* and perhaps *трѣмъ*) is also found more rarely. *Двумъ* is first recorded in the early 16th c.

(iv) Instr. *дѣвма* survived into the 17th c. but had long been rivalled by *двумѣ* (after *трѣмѣ*) and the compromise *двума*. A form *дѣвма*, with unclear -я, is recorded from the 15th c. (*дѣвма* *поити* *нелъзя*, Af. Nik.) which with the stem *дву-* gives the modern standard *двумя*, only established in the 18th c.

(v) To form compounds either the gen. *дву* (rarely *двою*) or (later) *двухъ* is used, e.g.:

двоюрóднъй братъ 'second cousin' (oldest type)

двуязычнъй 'bilingual' (ChSl.)

двуглáвнъй орёлъ 'double-headed eagle' (ChSl.)

двусмысленнъй 'ambiguous' (ChSl.)

двухднѣвнъй 'lasting two days' (newest type)

двухмѣстнъй 'two-seater' (newest type)

(vi) The neut. NA early becomes д(ъ)ва except in *двести* (§79 below); the fem. form *две* has been retained.

(vii) Оба 'both' originally followed *дѣва* exactly, i.e. oblique cases *обою*, *обѣма*, and the NA is still in agreement: *масc./neut.* *оба*, fem. *обе*. However, the oblique stem became predominantly *обѣ-* (gen. *обѣю* 1339) and there was further confusion with the forms of the adjectival *обои* (§84 below), leading to the variable forms gen. *обѣихъ*(ъ)/*обѣихъ*(ъ), dat. *обѣимъ*(ъ)/*обѣимъ*(ъ), etc.

(. . . что имъ къ суду обвѣмъ стая (Кот.) 'both of them must appear before the court'). The formalization of обѣих, etc., as masc./neut. and обѣих, etc., as fem. only was a more or less arbitrary decision of the early 19th c. (N. Grech, 1827).

73 *Three*

The declension was the pl. of an *i*-stem noun:

	<i>m.</i>	<i>n.</i>	<i>f.</i>
N	три <sup>81</sup>	три	три
A	три (later N or G)		
G	три <sup>82</sup>		
L	трѣхъ		
D	трѣмъ		
I	трѣми		

*Notes*

- (i) Like all such pl. nom. три<sup>81</sup> is given up early in favour of три, thus removing gender entirely.  
 (ii) LD трѣхъ, трѣмъ evolve *regularly* to трѣх, трѣм.  
 (iii) The theoretical gen. \*трѣй never established itself in face of analogical трѣх (after всех, двух, etc.).  
 (iv) Instr. (regular) трѣми and трѣма (after двѣма/двума) are used indifferently down to the 17th c. Трѣма, first recorded 1571 on the analogy of двѣма, eventually becomes standard.  
 (v) The further influence of два can be seen in a sporadic form such as GL трѣю.  
 (vi) Cpds. are in (learned) тре- and (more recent) трѣх-: треугольник 'triangle'; трѣхмѣсячный 'quarterly'.

74 *Four*

The declension was the plural of a consonant stem (§820 ff. above):

	<i>m.</i>	<i>n.</i>	<i>f.</i>
N	четыре	четыри	четыри
A	четыри (later N or G)		
G		четырь	
L		четырьхъ	
D		четырьмъ	
I		четырьми	

<sup>81</sup> Representing *triĵe* (cf. пуги, §18 above).

<sup>82</sup> Representing *triĵi*.

<sup>83</sup> Ярославичи же трие (RPC s. a. 1067).

*Notes*

- (i) Here the masc. четыре has prevailed for all genders.  
 (ii) The rest follows the evolution of три: GL четырѣх, dat. четыремъ, instr. четырьмя (after considerable currency of DI четыр(ь)ма).

(iii) An occasional instr. четырью is modelled on пятыю.

(iv) Cpds. only in четырѣх-; четырёхсторонний 'quadrilateral'.

*Note on 2-4.* The instr. двумя, трѣми/трѣми, четырьми still exist in dialects. Conversely, some N. dialects have generalized the ending -мя of these numerals to all or most *pronominals* (всемя, темя, своимя, etc.).

75 *Five-Nine*

(i) These numerals were fem. *i*-stem nouns in the sg. down to the 16th c.; see further 4.74 ff. The declension has remained that of an *i*-stem with final stress: пяти, пятью. A distinction is made in the instr. between normal пятью and multiplicative пятью (пятью пять 'five times five').

(ii) Шесть often made oblique cases шти, as if from \*шьсть (2.32).

(iii) The ESL form of 'seven' is семь, as opposed to ChSl. седмь, and of 'eight' восемь (influenced by семь), as opposed to ChSl. осмь. For the initial в- see 6.27 (1)(a).

76 *Ten*

Десять was originally a masc. consonant-stem noun in -t-, e.g. sg. GL десятѣ, pl. nom. десятѣ, gen. десятѣ. At an early date it was assimilated to дѣвятъ and thus confined to the sg. forms, except for the pl. gen. in cpds. (пять-десятъ 'fifty'; §78 below). The sg. loc. also survived for some time in the *teens* side by side with newer десятѣ (§77 below).

77 *Teens*

The structure три на десятѣ (loc.) 'three onto ten' is peculiar to Slav. At first treated as phrases (gen. одного на десятѣ *et sim.*), they were soon contracted in speech, certainly from the 14th c.; but examples are few since numerals were usually expressed by their alphabetical signs (Table II). In the early stages the second half was usually -нацати, finally -нацать after the pattern of the



nominatives of 5-9. The first half was still either declined correctly or (more often) stood in the gen. as with the cpds. mentioned above (§§72-4):

ген. у дванадцати человекъ (1597)  
 меньши осинадцати лѣтъ (1649)  
 дат. по пятнадцати рублевъ.

With final assimilation of the second half to nom. form the declension was transferred entirely to the end of the word and the first half reverted to nom. form, which had always been the case with *одинъ*. 'Twelve' has *дванадцать* for no clear reason.

The final modern forms are not reached till the 17th c.

78 *Decades*

(i) Двѣдцать 'twenty' is based on the du. два десяти and тридцать 'thirty' on the pl. три(е) десятѣ, with the same assimilation to the type 5-9 as in the teens. Stages can be seen in *тремядесятъ* (1284) and *тридцѣсти* (14th c.).

(ii) *Fifty-eighty*. These are cpds. with the pl. gen.: пятьдесятъ. Declension as a cpd. remained current: в семидесятъ судехъ; во штидесятъ верстахъ. Once again the second half was assimilated to the type 5-9, except in the nom., so that the modern standard has become:

NA пятьдесят  
 GLD пятидесятъ  
 I пятидесятью

The further assimilation *пятидесятью* is widespread in speech but subliterary.

(iii) *Forty*. The original formula *четыредесятѣ* (still used by most Slav languages) was early replaced by the colloquial *Нѣвогород терм сорокъ*, a standard bag in the fur trade containing forty skins;<sup>84</sup> cf. modern *сорочка* 'caul, shirt'.<sup>85</sup> There is an early example in *Русская Правда* (not later than 1282, probably 11th c.): въ чьехъ же вьрви голова лежить, то л. [80] гр[иве]нъ; паки людинъ, то сорокъ гривенъ.

*Сорок* was a normal o-stem noun:

<sup>84</sup> Furs continued to be sold in forties down to the 17th c.

<sup>85</sup> Though not unusual in special vocabularies (e.g. Eng. *brace* = 2, *score* = 20; Ger. *Schock* = 60 (a 'shock' was a pile of sixty sheaves)), such words rarely become the sole numerical expression.

три сороки белъ (1397);  
 пять сороков бѣлки (15th c.);  
 а послан тот сорок в Литву (1584).

It was gradually assimilated to the reduced declension of *сто* (§79 below), with all oblique cases *сорока* and the noun in the same case: *въ сорока верстахъ* (17th c.). The dat. *по сороку* is still sparingly used in the distributive sense.

(iv) *Nineety*. *Десятъ* *десять* also appears to be only ChSl. in ESl. usage. As early as 1265 we find an ESl. form *девяносто*, and about a century later *девяносто* by assimilation to *девятъ*. It too assumed the reduced declension of *сто*. Its form is far from clear; the first half may be an *ordinal* *девяно-*, suggesting a structural parallel to Goth. *niuntēhund*.

79 *Hundreds*

*Сто* (*състо*) was a normal neuter noun and so still in cpds.:

ду. д(ъ)въ с(ъ)тъ > двѣсти '200'  
 pl. ном. три, четъре ста '300', '400'  
 pl. gen. пять сот (< сътъ) '500'.

In the cpds. there has been attraction to the same case in all oblique cases: gen. *духсо́т*, dat. *трѣмста́м*, loc. *пятиста́хъ*, etc.

However, when used in isolation, *сто* developed a simple form *ста* for all oblique cases. The full neut. declension was still common in the 17th c. *По́ стю* '100 each' is still possible as well as the more usual *по́ ста*.

80 *Thousands*

The fem. noun *ты́сяча* is an ex-r.p.a., as OCS *тысящити/тысяшти* (fem. sg. nom.) and the parallel Goth. *þýsundi* show. Reinterpreted as a noun it is always followed by the pl. gen. of the thing counted. An instr. *ты́сячью*, by assimilation to the type 5-9, may be used if *ты́сяча* is not qualified by another numeral. The pl. gen. is *ты́сяч* (incorrectly *ты́сячѣй*).

81 *Fractions*

1. There are three primary words:

1/2: *пол(ъ)* (masc. *ѣ*-stem, §14 above), later also *половина*;

1/3: *треть* (fem. *ѣ*-stem);

1/4: *чѣтверть* (fem. *ѣ*-stem; often contracted in early texts to *чѣрь*).

Thereafter a suffix -ина was available. The type is now obsolete except for осьмина and десятina which survived until recently as terms of measurement (осьмина =  $\frac{1}{4}$  desjatina; десятina = about 3 acres).

2. Пол enters into composition in three ways:

- (a) Пóлдень 'midday', gen. пóлдня от полу́дня.  
 (b) Полу́круг 'semicircle'; полу́остров 'peninsula'; полу-свёт 'half-light'; полу́грамогный 'semiliterate'; полу́тон 'semitone'; полу́шутя 'half-joking'. Gen. полу́кру́га, etc.  
 (c) With second component in the gen.: полу́бутылки 'half-bottle'; полу́ба 'six months'; полу́сло́ва (с полу́сло́ва but also на полу́сло́ве); за полу́сны 'at half price'. In the oblique cases the first half usually (but not always) becomes полу- and the second half reverts to the case required:

полу́часом ра́ньше (from полу́часá 'half an hour')  
 в полу́бутылка́х

but also:

на полу́доро́ге, на полу́ти 'half-way'  
 впло́боса 'under one's breath'.

On this model small fractions and various composite numbers were formed before the 18th c.:

полу́(ть)трéти  $\frac{1}{6}$   
 полно́лтрéти  $\frac{1}{12}$

and with ordinals (short form):

полу́(ть) в(ъ)тора > полтора '1½'

(sc. 'half of the second integer').

Examples:

полу́трéтия деся́те гривны́ '25' (text no. 13)  
 въ полу́деся́ть рубле́хъ '9½'  
 на полу́трéтьяна́дцáте рубля́ '12½'  
 полу́се́мáдeся́ть '65'  
 въ полу́трéтьвэ́хъ рублéвхъ '250'.

Only полтора<sup>86</sup> '1½' and полтора́ста '150' remain in topa. The type półtrzecia (indecl.) is still current in Polish.

modern usage. The Westernization of mathematics under Peter the Great introduced the simpler models:

одна́ шéстья<sup>87</sup> (sc. часть от до́ля)  $\frac{1}{6}$   
 два с полови́ной '2½'.

## 82 Higher Numerals

Миллион comes into use in the 17th c., from which time all large numbers have been on Western models. Ты́ма '10,000' ('myriad') and various scarcely numerical learned words such as легион disappear.

## 83 Ordinals

The forms were:

	Short	Long
1	пéрв(ъ) (пéрв)	пéрвы́й
2	друг(ъ), в(ъ)тор(ъ)	друго́й, второ́й
3	трéтй, трéтeй	трéтий, трéтье, трéтья
4	чeтвeр(ъ)	чeтвeрты́й
5	пéт(ъ)	пéты́й
6	шéст(ъ)	шéстой
7	сeм(ъ)	сeдьмóй (dial. сeмóй and сeмьй)
8	? (OCS <i>osmъ</i> )	восьмóй
9	дeвят(ъ)	дeвятый
10	дeсят(ъ)	дeсятый

### Notes

(a) The first two are, as in many languages, not numerical.<sup>88</sup> 'Second' in ESL. was друг(ой) and so widely remains in dialect; the original usage is retained in на друго́й день 'the next day' and the marginally literary вдру́гбръдъ 'a second time, again' (see §85 (i) below). Второ́й is a Slavonicism, generalized from the ecclesiastical calendar, cf. на второ́й день пpáздника and второ́й 'Tuesday'. It becomes the normal literary word only from the 16th c.

(b) The Slavonicism сeдьмóй similarly became standard in the 17th c. (ChSL сeдьмóй день; сед(ъ)мiца 'week'; and other calendrical expressions). The now only dial. сeмóй will be found in early texts: до дне сeмаго (RPC s. a. 1066; Ukrainian still has сьомий).

<sup>87</sup> Две, три, etc.; шéстья (since шéстья is a nominalized adj.).

<sup>88</sup> Пър-в- cognate with \*per-/pro- 'in front'; втор- surely cognate with Gmc. \*anþar- (Eng. other, Ger. ander).

(c) The 'short' forms are now obsolete in literary usage except for *погорá* (§81 (2)(c) above) and the marginal country expressions *сам-друг* (not *сам-втор!*) 'myself and another', *сам-третей* 'the three of us', etc.

(d) Originals of the *teens* were originally *срd.* phrases (§77 above): *първъ* (первый) на *десяте* 'eleventh' (ChSl. also *единный* на *десяте*), etc.

By the 16th c. the ordinal component had become indeclinable with a connective vowel -o/e- and the second half took adjectival declension: *въ шестонацатой день*. They are gradually brought into line with the cardinals: *шестнадцатый*, etc., including 'eleventh' and 'twelfth' (*одиннадцатый*, *двенадцатый*).

Examples of *первый* на *десяте et sim.* in the 18th c. belong to the artificial high style.

84 *Collectives*

Three types:

- (i) Adj. *д(ъ)вой*, *д(ъ)вѣе*, *д(ъ)вѣя* (трой, обѣй).
- (ii) From *four* upwards *neut. nouns* *чѣтверо*, *gen. чѣтвера*, etc. The *sg.* declension of (i) (type *мой*) was little used; there remains only the *neut. NA* *двѣе*, *трѣе* (not *обѣе*), combined with the oblique *pl.* cases *двоих*, *троих*, etc.<sup>89</sup> *Чѣтверо*, etc., fall into the same pattern: *чѣтверо*, *чѣтверых*, etc. Forms beyond *сѣмеро* are now hardly ever found. The original sense of *двой*, *трой* was taken over by new derivatives *двойной* 'double', *двойкий* 'twofold' (это *можно понимать двойко* 'this can be taken in two ways').

The *pl. NA* forms *двои*, etc., survived into the early 19th c.: *двои*, *трѣи*, *чѣтверы* *сутки*. The only survivals of the *sg.* oblique cases are *обѣего* *пола* 'of both sexes' and adverbs of the type *двоём* '(two) together'.<sup>90</sup> For their use see 4.77 (б).

(iii) Nouns in -*лица*, e.g. *Троица* 'Trinity', are of ChSl. origin. The corresponding native type is *дво́йка*, *тро́йка*, *семёрка* (of cards and in other special uses).

85 *Multiplicatives*

(i) A type in -*жды* (apparently from *-šid-i*, a case-form of \**šidi* 'a "go"') of which the modern equivalent is *ход 'a move'* (e.g.

<sup>89</sup> The same paradigm is now followed by the words of vague number, e.g. *несколько*, *нескольких*, etc.; *много*, *многох*, etc.

<sup>90</sup> *Acc.* *двѣе*, etc., = 'two times': *двѣе* *больше* 'twice as big'.

at chess)) exists for 1-4: *однажды* (now only a temporal adverb), *дважды* (older *двожды*) 'twice', *трижды* (now as rare as Eng. *thrice*), *четырежды* (only in arithmetic) '4x'; *многожды* is a Slavonicism. The general colloquial procedure is, however, with *раз* 'blow, stroke': *два раза*, *пять раз*. Dialects show other nouns in this function, especially *ряд*:<sup>91</sup> в *другой ряд* 'a second time' (cf. *вдругорядь*, §83 above).

(ii) OCS (ChSl.) formed multiplicatives with *krat-* (CSl. \**kart-*): *dŭva kraty* or *dŭvo(e)kraty*, and with the instr. of nouns in -*ica*: *stoticeŕ* 'a hundred times'. Neither is native ESL.<sup>92</sup> which only has such ChSl. derivatives as вторичный 'secondary', многократный 'repeated, frequent'.

86 *Distributive Expressions*

The procedure has at all times been with the preposition *по* but the case varies between *acc.* and *dat.* Modern usage has: *по одному* (or plain noun *по яблоку* 'an apple each'); 2-4 with *acc.*: *по два*, *по две*, *по три* (ChSl. *по двѣьма du. dat.*); 5 onwards with *dat.*: *по пяти* (including *по ста*, *по сорока*). The collectives, when unavoidable, are in *acc.*: *по двое но́жниц* 'two pairs of scissors each', *по пятеро*, etc. Modern colloquial tends to generalize the *acc.*: *по пять*, *по сорок рублей*.

*The Verb*

87 Apart from five verbs of ancient lineage and antiquated paradigm (§§88 ff. below) all CSL., and therefore all ESL., verbs are *thematic*, i.e. have a vowel ('theme') inserted between the root and the personal endings. The vast majority of Russian verbs fall into the following broad categories:<sup>93</sup>

A. Thematic vowel -e- ('First Conjugation'):

1. Consonantal roots: type *нес-ти*; *pres. sg.* 1 *нес-у́*, *pl.* 2 *нес-ѣ-те*. A relic type; no new creations in ESL.

2. With infixed -н-: type *ми-ну-ти*; *ми-н-у́*, *ми-н-ѣ-те*. The final

<sup>91</sup> *Red* is similarly used in SCR., but more literary is *pŭt* (= *путь*); the latter is apparently not represented in ESL., nor is ESL. *раз* in SSL.

<sup>92</sup> WSl. has the type in \*-*kart-*, e.g. Pol. *dwaokróć* (adj. *dwaokrótny*).

<sup>93</sup> Full categorization requires also inclusion of the infinitive stem. The traditional numeration can be found in H. H. Biefeldt, *Altslawische Grammatik* (1961), p. 189. Cf. also A. Vaillant, *Grammaire comparée*, III<sup>1</sup>, pp. 137 ff.

consonant of the stem in many cases drops before -н-: двинути < \**divig-ni-ti*, дёрнуть/дёргивать, вернуть/вертеть; but more recent formations no longer conform, hence погнбнуть is younger than гнбнуть 'perish'. The infix -н- may be lacking in the preterite: исчёз, -ла (исчёзнуть). The type is productive in a small way, more at dial. than literary level: there are some characteristic subliterary formations such as двнгануть (lit. only двннуть, двнгатъ), садануть (< садить)<sup>94</sup> 'hit'. The majority of verbs in -нуть are *perfective* with typical 'semelfactive' aspect, e.g. *pf* крнкнуть 'give a (single) shout', *impf* крнчать 'emit (a series of) shouts'; дунуть 'give a puff', дуть 'blow (continuously)'.  
3. With infixed -j-:

(α) Primitive vowel stem: *zna-ti*, *zna-j-ǝ*, *zna-j-e-te* (R. znáю, znáете). Relict type. So: греть, грёю 'warm'; гннть, гннб 'rot'; дуть, дую 'blow'.

(β) Secondary vowel stem: *děla-ti*, *děla-j-ǝ*, *děla-j-e-te* (R. дёлаю, дёлаете); *im-ě-ti* (имёт); *dar-ov-a-ti*, *dar-u-jǝ* (даровать, дарую). Highly productive type, largely denominatives and cpd. derived imperfectives (4.91).

(γ) Consonant stem with palatalization: *pis-a-ti*, *pisǝ* < \**pis-jǝ*, *pisǝte* < \**pis-je-te*. (R. пишать, пишу, пишете). Not productive. Some have gravitated towards Type 3β as regular: махать 'wave', машу, машет (older) and махаю, махаёт (younger).

## B. Thematic vowel -i- ('Second Conjugation'):

1. Infinitive in -i-: R. говор-й-ть, говор-ю, говор-й-те. Турпically denominatives and causatives (вредить 'harm', ставить 'put' ('cause to stand')). Productive.

2. Infinitive in -b- (-ē-): *gor-ěti*, *gor-jǝ*, *gor-i-te* (R. горётъ, горю, горите).  
-bти/-еть will appear as -агн/-ать after -j- and ancient palatalized consonants, e.g. *děrz-á-ti* 'hold', *děrz-ú*, *děrz-i-te*; *stoj-á-ti* 'stand', *stoj-ú*, *stoj-i-te*.

Typically verbs of *stare*: сидеть 'be in a sitting position', гореть 'burn' (intr.), as are those of Type A3β, e.g. белеть 'be (or appear) white', уметь 'be able to, know how to' (sg. 3 белёт, умеёт). Productive in A3β but not in B2.

<sup>94</sup> -ануть is no doubt áканье spelling (6.55) for -онуть as the sequence of derivation appears to be *гоплатъ* > *гоплатъ* > *impf* *гоплатъ/гоплатъ* (intensive) > *pf* *гоплатъ*.

The relationship of some of these categories may be seen in the table of the verbs of position (Table XIV).

## ATHEMATIC VERBS

88 The five (irregular) athematic verbs are (pres. sg. 1):

есмь 'I am'	stem: * <i>es-</i> (cf. Lat. <i>s-um</i> , <i>es</i> , <i>es-t</i> )
<i>pf</i> дамь 'I (shall) give'	* <i>dā-d-</i> (< <i>dō-</i> )
имамь 'I have'	* <i>im-</i> ( <i>im-</i> )
вѣмь 'I know'	* <i>vēd-</i> (< * <i>woid-</i> )
ѣмь 'I eat'	* <i>ēd-</i>

The type corresponds to the *mi*-verbs in Greek (εἶ-μι 'I am', δέ-δω-μι 'I give' (with reduplication)).

89 1. The verb быть 'be' is wholly anomalous. It has a suppletive paradigm from several different aspectual stems: present (durative) \**es-*, past *durative* \**b(h)ě-* (cf. Lat. *fiō* 'become'), *perfective* \**b(h)ū-* (cf. Gk. aor. εἶπῶ 'came into being, grew').

Early ESL has the following forms (OCS/ChSl. variants in brackets; the dual forms are omitted):

	<i>Pres. dur</i>	<i>Pres. pf (fut.)</i>	<i>Imperf. (past dur)</i>	<i>Aor. (past pf)</i>
Sg. 1 есмь	бўду ( <i>brǝdǝ</i> )	бўхъ, бўхъ ( <i>běxǝ</i> )	бўхъ, бўхъ ( <i>běxǝ</i> )	бўхъ
2 еси	бўдешн	бўше ( <i>bě</i> )	бўше ( <i>bě</i> )	бў
3 есть ( <i>jestǝ</i> )	бўдетъ ( <i>brǝdetǝ</i> )	бўше ( <i>bě</i> )	бўше ( <i>bě</i> )	бўше, бўше ( <i>bysǝ</i> )
Pl. 1 есмь	бўдемь	бўхомь ( <i>běxomǝ</i> )	бўхомь ( <i>běxomǝ</i> )	бўхомь
2 есте	бўдете	бўшете ( <i>běšte</i> )	бўшете ( <i>běšte</i> )	бўште
3 суть ( <i>sǝtǝ</i> )	бўдутъ ( <i>brǝdǝtǝ</i> )	бўху ( <i>běše</i> )	бўху ( <i>běše</i> )	бўша ( <i>bysǝ</i> )

## Commentary

90 (a) The frequent forms бўхъ, etc., in early texts belong to ChSl., the anomalous formation (with *aor.* terminations) being supplanted by regular бўхъ or contracted бўхъ in ESL. and sometimes in ChSl. Бўхъ and бўхъ are always clearly a tense of state (*impf*): Вольга [Olga] же бўше въ Кыевѣ . . . воевода бѣ Свѣнелдъ (*RPC s.a.* 945); у Кыева бо бўше перевозъ (*ibid.*, *ad init.*) 'for there was a ferry at Kiev'.

(b) Быть is equally clearly a tense of *event* (pf): идеже послѣже бысть Кълевъ (RPC, ad init.) 'where Kiev later arose'; была си злая мѣсяца июля въ 23 (ibid. 1093) 'these terrible things happened on 23 July'.

(c) Rare forms were the (ChSl.) pf *imperfect будяхъ*, будяше (4.88 (ii)) and the fut. *participle бышацъ* (*byšestъ*), a unique relic of the sigmatic future in Slav (\**bū-s-jēt-j*; cf. Lith. fut. *būsiu* 'I shall be'; fut. part. *būsiąs*).

(d) In Russian only the inf. быть, perfect был (есмы), and fut. буду remain in use. With the wide use of nominal sentences of the type он студент and the very early dropping of the copula in the perfect (4.1) the present-tense forms became virtually superfluous. The modern literary language, under ChSl. influence, makes limited use of sg. 3 есть and pl. 3 суть:

(i) Бог есть (= существует) (not normal usage of OCS and earlier ChSl.); х есть у (mathematical or philosophical identity); мысль изреченная есть ложь (Туйтчев); есть as the positive of нет 'there is not': есть такие . . . 'there are such people'; есть чем заниматься 'I have) plenty to do' (neg. нечем заниматься 'there is nothing to do', 4.3 (4)).

(ii) Главные реки России суть: Волга, Днепр, Дон . . . (to introduce lists only).

(iii) Other persons of the present survive down to the 16th–17th c. in more or less bookish style, especially the sg. 2 еси (§105 below) and the pl. 1 which had by then acquired several regional forms—есmé (Novg., Pskov; recorded from 13th c.), есмб (SW and some Ukr. dialects; recorded from 14th c.), есмъ (rare; after pronoun мы), есмья (Centre); и орду есмья пробхали, и сараи есмья пробхали, и выбхали есмья в бузаны (Af. Nik., 15th c., who also has sg. 1 есмй after еси: прибыхалъ есмй на Кострому).

(iv) A reduced alternative form of sg. 3 есть—е (surviving in Ukrainian where it tends to replace all forms of the pres. tense)—must be posited for нбръ < нбру < \**ne-je-tu-ti* (verbal 3rd pers. ending) nearly parallel to Fr. [il] n'y a [pas], and in the negative adverbs of the type нбогда (Table XIII, col. 13) < *ne je kogda*, which now act as impersonal verbs: мне некогда 'I have no time to . . .'.

Derived frequentatives, etc., of col. 4.	Type A3B	(за-)стаивать, <sup>2</sup>	скаживать	(ChSl. -скаждать)	(по-)лагать	(вз-)вешивать
5		станвить 'cause to stand, put'	скажить 'cause to sit, set' (noun сай)	(noun лог 'lat')	pf положить 'lay'	pf повесить and impf вешать 'cause to hang, suspend' (вешъ, now only 'weigh')
4	Type B1	встаивать, -стано (earlier -стави)	скадиться 'seat oneself'	ложиться 'lie down'		
3	of col. 4)	Impertective of col. 1 (reflexives)	сидеть < сѣдѣти 'be sitting'	лежать 'be lying'	висеть (висѣти) 'be hanging'	
2	Type B2	Primary verb of state (intr.)	pf сестъ, сѣду 'seat oneself'	pf лечь, лягу 'lie down'	pf (повиснуть) 'become suspended' (no early form recorded)	
1		Primary verb of action (intr.) <sup>1</sup>	pf стаять, стану <sup>2</sup> replaced by стоять 'be standing'	встать < вѣ-стать 'stand up'		
Root			* <i>sĕd-</i>	* <i>lĕg-</i>	* <i>vis-</i>	* <i>hang-</i>

<sup>1</sup> All have ancient presents with -n- infix: *sta-n-, sĕ-n-d-, le-n-g-*.  
<sup>2</sup> Стаять now only 'become', with impf становиться (the pf was also early стаясь).  
<sup>3</sup> ChSl. \**sta-(j)-ĕ-n-, \*lĕg-ĕ-n-*.  
<sup>4</sup> Perfectives all in no-. \**Ложить* is obsolete, replaced by the verb класть, кладу. The parallel \*становить is only now used reflexively (n. 2) or in cpds. (col. 5).

TABLE XIV. The Verbs of Position

(v) The frequentative derivative *быва́ть* (see also §133 (3)) provides *impf* tenses for *pf* *быть* in certain contexts.

91 2. Дать *pf* has only partly normalized its present-future:

	OCS (ChSl.)	Mod. Russian
Sg. 1	<i>damī</i> (* <i>dād-mī</i> )	дам
2	<i>dasi</i>	дашь
3	<i>dastū</i> (ESl. <i>dastь</i> )	даст
Pl. 1	<i>damī</i>	дадим
2	<i>daste</i>	дадите
3	<i>dadētī</i> (ESl. <i>dadять</i> )	дадут

Sg. 1 and sg. and pl. 3 lose their final palatalization; *dasi* is remodelled on the normal sg. 2 in -ши (-шь) (§97 (c) below); the pl. has been reformed—pl. 3 *дадять* > *дадут(ь)* (after *будут?*) from 14th c. and *дадим*, *дадите* in the later Muscovy period. (Since the sg. and pl. 1 soon coincided, *дадим* is brought in probably from the imperative; *дадите* follows.)

The derived *impf* was *дачати*, later and colloquial *давати*; the latter infinitive is now combined with the present of the former: *давать*, *даю*.

Note. The root *зд-* 'build' (Slavonicisms *здание*, *зодчий*) has in the *срд.* *pf* *соз(ь)даты* been attracted to *дать* and now makes *pf* fut. *создам*, etc. The corresponding *impf* *созидать* has accordingly been largely replaced by *создавать*: *создаю*, etc.

92 3. The forms connected with 'have' need to be carefully distinguished. Early ESl. has:

(a) *pf* *яти*, pres.-fut. *иму*, *имет* (\**īm-ti*, *īm-ǝ*; cf. Lat. *ēto*, *ētere* 'buy') 'take, acquire' (act of taking into possession):  
 мьстисла[въ] . . . въеха въ Новгородъ . . . и я [аог. sg. 3]  
 Хота Григоревича (Novg. Chr., s.a. 1215).

Now only used with prefixes: *вз-ять*, *воз-ьму*; *при-н-ять*, *приму* (\**prī-īm-ti*), etc.

(b) *impf* *имати*, pres. *ёмлю*, *ёмлет(ь)*, also newer *имаю*, *имает* 'take'. The latter now provides the aspectual pair to -ять: *принимать*, -нимаю.

The earlier (and ChSl.) present -ёмлю is now antiquated or poetic; *примёлю*; cf. literary *срд.* *неприёмлемый* 'unacceptable'.

(c) *impf* *имѣти*, pres. *имамь*, *имать* 'possess, have' (verb of state). The thematic present disappears early in favour of the regular *имѣю*, *имѣет*.

Sparingly used colloquially for possession (4.2), more in literary language: *роза имѣет сѣльный запах*. Cf. *имѣние* 'estate' (lands which one possesses).

93 4. The primary verb *вѣмь* 'I know' (inf. *вѣдѣти*) has disappeared in Russian (not in WSl.: Pol. *wiem*, Cz. *vím*) but there remain many derivatives of the root *vѣd-*, e.g. *вѣдать* (Type A3β), *повесть* 'story', *развѣдка* 'reconnaissance'.

The earliest texts have not only sg. 1 *вѣмь* but also *вѣдѣ*, a unique relic of the old perfect (parallel to Gk. *οἶδα* 'I know', Lat. *vīdī* 'I saw'), e.g. in Русская Правда: *не вѣдѣ у кого есмь купилъ*.

*Я не вем* is still used by Pososhkón c.1724, but surely as a Polonism, by Prokóróvich and others in the 18th c. as an element of Slavonicized 'high style'.

Both *вѣмь* and *вѣдаю* = *savoir* have been displaced in modern Russian by *знать* = *connaître* (cf. the nouns *вѣсть* 'news'/*знáмя* 'sign'). *Вѣдать* + instr. 'be in charge of' is the only use of this verb.

*Вѣдѣ* survives in the adverbial particle *ведь* (§69 (f) above), and the sg. 3 in the Slavonicism *Бог вѣсть*.

94 5. *ѣмь* 'I eat' (root *ѣd-*; cf. Lat. *ēdo*). The OCS (ChSl.) spelling is normally *jamī*, etc., which frequently occur in all types of language.<sup>95</sup>

The present has been reformed on the same lines as *дам*, with pl. 1, 2 following maintained pl. 3:

	OCS (ChSl.)	Mod. Russian
Sg. 1	<i>jamī</i>	ем (not *ѣм, since ъ)
2	<i>jasi</i>	ешь
3	<i>jastū</i> (ESl. <i>ѣсть</i> )	ест (< есть)
Pl. 1	<i>jamī</i>	едим
2	<i>jaste</i>	едите
3	<i>jadētī</i>	едят (not *едут)

<sup>95</sup> The rule was: initial *je-* > *ja-*; internal *je* (b) remains; *je* and *ja* were phonetically very close to one another in late CSI. (2.3 (3)). Hence: *ob-ѣдī* (R. *обѣд*), Slavonicism *сѣдѣ*, but Slavonicism *ѣства* 'victuals' and *ѣси* pl. 'manger' (\**ѣd-sī-*).

REGULAR VERBS

95 Present Tense

	A1	A2	A3α, β	A3γ	B1	B2	OCS (ChSl.)
Sg. 1	нес-у	дви-у	зна-ю	пиш-у	говор-ю	сидж-у	-р/ј-р
2	-ещи	-ещи	-ещи	-ещи	-иши	сид-иши	-ѣ
3	-еть	-еть	-еть	-еть	-ить	-ить	-ѣ
Du. 1	нес-евѣ	дви-евѣ	зна-евѣ	пиш-евѣ	говор-ивѣ	сид-ивѣ	-ѣ
2	-ета	-ета	-ета	-ета	-ита	-ита	-ѣ
3	-ета	-ета	-ета	-ета	-ита	-ита	-ѣ
Pl. 1	нес-емъ	дви-емъ	зна-емъ	пиш-емъ	говор-имъ	сид-имъ	-ѣ
2	-ете	-ете	-ете	-ете	-ите	-ите	-ѣ
3	-уть	-уть	-ють	-ють	-ять	-ять	-ѣ
				(-ють)			-ѣ

Commentary

96 (a) Sg. 1. After the early centuries there remained only two current sg. 1 in -м: дам and ем. We do not find in Russian the partial or complete generalization of this ending in the productive conjugations, characteristic of WSl. and SSL, e.g. SCR. *gŕedam*, *čŕim*, *kŕujuŕem*. The essential analogy would seem to be:

*imāš(i)* : contracted *znāš*

*imā(tū)* : contracted *znā*

whence *imām(i)* : *znām* (replacing *znaju*).

But Russian did not normally lose intervocalic *j-* (still unique in Slav with *znāesh*, *znāem*) and the form *imam(b)* went out of living usage early.

(b) Pl. 1. The suffix varies in detail throughout Slav (as indeed throughout IE.: Gk. *-men*, Lat. *-mus*). At least *-mo(s)* and *-mū(s)* could have been dialectal variants in CSL. ESL. has predominantly *-mū* > -м but *-mo* was apparently also present and preserved (improbably created) in Ukr. and WhR. under stress: *несем-мó*. OCS (ChSl.) likewise had *-mū*. As ESL. did not develop a sg. 1 in -т there was no confusion; elsewhere this was avoided by sg. 1 -т, pl. 1: SCR. *-mo*, Blg. *-me*, Pol. *-my*.<sup>96</sup>

In Russian stressed -em automatically became -ём: *несём*, *даём*. (c) Sg. 2. There is no form *\*-sŕ* (> Slav -ш) in IE, only 'primary' *\*-sŕ* (> Slav -шь) and 'secondary' *\*-s* (which disappears in Slav, e.g. in the aor.). But -ши is universal in OCS and all early ESL.

<sup>96</sup> *-me* after pl. 2 -te?; *-my* after the pronoun *my*?; cf. *есмы* in §90 (d) (iii) above.

documents. Apparent reduction to -шь appears in the 13th c. (посудиль 1229). It cannot be excluded that the native ESL. ending was the theoretical -шь < *\*-sŕ*.<sup>97</sup>

Despite the depalatalization of *s'* (2.37) -шь [-š] has continued to be written to the present day.

(d) Sg. and pl. 3. ESL. had regularly -тъ, OCS -ŕ in both. The ESL. form was widely introduced into ChSl. texts from the outset, e.g. *Ostr.*, which has only five examples of -ŕ. Here again ESL. appears to be historically correct (-ŕ > -тъ) and the OCS -ŕ anomalous.

'Hard' -тъ begins to appear in vernacular texts from the late 13th c. Depalatalization of a final dental can scarcely be a purely phonetic process.<sup>98</sup> The influence of ChSl., especially during the 'Second South Slav Influence', may have counted for something in the written language but improbably in the spoken. Nor is depalatalization universal: the S. and W. dialects (including Ukr. and WhR.) have preserved -t' (WhR. -c'). Since some N. dialects, where -t first appears, have sg. 3 -t but pl. 3 -t' we must suppose a morphological pressure to avoid confusion with the infinitive, which was simultaneously being reduced from -ŕ to -t' (§114 below). The confusion arises in B1 verbs not exhibiting mobile stress.<sup>99</sup>

Inf. Sg. 3 Pl. 3  
 ↓ говорить говорить говорить  
 говорить говорить говорить

Thus *говора́тъ* could be retained. But in the Central dialects, and therefore in Moscow usage, -t was eventually generalized to all sg. and pl. 3. It is well attested in Moscow from the 14th c.

In view of the *nil ending* in Slav generally and sporadically in ESL. N. dialects, it is safest to suppose a CSL. reduction -ŕ > -t (rather than a 'secondary' ending -t), which was strengthened in OCS by -t > -ŕ, like *ot > oŕ* in suitable contexts, and a hesitation -ŕ/-t in ESL. Some late OCS texts, e.g. *Supr.*, have sporadic examples of third persons without -ŕ. An example in the colophon of

<sup>97</sup> The form -sŕ was generalized from the 2nd Conj., where it is regular (-sŕ > -sŕ > -sŕ (§58 (7) above)), but -sŕ persisted in the athematic presents (*dasi*, etc.: §888 ff. above).

<sup>98</sup> Depalatalization of the infinitive in -тъ is found sporadically in some Muscovite texts side by side with -тъ and -ри and regularly in a few dialects. The examples in Ludolf (1696) are hardly likely to be from such a source but rather inadequacies of his transcription.

<sup>99</sup> Sg. 3 *любить* is not identical to inf. *любить*.

*Ostr.* (да иже горазбе сего напше), if not a mere scribal error, may reflect local speech of that time; such forms are in fact quite common in vernacular Novgorod texts.<sup>100</sup> Sr. *-nesū* and Cz. *nesou* show, however, that *-t* was present in the pl. 3 until a late date, so probably also in the sg. 3. At all events it is improbable that ESL. *-tь* was generalized from the athematics, though *еть, суть*—in so far as they were still used (and they are not vernacular)—had remained 'soft'.<sup>101</sup>

98 (e) The *dual* was dropped early in the pres. and all other tenses. There are examples of pl. verbs with du. nouns in the 13th c. The 3rd pers. is only *-ra* in ESL. (ChSl. *-te*), and the 1st pers. sometimes *-va* by attraction to *-ra*.

#### The Inflected Past Tenses

99 1. *Imperfect*. The descriptive past tense (past of the present).

Selected paradigms:

		East Slav			OCS (ChSl.)
		A1	A3	B1	
Sg.	1	нес-яхъ	зна-хъ	мол-яхъ	-ахū
	2	-яше	-ше	-яше	-аше
	3	-яше	-ше	-яше	-аше
Du.	1	нес-яховъ	зна-ховъ	мол-яховъ	-аховѣ
	2	-яшета	-шета	-яшета	-ашета
	3	-яшета	-шета	-яшета	-ашета
Pl.	1	нес-яхомъ	зна-хомъ	мол-яхомъ	-ахотū
	2	-яшете	-шете	-яшете	-ашете
	3	-яху	-ху	-яху	-ахр

The above are the normal ESL. *contracted* forms. ChSl. partly maintained OCS *uncontracted* forms несвахъ, знаахъ, моляхъ (*mol'jakhū*), which presumably represented in fact a similar incipient contraction to that found in the 'long' adjectives (§39 above).<sup>102</sup>

<sup>100</sup> Commoner in sg. 3 than in pl. 3, but there are two examples of the latter in the *Novg. Mīnēi* (text no. 8).

<sup>101</sup> For a somewhat different view see C. Watkins, *Indogermanische Grammatik*, III/1 (Heidelberg, 1969), pp. 216–19.

<sup>102</sup> Contracted forms increased in late OCS manuscripts; there are few in *Zogr.* and *Mar.*, many in *Savv.* The whole tense was clearly new in late ChSl. (OCS), replacing a simpler tense \**nes-ū, -e, -ε* whose sg. 2, 3 were transferred to the aorist.

*Ostr.* has about ten times as many uncontracted as contracted forms, which may rather represent the proportion in the manuscript from which it was copied rather than the incursion of ESL. norms. ChSl. tends further to unify by replacing хорбаше by хорбаше *et sim.*

The uncontracted Slavonicisms became more frequent again in the period of the 'Second South Slav Influence', both the tense and the form belonging by then only to high literary style.

#### 100 Commentary

(a) The *-tь* of the pres. sg. and pl. 3 is often added to the 3rd persons of the imperf.: бяшеть, бяхуть.

(b) In du. 2, 3 and pl. 2 there are alternative forms *-ста, -сте*.

(c) The tense early became obsolescent and was no more than a literary archaism by the 16th c. It has been questioned whether the tense was really alive in ESL. *spoken* language from the very beginning of the records (11th c.). Texts do not give a clear answer since those nearest to the living language, e.g. Русская Правда, do not require the imperfect, the only common 'past' tense being the perfect. However, its use seems natural in the more colloquial parts of Novg. chronicles of the 13th c., e.g.

кадь ржи купяхуть по і. гр[и]внѣ . . . ядху люди соснову кору . . . дѣти свое даххуть одьрень . . . (1215).

It is also sometimes affirmed that the imperfect declined earlier than the aorist. It can only be said that the aorist was better *maintained*, and to a later date, in literary usage.

(d) The imperfect was in the nature of things mainly formed from *impf* verbs, but imperfects of *pf* verbs occur in a special sense (4.88).

(e) The imperfect was replaced by the *impf* preterite (4.89).

101 2. *Aorist*. The narrative past tense (events).  
Paradigms:

		East Slav				OCS (ChSl.)
		A1	A3	B1	B2	
Sg.	1	нес-охъ	зна-хъ	ход-ихъ	вид-ѣхъ	-хū
	2	-е	зна	-и	-ѣ	-ε (nil)
	3	-е	зна	-и	-ѣ	-ε (nil)

*Ostr.* (да иже горазбе сего напше), if not a mere scribal error, may reflect local speech of that time; such forms are in fact quite common in vernacular Novgorod texts.<sup>100</sup> Sr. *-nesū* and Cz. *nesou* show, however, that *-t* was present in the pl. 3 until a late date, so probably also in the sg. 3. At all events it is improbable that ESL. *-tь* was generalized from the athematics, though *еть, суть*—in so far as they were still used (and they are not vernacular)—had remained 'soft'.<sup>101</sup>

98 (e) The *dual* was dropped early in the pres. and all other tenses. There are examples of pl. verbs with du. nouns in the 13th c. The 3rd pers. is only *-ra* in ESL. (ChSl. *-te*), and the 1st pers. sometimes *-va* by attraction to *-ra*.

#### The Inflected Past Tenses

99 1. *Imperfect*. The descriptive past tense (past of the present).

Selected paradigms:

		East Slav			OCS (ChSl.)
		A1	A3	B1	
Sg.	1	нес-яхъ	зна-хъ	мол-яхъ	-ахū
	2	-яше	-ше	-яше	-аше
	3	-яше	-ше	-яше	-аше
Du.	1	нес-яховъ	зна-ховъ	мол-яховъ	-аховѣ
	2	-яшета	-шета	-яшета	-ашета
	3	-яшета	-шета	-яшета	-ашета
Pl.	1	нес-яхомъ	зна-хомъ	мол-яхомъ	-ахотū
	2	-яшете	-шете	-яшете	-ашете
	3	-яху	-ху	-яху	-ахр

The above are the normal ESL. *contracted* forms. ChSl. partly maintained OCS *uncontracted* forms несвахъ, знаахъ, моляхъ (*mol'jakhū*), which presumably represented in fact a similar incipient contraction to that found in the 'long' adjectives (§39 above).<sup>102</sup>

<sup>100</sup> Commoner in sg. 3 than in pl. 3, but there are two examples of the latter in the *Novg. Mīnēi* (text no. 8).

<sup>101</sup> For a somewhat different view see C. Watkins, *Indogermanische Grammatik*, III/1 (Heidelberg, 1969), pp. 216–19.

<sup>102</sup> Contracted forms increased in late OCS manuscripts; there are few in *Zogr.* and *Mar.*, many in *Savv.* The whole tense was clearly new in late ChSl. (OCS), replacing a simpler tense \**nes-ū, -e, -ε* whose sg. 2, 3 were transferred to the aorist.



	A1	A3	B1	B2	
Du. 1	нес-оховѣ	зна-ховѣ	ход-иховѣ	вид-ѣховѣ	-ховѣ
2	-оста	-ста	-иста	-ѣста	-ста
3	-оста	-ста	-иста	-ѣста	-ста
Pl. 1	нес-охомъ	зна-хомъ	ход-ихомъ	вид-ѣхомъ	-хомѣ
2	-осте	-сте	-исте	-ѣсте	-сте
3	-оша	-ша	-иша	-ѣша	-ѣ
	(-шя)	(-шя)	(-шя)	(-шя)	

## 102

## Commentary

(a) ESL. had eliminated all types of aorist except the sigmatic type given above. Older types still in use in OCS (e.g. asigmatic *radŭ, pade, pade, radomŭ, padete, padŭ*) sometimes appear in ChSl. texts. Fairly common is sigmatic sg. 1 рѣхъ (\**rĕk-sŭ*), 2, 3 рече, side by side with younger рѣкохъ, etc.; the verb is in any case characteristic of ChSl.

(b) -лъ is occasionally added to certain monosyllabic sg. 3 (*избитъ = избѣ*). On these and дасть, бысть see Vaillant, *Grammaire comparée*, III/1, p. 55 (§366), and C. Watkins, *Indogermanische Grammatik*, III/1, pp. 216–19.

(c) ESL. contractions had made sg. 1 and pl. 1 identical with the imperfect in certain verbs (*знахъ, знахомъ*). The aor. pl. 3 was easily confused with the imperf. sg. 3. These ambiguities were no doubt one of the reasons for the decadence of both tenses in the vernacular.

(d) The aorist was principally formed from *pf* verbs but *impf* aorists are not uncommon, representing the result of a composite action: въ томъ вечерѣ перевозился Ярославъ съ вои . . . got his troops across the river' (sc. in several similar operations). See further 4.88.

(e) Literary usage maintained the past narrative tense, exactly as French has done,<sup>103</sup> with varying consistency down to the end of the 17th c. and even, as an affectation, beyond. The moment of its extinction in the living language, as stated under the imperfect, is impossible to pin down.

<sup>103</sup> *Passé défini* 'je vis', replaced in speech by the *parfait* (*passé composé*) 'j'ai vu'. French, however, has maintained the *imparfait* 'je voyais'.

## The Perfect Tenses

## 103

These form a complete group (aspect)—present (perfect), past (pluperfect) and future (future-perfect)—of compound tenses formed with an active aorist or perfect participle in -l (§126 below) and appropriate parts of the auxiliary быть. The participle (short forms only since always a predicate) shows *number* and *gender*, and may be of either aspect.

Selected forms:

	Present	Past	Future
Sg. 1	есмь	бяхъ	буду
2	есѣ	бяхе	будеши
3	естъ	бяхе	будетъ(ь)
Pl. 1	есмь	бяхомъ	будемъ
2	есте	бяхете	будете
3	сутъ	бяху	будутъ(ь)
	'I have	'I had	'I shall
	seen,	seen,	have seen,
	bought'	bought'	bought'

## Commentary

## 104

(a) *Present of the Perfect*: есмь купишь indicates a present state resulting from a past action: 'I am [now] one who bought'. Nearly parallel to the Fr. (and antiquated Eng.) *je suis venu* 'I am come'. The perfect aspectual situation, as more vivid, often usurps the place of the plain statement about the past (aorist) in speech. The supersession was complete in Russian, but thereby the perfect forms inevitably forfeited their unique aspectual sense.

(b) The two parts of the cpd. are not closely linked and may be separated in various ways in the sentence.

(c) Gender distinctions were, as everywhere, early given up in the plural, but here the pl. masc. *nom.* naturally prevailed; there is thus a distinction:

adjective: вѣл(ѣн) 'withered, limp'; pl. вѣлы (§42 (б) above)  
verb: вѣнуръ 'wither'; pret. pl. вѣли.

## 105

(d) With the colloquial dropping of the auxiliary есмь, etc. (4.1 (b)) the perfect is reduced to a single gender-showing participle. Though it is, on general grounds, likely that the auxiliary

was most consistently absent or omitted in the 3rd persons<sup>104</sup> (there normally being an expressed subject) it was certainly facultative in the 1st pers., and presumably also the 2nd pers., in colloquial speech by the 12th c. ChSl. tended to preserve the auxiliary and written traditionalism therefore often inserted it even in otherwise colloquial texts down to late Muscovite times; see the example from Af. Nik. in §90 (d)(iii) above.

In literary styles close to ChSl. it was still felt in the 17th c. that the 2nd pers. should be distinguished in view of the awkward identity in the sg. 2 and 3 of both the aorist and imperfect. Hence early grammars, essentially ChSl., recommend a wholly artificial past tense with mixed forms, e.g. aor. *спасохъ*, *спаслъ еси*, *спасе* (Zizáni, 1596; similarly in Smotrítsky, 1648). A Slavonized style always favoured more copulas, both in present and past; they are naturally frequent in translations from Latin or German in the 16th–17th c., e.g. the calque (он) *есть тоб надежды = (er) ist der Hoffnung*.<sup>105</sup> *Аввакум*, however, rarely uses any even in relatively 'high' passages: *самъ разболблся . . . яко и очи опузли . . . и онъ отвбщали . . . и вскричалъ*.

*Pari passu* with the omission of the auxiliary goes the inclusion of the personal pronoun (though never obligatory): *я, ты, он дал*.

(e) The 'long' forms of the *l*-participle have survived in considerable number as *adjectives*, sometimes with stress specialization, e.g.: *былой 'former' ('which has been'), гнилой 'rotten', зрѣлый 'ripe', (за)лежалый 'shop-soiled' ('which has been lying [too long]), (по)линялый 'faded', запоздалый 'belated'; как угорѣлая кошка 'like one possessed'. Усталый 'tired' is still very close to the verbal form *я устал 'I am tired'*.*

106 (f) The *pluperfect* is properly formed with the *imperfect* *бяхъ* (occasionally with the *imperf aor.* *быхъ* in ChSl.) but there are examples with *pf aor.* *быхъ*.

With the decadence of both these tenses and before the elimination of the pluperfect altogether, the auxiliary has to be replaced by the new all-purpose preterite, viz. (*есмь*) *быль видѣль*,<sup>106</sup> the first auxiliary being normally omitted. Examples:

<sup>104</sup> Absence of the 3rd pers. auxiliary, but not others, is frequent in late OCS, e.g. *Supr.*, and is the position of modern Pol.; SSl. preserves the auxiliary *throughout*, e.g. SCr. *bio sam, je, bili su*.

<sup>105</sup> S. C. Gardiner in SR 39/93 (1961). But Novikón (1769): *я сам того мнения*.

<sup>106</sup> This is again parallel to the Fr. *passé surcomposé 'j'ai eu donné'* replacing literary '*j'eus donné'*', with different syntactical use from the *pluperf.* with the imperf. auxiliary (= *бяхъ*) '*j'avais donné'*'.

## Early ESl.:

у Ярополка же жена грекнии бѣ и бѣше бѣла черницею (RPC s. a. 977) 'Jaropolk's wife was a Greek [intrinsic state] and had [formerly] been a nun';

Святополкъ . . . всю ночь пилъ бѣ съ дружиною своею (ibid. 1016) 'Svjatopolk . . . had been carousing all night with his retinue'.

## Muscovite period:

а что селъ и свободъ дьмитриевыхъ, то дали есме былъ Андрѣю (14th c.) ' . . . we had already given them to Andrew' (better tr. 'we have given . . .', just as се далъ at the beginning of a legal document is the equivalent of 'I [hereby] give . . .');

да и назад уж был сходил (1576) 'I had already turned back'.

The sense of unrealized intention can be detected in the later examples, e.g. послал был Крылова, и Кудеяр сам назвался (1576) 'I was going to send Krylov but Kudejar volunteered'. This becomes modern *послал было*.

(g) The *pluperfect* disappeared in the course of the 17th c. and no doubt earlier in colloquial speech. Dial. formulae of the type *земля была высохла* (но опять промóкла) still exist, though not widespread, but it is difficult to be sure that they are direct descendants of the *pluperfect*; the *l*-form may be felt as purely adjectival.

(h) The *future-perfect* is frequent in early legal documents; the following examples show the standard formula (from Русская Правда):

а кто будетъ началъ, тому платити . . . 'whoever began [it] must pay . . .';

оже будетъ убилъ въ свадѣ или въ пиру явлено . . . 'if he shall have killed [someone] in a brawl or in public at a feast . . .'<sup>107</sup>

Modern usage still requires the *future* in such contexts: this has to be the *pf fut.* (когда приду 'when I arrive').

There was no widespread tendency to use the form as a *pf simple fut.* (without perfect reference), as in Polish,<sup>108</sup> but some examples may be taken this way.

(i) The *future-perfect* became obsolescent somewhat earlier than the *pluperfect*. Thus by the 17th c. the perfect aspect (system

<sup>107</sup> So in ChSl.: *аще буду Богу угождать и приять мя будетъ Богъ* (RPC s. a. 1074).

<sup>108</sup> Mod. Pol. *będę pisał* or *będę pisał* 'I shall write'.

of perfect tenses) with its built-in relative relation had been given up together with the two relative past tenses, imperf. and aor. The (present) perfect becomes a unique generalized *preterite*. Modern Russian has no tenses of *relative* time.

#### The Future Tenses

108 There were a number of inherited *pf presents* in ESL., e.g. from *pf* дать, пасть, сесть, лечь, стать, купить, which formed a basis for the reinterpretation of *all pf* presents as *pf futures* (4.87). The present often suffices for the (immediate) future, as in most languages: *завтра еду в Лондон* 'I am going to London tomorrow'.

CSl. apparently had no specific future formations; all the Slav languages have created new types. A (compound) *impf* future came to be formed with various originally modal auxiliaries from which the modal significance gradually drained away. In early ESL. texts we find:

1. *pf* present *иму, имет(ь) + inf.* and also *impf* present *имаю, имать + inf.* (§92 above) 'have'. The latter is a *Slavonicism* only and belongs to the literary tradition throughout:

(a) OCS: не иштѣре чѣло *имаге* вѣти и чѣго пиши (Matt. 6: 31) 'Take no thought, saying, what shall we eat? or what shall we drink?'

ChSl.: злою смертию умрѣти *имаши* (1073 *Anthology*, text no. 6) 'you shall die a dreadful death'. Pólotzky still uses it in his learned and artificial ChSl. poetry (17th c.).

(b) си *имуть* *имаги* дань на насъ (RPC *ad init.*) 'these people will exact tribute from us';

аще бо възмете рать межю собою, погани *имуть* радоваться и възмутъ [*pf fut.*] землю нашу (RPC *s.a.* 1097) '... the pagans will be glad and will take away our land';

а хто сю грамоту *иметь* рушити (1353) 'whoever shall break [the provisions of] this document'.

This formula is perhaps the prevailing one of clear, if slightly modal, futures down to c.1450. It has since died out in Russian<sup>109</sup> but is preserved in Ukr. where procedure (3) below did not develop: читатиму 'I shall read' (parallel to Romance *j'aimerai* < coll. Lat. *amāre habeo*).

<sup>109</sup> A future with (и)му + *impf inf.* is recorded in some N. dialects along the Volga.

#### 109 2. Formations with *хочу/хочу* 'wish':

се уже *хочемъ* померети отъ глада (RPC *s.a.* 997)  
предатися *хотятъ* люде печенѣгомъ (ibid. 968) (side by side with *предатися* *имаю* печенѣгомъ).

These are clearly futures of *necessity* ('we are bound to die . . .'); no *wish* is involved.

Despite the sporadic use of the Russianized *хочу* the formula is always a Slavonicism. It is more or less modal in OCS but has become the normal (neutral) SSL future (SCr. and Blg.).<sup>110</sup> As in modern SSL languages the *inf.* can be of *either aspect*.

3. Formations with *-чьну* 'begin'. Нач(ь)ну, поч(ь)ну and уч(ь)ну are all used. The first two appear in early texts, поч(ь)ну perhaps belonging especially to the North (Novg. dial.). Уч(ь)ну is characteristic of the Muscovy period; the earliest example is dated 1405. It is the commonest auxiliary in the *Stoglav* (1551) and throughout the 17th c. The *inf.* could be of *either aspect* but is normally *impf*.<sup>111</sup> The literal sense is, of course, frequent and it is not always possible to decide whether the formula is to be taken as a neutral future:

которая ли вѣрвь начнеть платити *дикую* виру . . . (RP, art. 4) 'if any commune begins(?) to pay a communal wergild . . .';

аже начнеть не знати у кого *купилъ* (ibid., art. 37) 'if he shall not recognize whom he bought [it] from . . .'

110 4. The modern буду + *inf.*<sup>112</sup> appears only at a late date. There is no reliable example from Central Russia before the 15th c.: а язъ буду ся отъ нихъ боронить закономъ Божиимъ (1450). It is still rare throughout the 16th c.

Its formation is similar to that of German *ich werde lesen* (but

<sup>110</sup> The 'wish' future may be accounted one of the conspicuous 'Balkanisms' in SSL, shared with Greek, Albanian, and Romanian. Greek was probably the originating language: *impf* θέλω γράφω, *pf* θέλω γράφω (θέλω < θέλω I wish to). SCr. has likewise greatly reduced the auxiliary forms: SCr. *ću* < *хочу* (still required for the literal sense 'I wish'), etc.; Blg. has invariable *ме* [ste], as in Greek.

<sup>111</sup> Throughout the history of Russian all verbs of beginning, continuing, and ending require an *impf* infinitive: я начал/продолжал/кончил читать; all define a process (reading).

<sup>112</sup> Буду is a *pf* future (entry into state) so is to that extent parallel to *иму*, начну, etc. and *страну* (type (5) below).

the German is without aspectual limitation), which had become normal in most German dialects by c.1300. Before that we also find *werdēn* + p.p.a. The earliest Czech texts (before 1300) have both of these—*budu* + inf., rarely *budu* + p.p.a.—as well as the strictly speaking fut.-perf. *budu* + *l*-participle.

There is at least a strong possibility that *budu* + inf. is a Germanism in Czech (Prague had a large German population at all times).

Polish also shows *będę* + inf. from its earliest texts; the native *będę* + *l*-participle was at first used very sparingly but became commoner from the 16th c. as an alternative *simple* future (an alternative which still remains today).<sup>113</sup> Polish came under strong Czech influence from c.1350.

It must be specially noted that *budu* + inf. is virtually absent from SSl.<sup>114</sup> and completely absent from OCS (ChSl.). The first examples in Muscovite texts are either in documents concerned with Western politics, i.e. with either Poland or Lithuania which used the somewhat Polonized 'West Russian chancellery language' (7.23) containing *буду* + inf. frequently from c.1500, or in authors closely connected with the WSl. world, e.g. Peresvetov (first half of 16th c.), who spent several years in Bohemia and Poland, and Prince Kúrbsky, who fled to Lithuania in 1564. We may also note the evidence of Donatus's *Latin Grammar*, translated in the early years of the 16th c., which records, with terminological misconceptions: 2 причастия иземяются от слова дел[ь]наго (sc. the verb): настоящее яко любящъ, а грядущее яко будетъ любящи (Lat. *amans, amaturus*).

There is thus little reason to doubt that this type of *impf* future, whatever support it may have had *within* living Russian, started as a *literary* importation, reaching Moscow from the West and more immediately from White Russia.<sup>115</sup> Where it occurs there are often other Polonisms, e.g. и язъ о томъ буду писати до государя своего (1558) (писать до is the Polish, not the Russian construction).

Conversely, there are at most doubtful examples in *Domostroj*

<sup>113</sup> The chief 14th c. texts—*Psalterz florentski*, *Psalterz putawski*, *Biblia królowej Zofii*—have 20 per cent or less *będę* + *l*-participle.

<sup>114</sup> It is found in early Čakavic SCr. texts (where it may be native) but is displaced by the Balkan 'wish' future in the 16th c.

<sup>115</sup> *Буду* + inf. is reported sporadically in the Ukr. area from c.1350, no doubt as a Polonism. It remains in Ukr. as an alternative to type 1(b) above.

(1550s) where native procedures and vocabulary dominate: *ишо уже вное будетъ платиги*. The *Uloženie* of 1649, a conservative text in most respects, only employs the traditional *уч(ь)ну* of officialese. Kotoshkin (mid 17th c.) also only uses it rarely, following the practice of деловой язык.

Perhaps the best chronological contrast is between Avvakum (b. 1621) who uses *по буду* (but the need for the future tense is small) and Pososhkov (b. 1652) for whom *буду* is normal.

*Буду* + inf. appears to have become the *spoken* norm also about the middle of the 17th c.

The points of entry into general Russian usage are perhaps two:

(a) The existence, if only precarious, in the 16th c. of the future-perfect *буду* + *l*-participle and, conceivably, the fact that parts of *быть* were otherwise the only auxiliaries (in the passive).

(b) More important, the widespread use of the sg. 3 *будет* in *impersonal* future sentences, with a dative of the interested person expressed or implied (i.e. the future form of the universal dat. + inf.), e.g. the dubious example from *Дом.* above and *кому вами будет владѣти? 'who will own you?' (Песни Джемса, с.1620)*. The transition to *кто вами будет владѣть?* is small. The universality of *буду* + inf. in all parts of Russia is evidently against it being a purely literary importation.

## 111

5. A future *стану* + *impf* inf. is recorded occasionally in Novg. texts of the 12th c., but is nowhere common till the 17th c. Ludolf defines the fut. as *буду вел* *стану* without further comment. It is still a living procedure but has never been completely grammaticalized as a neutral future; it retains a modal sense of *intention*, especially in negative phrases:

не станешь писать . . . (Грозны, 1576) 'if you won't write . . .';

из города в город вина по-прежнему возить не станут, но куды приедет, тут и купить будет.<sup>116</sup> (Pososhkov, с.1724) 'they will not (have to) transport liquor from one town to another as heretofore . . .'

The procedure was favoured by Avvakum, perhaps being characteristic of his middle Volga dialect.

<sup>116</sup> Impersonal *будет* (since the inf. is *pf*): 'wherever [a person] happens to be, he [ему understood] will be able to buy [liquor] there'.

## Imperative

112 The following early ESL forms are attested:

	A1, 2	A3	B1, 2
Sg. 2	нес-й	пиш-й	мол-й
3	-й	-й	-й
Du. 1	нес-ѡвѡ	пиш-ѡвѡ	мол-ѡвѡ
2, 3	-ѡвѡ <sup>17</sup>	-ѡвѡ	-ѡвѡ
Pl. 1	нес-ѡмѡ	пиш-ѡмѡ	мол-ѡмѡ
2	-ѡвѡ	-ѡвѡ	-ѡвѡ

113 Commentary

1. The ChSl. forms are essentially the same but preserve stem palatalization, later removed in Russian: *пишѣ/R. пиши*, *даждѣ*, *виждѣ* (early ESL. *даждѣ*, later only *дай*). A complete paradigm is found at least in the verb *буити*: sg. 1 *бѡдѣмѣ*, 2, 3 *бѡдѣ*; du. 1 *бѡдѣвѣ*, 2 *бѡдѣта*, 3 *бѡдѣте*; pl. 1 *бѡдѣмѣ*, 2 *бѡдѣте*, 3 *бѡдѣте*.

2. The 1st and 3rd persons are optative or hortatory ('let us', 'may they'). The colloquial evolves other procedures. In the 12th–14th c. *агъ* (cf. Czech *at'*) is the 3rd pers. marker: *агѣ* *промыжю* *събоку* *урядяте* ся [= *урядятъ*] (1229) 'let them settle [the matter] between themselves'. It is replaced by *пусть* (sublative-argу *пущаѣ*), imperatives of *pf* *пущаѣтъ/импф* *пущаѣтъ* 'let': *а онъ* *пусть* *едеть* *ко* *Пскову* (c.1464) 'let him come to Pskov'.

The pl. 1 may be said to persist in (pres.) *идѣм* 'let us go', more usually *пф* (fut.) *напишем* 'let us write', the small differences of form having been abandoned. *Идѣм* implies *two* people (1 and thou), *идѣмте*, with added pl. 2 ending, *more than two* (1 and you, all of us). This colloquial procedure is recorded at latest in the 17th c.:

да грѣнѣмте брѣтцы  
въ яровы весѣща (Песни Джемса, с.1620)  
'let us bend to our oars (?of susanore), boys . . .'  
(грѣнем < грѣ(б)нуть *pf*, inchoative of грѣсти 'tow').

Another colloquial procedure—no doubt more recent—is *давѣте* + *импф* inf. (*игрѣтъ*) or *пф* fut. (*сыграем*) 'let us play'.

ChSl. frequently has the Balkan да + present, still possible in Russian in solemn formulae:

<sup>17</sup> Here too (§98 above) ESL. has -ѡ corresponding to OCS (ChSl.) -ѡ in the 3rd pers.: *идѣта* на *роу* (*RP*, art. 37) 'let them both swear an oath'.

да придет цбсар(е)ствие твоѣ 'thy Kingdom come';  
а Б[ог]ъ буиди за грѣмъ . . . да судитъ ему Б[ог]ъ (Mstislav's Deed, c.1130) 'may God be . . . may God judge him . . . .'

3. In the remaining essential 2nd pers. forms (the dual also disappearing) the minority type in pl. 2 -ѡте conforms to the majority: *несѣ*, *несѣте*. *Ostr.* already has *приведите*.

4. The full vowel -и- is retained only when stressed, or unstressed after a difficult group of consonants (*исполни*). Otherwise и > ѡ, or ѡ after vowels: *бѡдѣ(те)*, *знѡй(те)*. Examples with reduction are found from the 13th c.

5. The negative has no special forms or procedures. Some dialects have preserved the formula *не могѣ(те)* + inf. (with *могѣ* restored from *мозѣ*), originally no doubt a strong expression ('don't dare to . . .'). Current in ChSl.: *не мози* *загрѣти* *мнѡ* . . . *не мозѣте* *кляти* (colophon to *Ostr.*); *не мози* *повѣдати* *никомуже* *от* *брѣтъ* (*RPC s.a.* 1091) 'do not tell any of the brothers'.<sup>118</sup>

## Infinitive and Supine

114 1. The infinitive in -ти is the dat. (or conceivably loc.) case of an *i*-stem verbal noun.

2. The ending -ти has only been preserved under stress: *несѣи*, *итѣ*.<sup>119</sup> Conversely, some dialects have *несѣ* for *несѣи et sim.*

Reduction of -ти to -тъ can be observed from the 13th c. Written texts, whether ChSl. or not, tended to maintain -ти but the spoken form was clearly -тъ throughout the Muscovy period. *Domostroj* has a high proportion of -тъ; the second edition of the conservative *Ulozhenie* of 1649 changes many -ти to -тъ. The two forms are frequently mixed in one and the same text, showing that -тъ was the spoken but -ти was considered the written norm, e.g. in Vasilii's correspondence with Ivan Grozny (1576): *послать*, *писать*, *сказать*, *говоритъ* but *спросити*, *солгати*, *окудати*.

Traditional oral poetry preserves -ти for metrical reasons:

да хѡчетъ герѣмы ломѣти,  
менѣ хѡчетъ царѣвну поймаѣти  
и на ѡстоужу на желѣзную отослѣти . . .

(Песни Джемса, с.1620; a recent composition, since referring to the fall of Boris Godunov in 1605).

<sup>118</sup> This formula is still normal in coll. ScT. in the form *нѣмѡй(те)* = 'don't . . . .'

<sup>119</sup> In *найтѣ*, *уйтѣ*, etc. Reformed from the 14th c. as *итѣи* (*итѣи*) after the pres. stem. The sublative *итѣтъ*, with an extra normalized -тъ, is fairly common from the 17th to early 19th c.: *не сойтѣтъся* *никогда* (*L'Érmonov*).

3. Velar stems have -чь (Type A1): беречь < берег-ти, печь < пек-ти, стречь < стриг-ти. Бечь (< бег-ти) survives in dialect but is replaced in the standard language by бежать (< бег-ь-ти).

115 4. The *supine* is the verbal noun of intention; the form -ти is parallel to, if not identical with, the Lat. (acc.) *intentionem*. It is regularly used after verbs of motion in early ESL., almost always (and properly) from *impf* verbs:<sup>120</sup>

да поидѣте княжигѣ и володѣти [altered] нами (RPC s.a. 862) 'come and rule over us';  
сидѣвѣса сама боротъ (ibid. 1022) 'let the two of us meet in (single) combat';

придоша половци первое на русьскую землю воевати (ibid. 1061) 'the Cumans came for the first time to make war on Russia';  
а въ Новгородѣ въсла .р. муж[ъ] Новгородъць Мьстислав[а] проваживать из Новгорода (Novg. Chr., s.a. 1215) 'he sent 100 Novgorod citizens into Novgorod to remove Mstislav thence';  
русичу не звати латина на поле битъ ся (1229) 'a Russian may not challenge a foreigner to a duel'.

If the verb is transitive, the supine, as a noun, is followed by the gen.: идеть рыбѣ ловитъ '(he) is going fishing' (i.e. 'for the catching of fish').

The supine was easily confused with the infinitive, which could have similar syntactical employment. In *Ostr.* we find: *idę položitĭ męsto; posūla prizivati* (NB *pf* infinitives) but also correctly: *pride žena . . . роцѣтĭ vodŭ* ' . . . to draw water' (R. почерпать).

The 1229 Treaty has: из Ригы ехали на гочкым берьго [= берегъ] тамо твердѣти миръ ' . . . to make peace' (for твердигъ мира).

The supine was obsolete by the 15th c. Иду пахар is recorded from dialects but this may be a deparatalized infinitive (see §97 (d) above).

### 116 Conditional

OCS possessed a special conditional (presumably optative) tense of *byti*, viz. *bimĭ, bi, bivĭ, biste, by*, used with the *l*-participle of other verbs. This was already largely replaced in ChSl. by the aorist *byxŭ, by, by*, etc. No temporal distinctions are possible. ESL.

<sup>120</sup> As the result of an *intention* is only problematical and not actual the *pf* aspect is inappropriate. The same rule applies generally today with the infinitive.

has only the latter: аж быхѣмъ что тако учинили (1229) 'if we should do anything . . .'

With the fairly early decadence of the aorist in ESL. the auxiliary is reduced to an invariable participle (sg. 3) бы. There are examples from the 13th c.: аще бы въ Турѣ [Туре] быша силы были (1215), where pl. 3 быша is still present but the extra бы shows the way things are going. By the 14th c. we find аще бы слѣши были (1339). Full invariability is certain with the reappearance of чтобы 'in order to' in the 14th c.:

а тыбъ ко мнѣ и впередъ о своемъ здоровѣ отписывала . . . чтобы мнѣ про то было вѣдомо (letter of Basil III to his wife Helen, c.1526-30).

Бы is early used to introduce uncertainty:

се убихъ Бориса, како бы убити Глѣба? (RPC s.a. 1015; later text) and later as a marker of necessity or duty:

все бы было прибрано (*Dom.*) 'everything must be tidied away'.

For conditional clauses see 4.23 ff.

### PARTICIPLES (VERBAL ADJECTIVES)

117 As with all adjectives a full 'short' and 'long' declension was, at least theoretically, available. It is only necessary to show here the peculiarities of the sg. and pl. NAG.

### 118 Present Participle Active (p.p.a.)

*Commentary to Table XV*

1. The suffix is *-om/-ent/-j*, giving OCS *-oŝt/-/eŝt-* (in ESL. spelling *-ѣш/-уш-* and *-ѣш/-яш-*) but native ESL. *-uŝ/-/jaŝ-* (*-уш/-яш-* (1.19)).

2. In addition to this important difference *consonantal roots* (Type A1) have ESL. sg. masc./neut. nom. -а (неса, идя) but ChSl. -ы (несы, идѣ).<sup>121</sup> The types знаѣ, моля, etc. are (nasals apart) identical in both. As only a small minority of verbs had -а, it disappears before analogical -я by the 15th c.: неса, идѣ (and несаѣ, идѣѣ). Example: се язъ . . . пишу д[у]ш[е]вную грамоту идя въ ворупу (Ivan Kalita, 1327-8) 'This is my last will and testament [since I am] going to the Horde'.

3. The sg. fem. nom. is in -ĭ (§7 above). This too is early levelled out: несучи(я) > несуча(я).

<sup>121</sup> It is not certain whether this difference is phonological or morphological.

TABLE XV. The Present Participle Active

		Early East Slav		
		Short		Long
	Masc.	Neut.	Fem.	Masc. Neut. Fem.
Sg. N	неса	неса	несучи	несаи несучи
A	несучь	несуче	несучу (-чу)	N or G несучее несучю
G	несуча (-ча)	несуча	несучь	несучего несучь
Pl. N	несуче	несуча	несучь	несучей несучая несучьб
A	несучьб	несуча	несучь	(-ии) несучьб несучая несучьб
G	несучь	несучь	несучь	несучьб несучая несучьб несучь(и)ихъ

OCS (ChSl.)

Short

	Masc.	Neut.	Fem.
Sg. N	несу	несу	несрѣти
A	несрѣти	несрѣте	несрѣтѣ
G	несрѣта	несрѣта	несрѣтѣ
Pl. N	несрѣте	несрѣта	несрѣтѣ
A	несрѣтѣ	несрѣта	несрѣтѣ
G	несрѣти		

Similarly:

		Early East Slav		
		Short		Long
	Masc.	Neut.	Fem.	Masc. Neut. Fem.
Sg. N	зная	зная	знаячи	знаяи знаячи
A	моля	моля	молячи	N or G молячи молячя
G	молячь	молячя	молячу (-чу)	молячье молячю
Pl. N	молячь	молячя	молячи	молячей молячая молячьб
A	молячьб	молячя	молячи	(-ии) молячьб молячая молячьб
G	молячь	молячя	молячи	молячьб молячая молячьб молячь(и)ихъ

OCS (ChSl.)

Short

	Masc.	Neut.	Fem.
Sg. N	знаѣ	знаѣ	знаѣшти
A	знаѣшти	знаѣште	знаѣштиѣ
G	знаѣшта	знаѣшта	знаѣштиѣ

4. The anomalous forms of the 'long' declension are superseded by regular formations on the oblique stem: знаи > знаючий, знаючее, and the pl. NA loses gender distinctions as in all adjs.: знаючий, знаючая, знаючье > знаючие.

5. The oblique cases of the short declension were little used and disappeared *pari passu* with those of other adjectives. The *nom. forms*, singular and plural, in appositional use, alone remained in common (including colloquial) use, but from an early date tend towards *invariable* 'gerunds' (verbal adverbs),<sup>122</sup> abandoning gender agreement; the prevailing forms are sg. masc. and sg. fem. (or perhaps reformed pl. masc.) in -чи:

жены кланяются тако молва (1282) (sg. masc. for pl. fem.); приходячи, бѣгаючи, хотячи (RPC s.a. 907, 1054, 1093); but equally commonly платяче, стояче (ibid. 862, 1093).

The change to invariables in -я/-а or -юч/-учи and -яч/-ачи (much less common than -я/-а in Type B verbs) was complete by the 15th c.

6. Of the two types, that in -чи appears to be the more colloquial<sup>123</sup> and is still fairly common in the 18th c. It is noticeable that the forms in -чи/-че in RPC (as opposed to the ChSl. forms) are almost always from common colloquial verbs: идуче, воюючи, мимоходячи, and examples above. If ChSl. forms are used agreement is usually correct:

корсуяне, подъякопаше стѣну градскую, крадуще сыпшему персть, и ношаху к собѣ въ градъ, слышюще посредѣ града (s.a. 988) (pl. masc. nom. including the past p.a. подъякопаше).

Since the 18th c. the formal paradigm of the verb has preferred

<sup>122</sup> Vaillant prefers 'gerundive' (*gerundif*) but the function of the Russian form does not correspond exactly either to the Latin gerund or gerundive.

<sup>123</sup> In *NBC*, no. 9 (c.1200) вода [not вода!] новую жену and добръ сътворя have a somewhat literary flavour, especially the second.

	Short			Long		
	Masc.	Neut.	Fem.	Masc.	Neut.	Fem.
Sg. N	несь	несь	несьши	несьи	несьшее	несьшия
A	зна-въ	знавъ	знавъши	знавъи	знавъшее	знавъшия
G	несьшь	несьше	несьшу	N or G	несьшее	несьшую
Pl. N	знавъшь	знавъше	знавъшу	несьшего	знавъшее	знавъшую
	несьша	ас masc.	несьшь	несьшего	ас masc.	несьшеб
	знавъша	знавъшь	знавъшь	несьшия	несьшьб	несьшьб
	знавъше	знавъша	знавъшь	знавъшии	знавъшая	знавъшьб

The suffix is *-ъш* (< *-us-*) after consonants, *-въш*- after vowels. In the Second Conjugation OCS has the symmetrical formation *sg. masc. nom. xvъl'ŷ* 'who praised', *pristopl'ŷi* 'having approached', etc., to be considered archaisms in ChSl.

## 125

## Commentary

1. The *sg. masc. nom. знав, любив, etc.* provides the invariable gerund, with an alternative *fem. несьши, знавши, любивши*. The latter is scarcely alive outside consonant stems (Type A1)—при-несьши, пришедши—and even these are largely replaced by formations on the model of the *present gerund*—принесъ, войдѣ (принёс, пришёд are quite extinct).<sup>124</sup> The ChSl. equivalent is in *-ъше*: рек(ъ)ше 'having said'.

2. The past gerund is certainly as native a formation as the present gerund; it is naturally almost always formed from *pf* verbs:

аже кто ударить мечемъ, не вынезъ его (RP, art. 23) 'if one person strikes (another) with a sword, without drawing it' (for *вынезъ*);  
 . . . а умереть не заплативъ (1229) ' . . . and dies without having paid';  
 измавъ я вся посла исковавъ по своимъ городомъ (1215) 'having arrested them all (he) sent them in chains . . .';  
 и мы обыскавъ головника, выдзали . . . (Pskov, c.1464) 'having sought out the murderer, we handed (him) over . . .';

The establishment of an invariable form is complete by the 15th c. Deverbilized forms (§120 above) are found in (несколько лет) *слустѣ 'later'* and *немногю погодѣ*.

<sup>124</sup> Other difficult forms have been eliminated by adding *-в* to the infinitive stem: *взяв, снавъ, начав* (for earlier and ChSl. *възъмъ, сънъмъ, начъмъ*). *Пришедъ* (пришод) and a few others were still current in the 17th c.

3. In verbs compounded with *-ся* the form in *-ши* has been preferred: *помолившись*. This normalisation is subsequent to the 17th c.; the *Ulozhenie* of 1649 still has *не дождався указу et sim*. In the long learned forms *-ся* is maintained: *читавшийся* (cf. §121 above).

4. The long forms have retained some literary use (cf. p.p.a. and 4.31).

There is a distinction between *лѣвшій* (literal) and purely ChSl. *лѣдшій* (metaphorical): *лѣдшая жѣнщина*. ChSl. is also *усобшій* 'deceased' (< *уснуть*, root *sup-*).

126 The past p.a. in *-л*, perfect in function, is entirely affected to the *cpd. perfect* tenses, now a general preterite.

(i) Many old *l*-participles have become adjectives (see also §105 (e) above): *унѣльнѣй 'despondent'*; *гѣльнѣй снег 'melted snow (slush)'*; *облѣзельнѣй 'shabby'*; *окаменѣльнѣй 'petrified'*.

(ii) Certain N. and W. dialects use formulae of the type он *пришедши 'he has arrived'*, он *въпивши 'he is drunk'*, thus re-establishing with the active participle (gerund) in *-вш* the specific perfect sense lost in *пришѣл, выпил*. It is possible that this is due to the Baltic substrate (see Table XIX) since Lithuanian uses the corresponding participle with the verb 'to be' in the same contexts as the Slav participle in *-л*.

## 127 Present Participle Passive (pres. p.p.)

1. The characteristic is *-м-*. The short *sg. masc. nom.* is thus identical (stress differences apart) with the *pres. pl. 1*: *знаем, молим* (long *знаёмый, любимый*); exceptions are only a few consonant stems and anomalous verbs with connective vowel *-o-*: *несом(ый), вбдом(ый)*. The declension is regular adjectival. There is little evidence that this participle was a native ESl. form, apart from a few survivals. In the modern paradigm it is wholly a Slavonicism. Nor is it available from all verbs (*imprf*): no verbs with consonant mutation form it (\**пишемый*). ChSl. example (RPC s.a. 1054): *помроша бггаючи, Божьимъ гнввомъ гоними* ' . . . pursued by the wrath of God'. Apparently colloquial survivals, now adjectives, are *любимый 'favourite'*, *родимый 'own, native'*, and perhaps *лакомый 'tasty'*, (не)видимый '(in)visible'; also the forms in *-ом-*: *свѣдом, (за)вѣдомо (adv)*. Clearly learned are *мнимый 'imaginary'*; *весомый аргумент 'a weighty argument'*;



искомое<sup>125</sup> (math.) 'the unknown quantity'; насекомое 'insect'; (много)уважаемый X. 'Dear X.' (in letters); derivative пиромец 'nurseling'. Curious is естóмые 'eatables' in *Dom.*, of unclear formation.

2. While comparatively little used as a verbal form, the type has been extended in literary vocabulary to provide (long) *adjectives*, usually negative, denoting (im)possibility. The formation is irrespective of aspect (a true *present* participle can only be formed from an *imperf* verb): необитаемый 'uninhabited'; непромокаемый 'waterproof'; неисчерпаемый 'inexhaustible'; обтекаемый (recent) 'streamlined'; необходимый 'unavoidable, necessary'; (не)осуществимый '(im)practicable'; (не)соизмеримый '(in)compensurate'; непрекэаемый 'incontrovertible'; невозвратимый 'irretrievable'. Formations from obviously Russian verbs are not excluded: невыносимый 'unbearable'; непроходимый дурак 'utter fool'.

There are models in OCS already, e.g. *неглаголїимї* 'inseparable'. Adverbs are occasionally possible: непроницаемо чёрный 'impenetrably black'.

### 128 Past Participle Passive (p.p.p.)

1. This is a necessary part of the transitive verb and outside ChSl. influence.

There are two types:

- (a) in *-t-*, mainly from monosyllabic vowel-stems and verbs in -нуть (Types A2, A3a).
- (b) the majority in *-n-* (*-an-*, *-en-*, *-jen-*): -несен, -писан, -делан, -пущен.

The type in *-t-* has been slightly extended in ESl. compared with OCS: native убит-ый 'killed', OCS (ChSl.) у-биенъ; native открыг-ый 'opened', ChSl. откровен(ный) 'open, frank' (figurative).

2. P.p.p. in *-an* are always stressed on the root: потерян(ный), сдэлан(ный), написан(ный). Exceptions are Slavonisms (arant from данный): желанный 'desired', избранный 'elect' (now usually избран(ный)), несказанный 'ineffable'.<sup>126</sup> Foreign words

<sup>125</sup> Plausibly a very ancient form before the establishment of the paradigm in *isk-j-* (pres. pl. 1 *идём*).

<sup>126</sup> Scarcely from R. сказать 'say'; OCS (ChSl.) *sъkazati* = 'explain': *sъkaziti namъ prїitїeŕ* 'explain the parable to us'.

adapted with -ировать, -изовать often have or had alternative stress but the p.p.p. is preferably -ован-: бомбардировать, -ирован; инсценировать 'produce', only инсценирован(ный).

The stress of p.p.p. in *-en* follows in almost all cases (as a rule of thumb)<sup>127</sup> the stress of the present (future) tense other than the sg. 1, but any palatalization in sg. 1 will also appear in the p.p.p. (*-jen-*):

*pf* решить 'decide': решу, решит; решён

*pf* принести 'bring': при-несу, -несёт; -несён

*pf* встретить 'meet': встрéчу, встрéтит; встрéчен

*pf* разбудить 'wake': раз-бужу, -будит; -бужен.

P.p.p. from ChSl. verbs now follow Russian phonology: возбудить 'arouse', p.p.p. возбуждён(ный); победить 'defeat', победён(ный). (У-)виденный is the only verb not to show the expected palatalization (sg. 1 *вижу*); but the ancient *срд.* обидеть 'insult' has обйжен(ный). Occasionally there is differentiation: p.p.p. приближённый/now only *adj.* приближённый 'approxi-mate'.

### 129

3. As an essential part of the predicate the p.p.p. appears in the short form and here preserves its original and correct spelling with one *-н-*: дан 'given', дано, дана, даны; (при-)несён 'brought', -несенó, -несенá, -несены́.

As an attribute (long form) the spelling has been arbitrarily changed. Down to the 17th c. we still have predominantly вь разорёныхъ городáхъ, ко́пченого с́бна, etc. But there was much confusion with adjectives in *-(ь)ный* from the same root, often virtually synonymous. Hence, by conflation укáзанный + укáзный (*adj.*) > укáзанный. Double *-нн-* (purely graphic; 2.27) begins to appear in the 16th c. (по преже писанному, *Dom.*) but is not fully regularized till the early 19th c.

4. The p.p.p. can theoretically be formed from either aspect but is now almost exclusively a form of the *pf* verb. Formerly *imperf* p.p.p. were more freely formed and an aspectual difference is sometimes discernible: one can still write éта кнїга писана для

<sup>127</sup> Exceptions to the stress rule are rare and have arisen by mixed choices where there was a regional or other alternative in the present: standard are now e.g. клонить, -клонит, -клонён; делить, -делит, -делён; поручить, -ручат, -ручен, but вручить, -ручат, -ручен; and some others. Принудить and вынудить 'force, compel', both with native sg. 1 -нужу, both make p.p.p. in ChSl. form: принуждён (irregular stress), вынужден; the *imperf* are both -нуждáть.

детей 'this book has been written for children' (true perfect) in contrast to эта книга написана Чеховым 'this book was written by Chekhov' (equivalent to an aor. passive). The form is by no means extinct outside the passive tenses (i.e. as a near-adjective) and the perfect sense of *acquired state* is usually evident. The old spelling with one -н- is always retained: битый час 'a full hour'; бритое лицо '(clean-)shaven face' ('shaved' is выбритый); варёная рыба 'boiled fish'; витая лестница 'spiral staircase'; вощёный пол 'waxed floor'; гружёные вагоны 'loaded wagons'; деланный 'counterfeit'; дублённые кожи 'tanned skins'; жарёное мясо 'toast meat'; жжёная известь 'slaked lime'; золочёный gilt, gilded'; калёное желёзо 'red-hot iron'; ломаная линия 'dotted line'; мёлотый кофе 'ground coffee'; морожёное 'an ice-cream'; рёзанный хлеб 'sliced loaf'; сушёные грибы 'dried mushrooms'; стрижёные вёлсы 'stopped hair'; учёный 'scholar'; холёные руки 'well-kept hands'; непрошённый 'unsolicited', and numerous other negatives.

In the 16th-17th c. p.p.p. were more or less freely formed from *срд. imperfectives* in a frequentative sense: дворяне посылали 'officers have been (repeatedly) sent'; а столникомъ . . . давано ис царские казны жалование (Kot.) 'a salary from the Treasury has been (regularly) paid . . .'; он распрашиванъ (1623) 'he has been questioned (several times)'.

This specific sense is not, however, always apparent; many such forms are no doubt due to the Polish fashions of the period (7.25); in Polish this participial formation is still normal. They have entirely disappeared from standard literary Russian.

130 5. Muscovite Russian also widely employed *impersonal p.p.p.* (neuter) from *intransitive* and *reflexive* verbs as well as transitive:

никому ни в чёмъ не слыгивано [солгать рл], ни манено, ни пересрочено (Дом., 16th c.);  
а остатки [асс.] сверчено и связано (ibid.);  
а с калмыками де у нихъ помрeness же (17th c.) 'peace has been made'.

The prevalence of this procedure in strongly colloquial texts (including Ivan Grozny's letters)<sup>128</sup> suggests that it was normal usage at that level, and indeed similar procedures are still widely recorded from N. and W. dialects: у него уехано = он уехал (usually *pluperfect*); всю картошку съедено (N. dial.) 'all the

<sup>128</sup> А уж засхано, 4.82.

potatoes have been eaten'; у kota руку исцарапано (W. dial.) '(my) hand was scratched by the cat'; сижено 'we sat'; жито 'one has lived'.

But once again there may have been, at least in more literary contexts, some influence of Polish where compound passive tenses are avoided if the subject is *inanimate*. The following is a typical modern example: *Rodatki* [acc. pl.] *nie tylko podwyższano ale także wudzierzawiano; uciekano się też do konfiskat* 'taxes were not only raised but also farmed out; recourse was had also to confiscations'. This procedure also disappeared from standard Russian after Peter the Great's reign. It persists in Ukrainian, perhaps as a Polishism.

131 6. A few ChSl. p.p.p. have been incorporated into Russian literary vocabulary as adjectives, e.g. совершённый (p.p.p. совершённый, 2.46), незабвённый 'unforgettable', обыкновённый 'ordinary, usual', вдохновённый 'inspired' (p.p.p. вдохновлён), дерзновённый 'insolent', откровенный 'frank' (p.p.p. открыт), надмённый 'arrogant' (p.p.p. надутый). Difference in form is most conspicuous in verbs in -нуть (Type A2): согбённый 'bowed' (native p.p.p. согнутый 'bent').

Some participles from now intransitive verbs in Russian are either due to a change in rection or are from ChSl.: достигнутый 'attained' (достигнуть + gen.); пожёртованный 'donated' (otherwise жёртовать чем 'sacrifice'); неожиданный 'unexpected' (ожидать + gen.); желанный 'desired' (желать + gen.).

7. Russian has differentiated by stress certain p.p.p. segregated as adjectives: занятый 'occupied'/занятой 'busy'; развитый 'developed'/развитой 'mature' (short masc. развит and развит respectively).

### 132 The Participles of Быть

These are all obviously ChSl. (except in its transitive *срд.*, e.g. p.p.p. забытый 'forgotten') but have achieved wide spoken use:

(a) p.p.p. а. сущий (the original sg. masc. nom. ES. са(и), ChSl. сы(и) also occur). Now only metaphorical: он сущий дурак 'he is a perfect fool'. Many ChSl. derivatives: существо, существённый. (b) *Future* будущий,<sup>129</sup> now an adj.: на будущей неделе 'next week'; в будущем 'in the future'.

<sup>129</sup> The unique fut. participle (быду is a *pf* tense); there are rare ChSl. alternatives, viz. на придушемъ вбдб (RPC s.a. 10668) 'in the life to come' (not an old form).

(c) Past p.a. бывший, from officiales: бывший секретарь 'former, ex-secretary'.

## PASSIVE VOICE

133 1. On the evidence of OCS, ChSl. had long abandoned any special passive (or middle) paradigm; the only passive forms were the indispensable p.p.p. and the pres. p.p. All Slav vernaculars untouched by education and literature avoid(ed) passive syntax as far as possible. It is still more natural and better in Russian to say эту книгу вездé читаю than эта книга вездé читается. Compare the text of Kotoshkin with the translation in 7.31.

If the passive is not to be avoided, two procedures are possible and common in OCS (ChSl.):

- (a) p.p.p. + appropriate part of auxiliary быть;  
 (b) a verb compounded with -ся (-se).<sup>130</sup>

2. ChSl. and Slavonicized style continues the use of (b) as passive more or less irrespective of tense and aspect. It is highly doubtful that this procedure was ever native ESL. The more colloquial texts indicate that 'reflexive' passives were confined to *inanimate* subjects and the *impf* (continuous) tenses. In Russian книга пишется is normal but \*книга написалась and \*книга напишется are impossible; and ребёнок моется = 'is washing (itself)', never 'is being washed'. Verbs that do allow a *pf* passive of this kind will be found to be Slavonicisms; only usage decides whether they are correct or not.

Altogether 'reflexive' forms as passives are shown to be largely literary by their relative rarity in, say, the colloquial parts of the *Novg. Chronicle*. The present pattern of usage is certainly not independent of ChSl. influence nor of W. European (French)

<sup>130</sup> As a verbal affix -ся has several uses. It will suffice to recall the other main ones here:

- (i) true reflexive (internal *trans.*): (ум)ыться 'wash (oneself)'; саяться 'seat oneself';  
 (ii) reciprocal: они́ часто переписываются 'they often correspond';  
 (iii) 'deponent' (internal *intrans.*), where *ся* may represent an earlier *си*, dat. of involvement): бояться 'fear'; намереваться 'intend' ('боять', \*намеревать do not exist).  
 (iv) impersonal (with dat. of involvement): мне хочётся 'I want to'; мне не спится 'I cannot sleep' (я хочу́, я не сплю equally possible but of different implication).

influence in the 18th–19th c. The language can thus make distinctions such as считать себя + instr. 'to consider oneself', считатья 'to be considered' (by others).

3. Shades of meaning are obtainable at the literary level by substituting the habitual быть for the auxiliary быть (бываёт, бывал прочитан) or the pres. p.p. for the p.p.p.: когда русское искусство было гонимо (Блок): . . . was being persecuted'.

4. *Ся* only becomes fully bound to the verb form in the 17th c.; 16th c. texts still exhibit some freedom: сам назвался/ся сам назвал (same text, 1576).

134 5. The present-day paradigm is thus:

	Present	Past	Future
<i>impf</i>	книга пишется is being written is (always) written	писалась was being written used to be written	будет писаться will be (being) written
<i>pf</i>	книга написана has been written	была написана was written had been written	будет написана will be written will have been written

It should be specially noted that the conflation of aorist and perfect into a general preterite *does not take place* in the passive, where the present of the perfect книга (есть) написана is still distinct. So in OCS: (aor.) *zavoreny bysę dviri* 'the doors were closed' (action) but *juže dviri zavoreny sōiū* 'the doors have been closed, are closed' (state); and in ChSl.: не ходи, отъиди ти умерль а братъ ти убиень от Святополка (*RPC s.a.* 1015) '... your brother has been killed by Svjatorolk' (with parallel active perfect).

Further examples of usage (ChSl. style):

яко же пишется (*RPC s.a.* 852) 'as is written';  
 си вси заухутся [imperf.] отъ Грекъ Великая Скуфь (*ibid.* 907) 'all these (people) were called by the Greeks "Great Scythia";  
 пересечены быша грекы (*ibid.* 915) 'the Greeks were massacred';  
 написахомъ харатью сию, на неи же суть имена наша написана (*ibid.* 945) 'we have written this document in which our names have been listed';

храни ти все еже есть написана на неи (*ibid.*) 'to observe everything that is written in it';  
 и от тбхъ заповѣдано обновити ветъхьи миръ (*ibid.*) 'and (we) have been instructed by them to renew the former peace(-treaty)'.

In a colloquial text we find: аж бы миръ не рѣздрушенъ былъ 'that the peace may not be broken'; аже будет(ь) холгытъ убить 'if a slave is murdered'; but аже кого уранять (pl. 3) 'if someone is wounded' (all 1229).

6. The extension of passive forms to the infinitive (бытъ сдѣлан(ным)) and gerund (будучи сдѣланным) is certainly literary only and recent.

7. It is therefore legitimate to say that though early ESl. had theoretically a complete passive system in practice its use was severely limited. Present usage has been formalized gradually under literary influences (ChSl. and Western).

#### VERBAL NOUN

135 1. In form the verbal noun adds *-ije* (ChSl. *-ие*, Russian *-ие*) to the short p.p.p., and is theoretically available from all verbs, trans. and intrans., *pf* and *impf*. Pure Russian forms are now relatively rare, usually from simple primary verbs and often with final stress: мытьё 'washing', шитьё 'sewing', дутьё 'glass-blowing', купанье 'bathing' (купаться); and frequently from verbs of sound, e.g. карканье 'croaking', to which may be added the learned terms аканье and цоканье (Table XVII), etc. and derivatives of colloquial verbs in *-ничать* (< nouns in *-ник*), e.g. гримасничанье 'pulling faces'. Many have passed from *action* to *concrete*: варенье 'jam', кушанье 'food, meal', вязанье '(piece of) knitting'. All the formations in *-ание/-ение* are on principle literary. Slavonicisms: спасение 'salvation', исследование 'investigation', (раз)решение 'solution', etc. Понятие 'idea' and понимание 'understanding' show the difference between the *pf* and *impf* verb. An artificial difference has also been established between (ChSl. spelling) воскресение 'resurrection' and (R. spelling) воскресенье 'Sunday'.

Slavonicisms are particularly evident in the verbs in *-нуть* (ChSl. p.p.p. in *-овен*): исчезновение 'disappearance', прикосновение 'contact', мгновение 'instant' (R. мигнуть 'blink'), камень преткновения 'stumbling block'; also забвение 'oblivion' but R. забыть 'swoon' (both from забыть). Russian forms in *-утье* are no longer current (тянутье is still recorded in 1708).

As a now fully acclimatized derivative the noun in *-ние* is formed freely from purely Russian verbs: переписывание 'copying

(process), выражение 'expression'. A Russian spelling of these ChSl. words is quite frequent in early texts: не преймаи же ученья отъ Лавльнъ (RPC s.d. 988); начало княженья Ярославля (ibid. 1016). Conversely in the 1229 Treaty: аж товаръ перевезлъ без дѣржания 'that he may transport the goods without delay', the noun may well be colloquial. Forms in *-ние* are common in poetry for metrical convenience.

2. Verbal nouns from derived *impf* verbs denote the pure process and are common in technical language: отбеливание 'bleaching'; распознавание самолетов 'aircraft recognition'; при наваривании 'during the process of welding'. So in ChSl.: пострижание 'action of tonsuring' but пострижение 'the (whole) ceremony of tonsuring (and its result)'. But in ordinary usage one form commonly does duty for both, especially as many such words now indicate *state* rather than *action*, or are completely concretized: возмущение (< воз-мутиться and -мутиться) 'indignation'; ChSl. одбние/одбание 'dressing' > 'dress, clothes'; растение 'plant'; здание 'building'.

3. While the verbal noun in *-ние* is certainly native, the characteristic verbal nouns of Russian are either suffixless or with suffix *-ка*; the latter are rarely recorded before the 18th c. but are often preferred thereafter as technical terms: перепіска 'correspondence', варка (піва) 'brewing' (rather than варение), стрижка овец 'sheep-shearing'. Modern vocabulary is thus rich in contrasts such as:

<i>Native</i>	<i>ChSl.</i>
сбор 'gathering, collection'	собрание 'collection' (concrete)
сборка 'assembly'	собрание 'process of collecting'

and

<i>Native</i>	<i>ChSl.</i>
разворот 'turn'	разврат 'depravity'
развѣртка 'development'	развращение 'corruption'.

4. It should be noted that the infinitive by itself was not used in the earlier language as the *subject* of a clause: this is the role of the verbal noun.<sup>131</sup> This usage becomes common under Western

<sup>131</sup> It was sufficiently verbal in OCS to take an object in the acc.: о субрании субортѣ.

influence in the 18th c. only. Proverbs, etc.—which may be old—can have the infinitive in a phraseological group, e.g. *жить прожить* — не поле перейти.

VERBS WITH VARIOUS ANOMALIES

- 137 1. Throughout Slav, сплю, спит 'sleep' (Type B1) has an unexplained infinitive спать.  
 2. Хотеть (early ESL. хотѣти and also х(ъ)лѣти) 'wish, want', apparently an old athematic verb reformed with a new infinitive of state. It had until the 17th c. a regular present of Type A3β, except for the original pl. 3 хотѣтъ(ь), with which goes a p.p.a. хотѣчий (> gerund хотѣ): а вы хотите изъмерети гладомъ (RPC s.a. 946) 'you will (surely) die of starvation' (future, §109 above). Since then the pl. 1, 2 have submitted to the attraction of the pl. 3 and are now only хотѣм, хотѣте.

138 3. The CSI. verb *děti pf* (originally athematic?) has the following development of forms and senses:

(a) OCS *děti pf* 'put', pres.-fut. *deždę* (< \**ded-j*, similar in form to *damī* < \**dad-nī* (§91 above)).

The corresponding ESL. pres.-fut. (or pres.?) *deže*-survived until at least the 13th c.: камь [= камо] его хочеть, тамъ [= тамо] дѣжетъ (1229), but the verb was reformed as *pf* деть, дѣну (on the model of стать, стѣну), now mainly in срдс., e.g. одѣтъ(ся) 'dress', задѣтъ 'touch', with new *impf* дѣвать. Older *impf* дѣяти in ChSl. надѣяться 'hope, rely on', одеяние 'clothes' (reduplicated stem in надежда 'hope' and одѣжда 'clothing').

(b) Дѣяти *impf* 'do', replaced by the denominative дѣлати (дѣлатъ) < *dělo* 'deed': что ся дѣбеть по врьемьнемъ (1229 Treaty, *ad init.*), but also тако дѣлати руси у Рязѣ (ibid.).<sup>132</sup>

Дѣять(ся) is still present in R. dialects.

(c) Дѣяти (дѣти) *impf* 'say': аще ли кто дѣбеть вы (RPC s.a. 1078) 'if anyone says to you'. Obsolete in Russian (but Cz. *díti, dítim*, etc.), having left behind only the coll. particle де(и) 'he says' (4.32 (1)) and its derivative дѣскагъ (< де сказагъ?).

139 4. *The Verbs of Motion* in Slav have two *impf* forms, a *determinate* (actual motion in a specific direction) and an *indeterminate*

<sup>132</sup> Дѣлатъ was relatively uncommon until recently. In the Muscovite period the normal verbs for 'to do' were творить and чинить (5.46).

TABLE XVI. Summary of the Modern Verbal Paradigm

Process or habit	Imperfective		Perfective	
	Participle	Gerund	Event	Participle
Present	act. читаю, читаюсь pass. читается is (being) read	читаю (while) reading читаюсь (while) being read	—	—
Future	act. буду читать I shall (be) read(ing)	—	—	—
Past	act. читал, читался will be (being) read	читавший (who was) reading	читая (gate) having read	прочитавший who read
Past	pass. был читан, читан was being read, used to be read	читавшеся (gate) having been read	гов. был прочитан was read, had been read	прочитавшеся* (not always available) who read
Conditional	act. читал бы pass. читан бы reading (go on)	—	—	—
Imperative	act. читай read (go on reading)	—	—	—
Infinitive	act. читать pass. читаться reading (from subaction)	—	—	—
Verbal noun	—	—	—	—

For considerations of aspect see also 4.83 ff. The stated forms are of ChSl. provenance.

(motion in general or undirected). The ablaut relation is very ancient:

<i>Det. (Type A1)</i>	<i>Indet. (Type B1)</i>	
нести	носить	'carry' (on one's person)
вести (< вед-)	водить	'lead'
везти	возить	'carry' (in a vehicle)
брести	бродить	'wade, pass'

To these must be added pairs with other newer relationships:

(intr.) бежать (* <i>bĕg-ĕ-</i> )	бегать (* <i>bĕg-ĕ-</i> )	'run'
лезть	лазять (лазить)	'climb'
лететь	летать (лѣтати)	'fly'
плыть	плавать	'swim, float' (i.e. move through water)
ползти	ползать	'crawl (about)'
(trans.) гнать (гнати)	гонять	'drive, chase'
катить	катать	'roll (about)'
тащить	таскать	'drag (about)'

The above pattern is faithfully preserved in ESl.

#### Notes

(a) Бежать replaces OCS or dial. бѣчь (\**bĕg-ĕ-*), from the present of which sg. 1 бегу and pl. 3 бегут remain.

(b) The older present of гнать was гнѣю, гнѣет(ь) (common in ChSl.) < \**gen-*.<sup>133</sup> It has been replaced by гоню, гонит from an *indet.* \*гонить, itself replaced by гонять, гоняю (\**gen-iti* : *nes-iti/nos-iti*).

(c) Лететь (лѣтати) is a new infinitive (no other is recorded) with its regular present (Type B2) лечу, летит; the original verb was probably athematic: Lith. has *lėkti*.

(d) The original sense of брести/бродить is probably preserved in the noun брод 'ford', i.e. the verb indicated some difficulty in motion. The verb is usual for crossing rivers in the chronicles, side by side with перевозити 'ferry across'. The sense 'wander about' is later (whence бродяга 'tramp'). In the 17th c. it is often little more than a synonym for идти; so in Аввакум: побрел один; я отбрел в дом свой. He also uses the already figurative на ум взбрелó 'it came into my head'; с ума сбрёл 'went mad' (noun

<sup>133</sup> So still Ukr. гнати, pres. жену.

сумасброд, also 17th c., still available side by side with the more learned сумасшедший). These usages are wholly colloquial.

140 5. The determinate verbs of motion идти (or идти, for идти) 'go on foot, walk' and ехать (ѣхати) 'go in a vehicle, travel' are highly irregular.

Both have a present with suffix *-d-*: иду́, ѣду́ (roots \**ei-*, \**jā-*). The perfect participle of идти is from a different root \**šād-*: шёлъ, шѣла > шёл, шла. This appears as \**xod-* in the corresponding indeterminate ходить, no doubt by deprefixation (*pri-s-* > *pri-x-*, *s* > *x* after *i*, §58 (7) above).<sup>134</sup>

The *-x-* in the infinitive ехать is obscure. OCS has *jeiti* and *jaxati* (*ĕxati*), pres. *jade-*. Russian ехать, еду is likewise the result of deprefixation, the CSI. rule being *jā-* initially, *-ĕ-* internally (cf. §94 above).

The corresponding indeterminate ѣздить, ѣзжу is altogether anomalous; it may be a denominative from езда́ but this does not explain much. Examples are rare before the 14th c.

It should be noted that in Muscovite Russian гнать is widely used as a synonym of идти or бежать. The original sense 'run' is found in OCS and still in SSl. (i.e. *rapid* motion, excluding flying). The Russian specialization to *liquids* ('run, flow') is recent and also present in the related causative гонять 'secrete'.

6. For the perfective-iteratives see 4.94.

<sup>134</sup> Ablaut forms \**sed-/\*sod-*; cf. Gk. ὁδός 'way'.