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The purpose of this thesis is to investigate norm in contemporary Russian verbal stress. In a first step the concept of norm is explored. It is shown that the criteria generally used in Russian for defining norm (correspondence to the language system, usage and authority/tradition/necessity) are not applied strictly. It is also concluded that any study of norms must take into account the distinction between the explicit norm, i.e. the codification, and the implicit norm, i.e. the usage and attitude of educated native speakers.

In a second step the explicit norm is investigated. The analysis is based on the stress notation in two orthoepic dictionaries. This comparison shows that there is not, as is often suggested, one unanimous, “objectively existing”, explicit stress norm.

In a third step, the implicit norm is examined. This is done through a survey of reported and actual usage, carried out on 106 Russian speakers in Moscow.

Subsequently, implicit norms are related to explicit norms. There is compliance between these in many cases, but the discrepancies are numerous. Furthermore, there is no direct or predictable relationship between the implicit stress norms and the labels these stresses are assigned in handbooks. A comparison with additional sources demonstrates that among the, in all, nine sources no two are perfectly alike in their notation. Sources that reflect the implicit norm better than others are identified.

Finally, dictionary data and the survey results are compared with results from previous surveys (1956–1994). This shows that certain stress variants have apparently functioned as the implicit norm for several decades, but this has not yet been taken into account in codification.

The general conclusions are that

• there is in theory an unclear definition of norm;
• there is in practice disagreement in codification; there is no official codex, although some sources might be considered more reliable;
• there is in many cases a discrepancy between explicit and implicit norms, which is most likely a result of arbitrariness or subjectivism and of conservatism.

It is possible that these conclusions are valid for areas of language normativisation other than verbal stress.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Preliminaries

Russian word stress is like a rampant field. Stress is free and mobile, it is not marked in writing and this makes it difficult for both non-native and native speakers. The numerous stress variants, the existence of stress handbooks and dictionaries and the appearance of language laws and programmes discussing stress as one subject all testify to the complexity of the problem.

Stresses which in some way or another deviate from a person’s own norm generally cause vivid reactions, and word-stress is one of the areas in which norms are discussed most actively. One reason for this could be that stress is so conspicuous. This is pointed out by, for instance, Vasil’eva (1990:27) who claims that the accentological subsystem in itself has a large regularity “при явной материальной выражаемости нормы”, which makes every deviation observable and obvious. (Cf. Grot 1885:355: “Ошибка в ударении может иногда более поразить слух, нежели неправильное окончание” and Dolopčev 1886:I–II: “слух неприятно поражается дурным произношением, произвольной и неправильной постановкой ударения”.) A similar view is expressed by Krivenko (1995), who says that “errors” in stress are frequent, they are “on the surface” and therefore “grate upon the ears” (1995:67).

In fact, stress has been called a “litmus paper” of the level of speech culture (Gorbačevič 1978b:85). Gorbačevič further claims that no other area causes so much hesitation and oscillation or as many discussions and controversies as word stress (1979:77). That stress is and has been so much in focus is also testified to by Voroncova (1996:305), who says that “errors” in stress are frequent, they are “on the surface” and therefore “grate upon the ears” (1995:67).

In discussions about stress verbs have, according to Krysin (1974:234), fallen into the visual field of the normalisers more than any other word group.

As mentioned above, stress is manifest and it is seen as an indicator of the level of linguistic competence. At the same time results of surveys (Voroncova 1959, Krysin 1974, Kolesov 1967, Pirogova 1967, Gorbačevič 1978a, Ukiah 1996) have proved or suggested that there are discrepancies in several cases between the stress norms of dictionaries or handbooks and the speech of the educated native speaker. As the standard language is generally defined as the language of this group – the educated native speakers – and the Russian standard language and the codified norm generally coincide (see Chapter 2) these discrepancies call for a study of stress norms in the contemporary Russian language.

1 For quotations from these and other pre-1918 sources modernised orthography has been used.
2 “Эти ошибки наиболее многочисленны, часто повторяются, лежат, что называется, на поверхности, а потому и ‘режут слух’, потому и заслуживают первостепенного внимания” (Krivenko 1995:67).
3 For instance, when Reformatskij & Ožegov (1994) discuss language on TV they deal particularly with stress.
In addition, language norms are of particular current interest as there is evidence that new interest in norms, normativisation and cultivation of speech has awakened in recent years. This is noted by Rozental' et al.:

Но в последние годы заметно повысился интерес к проблемам культуры устной речи среди самых различных слоев общества. Этому способствуют социально-экономические изменения в нашей стране, демократизация всех сторон жизни. (Rozental' et al. 1994:370)

There are several signs of this revival. Firstly, there is an active collection of variants and variation (e.g. Ageenko 1996, Kostomarov 1994, Krivenko 1995, Lapteva 1990b, 1993, 1997).

Secondly, language norms and variants are often discussed both by linguists and laymen.

Thirdly, new handbooks dealing with stress as one or as the only subject have appeared (e.g. Es'kova 1994) or have been re-edited in a new version with a new orientation. This is the case with A&Z–1993, which has abandoned its earlier orientation towards radio and television, and is directed towards all speakers (see below). However, A&Z–2000, again, is intended mainly for use in radio and television. Other handbooks with a general approach are Skvorcov (1995) and Eliseeva et al. (1996). There are also handbooks directed towards particular groups: Senkevič (1997) is intended for media workers and Graudina & Širjaev (1994) for deputies.⁴

Fourthly, the past few years have seen several programmes, councils and law proposals concerning language (see Chapter 2.4.4.4).

To sum up, a gap between current educated usage and superannuated stress norms seems to exist at the same time as there is a large and revived interest in norms and normativisation. This shows the importance of a study of language norms.

1.2 Presentation of the study

1.2.1 Scope and definitions
This thesis sets out to investigate norms in the contemporary Russian language and more precisely in the area of verbal stress.

*Norm* cannot be defined at this stage, as a definition of *language norm* is one of the central questions of this thesis. It should, however, already be emphasised at this stage that *norm* is not always equal to the codified norm. Therefore concepts such as *explicit and implicit norm* will be used.

*Contemporary Russian* refers to what in Russian is known as современный русский литературный язык. This is often rendered in English as *Contemporary Standard Russian*. Use of the term *standard* in the title of the thesis was eschewed for two reasons: the relationship between the codified (explicit) norm and the standard language is not totally clear and no clearer is the relationship between, on the one hand, the implicit norm of the group defined as language speakers and, on the other, the codified (explicit) norm. Both language norms and the contemporary Russian standard language will be expanded upon in Chapter 2.

⁴ Cf. Wardhaugh (1992:36): “there is a quite profitable industry devoted to telling people how they should behave linguistically, what it is ‘correct’ to say, what to avoid saying, and so on.”

⁵ This solution is a consequence of the investigation results. It does not imply that I am opposed to using the term *standard*, only that this solution provides an unprejudiced approach to the study.
In the present thesis *verb* generally refers to infinitives and predicate verb forms. However, both a narrower and a broader definition are possible in other contexts, where it can refer to the lexical verb and may also refer to the V node in the sentence. Participles and gerunds are not included in the study. In this context it should also be mentioned that both roots and stems might be referred to as stems. Compare Ukhia (1996:113) for a similar terminological solution: “If the non-desinential part of a word-form is a root alone, it may still be referred to as a stem in this study.”

I will consider verbs and verb forms which have stress variants in normative dictionaries and stress handbooks. The reason that verbs and forms with variation are chosen is that it can be assumed that there is a “norm problem” or a “problem of choice” in these, as variation and fuzziness is a token of change in progress (Nen’ko 1984c:62, Aitchison 1991:38). It should be stated that it is not within the scope of this investigation to go through the whole system of verbal stress, to describe paradigms in stress or to find stress patterns, etc.

By *stress* I mean word stress, i.e. the phonetic way of isolating the stressed syllable from unstressed syllables mainly through lengthening of the vowel in the stressed syllable, although this vowel prominence may also be achieved by a change of other prosodic features such as loudness and/or pitch.

### 1.2.2 Aim and method

This investigation of verbal stress norms in the contemporary Russian language will be made through:

- a study of the concept *norm*, Russian language policy and language normativisation;
- an analysis of orthoepic dictionaries in general and of the two main sources in particular: their theory and practice, their systems of normative and/or stylistical labels and whether there is a unanimous codified/explicit norm;
- a detailed scrutiny of the explicit norms and the variation in the two dictionaries which serve as main sources;
- an experimental investigation of what the actual – or implicit – norms are. This will be made through an informant survey consisting of two parts: to start with, I will analyse informants’ reported usage of both normative and – according to dictionaries – “wrong” stresses, and the informants’ assessment of these stresses (i.e. whether they are right or wrong). The second stage is to study the actual usage of verbal stress variants.

Based on this I will provide:

---

6 The term *variant* can be used both to designate the opposite to the codified norm, and then usually in the context “non-normative variant”, and to designate an occurrence in general, which means that it can be both equal to and opposed to the codified norm (see Chapter 2.3.2).


8 Word stress will be addressed in Chapter 1.4.

9 For details about the choice of sources see Chapter 3. Some scholars have used poetry as a source for stress studies (e.g. Nen’ko 1984a, Voroncova 1979). It could be objected that “normal” usage is not reflected in poetry due to its particular rhythmical organisation. However, there is generally agreement that poetry is a good source for stress studies as stress variation in poetry is not attributable to *licentia poetica* and the freedom exists only within certain limits: only forms which exist in the literary standard and in dialects occur in poetry (Agrell 1917:5, Bulachovskij 1952:22, Černyšëv 1912:42–43, Gorkačević 1971:44–45, 1978b:94, Nen’ko 1984a:10–11, Ogienko 1914:5, 13). Poetry might be useful as an additional source, but handbooks and dictionaries listing variation still provide a more exhaustive and systematic material on stress variants and this is the reason why they are used here. I will not search for variation where it has not been previously recorded, except for a few spot checks, although there is likely to be more stress variation than what is recorded in handbooks and dictionaries.
• a thorough comparison of implicit and explicit norms;
• a check whether the sources’ listings reflect the variation that exists in speech and, conversely, whether the variation listed in the sources is justified by the variants’ position among the speakers;
• a comparison of the results of the present survey with those of other surveys (1956–1994), which will show whether the variations are innovations;
• a comparison of the results of other surveys and codification, which will show if the findings of these previous studies have been taken into account in contemporary codification;
• a comparison of actual usage and reported usage and an analysis of these findings;
• a calculation of the extent to which the informants’ implicit norm coincides with the explicit norm;
• an investigation of which groups of informants are closest to the explicit norm and which groups’ implicit norm deviates most from the explicit norm, including whether the group defined as standard language speakers is the one that most often reports usage in accordance with the explicit norm;
• the characteristics of the informants with the highest and the lowest scores for replies in accordance with the explicit norm;
• a presentation of the survey results grouped according to the label of the variant investigated in order to detect what the relation is between the informants’ replies and the normative or stylistic labels given in stress handbooks;
• a study of the cases when the norm notation in the main sources is conflicting. This will be compared both with other normative sources and with the survey results in order to see whether a pattern emerges as to what sources are modelled on each other and which are more in line with the implicit norm;
• an analysis of the cases when the survey results are not in line with the notation in the main sources (stress variants with low usage codified as norms, stress variants with high usage not codified as norms). Here, too, a comparison will be made with other sources and their labels to see if there are other sources that reflect the implicit norm better than the main sources and can therefore be considered better referential points.

1.2.3 Disposition

Chapter 1 gives an introduction to the investigation, presents the aim and method and deals with previous research. It also gives an introduction to Russian word stress in general. Chapter 2 examines norm and normativisation in Russian. Chapter 3 is a presentation and analysis of dictionaries and handbooks dealing with stress, particularly the two main sources for the study. Chapter 4 deals with the informant survey. The method used for the survey is detailed in 4.1. Sections 4.2–4.5 present the variation in verbal stress in contemporary Russian as exhibited in the two dictionaries used as main sources. The dictionary data are followed by the results of the survey pertaining to different groups of verbs. In 4.6 the cases where there are several instances of one form in the written questionnaire are analysed. Section 4.7 concentrates on a comparison of the two parts of the informant survey. Chapter 5 contains a presentation of different informant groups’ degrees of adherence to the general codified norm. Chapter 6 examines the codification compared to the survey results and presents the results of the survey from the point of view of the normative and stylistic labels given in the sources. It also contains a study of the cases in which there is conflicting norm notation in the main sources and the cases in
which the implicit norms are not reflected in the codification of the main sources. Chapter 7, finally, provides a discussion and conclusion.

1.3 Research background

Russian stress has been studied from many viewpoints, although far from everything is relevant for this study. Works on historical accentology as well as those on other Slavic languages and those with a purely pedagogical aim are of limited relevance to the present thesis. This is the case as well for works dealing only with other word-classes than verbs. Neither will I here deal with works on categorisation or classification of stress patterns or with research preceding the 20th century.10

Many of the studies mentioned as a background to the present study will be dealt with in more detail in the following chapters. Four categories of studies will be touched upon:

- early 20th-century stress handbooks11;
- works on norms and linguistic change in Russian;
- works on Russian stress proper;
- stress surveys.

1.3.1 Early 20th-century stress handbooks

The first stress handbook bearing resemblance to the modern orthoepic ones seems to be Законы и правила русского произношения. Звуки. Формы. Ударение. Опыт руководства для учителей, чтецов и артистов by Černyšëv, which appeared in a second edition in 1908. When reviewing the first edition, which appeared two years earlier, Baudoin de Courtenay claimed that there had been nothing in that area – orthoepy – before and that Černyšëv with his critical and independent work had filled a gap (1907:491). Baudoin de Courtenay also claimed that the methods could seem somehow revolutionary (1907:500): “Патентованным авгурам и жрецам науки кое что в книжке г. Чернышева может показаться кощунством против принятых и освященных приемов и рецептов.” Stress is only one of the subjects covered in Černyšëv (1908) and there is very little about vacillation in or deviation from the “generally used forms”.12 Geographical variation as well as variation in the literary standard are mentioned and variation in the literary standard is mainly attributable to dialectal influence. Other reasons for stress vacillation are the coexistence of new and old forms and analogical stress influence from similar forms (1908:49–51).

In Černyšëv (1912; Русское ударение. Пособие к его изучению и употреблению) stress was dealt with more in detail. Černyšëv listed three sources for solving problems concerning stress variation: dictionaries and grammars, stress in poets and the contemporary pronunciation of educated people (1912:41). He also discussed discrepancies between recommendations and educated usage: even if dictionaries list only the stress tvoro´g (to take one example), the stress tvópor is also often found in educated usage. Černyšëv concluded that these stresses, too, have to be considered correct even though they are not in-

11 Dictionaries and handbooks of a later date are dealt with in Chapter 3.
12 He does not use the word “norm” (Černyšëv 1912:1), but “generally used forms”.
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cluded in dictionaries (1912:41), as dictionaries can never be so complete as to include all richness and variation in the language.

Another early stress handbook is Ogienko (1914; Русское литературное ударение (правила и словарь русского ударения)), which lists stress variants and assigns the words in the list to eight different stress patterns.

There are then apparently no new stress handbooks until the 1950s. These will be dealt with in Chapter 3.

1.3.2 Works on norms and linguistic change in Russian

Discussions about norms and variation in language often deal with language in media as language and its development are easily observed there. Besides, media language reflects language on the whole. Admitting that media language is not the object of investigation, an inventory of what has been said on this matter is essential to understand the linguistic situation and the discussion of norm in Russia.

The opinions of non-linguists about contemporary Russian have been studied by Ohnheiser, who has found three tendencies (1996:127): (1) merely stating the fact without analysing the reasons behind it (negative evaluation), e.g. Как живем, так и говорим; русский язык превратился из языка Пушкина в воровской жаргон; (2) the actual situation is explained by historic reasons and both the reasons and the results are characterised as negative (на протяжении 70-и лет создавался социалистический Вавilon; the current situation is compared to петровская языковая смута); and (3) the effects of changes in society for the language are seen as positive (тем, что отвергается языковой пуритизм, отвергается сталинская модель жизни).

Although she says that the arguments of writers and publicists – and also of non-specialists – are often more emotional, the same tendencies in judgements can be found in the opinions of linguists. Ohnheiser believes that this is linked to the traditionalistic interpretation (not found in most other languages) of the “Russian standard language” (1996:127).

If we look at linguists’ comments we find in Ohnheiser’s category 2 (category 1 is rarely found) for instance Širjaev (1995a:3), who believes that language reflects both national virtues and calamities and that the lack of law and order in the society is reflected in language. Of a similar opinion is Duličenko, who claims that social unchaining has led to linguistic unchaining (1994:309), and that the mass media are exercising linguistic violence upon the people (1994:314). Skvorcov also attributes the state of the Russian language today with its rising number of “various errors and variants” to the new socio-politico-economical situation in Russia with a vulgarisation of everyday communication (1995:5). He blames “the new democratic conditions of freedom of speech and openness” (1995:99), the low general cultural level, the low level of culture of speech and the low moral ideals of the noveaux riches (1995:10) for linguistic deterioration. Degradation – of economy, environment, human body and soul – is a point of departure for Karaulov’s discussion about language (1991:35), and Volgin (1993) sees a link between disintegration in society and individuals and disintegration in language:

Есть какая-то тайная связь между ослабевшей грамматикой и нашей распавшейся жизнью. Путаница в падежах и чудовищный разбор ударений сигнализируют о некоторой ущербности бытия. За изъянами синтаксиса вдруг обнаруживаются дефекты души ...

He further asserts that television has turned into a “hotbed for linguistic nihilism” ("рассадник языкового нигилизма"; Volgin 1993).\(^{14}\)

There seem to be fewer comments belonging to category 3 above. One example is Laptева (1995:66) see a reason for “degradation” in language in the disappearance of the “dictors”, first of all the specially trained radio and TV announcers with theatre education, who have been replaced by journalists and reporters without “mastery” of the language.\(^{15}\)

Secondly, there is less editing and less linguistic control, which in its turn depends on several factors. There is less censorship and auto-censure (Zemskaja 1996a:12) and there are more direct transmissions, more spontaneous speech, etc., which leads to a change in speech style (Ageenko 1996:25). Some linguists (Reformatskij & Ožegov 1994, Krivenko 1995:66) see a reason for “degradation” in language in the disappearance of the “dictors”, the specially trained radio and TV announcers with theatre education, who have been replaced by journalists and reporters without “mastery” of the language.\(^{15}\)

The change in speech style also concerns the parliamentary activities, which used to be planned, thoroughly prepared, and devoid of the unexpected (Širjaev 1994b:6). From the outset of the transmissions of the first session of the deputies of the ex-USSR the authors of Культура парламентской речи (Culture of Parliamentary Speech\(^{16}\); Graudina & Širjaev 1994) felt the need for that kind of handbook.\(^{17}\)

\(^{14}\) The commentaries on (media) language have telling titles: “Вот такая вот зараза” (Petrovskaïa 1996), “Гипертонический кризис жанра. Родной язык дается не каждому” (Reformatskij & Ožegov 1994), “Хорош ли русский язык?” (Rozdestvenskij 1996), “Печать бедламиности. Пуризм и вопросы языкознания” (Volgin 1993). There seems to be a medical or biological theme; certain linguistic features can be equated with a plague (зараза), there is a hypertonic crisis (гипертонический кризис), and linguistic ecology (экология языка) is discussed both as a discipline and as a problem or task (Gorbačevič 1990a:80, Ryazanova-Clarke & Wade 1999:334–335).

\(^{15}\) This should be compared to the comment of Gornung made thirty years earlier that the role of redactors is more negative than positive as they are not qualified enough (1965:215).

\(^{16}\) Authors’ or editor’s translation of the title.

\(^{17}\) The stressing of politicians has been subject to mockery and the parliamentary debates in particular seem to have had an impact on journalists’ and linguists’ – but also the public’s – views on the present state of the Russian language. See for instance Duličenko (1994:309).
Mihály (1994:384) sees the change in the style of speech as a backlash against the strict control of the Soviet era:18

Die heutige “totale Ungezwungenheit” des Sprachgebrauchs in den Massenmedien ist nämlich eine (gar nicht präzedenzlose) Rückwirkung auf die nicht weniger totale Eingeschränktheit und Reguliertheit des öffentlichen sprachlichen Usus in der Sovjetära.

However, discussions – and then mostly in the form of complaints – about the “state of the language” are not unique to Russia, and not unique to the present situation. On the whole the “state of the language” cannot be ascribed to post-1985 or post-1991 changes.

In the 1920s–1930s there was talk about языковая смута, языковая разруха, гибель языка, хаотическая пестрота, болезнь роста, огрубление языка, расшатывание норм (Gorbačevič 1971:39). The level of linguistic competence in the media is questioned in an article from 1965 (Leont'ev 1965:216). Even some of the explanations are the same as today. In an article dating from 1983 Dešeriev blames speech “errors” in the media on the fact that representatives of all social groups appear on television and radio, and in the newspapers (1983:71 ff.).

What really has changed is that the unprecedented open speech style has bored or uncovered the language, as pointed out by Skvorcov (1995:5–6):19

В условиях демократизации и гласности последних лет во многом обнажилась и как бы открылась сама наша речь. Ведь мы теперь гораздо больше, чем прежде, видим и слышим, каким языком пишут и говорят современники, как они выражают свои мысли и аргументы, как ведут дискуссии, как владеют литературными нормами.

Russian speech sounds on the radio and in the press; discussions – and then mostly in the form of complaints – about the “state of the language” cannot be ascribed to post-1985 or post-1991 changes. It is highly plausible that rather than undergoing a change in reality, Russian language has come out of the closet.20

This is suggested by Kostomarov (1999:286), who says that “предшествующая эпоха излишне тормозила все изменения языка, в том числе и оправданные” and suggests that it is particularly apparent in a situation where a traditionally strict and ossified norm has existed for a long time:

Ведь не подлежит сомнению и отмечалась многими исследователями излишняя по сегодняшним мировым меркам рутинность книжно-письменной традиции, которая веками не позволяла пере- гружать текст разного рода отклонениями от традиционной литературной нормы. (Kostomarov 1994:52)


Park (1991) is a study of the problems of codification in the modern Russian standard language. The study was applied to the selection and inclusion of specialist terminology into a standard language dictionary, the recognition and inclusion of colloquial language

18 For instance, Kostomarov (1999:11) suggests that negligence of norms is fashionable: “... пренебрежение нормой нетрудно увидеть, например, в распространении забавной моды употреблять варианты колеблющихся форм, как бы подчеркивая свое нежелание разбираться как правильно, а как ошибочно.”

19 See also Skvorcov in Graudina & Širjaev (1994:105–106) for a slightly different version.

20 The exception is, to a certain extent, vocabulary as for instance many neologisms and foreign loan-words have entered the Russian language.
(разговорная речь) and the chronological limits for the modern standard language. The conclusion drawn is that the Russian normative dictionaries lack objective criteria for dealing with these issues in codification practice.

In the 1990s the question of “the state of language” (состояние языка) has arisen. In a speech at the conference “Русский язык и современность. Проблемы и перспективы развития русистики”, held in Moscow in 1991, Karaulov said that linguistic criticism should not complain about a low culture of speech and list language errors (1991:3–4, 31). However, precisely that type of writing has been common and there are many articles or even monographs collecting material, predominantly from the media, and listing and commenting upon what they see as errors. One such example is Lapteva (1990b), which contains a collection of non-normative speech on television from a 10-year period (from the end of the 1970s up to 1990, with an emphasis on the end of the 1980s) (1990b:43).21 The articles (Lapteva 1993 and 1997) also deal with norm deviations in radio and television. Other listings of “norm deviations” in media are found in Ageenko (1996) and Krivenko (1995).

In Kostomarov’s monograph Языковой вкус эпохи22 (1994/1999) examples from contemporary mass media are used to illustrate the fact that (linguistic) taste (1999:29–30) is a factor that influences language norms and language evolution.23 Kostomarov is reproached by Voroncova for not giving explanations of the linguistic facts (i.e. speech errors) and she says that emotions prevail (Voroncova 1996:305). Kostomarov concludes that the period of like-mindedness unified and mummified the Russian language (Kostomarov 1999:41).24 Although subjective judgements can be found in a few of the above-mentioned works they are still far from the polemical line exemplified by Graudina et al. (1995; Мы сохраним тебя, русская речь!25). In the publishers’ declaration of content it says that the book discusses “illnesses” or “defects” in the contemporary language and culture or cultivation of speech as a “new topical discipline”. Criticism has been directed by Jachnow (1998:23) against the nationalist ideas and the negative attitude towards the “new language” in Graudina et al. (1995).


21 The re-edition of Lapteva (1990b), published in 2000, has not been taken into account in the present thesis.
22 This phrase was coined by Ožegov, according to Švarckopf (1970b:283).
24 “В то же время даже убежденные ревнители чистоты и неприкосновенности языковой традиции не могут не видеть, что в эпоху насаждения единомыслия масс-медиа (пропагандисты, агитаторы, организаторы) унифицировали и мумифицировали русский язык” (Kostomarov 1999:41).
25 English title (authors’ translation): We shall save you, Russian speech!
Other studies, like Comrie et al. (1996; a reworking of Comrie & Stone (1978)) have had a broader chronological perspective, but the end of the 20th century has still been very much in focus. One chapter of this study deals with stress and is mainly an account of surveys and other research. The authors comment upon the results of surveys, saying that:

The discrepancy between the results of the surveys of spoken Russian and normative grammars resulted, if partially, from the rigidity of language planning in the Soviet Union, and from the excessive use of the formal, “bureaucratic” style as the basis of the standard. (Comrie et al. 1996:25)

According to Comrie et al. the inadequacies of this style became apparent in the 1960s–1980s and the reaction of linguists was to introduce a new distinction: the one between the written and spoken varieties of the codified standard. The difference between these lies mainly in the degree of variation (1996:25). Comrie et al. also say that the gap between the spoken and the written language is "probably going to close in the next decade when the democratization of Russian society has allowed more spoken and even colloquial variants into the standard language" (1996:27).

Another comprehensive account of the contemporary Russian language is found in Ryazanova-Clarke & Wade (1999). It deals with lexical development, word formation, grammatical processes, name changes and "the state of the language". In this last chapter a section about stress is included. Although adding little to what is already known in this area, the authors summarise and exemplify the current tendencies in stress, and the monograph as a whole puts the tendencies in word stress into a general linguistic and social framework. The period from the second half of the 1980s to the early 1990s is said to bear resemblance – from a linguistic point of view – to the period following the 1917 revolution.

Since at times of social upheaval non-standard, spontaneous and uncontrolled linguistic elements usually gain the upper hand over rules and regulations, many disruptions of the linguistic norm occurred during both periods. (Ryazanova-Clarke & Wade 1999:307)

When discussing linguistic development, they do not enter into a discussion about what ‘norm’ is, although they admit that it is "notoriously difficult to define and may be subject to subjective interpretation" (1999:339).

1.3.3 Works on Russian stress proper

Stress notation in lexicographical and other works has been examined, evaluated and commented upon by Nicholson (1968). The study is important for a number of reasons. Nicholson’s conclusions are, among others, that no source of those scrutinised by him are up to standard and their main flaws are that they over-normativise or over-simplify. Ušakov–1935–1940 – although dated – is the one that is “closest to the standards of the Oxford Dictionary of English in its objectivity, detail, and discrimination” (1968:129). Nicholson (1968:131) also underlines the need for: “(1) an efficient notation; (2) conceiving stress as a structural system; (3) an even coverage in stress studies of the various parts of speech; (4) re-emphasis of the Russian dialects and East Slavic generally; (5) admitting more than one ‘Urbetonung’ if the facts so warrant; (6) viewing stress movements in statistical perspective; (7) acknowledgment of the memory burden as a limiting factor for the educated native speaker.”

The main tendencies in verbal stress discovered by him are that: “verbal prefixes are releasing the stress back to the verb base” and “there is a steady extension of the sphere of mobile stress in the present tense of -it’ verbs with stress on that ending in the infinitive” (1968:85).
Nicholson also identifies neglected areas (1968:113): “much more work remains to be done on the stress of -it’ verbs and past tenses of the pódnjálsjá type” and “It should therefore be evident that the field of stress studies is a very fertile, but greatly under-cultivated one at present.”

A synchronic and diachronic normative study of the Russian accentological system and of the changes in the stress norm of nouns and verbs is found in Voroncova (1979). In her study of verbal accentuation she has looked at preterite verbs, present-tense verbs and verbs with stress variation in the infinitive entailing vacillation in the whole verbal system26 (1979:167). The overall conclusion she draws is that there is a tendency towards immobility in the verbal system. Norms and tendencies in verbal stress have also been dealt with in other articles by Voroncova (1967, 1969, 1977, 1988, 1991, 1996).

Stankiewicz (1993) tries to combine an account of the historical development with synchronic description. The historical-comparative method is – according to Stankiewicz – characterised by “a strong speculative bent” and “paucity of attested historical facts”, while the synchronic studies are accused of “blunt descriptivism” and of being “content with the mere registration of the accentual facts” (1993:3–4). His study addresses a number of issues regarding Russian stress. One is the innovative tendency in the colloquial language with desinence stress in neuter preterite (далó etc.), another one is reflexive verbs being stressed as are the non-reflexive ones (пóднýлясь, зáперся) (Stankiewicz 1993:219–220).

Nen'ko (1984a, 1984b) has compared the changes in verbal stress from the 1930s (the appearance of Ušakov’s dictionary) up to the 1970s (Gorbačevič–1973) as reflected in dictionaries and – to some extent – in poetry. Although she does not discuss the problem of linguistic norm in detail (1984a:11), she lists two conditions for normativity: a linguistic fact has to be commonly used and the source for this use must be authoritative (1984a:14).

The study contains three chapters: 1. Change and variation in stress of verbs on -и́ть, 2. Change and variation in the stressing of verbs from other morphological classes, and 3. Limitation of mobile stress in the past tense. Nen'ko (1984a:198–199) has found that the changes in verbal stress from the 1930s to the 1970s are quantitative, not qualitative (as these tendencies were found already in 19th-century sources).

Her conclusions for verbs with the infinitival ending -и́ть are that a larger number of verbs have mobile stress, verbs that used to have two variants now show a tendency towards removing the variants with fixed end stress, the so-called recessive stress move (речёсивный сдви́г ударения) gives new variants, and changes in the other direction are few and irregular. She further concludes that the semantic specialisation of some stress variants is gradually disappearing and that the tendencies in the prefixed verbs are the same as for the unprefixe verbs. Generally, the stressing in the preterite forms of unproductive verbs is going along with that in the infinitive (i.e. generally towards stem stress): отда́л > отда́л, родилс́я > роди́лся. The strength of this

26 She does not discuss examples such as нача́ть and зáнýтъ, for which this type of stress variation touches the infinitive only as these verbs have other stress patterns in, for instance, the preterite.
tendency is, according to Nen'ko, varying for different forms as it depends on many factors of a morphonological, lexical and stylistical character. However, in the feminine forms there is little stress variation (1984a:199–200).

The stress variation found in dictionaries, and to some extent in poetry, is also discussed in Nen'ko (1982) (verbs on -итъ with variation in the present/future) and Nen'ko (1984c) (preterite forms).

Another study of variation and change in verbal stress norms, based on dictionary material, is found in Lehfeldt (1987). He has covered a shorter period of time and a smaller group of verbs than Nen'ko. His comparison is made on preterite forms in A&O–1959 and OS–1983. According to Lehfeldt, stem stress has, in OS–1983, become the norm for many verbs which in A&O–1959 had prefix stress. However, prefix stress still remains the norm for many verbs. He sees the notation of these two stress handbooks as real changes over time.

Different attempts at explanation of the variation and change in stress have been made. Pirogova (1959a) considers dialects as the main catalyst of stress change in the Russian standard language. She provides abundant material from dialects in order to prove that there is a new accentological tendency in the standard language towards fixed stem stress. For verbs with the ending -ить in the infinitive she sees the following stages of stress development in the present tense: fixed end stress > mobile stress > fixed stem stress. In the preterite forms she also sees a tendency towards stem stress. This is, according to Pirogova, attributable mainly to the influence of southern Russian, and she dismisses the possibility of influence from Ukrainian or Polish. She further asserts that there are no phonetical reasons like those mentioned by Grot (1876:324–325) (o- in the root attracting stress), although semasiology and prefixes are possibly playing a role in the stress development of the verbs on -ить (Pirogova 1959a:118–119). In Pirogova (1963) she also deals with this group of verbs, and a historical outlook on the stress of verbs in -ать is made in Pirogova (1959b). For these verbs she sees a tendency towards stem stress (1959b:130) and she concludes that this tendency is old (1959b:132).

The idea that stress variation and change is due to (southern) dialects is refuted by Gorbachevič, who has dealt with variation and norms in stress in several studies (1971, 1975, 1978a, 1979). Gorbachevič rather considers analogy as the promoter of stress change.

Tornow (1984), on the other hand, tries to explain stress variation and change by frequency. He sets up a core vocabulary and from this he attempts to find the most common stress pattern (although the relative frequency of word forms within a paradigm is not taken into account). He concludes that mobile stress is disappearing in the present/future of first conjugation verbs and in the preterite, while it is developing in the present/future of second conjugation verbs (1984:458–459). He also found that there is a link between frequency and stress mobility. Stress mobility does, for instance, occur twice as often in words found in Tornow’s core vocabulary (1984:469).
1.3.4 Stress surveys

Verbal stress has been subject to several experimental investigations. One of the first who made such a study was Agrell (1917) who sought semasiological explanations for stress variation. He studied the stressing of a very limited number of informants: three speakers (1917:7–10). He advanced the theory that for preterite forms prefix stress (пода́л) has momental/“concentrative”/resultative meaning, while stem stress (пода́л) has a processive/durative meaning (1917:14). The difference in meaning could also be one of intensity (1917:25). A similar differentiation is, according to Agrell, found in the present tense, where end stress (мани́т) marks an ending and is an indication of something concrete as compared to root stress (мани́т), which is more abstract and indefinite (1917:65). This distinction is thus analogous to the verbs of motion (Agrell 1917:66). Agrell is criticised by Pirogova (1959b:129) for, among other things, not having enough context.

Another, more quantitative, type of stress survey was made in Moscow in 1956 (Voroncova 1959). The subjects were 150 language students, aged 20–25, at the First Moscow State Pedagogical Institute of Foreign Languages (“InJaz”, now Moscow State Linguistic University). The study was “organized by the Section on Speech Culture of the Institute of Linguistics of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR” (Nicholson 1968:17). The method is not evident from the article. Voroncova uses the word “pronounces” when reporting the answers, although it is not excluded that the study was one of reported usage.

Voroncova concludes that in the group of verbs with infinitives on -ить present-tense end stress occurs more often in verbs used in bookish style, while in frequently used verbs the tendency towards mobile stress is more clear (1959:143–145). She also notes a stronger tendency towards mobile stress among verbs in which a link exists to a noun with stem stress (гру́зить – гру́зни́ть – гру́з) (1959:149). Voroncova claims that antiquity (давность) and frequency (частота) are important factors when deciding which forms should be considered normative (1959:155).

Language students were also the subjects in a survey made at the Leningrad State University in 1964, reported in Kolesov (1967). 225 first-year students took part in this survey. The investigation was of the self-reporting kind and built partly on material from the RJaSO survey (see below), partly on lists of word-forms. Kolesov compared his results with the recommendations of А&О–1959. It should be noted that the difference in time between the appearance of the stress handbook and the survey is short, only five years.

Kolesov finds that the non-standard stresses осведоми́ть, усу́губи́ть, ба́ловать are very common and suggests that a grammatical differentiation between the stress variants (бо́ловать) is possible (1967:109). He also reveals that variation is very widespread in вклю́чить, помести́ться and глу́шить, and, based on his results, stem stress in these should be recognised as an additional standard (1967:110).

Kolesov (1967:113) states that for preterite feminine stress there is mostly adherence to the codified norm and that adherence to the codified norm with end stress is most stable in originally monosyllabic verbs, while the number of stem stresses increases in verbs with a stem originally containing a reduced vowel (бра́ла, тка́ла etc.). He also sees a tendency

---

27 This is the reason why direct comparisons with the results of this study will not be made in the present thesis.
28 The number of answers does not always total 150. When making comparisons with Voroncova’s study in Chapter 4, percentages have been calculated on the number of answers given for each word form.
towards end stress in the preterite neuter forms (ждало). In the reflexive prefixed preterite forms prefix stress is rare, and there is a tendency towards stress on the stem. The stress differences between the same words given in different contexts are small. There is much variation in the preterite reflexive masculine forms and for many forms prefix stress is quite common, but never the standard norm, although зажерся is a colloquial variant.

According to Kolesov, statistical figures provide enough material for conclusions and are rather objective (1967:97, 116). He sees statistical indifference, i.e. the situation when two stresses are used to a similar degree, as proof of an absence of norm (1967:116). Kolesov is against the criterion “literary standard tradition” when deciding what is – or should be – the norm, as it is indefinite and by definition supports old norms (1967:111). He has also noticed subjectivity in AO (1967:117).

The main conclusion drawn from this is that Kolesov does not find elements in the replies of the – according to him – elevated and often obsolete style, which characterises many of the recommendations of AO and therefore “нет никакой надобности настаивать на этих нормах, следует как-то учесть изменения, происшедшие в речевой практике” (Kolesov 1967:118).

A third Russian stress study conducted on language students is reported by Pirogova (1967). Seventy-five students in the faculty of philology at the Moscow State University were questioned. All students were Muscovites. For her study Pirogova used questionnaires (“анкетный опрос”), although nothing is said about in what year the survey took place, what the questionnaires looked like, how the questions were put or the exact procedure. It could be assumed, though, that it was a self-reporting survey.

The study contains verbs in the present/future tense with infinitives on -ить, prefixed preterite masculine and plural forms, and simplex and prefixed preterite feminine forms. For the first group of verbs studied she finds a tendency towards stem stress among the – quite few – verbs studied, even when stem stress is not the codified norm. The exceptions here are verbs with the stems слонить and звонить, for which fewer – although still one quarter to one half of the students questioned – employ non-normative stem-stressed variants. Stem stress in prefixed preterite non-feminine forms is also seen by Pirogova as part of a natural linguistic development and the results of the survey confirm this. On the other hand stem-stressed preterite feminine forms are rare in usage and condemned by normative handbooks.

From her material Pirogova draws the conclusion that there is a pressing need for a review of the norms:

Если из 75 москвичей, к тому же филологов – людей, которые в наибольшей степени владеют нормами литературного языка, шестнадцать и более говорят “нелитературно”, то, очевидно, назрела необходимость в пересмотре того, что “литературно” и что “нелитературно”. (Pirogova 1967:18)

An example is the result for the non-normative stress глухит, used by 69 out of 75 informants, i.e. 92 per cent (Pirogova 1967:18). Pirogova showed that so-called “deviations” from the codified norm are current, and according to her these deviations are due mostly to influence from southern dialects (cf. above).

Another stress survey among students was made by Gorbačević at the Leningrad State University in 1974 (Gorbačević 1978a). He is, like Pirogova, Voroncova and Kolesov, quite laconic about the method. The only information he gives is that the survey implied “анкетирование”, which probably stands for self-reporting. Neither does he say anything about the number of informants, although he reports the answers in absolute figures and the number of answers appears to be about 250. His general conclusions are that there are
opposing trends in verbal stress, with a general tendency towards stem stress and more
rhythmical balance, and that this tendency is caused mostly by analogy (1978a:105–106).

The largest informant survey, when considering the number of informants, was the one
made by the Русский язык и советское общество-team of the Russian Language Insti-
tute of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. The method and the results of the RJaSO survey,
as it is generally abbreviated, are reported by Krysin (1974). This large-scale investigation
contained four questionnaires (pronunciation, morphology, word-formation and vocabu-
lar), compiled and distributed in the years 1959 to 1966. The questions concerning stress
were included in the morphology questionnaire (1963).

The study was primarily directed towards exploring the usage of stresses that are “old”
and “new” in the literary standard tradition (1974:224) and towards seeing to what extent
social factors influence the choice of so-called new variants (e.g. stem stress in the past
non-feminine forms) (1974:231). The general hypothesis was that the use of variants
depends on the social characteristics of the speakers (Krysin 1974:20).

The social object of the research were the speakers of the Russian standard language
(living in towns in the European part of USSR) (1974:17, 23) and this was the first time
the language use of non-linguists was investigated. As the goal was to study social differences
in language use, a large number of informants was necessary. Approximately 20,000 ques-
tionnaires were distributed. Of these 5,000 were returned and 4,000 were processed
(Graudina 1970:358, 1980:93). The results of the morphology questionnaire are based on
the replies from 4,300 informants (Krysin 1974:31).

The linguistic object of research were variants found mainly in A&O–1960 (1974:15).
Only 16 verbal stresses (+ 3 participles, and only 11 stress variants in nouns) were investi-
gated (1974:229–231). The low number of forms investigated is recognised as a disadvan-
261). The test was of the written, self-reporting kind.

The RJaSO survey shows that younger people use the “new” forms more often than
older people. However, there are exceptions, and this is seen as an effect of the norma-
tivisation work being done among the youngest informant group (born in the 1940s)
(1974:233–234), although warnings must be made against drawing such conclusions on a
material composed of only 16 word forms. Students and blue-collar workers are the socio-
professional groups which use the largest number of new forms, while writers and journal-
ists are the most conservative (1974:235). Education is not a very important factor, but
there is a slight difference in the use of new forms between people with higher education
As for territorial characteristics, the informants from Ukraine are the ones that use the
largest number of “new” stresses and the informants from Northern Russia the smallest
number (1974:237). Moscow and Moscow oblast' together with Leningrad form one
accentological zone, a zone which is neither the most conservative, nor the most

The number of social factors influencing the distribution of variants is largest on the
phonetical level and smallest in word-formation (with morphology in the middle). This in-
dicates, according to Krysin, that automated speech habits like pronunciation more than
others are subject to social variation (1974:242–243, 350).

The tendencies for verbal stress that were found were a general loss of mobility with
stem stress in reflexive (собрали́сь > собра́лись) and desinence stress in the neuter preterite
forms. Criticism of the RJaSO survey is found in Kempgen (1992).
Strom (1988) investigated past tense (preterite) mobile stress in “the individual grammars of educated native Russian speakers” through a field questionnaire which sampled approximately 27 per cent of the forms subject to variation (1988:vii). The number of speakers investigated was four (4) (1988:viii). They read sentences including one “overt linguistic choice” and stress placement was noted down (1988:30–31).

The overriding features from the field data collections were among others:

First, each speaker exhibits noticeable and regular departures from the reference manual standards, and they differ among themselves in certain aspects of those departures. The extent of the differences from the reference standards is surprising. Second, significant differences reflecting the operation of all three stress shifts identified for these verbs emerge from the data. (Strom 1988:135–136)

The three stress shifts in progress identified by Strom are:


2. Retraction of stress from the gender/number marker(s) in the non-reflexive feminine and all reflexive forms (fixed stem stress) or in the reflexive plural and neuter forms (traditional mobility) or in the reflexive plural only (neomobile pattern; most radical: a-suffixed group; most conservative: j- and v-stems and даться) (1988:384).


Strom concludes: “Hierarchies examined for contributing to the implementation of the patterns include: stem type (the a-suffixed group leads other types for each direction of innovation; the j- and v-stems tend always to be among the most conservative); non-reflexive/reflexive; simplex/prefixed; gender/number forms”. There is a tendency towards accentual unity in non-reflexives and reflexives. “The gender/number forms are weakly hierarchized for propensity to advance: neuter \(\leq\) plural \(\leq\) masculine” (1988:viii). (See also Strom 1988:26–30.)

Ukiah (1996) reports on an experiment conducted in Moscow 1994. It examined the stress patterns of Russian nouns, verbs and short form adjectives and of prepositions + nouns, numerals or verbs using a “distinctive approach” with, as its basis, “the patterns of contrasts made by stress between word-forms, and the resulting phonetic realisation of stems” (1996:2, 19). In the study of verbs Ukiah included only preterite forms as he claims that variation in the present/future forms of verbs in -ить is “well-covered ground” (1996:112).

As a basis for the study Ukiah used dictionaries and stress handbooks from the previous forty years. The test contained 1,457 short sentences. The sentences including verbs generally consisted of no more than a pronoun and a verb form: Он брался, Она бралась etc. These sentences were read by 21 speakers of Contemporary Standard Russian, aged 20–65 (1996:234).

In order to qualify as a standard language speaker the informant had to be a native speaker of Russian, a Muscovite (i.e. had been born in Moscow and had lived there all his/her life) and educated to at least tertiary level (1996:234). This rather narrow definition of a speaker of Contemporary Standard Russian is not to be found elsewhere.

The biographical data given for each respondent, including names, means that individual results are easily identifiable. The informants were not told about the object of investi-
gation, but, according to Ukiah, “the majority soon became aware that the survey concerned stress as a result of their own hesitation over pronouncing word-forms” (1996:235). The findings regarding non-reflexive preterite forms are that (1996:640):

1. $n$ is gaining desinence-stress;
2. $f$ is being levelled to stem stress of the rest of the past;\(^{30}\)
3. $f$ is being levelled to prefix stress of the rest of the past;
4. $m$, $n$ and $pl$ are replacing prefix stress with stem stress.

The conclusions for the reflexive preterite forms are that (1996:660–661):

1. the standard pattern is fixed desinence stress in $f$, $n$, and $pl$ but not on the reflexive particle in the $m$;
2. stress on the reflexive particle in the past $m$ – still recommended for a small number of verbs – is being lost in favour of stem stress and in some cases prefix stress (начался, заперся);
3. some verbs have a stem-stressed variant in the reflexive past $n$ and $pl$ (more often in $pl$ than in $n$) and a small number of verbs also have stem-stressed feminine variants; sometimes there is also prefix stress in the plural form.

Another conclusion, which is further developed in Ukiah (1998), is that retraction onto the negative particles не and ни only occurs with the verb быть ($m$, $n$, $pl$ forms) and is not found with the verbs дать, жить, пить (1996:680–682).

Ukiah’s inference from the investigation is that there is much less unanimity than suggested by what is shown in dictionaries and handbooks (1996:786)

1.3.5 Conclusion on research background

It seems that present understanding of the Russian language norm is limited. A broad and unprejudiced discussion of norms seems to be overlooked in discussions about the state of the language and of word stress, as an objective norm is often taken for granted.

As a matter of fact Bel’čikov had already underlined the importance of studying the concept of norm in 1965. He further said that no one should be satisfied with the mere collection of deviations from the norm and the collection of anecdotal and curious forms and constructions, and he called for a systematisation of the material (1965:15). However, a scantiness of norm discussions and of systematisation of variants, as well as an abundance of enumerations of and complaints about so-called norm deviations, still seem to prevail.

That the norm needs to be studied is clear from the suggestions by Park (1991) and Nicholson (1968) that the Russian normative dictionaries lack objective criteria for dealing with codification in practice, that they over-normativise or over-simplify and lack an efficient notation. The results of surveys (e.g. Voroncova 1959, Kolesov 1967, Pirogova 1967, Strom 1988, Ukiah 1996) have suggested that dictionaries are excessively normative and that there is less unanimity in actual usage than suggested by dictionaries and handbooks.

In this comprehensive linguistic study of norm and variation I will therefore systematically and in detail study both the theory and practice of normative dictionaries and hand-

\(^{30}\) 1 and 2 being alternatives, which hardly ever occurred in the same verb for the same speaker.
books. These lexicographic sources will also be used as a point of departure when accounting for variation and when sampling material for the survey.

Most researchers have investigated stress variation in an impressionistic manner (though not, for instance, Strom and Ukiah, who departed from dictionaries). And previous surveys have dealt mainly with stress in the present tense of verbs with infinitives on -умн and in the preterite. Again, here, all verbal forms – except participles and gerunds – with stress variation in dictionaries will be included. Although it may well be true that the most commonly discussed and investigated verbs and forms are the most interesting from a normative and accentological point of view, it is important not to overlook other stress variants that have generally not been investigated.

The survey method differs somewhat from the ones predominantly used. First of all it is not only a survey of reported usage and/or a reading survey, as the studies previously undertaken. Actual usage is elicited here in a masked reading test, where the subjects are not aware that word stress is the object of investigation. Reported usage is also studied, as well as the informants’ belief about whether a certain stress is correct. Previous studies have generally assumed that the informant uses only one possible stress and have therefore – directly or indirectly – asked informants to choose between forms, while, in this survey of reported usage, they assess one stress variant independently of the other alternative(s). Reported and actual usage are also compared. Comparisons of dictionary data and survey results will also be made with material from previous surveys and with additional lexicographic sources.

1.4 Russian word stress

Before embarking on the study of norms, a brief characterisation of Russian word-stress will be given below, with an overview of the variation and possible reasons for it.31

1.4.1 General characteristics

Stress is, according to O’Grady & Dobrovolsky (1993:40), “a cover term for the combined effects of pitch, loudness, and length – the result of which is vowel prominence. In each language, the effect of these prosodic features varies.” Stress – or accent – in Russian is defined by Hart (1996:177) as “the relative lengthening of a vowel in relation to how long that vowel is usually pronounced and relative to the length of neighboring unstressed vowels. This lengthening may be accompanied by a slight increase of amplitude (loudness – громкость) and tone or pitch (голос).”

In the Russian language all syllables are either stressed or unstressed (Garde 1980:28). The stressed syllable has the following characteristics (Garde 1980:26–27): (1) it is more intense than the unstressed syllables32; (2) it is higher pitched; (3) its vowel is longer; and

---

31 A detailed presentation and systematisation of the Russian verbal stress system falls outside the scope of the present study. For amplification on this matter see for instance the Academy grammar Russkaja grammatika (1980), Fedjanina (1976), Feldstein (1980, 1986), Garde (1980), and Gladney (1995). This is also the reason why no contrived terminology system will be used. The terms prefix-, root-/stem-, suffix-, end- or final stress etc. all describe stress placement in relationship to something else which is sufficient for the purpose of this dissertation.

32 In Ėnciklopedija “Russkij jazyk” (1997) it is remarked that for a long time the thought prevailed that Russian word stress was dynamic, i.e. that the stressed vowel was pronounced with more tension (напряженность) in the speech apparatus and that it was louder than the unstressed. (E.g. in the Academy grammar Russkaja grammatika (1980:90).) However, several experiments have shown that this is not the case and that the difference in loudness is due to inherent characteristics of the vowel itself (open vowels are
(4) most unstressed vowels are realised in a way other than the stressed with a reduced system of opposition: there are five vowels in the stressed position and three in the un-stressed.  Hence, a change in stress or an incorrect stress affects the pronunciation of the whole word on a phonetical level, not only stress proper, which makes a deviant stress particularly manifest.

The unit that has one and only one accentuated syllable is called a phonetic word (одно фонетическое слово). A phonetic word is usually the same as a word in the general sense (a grammatical word), although it can be longer or shorter (Garde 1980:26, 116). Grammatical words that are not phonetic words are called clitics. These are divided into proclitics and enclitics depending on their placement in relation to the main word (Garde 1980:28–29, 118–119, Russkaja grammatika 1980:90):

sometimes word-stress is distinctive. Examples of the distinctive lexical function of stress is found in мука ‘flour’ and муха ‘pain’, and stress has a morphological function in места (genitive singular) and мест (nominative plural) (e.g. Mathiassen 1990:14) and in узнало (ipf aspect) and узнало (pf aspect). (See Tornow 1984:48–53 regarding the lexical and grammatical functions of the mobile stress.)

Three types of accentological pairs have been distinguished by Tornow (1984:439):

(1) variation like слова – слов which appears quite often and regularly and is linked to the mobility of word stress;

(2) variation like мука – муха (lexical differentiation) which is quite rare and appears rather randomly; these are pragmatic accentological variants that have become semantically differentiated later;

(3) variation like искра – искри (pragmatical differentiation), which is linked to the freedom or instability of word stress and is the type of stress variation dealt with in this thesis.

The freedom and mobility of Russian stress raises difficulties for speakers (Fedjanina 1976:3, Hart 1996:177 ff.). Studies of non-native speakers’ Russian stress show that problems exist, both for speakers of languages that are linguistically and geographically close, like Ukrainian, and for more distant languages, like English. As shown by Prokopova et al. (1984:35–36) the Russian of native Ukrainian speakers shows signs of interference between the Ukrainian and Russian stress patterns, although this is not the only reason for errors and difficulties in stress. The stressing of English-speaking learners of Russian was investigated by Hart (1998), who found that the students stress correctly at a rate of 74 % to 80 % in the oral mode, which “implies a 20% – 25% incorrect rate” (Hart 1998:269). He

louder (громче) than closed, unlabialised vowels are louder than labialised, etc., and to the position of the vowel in the word (the nearer a vowel is to the beginning of the word, the louder the vowel, and an unstressed vowel at the beginning of the word will without fail be louder than a stressed vowel at the end of the word) (1997:575).

33 Garde suggests that there are two or three (1980:27).

34 See also Tornow (1984:464).
concludes that “[s]ince the competing Russian system is not compatible with the English system, the two systems evidently coexist one with another in the linguistic competence of the learner. Their incompatibility makes stressing one of the most difficult aspects of Russian to incorporate for English speaking learners of Russian” (Hart 1998:280).

But the difficulties that stress causes concern native speakers as well. Regarding this group of speakers Nicholson suggests that “[i]n part the reason for the variations is that the stress burden on the memory of even the most educated person is very great” (1968:8). It is also considered that little attention is being paid to stress in schoolbooks and in school in general (cf. Chapter 2.4.3.3).

What further adds to the difficulty is that stress is not marked in writing except for in particular cases (to avoid misunderstandings like in уже). There are two subsystems of CPSR (Contemporary Printed Standard Russian; Ambrosiani 1997:12), of which CPSR₁ is used most extensively and CPSR₂ is used “in dictionaries and in textbooks for foreigners learning Russian”. “The grapheme <´> is used consistently only in CPSR₂, whereas it in CPSR₁ occurs only when needed to avoid homonymy” (Ambrosiani 1997:14–15). Another complication is that in CPSR₁ the grapheme <ё> has two allographs: е (more common) and ɭ, whereas in CPSR; the grapheme <ё> has one allograph ɭ and the grapheme <е> has only one allograph е (Ambrosiani 1997:12).

1.4.2 Stress types

There are, according to the Academy grammar (Russkaja grammatika 1980:681f.), four main accentological types of the conjugated verb forms:

**Type A**: in all conjugated forms stress is on one and the same syllable of the stem: гуля́ю, -ешь, -ют, гуля́й, гуля́л, -ла, -ло, -ли.

**Type B**: in the preterite stress is on the last syllable of the stem; in the present-future tense and in the imperative stress is on the flexion: верну́, -ёшь, -у́т, верни́, верну́л, -ла, -ло, -ли.

**Type C**: in the preterite stress is on the last syllable of the stem; in the present-future tense stress is on the flexion in 1sg and on the stem in the other forms, and in the imperative the stress is on the stem like in the 1sg form: тянуть́, тяне́шь, -ут, тянуть́, тянуть́л, -ла, -ло, -ли.

**Type D**: in all conjugated forms stress is on the flexion (in word forms with zero flexion the so-called conditional stress is on the flexion): несу́, -ешь, -у́т, неси́, нёс, неслá, -ло, -ли.

As will be shown, much of the stress variation that occurs does so in the verbs that have some kind of deviation from the above-mentioned main accentological types (Russkaja grammatika 1980:681–682).

Even if most lexemes do not have accentological variants, the number of words with variation in stress is not negligible. Gorbachević (1978a:55–56) has found more than 3,500 lexemes with accentological variants. Both Skvorcov (1995:13) and Gorbachević (1978b:88) state that more than 5,000 words have vacillation in stress in contemporary Russian (not counting those with grammatical or lexical differentiation).

35 Grot, on the other hand, says: “Правда, в ударении природный Русский [sic] не ошибается” (1885:355).
36 For a historical perspective on the accentological paradigms a (fixed stress on the root), b (fixed stress on the ending) and c (mobile stress) see Dybo et al. (1990:8–9, 37–39).
As the purpose of the present study is to investigate the existing variation and norms in verbal stress, I will give a few examples here of what variations have attracted attention and been the subject of recent articles and monographs.

1.4.3 Variation existing

Lapteva (1990b) gives examples of non-normative stress on TV.37 Some of the variants listed by her are in the lexicographic sources mentioned as non-normative: послалá, премину́ли, сóздала. Others – although qualified as normative in sources available at the time of writing (e.g. OS–1983 and Оž&Šv–1988) – are listed by Lapteva as non-normative: изгналá,38 сгру́дилсé,39 ми́рítся, прой́снítся.40 Yet others – and this is of particular interest – are not in other sources (dictionaries, stress handbooks) cited as possible stresses: отмёрли, маски́ровался, нё былa, гла́венствует, исключён, противоречит (1990b:359–361). According to Lapteva, a particular group that is attracting attention is verbs with initial stress or stress striving towards the beginning of the word, a feature typical of southern Russian speech (1990b:386). Many of the examples come from politicians:41 нáчалась, прíнять, нáчало,42 нáчала, улúбить/улúбить, зáнять, прóдáть, нáчáть, излóжить, изгнáла, зáдала (1990b:386–387).

In another article Lapteva (1997) concentrates on variation in prefixed verbs (принять, при́быть, начá́ть(ся), занá́ться(ся), нáзвать, призвáть, поднятá(ся)), where the tendency is that the prefix attracts the stress (e.g. нáчался, прíняла) and she attributes this to the influence of southern Russian (1997:48–51). Lapteva has also observed what she calls a very stable and widespread tendency towards stem stress in the present tense (and in the participle forms on -н) for the verbs вклáхть(ся), отклáхть(ся), подклáхть(ся) (1997:51). Previously little attention had been paid to stem-stressed variants of verbs with this stem (e.g. вклáх(им)).43 Lapteva also mentions a tendency in preterite forms towards prefix stress instead of end stress in reflexive verbs (нáчался – начáлся), or end stress instead of stem stress in neuter forms (жáлó – ждáло).

In the book Культура парламентской речи Širjaev (1994b:5) and Ivanov (1994:131–132) give the following examples of variation: in present tense end stress vs. stem stress in verbs like звонить, and in the preterite for verbs in брать, быть, взять, врать, гнать, дать, жить, звать etc. and also for начать and принять in the preterite, and particularly in the infinitive (начать, принять).

37 Other parts of speech than verbs and the details Lapteva gives on who produced the stress will not be listed here.
38 This stress is normative according to modern stress handbooks and the stress marking is probably a mistake by Lapteva as it was marked by hand; cf. Lapteva 1990b:387, where the non-normative stress is marked as such.
39 This stress is normative in both OS–1983 and Оž&Šv–1988, and in OS–1983 the variant сгру́дилсé is equal to the codified norm.
40 According to stress handbooks this stress is normative in the context given by Lapteva. There is, however, an end-stressed variant that is normative in another context, when not referring to weather conditions.
41 Lapteva (1990b:387) characterises the following stresses as typical of M. Горба́цев: улúбить, прíнять, нáчáть, зáняться, исключить.
42 This prefix stress is perfectly normative in the sources and it appears to be the usage of a majority of the speakers (see results section). It is far from obvious why this stress has caught Lapteva’s attention and why she lists it here.
43 See Chapter 4.3.3.5.

Voroncova (1996:308–312) cites, for instance, the disappearance of reflexive masculine preterite stress on -сí, variation like отлýл, создáлось, посéлит, помóрнит, позвóнит; common errors like нáчать, зáнять, прíнять, прíбыть; вклóчить/са’, заклóчит, отклóчит, углóбить, облéгчит, обóбьей; ожíлó; прýнила, зáняла.

Kostomarov (1999:274) observes the tolerance towards non-normative stresses and lists as examples of verbs and participles: возбúдить, нáчать, прíнять, прýнáла, углóбить, сформировать, премировать, yдут, занáл, зáняла, заклóчен, позвóнит, удáлось, внéсены, пере-вéден, пёредал, пёредáно, провéдён, пережáла, углóблённый, миñуł.

The main tendencies in contemporary verbal stress have been summarised by Gorbačevič (1978a:120, 1978b:102) as follows:

1. **a progressive tendency** for verbs containing 2–3 syllables with stress variation in the infinitive (удёл > удёйт, умáлить > умалýть, прístру́нить > приструннит, багровéть > багроветь, ржáветь > ржавéть) and in verb forms containing two syllables with stress variation in the preterite (нáзвáл > назывáл, о́тпил > отпил, нáлил > налил);

2. **a recessive/regressive tendency** for verb forms containing three, four or five syllables with stress variation in the preterite (постлáл > постлала, разорвáл > разорвала, родилсé > родился, приподнялсé > приподнялся, дожdáлсé > дождался) and for verbs with an infinitive on -ить with stress variation in the present-future form (дру́жит > дру́жит, вклóчит > вклóчит, прислóнит > прислонит, помýрит > помýрит, видоизмéнил > видоизменил);

3. **a centre tendency** for verbs with four, five or six syllables and original stress on one of the marginal syllables (нормировать > нормировать). This centre tendency often in practice implies a recessive tendency for verbs (and a progressive tendency for nouns).

Two overall stress tendencies were found by Moiseev (1975) (based on A&O–1959): (1) a tendency to stress the centre of a word rather than the periphery; (2) a tendency to stress the second half of a word rather than the first. Of these tendencies the second is the stronger (1975:84).44

According to Voroncova (1996:323) these processes are not concerned with apparent changes in the language system. They are rather an example of analogous alignment and quantitative changes of already existing features. What is new is that these tendencies encompass different categories and groups of words and that these phenomena are so active. As a result “литературные нормы оказываются поколебленными в среде литературно говорящих людей” (Voroncova 1996:323).45

---


45 Voroncova (1996:307) sees the antimony between usage and the possibilities of the linguistic system as the basis for the processes in word stress. She believes that the extralinguistic factors of the 1980s–1990s (with mass media directed towards “living” communication, larger/broader groups of people having been given the opportunity to appear in media, etc.) have been particularly favourable to the manifestation of this antimony. According to Voroncova the tendencies and the concrete facts that are the result of these tendencies are known; what is new is the “масштабность” of these tendencies and there is also a certain broadening of the group of words affected by these tendencies (1996:308).
1.4.4 Reasons for variation and change in stress
As the goal of the present study is to investigate variation and norms in stress, not to find the reasons for this variation, the reasons for variation and change in stress that are most often propounded will just be listed here and commented upon in brief.

Intralinguistic factors such as analogy are often considered the most important influences for variation and change in verbal accentology (Gorbačevič 1978b:95, Voroncova 1979:26–27, Krivenko 1995:69). Other intralinguistic or endogenous factors are linguistic economy and frequency. As examples of social factors outside the language system we find influence from territorial and social dialects and from foreign languages.

While there are obviously echoes from the old accentological system and from the concurrence between Russian and Old Church Slavonic (cf. Gorbačevič 1978b:89), I agree with Nen'ko (1984a:37) in that not all changes in the system today can be ascribed to linguistic processes in Old Russian.46

Apparently, intralinguistic and extralinguistic factors for variation and change in stress are intertwined and it is on the whole impossible to pinpoint one or more factors in a certain case.

1.4.4.1 Analogy
According to Gorbačevič (1990b:234) there are two types of analogy: association of contiguity (ассоциация по смежности) and association of similarity (ассоциация по сходству). The first type keeps the word-formation relations. One example is the stress ви́хриться, an analogical formation keeping the stress of the noun ви́хрь (Gorbačevič 1978b:96). Other examples are кле́ить (клей; earlier stress: кле́й) and закли́ниться (клён; other possible stress: заклинить́ся).

The other type – association of similarity (ассоциация по сходству) – is what is usually intended when discussing analogy. This type is gaining ground at the expense of word formation analogy or association of contiguity. The associations of similarity imply that the stress type assimilates to a more general stress pattern of another word that structurally belongs to the same category of words: ви́хриться assimilates to the stress type кружиться, rather than keeping the link with the stress of the noun ви́хрь on which it is created (Gorbačevič 1978b:96). And verbal stresses such as звáла, рвáла in lieu of standard language forms звалá, рвалá are likely to be created either by interior analogy from stem-stressed masculine, neuter and plural forms: звал, звáло, звалí, рвал, рвáло, рвáли (Gorbačevič 1971:33–34) or through exterior analogy from other stem-stressed feminine preterite forms упáла etc. (See also Chapter 4.5.3.)47

46 I will not dwell upon historical development and reconstruction of older stages in Russian stress, i.e. the period from what Stankiewicz (1993:10) calls “the penumbra of prehistory” up to the beginning of the 20th century, as it falls outside the scope of the present study. Only occasionally will references be made to centuries preceding the 20th. Regarding the link between historical and modern see Stankiewicz (1993).

47 On analogy in the present tense see Hart (1987).
1.4.4.2 Linguistic economy
The principle of least effort and linguistic economy for variation and change in word stress should not be neglected. Aitchison (1991:124–125) puts it this way: “A more sophisticated view of changes which are castigated as laziness, however, is that they are tendencies which are inevitably built into language because of the anatomical, physiological and psychological make-up of human beings.” Some polysyllabic words are less awkward to pronounce with central stress, and following the line of least resistance the speaker pronounces пereplани́ровать rather than перепланировать, or восприня́ться rather than восприня́лся. But in these cases analogy (association of similarity) is at work as well. It should also be added that central stress often – but not always – implies stem stress, and can therefore be an example of an association of contiguity.

1.4.4.3 Frequency, pragmatic factors
Frequency has bearing on the speed of linguistic development, according to Nicholson:

In the various movements of stress towards regularization, often in a columnar way, or towards differentiation (as between singular and plural in the noun) quite subtle considerations of frequency can either retard or accelerate developments. (Nicholson 1968:130)

Comrie et al. claim that less frequent words have more conservative stress patterns than frequent words:

Stress change is induced by formal paradigm levelling, where mobile stress is to be avoided, and is motivated by semantic analogy to other words. Next, there are also the so-called pragmatic factors: words that are less frequent or that denote less familiar concepts tend to retain more conservative stress patterns, while common words denoting familiar concepts can develop innovatory stress. The familiarity of concepts is certainly a very fluid characteristic, and pragmatic factors play a crucial role in the diversity of stress changes in the language. (Comrie et al. 1996:309)

It is also assumed that “learned, less frequent words tend to retain fixed stress, while everyday words acquire mobile stress” (Comrie et al. 1996:89). This could be compared to what Tornow says about accentological variants being five times more common in the more frequent words:

Akzentdubletten sind bei den häufigsten Wörter fünfmal so gebräuchlich wie bei allen Wörtern. Je öfter ein russisches Lexem verwendet wird, desto eher in akzentuell verschiedenen Formen. Der scheinbare Zusammenhang mit der Mobilität erklärt sich durch die Häufigkeit der Mobilität. (Tornow 1984:469)

It is doubtful what role frequency plays in stress variation and change, and the conclusions above are somewhat contradictory. Besides, studies of the role of frequency are complicated by the fact that good and recent word-counts – particularly of spoken language – are

48 One example of how the view of stress variants can change when a word for one reason or another becomes part of the active vocabulary is the noun овен (‘Aries’). This lexeme is marked with a symbol meaning ’актуализация’ in Skljarevskaja et al. (1998) and the stress овен is given there as normative, while in OS–1997 and RPP–1996 this stress is marked неправ. and простореч. respectively and the norm is овén. The stress norm given in Skljarevskaja is probably more in line with modern usage even if it is in contrast to other normative recommendations. Cf. Voroncova (1996:318–319): “Развивает колебание в ударении и ряд слов, принадлежащих к некогда ’закрытым’ для широкой массы говорящих областям: астрология, религия и др. При попадании в сферу активного употребления слово из какой-либо подобной области часто вступает в противоречие с указанной лексикографической традицией нормой произношения. Один из ярких примеров — слово овен ’знак зодиака’ с закрепленным в словарях ударением овén, овéná но реально предпочитаемым вариантом овén, овéná.” See also Ryazanova-Clarke & Wade (1999:319): “овén in dictionaries”, a formulation which suggests that there is a conflict with modern usage.
scarce and, most importantly, they do usually not take account of the frequencies of various forms within a paradigm. (For a similar observation see Ukiah 1996:83.)

Linked to the question of frequency to some extent is the memory burden, although this is partly an internal psycholinguistic factor.49 This has been observed by Nicholson (1968):

The memory burden which the stress system places on the Russian is often forgotten, although the demonstrable gaps and inconsistencies in the stressing practice of even highly educated native speakers may be in large measure due to this burden rather than to the specific influence of dialect forms. (1968:130)

1.4.4.4 Moscow speech as the standard and influence from territorial dialects

The norms of pronunciation and stress were formed at the end of the 17th century on the basis of Moscow speech (Pirogova 1967:14, Bulachovskij 1952:19), which in its turn originated in the northern dialectal zone (Gorbačevič 1978b:89). The consequence of this is that the standard stress is – or at least has been – closer to the more archaic northern Russian stressing (Bulachovskij 1952:21). Later, however, the influence from southern dialects became strong and features from southern stress also, due to their greater alignment, entered the standard language (Bulachovskij 1952:21).50 The stressing systems of South Russian – and of Ukrainian and Byelorussian – are said to be in some respects “more revolutionary than those of standard Russian” (Nicholson 1968:113). One example of South Russian influence in verbal stress is the tendency towards root stress both in the present and preterite (Pirogova 1959a, 1963, Voroncova 1959:121–122, Sergeev 196151). Cf. Nicholson (1968:80–81):

In the verb, the influence of South Great Russian is probably in part responsible for the extension of the zvóniš’ type stress in the present tense of -it’ verbs and also in part for the tendency towards root stress in the past tense of verbs, as podnjálsja.

Not all researchers, though, are as convinced as for instance Voroncova and Pirogova about the influence of South Russian dialects. One of those who has expressed most scepticism in this respect is Gorbačevič, who claims that, for example, for the verbs with infinitive on -umt with stress variation in the present tense, there is presently no southern dialectal influence on the stressing of the standard language and that all factors of stress change lie within the system (1978a:101). He believes there is an exaggeration of the role of dialects (Gorbačevič 1978b:89) and that morphonology and word-formation play more important roles than dialects (Gorbačevič 1975:46).

One argument against the attribution of all stress change and particularly the change towards stem stress – notably in the past feminine forms – to a general southern influence is that the southern dialects are in fact not homogenous in this respect. (See Chapter 4.5.3.)

49 = The “linguistic and psychological factors which reside in the structure of the language and the minds of the speakers” (Aitchison 1991:106).

50 = That is in contrast to other phonetical and morphological features from the southern Russian dialects, which have had much more difficulty in entering the standard language (Bulachovskij 1952:21). South Russian influence on standard Russian also touches the noun. Levitskij (1989) has conducted a study of regional influence on Russian noun stress and concludes that “[Д]инамическая система словесного ударения противоречиво и неравномерно изменяется в результате функционального взаимодействия и контаминации, или смещений, диалектов и языков, в ходе развития и перестройки самой внутренней структуры современного русского языка” (Levitskij 1989:8).

51 In Sergeev (1961) dialectal – mainly South Russian – accentological influence on pupils’ speech is studied.
1.4.4.5 Influence from foreign languages and social dialects
Apart from territorial dialects external influence can also come from social dialects and from foreign languages. Stress influence from foreign languages is on the whole more applicable to nouns than to verbs as nouns are more often borrowed in their original form, while the verbs undergo adaptation to fit into the morphological system of Russian. However, the existence of works such as Gorpinič (1992) which deals with stress (and other orthoepic) Ukrainian-Russian and Russian-Ukrainian interference and Krylova (1986), on Byelorussian-Russian stress interference shows that other standard languages, at least those that are linguistically close, can influence verbal stress in Russian.

In this connection the rather vague factor fashion can be mentioned, as social convergence to the speech of high-status groups in society can play a role in language variation and change. (See Chapter 2.1.1.)

1.5 Statement of aims
Chapter 1 has introduced the topic and scope of the study, together with a discussion of previous work in the field and an introduction to Russian word stress. It concludes with a more specific statement of aims:
(a) To provide an analysis of the concept norm, Russian language policy and language normativisation;
(b) To provide an analysis of orthoepic dictionaries;
(c) To describe the explicit norms in contemporary Russian verbal stress;
(d) To describe the implicit norms in contemporary Russian verbal stress;
(e) To provide an analysis of the relationship between explicit and implicit norm and on the basis of this analysis gain understanding of the Russian stress norms in theory and practice.

52 Influence on the standard language from social dialects concerns only a few terms used in the terminology of various professions: kompās – u morākov (OS–1997) (cf. normative kompās, štrič – u medikov (OS–1997) (cf. normative štrič). This type of variation probably does not touch verbal stress.
53 E.g. revolyāfr (French, current norm) revoleyāfr (English, obsolete, not recommended) dokument (French/German, current norm) dokument (Polish, grossly incorrect) (cf. Gorbačević 1978b:91).
2 Norm and normativisation

Chapter 2 addresses the concepts norm and normativisation with an emphasis on the Russian situation. I will start by discussing definitions of norm and the consequences of these definitions. Then questions concerning the Russian standard language and varieties and variants will be dealt with. Lastly there will be a discussion of language policy in Russia, cultivation of speech and orthoepy.

2.1 Definition of the concept norm

2.1.1 Polysemy of norm

When discussing the concept norm it should be kept in mind that the word in itself is polysemic, something that is evident if we study the adjectives normal – normative and нормальный – нормативный. (See Rey 1972:5–8.) This polysemy is often eliminated or ignored by linguists dealing with norm, although the distinction between normal and normative is taken into consideration in, for instance, Ickovič (1968:4–5, 1970:11–13), although he does not use these terms. Ickovič claims that norm is (1) the generally accepted usage, what is regularly used in speech (= normal); (2) the prescriptions and rules of usage recommended in dictionaries, grammars etc. (= normative).

There is thus a link between norm and codification, although it is generally agreed that norm and codification are not to be equated. Ickovič even sees an opposition between the “objectively existing norm” and the codification: “[0]т объективно существующей нормы языка следует отличать ее кодификацию” (1968:7). Lapteva (1990a:68) refers to Ickovič and agrees, although she admits that codification does more or less exactly reflect the norm but is never adequate. Compare: “[н]орма не есть предписание извне, нормативными учебниками и справочной литературой” (Lapteva 1990b:46). The same view is held by Senkevič (1997:23), who points out that norm and codification are not identical: the norm can be codified but it can also be a potential but not codified tendency. According to Park (1991:2) the relationship between codification and norm is an unsolved question.

The reason that norm and codification are not perfectly synonymous is that norm is also a social phenomenon. Even if the distinction between norm = normal and norm = norma-

54 Regarding the terminology normalisation and normativisation see Chapter 2.4.1.
55 I will here not deal with various norm theories from earlier periods. Such an overview can be found in, among others, Bédard & Maurais (1983), Hartung (1977) and Park (1991).
56 Cf. definitions in BTS–1998: нормальный = 1. соответствующий норме (нормам); общепринятый, установленный или обычный; 2. хороший, правильный; такой как полагается; 3. психически здоровый; нормативный = устанавливающий норму (нормы), правила чего-л.
57 Ickovič further states that these two components are sometimes seen as a whole, which leads to a definition of norm as “the generally accepted and legitimised usage” (“общепринятое и узаконенное употребление”) (1968:5).
58 Exactly the same wording is found in Ėnciklopedija “Russkij jazyk” (1997:270).
tive is not always explicitly made, there is often a social component in the definition and creation of linguistic norms insofar as norms are linked to social values and cannot be logically deduced. Some researchers, like Rey, even claim that linguistic norm is conditioned by social norm only and nothing else:

En effet, la norme sociale et ses variations dans les réalisations concrètes sont la seule source conceivable de la norme autoritaire. Celle-ci ne peut se constituer et tenter de modifier l’usage réel qu’en empruntant ses éléments à la norme objective, qui, avec le système abstrait, le sous-tend. Le schéma de la langue n’est pas modifiable par une activité consciente; ce n’est pas une superstructure, une institution. Il a fallu des siècles d’élaboration théorique pour le concevoir comme une structure abstraite, comme une connaissance implicite, et ceci du fait même de ce caractère implicite. (Rey 1972:12)

Gloy (1975:61 ff., 1987–88:121) takes as his departure point for discussion about linguistic norms a general, non-linguistic, typology of norm and he, too, sees linguistic norms as social norms. Bartsch (1987:75) is of a similar opinion, professing that “linguistic norms are the social reality of concepts of linguistic correctness; this social reality secures the coordination concerning form and use of linguistic means in a speech community”. In this context, she distinguishes between acceptance, adoption, validity and justification of a norm in a population. There is acceptance of a norm concept by a population “if it is accepted as a guide of behaviour in the sense that acts of correction on behalf of it are approved of and wanted”. A norm concept is adopted “if it has been accepted by a population and exists for them as a practice” and it is valid if the members of a population “are justified in referring to it as the reason for certain behaviour and as the reason for criticizing certain other behaviour”. Justification of a norm concept exists when it “is rational (ie goal directed and goal adequate) with respect to a higher norm, value, or goal of the population” (1987:231–232). Recognition of the role of social conventions for norm and language is also found in Coseriu (1952:16) who asserts that “in realtà la norma è variabile secondo i limiti della comunità considerata, limiti che si stabiliscono convenzionalmente” and in Niemeyer (1994:9), who claims that norms appear gradually through social convention or through normativisation.

The question of identification underlies the creation of or adherence to norms, as speakers adapt to the speech of the group with whom they want to identify themselves. Obviously, norms are created through social conventions and what these social conventions actually are has bearing on the question of prestige.59 Or, as (Suber 1989)60 puts it: “One good reason to speak the way others do is precisely because others speak that way.” He says that this convergence of behaviour, having been “validated by time and numbers” has become a norm, and that this convergence of social practices is what is appealed to when the speech of, for instance, children and foreigners is criticised and corrected.

Mattheier (1997:9) suggests that the usage of a social group with prestige should be taken as the point of departure for the development of norms. This can be compared to what Ager (1990:239) says about the average form of the language being the descriptive norm and the socioculturally prestigious form being the prescriptive norm:

Since the concept of norm depends on subjective evaluation, according to how and for what purpose the norm is being identified, there has to be a prescriptive norm for education, although there may well be a descriptive one for translation and the language industries, where some degree of variation is permitted. An explicit norm exists in dictionaries and an implicit one can be derived from the actual usage of individuals; a prestige norm is identified as the defensible possession of the nation, a (range of) social norm(s)

60 The lack of reference to pages for this source is due to the fact that this is an electronically published source without pagination.
can be defined according to the social group involved and an individual norm, or expected manner of speaking of any one individual, can also be described. (Ager 1990:239–240)

Often in this context, it is assumed that prestige and traditional prescription are always to be equated (see for instance Skvorcov (1970:99)). However, prestige speech is not always the same as the traditional prescriptions. It can be the usage of a social group which carries prestige, and the composition of this group varies between societies and periods.

It should not be forgotten that the norm can be different for different groups. “The norm thus understood is differently perceived by different groups within a speech community and often remains impenetrable to prescriptive practice” (Comrie et al. 1996:20).61

2.1.1.1 Explicit and implicit norm

As can be concluded from the above, any discussion of norm must take into consideration the polysemy of the word. On the one hand norm is what is normative – the codification, the prescription. On the other hand it is what is normal – what is usual according to the social conventions and practices created by convergence of behaviour. This distinction is upheld by Áléong when he employs the terms implicit norm for “le normal” and explicit norm for “le normatif” (1983:277). These concepts are also found in Ager (1990:239–240; see quote above) and they are used by Hartung (1977). He defines implicit norm as the norm that the individual acquires through experience and linguistic activity and explicit norm as the reflection of these experiences in the forms of obligatory prescriptions. Implicit norms can become explicit through scientifically based explanations, and explicit norms become implicit through language acquisition. The implicit norm is more dynamic than the explicit (Hartung 1977:13 ff., Niemeyer 1994:13).

In order to make clear the distinction between the different sides of norm the following concepts will be used in the present study: implicit norm is equal to the actual norm/the de facto norm (i.e. the usage and attitude of educated speakers) and explicit norm is equal to the codified norm. Occasionally, the terms implicit norm/actual norm/de facto norm will be used interchangeably, as will the terms explicit norm/codified norm.

2.1.2 The Russian definition of norm

First of all it should be pointed out that surprisingly often the concept of normativity is even taken for granted and it is considered that norm exists objectively.62 In fact the objectively existing norm appears to be an obsession, and it is presupposed that this objectivity is separate from the usage of the language community. For instance, in the Academy grammar Russkaja grammatika (Русская грамматика 1980) norm is seen as a manifestation of the objectively existing language laws and is regulated by society through the obligatory realisation of linguistic rules. The non-normative variants are variants that contradict these linguistic rules and laws (1980:10). It is the more remarkable that a contrast between usage and objectivity is made as it could be argued that the only objective norm criterion is usage (see also Comrie et al. 1996:20–23). Cf. Suber (1989): “Above all, we should not simplify the complexity and concreteness of language by supposing that

61 Comrie et al. refer to Filin (1981:311–312): “Динамичность нормы при несинхронности осознания еë разными группами говорящих приводила пурристически настроенную критику к ограниченному пониманию языкового развития (нередко основанному и на недвусмысленно сформулированной классовой позиции).”

62 Cf. a similar observation in Park (1991:1).
there are norms of correct usage and pronunciation independent of the rich, daily practices of a community of speakers and writers.”

One recurring definition of norm is Ožegov’s (1974:259–260; and also in other works by him). (See Kunert 1984:380, Skvorcov 1970:51, Gel'gardt 1961:23, Širjaev 1995b:7; compare Vas'ileva 1990:20–21, where it says that other definitions are based on Ožegov’s.) This definition is quoted by Širjaev (1995b:7), who calls Ožegov’s definition “classical” (“можно считать классическим”):

Норма – это совокупность наиболее пригодных (“правильных”, “предпочитаемых”) для обслуживания общества средств языка, складывающихся как результат отбора языковых элементов (лексических, произносительных, морфологических, синтаксических) из числа сосуществующих, налицествующих, образуемых вновь или извлекаемых из пассивного запаса прошлого в процессе социальной, в широком смысле, оценки этих элементов.

That the norm consists of realisations selected by educated speakers epitomises many definitions:

... принятые в общественно-языковой практике образованных людей правила произношения, словоупотребления (см.), использования традиционно сложившихся грамматических, стилистических и других языковых средств. Литературная Н[орма] складывается как совокупность устойчивых, традиционных реализаций языковой системы в результате социально-исторического отбора языковых элементов из числа сосуществующих, образуемых вновь или извлекаемых из пассивного запаса прошлого и возводимых в процессе общественной коммуникации в ранг правильных, пригодных и общеупотребительных. (Enciklopedija “Russkij jazyk” 1997:270)

Die Norm der Standardsprache ist die Gesamtheit der sprachlichen Materialien, die zu einem bestimmten Zeitpunkt von der gebildeten Volkschicht einer gegebenen nationalen oder staatlichen Sprachgemeinschaft ausgewählt und als präskriptiv aufgefaßt werden. (Park 1991:78)

... совокупность наиболее устойчивых традиционных реализаций языковой системы, отобранных и закрепленных в процессе общественной коммуникации. [...] Нормативность проявляется в языке в двойном плане: Н[орма] как совокупность реально использующихся в языке лексем, словоформ, языковых конструкций и Н[орма] как совокупность тенденций отбора и правил использования языковых средств. (Lingvističeskij enciklopedičeskij slovar’ 1990:337)

Специально отработанные, принятые в данном языковом коллективе, сознательно поддерживаемые и предписываемые в качестве образцовых способы устной […] и письменной […] передачи слов, форм и отдельных звуков, допустимые виды лексической сочетаемости, а также предпочтения в выборе тех или иных слов или выражений в соответствии с конкретной речевой ситуацией … (Vas'ileva et al. 1995:68)

Итак, можно сказать, что языковая норма – это единообразное, образцовое, общепризнанное употребление элементов языка; правила использования речевых средств в определенный период литературного языка. (Vvedenskaja & Červinskij 1997:187)

Ordinarily a few criteria are put forward in order to define norm and to decide whether a certain linguistic fact is normative or should be recognised as such.

2.1.2.1 Three recurring criteria for normativity


(1) correspondence to the language system;


64 Kunert (1984:381) believes that there is a problem with these definitions of norm in that they are taxonomic. She also sees a common flaw in the norm criteria in that they are extra-linguistic (1984:380). (Cf. the discussion about speakers of the standard language below.)
(2) usage;
(3) authority/tradition/necessity.

The third criterion is usually referred to as *authority*, i.e. that it is found in an authoritative source, e.g. writers (Gorbačevič 1971, 1978a, 1978c, *Enciklopedija “Russkij jazyk”* 1997:271), or as *tradition* (= социальные оценки, “итог взаимодействия общественного выбора и индивидуальных вкусов”; Graudina 1980:63), or as *necessity* (необходимость; Ickovič 1968:39).  

The same criteria for recognising a linguistic fact as normative are found in Berkov (1996:40–41): it should be represented in an authoritative writer, preferably in classical literature, it should be widely spread and it should correspond to the laws of the language. Berkov has, however, noticed that usually not all the requirements have to be fulfilled at the same time. The argument that can serve as justification for the argument of the normalisator is used:

В общем, если называть вещи своими именами, нормой является то, что признается правильным нормализаторами, а критерии (чаще один или два) прилагаются тогда, когда факт соответствует взглядам нормализаторов. (Berkov 1996:42)

2.1.2.2 Subjectivity as a consequence of these criteria

This subjectivity is, according to Berkov, not necessarily negative as normalisators usually possess a good linguistic education, but it must be borne in mind that the codification contains or is based on subjectivity; it is the authors’ view of what should be the norm that is used (1996:42). This is not the only observation of the subjectivism of Russian normative sources, and some are quite negative, like Chvany (1998:136) commenting upon the sources of Comrie *et al.*:

As one reads this book, one is struck by how subjectively and inconsistently its sources, from standard handbooks to recent scholarly studies, use the labels translated as “substandard”, “colloquial”, and “archaic” (prostorechnyi, razgovornyi, ustarelyi). The normative classifications, reported almost apologetically, have yet to catch up with what has been learned about Colloquial Russian in the last 20 years.

Others recognise the subjectivity, but do not condemn it. Širjaev, for instance, nevertheless sees a problem in that the recommendations are often made by specialists in the area on the basis of their own feeling, when science needs objectivity (1992b:39). Yet others do not see anything negative about the fact that the use of the linguistic intuition or “feeling for language” of the officials at the institutions of language codification and cultivation is the main criterion for normativity:

It has been pointed out that in codification of linguistic norms, the linguistic intuition (German: *Sprachgefühl*) of the officials of the institutions of language codification and cultivation is the main criterion. This does not contradict what has been pointed out above, because the officials are members of the same élite whose linguistic usage provides the model. Linguistic intuition is only an internalization of the norms that regulate accepted linguistic usage, ie the linguistic usage of this group. (Bartsch 1987:86)

The arbitrariness or subjectivity is also commented upon by Shapiro (1969:56): “[i]t should be borne in mind that the demarcation line between standard and nonstandard...”

---

65 Why this is seen as one criterion and not three or more will be dealt with below.

66 To this Berkov (1996:41) comments by quoting from Kuprin’s *Поединок*: “вся рота шагает не в ногу, один поручик Ромашов шагает в ногу”, i.e. errors, too, can be widespread.


68 Not everyone agrees with this. Cf. Roždestvenskij (1996): “Первая слабость русского языка состоит в недостаточном владении языком тех, кто занят языковым трудом”.

69 He adds that in this field everyone sees himself as an authority.

Russian speech is not a stable one and is drawn arbitrarily (and of necessity) by normative grammarians.”

We will now examine the three requirements for normativity: correspondence to the linguistic system, usage and tradition/authority etc. to see whether they can be used for motivating normativity and/or codification.

2.1.3 Norm = correspondence to the system?
In some cases “correspondence to the language system” is seen as the sole determining factor for normativity, and this factor is emphasised on behalf of both usage and traditional codification. Sometimes “system” is confused with “supposed usage”. Red'kin (1971), for instance, believes that norms depend on conformity to linguistic laws: as the stress звонит is characteristic of the “stress system” (“свойственные системе ударения”) of the residents of Moscow and Leningrad (1971:83) the condemnation of the stress звонит has an “artificial character” (“носит явно искусственный характер”; 1971:86–87). The fact that probably a majority of the speakers do not use this stress and consider it wrong (at the same time as it is traditionally considered wrong in normative works) is disregarded by Red'kin.71

More often, however, it is claimed that the system gives the frames within which the activities of the language are possible, i.e. what is normative (e.g. Gorbačevič 1971:15, 18, referring to Coseriu72). But this assertion raises at least two objections. Firstly, it is quite obvious that the norm is not solely defined by the system and sometimes even contradicts the system.73 As can actually be seen from the table below, drawn up after Mustajoki (1980:27–28), not everything that is normative is systemic, and what is normative (codified) can actually be at the same time non-systemic and not used, e.g. много гусар.74

Table 2–1. Correspondence to the language system, normativity and assumed usage for variants of genitive plural forms of nouns. After Mustajoki (1980:27–28).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>Norm</th>
<th>Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>много заводов</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>много апельсинов</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>много торты</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>много солдатов</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>много солдат</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>много гусар</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>много апельсин</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>много завод</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondly, one language system can have several norms, as claimed by Coseriu (1952:16): “А un unico sistema può quindi corrispondere tutta una serie di norme.” Similar ideas can be found in Kostomarov & Leont'ev (1966:5) who say that the standard language norm can

71 This is in contrast with Voroncova (1969:58), who claims that for the prohibition of the stress звонит, pozvонить linguists have as point of departure “objective linguistic facts” (“исходят из объективных языковых данных”) and the linguists’ “use of the right of veto is completely legal” (“использование права вето вполне законно”).
72 Cf. Coseriu (1952:15): norm is a “sistema di realizzazioni normali”.
73 Cf. Dimitrova (1994), who equates the system with the norm. When discussing forms “deviating from the norm” she has in mind certain feminine preterite forms which are end-stressed (пнула) and not stressed like in the infinitive according to the general rule (пнула) (Dimitrova 1994:36).
74 Mustajoki's illustrative examples are used here, not examples from accentology.
75 Mustajoki recognises that the line between what is used and not used is difficult to draw (1980:26).
only be discussed as applied to concrete speech situations as there is a system of norms, varying from case to case.

In order to illustrate the relationship between system and norm, examples from noun stress will be used here. It is the “language system” that is referred to when explaining the rule permitting masculine nominative plural stress on -á. Stresses like городá, профессорá are said to be possible when the noun in question in the singular form bears stress on a syllable other than the last: город, профессор. Therefore, according to Горбацевич (1971:17), stresses like слесарý, инструкторá (pl of слéсарь, инструýктор) are possible, while инженерá, режиссерá etc. (pl of инженéр, режиссеýр) are not.76

However, that this explanation does not account for all cases is clear from the comparison between on the one hand дóктор, with докторá as the only codified norm, and on the other лéктор, similarly stressed in the singular, that does not have лекторá as normative stress. This form is “not recommended” and the codified norm is лéктory. Thus, from the point of view of the system лéкторá is correct, but still it is not normative (Горбацевич 1978c:36).77 This shows that the system is not the sole decisive factor for defining what is normative and what is not.

This is also touched upon by Myrkin (1998), who does not consider language an exclusively systemic phenomenon. He sees norm as a question of correctness and appropriateness in the use of linguistic units, although the question of “correctness” is not as simple as it might seem at first. How should one, for instance, assess the stress прóтокол in the speech of a professor who knows that it is incorrect and who knows that the audience knows that he knows, etc.? (1998:22)78

Myrkin concludes that norm is not determined exclusively by the language system; it is on the one hand determined by the language system, characterised by the existence of implications, models and regularities in the language, and on the other – when the linguistic elements are asystemic (no implications, no models) – by usage (usus). In this case the language community makes a selection of the linguistic resources. What determines usage is a difficult question and perhaps one for pragmatics, but as possible factors Myrkin mentions the society’s needs, changes in the world, fashion, taste, need for expressivity, level of education in the society, etc. (1998:28).

2.1.4 Norm = usage?

2.1.4.1 Different viewpoints regarding the relation between usage and norm

The relation between usage and the standard norm “остается в науке пока еще областью с белыми пятнами”, according to Гraudina (1980:4). An inventory shows that there are at least three different standpoints:

---

76 Cf. договор – договоры (codified norm) and договор – договорá, labelled допустимо in OS–1997 and просторечное in RPP–1996. Both these follow the rule or “correspond to the system” and are thus “possible” from a normative point of view, while договор – договорá is not.

77 Cf. Lehmann (1988:15): “The definitive pronouncement by reference works that lektora is incorrect or that lektory is the only form is a useful abstraction, only it should not be confused with a statement of reality.”

78 Moving stress is a widespread kind of word-play among standard language speakers. It is manifested either by “unrealistic” stresses, stresses that are usually not found, e.g. сапóгн (Земская 1983:179), or by putting on a “linguistic mask” through the use of dialectal or low colloquial speech: ~Как вам угодно/ вы же хозяевá-то/, от магазин, документ (Земская 1983:183).
1) **Usage and norm are basically identical and the norm can be studied by studying usage.**

This view is found in Andersen (1996:142), who defines norm as a set of rules that emerges through the study of usage. It is also found in Šachmatov (1899:32), who considers usage the only authority in language (“главный и единственный авторитет в языке – это обычай, употребление”) and in Lapteva (1990b:44–48), who regards quantitative material as objective: the norms result from the collective linguistic consciousness, stabilise as a consequence of individual speech and, consequently, all that consolidates in language is normative.

As for the use of statistics in codification the views differ. Obnorskij (1956) is in favour of an experimental study of the standard language as only then will there be to hand a genuine knowledge of the standard language and the question of normativisation can be solved more objectively.

One of the most fervent advocates of a statistical norm of usage is Graudina (1970, 1980:273, 1994:58). She claims that analyses of an experimental kind are the basis of a convincing normativisation of the standard language. She furthermore believes that strict limits can be set for codification: if usage of a form exceeds a certain pre-defined percentage, then this form should – and could – be codified as normative (1980:70–71). There are, however, reservations regarding the method based on frequency (and standard deviation) only; Graudina herself concedes that statistics should be used with complementary approaches (1980:68–69, 96), Voroncova (1977:224) sees statistics as part of the data that should be taken into account. And while Park (1991:130–131) claims that statistical methods should be used for an objective codification, he states that these methods must be elaborated.

2) **Usage is often the norm, although not all usage is the norm and not all usage is correct.**

This opinion is embraced by Vasil'eva et al. (1995:132), who see in usage not only the correct, normative language, but also deviations from the norm, although usage is partly regulated by the language norms. Ėnciklopedija “Russkij jazyk” (1997:575–576) defines usage as the base for normativisation and codification, but does not equate norm and usage. Senkevič (1997:67) says that usually the most used is also the norm, while Ickovič (1970:25) puts it this way: usage or non usage is an important criterion for deciding what is the norm, although not everything that is widely used is the norm, but if something is not used, it cannot be the norm.

There are also objections to the whole idea of having usage as the criterion for normativity. Gorbačević (1971:10) admits that it can be one of the criteria, but he looks at the problem from a totally different viewpoint, departing from an already given, or presupposed norm, when saying that errors, too, can be frequent.

3) **Usage is opposed to norm.**

This view is held by Alekseev (1977:47), who sees usage as the unrealised and uncodified norm, i.e. usage is in some way opposed to norm.

---

79 Šachmatov continues: “To, что вышло в языке из употребления, как бы оно ни было правильно или согласно с духом языка, не может быть насильно вновь навязано; обратно, борьба с узаконенной употреблением неправильностью (пользуясь этим термином вполне условно) бесплодна” (1899:32).

80 For example, the results of the experiments published in RJaSO were used for the compilation of Грамматическая правильность русской речи (Graudina et al. 1976) in which studies of usage (literature, newspapers, recordings) were the basis for giving recommendations.
2.1.4.2 Causality between usage and (codified) norm

A distinct connection between norm and usage has been found by Ukiah (1998) through a scrutiny of dictionaries and handbooks. He concludes that this connection exists in so far as predominant usage actually can be the basis for proposing new recommended forms.

Our justification for this approach is that the link between predominant usage and the construction of normative forms does in fact already exist. An examination of dictionaries and stress handbooks from the last forty years brings several points to light quite clearly: that normative forms are almost always conservative, older forms; that normative forms change over time; and that old norms are gradually replaced by newer, popular forms, but always with a certain ‘time-lag’. This becomes apparent, for example, when corresponding entries in A&O–1959 and OS–1989 are compared; many forms marked /не рек/ or simply /не/ in the earlier work are given as permissible alternatives or equally valid forms (i.e. new norms) in the later work. It is thus apparent that normative forms generally represent the predominant usage of a slightly earlier period and that forms considered incorrect today, but which in fact enjoy overwhelming popularity, frequently become the norms of tomorrow. (Ukiah 1998:295)

This seems reasonable, although two comments must be made:

Firstly, when Ukiah claims that normative forms represent the predominant usage of a slightly earlier period, it can be noticed that – as will be seen later in the results section – predominant usage from the 1960s has in several cases not yet been codified as normative. Consequently, the extent to which codification lags behind norms and actual usage can be great and thus the gradual replacement is by no means “automatic”; at any rate, it can be very slow. Something that must also be kept in mind when comparing dictionaries and handbooks edited at quite long intervals is that the apparent change in codified norms per se, can actually have as an underlying factor a new theory of norm and a new concept for codification. This is hinted at by Comrie et al. who suggest that there is a dynamic theory of norm in which change and variation are seen as important components. They adduce Gordačevič (1978a), Icković (1968), Graudina et al. (1976), Graudina (1980), Borunova et al. (1983) (= OS–1983) as representatives of this view (1996:21). Comrie et al. further claim that there are dictionaries representing this dynamic theory of norm, and which allegedly have taken the results of surveys into account. This becomes apparent, according to Comrie et al. (1996:20), by comparing A&O–1959, which recommends “one, major, variant” (“основной, правильный вариант”; 1959:7) to OS–1983, which views variation as a “regularity of the standard language stemming from language evolution” (“закономерное явление литературного языка, возникающее в процессе языковой эволюции”; 1983:3). It is claimed that the emergence of this conception “is in no small part due to the results of the RJaSO survey, which was a pioneering study in revealing and acknowledging variation in the standard language, and the studies of educated spoken Russian done in the 1970s and 1980s” (Comrie et al. 1996:21).

Secondly, it should be noticed that Ukiah does not make a distinction between codified norms as given in the dictionaries, and actual norms (or de facto norms), which can be studied in usage and – perhaps most importantly – in the speakers’ attitudes towards forms. It is important to remember that norm encompasses not only codification, but also what “good speakers” or high-status groups, usually educated native speakers, consider correct. The concepts explicit norms and implicit norms make this distinction.

81 However, several of the findings of RJaSO were not taken into account in OS–1983. See Chapter 4.
82 Cf. Wardhaugh (1992:35): “having de facto norms refers to the feeling that many speakers have that there are both ‘good’ speakers and ‘poor’ speakers and that the good speakers represent the norms of proper usage.”
2.1.4.3 Objectivity of the usage criterion

Whether usage is an objective or subjective norm criterion is a moot point. Somewhat simplified, the line of demarcation, although not clear-cut and not without exceptions, seems to be drawn between non-Soviet and Soviet linguistics. On the one hand we find pre-revolutionary Russian linguists and western linguists claiming that the only objective criterion is current educated usage (e.g. Comrie et al., see also Chapter 2.1.4.1); Šachmatov, for instance, claimed that the only authority in language is usage (Chapter 2.1.4.1). On the other hand, there is the category of Soviet linguists, including present-day Russian linguists schooled in the Soviet era or tradition (e.g. Gorbačevič, Skvorcov), for whom the objective criteria are “tradition” and correspondence to the development tendencies and the system of the language.

Accordingly, if there is a conflict between a widely used language variant and a variant that “corresponds to the development tendencies”, this conflict is usually in the Soviet/Russian codification tradition solved in favour of traditional prescriptions (Skvorcov 1970:99) allegedly following the law of social prestige.

This leads us to the third criterion for normativity.

2.1.5 Norm = authority/tradition/necessity?

Besides “correspondence to the linguistic system” and usage, dealt with above, there is a third criterion for deciding about, justifying and/or explaining normativity. This factor is usually referred to as “authority”, “tradition” or “necessity”.

As pointed out by Comrie et al. (cf. Skvorcov 1970:99), requirements for normativity such as communicative efficiency or current educated usage, are in Russian prescriptive literature often modified by an emphasis on the traditional norm, either by referring to tradition, or by using “subjective additional criteria” like “need” or “correspondence to the system”:

In general, discussions by Russian normative grammarians concern whether or not innovatory forms should be admitted as standard, alongside the traditional standard, and perhaps ultimately replacing it; the objective criterion of correspondence to current educated usage is typically modified in favour of greater adherence to the traditional norm, either explicitly so (e.g. on the grounds of the need for continuity of tradition), or on the basis of more or less subjective additional criteria (conformity with the general organization of the language, semantic need for the new form). (Comrie et al. 1996:23)

One advocate of such criteria is Gorbačevič, who emphasises tradition (1978c:45), and stability (“устойчивость”; 1971:17). Invoking the “cultural-historical content and aesthetic significance” of a linguistic expression (“культурно-историческое содержание и эстетическая значимость данного способа выражения”; 1978c:38) he writes:

Это заставляет лексикографов-нормализаторов при характеристике сосуществующих вариантов (прожил – прожил, договор – договор, тракторы – трактора […] отдавать предпочтение традиционным вариантам прожил, договор, тракторы […] и т. п., несмотря на продуктивность образования и даже количественное преобладание некоторых новых форм. (Gorbačevič 1978c:38)

And Graudina, as already mentioned above, even equates tradition with “ног взаимодействия общественного выбора и индивидуальных вкусов” (1980:63). It should be noted that at the same time as Gorbačevič pronounces the importance of taking account of

83 Among the exceptions we find Obnorskij (1956) and Graudina (1980, 1994), although Graudina’s approach is not totally quantitative as she refers to tradition and correspondence to the language system (see above).

84 These criteria are on the contrary seen as subjective by for instance Comrie et al. (1996:23; see quotation in 2.1.5).
the “cultural-historical factors and social and aesthetic evaluation” in linguistic normativisation, he contradictorily delivers the assertion that the “aesthetic and pragmatic” theories of “certain foreign linguists” are unacceptable for Soviet lexicography and that intuition cannot play a role in normativisation (1978c:35 f.).

It is all too apparent that this factor, usually referred to as “authority”, “tradition”, or “necessity” is a highly visceral one and appears to be a multi-purpose criterion that comes in handy when other arguments for recognising the normalisator’s own preference are lacking.

2.1.6 Conclusion

It can be concluded that every discussion about linguistic norm must differentiate between the different aspects of the concept: explicit and implicit norm.

If norm is equated to codification (= explicit norm) it has generally been argued that the criteria for normativity in Russian are: (1) correspondence to the language system; (2) usage; and (3) authority/tradition/necessity. What rings most true in this connection is Berkov’s observation that usually not all the requirements have to be fulfilled at the same time: what is considered subjectively correct by the normalisator and the variant that can serve as justification for the argument of the normalisator is considered normative (1996:42). Such a state of affairs certainly has repercussions for the normativising work, and the consequences of this will be demonstrated in subsequent chapters.

If the actual norm (= implicit norm) is discussed, then it can be concluded that usage and convergence to the usage of other speakers in the community play an important role in the norm-creating or norm-defining process. More precisely, it can be concluded that usage, with a few specifications, is the only objective criterion for defining the norm and it will be treated as such in the present thesis. The specification that has to be made is that the actual (implicit) norm is not a purely quantitatively defined concept based on the usage of all speakers.

(1) The implicit norm is not purely quantitatively defined as no limits can be set up. This contradicts Graudina’s assertion, suggesting that if usage of a variant is above e.g. 55 per cent, then the form should be considered normative (1980). Such strict limits cannot be put up as any figure would be relative, especially if the sampling does not contain all speakers in a speech community, which is hardly ever feasible.

(2) It is not based on usage only, as the attitudes of the speakers also play a role (the attitudinal dimension).

(3) Usage (and attitudes) of all speakers cannot be the basis for defining what should be considered normative. This should be based on a high-status group, which could be equated with the group usually defined as “standard language speakers”.

---

85 “В ряде случаев решающим оказываются не количественные, а культурно-исторические факторы и общественно-эстетическая оценка.” (Gorbačevič 1978c:35)

86 “Для советской лексикографии неприемлемы эстетические и pragmatические теории оценки словоупотребления, выдвигаемые некоторыми зарубежными лингвистами.” (Gorbačevič 1978c:35)


88 Stone (1973:170–171) suggests that the following criteria should be taken into account when deciding what should be codified as standard: (1) prestige; (2) the prospects of the variant surviving in the foreseeable future, (3) which social groups use a given variant most. These criteria can be in conflict with each other: a variant widespread in all social groups can be regarded as incorrect and a high prestige variant can be rare in speech.
2.2 The Russian standard language

This section gives an outline of the Russian standard language and its relation to the norm, and deals with the definition of standard language speakers.

2.2.1 Definition and terminology

“Standard language” will here be used for what in Russian is referred to as (современный русский литературный язык i.e. “the (modern or contemporary Russian) literary language”. In English it is generally referred to as “Contemporary Standard Russian (CSR)” (Comrie et al. 1996:3) or, more shortly, “standard Russian” (Offord 1996:3) or “standard language” (Comrie et al. 1996:3, Rehder 1995:352–353). For at least two reasons “standard” is the most appropriate English rendering of the term литературный in this context: (1) it does not lead to confusion with written language and literature (also in Comrie et al. 1996:4, Offord 1996:3, Park 1991:3, 32–35), and (2) the concept “literary language” is sometimes used to refer to (pre-standard) stages in the development of a standard language (Hill 1988:81).89

Standard language is generally defined as the supradialectal and polyvalent form of language (Skvorcov 1969:47–48, Hill 1988:81–82, Lingvističeskij ènciklopedièskij slovar' 1990:270), as opposed to, for instance, prostorečie and dialects (Vasil'eva et al. 1995:56–57, Lingvističeskij ènciklopedièskij slovar' 1990:270). It is the prestige variant that has been subject to standardisation. (See Chapter 2.4.1.) The characterisation of standard language as a polyfunctional variety with high social prestige is also found in Vasil'eva et al. (1995:56–57). Cf. what Wardhaugh (1992:326) says about prestige and status:

We should observe that linguists are agreed that no variety of a language is inherently better than any other. [...] A 'standard' variety of a language is 'better' only in a social sense: it has a preferred status, it gives those who use it certain social advantages, and it increases their life chances. ‘Nonstandard’ varieties tend to produce the opposite effect.

Ènciklopedija “Russkij jazyk” (1997:221–222) sees as characteristics of standard language a tradition and fixation in writing, coexistence of standard and colloquial speech, stylistical differentiation (on different grammatical levels), variation on syntagmatic and paradigmatical axes, “flexible stability” (“гибкая стабильность”), and a striving towards the elimination of doublets. It is also characterised by obligatory and codified norms (Ènciklopedija “Russkij jazyk” 1997:221–222, Vasil'eva et al. 1995:56–57).

This leads us to the relation between standard language and codified norms.

2.2.2 The relation between codified norms and standard language

The standard language is characterised by normativity, but norm and standard language are not identical as norms can also be found in other language varieties (Skvorcov 1970:62). That is, not everything that is normative is part of the standard language (Gel'gardt 1961:31), but standard language presupposes normativisation/normativity (нормированность; Vvedenskaja & Červinskij 1997:138). The standard language norm differs from the norms of other varieties by being consciously normativised (Park 1991:23–24, see also table in Park 1991:28). It is also more universal as compared to other norms, although there are indications, as observed by Kostomarov, that the standard language norm is on

89 For a discussion about the terminology стандартный язык, литературный язык see also Tumanjan (1985:170–171).
the whole becoming less defined and obligatory and that the standard is becoming less standardised, which leads to a democratisation – or rather liberalisation – of the standard language (“В целом литературно-языковая норма становится менее определенной и обязательной; литературный стандарт становится менее стандартным”; Kostomarov 1999:5). He continues:

Нет сомнения в том, что сейчас разрушен или быстро разрушается литературно-нормативный язык образованной части общества с его положительно консервативной, интеллигентски и художественно благораживающей сущностью и регулирующей, консолидирующей всю речевую деятельность нации ролью. (Kostomarov 1999:292)

Thus, it seems safe to conclude that although the Russian standard language is not to be equated with the codified norm, they do usually coincide.

2.2.3 The modern/contemporary Russian standard language

No definition exists for what the Russian Standard Language (литературный язык) actually is, Krysin asserts (1974:17, 1989:35). Nevertheless, there are recurring parameters in the definitions of “standard language” and most often these definitions are combined.

**Chronological definition.** The “Modern (современный can mean both ‘modern’ and ‘contemporary’) Russian standard language” usually refers to the language “from Puškin’s time to our days” (“от эпохи Пушкина до наших дней”; Gorbačevič 1971:37 and “от Пушкина до наших дней”; Russkaja grammatika 1980:7). Although the Academy Grammar Russkaja grammatika discusses a more narrow definition, which refers to the second half of the 20th century, it adheres to the broader definition starting from the beginning of the 19th century. Often, though, this definition is considered too inclusive (e.g. Gorbačevič 1971:37, Comrie et al. 1996:3) and therefore it is further divided into periods. Gorbačevič claims that for each decade that passes and distances us further from the era of Puškin such a view becomes less justifiable, and in order to separate the contemporary language from that of the early 19th-century terms like “the language of the new time” (“язык нового времени”) and “the living system of the standard language” (“живая система литературного языка”) are used (1978a:41–42, 1971:37). Gorbačevič (1971:39–40) suggests a border between the earlier period and the contemporary language, linking it to the “cultural revolution” following the stabilisation of new norms after the first Congress of Soviet Writers with “a fight for the purity of the Russian language” (“борьба за чистоту русского языка”; see Chapter 2.4.4.2):

Условной границей современного русского литературного языка могло бы служить словоупотребление конца 30 – начала 40-х годов нашего века. На конец 30-х годов падает окончание важного этапа культурной революции.

Sorokoletov (1988:21) is of a similar opinion. He claims that современный литературный язык is the language of the second half of the 20th century.

**Geographic definition.** The definition is also partly geographic as standard Russian is generally considered to be based on Moscow speech, although nowhere is it said that it is restricted to Moscow. This definition is used both in early 20th-century sources like Ogienko, who claims that standard Russian is based on “южновеликорусское

---

90 The main features of the orthoepical norm were formed in the first half of the 17th century, the basis being Moscow speech, and in the second half of the 19th century this came to be the national norm (Protčenko 1995:21).
московское наречие” (1914:9) 91 and in later sources like Offord, where it is stated that
the spoken form of standard Russian is “based on educated Muscovite speech” (1996:3).

**Social definition.** It is also defined socially: for instance in Krysin (1989:33) it says that
the standard language is found in the educated or cultivated part of society. This definition
is also found in Ėnciklopedija “Russkij jazyk” (1997:221).

**Domain definition.** The Russian standard language can also be defined by the domains
where it is found and used: the norms of the standard language are fixed and codified in
grammars and dictionaries, they are studied in schools and are supported by mass media
(Širjaev 1994a:8).

To sum up, the contemporary Russian standard language is the language from the
second half of the 20th century on, based on Moscow speech. Its norms are codified in
grammars and dictionaries, studied in schools and supported by mass media. It was also
suggested that it is the language of the educated speakers or the cultivated part of society,
and this calls for a more precise definition of who the “standard language speakers” are.

### 2.2.4 Standard language speakers

The criteria for defining a standard language speaker vary from country to country. As for
the speakers of standard Russian (носители литературного языка) there is no general
agreement on who these are (see for instance Krysin 1989:35).

Quite a broad definition is found in Vasil'eva (1990:19): “[с]овременным русским
литературным языком владеют (в большей или меньшей широте и/или глубине)
практически все русские, населяющие Советский Союз.”

More frequent, however, is a narrower definition (e.g. Krysin 1974, 1989, Zemskaja &
Kapanadze 1978:9). 92 In order to qualify as a standard language speaker a person should:

(a) be a native Russian speaker;
(b) be educated to at least secondary level;
(c) be an urban resident and/or have spent most of his/her life in a town.

The reason why these criteria and no more and no less 93 were chosen is, according to

(a) non-native Russian speakers do not master the language as well as native speakers
and traits of other languages can be found in their speech;
(b) education can eliminate non-normative features;
(c) usually several dialects are present in towns, not only one as in the countryside. It is
also considered that the influence of radio, television, newspapers and the speech of
educated citizens is more intense in towns than in the countryside.

The same criteria found in Krysin (1974) are used in Zemskaja & Kapanadze (1978:9) for
the project Русская разговорная речь. The only difference is that they add that the
persons should not only be urban residents, but also be born in a town. According to
Zemskaja & Kapanadze the educational criterion is the most important.

---

91 For quotations from this source modernised spelling is used.
92 Krysin (1973) put forward criteria similar to those he proposed for the RJaSO survey (1974), but apart
from being native Russian speakers, the persons should also from childhood have lived in a
Russian-speaking environment, and education should have been received at a school with Russian as
language of instruction (1973:38). These criteria were, however, later modified by Krysin himself. (Cf.
Krysin 1989:33 where he again claims that education must be received in Russian.)
93 The attempt at an explanation that Krysin gives regarding this aspect is as lengthy as it is unsatisfactory.
The main, but not the only, group among those who fulfil the criteria set up by Krysin is the *intelligentsia* (approx. urban citizens with higher education). Therefore, according to him, that group should be larger than the other groups in the survey, although no statistics are available as to the number of standard language speakers (Krysin 1974:33).

The motivation for using extra-linguistic factors to define standard language speakers is the following (Krysin 1974:17, see also 1989:32):

Предположение это полностью подтверждается: речевые навыки обследованных людей оказались в целом нормативными, соответствующими современному литературному узу" (Krysin 1989:35).

Thus it was postulated before the RJaSO survey that a standard language speaker should possess at least these three characteristics, and, according to Krysin, the survey proved that this assumption was correct: the speech of the people investigated was on the whole normative and “corresponding to contemporary standard usage” (Krysin 1989:35). This, however, appears to be an erroneous inference, stemming from the circular definition that standard language is the variety used by standard language speakers. How can it be known what contemporary standard usage is without doing an unbiased survey?

Criticism of the choice of social factors for defining standard language speakers is found in Kempgen (1992:189):

Diese Festlegung, die auf sozialen, nicht auf sprachlichen Merkmalen basiert, vermeidet heuristische Probleme, die ansonsten unvermeidlich wären, denn wie “hochsprachlich” der Idiolek einer bestimmten Person ist, kann ja erst beurteilt werden, wenn alle Daten schon erhoben und ausgewertet sind, also a posteriori.

Nevertheless, this is not necessarily problematic if only the definition is also adhered to after the survey results are obtained. A problem arises if the results of a survey with informants who fulfil these criteria show that these “standard language speakers” do not use what has been “supposed” to be the standard language (e.g. the codified norms of one or several dictionaries or grammars – or, for that matter, the subjective view of a researcher). It cannot then be claimed that the speakers are not “real” standard language speakers or do not adhere to standard norms. If the definition is based on non-linguistic criteria it has to be used all the way, including when the results are at hand. Otherwise a new definition of “standard language speaker” must be found.

2.3 Variation and variants

Wherever there are variants there is a “norm conflict” (see also Gorbačevič 1971:19–21). This is the reason why existing variants will be used as the base for this study of norms in Russian verbal stress and also the reason why variants and variation will be discussed in this chapter on language norms and normativisation.

---

94 See also Comrie *et al.* (1996:17) for a discussion about the *intelligentsia*.

95 What seems clear is that the number of norm-bearers has increased since the onset of literacy campaigns and social changes from the 1920s. See e.g. Comrie *et al.* (1996:9).

96 For instance: “standard language speakers are those who use the language codified in the Academy grammar and the Academy dictionary.”
2.3.1 Standard language norms and norms of razgovornaja reč', prostoporečie and territorial dialects

In the early 20th century Eastern Europe language variation was, according to Harlig (1995a:6–7), treated in a “mother-or-whore paradigm”, where dialects (the “mother”) – and particularly “the purest, most archaic forms were sought for recording or transcription” as the purpose was the preservation of older forms. Emerging normativism/prescriptivism saw the urban non-standard varieties and, paradoxically, dialects, as “degenerate” and “immoral” (“the whore”). Harlig’s key point is that “the normativist mentality, being evaluative rather than descriptive, excluded non-standard varieties from serious scholarly consideration” (Harlig 1995a:7).

The intolerance shown towards variation – linguistic and other – is testified to also by Kostomarov (1999:39):

Тоталитаризм и авторитарность создавали видимость некой нравственной однозначности и чистоты, в которой нетерпимыми признавались любые отклонения от нормы – будь то гомосексуализм или формальное искусство, эстетизм или упаднические стихи. И если в той атмосфере даже естественные колебания нормы казались нежелательными, то теперь люди склонны к подчеркнутой вариативности, если не к разрушению нормы вообще. Да и то сказать, норму, которой нет, нельзя нарушить!

Research, both in Russia and elsewhere, has brought out the existing variation. In the Academy grammar Russkaja grammatika (1980:10) variation is seen as a sign of a standard language. Besides, it has been shown, as pointed out by Lehmann (1988:20), that “the Russian ethnolanguage is a continuum in which the nondeterministic systems of the written standard language (KLJa), standard colloquial language (RR), substandard colloquial (prostorečie), and the dialect varieties overlap”.99

What separates these systems or varieties will be dealt with here in brief: 100

**Standard language vs. razgovornaja reč’.** There are different views as for whether the standard language and razgovornaja reč’ (разговорная речь)101 (= colloquial standard; Hill 1988:82)102 form one or several norm systems etc. Lingvističeskij ěnciklopedičeskij slovar’ (1990:407) considers razgovornaja reč’ to be part of the standard language. Lapteva (1990a:68–69) does not see an opposition between the standard and razgovornaja reč’ either: the latter variety is not codified, but it is normative. Zemskaja et al., on the other hand, believe that these varieties form a diglossia (1981:21).103

98 Thus the reluctance to tolerate language variation and studies of it had political reasons. Harlig continues (1995b:35): “A crucially important factor is a regime’s desire to shield itself from embarrassment (and the authority to make sure this can be done). This is accomplished through suppressing the collection, analysis, or, failing that, dissemination of ‘bad news’. In the social sphere, this meant avoiding examination of suicide, alcoholism and drug abuse, homosexuality, sexually transmitted diseases, and dysfunction in the family (divorce, incest, domestic violence), to say nothing of ethnic and class discrimination and economic inequality. In other words, the very stuff of Anglo-Saxon sociology (for better or worse, depending on one’s political orientation) is what eastern-bloc social sciences avoided.”

99 KLJa = КЛЯ = Кодифицированный Литературный Язык, RR = РР = Разговорная Речь.

100 An illustrative table is found in Park (1991:28).

101 In the present thesis used in transliterated form.


103 A systematical comparison of Lapteva’s views on this matter with those of Zemskaja is found in Lapteva (1990a:77).
Standard language vs. просторечие. It is generally claimed that просторечие (просторечие), unlike the standard language, is not codified and does not observe norms (see for instance Lingvističeskij ěnciklopedičeskij slovar’ 1990:402, Offord 1996:9 and Patton 1990:143), and that while standard language speakers can switch registers, speakers of просторечие are “locked in one speech code” (Comrie et al. 1996:6). One complication regarding просторечие is that there are at least two different definitions of the concept:

1. It is used to identify the lowest stylistic level of the standard (the so-called “literary or standard просторечие”) which can be used in literary works and in colloquial language to create an informal tone. Examples of this are lexical items like жрать (‘to guzzle’) (Gorbačevič 1971:23).

2. It is used for words or forms that are not acceptable in the standard language and imply a violation of the norm, i.e. are found not on a stylistic level, but on a normative scale: инженера, местов, делов, иных (Gorbačevič 1971:23).

A similar definition is found in Ėnciklopedija “Russkij jazyk” (1997:439): “Безусловно просторечными являются только те языковые средства, к-рые или окрашены экспрессией подчеркнутой грубости, или ощутимо противоречат лит. норме как неправильные.” It is also found in Filin (1973:8).

These two meanings are separated by Zemskaja & Kitajgorodskaja: просторечие-1 is according to them a stylistical means of the standard language, and просторечие-2 is the speech of persons who do not master the standard language, e.g. the stress принять (1988:164–168).

Nevertheless, this ambiguous definition is a problem in lexicography and normativisation (Gorbačevič 1971:23–24, Marszk 1988:58, Ėnciklopedija “Russkij jazyk” 1997:391) and sometimes the use of this definition in dictionaries is rejected on the grounds that it is too ambiguous (e.g. Skljarevskaja 1994:32).

This ambiguity also makes it difficult to find an equivalent in English or in other languages. Comrie et al. (1996:6) do not translate it, but describe it as “non-standard vernacular” or “popular speech”. Hill (1988:82) calls it “substandard”, and Offord (1996:9) uses “demotic” as an equivalent and defines it as “the spontaneous, informal speech of the uneducated”. It could also be described as an urban sociolect.

Standard language vs. territorial dialects. Apart from the fact that the territorial dialects are local, the standard language and the territorial dialects differ in so far as the norms of the dialects are defined exclusively by usage, while the standard language norms are de-

---

104 In the present thesis the term is in the text untranslated and transliterated (cf. 2.2.1), and when used for rendering a normative/stylistic label in the lexicographic sources it will be given in Cyrillic.
105 For a discussion of просторечие see Patton (1990). He defines просторечие as “a non-normative interdialect of the poorly educated urban population” (1990:143).
106 Cf. Ryazanova-Clarke & Wade (1999:113): “what is normally termed просторечие covers at least five types of additional lexical information.”
107 N.B. in OS these variants are on three different levels: инженера is грубо неправильно, местов and делов are exceeding even грубо неправильно and therefore not included in the dictionary (OS 1997:6); иных is неправильно.
111 Offord points out that it can also be used by the educated for special effects.
112 For more on просторечие see Patton (1990).
fined not only by usage, but also through conscious and deliberate intervention (Gorbačević 1971:22, Park 1991:28).

**Razgovornaja reč' vs. prostorečie.** There is disagreement as to the relationship between these. On the one hand it is suggested that razgovornaja reč' and the standard language are closely related and opposed to prostorečie in that razgovornaja reč' is – unlike prostorečie – part of the standard (Lapteva 1990a:67). Zemskaja & Šmelëv (1984:10–11) even claim that there is an “abyss” (“пропасть”) between razgovornaja reč' and prostorečie. On the other hand, razgovornaja reč' and prostorečie are linked together and are seen as opposed to the standard language: Marszk (1988:72) asserts that prostorečie and razgovornaja reč' form a continuum and what separates them from the standard language and dialects is that they have a “relatively flexible norm”.

**Razgovornaja reč' vs. territorial dialects.** Razgovornaja reč' is – unlike dialects – supraterritorial (Lapteva 1990a:67).

**Prostorečie vs. territorial dialects.** Unlike territorial dialects, prostorečie is not one system. It is also considered that prostorečie is supradialectal (Ěnciklopedija “Russkij jazyk” 1997:221). It does, however, overlap to a certain extent with territorial dialects (Comrie et al. 1996:6, Patton 1990:143) as some elements of prostorečie originate in dialects.

### 2.3.2 Definition of variant

Variants are defined as linguistic elements with identical meaning, but with partial non-coincidence, usually regarding the phonetical structure (Ěnciklopedija “Russkij jazyk” 1997:61, Kunert 1984:381). Similar definitions are given by Gorbačević (1978a:17):

Варианты слова – это регулярно воспроизводимые видоизменения одного и того же слова, сохраняющие тождество морфолого-словообразовательной структуры, лексического и грамматического значения и различающиеся либо с фонетической стороны (произношением звуков, составом фонем, местом ударения или комбинацией этих признаков), либо формообразовательными аффиксами (суффиксами, флексиями).

and by Lingvističeskij Ėnciklopedičeskij slovar' (1990:80):

Под вариантами понимаются разные проявления одной и той же сущности, напр. видоизменения одной и той же единицы, к-рая при всех изменениях остается сама собой.

#### 2.3.2.1 Types of stress variation

It has been taken for granted that norm is primary and variation secondary, but it has also been suggested that the order is the reverse: variation is primary and norm is secondary (Mattheier 1997:7–8). This second viewpoint seems reasonable, as norm problems – both with the explicit and the implicit one – are activated when there is a choice between existing variants.

Accentological variants, which will be dealt with in this investigation, are seen as grammatical variants and these are characterised above all by having identical grammatical function (Graudina 1980:102). As already touched upon in the introduction (Chapter 1) the accentological variants are linguistically or phonetically of three types (Gorbačević 1978a:20–21): (1a) variants differing only in stress placement and the pronunciation of sounds in weak position in all forms of a word (и́скриться – искріться); (1b) variants differing in stress placement in some forms of a word (гру́зить – грузи́ть); and (2) variants

---

113 It is suggested by Lapteva (1990b:59) that there is a difference between vacillation (колебание) and variation (вариативность), where vacillation is broader and implies a change of the normative legalised image of a variant.
that differ in stress placement and phoneme structure (заводский – заводской). Of these
types of accentological variation the first two will be dealt with in this dissertation.

Tornow (1984:64–65, 75–77) classifies the characteristics of the accentological
variation given in dictionaries and handbooks. The following three scales emerge:

- variation on a *chronological* scale;
- variation on a *sociolinguistic* scale (regional, social, functional/stylistical);
- variation on a *normative* scale (formal, colloquial, vulgar variants as opposed to neutral
language).114

2.3.3 Violation of or deviation from the norm

In order to demonstrate that deviation from the norm is not an absolute and simple notion,
there are a few subjects or aspects that will be touched upon: theoretical and practical vio-
lation of the norm, variation in an individual, overt and covert norms, gaps between the
codification and actual norms, and the loss of authority that this can entail.

First, however, a few points regarding the difference between norm deviations in stress
and some other types of norm deviations will be mentioned, together with examples of lan-
guage errors from two different sources. By this I do not claim that norm deviations in
word stress are totally unique and separate from other deviations, only that there are differ-
ent kinds of “errors”.

Stress solecisms are seldom *linguistically* important, they are rather socially important
in so far as they can alter the attitude to the speaker and his position in a group or in a soci-
ety. Furthermore, they are rarely illogical or contradictory and rarely hamper understand-
ing. Neither do “norm deviations” in stress contradict the language system as they are gen-
erally created by analogy.

Stress deviations are linguistically important only if there is a *difference in meaning* be-
tween two different stresses; this is very seldom the case and then most often in nouns: крёдит – кредит (Skvorcov 1995:167). (In addition, this stress difference is found in other
languages.)

Other types of mistakes can be based on *misunderstandings and misinterpretations:*
ero iniциалы – Иван Петрович (Skvorcov 1995:157). Or they can be the result of *contami-
nations: игра́ть значение* (from иметь значение and играть роль; Skvorcov 1995:16, 156).
Some types of norm deviation are *contradicting a general rule:* Увидев это жилище, у меня
сложилось самое плохое впечатление (authentic example from Zemskaja 1996b:280) (there
is a general rule that the subject of the gerund and the subject of the main clause are the
same). Another type of contradiction of a general linguistic rule is: Мы узна́вали о русских и запа́дных писа́телях (authentic example from Zemskaja
1996b:268) (the preposition о governs locative and accusative, not genitive). In contrast,
there are no general rules such as for instance “no stem stress in masculine preterite
forms”.

114 Offord (1996:6–7) gives the following examples of stress in razgovornaja reč differing from that of “the
accepted norm”: договор, приговор, развилось, развилась. That prostorečie in some cases is characterised by
stress other than in the standard language is conveyed by for instance Lingvističeskij enciklopedičeskij
slovar (1990:402), by Offord (1996:9), who exemplifies with документ, магазин, звонишь, гнала, отдала, and
by Zemskaja & Šmelëv (1984:9), who claim that stem-stressed feminine preterite forms гнала, отдала and
also the preservation of archaic stress like уменьши́ть are typical stress features of prostorečie.
2.3.3.1 Theoretical and practical violation

Suber (1989) differs between theoretical and practical violation: “[a] theoretical violation departs from the group’s generally held beliefs about correct usage, whether or not it departs from the group’s practice. A practical violation departs from actual convergent usage.” As for the change that takes place, Suber says that the theoretical violations of one generation may by the next generation be accepted even in theory. He continues:

If we regard the convergent behavior of a language community descriptively, then “violation” is merely divergent usage. If we regard it normatively, then divergent usage is “violation”. The descriptive and normative perspectives map each other perfectly. This follows from the anomalous ontology of immanent norms in which the factual convergence of social practice gives rise to normative authorization and confirmation of that historical practice. (Suber 1989)

2.3.3.2 Variation in an individual

The use of variants differs not only between individuals, but also within individuals, and several variants can be part of one idiolect. This is pointed out by Kostomarov & Leont’ev (1966:5 ff.), who assert that the use of different variants depends on the speech situation and that this variation is a sign of development towards differentiation of styles (1966:4–5). Aitchison (1991:35) mentions the “variations in style which exist within the speech of individual speakers”, and the notion that pronunciation varies according to context is also found in Offord (1996:4).

Agrell (1917), who based his whole stress variation theory on the situational variation in an individual, pointed out:

Но тому, кто внимательно прислушивался к свободной и непринужденной речи великоросса, легко установить, что одно и то же лицо в различных случаях изменяет в одной и той же форме ударение. (Agrell 1917:3)

The choice of different types of stress is, according to Agrell (1917:6–7), conditioned by the situational context (different styles and different stresses are elicited in read text and spontaneous speech), by the linguistic context and by linguistic psychology.

Unlike Agrell, who claimed that the choice of variants has a semasiological meaning, Nicholson (1968:12) regards semantic and stylistic stress variation as individual and changing: “[a] general criterion is the conscientiousness of semantic and stylistic stress differentiation, although it must be remembered that semantic differentiation through stress may be artificial, individualistic, and subject to constant revision.”

I will return to the question concerning the choice of variants depending on the situation and on the individual when discussing the survey results (Chapter 4).

2.3.3.3 Overt and covert norms

There is another aspect to violation of or deviation from the norm: the existence of overt and covert norms.115 This is often disregarded in works on language cultivation; not least in the Russian context, as it is often assumed that a norm violation is always a norm violation and that the reasons for this violation may lie in the individual.116 Nevertheless, awareness of overt and covert norms is found in Sergeev (1961), who deals with orthoepy

---

115 The concepts overt norm and covert norm border on implicit and explicit norms but it is not exactly the same: covert norms are generally found in a low prestige group, while implicit or actual norms are the norms of the society as a whole with the educated speaker as a base. See also the comparison of the results of the attitude-survey and pronunciation survey (Chapter 4.7) and Trudgill (1972) and Aitchison (1991:75).

116 For instance Vvedenskaja & Červinskij (1997:174), who claim that the type of norm breaking can be an indication of “нервного, психического, соматического расстройства” in a person.
in schools. He realises the existence of these two types of norms and the consequences for 
the solidarity that this can have: a pupil might know how to stress in a classroom situation 
in order to give the “correct” answer to the teacher, but outside the classroom he is embara-
ressed to use these standard variants out of fear of mockery from others (Sergeev 1961:22). 
This is of course applicable to society as a whole.117

2.3.3.4 Gaps between the codification and actual norms

It has been pointed out by many researchers that there are gaps between codification and 
actual norms. Comrie et al. for instance conclude that:

In the seven decades of the Soviet regime that followed, the standard language was fixed and promoted, 
through schooling, by normative grammarians. What started out as a rapid set of changes unleashed by the 
political and social overhaul eventually developed into a relatively static, conservative system that was far 
behind developments in the spoken language. The gap between the standardized language, prescribed by a 
succession of Academy grammars (the latest published in 1980) and largely fixed by official Soviet 
literature, which did not tolerate slang or spoken language, became particularly clear in the latest stages of 
the period, with the appearance of surveys of spoken standard Russian [...] As a result, claims started 
appearing in the linguistic literature that changes in the standard language did not go far enough, and that 
Russian standardized by normative grammars is too archaic [...] (Comrie et al. 1996:10–11)

They further establish that the recommendations are “sometimes at variance with educated 
usage as elicited, for instance, by the RJaSO survey” and that “[e]ven within the dynamic 
approach, normative handbooks tend to lag behind changes in usage” (Comrie et al. 1996:21). They see this as partly due to the “usual conception of the ‘modern Russian literary language’ (современный русский литературный язык) as the Russian language from Puškin to the present day” (Comrie et al. 1996:21).

This lagging behind is not unique to the contemporary Russian language. Firstly, a gap 
between the codified norm and current usage exists in many languages and societies, and is 
inherent to language and to lexicographic practice. Secondly, such remarks regarding Rus-
sian have been found much earlier: Černyšëv (1912:5, 37) comments upon the disparity 
between recommendations or prescriptions of grammars and dictionaries and the living 
standard language referring to, for instance, Grot (1876), published 36 years earlier. Nev-
ertheless, this disparity can be smaller or larger depending on, among other factors, lan-
guage policy, and it appears that it is indeed quite conspicuous in late 20th–early 
21st-century Russian.

Several observations testify to this. Pirogova (1967:14) points out that:

Рекомендуемые акцентологические нормы во многих случаях, однако, устарели, они нередко 
повторяют и узаконивают для нашего дня те явления, которые сложились у истоков орфоэпии два-
три столетия назад. Словари в ряде случаев резко отвергают незыблемость тех правил, кото-
рые уже фактически отвергнуты носителями языка.

Nicholson (1968:xiii) says “stress authorities artificially regulate stress patterns and 
categories”. The same idea is found in Gorbačević (1971:42):

Нередко в справочниках и пособиях по культуре речи указываются старые нормы ударения, уже не 
соответствующие современной речевой практике.

The explanation put forward by Graudina (1980:38) is that the divergence between the 
practice of normative judgements and the norm of usage in speech is partially due to the 
weak scientific theory, which alongside the study of prescriptive norms (codification), 
should pay attention to, as she puts it “the laws that govern the norms of usage of units in

117 See Trudgill (1972).
speech” (“должна уделять также внимание законам, управляющим нормами употребления единиц в речи”).

Vvedenskaja & Červinskij do, however, point out that the correspondence between normativisation and the “actual situation” (“реальное состояние”) in standard speech is not always attainable, and this difference between what is prescribed and the real normative situation is explained by the fact that norms are developing, non-static, often paradoxical and not always predictable (1997:178).  

Predominantly, however, this discrepancy and its unusual magnitude and implications – as has been and will be shown – is due to the political situation in the Soviet Union and the lexicographic and scientific tradition, which helped to create and emphasise the gap between the codified norm and the actual norm as manifested in the spoken language and the attitudes of the speakers. The reasons for the unwillingness to recognise “deviations from norms” or “vacillation within a norm” were – and are – partly political. Language policy was, as other policies, strictly regulated in the totalitarian state:118

… man sollte dabei erwägen, daß die öffentliche Sprechtätigkeit in der Sowjetunion viel strenger geregelt und eingeschränkt war als anderswo und daß darum auch die Rückwirkung, dem bekannten Newtonschen Axiom gemäß, eine entsprechend heftigere ist. (Mihály 1994:384)

There are indications of movement in the relationship between codification and actual norms: Comrie et al. (1996:311) believe that the rapid linguistic changes in Russia are undoing the “static system” in a way that could be compared to the linguistic changes after the 1917 revolution, and that these changes “actually reflect earlier changes that have accumulated in the language but have been impeded by normative grammars and handbooks”. Zybatow (1995:231) sees a unified norm system:

... die Spannung zwischen der flexibel-dynamischen endogenen Norm und der konservativen exogenen Norm im Russisch der Gegenwart wird kleiner bzw. das frühere starke Auseinanderdriften beider Normensysteme nimmt ab.

2.3.3.5 Loss of authority

We have seen above that deviation from the norm can be understood in different ways: there is theoretical and practical violation, there are overt and covert norms to violate, there is variation in an individual, etc. It can also be questioned whether “deviation from the norm” is the proper designation. If the actual, implicit norm is what is shown in the speech and attitude of a majority of educated speakers, then we should rather talk of a “deviation from the codification”. Bartsch, for instance, prefers to talk not about “deviation from the norm”, but about “conflicts” between different norms (1987:155). Graudina & Švarckopf (1992:102) prefer to talk not only of “norm” and “deviation from the norm” (“отклонение от нормы”), but also of “vacillation of the norm” (“колебание нормы”).

We will now look at the loss of authority that the gaps between the codified norm and actual norms can entail. This loss is double-edged. On the one hand, a deviation from the codified norm can lower the authority of the speaker (cf. for instance Rozental’ et al.

---

118 One example of such discrepancy between prescribed and actual norms is found in Offord (1996:4): “For example, authoritative Russian dictionaries indicate end stress throughout the future tense in the verbs поместить and поселить (поместить, etc, поселить, etc), but many educated speakers now consider поместить, etc and поселить, etc normal and correct.” This is one of the few grammars or other works aimed at the foreign learner of Russian to mention variation in stress, which is otherwise very often disregarded. For exceptions see Wade (2000:265) and Wikland (1987:123), which touch upon it, but not as explicitly as Offord.

Aitchison (1991:62) claims that people pay attention to the behaviour of others only if it is dramatically different from the norm: “[p]eople either do not notice a minor deviation from the norm, or they over-react to it”. However, the loss of authority on the part of the speaker takes place only if he deviates from the implicit norm. A deviation from a norm that is only explicit, not implicit does not generally entail a loss of authority as one single speaker operates in relation to the rest of the language community, not exclusively in relation to codification. Kostomarov (1999:246) claims that “[у] нас любое отклонение от принятых норм сразу же и безоговорочно воспринимается как нетерпимая ошибка даже тогда, когда оно происходит вполне в допускаемых системой рамках.” Hence it could be concluded from what Kostomarov says about norm deviation, that if there is no negative reaction, then there is no norm deviation either.120

On the other hand there is the other side of the loss of authority, which has much larger repercussions: a deviation from the actual – or implicit – norm lowers the authority of normative works. This was observed by Gel'gardt (1961:24) who declared that linguistic facts can, regardless of prohibitions, become so commonly accepted that if they are pointed out as incorrect or as non-standard these recommendations will only lead to perplexity (“недоумение”) among standard language speakers.

Bartsch (1987:92) also sees this complication:

If the cleavage between the standard language and linguistic usage and intuition of the educated middle class, which is supposed to be the substratum of the standard, becomes too broad, then the standard language cannot fulfil its very purpose; its normalizing and unifying force with respect to linguistic usage diminishes, because it is no longer accepted by the (relevant parts of) the [sic] population: the standard language is then felt to be too rigid, too antiquated, and too strange. Instead of being a norm which coincides at least with the linguistic intuition of the educated class, thus being a real norm for them from the internal point of view, it would become a mere prescription, ie a norm content that has been imposed on them.

The implementation of norms presupposes the acceptance of the norm by the language community.121 In fact, without the language users the prescribed norms cannot function.122

2.3.4 Changes in language norms

Variation is always present in language and is both a sign of change in progress and a pre-requisite for this change. Aitchison (1991:214–215) compares language to the tide, constantly ebbing and flowing. The result of this is, as she sees it, “a perpetual stalemate”, as neither disruptive nor therapeutic tendencies ever totally win or lose.

An example of linguistic change is given by Ickovič (1968), who describes a “typical” case of change from the variant $A^1$ to variant $A^2$:

121 Speech community can be used synonymously with linguistic community and language community, although in some contexts a distinction is required. For a discussion see Wardhaugh (1992:117–123). In this context the terms are referring to speakers of the Russian standard language.
122 See for instance Omdal (1996b) about the role of language users.
Table 2–2. Change from variant A\textsuperscript{1} to variant A\textsuperscript{2} in codification over a period of time. After Icković (1968:48).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
<th>Stage 4</th>
<th>Stage 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variant A\textsuperscript{1} norm</td>
<td>norm</td>
<td>not neutral, only in written language or bookish style</td>
<td>outside the standard language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variant A\textsuperscript{2} outside the standard language (e.g. просторечие)</td>
<td>within the standard language, first in oral language (colloquial)</td>
<td>norm in neutral written and oral language</td>
<td>the only norm of the standard language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A similar model is found in Vvedenskaja & Červinskij (1997):


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
<th>Stage 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;only one norm&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;dissipation and competition&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;priority and fall&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;only one (new) norm&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variant A norm</td>
<td>norm</td>
<td>obsolete</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variant B incorrect (= неправ.)</td>
<td>admissible/colloquial/ and (= доп./разг./и)</td>
<td>norm</td>
<td>norm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in the tables above, a new norm usually starts out as a non-normative form that gradually becomes more and more accepted in codification, until it takes over and the old norm becomes non-normative.

The “error” of today might be the norm of tomorrow (Lapteva 1993:48). This view is expressed by Gorbačevič as follows: “[н]ередко, однако, ошибка в ударении с течением времени перестает быть ошибкой и становится новой нормой литературного языка” (1971:42).

Accordingly, the creation of norms could be described as a contradictory and reflexive process. Suber (1989), who has looked at language norms from a philosophical point of view, has put forward the main thesis that: “norms stabilize and subvert themselves by virtue of inherently reflexive or circular processes.” These reflexivities are three in number:

1. The self-validation of usage that is “widespread and longlasting”: “norms arise from facts and facts from norms”.
2. The self-stabilisation or the self-reinforcement of stability: usage becomes a norm, and “by doing so it reinforces itself at both the descriptive and normative levels”.
3. The reflexive erosion of stability: if usage can create a norm, it can also alter a norm; but “usage that alters a norm is not in conformity with the norms it alters”. This is an “anomalous loop” (Suber 1989).

He further claims that the fact that some normative change is brought about by violations should be enough to “cause us to rethink the logic of normative change”. Norms and facts/usage are reciprocally dependent in so far as “[n]orms constrain usage every day; usage alters norms only over many years”.\textsuperscript{123} Thus norms are “constitutive a posteriori” (Suber 1989).

The contradictory character of norms is also noted by Nen'ko (1984a), although from a more superficial point of view. The norm is subordinated to two opposite tendencies: on the one hand there is the compulsory stability of the norm and, on the other, a striving not to be behindhand with linguistic change and to reflect this change (1984a:13–14).

\textsuperscript{123} Gorbačevič (1990a:71) compares linguistic change to the movements of the hour-hand of a clock: it is constantly moving but the movement cannot be seen directly.
2.3.4.1 Reasons for language change

Change originates from elements already existing in the language, and language change is a social phenomenon occurring when people come into contact and one group consciously or subconsciously copies features from the speech of another group that has some kind of prestige. Whereas conscious changes are generally in the direction towards overt prestige forms, subconscious changes tend to be in the direction away from them (Aitchison 1991:75). The role of the prestige factor for linguistic change is also mentioned by e.g. Kostomarov & Leont'ev (1966:12).

It is believed that it is often the educated middle class that is in the vanguard of linguistic change. Non-standard variant forms with support among well-educated people and in towns have a much greater chance of being accepted into the standard language than e.g. rural dialects (Stone 1973:181). Kostomarov (1999:297) agrees that it is often the educated part of the population with influence in society that is the initiator and the active participant in language change. Mihály (1994:384) is of the same opinion regarding the contemporary Russian language:

Im Gegensatz dazu stammen in unserer Zeit die meisten Verstöße gegen den traditionellen hochsprachlichen Usus aus dem Milieu der gesellschaftlichen Mittelschichten, in nicht geringem Maße sogar von professionellen Literaten.

The factors causing linguistic change and influencing its direction and speed are multiple and usually the reason for a particular change cannot be pigeon-holed. Or, as Aitchison (1991:162) puts it: “language is both a social and a mental phenomenon in which sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic factors are likely to be inextricably entwined.”

Among the internal or linguistic causes of language change, i.e. the “linguistic and psychological factors which reside in the structure of the language and the minds of the speakers” (Aitchison 1991:106), Goraćević (1971:32–34) lists the law of economy through which the speaker is saving time and energy by following the line of least resistance and the law of analogy, which is at work when one form of linguistic expression assimilates to another one that relates to the first form on the formal level and the level of content. However, as remarked by Aitchison, “[w]ords can only be in the forefront of a change if they are linguistically susceptible to that particular change” (1991:80).

There seems to be an agreement that the influence of extralinguistic factors, i.e. of social factors outside the language system, on language change is limited and that the internal factors are primary. Aitchison states that sociolinguistic causes like fashion, foreign influence, and social need or functional view of language change are not solely responsible for language change, but “they exploit a weak point or potential imbalance in the system which might have been left unexploited. This exploitation may create further weak points in the system” (1991:123).

The opinion that extra-linguistic factors are very seldom the direct reasons for linguistic changes but rather the “stimulators” which increase the speed of or bring out these changes

---

124 He refers to the 1920s with change mainly from below.
125 Despite this complicated interplay between different factors causing language change, attempts at and models for linguistic prognostication have been made. Prognoses are dealt with by, for instance, Goraćević (1971:26–27, 1990a, 1990b:242–243). What has been used are sociolinguistic facts such as “general culture”, education and mass media, elucidation of internal reasons for linguistic change, extrapolation from tendencies in development, statistics etc. A scale of probability for language change is found in Graudina (1980:125f.) and in Goraćević (1990b:238–239). The question could be asked whether it is not more urgent to find a model for eliciting actual norms than being obsessed with and trying to foretell the future.
is also found in, for instance, Graudina (1980:276). Nicholson (1968:130) draws similar conclusions regarding stress changes after the revolution: “[i]t might be assumed that major stress changes began to take place after the 1917 Revolution as a result of population movement and the mixing of persons from different regions. In fact, however, some of the major stress movements were in full process of development in the first half of the nineteenth century.” And Comrie et al. (1996:2) agree that external factors such as migration and language planning can affect the pace of changes caused by tendencies already present in language, although “[m]any other features of course would probably have appeared even if there had been no October Revolution”.

As hinted by Comrie et al. above, the importance of extralinguistic or social factors varies for different levels of language: extralinguistic factors can play quite a large role in influencing vocabulary, while the influence on stress and pronunciation is much less significant. (Cf. Gorbachević 1971:35.)

Linguistic and extralinguistic reasons for variation and change in word stress are discussed in Chapter 1.4.4.

2.4 Language policy and cultivation of speech

2.4.1 Terminology

An essential term for discussing norms of the Russian language is культура речи (henceforth культура речи or KR). The term культура языка was first used by the Prague Linguistic Circle and in Russia by G. Vinokur. Later культура речи became more common and it is generally rendered as culture – or cultivation – of speech (Stone 1973:166–169).

According to Comrie et al. (1996:5) культура речи, языковое нормирование, языковая кодификация are seen as Russian equivalents to language planning. It can also be argued that language planning is a broader concept than KR or that it is not at all equal to it. (See Stone 1973:167–168.) Therefore, before returning to KR, some of the terminology on language policy will be examined.

The overriding term in this area is language policy and language policies can be retrospective (cultivation of speech) and perspective (language planning, or in Soviet/Russian terminology: language building) (Lingvističeskij ènciklopedièeskij slovar’ 1990:616).

Language planning is sometimes also called language engineering and that term is usually employed for a language policy with “a positive aim of manipulating language as

---

126 Garvin (1983:148–149) restates the principles of the Prague School for cultivation of the national language:
1) “La base de la culture de la langue réside dans la connaissance scientifique de la norme réelle de la langue littéraire. La norme réelle se trouve dans la pratique littéraire et intellectuelle de la génération actuelle et de celle qui l’a immédiatement précédée. La norme fictive réside dans les idées “romantiques” des puristes.”
2) “Les linguistes doivent participer activement à la codification de la langue tant en matière d’ortographe que de grammaire.”
3) “Le travail linguistique doit contribuer à la differentiation fonctionnelle et à l’enrichissement stylistique de la langue littéraire.”

127 Cf. German Sprachpflege or Swedish språkvård, which include the element ‘care’.

128 Stone (1973:167) notes that the English title of Rozental’s book Культура речи is Modern Russian Usage.


130 Regarding the origin of this term see Stone (1973:167).
means of tackling social problems” (Posner 1997:34). By Wardhaugh (1992:346) it is defined as the changing of a particular variety of a language or a particular language, or of some aspect of how either of these functions in society. According to him this planning can be divided into status planning and corpus planning. Status planning changes the status of a language or a variety with regard to some other language or variety, by changing the function of it and the rights of those who use it (1992:347), and corpus planning is directed towards the internal condition of the language or variety with a view to changing that condition. This usually means to standardise the language or variety, i.e. to provide it with the means for serving every possible language function in society (Wardhaugh 1992:347).

Posner (1997:39) equates normalisation with status planning: it is “to fit the language for a wider variety of functions”, “the establishment of goals, policies and procedures for a language community”. She further equates normativisation with corpus planning: it is among other things a “yardstick” for correctness in language use, a metalanguage for discourse about language (1997:40). This distinction between normalisation and normativisation is apparently not always made and Posner’s view is probably not shared by everyone.

Regarding the concept standardisation, there is, according to Milroy & Milroy (1991:22 ff.), no uniform definition. They see it rather as an ideology and “[t]he whole notion of standardisation is bound up with the aim of functional efficiency of the language” (1991:23). Furthermore, they believe its chief characteristic is “intolerance of optional variability in language” (1991:26) and “suppression of optional variation at all levels of language” (1991:36). Posner (1997:34) claims that standardisation is used to improve the prestige of languages, and according to Wardhaugh it “refers to the process by which a language has been codified in some way” usually through developing grammars, spelling books, dictionaries (1992:30) and it is attempting “either to reduce or to eliminate diversity and variety” (1992:33).

The difference between codification and normalisation/normativisation (the Russian нормализация does not make a distinction between these two concepts) is said by Ickovič (1970:13–14) to be that codification can be the description of the norm – it presents language realities in the form of rules – and normalisation is the active interference in the linguistic process. Normalisation and norm are sometimes said to be synonymous (Skvorcov’s observation 1970:40). According to the Prague School of Linguistics, norm and codification are separate, the exception being orthography, where norm and codification coincide (Ickovič 1970:34).

In the present thesis the distinction between normalisation and normativisation will be upheld: cultivation of speech, the subject of the next subchapter, belongs to corpus planning and codification, and therefore normativisation will be used here for what in Russian is referred to as нормализация (see above, Posner 1997:40).
2.4.2 Definition of *cultivation of speech*

It was mentioned above that *cultivation of speech* (KR) can be used as a synonym for *языковое нормирование* and *языковая кодификация*. However, opinions differ as to whether KR and *norm* should be equated. Ickovič, for instance, sees the linguistic norm as the base for cultivation of speech (1970:10–11), but KR is broader than *norm* as KR also has a pragmatic component: in some situations a “wrong” form is the only correct one.

A similar view is expressed by Skvorcov, who states that KR is the degree of command of linguistic norms and the capacity to use all the expressive means of the language under different communicative conditions, according to the goals set and the content of the utterance (1995:6). That KR has two aspects, correctness and communicative expediency, is also professed by Senkevič (1997:9–10).

There are also – according to some authors – different levels of KR (as already touched upon), and discussion of whether KR is a *linguistic discipline in itself*. KR can thus have both a practical and theoretical side, and the practical side may exist on different levels. *Lingvističeskij ènciklopedičeskij slovar*’ (1990:247) considers cultivation of speech as (1) the command of the norms of the standard language (level 1 is correct speech, i.e. adherence to the norm and level 2 is linguistic mastery); (2) a linguistic discipline studying the problems of normalisation or normativisation. Vasil'eva et al. (1995:54) are of basically the same opinion, claiming that KR is (1) command of the norm, including pragmational norms; (2) a branch of linguistics studying problems concerning the correctness of speech. Similar views are held by for instance Skvorcov (1995:6).

Like *Lingvističeskij ènciklopedičeskij slovar*’ and Vasil'eva et al. above, Kunert (1984:378) distinguishes two levels of command of the standard language, where the first level is language correctness (*правильность речи*), which implies command of the language and its norms in terms of “Russian–not Russian”, “correct–incorrect language”, and the second level is cultivation of speech (*культура речи*), where variants are evaluated on a scale (“better–worse”). Unlike *Lingvističeskij ènciklopedičeskij slovar*’ and Vasil'eva et al., however, Kunert does not consider KR a scientific discipline in itself. She sees it as a complex of stylistic, lexical-phraseological, grammatical and phonoetical questions with a goal to build a theoretical base for practical deeds, namely the use of the optimal means for each speech situation (1984:378–379).

Whether KR is a discipline in itself has changed over the years, according to Širjaev (1992b:36; cf. the first version of the article in Širjaev 1992a). Up to the post-revolutionary days KR was not a discipline in itself and two parallel disciplines coexisted – one normalising and one rhetoric. The normalising direction has been the dominant one from the end of the 1920s up to today (1992b:38). Širjaev sees KR as a particular discipline with the task of making communication more efficient and it has three main components: normative, communicative, ethical (1992b:38, 1994a:9). KR is defined as the choice and organisation of linguistic means for reaching the highest efficiency in attaining the communicative goals (1994a:9). Another task of KR is the defence of the standard language and its norms (Širjaev 1995b:5).
2.4.3 Cultivation of speech and stress: orthoepy

2.4.3.1 Definition of orthoepy

KR and stress are closely linked. When KR is discussed the issue is often stress, and stress is said to be one of the most important questions for the normativisation of the Russian standard language (Voroncova 1959:117, Kunert 1984:393).

Cultivation of speech in the area of stress and pronunciation is dealt with in orthologic or orthoepic dictionaries. The definitions of orthoepy differ rather significantly. Some are very broad and equate orthoepy with cultivation of speech, while other definitions are very narrow and do only include certain aspects of phonetics, sometimes not even word stress. Senkevič (1997:25) sees orthology as the science of cultivation of speech, i.e. as synonymous to KR. Kostomarov & Leont'ev (1966:13) consider orthology as the study of variants which exist alongside each other but which are heterochronic. A somewhat narrower definition is found in Œnciklopedija “Russkij jazyk” (1997:307–308), which regards orthoepy as the standard norms of pronunciation (the structure and realisation of phonemes and the phoneme structure of morphemes) and the standard norms of suprasegmental phonetics (stress and intonation). In a broader understanding of the concept, grammatical variants can also be seen as part of orthoepy. Besides, orthoepy is regarded as a linguistic discipline studying the function of and developing norms of orthoepy. Quite a similar definition is found in Lingvističeskij Œnciklopedičeskij slovar’ (1990:351): orthoepy is “норматив[ая] реализаци[я] сегментных единиц (фонем) и суперсегментных единиц (ударение, интонация)”. An even narrower definition is found in Es'kova (1988:25–26), who qualifies orthoepy as what is not reflected enough in the Russian writing system (although stress can be reflected, as in dictionaries). Another narrow definition is found in Nen'ko who claims that “[в современном русском языке ударение не заключается в объем понятия ‘орфоэпия’]” (1984a:21).

The definition found in Œnciklopedija “Russkij jazyk” (1997) appears to be the one that best describes the orthoepy that is the subject of the dictionaries or handbooks used for the present study. Cf. OS (1997:4): “словарь […] ставит своей задачей отражение норм, реализующихся в устной речи”, referring first and foremost to the norms of pronunciation and stress, but also to grammatical forms.

2.4.3.2 Orthoepic dictionaries

The earliest type of orthologic or orthoepic dictionaries were the “dictionaries of errors” from the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century. Later, in the second half of the 20th century, the “dictionaries of correct speech” appeared. The 1950s mark a new

---

131 The term orthoepy from the Greek ὀγις/’right’, ‘straight’ and ηῆ/’speech’ is most often used, but orthology can also be found.
132 Œnciklopedija “Russkij jazyk” adds that traditionally all pronunciation norms of the standard language are included in orthoepy (Avanesov), but that there is another view (Panov), according to which orthoepy are only norms that admit pronunciation variants, and that this is where orthoepy differs from phonetics, which studies phonetic rules that do not have exceptions (1997:307).
133 There is thus a parallel to KR, with both a practical and a theoretical side, but orthoepy is generally seen as being more narrow than KR as it deals with pronunciation and to some degree morphology, but not with the lexical or syntactical level.
134 According to Graudina (1994:55), the term ортологический was consolidated in linguistic literature in the 1960s. The term encompasses both the so-called словари неправильностей of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century and словари правильной речи of the second half of the 20th century.
stage in the development of orthoepic dictionaries, as the orientation both towards difficulties in written and spoken language and towards the correction of errors on both the orthoepical and grammatical level was defined. (See Ėnciklopedija “Russkij jazyk” 1997:298–300.) Orthoepic dictionaries will be further dealt with in Chapter 3.

2.4.3.3 Other means of dealing with cultivation of speech
It should not be forgotten, however, that these dictionaries reflect certain norms and the variation in the language rather than function as a codex or manual for language learning and usage. The acquisition of language habits and norms is much more complex.135

There are realistically only two sources of norm implementation: one is through family and other informal social networks, the other through the early school years. Schooling is, according to Leont'ev (1965), the only means through which language can be influenced, and he believes that adult speech cannot be regulated.136 The role of the teacher is emphasised by Vikør (1996:26), who calls the primary-school teacher the “interface” of the language normativisation debate. The role of school is often mentioned and oral skills is considered a neglected area (Dolopčev 1886:IV, Sergeev 1961, Kostomarov & Leont'ev 1966:14–15, Gorbačevič 1971:41,137 Karaulov 1991:passim).

Even if the importance of school is underlined it is most likely that language is learned mainly through listening and speaking in an informal context with family and friends – particularly at an early age. Formal schooling with learning situations in which a teacher is correcting errors probably does not play an important role, and the older the student, the more limited the opportunity of regulating speech.

As for media language, it seems likely that it is first and foremost an indicator of the state of language, but that it can to a certain extent act as a reinforcement of speech habits. However, opinions differ regarding the role of media in influencing and forming speech habits. Krysin (1974:350) showed that the extent to which the language users listen to the radio proved irrelevant for linguistic practice, except for pronunciation and only to a very small degree here. Panov, on the other hand, says that radio was from the 1920s–1930s the most important source – the “main instructor” (“главный наставник”) – of pronunciation norms (1968b:17). Zemskaja (1996a:10) believes that media language both influences and reflects language on the whole, while Rozental' et al. (1994:370–371) believe that language in media exerts quite a strong influence on the public’s language and that wrong pronunciation can be fixated on a subconscious level. There is also the view that media language is a kind of legislator or normaliser. This point of view is expressed by Dešeriev (1983:71 ff.) and Senkevič (1997:4–5).

2.4.4 History of normativisation in Russian

2.4.4.1 The situation before 1917
Although, as suggested by Graudina (1980:5), normativity was discussed among linguists in the 1880s–1890s, most scholars seem to claim that normativisation was not a priority before the 1920s.138 Kunert (1984:385) asserts that cultivation of speech was of no

---

135 “Нельзя освоить культуру речи посредством пособия или совета” (Kolesov 1988:6).
137 Gorbačevič (1971:41–42) says that this was also earlier a neglected area in linguistics and refers to Grot (1876) and Černyšëv (1912).
138 See Graudina (1980:8–9) for an account of early writings in this area.
scientific concern before the revolution, when the linguists dealt with language from an objective and not a normative point of view. This view is also found in Švarckopf (1970a:369–370), and Gorbačevič (1971:24–25) agrees when he draws the history of language normativisation: at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century questions regarding the raising of the level of speech culture (“вопросы повышения речевой культуры”) and normative codification were not the objective of linguistics. He refers to Šachmatov, whose belief was prevailing at that time. It was considered that fighting common speech errors was a fruitless task and that normativisation as such was unnecessary: “странно было бы вообще, если бы ученое учреждение вместо того, чтобы показывать, как говорят, решалось указывать, как надо говорить” (Šachmatov 1899:33). Gorbačevič (1978b:86) also quotes Ušakov, who when asked in 1927 if there were rules for correct stressing, answered that “установленных правил ударения нет”.

2.4.4.2 The situation after 1917

It is generally agreed that the beginning of the strict normativisation process can be traced to the 1920s. Following the revolution linguistic democratisation started as a consequence of (a) the literacy campaign; and (b) migration, through which the make-up of the urban population and of standard language speakers changed. This democratisation worked in two directions (Stone 1973:176). On the one hand larger groups of people approached literacy and the standard language (Kunert 1984:383ff., Stone 1973:176), on the other hand the standard was influenced by the speech of the masses (Stone 1973:176). For instance, the norms of pronunciation and stress changed through migration (Gorbačevič 1971:40).

Gorbačevič writes that this period marks the end of a cultural revolution and as a result, a new intelligentsia takes shape: “На конец 30-х годов падает окончание важного этапа культурной революции. К этому времени складывается новая по социальному составу интеллигенция” (1971:40). According to Panov the consequence of this change of standard language speakers was that

Литературность речи пошла вширь, но не вглубь. Повсеместно распространился среднекультурный, сероватый уровень литературной речи. Таким оказался в конце 30-х годов и произношение, на этом уровне оно и застыло. (Panov 1990:16)

Actually, it appears that strict normativisation can be dated more exactly to 1934 and the first All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers. It is after this congress that the “fight for the purity” of the Russian language becomes more intensive:

После I съезда писателей усиливается борьба за чистоту русского языка, начинается упорядочение общественной речевой практики, известная стабилизация языковых норм. (Gorbačevič 1971:40)

This period is marked by a harsh political climate in general, which was reflected in culture politics and in language policy (“упорядочение”, “борьба за чистоту”).

It was in this period (1935–1940) that the first normative dictionary of the Russian language in the Soviet period, Ušakov–1935–1940, instigated by Lenin, was published (Sorokoletov 1978:30, Širjaev 1995b:7).

---

139 According to Cejtlin (1961:176 f.) questions concerning “correct stress” in Russian have been discussed in linguistic literature at least since the first half of the 19th century. Examples: нáчать for начáть, звóнит for звонíт.

140 See also Sorokoletov (1998:331).

141 The congress set the standard for literature and culture for decades to come: it “witnessed the institution of socialist realism as the sole correct method in literature. It remained the official doctrine and only sanctioned method of Soviet art and literature for the next fifty years” (Terras 1991:506).
2.4.4.3 The implications of the strict norm

One of the consequences of this strict language policy was that from the 1930s on a “monolithic normativity” ruled in Russia (Ryazanova-Clarke & Wade 1999:18) and, as Kostomarov says: “к 50-м годам мы пришли с весьма закостеневшей и строго насаждавшейся литературной нормой, вполне отвечающей социально-политической ситуации тоталитарного государства” (1999:6). He sees obvious parallels between the political system and the language policies; it was a deliberate proletarian language policy (Kostomarov 1999:6).

Stone (1973:180) attributes the low tolerance towards non-standard varieties to the above-mentioned campaign of the 1920s to abolish illiteracy, as during that “nonstandard speech and illiteracy were always closely associated, and the campaign to abolish illiteracy was seen as a campaign to eliminate ‘incorrect’ speech as well”.

Naturally, this concentration on the elimination of the incorrect influenced the view on language norms. Panov, cited in Zemskaja (1996a:12), says that norm from the 1930s to the 1960s implied placing a ban on incorrect forms, while this view has now changed and norm currently represents a choice. The view that norm implies a prohibition is also found in Red’kin (1971:83): “норма избирает одни из существующих в употреблении ударений и запрещает все прочие”.

While deideologisation of the social sciences and linguistics has taken place in Russia on the whole, the link between politics in general and language policy or cultivation of speech is by no means restricted to Soviet propaganda of the 1920s–1950s. This link is also to be discerned in some recent writings, for instance in Skvorcov (1995). According to Skvorcov a high culture of speech is considered necessary for political reasons: “Без этого невозможно наведение порядка в нашем доме, возрождение великой России, укрепление права ее народов играть, как и прежде, заметную роль в современном изменяющемся мире” (1995:13). He sees what he calls an ecological aspect to this matter. Surroundings, including on the linguistic and spiritual levels, should be sound and purified: “Каждый из нас в ответе за здоровье языковой среды, которую мы должны сохранить для новых поколений в чистоте и свежести” (Skvorcov 1995:12). Similar ideas, although more subtly expressed, can be found in “Федеральная целевая программа ‘Русский язык’” (“O Federal'noj ...” 1997 and “Federal focused programme ‘Russian Language’”). The name of the government council created in 2000, “Council for the preservation of the purity of the Russian language” (see below), also testifies to a certain ecological approach. The purification ideology of the 1930s thus remains to a certain extent.

2.4.4.4 Recent language policy activities

The past few years have seen an activation and actualisation of the issue “the state of the Russian language”. It started with a conference in Moscow in 1991 (see e.g. Karaulov 1991, Ryazanova-Clarke & Wade 1999:308–309). Then followed the launching of the journal Русистика сегодня (‘Russian Studies Today’) by the Russian Academy of Sciences in 1994. Its tasks are ‘theoretification’, ‘slavonification’ and ‘lexicographication’ (Ryazanova-Clarke & Wade 1999:336).

142 Cf. Voroncova (1959:118), where she sees doublets as “extremely undesirable” (the choice between them should be made through a study of the historical development) with her article from 1996, in which no such opinions appear.
A presidential decree “О совете по русскому языку при Президенте Российской Федерации” (‘On the Russian Language Council attached to the President of the Russian Federation’) was issued on 7 December 1995. A Russian Language Council was created as a direct result. Following the decree of 7 December 1995 came the “Federal focused programme ‘Russian Language’” (Федеральная целевая программа ‘Русский язык’). This programme was adopted in July 1996 (Henry 1996) and it is reported in the journal Русская речь (“О Федеральной целевой программе ‘Русский язык’” …). The goals of this portentous programme, to be implemented in the years 1996–2000, were among others: a spiritual renewal of Russia, with a strengthening of the position of the Russian language both within and outside Russia; a renewal of the language policy, including the creation of laws on language; research on language and speech culture; raising the level of speech culture among the population through the editing of dictionaries and handbooks, through radio- and TV-programmes about language and through improved teaching in schools and higher educational establishments. A particularly important role is played by mass media. Language in media will be studied and analysed, and recommendations on language usage will be given to journalists and other media workers. While there seems to be a genuine concern for culture and language, strategic interests and geopolitics seem to be at the bottom of the programme: the measures proposed will “promote the solution of the geopolitical missions of Russia” (“способствовать решению геополитических задач России”) as the strengthening of the position of the Russian language “meets the strategic interests of Russia” (“отвечает стратегическим интересам России”). However, on 9 July 1997, the decree that was the basis for the programme was annulled by another presidential decree. The federal programme seems not to have had any repercussions.

Then, by the end of 1998 a new law on the Russian language (“Закон о русском языке”) was waiting to be submitted to the State Duma (Blundy, Times 1998). Yet another council was created in January 2000: a Council for the preservation of the purity of the Russian language (Совет по сохранению чистоты русского языка), attached to the Government of the Russian Federation.
2.4.4.5 Subjectivism and purism

Ideology and emotions prevail in many writings on norm, normativisation and cultivation of speech, and ideology and emotion pave the way for purism and subjectivism. The former term is explained as follows by Thomas (1991:12):

Purism is the manifestation of a desire on the part of a speech community (or some section of it) to preserve a language from, or rid it of, putative foreign elements or other elements held to be undesirable (including those originating in dialects, sociolects and styles of the same language). It may be directed at all linguistic levels but primarily the lexicon. Above all, purism is an aspect of the codification, cultivation and planning of standard languages.

Gorbačevič (1971:28) asserts that “в нашем обществе нет почвы для идеологического пуризма”, but he claims that there is a fruitless or useless purism linked to taste and the subjective aesthetic reception of the language. There is also, according to Gorbačevič (quoting Vinokur), another type of purism, that is even harmful, viz. “scientific purism” (“учёный пуризм”), which has existed and exists in, for instance, various handbooks (1971:29–30). Still, Gorbačevič feels that he has to say that there are also positive sides of purism, e.g. the struggle for national culture and against loan-words (1971:31).

Purism is sometimes criticised for being opposed to a scientific approach: “Descriptive lexicographers and etymologists, however, become scientific (by the standards of their disciplines) precisely by overcoming this purism” (Suber 1989).

There is also criticism of emotion and subjectivism, but in this very criticism there is often an element of emotion and subjectivism. A typical utterance is that of Panov (1968a:37–39) criticising dilettantes – often writers – who on emotional grounds present their own subjective “often bad linguistic tastes” as the objective truth when they criticise linguistic innovations.

2.4.4.6 The role of dictionaries

Kiparsky (1962:13) asserts that prescriptive works elsewhere tend to follow usage, whereas in the USSR they sometimes anticipate usage, leading usage into quite definitive paths, as one “can easily see from the gradual disappearance of the so-called ‘fluid areas’”. I agree with Nicholson (1968) who sees this judgement as political rather than linguistic and who claims that Kiparsky “may erroneously be taking the statements of normativizing dictionaries as proof of tendencies in the living language” due to the fact that authors and compilers have had “different and progressively more restrictive attitudes towards normative requirements” (1968:16–17).

Graudina (1980:8) claims that lexicographers are often the last to take on innovations and that this is precisely the role of normalising “research”. It must be kept in mind, however, that not all dictionaries are always normative:

Вообще, следует отметить, что в истории русской лексикографии наблюдалась постоянная борьба двух противоположных принципов – принципа нормативности и ненормативности толковых словарей. (Sorokoletov 1978:31)

Sorokoletov (1978:31) disagrees with Obnorskij who considers all academic dictionaries – e.g. BAS (17 vols.) – as normative. Sorokoletov argues that earlier the academic dictionaries were not normative, in fact they were on principle non-normative, but that for the Soviet dictionaries the normative tasks are very important as they are both an instrument for and a product of cultivation of speech. They are in fact the legislator (законодатель), a normative act (Sorokoletov 1978:32).

149 Nicholson’s translation.
This can be compared to the situation in English-speaking countries and also in German-speaking countries, where the dictionaries (Oxford, Webster; Duden) are seen as norm-giving. (Cf. Vikør 1994:121 and Wardhaugh 1992:32.) Still, what differs in Russian is that there is no regularly updated edition of one standard dictionary (BAS appeared in 1950–1965 and a new edition started appearing in 1991, but only a handful of volumes have been edited). There is rather a plethora of handbooks made by individual compilers, which often treat quite limited areas of the language (only pronunciation, only orthography or only new or foreign words, etc.).

Furthermore, there is not an official body (like L’Académie française) whose writings, editions and sayings are seen as official. Thus in a country like Russia, where norms and normativisation are emphasised to such a degree there is in fact no official body or single standard dictionary. Panov (1990:17) draws the conclusion that “[н]ет общественно признанного, общеизвестного авторитета в области культуры произношения.”

2.4.5 Normativisation and cultivation of speech – can and should language be planned?

One century ago Šachmatov asserted that what has once disappeared from the language cannot be forced back into the language, and that “fighting” what is conventionally called “incorrect” is just as fruitless (1899:32).

Since then views on this matter have changed radically in Russia. Skvorcov, for instance, claims that it is possible to regulate speech:

В основе взглядов советских языковедов лежит признание принципиальной возможности регулировать социальную речевую деятельность, решать теоретические и практические вопросы культуры речи и языковой политики. (Skvorcov 1969:51)

Širjaev also believes in the possibility of regulating language. He suggests that normativisation should be dealt with by the creation of a “service of observation for linguistic innovations” which should give examples of innovations to be evaluated to an expert commission. The results of this evaluation could then be made obligatory for radio, television etc. (Širjaev 1992b:40–41).

It has been suggested that the belief in the omnipotence of linguistic normativisation is linked to the political system that reigned in Russia for the major part of the 20th century. However, the fact that a firm belief in the possibility of planning and regulating language can be found in countries other than those having embraced a communist ideology suggests that this is just one of the explanations. Still, language planning is reminiscent of the planned economy in its construction, according to Gregersen (1991:63), and Comrie et _____

150 Cf. Panov (1990:17): such a role had previously been played by the theatre, while television or radio could never assume that role.

151 “служба слежения за языковыми новациями и экспертная комиссия по оценке этих новаций” The commission should consist of standard language speakers categorised by their different attitudes to the norm (in each group there should be at least five persons): conservatives, neutrals, democrats, and specialists (the same answer from persons from different categories can be weighted differently depending on the persons’ classification into a group). This model appears to have too many flaws to be of any interest, and even if it was theoretically convincing it would not be feasible in practice.
(1996:5) suggest that “standardization would be greater and more rigid in non-democratic societies”. Stone (1973:179) puts it this way:

The assumption that society is able to shape its own linguistic destiny and to direct the course of linguistic history is consistent with the prevalent ideology in the Soviet Union. LP is regarded as an essential feature of a planned society. The question of the ability of society consciously and deliberately to influence language change has therefore engrossed Soviet linguists more than it would otherwise have done.

He does, however, qualify Russian language planning as “pragmatic”, i.e. although the possibility of predicting and controlling language change exists, Russian language planners do not seem to exploit this in practice (Stone 1973:183). Jachnow also discusses the belief in planning. He writes that Soviet sociolinguistics has or had not only a descriptive, but also an evaluative (“оценочная”) function, so that research findings should mainly be used in language planning and language politics (1984b:807).

Examples of such views can be found, for instance, Gorbachevič (1971:26), who accuses linguists like Saussure152 and Coseriu of standing for “normalising agnosticism” (“нормализаторский агностицизм”) as they believe that conscious, deliberate intervention is not possible. Gorbachevič himself wants, instead of looking at the present situation, to make extrapolations from the past to predict future linguistic development. He believes, rather contradictorily, that linguistic prognoses are on the one hand impossible and unscientific and on the other necessary for “correct normative judgement” (“правильная нормативная оценка”; Gorbachevič 1971:26–27). However, from the point of view of language policy he covers himself fully as he does not enter into a discussion about how to approach and judge different linguistic phenomena (1971:263–264).

It has also been suggested that there are negative sides to language planning. Firstly, there is a belief that too rigid language planning can cause, and has caused, a low level of linguistic competence:

There is general agreement that the low state of ‘speech culture’ can be traced to ideological pressures which for decades during the Soviet period prevented speakers and writers from exploiting the full potential of the Russian language. (Ryazanova-Clarke & Wade 1999:311, with reference to Karaulov.)

Secondly, prescription is in itself seen as opposed to linguistic professionalism: “the strength and social function of prescriptive ideologies militate against an objective and professional approach to language” (Milroy & Milroy 1991:156, cf. 1991:11).153

The shortcomings of codification are also discussed by Ickovič (1970). He believes that when not showing variants there is a risk of an external rigour, where the orientation towards the old norm has the consequence that codification lags behind the contemporary norm (1970:28–29). There is also a risk of an internal rigour. This is represented by the very fact that codification exists and that an authoritative source often sets the standard for the subsequent dictionaries and handbooks, thus consolidating for many years the norm of the time when the original source was created.

---

153 Milroy & Milroy (1991:22) claim that it is easier to standardise the writing system and that “absolute standardisation of a spoken language is never achieved (the only fully standardised language is a dead language)".
It should not be forgotten, however, that the role that in reality is played by the speakers is essential in the norm creation process. As shown in the following model for language planning, planning and implementation are directed towards the language community and there is an evaluation on the part of the language community that is the feedback to the language planners.

![Diagram of the language planning process](image)

Figure 2–1. The language planning process. From Vikør (1994:98).

### 2.5 Conclusion: norm and normativisation

The overall purpose of this chapter has been to explore the concepts *norm* and *normativisation*, particularly in the Russian language. To sum up so far, three points will be listed:

- **Norm in theory.** The fact that researchers have different views on norm is not that remarkable, but what constitutes a serious problem for Russian language normativisation is that the norm is neither defined operationally, nor linguistically, nor socially, but is a subjective construction.

- **Norm in practice (codification).** There is a norm which exists both in its explicit and implicit form. One problem here is the existence of preconceived ideas of an objectively existing norm. In fact, language norms are created through an interplay as shown in Figure 2–1 above, and are not to that high a degree created and regulated through codification. Even so, there is no single dictionary that is seen as the *codex* of linguistic conduct. Furthermore, the recommendations given in dictionaries and handbooks are not unanimous. “However, even within one approach, not all normative grammarians would agree, and in practice recommendations sometimes differ from one handbook to another” (Comrie *et al.* 1996:21). This will be further investigated and commented upon in Chapters 3 and 6.

- **The different approach of language users and linguists towards the language norm and questions regarding linguistic correctness.** On the one hand the layman is more often convinced than the linguist that what is correct and incorrect in language is a clear-cut decision and that innovations or deviations are signs of decay. Linguists usually – although not always – see innovations or deviations as signs of development and they believe that change is inherent to language and that many variants are possible. (Cf. Milroy & Milroy 1991:11.) On the other hand there is the gap between codification and actual norms already mentioned in this chapter. These different views cause problems: in order to make the interplay illustrated in the figure above work, normalisators must have the same outlook as the language users. This is in fact a prerequisite for a successful “cultivation of speech”. Language policies cannot be applied to recalcitrant speakers, regardless of whether these policies are more lax or more strict than the speakers’ views. Therefore norm focus should be shifted to the user, the speaker.

---

154 See Josephson (1999) for a survey containing a comparison between the attitudes of Swedish language users (“ordinary people”) and linguists towards language, language change, normativism etc. The investigation showed that while 61 per cent of the language users believe that the language is deteriorating,
Normativisation or cultivation of speech is necessary, but it is for the language users’ needs that they exist and the speakers should be the point of departure in any discussion of linguistic norms.

only 8 per cent of the linguists are of the same opinion. This result is comparable to that from an opinion poll of people’s language attitudes in France made by SOFRES in 1988 (Ager 1990:224–226), which showed that 60 per cent of the people consider that the language is deteriorating. (Linguists were not investigated as a particular group in the French poll.)

155 See Karaulov (1991:3–4, 31), who claims that linguistic criticism is a new discipline. It does not imply “criticism” meaning “listing and complaining about low culture of speech and language errors”. Karaulov wants to put the individual in the centre and focus on the ordinary native speaker when discussing the “state of the language”.

3 Orthoepic dictionaries and the codified norm

In this chapter the sources for the study are presented. First a short background to the contemporary reference works will be given, after which the two main sources will be introduced and submitted to a general comparison. A more detailed comparison of the variation in verbal stress in these two dictionaries will then follow in Chapter 4.

3.1 Orthoepic dictionaries in general – a short background

The history of normalisation/normativisation and cultivation of speech from the end of the 19th century on was traced briefly in the previous chapter. Vvedenskaja & Červinskij (1997:154) characterise the general development of and attitudes towards the norm in the Russian language in the 20th century as follows:156 in the 1920s–1930s low colloquial (prostorečie), dialectal and professional traits enter the standard language. The 1930s–1940s witness the creation and stabilisation of new norms157 and the 1950s–1960s the codification of the strict norm. In the 1960s–1970s there is “professionalisation” of the language, active development of neologisms and foreign loan words, and in the 1970s–1980s there is democratisation of the standard norm with a “scale of admissibility”, functional differentiation and stylistical development of the standard language.

3.1.1 The first modern orthoepic dictionaries and their successors

The 1950s were above characterised as the period of codification of the strict standard norm, and it is to this period that the origin of the first orthoepic dictionaries of the kind used for the present study can be traced.158 The point when the questions of “broad normalisation” of the standard speech arose is suggested by Graudina (1994:56) to be contemporaneous with the creation in 1952 of the sector of cultivation of speech at Institut jazykoznanija on the initiative of Ožegov.159

The first Russian lexicographic work of the orthologic or orthoepic type was Русское литературное произношение и ударение: опыт словаря-справочника by Avanesov and Ožegov (A&O–1955). It was re-edited and re-cast under the title Русское литературное ударение и произношение: словарь-справочник in 1959 and then in 1960 (A&O–1959–1960).

---

157 The first modern dictionary fixing the accentological norms of the 20th century was Ušakov–1935–1940 (Voroncova 1979:7). It was also the first dictionary in which orthoepical and accentological norms were given fully and consistently (Nen'ko 1984a:24). Still, it is an explanatory dictionary, not a handbook of stress and pronunciation. Then Ožegov’s dictionary was created “на базе Словаря Ушакова (1949 г.) и был задуман как сокращенный его вариант” and many of the normative recommendations of that dictionary follow Ušakov’s (Nen'ko 1984a:24). The next stage in the normativisation process after Ušakov was A&O–1959 (Voroncova 1979:7).
158 For an account of similar types of dictionaries of the Russian language before the 1950s see Graudina (1994).
159 Širjaev (1992b:38) mentions the creation of the sector at the Institut russkogo jazyka in 1964.
On the basis of A&O–1959 Орфоэпический словарь русского языка (OS–1983) was created (“... создан в результате коренной переработки ...”; OS–1983 foreword). For this dictionary or handbook the approach towards normalisation underwent an essential change: variation is seen as a regular feature of the standard language and a scale of normativity that is uniform for all types of variants (pronunciation, accentology, morphology) is used (Ěnciklopedija “Russkij jazyk” 1997:305–307).

OS has since been re-edited in 1985, 1987 and 1988. In 1989 (5th ed.) it was revised and a new printing appeared in 1997 (6th ed.). And OS–1983 has in its turn “inspired” other orthoepic dictionaries. Es'kova–1994 (Краткий словарь трудностей русского языка) is written by one of the authors of OS–1983 and its content is in much the same, although somewhat narrower. OS has also influenced Русское произношение и правописание (RPP–1996). In the foreword of RPP the authors state that they have leant mainly on OS (“на который мы опирались в своей работе”; 1996:3). Consequently, a line can be traced from 1955, when A&O appeared, to the most recent works (OS–1997, Es'kova–1994 and RPP–1996).160

3.1.2 The orthoepic heritage

However, the perfunctorily edited or merely reprinted “new” editions of dictionaries create the risk of perpetuating norms prevailing several decades ago:

Простое непереработанное переиздание словаря современного языка или переиздание его с незначительными поправками и улучшениями, как правило, не оправдывает себя, ибо второе издание в этих случаях уже не отражает состояние языка данного времени, особенно в эпоху, отличающуюся быстрым темпом языковой эволюции. (Sorokoletov 1974:31)

Однако жизнь идет вперед. Все то, что казалось неизмененным и стабильным в 50-е годы, в 90-е – подвергается сомнению, а иногда и опровержению. С этой точки зрения, не все лингвисты могут согласиться с отдельными рекомендациями словаря в его издании 1983 г. (Graudina 1994:57)

It should also be noted that there is an indication that the lexicographical and/or normative heritage of the contemporary sources goes back even further than to A&O 1955–1959. In a review of A&O–1955 Obnorskij points out that the influence of Ušakov–1935–1940 can be detected and that A&O–1955 is 99 per cent based on its predecessor (1956:106). Obnorskij also states that the proposed orthoepy in the dictionary reviewed (A&O–1955) gives the impression of a subjective orthoepy:161

Очень много замечаний вызывает рекомендуемое ударение. Объясняется это тем, что автор этой части словаря руководствовался субъективным ощущением от слова. Между тем современный словарь связан с прошлым, на 99 % вытекает из него, и нельзя судить о словаре, не исходя из его прошлого. (Obnorskij 1956:106)

Evidently there was criticism already of the “ancestor” of today’s orthoepic dictionaries, which indicates that there is a problem ab ovo. What further aggravates the situation is that as time has worn on language has changed, but this change might not have been taken into account as the sources apparently build on each other to such a degree. This is the point at which we stand when we now go on to study the sources used in the present investigation.


161 Apparently Obnorskij qualifies as “subjective” recommendations that he himself (subjectively) does not agree with. He says for instance that he would in some cases list the two “equal” stresses (there is a ranking where the preferred variant is put in the first place) in reverted order.
3.2 Main sources for the study

As the point of departure for the investigation, viz. as a source for which variants there are in the contemporary Russian language and how they are labelled on a stylistic and/or normative scale, two modern orthoepic dictionaries with extensive information on stress variants were used. To a limited extent additional material – other reference works, an exercise book and an article on non-normative speech on TV – was used.

The two main sources are Орфоэпический словарь русского языка (henceforth OS–1997) and Русское произношение и правописание (RPP–1996). The reason why these were chosen is that they are the only recent dictionaries that contain extensive stylistic and/or normative notations on variants, thus giving a fuller, although by no means complete, picture of the variation existing in contemporary Russian. Besides, OS is seen as the most authoritative orthoepic manual: “[н]аиболее авторитетное руководство по современной орфоэпии” (Protčenko 1995:21–22).

Most other dictionaries or handbooks give only one standard variant or very little information on variants, and “negative linguistic material” is usually not given (Gorbačevič 1978a:51–52). For instance MAS–1981–1984 and MTS–1990 generally list variants only if these are equal to the norm or colloquial, Ož&Šv–1995 and BTS–1998 give stress variants with labels to a certain extent, although much less extensively than OS and RPP, and A&Z–1993 and A&Z–2000 hardly ever give variants and, if they do, generally in the form of warnings against their use.

There are also other works of the same type as OS–1997 and RPP–1996. Gorbačevič–1973 (Трудности словоупотребления и варианты норм русского литературного языка) gives extensive information about variants, including normative/stylistic labels for these. But as it appeared more than a quarter of a century ago it will not be included as a main source, although there is on the whole no reason to assume that its recommendations are more antiquated than those of more recent handbooks. (See Appendices 17–19.)

One recent handbook with extensive information regarding variants in stress and morphology is Es'kova–1994. But as it is modelled on OS and the notation of the variants – both the system of labels and the assessment of each variant – is exactly the same as in OS it will not be included either as a main or as an additional source. The only difference is that it is smaller than OS (12,000 entries as compared to 65,000) and that a small number of variants which are not included in OS–1997 have entered Es'kova–1994. Otherwise this handbook can be taken as yet another example of the strong connection to preceding sources and the perpetuation of norms.

The main sources chosen for the study differ in several respects. Firstly, they have a different scope and approach. RPP is more concerned with style, while OS, on the other hand, looks at linguistic facts from a normative standpoint and comments on the “error gravity”, explicitly stating that its normative notation is not stylistic (1997:4).

---

162 Edited within the last 10 years.
163 OS–1997 has 65,000 entries on 688 pages and the 1983–1988 editions have 63,500 entries and 702 pages. RPP–1996 does not give an exact number of entries, but it has a total of 607 pages.
164 See Ogienko (1914:228–237) for 19th-century references.
165 Es'kova is the main author of OS according to Krongauz (1996:347). Cf. OS (1997:3) where it says that the normative recommendations regarding stress in OS were made by Es'kova and Voroncova.
166 заключить, исключить, искривить/ся, казнить, кривить/ся, отличить, скривиться.
Secondly, they are edited with a time interval of 7 years: 167 in 1989 (as the 1997 ed. is a reprint of the 1989 ed.) and 1996, respectively. In this connection it should be noted that in the area studied – verbal stress – there are no changes in stress notation between the 1983 (1st) – 1988 (4th) editions of OS and the 1989 (5th) – 1997 (6th) editions. There are only a few corrections, so in fact the “difference in age” could be said to be 13 years.168

Thirdly, OS and RPP show several instances of different notation, a fact that will be illustrated in Table 3–2 and Table 3–3. This will also be commented upon further in Chapter 4 and in Chapter 6.

3.2.1 Orfoèpièšeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka (OS)

The 1989 edition of OS was used for this study until the appearance of OS–1997. These editions are basically the same, the only differences between the 5th and 6th editions being a few minor corrections. In the foreword of OS (1997:3) it says:

Первое издание словаря вышло в 1983 г. Второе, третье и четвертое стереотипные издания – в 1985, 1987 и 1988 гг. В настоящее издание внесен ряд дополнений и уточнений. Пополнен словарник (в значительной степени за счет слов, появившихся в последние годы). Уточнены некоторые нормативные рекомендации (при этом учитывались замечания, высказанные в печатных рецензиях и устных выступлениях при обсуждении словаря).

3.2.1.1 General principles

The principles for compiling an orthoepic dictionary are discussed in Es'kova (1972), where reference is made to the work being carried out at the time under Avanesov at the institute of Russian language of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR.169 As this work later resulted in OS–1983 it could be justifiable to relate Es'kova’s discussion and principles at length in order to understand the structure of and the ideas behind OS and also to what extent it continues and/or breaks with traditions.

Es'kova deals mainly with three questions: (1) the amount of material to be included; (2) the composition of an orthoepic dictionary; (3) the norm of the standard language and its reflection in the dictionary.

Regarding the amount of material and the composition of such a dictionary Es'kova believes that only words and forms with “particularities” (“особенности”) have to be included (1972:126). She proposes that dictionaries such as A&O–1955 and A&O–1959 and the revision envisaged by her and her colleagues should be called orthoepic as they deal not solely with stress and pronunciation, but with correctness of speech as a whole. However, this designation is not wholly precise as these dictionaries give a broader range of information than purely orthoepic such (1972:124).170

As regards the norm and its reflection in the dictionary, including the labels used, Es'kova explains and justifies her own principles through a comparison with those of her predecessors. In A&O–1955 and A&O–1959 she sees a tendency towards what she calls

167 RPP (1996:3) claims that ten years have passed since OS was edited and that for the continually changing norm this time span is more than enough. However, RPP was edited in 1996 and OS in 1983–1988 (1st–4th ed.) and in 1989/1997 (5th–6th ed.) so it is not clear how the authors of RPP have reached the conclusion that the time span is 10 years.

168 Cf. what Nicholson says about the time span between the first and the last volume of BAS: “In a fairly rapidly changing field, such as that of stress, seventeen years is a considerable period” (1968:25).

169 Avanesov was one of the editors of A&O–1959/1960 and the editor of OS.

170 Whether dictionary (словарь) is the correct term is also discussed by Es'kova (1972:124).
“the normalisator’s prejudice” (“которую хочется назвать нормализаторским предрассудком”; 1972:130) and concludes from this that the ideal of the normalisation in A&O is a total liquidation of variation.\textsuperscript{171}

Es’kova, on the contrary, is of the opinion that variation has to be “legalised” and that dictionaries should reflect the variants existing and functioning in the standard language (1972:131). Variation is seen as inherent in an ever-changing language and the authors of OS want to reflect the existing norms and variation (OS–1997:3).\textsuperscript{172} The application of this dynamic theory of norm is the most important change that has taken place between A&O–1959 and OS–1983 (Comrie \textit{et al.} 1996:20).\textsuperscript{173}

Es’kova sees norm as the realisation of a choice between alternatives, where the compilers of a normative dictionary are interested in an average norm – a totality of norms accepted by a group of speakers qualified as “standard language speakers”. She admits that this is not an easy task as criteria for who can be considered a “standard language speaker” have not yet been elaborated, and without such criteria it is not possible to define the norm through mass statistical tests. Therefore, she claims, the researcher so far has been confined to subjective methods, applying his “feeling for language” (“языковое чутье”) to the systematic relations and the direction of language development. Es’kova justifies this view by stating that “[с]убъективное представление квалифицированного исследователя в той или иной степени приближается к объективному положению вещей” (1972:129).

She also enters a discussion about the labels used for characterising the variants and comments upon the many transition variants that exist, i.e. that are somewhere between norm and non-norm. She suggests the following labels: (1) a “zero-variant" = \( u \); used to indicate that two variants are recognised to be equally normative (“"нулевая’ нормативная помета, означающая признание двух вариантов в равной степени соответствующими литературной норме”); (2) the label доп. (допустимо), which shows that a variant labelled in that way corresponds to the norm to a lesser degree than the variants labelled \( u \); and (3) the label доп. устар. (допустимо устаревающее), which indicates that the variant in question is disappearing from the language (Es’kova 1972:132). The system in A&O–1959 with the labels доп. (допустимо), устар. (устарелое) and разг. (разговорное) is considered asymmetric by Es’kova.

Among the stress variants which are considered non-normative, i.e. are labelled не in A&O–1959/1960, Es’kova suggests that a distinction has to be made between two types: (1) variants which signal a non-sufficient command of the standard language (e.g. ходатайствовать, понят, осталось, послал, предложить); and (2) variants which do not correspond to the norm but are nevertheless found in the speech of people who on the whole have a command of the standard norm (e.g. звонить). For the first type of errors Es’kova suggests that the label неправильное or нелитературное be used, and for the sec-

\textsuperscript{171} It should be noted that there is variation in A&O–1960: between equal standard variants, between unequal standard variants and between standard and non-standard variants (Švarckopf 1970a:392–393, A&O–1960:6–8).

\textsuperscript{172} “Настоящий словарь стремится отразить столько вариантов нормы, сколько их реально существует в языке на данной стадии его развития, по возможности точнее их квалифицирован” (OS 1997:3).

\textsuperscript{173} It is observed by Lehfeldt (1985:74) that there are more variants in OS than in its predecessor.
ond не рекомендуется (1972:132–133). However, these intentions were not realised in this way in OS.\textsuperscript{174}

It is not clear what Es'kova bases her assumptions and her distinction between types of variants on. As stated above, Es'kova claims that norm could be equated with the qualified researcher’s subjective view and that this view is close to the “objective state of affairs”. She furthermore presupposes the existence of a group with command of the standard norm, without having defined this “objective state of affairs” either in linguistic or in social terms. Hence the point of departure for the assessment of variants is indefinite and unspecified. This way of departing from some “objectively existing norm” without defining how – in linguistic or social terms – this norm is defined and then presupposing that this norm exists “objectively” is also continued in OS–1997. On the cover of OS–1997 it says that the dictionary contains the norms of Russian pronunciation and stress and that it is “an authoritative dictionary corresponding to [my italics, EMS] the contemporary norms of the Russian language”.\textsuperscript{175}

3.2.1.2 Norm in OS

For variants that are part of the norm the following labels are used in OS:

- \textit{и} (= and) is written between equal variants and the order between them does not play a role;\textsuperscript{176}
- \textit{доп}.\textsuperscript{177} (допустимо = admissible) stands for a less desirable variant of the norm;
- \textit{доп. устар.} (допустимо устаревающее = admissible, obsolescent) is used for a less desirable variant of the norm which is obsolescent and often represents the old norm.

3.2.1.3 Non-norm in OS

For non-normative variants OS uses the following labels:

- \textit{не рек.} (не рекомендуется = not recommended) is used for facts corresponding to general linguistic development, which cannot be excluded as future norms and may eventually receive the stamp of approval;
- \textit{неправ.} (неправильно = incorrect);\textsuperscript{178}
- \textit{грубо неправ.} (грубо неправильно = grossly incorrect);
- \textit{не рек. устар.} (не рекомендуется устаревающее = not recommended, obsolescent).

\textsuperscript{174} The stress variants given as examples are not all assessed in the same way in OS: \textit{ходатайствовать} and \textit{послал} are marked as \textit{грубо неправ.}, \textit{послала} is marked \textit{неправ.}, and the variants \textit{осталось} and \textit{предложили} are not included at all.

\textsuperscript{175} “Нормы русского произношения и ударения”, “Авторитетный словарь, отвечающий современным нормам русского языка”.

\textsuperscript{176} Compare e.g. Ожегов (1972:14) in which in the first place the preferred of two stress variants of “equal” normativity is given. (“Apparently, some variants are more equal than others.” Comrie et al. 1996:72.) See also RPP (1996:7), A&O (1960:7) and Горба́чев (1973:8), which all give the preferred of two equivalent forms (marked \textit{и}) in the first place.

\textsuperscript{177} In OS the abbreviation for this label was \textit{доп}. The one used in Es'kova–1994 – допуст. – is clearer, giving rise to fewer misunderstandings. See for instance Comrie et al. (1996:92), who believe it stands for дополнительно, not допустимо.

\textsuperscript{178} Cf. the system conceived for Новый Академический словарь (Skljarevskaja 1994), where all “accentological confusions” (“акцентологические смешения”) are marked Неправ., both those that in OS are marked неправ. (дует) and those that are marked не рек. (каталог), this notwithstanding that Skljarevskaja uses both these labels. The label Не реком. is used for other types of “errors” than accentological ones (Skljarevskaja 1994:43).
For a more detailed characterisation of these labels we turn to Es'kova (1994), where the same labels are used and explained. The “mildest” of the labels used for characterising variants outside the norm is “not recommended” (не рек.). It is used for variants which, according to Es'kova, do not compromise the speaker as much as the variants with “stronger” labels. They are, however, not recommended for people striving towards an “exemplary language”. Then there is the label “not recommended, obsolescent” (не рек. устар.) used for variants that were once normative, but are now outside the boundaries of the norm. The label “incorrect” (неправ.) is used for a variant “резко противоречащий литературной норме”. The strongest label is “very incorrect” (грубо неправильно), used for variants that to an even higher degree compromise the language of those who use them (e.g. зάнять, зάнятся, принять, приняться, начать, начаться; 1994:10).

The wide range of labels is considered by Krongauz to be positive, but he agrees that it also creates problems: “[к]онечно, реальное отсутствие точных критериев оценки и индивидуальность каждого отдельного варианта создают предпосылки для бесконечной дискуссии” (Krongauz 1996:349). Nevertheless, Es'kova–1994 and OS are said to have lexicographic boldness, and according to Krongauz (1996:350) Es'kova–1994 reflects the living standard language.

3.2.2 Russkoe proiznošenie i pravopisanie (RPP)

3.2.2.1 General principles

Turning now to the other of the two main sources, it claims to be based on OS, although it is less complete (“менее полон”; RPP 1996:3–4). It has fewer “equal” variants than OS 179 (RPP 1996:7). One criterion for the inclusion of words and word forms is the presence of variants (1996:4). However, a quick glance suffices to tell that this is not the truth as there are several entries for which no variants are given.

RPP boasts a typographically clear layout as it writes all forms out in full (which OS does not), lists the word forms and variants under each other, and gives the non-normative forms in italics.

It is evident that RPP has been compiled with less consistency than OS. For example, it often leaves out reflexive verbs when the corresponding non-reflexive verb has been listed, although conclusions about stress in the reflexive form, particularly in the preterite, cannot been drawn directly from the stress of the non-reflexive form. 180 It also leaves out quite a large number of frequent verbs with stress variants 181 and is less consistent regarding the stress notation within a present/future stem in cases when it might be assumed that the stress is quite uniform for all verbs containing the same stem. 182

The authors point out that the ideal situation would be if handbooks of this kind appeared at ten-year intervals to reflect the changing standard norm (RPP 1996:3). It is stated

---

179 OS has 233 forms out of 2,260 marked with an и, while RPP has 158 out of 2,331. The percentages of “равноправные варианты” of the total number of variants listed are approximately 10.3 % and 6.8 % respectively, so it is a true claim that the number of equal variants is smaller in RPP.

180 One example is набрать and набраться: stem stress набрало is normative and end stress набрало is labelled не рек. in OS and простореч. in RPP. Cf. the reflexive verb in which end stress набралось is labelled доп. in OS and is not listed at all in RPP.

181 мутить, скоблить, морить to mention a few.

182 E.g. verbs on -пойти (see Chapter 4.3.3). Of course this could be due to actual differences in stress, but it seems more likely that it stems from inconsistency in the notation.
that the Russian language “переживает в настоящий момент новое нормативное состояние” (RPP 1996:3) and that orthoepic dictionaries will be more in demand as society becomes more civilised (RPP 1996:7).

Three “spheres of usage” are distinguished: (1) the neutral or commonly used standard (литературные общеупотребительные); (2) the colloquial language (second level norm), which is part of the standard language and normative like the neutral sphere of usage, although it is used more in a free communication style and less in official situations; (3) просторечие, a variety which is outside the standard, has its own norm and is not limited to particular spheres (territorial, professional, age etc.), and a person who wants to appear cultivated and educated should avoid it (RPP 1996:5–18).

The authors claim that they are orientated towards contemporary usage, although whose usage is the point of reference for the normative recommendations is not spelled out:

В своей работе над словарем мы как авторы более обращались к условиям, формам и сферам современного речевого узуса, нежели следовали вслед за словарной традицией, традицией сложившихся интерпретаций и описаний. (RPP 1996:15)

Below follows a presentation of the labels used in RPP for characterising the variants. A major flaw, however, is that the authors do not systematically discuss or explain all the labels used.

3.2.2.2 Norm in RPP

For the neutral or commonly used standard variants no characteristics or labels are given, neither in RPP (1996:6), nor in other similar sources. For the other normative variants the following labels are used (see also table in RPP 1996:21):

- и (= and) is used for variants that are “equal” to the norm, and in RPP the variant listed first is the preferred one (1996:7); 184
- разг. (разговорное = colloquial) is used for variants that are normative and do not imply a breaking of the standard norm (“не предполагает нарушения литературной нормы”; 1996:9), although they are used in less formal contexts;
- возв. (возвышенное = elevated) is a label used for variants often found in classical poetry (1996:19);
- книжн. (книжное = bookish) is also used for variants belonging to the contemporary standard norm, but which are not neutral (1996:18);
- устар. (устаревшее = obsolete) is also used for variants that belong to the norm, but which are marked on a temporal scale (1996:18).

In addition to this there are labels that combine the element “obsolete” with another element, thus creating a whole array of labels for various senescent variants:

- устар. и поэт. (устаревшее и поэтическое = obsolete and poetic);
- устар. и возв. (устаревшее и возвышенное = obsolete and elevated);
- устар. и книжн. (устаревшее и книжное = obsolete and bookish);
- устар. возм. (устаревшее возможное = obsolete, possible).

Any distinct difference between these, particularly the first three, is difficult to discern and the authors give little information on this matter.

183 This is not consistent with the claims above where the authors state that they have leant mainly upon OS.
184 As already mentioned the order between variants labelled и does not play a role in OS (1997:5), although the opposite is suggested by the authors of RPP (1996:7).
3.2.2.3 Non-norm in RPP

There are three labels that are used in RPP for the variants outside the boundaries of the standard norm (1996:21):

- простореч. (просторечное = vulgar speech or low colloquial) is used for variants in the contemporary language that are seen as “incorrect” (1996:13–16);\(^{185}\)
- грубо простореч. (грубо просторечное = flagrantly vulgar or low colloquial speech) is used for “то, что наверняка уже в язык не войдет” (1996:17). The distinction between грубо простореч. and простореч. is thus drawn between forms that are potential norms, i.e. what can enter the language and what cannot, where документ is an example of the latter category, i.e. грубо простореч. (1996:15–18);\(^{186}\)
- устар. простонар. (устаревшее простонародное = obsolete, vulgar) is an old form of просторечие (1996:20).\(^{187}\)

3.2.3 Comparison of the set of labels used

Obviously, there is a plethora of normative and stylistical labels and, as is apparent from the above, the normative and stylistic labels create a motley system, albeit with some common points.

The common points are (a) that the characteristics of variants given in dictionaries can generally be assigned to three different groups: chronological, sociolinguistical (regional, social, functional/stylistical) and normative (Tornow 1984:75–77, see also Chapter 2); and (b) that some of the labels are recurring.

Yet a closer look at the labels gives a picture that is confused and confusing. One example is that the labels are used somewhat differently in different sources. Even the seemingly uncomplicated label и (= and) is ambivalent as it stands for both “totally equal variants” and for “equal variants, but the variant given first is preferred”.

Also, for the variants that are further from the standard norm two different labels are used: допустимо and разговорное. As can be seen from Table 3–2 and Table 3–3 below, there is a certain parallel between the labels of the dictionaries, where доп. (admissible) in OS generally corresponds to разг. (colloquial) in RPP. However, some other sources, e.g. Горбачёвич–1973, use both these labels: доп. is a normative label (“применяется к тем новообразованиям, которые вошли в современную речевую практику”) and разг. is stylistic (“придает речи непринужденный характер”; 1973:8–9).\(^{188}\) Cf. the seemingly quite arbitrary notation in Горбацевич–1973 of such stresses as дожил и разг. дожил, залпил и допустимо залпил. However, Горбацевич later criticised the use of the label разг. for accentological variants, as the claims that characterisation should be made mainly on a chronological scale (1978а:121). The term разговорное is not used in OS. Voroncova

---

185 The authors explain that they have not included the label неправ. which is used in many other sources, as it is unclear as a notation and as variants labelled простореч. are also incorrect (RPP 1996:12–13).
186 Cf. the notation in OS where the border between potential and not potential norms is drawn between variants labelled не рек. and variants labelled неправ. (1997:6).
187 The only two stress variants that have this label (устар. простонар.) are подклюёт and подкуёт (normative: подклюёт and подкуёт).
188 In the journal Русская речь (1971:4–6, 1972:1–6) there is a “Словарь произношения и ударения” and the labels used are не, устар., проф. and both доп. and разг. (1971, no 4, p. 151). Kolesov (1967:114) concludes that A&O–1959 uses доп. for “разговорная речь”. In Skljarevskaja et al. (1998) both the labels разг. and доп. (= дополнение, not = допустимое) are used for stress variants (in nouns, as there are no stress variants given for the verbs included in the dictionary). E.g. маркетинг и разг. маркетинг и доп. знахарка.
claims that the reason for this is the normative vagueness and ambiguity of the term.

For non-normative variants, which in A&O–1959/1960 were labelled не, two labels are used in OS–1983–1997: не рек. and неправ. In RPP only one label – простореч. – is used. This label is on a different axis from не рек. and неправ. as it is stylistical rather than normative. These different systems of labels lead to complications. Cf. Park (1991:107):

Daher ist es schwierig, genau zu entscheiden, ob Differenzen zwischen verschiedenen Wörterbüchern aufgrund einer Veränderung im Sprachgebrauch oder aufgrund einer Veränderung des Prinzips der Normbewertung entstanden sind.

3.3 Other sources

Hitherto only the two main sources have been discussed. In this study reference will be made to additional sources in the cases where OS and RPP do not agree in their normative notation. These other sources will also be referred to when the results of the survey are not in line with the codification of the main sources.

Gorbačevič–1973 (Трудности словоупотребления и варианты норм русского литературного языка) has both normative (и, допустимо, не, неправильно) and stylistic (высокое, разговорное, просторечное, устарелое, устаревающее) notation. This handbook does not have a particularly purist approach and is representative of the more dynamic theory of norm (cf. Kunert 1984:381). It has a functional approach, giving chronological relations, and according to Nen'ko (1984a:29) it takes into account “real facts” of contemporary speech (“с учетом реальных фактов современной речи”).

Gorbačevič sees questionnaires as a source for normativity:

Для выявления норм разговорной речи в Словаре частично использованы записи устной речи, имеющиеся в фонотеке Института русского языка АН СССР, а также результаты анкетного опроса, проведенные в некоторых вузах. (Gorbačevič 1973:7)

Furthermore, he is of the opinion that accentual variants are marked mainly on a temporal scale, and that stylistic differentiation is neither consequent, nor contrastive (Gorbačevič 1978a:121). He claims that the choice of labels is a normative and lexicographical problem still waiting to be solved. Gorbačevič further believes that the labels used in some handbooks (книжн., высок., разг., прост.) do not reflect the actual relationships of accentual variants and suggests that the contrast between new and old should be used for categorising variants: устарелое, устаревающее, допустимое, новое.

MAS–1981–1984 (Словарь русского языка) claims that “В отдельных случаях в русском литературном языке допустимы два ударения. В этих случаях в Словаре на первом месте даётся рекомендуемое ударение, а на втором – допустимое” (MAS–

189 The expediency of using stylistical labels for accentual variants is questioned both by Nen'ko (1984a:66) and Gorbačevič (1978a:121), with Nen'ko considering these labels as “unsustained” and Gorbačevič seeing them as lacking regularity and contrast.

190 BAS–1991–1994 (BAS–2 or Словарь современного русского литературного языка, the successor of BAS–1950–1965) could not be used systematically in the study as only six volumes out of a planned 20 are available.

191 Obviously, the more numerous the sources the more variation there is, and the divergences between the sources would have been even wider had more than two main sources been employed.

192 This last label is not used by Gorbačevič in his handbook. On the other hand he uses the label разг. which he has later rejected.
1981–1984:12). Thus, the labels и and доп. are used more or less synonymously as the label и is said to be used for допустимые (= admissible) variants (e.g. вобралось и вобралось). Other labels are not generally used for stress variants.

**MTS–1990** (Малый толковый словарь русского языка) uses the label разг. (разговорное)⁵⁹ – “при лексических единицах, употребляющихся в живой, непринужденной, преимущественно устной речи” (MTS–1990:8). It also uses the label и, although it does not comment upon this label.

**A&Z–1993** (Словарь ударений русского языка) is a reworked edition of A&Z (Словарь ударений для работников радио и телевидения), edited six times during the period 1960–1984. For this new edition the accentological and other recommendations were revised.⁶⁴ The handbook almost excludes variant stresses and explains its principles as follows (A&Z–1993:4): “почти не включает в свой состав варианты норм (как в плане стилевом – книжные и разговорные, так и хронологическом – устаревшие и самые новые)”, “[п]ри этом в качестве рекомендуемого избирался наиболее употребительный вариант в пределах литературной нормы.”⁶⁵ It always makes a choice when there are variants and the criterion for this choice is “наибольшая употребительность и соответствие системе русского языка разговорной практике наших дней, традиционность” (Ageenko 1990:78). Therefore in the choice between ржаве́ть and ржаве́ть the variant ржаве́ть is recommended: “то есть налицо победа более разговорных вариантов” (Ageenko 1990:78), “[в]ыбор варианта делается в пользу наиболее употребительного в пределах нормы” (Ageenko 1996:30).

A new edition of A&Z appeared just before this study was printed: **A&Z–2000**. According to the authors of A&Z, over 2,000 recommendations have been changed since the 1993 edition.⁶⁶ An Internet poll with nine thousand informants was carried out, mainly in the cases when the views of the authors and the editor differed. Not only the results of the Internet poll were taken into account for the recommendations, but also many years of observations of pronunciation in the media. The recommendations were generally in favour of the most used variant within the standard (A&Z–2000:3).⁶⁷ Like previous editions, A&Z–2000 recommends only one of the variants and explains this by the fact that it is intended mainly for radio and television workers (2000:3).

Both the 1993 and 2000 editions will be included in the discussions in the present study.

---

⁵⁹ In the dictionary given as и (разг.).

⁶⁴ One example is the acceptance of the stress глушить, which in the 1993 edition is given as the only normative form. In A&Z–1984 the norm was глушить.

⁶⁵ Two of the authors of OS, Borunova and Voroncova, were among the four reviewers (рецензенты) of A&Z–1984 (but not of A&Z–1993 and A&Z–2000) and they might have approved of stresses they did not list as the first norm in their own dictionary. The stresses обоснóую, переперечíть, заслонíт, заржавéть, бульхнúться, дошlí, залéло, наплí, оши́л, оби́л, обнóйлась, родíлся were listed as normative by A&Z–1984 (I list here only the verbs that can be found in the tables in Appendices 18–19), and thus may be approved of by Voroncova and Borunova, although it is possible that their influence as reviewers was slight and that their views were not taken into account. In “their own” OS, both the first edition and the latest one, the stresses заржавéть, родíлся, заслонíт, дошlí, оши́л, обнóйлась were labelled и, i.e. practically equal to the “first norm”, although still mentioned in second place, and the stresses обоснóую, переперечíть, бульхнúться, залéло, наплí and were labelled доп.

⁶⁶ For instance глушить has again become the norm, as it was in the 1984 edition. Cf. footnote above.

Ož&Šv–1995 (Толковый словарь русского языка) usually gives only one stress variant. When two variants are given one of them is marked и, и (разг.) or устар.


Bilingual dictionaries have not been included in the study, but the stress notation of such dictionaries is a subject definitely worthy of a study of its own. It can be concluded that they generally list only one stress variant as normative, although The Oxford Russian Dictionary (1997) recognises dual norms in some cases. For instance, it gives both prefix-stressed and stem-stressed variants to some past tense verbs and these are presented in a clear and economical way, like the entry навлить, for which two possible stresses are given in this form: нáлить. Dual norms can also be found in Rysk-svensk ordbok (1976), but in this source they are not as visually clear, as stress information for paradigms is given in an appendix with tables (Zaliznjak’s system), although there are exceptions when dual norms are marked in the entries, e.g. бутыл’хнуться.198 However, it seems that both the dictionaries edited in Russia and outside the country are on the whole at least as conservative and idiosyncratic as the monolingual dictionaries or stress handbooks: Rysk-svensk ordbok (1976), Russian-English Dictionary (1990), The Oxford Russian Dictionary (1997) all give only the stress ржаветь, to take one example.199

3.4 Stress notation in the sources

For the present study all verbal stresses with variation in OS and RPP were extracted and a card-index was made. Based upon this a database was subsequently established in Excel. The database contained fields for infinitive form, codified stress, variant stress in OS, label in OS, variant stress in RPP, label in RPP and variation group. The purpose of organising the material in fields in a database was to facilitate searches and calculations throughout the study.

3.4.1 Categories of verbs and verb forms with stress variation

As could be seen in Chapter 1.4.3. there are recurrent verbs or forms and recurrent patterns in the discussions about variation. In order to make a more systematic study of verbal stress variation and in order to facilitate and clarify the investigation all the variants found in the orthoepic dictionaries RPP–1996 and OS–1997 were categorised.

The division into different categories or groups was based on (1) in which forms there is variation; (2a) the infinitive ending (for verbs with variation in the infinitive and the whole paradigm, and in the present-future tense); (2b) whether they are prefixed and/or reflexive or not and also whether they contain an originally mono- or disyllabic stem (for verbs with variation in the preterite).


199 Cf. Ož&Šv–1988, which gives ржаветь only, and Ož&Šv–1995, which gives both ржаветь and ржаветь. The results in Chapter 4, and the observations of Gorbačević (1978b:127–128) and Nen’ko (1984a:103–104), among others, show that ржаветь is more common in poetry and in current usage.
The number of verbs or verb forms in each group is given below in brackets. For verbs with variation in the non-preterite forms an unprefixed verb and a prefixed verb that are otherwise the same count as two different entries, while a reflexive verb and a non-reflexive verb that are otherwise the same count as one entry; бомбардирова́ть with the variant бомбардиро́вать counted as one, заня́ться with the variants заня́лся and заня́лся counted as two, etc.

Table 3–1. Number of verbs or verb forms with stress variation in the main sources and in the informant survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs with variation in the infinitive, present/future and preterite forms:</th>
<th>Total number of verbs or forms with variation</th>
<th>Number of verbs or forms in the survey (number of these appearing in both parts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive on -ать</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive on -еть</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive on -ирова́ть</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive on -ить</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>11 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive on -нуть</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive on -овать</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive on -ять</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbs with variation in the present/future forms:

| Infinitive on -ать | 15 | 1 (0) |
| Infinitive on -еть | 17 | 0 (0) |
| Infinitive on -ить | 848 | 60 (21) |
| Infinitive on -ичь | 1 | 1 (0) |
| Infinitive on -нуть | 34 | 5 (2) |
| Infinitive on -овать | 15 | 3 (2) |
| Infinitive on -ить | 1 | 0 (0) |
| Infinitive on -очь | 2 | 1 (1) |
| Infinitive on -иться | 2 | 1 (0) |
| Total | 935 | |

Verbs with variation in the infinitive form:

| Verbs with variation in the imperative: | 5 | 8 (4) |

Verbs with variation in the imperative:

| Forms with variation in the preterite: | 1 | 0 (0) |

Unprefixed non-reflexive originally monosyllabic verbs | 35 | 7 (4) |
Unprefixed non-reflexive originally disyllabic verbs | 32 | 5 (2) |
Prefixed non-reflexive originally monosyllabic verbs | 665 | 80 (26) |
Prefixed non-reflexive originally disyllabic verbs | 261 | 9 (3) |
Unprefixed reflexive originally monosyllabic verbs | 30 | 3 (1) |
Unprefixed reflexive originally disyllabic verbs | 29 | 6 (3) |
Prefixed reflexive originally monosyllabic verbs | 464 | 47 (12) |
Prefixed reflexive originally disyllabic verbs | 270 | 12 (7) |
Total | 1,786 | |
Total: | 2,982 | 289 (101) |

---

200 There are thus two types of variation in stress with verbs with an infinitive on -ить: vacillation between end stress and stress on the stem concerning the infinitive and the whole paradigm, and vacillation between end stress and stem stress in the present tense. These will be studied as two separate groups.
This order of presentation and this division into categories has been kept for the results section (4.2–4.5) with one exception: for the verbs with variation in the preterite the variation is presented according to gender/number and whether the verb is reflexive or not:  

- Masculine non-reflexive verb forms with and without prefix
- Feminine non-reflexive verb forms with and without prefix
- Neuter non-reflexive verb forms with and without prefix
- Plural non-reflexive verb forms with and without prefix
- Masculine reflexive verb forms with and without prefix
- Feminine reflexive verb forms with and without prefix
- Neuter reflexive verb forms with and without prefix
- Plural reflexive verb forms with and without prefix

3.4.2 Comparison of notation in the sources

We will now proceed to compare the labels and the notation in the main sources. The tables below show a comparison of the notations for all the variants listed in the two sources. The first column shows the label in OS, the second the label in RPP, and the third column gives the number of times such a combination of labels occurs. Example: the first row shows that in 17 cases a stress variant given as norm in OS–1997 is described as a colloquial (разг.) variant in RPP–1996.

These tables show the degree of agreement and disagreement that exists. A ‘–’ indicates either that the verb (or form) is listed in the dictionary, although no variants are given, or that the verb (or form) is not mentioned at all in the dictionary. Cases where a normative stress is given in one dictionary, but not in the other have not been included in the tables. In the first table the combinations are sorted by the labels used in OS, in the second table according to the labels used in RPP.

---

201 The distinction between verbs with originally mono- and disyllabic stems is relevant in so far as – as can be seen above – variation is more current in verbs with originally monosyllabic stems (see also Chapter 4.5.1.1), but this has not been taken account of in the presentation.
Table 3–2. Correspondence of normative/stylistic labels in the two main sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OS–1997</th>
<th>RPP–1996</th>
<th>Frequency of this combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>книжн.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>устар.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>простореч.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>и</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>и</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>и</td>
<td>устар.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>и</td>
<td>книжн.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>и</td>
<td>устар. и книжн.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>и</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>простореч.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>не рек.</td>
<td>простореч.</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>не рек.</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>не рек.</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>не рек.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>неправ.</td>
<td>простореч.</td>
<td>586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>неправ.</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>неправ.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>грубо неправ.</td>
<td>простореч.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>грубо неправ.</td>
<td>грубо простореч.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>грубо неправ.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>доп. устар.</td>
<td>устар.</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>доп. устар.</td>
<td>устар. и книжн.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>доп. устар.</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>доп. устар.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>не рек. устар.</td>
<td>устар.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>не рек. устар.</td>
<td>простореч.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>не рек. устар.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3–3. Correspondence of normative/stylistic labels in the two main sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OS–1997</th>
<th>RPP–1996</th>
<th>Frequency of this combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>и́</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>не рек.</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>и́</td>
<td>и́</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>и́</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>и́</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>доп. устар.</td>
<td>и́</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>и́</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>доп. устар.</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>не рек.</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>и́</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>неправ.</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>неправ.</td>
<td>простореч.</td>
<td>586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>не рек.</td>
<td>простореч.</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>простореч.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>грубо неправ.</td>
<td>простореч.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>не рек. устар.</td>
<td>простореч.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>простореч.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>простореч.</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>грубо неправ.</td>
<td>грубо простореч.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>доп. устар.</td>
<td>устар.</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>не рек. устар.</td>
<td>устар.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>устар.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>и́</td>
<td>устар.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>устар.</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>доп. устар.</td>
<td>устар. и книжн.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>и́</td>
<td>устар. и книжн.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>устар. и книжн.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>книжн.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>и́</td>
<td>книжн.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>книжн.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>устар. и возв.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>устар. и поэт.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>устар. и простонар.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>устар. возм.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>возв.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the two sources make use of different labels there seems to be a certain parallel between the systems of labels in that, for instance, доп. in OS most often corresponds to разг. in RPP, etc. If we admit that this parallel exists, agreement between the notation of the two main sources is found in about half the cases – 48.9 per cent – and in 46.0 per cent of the cases one source lists a variant that is not listed in the other. For 5.0 per cent of the stress variants the two sources have different notation. These differences can be small or large: one stress variant can be listed as normative in OS and at the same time be labelled разг. in RPP, or one stress variant that is labelled доп. устар. in OS can in RPP be labelled и́.

---

202 These cases are marked in bold in the table.
Table 3–4. Agreement in normative notation and listing of stress variants in verbs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement in notation (in bold)</th>
<th>1,459 (48.9 %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No corresponding form (–)</td>
<td>1,373 (46.0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences in notation</td>
<td>150 (5.0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of variants</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,982</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.5 Conclusion regarding the normative notation

Firstly, it appears that the compilers of stress handbooks do not have a defined norm concept, but see norm rather as an opportunity to have one’s subjective pick from predecessors’ recommendations. (See Chapter 2.)

Secondly, there seem to be too many labels for characterising variants, and these labels are not always clearly defined. Several of them are very rare and appear to be very similar to each other.

Thirdly, some labels recur, but are used differently in different sources, e.g. устар (= and).

Fourthly, some labels comprise large groups of variants that in another source have at least two different labels. An example is простореч in RPP, which as a rule encompasses both the variants that are labelled не рек and those that are labelled неправ in OS.

Fifthly, there is agreement in notation between the two main sources in only half the cases. In the rest either only one source lists the variant or the sources have different notation. It should be underlined that this is when only two sources are used; if there were a larger number of sources it is likely that there would be even more disagreement (cf. Appendices 17–19).

By way of conclusion I will argue that there is a lack of unanimity in prescriptions stemming from an unfortunate mix of idiosyncrasies and of over-reliance upon old sources. This is obviously a problem both from a theoretical and from a practical point of view. Cf. Nen'ko (1984a:127): “О наличии нормы можно говорить в том случае, если показания большинства источников совпадают.”

This will be further demonstrated in Chapter 6.

---

203 Verbs or verb forms. See Table 3–1.
204 Cf. such labels as the following (the number of variants labelled accordingly is given in brackets): устар. и книжн. (14), книжн. (6), устар. и поэт. (2), устар. и возв. (3), устар. и простонар. (2), устар. возм. (1), возм. (1).
205 What is, for instance, the difference between устар. и поэт. and устар. и возв.?
Chapter 4 is devoted to the variation in verbal stress in the sources and in the survey results. Section 4.1 contains a presentation of the method used for the survey. Then follows, in sections 4.2–4.5, a relation of the variation in verbal stress in contemporary Russian as presented in the two dictionaries that served as main sources. The highly varying length of commentaries and of references to other research is due to the fact that the various groups of verbs have been more or less interesting to scholars. These sections also present and discuss the results of both the written and the oral part of the informant survey. Section 4.6 shows the inferences from the inclusion of several instances of one form in the written questionnaire and section 4.7 is a comparison of the results of the written and the oral parts of the survey.

4.1 Method used for the survey

The aims of the present thesis were defined in Chapter 1, and an investigation of the concept norm and of Russian language policy, cultivation of speech and linguistic normativisation was made in Chapter 2. A study of the orthoepic dictionaries in general and the two main sources in particular, including an investigation whether there is a unanimous codified norm was dealt with in Chapter 3.207

The other aims were to investigate:

(a) what the actual norm is in the language society and what the actual usage is;
(b) how actual norm and actual usage, which are often – but not necessarily – the same, relate to the codified norms, i.e. an investigation of whether implicit and explicit norms coincide;
(c) how actual usage relates to reported usage;
(d) whether the sources’ listings reflect the variation that exists in speech and, conversely, if the variation as listed in the sources is justified by the variants’ position among the language users;
(e) what groups of informants are closest to the codified norm (as it is given generally in the dictionaries) and whether the so-called standard language speakers are the ones who most often adhere to the codified norm;
(f) what relation there is between the labels given in the sources and the language users’ assessment of the stresses assigned to the labels in question.

In order to reach these aims an informant survey was designed. Section 4.1 is concerned with the method used for the survey.

207 A detailed presentation of the variation as presented in the dictionaries will be given in Chapters 4.2–4.5.
4.1.1 Methodological considerations
The above-mentioned aims call for a survey containing several dimensions, as one single
dimension or method (e.g. informants marking stresses in a written text or reading a word
list) would not give sufficient or reliable enough data.

4.1.1.1 Actual norm
The actual norm, or implicit norm, as it was called in Chapter 2, is found by asking what
the language users believe is correct, what they report that they use, and also by studying
their actual usage. Thus, the investigation would have to comprise: (1) the informants’ at-
titudes concerning correctness; (2) their reported usage;208 and (3) their actual usage. Cf.
Greenbaum & Quirk (1970:1), who talk on the one hand about use (potential or habitual)
and on the other about attitude. According to them attitude reflects (A) belief about own
use; (B) recognition of a precept; and (C) willingness to tolerate.

The informants’ attitudes (attitudes concerning correctness – point 1 above or point B
and C according to Greenbaum & Quirk – and their reported usage – point 2 above or point
A according to Greenbaum & Quirk) were to be measured in a written survey, while actual
usage (point 3) was to be measured in an oral survey.

The reported usage of stress variants and the informants’ attitudes concerning correct-
ness is at least as important as actual usage. Such answers show their norm, what they
strive towards, what their linguistic ideal is, factors which are essential for the formation of
language habits and norms.

In this context it is important to distinguish carefully between reported and actual usage,
a distinction which is not always observed in other research. Frequently the concepts
“reported usage” and “usage” are employed synonymously: when talking about survey re-
results the author uses the words “pronounces” or “uses” for what is – or appears to be – re-
ported usage.209

Another reason why both reported and actual usage were to be investigated is that a
certain scepticism has been expressed as to whether these actually coincide and whether
reported usage really reflects actual usage. Ickovič, for instance, claims that the norm is
usually not formulated in the conscience of the speakers and exists only as an experience
or a skill. If asked how they speak, informants do not always give the answer that reflects
how they really speak, but rather their belief as to how one should speak and these two
may not always coincide (Ickovič 1970:13).

The reason for choosing a speaker-report test of the kind where the informants have to
assess given stresses and not one where they should write out the stress they use (a method
used in RJaSO, among others) is that self-monitoring is difficult for informants who are
not linguists.

Finally, it was also judged necessary to collect information about the informants’ educa-
tion, geographical background etc. in order to establish whether they could be defined as
standard language speakers according to the commonly used definition. This information

208 The importance of studying both actual speech habits and linguistic attitudes is also noticed by Stone
(1973:170).
209 This can be seen in Voroncova (1959), Kolesov (1967), Pirogova (1967), RJaSO (Krysin 1974), but not in
was also to be used when comparing the adherence to the codified norm for different speaker subgroups.\(^{210}\)

### 4.1.1.2 Actual usage

In the matter of the investigation of actual usage the methodological considerations are particularly complicated. It is generally agreed that the optimal object of study is “natural language”, as opposed to the language used in a formal questioning and recording situation. Although the concept “natural speech” or “vernacular” is probably an abstraction (cf. Milroy 1987:59–60) it is nevertheless considered worth striving for:

But if the objective is to examine the processes and mechanisms of linguistic change, or the structural characteristics of a particular variety, the best data base is a speech style as close as possible to a speaker’s spontaneous, everyday speech. (Milroy 1987:57)

But here we are confronted with the problem that is called the observer’s paradox (term coined by William Labov). When the aim is to investigate how people speak in a natural situation, viz. when not subject to systematic observation, and the only method through which data are available is through systematic observation, there is an obvious risk – or rather it is almost inevitable – that the investigator will influence the situation through his presence as a researcher and a stranger and through the presence of technical appliances like cassette-recorders. The informants change their behaviour and also their language. This is the observer’s paradox.

In order to avoid this problem, material could be collected through passive observation only. However, a drawback of this approach is that it would be extremely time-consuming, if not impossible, to get data of the quality and amount required to investigate the linguistic variable of interest: to gather, for instance, approximately 100 instances of the verb form подкрадётся from 100 different informants, together with their biographical data, let alone instances of an additional almost 300 verb forms from these same 100 informants. (Cf. Panov 1968a:44, Krysin 1974:28–29, Graudina 1980:77.)

A directed method, therefore, is usually the only possible way of collecting material for this type of investigation. As it was decided that actual usage as well as reported usage and users’ norm should be investigated, it was judged necessary – for the reasons of quality and amount of data touched upon above – to elicit usage in the form of making the informants read ready-made sentences aloud. These sentences would include at least one verb form with at least two possible different stresses. But reading from a list usually means that much attention is paid to linguistic form and this entails a high degree of formality. In an attempt to avoid distortion and to somehow cover the precise object of study, focus would be drawn away from word stress. This was effected through the inclusion of words with possible morphological variants, where the endings indicating the choice of morphological variant were omitted. This would make the informants focus on filling in the gaps and rather than focusing on stress they would stress more or less as naturally as in a conversation. Thus, a less monitored variety, at least concerning the particular variable to be tested – verbal stress – was accessed and, in parallel, the required amount of clean data was collected in a fairly short time.

---

\(^{210}\) In this context it should be emphasised that most important for this study is the group of informants as a whole, not the subgroups, as the aim was not to make a correlational study and answer questions like “How do young men from northern Russia stress verbs with an infinitive on -ировать?”
The fact that the precise object of investigation remained undisclosed to the subjects could give rise to ethical concerns. However, the fact that the precise aim was to investigate verbal stress is probably quite irrelevant to the informants and hardly influences their decision to participate. On the other hand, disclosing the precise object of investigation would harm the quality of the data considerably. The most reliable method of systematically getting high-quality data concerning the variable to be investigated is through this kind of individual audio-recording, where a less-monitored speech style is elicited.

Similar methods of “distraction” have been successfully employed by others, e.g. Levine and Crockett, who investigated the post-vocalic (r) in English (Levine and Crockett 1967:92–93, Dittmar 1976:194) and Strom (1988:30–31).

Further advocacy for similar methods of distraction is found in Comrie et al. (1996:19):

Particularly interesting from this viewpoint are pronunciation tests where the informant is asked to read a passage, so that he or she is not aware of the particular points of pronunciation that are being tested (though the informant may, of course, modify his or her normal pronunciation, simply given the general conditions of a test recording).

and in Quirk & Svartvik (1966:13):

In most of our own tentative sorties in this field over the past few years, however, we have taken it as axiomatic that direct questioning is the least reliable technique, and that the informant’s focus of attention should be systematically shifted away from the investigator’s problem, as a necessary condition of achieving a controlled and natural (if not naive) reaction.

A “lame” form of distraction was used in the questionnaire on accentology in Krysin (1974). The informant was to mark stress in all words, not only those which were the object of investigation (“так что подлинная цель задания оставалась для него не вполне ясной”), and this, according to Krysin, gave more objective results (1974:31). 211

There is also another, although related, methodological problem besides the one regarding quality of data and ethics. This other conflict can be illustrated by the different approaches used in two surveys:

Русский язык и советское общество (Krysin 1974) had a large number of informants (over 4,000), although this was only about a fourth of the total number of questionnaires that were originally distributed (Graudina 1970:358, 1980:93). On the other hand, the number of stress variants investigated was very small. Only 19 verbs, including participles, and 11 nouns were included (1974:229). The method used was self-reporting, which is perhaps the only feasible method with such a large number of informants, but it also increases the risk of inaccuracy. (See Chapter 1.3.4.)

Ukiah (1996) made a survey of usage using a small number of informants (21 speakers), but investigating the stress of a large number of forms (verbs, nouns etc.). He had 1,457 short sentences, typically consisting of a pronoun + a verb + a pronoun (subject + predicate + object). 212 This design undoubtedly lead to an awareness of stress in a majority of cases (Ukiah 1996:234–235). He used recordings and not written questionnaires because of the risk of incorrect self-reporting (1998:304). 213 (See Chapter 1.3.4.)

For the present study it was decided that neither the number of forms to be investigated, nor the number of informants should be too small. At the same time it was quite obvious that for practical reasons it was not possible to include all verb forms with variation in

211 Nevertheless, focus in the RJaSO survey was doubtless upon stress and the test was of the self-reporting kind, not a test of actual usage.

212 E.g. Они обняли ее; Она поняла (Ukiah 1996:839).

213 He did, though, also use self reporting from a slightly larger number of informants.
stress (perhaps in itself an almost infinite category) or, obviously, all speakers. Anyway, it was decided that the number of forms to be investigated should be significantly larger than in RJaSO (Русский язык и советское общество, Krysin 1974). It was also decided that the number of informants should be larger than in, for instance, Ukiah’s survey.

These examples and this discussion show the inevitability of a compromise between (1) the method and its reliability, (2) ethics, (3) the number of forms or words to be investigated and (4) the number of informants. It also shows the considerations which are the grounds for the choice of method for this study.

4.1.2 The test material and test design
The test material for the investigation was chosen from among the total of 2,982 verbs or verb forms that, according to the sources OS–1997 and RPP–1996, have stress variants and which were included in the database (see Chapter 3). Attention was paid to representing all groups (see Chapter 3.4.1 on the division into groups) – with the exception of a few with a very small number of verbs or forms, often only one or two.

The variant stresses were carefully selected on the basis of mainly (1) the size of the group, larger groups being represented by a larger number of verbs; (2) the “typicality” or frequency of words, stems and stress patterns, frequent verbs and recurring stress patterns and variations being represented by a larger number of verbs; and (3) the extent to which the sources differ in the normative/stylistical labelling of stresses, verbs with different notation often being included.

Ultimately, the material to be included in the written questionnaire, which also was the basis for the oral survey, amounted to 289 verb forms, making up about 10 per cent of the total number of verbs or verb forms with stress variants according to the sources used. A small number of the stress variants included were not listed in the sources but could be assumed to have variation as they were found in an article on speech and speech errors in mass media (Lapteva 1990b:359–361, 386–387)214 or in an exercise book in Russian for students preparing for university application (Rozental' 1994:196).215 These two supplementary sources were included in order to study whether there is stress variation that is not listed in the dictionaries and handbooks but is current and should perhaps be included in these sources. One stress variant (опёрлась), which was found in Kolesov’s study (1967)216 but not in the main sources, was also included.

4.1.2.1 Pilot study
Before the test received its final design a small-scale pilot study was undertaken. For the written part of the study seven native Russian speakers (aged 25 to 60) living in Sweden, Moscow and St Petersburg were used. These subjects filled in a questionnaire – almost identical in construction to the one finally used – containing 10 verb forms.

The pilot study of the oral part of the study consisted of 24 of the sentences that were later included in the large-scale study. Three of the subjects that completed the written part of the pilot study also read these test sentences.

214 продать (не норма), не была (уверена) (не норма), исключим (не норма), противоречит (не норма), разделит (не норма).
215 принудить (stress not marked in the text, but the codified norm is принудить), группировать (норма).
216 Used by 7.6 per cent of the informants.
The pilot study showed that altogether the design of the two parts was functional: the informants seemed to understand the task, those who read the sentences seemed not to focus upon verbal stress, but on the missing endings, which could be taken as a sign of an unmonitored or “natural” style. The only change that was made for the full-scale study, except for the increased amount of material included, was that the size of the cells in the real questionnaire were made smaller to fit in 292 experimental units on a reasonable number of pages. When the final versions of the questionnaires were ready they were checked by two people for intelligibility and approximate time requirements.

At this stage of the pilot study, a system for coding the replies of the personal information sheet and the oral and written questionnaires was designed, and frames were prepared so that the spreadsheet programme was ready for coding the material collected.

4.1.2.2 Written judgement test (attitude)
The written test concerning attitude (cf. Greenbaum & Quirk 1970:1 above) – i.e. reported usage and opinions regarding normativity – consisted of the 289 forms chosen in the procedure described above plus three control words, included in order to check both the person’s perception of and ability to read stresses and his/her seriousness and accuracy. The first assumption is that if someone reports usage of the more or less “impossible” stresses چیتتهت (journal) or سادل (деревья) then caution should be observed regarding this informant’s replies. The second assumption is that if someone does not report usage of the stress گازل (правду) – for which it is difficult to imagine anyone stressing in another way, even in low standard or dialectal speech, then caution should be observed regarding this informant’s replies. Thus there was a total of 292 verbs with stresses written out (Appendix 2).

The informants’ attitude was studied through their marking in a table (a) whether they use this stress or not (first row in the part of the table below), and (b) whether they believe the stress is right or wrong and how sure they are about that (second row in the table below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Я сам/а так говорю</th>
<th>Я сам/а так говорю</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Я знаю, что это правильно</td>
<td>Я знаю, что это правильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Я думаю, что это правильно</td>
<td>Я думаю, что это правильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Я не знаю, что это правильно</td>
<td>Я не знаю, что это правильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Я не знаю, что это неправильно</td>
<td>Я не знаю, что это неправильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Я знаю, что это неправильно</td>
<td>Я знаю, что это неправильно</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both stresses that are normative and non-normative according to the sources were included, and in several cases both the normative and the non-normative stress variant for one verb or verb form were included. In this case they were usually presented on different pages of the questionnaire. In some cases the same stress occurs more than once. It was also the aim to mix the types of stresses, so that not all verb forms of one type would be placed together. Generally the stress variants were not given in context, except for in some cases where the pilot study had shown that disambiguating was necessary or when semantical differences in different contexts were to be checked.219

217 289 + 3 control words. See 4.1.2.2.
218 See Panov (1968a:45) on control questions.
219 This was usually made through the addition of an object in the form of a noun in brackets: ہٹسیا (پلنکا), but there were other ways as well (cf. Appendix 2).
4.1.2.3 Oral performance test (usage)

The material for the oral performance test (Appendix 1) studying actual usage contained approximately one fourth of the verbs or verbs forms contained in the written part. These were embedded in 98 sentences, of which a few were taken from The Uppsala Corpus\(^{220}\) (often in a slightly shortened or modified version) or from dictionaries. Parts of some phrases were also taken from other surveys (RJaSO, Kolesov). However, as it was almost impossible to find sentences containing both the verb to be investigated and a second word that could have morphological variants, it was necessary to construct sentences.

As already mentioned, the aim was to draw the informants’ attention away from the object of investigation (verbal stress) with the intention of playing down the artificiality that almost every test situation implies. In order to offset the disadvantages of a test situation I was ostensibly asking for noun endings, the endings omitted being of four types:

1. masculine singular, for the most part a choice between genitive on -а or -у, sometimes between genitive, partitive genitive or accusative (-а-, -у- or -ё-ending);
2. masculine plural nominative (or nom. = acc.) (-ы-/-и- or -а/-я-ending);
3. masculine plural genitive (-ов- or -ё-ending);
4. masculine singular locative (-е- or -у-ending).

Example: Ты покупаешь все подряд, без разбор__, просто соришь деньгами. The informants were told to fill in the blanks with the ending they thought appropriate (here presumably with either разбора or разбору), while I was surreptitiously obtaining material on verbal stress: did the informants stress соришь or соришь? Naturally, word stress was not marked in the text.

The order of the test sentences was determined by the nature of the endings that should be filled in (all sentences containing an omitted genitive plural ending were grouped together, etc.). The verbal stress variants did not influence the order of the sentences.

4.1.3 The informants

4.1.3.1 Target population

The target population was identified as university and college students and employees in Moscow aged approximately 17–60.

The lower age boundary was set at the age for leaving school as this is an age by which speech habits have usually already been formed. The upper boundary was set at the official retirement age for the male population as too old a population would reflect the norm and usage of the past, rather than the norm and usage of the present and the future.

The generations of linguistic interest are, according to Ager, defined as follows:

For many purposes in the social sciences two types of generations can be distinguished: the long (thirty years) and the short (fifteen). Linguistically, however, the three generations of interest are probably best defined as the period of schooling; the period of economic activity; and the period of retirement, roughly definable as three unequal groups of people aged up to 19, from 20 to 59, and those over 60, although there are obviously no clear-cut divisions at such ages. (Ager 1990:113)

---

\(^{220}\) The Uppsala Russian Corpus (Electronic corpus consisting of one million running words (word tokens). See References for URL etc. For the present investigation the corpus was first consulted in the printed version available at the library of the Department of Slavic Languages at Uppsala University.
Considering the Russian demographic situation with an estimated life expectancy at birth in 1997 of 64.81 years for the whole population, and 58.39 years for the male population\(^{221}\) (CIA. *The World Factbook* 1998) a division like the one proposed by Ager is not applicable. Therefore the age boundaries as specified above were used and for any calculations the informants were divided into three equally broad age categories.

The reason for choosing Moscow as the place of investigation is that on the whole Moscow speech is seen as the norm, and the word-stress of Muscovites is the model for the Russian standard language (Bulachovskij 1952:19, Krysin 1974:23).\(^{222}\) Not all informants were natives or residents of Moscow – and this was not a criterion during the sampling. Nevertheless, almost all the informants (83 out of 106) had spent their childhood in Moscow and an even larger number (90 out of 106) had spent most of their life in Moscow city or oblast', and as a consequence mostly Moscow speech is reflected.

### 4.1.3.2 Sampling

For sampling informants judgement sampling was used. The quality of the material collected, including good data on the informants’ geographical, educational, etc. background, was considered more important than full random sampling. (Cf. Wardhaugh 1992:153 f., Sankoff 1987–88:901–902.)

The types of speakers to be studied, i.e. the target population, was identified as above. No quotas were set for the characteristics of the informants. It was, however, decided that

(a) a majority of the informants should be in the lower age range as these informants’ speech is likely to represent the speech of not only today but tomorrow;

(b) both men and women should be represented and as the female population in Russia outnumbers the male population\(^{223}\) it would not be seen as problematic if there were more female than male informants;

(c) when choosing units for selecting informants there should be colleges or universities and work-places with different profiles,\(^ {224}\) as it might be assumed that linguistic awareness differs between, for instance, language students and technology students.

Many studies of this kind have used only language students as informants.\(^{225}\) I attempted to broaden the perspective somewhat and also used informants who were not students.

The informants came from the following places: *The Academy of National Economy under the Government of the Russian Federation\(^ {226}\)* (Академия Народного Хозяйства при правительстве Российской Федерации), *The Moscow State Linguistic University*

---

\(^{221}\) Female population 71.56 years.

\(^{222}\) Cf. with Voroncova who sees Moscow, Moscow oblast' and St Petersburg as one “accentological zone” (1979:281).

\(^{223}\) Ratio 0.94 according to CIA, *The World Factbook* (1998), ratio 0.88 according to *Dagens Nyheter* (1997).

\(^{224}\) A student’s guide listing all higher educational institutions in Moscow was consulted: *Výšie učebnye zavedenija Moskvy i Moskovskoj oblasti* (Высшие учебные заведения Москвы и Московской области 1997).


\(^{226}\) The translations into English of the names of the educational establishments have been taken from the guide *Výšie učebnye zavedenija Moskvy i Moskovskoj oblasti* (Высшие учебные заведения Москвы и Московской области) 1997. The exception is Академия Народного Хозяйства при правительстве Российской Федерации, which is not found in the guide. The translation used is the one found in documents of the Academy.
The composition of each group was to some extent arbitrary as participation depended on which teacher or manager was willing to let students or personnel spend time on the survey, and in each group the subjects were selected on a first-come basis. No one was forced to participate but a few needed some explanation as to procedure, time required, etc.

Questions regarding certain characteristics pertaining to the informant were included in the questionnaire (Appendix 3). The following information was asked for, and for the following reasons:

- Native language (Russian or not)
- Type of place where the informant has spent the largest part of his/her life (town or countryside)
- Educational level

are all factors which are assumed to be important in assessing whether an informant is a standard language speaker (носитель литературного языка; cf. Chapter 2). Information about the informants’ native language, educational level and the type of place where he/she had spent the largest part of his/her life (town or countryside) was not collected beforehand. Neither was the information used as a criterion for including an informant. No one was directly disqualified from taking part in the investigation based on the personal characteristics given. This information was collected in connection with linguistic material to be used for further study.

- Age
- Geographical origin: where childhood was spent
- Geographical origin: the place of longest residence

are all factors which have proved relevant for differences in stress in RJaSO (Krysin 1974:21–23, 236–237, 350).

- Sex

is a factor which has never been studied before in this type of survey, not in Krysin (1974) for instance. Besides, it is suitable to include since it is easily coded and there are only two, distinct, possible alternatives (as compared to, for instance, socio-economic groups which are much more complicated).

### 4.1.3.3 Number of informants

In linguistic research sample size is usually defined by practical considerations rather than strict statistical ones. However, this does not necessarily imply a problem. Cf. Milroy (1987:27):

---

227 The former First Moscow State Pedagogical Institute of Foreign Languages (“InJaz”), where, for instance Voroncova carried out an investigation in 1956 (Voroncova 1959).

228 Cf. Panov (1968a:46) who chose informants for a reading task using the following criteria: they should be (1) good at reading aloud and (2) have standard pronunciation (according to Panov this is found in representatives of the intelligentsia, white-collar workers and students who are Muscovites, i.e. are born in Moscow or who have lived there for most of their lives).
First, the samples used in linguistic surveys are in general demonstrably not technically representative, and to claim that they are leaves a researcher open to quite proper academic criticism. Second, relatively small samples (too small to be considered technically representative) appear to be sufficient for useful accounts of language variation in large cities.

This is according to the Labovian tradition in which language is seen as more homogenous than other types of behaviour: Cf. what Nordberg says:

Unlike “ordinary” social characteristics and attitudes (such as income, health care consumption, or political sympathies), linguistic behaviour is not a property residing in one person alone. Language is shaped in interaction and co-operation with an interlocutor and is also dependent on the social context as a whole. (Nordberg 1987–88:869)

Nevertheless, this traditional view does not escape criticism. Romaine, for instance, sees small samples and the argument of the homogeneity of linguistic behaviour as “a convenient post hoc justification for the limitations of time, money and manpower which affect most sociolinguistic research” (1980:172).

At any rate it seems plausible that the size of the sample should be dependent on the goal of the investigation. (Cf. Graudina 1970:352–355.) As in the present survey variation between groups of speakers was not the major objective and the group as a whole was most important, a relatively limited sample was considered sufficient.

A sample size of 100 subjects has, according to Sankoff (1987–88:901), become standard practice, and the sample size should, according to Graudina (1980:89), preferably be 1,000 or at least 100; if smaller, caution is to be observed.

It was decided that for this investigation the number of informants should be at least 100. Of these a majority should be students or in the same age group as most of the students. Of the total number of informants about one fourth to one third should participate in both the oral and the written part of the survey, while the rest of the informants should complete only the written part. Among these, too, the youngest age group should be in the majority. The reason why the number of people tested orally was to be smaller than that for people tested only in writing was mainly practical as the informants could only be recorded one at a time and recording a large number of informants would be very time consuming.

In the event the total number of informants amounted to 106.\textsuperscript{229} The number of informants from each place and for each part of the survey was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1-1. Number of informants from each place where the investigation was conducted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oral and written survey</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Academy of National Economy under the Government of the Russian Federation (mature students studying government administration, one teacher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Moscow State Linguistic University (students in different programmes and at different levels, one teacher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Moscow State University of Civil Engineering (students in different programmes and at different levels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A private medical clinic (personnel, mostly administrative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A building materials outlet (personnel in administration and sales)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Moscow Technical University of Communication and Informatics (students in different programmes and at different levels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control group\textsuperscript{230}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{229} Two of the people asked refused to participate (a male student and an elderly woman). Cf. 4.1.1.2.

\textsuperscript{230} Informants who cannot be assigned to one of the above-mentioned groups.
### 4.1.3.4 Characteristics of the informants

Table 4.1-2. The informants’ age (in 1997).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17–31</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32–46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47–61</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No age given</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the questionnaire the informants were asked to give their year of birth. The reason why this information was asked for instead of age is that this is less “sensitive material”, and also usable for a longer period of time. The replies obtained ranged from 1936 to 1980 so the informants were between 17 and 61 years old at the time of the investigation. A majority of the informants could be assigned to the youngest age group, which was the goal of the sampling.

Table 4.1-3. The informants’ sex.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A majority of the informants were female, which is a reflection of the demographic situation in Russia, although the male/female ratio (0.51) is lower here than in the society as a whole. If this affects the results at all then it can be supposed that the results reflect speech that is closer to the codified norm (see Chapter 5).

Table 4.1-4. The informants’ sex/age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex/age</th>
<th>17–31</th>
<th>32–46</th>
<th>47–61</th>
<th>No age given</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution between the sexes was similar in all age groups with approximately two thirds female and one third male informants.

Table 4.1-5. The informants’ native language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

231 The numbers show absolute figures with percentages given in parentheses.
232 Six informants did not give their age, but of these three were sampled in colleges/universities, so it could be assumed that these respondents were probably not older than 25.
233 The sources mentioned above in the section on sampling give the ratios 0.94 and 0.88.
234 See footnote above regarding the informants’ age.
235 Ukrainian 2, Yakut 1, unspecified 3. It was not necessary to specify language, those who did so did it on their own initiative. Two of the informants with an unspecified other native language had spent their childhood and the larger part of their life in Moscow or Moscow oblast’, so a large Russian influence is probable. The third of these is the informant who probably gave invalid answers in this questionnaire (see coding below). One informant stated that he was bilingual, which has been counted as if the native language was Russian.
Almost all informants were native speakers of Russian. The informant’s own definition of native language is used as it is considered sufficient in this context. It should be added that the definition of native speaker is not as obvious as might be assumed, as it can be linked to both knowledge (psychological view) and identity (sociological view; cf. Davies 1994:2724).  

Table 4.1-6. The informants’ geographical origin: where the major part of the first fifteen years was spent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical Origin</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moscow oblast'</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Russia/Siberia/Russian Far East</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other republics of the former USSR</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Russia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the former USSR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Russia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>106</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1-7. The informants’ geographical origin: the place of longest residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical Origin</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>68.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moscow oblast'</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Russia/Siberia/Russian Far East</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other republics of the former USSR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Russia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the former USSR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Russia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>106</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was assumed that most informants would come from Moscow and Moscow oblast' and that few informants would belong to other territorial groups, based on where they had spent their childhood and which was their place of longest residence. The division into reply categories was not very detailed, therefore, but mainly used to distinguish those from the Moscow area from the others, with the division being made with reference to what might be linguistically relevant as far as differences in stress are concerned, or what is easily distinguishable (northern/southern/central Russia, other places of ex-USSR and outside ex-USSR).

Table 4.1-8. The informants’ principal residence type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>95.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countryside</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>106</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most informants were of urban origin. Thus these subjects fulfilled one of the criteria for being qualified as a standard language speaker.

---

236 For an account of native speaker see Davies (1994:2719–2725).
237 One of these answers could be invalid.
238 One of these answers could be invalid.
239 One of these answers could be invalid.
Table 4.1-9. The informants’ educational level (highest level completed).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8–9 years</td>
<td>1 (0.9 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary education 10–11 years, currently in higher education</td>
<td>59 (55.7 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary education 10–11 years</td>
<td>10 (9.4 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary specialised education 10–11 years</td>
<td>9 (8.5 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education</td>
<td>27 (25.5 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106 (100.0 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the informants 99 per cent had completed secondary or higher education. This percentage is higher than that for the population as a whole: “in 1987 about 90 per cent of the urban population in the over-10 age group had higher or secondary education, and the percentage for the rural population rose to 80” according to Comrie et al. (1996:9), quoting Soviet statistics.

One of the criteria conventionally used for defining standard language speakers is that the person is educated to at least secondary level. All but one of the informants in the present survey fulfil this requirement. However, education has proved not to be too significant for stress variation compared to other factors, although the RJaSO survey has showed that people with secondary education are somewhat more inclined to use “new” accentological variants than people with higher education.

4.1.4 The test situation and procedure

4.1.4.1 Preparations and instructions

The survey was conducted in Moscow between 13–30 September 1997. Arrangements were made beforehand and then by phone upon my arrival to Moscow, so that a contact person at each place knew that the investigation was to take place, and that time and, if possible, space, was to be provided. The contact persons were in most cases teachers or office managers.

The procedure was in general the following: I introduced myself and informed the informants that I was conducting a survey on “norms and variants in the Russian language”. The reason for giving this less specified information was that I did not want to focus the informants’ attention on stress in general and on verbal stress in particular, especially before their reading the sentences (see the discussion above about the observer’s paradox). Their attention was nevertheless focused on verbal stress in the attitude questionnaire, but at this point the informants could believe that this was just one part of the problem to be studied, and not the one and only issue.

Each informant was assigned a three-figure identification number, the first figure of which indicated at which place the material was collected. The number of each informant was also read before he/she started the reading so that it would be recorded on the cassette. This number was written on the cassette, on the reply form on which each informant’s reading was coded afterwards, on the written judgement questionnaire and on the personal information sheet.
4.1.4.2 Oral performance test (usage)
The oral test took place in almost all cases before the written one so as not to risk revealing the object of the investigation – disclosed in the written but not in the oral part of the test.\textsuperscript{240} It was, though, perhaps not necessary to do the experiments in this order as apparently no one seemed to discern a link between the two parts of the investigation.

In the first part of the investigation – the oral performance or usage test – the informants were asked to read the 98 sentences on the sheet aloud at their own pace and fill in the missing endings of the words. This was presented to the informants as the main task and verbal stress was not mentioned. These instructions were given both orally and in writing on page one of the sheet (Appendix 1). The subjects read the sentences in my presence and it usually took about 10–15 minutes depending on the informants’ individual reading style and speed. The reading was recorded on cassettes and all the informants were of course fully aware of the recording: permission had been obtained beforehand and the cassette player was visible. They were also aware that the recordings were confidential.

4.1.4.3 Written judgement test (attitude)
After completing the reading task the informants were given the written judgement test. Here they were asked to put a cross in the appropriate box, depending on whether or not they use the stress presented to them and if they believed this stress to be correct or not. Most of the questionnaires were filled in with me present. However, as this was more time-consuming (the approximate time requirement was 30–45 minutes), some of the informants were given the questionnaires to fill in during the day in their classroom or at their place of work while I recorded other informants at the same place. In a few cases the questionnaires were handed out overnight. There is no reason to believe that this circumstance has affected the test results. For instance, not one of these informants answered 100 per cent (or even close to that number) in accordance with what most dictionaries or handbooks would recommend. Besides, the number of answers in accordance with most normative recommendations are evenly distributed over the whole scale for these informants.

4.1.4.4 Information pertaining to the informant
Finally, the informants were asked to give information concerning their year of birth, sex, level of education, etc. (see Appendix 3).

4.1.4.5 Test conditions
It was the aim to provide all informants with the same test conditions.\textsuperscript{241} While the test material was the same, external facilities varied. In general, no calm space was provided for the test procedure, which took place in offices, class-rooms, corridors or cafeterias. While this did not facilitate data collection, it probably did not affect the outcome.

\textsuperscript{240} There were a few exceptions to this for practical reasons. However, it did not seem to affect the result that some people started filling in the written questionnaire before starting the recording. There was apparently no particular focus on stress or any comments which could indicate that the purpose of the investigation was known.

\textsuperscript{241} The informants were not paid for their participation, but they were allowed to keep the folder in which the questionnaire was presented and the pen which was provided for filling in the questionnaire.
4.1.4.6 Coding and principles for working with the data

Oral part of the survey: When all the material had been collected the recordings were played and stress was noted down on a copy of the same questionnaire from which the informants had read the sentences. These results were later entered into the spreadsheet programme Excel. Excel was used for simple calculation, filter and pivot table functions. Some functions in Excel were adapted to the needs of this study.

- If the informant misread the sentence and used the wrong verb form of the word to be checked, used a totally different verb or the wrong tense (e.g. определи instead of определили), this was counted as an invalid answer. If he/she first used the right form or tense and then changed into another (определил > определили) then the first was counted as a valid answer. Small misreadings in words other than those investigated (the verbs with stress variants and the nouns with the omitted endings) were not disqualifying.

- In some cases the reader instantly corrected him/herself when reading the noun with morphological variants or the verb with stress variants. In these cases the second answer was taken as valid.

- It happened 16 times\(^\text{242}\) that informants corrected their stressing of a word immediately while reading. Most of these changes were towards the codified norm (underlined here). However, this was not always the case. For instance all the stress corrections concerning verbs on -ключить go in the other direction, towards the stem-stressed variant not codified as norm, and this further points to the strong position for stem stress in these verbs: сориши > (was corrected into) сорішь, пойт > поїт\(^\text{243}\) (twice\(^\text{244}\)), включаю > включають (twice), закликаю > закликаю, стажирюаться > стажироваться, пережили > пережили, прокляли > прокляли, начало > начало, отмерли > отмерли (twice), загляли > загляні, роздягли > роздягали (twice), подняли > подняли.

Written part of the survey: The replies in the written judgement test were coded into numerical values (conditional figures were assigned to each column) and these were entered into Excel.

- If an informant gave two answers for one verbal stress variant through marking two boxes on the same line or did not give an answer at all, this was coded as an invalid answer for that stress variant.

Personal information sheet: The answers on the form asking for information about the informants did not generally cause any problem in coding. These answers were entered into Excel for further processing as well.

- Two informants ticked two boxes when indicating where they had spent the largest part of their childhood. In the analysis only the alternative that was the same as the place where these persons had spent the largest part of their life was counted.\(^\text{245}\)

- There was one informant whose replies in the personal information sheet may not be reliable. His answers in the personal information questionnaire have not been taken into account except for what could be observed: male and student and without doubt belonging to the youngest age group. The claims that he has a native language other than Russian and spent his childhood outside Russia but within the borders of the former

---

\(^{242}\) Out of a total of \(31 \times 103 = 3,193\) instances.

\(^{243}\) In OS the end-stressed form is labelled \(n\) and in RPP it is considered obsolete and bookish.

\(^{244}\) Some of the changes occurred more than once.

\(^{245}\) For both of these two informants it coincided with one of the alternatives where they had spent the largest part of their childhood.
USSR and most of his life in the countryside outside the former USSR have not been
used in the analysis. This called for particular attention to this informant’s answers in
the written judgement questionnaire, particularly regarding the control questions. How-
ever, this check did not show anything that would disqualify this informant’s replies and
they are therefore only excluded where they are related to social factors, as in Chapter
5.
- One male informant ticked the box for “female”. This is most likely a lapsus linked to
the fact that in enumerations or in questionnaires the alternative “male” is usually listed
first, while here the alternative “female” was listed first. The answer has been coded as
“male” in the processing. There was no reason to believe that this informant had an-
swered “incorrectly” in this or other questionnaires.

4.1.5 Evaluation of and conclusions regarding the method

4.1.5.1 Relevance, validity and reliability
The purpose of the study was to investigate the actual norms and actual usage in
contemporary Russian. The target population was identified as university and college
students and employees in Moscow aged approximately 17–60. These were also the groups
that were investigated.

The construction of the oral part of the survey seems to have worked.247 The same
applies to the construction of the written questionnaire.248 Only one informant partly misun-
derstood the concept, as he did not use the last three columns at all and noted all instances
of non-acceptance of forms in column 4. As a consequence all his answers in column four
have been coded as invalid, as they can stand for both an answer in column 4 or an answer
in columns 5–7. A few informants responded to the stresses proposed in the written ques-
tionnaire by commenting orally or in writing that their stressing depended on what object
follows the verb: занять деньги or занять место, отдал приказ or отдал деньги, while others
said that this was not the case, and that they always stressed, for instance, отдал приказ.

On the other hand, the informants’ individual interpretation of the proposed answers has
played a role in that some informants never used columns 1 and 7, but used only 2 and 6,
others used only columns 1 and 7. This is most likely due to the psychology of the individ-
ual. Some people are more inclined to be categorical, while others either cover themselves
with a more middle-of-the-road answer or are insecure. However, this only pertains to the
degree of certainty about correctness and not to the main question regarding reported usage
or non-usage.

A larger pilot test might have indicated that an eighth column representing the reply al-
ternative “I do not say it like that myself but I know that it is correct” – which would have
filled a logical gap – could have been added to the written questionnaire as two informants

246 This informant’s answers are therefore not counted into the group that are not standard language speakers.
247 There were two misprints in the sentences used for the oral part of the study: sentence number 81
видно (видно) and sentence number 86 возможно (возможно). The stress of the form начал in sentence 14 and
не было (не было) (figuring in sentences 20, 23, 25 and 73) could also have been included in the results. But as these
forms were not sampled from the outset and as these answers actually contain no more than adherence to the
codified norm this was not done.
248 There was one minor misprint in the instructions for the written judgement test, where the form глаголов
remained, although the actual figure was changed, thus requiring the form глагола.
expressed the feeling that it was needed for their replies for перепёрчить (see results section).

The first part of the survey measures actual usage in a less-monitored speech style, obtained through the deviation technique where the informants’ attention was drawn away from the object of study, i.e. verbal stress. The second part of the survey measures whether the informants use a form or not and whether they believe it is correct or not (these two do coincide most often). It is at least as important to study reported speech as actual usage, as it serves as an indication of what norms the speakers strive towards and is therefore important for the study of implicit language norms.

The inclusion of two instances of the same verb form and the answers to these could also be assumed to function as a control instance that the informants have answered “correctly”. However, the present investigation has shown that this is not a reliable means for checking the seriousness or accuracy of the informants, as two variants are not always in complementary distribution: the speakers do not always choose between two forms and do not always have only one norm. For the same reason a comparison of the results obtained in the oral and written part of the investigation, which do after all comply more often than not, cannot be taken as an indication of validity and reliability, as it was proved that several norms can coexist in one individual and in one speech community. (See the following sections and Chapter 4.7.)

In the small number of cases where the informants did the written judgement test first, this does not seem to have influenced the results. In fact, the informants did not, even when the whole procedure was completed, appear to see a connection between the two parts of the study, that they do in fact investigate the same aspect of the language. No one seemed know that stress placement was the issue (cf. the same conclusions for Strom 1988).

The investigation has been compared to the results of previous studies from the period 1956–1994, although the purpose of these comparisons was not of a methodological character. There was also a complementary micro-study in newsgroups.

---

249 Stress variation other than in verbs was also found in the recordings. I will not count the morphological variants договори́ (from договорь) and договори́ (from договорь) here, although these are related to stress. The following variants were elicited, but the normative stresses (given in brackets here) were used by a majority: на фронтах — не рек. устар./устар. (на фронтах), с со всеми поставщиками (variant not included in the sources) (со всеми поставщиками), к двери — не рек./простореч. (к двери), стену́ (variant not included in the sources) (стену́), ну́жны деньги — доп. устар./_ (нужный деньги), торговцы́ (variant not included in the sources) (торговцы́). The noun гамбургер was included to check if there is variation in this word. I have heard all stresses гамбургер, but no variation is recorded in dictionaries. This lexeme is not included at all in OS–1997 and the dictionaries RPP–1996, Ož&Šv–1995, Skljarevskaja–1998 and BTS–1998 give the stress гамбургер as normative. Thirty informants stressed гамбургер and one гамбу́ргер. This suggests that there is variation, although 31 informants is too small a sample to provide material for any far-reaching conclusions.

250 “Throughout all of the interviews no speaker ever indicated any recognition that stress placement, in particular words or generally, was of interest in the investigation, or even paid any particularly attention to stress placement. The data collected, then, furnish reasonably detailed profiles of individual speaker’s ordinary stress placements for the verbs in question” (Strom 1988:33).

251 In June 1999 a list of 20 verbs or verb forms (осведомиться, баловаться, ржаветь, черпать, включить, поселиться, глушить, кровоточит, марит, поместиться, написать, долго, опять, родился, обнялся, заперся, начался, воспринялся, не дало) was posted to the newsgroups relcom.talk, k12.lang.russian, sci.lang and alt.uu.lang.russian.misc. The respondents were supposed to say which out of two or three stress variants they used. Thirteen replies, some containing commentaries, were received. In some cases two variants were reported to be used. In spite of the small number of answers and the, from a scientific point of view, dubious sampling the results are similar to those of the survey; the distribution of
Certain facts about the informants’ background are known as the personal information sheet was used to gather information about the informants, especially factors that could be linguistically relevant.

The study was carried out using a comparatively large number of informants (106) with adequate types and quantities of language (289). Three control words were included in order to ascertain a control of the informants’ accuracy and seriousness. There were six informants whose answers to the control questions called for a more detailed study of their answers. After this check not enough evidence was found to exclude these informants’ answers from the analysis, although some caution should be observed with six of the informants from MGSU (The Moscow State University of Civil Engineering).

Finally, reliability was aimed at through considering

- congruence: the same material and similar experiment situations were used for all informants;
- precision: the coding and processing of replies was thorough, although the “human factor” might play a role when thousands of items are to be processed. On some informants’ part there was a certain lack of precision in the reading with a number of misreadings. However the principles for tackling these in coding are given above (the general principle being that when a misreading affects the relevant material and the results it is coded as invalid);
- objectivity: only one person worked with the analysis of the material and did this according to the same principles which had been planned and tested beforehand;
- consistency: language use, especially pronunciation, in an individual is not as volatile as other individual characteristics and points of view, so it is plausible that the results would not change radically over a couple of years.

4.1.5.2 Standard language speakers

The commonly applied definition of a speaker of standard Russian is based on non-linguistic criteria, questions on which had been included in the personal information sheet (cf. Chapter 2, Krysin 1974:17, Comrie et al. 1996:14–15):

- native language – he/she should be a native speaker of Russian;
- educational level – he/she should have completed higher or secondary education;
- principal residence type – he/she should have been an urban resident for the larger part of his/her life.

It was decided that this information should not be collected before the test procedures and that the replies of all informants should be used, regardless of whether they were – according to the common definition – standard language speakers. The reason for this is that if so-called non-standard speakers – by this definition – were sampled, it would be seen as a valuable source for comparison. If questions on these features were included it enabled subsequent checks to establish whether these informants actually deviate more from the codified norm than the so-called standard language speakers.

Almost all informants (92 per cent) could be defined as standard language speakers, due account being made for the three factors mentioned above. In all there are nine informants who fail to fulfil one criterion, or a maximum of two. No one fails to fulfil all three.

---

reported usage between the variant stresses is in fact in most cases strikingly similar, the only exception being the form морит for which the distribution between the variant stresses was more even than it was in the large survey, where the preferred stress was морит.
• Four people have a native language other than Russian but have at least secondary education and have spent the larger part of their life in a town (two in other parts of the ex-USSR than the Russian Federation, the other two in Moscow and Moscow oblast').
• One informant has not completed secondary education.
• Three people have spent most of their life in the countryside but they are native Russian speakers and have at least secondary education.
• One person has a native language other than Russian and has spent most of his/her life in the countryside.252

These informants’ answers have been included in the results reporting for three reasons: (1) their number (nine) is known so their answers can easily be abstracted from the answers if one is of the opinion that these informants have no raison d’être in the analysis. For instance, if 94 out of 106 informants claim to use a stress that is not codified as normative form and believe it is right – as in the case of осведомиться (не рек./простореч.) – this cannot be ascribed to the inclusion of non-standard speakers as they number only 9 and maybe not even all of them are among the 94; (2) their number is quite small and they probably do not therefore influence the results on the whole (see next point); (3) the average figure for correspondence to the codified norm for all informants is 165.0 out of 289 answers (57.1 per cent). If these nine informants are removed the figure is 166.5 (57.6 per cent). Thus, the average figure of adherence to the codified norm does not change more than marginally without these nine informants, which shows that the informants which do not fulfil one or two of the three criteria generally used to define standard language speakers do not, as a group, change the results on the whole. Besides, of these nine four have a score above average for the whole group of informants (165.0) and five have a score below average.

4.1.6 Principles for the presentation of dictionary data and survey results

The following sections (4.2–4.5) present the variation and the results. Here a few principles for and clarifications of the presentation will be given.

In the listing of dictionary data all verbal stress variation is listed, while, of course, in the survey results only the verbs or forms included in the surveys are mentioned. It should again be emphasised that the sample of the verbs is not representative stricto sensu, for the obvious reason of lack of criteria for such representativeness.

The listing of variation as presented in the sources is divided into sections according to the type of variation. The dictionary data generally also apply to the cases where there is a prefix, unless stated otherwise. In the presentation of the variants, a presentation like -был-а – -была means that this variation only occurs in prefixed verbs, while the presentation брал-а – брала means that this variation occurs either only in the unprefixed verb or with prefixation.

The labels for the variant stresses are presented in the same manner throughout. The first label shows the notation in OS and the second the notation in RPP: доп./разр., for instance, means that the label in OS is доп. and that the label in RPP is разр., and */устар. means that the variant is not listed in OS and that it in RPP is considered устар.

252 It should be noted that the only informant who fails to fulfil two of the three criteria for defining a standard language speaker has a much higher figure for correspondence to the general codified norm (181) than the average (165).
When the two dictionaries do not have parallel labels like доп. and разг. for one variant (see Chapter 3) then the variant will be grouped according to the label given in OS. When a variant is listed only in RPP and labelled простореч. it will generally be listed in the presentation of dictionary data together with the variants under the heading неправ./простореч. and not under не рек./простореч. While this classification is essentially arbitrary, it is made for the sake of consistency.

The results of the written part of the survey are presented as percentages, the total number of observations always being 106. The results for columns 1–3 and 5–7, respectively, have generally been added in the discussion following the results tables in order to present to what degree the informants claim allegiance or not to a certain stress. “Reported usage” will in the text thus represent both reported usage and belief about correctness. Such an addition is possible as the informants’ reported usage coincides with their own beliefs about what is correct or not to a large extent – actually much larger than expected. What is more, this addition of the columns was made in order to facilitate comparison of the results from this part of the investigation with those of the oral part and with results from other surveys of usage and reported usage. The results of the oral survey are given in connection with the results of the self-reporting survey.

Throughout the presentation and discussion of results comparison will be made – where available – with results of other surveys of usage and reported usage of Russian verbal stress. These other surveys are the following:254

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey reference (place of investigation in brackets)</th>
<th>Results published in (see References)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voroncova 1956 (Moscow)</td>
<td>Voroncova (1959)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RJaSO 1963 (Soviet Union)</td>
<td>Krysin (1974)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolesov 1964 (Leningrad)</td>
<td>Kolesov (1967)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pirogova 1967 (Moscow)</td>
<td>Pirogova (1967)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorbachević 1974 (Leningrad)</td>
<td>Gorbachević (1978a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The references to other surveys will be made using the investigator’s name, except for RJaSO (Krysin 1974), where an abbreviation of the name of the survey will be used as it was made by a large team. The year mentioned in connection with the surveys is the year when the survey was conducted.255 As the results of these surveys were in many cases reported in the form of absolute figures these have been converted to percentages of the total number of answers given. Information regarding informants, sampling, etc. was generally scarce. Further information about the surveys is given in the introduction (Chapter 1). It should be underlined that the methods of the surveys vary (written/oral, reported usage/actual usage, number of informants from 21 to 4,300, choice between variants or not), and this should be kept in mind when comparing the results, although this variation is not necessarily a drawback.

The reason that the results of these other surveys are included in the presentation and discussion of the survey results is that they provide useful material from five decades, and it seems more reasonable to compare with and perhaps corroborate with previous research.

253 In the tables the label простореч. will be further abbreviated to про.
254 See Key to abbreviations.
255 This is more relevant than the year of publication of the results when comparing survey results, particularly as there are such cases as the RJaSO survey, carried out in 1963, but for which the results where published 11 years later (Krysin 1974). In the case of Pirogova no year for the investigation is specified, therefore the year of publication of the results (1967) is given.
instead of operating in a vacuum and from there ask for future corroboration of the results. Compare what Ukiah says:

Of course, the results of a small-scale survey such as that described here are by no means statistically representative of the whole mass of speakers of standard Russian. However, it is hoped that they will be of some interest in themselves, indicating – as they appear to do – certain trends amongst a small group of speakers of the standard language. Furthermore, if corroborated by similar indications from other studies, they would provide evidence for recommended pronunciations such as those tentatively suggested here. (Ukiah 1998:288)

4.2 Verbs with variation in the infinitive, present/future and preterite forms

Among the verbs with stress variation and vacillation in the whole paradigm – here represented by the infinitive form – there are two opposed stress development tendencies (Gorbačevič 1978a:92):

1. **progressive** with stress moving from the root or stem to the thematic vowel: ржáвêть > ржáвêть;
2. **regressive** with stress moving from the suffix to the root or stem: клéйтъ > клéйтъ.

The former is prevailing according to Nen'ko (1984a:199).

4.2.1 Verbs with infinitive on -ать

4.2.1.1 Dictionary data

**End stress is the codified norm**

- **Stem stress is неправ. / простореч.** брать – брать, озорничать – озорничать, плескать – плескать.
- **Stem stress is не рек. / простореч.** перхать – перхать.
- **Stem stress is и/и.** рыкать – рыкать, черкать – черкать (also with prefixes).

**Stem stress is the codified norm**

**End stress is / простореч.** (variation listed only in RPP): комкать – комкать, отхárкать – отхárкать, перeduергать – перeduергать, перепоёśćать – перепоёсьать.

**End stress is не рек. / простореч.** -щёлкать – -щёлкать, -чёрпать – -чёрпать. Regarding this second stem two remarks must be made. Firstly, two verbs with this stem are assessed differently in the sources: the variants исчерпáть/сы and счерпáть are in RPP labelled разг., thus considered “more acceptable” in this dictionary than for instance черпáть (простореч.). Secondly, in RPP, the verbs дочёрпáть and начёрпáть also have variants with stress on ê (дочёрпáть, начёрпáть), marked простореч.

**End stress is и/разг. запыхаться – запыхаться.**

**Other stress variation**, i.e. not stem-stressed codified norm with an end-stressed variant, or vice versa, is found in a small number of verbs which all have in common that they consist of at least four syllables:

---

257 отшелкáть is labelled доп. in OS.
(a) codified normative stress on the first syllable out of four and variant stress on the second syllable out of four (progressive tendency): скáредничать – ска́редничать (/простореч.), гáерничать – гáерничать (/простореч.), сумéрничать – сумёрничать (не рек./простореч.).

(b) codified normative stress on the third/fourth syllable out of four/five and variant stress on the second/third syllable out of four/five (regressive tendency): (по)домóвничать – (по)домóвничать (не рек./простореч.).

(c) codified normative stress on the second out of five syllables and variant stress on the third out of five (progressive tendency): -ку́пориватþ with the variant stress, -купóриватþ considered неправ./простореч. (appears with the prefixes за-, от-, рас-, у-).

4.2.1.2 Results

Table 4.2-1. Reported usage and language users’ norm. Percentage of respondents for each category of answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress variant examined</th>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>I say it like that myself</th>
<th>I do not say it like that myself</th>
<th>and I know that it is correct</th>
<th>and I believe that it is correct</th>
<th>but I do not know whether it is incorrect</th>
<th>and I do not know whether it is incorrect</th>
<th>and I know that it is incorrect</th>
<th>and I believe that it is incorrect</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>do héрpatþ</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doчёрпать</td>
<td>не рек./про.</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doчёрпать</td>
<td>_/про.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>черкать</td>
<td>не рек./про.</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>черкать</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>чёркать</td>
<td>и/и</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>зацелкать</td>
<td>не рек./про.</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отцелкать</td>
<td>доп./про.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>подомовничать</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the survey show that there is discrepancy between implicit and explicit norm in some cases. No general tendency towards, for instance, end stress can be discerned. The stress norm seems not to be motivated by any particular rules, but depends on the individual verb form.

End stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm.
The codified norm черкать is used by a large majority – 83.0 per cent of the informants and the “equal” variant чёркать is used by 24.5 per cent, which shows that the implicit norm is identical with the explicit.

Stem stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm
There also appears to be correspondence between implicit and explicit norm for verbs on -щёлкать. The informants do not claim usage to a high degree for either of the stresses зацелкать (не рек./простореч.): 10.4 per cent, or отцелкать (доп./простореч.): 15.1 per cent, suggesting that the codified norm (-щёлкать) is adhered to. The results also indicate that the different assessment for these stresses in OS might have a correspondence in the informants’ answers: a larger percentage – 50.0 – claim they know зацелкать (labelled не рек.) is “incorrect” as compared to 32.1 per cent who claim they know отцелкать (more “mildly” labelled доп.) is “incorrect”.

Stem stress is the explicit norm ≠ implicit norm
Nen'ko (1984a:94) professes that for verbs with the stem -черпать the stress -черпа́ть is...
quite widespread and that her material from poetry confirms her idea that codification lags behind actual contemporary usage to a certain degree. This is confirmed by the results of the present investigation: the codified norm дочерпать is claimed to be used by 21.7 per cent of the informants, while the stresses дочерпать and черпать (labelled не рек./простореч.) are reported to be used by 75.5 and 72.7 per cent respectively. The fact that both the prefixed and unprefixed forms have such high figures for reported usage and that these figures are almost equal shows that the language users’ norm is quite distinct. The results of the actual usage survey give additional corroborative material: more informants – 64.5 per cent – used the variant stress черпать, than the codified norm черпать (35.5 per cent). The stress дочерпать has less than 10 per cent reported usage, and is thus not perceived as a norm and poses no serious threat either to the explicit (codified) norm or to the implicit norm. The fact that the codified norm is used by a minority and that only a minority of the language users believe it is correct, while they claim to use – and in fact do use – a stress that is not recommended in the sources, suggests that there is a new norm, черпать, not yet codified.

Table 4.2-2. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>черпать</th>
<th>черпать</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>не рек./простореч.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.5% (11)</td>
<td>64.5% (20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other types of stress variation where explicit norm ≠ implicit norm**

The stress подовиничать, given as the norm in the sources, was rejected by 85.9 per cent of the informants, and only 11.3 per cent claim to use it. Thus, there is no correspondence between the norm as codified in the main sources RPP–1996 and OS–1997 and the actual norm, assumedly подовиничать, in these sources labelled не рек./простореч. As a matter of fact, this implicit norm домовничать is codified as the only norm in BTS–1998 and A&Z–2000.\(^{258}\) Considering the general unwillingness of authors to reconsider recommendations it is not unlikely that forthcoming editions of, for instance, OS will continue to recommend a stress that is not the actual norm and which has been abandoned by at least two recent lexicographic sources.

4.2.2 Verbs with infinitive on -еть

4.2.2.1 Dictionary data

**End stress is the codified norm**

Stem stress is неправ./простореч.: лиловеть – лиловеть, -чёрстветь – -чёрстветь (with the prefixes о-, по-\(^{259}\)) (/_простореч.).

**Stem stress is the codified norm**

End stress is _/простореч. (listed only in RPP): ойловеть – ойловеть (_/простореч.).

End stress is не рек./простореч: обезуметь – обезуметь. As far as the verbs плесневеть – плесневеть, проплесневеть – проплесневеть, заплесневеть – заплесневеть are concerned the

---

\(^{258}\) In Оз\&Шv–1995 it is labelled разр., indicating a larger tolerance for this stress than in the main sources.

\(^{259}\) No variation is recorded in the sources for the simplex verb.
two sources do not agree: the variants are marked не рек. in OS and разг. in RPP, i.e. they are more accepted in RPP.260

End stress is доп./разг.: сурóве́ть – суровéть, заплéсне́ть – заплесне́ть, индевéть – инде́вёт (also with the prefixes за-, об-261).

End stress is и/и. ржáве́ть – ржавéть (simplex verb and with the prefixes за-, пере-, по-, про-).

4.2.2.2 Results

Table 4.2-3. Reported usage and language users’ norm. Percentage of respondents for each category of answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress variant examined</th>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>I say it like that myself</th>
<th>I do not say it like that myself</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and I know that it is correct</td>
<td>and I believe that it is correct</td>
<td>but I do not know whether it is correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>о́черствéть</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>полилóве́ть</td>
<td>неправ./про.</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>заржáве́ть</td>
<td>и/и.</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>заржáве́ть</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>зайнáде́веть</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Nen’ko (1984a:102) the formal analogy is weaker in this group than in verbs with infinitive on -ить. However, judging from the small material at hand (this group is in itself small) there appears to be a progressive tendency with the stress moving from the stem or root to the thematic vowel. For the verb forms examined in this group, stress on -е́ть is widely used (according to reported usage or actual behaviour) both when it is the explicit norm and when it is a variant to the norm, while the variants stressed one or two syllables further to the left have much smaller usage, regardless of whether they are by normative works given as normative or incorrect variants. (Compare verbs with infinitive on -ить, where there appears to be little formal analogy.)

-е́ть-stressed: о́черствéть 94.3 норма
заржáве́ть 88.7 и/и.

stem-stressed: полилóве́ть 33.1 неправ./простореч.
заржáве́ть 15.1 норма
зайнáде́веть 13.2 норма

End stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm

The informants seem to agree with stress on the ending -е́ть where it is normative: о́черствéть has a total reported usage of 94.4 per cent. And as the stress полилóве́ть (неправ./простореч.) has a reported usage of 33.0 per cent, it can be assumed from this that the codified norm полилóве́ть is also the actual norm.

Stem stress is the explicit norm ≠ implicit norm

The stresses ржáве́ть and ржавéть (simplex verbs and with the prefixes за-, пере-, по-, про-) are considered equal by both dictionaries,262 and ржáве́ть is mentioned first.263 The reported

260 Dimitrova (1994:35) claims that verbs with the suffix -е- motivated by nouns bear stress on the suffix in the infinitive and that “в современном языке употребляется плеcневéть”. Cf. above where it is not recommended.
261 But обьнáде́веть is labelled и in RPP.
262 The prefixed verbs are not included in RPP.
usage for the “first norm” заря́вёт is 15.0 per cent and for the “second norm” заря́вёт 88.7 per cent. The answers for the oral part of the investigation are even more uniform. All informants used the end-stressed заря́вёт and no one заря́вёт. Thus the stress заря́вёт seems to be obsolescent, i.e. has reached stage 4 in Ickovič’s model (1968:48) or stage 3 in the model used by Vvedenskaja & Červinskij (1997:178) (see Chapter 2). It has earlier been observed that заря́вёт is more common in poetry and in current usage (Nen'ko 1984a:102–103, Gorbačevič 1978b:127–128) and one can reasonably assume that the (only) actual norm is (за)ря́вёт.

Another codified normative stress with little support among the language users is -и́нде́вёт (variant stress -инде́вёт is labelled доп./разг.). In the present survey only 13.2 per cent of the informants reported usage for the codified traditional norm заи́нде́вёт. The likely actual norm is (за)инде́вёт. Gorbačevič (1978a:96) also shows from poetry and from a survey that инде́вёт is more widespread. Nen'ko (1984a:104) does not agree: she claims that the stress инде́вёт is not normative in dictionaries (which it in fact is, and was in 1984, too), and that it is preferred in poetry and in modern usage (which it probably is not).

4.2.3 Verbs with infinitive on -ировать

The verbs with an infinitive in -ировать is a comparatively recent category, which appeared in the Russian language in the Petrine epoch when German verbs on -ieren were adapted to the Russian language by means of the suffix -овать (Voroncova 1967:82, Gorbačevič 1971:52). This suffix later became productive and is now used for many neologisms and loan words.

The small group of verbs on -овать first adapted stresswise to the large old group of Russian verbs on -овать. Verbs that came into Russian early often have final stress (-ирова́ть), while more recent words often have pre-final stress (-и́рова́ть), and neologisms of the late 20th century almost exclusively have pre-final stress without going through any stages of variation (Voroncova 1967:82–83 and 1979:242, Gorbačevič 1978a:98).

---

263 The order of “equal” variants plays a role in RPP. It is said not to play a role in OS, although the traditional forms are generally given as number one, perhaps indicating that there might be a covert grading.

264 The fact that it has been listed under this heading does not mean that it is suggested that there is a total non-correspondence between explicit norm and implicit norm – one of the explicit norms is also the implicit norm. It means that one of the explicit norms (stem stress) is not functioning as an actual norm.

265 In RPP the stress обы́нде́вёт is labelled i.

266 This could be a misprint from the part of Nen'ko, having marked stress by hand. However, the examples given by her are contradictory, which is then a double misprint, indicating a sloppiness in stress assignment.

267 However both Gorbačevič (1978a:99) and Voroncova (1979:237–238) point out that the influence came not only from German.

268 As these words often entered Russian through Polish, Polish verbs in -ować could give such doublets as организо́вывать – организо́вывать (Voroncova 1979:237–238). Voroncova (1967:83) does not see a link between source language and the stressing of the particular verb in Russian, but suggests that Polish stress might have played a role.

269 Cf. the results for the verb дотирова́ть below, which confirm this.
For verbs that are not neologisms there have been two parallel processes: (1) a stabilisation of stress on -и́рова́ть and (2) a stabilisation of stress on -и́ровать (Voroncova 1967:83). This second process leads to vacillation in verbs which originally had stress on -и́рова́ть and continued in the second half of the 19th century: verbs that had vacillated most often got the codified stress -и́ровать (нивелировать) and verbs that had formerly had only final stress started to show vacillation: гофрира́ть – гофри́ровать (Voroncova 1967:84). A study of dictionaries from different periods gives a picture of the general development among these verbs, where an increasing number of verbs go from final stress (-и́рова́ть) to pre-final (-и́ровать) (Gorbačevič 1971:53, Nen'ko 1984a:98–99, Voroncova 1979:237–248). Below is an example of a typical pattern of stress change – illustrated by the recommendations from Slovar’–1847 up to today:

Table 4.2-5. Normative notation for the stresses бу́кси́ровать in sources from the 1840s to the 1990s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slovar’–1847</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolopće–1886</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogienko–1914²⁷²</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ušakov–1935–1940</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS–1950–1965</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;O–1960</td>
<td>не</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorbačevič–1973</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;Z–1984</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ož&amp;Šv–1995</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPP–1996</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS–1997</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This illustrates that the stress бу́кси́ровать was the only norm up until the end of the 19th century when the variant stress бу́кси́ровать appeared in dictionaries, first as a non-normative variant, later as an equal variant. It remained so until around 1950 when the first volume of the first edition of BAS was edited. In subsequent dictionaries бу́кси́ровать has been the only norm, and бу́кси́ровать is not even listed in contemporary sources as an obsolete or obsolete variant. It has been suggested that stress changes in this group are to a high degree of the same type (“однотипны”; Voroncova 1979:237–248; see also Gorbačevič 1978:98). However, there are exceptions from the general line of development. One is стажи́ровать, which in the 1930s appeared in dictionaries with stress on -и́ровать, although it is actually used with end stress (стажи́ровать; Voroncova 1979:247–248). Other examples of this quite rare change in the opposite direction are маркиро́вать, трениро́вать (Nen'ko 1984a:100).

The number of verbs on -ирова́ть varies according to the sources, but there is agreement that stress on -и́рова́ть prevails and that vacillation is frequent. According to Gorbačevič (1971:52) there are in contemporary-Russian approximately 500 verbs on -ирова́ть. Bogatyrev (1985:165) claims that there are about 1,000 verbs with the ending

---

²⁷⁰ Gorbačevič (1971:53) concludes that the “attempts of certain purists” (“попытки некоторых пуристов”) to stop the process of stress change in many verbs on -ирова́ть have been unsuccessful. As an example he takes Dolopće’s 1909 qualification of блоки́ровать as incorrect.

²⁷¹ The examples are partly from Gorbačevič (1971:53). For listings of the stress development in this group in earlier dictionaries (from the 18th century onwards) see Kiparsky (1962:296–298).

²⁷² Černyšëv (1912:38) claims that Ogienko is not always reliable.

²⁷³ In contemporary dictionaries the variant stresses are marked as equal, but the speakers prefer the end stress (see results below).

²⁷⁴ His source is from 1958.
-ировать and that for more than 90 per cent of these verbs the norm is pre-final stress and among those that do not have this stress as a norm, several have vacillation. Voroncova mentions the figure 800 verbs on -ировать. Of these approximately 40 have final stress and some have vacillation (1979:246; cf. Voroncova 1967:85, where she says that in contemporary language, of the verbs used in the period spanning the late 18th–early 20th centuries, only 22 remain that still have the stress -ировать).

4.2.3.1 Dictionary data

Final stress is the codified norm


Pre-final stress is доп./_ (not listed in RPP): нормировать – норми́ровать.

Pre-final stress is не рек./простореч.: гофрировать – гофри́ровать (and на-), костюмировать – костюми́ровать, премировать, премирировать, экши́ровать/ся/ – экши́ровать/ся/.

Pre-final stress is неправ./простореч.: пломбиро́вать – пломби́ровать (also with the prefixes о-, за-276), бомбардировать – бомбарди́ровать, громировать – громи́ровать.

4.2.3.2 Results

Table 4.2-6. Reported usage and language users’ norm. Percentage of respondents for each category of answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress variant examined</th>
<th>I say it like that myself</th>
<th>I do not say it like that myself</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and I know that it is correct</td>
<td>and I believe that it is correct</td>
<td>but I do not know whether it is correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>бомбардировать норма</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>группировать норма</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>премировать норма</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>запломбировать норма</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>нормировать норма</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>татуироваться и/и</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>стажироваться и/и</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>дотировать норма</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With one exception, the informants as a group prefer the codified norm and reject the variants. There seem to be no general tendencies or explanations for stress placement in these verbs:

Firstly, there does not in the limited material available seem to be an overall tendency towards stress on -ировать. There are several words for which the explicit norm is -ировать and this is also the implicit norm.

Secondly, the number of syllables does not seem to be decisive for stress placement. There is a theory that the number of syllables plays a role in determining on which of the two suffix syllables the stress falls; if there are four or five syllables the stress is final and if there are six or more stress is usually pre-final, although Voroncova agrees that the number of syllables is not always determining (1967:82, 1979:242–243). The informants stress on

275 In the meaning ‘lay out’.
276 The variant запломбировать is marked разг. in RPP.
the fifth syllable out of five (not counting -ся): bombardirovàť, запломбироvàť, tatuироваться*, 277 the fourth syllable out of four: группировать, премировать, стажировать* and the second syllable out of four: нормировать*, дотировать. 278

Thirdly, there does not seem to be a universal pragmatical explanation of the type of stress for these verbs. Such an explanation is put forward by Bogatyrev (1985). He claims that verbs with the prefix вы- have stress on the first syllable, those with the prefix для- have pre-final stress, other ones are stressed like their prefixed counterparts, unprefix reflexive verbs have stress like the corresponding non-reflexive ones, and for non-reflexive verbs there is final stress in маршировать and рокировать (Bogatyrev 1985:169–171). 279 For the rest there is a tendency towards final stress for verbs that contain the fragment “длительное воздействие на объект с целью придания ему некоторого признака или качества” under the condition that this quality or characteristic is customary for the speaker (1985:167–169). According to Bogatyrev’s theory there are verbs that should, with their meaning taken into consideration, have end stress. For the verbs included in the present survey and listed by Bogatyrev this theory does apply: the verbs запломбировать, группировать, татуировать(ся) are apparently end stressed both in codification and in reported usage/actual usage. There are also, according to Bogatyrev, verbs that should not have end stress when the meaning of the verbs is taken into consideration. The results of the survey carried out for this monograph indicate that this is true for нормировать (which is the implicit norm, but not the explicit norm; that is нормировать), but it is not true for премировать (which is both the explicit and implicit norm). Obviously, Bogatyrev’s theory cannot account for all stress placements either in codification or in actual usage, but there appears to be a point in his general conclusions.

Seemingly, the partition of verbs on -ировать into two classes with different stress is, as expressed by Comrie et al., “essentially arbitrary” (1996:96).

**Final stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm**

For all but one of the checked final stresses that are codified as normative, reported usage and/or actual usage was above 50 per cent, indicating a correspondence between explicit and implicit norm.

The explicit norm (с)группировать (no variants listed in the sources) was the reported usage of 94.3 per cent of the informants and the actual usage of all of them.

Table 4.2-7. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(с)группировать</th>
<th>(с)группировать</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>—/— (not included)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0% (31)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

277 For the verbs marked * the assumption is made that if the informants do not claim that they are in favour of the stress mentioned in the survey, they use the alternative stress given in the source(s).

278 For new words it is plausible that the stress -ировать is the only possible one, i.e. that it is productive. This would support the theory that there is no universal tendency for stress placement in this group. Thus, -ировать is the productive stress, but for words already existing in the language the usage is quite traditional.

279 Bogatyrev includes in his investigation only those verbs that fit the model F(ировать), where F is the formant stem (“производящая основа”). This means that he does not include verbs on -изировать, verbs with a stem on -ир (бомбардировать from бомбардир) or verbs with word-formation stems with no more than two syllables related to nouns on -ёр (стажироваться, гримировать) (1985:166).
For the verb бомбардировать there was also a prevalence for the explicit norm бомбардировать both in reported usage (55.7 per cent) and actual usage (58.1 per cent, бомбардируют), but the insecurity here is larger. As many as 41.9 per cent of the informants used the variant stress бомбардируют, a variant not even listed in OS.

Table 4.2-8. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>бомбардируют</th>
<th>бомбардируют</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>__/простореч.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.1% (18)</td>
<td>41.9% (13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The explicit norm запломбировать, for which the reported usage was 55.7 per cent, is apparently also the implicit norm, although a certain hesitation regarding the stressing of this form can also be read into the results. Considering the small majority that pronounced themselves in favour of this stress it is not unlikely that the stress запломбировать (неправ./разг.) is quite widespread and believed by many to be correct.

Hesitation was also found regarding the explicit norm премировать. Approximately half the informants – 51.9 per cent – reported usage of this stress, while in speech, a majority – 71.0 per cent – chose this stress, and 29.0 per cent stressed премировали. It has been suggested (Voroncova 1967:84) that vacillation is particularly common in премировать (alongside with нормировать) and that use of the incorrect stress (премировать) is widespread (Gorbačevič 1971:54). However, Gorbačevič’s own survey results showed that 68.1 per cent used the normative stress премировать and only 31.9 per cent the stress премировать.

Concluding from Gorbačevič’s results and those obtained from the present investigation, it would seem that vacillation in премировать is not as significant as suggested and, at least, not as notable as in нормировать (see below). Evidently, there is correspondence between explicit and implicit norm, although, as already pointed out, there is some uncertainty among the speakers regarding the stress of this verb.

Table 4.2-9. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>премировали</th>
<th>премировали</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>__ не рек./простореч.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.0% (22)</td>
<td>29.0% (9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The и/и-labelled variant stress стажироваться was the reported usage of only 7.6 per cent of the informants and only one of the informants used this stress in actual speech. The rest stressed according to the codified norm стажироваться, which can then be concluded to be the implicit norm as well.
Neither does the other  и/и-labelled variant татуйроваться seem to be spread among the speakers. Only 16.0 per cent of the respondents reported usage of this stress variant, which leads to the assumption that the explicit and implicit norms comply for this verb.

**Final stress is the explicit norm ≠ implicit norm**

By some kind of orthoepical irony, the reported usage for the normative нормирова́ть (‘to normalise’) is a mere 29.3 per cent, and as large a percentage as 69.0 claim not to use this stress and believe it is incorrect. Similar results were obtained by Gorба́чев (1974), where 22 per cent used the normative stress нормирова́ть and 78 per cent the доп.-labelled stress норми́ровать.

**Pre-final stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm**

The neologism доти́ровать,280 not listed in dictionaries, except for Skljarevskaja et al. 1998 (Толковый словарь русского языка конца XX в. Языковые изменения)281, was the reported usage of 74.6 per cent of the informants (7.5 per cent invalid replies). This could suggest, as mentioned above, that there is little hesitation in placing the stress of new words on -ирова́ть.

### 4.2.4 Verbs with infinitive on -ить

According to Gorба́чев (1978а:93), 61 per cent of the verbs with an infinitive on -ить have stress on the last syllable and 39 per cent have stress on other syllables. Among these verbs there are two stress change tendencies (Gorба́чев 1978а:92):

1. a general *progressive* tendency moving the stress from the root to the suffix/the thematic vowel by formal analogy: умáлить > умалй́ть;
2. a general *regressive* tendency moving the stress from the suffix to the root or to the vowel of the suffix that is closer to the root: клéйть > клéйть.

Gorба́чев (1978а:92) advances three explanations for the two-way change. Firstly, there is an accentological heterogeneity even within a verbal class and different relations between the components used in word formation. Secondly, there is stress instability in certain forms and, thirdly, the words are of different lengths and the tendency towards stress on one of the central syllables is stronger for polysyllabic words. Apart from these general explanations territorial and other dialects are also said to play a role. One example of this is клéйть, where a general tendency to stress the root (often linked to a noun; here клéй) could be accompanied by a dialect influence. In dictionaries from the 18th and 19th centuries (e.g. Dal’) only the stress клéйть was given and the stress клéйть, first given in a dictionary in 1910, was in Černýšëv (1912:44) said to be typical of southern Russian dialects.

---


281 This stress is given as normative stress and the word is marked as "относительно новое слово (значение); словарные фиксации в пределах описываемого периода" (1998:32). This period refers to 1985–1997 (Skljarevskaja et al. 1998:5).
4.2.4.1 Dictionary data

The data given below apply to both the simplex verb and, if nothing else is mentioned in the footnotes, also to reflexive and prefixed verbs. All variation is between end stress and stem stress, with one exception: the stress -купить is the codified norm and the stress variant -купить is labelled неправ./простореч.

**Stem stress is the codified norm:**


End stress is не рек./простореч.: осведомить — осведомить, уведомить — уведомить, выйжит — выйжит, пригубить — пригубить, приструнить — приструнить, расклёшить — расклёшить.


End stress is доп. устар./устар.: уменьшить — уменьшить (пре-, при-), успокойть — успокойт.

End stress is не рек. устар./устар.: клён — клейт (including prefixed verbs).

**End stress is the codified norm:**


Stem stress is не рек./простореч.: раздвоить/ся/ — раздвоить/ся/, рыхлить — рыхлить, стройть — стройт., торочить — торочить.

Stem stress is доп./разг.: опорожнить/ся/ — опорожнить/ся/, усугубить/ся/ — усугубить/ся/.

---

282 With the prefixes за-, от-, рас-, у- and the particle -ся.
283 The variant is marked разг. in RPP.
284 The variant is marked разг. in RPP.
285 Including verbs with the prefixes на-, по-, при-, пере-, про-, but the end-stressed variants of the verbs перерезать and прочеркнуть are marked и in RPP.
286 In RPP уменьшить is labelled и. Zemskaja & Smelyov (1984:9) mention уменьшить as a typical variant of просторечие keeping archaic stress.
287 But: приклеить/ся/ is не рек. устар. in OS and простореч. in RPP.
288 With the prefixes за-, об-.
289 With the prefixes ве-, пере-.
290 With the prefixes за-, при-.
291 Compare with the verbs with the prefixes с-, у-, where the stresses -двоить and -двоить are equal.
292 = "соединить по три".
293 Also with the prefixes в-, пере- при-. But оторочить is the norm in OS and labelled разг. in RPP and оторочить is the norm according to RPP and labelled не rek in OS.

4.2.4.2 Results

Table 4.2-11. Reported usage and language users’ norm. Percentage of respondents for each category of answers.\(^{295}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress variant examined</th>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>I say it like that myself</th>
<th>I do not say it like that myself</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and I know that it is</td>
<td>and I believe that it is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>correct</td>
<td>correct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>but I do not know</td>
<td>but I do not know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whether it is correct</td>
<td>whether it is incorrect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and I know that it is</td>
<td>and I believe that it is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>correct</td>
<td>incorrect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and I know that it is</td>
<td>and I believe that it is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>incorrect</td>
<td>incorrect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пеpеперхійтþ</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пеpеперхійтþ</td>
<td>доп./и</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>приклійтþ</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>приклійтþ</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>приклійтþ</td>
<td>не рек. уст./про.</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>приклійтþ</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>одолійтþ</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отороchить</td>
<td>норма/раз.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>заклийтþ</td>
<td>и/и</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>усугубиться</td>
<td>доп./раз.</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>осведомиться</td>
<td>не рек./про.</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One conclusion for this group of verbs, with infinitive on -итъ, is that there are cases where the implicit and explicit norm do definitely not coincide (переpерхійтþ, приклійтþ, заклийтþ). Another conclusion is that, judging from contemporary usage and implicit norm, there is no general tendency towards stem stress. This observation is due to the fact that there are such examples as поpеперхійтþ, не рек./устар./простореh. Neither is there – as can be seen in the table below – a tendency towards end stress (or stem stress) by analogy:

Table 4.2-12. Verbs with infinitive on -итъ: patterns in replies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>stem stress</th>
<th>end stress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>explicit norm</td>
<td>non-normative variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>приклійтþ, прийдітþ</td>
<td>заклийтþ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>переpеперхійтþ, прийдітþ</td>
<td>усугубиться</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stem stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm**

The stem stress приклійтþ is the explicit norm, and the implicit norm is undoubtedly the same: an overwhelming majority – 95.3 per cent of the informants – report usage of this stress and only 11.3 per cent report usage of the stress приклійтþ (не рек. устар./простореh). In the oral survey all informants who gave valid replies used the codified stress приклійтþ. Kolesov (1964) also showed prevalence for клійтþ (97.4 per cent; клейтþ 6.2 per cent).\(^{299}\)

\(^{294}\) With the prefixes с-, y- (cf.: раздвоитъ/сая – раздвояйтъ/сай; не рек. устар./простореh).

\(^{295}\) One verb theoretically belonging to this group was included in the oral survey, not as an object of study, but for context in one of the sentences. The results showed that all but one informant used the stress ожесточиться, codified as normative (one stressed ожестоcиться).

\(^{296}\) Two informants say that they do not use this form, but they know it is correct.

\(^{297}\) Norm in OS.

\(^{298}\) Non-normative in RPP.

\(^{299}\) In BAS–1950–1965 both stresses are given as normative.
Table 4.2-13. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>прикленить</th>
<th>приклинеть</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>не рек./устар./простореч.</td>
<td>96.8% (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The stem stress **пришпи́лить** is the explicit and most likely also the implicit norm: 83.9 per cent of the informants report usage, while 12.3 per cent are negative towards it. A variant stress, **пришпи́лить** (**простореч.**), is listed only in RPP.

**Stem stress is the explicit norm ≠ implicit norm**
The stem stress **переперчи́ть** is the explicit norm. Nevertheless, a majority of the informants – 81.1 per cent – are negative towards it, and of these 68.8 per cent believe or know that it is wrong, i.e. are quite convinced of its non-normativity. Only 15.1 per cent say that they use it and believe it is correct. The explicit norm is neither perceived as nor functioning as a norm. The actual norm is the stress **переперчи́ть**, in the handbooks labelled **доп./и** and for which the reported usage was 85.9 per cent.300

Another stem stress being the explicit but not implicit norm is **принуди́ть**, of which only 28.3 per cent of the informants report usage and towards which 65.1 per cent are negative. Yet no variants to this stress are included in the dictionaries used for this study. An indication that the stressing of this word might cause difficulty is its inclusion in the exercises in Rozental' (1994). It is suggested by Krivenko (1995:71) that end stress (**принуди́ть**) is current and the same idea is conveyed by Comrie et al. (1996:90): “For a number of verbs where Avanesov and Ožegov (1959) and Borunova et al. (1983) give only stem-stress, end-stress in the infinitive is in fact common in contemporary speech and verse”.301 Thus, a stress variant that could even be the actual norm is not even listed in the dictionaries, let alone codified as normative.

A third example of a verb with stem stress as explicit but not implicit norm is **освёдоми́ть/са**. The stress variant **освёдоми́ться** (**не рек./простореч.**) was claimed to be used and believed to be correct by a majority – 88.7 per cent – of the informants, and only 10.4 per cent rejected this “incorrect” stress variant. The percentage of informants actually using this stress (**освёдоми́лся**) in speech was 90.3, and a mere 6.5 per cent used the explicit norm **освёдоми́лся**. Kolesov’s 1964 Leningrad survey showed similar results, with a majority reporting usage of/using the end-stressed variant.302

Table 4.2-14. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>осведомился</th>
<th>осведомился</th>
<th>осведомился</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>не рек./простореч.</td>
<td>6.5% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90.3% (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this verb both progressive and regressive tendencies are working at the same time. As Gorbačevič (1978a:94–95) points out, possible influences are the related words **вёдать** and **свёдения** (**освёдоми́ть**), but also **осведоми́ть** and **осведоми́нение** (**освёдоми́ть**). He also claims that this verb is resisting formal analogy (progressive tendencies) towards

---

300 It can also be noted that the label for the variant in RPP (и) shows that this dictionary’s notation is more tolerant towards the variant, but it is anyway number two among the alternative stresses.
301 Reference is made to the verbs **пригубить**, **принудить**, **приструнить**.
302 39.3 per cent for **осведоми́ть**, 59.2 per cent for **осведоми́ться**, 1.5 per cent for **осведоми́ться**.
stress on -ить (1978a:67, 94–95). This is now apparently not the case. Of the two tendencies the progressive one with analogical stress shift is the strongest.

**End stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm**

The results indicate that the end-stressed усугубиться/ся is the implicit as well as the explicit norm, although there is some hesitancy. Elicited usage showed that усугубился was used by 80.6 per cent of the informants and усугубился (доп./разг.) by 12.9 per cent. The reported usage of усугубиться was 22.6 per cent. Although not directly comparable, the results of Kolesov from 1964 go in the same direction, but in his study a larger percentage (41.3) used/reported usage of the stem-stressed variant, although a majority (59.2 per cent) was in favour of the codified stress.

Table 4.2-15. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>усугубился</th>
<th>усугубился</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.6% (25)</td>
<td>12.9% (4)</td>
<td>6.5% (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the codified norm одолжить there appears to be even less hesitancy regarding the correspondence between implicit and explicit norm: 90.6 per cent of the informants reported usage of this stress and believe it is correct.

**End stress is the explicit norm ≠ implicit norm**

The stress оторочить, which is the codified norm in OS and is labelled разг. in RPP, has low reported usage, 15.0 per cent, and as many as 83.0 per cent are negative towards this form. The stress оторочиться, which in RPP is considered normative, is labelled не рек. in OS. From the results of the written part of the survey it can be assumed that this stem-stressed variant is the one that the speakers prefer. The findings of the oral part of the survey indicate that this assumption is correct: only five out of 31 informants – 16.1 per cent – use the stress оторочить and a majority – 80.6 per cent – use the stress оторочиться. From this it can be concluded that the implicit norm is оторочить which complies with the explicit norm of RPP, but not of OS.\(^{303}\)

Table 4.2-16. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>оторочить</th>
<th>оторочиться</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма/разг.</td>
<td>не рек./норма</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.1% (5)</td>
<td>80.6% (25)</td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The stresses заклинить and заклинился are considered equal in the sources, with заклиниться mentioned in the first place. The survey results indicate that in the implicit norm these variant stresses are far from equal. A large majority – 93.4 per cent of the informants – reported usage of заклиниться, and the results of the oral part, where all the informants used the /i/-labelled stress заклинило and no one the first listed stress заклинило, confirm that the implicit norm is заклинился.\(^{304}\)

---

\(^{303}\) This stress is also the norm in BTS–1998. See Chapter 6.

\(^{304}\) In the oral part of the survey the form заклинило was given, i.e. not the infinitive. Anyway it can be assumed that a person is likely to use the same stress in заклинило and заклинился. (The forms are here quoted without accents as it was in that way that they were presented in the survey.)
Table 4.2-17. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>zakliniyo</th>
<th>zaklinilo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>н/н</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>100.0% (31)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.5 Verbs with infinitive on -нуть

4.2.5.1 Dictionary data

End stress is the codified norm


Stem stress is н/н. рыкнуть – рыкнуть, юркнуть – юркнуть.

End stress is the codified norm


End stress is не рек./простореч.: ка́шлянуть – кашлянуть, -впрьгнуть – впрягнуть, подпрыгнуть – подпрыгнуть. 309

End stress is доп./разг.: бултьхнуть/ся/ – бултьхнуть/ся/.

End stress is доп. устар./устар. (etc.): подвигнуть – подвижнуть, прыгнуть – прыгнуть, 311 вспрыгнуть – вспрыгнуть (устар. и поэт.). 312

---

305 With the prefixes от-, с-.
306 With the prefixes от-, с-.
307 Cf. преминуть – преминуть (неправ./простореч.). The stresses ми́нуть and ми́нуть are in Černyšëv (1912:45) considered more or less equally acceptable.
308 Cf. ми́нуть – ми́нуть (доп./разг.).
309 Cf. the simplex прыгнуть – прыгнуть and with the prefixes пере-, and с- (устар.); cf. also вспрыгнуть – вспрыгнуть (устар. и поэт.).
310 доп. in OS and н in RPP.
311 Also with the prefixes пере- and с-.
312 Cf. впрьгнуть, подпрыгнуть, labelled простореч.
4.2.5.2 Results

Table 4.2-18. Reported usage and language users’ norm. Percentage of respondents for each category of answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress variant examined</th>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>I say it like that myself</th>
<th>I do not say it like that myself</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and I know that it is correct</td>
<td>and I believe that it is correct but I do not know whether it is correct</td>
<td>but I know that it is incorrect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>подпрыгнуть</td>
<td>/пр.</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>спрыгнуть</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>бутлыкнуться</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were few words investigated in this relatively small group of verbs, therefore no general conclusions can be drawn, only conclusions for certain groups of lexemes. However, it is plausible that a larger sample of verbs might have shown that the stress placement in this group is – as in many other groups – arbitrary.

**Stem stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm**

Two verbs with the stem -пыгнуть were included in the survey. The variant подпрыгнуть, labelled простореч. and listed only in RPP, was the reported usage of only 1.8 per cent, and the stress спрыгнуть, codified as norm, was the reported usage of 96.3 per cent. The variant спрыгнуть is listed only in RPP with the label “obsolete” (устар.) (cf. подпрыгнуть, which is простореч.). Here it could be assumed that the end-stressed variants of verbs with this stem have low usage, regardless of their labels, and that the explicit norm coincides with the implicit.

**Stem stress is the explicit norm ≠ implicit norm**

Among the -нуть-verbs that according to the sources bear stem stress in the infinitive there was also one example of a verb for which the explicit norm, бутлыкнуться, which was the reported usage of only 24.5 per cent of the informants, is apparently not the same as the implicit norm.

4.2.6 Verbs with infinitive on -овать

4.2.6.1 Dictionary data

**End stress is the codified norm**

**Stem stress is */простореч.: колядовать – колядовать.**

**Stem stress is не рек./простореч.: баловать/ся – баловать/ся/ (unprefixed verb and with the prefixes из-, на-, по-, раз-).**

**Stem stress is не рек. устар./устар.: салютовать – салютовать (also with the prefix от-).**

**Stem stress is the codified norm**

**End stress is неправ./простореч.: соболезновать – соболезновать.**

**End stress is доп. устар./устар.: пёрвенствовать – первенствовать.**
Another type of stress variation is found in between the codified normative stress ходатайствовать and its variant ходатайствоватъ marked грубо неправ. in OS and простореч. in RPP.313

4.2.6.2 Results

Table 4.2-19. Reported usage and language users' norm. Percentage of respondents for each category of answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress variant examined</th>
<th>I say it like that myself</th>
<th>I do not say it like that myself</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and I know that it is correct</td>
<td>and I believe that it is correct</td>
<td>but I do not know whether it is correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>баловаться</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>балуешься</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ходатайствовать</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End stress is the explicit norm ≠ implicit norm

For the verb баловаться the results of the present – and other – investigations indicate a conspicuous incongruity between the implicit and the explicit norm. For the explicit norm баловаться 38.7 per cent reported usage and believed it to be correct, while a majority – 58.5 per cent – said that they do not use it and do not believe it is correct. For the present tense explicit norm балуешься the figures were quite similar: 36.8 and 59.5 per cent respectively. The results of the oral survey – the performance test – confirm that the explicit norm has little support among the speakers: only two out of 31 informants (6.5 per cent) used the stress баловаться, while баловался (не рек.простореч.) was used by 93.5 per cent. Similarly, two out of 31 informants (remarkably enough not the same two as for баловаться) stressed балуешься, and 93.5 per cent used the stress балуешься, considered не рек.простореч. in the sources.

Earlier surveys have given results in line with this. In Горбаčevič (1974) the distribution was баловать 21.1 per cent – баловать 78.9 per cent; in Kolesov (1964) баловать 35.6 per cent – баловать 64.9 per cent and балуешься 29.1 per cent – балуешься 77.1 per cent.314 To sum up, the figures for reported usage of the stress баловать/ся etc., non-normative according to the sources, are over 60 per cent in three different surveys made during the period 1964–1997 in Moscow and Leningrad. Current actual usage is even higher (here over 90 per cent), while the figures of reported usage for the traditional norm баловать/ся etc. are considerably lower (between 29.1 and 38.7 per cent, the highest figures being found in the present survey), and current actual usage even lower than that: below 10 per cent.

Vacillation and variation in this verb is no innovation. It existed in the 19th-century dictionaries (e.g. Dal’). This stress might be an influence from Ukrainian and Byelorussian, where standard stress is on the first syllable.315 It is also found in early 19th-century poets (Voroncova 1979:250). In Černyšëv (1912:33) the variant баловать is included as admissible. It is conceivable that this stress is quite widespread in contemporary speech (see Горбаčevič 1978а:97 and Voroncova 1979:250–251). It is thus remarkable that this has not been reflected in codification and that the stress variant that is – at least alongside

---

313 This applies to the unprefixed verb and to the verbs with the prefixes не-, по-, and shows that RPP is somewhat more lenient towards the variant.
314 Kolesov (1964): баловать 1.5 per cent.
the other form – the *de facto* norm and which is likely to have been so for several decades is so severely condemned that it is labelled не рекомендуется and просторечное.

Table 4.2-20. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>баловался</th>
<th>баловался</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>не рек./простореч.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5% (2)</td>
<td>93.5% (29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2-21. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>балуешься</th>
<th>балуешься</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>не рек./простореч.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5% (2)</td>
<td>93.5% (29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other types of stress variation where explicit norm = implicit norm**

The explicit norm *ходатайствовать* is the reported usage of 55.8 per cent while 40.5 per cent say they do not use this stress. This verb is interesting as it is one of the few with a variant (*ходатайствовать*) as severely assessed as грубо неправ./простореч. Even if a majority of the informants more often than not report using the norm, they do as a group demonstrate norm insecurity: 22.6 per cent “know” that the codified normative stress is “incorrect” (cf. with the 20.8 per cent who “know” that it is correct).

4.2.7 Verbs with infinitive on -ять

4.2.7.1 Dictionary data

Verbs on *блёять* (also with the prefixes за-, про-) have a variant *блёять* that is labelled не рек. устар./устар. and the verb *вечёратъ* (also with the prefix по-) has a variant *вечёратъ*, labelled и.

4.2.7.2 Results

Table 4.2-22. Reported usage and language users’ norm. Percentage of respondents for each category of answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentages (%)</th>
<th>I say it like that myself</th>
<th>I do not say it like that myself</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stress variant examined</td>
<td>Notation</td>
<td>and I know that it is correct</td>
<td>and I believe that it is correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>проблеять</td>
<td>не рек. устар./устар.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stem stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm**

Only one verb was included in the survey and for this one the explicit norm (*по*блёять) appears to coincide with the implicit: 89.6 per cent of the informants reject the end-stressed archaic проблеять and only 7.6 per cent of the informants claim to use it.

4.3 Verbs with variation in the present/future form

Variation in this group is often due to the influence between mobile and fixed stress or between different types of mobile stress (Es’kova 1994:428) and generally pertains to all personal forms in the present/future paradigm except 1sg, although there are a few instances of variation in 1sg. When variation occurs in 1sg that form will be listed, and when variation occurs in 2sg–3pl it will be represented by the 3sg form as customary in dictionaries.
There are two overall tendencies in the verbs with variation in the present/future stress patterns: in verbs with infinitive on -ить there is a recessive tendency and a tendency towards more mobile stress, in the groups with other infinitive endings there is a progressive tendency and a tendency – not strong – towards fixed stress on the ending (Nen'ko 1984a:198–199).

4.3.1 Verbs with infinitive on -ать

4.3.1.1 Dictionary data

**Stem stress is the codified norm**

End stress is /

End stress is "/устар.: догонят – догони́т, попри́держит – попри́держит.

**End stress is the codified norm**

Stem stress is /

End stress is /

Stem stress is "/разг.: прецепи́лъ – прецепи́лъ.

4.3.1.2 Results

Table 4.3-1. Reported usage and language users’ norm. Percentage of respondents for each category of answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress variant examined</th>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>I say it like that myself</th>
<th>I do not say it like that myself</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and I know that it is correct</td>
<td>and I believe that it is correct</td>
<td>but I do not know whether it is correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>дополнять</td>
<td>/простореч.</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**End stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm**

Only one form was tested in this group: дополнять etc., labelled простореч., included in RPP, but not in OS.

Reported usage is quite low for the variant investigated – 17.1 per cent – so it can be assumed that explicit and implicit norms coincide, but as this variant seems to be used to some extent, it appears justified to include it in stress handbooks.

4.3.2 Verbs with infinitive on -еть

4.3.2.1 Dictionary data

**Prefix stress is the codified norm**

End stress is /и: при́зрит – призри́т.

**Stem stress is the codified norm**


---

316 The variation in this group is only listed in RPP.
317 Cf. узреть below.
End stress is the codified norm

Stem stress is _/простореч.: велі́т – вё́лит.
Prefix stress is _/простореч.: затрё́т – зэтрет.
Prefix stress is доп. устар./устар.: узрё́т – ўзэ́рит.318

4.3.2.2 Results
No verb from this group was included in the survey.

4.3.3 Verbs with infinitive on -ить
As the group with infinitives on -ить is the largest group with stress variation in the present/future forms, and as quite a lot of attention has been paid to it compared to other groups, there will be more details and introductory remarks for these verbs than for most others.

In the presentation of dictionary data for this group only the simplex forms will generally be listed. If the prefixed verbs have other labels this is mentioned in the footnotes.

4.3.3.1 Stress patterns
Among second conjugation verbs three stress patterns can be discerned:

- Stress falls on the stem: These verbs are generally denominal verbs with originally rising/acute intonation on the root (Pirogova 1959a:114). This group is growing due to the addition of verbs with previously mobile stress or fixed end stress.

- Stress falls on the desinence/ending: These verbs – stressed on the thematic vowel in the infinitive – are created from nouns with a short or circumflected stem vowel or from old oxytones (Pirogova 1959a:114). In the 16th and 17th centuries many verbs belonged to this group, but the number of verbs with this stress is decreasing.

- Stress shifts from one syllable to the other (mobile stress): This applies to verbs that have end stress in the first person singular only and stem stress in the other forms. They are created from verbs of iterative or causative meanings: поить, носить (Pirogova 1959a:114). In the infinitive they are stressed on the thematic vowel (Pirogova 1963:88). According to Ingram (1979:243) the relative distribution of these stress patterns is the following (based on Ož&Šv–1972):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fixed stem stress</th>
<th>Fixed desinence/end stress</th>
<th>Mobile stress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.4 %</td>
<td>46.3 %</td>
<td>11.3 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This can be compared to the figures given by Voroncova (1979:230):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fixed stem stress</th>
<th>Fixed desinence/end stress</th>
<th>Mobile stress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>550</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.4 %</td>
<td>40.0 %</td>
<td>7.6 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

318 Cf. призрётъ above. As for the stem -зрётъ it is assessed differently together with the two prefixes: for призрё́тъ the stresses призрё́т (listed first) and призрё́т are considered equal (labelled i/i) from a normative and stylistic point of view, but for узрё́тъ the normative stress in the present/future form is on the ending: узрё́тъ. Prefix stress узрё́тъ is qualified as доп. устар./устар. Cf. Voroncova (1979:196–197) who claims that mobile stress remains the norm for узрё́тъ.

319 For a detailed account of the relationship between stress in nouns and verbs see Red'kin (1965).
320 Out of which more than 50 have vacillation according to Voroncova.
321 Out of which more than 30 have vacillation according to Voroncova.
All newly created words belong to one of two groups: with fixed stress on the ending or with fixed stress on the stem (Voroncova 1996:311–312). Mobile stress is generally unproductive, but this group is growing mainly on account of verbs with fixed end stress (Comrie et al. 1996:87, Voroncova 1996:312). This process of re-distribution from one group to another started in the 18th century (Nen'ko 1982:63).

4.3.3.2 Historical background and dialects

The accentological system of the standard language was formed on the basis of northern dialects, characterised by end stress. This northern Russian influence on the accentological system is more and more apparent the further one goes back in history. Up to the 19th century verbs belonging to this conjugation almost exclusively bore end stress in the present tense (see Slovar′–1847; for further examples see Gorbačevič 1971:46). The moving of stress from ending to stem had already begun during the second half of the 19th century and reached a peak of intensity before 1900 (Nen'ko 1984a:53).

One example of the typical course of change of stress pattern and norm as described in Chapter 2.3.4 (see also Ickovič 1968:48, Vvedenskaja & Červinskij 1997:178) is the verb дружить in the present tense:

Table 4.3-2. Normative notation for the stresses дру́жи́ть in sources from the 1840s to the 1990s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>норма</th>
<th>дру́жи́ть</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slovar′–1847</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>дру́жи́ть</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Оgiенко–1914</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>дру́жи́ть</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Уšakov–1935–1940</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>дру́жи́ть</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS–1950–1965</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>в просторечии</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;O–1960</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>и допустимо</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAS–1957–1961</td>
<td>и (number 1)</td>
<td>и (number 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;Z–1970</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OŽ&amp;Šv–1972</td>
<td>и (number 1)</td>
<td>и (number 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorbačevič–1973</td>
<td>устаревающее</td>
<td>норма</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;Z–1984</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPP–1996</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS–1997</td>
<td>допустимо устаревающее</td>
<td>норма</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTS–1998</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the past two or three centuries, particularly from the second half of the 19th century on, the influence of southern dialects on the accentological system of the standard language has become stronger (Nen'ko 1984a:52, Pirogova 1959a:117–118, Voroncova 1979:226–227).

End stress is typical of northern Russian dialects and stem stress of southern Russian dialects (cf. Gorbačevič 1971:48–49, Pirogova 1959a:113). In southern Russian dialects verbs like валить, варить, губить, дарить, донить, звонить, косить, круить, пилить, поить, положить, садить, солить, тащить and шутить are used with mobile stress only, while northern dialects keep the fixed end stress, and transient stress types are found in the middle parts and in the north-west of Russia (Pirogova 1967:17). Thus the influence of the southern Russian dialects implies either that the number of mobile stresses has increased or that stress has stabilised on the root morpheme (Pirogova 1967:17).322

322 Pirogova (1967:17) advances the theory that mobile stress in verbs like косит′ – косу′ – косит is a temporary, although not a short, stage in the development towards stem stress, where the course of development can be drawn like this: in the 18th century there was fixed end stress, then mobile stress, and for quite some time fixed stem stress has been the norm (e.g. красит′ – кра́шу – крásи́ть, and also значить, бросить, разрушить, продолжить, жарить and похотить).
Comrie et al. (1996:88–89) agree that this is “evidence of the eastern and southern dialects encroaching on the north-western standard”:

The role of southern dialect influence is particularly clear here because the effect of this change is to increase the amount of stress alternation within the paradigm, rather than to reduce it, as has been the case in most of the stress changes examined earlier in this chapter. The southern dialect influence has here been a much more potent factor than analogical levelling. (Comrie et al. 1996:89)

However, there is no general agreement among researchers as to the significance of the southern Russian stress influence. Gorbačevič (1978а:101), for instance, is quite sceptical towards the southern stress influence – both in the present/future and in the preterite – and not at all as convinced as Pirogova and Comrie et al.

### 4.3.3.3 Current tendencies

It has been shown that the general tendency in this group is for the number of verbs with mobile stress and fixed stem stress to increase, while the number of verbs with fixed end stress decreases. At the same time more and more verbs show variation and there is a stabilisation in verbs that have for a long time shown variation.

The conclusions of Nen'ko (1984b:10) are that

(a) An increasing number of verbs have mobile stress: городи́ть > горо́дишь, дразни́ть > дра́знишь.

(b) In verbs that previously showed variation the variants with fixed end stress are disappearing: гру́зи́ть > гру́зишь.

(c) The so-called рецессивный сдвиг ударения gives new variants: долбийшь > дольбийшь.

(d) Stress changes in the other direction are few and irregular: зубри́ть > зубри́шь, кровото́чить > кровоточи́ть, руково́дишь > руково́дишь, сори́шь > сори́шь, свё́рлишь > сверли́шь.

(e) The semantic specialisation of some stress variants (валить, катить, мутить, чинить) is gradually disappearing. Nen'ko (1984а:69) sees it as “somewhat exaggerated”\(^\text{323}\). (See also Gorbačevič 1978а:103, Voroncova 1979:218–222. Cf. Agrell 1917.)

(f) Forms with mobile stress, an influence from простоя́ и dialects that was approved of in the dictionaries of the 1920–30s (e.g. Ušakov), now generally have fixed stress: ре́зви́ть > ре́звийшь, повто́рить > повтори́ть, ше́влеть > шевел́ить.\(^\text{324}\)

Depending on where they are in this process unprefixed verbs of this conjugation can be divided into three groups (Nen'ko 1984а:69–70): (1) The move of the stress one syllable closer to the beginning of the word has been made or is in its last stage. (2) This process has been going on for a while but the result is not clear. (3) The shift has just started.

Which of these three groups a particular verb belongs to can hinge on frequency in so far as there is more often mobile stress in words with wide usage (wide spheres of usage)

---

\(^{323}\) “Вообще суждение о строгой зависимости места ударения от лексического значения представляется несколько преувеличенным” (Nen'ko 1984а:69).

\(^{324}\) Whether they have actually stabilised can be discussed. Their “normative fate” is quite different as can be seen from contemporary sources. For ре́звийшь no variant is given in contemporary sources (in Ušakov–1935–1940 the variant ре́звийшь was listed as простоя́, устар.) so it is probable that ре́звийшь is the only variant used. For повтори́ть, on the other hand, there is a variant повтори́ть labelled не рек. and the stress шевел́ить has an alternative шёвлить labelled as доп. in OS and as и in RPP and which has rather high actual and reported usage.
Moreover, the number of syllables and the rhythm can play a role as trisyllabic verbs, according to Gorbačevič (1978a:102), are more prone to change towards mobility.

Style and stylistics also play a role as mobile stress is more characteristic of the everyday lexicon while more bookish words have the traditional fixed end stress (Gorbačevič 1978a:101).

As for the significance of the prefixes for the accentuation, Voroncova (1979:212 ff.) asserts that the majority of prefixed verbs do not differ from unprefixed verbs insofar as stress change in them goes in the same direction. Nen'ko does not agree: the majority of unprefixed and prefixed verbs with the same root have, in the dictionaries investigated by her, divergences in the accentuation of present/future tense (1984a:71). She explains the difficulties in studying the role of the prefixes in the accentuation of present-tense forms with the facts that (1) in one single dictionary there can be differences in stress between on the one hand unprefixed and prefixed verbs, and on the other prefixed verbs with the same stem: глуши́ть, заглуши́ть, переглуши́ть (Nen'ko's examples from Ušakov–1935–1940); (2) a check of the same prefixed verbs in different dictionaries gives evidence of at least a certain “arbitrariness” if not errors. Cf. Ušakov–1935–1940: постро́ить, обстро́ить and BAS–1950–1965: постро́ить и -стро́ить, обстро́ить; (3) a comparison of verbs with different stems and the same prefix makes it difficult to study the role of the prefix in the accentuation of one or the other word form (Nen'ko 1984a:73 ff.).

In face of the difficulties involved in analysing the role of the prefix, Nen'ko draws some – very general – conclusions (1984a:81–82): verbs with the prefix пере- do more often retain fixed stress or vacillating stress with a prevalence of end stress; verbs with the prefixes про-, под-, при- have vacillating stress but they often have mobile stress in the first place; verbs with the prefixes по- and на- have variation but generally the variant with mobile stress is listed in the first place.

4.3.3.4 Dictionary data

Most, although not all, verbs with this type of variation are stressed on the ending in the infinitive (-ить).

Stem stress is the codified norm


325 RPP has a predilection for this type of variation: вárить – варить and several of the variants are only mentioned in RPP.
326 уласить, могласить (/устар. и возв.), погласить (/устар. и возв.).
327 подарить (доп. устар./и), отдарить (доп./разг.).
328 приколотить (/разг.).
329 вскоромить (/устар. и поэт.).
330 совокупить норм, совокупить (/разг.).
331 перекусить, прокусить, укусить (/устар.). Cf. покуситься норм, покуситься (/простореч.).
332 влепить (/разг.).
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End stress is _/разг.: ұзит – ұзит.

End stress is доп./и: солит – солит.


333 положйтся (_/и), ложжится потгм, ложжится (_/простореч.).
334 сломйт (_/устар. и книж.), вломйтся (_/разг.).
335 струйт (_/устар. и книж.).
336 переманит (доп. устар./и).
337 вменйт погм, вмйнт (неправ./простореч.).
338 поплатйться (_/разг.).
339 Labelled _/устар. и книж.
340 упростйт (_/устар. и книж.).
341 осадйт норм, осадйт (_/доп./разг.); отсадйт not included in OS, norm in RPP; отсдйт norm in OS, разг. in RPP.
342 рассердйт (_/разг.).
343 пристрелйт (_/устар. и книж.), прострелйт (_/устар.).
344 переустройт (_/устар. возм.).
345 переструйт (_/и).
346 With the prefixes пере-, пере-, под-, при- and у-. But: проступис (_/устар. и книж.); струйт погм, стйт (_/и).
347 приотпрйт (_/устар. и книж.), припрйт (_/и).
348 протопйт (_/устар. и книж.).
349 сосредоточйт (_/простореч.), сточйт (_/и), кровоточйт погм, кровоточйт (неправ./_).
350 спохватйтся (_/устар. и книж.).
351 отпеляйт (_/разг.), седлйт (_/и).
352 отпйт (_/разг.).
353 отчертйт (_/разг.).
354 подчинйт (_/простореч.).
355 отштйтся (_/разг.).
356 в "срезать косой, косилкой".
357 вкйсит norm in OS and разг. in RPP, вкйсит norm in RPP and labelled и in OS.
358 поволочйт, подволочйт (и/разг.).
359 огородйт is norm in OS and разг. in RPP, огородйт is the norm in RPP and labelled и in OS.
360 The stresses отзубрит, подзубрит, позубрит are the norm in OS and labelled разг. in RPP. Normative in RPP are отзубрит, подзубрит, позубрит, which in OS are labelled и. For the stress прозубрит the two
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---

dictionaries agree that it is the norm and прозубрі́т is labelled н/н. The stresses зазубрі́т and иззубрі́т are listed only in OS with зазубрі́т and иззубрі́т as variants labelled н/−.

361 окружит norm, окру́жит (не рек./простореч.).
362 With the prefixes do-, от-, под-, про-, о-, у-. The variant напоит is in RPP listed as number two, while it is listed first in OS. The variant нойт is labelled і/устар. і книжн. and попойт і/кинн. The stresses опоит and перепоит are the norm in OS and раср. in RPP, опоит and перепоит are labelled н in OS and are the norm in RPP. The variant вспоит is labelled до/−.
363 порядит (і/устар.), обряжит/св., перераху́йт, подзарядит, разрядит ([у/устар.), Ср: перераху́йт norm, перера́дит ([/растр.), снарядит норм, сна́ряді́т ([/простореч.), переснарядит норм, пересна́ряді́т ([/простореч.).
364 подсветит, просветит, светить ([у/устар.).
365 The simplex verb and with the prefixes do-, на-, под-, про-. The stresses оксобі́т, пособі́т, сособі́т, от скобі́т are the norm in OS but раср. in RPP. The end stress for these is labelled н in OS and is the norm in RPP.
366 With the prefixes за-, при-. The stress отслоні́т is norm in OS and раср. in RPP, отслоні́т is labelled н in OS and norm in RPP.
367 With the prefix по- the two stresses are equal in both sources, while the unprefixed verb стороні́ться is the norm in OS and раср. in RPP. The end stress is labelled н in OS and norm in RPP.
368 обстрочит is the norm in OS, labelled раср. in RPP, обстрочит is the norm in RPP and labelled н in OS.
369 наделит, оделит, определит/св., перераспределит/св., подразделит, распределит/св., удели́т.
370 Вут: распределит/св/ (неправ./раср.). Ср: доделит, отделит, переделит, поделит ([/устар.).
371 вклолит (неправ./раср.).
372 кріві́т, перекашувати; скашувати, втілювати в думку (о його уяві).

Stem stress is _/разг._ (variation in the 1sg): смежу – смéжу.

Stem stress is и/в: блудит – блу́дит, поглотит – поглотит. 385

A few stems show no overall pattern for stress vacillation and will therefore be listed separately (codified norm listed first, then variant with label): -будить: пробудить/ся/ – пробудить/ся/ (и/в), пробудить – пробудить (_/устар.), возбудить – возбудить (_/простореч.);
-водить: вóдит – водит (_/устар.), руководить/ся/ – руководить/ся/ (не рек. устар./ простореч.);
-кутить: покутить – покутить (_/устар.), покутить – покутить (_/и); -лениться: полёнось – полёнось (_/простореч.), полёниться is the norm in OS but labelled разг.in RPP and полени́ться is the norm in OS and labelled и in RPP and препоручить is the norm in RPP and not listed in OS. Cf. препоручить – перепоручить (_/устар.), поручить – поручить (_/устар.), перепоручу – перепоручу (_/простореч.);
-skочить: соскочить – соскочить (_/и), перескочить – перескочить (_/устар.);
-слу́нить: слонить – слонить (_/простореч.), обслонить – обслонить (_/разг.); -су́лить: су́лить – су́лить (_/разг.), посу́лить – посу́лить (_/простореч.); -тру́дить: нату́дить is the norm in OS, but considered простореч. in RPP (in RPP this applies to the infinitive нату́дить and the whole paradigm) while the stress нату́дить is labelled и in OS and seen as normative in RPP. Cf. перетру́дить – перетрудить (и/в), потрудиться

377 затру́бит (не рек./разг.).
378 подвалить (и/в), ввалить, взвалить, обвалить, перевалить, повалить, провалить, свалить (_/устар.) with stem stress as the codified norm.
379 откrestиться, скреститься. Cf. искрестить, крестить, окрестить, перекрестить (_/устар.) with stem stress as the codified norm.
380 поместить/ся/ (доп./разг.), заместить/ся/ (не рек./разг.), умёстить/ся/ (не рек./разг.), переместить/ся/ (не рек./простореч.), вместить/ся/ (неправ./простореч.), возместить (_/простореч.).
381 помутить (_/простореч.).
382 спалить norm, спалить (_/книж.).
383 селить/ся/ is the norm in OS and книж. in RPP, селить/се/ is labelled доп. in OS and is the norm in RPP.
384 расшевелить (доп./разг.), пошевелить, шевелить, шевелиться (доп./и).
385 поглотить (и/разг.). But: проглотить is the norm and проглотить is устар. in RPP, not listed in OS.
тупить: тупи́ть — тупи́ть (устар.), отупи́ть — отупи́ть (и/и), перетупи́ть — перетупи́ть (и/и), притупи́ть — притупи́ть (и/и); -хоронить: хорони́ть — хорони́ть (и/и), перехорони́ть — перехорони́ть (устар.), похорони́ть — похорони́ть (устар.); the stress схорони́ть is the norm in OS and labelled и in RPP, while the norm in RPP is схорони́ть, a stress not listed at all in OS.
### 4.3.3.5 Results

Table 4.3-3. Reported usage and language users' norm. Percentage of respondents for each category of answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress variant examined</th>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>I say it like that myself</th>
<th>I do not say it like that myself</th>
<th>I say it like that myself</th>
<th>I do not say it like that myself</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>переключиться</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отказывать</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>включить</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>выключить</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>заключить</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>шевелиться</td>
<td>доп./в</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>шевеление</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>шевелить</td>
<td>доп./в</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>сорить</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>сорить</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>сознаваться</td>
<td>доп./в</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>вызывать</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>вызывать</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>звонить</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>звонить</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>навойт</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пойт</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>со́бывать</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>соли́ть</td>
<td>доп./в</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>не́должно́ть</td>
<td>доп./в</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>сольть</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>присла́нень</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>заслана́ть</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отслаго́ть</td>
<td>норма/норма</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>заморить</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>задрало́ть</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>морить</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>затягивать</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>заво́йть</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отсдать</td>
<td>не норма/норма</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>прелья́ть</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отслать</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>дразни́ть</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>постёлеть</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>доньт</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>зарядить</td>
<td>доп./устар.</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>сла́щать</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>протяну́чь</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>проруба́ть</td>
<td>доп./в</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>промани́ть</td>
<td>доп./устар./устар.</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>перестелёй</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>притя́брыть</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>винить</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>скользьть</td>
<td>доп./н/</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>соскользьть</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>строчь́ть</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>строчь́ть</td>
<td>доп./н/</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>поместяться</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>поместиться</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>послешь́ть</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>поселиться</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>расплёдиться</td>
<td>доп./в</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>разделить</td>
<td>доп./н/</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>опозда́ть</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кровоточи́ть</td>
<td>доп./н/</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кровоточи́ть</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table shows the results of the questionnaire of reported usage and beliefs about norms for this group of verbs. The verbs are grouped according to stems as verbs with variation in the present with the same stems seem to have much in common (compared to, for instance, verbs with variation in the preterite forms).

It is worth pointing out that the informants do not report usage of the stresses переключит and отключит to such a high degree and that they are so sure that these stresses – considered normative by the handbooks – are “wrong”. The reported usage and belief about normativity for these variants is on a par with, for instance, the variant позво́ним, labelled не рек./постороч. Other forms which the informants are quite sure are incorrect and for which they do not report usage are затво́рит, глушит, приотворо́рит, посели́шь (all normative according to the handbooks), отсадит (normative in RPP, but not in OS), дозво́нью (нек./постороч.), зво́нит (не рек./постороч.), противоро́чит, разде́лйт (both non-normative and not listed in the main sources; examples from Lapteva), распреде́лйт (неправ./постороч.), соскобли́шь (norm in OS, разг. in RPP), солит and недосолит (both доп./и).

In contrast, the stress variants which the informants are most sure are correct and for which a large proportion report usage are дра́знй, перестело́, опреде́лйт, зво́нит (all normative according to the sources), сокобли́шь (и/и), строчи́шь (и/и), посели́шь, переме́рит (both доп./разг.), кровото́чит (неправ./и) and вкло́нйшь (labelled неправ./ разг.).

The stresses which have the highest figures in the column “I say it like that myself, but I know that it is incorrect” are вкло́нйшь (codified norm), созво́ннымся (не рек./постороч.) and зво́нит (codified norm). The fact that among these can be found both codified norms and, according to the normative works, non-normative stresses is an indication of a certain “norm instability”.

**Stem stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm**

**доить**

The explicit norm до́ит (which has a variant stress до́йт, labelled и, listed only in OS) has high reported usage: 82.1 per cent. Other surveys also show prevalence for the stem-stressed forms, codified as normative. Voroncova (1956) до́йшь 74.2 per cent, до́йшь 25.8 per cent, and Pirogova (1967) до́ит 76.0 per cent.386 Apparently, stem stress is the explicit and implicit norm.

**зарядить**

Reported usage of the variant stress заряди́т (и/устар.) is 46.2 per cent (50.9 per cent reported non-usage). In Kolesov’s investigation (1964) usage of this stress (заряди́т) was 67.6 per cent. Stem stress (заряди́т) is the codified norm of both dictionaries. While заряди́т was not included in the present survey it was used by 50.6 per cent in RJaSO (1963) and by 31.9 per cent in Kolesov (1964).387 Seemingly, there is no distinct implicit norm and these forms are probably seen as quite equal. As the end-stressed variant is quite widespread and is thus most likely not to be perceived as obsolete by the informants, the label in OS (и) seems more appropriate than the one in RPP (устар.).

**-манить**

The end-stressed variant поманит (доп. устар./устар.) is the reported usage of 12.3 per cent. The unprefixed verb was included in Voroncova’s 1956 survey in which the stem-stressed

---

386 Pirogova generally gives the result for only one of the variants.
387 Kolesov (1964): зарядит 0.5 per cent.
variant манівþ was used by 82.9 per cent and the end-stressed манйвþ by 17.1 per cent of the informants. It can be noted that at that time the assessment of the end stress was the same as today (устар. in A&O–1960). Thus end stress is – and was in the 1960s – obsolescent/obsolete and the explicit and implicit norm is stem stress.

-поить
As mentioned above the labels for the stresses of verbs on -поить are very heterogeneous. The stem-stressed перепойт is the norm in OS, labelled разр. in RPP and the reported usage for this variant is 43.4 per cent (non-usage 52.9 per cent). The end-stressed variant напоит is the norm in RPP and labelled i in OS, and like the other stress variant it has quite evenly distributed replies: reported usage 49.1 per cent, non-usage 46.2 per cent.

The end-stressed пойт (и/устар. и книжн.) was claimed to be used by 28.3 per cent (67.0 per cent reported non-usage). In actual speech all informants used the stem-stressed codified norm and no one the end-stressed variant. Although additional material would be needed for drawing conclusions regarding the verbs containing this stem, tentative conclusions would be that codification is not uniform within one source (as verbs with one stem but different prefixes are labelled differently), it is not uniform between the sources, both stress variants are accepted and stem stress is more current than end stress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>норма</th>
<th>пойт</th>
<th>Инвалд</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96.8% (30)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

противоречить
While Lapteva (1990b) gives противоречит as a possible stress mistake, the dictionaries list no variants of the codified norm противоречит. The question is whether this stress variant is current. The results of the survey show that this is not so, as only 4.6 per cent say they use it and 90.6 per cent report non-usage. Accordingly, the implicit and explicit norm is противоречит.

-садить
In OS the norm is the stem-stressed отсадит, in RPP assessed as разр. The stress отсадйт is given as the norm in RPP, and is not mentioned at all in OS. This stress отсадйт, however, has very low reported usage: 8.4 per cent, so it is likely that the implicit norm is отсадйт, which coincides with the explicit norm of OS and other dictionaries. The normative notation of RPP in this case deviates both from the explicit norm as given in other dictionaries and from the implicit norm as found in the survey results.

-слонить
For the stress прислонйвþ, normative in codification, 33.9 per cent of the informants report usage, while 62.3 per cent say that they do not use it. Elicited usage, however, shows that a majority, 61.3 per cent, actually used the explicit norm прислонйвþ and 38.7 per cent the “equal” variant (и/и) прислонйвþ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>норма</th>
<th>прислонйвþ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61.3% (19)</td>
<td>38.7% (12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the form прислонйвþ the explicit and implicit stress norm appears to be the same – stem stress. The different results of reported usage and elicited usage are probably due to the fact
that the informants use and accept both stresses, which are after all (according to the hand-
boks) “equally” acceptable. Voroncova’s survey (1956) showed results similar to those of
the elicited usage in the present investigation: прислониться 66.2 per cent, прислониться 33.8.

The codified norm заслонить had 26.5 per cent reported usage (72.7 per cent non-usage),
while the stress заслонить (и/и) had higher reported usage: 70.8 per cent (24.6 per cent non-
usage). Pirogova (1967) also investigated this verb, and the codified normative stresses заслонить and заслониться were used by 46.7 per cent and 52.0 per cent respectively.

The stress variant отклонить, which in OS is considered normative and in RPP marked раз., was the reported usage of a minority of the informants – 17.0 per cent (79.3 per cent non-usage).

This gives a picture for verbs with this stem that shows some incongruity between re-
ported and actual usage, but usage of stem stress is higher, although in self-reporting the end-stressed variant received higher figures (a sign of hypercorrection, a striving towards end stress?). That both stresses are accepted cannot be excluded, neither can it be excluded that stress placement differs between verbs with different prefixation.

-солить

The codified norm солить was the reported usage of 67.0 per cent of the informants, while
26.5 per cent reported non-usage and the figures for the codified normative form солишь were 75.5 per cent and 19.9 per cent, respectively. For the end-stressed alternative солить (доп./и) reported usage was 20.7 per cent and for недосолить (доп./и) it was 24.6 per cent. Thus the stem-stressed variants investigated have high reported usage and the end-
stressed variants low. The results of the oral part of the survey show commensurate results:
the variant stress marked доп./и is used to a certain extent, but the codified norm with stress on the stem is preferred by a majority of the language users: со́лишь 71.0 per cent, со́лить 29.0 per cent. Previous surveys as well show prevalence for the codified stem stress: Pirogova (1967) со́лить 88.0 per cent, Voroncova (1956) со́лить 81.5 per cent, со́лить 18.5 per cent.

Table 4.3-6. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>со́лить</th>
<th>со́лить</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>доп./и</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.0% (22)</td>
<td>29.0% (9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All results – reported usage, elicited usage, together with previous surveys – show that stem stress is the implicit norm and it complies with the explicit.

**Stem stress is the explicit norm ≠ implicit norm**

протворить

The codified norm приотворить is claimed to be used by only 10.3 per cent of the inform-
ants, while 86.8 per cent say they do not use it and believe it is incorrect. There is a vari-
ant stress приотворить recorded only in RPP, there labelled as устар. и книжн. The low figure of reported usage could perhaps be due to the fact that this verb form is infrequent and therefore perceived as “strange” by the informants. It is also possible, however, that the informants have confused this form with the form притворить, for which the stress притвори́ть is the codified norm in some sources (e.g. A&Z-2000, but not in OS-1997). Therefore caution must be observed regarding the conclusions for this form.

-скоблить
The end stress скобли́ть (и/и; cf. codified norm скобли́ть) is the reported usage of 86.8 per cent. Results from Voroncova’s 1956 Moscow survey suggest that the stress variants are not equally common and accepted: скобли́ть 67.4 per cent, скобли́ть 32.6 per cent. The prefixed verb соскобли́ть with stem stress, given as the norm in OS and as a colloquial variant (разг.) in RPP, is the reported usage of 15.1 per cent, while 80.2 per cent repudiate this stress. In fact, the end stress скобли́ть/соскобли́ть seems to be the implicit norm, and this is also the explicit norm of RPP.388

стро́чить
The stress стро́чить is given as norm in both sources, and 34.9 per cent reported usage of this variant (64.3 per cent reported non-usage), while the “second norm” стро́чить (и/и) was reported to be the usage and the correct form by 79.3 per cent of the informants. In Voroncova’s survey the two forms scored almost equal figures: стро́чить 47.7 and стро́чить 52.3 per cent. The end-stressed form generally seems to be prevailing.

The results for both this verb and for -скобли́ть above show that even if the variants are practically on the same normative level in handbooks there is not always a tendency among the speakers to use stem stress, regardless of the “general tendency towards stem stress”.

затвори́ть
Reported usage for the codified norm затво́рить was low: 15.1 per cent (non-usage 83.1 per cent), suggesting a discrepancy between explicit and implicit norm. The variant затвори́ть (и/устар.) might be the implicit norm, although then this would be the only example in this investigation of a stress codified as obsolescent being the implicit norm. On the other hand this variant is listed only in RPP, and the assessments in that dictionary are sometimes rather peculiar and deviate from other sources. It might very well be the case that this variant has been labelled as obsolete in line with many other end-stressed variants of this group, listed in RPP. It should also be noted that затвори́ть is the norm in A&Z–2000.

**End stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm**

-бу́рить
The variant пробу́рит (неправ./простореч.) is the reported usage of 30.2 per cent of the informants (66.0 per cent reported non-usage). Thus it could be presumed that the codified norm пробу́рит is in fact the stress that is more widely used and the results of the recordings show that this is the case: 61.3 per cent used the codified norm пробу́рит and 38.7 per cent пробу́рит. Prevalence for end stress in this verb was also found in Kolesov’s study (1964), which included the unprefixed verb: бу́рить 82.1 per cent and бу́рить 17.9 per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>пробу́рит</th>
<th>пробу́рит</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>неправ./простореч.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.3% (19)</td>
<td>38.7% (12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In verbs with this stem there is compliance between implicit and explicit norm, although reported and actual usage of the stem-stressed variant is not negligible.

вини́ть
The stem-stressed variant ви́нить (доп./разг.) was reported to be used by 35.9 per cent of the informants. This result lies between the results of Kolesov (1964): 32.8 per cent and

388 The unprefixed verb is not listed in RPP.
Voroncova (1956): 43.8 per cent. In these other surveys usage of the codified stress винти́вþ was 56.8 per cent (Voroncova) and 72.4 per cent (Kolesov) for the book norm. It can be concluded that the variant винти́вþ (доп./разр.) seems to be used to about the same extent as in the 1950s–1960s, and that the end stress винти́вþ is the implicit and explicit norm.

-делить

Of the informants, 92.5 per cent reported usage of the explicit norm опреде́лить. In the oral part of the survey the usage of the normative form was much higher than for опреде́лить (неправ./простореч.; 3.2 per cent). The stress опреде́лить was found in 54.8 per cent of all answers given and would probably have been higher had not as many as 13 out of 31 informants (41.9 per cent) misread the sentence and used the preterite form.

Table 4.3-8. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>опреде́лить</th>
<th>опреде́лить</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>неправ./простореч.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.8% (17)</td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
<td>41.9% (13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The stress распреде́лить (неправ./простореч.) was not reported to be used by the informants to a high degree: only 6.6 per cent claimed that they use it and believe it is correct. Results from other surveys also show that this alternative stress is not current: in RJaSO (1963) 6.0 per cent used распреде́лить, in Voroncova (1956) 10.1 and in Kolesov (1964) 1.3 per cent, while the codified norm was widely used: распреде́лить 89.9 per cent in Voroncova and распреде́лить 99.1 per cent in Kolesov. In the oral part of the present survey the number of invalid answers (9 out of 31 informants, i.e. 29.0 per cent, misread the sentence and used the preterite form) somewhat complicates the interpretation of the results. Anyway, the elicited usage of the explicit norm was 67.7 per cent of all answers given – both valid and invalid – thus largely outnumbering the alternative stress, used by only one informant (3.2 per cent). Consequently, the explicit and implicit norm coincide for this verb.

Table 4.3-9. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>распреде́лить</th>
<th>распреде́лить</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>неправ./простореч.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.7% (21)</td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
<td>29.0% (9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The non-normative разделить (from Lapteva 1990), not given as an alternative stress in the sources, was the reported usage of 13.2 per cent of the informants. This, alongside the fact that this stress was found by Lapteva in actual speech (on TV), might indicate that the variant is current enough to be included in dictionaries giving ample information on stress variation. There is, however, hardly any doubt that explicit and implicit norms comply for this form.

dразню

The alternative stress дразню́ (cf. normative дразну́) was included in RPP, but not in OS or other sources, and it is considered простореч. It could be assumed that this is a rare variant and the results confirm this: the actual usage shows that no informant used this stress, all of them used the codified norm дразню́, and the reported usage for the codified norm was 90.6 per cent. Hence, implicit and explicit norm coincide for this form.

389 Сф. дразнит (_/устар.).
Table 4.3-10. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>норма</th>
<th>дрънйо</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.0% (31)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ЗАЩЕМИТЬ**

The variant **защемить** is labelled неправ./простореч. in the normative sources, and 41.5 per cent of the informants report usage of this stress, while 52.8 per cent do not. In Pirogova’s investigation (1967) the figure was even higher for this non-normative stress: 61.3 per cent. Seemingly, the speakers vacillate between the two variants and there is no clearly pronounced implicit norm. Usage does not therefore unequivocally coincide with the explicit norm, but at the same time not enough data is available to conclude that **защемить** is not the implicit norm.

**-ЗВОНИТЬ**

Verbs on -зvonить and their stress have received much attention and it has generally been believed that this is one of the verbs where stress “errors” are most frequent.

In Voroncova (1956) the (reported?) usage of звонишь was 54.5 per cent (45.5 per cent for the codified norm звонишь). This lead Nicholson (1968:32) to the conclusion that “the condemnation of звонит by Avanesov and Ožegov discussed earlier makes it clear that Voroncova’s own research into the modern norms of stress had not yet been fully embodied in AO.1959, or at least that the implications of her research had not been accepted”.

This has proved refutable, first by Kolesov’s survey (Leningrad 1964), in which usage of the non-normative stress звонишь and звонит was significantly lower than in Voroncova’s study: 26.2 per cent and 31.2 per cent, while it was quite high (78.7 and 74.1 per cent respectively) for the stresses звонишь and звонит, codified as normative.

Results similar to Kolesov’s were later found in Pirogova’s survey (1967), where 30.7 per cent used the non-normative form, and also in Gorbačevič’s survey at Leningrad State University in 1974 (позвоним 77.2 per cent, позвоним 22.8 per cent). Gorbačevič (1978a:104) says that the figures from his survey show that the traditional stress is prevailing but still he believes that “the figures obtained hardly reflect the actual usage of young people” and that the answers are a natural manifestation of a hypercorrect relation to the norm in a conscious choice. He also says that

"...необходимо было бы ожидать ударение звонит, звонила, однако словари рекомендуют звонит, звонила (звенит, звенела, звенят). Запред ударения звонит, звонила носит явно искусственный характер, так как не опирается на систему русского ударения. Однако до тех пор, пока словари не отменят запрет, возможно лишь звонит, звонила."

390 "полученные цифры едва ли отражают реальный речевой узус молодежи, т.к. гиперкорректное отношение к норме при сознательном выборе в этом случае вполне естественно." But in the oral part of the present investigation the choice was not conscious as the informants did not know that stress was the object of study. Still, their answers showed that a majority use the codified end stress позвоним (67.9 per cent), while позвоним (не рек./простореч.) was used by 32 per cent.

391 Red’kin (1971:86–87) also comments upon the relation to the system: "Следовало бы ожидать ударение звонит, звонила, однако словари рекомендуют звонит, звонила (звенит, звенела, звенят). Запред ударения звонит, звонила носит явно искусственный характер, так как не опирается на систему русского ударения. Однако до тех пор, пока словари не отменят запрет, возможно лишь звонит, звонила."
In spite of the survey results accounted for above звонит etc. are still seen as notorious errors. For example Ivanov (1994:131) says that this is one of the more “popular” of the difficult cases of stress in the present tense, and blames this on “false analogy”. Compare Red'kin (1971:83):

... иногда в словарях отражается определенная традиция в постановке ударения, которая не соответствует повседневной практике. Это относится, в частности, к постановке ударения в словах звонит – звонит.

However, not everyone has exhibited reluctance to survey results. That this stress is probably not that common was observed by Comrie et al. (1996:88): “this verb has become something of a shibboleth with normative grammarians, being one of the most cited examples of a word which is frequently wrongly stressed, although from the informant responses in Kolesov (1967:109) it is doubtful whether mobile stress is so widespread with this word”.392

The results of the present investigation corroborate the findings of Kolesov (1964), Pirogova (1967) and Gorbačevič (1974) (but not Voroncova 1956, which stands out from all the other four surveys). Usage – reported and actual – of the stem-stressed variants, regardless of prefixation, regardless of year (1964–1997) and place (Leningrad and Moscow) of investigation is approximately the same: about one third to one quarter of the speakers use this stress (or in the case of the present survey: report usage and also believe it is correct).393

The verb on звонить that has the highest reported usage for non-normative stress is созвонимся (не рек./простореч.), which 40.6 per cent of the informants say they use and believe is correct. The results of the survey of actual usage are similar (although the results are not directly comparable): 38.7 per cent use the non-normative stress and 61.3 per cent the codified norm созвонимся.

Table 4.3-11. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>созвонимся</th>
<th>созвонимся</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>не рек./простореч.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.3% (19)</td>
<td>38.7% (12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the form позвоним as well a majority report usage of the codified norm: the reported usage of позвоним is 67.9 per cent, and 23.6 per cent say they do not use it and believe it is incorrect, while the corresponding figures for the variant stress позвоним (не rek./простореч.) are 32.0 per cent and 62.3 per cent (non-usage). The oral part of the survey shows that a majority – 58.1 per cent – used end stress, but that usage of the stem-stressed variant is as high as 41.9 per cent.

---

392 141 informants gave end stress (i.e. mobile pattern), 53 stem stress and 11 cited both forms.
393 N.B. actual usage of the form звонит was lower in the present investigation: 6.5 per cent.
Table 4.3-12. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>позво́нитъ</th>
<th>позво́нитъ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>58.1% (18)</td>
<td>41.9% (13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results from other surveys show similar results with a majority for the normative stress: Gorbačević (1974) позво́нитъ 22.8 per cent, позво́нитъ 77.2 per cent and Pirogova (1967) позво́нитъ 28.0 per cent.

In the unprefixed form end stress was even more prevalent in actual speech than in the prefixed. Almost all informants (93.5 per cent) stressed зво́нитъ and 6.5 per cent зво́нит.

Table 4.3-13. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>зво́нитъ</th>
<th>зво́нитъ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>93.5% (29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reported usage for the stress зво́нитъ (не рек./простореч.) was higher: 35.7 per cent, which could indicate that acceptance of this stress is higher than shown by the figures for elicited usage.\(^{394}\) Still reported usage was much higher for the stress that is codified as normative: зво́нитъ. 77.3 per cent (reported non-usage 17.1 per cent), and 4.7 per cent say they use it but know it is incorrect.

Results from other surveys, with the exception of Voroncova (1956),\(^{395}\) also show a prevalence for end stress. In Kolesov зво́нитъ was used by 78.7 per cent, зво́нитъ by 74.1 per cent and зво́нить by 26.2 and зво́нить by 31.2 per cent. Cf. Pirogova: зво́нитъ 30.7 per cent.

The 1sg stress variant дозво́нитъ (/_простореч.) is given only in one source, RPP, and is accepted by very few of the informants: 4.7 per cent. This is thus a very rare stress that might even exist only in theory.

The conclusion that can be drawn regarding the verbs on -звонить is that implicit and explicit norms comply. Stem stress occurs in not a negligible number of cases, both in actual and reported usage: about one third of the informants reported usage of the non-normative variants for the prefixed verbs, and a much smaller proportion of the unprefixed verb, maybe because of the attention paid to this verb.\(^{396}\) Thus, stem stress is not the prevalent usage, at least not among standard language speakers, and it has not (yet) become a “new norm” as foreshadowed (cf. above).\(^{397}\)

Voroncova (1959:138, 1979:212) suggests that as this verb was immediately assessed as strikingly incorrect it has not been accepted. It could also, however, be suggested that pre-

---

\(^{394}\) Some informants added their own objects when filling in the questionnaire, indicating that the stress depends on the object following: зво́нок; колокол.

\(^{395}\) Voroncova’s results differ from the other surveys in that usage of stem stress is higher: зво́нить 54.5 per cent, зво́нить 45.5. Not enough material is at hand in order to attempt an explanation of this, although it cannot be excluded that a real change might have taken place. The difference may also be due to the method of investigation.

\(^{396}\) Other forms (not included in the present survey) investigated by Pirogova are дозво́нится 33.3 per cent, зазво́нить 24.0 per cent usage/reported usage.

\(^{397}\) Cf. the verbs on -ключить below, of which rather little notice has been taken and in which there apparently is a “new norm”.
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ciscely because quite a lot of attention has been paid to these verbs and as a consequence their stressing has been brought into focus, stem stress has not become the implicit norm.

МУТИТЬ
The stress "mutations" is the codified norm, and 66.1 per cent reported usage of this stress, which indicates a correspondence between explicit and implicit norm. However, it could be assumed that the stress "mutations" (доп./_ ) is quite current. In Pirogova’s 1967 survey, for instance, this stress was used by 81.3 per cent.

-стелить
There is agreement between explicit and implicit norm for the verbs on -стелить. The reported usage of the codified norm перестелитель is 90.6 per cent and of постелитель 91.5 per cent.

сорить
The results for the stress сорить (не рек./разгр.) show that about half the informants report usage, half not (49.0 and 48.2 per cent). Together with the results for the codified norm сорить – 65.1 reported usage and 31.2 per cent reported non-usage – they give a total picture that indicates that both variants are used and accepted, but that the end-stressed сорить is preferred. This is confirmed by the results from the actual usage survey, where end stress was used by 67.7 per cent and stem stress by 29.0 per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>стол</th>
<th>стол</th>
<th>стол</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>стол</td>
<td>стол</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.7% (21)</td>
<td>29.0% (9)</td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from other surveys are contradictory. The codified norm сорить/сорить was used by 23.9 per cent in Voroncova’s study (Moscow 1956) and by 80.5 per cent in Kolesov (Leningrad 1964). The results for the stem-stressed variants сорить/сорить were 77.3 per cent in Pirogova (Moscow 1967), 76.1 per cent in Voroncova, and only 19.9 per cent in Kolesov. The answers in the Leningrad study are in line with the codified norm to a much higher degree than the two studies from Moscow. There is not enough material at hand to try to explain the cause for this difference. Chronologically the Leningrad survey lies between the two Moscow surveys, so linguistic change over time is probably not an issue here. The differences could be due to geographical stress variation, but the results of the present survey overthrow such an assumption.

The conclusion that can be drawn is the following: both forms are used and seen as correct, but the traditional codified norm is currently preferred, i.e. there is a stabilisation of end stress.

шевелить
In the non-reflexive verbs on -шевелить reported usage for the codified norm шевелить and шевелить is 62.3 and 66.1 per cent respectively. Compare the similar result in Voroncova’s survey (Moscow 1956): шевелить 66.2 per cent. Reported usage of the variant stress шевелить (доп./н) was lower than for the explicit norm, 39.6 per cent (cf. Voroncova шевелить 33.8 per cent).

In the reading test the number of invalid replies was large (several informants read a reflexive form), which renders it quite difficult to draw conclusions regarding the stressing

398 The variant stress перестело is given only in RPP (with the label простореч). There is a certain tendency in RPP to include variant stresses that appear to be rather theoretical.
of these forms, although one conclusion is that the stem-stressed variant is probably at least as widespread as end stress, while on the whole, judging by reported usage and beliefs regarding normativity, end stress is the implicit norm.

Table 4.3-15. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>шевелить</th>
<th>шевелить</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>доп./и</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.0% (9)</td>
<td>35.5% (11)</td>
<td>35.5% (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a difference between reflexive and non-reflexive verbs in that stem stress seems to have a stronger position in the reflexive verbs. For the reflexive шевёлиться (доп./и) the figure of reported usage is significantly higher than for the non-reflexive шевёлить: 83.9 per cent. Here, the number of syllables might play a role: there are three syllables and there is a general tendency for the stress to strive towards the middle. The results from the oral part of the investigation confirm that in the reflexive verbs stem stress is the implicit norm and in the non-reflexive, end stress. On the whole, however, both stresses seem to be quite current and accepted and could therefore be seen as normative.

Table 4.3-16. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>шевелиться</th>
<th>шевелиться</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>доп./и</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.0% (9)</td>
<td>67.7% (21)</td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**End stress is the explicit norm ≠ implicit norm**

глушить

The stress глушить, listed as norm in both sources, is reported to be used and considered correct by 19.9 per cent of the informants, and 78.3 per cent claim not to use it. Recordings show that not one of the informants used the codified stress глушить and 100 per cent (31 persons) used глушишь, which in the sources used is labelled as не рек. and простореч. respectively.

Table 4.3-17. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>глушить</th>
<th>глушить</th>
<th>н.рек./простореч.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>не рек.</td>
<td>пробереч. 100.0% (31)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearly, these results corroborate those of previous surveys. In Kolesov (1964) a mere 15.1 per cent claimed usage of глушить, while the figure for глушишь was 85.9 per cent. (Cf. Kolesov 1967:110.) In Pirogova (1967) the percentage using глушит was 92.0. Thus, the implicit norm is глушишь and it has yet to be codified as normative in most recent normative sources, although it should be noted that there are sources such as Gorbačević–1973 and A&Z–1993, which list the stress глушишь as normative.

ключить

The form ключить was included in Kolesov’s survey (Leningrad 1964), but otherwise not much attention has been paid to stress variants for verbs with this stem. Still, stem stress in

---

399 The stress шевёлить is found in Krylov (1833), according to Bulachovskij (1954:218).
400 глушить is labelled устаревающее in Gorbačević–1973.
401 Cf. A&Z–2000, which recommends only глушить.
these verbs is no innovation: the stress заклю́чит is, for instance, found in Žukovskij 1846–1847 (Bulachovskij 1954:218).

However, in the past few years the stressing of verbs on -ключить appears to have been brought more into focus. Voroncova (1996:312) has made the observation that the verb включить(ся) and other verbs with the same stem (отключить, заключить) are the most frequent non-normative variants with mobile stress. Ageenko (1996:27) also mentions these verbs. Ryazanova-Clarke & Wade (1999:316–317) call this stress “a non-normative fashion among young people” and refer to Lapteva (1997) who ascribes stem stress in these verbs to the young generation (“полностью охватившая молодое поколение”; 1997:51).

Lapteva further asserts that stem stress in the present-tense forms of the verbs включить(ся), отключить(ся), подключить(ся) cannot be considered normative as this stress is “regarded by the contemporary norm as not only undesirable, but flagrantly incorrect” (1997:51). This assertion is made without her defining norm, although it is probably presupposed that norm is equated with normative works. However, the normative works do not see this stress as “flagrantly incorrect”: it is qualified as неправ. in OS–1997 and as разг. in both RPP–1996 and Gorbачевіч–1973.

Moreover, a look at the results of the present survey shows that stem stress actually is the implicit norm. The reported usage and belief about normativity is low for all three end-stressed forms included in the questionnaire: отключит 9.4 per cent, переключит 15.1 per cent, включиться 27.4 per cent, and as many as 84.9 per cent, 78.3 per cent and 66.0 per cent, respectively, believe that these stresses, codified as normative, are wrong.

When confronted with the stress включить (codified norm) 27.4 per cent of the informants say they stress this way and believe it is right, while as many as 66.0 per cent believe it is wrong (and seem to be quite sure of this, as they marked in the last two columns). This could be compared to the figures for включить (неправ/разг): 85.8 per cent claim they use this stress and believe that it is correct, while only 11.3 per cent see this variant – in one of the sources marked as incorrect and in the other as colloquial – as wrong. The results are in line with those from Kolesov’s investigation in Leningrad 1964, where the figure was higher for stem stress than for end stress: включить 61.5 per cent, включиться 43.2. The position of stem stress appears to be even stronger now.

Forms that are not the codified norm and not even listed as variant stresses were also included in the survey. The reported usage of the stress исключим (example from Lapteva 1990b) was 34.9 per cent and suggests that implicit and explicit norms comply. Still, when more than a third of the informants report usage and believe it is correct it could be argued that this stress should be included as a variant in stress handbooks. This applies to заключим as well. This stress is the reported usage of 47.2 per cent, but it is not even included as an “incorrect” form in the sources.

---

402 Participles of -ключить also show this tendency towards stem stress, but these will not be dealt with here.
403 "Такое корневое ударение рассматривается современной нормой не просто как нежелательное, а как грубо ошибочное" (Lapteva 1997:51).
404 N.B: Gorpinič marks включит as неправ and включить as correct (1992:204). The stress включить is normative in Ukrainian.
405 N.B. five informants say they use this form, but believe it is wrong. This is an unusually high number of answers in this column. Thus, these persons claim that they use a stress seen as normative by handbooks but that they themselves believe it is wrong.
406 In Černyšev (1912:65) the stress исключат is said to have provincial character.
Whether the difference in reported usage between включить on the one hand and
исключим and заключим on the other is due to grammar (1pl as opposed to 2–3sg), se-
mantics, rhythm (2 vs. 3 syllables) or frequency is impossible to say.

Results from the oral part of the investigation provide additional material supporting the
assumptions that the explicit norm is not current in contemporary educated usage. All in-
formants but one, i.e. 96.8 per cent, used the stem-stressed variant отключит.

Table 4.3-18. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>отключит</th>
<th>отключит</th>
<th>неправ./простореч.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
<td>96.8% (30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, a large majority, 90.3 per cent, used the stem-stressed включить. The label
разгр. in RPP shows that the acceptance for this variant might be larger, although it is not
considered normative.407

Table 4.3-19. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>включить</th>
<th>включить</th>
<th>неправ./разгр.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>6.5% (2)</td>
<td>90.3% (28)</td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast to the above-mentioned verbs containing the same stem a majority used end
stress in the form заключим. That the stressing of this form differs from that of the other
verbs containing this stem could be due to the more formal context this word appears in
(заключим договоры(a)). Anyhow, it is quite remarkable that such a common variant –
used by almost one third of these informants – is not recorded in the sources (cf. above).

Table 4.3-20. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>заключим</th>
<th>заключим</th>
<th>неправ./разгр.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>71.0% (22)</td>
<td>29.0% (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To sum up, stem stress appears to be the implicit norm for some, although not all, verbs
containing -ключить, while the explicit norm for all is end stress. In some cases the
sources do not even list variants that are quite common, judging from both reported and
actual usage. Another indication of the strong position of stem stress in these verbs is that
in all cases where the informants change their stress of verbs on -ключить while reading
(see Chapter 4.1.4.6) they change from end stress (включить etc.) into stem stress
(включить etc.), probably because they perceive end stress as “strange”.

перемирить
The stress перемирит (доп./разгр.; cf. the codified norm перемирит) was the reported usage
of a large majority of the informants, 87.7 per cent. This points towards stem stress for this
verb, which is also in line with the general tendency for this group of verbs. It can be
assumed that explicit and implicit stress norms do not comply for this verb, although addi-
tional material is required.

-морить

407 The two informants using the normative stress are one male student from University of Civil Engineering
and one young female working at the building materials outlet. The only common point between these which
it is possible to observe in the answers given in the personal information sheet is that they both come from
Moscow oblast’ but this fact hardly has anything to do with their common stress of this word form.
For the stress замóрит (не рек./разрг., i.e. RPP is somewhat more lenient towards it) 69.9 per cent reported usage and 25.6 per cent reported non-usage. Similarly, the survey of actual usage indicated a prevalence for stem stress: 71.0 per cent used замóрит/ся and 12.9 per cent the codified norm замóрит/ся. Pirogova’s 1967 Moscow survey also showed a preference for the stem-stressed variant: замóрит 85.3 per cent.

Table 4.3-21. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variant</th>
<th>norm</th>
<th>не рек./разгр.</th>
<th>Invalid 408</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>замóрит/ся</td>
<td>12.9% (4)</td>
<td>71.0% (22)</td>
<td>16.1% (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the unprefixed verb as well the stem-stressed variant apparently has a much stronger position among speakers than the end-stressed. Of the informants 19.8 per cent reported usage of the codified norm морíт and as many as 75.5 per cent claimed not to use it, and only 5.7 per cent were “sure” that this stress, normative according to the sources, is correct. Elicited usage also gave low figures for end stress: 9.7 per cent used морíт, while 90.3 per cent used the stem-stressed мóрит (не рек./__). Compare Pirogova: мóрит 90.7 per cent.

Table 4.3-22. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variant</th>
<th>norm</th>
<th>не рек/__</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>морíт</td>
<td>9.7% (3)</td>
<td>90.3% (28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hence, there is a striking incongruity between the explicit and implicit norm in the present/future tense forms of verbs on -морить.

кровоточить

The end-stressed кровоточíт is listed as normative in the dictionaries and is claimed to be used by 25.6 per cent, while 67.0 do not use it and do not believe it is correct. On the other hand, the variant stress кровоточит (неправ./__) is the reported usage of a large majority – 87.8 per cent – while a mere 12.2 per cent believe that this variant marked “incorrect” is in fact incorrect. 409 The discrepancy between implicit and explicit stress norm is quite distinct in this verb.

поместиться

The stress поместа́ться is given as the norm in both sources, but not more than 18.8 per cent report usage of this stress and 79.3 per cent say they do not use this stress and do not believe that it is correct. The figures for the alternative stress – 87.7 per cent reported usage – confirm that the stress поместа́ться (доп./разгр.) is the implicit norm. Further evidence is found in the results of the oral investigation, where 16.1 per cent pronounced поместа́ться and 83.9 per cent поместа́ться.

408 Several informants read the verb in the preterite form and therefore their answers were not counted.
409 In contrast to this, Nen'ko (1982:65) claims that the traditional stress has consolidated as a norm in this verb for stylistical reasons (“в словах с явным стилистическим наполнением”).
Additional corroboration is found in the results of other surveys. RJaSO (1963) showed that 54.5 per cent used поместятся and Kolesov (1964) that 23.9 per cent used поместится and 76.1 per cent поместятся. (Cf. Kolesov 1967:110.)

This verb is one of the most blatant examples of discrepancies between explicit and implicit norm, and this discrepancy has probably existed at least since the 1960s.

-селить
The explicit norm is поселиться, but only 9.4 per cent of the informants claim that they use this stress. A majority – 86.7 per cent – profess they do not use it and do not consider it correct. The results for the variant stress посёлиться (доп./разг.) are reversed: 88.7 per cent claim to use it, while 8.5 per cent do not. The results from the oral part of the survey confirm that stem stress is the implicit norm: 6.5 per cent stressed поселиться and 90.3 per cent посёлиться.

Voroncova’s 1956 survey results also showed a significantly higher usage of the stem-stressed variant than the end-stressed: поселиться 22.1 per cent – посёлиться 77.9 per cent. This verb is another example of discrepancy between explicit and implicit norm, a discrepancy which has probably existed for several decades.

4.3.4 Verbs with infinitive on -ичь

4.3.4.1 Dictionary data
Only one verb, подстричь, has this type of variation: the codified norm is подстрижёт and the stress variant подстрижет is marked устар.

4.3.4.2 Results

End stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm
Only 8.5 per cent report usage of the obsolete stress подстрижет, listed only in RPP. This stress might be so uncommon that its inclusion in the dictionaries can be questioned.
4.3.5 Verbs with infinitive on -нуть

Among the verbs on -нуть with variation that bear end stress in the infinitive, very few exhibit stem stress in the present tense, which can be an indication of the tendency towards reduced mobility (Voroncova 1979:198–200).

4.3.5.1 Dictionary data

**Stem stress is the codified norm**

**End stress** is устар. etc.: ввёрну – вверну́ (/устар. и возв.), повёрнут – повернёт (/устар.), отторгнёт – отторга́нет (/возв.), упомяну́т – упомяну́т (/устар.).


**End stress is не рек./разр.:** помяну́т – помяну́т.

**Stem stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm**

Reported usage of the variant упомяну́т is high enough – 18.9 per cent – to justify its inclusion in the dictionary, but it is listed only in RPP.

For помяну́т, too, implicit and explicit norms appear to coincide. The form помяну́т (не рек./разр.) had reported usage of 27.3 per cent, while 69.8 reported non-usage

---

410 Hart (1987:16) discusses the role of stem structure for determining stress patterns in verbs with this infinitive.

411 End stress is labelled не рек./разр. for the variant помяну́т (cf. normative помяну́т), while end stress for another verb with the same stem is marked устар.: упомяну́т (cf. normative упомяну́т; see also Nen'ko 1984a:111–112).

412 неправ./разр.

413 These stem-stressed variants are only listed in RPP. This is perhaps due to southern influence as the authors of this dictionary work at the university of Rostov-na-Donu.
of it. The results of the oral investigation confirmed the high usage of the codified norm (93.5 per cent, while only 6.5 per cent used the non-normative stress помянет).

Table 4.3-27. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>помянет</th>
<th>помянет</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>не рек./разг.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.5% (29)</td>
<td>6.5% (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no doubt that the implicit and explicit norm is the same for the form заглянет. The codified norm заглянет is also seen as the norm by the informants: 93.4 per cent report usage of and 100 per cent actually use this stress. Perhaps RPP with its label разг. for заглянет is too lenient upon a stress variant that almost no one uses or believes is correct.

Table 4.3-28. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>заглянет</th>
<th>заглянет</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>неправ./разг.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0% (31)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**End stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm**

The stress подтолкнёт is the norm according to the sources, and the informants agree: 94.3 per cent report usage of this stress.

Similarly the informants seem to agree that the norm is перевёрнёт: reported usage for the variant перевёрнет (/просторч.) is only 6.6 per cent.

4.3.6 Verbs with infinitive on -овать

4.3.6.1 Dictionary data

Stem stress\(^{415}\) is the codified norm

**Stress on -ý- is */просторч.:** памятую – памятую, памятует – памятует, опамятуюсь – опамятуйся, опамятуется – опамятуется.

**End stress is the codified norm**

**Stress on -ý- is доп. etc.:** обосную/сы and обоснует/сы are normative in OS and stem stress обосную/сы and обоснует/сы are labelled доп. In RPP обоснью and обоснует are normative and end stress (обоснью, обоснует) is considered устар. Thus, there is quite a significant difference in the assessment of the variant stresses in the dictionaries.

**Stress on -ý/-ý- is */просторч.:** клюет – клюет (and with the prefixes по-, с-), снует – снует.

**Stress on -ý/-ý- is */устар. простонар.:** подкует – подкует, подклюет – подклюет; cf. the notation for other verbs on -клюет above.

**Stress on -ý/-ý- is */устар.:** плюет – плюет.

---

\(^{414}\) In one case the infinitive ending is -евать: клевать – клует.

\(^{415}\) Before the suffix -y-.
4.3.6.2 Results

Table 4.3-29. Reported usage and language users’ norm. Percentage of respondents for each category of answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress variant examined</th>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>I say it like that myself</th>
<th>I do not say it like that myself</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and I know that it is correct</td>
<td>and I believe that it is correct</td>
<td>but I do not know whether it is correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>обосную́</td>
<td>доп./норма</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>памьютé</td>
<td>_/простореч.</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>клоéт</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stem stress is the explicit norm ≠ implicit norm

The stress памьютé (_/простореч.) was the reported usage of 58.5 per cent – a majority of the informants, which could suggest that the explicit and the implicit norm do not coincide. However, it cannot be excluded that the figures would be high for the codified norm пáмятует as well. What these figures show with certainty is that only one of the sources (RPP) lists this apparently current variant, while OS ignores it by listing only the stress пáмятует (which according to both sources is normative).

End stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm

The stress клоéт is the explicit and implicit norm. Of this variant 92.4 per cent reported usage and said they believe it is correct, and in the oral survey this stress was used by 100 per cent of the informants. Usage of the non-normative клоет appears to be practically non-existent, although it is not a purely “theoretical” stress variant as, according to Pirogova (1967:16), it can be found in dialects and has been found in poetry from 1839 (клоёшь, Bulachovskij 1954:212).

Table 4.3-30. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>клоёт</th>
<th>клоет</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>_/простореч.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0% (31)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End stress is the explicit norm ≠ implicit norm

The reported usage for the stress обосную́, in OS labelled доп. and in RPP considered normative, was 90.5 per cent, and in the oral survey 100 per cent of the informants used this stress. This can be taken as proof that the norm given in OS (обоснюю́) is dated (it is in fact labelled устар. in RPP) and that the norm of RPP – and of A&Z–2000, A&Z–1993, BTS–1998, and MTS–1990 – reflects current educated usage. (Compare Chapter 6.)

Table 4.3-31. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>обосную́</th>
<th>обосную́</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма/устар.</td>
<td>доп./норма</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>100.0% (31)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.7 Verbs with infinitive on -оть

4.3.7.1 Dictionary data
The verb \( \text{поперо́ть} \) has the stress \( \text{поперо́й} \) as the explicit norm and the variant \( \text{поперо́ю} \) is listed only in RPP with the label \( \text{простореч} \).

4.3.7.2 Results
This verb was not included in the survey.

4.3.8 Verbs with infinitive on -очь

4.3.8.1 Dictionary data
For the verbs \( \text{вволо́чь} \) and \( \text{свволо́чь} \) the codified norm is the stress \( \text{-волочёт} \) and there is (only in RPP) a variant \( \text{-волочет} \ (/_/разг.) \).

4.3.8.2 Results

Table 4.3-32. Reported usage and language users' norm. Percentage of respondents for each category of answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress variant examined</th>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>I say it like that myself</th>
<th>I do not say it like that myself</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and I know that it is correct and I believe that it is correct but I do not know whether it is correct but I know that it is incorrect</td>
<td>and I do not know whether it is correct and I believe that it is incorrect and I know that it is incorrect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>вволочет</td>
<td>_/разг.</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm
Almost half of the informants – 47.2 per cent – claim usage of the variant вволочет, in RPP labelled as разг. and not listed at all in OS, which only gives the normative stress вволочёт. The results of the oral part of the survey show a similar fifty-fifty relationship between the two variants. Given the rather high reported and actual usage of the variant вволочет it is quite remarkable that it is not listed in OS.

Table 4.3-33. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>вволочёт</th>
<th>вволочет</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>_/разг.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.6% (16)</td>
<td>45.2% (14)</td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.9 Verbs with infinitive on -стъ/ся/

4.3.9.1 Dictionary data
For the verbs \( \text{кра́ться} \) and \( \text{подкра́ться} \) the explicit norm is the stress \( \text{-крадётся} \), and there is (only in RPP) a variant \( \text{кра́дется} \) (considered простореч).
4.3.9.2 Results

Table 4.3-34. Reported usage and language users’ norm. Percentage of respondents for each category of answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress variant examined</th>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>I say it like that myself</th>
<th>I do not say it like that myself</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>podkrádetsæ</td>
<td>/pro.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm

The low reported usage (6.5 per cent) for the stress variant podkrádetsæ (/pro.) could be seen as another example of the inclusion in RPP of rare, perhaps only theoretical stress variants.

4.4 Verbs with variation in the infinitive form

In addition to the verbs with variation in the infinitive forms and the whole paradigm there are verbs with stress variation only in the infinitive forms.416 One possible explanation for variation/errors in the stress of the infinitives on -нать and -чать is that these verbs are never used without prefix. And as there are no other orientation points, like for instance unprefixed forms, these participles, gerunds and preterite non-feminine forms (занял, начавший, принял) can trigger prefix stress in the infinitive. (Compare Krivenko 1995:68–69.)

Furthermore, this type of stress may be an influence from southern Russian.417 Voroncovova (1996:310–311) cites as an example M. Gorbačev who uses southern dialectal features with prefix stress in the infinitive: нать, занять, принять, прибыть, and she gives several other examples, many from politicians.418 The verbs нать, принять are even called by Ivanov (1994:132) the “favourite parliamentary verbs”: “ударение в формах ‘любимых’ парламентских глаголов”.

4.4.1 Verbs on -нять, -чать

4.4.1.1 Dictionary data

There are five verbs in this group, listed only in OS–1997 (see also Es’kova 1994:439).419 The infinitives занять, заняться, нанять, начать, принять have variants that are stressed on the prefix: занять, заняться, нанять, начать, принять, all marked грубо неправ./___.

416 There is only one verb in the sources that has a stress variant in the imperative form only: посовеститься. It is only mentioned in RPP (where it is mis-spelled). The normative imperative form is посовестись, and the variant посовестись is marked простореч.
417 Although not from Ukrainian.
418 принять is also referred to in this context as it is said to have a weak connection with the verb быть and other derivations from it (Vorontcovova 1996:311). This can, as I see it, also be the reason why some other verbs retain prefix stress more often than others. Cf. the section on variation in the preterite forms (4.5): if there is a strong connection with the meaning of the stem-verb (запил), stress is on the stem, while if this connection is weaker stress more often falls on the prefix (проклял, пролал).
419 Few researchers mention this type of stress at all: Nen'ko does not, for instance, and these forms have not been included in the surveys referred to earlier. Only in OS–1989 (5th ed.) and in Es’kova–1994 they appear
4.4.1.2 Results

Table 4.4-1. Reported usage and language users’ norm. Percentage of respondents for each category of answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress variant examined</th>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>Percentages (%)</th>
<th>I say it like that myself</th>
<th>and I know that it is correct</th>
<th>and I believe that it is correct</th>
<th>but I do not know whether it is correct</th>
<th>and I know that it is incorrect</th>
<th>and I believe that it is incorrect</th>
<th>and I know that it is incorrect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>занять</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>нанять</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>заняться</td>
<td>грубо неправ./__</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>наняться</td>
<td>грубо неправ./__</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>заняться</td>
<td>нанятый</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>наняться</td>
<td>нанять</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пройти</td>
<td>грубо неправ./__</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in the table above there is correspondence between explicit and implicit norms, and there is almost no insecurity among the informants as to the correctness of the normative stresses and the incorrectness of the non-normative stresses. The only non-normative stress for which a slight insecurity is recorded is заняться, with somewhat higher figures in columns 4 and 5 (“I say it like that myself but I know that it is incorrect” and “I do not say it like that myself and I do not know whether it is correct”) than the other variants. The one form that was pronounced somewhat more often than the others with prefix stress was нать.

End stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm

Reported usage for all these prefix-stressed infinitives labelled грубо неправ. is low: нать 10.4 per cent (non-usage 85.0 per cent), занять 11.4 per cent (non-usage 85.8 per cent), заняться 9.5 per cent (non-usage 86.8 per cent), нанять 10.4 per cent (non-usage 88.6 per cent), пройти 7.6 per cent (non-usage 89.6 per cent). The stress пройти (found in Lapteva 1990b:386) is not codified as the norm and not listed in the main sources as a variant. Only 4.7 per cent claim that they use this stress (non-usage 91.5 per cent).

These results are confirmed by the results for the codified normative stresses with high reported usage: нать 93.4 per cent (non-usage 4.7 per cent), занять 96.2 per cent (non-usage 1.8 per cent).

Further confirmation that the explicit and implicit norms coincide in these verbs is found in the elicited usage. A majority of the informants, 87.1 per cent, used нать and 12.9 per cent нать. Of the verbs in this group нать is the one with the highest actual usage of the non-normative stress. Even if there is no doubt what the implicit norm is, the prefix-stressed variant is current enough to suggest that this stress variant should generally be included in orthoepic works; RPP does not include it, for instance.

for the first time. Apart from the variation in verbs of this type listed in OS, Es’kova also gives нать – нанять, начать – нать, пройти – нать, in which prefix stress is considered грубо неправ.

420 There is one informant who consistently uses the stresses заняться, нанять, пройти (twice): a female, born 1948, native Russian speaker, with secondary, specialised education, having spent most of her childhood in Ukraine and most of her life in Moscow обл. The stress нать is used by another three informants: one student – a female from Moscow – from the Linguistic University, the male Muscovite who was the only informant to be educated to less than secondary level (8–9 yrs) and the informant with Ukrainian as native language.

421 Its inclusion could also be motivated by the frequency of the lexeme.
Table 4.4-2. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>наконечить</th>
<th>наконечить</th>
<th>норма</th>
<th>грубо неправ./условно</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87.1 % (27)</td>
<td>12.9 % (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The codified norm заняться was used by 93.6 per cent and заняться by 3.2 per cent (i.e. only one person).

Table 4.4-3. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>заняться</th>
<th>заняться</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93.6 % (29)</td>
<td>3.2 % (1)</td>
<td>3.2 % (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The verb принять was included twice in the oral questionnaire, and in both instances thirty informants (96.8 per cent) stressed принять and one (3.2 per cent) принять.

Table 4.4-4. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>принять</th>
<th>принять</th>
<th>норма</th>
<th>грубо неправ./условно</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96.8 % (30)</td>
<td>3.2 % (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4-5. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>принять</th>
<th>принять</th>
<th>норма</th>
<th>грубо неправ./условно</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96.8 % (30)</td>
<td>3.2 % (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 Verbs with variation in the preterite form

4.5.1 Types of variation

As mentioned in Chapter 1.4.2 and as will be shown in the subsequent chapters, much of the variation in stress and so-called speech errors occur in groups that have some kind of deviation from the main accentological types (Russkaja grammatika 1980:681–682). The verbs that show stress variation in the past tense are generally unproductive verbs with mobile stress (Nen'ko 1984a:170), and the reasons for this potential mobility lie in old international patterns of the verbal stem (Nen'ko 1984c:58).

The verbs in preterite form that have deviations from the accentological types given in the above-mentioned subchapter bear stress on:

(a) The flexion in the feminine past tense: from the accentological type А быть, from the accentological type В гнить, вить, лить, пить, врать, врать, рвать, ткать, брать, драть, звать, -мереть, some verbs on -переть, прысть, жить, плыть, слить, клясть, -чать, -нять (and взять), родить, спать, дать, создать, and from the accentological type С some verbs on -нить and the verb гнать (Russkaja grammatika 1980:688–689).

(b) The prefix in the non-feminine past tense forms: some of the verbs containing -бить, быть, вить, -дать, -жить, -клясть, -лить, мереть, -нить, -переть, -пить, -плыть,

422 See Chapter 1.4.2.
423 The prefixes из- and воз- are never stressed. In verbs with the prefix пере- stress is on the first syllable of the prefix. If a verb has two prefixes stress falls on the second of these: распределил (Russkaja grammatika 1980:689).
(c) The reflexive particle: e.g. *занялся* (Russkaja grammatika 1980:689).
(d) The negative particle *не* in combination with non-feminine forms of the verbs *быть*, *дай*, *жить*, *пить* and the negative particle *ни* in combination with non-feminine forms of *быть* (Russkaja grammatika 1980:691–693).

Moreover, it can be added that reflexive verbs generally have the same stress as non-reflexive, but for the unproductive verbs the situation is different: feminine forms mostly retain stress on -а́сь and neuter and plural forms exhibit vacillation between stem stress and stress on -о́сь/-и́сь, the stress variation being larger in originally disyllabic stems in neuter and plural forms as well as in the feminine.

The accentological variation found in the preterite is mainly of the following types (Nen'ko 1984c:56, Stankiewicz 1993:219–220):

(a) Variation between end stress and stem stress in the feminine, neuter and plural forms: созва́л – созва́ла; да́ло – да́лó, пь́ли – пь́лý (recessive and progressive tendency). There is a tendency towards unification where, on the one hand, the stress pattern of feminine forms aligns with the other forms (giving prefix stress or stem stress in the feminine forms): на́чала, дóбыла, пóдала; спáла, брáла, ожíла, подáла, добýла (Voroncova 1996:309). On the other hand, the stress patterns of other forms align with those in the feminine, giving neuter end stress, and to a certain extent also plural end stress: издалó, ожилó, подалó; поднялý. These stresses are all generally non-normative (Krysin 1974:228, Stankiewicz 1993:219).

(b) Variation between prefix and stem stress in prefixed verbs in the masculine, neuter and plural forms (variation between end stress and prefix stress is possible but rare in the feminine): прóжил/о/и/ – про́жил/о/и/ (progressive tendency). For these there are several possibilities (cf. Lehfeldt 1987:622–623, Stankiewicz 1993:219): (1) only stem stress is possible, prefix stress is never used, (2) both prefix stress and stem stress are possible within the norm, (3) prefix stress is preferred, (4) only prefix stress is possible within the standard norm.

(c) Variation between end stress and stem stress in reflexive masculine, feminine, neuter and plural forms: роди́лся – роди́лся, роди́лась – роди́лась, роди́лось – роди́лось, роди́лись – роди́лись (recessive tendency). Stress on the reflexive particle is generally antiquated in the masculine form and occurs only in a few verbs, otherwise the main tendency is that the stress shifts to the syllable preceding the reflexive particle. In the feminine forms end stress is more often retained both in codification and in usage, while in the neuter and plural forms the variants (either with stress on the last syllable of the stem or on the ending) usually exist alongside, and are more or less equal from a normative point of view.

424 There is reason to believe that stress on *не* is disappearing except for in combination with *быть*. See Ukiah 1996 and the results below.
425 Variation between stress on the negative particle *не* and stress on the stem of the non-feminine forms of the verb can also be found.
(d) Variation between end stress and prefix stress in the reflexive forms, generally in the masculine, neuter and plural (possible but rare in the feminine): поднялся – поднялось, поднялся – поднялись, подняла – поднялись; заперся – заперлась, заперлся – заперлись (recessive tendency).

4.5.1.1 Division of verbs into mono- and disyllabic stems

Verbs with mobile stress can be divided into two different groups: verbs with historically monosyllabic and verbs with historically disyllabic stems (before the loss of the reduced vowels) (Bulachovskij 1954:223–229). There is a point in maintaining this division in at least some discussions as verbs belonging to these two different groups behave quite differently stresswise in contemporary Russian also. The differences between the two types of stems can be summarised as follows: in verbs with originally monosyllabic stems prefix stress in the preterite is possible and stress variation is large (both between and within stems) (Gorbačevič 1971:56, Krysin 1974:228, Voroncova 1979:179, Nen’ko 1984c:58).

Verbs with an originally disyllabic stem (i.e. with a lost reduced vowel) usually maintain stress on the stem and there is less stress variation in these (Krysin 1974:228, Voroncova 1979:171 ff., Nen’ko 1984c:58).

The same conclusions have been drawn by Strom (1988:43), although he does not take the number of syllables in earlier periods as the point of departure when he claims that the stress patterns for the sonorant stems ending in -j- (вить, лить, пить, гнить), -v- (жить, плыть, слыть) and -r- (мереть, переть) as well as for the nasal stems (клясть, -/н/ять, взять, -чать) are less uniform than that for the -a-stems.

This distinction between originally mono- and disyllabic stems will sometimes be referred to in the presentation and discussion of the results below, although the results for the verbs of the different groups will be presented together in the tables and the text.

4.5.1.2 Differences in stress placement and course of development for different types of stems

There is a general tendency towards fixed stem stress, but this process is selective, gradual, slow and irregular. It has been faster in verbs with originally disyllabic stems (брать, врать, гнать, звать, рвать, спать etc.) and slower in verbs with originally monosyllabic stems (быть, вить, дать, жить, класть, лить, пить, плыть etc.) and in verbs in -ча-, -ня- (Voroncova 1996:308).

For verbs with originally disyllabic stems there are currently no forms in the dictionaries with stress on the prefix except for со́здал/o/i/ (and prefixed verbs like переосо́здал etc.). (See also Voroncova 1979:175–176, Nen’ko 1984a:139.) In the 19th century, however, variants with stress on the prefix could be found (cf: позва́л, example from Nen’ko 1984c:58; or со́вра́л (Vjazemskij 1821), example from Bulachovskij 1954:226). (Compare Pirogova 1959b:126f.)

The same conclusions have been drawn by Strom (1988:43), although he does not take the number of syllables in earlier periods as the point of departure when he claims that the stress patterns for the sonorant stems ending in -j- (вить, лить, пить, гнить), -v- (жить, плыть, слыть) and -r- (мереть, переть) as well as for the nasal stems (клясть, -/н/ять, взять, -чать) are less uniform than that for the -a-stems.

This distinction between originally mono- and disyllabic stems will sometimes be referred to in the presentation and discussion of the results below, although the results for the verbs of the different groups will be presented together in the tables and the text.

4.5.1.2 Differences in stress placement and course of development for different types of stems

There is a general tendency towards fixed stem stress, but this process is selective, gradual, slow and irregular. It has been faster in verbs with originally disyllabic stems (брать, врать, гнать, звать, рвать, спать etc.) and slower in verbs with originally monosyllabic stems (быть, вить, дать, жить, класть, лить, пить, плыть etc.) and in verbs in -ча-, -ня- (Voroncova 1996:308).

For verbs with originally disyllabic stems there are currently no forms in the dictionaries with stress on the prefix except for со́здал/o/i/ (and prefixed verbs like переосо́здал etc.). (See also Voroncova 1979:175–176, Nen’ko 1984a:139.) In the 19th century, however, variants with stress on the prefix could be found (cf: позва́л, example from Nen’ko 1984c:58; or со́вра́л (Vjazemskij 1821), example from Bulachovskij 1954:226). (Compare Pirogova 1959b:126f.)
For verbs with originally monosyllabic stems there was also vacillation in the masculine, neuter and plural preterite forms in the 19th century. For instance Puškin has the stress поднял in Ruslan i Ludmila and the stress поднял in Boris Godunov (Gorbačevič 1971:59). In this verb, and in many others, there is still variation, and any development towards stem stress is slow.\footnote{The preterite forms of the prefixed verbs in the two stress handbooks A&O–1959 and OS–1983 have been compared by Lehfeldt (1987), who found that stress on the prefix had in a majority of cases been preserved as normative (1987:622).} Stress on the prefix is in some verbs codified as the only norm, for other verbs the prefix-stressed and the stem-stressed variants exist alongside and are (almost) equally acceptable, yet for others stem stress is considered normative.

Divergences from general rules and tendencies are common (Nen'ko 1984a:60, Gorbačevič 1978a:106). While Krysin (1973:41) sees stem stress in prefixed preterite forms as a southern Russian influence that is used by a majority of speakers,\footnote{Gorbačevič refers to this unpredictability and arbitrariness in stress placement as “[л]ексикализованный характер нормы” (1978a:106).} Gorbačevič claims that dialects do not play too important a role (1978a:106).

4.5.1.3 Verbal stems with stress variation in the preterite forms

The verbs that show variation in the preterite form have been described in an article by Nen'ko (1984c). The verbs or stems with mobile stress (variation in the stressing in the feminine preterite is generally considered a prerequisite for variation in stress) that she has studied are: быть, вить, гнить, дать, жить, класть, лить, пить, пить, прять, снять, слить (all with originally monosyllabic stems) (see also Nen'ko 1984a:118–120; cf. Bulachovskij 1954:223–229). Also the verbs or verbal formants -мереть, -переть, -чать, -(н)ять belong to this group.

The verbs with originally disyllabic stems included are: брать, врать, гнать, драть, ждать, жрать, звать, -здать, лгать, -прапать, рвать, спать, слать. Nen'ko also mentions the verbs класть, ткать, родить in another place in the article, without including them in the discussion about and division into two groups. (The verb сечь is allotted a whole subchapter in Nen'ko’s dissertation, but not touched upon in the article.)

Voroncova (1979:170) enumerates the following verbs and verbal formants with mobile stress in the preterite and, consequently, with variation in stress: брать, быть, вить, врать, гнать, гнить, дать, драть, ждать, жить, жрать, звать, -здать, класть, лгать, лить, пить, пить, прять, рвать, снять, слить, ткать, -чать, -(н)ять, -мереть, -переть, родить.

In the sources used for this investigation an additional number of verbs with preterite stress variation were found, thus adding to the verbs listed above: -бить, -бестись, -вергнуть, -вестись, -красть, -плестись, скрестись, слать, -стричь, -тереть, -толочь, -шебиться.

4.5.2 Masculine non-reflexive verb forms with and without prefix

As the masculine preterite simplex verb forms are monosyllabic, stress variation – if any – occurs only in combination with не. This retraction onto the negation in combination with preterite verb forms concerns, as already mentioned, verbs of the mobile type with previous circumflex intonation and, consequently, end-stressed feminine form. Retraction of stress in the past tense in verbs with mobile stress and two initial consonants could be found up to the middle of the 19th century: Я не спал ... (Deržavin, quoted by Bulachovskij 1953:253).
Vacillation of the type не дал – не дал existed already at the beginning of the 19th century (Bulachovskij 1954:229–230). This kind of retraction onto the negative particles не and ни is, as suggested by Ukiah (1996:680–682), no longer current with the verbs дать, жить, пить and occurs in the modern language only with the non-feminine forms of the verb быть. (Cf. 4.5.4.2.)

For the prefixed masculine preterite verb forms variation is found between prefix stress and stem stress. A general observation is that preterite verb forms with previous prefix stress tend towards stem stress, although for some verb forms stem stress is the codified norm, for others a condemned variant, for others yet a variant stress which is admissible or equal to the codified norm.

The assessment of these variants varies both between stems and between verb forms with the same stem. One explanation for the variation within a stem is put forward by Gorbačevič: принял has an open syllable, which promotes traditional stress, while подняль has a combination of consonants that promotes the development of stem stress (1978a:107). However, this explanation does not elucidate the difference between, for instance, уньял and принял.430

Gorbačevič (1978a:106) has attempted to put forward “rules” for stress placement in prefixed verbs: (1) If the verb contains an originally disyllabic stem or if two consonants meet on each side of a morpheme boundary, stress in the modern language tends to fall on the stem: назвал, собрал, отпил, подлил; exceptions: создал, пересоздал. (2) If three consonants meet at the morpheme boundary, stress is only on the stem: отпил. (3) In verbs with an originally monosyllabic stem and a prefix consisting of one vowel or ending in a vowel stress remains on the prefix (убыл) or continues to vary (ожил – ожил, пролил – прожил). The exceptions are numerous, though.

Another, not purely morphonological, reason for the rise of stem-stressed variants may lie in the fact that some prefix-stressed forms, particularly those with prefix stress in the infinitive, are considered part of просторечие (начать, принять) and speakers therefore, as a hyper-correction, avoid prefix stress even in cases where this is not necessary (Comrie et al. 1996:86).

Yet another factor promoting stem stress is a clear morphological structure of the prefixed verb (Gorbačevič 1978a:107). The same conclusion is drawn by Comrie et al. (1996:85).431

In current usage, there is a tendency for this to be replaced by stress on the root of the verb, particularly where the meaning of the prefixed verb is literally the sum of the meaning of prefix plus root, e.g. отдать ‘give away’, but less so where this is not the case (e.g. продать ‘sell’), or where the root does not exist as a separate word (e.g. принять ‘accept’).

The lexical specialisation of different stress variants seems to be losing its importance, meaning that обдал and отдал are not used in different lexical and grammatical contexts (cf. Gorbačevič 1978a:107–108 for conclusions from results from a survey in Leningrad 1974; cf. also 4.5.2.2.)

430 Stem stress принял is considered normative and no variants are mentioned in OS, while stem stress принял is considered incorrect (the norm is принёл), and stem stress подняла is considered admissible with подняла as the codified norm.
431 Another theory is proposed by Agrell (1917). See Chapter 1.3.4.
4.5.2.1 Dictionary data

Prefix stress is the codified norm


**Stem stress is** не рек./разгр.: жил – жил, отбил – отбил, пребил – пребил.


**Stem stress is** грубо неправ./(грубо) простореч.: недопонял – недопонял (грубо неправ./простореч.), понял – понял (грубо неправ./грубо простореч.), начал – начал (грубо неправ./простореч.).

**Stem stress is** the codified norm

Prefix stress is неправ./простореч.: подгнил – подгнил, развил – развил and the verbs передрал – передрал, подобрал – подобрал, позвал – позвал that contain originally disyllabic stems and are only listed in RPP (_/простореч.). Verbs containing the prefix пере- are not to be stressed on the second syllable of the prefix (неправ./простореч.).

The normative stress is either передал or передал, 443 but not передал, it is either пережил or пережил, but not пережил and it is перенял, not перена́л.


---

432 In the meaning ‘strike (an hour)’.
433 и/разгр.
434 и/разгр. = ‘испытать; перенести, выдержать’.
435 и/разгр.
436 (/_простореч.). One of the two verbs with originally disyllabic stems that have prefix stress codified as normative.
437 и/разгр.
438 и/разгр.
439 = ‘вручить, сообщить и др.’.
440 пёремер is the norm in OS and labelled книжн. in RPP, перемёр is labelled доп. in OS and norm in RPP.
441 доп./простореч.
442 One of the two verbs with originally disyllabic stems that have prefix stress codified as normative.
443 In the meaning ‘дать лишнего’ stem передал is the codified norm, with передал as the only variant. Ср. the meaning ‘вручить, сообщить и др.’ above, where prefix stress is the codified norm.
444 = ‘прожить какое-то время; прожить дольше кого-чего-н., оставаться жить после смерти кого-н.’.
Stress on не is the codified norm in не дал with the variant не да́л (доп./_) and in не жил with the variant не жи́л (доп./разг.).

Stress on не is not the codified norm in combination with the verb пить. Stress retraction to the negation (не пил) is considered obsolete/obsolescent (доп. устар./устар. и книж.) and the codified norm is stress on the verb: не пил.

4.5.2.2 Results

Table 4.5-1. Reported usage and language users’ norm. Percentage of respondents for each category of answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress variant examined</th>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>I say it like that myself</th>
<th>I do not say it like that myself</th>
<th>I know that it is incorrect</th>
<th>and I believe that it is correct</th>
<th>and I do not know whether it is correct</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>проклял</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>прибал</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>предал</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>прясил</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>проклыл</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пробыл</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>предал</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>прережал</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пронил</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отдал</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>обял</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>побыл</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>приподъёл</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отыл</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>перёдал</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>наил</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пёремер</td>
<td>норма/книжн.</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>прережал доп./устар./_</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>прайдал доп./устар./_</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>добыл</td>
<td>доп./устар./_</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>передал</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пережил</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отыл</td>
<td>и/и</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>наил</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пёрёдил</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отдал</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пройдёл</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пережил доп./разг.</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>перемёр</td>
<td>доп./ норма</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пронил</td>
<td>и/и</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>обилик</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>прибал</td>
<td>не рек./разг.</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>занял</td>
<td>непр./про.</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>прращил</td>
<td>непр./про.</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>начил</td>
<td>груб. неправ./про.</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is to be noted that stresses such as отпил, передал, наил, перёрер, all being the explicit norm, are reported to be the usage and believed to be correct as seldom as the prefix-stressed forms перёрежил, прыйдал, добыл, labelled as obsolescent. This could be an indication that отпил, передал, наил, перёрер should be labelled the same way. There are also stem-stressed variants to the norm (most often labelled и/и or доп./разг.) that are the implicit norm to as high a degree as the stem-stressed explicit norms. This applies to, for instance, наил and передал, and indicates that these variants could be recognised to be “fully normative”.

445 One informant replied that there is a difference between занять деньги and занять место and that stress placement would depend on which object follows the verb: деньги or место.
Furthermore, it can be noted that as a group the stem stresses that are codified as normative show stability, while the prefix stresses do not, as there is a tendency among the informants to use stem stress when prefix stress is the norm but not the other way round. Thus, there is less hesitancy and less deviance when the codified norm is stem stress than when we have stem stress. These conclusions are drawn from the results shown in the table above: when prefix stress is the explicit norm it has very varying reported usage (from 5.6 to 88.8 per cent) and when it is non-normative (obsolescent or obsolete) it is not widely used (8.5 to 30.2 per cent). Stem stress is highly used when it is the codified norm (86.8–88.7 per cent\textsuperscript{446}). When it is a variant to the norm it has highly varying reported usage (from 12.2 to 94.3 per cent), depending on the individual lexeme or form.

All in all, the results of previous surveys and those of reported usage and actual usage in the present study point out that a test of only actual usage or only reported usage and speakers’ norm is not enough to assess the actual situation. In fact, two stresses can function alongside each other as the implicit norm and one informant’s use of one stress does not necessarily exclude his/her use of another. The choice of a stress variant may be linked to the context and the meaning, although whether this choice takes place at all is an individual feature, as is the actual choice of stress variant in a given context. This will be further commented upon when discussing the results.

*Prefix stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm*\textsuperscript{447}

For the verb forms listed below the implicit and explicit norm seem to comply, i.e. what in the dictionaries is codified as norm is also perceived as such by the language users, as manifested by their replies concerning whether they consider it correct or not and by their reported and actual usage.

On the whole, stem stress for verbs on -нять seems to be rare and not asserting itself as the norm. The stress *занял* (неправ./простореч.) was reported to be used by 20.8 per cent, while 75.5 per cent claimed they do not use this stress and know or believe that it is incorrect. Consequently, this stress does not seem to encroach upon the explicit norm *занял*. Similarly, the reported usage for the stress *принал* (неправ./простореч.) is quite low, 17.9 per cent, as compared with the figures for the normative *принал*: 77.4 per cent. Analogous results are found in Kolesov’s study, where 84.2 per cent used prefix stress and 13.7 per cent stressed *принал*.

The variant *нача́л* is non-normative in the sources (грубо неправ./простореч.) and only 12.3 per cent claim usage of it\textsuperscript{448} while 78.3 per cent say they do not use it, which indicates agreement between the explicit and the implicit norm.

Compliance between explicit and implicit norm is also found in *прибы́л*. This stress was the reported usage of 84.9 per cent of the informants, while the figure for the stem-stressed variant *прибы́л* (не рек./разр.) was significantly lower: 26.4 per cent.\textsuperscript{449} Data confirming the strong position of prefix stress in this verb can be found in earlier surveys: 96.5 per cent usage of *прибы́л* in Kolesov (1964), 90 per cent in Ukiah (1994).

\textsuperscript{446} Only two instances.
\textsuperscript{447} The grouping under these headings should not be seen as absolute, but rather as an indicator, and the tendencies are then explained in the text.
\textsuperscript{448} 0.0 per cent in Ukiah’s study.
\textsuperscript{449} Cf. 4.0 per cent usage of *прибы́л* in Kolesov (1964), 7.2 per cent in RJaSO (1963) and 10 per cent in Ukiah (1994).
For прédal, too, which was the reported usage of and seen as correct by 83.0 per cent of the informants, explicit and implicit norms apparently coincide.

This is apparently also the case for прóklyal. The percentage reporting usage of this stress, codified as normative, was 88.8, and only 7.5 per cent of the informants discarded it. Elicited usage also showed a preference for прóklyal. This stress was used by 77.4 per cent, as compared to 22.6 per cent for прокл́yal. In Ukiah’s survey, too, usage of the codified norm прóklyal was high: 95 per cent.

Table 4.5-2. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>прóklyal</th>
<th>прокл́yal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>неправ./простореч.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.4% (24)</td>
<td>22.6% (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The normative stress прódal was the reported usage of 53.7 per cent and the alternative stress прод́al (доп./разг.) had even higher reported usage: 70.8 per cent. Elicited usage displayed quite an even distribution between the two forms: прódal was used by 48.4 and прод́al by 51.6 per cent.450

Table 4.5-3. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>прódal</th>
<th>прод́ал</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.4% (15)</td>
<td>51.6% (16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Together the results of the two parts of the survey show that two stresses can function as the implicit norm. The stem-stressed variant is somewhat more used, though. These variants could be considered equal according to the implicit norm, and this should be reflected in codification. What is very important and has generally not been taken account of in previous research, is that the results also prove – and there are further examples – that two stress variants can exist alongside each other and that there is not always a necessity for one individual or one language community to choose between them, as they both (or all451) can be considered normative.

Another verb form for which there are apparently two stresses – both prefix stress and stem stress – belonging to the implicit norm is прозил. The stress of прозил was investigated in the oral performance test in two different contexts. In both these the distribution between prefix stress and stem stress was rather even. In the context “... прозил год ...” 58.1 per cent stressed прóжил (the codified norm) and 41.9 per cent прозил (доп./разг.), and in the context “... прозил бо́льшую часть своей жизни ...” 51.6 per cent stressed прóжил and 48.4 per cent прозил.

450 In Pirogova’s study продал is used by 45.3 per cent.
451 In practice some forms have more than two possible stresses. Thus, theoretically there can be more than two normative stresses for one form. In practice, however, it seems that not more than two variants are the implicit norm.
The replies in the written part of the investigation showed that both stresses are commonly used and considered to be normative by a majority of informants, but that the figures are higher for the stem-stressed прожил (доп./разг.): 79.3 per cent, as compared to 58.5 per cent for прожил. Likewise, previous surveys indicate quite an even distribution of the two stress variants: Gorbачевић прожил 53.9 per cent, прожил 46.1 per cent, and Пирогова прожил 50.7 per cent. In Ukiah’s survey, though, the figures were higher for the prefix stress: прожил 76 per cent, прожил 24 per cent.454 Thus, the explicit norm is also the implicit, but there is another implicit norm, not equally recognised in codification.

In the verb обнял both prefix stress and stem stress are used and accepted: the reported usage for the codified norm обнял is 43.4 per cent and for the variant stress обнёл (доп./разг.) 59.5 per cent. The actual usage was 64.5 per cent for обнял and 35.5 per cent for обнёл. In Ukiah’s small scale study (1994) 86 per cent stressed обнял and 14 per cent обнёл. It seems that in actual speech, when being forced to make a choice, the informants choose prefix stress, but that in fact both stresses are the implicit norm.

For the verb form отдал the situation is similar with both prefix stress (codified norm) and stem stress being the implicit norm. The results of the oral performance test show that the prefix stress, i.e. the codified norm, is less common than stem stress in both contexts. It is slightly higher, though, in combination with приказ (35.5 vs. 41.9 per cent), perhaps because it is perceived as a fixed construction and this promotes traditional stress, although the difference is too small to be significant.
In the written questionnaire 46.2 per cent reported usage of the stress \ötdal (приказ) and a slightly larger percentage – 50.9 per cent – claimed not to use it. The reported usage for the stem-stressed variant – in the context \ötđał (за бессенок) was significantly higher: 78.3 per cent. Previous surveys – with the exception of Ukiah – also show higher usage and/or reported usage of \otđał. There generally seems to be a preference for the stem-stressed variant. In Pirogova (1967) 76.0 per cent used this stress, in Gorbačevič (1974) the usage of \otđał, checked in four different contexts, varied between 60.9 and 77.7 per cent, while the usage of the prefix stress \ötdal in that survey in all contexts was significantly lower: between 22.3 and 39.1 per cent. In Ukiah (1994), however, the relation between the elicited stresses was the inverse: 67 per cent stressed \ötdal and 33 per cent \otđał.\(^{457}\) Thus, the results of the survey at hand\(^{458}\) reveal that the seemingly contradictory results of the other surveys in fact show that both stresses are the implicit norm. The stem-stressed variant is more widespread and more often seen as correct. There is apparently no reason why \otđał should not receive the same stamp of approval in codification as \ötdal. It could also be noticed that there might be differences in the employment of the stress variants of this verb that are due to the lexico-grammatical context, but such differences are features of an idiolect rather than universally observed language rules.

Another example of a verb form with two stresses as implicit norm is \пропил. The usage and acceptance of the two stresses are rather equally distributed, although the stem-stressed variant seems to be somewhat more widespread. Reported usage of the codified norm \пропи́л is 50.0 per cent (reported non-usage 43.4 per cent) and for \пропи́л (и/i) it is 61.4 per cent (30.3 per cent reported non-usage). This is in line with the results of Pirogova’s study from the 1960s, where the usage of the stem stress \пропи́л was similarly high, 65.3 per cent, and Ukiah’s 1994 study, in which the distribution was quite even: \пропи́л 52 and \пропи́л 48 per cent.

**Prefix stress is the explicit norm ≠ implicit norm**

There are also examples of codified prefix stresses that are not the actual norm.

The stress \побы́л is listed as normative in codification. It seems, however, that the implicit norm is \побы́л, in the sources доп./разг. This variant stress is the reported usage and the norm of 27.4 per cent of the informants, while a majority – 68.9 per cent – claim that they do not use it and believe it is incorrect. The results of Ukiah’s study point in the same direction as only 33 per cent used this prefix-stressed codified norm and 67 per cent the variant \побы́л.\(^{459}\)

One form for which the explicit norm is certainly not the implicit norm is \налил. The results of the oral part of the survey concerning this verb are quite eloquent: there was not one single instance of elicited usage of the codified norm \налил. All informants used the alternative stress \налил, in the sources labelled as доп./разг.

\(^{457}\) The form was included in the context “Он \ötdal книгу”.

\(^{458}\) A choice between the variants in actual or reported speech was not required by the method.

\(^{459}\) For a more certain conclusion regarding this form we would need corroboration from a check of the informants’ attitudes towards \побы́л and/or from elicited usage.
Table 4.5-9. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>накла</th>
<th>наклл</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>100.0% (31)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reported usage of the explicit norm was also low: a mere 7.6 per cent, while as many as 82.1 per cent rejected it, thus confirming the prevalence of наклл. The results of reported usage of наклл further confirm that this is the implicit norm in contemporary educated Russian: 92.5 per cent report usage of this stress and only 3.7 per cent claim not to use it.

The results from two surveys can be taken as a final piece of evidence that наклл is not currently the actual norm and probably has not been for several decades: in RJaSO (1963) 78.9 per cent of the 4,300 “standard language speakers” questioned reported usage of наклл and in Kolesov’s study (1964) 76.9 per cent used this stress, as compared to 23.1 per cent for the stress накла. Apparently, the actual norm for the past 35 years – at least – has been накла. Although not totally commensurable, the results from the surveys of the 1960s and those from the present investigation point to the inexpediency of attempting, through codification, to maintain a norm that is obviously obsolescent or obsolete.461 If the codified norm should reflect the actual norm, a more adequate labelling of the stresses could be obsolescent (доп. устар. etc.) for накла, with наклл listed as normative.462

The stress norms for the past tense forms of перемереть does, as already touched upon above, differ in the orthoepic sources. Here, however, they have been assigned to this heading on the grounds of the labelling in OS, as it is the most “authoritative” source (see Chapter 3). The codification in OS with the stress перемер as normative is not supported in current educated usage, and consequently, is not the implicit norm. This stress is the reported usage of a mere 5.6 per cent of the informants; 93.4 per cent report not using it and believe it is incorrect. In RPP this stress is labelled “bookish” (книжн.), which better seems to reflect its actual marginal position in the speech community. It is the stress перемер, normative in RPP and labelled доп. in OS, and the reported usage of 68.0 per cent, that is the implicit norm. The fact that the sum of reported usage for the two alternative stresses is only approximately 73 per cent indicates one of two things. Either this is an infrequent lexeme and the informants do not use or understand it, or there is another variant that is used but not recorded in the sources (перемер ?, перемер ?).

The results of the oral part of the survey show that both these assumptions seem well-founded. Firstly, there is a third stress variant not recorded in the sources: перемер, here used by 19.4 per cent of the informants. Secondly, the relatively high number of invalid replies is due to the fact that as many as 7 informants read помер, which could suggest that the verb перемереть as such is rare. Not one informant used the stress перемер, and 58.1 per cent used the stress перемер.463

460 The assessment of this variant was at that time – i.e. in A&O–1960 – the same as in the sources from the 1990s.
461 It is quite remarkable that the compilers of OS–1983–1997 have not taken into consideration the results of a large-scale survey of “standard language speakers” conducted by a group at the Russian Language Institute of the Soviet (now: Russian) Academy of Sciences (by the way the very institution in which OS was elaborated).
463 In Ukiah’s survey (1994) 5 per cent (= one informant) used this stress, and 95 per cent stressed перемер.

The codified norm примочила does not appear to be the actual norm: 69.8 per cent of the informants reject it and only 26.4 per cent of the informants report usage of this stress and believe it is correct.

The prefix-stressed explicit norm отпил is not the implicit norm. As many as 71.7 per cent of the informants claim not to use this stress and only 24.5 per cent report usage of it. Preference is given to the stem-stressed отпил, labelled и/i, which is the reported usage of 94.3 per cent of the speakers in the study. There is conformity with results from previous studies: отпил was used by 11.1 per cent in Kolesov’s study (1964) and by 15.4 per cent in Gorbachević’s study (1974). These figures should be compared to the results for отпил. This stress was used by a majority of the informants in three previous studies: 84.6 per cent (RJaSO), 91.2 per cent (Kolesov) and 84.6 (Gorbachević).\(^{464}\) Hence, stem stress in this verb seems to have been the implicit norm since the 1960s. Despite the low figures for the prefix-stressed variant in the 1960s – and at present – it is still given as the “first norm”, and contemporary sources perpetuate a norm apparently already obsolescent 35 years ago. It should be observed, though, that there are handbooks which give an explicit norm that is in line with the current implicit norm: the 1984, 1993 and 2000 editions of A&Z list отпил.\(^{465}\)

**Stem stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm**

The explicit as well as the implicit norm is doubtlessly the stem-stressed добыл. There is no indication that the prefix-stressed добьл (доп. устар/_) is a widespread variant stress or that it is seen as correct by the speakers: it has low reported usage: 8.5 per cent, and 87.7 per cent report not to use the stress and believe it is incorrect.\(^{466}\)

The prefix-stressed придал (доп. устар/_) was the reported usage of 8.5 per cent, and it was equally low in Ukiah’s study: 14 per cent. This variant stress is therefore not competing with the explicit norm. Hence, the results for добыл and придал suggest that a prefix stress that has been labelled as “obsolescent” does not encroach upon current normative stem stress.

**Different stress codification for different meanings**

Verbs for which different stress variants convey different meanings can be found, at least in codification. It appears, though, that the semantic differentiation between stress variants in for instance передать and пережить is disappearing and that only one stress becomes

---

\(^{464}\) Gorbachević qualifies the listing of отпил and нáлil as the only normative stresses in a source from 1967 as “[п]римером лексикографического пурризма” (1978a:105).

\(^{465}\) A comparison of the results for the compounds of -пить (with different prefixation) shows the stress diversity within one stem. For both пропил and отпил the prefix-stressed form is the explicit norm and the stem-stressed variant is labelled и/i. However, according to the implicit norm пропил is normative alongside with пропил, while отпил is the only norm and отпил is on the way of becoming obsolete.

\(^{466}\) In Ukiah’s survey 14 per cent used this stress.
normative – first in the implicit norm, then in the explicit – and is then used in all contexts. An example from Nen’ko (1984c:59) of a word that has followed this course of development is раздаться, which in dictionaries used to have semantic differentiation (BAS–1950–1965: раздал meaning ‘сделал просторнее, расширил’ and роздал meaning ‘отдал, распределил’; other dictionaries have given double forms considered equal). In contemporary sources like OS and RPP there is no semantic differentiation in this verb, and the stresses are not equal from a normative point of view: роздал is considered obsolescent and раздал is the norm.

The disappearance of semantic differentiation between stress variants is not an unlikely form of development for other verbs, too, although there might be verbs for which this difference is maintained in current usage.

The verb пробил is one of the few verbs for which there might be a difference in meaning, not only in the dictionaries but also in current usage. It was checked in different contexts in the oral and the written part of the survey. In the oral part the context was “… пробил стену …” and for this meaning only one possible stress was given in the normative sources: пробил. This was also the stress that was most used by the informants: 87.1 per cent, although 12.9 per cent used the stress пробил, not mentioned in the sources as a possible variant for this meaning.

Table 4.5-11. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>пробил</th>
<th>пробил</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>/ (not included)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.1% (27)</td>
<td>12.9% (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The stress пробил was checked in the written part of the survey without specification of the context. The reported usage was 58.5 per cent for the prefix-stressed variant. In Ukiah’s survey пробил in the meaning ‘make a hole through’ was used by 26 per cent and пробил by 74 per cent, while in the meaning ‘strike’ (a time/an hour) 76 per cent stressed пробил, which is also the codified norm, and 24 per cent stressed пробил. In his survey the difference in meaning was reflected in the informants’ replies. Thus, the implicit norm and the explicit appear to comply, but strict separation of stress variants in different contexts is not observed and there is some confusion as to the use of the variants. This is reflected in the informants’ use of prefix stress also in a context where it is not even given as a variant stress in the sources.

Firstly, it can be stated that the stress передал was not elicited once (although 31 speakers each twice read a sentence containing this word). This indicates that this stress is rare and that it might not even be necessary to warn against it in dictionaries as it seems to be more of a theoretical stress variant than a serious “threat” to the existing norm.

Secondly, it can be stated that the differentiation in meaning between the stress variants – made in OS, but not in RPP – is not supported by contemporary usage. The stem-stressed передал was the most commonly used variant, both in the context where it is normative according to the sources: передал сдачу (74.2 per cent) and in a meaning and context

---

467 The informants generally do not appear to have hesitated because of any semantic differentiation. Two informants replied that they use this stress but know it is incorrect, and only one informant added a word (час) so as to specify the context in which this stress should be used according to him/her.

468 Cf. the same findings in Ukiah: he did not find any differentiation in meaning for different stresses of this verb linked to differentiation in stress (1996:594–595), neither did he find evidence “for retraction onto the second syllable of the prefix, warned against by OS” (1996:619–620).
where it is considered доп./разг.: переда́л чертеж (83.9 per cent). For the prefix-stressed variant (with stress on the first syllable of the prefix) the elicited usage was 16.1 per cent (переда́л чертеж = норма) and 22.6 per cent (переда́л сдаку; this variant stress is not listed in this context in the lexicographic sources). The results in the written part of the survey seem to confirm what has been found in the elicited usage: the codified norm переда́л (письмо) is reported usage of only 15.2 per cent of the informants, while 79.3 claim not to use it and believe it is incorrect. This can be contrasted with the equally normative but stem-stressed переда́л (сдаку), for which the reported usage was 88.7 per cent. This verb, in the meaning ‘pass, broadcast’, was also included in the survey made by Ukiah, in which 19 per cent stressed переда́л and 81 per cent переда́л. Thus, no semantical differentiation is made by the language users, and stem stress – переда́л – is the implicit norm in both contexts, although the stress переда́л is used to a certain extent.

Table 4.5-12. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>переда́л</th>
<th>норма</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>неправ./простореч.</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5-13. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>переда́л</th>
<th>норма</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>/</em>(not included)</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>неправ./простореч.</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elicited stress for the verb пережи́л shows that usage is higher for the stem-stressed variant in both contexts, although it is labelled differently depending on its meaning. In the meaning ‘to live through; to outlive, outlast, survive’ the stress пережи́л is normative and it was used by 74.2 per cent, while in the meaning ‘to experience; to go through; to endure, suffer’ it is labelled и/разг. and here it was used by almost as large a percentage: 71.0. The prefix-stressed variant пережи́л was less used both in the first meaning, in which it is considered obsolescent (22.6 per cent), and in the second, in which it is considered normative (29.0 per cent). This shows that semantic differences in stress are probably disappearing and that пережи́л is most likely ultimately asserting itself as the only norm.

Table 4.5-14. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>пережи́л</th>
<th>норма</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>доп. устар.</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>неправ./простореч.</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5-15. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>пережи́л</th>
<th>норма</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>и/разг.</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>неправ./простореч.</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In reported usage, too, the figures were higher for the stem stress. The results indicate, though, that both stresses are used and accepted.

According to the sources prefix stress is considered доп. устар./устар. when the verb has the meaning ‘to live through; to outlive, outlast, survive’. In the context переда́л сенсью the
variant пёргййл was the reported usage of 30.2 per cent and the codified norm пёргйїл (женю) was the reported usage of 86.8 per cent of the informants. Thus, here there is compliance between the implicit and explicit norm. However, also in the context where it means ‘to experience; to go through; to endure, suffer’ and in which prefix stress is considered normative in the sources, the reported usage for the prefix stress пёргййл (горе) was lower – 51.9 per cent (non-usage: 45.2 per cent), than for the stem stress пёргйїл (зим), labelled и/разр. – 68.9 per cent (non-usage: 28.3). In Ukiah’s investigation as well, usage of stem stress was higher: пёргйїл – 86 per cent and пёргййл – 14 per cent.

As a conclusion it can be stated that there is an indication of a stronger tendency towards stem stress than towards prefix stress. Different contexts do not seem to play a role in the choice of stress either for the verb пёргййл or for передал. It can also be concluded that, as in the case with передал above, stress on the second syllable of the prefix (пёргйил) was not elicited once. This stress on the second syllable of the prefix probably only exists in theory, i.e. in dictionaries.

4.5.3 Feminine non-reflexive verb forms with and without prefix

It can be concluded from a comparison with older dictionaries that the number of feminine forms with stress on the flexion (-a) is increasing (Nen'ko 1984c:56).


At the same time as there is stabilisation of feminine end stress with this pattern influencing the stress of the neuter forms (началъ > начало) there is a tendency towards stem stress (or prefix stress) in the feminine either through interior analogy: разорвлъ, разорвъло > разорвлъла; прйняла, прйнялъо > прйняла, or through exterior analogy: упала, узнъла etc. > разорвлъла (Gorbačevič 1978a:108–109, Voroncova 1996:310). The stem-stressed feminine preterite forms such as гнъла, отдъла are generally seen as typical features of prostoreке (Zemskaja & Šmelëv 1984:9, Offord 1996:9).

Another explanation put forward for explaining stem stress in the feminine is that it is an influence from southern Russian dialects. (Compare Pirogova 1959a:132–133.) However, at least two points must be kept in mind here. Firstly, the belief that all southern dialects have stem stress in the feminine preterite forms that in the standard language are end-stressed is refuted by Danilov’s material from Tula oblast’ (1967:113–115). These verbs do not unconditionally take stress on the stem, but there is rather vacillation: прялъ – пряла; бралъ – бралъа (Danilov 1967:86–91). Secondly, stem-stressed feminine preterite forms are also found in dialectal areas other than the southern. Styles like бралъа, звъла, ткъла,
Oscillations are frequent (Stankiewicz 1993:282).476

4.5.3.1

and Chapter 1.4.4.2.)

The length of the words could also play a role in the stress placement. Gorbačevič (1978a:108–109) suggests that as a consequence of a tendency towards rhythmic balance there is stem stress particularly often in verbs with disyllabic (or trisyllabic) prefixes (podobrala > подобрала, переизбралал – переизбрала).477 (Cf. Gorbačevič 1978b:123–126 and Chapter 1.4.4.2.)

4.5.3.1 Dictionary data

End stress is the codified norm


In the following cases only the prefixed verb has this type of variation: -была – бывла (with the prefixes из-, от-, по-, при-, про-, с-, у-), -ньяла – няла (with the prefixes в-, до-, воспри-, дос-, зас-, на-, от-, отс-, переза-, пере-, перес-, под-, предпри-, приза-, прина-, припод-, про-, раз-, с-, у-) and взяла – взяла – чала (with the prefixes за-, по-, здалла – здала (with the prefixes во-, воссо-, пересо-, со-). The variants залила, обніяла, отбывла479 are, like the above-mentioned stem stresses labelled неправ. in OS, while they in RPP are less severely assessed (разг.). This variation is also found in перетолкля – перетолкля (/простореч.).

Stem stress is доп./разг. or и: пряла – пряла is marked (и/_) for one meaning (прясть ушами) and доп./разг. in the other (‘to spin’), ткалал – ткаля (including prefixed verbs) (доп./разг.), оперлал – оперля (и/разг.).

Stem stress is marked не рек. etc.: добыла – добыла (не рек./_), прижили – прижили (не рек./простореч.), перемерла – перемерля (не рек./разг.).

Stem stress is грубо неправ./(грубо) простореч.: поняла – поняла (грубо неправ./грубо простореч.), началал – начальала (грубо неправ./простореч.), недопоняла – недопоняла (грубо неправ./_).

Stem stress is marked доп. устар./устар.: секла – секла.

Prefix stress is marked неправ./простореч. (the normative forms are end-stressed and most of them are listed above): дожала, дожила, дольла, доньяла, донила, зала, зала, зажила, залила, восприняла, заморила, занияла, запёрла, запилила, запроздала, нажила, налила, наняла.

---

475 In 1912 Černyšëv asserted that non-end stress in feminine preterite (была, умерла, начала) was “not seldom” heard in the speech of students from St Petersburg (1912:39).

476 See also Krylova (1986:175): брала, назвала etc. are examples of stem stress in feminine preterite forms in Byelorussian that in standard Russian are end-stressed.

477 “Большинство опрошенных (интеллигенты разных профессий) предпочло накоренной акцент (переизбрала), мотивируя это тем, что он легче произносится, чем переизбрала” (Gorbačevič 1978a:109).

478 = ‘исполнить’.

479 = ‘торнуться в путь, отправиться’.
Stem stress is the codified norm

End stress is не рек./простореч.: -перѣть: упѣрл — уперл, подпѣрл — подперл.

End stress is неправ./простореч.: клѣла — клал, краѣла — крал, слѣла — слал, стѣла — стлѣла (including all prefixed verbs with these stems) and — only in RPP: опровергл — опровергл, -стрѣгля — -стригл (like in подстраигл — подстригл etc., also with other prefixes) and -тѣрл — -терл (like in стѣрл — стерл etc., also with other prefixes).

480 Labelled разг. in RPP (cf. неправ. in OS).
481 This variation occurs in both meanings for this verb (cf. masculine forms).
482 This variation occurs in both meanings for this verb (cf. masculine forms).
483 This variation occurs in both meanings for this verb (cf. masculine forms).
484 This variation occurs in both meanings for this verb (cf. masculine forms).
485 Only in RPP is this variant given in the meaning ‘to make a hole’.
486 The verb form созданл is the only one with an originally disyllabic stem that according to the sources has a possible prefix-stressed variant in the feminine preterite form. All the other verbs listed here contain originally monosyllabic stems.
4.5.3.2 Results

Table 4.5-16. Reported usage and language users’ norm. Percentage of respondents for each category of answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress variant examined</th>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>Percentages (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and I say it like that myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хо́дял</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>сна́ла</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>врала</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>гнал</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кала</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>задала</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>си́нна</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>обвила</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>изгнала</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>создала</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>доткала</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>прогнала</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>прала</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>жойла</td>
<td>непр./про.</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>брала</td>
<td>непр./про.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>начала</td>
<td>грубо непр./про.</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>задала</td>
<td>непр./про.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>проспала</td>
<td>непр./про.</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кра́ла</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>подстра́йгла</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>опровергла</td>
<td>непр.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>послала</td>
<td>непр./про.</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>зание́ра</td>
<td>непр./про.</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>работа</td>
<td>непр./про.</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>нáчала</td>
<td>непр./про.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>позвала</td>
<td>непр./про.</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>нé была</td>
<td>не норма</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tornow (1984:437) sees two perspectives in the feminine past tense stress: either stem stress will assert itself or end stress will prevail, supported by the end-stressed neuter form ждало etc. This second course of development seems more likely, judging from the results of the present and other surveys.

Comrie & Stone (1978) concluded that feminine preterite stress in general poses no problem. To this Townsend (1979:307) has objected that:

The comment that feminine singulars like взяла pose no problem in usage [...] may be criticized, since the loss of the feminine versus non-feminine distinction in the past and past passive participle of resonant stems (resulting in divergences like взяла and принжала) is in fact a quite prominent colloquial feature and cannot be ignored.

However, Townsend’s remark seems to be ill-founded. In both Ukiah (1996) and the present investigation there is, on the whole, compliance between explicit and implicit norm in the preterite feminine in current educated usage.

Regardless of whether a verb contains an originally monosyllabic or disyllabic stem or whether the verb is prefixed or not, the informants report usage of and use the end-stressed norm (дала, спала, врала, гналá, ткалá, задала, си́лá, обвила, изгнала, создала, доткала, прогнала).

At the same time, the “incorrect” variants stressed on the stem or on не, like жила, брала, начала, задала, проспала, нё была are not widespread and are not believed to be correct. The reported usage (and actual usage) is low also for the prefix-stressed non-
normative stresses (заперла, задала, начала, позвала), although higher for заперла than for the others.

The language users are very sure about the normativity of the stem stress подстригла, and end-stressed variants to stem-stressed codified norm are rare in reported usage. However, one of the two stem stresses codified as normative that were included in the survey, крала, had relatively low reported usage (36.9 per cent; 62.3 per cent reported non-usage).

**End stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm**

All feminine end stresses which are codified as normative, both prefixed and unprefixed are, with one exception (прогнила), also the actual norm.

In the recordings all informants stressed дала and the reported usage was equally high: 88.7 per cent (of which as large a percentage as 58.5 claimed that they know it is correct). Previous studies also have high figures for дала: 95.5 per cent in Kolesov (1964) and 100 per cent in Ukiah (1994).487

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>дала</th>
<th>дала</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>неправ./простореч.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0% (31)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5-17. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

Another end-stressed form that was used by all speakers in the oral performance test was спала. Reported usage was 92.5 per cent, which is in line with the results of other surveys: 92.0 per cent in Kolesov (1964) and 100 per cent in Ukiah (1994).488

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>спала</th>
<th>спала</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>неправ./простореч.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0% (31)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5-18. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

Reported usage was high for most end-stressed feminine forms that are codified as normative in the present investigation, and also, when such material is available, in previous surveys: врала 89.6 per cent (74.1 per cent in Kolesov (1964) and 100 per cent in Ukiah (1994)), гнала 86.8 per cent (95 per cent in Ukiah (1994)), задала 87.7 per cent, at the same time as the two variants задала and задала, labelled неправ./простореч., have low reported usage (11.4 and 13.2 per cent respectively), снала 86.8 per cent (92.1 per cent in Kolesov (1964) and 100 per cent in Ukiah (1994)) and созданла 82.0 per cent (95 per cent in Ukiah 1994).

The stress позвала was the actual usage of 96.8 per cent of the informants, while stem stress was used by one informant. Not once was the prefix-stressed позвала (неправ./простореч.) elicited. It was the reported usage of only 5.7 per cent of the informants and the percentage rejecting this stress was very high, with as many as 63.2 per cent claiming that they know

487 Cf. the small usage for the stem-stressed variant дала both in Pirogova (1.3 per cent) and Kolesov (5.5 per cent).
488 спала (неправ./простореч.) was used by 21.1 per cent in Kolesov and by 6.7 per cent in Pirogova (1967).
489 Kolesov (1964): врала (неправ./простореч.) 29.9 per cent.
490 Cf. Pirogova (1967) where the stem-stressed variant гнала (неправ./простореч.) was used by only 10.7 per cent.
491 Kolesov (1964): снала (неправ./простореч.) 6.6 per cent.
this stress is incorrect. This suggests that this is a very rare stress variant, not in any way infringing upon the current explicit and implicit norm, which is позвалá.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>позвалá</th>
<th>позвáла</th>
<th>позвáла</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>нрн.простреч.</td>
<td>нрн.простреч.</td>
<td>нрн.простреч.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.8% (30)</td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the stresses обвиlá and изгналá the reported usage was somewhat lower than for the above-mentioned codified end stresses: 74.6 per cent and 62.2 per cent respectively. Although a majority of the language users see these stresses as correct, a greater hesitancy is displayed as to the normativity of end stress in these verb forms as compared to many other feminine end-stressed verb forms. In both these stem stress is condemned, labelled as “incorrect”.

Another form that had somewhat lower reported usage than the other normative end-stressed forms was ткалá. Here, 78.4 per cent reported usage (non-usage 18.9 per cent). Other surveys, too, evince predominance for end stress, although the figures vary more than for the verbs listed above: in Kolesov (1964) 59.1 per cent used this stress and in Ukiah (1994) 86 per cent. The results for the stem-stressed variant тка́ла (доп./разг.) – 46.1 per cent in Kolesov (1964), 25.3 per cent in Pirogova (1967) and 14 per cent in Ukiah (1994) – indicate that this stem-stressed variant is more accepted among language users than stem-stressed variants in most other feminine preterite verbs. This is also reflected in the codification, where it is labelled доп./разг. as compared to неправ./простреч. for most other verbs of the same group.

With the prefix до- this verb showed similar results: доткалá was the reported usage of 67.9 per cent of the informants, and elicited usage shows quite an even distribution of the two stresses among the informants: slightly more than half of them used the normative and slightly less than half used the stem-stressed variant labelled доп./разг. Accordingly, the dual norms – or the hesitancy and insecurity – are reflected both in codification (where the variant stress is not strongly condemned) and in attitudes and usage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>дотка́ла</th>
<th>дотка́ла</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.6% (16)</td>
<td>45.2% (14)</td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The normative началá was not included in the written survey. However, the stem-stressed нача́ла (грубо неправ./простреч.) had low reported usage, 13.2 per cent, as had the prefix-stressed нача́ла (неправ./простреч.): 10.3 per cent. The oral survey confirmed the strong position of the normative end stress, but also showed that the stress нача́ла is more widely used in spontaneous speech than indicated in surveys, where it is obvious that stress is the object of study. This stress is probably an analogical levelling with stress in the masculine and other forms.

---

492 Ukiah (1994): 86 per cent, and 14 per cent stressed обви́ла.
493 In Ukiah’s survey the figures for these variants were 0 and 5 per cent, respectively.
Table 4.5-21. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>началá</th>
<th>началa</th>
<th>началâ</th>
<th>Invalid^494</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>неправ./простореч.</td>
<td>грубо неправ./простореч.</td>
<td>54.8% (17) 25.8% (8) 0.0% (0) 19.4% (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shapiro (1969:28–29) claims that a possible course of development is towards stem stress (началá, началâ). It seems more probable, however, that for the foreseeable future the present codified and actual norm will persist, and changes, if any, will most likely be towards prefix stress in all forms, including the feminine.

Further indications – although not absolute proof – of end stress being both the explicit and implicit norm can be found in the informants’ rejection of stem- and prefix-stressed variants. The non-normative variant нё была was not included in the sources for this investigation, but was found in Lapteva (1990b) as an example of a speech error from TV. Reported usage of this non-normative form was 16.0 per cent and actual usage 12.9 per cent^495 and a majority of the speakers reporting usage also say that they know it is right. This stress might be an influence from the normative нё был/o/i/, which appear to have a strong position and which are in fact the only examples of stress retraction to не that are functioning as a norm in current educated speech.^496 Although this is not a widely used variant and it is by no means competing with the normative form, it can be argued that нё была should be included in handbooks of the kind that also list non-normative forms.

Table 4.5-22. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>я не была уверена</th>
<th>я не была уверена</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма (not included)</td>
<td>87.1% (27) 12.9% (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another non-normative variant to an end-stressed codified norm is жи²ла (неправ./простореч.) and this stem stress had low reported usage, only 11.3 per cent. It was equally low in the other surveys: 5.3 per cent in Pirogova and 0 per cent in Ukiah. The percentage of informants who claim that they do not use this stress and know that it is incorrect is very high, 56.6 per cent. Consequently, there seems to be no doubt that the explicit and implicit norm is жи²ла.

Another non-normative variant to an end-stressed codified norm is бра³ла (неправ./простореч.) and for this stress as well reported usage was low: only 10.4 per cent. As many as 85.9 per cent of the informants claimed not to use it and believed it was incorrect. There was a similar distribution of answers in other studies: бра³ла was reported in Kolesov (1964) to be the usage of 88.2 per cent and бра³ла (неправ./простореч.) of 17.4 per cent. In Ukiah (1994) no one used this latter stress. In the present survey, too, all informants’ elicited usage was end stress.

Table 4.5-23. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>бра³ла</th>
<th>бра³ла</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>неправ./простореч.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

494 The relatively large number of invalid replies is due to the fact that several informants read “Миша начал” instead of “Маша начала”.

495 In Ukiah’s study the actual usage was 0 per cent.

496 Cf. Ukiah (1996:680–682) and the section on results for neuter forms below.
Reported usage for пропсала (неправ/простореч.) was low: 19.8 per cent, although higher than in previous surveys (2.7 per cent in Pirogova and 5 in Ukiah). As many as 14.2 per cent of the informants claim that they use this stress, but know that it is incorrect, and this is by far the highest percentage of answers in this column for the whole survey. What is interesting, too, is the fact that even if the informants are on the whole negative towards this stress, there is only one person who claims that he/she does not use it and knows that it is wrong. Still, it appears that the implicit norm is the same as the explicit: пропсала (cf. спала above with reported and actual usage of over 90 per cent).

The stem-stressed form прйла (labelled н/_) was the reported usage of 43.4 per cent of the respondents. In Ukiah’s study about half the informants (57 per cent) used this stress and 43 per cent the codified norm прлла. The conclusion is that the equality of these forms in implicit norm is reflected in codification and vice versa.

As shown above, позвала is a prefix-stressed variant that has low usage. While it was not found that prefix stress is claiming normativity in any preterite feminine form, there are prefix-stressed variants that are quite frequent: зперла (неправ/простореч.) is seen as the norm by 34.0 per cent of the informants in the present survey and was used by 31 per cent in Ukiah’s study.497

In conclusion, there is no indication that stem stress or prefix stress is infringing upon end stress when codified as the norm in the feminine.

**End stress is the explicit norm ≠ implicit norm**

The only normative end-stressed feminine form that sticks out by having relatively low reported usage is прогнила: 38.7 per cent (as compared to the 54.7 per cent who claim not to use this stress and believe it is incorrect). In Ukiah’s survey the figures were higher for end stress, 60 per cent (with 40 per cent stressing пргнйла), but still not as high as for the other feminine forms with end stress as the codified norm. Accordingly, there appears to be some vacillation in this agreement between the implicit and explicit norm. It seems plausible that reported and actual usage of the stress пргнйла (неправ/простореч.) is rather high, although for firmer conclusions additional results are needed. Why the adherence to end stress is smaller in this verb is hardly possible to detect with the present material and method. It is most likely not due to the number of syllables (three) as there are other verbs, like позвалла above, that contain three syllables and which are almost unanimously end-stressed.

**Stem stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm**

The stress подстрйгла is the explicit and undoubtedly also the implicit norm. Reported usage is as high as 95.3 per cent (of which 53.8 “know” that it is correct) and only 1.8 per cent of the informants claim not to use it.

The informants’ rejections of end-stressed variants – through reporting relatively low usage of the stem-stressed codified norm and seeing it as incorrect – could also be taken as an indication of the strong position of stem stress: 6.6 per cent of the informants claim usage of опроверглй (_/простореч.), while as many as 61.3 per cent “know” that this stress is incorrect, and 35.9 per cent report usage of посллла (labelled неправ/простореч.).

---

497 69 per cent stressed заперл в Ukiah (1994).
Stem stress is the explicit norm ≠ implicit norm

One of the quite few stem-stressed normative preterite feminine forms is крάла. A minority of the informants (36.9 per cent) reported usage of this stress and as many as 62.3 per cent reported that they do not use it. The comparatively low figures for this stem-stressed normative form could be taken as further indication of the strong position of feminine end stress. A tentative hypothesis is that it is a sign of hypercorrection (analogical levelling with other stems in the feminine with normative end stress); the speakers believe that feminine preterite forms should “always” be end-stressed. This hypothesis would then be applicable to verbs ending in V+ла (клала, крала, слала, стлала; cf. verbs ending in C+ла: опровергла, подстригла, for which there is no tendency towards hypercorrection with end stress).

4.5.4 Neuter non-reflexive verb forms with and without prefix

In the neuter past variation occurs between stem stress and end stress in simplex verbs (жилó) and between prefix, stem and end stress in prefixed verbs (прожилó). The variation between prefix stress and stem stress has been dealt with at the beginning of this chapter and in the section on masculine forms.

As for the end-stressed variants, it is sometimes suggested that they are an analogical creation from the feminine. As mentioned in Chapter 4.5.3, there are two stress development tendencies in the feminine preterite, and it was shown above that the stronger tendency is the one towards end stress, which in its turn has given rise to the neuter past tense forms with stress on the gender/number marker (cf. Comrie et al. 1996:86). This type of stress is considered quite recent (Comrie et al. 1996:86–87, Voroncova 1979:183–185, Ukhia 1996:592) and Ukhia points out that this development is especially current among young speakers.498

There is generally little unanimity and systematisation in the discussion about end-stressed neuter forms. Nen’ko suggests that this stress is particularly common in the verbs далó, жило, гналó, спалó (1984c:58), while Voroncova (1996:309) professes that it is only possible in далó and взяло. According to Lapteva (1997:52) the neuter end stress ждалó is often found in use among the old Moscow intelligentsia and it is, according to her, admissible (although in OS it is не рек. and in RPP простореч.). If we turn to normative sources we find that most end-stressed neuter forms are considered incorrect (labelled не рек./простореч. or неправ./простореч.) and the only normative end-stressed neuter forms are далó and сенкó, with взяло (доп./_), не далó (доп./_), рвалó (доп./_), нарвалó (доп./разг.), уткалó (не рек./разг.) being more or less accepted in at least one of the sources.

There are different propositions regarding the origin of or motivation for this stress type. Agrell (1917:27) suggests that there is a difference in meaning between stresses like заняло and занялó, where stress on the gender/number marker signals definiteness and marks an ending. Stankiewicz (1993:219) makes the assumption that the neuter preterite forms are stressed by analogy with the reflexive neuter preterite forms, as both have similar syntactic functions, and are used “mainly in impersonal constructions”. Another expla-

498 It is highly doubtful whether Ukhia has enough informants (he has 21 in all) to make correlations between one group of informants and one particular feature. Neither is the material in the present survey sufficient. Anyhow, the results showed that далó and не далó were used by almost all informants and that началó was used by 9 out of 31 informants, of which all were born in 1972 or later, and создалó was used by 8 informants, including informants from older age groups.
nation for stress on the gender/number marker in the neuter and plural forms (-ó, -í) could be that it is an influence from Ukrainian or Byelorussian. For some verbs that in Russian have prefix stress in preterite masculine, neuter and plural, in Ukrainian and Byelorussian usually have end stress in all the preterite forms except the masculine: зайня́в, зайня́ла, зайня́ло, зайня́ли (Ukrainian; cf. Russian: зáнял, заня́ла, зáняло, зáняли) (Gorpič 1992:234), адáл, адáлá, адáлó, адáлі (Byelorussian; cf. Russian: отдал, отдалá, отдалó, отдали) (Krylova 1986:175). End stresses like the following are current in Byelorussian: лілó, пілó, плилó, жылó, клялó, нанялó, паднялó, пачалó, былó (Stankiewicz 1993:282).

4.5.4.1 Dictionary data

**Prefix stress is the codified norm**


- **Stem stress is** не рек. ест.: прибылó – прибылó (не рек./простореч.), ожилó – ожило (не рек./разг.), обьило – отбыло (не рек./разг.).


- **Stem stress is** грубо неправ./грубо простореч.: недопоня́ло – недопоняло (грубо неправ./_), поня́ло – поняло (грубо неправ./грубо простореч.), начало – начало (грубо неправ./_).


---

499 In the meaning “to strike”.
500 и/разг.
501 и/разг.: ‘испытать; перенести, выдержать’.
502 и/разг.
503 и/разг.
504 и/разг.
505 доп./простореч.
506 = ‘вручить, сообщить и др.’.
507 The only verb with an originally disyllabic stem that has normative prefix stress.
508 перемерло is the norm in OS and labelled книжн. in RPP, перемерло is labelled доп. in OS and is the norm in RPP.
509 доп./простореч.
510 доп./и.

511 = 'вручить, сообщить и др.'.
512 = 'испытать; перенести, выдержать'.
513 = 'прожить какое-то время; прожить больше кого-чего-н., остаться жить после смерти кого-н.'.
514 наравало is labelled доп. in the meaning ‘тошнить’ and не рек. in the meaning ‘выдерживать и др.’.
515 = 'прожить какое-то время; прожить больше кого-чего-н., остаться жить после смерти кого-н.'.
516 In the meaning ‘тошнить’ рвало is labelled доп. не рек./разг.
517 ne рек./разг.
518 Variant only listed in RPP, meaning ‘to make a hole’.
519 End stress is normative for the simplex verb.
520 = 'дать лишнего'.
521 раздало — роздало.
End stress is the codified norm

Stem stress is \( \text{нэ} \text{дало} \) – \( \text{дало} \).

Stem stress is \( \text{доп. устар.} \text{/устар.} \text{ сэкло} \) – \( \text{сэкло} \) (simplex and with the prefixes \text{за-}, \text{ис-}, \text{над-}, \text{на-}, \text{об-}, \text{-о-}, \text{-от-}, \text{-перед-}, \text{-под-}, \text{-по-}, \text{-пре-}, \text{-про-}, \text{-рас-}, \text{-с-}, \text{-у-}).

Stress on \( \text{нэ} \text{дало} \) with the variants \( \text{не} \text{дало (доп./_)} \) and \( \text{не} \text{дало (доп./разг.)} \) and in \( \text{нэ} \text{жило} \) with the variant \( \text{не} \text{жило (доп./разг.)} \).

Stress on \( \text{нэ} \text{пило} \) (доп. устар./устар. и книжн.) and the explicit norm is \( \text{не} \text{пило} \).

4.5.4.2 Results

Table 4.5-24. Reported usage and language users’ norm. Percentage of respondents for each category of answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress variant examined</th>
<th>I say it like that myself</th>
<th>I do not say it like that myself</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and I know that it is correct</td>
<td>and I believe that it is correct</td>
<td>but I do not know whether it is correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>нічало</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>сончало</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>залило</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>оцерло</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>далило</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>нё дало</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>прольло</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>залило</td>
<td>доп./_</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>поддало</td>
<td>и/разг.</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>прогнило</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>взяло</td>
<td>доп./_</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>набрызгл</td>
<td>не рек./про.</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>дало</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For some prefixed verbs with prefix stress as the explicit norm reported usage (and, where applicable, elicited usage) is low or very low. This is the case with, for instance, 
\\( \text{дольло}, \text{зольло}, \text{отерло}, \text{сидало}. \)\(^{522}\) Stress on the negation (нё дало) was neither used, reported to be used or considered correct.

Regarding the stem-stressed forms, only one such stress codified as normative was investigated. However, there was in this survey (with supportive material from a previous study) no hesitation among the informants as to whether прогнило is correct. In addition, for the three stem-stressed variants investigated and labelled as equal to the norm or admissible/colloquial, the reported usage was between 27.3 and 45.4 per cent, which is higher than for several prefix-stressed codified norms.

As far as the end-stressed forms are concerned, reported (and actual) usage was high both in the cases when they are normative, like дало, and when they are not: не дало (доп./_), взяло (доп./_), and набрало (неправ./простореч.). The only exception is начало. Strom (1988:443–444) concluded from his field data that neuter end stress “only occurs together with the maintenance of feminine end stress”:

Since its retraction off the feminine gender/number marker which results in the failure to distinguish feminine from neuter (both forms having identical phonetic realizations – \([\leftrightarrow]\) – and identical stress

\(^{522}\) The only prefix stress of those investigated which is widely spread and seen as correct is нічало.
placement), the development of neuter end stress in conjunction with steadfast feminine end stress is better understood as amplification of the feminine : neuter distinction than as a manifestation of a tendency to neutralize the distinction.

It seems to be a reasonable assumption that feminine end stress is a prerequisite for, but does not necessarily entail, neuter end stress (cf. началá : начало).

To sum up, there is in the neuter forms both a tendency towards stem stress and towards end stress. Prefix stress is a weakening tendency, although there are a few exceptions like начало, where it is still retained.

**Prefix stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm**

A majority of the informants agree with the codified norm начало: 65.1 per cent report usage of this stress and it was the elicited usage of 71.0 per cent. The end-stressed variant was the actual usage of 25.8 per cent of the informants in the present survey, while stem stress seems hardly to be used.

Table 4.5-25. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>начало</th>
<th>начало</th>
<th>начало</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>не рек./простореч.</td>
<td>грубо неправ./–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.0% (22)</td>
<td>25.8% (8)</td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, the position of this prefix-stressed form is rather strong: it is the explicit and the implicit norm, although other forms – notably end stress – are spread. Further testimony of its viability is the fact that normative prefix stress in this verb (начал, начало, началу) appears to influence the stressing of the feminine form and the masculine reflexive form (> начала, начался).

The only verb with an originally disyllabic stem and prefix stress as explicit norm is создало. While elicited usage showed that this stress was the most current one among the language users, the two alternative stresses создало (доп./разг.) and создало (не рек./простореч.) were quite frequent and the distribution between these variants was rather even. The reported usage for создало was 35.9 per cent (61.3 per cent reported non-usage). In Ukih (1994) it was used by just over half the informants (55 per cent), while создало was used by 20 per cent and создало by 25 per cent. Accordingly, создало, созда́ло and создало are all frequent, although prefix stress apparently prevails.

Table 4.5-26. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>создало</th>
<th>созда́ло</th>
<th>созда́ло</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
<td>не рек./простореч.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.2% (14)</td>
<td>25.8% (8)</td>
<td>29.0% (9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No conclusions as to the position of prefix-stressed codified norms can be drawn solely from the results for stem-stressed variants of these. Nevertheless, the reported usage of пролило (доп./разг., 45.4 per cent, 33 per cent in Ukih) and поддало (и/разг., 27.3 per

---

523 The relationship between these requires further studies, both as to which tendency is the stronger and as to whether one stage generally precedes the other, i.e. if there is a line of development such as prefix stress > stem stress > end stress.

524 In Ukih’s survey usage of this stress was 57 per cent, while 43 per cent stressed начало and no one начало.

525 Cf. the results in Ukih for прожило: прожило 48 per cent, прожило 19 per cent, прожил 33 per cent.

526 In Ukih’s survey 24 per cent stressed прожило (codified norm) and 43 per cent прожил (не рек./простореч.).
cent) indicate that stem stress is not the strongest tendency for all preterite neuter forms. In certain verbs, prefix stress can be retained, yet in others end stress prevails.

**Prefix stress is the explicit norm ≠ implicit norm**

With the exception of нача́ло and to a certain extent со́зда́ло, reported and actual usage was low for the neuter forms with prefix stress as explicit norm. For доль́ло it was even very low: only 3.7 per cent reported usage for this stress, while 89.6 per cent of the informants reported that they do not use it and know or believe it is wrong.

Another prefix-stressed norm with low reported usage (19.8 per cent) is о́тперло.

For залы́ло the figures are somewhat higher, although here, too, only a minority agree with this explicit norm (24.6 per cent; 67.9 report not using it). This could be compared to the figures for the admissible variant залы́ло (доп./_) which can be considered to be the norm of 40.6 per cent of the informants. The comparatively low total figure for these two variants (only about 65 per cent) leads us to assume that the variant залы́ло (не рек./простореч.), not included in the survey, is probably at least as widespread as the codified norm залы́ло.

In this connection stress on the negative particle не will be dealt with. Not one informant used the explicit norm не́ дало in the oral part of the investigation, and it was the reported usage of and considered correct by 12.2 per cent of the informants, as compared to 85.9 per cent who reported non-usage. The stem-stressed variant не д́ало (labelled доп./_) was used by 9.7 per cent, and the stress variant that had the largest usage – 83.9 per cent – was не дальо (labelled доп./_). End stress thus seems to be the implicit norm for дало both with and without не, and in the latter case it is also the explicit norm (see below).

Table 4.5-27. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>норма</th>
<th>доп./_</th>
<th>доп./_</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>не́ дало</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>83.9% (26)</td>
<td>9.7% (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Ukiah’s survey no informant used the stress не́ дало either; 20 per cent stressed не́ д́ало and 80 не д́ало. He concludes that “[i]n the modern language retraction onto the negative particles не and ни only occurs with the verb быть (non-feminine forms) and it is no longer current with the verbs дать жить пить” (Ukiah 1996:680–682). Consequently, the results of the present investigation, corroborated by another survey, lead to the conclusion that although the stress не́ дало is the explicit norm, it is not the implicit norm. It has as such been replaced by не дальо and this awaits reflection in codification.527

**Stem stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm**

The only stem-stressed neuter normative stress investigated, пропони́ло, is undoubtedly also the implicit norm (91.6 per cent reported usage). (Compare Ukiah: 86 per cent.)

**End stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm**

Reported usage of the end-stressed norm дало́ was high: 86.9 per cent, as was actual usage: 87.1 per cent.528 The stem-stressed дало́ (ул./_) was used by only one of the informants. Consequently, дало́ is the explicit and the implicit norm.

---

527 Remarkably enough, when BTS–1998 lists two stresses as normative and equal, it gives не́ д́ало and не́ дало, but not не дально.

528 In Ukiah’s survey there was also high usage: 90 per cent. 10 per cent stressed дально.
Table 4.5-28. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>далó</td>
<td>дáло</td>
<td>Invalid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>и/из</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Ukiah (1998:318) a majority of speakers used what he calls “[t]he surprising desinence-stressed forms далó and жилó”. Actually, they are not quite that surprising, as neither is rare in contemporary speech. They are not, however, equally surprising from a normative point of view as далó is even considered perfectly normative in for instance OS–1997, while жилó is labelled не рек./простореч.

In the survey results there was no example of a normative end stress that was not adhered to. On the other hand, there were examples of non-normative end stress with high reported usage: набра́ло (не рек./простореч.) – 50.9 per cent and взя́ло (доп./.), – 74.6 per cent (76 per cent in Ukiah 1994). This further underlines the strong tendency towards end stress in the neuter past form, although it seems unlikely that it encompasses all verbs.

4.5.5 Plural non-reflexive verb forms with and without prefix

The variation in the plural preterite is, like in the masculine and neuter forms, mainly between prefix stress and stem stress. (See 4.5.2.)

There is also variation between prefix stress/stem stress and end stress, like in the neuter forms. It has been put forward that end stress is less common in plural than in neuter forms (Nen'ko 1984c:58), and in the sources examples of end stress in the preterite plural are indeed fewer than those in neuter. In fact, only the following verbs or verbal formants are listed in both sources as having an end-stressed variant: кля́ли, -мерли (об-, от-, по-, у-), -перли (за-, от-), -пълли (without prefix and with по-). Apart from these there are several forms that are listed only in RPP, but even if these are taken into account the number of plural end-stressed variants is smaller than for neuter end stress.

End stress in the neuter is not only more frequent than in the plural, it is also more accepted. While there are several neuter end-stressed variants that are considered admissible, all plural end stresses are in RPP labelled простореч., and, as can be seen in the assessment of OS for the end-stressed variants поплълъ (не рек.) and поплълъ (неправ.), end stress is less condemned in neuter than in plural.

4.5.5.1 Dictionary data

*Prefix stress is the codified norm*

*Stem stress is и/из: проби́лъ – про́би́лъ,534 подди́л – подди́лъ,535 обжки́лъ – обжки́лъ, отжки́лъ – отжки́лъ, пережки́лъ – пережки́лъ,536 доли́лъ – дольлъ,537 недоли́лъ – недоли́лъ,

---

529 The stress жилó was used by 60 per cent and жилó by 40 per cent.
530 The explicit stress norm for this verb is набра́ло.
531 In Ukiah (1994) 24 per cent used the codified normative stress взя́ло.
532 In Kolesov (1964) for instance, 67.6 per cent stressed ждáло and 36.0 ждалó. In Ukiah (1994) 24 per cent used ждáло (codified norm), 76 per cent ждалó (не рек./простореч.), 29 per cent сиáло (codified norm) and 71 per cent сиáло (не рек./простореч.).
533 “Frequent” here refers to the number of forms in which end stress in the neuter is found in the lexicographic sources.
534 In the meaning ‘to strike’.
535 и/разг.
536 и/разг. In the meaning ‘испытать; перенести, выдержать’.
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Stem stress is не рек./простореч.: отбыли – отбыли, 544 прибыли – прибыли, жили – ожили. 545


Stem stress is грубо неправ. etc.: two verbs on -нить (cf. above): недопняли – недопняли (простореч. in RPP), поняли – поняли (грубо простореч. in RPP); and also начали – начали (простореч. in RPP).

End stress is неправ./простореч.: Only the verbs on -мереть and -переть are listed in both sources with an end-stressed variant (labelled неправ./простореч.): обмерли – обмерли, отмерли – отмерли, померли – померли, умерли – умерли, зазерли – заперли, отмерли – отмерли. The following end-stressed variants are listed only in RPP (as простореч.): убыли – убыли, здали – задали, недодали – недодали, перепродали – перепродали, предали – предали, переняли – переняли, недолили, поляли – поляли, доняли – доняли, переняли – переняли, подняли – подняли, проняли – проняли.

Stem stress is the codified norm

Prefix stress is _/простореч.: пробили – пробили, 547 подобралли – подобрали, развяли – развяли, подгнили – подгнили, позваляли – позваляли, пересоздали – пересоздали, отсыняли – отсыняли. The verbs containing the prefix пере- are never stressed on the second syllable of the prefix. According to the book norm they may be stressed on the first syllable of the prefix (передали, пережили, переняли) or on the stem (передали, 548 пережили) (cf. above), but never переали, пережили, переняли (all labelled неправ./простореч.).

537 и/разг.
538 и/разг.
539 * ´vručit′, ‴сообщить и др.′.
540 Stem stress is доп. in OS, in RPP it is the norm and prefix stress is labelled простореч.
541 и/разг.
542 перенерви is labelled доп. in OS and is the norm in RPP. The norm in OS – пеперенерви – is in RPP labelled книжн.
543 доп./н.
544 не рек./разг.
545 не рек./разг.
546 * ‴испытать; перенести, выдержать′.
547 In the meaning ‴make a hole″.
548 передали is the codified norm in the meaning ‴дать лишнего″ and here передали is the only variant.

End stress is не рек./простореч.: кляли – клялі (не рек./простореч.).

End stress is неправ./простореч.: плыли – плылі (неправ./простореч.). The only prefixed verb of this type included in both dictionaries is поплыли – поплылі (неправ./простореч.).

End stress is не рек./простореч.: клейли – клейлі (не рек./простореч.).

End stress is не рек./простореч.: плыли – плылі (не рек./простореч.).

The only prefixed verb of this type included in both dictionaries is поплыли – поплылі (неправ./простореч.).


End stress is the codified norm

Stem stress is доп. устар./устар.: секлі – секлі (the simplex verb and with prefixes).

Stress on не is the codified norm in не дали with the variant не дали (доп./_) and in не жили, with the variant не жили, labelled доп./._.

Stress on не is not the codified norm in не пили (доп. устар./устар. и книжн.) and the codified norm is не пили.

--

549 = ‘прожить какое-то время; прожить дольше кого-чего-н., оставаться жить после смерти кого-н.’.

550 = ‘прожить какое-то время; прожить дольше кого-чего-н., оставаться жить после смерти кого-н.’.

551 = ‘прожить какое-то время; прожить дольше кого-чего-н., оставаться жить после смерти кого-н.’.

552 Нен’ко devotes a whole subchapter to this verbal stem. There is much more variation in earlier sources than in the contemporary ones used for the present study, but both OS–1997 and RPP–1996 and the informants seem to confirm that the norm in this stem is fixed now and that this stress has taken over both in usage and in codification (Nен'ко 1984а:166–170).
4.5.5.2 Results

Table 4.5-29. Reported usage and language users’ norm. Percentage of respondents for each category of answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress variant examined</th>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>Percentages (%)</th>
<th>I say it like that myself</th>
<th>I do not say it like that myself</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and I know that it is correct</td>
<td>and I believe that it is correct</td>
<td>but I do not know whether it is correct</td>
<td>but I know that it is incorrect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>за́дали</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>34.0 41.5 8.5 0.0 3.8 4.7 6.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>нáчали</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>38.7 34.0 5.7 0.9 2.8 10.4 7.6 0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>бóжили</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>18.9 22.6 15.1 0.9 15.1 12.3 11.3 3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>прóжили</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>17.9 29.3 8.5 1.9 11.3 18.9 7.6 4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>за́&lt;или</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>16.0 30.2 8.5 1.9 5.7 21.7 13.2 2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>про&lt;или</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>16.0 20.8 15.1 4.7 6.6 18.9 12.3 4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>распро&lt;дalia</td>
<td>норма/про.</td>
<td>17.9 27.4 9.4 0.9 10.4 21.7 8.5 3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пóдняли</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>7.6 17.0 1.9 2.8 10.4 36.8 20.8 2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>о̲т&lt;или</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>5.7 13.2 3.8 1.9 17.0 25.5 28.3 4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>перенéили</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>6.6 3.8 1.9 1.9 9.4 30.2 42.5 3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>добóйли</td>
<td>и/разг.</td>
<td>48.1 42.5 6.6 0.0 0.0 1.9 0.0 0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>перенéили</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
<td>34.0 47.2 7.6 0.9 3.8 3.8 1.9 0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отжáйли</td>
<td>и/и</td>
<td>31.1 37.7 9.4 0.0 9.4 9.4 2.8 0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пропóйли</td>
<td>и/и</td>
<td>26.4 40.6 10.4 0.9 4.7 11.3 4.7 0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>про&lt;дáли</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
<td>22.3 42.5 9.4 0.9 6.6 9.4 8.5 0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>побóйли</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
<td>29.3 29.3 15.1 0.0 8.5 9.4 5.7 2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>поднáйли</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
<td>25.5 45.3 1.9 1.9 5.7 10.4 4.7 4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>про&lt;шёл</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
<td>27.4 32.1 5.7 0.9 13.2 14.2 5.7 0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>про&lt;бóйлы</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
<td>18.9 37.7 8.5 0.9 10.4 16.0 6.6 0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отжàйль</td>
<td>не рек./разг.</td>
<td>19.8 28.3 10.4 0.9 14.2 16.0 9.4 0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>начáйль</td>
<td>грубо неправ./про.</td>
<td>5.7 7.6 0.0 0.0 18.9 16.0 51.9 0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>просёкáли</td>
<td>доп./устар./устар.</td>
<td>2.8 2.8 2.8 1.9 8.5 30.2 50.9 0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отсёкáли</td>
<td>_/про.</td>
<td>1.9 2.8 2.8 2.8 8.5 29.3 48.1 3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отмерáй</td>
<td>неправ./про.</td>
<td>6.6 11.3 8.5 2.8 11.3 27.4 27.4 4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>набралáй</td>
<td>_/про.</td>
<td>1.9 1.9 0.0 1.9 9.4 25.5 58.5 0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some prefix-stressed plural preterite forms are definitely the explicit and the implicit norm: за́дали, нáчали, отмерли, о̲жили (although о̲жи́ли also has a strong position\(^{554}\)).

For some verb forms the implicit norm is both prefix stress and stem stress, with stem stress appearing as the stronger one for most, but not for all, of these: прóжили – прóкáл, зáжил – зáкáл, пропóйли – пропóйл, поднáйлы – поднáйля (and probably also приподнáйлы – приподнáйля), прода́ли – прода́л, прóбóйлы – прóбóйлы, распро́дáли – распро́дáли.

For a few other verb forms prefix stress appears to be on the way of becoming – or has already become – obsolete, while the position of the stem stress is strong and it is already the implicit norm, asking for reflection in codification. This applies to отжáйля and о̲жáйл, перéнýля и перéнéля, and probably also добóйли и дóбóйлы и побóйлы.

When prefix stress is not the codified norm, it is not widespread. The opposite, however, i.e. high usage of non-normative stem stress, is quite common.

Obsolescent forms (here просёкáли, and there is further evidence in other parts of the study) are never used to a high degree once they have been codified as antiquated. It seems

\(^{553}\) One informant claims not to use the stress, but “knows that it is correct”.

\(^{554}\) The label “not recommended” in OS might be too strong a condemnation for this stress variant. The labelling in RPP, “colloquial”, or even a recognition of it as normatively equal to prefix stress is perhaps more appropriate.
that once a form receives the notation “obsolescent” etc. it has already such a weak position in the language community that it hardly poses a threat to the new explicit norms.

For end stress in the plural preterite forms there is low usage – elicited and/or reported – and it is generally much lower than for the neuter forms. As an example a comparison of the informants’ attitudes to the end-stressed набралó and набрылý can be adduced. Approximately half the informants – 50.9 per cent – claim to use the stress набралó (не рек./простореч.) and believe it is correct, while набрылý (/_простореч.) gets almost no recognition at all: only 3.8 per cent (4 out of 106 informants) say they use it and believe it is right. Consequently, if end stress is impinging on prefix and stem stress in the neuter forms, this hardly seems to be the case for the plural preterite forms. (Compare Strom 1988, who claims that the rise of end stress is taking place also in the plural.)

**Prefix stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm**

There is no doubt that explicit and implicit norms coincide for началý. The reported usage of this codified norm was 78.4 per cent. This form was included twice in the sentences used for the oral part of the investigation and all (60) valid replies except one gave the stress началý. The other elicited usage was началý, not listed as a variant in the dictionaries. The stress началý, labelled as грубо неправ./простореч., was not elicited once.556

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>началý</th>
<th>началý</th>
<th>началý</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>93.5% (29)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5-30. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

Another verb with a strong position for prefix stress is зáдáли: 84.0 per cent of the informants reported usage of this stress and the actual usage was equally high: 74.2 per cent. The stem-stressed variant was used by 22.6 per cent and no one used end stress. The results in Kolesov (1964) showed a similar distribution of the replies between the different variants, with a majority for prefix stress: 91.0 per cent used зáдáли, 13.1 per cent задáли (cf. 11.9 per cent in RJaSO 1963) and 0.5 per cent used задáлý.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>задáли</th>
<th>задáли</th>
<th>началý</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>74.2% (23)</td>
<td>22.6% (7)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5-32. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

The explicit norm о́тмérли was the actual usage of 77.4 per cent, while отмýрлý (marked as неправ./простореч.) was used by 12.9 per cent of the respondents. The variants отмёрлý and отмéрлý were each elicited once. When asked whether they use the end-stressed variant отмýрлý and whether they see it as correct 26.4 per cent of the informants answered that they did so. These results show (1) that the explicit norm is also the implicit norm, (2) that the end-stressed variant is used to a certain extent, although not competing with the norm, and (3) that variants not listed in the orthoepic sources do exist.

555 In Ukiah all 21 informants stressed началý.
556 Reported usage of this stress was 13.3 per cent.
Apart from the above-mentioned verb forms, in which prefix stress appears to be the only implicit as well as explicit norm, there are forms for which this prefix stress is existing in parallel with an implicit stem-stressed norm that in codification is generally not on par with prefix stress.

One such form is ожили. The reported usage was high for two stress variants of this verb: 56.6 per cent for the prefix-stressed norm ожили, and 58.5 per cent for the stem-stressed variant ойили (не рек./разг.). In actual usage, in less monitored speech, stem stress is somewhat more common: 58.1 stressed ойили and 38.7 per cent ожили.557 The results of the two parts of the survey taken together show that both stresses are used and accepted, and that the labelling “colloquial” in RPP for the stem stress might be more appropriate than the more severe “not recommended” in OS, although it could be argued that these stress variants should even be recognised as equal in codification.

For the verb прожили as well a majority of the informants claim that they use both stresses, although the majority is larger for the stem-stressed variant прожили (доп./разг.): 65.2 per cent, as compared to 55.7 per cent for прожили (codified norm). The results of the oral survey confirm that there are two norms (прожили and прожили) and that stem stress is prevailing in actual usage: прожили: 38.7 per cent; прожили: 61.3 per cent.558

The prefix-stressed зашли is the explicit norm and 54.7 per cent of the informants reported usage of this stress. Together with the results of Ukiah – зашли 57 per cent, зашли 43 per cent – and of Pirogova – зашли 60 per cent – this indicates that both prefix stress and stem stress are widespread and functioning as the implicit norm.

Another form with two stresses as implicit norm is пропили. The reported usage for пропили (codified norm) was 51.9 per cent559 and for the “equal variant to the norm” пропили (и/и) it was higher: 77.4 per cent. The results of the other surveys are at least superficially conflicting, although they indicate rather high usage for both stresses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>oтмёрли</th>
<th>oтмёры</th>
<th>oтмёрли</th>
<th>oтмёрли</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>неправ./простореч.</td>
<td>/_ (not included)</td>
<td>/_ (not included)</td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5-35. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>пропили</th>
<th>прожили</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.7% (12)</td>
<td>61.3% (19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

557 In Ukiah’s study (1994), which implied a choice between the two variants, 81 per cent stressed ожили and 19 per cent ойили.

558 Cf. congruous results in other surveys: прожили was used by 52 per cent in Ukiah (1994) and прожили was used by 60 per cent in Pirogova (1967) and by 48 per cent in Ukiah (1994). The results can also be compared with the results for this verb in the masculine, where the words were checked in two contexts. The results were similar for the two contexts and quite similar for the two variants; just above 50 per cent for the prefix-stressed normative form and just below 50 per cent for the stem-stressed. The number of syllables could play a role for the difference in the results between the masculine and plural forms.

559 One informant claims not to use the stress, but “knows that it is correct”.
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propiły 67 per cent and propiły 33 per cent in Ukiah (1994), and propiły 62.7 per cent in Pirogova (1967).

Yet another form with two stresses as implicit norm is prodali. Reported usage for the stem stress prodali (dop./razg.) was high: 74.5 per cent (non-usage 24.5 per cent). The survey of actual usage showed that the prefix-stressed pródali (explicit norm) was used by 74.2 per cent of the respondents, while pródáli was used by 22.6 per cent.⁵⁶⁰ Both prefix stress and stem stress seem to be used and accepted; in more or less unmonitored speech prodali is more common, but still a majority of the informants accept and claim to use the stress prodáli.

Table 4.5-36. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>prodáli</th>
<th>prodali</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74.2% (23)</td>
<td>22.6% (7)</td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another verb form for which it is necessary to take the results of both parts of the survey in order to get the full picture of the norm situation is probyli. In actual speech preference was given to prefix stress: próbyli (codified norm) was used by 67.6 per cent and probylí (dop./razg.) by 32.3 per cent.⁵⁶¹ Reported usage, however, showed a large acceptance of the variant probylí, as 65.1 per cent claimed to use this stress and believed it was correct.

Table 4.5-37. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>probylí</th>
<th>probyli</th>
<th>norma dop./razg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67.6% (21)</td>
<td>32.3% (10)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The stress rasprodáli is the explicit norm of OS and labelled простореч. in RPP (a labelling that differs not only from OS, but also from other sources). Reported usage of this stress is 54.7 per cent, and actual usage is 61.3 per cent (38.7 per cent for rasprodáli). This suggests that rasprodáli is also the implicit norm and that the sources giving this stress as the explicit norm are in line with current educated usage. Hence the labelling in RPP seems peculiar as it deviates both from the explicit norm in the other sources and from the implicit norm.

Table 4.5-38. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rasprodáli</th>
<th>rasprodali</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61.3% (19)</td>
<td>38.7% (12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prefix stress is the explicit norm ≠ implicit norm

For podnæli both reported and actual usage were larger for the stem-stressed variant than for the prefix stress, codified as normative: 72.7 per cent of the informants reported usage of podnæli (dop./razg.) and claimed that they believe it is correct (20.8 per cent non-usage), and 51.6 per cent actually pronounced podnæli. The reverse figures were found for pódnæli, which was the reported usage of 26.5 per cent (non-usage 67.9 per cent) and the actual usage of 38.7 per cent. These results suggest that stem stress in this verb is the implicit norm and while prefix stress is still used and accepted, the position of stem stress in this case is stronger.

⁵⁶⁰ prodáli was used by 45.3 per cent in Pirogova (1967).
⁵⁶¹ Stem stress was used by 38.7 per cent in Pirogova (1967).
Reported usage for the explicit norm пріподняли was 22.7 per cent (with 70.8 per cent non-usage). The results for this verb form are thus similar to those for подняли above.

Another verb in which prefix stress is the codified norm, although stem stress has a stronger normative position among the speakers, is откили. For this form the proportion between the replies is about the same as for подняли. Reported usage of prefix stress (откили) is 26.5 per cent (non-usage: 70.7 per cent), while for the stem-stressed отк’ilи (и/н) it is 78.2 per cent (non-usage: 21.6 per cent). It could be assumed that отк’ilи might be disappearing.

Yet another prefix stress which does not seem to function as a norm, although it is codified as such, is п’ереняlli. The percentage reporting usage of this stress is 12.3 (non-usage 82.1 per cent). At the same time, переняили (доп./разг.) is the reported usage of 88.8 per cent (non-usage of 9.5 per cent). Thus, there seems to be no doubt that stem stress is the implicit norm, and that prefix stress is on the way to becoming obsolete. This process has perhaps gone even farther in переняли than in откили above.

Two final examples of prefix stress being the explicit norms, but probably not existing as implicit norms are д’опили and п’обыли. Since the prefix-stressed forms were not investigated for these two verbs, conclusions cannot be drawn as for their diffusion. Still, based on the high figures for the stem-stressed variants, it seems reasonable to postulate that these are two of the many verbs where stem stress – codified as a variant to the norm in the sources – is in fact the implicit norm. Reported usage is high, 73.7 per cent (23.6 per cent non-usage) for the stem-stressed variant побыли (доп./разг.), and it was even higher for д’опили (и/разг.): as many as 97.2 per cent of the informants claim to use this variant and consider it correct, while a mere 1.9 per cent report not using it.

Stem stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm
Both prefix-stressed and end-stressed variants to the stem stresses codified as normative were discarded. This is a token that the explicit norm is at least not being ousted by these variants. Although this does not automatically imply that the explicit norm with stem stress is also the implicit norm, it is the reasonable conclusion in these cases, as the general tendency is towards stem stress. That prefix stress is not widespread when not normative is proved by the results for the stress variant отк’ilи (see also masculine above). It is listed only in RPP (as простореч.) and is discarded by as many as 85.9 per cent of the users, with only 7.5 per cent reporting usage.

The end-stressed variant in the plural preterite набрали (и/простореч.) also had very low reported usage: 3.8 per cent (cf. 93.4 per cent reported non-usage).

---

562 In Ukiah’s survey stem stress prevailed: побыли 38 per cent, побыли 62 per cent.
563 In Ukiah (1994) д’опили was used by 79 per cent and д’опили by 21 per cent.
564 The exception to this are some reflexive verbs with the stems - чать, -нять, -переть in the non-feminine forms.
565 N.B. Nevertheless this “incorrect” prefix stress is more accepted than some prefix-stressed forms codified as norms (на’ли, п’еремер, д’олило).
End stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm

That the end-stressed просе́кли́ is both the explicit and the implicit norm can be conjectured from the results for the stress просе́кли (considered доп. устар./устар.). This stress is the reported usage of only a small number of the informants (8.4 per cent). A large majority, 89.6 per cent, claim not to use it and know or assume it is incorrect.

4.5.6 Masculine reflexive verb forms with and without prefix

Masculine preterite reflexive forms stressed on -сá are, according to Voroncova (1979:187–190), hardly found in 18th century poetry, and it was not until the beginning of the 19th century that these stress variants became frequent.566 In poetry from the first half of the 19th century there is vacillation between stress on the reflexive ending and on the stem in the masculine form of the preterite of verbs containing an originally monosyllabic stem. By way of example, Puškin vacillates between родился and родился, поднялся and поднялся, взвился and взялся (Černyšëv 1912:65–66). He uses, for instance, both stresses in one and the same poem (“Гусар” 1833, quoted from Gorbačevič 1971:56): “Как взялся, как понёс меня ...” and “Но кверху вдруг взялся я пухом”.567 Up to the beginning of the 20th century several verbs had end stress in the masculine reflexive preterite form: брасался, взялсé, вшился, дался, удался (etc.), дождался, завелся, заперся (etc.), звался, клась, назвался, начался, оперся, полтелся, прожился, принялся, приплелся (etc.), разбрелся, родился, спатьлся (Černyšëv 1908:58–59).568

As shown in the table below the stress отдался was considered normative in Ušakov–1935–1940, while from at least 1950 it has not been considered normative in codification. It is still, however, included as an obsolescent variant in contemporary dictionaries. This raises the question as to how long it is necessary to include such variants in handbooks. How likely is it that a stress that probably even before 1950 was seen as obsolete is still used today and has to be “warned against”? 

Table 4.5-40. Normative notation for the stresses отдался in sources from the 1930s to the 1990s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ušakov–1935–1940</td>
<td>отдался норма</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS–1950–1965</td>
<td></td>
<td>отдался норма</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>А&amp;О–1960</td>
<td></td>
<td>устар. норма</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>А&amp;З–1970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>отдался норма</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorbačevič–1973</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>устаревающие норма</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>А&amp;З–1984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>норма</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPP–1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>доп. устар. норма</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS–1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>доп. устар. норма</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contemporary sources stress on -сá is preferred by dictionaries and handbooks for a few verbs only. Nen'ko (1984c:61) draws the conclusion that end stress is somewhat more widespread among verbs containing the roots -нá-, -кля-, -ча- and in the verb родиться. In reply to this statement, three remarks must be made. Firstly, Nen'ko does not explicitly say that there are also verbs on -нáться that, according to contemporary normative sources, are

---

566 The origin of and explanation for this stress type is discussed in, among others, Pirogova (1959a:134–136) and Voroncova (1979:186–191).

567 In Уšakov’s dictionary from 1935–1940 the two variants are considered equal: взялся and взялся. The end-stressed variant is now considered obsolescent.

568 “Постепенно ударение на основе (характерное для южнорусских говоров) становилось преобладающим” (Gorbačevič 1971:57).
stem-stressed (сня́лся, уня́лся) and in which end stress (сня́л, уня́л) is looked upon as obsolescent. Secondly, -кля- is mentioned by Nen'ko as one of the stems in which end stress can still be found, but in our – more recent – sources (and also in Gorbачевић–1973 and A&O–1960, referred to by Nen'ko), покли́лся and кля́лся are definitely dated (доп. устар./устар.) and the contemporary norm is кла́лся, покла́лся. Thirdly, she does not mention -пер́ёлся as one of the stems which still has end stress as the codified norm (заперс́а, отперс́а).

Apparently, there is no consensus regarding in which verbs end stress in the reflexive masculine preterite form is normative. According to the Academy grammar (Russkaja grammatica 1980:692) end stress is from a normative point of view more or less equal to stem stress in заня́лся, наня́лся, отня́лся, подня́лся, приня́лся and родил́ся.


Stress on the reflexive particle in the masculine preterite forms seems to be disappearing, as it is generally classified as obsolescent or obsolete and is the codified norm only for a few verbs. This conclusion is drawn by, for instance, Nen'ko (1984c:60–61), Nicholson (1968:31) and Krysin (1974:228). Garde (1976:275) vindicates that “Il reste en russe moderne quelques rares traces d’accent sur un -sja resté syllabique: zanjal’sja ‘il s’occupa’, načalsja ‘il commence’”, mais ces formes sont concurrençées dans la langue moderne par načalsja, zanjal’sja, elles sont en voie de disparition.” However, it is doubtful whether the stem-stressed variants нача́лся (неправ) and заня́лся (доп.) are the more serious competitors or successors of the end-stressed forms. It seems more likely that the prefix-stressed variants of these verbs, нана́лся and заня́лся (both labelled неправ), will ultimately assert themselves.569

4.5.6.1 Dictionary data

Stem stress is the codified norm


569 I agree with Nicholson in his comment about the early editions of A&Z: “It may, however, be legitimate to express doubt whether načalsja is more viable than nàčalsja” (1968:34).
(вз-, во-, до-, за-, изо-, надо-, на-, обо-, ото-, пере-, подо-, пообо-, по-, пре-, про-, разо-, со-, у-), \(-/н/ълся – \(-/н/ълся\) (вз–, 570 с–, у–).

End stress is /простореч.: скрёбся – скрёбся.

Prefix stress is неправ/простореч.: дёлался, зажался, загнался, нёжился, нёдался, обнался, обжался, обнался, отдался, перёдался, поддался, поджался, положился, прётелся, пропался, пропёрся, создался.571

End stress is the codified norm
Almost all verbs on -нёлся572 are in codification end-stressed and the stem-stressed variants of these are labelled differently. There are, however, also other stems with this type of stress as codified norm.

Stem stress is и, и.573 облылся – обнёлся, отнёлся, поднёлся – поднёлся, приподнёлся, родился – родился.


Stem stress is неправ./_: начался – начался.

Prefix stress is не рек.: заперся – заперся.


4.5.6.2 Results

Table 4.5-41. Reported usage and language users’ norm. Percentage of respondents for each category of answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentages (%)</th>
<th>I say it like that myself</th>
<th>I do not say it like that myself</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stress variant</td>
<td>Notation</td>
<td>and I know that it is correct</td>
<td>but I do not know whether it is correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>начался</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>родился</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>обнёлся</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>воспринялсі</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>заперся</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>родился</td>
<td>и/к</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>обнёлся</td>
<td>и/к</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>развёлся</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>перебрался</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>развёлсі</td>
<td>доп. устор./устар.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>перепеллся</td>
<td>доп. устор./устар.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>обнёлся</td>
<td>неправ/к</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>начался</td>
<td>неправ/к</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout the informants are rejecting the variants with stress on the reflexive particle in the masculine, both when this is the codified norm (обнёлся, воспринялсі, заперся, начался) and when it is labelled “obsolescent” (развёлсі, перепеллся).

570 взълсі.
571 All of these verbs, except созданы, have an originally monosyllabic stem.
572 The exceptions are сиделся and упёлсі, the end-stressed variants of which are marked доп. устор./устар. like for most reflexive masculine forms with variation.
573 Only the verbs поднялись and приподнялись are listed in RPP.
574 и разг.
575 и разг.
In fact, stress on -сі is perceived as incorrect and has low reported usage almost as often when it is the codified norm as when it is given as an obsolescent stress in the handbooks. Cf. переplelsá (10.4 per cent reported usage) and развелсá (5.6 per cent), both labelled доп. устар./устар., with the explicit norms воспринялсá (8.5 per cent), родилсá (10.4 per cent), обнялсá (21.7 per cent), заперсá (24.6 per cent) and началсá (34.0 per cent).

Evidently, this stress pattern is senescent, and in at least воспринялсá and родилсá is it already dated. Thus, stress on -сі will in all likelihood eventually disappear as it is perceived as archaic. It is likely to be replaced by stem stress for some verbs (родилсá and обнялсá) and by prefix stress for others (началсá, заперсá and probably also воспринялсá). Furthermore, it can be added that there is no hesitation among the informants regarding the normativity of the stem stresses развёлсá and перебралсá.

**Stem stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm**

The survey gave no example of stem stress being the explicit norm when it was not also the implicit norm: перебралсá had 91.5 per cent reported usage (3.8 per cent non-usage) and развёлсá had 94.4 per cent (1.8 per cent non-usage), while the obsolescent form развёлсá was the reported usage of 5.6 per cent. The stress переpleлсá, also obsolescent, had low support among the language users; only 10.4 per cent report usage of this stress, so stem stress (переплëлсá) most likely prevails in usage as well as in codification. Thus, there is no reason to believe that reflexive masculine preterite forms that are stem-stressed according to the explicit norm are not complying with the implicit norm.

**End stress is the explicit norm ≠ implicit norm**

Almost all informants, 93.5 per cent, pronounced родилсá (и/_), and only one used end stress, which is the codified norm. The results regarding reported usage confirm the prevalence of родилсá (reported usage 93.5 per cent, non-usage 3.7 per cent) over родилсá (reported usage 10.4 per cent, non-usage 84.0 per cent). Other surveys show commensurate results: Kolesov (Leningrad 1964) родилсá 10.1 per cent, родилсá 93.9 per cent; Ukiah (Moscow 1994) родилсá 0 per cent, родилсá 100 per cent. Thus, родилсá is the implicit norm, and has probably been so since at least the middle of the 1960s. Still, родилсá is in several contemporary sources the stress that is mentioned in the first place or as the only norm. There are, however, sources which better reflect the current implicit norms. BTS–1998 and Ož&Šv–1995 give the stress родилсá as the second option and A&Z–1993 and A&Z–2000, which usually give only one stress as the norm, list родилсá.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>родилсá</th>
<th>родилсá</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
<td>93.5% (29)</td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The verb form with stress on -сі that had the highest reported and actual usage was началсá, although even here the reported usage was lower than could perhaps be

---

576 According to dictionaries and grammars this applies to the pf aspect, while in the ipf aspect there is stress on -н- in all forms. Ukiah, however, objects to this (1996:653–654). From his informants’ replies he suggests that the current normative stress is родилсá, родилсá, родилсá, родилсá, in both aspects, and that “the aspectual distinction by stress is by no means universally upheld” (рождаться is suggested as an ipf verb instead of making use of stress distinction). This appears to be a reasonable assumption, although this question would need further investigation.
“expected” from a form listed as normative: 34.0 per cent. As large a percentage as 57.6
claim not to use this stress and even “believe” or “know” it is incorrect. This could be com-
pared to the results for the prefix-stressed нáчался (неправ./_) with 56.6 per cent of the
informants reporting this as their usage and considering it correct. Elicited usage indicates
that in speech нáчался is even more prevalent: 80.6 per cent of the respondents used this
stress as compared to 16.1 for the codified norm нáчался. No one used the stress variant
нáчáлся (неправ./_).

If we turn to other surveys for a comparison, we find that in Kolesov’s survey (Lenin-
grad 1964) нáчался prevailed with 58.2 per cent of the replies, while 26.8 per cent stressed
нáчался and 22.2 per cent нáчался. In Ukiah’s survey (Moscow 1994), the results were in
line with those of the present investigation: 19 per cent stressed нáчался as compared to 67
per cent for нáчался.577 Accordingly, usage of end stress was low even in Ukiah’s survey,
where the subjects could easily detect the purpose of the study and were therefore perhaps
monitoring their pronunciation to a higher degree. From these results he draws the conclu-
sions that there is a new pattern for this verb, with prefix stress in the masculine and end
stress in the past feminine, neuter and plural, and that the recommended stress on the re-
flexive particle in the masculine is not reflecting modern usage (1996:648). The results of
the present survey corroborate these findings, although it might be too early totally to dis-
card this probable last stronghold of reflexive end stress in the masculine preterite.578

Table 4.5-43. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>нáчался</th>
<th>нáчался</th>
<th>нáчался</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>нáчался</td>
<td>неправ./</td>
<td>неправ./</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.1% (5)</td>
<td>80.6% (25)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another verb apparently taking the same course of development as нáчался is заперся. Pre-
fix stress заперся (не рек./_) was used by 61.3 per cent of the informants, while a mere 9.7
per cent pronounced заперся, which is the explicit norm. Reported usage for заперся was
somewhat higher, but still low: 24.6 per cent. The investigation also showed that there is a
stem-stressed variant, not recorded in the sources (zapërsæ), here used by 29.0 per cent of
the respondents.579 This implies that this variant is probably at least as widespread as the
explicit norm заперся. In both the other surveys that investigated the stress of this verb
form, usage of prefix stress was higher than that for end stress: in Kolesov (1964) 37.4 per
cent stressed заперся and 56.8 per cent заперся, and in Ukiah (1994) 5 per cent stressed
zapërsæ and 95 per cent заперся.580 Thus, enough evidence seems to be at hand to claim that
the current implicit norm is заперся.581

577 In Ukiah the stress нáчался was used by 14 per cent (3 out of 21 informants).
578 Not one source – not even the lexicographically bold A&Z–1993 and A&Z–2000 – gives a norm other
than end stress for this verb.
579 The variant заперся was also found in Kolesov’s 1964 survey, there used by 5.8 per cent of the
respondents. It is also found in the sources as the only normative stress in the meaning ‘не признаваться в
чем-н.’.
580 “The past m[asculine] is, unusually, almost universally prefix-stressed, with only one older speaker giving
581 In Russkaja grammatika (1980:692) prefix stress and end stress are considered equal in one meaning.
“Нужно отличать формы заперся и заперся, заперлся, -лось, -лись 'закрылся', отперся, -лась, -лось, -лись
от разг. заперся, -лась, -лось, -лись, отперся, -лась, -лось, -лись 'не сознался, отказался от ч. и.' – с
постоянным ударением на корне.”
In обня́лся, too, end stress seems to be disappearing, although here it seems that stem stress, not prefix stress, is prevailing. The explicit norm обня́лся is the reported usage and the norm of 21.7 per cent, while 75.5 per cent reject it. That the explicit norm is not the same as the implicit norm is confirmed by the results for the variant обня́лся (н/_), which is reported usage and norm for a large majority of the informants: 85.9 per cent. The reported usage for the prefix-stressed variant обня́лся (неправ./_) – 19.8 per cent – is almost as high as that for the normative end stress. The matching results of elicited usage (обня́лся 61.3 per cent, обня́лся 22.6 per cent, обня́лся 16.1 per cent) are an affirmation that the implicit norm is обня́лся, that обня́лся is disappearing and that a variant обня́лся is used to a certain degree, probably analogically with the non-reflexive verb, where prefix stress prevails.

The results of previous surveys are strikingly similar to the findings of the present study: обня́лся 21.2 per cent in Kolesov (1964); обня́лся 68.5 per cent in Kolesov and 80.0 per cent in RJaSO 1963; обня́лся 13.5 per cent in Kolesov.

The normative end stress with the lowest reported usage is восприя́нель. Only 8.5 per cent claim to use this stress and consider it correct, while 87.7 per cent discard it. Other variants were not included in the study. There is, however, a stem-stressed variant восприя́нель (доп./_) and a prefix-stressed variant восприя́нель (labelled неправ./_). One of these is the current norm and it could be assumed that it is восприя́нель.

4.5.7 Feminine reflexive verb forms with and without prefix

4.5.7.1 Dictionary data

End stress is the codified norm


Two verbs with the stem -переты́ться (за́перться и отпертый) are also end-stressed according to the codified norm and have this type of variation.587 As the verbs with this

---

582 The micro-survey made in the newsgroups elicited a larger number of replies for восприя́нель than for восприя́нель. Cf. прини́л.
583 N.B. some stems appear only in combination with prefixes.
584 But: закла́лась is labelled не рек./постоянен.
585 Including взя́лась.
586 N.B. прирвала́сь is labelled не рек./постоянен.
stem are so complicated and heterogeneous – the assessment of the stresses is not remotely predictable from the stem, but depends on what prefix is attached to it – the norm and variation of verbs on -переться will be presented in a table.\textsuperscript{588}

Table 4.5-46. Norms, variants and assessment for feminine reflexive preterite verbs with the stem -переться.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>End stress (-перлать)</th>
<th>Stem stress (-перлать)</th>
<th>Prefix stress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>опереться</td>
<td>норм</td>
<td>_/</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>занереться</td>
<td>норм</td>
<td>_/</td>
<td>неправ./простореч.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отпереться</td>
<td>норм</td>
<td>_/простореч.</td>
<td>неправ./простореч.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>подпереться</td>
<td>не рек./простореч.</td>
<td>норм</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>упереться</td>
<td>не рек./</td>
<td>норм</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stem stress is** _/_: оперлать – оперла́сь.

**Stem stress is** доп./разг.: ткалать – ткалала́сь (with and without prefixes), родила́сь – роди́лась.\textsuperscript{589}

**Stem stress is** доп. устар./устар.: секла́сь – сёклась (with and without prefixes)

**Prefix stress is** неправ./простореч. (these variants exist to some of the end stresses listed above): воспри́нялась, до́лилась, зáдалась, зáжилась, зáлилась, на́жилась, на́лита́лась, на́нёсся, на́пилась, обда́ллась, обди́лась, обли́лась, обна́лась, отда́ллась, отны́лась, пёреда́ллась, перёдальса́, по́далась, по́днялась, полни́лась, пре́далась, прини́лась, при́дальса́, при́дальсы́, пропо́лась, пропы́лась, созда́лась.

**Stem stress is the codified norm**

**End stress is** не рек./простореч.: подперлаться – подперлать, уперлаться – уперлать.

**End stress is** неправ./простореч.: кра́лась – кра́лась, стлала́сь – стлала́сь, обтёрлась – обтёрлась, ошиблась – ошиблась.

---

\textsuperscript{587} They have the variants зáперлась (неправ./_), отпёрлась (_/простореч.), отперлась (неправ./простореч.).
\textsuperscript{588} That there also is some confusion as to the stressing of these verbs among the language users could be seen in the informants’ answers.
\textsuperscript{589} N.B. According to the sources this variation pertains only to the pf aspect. In the ipf aspect the only stress possible in the preterite is on the -и- (for all persons).
### 4.5.7.2 Results

Table 4.5-47. Reported usage and language users’ norm. Percentage of respondents for each category of answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress variant examined</th>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>I say it like that myself</th>
<th>I do not say it like that myself</th>
<th>and I know that it is incorrect</th>
<th>and I do not know whether it is correct</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>началлась</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>54.7 30.2 5.7 0.9 1.9 2.8</td>
<td>9.5 1.9 2.8 2.8 2.8 2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>дралась</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>39.6 44.3 5.7 0.9 1.9 2.8</td>
<td>9.5 1.9 2.8 2.8 2.8 2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>разорвалась</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>32.1 34.0 10.4 1.9 2.8 9.4</td>
<td>10.4 17.9 7.6 7.6 7.6 3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>вилась</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>28.2 27.4 10.4 1.9 10.4 10.4</td>
<td>10.4 17.9 7.6 7.6 7.6 3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>оперлась</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>25.5 24.5 16.0 1.9 10.4 10.4</td>
<td>10.4 17.9 7.6 7.6 7.6 3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>опёрлась</td>
<td>и/н</td>
<td>16.0 8.5 8.5 0.9 11.3 24.5</td>
<td>17.0 5.7 17.0 17.0 17.0 5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>опёрлась</td>
<td>и/н</td>
<td>16.0 18.9 4.7 0.9 14.2 25.5</td>
<td>17.9 19.9 17.9 17.9 17.9 19.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>поднялась</td>
<td>неправ./про.</td>
<td>6.6 9.4 1.9 0.9 14.2 30.2</td>
<td>35.9 0.9 35.9 35.9 35.9 0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>поднялась</td>
<td>доп./н</td>
<td>2.8 7.6 0.9 1.9 14.2 33.0</td>
<td>34.9 4.7 34.9 34.9 34.9 4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отпёрлась</td>
<td>и/про.</td>
<td>4.7 15.1 5.7 0.0 16.0 36.8</td>
<td>19.8 1.9 19.8 19.8 19.8 1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>подперлась</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>23.6 17.9 6.6 0.0 9.4 26.4</td>
<td>12.3 3.8 12.3 12.3 12.3 3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>упёрлась</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>46.2 30.2 13.2 0.0 1.9 1.9</td>
<td>2.8 3.8 2.8 3.8 2.8 3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>подперлась</td>
<td>неправ./про.</td>
<td>18.9 17.9 5.7 1.9 13.2 23.6</td>
<td>16.0 2.8 16.0 16.0 16.0 2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>подперлась</td>
<td>не рек./про.</td>
<td>12.3 22.6 9.4 1.9 23.6 20.8</td>
<td>8.5 0.9 8.5 8.5 8.5 0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>обперлась</td>
<td>и/про.</td>
<td>4.7 2.8 1.9 0.9 7.6 30.2</td>
<td>49.1 2.8 49.1 49.1 49.1 2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>обперлась</td>
<td>и/про.</td>
<td>2.8 2.8 0.0 2.8 2.8 2.8</td>
<td>69.8 0.9 69.8 69.8 69.8 0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>нёжачилась</td>
<td>неправ./н</td>
<td>5.7 4.7 1.9 0.9 10.4 30.2</td>
<td>45.3 0.9 45.3 45.3 45.3 0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The conclusions that can be drawn from the results for the reflexive feminine preterite forms is that on the whole there is compliance between explicit norm and implicit norm for end-stressed, as well as for stem-stressed explicit norms. However, in the verbs on -переться the motley codification situation is reflected by quite a high degree of vacillation in the informants’ replies.590

**End stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm**

The stress началась is the explicit and implicit norm. All informants except one used this stress (one stressed началась and no one началась).591 The large reported usage for началась – 90.6 per cent592 – and the relatively small reported usage for началась (неправ./н) – 12.3 per cent – confirm the strong position for the end stress.

Table 4.5-48. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>началась</th>
<th>началась</th>
<th>началась</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>неправ./н</td>
<td>неправ./н</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.8% (30)</td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

590 For оперлась the normative end stress has the highest reported usage, but stem stress (with both -ё- and -ё-) has high actual or reported usage. For отперлась, too, the normative end stress is prevailing among the informants, although the stem-stressed variant is the reported usage of about ¼ of them. For подперлась and уперлась the reported and/or actual usage is somewhat higher for the normative stem stress, but the end-stressed variants have figures almost as high (especially in подперлась). This could be a sign of hypercorrection (generalising feminine end stress) and/or influence from оперлась, заперлась, отперлась. (See results section below.)

591 In Ukiah (1994) all informants stressed началась, no one началась.

592 With an exceptionally high percentage in the first column: 54.7.
There is likewise correspondence between explicit and implicit norms for дралась. This stress was the elicited usage of all the informants who gave a valid answer and it was also the reported usage of 89.6 per cent of the informants.\footnote{In Ukiah (1994) 95 per cent used дралась.}

Table 4.5-49. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>дралась</th>
<th>дралась</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>неправ./_</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.8% (30)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The stress родилась (normative in the sources) was produced by 100 per cent of the respondents in the oral part of the survey. No one stressed родилась, which is the same result as in Ukiah. This stem stress, labelled доп./_, was approved of by only 11.3 per cent in the written part of the present survey. In consequence it can be stated that there is no doubt that the norm – explicit and implicit – is родилась, and that the codicators’ relatively large acceptance of the variant has no correspondence in the attitudes and norms of the language users.

Table 4.5-50. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>родилась</th>
<th>родилась</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>доп./_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0% (31)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An additional example of correspondence between the implicit and explicit norms in the feminine preterite reflexive forms is поднималась. All informants used this stress in actual speech,\footnote{In Ukiah (1994) 0 per cent used поднималась.} and the low reported usage (17.9 per cent) of the stem-stressed variant поднёмалась (неправ./простореч.) further attests that поднималась is the only norm.

Table 4.5-51. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>поднималась</th>
<th>поднималась</th>
<th>поднималась</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>неправ./простореч.</td>
<td>неправ./простореч.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0% (31)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The stress разорвалась is the explicit norm and most informants, 76.5 per cent, report usage of this. However, the position for this normative end stress is somewhat less strong than for the above-mentionend verbs.

Another explicit norm for which a majority – although small – claims usage is вилась (58.6 per cent).\footnote{In Ukiah (1994) вилась was used by 95 per cent.} The present material and method would not allow for anything but conjectures regarding the reasons why the reported usage is lower for this form than for the other feminine end-stressed forms.

The reported usage of 66.0 per cent of the informants is the codified norm оперлась. End stress thus appears to have a strong position for this verb form, although it experiences some competition from variant stresses: 25.5 per cent of the informants report usage of оптёрла, a variant not even listed in OS (and in RPP labelled простореч.)\footnote{In Ukiah оперлась was used by 65.1 per cent.}, while 9.4 per cent report usage of оптёрла (неправ./простореч.).

A similar situation is found in оперла: the explicit norm оперлась receives the largest support from the language users: 65.1 per cent reported usage. However, two alternative
stresses have rather high reported usage: опё́рла́сь (и/_; 40.6 per cent) and опё́рлась (not
listed in the sources; 39.6 per cent).га
There is thus generally for the feminine end stresses codified as normative agreement
with the implicit norms, although for some verbs, particularly those on -перлась, the coin-
cidence between explicit and implicit norms is less obvious and the informants’ answers
show that the dispersion between different stresses is larger. The explanation for this could
possibly lie in the influence from other verbs containing the same verbal formant and for
which the codified stress sometimes is the stem-stressed variant.

**Stem stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm**

It seems, however, that there is hesitation also for the verbs on -перлась in which stem
stress is the codified norm. This suggests that the analogy or over-extension between the
two groups of verbs on -перлась cuts both ways.

The codified norm подпё́рла́сь is supported by 48.1 per cent of the informants, and as
large a percentage – 48.1 per cent – reject it. A similar distribution is found in the replies
for the variant подперла́сь (labelled не рек./простореч.), where 44.3 per cent report usage
and 52.9 per cent report that they do not use it. In Ukiah’s study the distribution between
the two variants was similarly equal: подпё́рла́сь 52 per cent, подперла́сь 48 per cent.

Stem stress is also the codified norm in the verb уперла́сь. Here there seems to be some-
what less insecurity regarding the stress: 89.6 per cent report that they use it and only 6.6
per cent reject it. In actual usage, however, the end-stressed variant уперла́сь (не рек./_),
pronounced by 25.8 per cent, was more common than suggested by the reported usage, al-
though a majority – 64.5 per cent – still preferred the explicit norm уперла́сь. In Kolesov’s
study the prevalence of the codified norm was even smaller: уперла́сь 57.5 per cent,
уперла́сь 41.6 per cent and уперла́сь (a variant not mentioned in the sources) 0.9 per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>норма</th>
<th>уперла́сь</th>
<th>не рек./_</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64.5% (20)</td>
<td>25.8% (8)</td>
<td>9.7% (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other end-stressed variants not codified as normative caused little hesitation among the
informants, except for perhaps подкралась, labelled as неправ./простореч. (codified
norm подкралась), which 42.5 per cent of the informants claimed to use and believed was
correct and 52.8 per cent dismissed. For обёрлась (the reported usage of the variant оберлась, _/простореч. was 9.4 per cent) and for ошиблась (the reported usage of
the variant ошиблась, _/простореч. was 5.6 per cent) there is most likely no discrepancy
between explicit and implicit norms.

596 Probably influenced by the codified norm уперла́сь.
597 This stress variant was also elicited in Kolesov (1964): опё́рла́сь 7.6 per cent; оперла́сь was used by 92.4
per cent.
598 “Hesitation” in this context signifies (a) that the codified and actual norms are not always or not in a large
majority of cases the same and (b) that the informants as a group do not agree between them.
599 Most informants answer that they use one of the variants and at the same time they answer that they do not
use the other. However, 23 informants do not report usage of any of the variants and 19 informants report
usage of both variants. This could be taken as further evidence of insecurity concerning the stressing of this
verb form.
4.5.8 Neuter reflexive verb forms with and without prefix

The general tendency in the neuter and plural reflexive preterite forms is for the stress to move from the ending to the stem. Even if these variants are not common in speech or codified as norms, they do, according to Nen’ko (1984a:185–186), appear increasingly often in normative dictionaries. However, as can be seen in the table below, the existence of a variant or its inclusion in dictionaries is not necessarily a sign of its strong position in the language community. A variant to the codified norm can be listed as such for several decades without it necessarily entailing normativity in codification and/or among the language users. Compare the table below.

Table 4.5-53. Normative notation for the stresses отдалось in sources from the 1950s to the 1990s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norm</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>норма</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Разг.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.8.1 Dictionary data

End stress is the codified norm

Stem stress is n/_: оперло́сь – опё́рло́сь.


Most verbs with the stem -нлся also belong here with the variation -(н)яло́сь – -(н)я́ло́сь. This applies to взяло́сь and the verbs with the prefixes об-, от-, перес-, под-, припод-, с-, у- 604. In some cases, though, the stem-stressed variant of verbs on -(н)яло́сь is more negatively assessed; see below.

Stem stress is не рек./простореч.: -н(я)яло́сь – -(н)я́ло́сь (with the prefixes воспри-., за-, на-, при-). 605

Stem stress is неправ./простореч.: нача́ло́сь – нача́лос́ь, отперло́сь – отпё́рло́сь.

Stem stress is доп. устар./устар.: счё́кло́сь – сё́кло́сь (with and without prefixes).

Prefix stress is не рек./_: заперло́сь – запёрло́сь

Prefix stress is неправ./простореч. (normative end stresses given above): восприня́лось, доль́лось, задало́сь, за́жили́сь, за́ли́лось, на́жели́сь, на́льлось, наня́лося, наже́ло, обда́ло, обжили́сь, обложи́ло, отда́ло, отня́ло, отперло́, передало́сь, перё́дало́сь, пода́ло, подя́ло, подня́ло, по́лило, прода́ло, приня́ло, пропо́дяло, пропи́ло, прони́ло, содало́.

600 N.B. some stems appear only in combination with prefixes, while others appear only without prefixes.

601 But for the unprefixed жила́сь the stem-stressed variant жи́лась is more condemned (не рек./_) than for the prefixed verbs.

602 поддя́лось is простореч. in RPP.

603 ушло́сь is простореч. in RPP.

604 унё́лось is простореч. in RPP.

605 For many of these verbs variation is recorded only in OS.

606 Cf. for the prefixed verbs with the stem -пать end stress and stem stress are equal variants.
Stem stress is the codified norm

End stress is \( /i/\) – \( -\)-галось – \(-\)-галось, –спалось – \(-\)-спалось (for the prefixed verbs).\(^{607}\)

End stress is \( \text{не рек.}/\text{простореч.}\) : подпёрлось – подперло, уперлось – уперло.

End stress is \( \text{неправ.}/\text{простореч.}\) : кра́лось – кра́лось.

Verbs with the stem -переться are as complicated in the neuter forms as in the feminine, but the assessment is the same as in the feminine, except for the prefix-stressed variants of запереться which are \( \text{неправ.}/\text{простореч.}\) in the feminine and \( \text{не рек.}/\text{простореч.}\) in the neuter form.

Table 4.5-54. Norms, variants and assessment for neuter reflexive preterite verbs with the stem -переться.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress variant examined</th>
<th>End stress (-перло́сþ)</th>
<th>Stem stress (-пержо́сþ)</th>
<th>Prefix stress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>опереться</td>
<td>норм</td>
<td>( i_/)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>запереться</td>
<td>норм</td>
<td>( –)</td>
<td>( \text{не рек.}/\text{простореч.})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отпереться</td>
<td>норм</td>
<td>( –)/простореч.</td>
<td>( \text{неправ.}/\text{простореч.})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>подпереться</td>
<td>( \text{не рек.}/\text{простореч.})</td>
<td>норм</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>упереться</td>
<td>( \text{не рек.}/_)</td>
<td>норм</td>
<td>( –)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.8.2 Results

Table 4.5-55. Reported usage and language users’ norm. Percentage of respondents for each category of answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress variant examined</th>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>I say it like that myself</th>
<th>I do not say it like that myself</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and I know that it is correct</td>
<td>and I believe that it is correct</td>
<td>but I do not know whether it is correct</td>
<td>but I know that it is incorrect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>жило́сь</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>продало́сь</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>создало́сь</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>распало́сь</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>оторвало́сь</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>создало́сь</td>
<td>доп./_</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>продало́сь</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>дёлало́сь</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>спало́сь</td>
<td>не рек./про.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>продало́сь</td>
<td>неправ./про.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отдало́сь</td>
<td>неправ./про.</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>бёдало́сь</td>
<td>неправ./про.</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally speaking, there is agreement between explicit and implicit norms in the preterite neuter reflexive forms; the end-stressed forms codified as norms are the reported and actual usage and the language users believe them to be correct. From this relatively small amount of data it can also be concluded that stem-stressed variants are used to a certain extent, while prefix-stressed variants are virtually non-existent.

End stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm

The end-stressed жило́сь with 91.5 per cent reported usage in the present survey\(^{608}\) is the explicit as well as the implicit norm.

This holds good for продало́сь as well. This stress is the reported usage and the norm of 73.7 per cent of the informants. Figures for the other variants are significantly lower: 18.9 per cent reported usage (79.2 per cent non-usage) for продало́сь (доп./разг.) and 7.5 per cent reported usage (89.6 per cent non-usage) for продало́сь (неправ./простореч.)

\(^{607}\) As mentioned above, for the unprefixed verb the stress спало́сь is the norm, спало́сь is не рек.=/простореч.

\(^{608}\) 100 per cent usage in Ukiah (1994).
Yet another reflexive neuter form with end stress as both explicit and implicit norm is распльялъсъ. This stress was reported to be used by 70.8 per cent of the respondents and was the actual usage of 77.4 per cent of the informants, while 16.1 per cent stressed распльялъсъ (labelled доп./разг.). Other surveys show a similar prevalence for the normative end stress: распльялъсъ: 85.8 and 70.6 per cent in Kolesov (1964) and 95 per cent in Ukiah (1994). Compare the relatively low usage of распльялъсъ: 18.2 and 29.2 per cent in Kolesov.

Table 4.5-56. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>норма</th>
<th>доп./разг.</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77.4% (24)</td>
<td>16.1% (5)</td>
<td>6.4% (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The elicited pronunciation of the verb form создалъся showed that 83.9 per cent used создалъся, 12.9 per cent создалъся (доп./_), and no one создалъся (неправ./_). Reported usage further confirms the strong position of the stress that is the explicit norm: 87.8 per cent claimed to use создалъся and said that they believe it is correct, while the figure was much lower for создалъся: 18.9 per cent. The results of other studies confirm that end stress is both the explicit and implicit norm, that stem stress is used to a certain extent and that prefix stress has very low usage: создалъся 75.7 per cent in Kolesov (1964), 95 per cent in Ukiah (1994); создалъся 15.0 per cent in RJaSO (1963), 23.0 per cent in Kolesov; создалъся 0.9 per cent in Kolesov, 5 per cent in Ukiah.

Table 4.5-57. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>норма</th>
<th>создалъся</th>
<th>создалъся</th>
<th>создалъся</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83.9% (26)</td>
<td>12.9% (4)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The verb собралиъся was not part of the written survey as it was initially not included in the survey material. However, since it was included in the oral part of the survey for the construction of a test sentence it provided additional material on actual stress. A majority of the elicited stresses were in line with the codified norm: 83.9 per cent used собралиъся and 12.9 per cent собралиъся (доп./разг.).

Table 4.5-58. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>норма</th>
<th>собралиъся</th>
<th>собралиъся</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83.9% (26)</td>
<td>12.9% (4)</td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The end-stressed norm далъсь is adhered to by the informants. All of them stressed according to the explicit norm. The variant далъсь, labelled доп./разг. and thus quite accepted in codification, was not elicited once and the reported usage of this variant was low: only 11.3 per cent.610

609 Different contexts.
610 Neither in Ukiah (1994) was далъсь used.
The actual and/or reported usage for the stem-stressed alternatives was low: 0 to 34.9 per cent, with the highest figures for оторвалось, which might be due to the length of this word. These stem-stressed variants are no threat to the end stress, which is obviously both the explicit and implicit norm. The low reported usage – 18.0 per cent – for отдалось (доп./разг.) as well as for the prefix-stressed variant (see below) indicates that the implicit norm is the same as the explicit: отдалось. This apparently applies to спалось, too: the reported usage of the variant stress спалось (не рек./простореч.) was small, 11.3 per cent. The following stresses were not widespread either: продалось (доп./разг.) with 18.9 per cent reported usage, создалось (доп./_) with 12.9 per cent actual and 18.9 per cent reported usage, далось (доп./разг.) with 11.3 per cent reported usage and собралось (доп./разг.) with 12.9 per cent actual usage (cf. above).

As for the prefix-stressed alternatives, they have an even weaker position than the stem-stressed variants: отдалось (неправ./простореч.) was the reported usage of 3.7 per cent and продалось (неправ./простореч.) of 7.5 per cent. As was shown above, explicit and implicit stress norms comply for these verb forms.

4.5.9 Plural reflexive verb forms with and without prefix

4.5.9.1 Dictionary data

End stress is the codified norm

Stem stress is u/,: оперлісь – опёрлісь.


Most verbs with the stem -ні́ться also belong here. They exhibit the variation -(н)я́лися – -(н)я́лісь, with stem stress labelled as доп./разг. This applies to взя́лися and the verbs with the prefixes об-, от-, перес-, под-, припод-, с-, у-. 617

Stem stress is не рек./простореч.: сбýлісь – съ́блісь, -(н)я́лісь – -(н)я́лісь (with the prefixes воспри-, за-, на-, при-).

Stem stress is неправ./простореч.: нача́лісь – началь́сь, отпера́лісь – отпёрлісь.

611 It has four syllables, which might increase the propensity to stress closer to the central syllable(s); the other forms investigated here contain two or three syllables. This variant оторвалось is also somewhat more mildly labelled in RPP (u. i.e. it is an “equal” variant to the norm; in OS it is marked доп.).

612 In Ukiah (1994) no one used this stem stress. It can also be noted that in the present investigation 12.3 per cent of the informants claimed that they use this stress but “know that it is wrong”, which is quite a high percentage for this column.

613 N.B. some stems appear only in combination with prefixes, while others appear only without prefixes.

614 поді́літься is простореч. in RPP.
615 упі́літься is простореч. in RPP.
617 уні́ліся is простореч. in RPP.
Stem stress is the codified norm

End stress is \( \text{-перѣться} \) (for the prefixed verbs).

End stress is \( \text{неправ./простореч.} \): подперѣться – подперѣться, уперѣться – уперѣться.

End stress is \( \text{неправ./простореч.} \): кра́лись – кралі́сь.

The assessments for the verbs with the stem \( \text{-перѣться} \) are, in the plural forms, as complicated as they are in the feminine and neuter; the variation in the plural forms is the same as that in the neuter forms.

Table 4.5-60. Norms, variants and assessment for plural reflexive preterite verbs with the stem \( \text{-перѣться} \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress variant examined</th>
<th>End stress ( \text{-перѣться} )</th>
<th>Stem stress ( \text{-перѣться} )</th>
<th>Prefix stress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{перѣться} )</td>
<td>( \text{норм} )</td>
<td>( \text{н_} )</td>
<td>( \text{прек} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{заперѣться} )</td>
<td>( \text{норм} )</td>
<td>( \text{н/простореч.} )</td>
<td>( \text{прек/простореч.} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{подперѣться} )</td>
<td>( \text{нrek/простореч.} )</td>
<td>( \text{норм} )</td>
<td>( \text{н_} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{уперѣться} )</td>
<td>( \text{нrek/простореч.} )</td>
<td>( \text{норм} )</td>
<td>( \text{н_} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.9.2 Results

Table 4.5-61. Reported usage and language users’ norm. Percentage of respondents for each category of answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress variant examined</th>
<th>I say it like that myself</th>
<th>I do not say it like that myself</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{норма} )</td>
<td>( \text{н_} )</td>
<td>( \text{нrek} )</td>
<td>( \text{нrek/простореч.} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{н_} )</td>
<td>( \text{нrek} )</td>
<td>( \text{нrek/простореч.} )</td>
<td>( \text{нrek} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally speaking, there is agreement between explicit and implicit norms in the preterite reflexive plural forms, both for verbs in which end stress is the norm and in which stem
stress is the norm. However, in several cases a stem-stressed variant with a strong position exists alongside the normative end stress, and for some verbs it can be claimed that there are two stress variants that are the norm.618

End stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm

For the form заня́лся, the explicit and implicit stress norm coincide (заня́лся). This stress was included twice in the written part of the questionnaire and it was the reported usage of 75.5 and 72.7 per cent of the informants (non-usage 21.7 and 25.5 per cent), respectively. Neither of the variants that are non-normative according to the sources has the approval of a large percentage of the informants: заня́лся (неправ./_) 28.3 per cent (vs. 65.1 per cent reported non-usage) and заня́лся (не рек./_) 16.1 per cent (vs. 80.2 per cent reported non-usage). The results of the oral part of the investigation confirmed the predominance of end stress for this form, there included in two sentences: “Врачи заня́лись лечением...” and “Налоговые инспекторы... заня́лись...” In both contexts end stress was the most current: 54.8 and 61.3 per cent of the informants stressed заня́лся, as compared to 41.9 and 29.0 per cent for the prefix-stressed variant заня́лся. Firstly, it should be noted that the more condemned variant заня́лся, labelled as “incorrect”, has larger reported and actual usage than заня́лся, labelled “not recommended”. Secondly, it should be noted that the actual usage of the prefix stress is rather high. While not rivalling the normative end stress, it cannot be excluded that заня́лся will become the prevalent usage and perhaps the norm in the future, which would be in line with the development for начался and завершиться. (Cf. 4.5.6.2.)

The end stress сбы́лся, of which 87.8 per cent of the informants reported usage,619 is the explicit as well as implicit norm.

This also applies to разо́брался, although its normative position appears somewhat weaker. It was the reported usage of 67.9 per cent and the actual usage of 64.5 per cent. The variant разо́брался (доп./_) was used by 35.5 per cent.

One verb form for which in all likelihood both end stress and stem stress are the implicit norm is обшли́сь. The explicit norm обшли́лся has among the informants about as large a measure of acclaim (47.2 per cent) as dismissal (50.0 per cent), and for the stem-stressed

---

618 The prefix-stressed variants to the norm are not particularly widespread.
619 In Ukiah (1994) the usage was similarly high: 90 per cent.
variant обли́лись (доп./__) reported usage is higher than for the codified norm: 69.8 per cent (vs. 27.3 per cent rejecting this stress).

Another form with both end stress and stem stress as implicit norm is подня́лись. The reported usage of the explicit norm подня́лись was 58.5 per cent and the reported usage for the stem-stressed variant подня́лись (доп./разг.), included twice in the questionnaire, was similar: 61.4 per cent in one instance and 53.8 per cent in the other.620 The prefix-stressed variant подня́лись (неправ./простореч.) was approved of by only 5.6 per cent.

The results of the oral part of the survey show that in actual usage the codified norm подня́лись is likely to be the most common. The stressing of this verb form was checked in two different contexts, and in “Требования на заводе подня́лись ...” the stress подня́лась was used by 80.6 per cent of the informants, подня́лись by 16.1 per cent and подня́лись by no one. However, in the context “Инженеры подня́лись на 6-й этаж ...” prefix stress was elicited four times (i.e. by 12.9 per cent of the informants) at the cost of the end stress, which was here used by 64.5 per cent of the speakers, while stem stress was used by 19.4 per cent.621

Thus, the most common elicited usage was end stress, which is also the norm given in codification, and most informants were consistent in their usage, although there is a fair amount of intrapersonal variation.622 However, it should also be noted that the two sentences were placed close to each other in the questionnaire (numbers 46 and 48 respectively), thus probably increasing the propensity of the informants to use the same stress in the two sentences. The variation in the choice of stress variants could be due to the different contexts in which the verb was included, although the most likely assumption – supported by the results of the written part of the survey – is that both end stress and stem stress comprise the implicit norm and these variants are at times used interchangeably.

Table 4.5-65. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>подня́лись</th>
<th>подня́лись</th>
<th>подня́лись</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>80.6% (25)</td>
<td>16.1% (5)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5-66. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>подня́лись</th>
<th>подня́лись</th>
<th>подня́лись</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>64.5% (20)</td>
<td>19.4% (6)</td>
<td>12.9% (4)</td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In напи́лись both end stress and stem stress are seemingly the implicit norm. The reported usage for both stresses is high: 70.7 per cent for the explicit norm напи́лись and 53.8 per cent for напи́лись (доп./разг.). The results for the oral part of the survey which showed that 54.8 per cent of the informants stressed напи́лись and 35.5 per cent напи́лись, confirm that

620 For the possibility that the order of the items in the investigation influences the results see Chapter 4.6.4.
621 The results of other surveys also show – like the oral part of the present survey – that when presented with a choice the speakers choose end stress: подня́лись 85.2 per cent in Kolesov (1964), 95 per cent in Ukiah (1994); подня́лись 18.8 per cent in RJaSO (1963), 13.8 per cent in Kolesov and 5 per cent in Ukiah; подня́лись 2.4 per cent in Kolesov and 0 per cent in Ukiah.
622 19 subjects stressed подня́лись in both instances, 2 stressed подня́лись in both instances, 4 used подня́лись and подня́лись, 2 used подня́лись, and one other, invalid, response, 1 подня́лись and подня́лись, and 3 подня́лись and подня́лись.
the prevailing stress is end stress, but that both can probably be considered the implicit norm.  

Yet another verb form for which there appear to be two normative stresses is собрались. A majority of the informants – 70.7 per cent – claim usage of the codified norm собрались and a majority, although smaller (50.9 per cent), report that they use собрались (доп./разг.) and believe that it is correct. The results of the oral investigation, where собрались was used by 77.4 per cent and собрались by 22.6 per cent, point in the same direction: both stresses are used, but the end-stressed codified norm has a stronger position.

About half the informants – 47.1 per cent – replied that they use the stress придрался and believe it is correct, and about as many – 50.0 per cent – rejected it. Actual usage shows quite an equal distribution between end stress and stem stress: придрался was elicited from 51.6 per cent and придрался from 48.4 per cent. In other surveys usage of stem stress was higher: придрался was used by 14.4 per cent in Kolesov (1964), придрался by 86.1 per cent in Kolesov and by 71.4 per cent in RJaSO (1963), придрался by 1.9 per cent in Kolesov. A real change towards end stress and greater agreement with the book norm might have taken place since these studies were carried out in the 1960s, although the results on the whole indicate that both stresses are highly used and accepted.

The percentage of actual usage of the codified norm дождались was 64.5 and of дождались (доп./разг.) 32.3. Accordingly, in actual speech the language users prefer the end-stressed explicit norm. However, as the results of the other part of the survey show, acceptance of the stem-stressed variant is high: 51.9 per cent declare that they use this stress and consider it correct (cf. with the 43.4 per cent who dismiss it). Other surveys show similar figures: дождались 44.4 per cent in Kolesov (1964) and 60 per cent in Ukiah (1994); дождались 54.1 per cent in RJaSO (1963), 57.0 per cent in Kolesov and 40 per cent in Ukiah.

623 Other investigations show varying results. In Ukiah (1994) all informants used end stress and no one stem stress, while in Kolesov (1964) 50.4 per cent stressed написал, 54.9 per cent написал and 0.4 per cent написал. In RJaSO (1963) 48.1 per cent stressed написал (no figures given for other variants).
624 The results of other surveys are in line with the present findings: собрались 54.6 per cent in Kolesov (1964); собрались 42.6 per cent in Kolesov, 34.1 per cent in RJaSO (1963); собрались 2.8 per cent in Kolesov.
625 The prefix stress дождались was also elicited in Kolesov (0.5 per cent of the respondents used it).
For two forms only the stem-stressed variants were investigated. The reported usage of the variant рвались (доп./_ ) was quite high: 64.2 per cent (reported non-usage 33.9 per cent). This could be compared to Ukiah (1994) where only 5 per cent used the stress рвались. The stress рвались is likely to be the implicit norm, as well as the explicit, but there is considerable tolerance of the stem-stressed variant.

The stem-stressed variant ушлись, which is assessed differently in the two sources (доп. in OS and простореч. in RPP), was accepted by and reported to be the usage of 37.8 per cent of the informants, suggesting (a) that end stress is more accepted and is thus both the implicit and explicit norm and (b) that the labelling in RPP could be too condemnatory.

**Stem stress is the explicit norm = implicit norm**

There is compliance between explicit and implicit norms for the form подкralись as the stem-stressed подкralись is the codified norm and 81.1 per cent reported usage of this stress, while the end-stressed variant подкralись (неправ./простореч.) was the reported usage of 24.5 per cent of the respondents.

The stem-stressed codified norm zalгались is the reported usage of 53.8 per cent of the informants (43.4 per cent non-usage). This suggests that explicit and implicit norms comply for this form, but that there is some hesitancy regarding its stressing.

The end-stressed variant otospались, which is well accepted by the sources (labelled и/и) is not embraced by the language users. Only 14.2 per cent report usage of this stress. Elicited usage confirms the strong position of the codified norm otospались, which was used by 77.4 per cent, while otospались was used by 22.6 per cent.

### Table 4.5-71. Actual usage. Percentage of respondents for each stress variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>otospались</th>
<th>otospались</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>норма</td>
<td>77.4% (24)</td>
<td>22.6% (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, although the pool of data is quite small, it can be assumed that when stem stress in the plural reflexive preterite is the explicit norm it is also the implicit norm, although there seems to be some hesitation concerning the stressing of zalгались.

### 4.6 Several instances of one form in the written questionnaire

For several verbal forms two or more variant stresses were included in the investigation – for instance both the codified norm началась and the variant stress начала, labelled неправ./_ – so that internal comparison within the questionnaire could be effectuated.626 This internal comparison shows that either there is only one stress that is the implicit norm (this stress can be both = the explicit norm and ≠ the explicit norm), or there are two or sev-

---

626 Ideally, all variants, both normative and non-normative stresses, should have been included but this was not possible within the scope of this survey.
eral coexisting implicit norms, i.e. there is variation in the individual and variation in society.

4.6.1 One implicit norm is equal to the explicit norm

The results from the questionnaire show that for many verbs or forms the informants as a group have one and only one implicit norm, which is equal to the explicit norm. This would appear to be supported by figures showing that a large majority (approximately two thirds of the informants) approved of one stress (marked in bold below), whereas a minority (not more than a quarter to a third) approved of the other stress. This is at the same time as the second stress variant is rejected by a majority and the sum for the percentages for the stress alternatives is around 100 per cent. Still it should be kept in mind that for this kind of comparison no strict numerical borders can be set and that a sliding scale is dealt with here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verb</th>
<th>norma</th>
<th>не рек. устар/простореч.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>занять</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>занять</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>приклёнть</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>разве́ться</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>началась</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>создалось</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>задалá</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>черка́ть</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>подкралáсь</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>при́нёл</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>продалóсь</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>позво́ним</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>сёлить</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>шевёлить</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отперла́сь</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

627 In the listing below the conventional border has been set at 95 to 115 per cent, the figures being chosen to allow for a certain number of invalid replies and a certain overlapping in the answers of the informants.
4.6.2 The implicit norm is not equal to the explicit norm

For some forms, though, the stresses that are the implicit norm are not given as the explicit norm in the handbooks, and the stress that is codified as normative has low reported usage. Thus for these forms there is one implicit stress norm (in bold below), but it is not equal to the stress codified as normative in the sources. These stresses that function as actual norms are, with two exceptions, marked и or доп./разг., which means that they are within the norm, but not the preferred stress. The two exceptions are вклю́чить and дочернáть.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Stressed Form</th>
<th>Implicit Form</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>нáлй</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>нáлй</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>родýлся</td>
<td>и/и</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>родилсé</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>перенё́л</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>переняли</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>посéлышь</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>посéлышь</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>заржа́веть</td>
<td>и/и</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>заржа́веть</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>помéстяться</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>помёститься</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>перепернеть</td>
<td>доп./и</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>перепё́рнеть</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>вклю́чить</td>
<td>неправ./разг.</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>вклю́чить</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отжёли</td>
<td>и/и</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отжили</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>дочернáть</td>
<td>не рек./простореч.</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>дочёрнать</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>дочёрнать</td>
<td>_/простореч.</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>подё́ляли</td>
<td>доп./разг.</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>подё́ляли</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>заслони́ть</td>
<td>и/и</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>заслони́ть</td>
<td>норма</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the method for this study did not imply a choice between two (or more) forms, but rather investigated the acceptance and usage (mainly reported, but also actual) of stress variants, a method which more clearly shows the norm, it was possible to prove that one person can use and accept several different forms on different occasions or in different contexts.

4.6.3 Two or several stresses are the implicit norm

There are answers indicating that there are two or several stresses that are the implicit norm (marked in bold below), here defined as the cases where a majority of informants are in favour of each of the two alternative forms.

As suggested by Greenbaum & Quirk (1970:6) “some subjects can prefer one form while other subjects prefer a different one (variation in society); and they also show that some subjects give an identically high ranking to two or more forms (variation in the individual)”. As will be shown below, this is confirmed in the present study. These findings could be contrasted with, for instance, Graudina (1980:71, 125–126) who has as a point of departure that there are two variants and that the informants have to choose between these.
The results for the verbs ending on -личь for which two or more stresses were investigated resemble each other: both end- and stem stress are used by more than 50 per cent of the informants and the codified norm (stressed -личь) is the most used form, or at least as much used as the variant form marked доп./разг. This indicates that the informants accept both end-stressed and stem-stressed plural preterite forms, but that the normative end-stressed form is prevailing.628

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Norm</th>
<th>Dop./ Razg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>напишись</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>поднялися</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>поднялись</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>поднялась</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>собралися</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the masculine and plural forms of preterite verbs with originally monosyllabic stems for which both variants were investigated there is a uniform pattern: both prefix stress and stem stress are the reported usage of more than 50 per cent of the informants. The stem-stressed forms (labelled и, доп., разг.) are more current (61–79 per cent reported usage), and the prefix-stressed forms which are the codified norms are the reported usage of 50–58 per cent. This indicates that both the stem-stressed and the prefix-stressed forms are the implicit norm, but that stem stress is gaining ground. It also shows, which could be expected, that there is no correspondence between the label of the stem-stressed variant and acceptance in the language community: a stress marked и is not always more often seen as normative than a variant labelled доп./разг.:629

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Norm</th>
<th>Dop./ Razg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>пролю</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>прошёл</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>прошли</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>перекипли</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пропили</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пропили</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>продал</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To conclude, the importance of not necessarily making the informants choose between two variants, but rather to assess given variants, is demonstrated clearly by the above.

4.6.4 The importance of distance in the questionnaire

As already mentioned the intention was to mix the order of stresses of the same type so that, for instance, not all preterite reflexive verbs in the plural form would be placed adja-

---

628 The figures for the end-stressed form поднялися are between those for the two instances of stem stress поднялись.
629 This leads to the following questions: On what basis is that labelling made? It is neither linked to usage nor to structure. What indicates that перекипел (зиму) should be labelled и/разг. and прошёл доп./разг., or прошёл доп./разг. and пропили и/и?
cently in the questionnaire. It can be conjectured that such a placement influences the survey results as the informants are more likely to give similar answers to two similar forms if these two are placed one after another than if they are on separate pages. In order to study this the results for the variant проки́л (number 145, page 4) and for проки́л (number 239, page 6) will be compared with the results for the prefix-stressed variants проки́л and проки́л which were – with the purpose of making such a comparison – placed next to each other on page 5 as numbers 189 and 190 respectively. The table below shows this comparison.

Table 4.6-1. The informants’ answers about reported usage for variants in the questionnaire placed at a distance or adjacently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Placed on separate pages:</th>
<th>Adjacent to each other:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>проки́л проки́л</td>
<td>проки́л проки́л</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exactly the same answer</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar answer</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different answer</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one invalid answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The conclusion that can be drawn from this quite limited material is that the fact that two similar stress types are placed next to each other increases the likelihood that the respondent assesses them in the same way. On the other hand, what was shown above and in Chapter 4.5 should be kept in mind, i.e. that the informants can use the two stresses indiscriminately and do not believe they have to make a choice between two stresses: they report usage of the codified norm проки́л (58.5 per cent) and проки́л (55.7 per cent) alongside the even more popular доп./разг.-marked stresses проки́л and проки́л (79.3 and 65.2 per cent).

### 4.7 Comparison of the results of the oral performance test (usage) and the written judgement test (attitude)

The relation between reported and actual usage is important both for an understanding of the normative structure (4.7.3) and for an evaluation of the individual parts of the survey. The following section sets out to investigate this relation briefly.

As for the reliability of the speaker-reported material, Panov states that the objectivity of the facts obtained is often questioned as the informants can ascribe to themselves speech habits – particularly in morphology and phonetics – that they believe are correct, although they do not use them. Panov asserts, however, that material collected shows that the number of variants and deviations from the norms often reaches the level found in observations of speech (1968a:44). The same conclusion was reached by Krysin who compared recordings to the answers in the questionnaire for the RJaSO survey. This comparison showed that there was insignificant deviation from the questionnaires, and the conclusion

---

630 Nothing of course implies that a masculine and a plural form of the same verb should unconditionally have the same stress in codification or in the usage of one individual. However, it is quite probable that a person who stresses проки́л is also likely to use the stress проки́л.

631 Answers are considered “similar” where, for instance, the informant claims to use the variant, but in one case believes it is right and in the other knows it is right.

632 “Их количество часто достигает предела, который был найден из наблюдений над живой речью” (Panov 1968a:44). See also 4.1.1.1.
he draws is that the material can basically be seen as a reflection of actual usage (1974:34). And although Greenbaum & Quirk claim that “[i]t is also important to recognise that a preference in use need not correspond to a preference in attitude” (1970:6) they, too, infer that “there is in general a fairly close harmony between attitude and use” (1970:6).

4.7.1 Method
As the methods for the two parts of the survey were different, it is not justifiable simply to compare percentages of reported usage and percentages of actual usage. What has to be checked is the agreement of each singular answer for each individual informant. And, as it cannot be checked when the reported and actual usage do agree – there are several variants and one informant can use several of them – I have here counted the cases when there is no agreement between actual usage (the oral part of the survey) on the one hand and reported usage (the written part of the survey) on the other.

The number of normative stresses, codified as normative, which were represented in both parts was 60, and the number of variant stresses (non-normative and also “equal variants to the norm”) was 63.633 If one word or form appears twice in the oral part of the survey, the number of disagreements in reported usage and actual usage was added, but one disagreement cannot be counted more than once for one informant.

Comparisons on a more detailed word level are made in the preceding parts of this chapter, in connection with the results for each group of verbs or forms.

4.7.2 Results
The results show that reported usage and actual usage do more often than not tally. Of the total of 3,875 observations634 there was incongruity between reported and elicited usage in 904 cases, i.e. 23.3 per cent.635

The comparison showed that there are cases where the differences between reported usage and actual usage are particularly large. This either indicates a norm insecurity (both on an individual level and in the society) or an acceptance of several stress norms. This applies to the following:

In preterite non-reflexive masculine and plural forms (prefix stress and stem stress): őtdál, прожили, продал, продали, распродали, пережил, ʒi, прожил, подняли, пробыли, проклял, обнял, проМ.

In preterite reflexive masculine forms (prefix stress and end stress, sometimes root stress): нажался, обнялся.

In preterite reflexive plural forms (prefix stress and end stress, sometimes root stress): поднялись and заннылись. For some plural forms with other roots/stems than -ни- (and perhaps also -ча-) the insecurity or acceptance touches stem stress and end stress: собрались, написались, дождались, разобразились.

Some present tense verbs (stem stress and end stress): приложишь, шевелishi, мори́т,
4.7.2.1 Analysis of the non-coincidence of answers

However, as the cases where reported usage and belief about norms are not in accordance with actual usage are important for the study of the language users’ norms these will be studied more in detail here. The table below shows more specifically how the informants responded when their reported usage and belief about norms were not in accordance with their actual usage.

Table 4.7-1. Number of cases when reported usage and belief about norms are not in accordance with actual usage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODIFIED NORM</th>
<th>VARIANT TO THE CODIFIED NORM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informant claims to use (+)</td>
<td>Informant claims not to use (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informant does actually use (+)</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informant does not actually use (-)</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most common case is that informants claim to use a variant stress not codified as the norm but do not use it (383), and second comes the case where they claim to use the codified norm, but do not use it (266). The number of cases where they actually do use stresses – normative and non-normative – which they say that they do not use is on the other hand smaller (187 and 104 respectively). The lowest figure is found for the situation where the informant claims not to use, but actually uses, a variant to the codified norm.

Clearly, the acceptance of variants among the informants is rather high. It is more common that informants claim to use a stress which they do actually not use (this applies to both normative and non-normative stresses) than the other way round. Nevertheless, it is – quite remarkably – more common that the speakers under-report usage of explicit norms than of non-normative variants, and it is also more common that they over-report usage of non-normative forms than of explicit norms. Still, the fact that there are cases when they claim to use normative stresses which they do not use in speech could indicate a certain awareness of the norm and an ideal that they are striving for, although it is not as strong as their acceptance of variants. Consequently, the speakers acknowledge the variants and do not consider them wrong, although they, in speech, more often use the stress that is codified as normative.

Generally it is assumed that informants over-report usage of prestige variants. “This mismatch between actual usage and what people publicly claim to think constitutes one of the many paradoxes in sociolinguistics” (Milroy & Milroy 1991:19).

A major task of sociolinguistics is to explain why linguistic differences that are essentially arbitrary are assigned social values. Another associated task is to explain why people continue to use non-standard varieties when they claim publicly to agree that only the ‘standard’ is ‘correct’. What is the function of prescriptive attitudes and what effects do they have? (Milroy & Milroy 1991:19)

It seems that people are willing to pay lip-service to correctness and prestige variants, but at the same time they continue to speak the variety current in their own speech communities. In fact, statistical counts of variants actually used are probably the best way of assessing attitudes. Despite the views of the guardians, most people do not put into effect absolute views that particular usages are ‘right’ or ‘wrong’. (Milroy & Milroy 1991:19)

However, as shown in the table above it is not necessarily the case that discrepancies between self-reporting and actual usage go in this direction (if one assumes that the codified
norm is the prestige form). The informants in the present investigation do not seem to strive towards some known ideal norm in an attempt to be “educated” and correct, and they are not guilty of “idealisation” of their own language through over-reporting usage of stresses that are the codified norm. It is rather the other way round. This does, it should be pointed out, create a difference and lends further weight to the argument that the codified norm in certain cases is not perceived as the prestige variant.

Another tentative proposal for an explanation of this type of discrepancy is that this might be an indication that acceptance and recognition of variants can be as wide as that of norms. As Greenbaum & Quirk rightly point out, usage in others can be tolerated even if this usage does not coincide with one’s own reported usage or what one believes is recommended:

If elicited behaviour is different from the ‘actual’ behaviour casually observed and (if one is lucky) collected in a corpus, it is at least equally important to distinguish elicited usage from attitudes to usage. And these attitudes can be seen as reflecting three potentially quite distinct but often interacting factors. We may have strong beliefs about the forms we habitually use and we may also have strong views about the forms that ought to be used; these may be in harmony or in rueful conflict, but – needless to say – our beliefs about our own usage in no way necessarily correspond to the facts of our actual usage. Furthermore, we may tolerate usage in others that corresponds neither to the forms we believe we use ourselves nor to the forms that we believe are the most to be commended. (Greenbaum & Quirk 1970:2–3)

4.7.3 Conclusion

While this comparison between elicited usage and speaker-report results shows that by and large they comply, there is a certain incongruity between usage and the ideas about this usage. The character of this incongruity points towards an underlying normative structure where the Russian informants on the whole use what they genuinely believe are the norms, whether or not these stresses actually comply with the explicit norms given in dictionaries. On that account, it can be argued that there is rather a low level of language insecurity among these Russian informants, and if there is any insecurity at all, it is a latent insecurity (cf. Labov 1966:477 f.).

---

637 Cf. Labov (1966) where New Yorkers, when reporting their own usage, gave their norms of correctness, i.e., the norms they were aiming at, not their usage and consequently showed linguistic insecurity.
5 Adherence to the codified norm for particular groups of informants

The topics that will be investigated in this chapter are:

(a) to what extent the informants’ implicit norm coincides with the explicit norm (5.1);
(b) whether the group defined as standard language speakers is the one that most often reports usage in accordance with the explicit norms (5.1 and 5.10–5.11);
(c) which groups of informants (based on the variables age, sex, native language, childhood residence, place of longest residence, type of longest residence: town or countryside and educational level; and also samples units, i.e. places used in the investigation) are closest to the explicit norm and which groups’ implicit norm deviates most from the explicit norm (5.2–5.9);
(d) which are the characteristics of the informants with the ten highest and ten lowest scores for replies in accordance with the explicit norm (5.10–5.11).

In order to investigate to what extent the informants report usage of the explicit norm, a comparison of the assessments of dictionaries/handbooks and of the results of the attitude questionnaire was made.

Only the results of the first dimension of the questionnaire were taken into account, i.e. whether the informants do or do not report usage of a stress variant, not their belief about normativity (the second dimension). When an informant’s answer coincided with the codified norm it was coded as a 1, when not, it was coded as a 0. Then the number of 1s for each informant was added, and these numbers were used for the following calculations.

The number of cases (min. 0, max. 289) in which an informant’s replies were in line with the explicit norm was counted. Below, the results are presented for each group of informants and for each social variable. In the following averages (mean values) will be used and it should be kept in mind that mean values are symbols which do not exist in reality. The number of individuals in each group is given in parentheses.

This investigation was only made on the totality of the results of the questionnaire, not per singular word or type of variation. It should be observed that the number of speakers in some groups is very small. Those results are therefore by no means representative and should rather be seen as a presentation of the survey results according to the social variables than as an indicator of norm adherence for certain groups. Naturally, this material is skewed as the informants were not sampled on the basis of these social parameters.

According to Krysin, norms in pronunciation are in general – to a higher degree than lexical and inflectional norms – considered to be dependent on social factors. He suggests that this could be explained by the fact that pronunciation is an automated speech habit, i.e.

---

638 Although the normative assessment is in most cases the same in both main sources, there is, as already shown, no coincidence between these in several cases. In such situations the codified norm of OS, for the sake of argument, has been equated with the explicit norm.

639 The sample is not suited to a correlational study of the type investigating questions like how women aged 45–60 from central Russia stress reflexive preterite neuter forms, and such questions will therefore not be investigated here.
not controlled in the communication process (Krysin 1973:49). The most important factors for the distribution of language variants are territorial factors, then comes the time factor (age differences; Krysin 1973:42, 48–49). Krysin (1973:47–48) suggests that differences in social status have little impact on language and also that these differences are small and (seemingly) decreasing.

5.1 The whole informant group

The average score of adherence to the explicit norm for all informants is 165.0 out of 289, i.e. ≈ 57.1 per cent of the answers given are in line with the prescribed norm. In reality the scores vary between 203 and 95 and the standard deviation (s) is 20.3. The dispersion of the results is shown below:

| 203 | 190 | 183 | 177 | 173 | 167 | 164 | 158 | 155 | 146 | 127 |
| 202 | 189 | 181 | 176 | 171 | 166 | 163 | 158 | 155 | 146 | 121 |
| 201 | 188 | 181 | 176 | 171 | 166 | 162 | 157 | 155 | 145 | 118 |
| 200 | 188 | 181 | 175 | 169 | 165 | 162 | 157 | 155 | 150 | 144 | 111 |
| 199 | 186 | 180 | 175 | 169 | 165 | 161 | 157 | 148 | 144 | 110 |
| 194 | 185 | 179 | 175 | 169 | 164 | 160 | 157 | 148 | 142 | 95 |
| 194 | 185 | 178 | 174 | 168 | 164 | 160 | 156 | 147 | 141 |
| 194 | 184 | 178 | 174 | 168 | 164 | 160 | 156 | 147 | 140 |
| 191 | 184 | 177 | 173 | 167 | 164 | 159 | 156 | 147 | 139 |
| 190 | 183 | 177 | 173 | 167 | 164 | 158 | 155 | 146 | 136 |

In this connection it should be kept in mind that the verbs and forms investigated here are in general those with variation recorded in dictionaries and they therefore contain some kind of difficulty. The most simple or most uncontroversial stresses have not been included, and the figures should thus not be interpreted to mean that Russian speakers stress in accordance with the explicit norm in only about 60 per cent of the cases.

If we then remove from these replies those given by people who, according to the generally used definition, cannot be qualified as standard language speakers, the average amounts to 166.5, which is slightly higher. The average number of answers in accordance with the prescribed norm for so-called non-standard speakers is 149.6.

Accordingly, adherence to the explicit norm in verbal stress is somewhat higher for the group defined as standard language speakers, but given the small number of non-standard speakers the results are of limited significance.

---

640 Krysin talks about phonetics, but appears to equate it with pronunciation in general, including word stress.
641 Where childhood was spent and where a person has lived most of his life were of the same significance (Krysin 1973:40).
642 What effects the less uniform sociological make-up of Russian society at the end of the 20th and in the 21st century will have on the language and on social differences in language remains to be seen.
643 This is if the informant whose replies are not certainly reliable are removed; he gave personal information qualifying him as a non-standard speaker.
5.2 Places used in the investigation

Figure 5-1. Average score of coincidence between reported usage and the codified norm (out of 289) per group of informants.

Unsurprisingly, the informants from The Moscow State Linguistic University deviate less from the explicit norm than any other group of informants. Their average score is 177.6 (for the Russian language teacher 181). Then come the students from The Moscow Technical University of Communication and Informatics (with a specialisation in business and languages) who also have a relatively high degree of adherence to the codified norm: 175.9. These two groups are rather high above the average for all informants (165.0). Just below the average we find the personnel at the private medical clinic (160.4), the building materials outlet (159.8) and the control group of informants (158.4). The lowest score of adherence to the codified norm is found among the students from The Academy of National Economy (149.1) and from The Moscow State University of Civil Engineering (142.5).

5.3 Age

Figure 5-2. Average score of coincidence between reported usage and the codified norm (out of 289) per group of informants.

The informant group with the highest number of answers in accordance with the codified norm is the youngest, 17–31 years, with an average score of 169.0. Then comes the age group 32–46 years (156.4) and lastly the age group 47–61 years, with a score of 151.4. There were also six informants who did not give their age/year of birth and whose score is in the middle (159.7).

The results show that the oldest age group is the one that adheres the least to the explicit norm. However, as is the case with most social variables discussed here, the bias in the material could have influenced the results. The only conclusion that can be drawn with any
kind of certainty is that the young do not deviate more from the codified norm than the older informant groups.

Krysin concluded that younger groups (those born in the 1940s, i.e. the oldest age group in the present survey) use stem stress in present tense and in prefixed past tense verbs more often than other groups on the whole (1973:43 f., 1974:234).

It should be noticed that, as Nordberg (1987–88:869–870) points out, differences in age groups in a study (apparent time) is not necessarily the same thing as actual change in real time. Such differences could be due to age grading. However, it seems most unlikely that age grading occurs in word stress.

5.4 Sex

As the factor sex has not been studied in a similar kind of study on Russian (see 4.1.3.2) it will be expanded upon here. This factor was strangely enough not studied in the RJaSO survey (Krysin 1974). The questionnaires included a question about the parameter male/female, but it was not taken into account in the processing:

Another reason why this factor will merit more attention than the others is that it is in fact the only one about which more or less certain conclusions can be drawn. For many of the other variables the number of alternatives is larger and the number of informants in each group is small, as the material was not sampled on these grounds. For this factor, however, there is sufficient material to allow a statistical test.

The average score of correspondence to the codified norm was 171.9 for the 70 female informants, compared to 151.7 for the group of 36 male informants. And, as far as the difference between men and women is concerned, it is statistically significant that in this survey men deviate more often from the codified norm than women. We can, through a \( X^2 \)-test, reject the null hypothesis (no difference between the frequencies subjected to the test) with an error probability of less than 0.1 (\( p < 0.1 \) per cent).

There can be several reasons for this. It could be due to a skewness in the sample as there is a certain bias towards women with a linguistic background, although here it is difficult to say what is the cause and what is the effect.

There is practically no difference in educational level among the informants of different sex. Among the men 80.6 per cent are students or have higher education and the figure for females is 81.4. On the other hand, 84.3 per cent of the female informants come from Mos-

---

Zemskaja et al. (1990) study differences in men’s and women’s speech but do not discuss word stress.
cow and Moscow oblast’ while the corresponding figure for the male informants is 69.4 per cent. This might be one of the explanations for this difference between the sexes.

It should also be noticed that six males deviate more than the female who deviates most from the codified norm. And five females deviate less than the male who deviates least from the codified norm.

Commentaries regarding differences in the speech of Russians have generally been in the direction that the speech of women (and also children) is “worse” than that of men (Dolopčev 1886:II). And referring to the fact that illiteracy was previously higher among women Comrie et al. (1996:8) say:

The disparity between the sexes had been virtually eliminated by 1959, but the fact that formerly there was such a marked difference leads us to assume that until recently (perhaps still) non-standard speech was more common among women than men. There are no figures to support this, but it seems to be a reasonable assumption.

There is little evidence to suggest that this is the situation today. In Anglo-American and in European sociolinguistics women are considered closer to the standard. There is no reason to believe that this should be different in Russia, which socially and educationally resembles Europe in much.

In fact, it is something of a sociolinguistic axiom that women deviate less from standard speech than men. For this, three main explanations are usually put forward: conservatism, status and solidarity (Cameron & Coates 1988:13–14). However, Cameron & Coates see these common explanations as “implicitly sexist” and underline the importance of not conducting empirical research in a framework “which assumes that male behaviour and male norms are prototypical” (1988:24). They cite examples from studies (1988:14–22) which prove that “women do not always and everywhere produce speech nearer to the prestige standard than men’s [speech]” (1988:22). Cameron (1988:8) says that “the ‘classic’ sociolinguistic pattern whereby women are more standard in their speech than men is indeed an overgeneralisation – counterexamples do exist” and that, although widespread, it is “not universal or unchallengeable” (1988:11). She also underlines the differences within groups: “neither men nor women form homogeneous categories” (1988:11). (See also Cameron & Coates 1988:23.)

What we see here is (1) a general (old?) view that in Russia women do to a lesser degree than men use standard language; (2) research results from non-Russian and Russian contexts that show higher adherence to standard speech or codified norm for women than for men; and (3) a feminist oriented point of view suggesting that many of these findings are sex biased. This question could merit further research.

5.5 Native language

Figure 5-4. Average score of coincidence between reported usage and the codified norm (out of 289) per group of informants.
Opinions differ as to the character of non-native speakers’ Russian. Kolesov found in his survey that the explicit stress norms were best reflected in the speech of non-native Russian speakers:

Любопытно, что литературное ударение, рекомендуемое орфоэпическими справочниками, как правило, лучше всего отражено в речи лиц, для которых русский язык не является родным; как показывают цифры, приведенные в скобках, ударение ленинградцев менее всего соответствует рекомендуемым нормам. (Kolesov 1967:118)

Still, Kolesov is criticised by Ukiah who says that “the impact of these data is lessened, however, by the fact that not all the informants were native Russians” (1996:107). But if this fact has influenced the results at all, then the assumption is – following Kolesov’s conclusion – that the replies contain a larger number of answers in line with the codified norm than would be the case if only native Russian speakers were used as informants.645

The results of the present survey show that the difference in adherence to the codified norm between informants with Russian as native language and those with another native language is slight: 165.2 for the first group (100 persons) and 164.4 for the second (5).646 This difference is not statistically significant (the number of informants with a native language other than Russian is 5, which is the absolute minimum for this kind of test).

5.6 Geographical origin: childhood residence

Figure 5-5. Average score of coincidence between reported usage and the codified norm (out of 289) per group of informants.

Simply put, the highest number of answers in accordance with the explicit norm is found among informants who have spent their childhood647 either outside Russia (outside ex-USSR or in one of the republics of former USSR except Russia) or in the Moscow area (Moscow and Moscow oblast’). Consequently, the informants with the lowest number of answers in accordance with the explicit norm are those who have spent their childhood in Russia but outside the Moscow area.

Since the number of informants in some groups is very small (for instance those who have spent their childhood outside ex-USSR, in northern or in southern Russia) it would be

645 Cf. Agrell (1917:9): People from more peripheral parts of the Russian-speaking area, who have learnt Russian mainly by formal schooling, have a certain “fossilisation” in their stressing: “вообще, у представителей русских окраин, знакомящихся с русским языком главным образом в школах, замечается некоторая окаменелость в ударении.”
646 If data from the informant who gave unreliable answers in this questionnaire are removed.
647 Defined as the largest part of the first 15 years.
very much an oversimplification to draw any valid conclusions from this material as some of the differences may be fortuitous.

The group with the highest adherence to codified norms is the one comprising informants who had grown up abroad (outside ex-USSR). The average score of adherence to codified norm for these two speakers is 186.5. Another group of informants with a relatively high score comprises those from Moscow (169.9). For the informants who have spent their childhood in parts of ex-USSR other than Russia the score was 161.4. Then came the groups of informants from Moscow oblast’ 158.1 (16 subjects), Central Russia/Siberia/Far East 152.6 (9) and Northern Russia 150.5 (2). The group that has the lowest number of answers in accordance with the explicit norm is the one of informants who had spent their childhood in southern Russia 127.0 (2).

5.7 Geographical origin: place of longest residence

Figure 5-6. Average score of coincidence between reported usage and the codified norm (out of 289) per group of informants.

The same pattern as for the variable geographical origin/childhood residence above is found for the variable geographical origin/place of longest residence: the highest adherence to the explicit norm is found among informants either from outside Russia or from the Moscow area. And, consequently, the lowest scores are found among the informants from Russia outside the Moscow area.

The same reservations as above regarding the results apply to the figures pertaining to the place of longest residence of the informants, as in many groups the number of informants is too small for any safe conclusions.

The informant deviating the least from the norm is the one who has spent most of her life outside the former USSR (194.0). The informants from Moscow came next, with a score of 169.4 (73 persons), followed by those from Moscow oblast’ 159.9 (17). These were followed by informants from other parts of the former USSR 158.3 (3), Northern

---

648 The individual figures for the two informants are 179 and 194.
649 Seven informants after abstracting one unreliable one.
650 Cf. Comrie et al. (1996:16): “the relative tenacity of southern dialect features”. The following typical southern features are found in both these informants' reported speech: звонит, созвонимся, отклонит, заклю́чим, подвя́л, напя́л, подвя́ли, отворы́лось, ги́да, подвя́ли, облвя́лись, ра́вя́лись, проспа́ла.
651 One unreliable informant was removed from this group.
652 One explanation for the difference between the results for Moscow and Moscow oblast' can be that 6 out of the 17 informants from Moscow oblast' were sampled at the University of Civil Engineering, and these technology students generally had low scores. These two factors – place used for sampling/area of study and geographical origin – may also be co-related.
Russia 150.5 (2) and Central Russia/Siberia/Far East 147.0 (8). The informant having spent most of his life in southern Russia had the lowest score for norm adherence (110.0), although one single person is of course not material enough to provide statistically valid conclusions.  

5.8 Principal residence (type: town or countryside)

The group of people having spent most of their life in the countryside is so small that it is difficult to draw any conclusions from this material. Nevertheless, the results indicate that there might be a difference between the two informant groups. Informants who have spent most of their life in towns are more likely to adhere to the norm as their score is 165.9 (101), while the score for those who have lived in the countryside is 146.8 (4). However, this last group is very heterogeneous (the scores are 95–142–169–181).

5.9 Educational level

There seems to be no marked difference in adherence to the explicit norm between informants with different levels of education. The only sharp borderline that could be said to exist is the one between those with little formal education (8–9 years) on the one hand, and informants with secondary and higher education on the other.

In this presentation the students have been separated from the total number of informants who had completed 10–11 years’ education, although the students belong to that group and also replied in accordance with this on the form.

---

653 There was another informant who marked this alternative, too, but it was the informant judged to be unreliable.

654 This alternative was also marked by the “unreliable” informant.

655 There was only one person in this group: a native Russian speaker, a Muscovite, with the score 118.
The group with the highest score of norm adherence are the students 170.5 (59 persons), then come those with completed secondary education 162.4 (10). The informants with completed higher and with secondary specialised education have approximately the same score: 158.2 (27) and 157.4 (9).

As mentioned in 4.1.3.4, education has proved not to be too weighty compared to other factors, but the RJaSO survey showed that persons with completed secondary-level education use “new” accentological variants slightly more often than persons with higher education, especially in verbal stress (Krysin 1974:234, 241).\textsuperscript{657}

5.10 Informants with the ten highest scores
Among the ten informants that have the highest number of adherence to the norm all persons fulfil the three criteria for standard language speakers: they have at least secondary education (they are all students), have spent most of their life in a town and are native Russian speakers. Six of these ten are students at The Moscow State Linguistic University. These informants are females and Muscovites. There is also one student from the same university who has spent most of her life outside the ex-USSR. In this group we also find three students – two female and one male – from The Moscow Technical University of Communication and Informatics, all of whom are from Moscow.

5.11 Informants with the ten lowest scores
Among the ten informants that have the lowest number of replies in accordance with the explicit norm not all fulfil the three criteria for standard language speakers. But not one among these ten – or among the total number of informants – fails to fulfil at least one of these:

- **All but one have at least secondary education (three have higher education).** The exception is a native Russian speaker from Moscow, male, with 8–9 years’ education.
- **All but one have spent most of their life in a town.** The exception is a native Russian speaker, male, with higher education, who has spent most of his life in the countryside in eastern Russia.
- **All but one are native Russian speakers.** The exception is a male who is not a native Russian speaker (his native language is Ukrainian), but who has higher education and who is from a town.\textsuperscript{658}
- **All the others fulfil all requirements:** two of these are male students from Moscow, two from towns in Moscow oblast‘ and one from a town in southern Russia. These five informants are from The Moscow State University of Civil Engineering. In this group there is also one female Muscovite from The Moscow State Linguistic University and one informant from a town in eastern Russia with completed higher education.

\textsuperscript{656} It should be noted that among the students a majority were language students.
\textsuperscript{657} The difference is small, however, varying from 0.1 per cent (созда́лось, used by 13.9 per cent of those with higher education and 14.0 per cent of those with secondary education; дру́жить 95.3 and 95.4 respectively) to 6.6 per cent (напи́ться used by 45.4 of the informants with higher education and 52.0 per cent of those with secondary education) (Krysin 1974: 234–235, 241, 243, 261).
\textsuperscript{658} Nowhere is it said that a town has to be situated in the Russian Federation in order to qualify as a residence for standard language speakers, although this might be presupposed.
6 Codification compared to the survey results

The present chapter is devoted to

(a) a presentation of the survey results grouped according to the label of the variant investigated. It shows the relationship between the informants’ replies and the normative or stylistic labels given in stress handbooks (6.1). Accordingly, the same figures as in the presentations in Chapter 4 are shown here.

(b) a study of the cases in which there is conflicting norm notation in the main sources, including a comparison with additional sources (6.2);

(c) a study of the cases in which the implicit norms are not reflected in the main sources, including a comparison with additional sources (6.3). This comparison with additional sources is made as it could be assumed that some implicit norms not reflected in the main sources can actually be found in other sources. First, the codified normative stresses with low (reported and/or elicited) usage are investigated (6.3.1). Then follows a presentation and analysis of the stress variants with high usage, but which are not codified as norms (6.3.2).

6.1 Normative or stylistic labels and the speakers’ norm and usage

6.1.1 The codified norms

The total number of normative stresses with stress variants found in the sources for the present study is almost 3,000. Of these, 133 were checked in the questionnaire and the recording.

Below follows a study of (1) how often normative stresses with stress variants are the reported usage and are seen as correct or not; and (2) if there are any patterns for which explicitly normative stresses are also more often the implicit norm.

In appendices 4, 5, 6 and 7 it is shown that the reported usage of the stresses codified as normative ranges from almost 100 per cent to almost 0 per cent. There are thus on the one hand explicit norms that are used and seen as correct by almost all informants and, on the other, those that are used and seen as correct by almost no one.

Among the explicit norms with high reported usage we find the non-reflexive stem-stressed preterite masculine, neuter and plural forms: прогніло (91.6 per cent), передал (88.7 per cent), пережил (86.8 per cent).

---

659 When the labelling differs between the two main sources the label in OS has been the basis for deciding under which heading the variant should be listed, e.g. under “not recommended” if the labels are не рек. and разг.

660 As the same figures as the rounded ones in the text in Chapter 4 are used, sometimes, for instance, both the percentages 96.3 and 96.2 occur, although they refer to the same number of informants (cf. 4.1.6). The figures for each stress variant examined will thus be presented twice, in different contexts. But in order to avoid repetition the commentaries in this chapter will not be as detailed as in Chapter 4.
On the other hand, the reported usage for the non-reflexive prefix-stressed preterite masculine, neuter and plural forms, codified as normative, ranges over the whole spectrum: from прóклял (88.8 per cent) to на́ліл (7.6 per cent) and дóліл (3.7 per cent).\footnote{These are the lowest figures found among all stresses codified as normative.} As the verbs were not chosen systematically for these particular features there might not be sufficient material to draw valid conclusions, although it is still possible to see if there are any patterns regarding the roles of prefixes, gender/number and stems.

The individual prefixes do not seem to play a decisive role for what verbs have stress on the prefix. What can be noted, though, is that all the eight verbs examined that contain the prefix про- have at least 50 per cent reported usage for prefix stress: from 50.0 per cent for прóпі́л to 88.8 per cent for прóклял, which could indicate that про- tends to attract stress (but: про́gni´л 91.6 per cent).

Gender/number. After studying this particular point more systematically over the paradigm (although with only four informants), Strom (1988:viii) draws the conclusion that there is a weak hierarchisation for the gender/number forms’ propensity to advance stress from the prefixes to the stem in the preterite verbs: neuter < plural < masculine. Nothing is found in the results of the present investigation that would contradict this.

Stems/roots. Strom finds that the most “radical” in promotion of stress from prefixes to root in the preterite forms are the j- and v-stems and that the most “conservative” are the r-stem, -ні́ть, -бы́ть and -да́ть (1988:374). Among the j- and v-stems the reported usage of prefix stress is from 50–60 per cent and down: all the prefix-stressed verbs on жи́ть are gathered around the middle (50–60 per cent) except for отжілі (26.5 per cent). Verbs on -ні́ть have reported usage of around 50 per cent, except for отпі́л (24.5 per cent). Prefix stress in verbs on -ні́ть is not the reported usage of a majority of the speakers (на́ліл, заліл). As for other roots there are either very few examples or no discernible pattern. The preterite of verbs on -чить have high reported usage: 78.4 per cent for на́ча́ли and 65.1 per cent for на́ча́ло. Verbs on -ні́ть, for instance, are considered to be among the most conservative roots or stems throughout the whole preterite and they allegedly often retain prefix stress. However, only the stress прі́нял has high reported usage (77.4 per cent; cf. переняли 12.3 per cent).

To sum up, as has already been touched upon in preceding chapters, there is probably no pattern as to which preterite non-reflexive non-feminine forms attract prefix stress or stem stress. Stress placement is individual for each form.

End-stressed preterite feminine forms do not cause any particular problems among the language users. The informants agree with the codified norm and they agree between themselves. The non-reflexive preterite forms all have over 60 per cent reported usage, except for пропі́гнала (38.7 per cent). It also seems that the shorter the form the greater the tendency to adhere to an end-stressed norm. Compare for instance доткала́ (67.9 per cent) with тка́ла (78.4 per cent) and изгнала́ (62.2 per cent) with гна́ла (86.8 per cent).

Stem-stressed preterite feminine forms, non-reflexive or reflexive, do not cause particularly large problems among the speakers either. There could be, however, an indication of hypercorrection towards end stress as кра́ла has only 36.9 per cent reported usage (cf. спала́, врала́, далá etc.). There is also an indication of confusion as to the normativity of the stress -пё́рлы́сь, due to the fact that the stressing of verbs created on this verbal formant is
highly varying both in codification (cf. 4.5.7.1.) and in usage (упёрлась 89.6 per cent, подпёрлась 48.1 per cent).

For the reflexive end-stressed preterite neuter and plural forms there is quite large variation, although in most cases a majority (from жилось 91.5 per cent to поднялись 58.5 per cent) considers this type of stress normative. The exceptions are придралось (47.1 per cent) and облёнись (47.2 per cent).

Reflexive end-stressed preterite masculine forms (начался, заперся, обнялся, родился, воспринялся) are generally not approved of by the informants: the highest figures for reported usage, 34.0 per cent, are found for начался and the lowest, 8.5 per cent, for воспринялся.

The reflexive stem-stressed preterite masculine forms included in the investigation were перебрался and развёлся. The high figures of reported usage for these, 91.5 and 94.4 per cent respectively, in combination with the low figures for the end-stressed forms codified as normative, indicates that stem stress in these forms is gaining ground.

For the verbs with infinitive on -ить with variation in the present tense there appears to be no particular tendency. The reported usage for the end-stressed codified norms ranges from 92.5 per cent for определит to 9.4 per cent for отключит and пошёл. The reported usage for the stem-stressed codified norms also ranges over the whole scale: from 82.1 per cent for дойти to 10.3 per cent for притворились.

To sum up so far, the stresses codified as norms which can be pointed out as “problem areas” (regardless of one’s point of departure or original standpoint as far as normativisation and norms are concerned) are:

- reflexive end-stressed preterite masculine forms (-ся);
- some non-reflexive prefix-stressed preterite non-feminine forms: нáлил, дóлило and also нё дало;
- some verbs on -ят with end stress as codified norm: морит, поместятся, включится, кровоточит, глушит;
- some verbs on -ит with stem stress as codified norm: стрóчитъ, прислони, заслонит;
- the verbs перепёрчить, зайдеветь, заржаветь, подомовнитьчать, бáловаться.

6.1.2 Variants normative in one source and with other notation in the second source

6.1.2.1 Normative in OS, other notation in RPP

Of the stress variants, which in OS are considered normative and in RPP have other notation, some have rather low reported usage (see Appendix 8): перерёл (5.6 per cent; actual usage 0 per cent), соскóbлись (15.1 per cent), оторочить (15.0 per cent; actual usage 16.1 per cent), отклонить (17.0 per cent). This suggests that the notation in RPP in these cases is more in line with the implicit norm. The stress перепёрт, normative in OS and labelled разг. in RPP, is the reported usage of 43.4 per cent of the informants. This could suggest that both stresses are the implicit norm and that both sources are to a certain extent correct. The stress распрóдали is the codified norm in OS and this corresponds to the implicit norm.

6.1.2.2 Normative in RPP, other notation in OS

As in 6.1.2.1 above, it appears that in the cases where the two main sources differ in the normative assessment it cannot be stated that one particular source always reflects the im-
licit norm better than the other. For перемёр and обоснuyo it appears that RPP is more in line with the implicit norm, while for отсадить it is OS (Appendix 9). For напоить both sources appear to reflect the implicit norm, as both the stresses поить and поить appear to be used (cf. 6.1.2.1). These assumptions are in some cases supported by other material, for instance from the oral part of the survey.

6.1.3 The second of two “equal” variants
Of the total of 233 variants “equal” to the codified norm (labelled и) 17 were checked in the survey. The reported usage for these was rather evenly distributed from 97.2 down to 7.6 per cent of the informants (Appendix 10). An appallingly large number of these variants “equal” to the norm that have high reported usage pertain to the non-reflexive stem-stressed preterite non-feminine forms: допили (97.2 per cent), отпил (94.3 per cent), отжили (78.2 per cent), пропили (77.4 per cent), пережил (68.9 per cent), пропил (61.4 per cent). Among the current forms labelled as equal there are also the reflexive stem-stressed preterite masculine forms родился (93.5 per cent) and обнёсся (85.9 per cent). On the other hand, the “equal” variants to the verbs on -проводить, татуировать and стажировать, are not seen by the speakers as competitors to the codified norm with final stress.

6.1.4 Admissible/colloquial variants
The number of variants with the labels доп./разг. (admissible or colloquial) included in the investigation was 42, out of the total number of 478 found in the sources. Mirroring the category above with variants equal to the norm, the label доп./разг. is used for forms that are used by almost no one and for forms that are very largely used (from 92.5 to 11.3 per cent of the informants). This is shown in Appendix 11.

The highest figures of reported usage are found for the non-reflexive stem-stressed preterite non-feminine forms: from налил (92.5 per cent) to пролило (45.4 per cent) and залпило (40.6 per cent), with all the others in the span between 88.8 and 59.5 per cent. This shows that this is a highly used stress pattern and that many of the stem-stressed variants of the non-reflexive preterite non-feminine forms marked доп./разг. are already, or are becoming, the (implicit) norm. It should be noted that the stresses дылосъ and родилась are used to a very small degree and not believed by many to be correct (11.3 per cent for both), even though they are considered acceptable in the sources.

6.1.5 Not recommended/vulgar or low colloquial variants
A relatively small number of the variants labelled не рек./простореч. were included: 11 out of the total number of 392. About the variants marked не рек. the handbook OS says that

[Они], как правило, отражают явления, соответствующие общим тенденциям языкового развития; нередко этой пометой оцениваются варианты, о которых можно предполагать, что не в очень далекой перспективе они станут нормативными. Но само содержание пометы этого не предполагает, так как прогнозирование не входит в задачи нормативного словаря. (OS–1997:6)

This indicates that a scenario in which these forms become the norm is not unlikely, although not determined.

Appendix 12 shows that there are forms labelled не рек. with very high reported usage and which a large majority of the informants believe are right. This suggests that the “warning” contained in the label does not work and that these stresses have already, as indicated in the quotation above, become the (implicit) norm: осведомиться (88.7 per cent),
docherpáť (75.5 per cent), čerpáť (72.7 per cent), zamórit (69.9 per cent). There are also other stresses that are not recommended but show quite high reported usage (about half of the informants): ojíli (58.5 per cent), nabraló (50.9 per cent), sorišď (49.0 per cent). And there are stresses labelled ne rek. which a minority, but not an insignificant part, of the informants claim to use. This is the case for instance with the three stem-stressed variants of verbs on -zvonít: sозво́нимся (40.6 per cent), звóнит (35.7 per cent), позво́ним (32.0 per cent); and with подперла́сь (44.3 per cent), помя́нёт (27.3 per cent) and при́бы́л (26.4 per cent).

On the other hand, there are stresses that are not recommended which few informants claim to use and believe are correct: занá́лись (16.0 per cent), спá́лось (11.3 per cent) and защелка́ть (10.4 per cent).

For some variants the notation is ne rek. in OS, while it is разг. in RPP, meaning that RPP condemns these forms less severely. The range of figures for reported usage are approximately the same as for the variants marked ne rek./простореч.: from 69.9 per cent for zamórit and 58.5 per cent for ojíli to 26.4 per cent for при́бы́л.

To sum up, the label ne rek. has no correspondence to a stable quality in the implicit norm (the informants’ view on normativity or reported usage). Both stresses that are already the de facto norm and variants that are almost not used at all and not believed to be correct are labelled ne rek./простореч.662

6.1.6 Incorrect/vulgar or low colloquial variants
Out of the total number of 798 variant stresses marked неправ./простореч. 42 were included in the survey. It is again noticeable that reported usage and belief about normativity encompasses the whole scale (Appendix 13). Some of these “incorrect” or low colloquial forms are already de facto norms since they are not perceived as wrong by the informants and are highly used according to reported and/or actual usage. Here кровотóчит (87.8 per cent) and вклю́чить (неправ./разг.; 85.8 per cent) particularly stand out. The figures are high also for памя́тует (58.5 per cent) and нача́лься (56.6 per cent).

However, most stress variants labelled неправ./простореч. are perceived as wrong and are not used by the informants, and the explicit norm corresponds to the implicit. For instance, 103–104 out of 106 informants believe that the stresses набра́л, отда́лось and подпрыньну́ть are wrong and say that they do not use them. Also many of the variants labelled _/простореч. (given in only RPP) are rather infrequent and are not considered correct (дозвона́сь, перевёрнет, памятует, подкра́дется, дочёрпать, подпрынуть, опроверглá, по́звала, отси́ли, набра́л, оберла́сь, ошиб́лýсь). However, there are at least three stress variants which appear to be frequent enough and not only accentological occasionalisms, which would definitely justify their inclusion in OS and other stress handbooks listing variation: памя́тует (58.5 per cent), отпёрлась (25.5 per cent) and дрёмлю (17.1 per cent).

662 All of what is said above about the label не rek. does of course also apply to the label простореч. in RPP, which is generally used both for variants labelled не rek. and неправ. in OS.
6.1.7 Grossly incorrect/flagrantly vulgar or low colloquial variants

Out of a total number of 20 variants labelled грубо неправ./грубо простореч. etc. eight were included in the investigation. Among these were five infinitives on -нать and -чать (занять, заняться, нанять, принять, начать). The reported usage is low for all these variants: from 11.4 per cent for занять to 7.6 per cent for принять (8 to 12 informants) (Appendix 14). The difference in reported usage between these is negligible. These variants are only mentioned in OS (and only in the editions from 1989 onwards; see 4.4.1.1).

There were also three preterite forms labelled as грубо неправ. in OS and as простореч. in RPP: нача́л, нача́ла and нача́ли. The reported usage for all these variants is low: 12.2 to 13.3 per cent.

Accordingly, for all the variants labelled грубо неправ./грубо простореч. etc. included in the survey, the dictionary’s (OS; and also the similar Es'kova–1994) assessment and the implicit norm coincide as the variants with this label have a weak position among the speakers: they are neither believed to be correct nor used to a high degree.

6.1.8 Admissible, obsolescent/not recommended, obsolescent/obsolete variants

The total number of obsolescent and obsolete variants in the sources is 306. While OS makes a difference between admissible, obsolescent (доп. устар.) and not recommended, obsolescent (не рек. устар.),663 no such distinction is made in RPP. It has only the label устар.664 In all there are 11 obsolescent and obsolete variants in the investigation.

On the whole these are not considered correct or reported to be used by many of the informants (Appendix 15). The reflexive preterite masculine forms stressed on -сó have low figures (as have the codified norms stressed on -сó; cf. 6.1.1). The same applies to the obsolescent prefix-stressed preterite forms, indicating that these stresses are not viable in the contemporary language. The only variant of these that is quite common is пе́редил (семью) with 30.2 per cent (actual usage for this variant in this context was 22.6 per cent).665

The results also indicate that the forms labelled не рек. устар. have about the same figures of reported usage as those marked доп. устар., with the exception of пе́редил. This suggests that some forms now labelled доп. устар. are so infrequently used that it would perhaps be more appropriate to see them as не рек. устар., even if this is a distinction that cannot be quantified. It can also be discussed how long these archaic forms should be included for, when some of them seem to have a very weak position among the speakers.

6.1.9 Non-normative forms not included in the sources

Also included in the survey were non-normative forms not listed in dictionaries, but found in the additional sources (Kolesov 1967 (survey), Lapteva 1990b (observations of TV language), Rozental' 1994 (exercise book)). The fact that these variants are found in the addi-

663 The verbs with the label не рек. устар. in OS are very few: бле́ять (including prefixed verbs), current norm бле́ять, кле́ить/сý (including prefixed verbs), current norm кле́ить/сý, сало́товать (including prefixed verbs), current norm сало́товать, руково́дить/сý, current norm руково́дить/сý.
664 There are also the related but rarely used labels устар. и поэтр., устар. и возв., устар. и книжн., устар. возм. See Chapter 3.
665 This stress is normative in another meaning according to the written sources.
tional sources suggests that they are current and should perhaps be included in stress hand-
books and dictionaries. The results (Appendix 16) show that this is definitely the case for
заключным and исключим, which are so widespread (47.2 and 34.9 per cent) that they
should be included as variants. This also applies to опёрлась (39.6 per cent), a variant
which was elicited also in Kolesov (1964; there used by 7.6 per cent of the informants).
The aforementioned stresses might even be on the way to becoming the implicit norm.
The non-normative forms не была (16.0 per cent reported usage) and разделит (13.2 per
cent), and also противоречит and продать (4.6 and 4.7 per cent), are more used than several
forms labelled неправ., грубо неправ., доп. устар. and не рек. устар., and even more than
several codified norms and variants labelled н and доп./разгр. Therefore these stress variants
could be included at least as a “warning” against incorrect stresses.

6.1.10 Conclusion
To summarise, one infers from the results in 6.1.1–6.1.9 that there is no direct relationship
between the implicit stress norms and the labels these variants are given by individual
authors in normative handbooks, except for the stresses labelled грубо неправ./грубо про-
стореч./простореч. and the obsolescent and obsolete stress variants. These were all discarded
by a large majority of the informants.

For all the other variants – normative as well as those labelled as equal to the norm (н),
admissible/colloquial (доп./разгр.), not recommended/low colloquial (не рек./простореч.),
incorrect/low colloquial (неправ./простореч.) – the reported usage and belief about norma-
tivity covers the whole scale: from almost 100 to almost 0 per cent of the informants.

6.2 Conflicting norm notation in the main sources, including
a comparison with other sources
There are some verbs or forms for which the dictionaries used as main sources disagree as
to which stress is the norm.666 This calls for a comparison with the assessment of other dic-
tionaries regarding these stresses and a comparison with reported and actual usage.667 This
is found in section 6.2 and in Appendix 17. The shadowed boxes in the table in Appendix
17 show the codified norm.668 The abbreviation N (= norm) means that the stress variant is
codified as normative in the source in question (there may also be other norms). If another
stress is given as a norm the stress checked here is marked not N (= not norm). If a stress is
not the norm and it is mentioned with a particular label (e.g. “obsolete”) this label is indi-
cated in the table.

6.2.1 Comparison of notation in the sources
The stress перемер/ло/ли, which is the explicit norm in A&Z–2000, RPP–1996 and
Ож&Шв–1995, corresponds to the implicit norm as found in the language users’ attitude

666 Of course there might be cases in which OS and RPP both agree, and in which one or several of the other
sources give other recommendations. But as OS and RPP were the point of departure for the investigation
(see Chapter 3.2), the comparison has only been made when these do not agree.
667 See Chapter 4.1.6 and the Key to abbreviations for references to other surveys.
668 Nuances such as if a variant is listed first or second have been taken into account.

The classification in RPP–1996 of the stress распрóдал as простороch, stands out from all other dictionaries, which list this stress as the explicit norm. Judging from reported and actual usage, there is no reason to believe that распрóдал is not perceived as a norm among the language users, and therefore the codified norm of all dictionaries except RPP–1996 appears to have support in current usage.


The stress соскóблишь, given as the norm in BTS–1998, OS–1997, Ož&Šv–1995, MTS–1990, MAS–1981–1984 and Gorbačević–1973, has low reported usage, and a majority of the informants report that they do not use this stress. It could be assumed, although it is not an absolute implication, that the stress соскóблишь, which is the codified norm of A&Z–2000, A&Z–1993 and RPP–1996 and an equal variant to the normative stress in the other sources, is the implicit norm. It must, however, be kept in mind that only one verb with this prefixation was checked, and only in the written part of the survey; the results were not confirmed by an oral investigation. For other verbs with this stem a pattern is found in the notation. End stress (отскóблитъ, оскóблитъ, поскóблитъ), which could be assumed to be the implicit norm, is the explicit norm in A&Z–2000, A&Z–1993, BTS–1998 and RPP–1996. Stem stress (отскóблитъ, оскóблитъ, поскóблитъ), which is not perceived as a norm by the speakers, is the explicit norm of OS–1997, Ož&Šv–1995, MAS–1981–1984 and Gorbačević–1973.


The stresses напóйтъ and перепóйтъ have equal distribution of reported usage and non-usage. In actual usage only the unprefixed поитъ (in which the stress поитъ is the norm in both main sources) was tested, and here all informants who gave valid replies used the stress поитъ. The situation could be different for verbs with different prefixes, but it is plausible that the stem-stressed variants given as norms in OS–1997, Ož&Šv–1995, A&Z–1993 and MTS–1990 are more in line with implicit norms. End stress (перепóйтъ,

The stress otsađít is given as norm in RPP (and only in this one of the dictionaries studied), but a majority of the informants reject this variant. The stress otsáďít, the explicit norm of BTS–1998, OS–1997, Ož&Šv–1995, MTS–1990 and MAS–1981–1984, is most likely more in line with the actual, or implicit, norm.

For the simplex verb selit no stress variant was investigated in the survey and therefore there is no material for comparison. However, the present survey and a previous one (Voroncova 1956) have shown that the implicit norm is stem stress, at least in the prefixed poseliwþ (see 4.3.3.5). End stress seliť/sæ/ is the norm in BTS–1998, OS–1997, Ož&Šv–1995, A&Z–1993, MTS–1990, MAS–1981–1984 and Gorbačevič–1973. It is likely, however, that the explicit norm of A&Z–2000 and RPP–1996 – selíť/sæ/ – is what best reflects the implicit norm.

For a few other stresses there is no material in the surveys that can give an indication about the implicit norm. But a short inventory gives a few patterns as to which sources give the same norm. For instance, in some cases RPP–1996 stands out from all the other dictionaries that list the form in question.


The stresses отузб́ріт, позузб́ріт and подузб́ріт are the norm in RPP–1996 only. The norm in A&Z–2000, A&Z–1993 and OS–1997 is отуз́бріт, позуз́бріт and подуз́бріт. However, подузб́ріт is also listed as normative in BTS–1998 and MAS–1981–1984 (the other sources do not list the verbs in question).


---

674 And napoït also in A&Z–1993.

6.2.2 Conclusion
The above results show that there is – as already said – no agreement in the sources as to which stress is normative. If we then compare with sources other than the two main ones used in the thesis, the picture becomes even more blurred. Which ones agree cannot be predicted and it cannot be claimed that one source is in detail modelled on another one. It is true that in many respects MAS–1981–1984 and OS–1997 show large similarity; the only exception is that they have reversed the order of the “equal” stress variants of **отслонить**. Otherwise there are no such patterns. This notwithstanding that Ož&Šv–1995, for instance, claims that its recommendations follow those of OS and of Russkaja grammatika:


This, however, is not altogether true. While these sources might have been the references for the editors or authors of Ož&Šv–1995, they have not been the canon. In OS and Russkaja grammatika **перемёр/ло/ло** is normative, while in Ož&Šv–1995 the stress **перемёр/ло/ло** is normative (it is labelled **доп.** in OS and **разг.** in Russkaja grammatika). And the stress **вкусить** is normative in OS, but Ož&Šv–1995 does not list this stress at all and gives **вкусить** as norm (a stress labelled **н** in OS).

While no source can be said to be “perfect”, it seems that some are better than others in so far as they are on the whole more in line with the implicit norm. RPP–1996 together with A&Z–2000 and A&Z–1993 (and also to some extent Ož&Šv–1995 and BTS–1998) are the sources that are most in line with the norm as expressed by the informants in these cases where there are differences in the notation of the main sources. For further conclusions see 6.3.3 below.

6.3 Implicit norms not reflected in the main sources, including a comparison with other sources

6.3.1 Stress variants with low usage codified as norms
There are stresses which in at least one of the main sources (OS and in most cases RPP) are normative, although the results of this survey (and often others, too) show that they have low reported and/or actual usage.675

Such a situation calls for a comparison with other sources as it might be assumed that these stresses, codified as norms in one or two of the most recent sources, but not widely used, could be codified as non-normative in other contemporary sources. Appendix 18 shows a comparison with other dictionaries (presented in Chapter 3). As in Appendix 17 the abbreviation **N** (= norm) means that the stress variant is codified as normative in the

---

675 The criterion here for including a form in the table is that less than approximately one third of the informants actually used or reported usage of it. The variant **пробил** could have been included but is not listed here as a distinction in meaning is sometimes made in dictionaries and surveys, sometimes not.
source in question (there may also be other norms). If another stress is given as a norm the stress checked here is marked not N (= not norm). If a stress is not the norm and it is mentioned with a particular label (e.g. “obsolete”) this label is indicated in the table. The shadowed boxes show dictionary codifications that are in line with the implicit norm as found in the present survey.

The comparison with other sources and survey results in Appendix 18 shows that
(a) In several cases there is disagreement between the codified (explicit) norm and the actual (implicit) norm.
(b) There is disagreement between the various sources in their assessment of stress variants.
(c) The more numerous the sources the more variety in the notation.
(d) There are instances in which these stresses which are not the implicit norm are actually not considered normative in one or several of the sources. This means that there are, at least for the verbs examined here, some sources in which the implicit norms are better reflected than in the main sources, notably OS. This becomes clear when examining the shadowed boxes in the table. The following stresses with low reported usage (and generally low actual usage) are not codified as norms – or at least not as the first norm – in the dictionaries listed after each stress variant:


(e) There are several stress variants that have low reported and/or actual usage and are not considered correct by a majority of the speakers but are still considered normative in all the sources investigated here. This applies to the following: вклучи́ть, замор́ить, кровоточить́, морить́, отключи́ть, переключи́ть, помести́ться, посели́ться, шевели́ться, шевели́ть, дочерчива́ть, балова́ться, балу́ешься, нè дало́, отжил, отперло́, пережил, переняли́, побь́л, подни́ли, восприня́ли́, заперся́, начался́.

(f) Obviously, the most recent sources are not always the most up-to-date. For instance, Gorbačevič–1973 gives the stress обна́л as obsolescent (устаревающее) and this stress is not included as normative in A&Z–1993 and Ož&Šv–1995. In spite of this precedent codification and of Kolesov’s survey results from 1964, the proscription of обна́л in found in, among others, OS–1997, BTS–1998 and A&Z–2000.

---

676 It should be noted that these verbs or forms are the ones that were found among the approximately 10 per cent with stress variation that were included in the investigation. This list is therefore not exhaustive. Neither can it be said to be representative when judging which source is the best. It is rather an indication of which sources might be better, and first and foremost an indicator of which variants could be codified as normative.
Whereas no singular source can be said accurately to reflect the actual norm in contemporary Russian verbal stress, A&Z–2000, A&Z–1993 and BTS–1998 seem to be the ones that best reflect implicit norms (cf. 6.3.2 and 6.3.3).\(^{677}\) This even though the latter dictionary almost excludes variant stresses.\(^{678}\)

### 6.3.2 Stress variants with high usage not codified as norms

Conversely, there are stress variants which are codified as non-normative\(^ {679}\) in the two main sources\(^ {680}\) at the same time as they are the reported usage and/or actual usage of a majority of the informants. In most of these cases previous surveys give similar indications of usage.

In Appendix 19 there is a presentation of how these stress variants are labelled in other sources. The labels are written in the table. \(N (= \text{norm})\) means that the stress variant is codified as normative. The word \(\text{не} \) means that the dictionary explicitly condemns that stress, while \(\text{не} \text{н} \) means that the dictionary lists another stress as normative, but does not comment upon the variant. The shadowed boxes show dictionary codifications that are in line with the implicit norm as found in the present survey.

From Appendix 19 it is apparent that

(a) There is disagreement in several cases between the codified (explicit) norm and the actual (implicit) norm.

(b) There is disagreement between the various sources in their assessment of stress variants.

(c) The more numerous the sources the more variety in notation.


(e) There are also several stresses that are the implicit norm but which are not the first explicit norm of any of the sources. The following variants are not the “first norm” in any of the sources (but are labelled \(\text{и} \) in at least one of them): \(посèçý\), \(шевèçý\), \(взççý\), \(обççý\), \(отççý\), \(перенççý\), \(пòбççý\), \(поднèççý\), \(прòбç\), \(прòдççý\), \(прòдççý\), \(прòжççý\).

\(^{677}\) As this comparison was made for the stresses for which the explicit norm of the main sources (OS and/or RPP) does not coincide with the implicit norm, the main sources are by definition deficient in this respect. Still such a comparison gives indications of which sources better reflect implicit stress norms.

\(^{678}\) See Chapter 3.3 regarding its principles for codification.

\(^{679}\) So-called equal variants (labelled \(\text{и} \)) have not been counted.

\(^{680}\) In the case of \(\text{перем}ççý\) and \(\text{обосн}ýå\) one of the sources.

\(^{681}\) End-stress obsolescent.

\(^{682}\) The codified norm of RPP–1996 (распрóд) deviated from both other sources and from current usage.
prožíli, за́перся, до́ждímься, напíлись, облі́лись, подна́лись, ра́вáлись, собра́лись.

Then there are implicit norms that are condemned in all the above-mentioned sources: памя́тúть, осве́домíться, вкlíчи́ть, замóрмít, кровó-то́чíть, мóрмít, откlíчи́ть, перемíрмít, помéжить, дóчерпа́ть, черпа́ть, бáло-ваться, набра́ло, о́жи́ли, нача́лись.

(f) The latest dictionaries or handbooks are not always those that best reflect current educated usage. Or, to put it another way, an implicit norm can actually have been the codified norm in previous sources (sometimes as early as in 1973) or in later sources, and still it is not the codified norm in one or both of the main sources. One such example is глúши́ть.

(g) As has been suggested above, the dictionaries or stress handbooks that correspond best to the implicit stress norm are A&Z–2000, A&Z–1993 and BTS–1998 (and to a certain extent Ož&Šv–1995 and MTS–1990). In spite of the fact that A&Z–1993 and A&Z–2000 have eliminated variation to a great extent, they still manage to reflect current educated usage: their point of orientati on has been usage, even if what this is is not quite precisely defined.

6.3.3 Conclusion

One obvious consequence of this comparison of (a) stress variants with low usage codified as norms in the main sources, and (b) stress variants with high usage not codified as norms in the main sources, is that stresses that should not be codified as norms have been identified. This is proved by (1) at least one inclusion in codification other than the main sources and (2) one survey result. This applies to the following verbs or forms: обоснóу, перепéрчíть, оторо́чит, принúдить, глúши́ть, засло́нит, затвóрмít, приотвóрмít, подомовнìчáть, заржа́вèть, бултýхнуться, дóлило, зáлило, на́лил, отпíл, перёдёл, пéремер, припóднял, припóдняли, обнìлась, родìлся.

Stress variants that should be codified as normative according to the same criteria have also been identified: обоснóу, оторóчит, переперечíть, (зá)ржавèть, заклини́ться, глùши́ть, налил, не далó, передёл, пережèл, пережèр, допíл, отпíл, обнìлся, родìлся.

There are also the stress variants mentioned above which already function as an implicit norm, but which are unprecedented in lexicographic or normativising practice. Therefore more lexicographic boldness would be required of the editor who decides to include these stresses. However, there is in the end no less reason to include them.

Another consequence of the above-mentioned comparison is that it has given an indication of what is the most reliable source for a stress notation that corresponds to current usage, a point which is particularly relevant to codifiers, lexicographers or editors. And, as has been shown, A&Z–2000, A&Z–1993 and BTS–1998 appear to be the sources that best reflect the actual norms. However, there must be a caveat against relying too much on one single source.

Moreover, the most recent sources do not necessarily reflect the implicit norm better than earlier ones. Even if Senkevič (1997:24) recommends the use of only new dictionaries and handbooks it should be emphasised that the year of publishing is not necessarily the crucial factor regarding the reliability of a source. (See for instance 6.3.1 and 6.3.2.)

Regarding the differences between the 2000 and the 1993 editions of A&Z, between which quite a number of changes in notation were made, it can be concluded that there seems to be a change both towards and away from implicit norms. The following implicit norms, which were not normative in A&Z–1993, are recognised in A&Z–2000 (changes
towards the implicit norm): закли́ниться, сё́ли/ся/, затвори́ть, приотвори́ть, подомо́вничать, перемёр/ло/ли. The following implicit norms, recognised as normative in A&Z–1993, are considered non-normative in A&Z–2000 (changes away from the implicit norm):
глу́ши́ть, залй́ло, обнйлся.683

Concluding this section, we can say that a constant revision of dictionaries is necessary both when re-editing existing dictionaries and when editing new ones and that – notably because there is not one single official stress authority – several lexicographical sources must be taken into account, alongside surveys of usage.

683 Other changes, for which no survey data are available for comparison: опо́йт > опо́йт, перепо́йт > перепо́йт, вкъ́сит > вкуси́т.
7 Discussion and conclusion

A number of key issues have been addressed in this study of explicit and implicit norms in contemporary Russian verbal stress.

One was the exploration of how the codified – or explicit – norm and its variants are presented in, principally, two recent orthoepic dictionaries, RPP–1996 and OS–1997. Chapter 3 contains a study of the similarities and differences between these sources, concerning their background and their system of normative and/or stylistic labels.

Firstly, it can be stated that the link between preceding sources and new ones is very strong. For instance, OS–1983–1997 has influenced RPP–1996, even if the recommendations in some cases differ, and the recommendations in Es'kova–1994 are almost a carbon copy of those in OS. On the other hand, OS–1983–1997 is originally descended from a stress handbook (A&O–1955 and A&O–1959–1960), which was, at the time, criticised for subjectivism and for being 99 per cent based on a dictionary edited in 1935–1940.

Secondly, there is an abundance of normative and/or stylistic labels, and the system of labels is not common for the sources. A certain parallelism is found between the different systems, but even when the labels recur or coincide, they are sometimes used differently. Even the label и (= and) does not have an unambiguous interpretation in the dictionaries.

Thirdly, even if we admit that there is a certain parallelism in the label systems so that the notation can be compared, it can be established that there is not always a unanimous norm in codification. The dictionaries do in most cases comply in their normative assessment, but in several cases they are strikingly different. They differ both with respect to how severely condemned a non-normative variant should be, and about which stress is normative (Chapters 3 and 4.2–4.5).

Thus, it is apparently a delusion that there is one single, objectively existing stress norm, which is reflected in handbooks. The stress handbooks are rather characterised by the idiosyncrasies of individual compilers and over-reliance upon previous sources.

The main focus of the study was on the experimental investigation of the implicit norm, i.e. reported usage, actual usage and attitudes regarding normativity. This was made through an informant study, the method of which is given in Chapter 4.1. The approach used has a number of advantages. Firstly, it encompasses not only actual usage or reported usage as has generally been done before, but combines these, so that they can then be compared. Secondly, it also studies attitudes, which are crucial for the creation of language norms. Thirdly, the survey of actual usage was made using a distraction method. The subjects were not aware that verbal stress was the question to be studied, but concentrated on other linguistic tasks. By all accounts, this method elicits a more natural stressing.

The study of implicit norms showed that in some cases there are dual norms both in the language community and in the individual (e.g. подны́лйся; section 4.6). Two stress variants do not have to be in a situation of complimentary distribution, and the usage or acceptance of one stress does not exclude another. This has previously not been taken into account in studies and has not been possible to assess by the methods used there. While it may well be valid that for most verbs or forms only one stress is the norm, this study ar-
The importance of not confining one’s horizons to a minimalist or exclusive normativisation.

The findings of the survey show that in many cases there is compliance between explicit and implicit norm, that is, language users often, although far from always, use and see as correct the stress that is the norm according to most dictionaries. Numerous examples are given throughout sections 4.2–4.5.

The correspondence between implicit and explicit norm is particularly high for the preterite feminine forms and the verbs with variation in the infinitive forms only (принять etc.). On the other hand, the correspondence between explicit and implicit norm is very low for reflexive end-stressed preterite masculine forms (e.g. родился). In fact, stress on the reflexive particle in the past masculine is as uncommon for the forms in which it is the norm as for the forms in which it is labelled as obsolescent. This is most likely evidence of the disappearance of the end-stressed preterite masculine reflexive forms. There are also several examples of codified norms with prefix stress in non-feminine preterite forms competing with an implicit norm with stem stress (e.g. нáл). It was shown that the dictionaries or handbooks are apparently over-normative in many cases: they recommend a variant that is not even considered correct by a majority of informants.

One of the questions that this study attempted to answer was whether the variation that exists in speech is reflected in the dictionaries and stress handbooks and whether the variation listed in the sources is justified by the variants’ position among the speakers. It has been shown that the dictionaries fail to reflect all the variation that occurs in the language, even if it was apparently the aim of both main sources to reflect it. In some cases a stress, which was not included in the dictionaries, was the reported and actual usage of approximately half the informants. Sometimes the sources even failed to list “variants to the norm” or “errors” that could be considered the actual norm (e.g. принудить). The results also showed that there are alternative stresses that are listed in the dictionaries as obsolete or low colloquial etc., but that seem to be almost non-existent (e.g. подпрыгнуть).

This study has gone some way towards understanding the underlying normative structure. The speakers’ own norms and reported usage generally conform to their actual usage. None the less, in approximately 24 per cent of the cases there is incongruity between reported usage and elicited usage. The most current type of incongruity is that informants claim to use a (non-normative) variant stress but do not actually use it. Hence it can be concluded that the acceptance of variants among the informants is rather high.

In Chapter 4.7 it is shown that the Russian informants use stresses which they genuinely believe are normative regardless of whether these stresses actually comply with the explicit norms. There is apparently rather little linguistic insecurity. The fact that the speakers do not “idealise” their own speech by over-reporting usage of stresses that are the codified norm, could be taken as further testimony that the explicit or codified norm in certain cases is not perceived as the prestige variant.

The number of replies in accordance with the prescribed norm is slightly higher for the informants who fulfil the criteria generally used for defining a standard language speaker than for the small group not belonging to this category. However, this difference is not significant.

As for other differences between speaker groups (Chapter 5), they are with one exception not statistically significant. This is most likely partly due to the fact that the informants were not sampled on the basis of social criteria and therefore some speaker groups are very
small. The only statistically significant difference is found between men and women: women do report usage of stresses codified as norms more often than men. It is not excluded, though, that the sample is skewed: there is a higher percentage of people with linguistic education among the female informants, although the difference in educational level between the sexes is negligible.

The survey results were also studied from the point of view of the normative and/or stylistic labels. The purpose was to investigate the relation between, on the one hand, the implicit norm and, on the other, the various labels. It was found (Chapter 6) that there is no direct relationship between the implicit stress norms and the labels these stresses are assigned in normative handbooks, except for the stresses labelled as grossly incorrect/flagrantly vulgar or low colloquial and the obsolescent and obsolete stress variants. These were all rejected by a majority. For all the other stresses – normative, “equal to the norm”, admissible or colloquial, not recommended or low colloquial, incorrect or low colloquial – the reported usage and belief about normativity is highly varying. Among the stresses with these labels there are those that almost all informants use, report using and consider correct, and there are those that hardly anyone uses or regards as correct.

In the cases where the norm notation in the sources was conflicting, this notation was compared to other sources and to the survey results. The goal was to see if there is a pattern in the way in which sources are modelled on each other and which sources should be considered the most reliable. It was found that among the total of nine sources compared (Appendix 17) there are not two that are perfectly alike in this respect. It was also found that in these cases, when the recommendations of the main sources differ, the sources that reflect the implicit norm better than the others are A&Z–2000, A&Z–1993 and RPP–1996.

In the cases when the survey results were obviously clashing with the notation in OS–1997 and RPP–1996 (stress variants with low usage codified as norms (Appendix 18), stress variants with high usage not codified as norms (Appendix 19)), the results were compared with other sources in order to see if there are those that better reflect the implicit norm. The results of previous surveys of usage have also been included in the comparison. Here, again, it was found that there is disagreement between the various dictionaries and handbooks in their assessment of stress variants, and the more numerous the sources, the more variety there is in the notation. There are some sources in which the implicit norms are better reflected than in the main ones. However, at the same time there are implicit norms that are not reflected in any of the dictionaries and handbooks investigated, several stress variants which are not the implicit norm and are still considered normative in all the sources, and implicit norms that are condemned everywhere. Besides, the most recent dictionaries are not always the ones that best reflect current educated usage. While no singular source could claim truly to reflect the actual norm in contemporary Russian verbal stress, A&Z–2000, A&Z–1993 and BTS–1998 seem to be most reliable in this respect.

The results of the survey of reported and actual usage were compared with results from other surveys of Russian stress from the period 1956–1994. Here it should be observed that the methods of some of these studies are dubious or unclear and therefore some of their results should be approached with some caution. However, when several surveys point in the same direction it could be assumed that more firm conclusions can be drawn. This comparison shows that the results of the present survey give indications similar to those of previous surveys in many cases. Hence it can be concluded that several so-called errors and deviations from the norm are not new. They have, in many cases, been around since at least the 1950s–1960s and are not “inventions” due to lax norms in a democratising society, as
is sometimes suggested. Several of these stresses have not only existed as variants or “errors” but have probably been the implicit norm since the 1950s–1960s (e.g. осведомиться, баловаться, вклю́читься, глу́шиться, мёрить, посе́лишь, поместя́ться, нали́л, опь́лл, обна́лся, роди́лись). It seems safe to conclude that these are currently the implicit norm. They may eventually also receive the stamp of approval in codification. From the above it can be concluded that codification has on the whole not paid due heed to survey results obtained.

There are also indications that other surveys have failed to pay attention to certain verbs, forms or groups of verbs in which stress variation is common and where explicit and implicit norms do not coincide (e.g. че́рпать – черпа́ть and перепё́рхать – переперхать). Such verbs or forms are more easily detected when – as was done here – excerpting all stress variants from lexicographical sources instead of studying only the most well-known or well-studied examples.

This comparison also shows that some deviations from the norm which have been suggested are widespread are in fact not so: the notorious зво́нить is currently used by a minority and does not appear to be on the way to becoming the implicit norm; the similarly notorious на́чать and при́нять even less so. This shows that in certain cases linguists and others have been crying wolf over certain stress variants.

One of the aims of the present work was to investigate the concept norm and, in connection with this, to study the principles for Russian language policy and language normativisation. This was done in Chapter 2.

It was stated that the fact that the word norm is polysemic must be taken into account as discussions about norms are elucidated by distinguishing, on the one hand, the explicit norm, i.e. what is normative – the codification or the prescription, and, on the other, the implicit norm, i.e. what is normal – what is usual, according to the social conventions and practices created by convergence of behaviour.

Furthermore, it was found that the three criteria used for defining norm and normativity in Russian linguistic literature (correspondence to the language system, usage and authority/tradition/necessity) are not applied strictly. Generally, not all the requirements tend to be fulfilled and at the same time, and the argument that can serve as justification for the argument of the author’s own preference is used. The language norm is not equal to usage in Russian practice. Neither is it – as there is no single canon – equal to one particular dictionary or grammar. Thus, the supposedly objective norm is generally – and contradictorily enough – equated with the subjective view of one linguist. Moreover, the explicit Russian language norms are, beyond doubt, ossified. This is largely due to the language policy, which has close links to politics in general. The strict normativisation of the Russian language can be dated to 1934, the year of the first All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers.

Even though the standard language and the codified norm are not equal they are closely related. The Russian standard language has generally been defined as the usage of a particular group of speakers, viz. native Russian speakers who are educated to at least secondary level and who are urban residents. As has been shown there are indications that the codified norm is sometimes not perceived as a norm by the group defined as standard language speakers (носители литературного языка). The fact that the definition of the category ‘standard language speakers’ is made a posteriori based on social criteria entails the risk of the pitfall that in some cases not even standard language speakers use the standard or the codified norm. Too large a gap between explicit and implicit norms (as expressed by
the usage and the attitudes of the standard language speakers) risks undermining the authority of the recommendations of dictionaries and handbooks.

This is important if cogent attempts at language normativisation or cultivation of speech are to be made. There are indications that such activities have been brought to the fore again in the 1990s.

This study has highlighted a number of problem areas in existing theory. The main contribution is that the codification of Russian verbal stress is perfunctory and does not reflect actual norms in many cases. The explicit norm is in certain cases not perceived as the prestige variant. This discrepancy is most likely a result of subjectivism and conservatism, the hallmarks of Russian normativisation, which in their turn are partly linked to the normative tradition and politics. For a reliable stress notation several dictionaries or handbooks must be taken into account as there is neither a single source which can be considered a truthful reflection of actual norms nor an official stress codex. The results of this study suggest a number of new avenues for future research as it is possible that these conclusions also concern areas of language normativisation other than verbal stress.
Key to abbreviations

f = feminine
ipf = imperfective
KR = культура речи (= cultivation of speech)
m = masculine
n = neuter
pl = plural
pf = perfective
sg = singular
1sg = 1st person singular
3sg = 3rd person singular
3pl, etc. = 3rd person plural, etc.
возв. = возвышенное (elevated)
grubo неправ. = грубо неправильно (grossly incorrect)
grubo простореч./про. = грубо просторечное (flagrantly vulgar or low colloquial speech)
dоп. = допустимо (admissible)
dоп. устар. = допустимо устаревающее (admissible, obsolescent)
и = and; used for variants equal to the norm
книжн. = книжное (bookish)
nеправ. = неправильно (incorrect)
не рек. = не рекомендуется (not recommended)
не рек. устар. = не рекомендуется устаревающее (not recommended, obsolescent)
простореч./про. = просторечное (vulgar speech or low colloquial)
разг. = разговорное (colloquial)
устар. = устаревшее (obsolete)
устар. возм. = устаревшее возможное (obsolete, possible)
устар. и возм. = устаревшее и возможное (obsolete and possible)
устар. и книжн. = устаревшее и книжное (obsolete and bookish)
устар. и поэт. = устаревшее и поэтическое (obsolete and poetic)
устар. простонар. = устар. простонародное (obsolete, vulgar)

Surveys referred to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey reference</th>
<th>Results published in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(place of investigation in brackets)</td>
<td>(see References)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voroncova 1956 (Moscow)</td>
<td>Voroncova (1959)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RJaSO 1963 (Soviet Union)</td>
<td>Krysin (1974)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolesov 1964 (Leningrad)</td>
<td>Kolesov (1967)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pirogova 1967 (Moscow)</td>
<td>Pirogova (1967)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorbačevič 1974 (Leningrad)</td>
<td>Gorbačevič (1978a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukiah 1994 (Moscow)</td>
<td>Ukiah (1996)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The second abbreviation is used in the tables of results.
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Appendices

Appendix 1. Form: Oral performance test (usage)

Прочитайте предложения вслух, вставляя окончания в пропущенных местах. (Иногда окончания могут не требоваться.)

Пример: Дедушка купил килограмм виноград__. (винограду или винограда)

1. После денежной реформы дефицит товаров только усугубился: даже пачку табак__ не купишь.
2. Нет спор__: все это дало экономический эффект значительно превышающий 50 миллиардов рублей.
3. Усевшись за стол, Гришка первым делом налил себе чай__.
4. Врачи занялись лечением всех ее болезней и уговорили для начала принять аспирин__.
5. Так хорошо день начался, но уже к обеду было не до смех__.
6. На Пушкинской площади собралось много народ__ в ожидании раздачи гамбургеров.
7. Дачники хотели купить двадцать килограмм__ сахар__, но продавщица дала только десять.
8. На зиму надо купить побольше корм__, чтобы скот не перемер с голод__.
9. Я слышала, что Петров продал машину очень дешево, так как ему до зарез__ нужны были деньги.
10. Сев за крайний столик, молодая женщина позвала официанта и заказала стакан сок__, попросив поменьше льд__.
11. Неуклюжий мальчишка разлил стакан лимонад__ и пятно расплылось по всей скатерти.
12. Солдаты напились чай__ без сахар__ и без хлеба и начали дремать.
13. Все элементарно: включишь мотор и увидишь, надо ли тебе докупить бензин__.

14. Ребята дождались пока поезд начал отходить от платформы, и с разбег__ запрыгнули в последний вагон.

15. Придя домой, Маша для вид__ начала листать учебник математики.

16. На рынке бабушка часто брала немного лук__, рис__, горох__ и сыр__.

17. Юра по дороге с работы купит немного шоколад__ и заморит червячка.

18. Он своими рассказами и анекдотами морит всех со смех__ и буквально доводит до слез.

19. На прощание он обнялся с родителями, с сестрами, со всеми по порядку, но столько народ__ пришло провожать его, что он скоро сбился со счет__.

20. Такого уговор__ не было, таким поведением ты поселишь сомнение в твоей серьезности.

21. Народ__ было много, и в ресторане, и возле него, и проникнуть вовнутрь далось не без усилий.

22. На работе покой__ нет, телефон постоянно звонит – даже кофе некогда попить.

23. Наши родственники прожили пять лет за границей, и от них не было слышно ни ответ__ ни привет__.

24. Она уперлась что было силь, но безрезультатно: давление было из ряд__ вон выходящее.

25. Он давно проклял свою работу в киоске, но от покупателей отбой__ не было, да и деньги получались неплохие.

26. Брат считал, что он пережил ужасные оскорбления и наделал много шум__ по этому поводу.

27. После длительного перехода туристы наконец отоспались и решили прибавить ход__ на следующем этапе.

28. Такой страшный фильм, что при просмотре волосами шевелишь с испуг__.

29. Эта птица у меня клюет все растения, в том году она испортила много горох__.

30. Он поболтал о том, о сем и, наконец, как бы между прочим, не подавая вид__, осведомился о главном.

31. Если ты не прислонишь ладонь к двери определенным способом, у тебя не будет доступ__ к сейфу.
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32. Мама меня упрекает в том, что я часто дразню нашу собаку и никогда не даю ей покой__.

33. Ты сказал, что глушить мотор, но мне кажется, что ты наоборот прибавляешь газ__.

34. Не беспокойтесь, мы вам позвоним заранее; мы не привыкли приходить без спрос__.

35. Бабушка здесь в деревне меня постоянно поит и кормит, но почему-то аппетит__ у меня нет.

36. Ты без моего совета не делай лишнего шаг__; давай созвонимся на следующей неделе чтобы договориться.

37. Новые хозяева распределили имущество и теперь тратят деньги без счет__.

38. Ты покупаешь все подряд, без разбор__, просто сориш деньги.

39. Как только все собрались у стойки бара, Вася решил заказать всем коньяк__.

40. Я уверен: пройдут год__, и он помнит нас еще добрым словом.

41. Как только он вволочет все катор__ на сушу, мы начнем работать.

42. Сказали, что различные сорт__ яблонь и груш следует сгруппировать по морозоустойчивости.

43. Наши инструктор__ и тренер__ с первого же дня задали определенный темп тренировок.

44. Если бы не забота местного священника во время войны, все колокол__ могли бы зазвучать и навеки замолкнуть.

45. После дождя тополь__ как бы ожили и поменялись в окраске.

46. Требования на заводе поднялись, и предприятию нужны были новые опытные механик__, слесар__ и токар__.

47. Началась война, и все фельдшер__ были нарасхват.

48. Инженер__ поднялись на 6-й этаж чтобы осмотреть стройку с высоты.

49. Управление предприятия начало перестройку: все отдел__ и сектор__ были реорганизованы.

50. Он передал чертеж заказчику и дал понять, что архитектор__ не согласны по многим вопросам.
51. Ночью вор пробил стену и проник на склад, несмотря на то что сторож__ находился в соседнем здании.

52. Пограничник долго рассматривал наши паспорт__, а потом вдруг отдал их без вопросов.

53. Учитель без проблемы определит почерк__ всех своих учеников.

54. Я еще обосную свою предвыборную программу, так как выбор__ проводятся только в конце года.

55. Полевой командир отдал приказ привести вчерашние приговор__ в исполнение.

56. Так как все бухгалтер__ были в отпуске, наши аудитор__ не смогли начать проверку.

57. Все директор__ концерна съехались в Сочи, чтобы обсудить и принять новый устав.

58. Я хотел бы купить новый шкаф в который поместятся все мои вещи: и пиджаки, и рубашки, и свитер__, и брюки.

59. Налоговые инспектор__ вплотную занялись прошлого днilet отчетом сомнительных фирм.

60. Постепенно Катя поднялась до уровня, где народные промысл__ становились уже искусством.

61. Валентина попала в штурман__, можно сказать, случайно, она родилась вдали от морских трасс – в Воронежской области.

62. Вскоре же начали поступать с заводов новые пушки и трактор__.

63. Журналистка не была уверена, опубликовать ли редактор__ вечерних газет ее заметку.

64. Опытные шофер__ его особо не жаловали; баловался он вином, да и водитель был неважный.

65. Автор книги считает, что корректор__ придрились к пустякам, в связи с чем создалось множество проблем с публикацией книги.

66. После семинара можно сделать вывод, что все профессор__ исторического факультета нашего университета согласны, что опыт надо черпать из сокровищницы древних цивилизаций.

67. Ученики–пекарь__ столичного ПТУ No 5 отказались стажироваться на мытищинском хлебозаводе.

68. Уже третий сутки американские военно–воздушные силы бомбардируют саддамские бункер__ недалеко от иракской столицы.
69. Мы сами приедем в Швецию и заключим прямые договоры со всеми поставщиками.

70. До рассвета оставалось больше часа, но все уличные фонари и прожекторы внезапно потухли. Что-то заклинило в системе городского освещения.

71. Драган воевал с кем пришлось, но это не дало ему ожесточиться ни на хорвате ни на сербе.

72. Согласно дежурному врачу, у многих солдат, участвовавших в войне, раны еще не зажили, и поэтому на фронтах не хватало бойцов.

73. Мяса на базаре не было. Видимо, торговцы все продали с утра, остались только горы абрикосов и баклажанов.

74. В короткое время подняли надои молока с трех до пяти тысяч килограмм.

75. Правление колхоза создало все условия для выращивания помидор.

76. Я думаю, что она скорее отключит свет вообще, чем разрешит нам использовать лампу в сто ватт.

77. Хотя мой двоюродный брат родился и прожил бо́льшую часть своей жизни среди туркмен, он так и не выучил их язык.

78. Иван Сергеевич по окончании службы купил себе пять гектаров земли, чтобы было чем заняться на старости лет.

79. Чтобы как следует оторочить плате, ушло 5 аршин шелка.

80. Он заперся в сарае, думая таким образом обмануть партизан.

81. — Так жалко, что старые обычаи давно отмерли, сказала бабушка, — уже не видно гусара и драгун на улицах по праздникам.

82. Он обнял ее и протянул свадебный подарок: бриллиантовое кольцо в десять карат.

83. Петр Петрович пережил всех в деревне, даже долгожителей—гру zinc.

84. Утром на рынке Боря купил килограмм апельсинов, половику гранатов и две килограммы мандаринов; только дома он заметил, что продавец обсчитался и передал сдачу.

85. Тетя Валя конечно дотекла бы плед, но ей не хватало всего грамм пятьдесят шерсти.

86. Саша сейчас в отпуск, и он, возможно, заглянет к нам в гости на следующей неделе.
87. Пионеры нашли золотые царские монеты в снег__, Совет отряда распределит эту своеобразную находку между ребятами.

88. Девушку премировали за трудовые успехи поездкой в ГДР. Увидев обилие в магазине колбас, сыров, всего–всего, она почувствовала себя в рай__.

89. Брат прожил год на Севере, на холод__, на ветр__.

90. После громкого скандала на выпускном бал__, где она дралась, Вера ни с кем не общалась.

91. Отец хотел приклеить объявление о продаже квартиры как можно выше, после нескольких попыток это удалось, но все руки были в клей__.

92. –Зачем ты еще солишь? В этом суп__ и так много соли.

93. Из–за нелетной погоды, мы пробыли шесть часов в аэропорт__ и опоздали на встречу с клиентом.

94. В цех__ наконец–то разобрались с несумами, и виновые понесли наказание.

95. –Олег, опять ты балуешься с огнем, хоть на снег__, но все равно опасно!

96. Фирма пробурит скважину в грунт__, даже не повредив деревьев и кустарников.

97. В дым__ ничего не было видно, но было слышно, как что–то шевелится в комнате.

98. Даша любила чистый воздух и летом часто спала в стог__ свежего сена.
Ниже следует 292 слова (глагола), с проставленными ударениями.
Вы должны выразить свое отношение к этим вариантам ударения.
Поставьте крестик в той колонке, которая соответствует Вашему отношению к каждому ударению.
Сначала решите, так Вы ставите ударение или нет, а потом решите, правильно ли это ударение.

Внимание:
• Ответьте на все вопросы. В случае, если Вы сомневаетесь, выберите наиболее подходящую альтернативу.
• Не обсуждайте содержание анкеты друг с другом.
• Помните, что во многих случаях нет "правильных" или "неправильных" ответов. Мне интересно Ваше отношение к предлагаемым вариантам.
• Анкета анонимна.

Спасибо за Ваше участие.

Elisabeth Marklund Sharapova, Department of Slavic Languages, Uppsala University, Box 513, S-751 20 Uppsala, Швеция
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Слово</th>
<th>Я сам/а/ так говорю</th>
<th>Я сам/а/ так не говорю</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>и знаю, что это правильно</td>
<td>и думаю, что это правильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>перепёлочь</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ушли</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>перепелёл</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>отдалось</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>отоспались</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>поднялись</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>опёрлась</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>начался</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>облелось</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>рвались</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>заперся</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>занялись</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>обтерласся</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>забали</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>начал</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>расплылось</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>перепо́йт</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>со́дало</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>обнёл</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>стажироваться</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>поднёл</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>сбылись</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>распродали</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>позва́ла (его)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>сори́лъ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>родёлся</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>отперла́сь</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>подкрядется (к ней)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>продалось</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>прьла</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>развелсé</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>пёредал (письмо)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>затво́рит</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>переключить</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>перенили</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>баловался</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>пропили</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>нáлил</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>ключет</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>приподняли</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>гналá</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>пережил (зиму)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Я сам/а/ так говорю</td>
<td>Я сам/а/ так не говорю</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>и знаю, что это правильно</td>
<td>и думаю, что это правильно</td>
<td>но не знаю, что это правильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>соли́т</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>дочёрпать (воду)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>не дало</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>подпрыгнуть</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>скоблить</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>обнял</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>продать</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>читает (журнал)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>стрёбни́ть</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>прибы́л</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>пережил́ (жену)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>ходатайствовать</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>продали</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>присложи́ть</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>проспа́ла</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>нача́ли</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>перевёрнет (чашку)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>собра́лись</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>защёлка́ть</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>подкра́ли́сь</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>восприя́лсé</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>шеве́лится</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>подни́лись</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>кра́ла</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>поместиться</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>обня́лась</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>спа́лось</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>отключи́т</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>зани́л</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>ошиба́ться</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>подстри́гла</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>на́чалась</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>защи́мит</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>зáнять (деньги)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>бомбардиро́вать</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>очереветь</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>спалá</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>заня́лись</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>подтолкнёт</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>создало́сь</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>закли́ниться</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Я сам/а/ так говорю</td>
<td>Я сам/а/ так не говорю</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>и знаю, что это правильно</td>
<td>и думаю, что это правильно</td>
<td>и не знаю, что это правильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>ожи́ли</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>оперла́сь</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>задаля́</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>созво́нимся</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>изгналá</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>пропиль</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>отсади́т (в сторону)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>побы́ли (в гостях)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>посе́ли́шь</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>отмерли́ (руки)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>дозво́нюсь</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>за́лило</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>дала́</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>нача́ла</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>зáжили</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>не́ была (уверена)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>создáлось</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>переми́рит</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>при́дал</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>распреде́лить</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>продáл</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>напи́лись</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>бу́лты́хну́ться</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>сóришь</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>подны́лись</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>нáнать</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>приня́л</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>позво́ним</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>чёркать (спичкой)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>пережи́л (семью)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>вила́сь (речка)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>дóлило</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>перепе́рчить</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>ткала́</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>мути́т</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>подны́ли</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>вволочеч</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>ожи́ли</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>принуди́ть</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>недосоли́т</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>помя́нёт</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>пёремер (скот)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>№</td>
<td>Я сам/а, так говорю</td>
<td>Я сам/а, так не говорю</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>усугубиться</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>отжили</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>отпёрлась</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>шевелишь</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>отпил</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>кровоточит</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>отдал (приказ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>заморит</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>родилась</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>дразнило</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>отдалось</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>подстряжет</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>опровергло</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>постелет (кровать)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>дало</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>исклоним</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>добыл</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>дошёл</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>полиловеть</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>прожидали</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>начало</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>заржалось</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>принять</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>приклеим</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>собрались</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>татуироваться</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>набрали</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>залито</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>взяло</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>зарядите</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>дочёрпать</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>строчишь</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>заслонит</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>передал (сдачу)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>морит</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>врало</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>спрыгнуть</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>предал</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>развёлся</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>шевёлить</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>звонит</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>отжили</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Номер</td>
<td>Слово</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>перенёл</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>глушён</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>пропилю</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>продалось</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>группировали</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>побывал (дома)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>обвила</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>противоречит</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>оперлась (на руку)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>отдал (за бешенок)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>создал</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>отняли (пленку)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>дотировали</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>осведомились</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>заглянет</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>подняли</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>проблеять</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>отперло</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>начали</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>продал</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>включили</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>прожил</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>прожили</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>премировали</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>определил</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>бросил</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>пробили</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>залала</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>сняла</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>прошли</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>напоит</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>начать</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>дождались</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>проклял</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>пришпилить</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>пробурил</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>соскоблил (грязь)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>пропил</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>приклейте</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>поманите</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>занялись</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Проверьте слово - компрессия или компрессия?

Вам нужно внести исправление в текст.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Слово</th>
<th>Я сам/а так говорю</th>
<th>Я сам/а так не говорю</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>приподнял</td>
<td>и знаю, что это правильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>перестелё</td>
<td>и думаю, что это правильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>дочерпáть</td>
<td>но не знаю, что это не правильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>бра́ла</td>
<td>и знаю, что это правильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>черкáть</td>
<td>и думаю, что это неправильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>обоснóу (теорию)</td>
<td>и знаю, что это правильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>перемёр (скот)</td>
<td>и думаю, что это неправильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>доткалá (ковер)</td>
<td>и знаю, что это правильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>шевелит</td>
<td>и думаю, что это неправильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>балуéешься</td>
<td>и знаю, что это правильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>обнёйл</td>
<td>и думаю, что это неправильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>заслоннít</td>
<td>и знаю, что это правильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>кровоточит</td>
<td>и думаю, что это неправильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>пёрежил (горе)</td>
<td>и знаю, что это правильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>прогнилá</td>
<td>и думаю, что это неправильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>приотворнít</td>
<td>и знаю, что это правильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>прибнáл</td>
<td>и думаю, что это неправильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>пробнáл</td>
<td>и знаю, что это правильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>позво́ннм</td>
<td>и думаю, что это неправильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>зада́ла</td>
<td>и знаю, что это правильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>жýла (с мамой)</td>
<td>и думаю, что это неправильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>сóлнит</td>
<td>и знаю, что это правильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>запломбирова́ть</td>
<td>и думаю, что это неправильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>подперлáсь</td>
<td>и знаю, что это правильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>налнл</td>
<td>и думаю, что это неправильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>поддáло</td>
<td>и знаю, что это правильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>залгáлись</td>
<td>и думаю, что это неправильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>оторочнít</td>
<td>и знаю, что это правильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>приннл</td>
<td>и думаю, что это неправильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>поссéлишь</td>
<td>и знаю, что это правильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>прённл</td>
<td>и думаю, что это неправильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>отпидкáть</td>
<td>и знаю, что это правильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>зáнялись</td>
<td>и думаю, что это неправильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>разорвалáсь</td>
<td>и знаю, что это правильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>памятнует</td>
<td>и думаю, что это неправильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>сóлншь</td>
<td>и знаю, что это правильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>началнй</td>
<td>и думаю, что это неправильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>поместнй</td>
<td>и знаю, что это правильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>упёрнлась</td>
<td>и думаю, что это неправильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>допнйл</td>
<td>и знаю, что это правильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>заннй</td>
<td>и думаю, что это неправильно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>включнйшь</td>
<td>и знаю, что это правильно</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Слово</th>
<th>Я сам/а/ так говорю</th>
<th>Я сам/а/ так не говорю</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>набрало</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>сказал (правду)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>зáперла</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>подововинчать</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>послалá</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>отслóнит (ставень)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>родилсé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>одолкýть</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>занялýсь</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>нàчало (темнеть)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>пойт</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>просёкли</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>пропýли</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>разделийт</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>придралýсь</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>зайденеветь</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>началáсь</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>дрёмлю</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>вýнтишь</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>поднýлись</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>оторвáлось</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>жилóсь</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>дралáсь</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>подкралийсь</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>заклю́чным</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>разобралýсь</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>нормировáть</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>облизýсь</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>упомянуéт</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>напýлись</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>заржа́веть</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>óтперлась</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>прóдалось</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>обнялýсь</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>подкрала́сь</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>(легко) дáлось</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>перебрáлся</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>сáдил (деревья)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>напýть</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>черпáть</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>звонит</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>поднýлась</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Заполните, пожалуйста, анкету Ваших личных данных. Анкета анонимна.

Год рождения: _________

Пол: Женский…………………………………………..☐
Мужской………………………………………………..☐

Родной язык: Русский…………………………………………..☐
Другой……………………………………………………..☐

Место, где Вы прожили большую часть первых 15 лет своей жизни:
Москва………………………………………………………☐
Московская область…………………………………..☐
Ленинград/Санкт Петербург…………………………☐
Север России……………………………………………☐
Юг России………………………………………………..☐
Центр России, Сибирь, Дальний Восток…………☐
Другие республики бывшего СССР………………..☐
Вне пределов бывшего СССР………………………☐

Место, где Вы прожили большую часть своей жизни:
Москва………………………………………………………☐
Московская область…………………………………..☐
Ленинград/Санкт Петербург…………………………☐
Север России……………………………………………☐
Юг России………………………………………………..☐
Центр России, Сибирь, Дальний Восток…………☐
Другие республики бывшего СССР………………..☐
Вне пределов бывшего СССР………………………☐

Вы прожили большую часть своей жизни:
В городе…………………………………………………..☐
В сельской местности……………………………………☐

Ваше образование /законченное/:
8–9 классов или меньше…………………………........☐
Среднее: 10–11 классов………………………………..☐
Среднее специальное…………………………………☐
Высшее образование………………………………….☐
Appendix 4. Reported usage (%) of stresses codified as normative (1).
Appendix 5. Reported usage (%) of stresses codified as normative (2).
Appendix 6. Reported usage (%) of stresses codified as normative (3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress</th>
<th>Usage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>нормир.</td>
<td>58,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>преображ.</td>
<td>58,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пром.</td>
<td>58,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>струй.</td>
<td>56,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>головна</td>
<td>55,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>головна тис.</td>
<td>55,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>головна тис. в</td>
<td>55,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>т. о.</td>
<td>55,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>бал.</td>
<td>55,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ар.</td>
<td>54,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>зал.</td>
<td>53,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пред.</td>
<td>53,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пред. в</td>
<td>51,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>проф.</td>
<td>51,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>н/реж.</td>
<td>51,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>н/реж. в</td>
<td>51,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>н/реж. л</td>
<td>50,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пред. стар.</td>
<td>48,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>об.</td>
<td>47,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>об. в</td>
<td>47,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>об. л</td>
<td>46,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>обр.</td>
<td>43,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>обр. в</td>
<td>38,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>обр. л</td>
<td>38,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>крыл.</td>
<td>36,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>крыл. в</td>
<td>36,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>крыл. л</td>
<td>35,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>стр.</td>
<td>34,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>т. о.</td>
<td>34,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>т. о. в</td>
<td>33,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>т. о. л</td>
<td>29,3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7. Reported usage (%) of stresses codified as normative (4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian Word</th>
<th>Usage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>привлечение</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>волна</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>эксклюзивнъ</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отмежевание</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>вольный</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>забастовка</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>приподняться</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>крошкочёк</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>заплеск</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>залéло</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>бултыхаться</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>младый</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>приблизиться</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>обнять</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>до́кáртать</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>скушáть</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>аminster</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>морóт</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>поместёться</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>верхóт</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>запа́зить</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пере́чичь</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>переплáчуть</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>заплакать</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>заиёдовать</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>верёвка</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>зó делó</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>подмо́войчи́ть</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>родóлес</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>приостáрать</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пойдáшь</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отпáлочить</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>воспрóйскóть</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>злó гóл</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>облóкáл</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 8. Reported usage (%) of stresses codified as normative in OS having another label in RPP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stresses</th>
<th>Usage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>распределил (норма/про.)</td>
<td>54,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>прервал (норма/разг.)</td>
<td>43,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отсыпали (норма/разг.)</td>
<td>17,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отодвинули (норма/разг.)</td>
<td>15,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отпороили (норма/разг.)</td>
<td>15,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>перерез (норма/косм.)</td>
<td>5,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 9. Reported usage (%) of stresses codified as normative in RPP having another label in OS.
Appendix 10. Reported usage (%) of stresses with the label ‘and'; the second of two “equal” variants.
Appendix 11. Reported usage (%) of stresses with the labels доп./разг. (admissible/colloquial).
Appendix 12. Reported usage (%) of stresses with the labels не рек./простореч. (not recommended/vulgar or low colloquial).

![Bar chart showing the reported usage of stresses with the labels не рек./простореч. (not recommended/vulgar or low colloquial).]
Appendix 13. Reported usage (%) of stresses with the labels 
неправ./простореч. (incorrect/vulgar or low colloquial).
Appendix 14. Reported usage (%) of stresses with the label грубо неправ./грубо простореч. (grossly incorrect/flagrantly vulgar or low colloquial).
Appendix 15. Reported usage (%) of stresses with the label доп. устар./не рек. устар./устар. (admissible, obsolescent/not recommended, obsolescent/obsolete).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stresses (with label)</th>
<th>Usage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18,9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 16. Reported usage (%) of stresses that are non-normative and not included in the sources.
### Appendix 17. Different norms in the main sources: comparison with other sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>пëремер³</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>книжн.</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>перемер³</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>разг.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пëремерло</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>книжн.</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>перемерло</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>разг.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пëремерли</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>книжн.</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>перемерли</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>разг.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>распрада³⁴</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>простореч.</td>
<td>N⁵</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>распрада³⁴</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>допустимо</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>обоснуй/съ³⁸</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>устар.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>обоснуй/съ³⁸</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>обоснуйт/съ³⁹</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>устар.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>обоснуйт/съ³⁹</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отрочи³⁴</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отборочи³³</td>
<td>не</td>
<td>не</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>не рек.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>доп.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>соскоблишь¹²</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>соскоблишь</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отскоблит</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отскоблит</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>и</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>оскоблат</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>оскоблат</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>и</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>послоблён</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>послоблён</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>и</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отцдоби¹³</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отсади³⁶</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>селит/съ³⁷</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>книжн.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>сёдит/съ</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>не</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>допустимо</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>обстрочи³⁴</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>и</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>обстрочи³⁴</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>огороди³⁴</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>огороди³⁴</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>устаревающее</td>
<td>—²⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>схорони³⁴</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>схорони³⁴</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>не</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>устаревающее</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>вскун³⁴</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>не</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>вскун³⁴</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>устаревающее</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отзубри³⁴</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отзубри³⁴</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>подзубри³⁴</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>подзубри³⁴</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>подзубри³⁴</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>подзубри³⁴</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>полёнись³⁴</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>полёнись³⁴</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>не</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>устаревающее</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>натруди³⁴</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>простореч.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>натруди³⁴</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>препоручи³⁴</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>препоручи³⁴</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>устаревающее</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>сторонись³⁴</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>сторонись³⁴</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>устаревающее</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The dictionaries and stress handbooks are sorted chronologically with the exception of A&Z–1993, which has been juxtaposed to the 2000 edition in order to facilitate comparison between these two sources.

2 Reported usage 5.6\%, reported non-usage 93.4\%, actual usage 0\%; Ukiah (1994) 5.0\%.
3 Reported usage 68.0\%, reported non-usage 29.2\%, actual usage 58.1\%; Ukiah (1994) 95\%. Note that only about 73\% of all informants claim to use any of the two variants mentioned in dictionaries. This may be viewed as being due to the fact that this probably is an infrequent lexeme. However, as the results of the oral part of the survey show, the variant перемёр is also used. This variant, not mentioned in the sources, is used by 19.4\%, and 22.6\% misread the sentence and gave no valid answer.
4 Reported usage 54.7\%, reported non-usage 40.6\%, actual usage 61.3\%.
5 The masculine form was listed in the dictionary.
6 Actual usage 38.7\%.
7 The masculine form was listed in the dictionary.
8 Actual usage 0\%.
9 Reported usage 90.6\%, reported non-usage 7.6\%, actual usage 100\%.
10 Reported usage 15.0\%, reported non-usage 83.0\%, actual usage 16.1\%.
11 Actual usage 80.6\%.
12 Reported usage 15.1\%, reported non-usage 80.2\%. The unprefixed скобли́ть was included in the reported usage survey (result: 86.8\%). It was also included without prefix in Voroncova (1956), which also showed prevalence for end stress: скобли́т 32.6\% скобли́ть 67.4\%.
13 Reported usage 17.0\%, reported non-usage 79.3\%.
14 Reported usage 49.1\%, reported non-usage 46.2\%.
15 Reported usage 43.4\%, reported non-usage 52.9\%.
16 Reported usage 8.4\%, reported non-usage 85.8\%.
17 This verb was not included in this or other surveys without prefix. With the prefix по- it was included both in the present investigation and in Voroncova (1956). While it cannot be assumed that the assessment and usage of the unprefixed verbs is the same as for the prefixed, the results for посели́ть could be an indication that the current implicit norm is stem stress for both the prefixed and unprefixed verb. Cf. посели́ть reported usage 9.4\%, actual usage 6.5\%; Voroncova (1956) 22.1\%. For посели́ть the reported usage was 88.7\% and actual usage 90.3\%; Voroncova (1956) 77.9\%.
18 стро́нись reported usage 34.9\%, reported non-usage 64.2\%.
19 стро́нись reported usage 79.3\%, reported non-usage 16.1\%.
20 Cf. the notation for the unprefixed verb: хоро́нись norm, хоро́нись labelled ne.
Appendix 18. Comparison of stress notation for variants with low reported and/or actual usage codified as normative in (at least one of) the main sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>обоснуйь</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>устар.</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>перенёсить</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отторочить</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>принюхнуть</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>включить</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>глушить</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>not N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>заморить</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>заслонить</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>затворить</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кровоточить</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>морить</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отключить</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>переключить</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>поместиться</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>поселиться</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>приготовить</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>шевелиться</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>шевелить</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>нормировать</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>дочерпать</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>подомовничать</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>зайдёвывать</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>заржаветь</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>булькиннуться</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>базовьёсть</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>базовьёсть</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>дольило</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>залить</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>нёдло</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>нёдало</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>наглядь</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отпёрло</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отпила</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>перелёк</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>перёлока</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>нёдлало</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>перенёлло</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пёбыло</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пёблило</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>припёблило</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>припёблило</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>воспрепятствовал</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Н</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>заперся</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>начался</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>обидался</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>устаревающее</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>родился</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Actual usage 0.0 %.

do osnuó = norm.

do osnuó = norm.

Reported usage 15.1 %, reported non-usage 81.1 %.

пеперечить = norm.

The two different stress variants are both normative and listed as separate entries.

Reported usage 15.0 %, reported non-usage 83.0 %, actual usage 16.1 %.

Reported usage 28.3 %, reported non-usage 65.1 %.

Reported usage 27.4 %, reported non-usage 66.0 %, actual usage 6.5 %; Kolesov (1964) 43.2 %.

Reported usage 19.9 %, reported non-usage 78.3 %, actual usage 0.0 %; Kolesov (1964) 15.1 %.

glu#ini# = norm. Cf. не рек. in OS.

glu#ini# = norm. Cf. не рек. in OS.

Actual usage 12.9 %.

Reported usage 26.5 %, reported non-usage 72.7 %; Pirogova (1967) 46.7 %.

заслонiт = norm.

Reported usage 15.1 %, reported non-usage 83.1 %.

Reported usage 25.6 %, reported non-usage 67.0 %.

Reported usage 19.8 %, reported non-usage 75.5 %, actual usage 9.7 %. Pirogova has 90.7 % for the other stress variant мóрить, thus corroborating the results of the present survey.

Reported usage 9.4 %, reported non-usage 84.9 %, actual usage 3.2 %.

Reported usage 15.1 %, reported non-usage 78.3 %.

Reported usage 18.8 %, reported non-usage 79.3 %, actual usage 16.1 %; Kolesov (1964) 23.9 %.

Reported usage 9.4 %, reported non-usage 86.7 %, actual usage 6.5 %; Voroncova (1956) 22.1 %.

Reported usage 10.3 %, reported non-usage 86.8 %.

Actual usage 29.0 %.

Reported usage 62.3 % (ше велит 66.1 %), reported non-usage 35.9 %, actual usage 29.0 %; Voroncova (1956) 66.2 %.

Reported usage 29.3 %, reported non-usage 69.0 %; Gorbachevi (1974) 22.0 %.

The two different stress variants are both normative and listed as separate entries.

Reported usage 21.7 %, reported non-usage 76.4 %.

Reported usage 11.3 %, reported non-usage 85.9 %.


Reported usage 13.2 %, reported non-usage 84.9 %.

The two different stress variants are both normative and listed as separate entries.

Reported usage 15.0 %, reported non-usage 83.1 %, actual usage 0.0 %.

заржавéть = norm.

The two different stress variants are both normative and listed as separate entries.

Reported usage 24.5 %, reported non-usage 71.7 %.

булýtïнъиться = norm. Cf. доп. in OS.

булýtïнъться = norm. Cf. доп. in OS.

Reported usage 38.7 %, reported non-usage 58.5 %, actual usage 6.5 %; Gorbachevi (1974) 21.1 %; Kolesov (1964) 35.6 % (the infinitive form was investigated in these studies).

Reported usage 36.8 %, reported non-usage 59.5 %, actual usage 6.5 %; Kolesov (1964) 29.1 %.

Reported usage 3.7 %, reported non-usage 89.6 %.

doliló = norm.

doliló = norm.

Reported usage 24.6 %, reported non-usage 67.9 %.

залилó = norm.

Reported usage 7.6 %, reported non-usage 82.1 %, actual usage 0.0 %; Kolesov (1964) 23.1 %.

илiló = norm.

Reported usage 12.2 %, reported non-usage 85.9 %, actual usage 0.0 %; Ukhia (1994) 0.0 %.

ne далó = norm and не дàло is labelled и.
70 Reported usage 26.4 %, reported non-usage 70.8 %.
71 Reported usage 19.8 %, reported non-usage 77.3 %.
72 Reported usage 24.5 %, reported non-usage 71.7 %; Kolesov (1964) 11.1 %; Gorbačevič (1974) 15.4 %.
73 оптим = norm.
74 Reported usage 15.2 %, reported non-usage 79.3 %, actual usage 16.1 %; Ukiah (1994) 19.0 %.
75 Reported usage 51.9 %, reported non-usage 45.2 %, actual usage 29.0 %; Ukiah (1994) 14.0 %.
76 Reported usage 5.6 %, reported non-usage 93.4 %, actual usage 0.0 %; Ukiah (1994) 5.0 %.
77 перемеш = norm.
78 Reported usage 12.3 %, reported non-usage 82.1 %.
79 Reported usage 27.4 %, reported non-usage 68.9 %; Ukiah (1994) 33.0 %.
80 Reported usage 26.5 %, reported non-usage 68.0 %, actual usage 38.7 %.
81 Reported usage 26.4 %, reported non-usage 69.8 %.
82 Reported usage 22.7 %, reported non-usage 70.8 %.
83 Reported usage 8.5 %, reported non-usage 87.7 %.
84 Reported usage 24.6 %, reported non-usage 71.6 %, actual usage 9.7 %; Kolesov (1964) 37.4 %; Ukiah (1994) 5.0 %.
85 заперся = не pec. Cf. the label не рек. in OS.
86 Reported usage 34.0 %, reported non-usage 57.6 %, actual usage 16.1 %; Kolesov (1964) 58.2 %; Ukiah (1994) 19.0 %.
87 Reported usage 21.7 %, reported non-usage 75.5 %, actual usage 16.1 %; Kolesov (1964) 21.2 %.
88 обилья = norm.
89 обилья = norm.
90 Reported usage 10.4 %, reported non-usage 84.0 %, actual usage 3.2 %; Kolesov (1964) 10.1 %; Ukiah (1994) 0.0 %.
91 родился = norm in both ipf and pf aspect.
Appendix 19. Comparison of stress notation for variants with high reported and/or actual usage codified as non-normative in (at least one of) the main sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>обосну́ть 92</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>памя́тует 93</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>простореч.</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>овседо́мить 94</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>не рек.</td>
<td>простореч.</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>не</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>оторо́чь 95</td>
<td>не</td>
<td>не</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>не рек.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>доп.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>перепереть 96</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>доп.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>зарка́вь 97</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>доп.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>заклинить 98</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>включа́ть 99</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>неправ.</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>разг.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>глушить 101</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>не рек.</td>
<td>простореч.</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>замёртвить 102</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>не рек.</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>не</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кровоточить 103</td>
<td>не</td>
<td>не</td>
<td>и (разг.)</td>
<td>неправ.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>доп.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>мёртвить 105</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>не рек.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>не</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отклю́чить 106</td>
<td>не</td>
<td>не</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>неправ.</td>
<td>простореч.</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>не</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>перемы́рить 107</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>поспя́ть 108</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>и (разг.)</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>разг.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>помё́ститься 109</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и (разг.)</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>не</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>шевелить 110</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>доп.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ло́черять 111</td>
<td>не</td>
<td>не</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>не рек.</td>
<td>простореч.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>разг.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>чёрпа́ть 112</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>не рек.</td>
<td>простореч.</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>не</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>разг.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>бáловаться 113</td>
<td>не</td>
<td>не</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>не рек.</td>
<td>простореч.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>разг.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>взя́ло 115</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>не рек.</td>
<td>простореч.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>не</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>набра́ло 116</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>не рек.</td>
<td>простореч.</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>не</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>па́лил 117</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>доп.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>не дала́ 118</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>доп.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>обий́л 119</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>и (разг.)</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>разг.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>оживи́ 120</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>не рек.</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>разг.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отда́л 121</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и (разг.)</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>и (разг.)</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>доп.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>переда́л 122</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>доп.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пережил 124</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>(разг.)</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(разг.)</td>
<td>и</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>перемер 125</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>допили́ 126</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>доп.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>отпи́л 127</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>переня́л 128</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и (разг.)</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и (разг.)</td>
<td>разг.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>побь́лы 129</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и (разг.)</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и (разг.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>подня́ли 130</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>и (разг.)</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>доп.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>про́бли 131</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>и (разг.)</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>доп.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>прода́ла 132</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и (разг.)</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и (разг.)</td>
<td>доп.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>продад́ли 133</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и (разг.)</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и (разг.)</td>
<td>доп.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>прожи́ла 134</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и (разг.)</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и (разг.)</td>
<td>доп.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>распро́дадли 135</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>доп.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>нáчался 136</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>неправ.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>не</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>завéрся 137</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>не рек.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>доп.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>обийшься 138</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>родился 139</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>дождáлся 140</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>доп.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>напился 141</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>доп.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>обиль́ся 142</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>доп.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>подня́лся 143</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>доп.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>рыв́лся 144</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>доп.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>собрался 145</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>not N</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>доп.</td>
<td>разг.</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>доп.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reported usage 90.6 %, reported non-usage 7.6 %, actual usage 100.0 %.

Reported usage 58.5 %, reported non-usage 38.7 %.

Reported usage 88.7 %, reported non-usage 10.4 %, actual usage 90.3 % (осведомился was the form checked); Kolesov (1964) 59.2 %.

Actual usage 80.6 %.

Reported usage 85.9 %, reported non-usage 13.3 %.

Reported usage 88.7 %, reported non-usage 6.6 %, actual usage 100.0 % (the preterite form was included in the oral part of the survey).

Reported usage 85.9 %, reported non-usage 13.3 %, actual usage 90.3 %; Kolesov (1964) 61.5 %.

Actual usage 80.6 %.

Reported usage 85.9 %, reported non-usage 6.6 %, actual usage 100.0 %.

Reported usage 93.4 %, reported non-usage 5.6 %, actual usage 100.0 % (the preterite form was included in the oral part of the survey).

Reported usage 85.8 %, reported non-usage 11.3 %, actual usage 90.3 %; Kolesov (1964) 85.9 %; Pirogova (1967) 92.0 %.

Reported usage 92.5 %, reported non-usage 2.8 %, actual usage 94.3 %; Kolesov (1964) 91.2 %; RJaSO (1963) 84.6 %; Gorbačević (1974) 84.6 %.

Actual usage 89.0 %; Ukiah (1994) 80.0 %.

е́ дalo is also normative.

Reported usage 59.5 %, reported non-usage 32.1 %, actual usage 35.5 %; Ukiah (1994) 14.0 %.

Reported usage 58.5 %, reported non-usage 39.6 %, actual usage 58.1 %; Ukiah (1994) 19.0 %.

Reported usage 78.3 %, reported non-usage 17.0 %, actual usage 64.5/58.1 %; Gorbačević (1974) 77.7/77.1/67.1/60.9 %; Ukiah (1994) 33.0 %; Pirogova (1967) 76.0 %.

Actual usage 83.9 % (checked in one context, in one context normative, in another not; the distinction between contexts not applied in reality); Ukiah (1994) 81.0 %.

Reported usage 68.9 %, reported non-usage 28.3 %, actual usage 71.0 %; Ukiah (1994) 86.0 %.

Reported usage 68.0 %, reported non-usage 29.2 %, actual usage 58.1 % (перемёр 19.4 %, invalid replies 22.6 %); Ukiah (1994) 95.0 %.

Reported usage 97.2 %, reported non-usage 1.9 %; Ukiah (1994) 79.0 %.

Reported usage 94.3 %, reported non-usage 2.8 %; Kolesov (1964) 91.2 %; RJaSO (1963) 84.6 %; Gorbačević (1974) 84.6 %.

Reported usage 88.8 %, reported non-usage 9.5 %.

Reported usage 73.7 %, reported non-usage 23.6 %; Ukiah (1994) 62.0 %.

Reported usage 72.6 %, reported non-usage 20.8 %, actual usage 51.6 %.

Reported usage 65.1 %, reported non-usage 33.0 %, actual usage 32.3 %; Pirogova (1967) 38.7 %.

Reported usage 70.8 %, reported non-usage 24.6 %, actual usage 51.6 %; Pirogova (1967) 45.3 %.

Reported usage 74.5 %, reported non-usage 24.5 %, actual usage 22.6 %; Pirogova (1967) 45.3 %.

Reported usage 79.3 %, reported non-usage 18.9 %, actual usage 41.9/48.4 %; Gorbačević (1974) 46.1 %; Pirogova (1967) 50.7 %; Ukiah (1994) 24.0 %.
135 Reported usage 65.2 %, reported non-usage 33.1 %, actual usage 61.3 %; Pirogova (1967) 60.0 %; Ukiah
(1994) 48.0 %.
136 Reported usage 54.7 %, reported non-usage 40.6 %, actual usage 61.3 %.
137 Reported usage 56.6 %, reported non-usage 39.6 %, actual usage 80.6 %; Kolesov (1964) 26.8 %; Ukiah
(1994) 67.0 %.
138 Actual usage 61.3 %; Kolesov (1964) 56.8 %; Ukiah (1994) 95.0 %.
139 Reported usage 85.9 %, reported non-usage 11.4 %, actual usage 61.3 %; Kolesov (1964) 68.5 %; RJaSO
(1963) 80.0 %.
140 Both forms are given as normative in this form: оби́лсй (not оби́лсй и оби́лся).
141 оби́лсй = устаревающее.
142 Reported usage 93.5 %, reported non-usage 3.7 %, actual usage 93.5 %; Kolesov (1964) 93.9 %; Ukiah
(1994) 100.0 %.
143 Reported usage 51.9 %, reported non-usage 43.4 %, actual usage 32.3 %; RJaSO (1963) 54.1 %; Kolesov
(1964) 57.0 %; Ukiah (1994) 40.0 %.
144 Reported usage 53.8 %, reported non-usage 43.4 %, actual usage 35.5 %; Kolesov (1964) 54.9 %; RJaSO
(1963) 48.1 %; Ukiah (1994) 0.0 %.
145 Reported usage 69.8 %, reported non-usage 27.3 %.
146 Reported usage 61.4/53.8 %, reported non-usage 35.9/41.5 %, actual usage 16.1/19.4 %; Kolesov (1964)
13.8 %; Ukiah (1994) 5.0 %; RJaSO (1963) 18.8 %.
147 Reported usage 64.2 %, reported non-usage 33.9 %; Ukiah (1994) 5 %.
148 Reported usage 50.9 %, reported non-usage 45.3 %, actual usage 22.6 %; Kolesov (1964) 42.6 %; RJaSO
(1963) 34.1 %.
8. Леннарт Лённгрен (Lennart Lönngren): Употребление краткой формы страдательного причастия прошедшего времени в современном русском языке. (With a Summary in English: The Use of the Short Form of the Past Passive Participle in Modern Russian.) 1970.
19. Леннарт Лённгрен (Lennart Lönngren): Русские деривационные суффиксы. (With a Summary in English: Russian Derivational Suffixes.) 1978


34. Тамара Лёнгрен (Tamara Lönngren): Лексика русских старообрядческих говоров (на материале, собранном в Латгале и на Житомирщине). (With a Summary in English: The Lexicon of Russian Old-Believers [based on Material from Latgale and the Žitomir Area].) 1994.


