# On the Relations Between Russian Desinences and Stress Patterns

Ronald F. Feldstein, Indiana University

## I. Introduction.

This paper is an attempt to explore the interrelationship between the set of segmental phonological desinences found in Russian nominal paradigms and the accentual patterns which can occur for the nouns in question. Simply put, not all declensional sets can co-occur with all accentual paradigms. Nevertheless, very little work has been done on establishing the nature of these relationships and delving into the matter of why they occur as they do.

One of the few attempts to relate Russian desinences to their accentual pattern can be found in Jakobson (1957). This well-known and important paper pointed out that Russian tends to have a pure stress opposition between identical segmental forms in the genitive singular vs. the nominative plural (e.g. *selá* vs. *sëla*, *dušĭ* vs. *dúšu*, and the new productive type *góroda* vs. *gorodá*). Jakobson's paper contrasts this accentual opposition to the opposition of vocalic desinence vs. zero desinence in the nominative singular vs. the genitive plural, and the author correlates this with varying types of quantifier oppositions. However, he does not direct any particular attention to the fact that the pure stress oppositions all involve either high or low vowels, as illustrated above. Thus, Jakobson took a semantic opposition (quantification) as his starting point, and observed how the various oppositions of this grammatical meaning are implemented phonologically.

In a previous paper (Feldstein 1987), I attempted to demonstrate another type of segmental/prosodic interrelation, as applied to the Russian verb, where one finds that the segmental length of the surface verbal stem is directly correlated to the number of accentual oppositions which can occur. In fact, it is an inverse relation, where the longer segmental stems tolerate the fewest accentual oppositions, yet the smallest stems have the greatest accentual variation. The full nature of all of the segmental/prosodic interdependencies appears to be much greater than has been described heretofore. The present paper represents an attempt to demonstrate a number of further instances in which the accentual patterns appear to be a function of the desinential phonology. Since only a very small number of the full set of possible mobile stress patterns can actually occur, I will try to demonstrate that the patterns that actually do occur are, in large measure, a function of the segmental desinences that are used.



## II. Basic types of Russian accentual mobility.

Now let us proceed to define the terms paradigm and subparadigm, as they shall be understood in the remainder of this paper. While the concept of accentual paradigm simply refers to the full set of grammatical forms of an inflected lexeme, such as a noun, verb, or adjective, the notion of subparadigm can be more elusive. It refers to two halves of a full paradigm, such as the singular and plural number subparadigms of the noun. It presupposes that meaningful recurring patterns can be identified below the level of the full paradigm and that these patterns can be more economically described or explained if smaller accentual units are assumed to exist. One problem is that not every linguist recognizes the exact same split into two subparadigms. In any case, I will follow the most generally recognized subparadigms of singular and plural for the noun, attributive and predicative for the adjectival, and past and non-past for the indicative mood of the verb.

In terms of its accentual subparadigms, the Russian noun can be said to have two polar types of stress mobility--a type where the mobility occurs within the singular or plural subparadigm and a type in which the subparadigm itself has no mobility, but is opposed to the stress of the other subparadigm.[1] The first type can be termed intra-subparadigmatic, or case mobility, since it serves to oppose some cases to others within a subparadigm. The singular subparadigms of such Russian words as *golova* and *sneg*, and the plural of *golova*, can illustrate this situation, as follows:

**Table 1. Case mobility.**

| | Sing. | Sing. | Plur. |
|---|---|---|---|
| N | golová | snég | gólovy |
| A | gólovu | snég | gólovy |
| G | golový | snéga | golóv ({golov-Ø}) |
| L | golové | snége | golováx |
| D | golové | snégu | golovám |
| I | golovój | snégom | golovámi |
| L-2 | -------- | snegú | |

Note that there are only three basic patterns of case mobility. In the singular, the *a*-noun opposes the initially stressed accusative to end-stress in the other cases, and the Ø-noun opposes end-stress in the second locative to initial stress in the other cases. The plural, regardless of stem type, opposes the initial stress of the direct cases (i.e. the syncretic nominative and accusative) to end-stress in all the other forms (i.e. the oblique cases).

Since the other type of mobility opposes the stress of the singular and plural subparadigms, it can be referred to as inter-subparadigmatic, or number mobility. There are two basic types of this mobility, depending on whether the singular or the plural is end-stressed. If the singular has end-stress throughout, number mobility is manifested by predesinential (stem-final) stress in the plural, a type which occurs in *o*-nouns[2] and *a*-nouns, as follows:

**Table 2a. Number mobility with singular end-stress.**

| | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| N | veretenó | veretëna | kolbasá | kolbásy |
| A | veretenó | veretëna | kolbasú | kolbásy |
| G | veretená | veretën | kolbasý | kolbás |
| L | veretené | veretënax | kolbasé | kolbásax |
| D | veretenú | veretënam | kolbasé | kolbásam |
| I | veretenóm | veretënami | kolbasój | kolbásami |



However, if the plural has end-stress throughout, number mobility is realized by means of initial stress in the singular, a type which occurs in both *o*-nouns and Ø-nouns, as follows:

**Table 2b. Number mobility with singular stem-stress.**

| | Sing. | Plur. | Sing. | Plur. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| N | zérkalo | zerkalá | górod | gorodá |
| A | zérkalo | zerkalá | górod | gorodá |
| G | zérkala | zerkál ({zerkal-Ø}) | góroda | gorodóv |
| L | zérkale | zerkaláx | górode | gorodáx |
| D | zérkalu | zerkalám | górode | gorodám |
| I | zérkalom | zerkalámi | górodom | gorodámi |

The above cited forms of tables 1-2b make it clear that case mobility is not usual for (neuter) *o*-nouns, while it is the *o*-noun which manifests both types of number mobility, in contrast to the *a*-nouns and Ø-nouns, which generally[3] have only one type each (i.e. end-stressed singular vs. stem-stressed plural for *a*-nouns, but stem-stressed singular vs. end-stressed plural for Ø-nouns). I.e., if case mobility and the two types of number mobility are considered to total three, each declension class generally uses two of the three.[4]

**III. Desinences in an accentually mobile subparadigm.**

Several years ago, in an unpublished paper (Feldstein 1990) I pointed out that if all of the accentual subparadigms of Russian are considered, there is a strict correlation between accentual mobility and desinential features, as follows:

1. Firstly, each accentual subparadigm--whether the singular or plural of nouns, the past or non-past of verbs, or the predicative adjective--opposes a single segmental shape with one accentual characteristic to all of the other forms which possess another accentual property. Thus, the singular accentual subparadigm of *vodá* opposes the stem stress of the accusative (*vódu*) to the end-stress of all the other singular forms (*vodá*, *vodý*, *vodé*, *vodój*); the plural of *golová* opposes the syncretic nom./acc. form (*gólovy*) to all other plural forms; the past tense of *žit'* opposes the feminine singular (*žilá*) to all other past forms, and the

present tense of *prosit'* opposes the first person singular (*prošú*) to other forms of the present tense subparadigm. In fact, we can say that every accentual subparadigm of Russian contains precisely either zero or one accentual form which differs from others of the set (where zero deviation is found in the case of constant stress in the subparadigm). Since subparadigms can typically contain four, six, or more different segmental representations, the fact that only zero or one may deviate accentually appears to be an interesting fact, since the number could have been two, three, or four out of six, but is not. In fact, one could say that the property of zero or one deviating forms per subparadigm defines the essence of Russian stress mobility.[5] These facts can be summarized as follows:

**Table 3. Mobile stress with one deviating form in the subparadigm.**

| Deviating Form | Other forms | Subparadigm |
|---|---|---|
| gólovu | golová, golový, golové, golovój | a-noun sing. |
| gólovy | golóv, golováx, golovám, golovámi | a-noun plur. |
| snegú | sneg, snéga, snége, snégu, snégom | Ø-noun sing. |
| vólki | volkóv, volkáx, volkám, volkámi | Ø-noun plural |
| grjazí | grjaz', grjázi, grjáz'ju | Ø-noun sing. (fem.) |
| prošú | prósiš', prósit, prósim, prósite, prósjat | non-past indicative |
| žilá | žíl, žílo, žíli | past indicative |
| molodá | mólod, mólodo, mólody | predicative adj. |

The data lead me to believe that the consistent pattern of one accentual standout per subparadigm is not accidental, but part of the logic of the system. Furthermore, there is a direct phonological link between the desinences and the stress pattern, such that each morphological subset seems to be correlated with the use of specific phonological features for its accentually isolated form. If one views at the phonological manifestation of the desinence in the isolated accentual form as a redundant grammatical signal, there appear to be two major splits that can be identified, as follows:



1. All accentually isolated noun forms have high-vowel desinences (as opposed to verbs and adjectives, which may have high or low desinences--mid vowels are totally excluded from the class of accentually isolated desinences).

2. Isolated accentual forms found in subparadigms which are inflected for gender invariably use the low stressed vowel (*žilá*, *molodá*), as opposed to nouns and conjugated verb forms which use high vowels.

In the verb, the high vowel is invariably stressed, but in the noun it can be either stressed or unstressed, so we can conclude that it is unmarked for stress. Within the noun, the features of stress and rounding pinpoint the various subcategories: plural isolated accentual forms are unstressed and unrounded (*gólovy*); in the singular, the *a*-noun form is unstressed but rounded (*gólovu*), while the Ø-noun forms are always stressed (*snegú*, *grjazí*). This hierarchy can be depicted as follows:

**Table 4. Hierarchy of desinential vowels used as isolated accentual forms.**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Primary Division:** | |
| All Nouns: +high | All Verbs/Adj.: +stressed |
| **Secondary Division:** | |
| Direct case: -stress (gólovu, gólovy) | Non-conjugated: +low (žilá, molodá) |
| Oblique case: +stress (sadú, grjazí) | Conjugated: +high (prošú) |

Of course, a mere statement about the existence of these patterns does not necessarily prove that they are a productive part of the Russian grammatical system. One could argue that they are just accidental remnants of an inherited system with no systematic importance or relevance to the synchronic system of Russian. However, I will attempt to show that some important aspects of this pattern have provided a

productive model for Russian stress and morphology. In the system of the Russian noun, we have seen that the illustrated mobile accentual types have a single deviating form in each subparadigm, and that form is characterized by a high vowel desinence. It can be stressed or unstressed, and rounded or unrounded, depending upon the declension class and whether the subparadigm is that of singular or plural. However, the common thread of all such isolated forms of the Russian noun is their use of a high desinential vowel.

In answer to the question of whether the use of such high vowel desinences is just historical accident,[6] it can be argued that even such recent additions to the Russian nominal paradigm, such as the second locative, conform to the pattern. Thus, nouns such as *sad*, *sneg*, *pol* possess mobile accentual paradigms in the singular which do not correspond to the original historical situation, in the sense that they have the reflex of an original *o*-stem locative--known as locative-1 and ending in *-e*, alongside the reflex of an original *u*-stem locative--known as locative-2, which ends in *-ú*. Thus, even such novel, hybrid subparadigms show exactly the same structure as do all of the other nominal mobile subparadigms, i.e. a single deviating form which ends in a high vowel desinence (e.g. *sadú*, *snegú*, *polú*). Therefore, we can conclude that historically recent forms were integrated into a new system, together with the more ancient forms. In addition, it should be noted that the very high vowel status of desinences in accentually deviating forms is often a recent fact, derived from an older non-high vowel desinence. For example, the *a*-noun accusative singular (e.g. *gólovu*) is assumed to have had a Late Common Slavic desinential vowel that was a nasal mid vowel (*ǫ*). Therefore, if this paper's contention is correct that a systematic pattern of high vowel desinences exists within the isolated accentual forms of Russian nominal subparadigms, it certainly is not a direct continuation of the Late Common Slavic situation.

Within the verbal present tense (non-past), the accentually deviating high vowel is also derived from the non-high nasal vowel *ǫ*. Moreover, the pattern of accentual mobility of verbs such as *prosít'* is itself felt to be secondary, derived from an originally oxytonic stress type. According to the accentological schools of both Stang and Dybo (Dybo 1962:10)), it is today's end-stressed non-past (e.g. *živú*, *živëš'*, etc.) which was originally mobile in Common Slavic, rather than the present-day



mobile pattern *prošú*, *prósiš'*. Therefore, in spite of the fact that the desinential vowel of *prošú* comes from a non-high vowel, and that the stress pattern itself was originally not even mobile, in today's Russian we have a non-past subparadigm which is both mobile and makes use of a accentually deviating form with a high vowel. In other words, this class of words was originally not part of today's pattern, with its single isolated accentual form in the present-tense and its use of the high-vowel for this form.

## IV. Russian's new productive stress mobility

Perhaps the most interesting issue to explore is that of how the new and most productive accentual mobility of the Russian noun behaves in terms of desinential vowels.

As noted above, the older type, which we have referred to as case mobility, sets off a single form within the subparadigm by means of a deviating stress and the ubiquitous presence of a high vowel. Since the nominal subparadigms consist of six or seven case forms within a single number, the morphophonemic stress alternation can be said to set off one case form against the others (or, in the instance of the syncretism of nominative and accusative, one syncretic direct case form, opposed to the oblique cases).

The newer type of accentual mobility, which we have termed number mobility, presents immobility within each of the two given subparadigms, but manifests an accentual opposition between the two subparadigms in question. Since the nominal subparadigms are those of number, this type of accentual mobility morphophonemically opposes the singular and plural, and has proven to be very productive in Russian.

Let us examine the grammatical inventory of Russian nouns which can have number mobility. There are two basic types of paradigms--a stem-stressed singular opposed to an end-stressed plural and the opposite--an end-stressed singular opposed to a stem-stressed plural.[7] For simplicity, I will refer to the type with stem-stressed singular and end-stressed plural as STEM-END and the opposite type with end-stressed singular and stem-stressed plural as END-STEM. It is important to realize that the major morphological classes of nouns are very different in terms of whether they admit both STEM-END and END-STEM varieties of mobility or only one of the two. The three main

declension classes of Russian nouns--which I refer to by their nominative singular ending as Ø- (zero), *a*-, and *o*- nouns (roughly corresponding to the traditional labels masculine, feminine, and neuter), have the following distribution of number mobility types:

**Table 5. Distribution of number mobility types.**

A. Zero-nouns:

| | STEM-END (Productive with nom. plural in *-a*) | | END-STEM (Found with the genitive plural in -Ø) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| NA | górod | gorodá | zubók | zúbki |
| G | góroda | gorodóv | zubká | zúbok (Zero ending!) |
| L | górode | gorodáx | zubké | zúbkax |
| D | górodu | gorodám | zubkú | zúbkam |
| I | górodom | gorodámi | zubkóm | zúbkami |

B. a-nouns:

| STEM-END | | END-STEM | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | N | kolbasá | kolbásy |
| (Does not exist.)[8] | A | kolbasú | kolbásy |
| | G | kolbasý | kolbás |
| | L | kolbasé | kolbásax |
| | D | kolbasé | kolbásam |
| | I | kolbasój | kolbásami |

C. o-nouns

| | STEM-END | | END-STEM | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| NA | slóvo | slová | veretenó | veretëna |
| G | slóva | slóv | veretená | veretën |
| L | slóve | slováx | veretené | veretënax |
| D | slóvu | slovám | veretenú | veretënam |
| I | slóvom | slovámi | veretenóm | veretënami |

Generally speaking, this pattern means that Ø- and *a*-nouns can each have only one of the two possible number mobility accentual paradigms (except for a tiny class of Ø-nouns, exemplified in the table by zubók), while the *o*-stems can actually have both types. In the case of Ø-nouns, two observations must be made about the nouns listed:

1. Nouns with nom. plural in *-ý*, rather than *-á* are often listed as belonging to the STEM-END number mobility type, such as *sad-sadý*, *voz-vozý*, *xod-xodý*, etc. However, as noted by Zaliznjak (1967:287), the end-stressed second locative singular in *-ú* regularly occurs in the singular subparadigm of such nouns; thus, they could be considerely more accurately as MOBILE-END. Therefore, I conclude that virtually none of these usually cited nouns really has a pure number mobility, since the singular itself is not uniformly stem-stressed, due to such forms as *na vozú*, *na xodú*, *v sadú*, etc. On the other hand, cases of pure number mobility for Ø-nouns are truly found when the nominative plural uses the *-á* ending, where the second locative in *-ú* generally does not occur (e.g. *gorod*, *professor*, *učitel'*). Therefore, the use of pure STEM-END number mobility for the Ø-noun virtually always implies the use of the nom. plural *-á* ending.

2. Ø-nouns with the number mobility pattern END-STEM also share a very exceptional morphological property: they have the nom. sing. zero-ending, yet they also have a zero-ending in the genitive plural, rather than the typical mid-vowel ending *-ov/-ej*. This includes a group of diminutives in *-ok*, e.g. *zubók*, *glazók*, *sapožók*, *rožók*. Virtually all other so-called (as in Fedjanina 1982:70) END-STEM Ø-nouns use a jot stem extension in the plural, e.g. *líst/líst'ja*.[9] There is the single exception of the word *kazák*, which for many speakers has constant end-stress, but which has a variant plural with stem-stress, making END-STEM stress possible.

It is significant that both Ø-noun types which have pure number mobility also have a morphologically exceptional desinence, either in the nominative or genitive plural.[10] In turn, these two facts lead to my hypothesis that the nominative and genitive plural endings can provide a solution to the distribution of Russian number mobility. Firstly, as noted, morphologically identical singular subparadigms may have number mobility with both stem and end-stress (such as *gorod* and *zubok*), yet certain plural subparadigms can be linked to specific accentual patterns. Therefore, the variation to be explained is clearly in the plural, not the singular. However, if the plural desinences are involved, the oblique plural desinences of the locative, dative, and instrumental cases cannot be

the source of the variation, since they are identical for all classes of nouns. In addition, the accusative is not an independent case in the plural, since it always coincides in form with either the nominative or genitive. In fact, what I have just noted about the Ø-noun distribution of number mobility is fully in accord with the more general observation that a noun's nominative and genitive plural endings appear to be directly correlated with the question of whether it can have both types of number mobility or only one. Based on the preceding chart of number mobility types, the following correlation can be suggested for regular Ø-, *a*-, and *o*-nouns:

**Table 6. Relation of plural segmental desinences and accentual paradigms.**

| Noun Class | Nom. Pl. | Gen. Pl. | Number Mobility Types |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ø-nouns | Low (-a) | Mid (-ov/-ej) | STEM-END (górod-gorodá) |
| a-nouns | High (-i) | Zero | END-STEM (kolbasá-kolbásy) |
| o-nouns | Low (-a) | Zero | STEM-END (slóvo-slová) **and** END-STEM (veretenó-veretëna) |

Although *a*-nouns can occur with a mid-vowel genitive plural ending, instead of zero (e.g. *júnošej, mežéj*), this rather exceptional *a*-noun ending never is found in paradigms which have number mobility. Number mobility of *a*-nouns is, therefore, restricted to the END-STEM variety, exemplified by *kolbasá-kolbásy*. It is only in the *o*-noun class (neuter) that we find a regular occurrence of both types of number mobility. In fact, case mobility within the *o*-noun subparadigm is virtually non-existent, and can only be found when the nominative plural uses an anomalous high vowel ending (e.g. *úši-ušéj, óči-očéj*); the two or three instances of neuter plural mobility with the use of the nom. plur. *-a* ending listed in the handbooks (*tavro, kryl'co*) are felt to be artificial and unusable by native speakers.[11]

We can now see the general pattern, according to which the STEM-END pattern of number mobility implies the use of the nominative plural *-a* ending, while the END-STEM pattern implies the use of the



genitive plural zero ending. If the full inventory of post-stem desinential vowels of the plural is considered, the pattern becomes clearer. As noted, the oblique plurals all have desinences in *-a*. If we examine the *o*-noun in more detail, since it is the type which most favors the occurrence of number mobility, we see that the nominative plural has the *-a* desinence, the genitive has the zero, and the oblique cases all have the vowel *-a* again. In other words, the only occurring plural desinential vowel for this type is *a*. This is indicated in the following table, along with the similar vowel inventory of the other nouns under discussion:

**Table 7. Plural cases desinences of the various accentual types.**

| | o-noun (slovo vereteno) | zero-noun (gorod) | zero-noun (zubók) | a-noun (kolbasá) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nom. | -a | -a | -i | -i |
| Gen. | -Ø | -o... | -Ø | -Ø |
| LDI | -a... | -a... | -a... | -a... |

The pattern shows us that an inventory of plural desinential vowels limited to *-a* is most conducive to number mobility (*o*-noun), while an *-a*, together with a single other deviating vowel height--mid or high, can occur in another desinence with one of the two types of number mobility. On the other hand, number mobility is generally exluded when all three vowel heights are represented in the inventory of plural desinential vowels. As noted above, a typical instance of this type is a plural subparadigm such as *sadý, sadóv, sadámi*, etc., representing all three vowel heights. As observed earlier, I am claiming that such cases are not true instances of pure number mobility, since the singular subparadigm includes the case mobility of the six regular cases vs. the locative *sadú*, making this an instance of MOB-END, rather than STEM-END, as it is usually treated.

This pattern explains a number of interesting facts of Russian phonology and accentology. The standard language treats number mobility as the more productive type and, consequently, has adopted the innovative use of the nominative plural *-a* desinence for Ø-nouns. However, many Russian dialects extend case mobility within the plural

as the productive type, opposing the direct to the oblique cases. One may ask how this has affected the *o*-noun (neuter) plural, insofar as the nominative plural *-a* ending can be viewed as incompatible with case mobility and compatible only with number mobility. The answer is that the opposite development takes place in the neuter nominative plural in many Russian dialects--the high vowel *-i* is used in place of *-a* and plural case mobility becomes productive, instead of number mobility (e.g. *veretëny-veretenámi* instead of *veretëna-veretënami*).[12]

The ubiquitous presence of the low vowel *a* in cases of number mobility, along with the complete dominance of *a* where both types of number mobility occur, stands in striking contrast to the universal use of the high vowel as the isolated desinential type in the opposite type of accentual mobility (case mobility), which take place within the singular or plural subparadigms. While the desinential vowels of the locative/dative/instrumental plural forms have been levelled to *-a...*, and thus bear no relation to other sorts of variation, this is clearly not the case for the nominative and genitive forms. Insofar as their inventory matches that of the productive oblique in *-a*, the pattern of stress mobility also can conform to the productive pattern of number mobility. However, deviations from the pattern of plural low vowel desinences are correlated with the use of accentual case mobility in place of number mobility, culminating in the absence of number mobility when all three vowel heights are found among the desinential vowels of the plural.

## Notes

1. When mobility occurs within a subparadigm of the Russian noun, it can be paired with another subparadigm that has either mobility, immobile stem-stress, or immobile end-stress. The presence of at least one mobile subparadigm implies an accentually based case opposition within that subparadigm, plus varying degrees of number opposition across the two subparadigms, as follows:

a. number opposition only in the nominative case, in *a*-nouns which are mobile in both singular and plural, e.g. *golová* vs. *gólovy*. Outside of the nominative, all case forms agree as either stem-stress (accusative) or end-stress (oblique, counting gen. plur. *golóv* as morphophonemically of the end-stress type).

b. number opposition only in the direct cases (nom. and acc.), but not in the oblique, in *a*-nouns which pair singular end-stress to plural mobility, e.g. *gubá*, which opposes direct singular *gubá/gubú* to direct plural *gúby*, but has uniform end-stress in both singular and plural oblique.



c. number opposition only in the oblique cases, but not in the direct, in Ø-nouns which pair singular stem-stress to plural mobility, e.g. *volk*, where singular and plural direct cases are all stem-stressed (*vólk, vólki*), but oblique singular oppose their stem-stress to the end-stress of the oblique plural (dative *vólku* vs. *volkám*, etc.).

When neither subparadigm is mobile, yet one of the two subparadigms has stem-stress and the other has end-stress, there is no accentual opposition of case forms, but a full opposition of singular to plural. Therefore, one can say that there is a continuum of the following three types of full paradigms:

1. immobile paradigms, in which both subparadigms agree as either stem-stressed or end-stressed.

2. paradigms with case mobility, in which at least one subparadigm is mobile, as detailed above.

3. paradigms with full number mobility, in which the two subparadigms each have the differing immobile accentual patterns of either stem-stress or end-stress.

2. Names of stem-types (*o*-noun, etc.), are based on the nominative singular desinence, in preference to the more traditional gender designation, since the latter is often inaccurate, e.g. in the case of masculine *a*-nouns. However, even the classes based on the nominative singular are not completely uniform for accentual classification, since the nominative and genitive plural can differ within a given class.

3. With rare morphologically unified exceptions, such as the masculine Ø-noun diminutives in *-ók*, which also take the zero-ending in the genitive plural, e.g. *zubók, sapožók*, etc., discussed in more detail below; see table 5.

4. There are infrequent and special exceptions to this pattern. For example, a single *a*-noun (*djádja*) has a substandard plural with end-stress; several Ø-nouns with uncharacteristic zero endings in the genitive plural have plural predesinential stress (*zubók, glazók, sapožók*); and several *o*-nouns with unusual direct case plurals in *-i*, which have case mobility in the plural (*uxo. oko, plečo*). In fact, this bolsters the main argument of this paper, since each instance shows that it is not the general declension class or gender *per se* which permits a particular stress pattern, but the presence of particular desinences in critical inflectional forms.

5. Note that there are the two exceptions--both suppletive plurals of names for human beings--*ljudi* and *deti*, which have two deviating forms with end-stress (*ljudéj, ljud'mí* and *detéj, det'mí*).

6. This argument was made by an anonymous reviewer of an earlier version of this paper.

7. More precisely, number mobility implies that singular stem-stress is initial, while plural stem-stress is predesinential. Of course, this is only visible in stems which are at least two syllables long. E.g. initial stress in sing. *górod*, as opposed to plur. *gorodá*, and predesinential stress in plur. *veretëna*, as opposed to sing. *veretenó*.

8. Perhaps, except for the substandard plural of 'uncle', *djad'já*.

9. The fact that they contain the *-#j-* suffix only in the plural means that such nouns are not comparable to the other, regular types, for which it is assumed that the stem is identical in both subparadigms. Moreover, if the stress of *líst'ja* is morphophonemically treated as {list-#j-a}, one might set up a special class of constant stress following the singular stem, with regular phonological retraction of the stress -#j- to the preceding syllable. Nevertheless, the surface manifestation of the stress of *list/list'ja* is END-STEM.

10. Or, an instance of unequal singular and plural stems, which negates the potential for a true paradigmatic opposition of accent.

11. A. Zaliznjak--personal communication.

12. Observed in fieldwork I did in 1991 in the villages of Ljutovinovka (Tula oblast') and Pustoša (Eastern Moscow oblast'). See also Bromlej and Bulatova 1972:102-3.

## References

Dybo 1962. "O rekonstrukcii udarenija v praslavjanskom glagole," *Voprosy slavjanskogo jazykoznanija*, vyp. 6, pp. 3-27.

Bromlej, S.V. and L.N. Bulatova 1972. *Očerki morfologii russkix dialektov.* Moscow: Nauka.

Fedjanina, N.A. 1982 *Udarenie v sovremennom russkom jazyke.* Moscow: Russkij jazyk.

Feldstein, Ronald F. 1987 "The Inverse Proportionality of Segmental and Suprasegmental in the Russian Verb," *Slavic and East European Journal*, 31:4, pp. 582-594.

Feldstein 1990 (ms) "Desinential Vowel Features in Slavic Prosodic Alternations"



Jakobson, Roman 1984 "The Relationship Between Genitive and Plural in the Declension of Russian Nouns," *Russian and Slavic Grammar: Studies 1931-1981, ed. by Linda R. Waugh and Morris Halle*, pp. 135-140. Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton.

Zaliznjak, A. A. 1967 *Russkoe imennoe slovoizmenenie.* Moscow: Nauka.

Ronald F. Feldstein
Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures
BH 502
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405

feldstei@indiana.edu