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ABSTRACT

This dissertation proposes a model of adaptation and nativization and variation of borrowed verbs in Russian, Bulgarian and Macedonian. The Model of Adaptation and Nativization and Variation is distinguished from other models of borrowing and nativization in that it provides for the speaker perception and thereby incorporates the speaker usage into a linguistic analysis at the morphological level. This study specifically focuses on the status and position of borrowed verbs not only within the parameters of the norms of the standard languages under study, but also concentrates on what constitutes "my language" within the parameters of speaker perception.

This study begins from the traditional theoretical constructs of structuralism and markedness theory. Thus the feature [+not mine] is introduced within the concept of a borrowing continuum that at once both reflects and encompasses the process of nativization for the speaker. As the feature is proposed it reflects the limits of the scope of Slavic aspect. Hence, if a speaker accepts a complex form of the borrowed verb then the verb is no longer marked for the feature [+not mine]. The borrowed verbs that are marked for the feature are outside the scope of aspect, i.e., they are without formal aspectual distinction and, moreover, are not incorporated into speaker perception of what constitutes "my language".

It is argued that even though prescriptive and normative sources describe the status of borrowed verbs as biaspectral, therefore unassimilated, or as incorporated and therefore assimilated, such sources do not account for the synchronic variation that emerges from data presented in this study.
It is further argued that traditional accounts of borrowed verbs fail to incorporate the factors of borrowing and nativization into their description of borrowed verbs. This study takes as its point of departure an incorporation of these factors into an explanation of the synchronic variation of the status and position of borrowed verbs. Such an integrated approach employs borrowed verbs as a source of linguistic information which in turn has implications for the study of language change.
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INTRODUCTION

0.0 Borrowed Words in the "Center" and the "Margins"\(^1\)

The factors involved in the nativization of borrowed words are often neglected as sources of information regarding the grammatical categories of the borrowing language. Nativization refers to "the adjustments of loanwords to the native structure of the borrowing language" (Hock 1986/91 (2nd ed.):390). Traditionally, studies of borrowing tend to treat only examples of a) assimilated elements (see Gulová 1987) or b) nonassimilated elements (see Gimpelevič 1982), thus limiting consideration of the totality of available data. This project, however, argues that a study of borrowing must also address the linguistic reality: the coexistence of both the nativized elements and the non-nativized elements in all forms of the language, leading to synchronous variation in the spoken as well as literary language (see Labov 1972; Aitchison 1992).\(^2\)

If we accept that languages are systemic (and the fact that we do is reflected in our descriptions of languages), then borrowed elements can enter the language only at the "margins" of the system.\(^3\) However, it may not be the case from the point of view

---

\(^1\)The "center" here may more appropriately be stated as "no longer at the margins". The tradition of distinguishing "center" and "margin" has influenced my choice of terms. I recognize that to define "center" for an individual speaker is difficult and outside the scope of this discussion.

\(^2\)Though the work of Labov and Aitchison regarding borrowing and adaptation is at the phonological level, I propose to extend their theories to the morphological level.

\(^3\)I do not mean to imply that I accept or reject the concepts of Structuralism and markedness relations but simply acknowledge that this perspective has inherent paradoxes when we discuss issues and descriptions attributed to the borrowed verbs which do no:
of speakers that borrowed words are marginal to the language. Yet, it is often the case for grammarians and linguists that borrowed words remain at the margins of the language system. This study shows that, for the native speaker, borrowed lexical items, specifically borrowed verbs, can and do shift their position within the system and, in fact, borrowed words can occupy a central postion within the linguistic repertoire of the speaker. This central position is marked not only by the usage and acceptance of the borrowed word but also by the complete incorporation and assimilation of a borrowing to the native structure of the language by native speakers regardless of the status of the borrowing in prescriptive and normative sources. The margins are generally felt to be a position for non-conforming and exceptional elements of the language, not fully incorporated and regular ones. Therefore, a linguistic explanation and description of borrowed words must account for the fact that nativization and use of these loanwords does not necessarily occur simultaneously for all speakers with the initial borrowing, but takes place over a period of time (see Danesi 1983; Poplack 1983; Holden 1976; Deroy 1956; Robins 1964). Thus, the primary concern of this project is to construct a explanatory model which accounts for the nativization of borrowed verbs and their synchronic variation in three Slavic languages, Russian (RUS), Bulgarian (BLG) and Macedonian (MAC). These three languages were chosen as points of study because the suffix -

4 Throughout the present study I, like Danesi (1983), Deroy (1950), Poplack (1983) et al., distinguish between the adaptation and the assimilation of borrowed words. Assimilation refers to the nativization of the borrowed word. Adaptation refers to a less concise point of time on a "borrowing continuum." There are different degrees of adaptation: lexical coexistence, partial overlapping and partial adaptation. All of these concepts will be subsumed under the term "adaptation" throughout the present work unless specifically noted otherwise (see Danesi 1983; Deroy 1950).

5 I point this out because the West Slavic languages (WSL) (Polish, (POL), Czech (CZ), Slovak (SLK), Lusatian (LUS)), and Ukrainian (UKR) and Belarussian (BEL) all seem "to fit" into a binary system. This will be discussed further in Chapter 4.
point for this study of Slavic aspect primarily because in many instances RUS is the model of Slavic aspect (see Smith 1991; Binnick 1991). Moreover, in RUS there are the fewest morphologically marked verbal distinctions in Slavic. The marked difference in the verbal systems of RUS and specifically two of the South Slavic languages (SSL), BLG, MAC, serves as an interesting background to the adaptation and assimilation of borrowed verbs to the specific languages. The focus of this particular study is the developments in BLG and MAC. These two languages are close in structure but very different in their orientations, both linguistically and socially, (MAC to SBC and BLG to RUS). Therefore, the corresponding differences in the adaptation and assimilation process are of particular interest.

0.1 Parallel Developments: Gender Assignment in Loanwords

Though the primary focus of this study is the status and nativization of borrowings in the verbal systems of three Slavic languages- RUS, BLG, and MAC- the fate of borrowings in the nominal systems illustrates the fundamental concepts under study here. There are fewer grammatical categories in the nominal system compared with the verbal system; the processes of adaptation and nativization of nouns are less complex and may serve as an introduction to similar processes within the verbal systems discussed in this project (see Haugen 1972).

use the suffix -ova- with borrowed verbs.

'Serbo-Croatian (SBC) and Slovenian (SLO) as the other two SSL languages are tangential to the scope of this study. The verbal system of SLO is not as complex as the verbal systems of the other SSL languages and in fact more closely reflects that of. SLO has four tenses which includes a past pluperfect, and in this respect is more complex than RUS (see Lencek 1993;1980). And further SLO within the verbal system distinguishes dual number as well, thus RUS also has fewer morphological verbal distinctions than SLO. I would also note that the productive verbal suffix for borrowed verbs in SLO is -ira-, see Priestley 1987. SBC on the other hand traditionally has been considered to more closely aligned with MAC and BLG regarding the complexity of the verbal system because it too has aorist and imperfect distinctions. However, more recently it has been noted that the aorist and imperfect occur only in specific dialects. These optional past tense forms though continue to be included in the literary standard, see Browne (1993).
Nouns can express the grammatical categories of gender, number, case and animacy; verbs express tense, aspect, mood, person, number, witness, and occasionally gender. The formalization and/or grammaticalization of these nominal and verbal categories varies for each language. Therefore, when a loanword is borrowed (if it is nativized) the process and path of that nativization can provide information about specific grammatical categories of the borrowing language. For instance, in Russian (RUS) the category of gender is formalized;¹ RUS grammatically distinguishes three genders: masculine, feminine and neuter and each is expressed through three basic desinences (see Wade 1992). All RUS nouns inherently are, or have been assigned to, one of the above genders (Townsend 1980; Wade 1992). The neuter gender has commonly been accepted as the "default gender" for RUS gender assignment of borrowings.² Within the neuter gender class there are native nouns which decline and borrowed nouns which do not. The neuter borrowed nouns are further classed as indeclinables, e.g., kino ‘film’. And when viewed along a kind of "borrowing continuum" synchronically and diachronically, these borrowed nouns are adapted phonologically and morphologically to different degrees, e.g., RUS sensacija 'sensation' which has been completely nativized and RUS tatū 'tattoo' which has not. (See examples of indeclinables 1-4.)

---

¹For purposes of this study grammaticalization (and formalization) refers to a partially grammatical lexical word becoming more grammatical, i.e., formalizing more of the grammatical categories.

²Throughout this investigation the term “formalize” refers to the overt and grammatical expression of a specific category or feature.

1) RUS  *metro*  'subway' (NEUT)
2) RUS  *radio*  'radio' (NEUT)
3) RUS  *Ja ne znaju, gde v aši radio. Moe na stole.*
   'I don't know where your radios are. Mine is on the table.'

As indeclinable nouns, the borrowed words do not express number, as illustrated in example 4. The possessive modifier (*v aši*  'your') overtly marks the plural number, and in the second sentence of example 4 the modifier (*moe*  'my') overtly indicates the neuter gender of the noun 'radio.' Only through context, verb forms and modifiers, are number and case identifiable for the indeclinable nouns. In synthetic languages such as RUS, if a noun does not decline, it is marked (Andrews 1986;1993; Gimpelevič 1982). The borrowed indeclinable nouns, thus, are considered distinct from "regular" declinable nouns in the language by virtue of their "nonconformity" to the system. And it is important to note that some nouns remain outside the declensional system. In this instance, context (e.g. modifiers) serves as the means to mark the borrowed indeclinable for the specific grammatical categories.11

However, not all borrowed words remain outside the declension system. Borrowed words are morphologically adapted and nativized for gender, number, and case. (See examples 5-7.) Such variations in the processes of borrowing and adaptation of nouns are reflected in synchronic descriptions and grammars of the respective languages. (See Wade 1992; Townsend 1980; Gimpelevič 1982; Ivč 1981-2; Holden 1976; Usikova 1980). (See examples 5-7.)12

10We find similar examples in BLG, *bižu*  'jewelry' NEUT.

11By context I mean the information and indicators in a sentence that provide information about the verb, e.g., duration, repetition.

12An interesting question that arises with the assignment of gender and the assimilation of borrowed substantives is whether they undergo complete assimilation upon being borrowed, or if there is a period during which these substantives do not demonstrate
4) planeta 'planet' FEM NOM / planetu ACC
5) situacija 'situation' FEM NOM / situaciju ACC
6) sport 'sport' MASC NOM / sportu DAT

The variations in the processes of adaptation and nativization of borrowed words, specifically as we have seen in nouns above, occur similarly with the adaptation and nativization of verbs. The details, though, are more complex in the Slavic languages because there are more grammatical categories involved in the verbal systems than in the nominal systems. The nativization of borrowed verbs is made more intriguing by the lack of extensive research and scholarship on the topic. Further, this gap in our understanding may to some degree be attributed to the added complexity of the category of aspect in Slavic. In sum, the literature concerning aspect tends to focus more on the center of the category rather than the margins, i.e., a description of the literary norms rather than of the spoken language.

0.1.1 Gender Assignment: Borrowed Words as Indicators of Language Change

In addition to furthering our knowledge of the general borrowing processes, the study of the gender assignment of borrowed nouns, like the study of the nativization of borrowed verbs, can also provide insight into an understanding of language change. For example, SBC exhibits a pattern similar to RUS in the process of borrowing lexical items. All nouns in SBC inherently have or are assigned gender and a declensional class. The situation is such that the substantives that are borrowed are, apart from the semantic assignments (e.g., male referents regardless of the shape of the noun are

a regular declension pattern, and, hence, are indeclinable even though they eventually evolve into a stage of being 'declinable', i.e., nativized. This is an area for further research but one that is only indirectly addressed in this study; still I will make the assumption that it is a gradual process.

13 BLG and MAC examples are absent from this discussion of case because the languages are analytic, i.e., nouns do not decline.
masculine), assigned to the masculine gender. It is interesting to note that the neuter
gender is closed to foreign substantives regardless of their morphological shape.\(^{14}\)
(See examples 8-10.)

8) kasino 'casino' MASC
9) bife 'buffet' MASC
10) derbi 'derby' MASC

It is important to point out that the neuter gender has not always been a closed class in
SBC. A closed neuter gender contrasts to the earlier phonological and morphological
adaptations of originally Turkish (TRK) nouns that were fully assimilated and
nativized, (see examples 11-14)\(^{15,16}\)

11) TRK buyrui 'commander' / SBC bujrultia MASC
12) TRK köprü 'bridge' / SBC cuprija FEM
13) TRK avlu 'yard' / SBC avlija FEM
14) TRK ege 'knife sharpener' / SBC ege, jege NEUT
15) TRK meze 'snack' / SBC meze NEUT

Hence, a comparison of two different synchronic states makes it possible to conclude
that the neuter gender synchronically is a closed category for foreign nouns in the SBC

\(^{14}\) See Hock (1986/a1) and Priestley (1981) regarding the neuter gender as a
general default gender in languages in which gender is a grammatical category. Examples
of neuter as the default gender occur in the Romance languages, which inherited three
genders from Indo-European, and most modern Romance languages have lost the neuter
gender. Romanian though maintains a third gender (see Botoman 1995). This third
gender is an interesting morphologically because the singular endings are from the
masculine endings and the plural endings are from the feminine.

\(^{15}\) The Turkish occupation began in June 28, 1389 with the Battle of Kosovo Polje
and for Serbia lasted roughly until 1830-4 for Serbia, until 1908/9 for Bulgaria and 1912
for Macedonia. Thus, the many borrowings that no doubt entered the language during
this time, I assume, parallels the gradual process of nativization as it is discussed
throughout this study. Therefore, I assume that complete nativization did not take place
immediately upon borrowing of the TRK loans as it is not occurring simultaneous with the
borrowing of the Western European loanwords.

\(^{16}\) The question concerning 'moment' of assimilation is left unresolved here. An
analogous application of current linguistic discussions of borrowing and assimilation
would indicate that the nativization was not simultaneous upon borrowing.
nominal system. Here I would note that TRK has no gender classes. But most important, for the purposes of this study, is that the process of gender assignment to borrowed nouns conveys information about the synchronic status of the category of gender (see Neikirk 1992; Gulová 1987). Likewise, a similar examination of the assimilation of verbs to the grammatical category of aspect in Slavic can be a source for information about the category of aspect itself, synchronically and diachronically. This study shows that borrowed verbs shift their position over time as 1) whole classes and 2) individually within the verbal system and 3) within the category of aspect for individual speakers.

0.2 Theoretical Concerns Inherent in a Study of Borrowed Words

A study of borrowed words and their nativization process necessarily requires a discussion of the underlying theoretical concerns. It should be stated at the outset that this project follows in the tradition of the American Structuralist school. By this I mean that it is useful to discuss borrowed words in terms of their diachronic and synchronic status, but I will primarily concentrate on a study of borrowed verbs in RUS, BLG, and MAC from the point of view of current spoken language and speakers (parole) rather than the point of view of the general structure of the language (langue) (Saussure 1916). I recognize the interconnectedness of grammar and speech, langue and parole and relevance of diachrony to synchrony. However, I focus on the linguistic reality, i.e., synchronic speech of native speakers. This project argues for the connections and relationships between such elements and views them in complete isolation within a systemic structure and further, argues that linguistic variation is indicative of language change in progress (see Aitchison 1992). Yet, I am above all concerned with the individual language perceptions and speech of the native speaker and the ways in which borrowed verbs in linguistic reality are not accounted for by the traditional linguistic discussions and normative grammars. In other words, this project addresses
both the point of view of the linguist and the point of view of speaker. The reason for such neglect of "the speaker" in accounts of borrowed verbs heretofore can be, in part, explained by the fact that in most, if not all, discussions of Slavic aspect there is an attempt to account for the nativization of borrowed verbs based on Structuralist theories of binary oppositions and markedness. (See Saussure 1916; Jakobson 1962; 1932; Comrie 1976; Maslov 1963; Galton 1976; Schuyt 1990; Merrill 1985.) Such Structuralist theories of binary oppositions and markedness are referred to throughout this project and are taken as a starting-point for this study of borrowed verbs.

0.2.1 Markedness Relations: The Feature [+Not Mine]

For Structuralism, the concept of binarism implies an opposition that is realized as a privative opposition (see Jakobson 1932; Forsyth 1976; Merrill 1983). Here the general definition of a privative opposition is an opposition whereby one member is formally marked for a feature (usually a positive marking denoting the presence of the feature) and the other member of the opposition is unmarked for that feature, a zero marking (Comrie 1976; Hock 1986; Battistella 1990). I propose that markedness relations may indeed be applied to the negation of a feature as well: [+not mine], i.e., a feature describing any given element which is perceived by a given speaker as not part of "my language". Thus, I propose a feature [+not mine]. Here I should note that this does not mean it is marked for the absence of a feature. What will be especially important for this study, is that this markedness designation places the lexical item outside the scope of what the speaker considers "his/her language". This feature is derived from the fact that, historically, the tendency of any given identity--linguistic and ethno-national--is often first expressed as a negative rather than positive identity. I argue for a negative (and negated) feature because such a tendency to identify what is not within one's own identity often serves as identification of oneself (see Anastasova 1991; Lozanova 1994; Danforth 1995). For instance, in a study of the category of
"alien - one's own" in BLG folk culture, Lozanova (1994:37) argues that BLG folk culture produces the category of "alien" by identifying "some negative character feature... which is meant to shape the collective image of the non-Bulgarian." In other words, defining oneself and necessarily 'one's own' is a process of defining and identifying oneself in relation to others. I suggest that it is possible and useful to extend this ethnological and anthropological theory of self-identification to the linguistic field with the feature [+not mine].

0.2.2 Borrowed Verbs at the Center and the Margins

As is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 1, borrowed verbs are traditionally thought to belong to both aspects and are described as bispectual verbs (see Townsend 1980; Baršić 1988; Lunt 1952; Sheljakin 1966; Demidenko 1966 et al.). The descriptor 'bispectual' and its implications, however, contradict the generally accepted structuralist approach to aspect as a grammatical category which by definition has formal realization and binary oppositions. The development of formalized aspectual meaning with borrowed verbs remains largely unaddressed regardless of the frequency and use of aspectually marked forms by the native speaker. Hence, there is a discrepancy between the accounts of borrowed verbs and the linguistic reality: linguists maintain that context alone is sufficient to express aspectual meaning, yet speakers overtly mark forms of the borrowed verbs to indicate aspectual meanings, suggesting, in fact, that context is not sufficient. Thus, this study argues that, for the speaker, borrowed verbs are at the center of his/her linguistic repertoire-- when the borrowing is no longer marked [+not mine]-- and they are not necessarily thought of as bispectual.

---

17 See Danforth (1995) for more discussion of the notion of self-identification through negative characterization.

18 There are other types of oppositions, e.g., equipollent. See Comrie (1976) for a discussion of these oppositions.
verbs. This project presents data which show that these so-called biaspectral verbs are being formally marked for aspect. Therefore we must re-evaluate the generally accepted perception that borrowed verbs are at the margins of the category of aspect.

0.3 Statement of the Problem

This study explores the status and position of borrowed verbs within the aspectual systems in RUS, BLG and MAC based on the notion that the adaptation and assimilation processes of borrowed words provide information about the synchronic status of verbal categories. Studies of borrowing and nativization processes are often diachronic (Kragalott 1974; Neilkirk 1992; Ivic 1981-2); they compare different synchronic states of identical or near identical borrowed lexemes. Studies conducted in such a framework yield specific descriptive accounts of the historical process of borrowing and nativization (Saussure 1916). The present study, rather, offers a synchronic study of borrowing and therefore addresses general patterns of the borrowing and nativization processes. One primary component of the borrowing process that is often omitted in diachronic studies of borrowing is the notion of variation (see Muchnik 1961; Maslov 1963; Bailey 1973). In this study, synchronic variation of the aspect and the form of borrowed words in RUS, BLG and MAC is addressed in an attempt to develop a model of nativization and synchronic variation.

Variation is a component of linguistic borrowing and assimilation processes. There are different levels of variation. On one level there is idiolectal variation of borrowed verbs whereby an individual speaker treats one borrowed verb differently from a second borrowed verb. Further, one speaker might use the same verb in different ways, and two speakers might treat the same verb differently. This is a result no doubt of a variety of factors including: 1) a difference in the individual perception of loanwords, i.e., whether the borrowed word is perceived as foreign to the speaker, and 2) the age of the borrowing. A second level of variation is among scholars,
grammarians and linguists in the description and normalization of the borrowed verbs. Each source (grammars and normative sources) I consulted implies that the treatment of these borrowed verbs is uniform. Ironically, the sources themselves treated individual borrowed verbs differently in terms of the aspeccal status of the borrowing.

Therefore, a discussion of the nativization of loanwords must necessarily be mindful of the ways in which sociolinguistic and intrasystemic linguistic factors affect the nativization process of loanwords. Therefore, the goals of this project are: 1) to re-examine the nativization process of borrowed verbs from a perspective that admits both nativized and non-nativized elements as they coexist within the verbal systems of RUS, BLG and MAC independent of any comparison with related languages and 2) to offer a synchronic analysis that accounts for linguistic reality (i.e., "puts the speaker back" into the linguistic and grammatical discussions of aspect, (see Joseph 1992)). To this end, I analyze questionnaire data gathered from fieldwork conducted in Veliko Tarnovo, Bulgaria and Skopje, Macedonia in 1994 and questionnaire data resulting from Russians visiting the United States. Finally, I propose a model of nativization which accounts for the synchronic variation of borrowed verbs in the Slavic languages under study.

0.4 Toward a Model of Nativization and Variation

Chapter 1 provides a summary of the existing approaches and explanations of Slavic aspect. Hence, the discussion centers on aspect as a morphological category within the scope of binarism and formal oppositions. Yet, more recent studies explore notions of the category of aspect beyond that of morphological (see Brecht 1985) and challenge existing theories of markedness in aspect (see Anderson 1980; Townsend 1985). I follow those like Brecht and Timberlake which challenge some of the existing
notions of the category of aspect in Slavic. It is possible that a re-evaluation of the status and position of borrowed verbs, while challenging the limits of our Structuralist descriptions, ultimately, upholds the notions of this theoretical approach.

Further, in Chapter 2, I outline a series of questions concerning borrowed verbs which have been unsatisfactorily addressed in the literature on Slavic aspect. Specifically, these questions concern the exceptional or marginal status and position of the borrowed verbs. For example, do the borrowed verbs formalize aspectual meaning?; can borrowed verbs answer questions about "bipartite" as a classification for verbs in Slavic?; and, finally, what do the answers to these questions reveal about the verbal and language systems themselves.

In Chapter 3, I present the results of questionnaires concerning the status and use of borrowed verbs in RUS, BLG and MAC and interpret the findings in light of the questions posed in Chapter 1 and 2 regarding the synchronic status and positions of borrowed verbs in the respective languages.

In Chapter 4, I develop a model of nativization which integrates the point of view of both the linguist and the speaker. Such a model of nativization is able to provide a more comprehensive description of borrowed verbs and a more comprehensive description in terms of the synchronic variation that remains largely unaccounted for in previous descriptions. The model includes an explanation of the feature [+not mine] as a mechanism that at once influences and reflects the nativization process at the speaker level.

Finally, by questioning the limitation of traditionally accepted structural descriptions in regard to borrowed verbs this work contributes to the on-going studies concerning the nature and scope of Slavic aspect and language change.
CHAPTER 1

COMPARATIVE APPROACHES AND COMPARING APPROACHES TO SLAVIC ASPECT

Dvuvideovye glagoly, nosomennno, predstavljaju bol’soj interes i v teoretičeskom plane. "The biaaspectual verbs undoubtedly are of great interest on the theoretical plane as well." (Muchnik, I. P. 1961:123)

1.0 Introduction

This chapter presents and summarizes literature concerning aspect in general and aspect specifically with regard to borrowed verbs in the Slavic languages. It is necessary to understand the ways in which the category of aspect in Slavic is described in order to reassess the challenges that borrowed biaspectral verbs pose to such descriptions. While the topic of aspect commands a vast amount of literature in the field of Slavic linguistics, relatively little attention has been paid to the adaptation and assimilation of borrowed verbs to the different verbal and aspectual systems. Even such major contributions to the study of aspect as Verkuyl (1972), Forsyth (1970), Comrie (1976), Maslov (1962), and Rassudova (1982) do not take up the issues surrounding borrowed verbs within the aspectual system. Here, I am primarily concerned with defining the precise nature of such gaps in the descriptions concerning the position of borrowed verbs and the scope of aspect in RUS, BLG, and MAC in order to better delimit the parameters of the aspect of borrowed verbs as they are

1 It is important to note at the outset of this project that much of the literature on Slavic aspect is concerned with aspect in RUS. Friedman (1985:234) makes the point regarding the literature on aspect: "...treatments even go so far as to use the terms Russian and Slavic interchangeably. To a lesser extent, accounts of aspect in other Slavic languages assume the same type of general validity." Therefore a majority of the references to the literature will be concerned with aspect in RUS. When available, language-specific references will be made. The fact that there is less reference to other languages is reflective of the literature available. It is not a choice or bias on my part.
adapted and assimilated by the borrowing Slavic languages. Of particular interest are:
1) the formal realization of aspect with borrowed verbs within the three verbal systems;
2) the information/value that the adaptation and nativization processes can and do
provide for the notions of aspectual pairs and expression; and 3) the pressures that may
be exerted upon the borrowed verbs to conform, as well as the source of that pressure.

Two broad distinctions emerge out of this review of literature that I term: 1) 
assumptions and 2) expectations. By "assumptions" I mean those descriptions and
analyses of borrowed verbs which I follow and which appear to be borne out in
linguistic reality. The term "linguistic reality" is here used to refer to the native
speaker's behavior and attitudes (parole). These realities are based on speech patterns
of speakers; these patterns may or may not correspond to the prescriptive norms, i.e.,
expectations of linguists and scholars. By "expectations" I mean those analyses and
descriptions which are challenged by the linguistic reality (as discussed in Chapters 3
and 4), and may or may not be borne out in linguistic reality. Here I use the term
"expectation" as a classification for features that are regularly and consistently attributed
to aspect in the various existing descriptions; if we read the literature concerning aspect
and borrowed verbs then we "expect" borrowed verbs to demonstrate the features
outlined in the scholarly accounts. But as the data (in Chapter 3) demonstrates,
expectations and linguistic reality do not always coincide.2

---

2A distinction between langue and parole (Saussure), competence and performance (Chomsky), etc. is certainly not a new one. However, the gap between the
two is rarely addressed on the topic of borrowed verbs and their status within the aspe actual
system. Yet, speakers make distinctions and the prescriptive sources, as expected, do not
account for such occurrences in the language. I make this point to emphasize the notion
that language change begins at the speaker level.
1.1 A Clarification of Terms and Concepts

The terms and concepts which recur in discussions of aspect must be clarified at this point. The most fundamental term and concept is that of aspect itself. For purposes of this study, I follow both Comrie’s (1976:3) generally accepted definition of aspect: "different ways of viewing the internal temporal constituency of a situation," and Lunt’s (1952:66) description of aspect as defining "the character of the action itself, without reference to the utterance."³ Comrie’s (1976:3) oft-cited example provides a distinction of basic aspectual meanings:

1) John was reading when I entered.

In this example, was reading is the imperfective aspect (IMP) and serves to provide background information to the action, entered, which is the "main event" and thus the perfective aspect (PFV). The use of the PFV provides that there is "no attempt to divide this situation up into the various individual phases that make up the action of entry" (Comrie 1976:3).

I wish to make clear that this study deals with the development of grammatical aspect in borrowed verbs rather than lexical aspect. By grammatical aspect I mean a basic feature inherent in a binary aspectual opposition; grammatical aspect is to be reflected in every form of every verb. By extension there should be no distinction among verbs between those that express this basic feature and those that do not. Throughout this work the term aspect refers to grammatical aspect. In those instances when it is necessary or useful to refer to lexical aspect (or Aktionsart)⁴ the distinction will be made explicit.

³Comrie’s definition is based on Holt’s 1943 work on aspect.

⁴For a discussion of the aspect and Aktionsart distinction see Hamburger (1984); Kunte (1984); Veters (1990); and Klein (1974). Lexical aspect can be defined broadly as an aspect that refers to the shape of the act; shows the act as it begins, progresses and runs its course in time. Lexical aspect is sometimes referred to as Aktionsart.
It is generally accepted that there are two aspects in Slavic: imperfective and perfective. The **perfective aspect** characterizes the verb that indicates that an act is viewed as a whole (see Comrie 1976; Forsyth 1970). The **imperfective aspect** is unmarked for the feature that characterizes the perfective aspect, though a precise definition of the perfective feature,—whether [+completion], [+terminative] or [+result]—is not the focus of this study. Rather, suffice it to state that the perfective aspect implies a markedness feature that is not commented on with the use of the imperfective aspect. Additionally, the structuralist theory of binary opposition underlies this PFV-IMP system and the subsequent expectations that such oppositions will be formally, i.e., morphologically realized (Jakobson 1927; Forsyth 1970; Comrie 1976; Rassudova 1982). In most discussions of aspect, there is general agreement that aspect is a system of privative oppositions whereby one member, the PFV, of the opposition is marked for a specific feature and the other member, the IMP, is unmarked for that feature (see Galton 1976; Comrie 1976; Schuyt 1992; Maslov 1963.)

---

5Different languages have other aspects that are described in different terms. In English (ENG) the opposition is +/- progressive, e.g., 'is playing' vs. 'plays'. Although the presence of the category of aspect in ENG is arguable, I mention it here as an example to demonstrate that Slavic aspect is not representative of a comprehensive universal aspect. (See Spalatin (1959) for a discussion of aspect in ENG.) For a discussion of the absence of aspect in ENG see Klein (1974).

6Lunt, for instance, uses the term **terminative** to define the perfective meaning; Maslov (1965;1963) uses the notion of **celostnost** 'totality'; Galton (1976) defines it as **succession**.

7There have been numerous discussions concerning the definition of the markedness of aspect. For example, see Vendler (1967), Isačenko (1960), Comrie (1976), Galton (1976), Maslov (1963;1965) et al. For discussions concerning the different theories of markedness see Battistella (1990), Andrews (1986) and Trubetzkoj (1936). Drawing from the theories of markedness in phonological discussions there is the notion of markedness that breaks the tradition of a strictly binary opposition in so far as the markedness relationship is a three-way, ternary, distinction: one positive marking, another negatively marked and the third which makes no comment on the markedness or indifferent to the markedness feature. In such discussions there is the notion of "redundancy" in so much as the presence of a specific feature, e.g., [+nasal] implies the feature [+voice] because all nasals are voiced. However, the feature of [+voice] is the indispensable feature which distinguishes between /b/ and /p/. For purposes of this discussion I approach the notion of markedness within the parameters of a privative opposition whereby one member is marked and the other is unmarked for the feature. For a discussion of aspect in BLG, see Fielder (1993).
The term **biaspectual** is commonly reserved for what is considered a marginal and exceptional class of verbs in Slavic (see Hubenova 1968; Wade 1992; Stojanov 1980; Usikova 1985). Throughout the literature **biaspectual** is applied to verbs that do not formally distinguish the aspектual meanings, i.e., a single form for the two aspects. This class of verbs includes both native verbs and borrowed verbs. It is expected that context is the primary means of expressing the aspектual meaning (see Partridge 1976; Maslov 1965; Wade 1992; Belić 1959 et al.).

Thus, verbs in Slavic are classed as perfective or imperfective, or biaspectual. By definition, biaspectuals lack the formal aspектual distinctions that are present and productive with native "mono-aspectual" verbs. **Context** alone expresses the aspектual meaning. **Context** within the scope of this study is interpreted in the broadest sense; context refers to all indicators in the utterance or sentence and surrounding material that provide information about the verb’s duration, repetition and progress with respect to other acts. An overwhelming majority of generally accepted descriptions of biaspectuality in Slavic offer little explanation as to how and why such verbs are included in the category of aspect nor do they attempt to account for the relationship (position) of biaspectual verbs to the category of aspect as a whole. I suggest that this is due in large part to the perceived marginal status of this class of verbs and the complexity of aspect as a grammatical feature. Indeed, the concept of biaspectuality presents a significant challenge to standard accounts of the category of aspect.

I use the term **mono-aspectual** to refer to those verbs that are in opposition to the biaspectuals, i.e., there is a formal "one-aspect-to-one-verb" (1A:1V)

---

8If what I say in the Introduction is true, i.e., that all verbs have two distinct aspектual formalizations, one perfective one imperfective, the inconsistency of a class of biaspectual verbs with our descriptions of the verbal system is not recognized in the grammars.
correspondence, e.g., RUS čitat' IMP and pročitat' PFV are both mono-aspectual verbs. Referring to RUS, Avanesov (1945:167) states:

Kak pravilo, každyj glagol omnostiq kakomu-nibud' odnomu vidu ili soveršennomu, ili nesoveršennomu... 'As a rule, every verb belongs to a single aspect, perfective or imperfective.'

Similarly Avilova (1976:8) maintains:

Vidovaja opposicija ili vidovaja para-eto protivopostavlenie dvux glagolov sov[eršennogo] i nesov[eršennogo] vida. 'The aspectual contrast or aspectual pair - this is an opposition of two verbs, one perfective and one imperfective.'

Implicit in Avilova's statement is that the pair is composed of two separate and formally distinct, though related verbs. (This notion of "one aspect to one verb" is important to discussions of biaspectual verbs and their status within the category of aspect; this topic is discussed later in Chapter 1.4.)

1.2 Slavic Aspect: Expectations and Realities

A brief review of the verbal systems of the three languages under study is helpful to indicate the differences among these three related languages. Noting the essential differences among them allows us to see that these are, in fact, different languages and further removes any anticipation that the aspectual systems and the nativization processes are the same in each language.⁹

BLG and MAC, as Balkan Slavic languages, occupy a special position in the Slavic language family with regard to the structure of their verbal systems: they are more complex in comparison with the East and West Slavic languages.¹⁰ The

---

⁹Recall here Friedman's comments discussed in fn 1 of Chapter 1 regarding the tendency (if not tradition) among scholars to equate RUS and Slavic and further to consider non-RUS Slavic languages somewhat "less Slavic" or "a-typical" Slavic languages.
complexity of the MAC/BLG verbal systems contrasts with the simplicity of the RUS verbal system.

Thus, a brief study of the RUS verbal system is a useful introduction to this discussion of aspect because it is the "standard" starting point of studies of Slavic aspect. The structure of the RUS verbal system is less complex when compared to other Indo-European verbal systems as well as when compared to other Slavic languages: RUS has three tenses, one compound (future), one simple somewhat elaborate (present), and one simple but less elaborate (past) (cf. French with eight verb tenses and BLG with nine). The RUS verbal system encompasses six verbal categories: a) tense; b) person; c) mood; d) number; e) gender; and f) aspect. The last of these categories, aspect, is the most complicated and most distinctive feature of this otherwise 'simple' verbal system.

The nature of a category implies that a member exhibit an adherence to and an overt expression of the criterial attribute of that category (see Dančeva 1986; Isachenko 1965; Jakobson 1957). However, within the RUS verbal system the formalization of a category varies according to tense. For example, the category of person is not morphologically expressed in the past tense of RUS verbs. (See examples 2-3.)

---

10 Here "complex" is used in reference to the larger number of verbal forms one language exhibits relative to another.

11 "Elaborate" here is used to make the point that the present tense has six distinctive forms and/or markers indicating person and number, whereas the past tense has a maximum number of four forms distinguishing gender and number. Moreover, the present endings (person markers) are unique to the present tense whereas the past tense markers are common as adjective endings.

12 Nikelesku (1984) remarks on the development of aspect in RUS and suggests a relationship between the loss of compound tenses and the rise of a complex aspectual system. However, he does not comment on the development of an even more complex aspectual system in the Balkan Slavic languages (MAC and BLG) which both retain the compound tenses, and in the case of BLG even more developed aspectual system. The past perfect of ChSL has been simplified; the active participle alone today expresses the past tense in RUS today.

13 Context, then, marks person in the absence of the verbal marker.
2) čital (a) SG 'did read, was reading'  kaznil (a) 'was torturing'
3) čitali  PL. 'did read, were reading'  kaznili 'were torturing'

The -l-(i) is the past tense marker, the -i- is the plural number marker. There is no overtness of person. Person, though, is overtly expressed in the present and future tenses. (See examples 4-5.)

4) čitať PR. SG 'you read'.
5) budeš čítať  FUT. SG 'you will read'

Gender finds a degree of grammaticalization in the RUS verbal system i.e., it is overt and only in the singular and only in the past tense, (see examples 6-8).

6) delal  SG 'he did, was doing'
7) delala  SG 'she did'  But
8) delali  PL 'they did'

The past tense in RUS is expressed with a form that historically derives from an active participle, specifically from a perfect construction: the auxiliary verb which expressed person and number was eventually lost and the participle itself, without any overt marking of person, is the past tense form in modern RUS (see Vlasto 1986).¹⁴ Only voice and aspect characterize all the modern RUS verb forms (Rassudova 1982). This study, then, questions the scope of the category of aspect by questioning the accuracy of positing that borrowed biaspectral verbs necessarily can be characterized by aspectual distinctions.¹⁵

¹⁴ An example of ORUS perfect with participle and auxiliary as past tense is esm' kupili'' I am one who bought'' biţaxu kupili (past).

¹⁵ The development of aspect in RUS promulgated a series of systemic changes. The system of the system may be attributed to the development and realization of aspectual distinctions which simplified and reorganized predicate realizations. The loss of the conjugated form of the present tense of the verb byti 'to be' led to an increase in the functional load of the infinitive and other verb forms. The carrier of verbal information shifted from temporal distinctions to distinctions of aspect. This pattern of shifting the load, from one category to another, is important when we consider that borrowed verbs,
1.2.2 Slavic Aspect: Assimilatory Pressures

An examination of the assimilatory pressures to show aspect in RUS, BLG and MAC systems may serve to better highlight points of divergence within aspectual and verbal parameters.

It is generally accepted that all three languages realize at least three tenses: past, present, and future. BLG by standard descriptions has nine paradigmatic tenses; MAC has five, RUS has three. However, not all three languages have formal aspectual opposition in all three tenses. BLG and MAC both have a formal distinction of aspect in the present, i.e., perfective present and an imperfective present. Fielder (1993:30) notes: "[a]lthough the present is most frequently formed from imperfective verbs, perfective present tense forms do occur." On the use of perfective present in MAC Lunt (1952:82) states that "[t]hese forms...used only with certain conjunctions which define more closely the time or condition of the completion." For example:

9) MAC \textit{Durí ne najdam nešto za nea, ne ke dojdam}.\footnote{The example is cited in Lunt 1950. It can be argued that the action 'find' here is in fact a future act, i.e., will take place after the moment of speech. Such arguments in general challenge the notion of a PFV present opposition at all. Here I am primarily concerned with the generally accepted distinctions between the languages. The actual fact of the presence or absence of a PFV present in these languages does not play an integral role in the argument presented here.}

'Until I find something for her, I won't come.'

In RUS, by contrast, there is no formal aspectual opposition in the present. Comrie (1976:22, fn 1) states: "[i]mperfective verbs have a Future Tense distinct from the Present Tense, and formed with auxiliary \textit{budu} [will] plus the Infinitive; Perfective

\begin{quote}
\textit{Initialy upon borrowing are considered biaspectual and are basically forcing a "crippled" verbal system to express both temporal and aspectual distinctions. However, in reality none of those distinctions are available to the speaker. In the case of RUS the urgency, so to speak, to grammaticalize verbal categories is greater than may be found in languages which maintain relative temporal distinctions, e.g. BLG, MAC.}
\end{quote}
verbs have only one non-Past Tense, and cannot be used with *budu.*" (See also Vinogradov 1947; Wade 1992; Rassudova 1982.) The presence of renarrated (or witnessed) forms in MAC and BLG adds another component to the relatively complex systems.\(^\text{17}\)

Both BLG and MAC verbal systems maintain two distinct aspectual oppositions a) perfective / imperfective which is superordinate to the second (subordinate) opposition, b) aorist / imperfect (see Aronson 1981).\(^\text{18}\) Mindful of this distinction, the scope of this investigation includes only the superordinate aspectual opposition of perfective / imperfective.

BLG and MAC are further distinguished from RUS with respect to the productivity of imperfective derivations (Andrejčin 1958; Ivanchev 1971). This verbal form, the derived imperfective, is possible for most verbs in BLG and MAC. Aronson (1985:) asserts that this aspectual derivation is almost inflectional in its regularity; in RUS, by contrast, this form is restricted in development based on stress.\(^\text{19}\)

All three languages under study here have the same historical origins. Therefore, the differences and similarities that emerge in this investigation hold particular significance. The historical and genetic closeness of BLG and MAC further create an expectation that the two languages are closer in all developments. The languages represent very different verbal systems and therefore a study of the

\(^{17}\)The witness mood has been called both a mood Usikova (1985) and an aspect (Lunt 1952); it is similar to the evidential in Turkish. I do not take sides on this debate. I simply consider the different verb forms and make no statement on the grammatical, morphological or systemic status of the forms. A precise definition has no bearing on this study.

\(^{18}\)The scope of the aorist / imperfect opposition includes all the verbs in BLG with the exception of the verbs sam/badat ‘to be’; this opposition is limited to the past/nonpast distinction.

\(^{19}\)In RUS the derived IMP form -ovyvat’ is only productive with verbs with end stressed -ovat’, e.g., zabrakovat’ PFV ‘to scrap, reject’ zabrakovyvat’ IMP, zaverkovat’ ‘to recruit’ PFV, zaverbovyvat’ IMP but oradovat’ ‘to handle, manage’ does not have an -ovyvat’ form.
phenomena (borrowing and nativization of verbs) in each language is interesting from the historical perspective as well as the synchronic. The similarities between MAC and BLG in the verbal systems seem to suggest that the nativization processes are similar between these two languages and very different from the RUS. Yet, the data (in Chapter 3) challenge this notion.

1.3 Aspect as a Grammatical Category

Though it seems tautological to state that a grammatical category is realized by linguistic, i.e., morphological features, it must nonetheless be reiterated that discussions of aspect heretofore have employed a structuralist approach, whereby aspect, and all other grammatical categories, are defined in terms of markedness theory and formal binary oppositions (see Comrie 1976; Ružička 1957; Rassudova 1982; Maslov 1963; Merrill 1983)26

Aspect, as a grammatical category, necessarily implies morphological and derivational rules. Many researchers, including myself, have come to the conclusion that Slavic aspect is primarily a morphological category (Bermel 1994; Forsyth 1970; Maslov 1963; Rassudova 1980; Lunt 1952).21 Such a conclusion is based on patterns and generalizations that emerge in the formal structure and derivation of one aspect from another in the Slavic languages (see Maslov 1965; Townsend 1980; Comrie 1976).

26Again, this is not to assert a positive or negative valuation of structuralist theories, but simply point out that this fact must be addressed. I return to this point later.

21As a morphological and grammatical category it is expected that aspect is expressed through inflectional morphology. Otherwise aspect is expressed through periphrasis and is thereby an analytic category. There is some debate on the issue of aspect as anything other than a grammatical category, see Klein (1974) in which he rejects the English progressive as aspect because it is periphrastic in its expression. Two volumes specifically consider other mechanisms of Slavic aspect, e.g., discourse factors: Timberlake (1985) and Brecht (1985).
The RUS aspectual system is the focus of much research on the topic of aspect among Slavists as well as general aspectologists because RUS reflects a more developed aspectual system than other non-Slavic languages by virtue of the presence of aspectual distinctions in the future tense as well as in the past.\textsuperscript{22} (See for example, halted Baltic aspect, FRN which has aspectual distinctions only in the past tense, ENG which has a syntagmatic expression of aspect vs. paradigmatic expression.)\textsuperscript{23} The research discusses aspect in the terms of the structuralist grammatical category. Therefore, the members of that category must be consistent with the description of a category as it is framed in the theoretical terms. Otherwise there arises a need to reevaluate the notion of a grammatical category, i.e., question the validity and/or necessity of binary oppositions and distinctions and to push the structural limits of the category.

The notion of a grammatical category implies certain structural features. As Jakobson (1927) discusses the grammatical category there is the anticipation that the category encompasses all of the elements belonging to a specific categorization within the grammar of a language i.e., gender as a nominal grammatical category implies that all nouns in the language are inherently of a gender (see Dancheva 1986). RUS for example has three genders, as was noted above, but with few exceptions the Romance

\textsuperscript{22}See fn 1 of this chapter. MAC and BLG both have aspect distinctions in future as well as the past, BLG e.g., šie nameria PFV vs. šie namiram IMP 'I will find'. For detailed accounts of the development of aspect in RUS see Bermel (1995), and Schuyt (1990) et al. For detailed accounts of the development of aspect in Slavic see Van Wijk (1927, 1962). And for a comparative look at aspect in Slavic and non-Slavic languages, see Comrie (1976).

\textsuperscript{23}Here the reference to a "halted Baltic" aspect is based on Comrie's (1976:91) discussion of aspect in Baltic relative to the 'most developed' Slavic aspect. If we accept a Balto-Slavic unity then aspect in Lithuanian and Latvian has not reached the same level as Slavic. "In Lithuanian, we find a situation very similar to the earlier Slavonic position: prefixing a simple verb may make it Perfective, particularly if there is otherwise no semantic change involved. Where the prefix does involve semantic change, Dambruni
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languages (e.g., FRN and SPA) only have two grammatical genders.²⁴ Naturally borrowed nouns are not inherently any gender in the borrowing language; rather they are assigned to a gender based on different criteria, e.g., meaning, shape (see Poplack and Pousada 1983). The assignment of gender occurs with borrowing.²⁵

1.4 Slavic Aspect: Formal Opposition and Asp ectual Pairs

The most prominent characteristic of aspect in Slavic is formal opposition of the aspects. Comrie and Corbett (1993:10), for instance, introduce the concept of aspect in the Slavic languages with the statement that "most verbs occur as a pair" and that "aspect is particularly salient in the Slavonic languages because the perfective and imperfective opposition characterizes virtually all verb forms usually covering all moods and tenses...and both finite and infinite forms." The nature of a binary system requires that aspect realizes a formal opposition and expression of the category.

We encounter similar descriptions of aspect in studies of other Slavic languages. For example, "Every verb in Macedonian belongs to one of two aspects" (Lunt 1952:66).²⁶ Similarly concerning Bulgarian, Maslov (1958:499) writes:

²⁴ See fn 14 p. 7 concerning Romanian.

²⁵ The noun ‘kofe’ ‘coffee’ in RUS demonstrates synchronic variation in gender assignment (see Gimpelevič 1972). Some speakers use kofe a neuter noun e.g., krepkoe kofe 'strong coffee', while others consider it masculine e.g., kreplj kofe; the gender fluctuation does not entail any formal change in shape. Diachronically, it is interesting to note here that a decline of the modern RUS noun kofe occurred in early modern RUS but is no longer cited in contemporary standard dictionaries. The declinable form was assigned to the masculine gender. However, I would make the point here that the incidence of two forms for a single lexical item is the result of two different borrowings at different periods. The indeclinable kofe is more recent and supplanted the declinable form kofe. The relationship is not lineal between the two, i.e., the indeclinable lemme did not develop from the declinable. Thus, while diachronically the issue of the gender fluctuation with this particular borrowed noun is complex, synchronically the variation in the gender can be addressed in terms of variation and nativization.

²⁶ The underscores are mine to mark the 'one aspect to one verb' (1A:1V) expectation that occurs throughout the discussions of aspect presented in this study.
glagoli, različni po vid., no ednakvi po leksikalnoto i značenje. 'The most characteristic feature of Slavic verbal aspect is usually indicated by the presence of so-called, 'aspectual pairs,' that is a twosome of verbs, differentiated by aspect, but identical in lexical meaning.'

And also referring to BLG, Hubenova (1968:144), in the same vein, states that

"[a]lmost every action may be expressed by a pair of almost identical verbs differing from each other only in aspect."

Further, Avilova (1967:67) on the RUS aspectual system concludes, 

_V sovremennom russkom jazyke každomu glagolu nesoveršennogo vida obično sootvetstvuet glagol soveršennogo vida' 'In modern Russian, usually every imperfective verb has a corresponding perfective.' On MAC Usikova (1985:88)

likewise states:

_Každyj glagol vo vseh svoix formax imet vidovoe značenie-vyražennoe glagol'noj osnovoj' popaga PFV po + paga. 'Every verb in all of its forms has aspectual meaning- expressed through the verbal stem, popaga 'to fall'. '

Based on these discussions of Slavic aspect it is appropriate to expect Slavic verbs to formally distinguish the aspectual meanings of PFV and IMP with a pair of verbs.

Thus, in the prescriptive and normative grammars of each Slavic language, verbs are characterized by the concept of grammatical aspect. They are further characterized by the notion of aspectual pairs, wherein one verb is imperfective and the other perfective, thus realizing a formal opposition. (See examples 10-13.)

27 She cites Sovremennyj russkij jazyk. 1952: 537.

28 The question of whether the aspectual pair is two distinct lexical items or a single "lexeme" is not directly addressed here. Arguments concerning the nature of the aspectual pair, simple IMP and prefixed PFV or derived IMP and prefixed PFV, are frequent (see Merrill 1985; Ivanova 1967; Holden 1976). I would offer that here I accept that the aspectual whether, regardless of the position one adopts is a single lexeme while there is a semantic distinction between the two, that distinction being the meaning assigned to "aspect". The derivation of one aspect from another is the basis for discussions concerning aspect as a morphological category, however suppletive pairs do exist that are outside the scope of aspect as a morphological category, e.g., RUS *govorit'* IMP/IMP/ *sказать* PFV 'to say, tell'. These suppletive pairs are treated in the same manner as "regular" aspectual pairs with regard to distribution and usage.
10) RUS čitat’ 'to read' IMP / pročitat’ PFV 'to read through'
11) BLG davam 'to give' IMP / dam PFV 'to give'
12) MAC čita 'to read' IMP / pročita PFV 'to read through'
13) POL chybiać IMP / chybięć PFV 'to miss, fail'

The position elaborated above—that aspect implies a duality—certainly seems to hold true for at least most native verbs; see fuller discussion in Chapter 2.1. In fact, this notion that aspect formalizes the opposition is pointed out by Maslov. He (1985:103) refers to the occasion of aspectual pairs as the "functional completeness of the aspectual paradigm."

However, there is a small, "exceptional" group of native verbs in RUS that are considered biaspectual, RUS kaznit' 'to execute', BLG mogi 'to be able' MAC večerjam 'to have dinner'. The native biaspectual verbs do not formalize the aspectual opposition that is considered a regular feature of Slavic aspect. This apparent non-conformity to the existing descriptions of aspect do not appear to bother scholars and linguists.²⁹

Whatever one's position regarding the status and position of native biaspectual verbs, the problem of borrowed biaspectual verbs remains. Biaspectual and borrowed verbs, as such, challenge the status of this formal opposition (a single form for both perfective and imperfective meaning). The current inventory and productivity of biaspectual borrowed verbs in RUS, BLG and MAC speaks to the need for a study and appropriate classification of these verbs. Hence, based on the precarious status of borrowed and biaspectual verbs, i.e., no pairing or formal opposition of aspect, I accept the notion of the aspectual pair as an expectation rather than an assumption.

²⁹The "list" of native biaspectual verbs for a given language can vary depending on the scholar; there is not unanimously agreement by scholars regarding this issue. Compare Maslov (1965) and Beaulieux (1950) for difference of opinion concerning the native biaspectual verbs in BLG.
There is a general consensus among scholars concerning the notion of the one-aspect-to-one-verb realization of aspectual pairs in the Slavic languages. What differs among scholars is the degree to which they specify the regularity of this 1A:1V correspondence. For example, Scatton (1993:212) makes general reference to the 1A:1V notion: "Most Bulgarian verbs have perfective-imperfective pairs." This implies a regularity and pervasiveness of the presence of this understanding. Pašov (1989:106) treats 1A:1V as fact but, unlike Scatton, he quantifies the applicability of this notion:

\[ Poveče ot devetdeset procenta ot balkanskite glagoli sa "vidovi čovjek"- glagol ot svaršen i glagol ot nesvaršen vid s ednakvo značenje toest označavašči edno i sašto dejstvie, sam ce predstavljajči go po različen način. \]

"More than 90% of the BLG verbs are aspectual pairs, a perfective verb and an imperfective verb both with identical meaning that is expressing one and the same action, but presenting it [the action] in a different manner."

Pašov fails to address the remaining 10% of the verbs which no doubt consists of borrowed and biaspectual verbs. Stojanov (1993:332) offers a more definitive statement to characterize this feature. He writes, "[v] balkanskija ezik za izrazjavane na počti vsako dejstvie soštestvovat po dva glagola - eden ot svaršen i drug ot nesvaršen vid." In BLG, for the expression of almost every action, there exists a pair of verbs, one perfective and the other imperfective. The concept of 1A:1V dominates the descriptions of the Slavic aspectual systems. Beaulieux (1950:170) summarizes simply and clearly that "Tout verbe est en effet d'aspect perfectif ou d'aspect imperfectif."

"Every verb is either perfective or imperfective." What is important for the purposes of this study is that borrowed verbs do not exhibit this feature.

The fact that borrowed verbs do not "fit" into the prescribed and expected pairing and one-to-one correspondence is often overlooked in discussions of these verbal systems. The borrowed verbs, the designated biaspectual verbs, unquestionably fall outside the scope of such a description. The 1A:1V feature of aspectual pairs in
Slavic is interpreted here as an example of Structuralist form and function regularities: the one form:one meaning is a focus of Structural linguistics, (see Aronson 1985 for an interesting discussion of meaning to form). Because of the challenge that the borrowed and biaspectual verbs offer this notion of aspectual pairs, I accept this feature as an expectation rather than an assumption.

1.4.1 Aspectual Pairs: Prefixation

The derivational morphology of Slavic aspect, in part, lies in the process of prefixation. In general, it is possible to "create" a perfective verb from an imperfective verb. Time and time again we encounter similar explanations as the following citations indicate: Forsyth (1970:18) observes that "simple verbs, verbs without a prefix, are imperfective," and that "the addition of a prefix to a simple verb makes it perfective." (See examples 14-19.)

14) RUS pisat' 'to write' IMP
15) RUS na+ pisat' PFV
16) BLG pravja 'to do' IMP
17) BLG napravja 'to do' PFV
18) MAC bara 'to seek' IMP
19) MAC pobara 'to seek' PFV

(See also Comrie 1976; Rassudova 1982; Georgiev 1993; Schuyt 1990.) Baresić (1975:179) SBC notes that verbal aspect may be changed by adding a prefix to nonperfective verbs, e.g.:

20) SBC pisati IMP na+pisati PFV 'to write'

Similarly, Vinogradov cites Ul'janov (1945:514) on the mechanism of the prefixation in RUS: Glagol nesoveršennogo vida, sočetajš's predlogom, perexodit v
soveršennyj vid; 'An imperfective verb, combined with a preposition becomes perfective.' Vinogradov (1947:499) himself adds:

> Glavnym sredstvom obrazovanija novyx leksičeskix značenij i ottenkov v glagole javljajutsja pristavki. Kak protivodejstvie etomu leksičeskomu drobljeniju odnorodnyx obrazovanij, v grammatike usilivaetsja tendencija k <<grammatikalizacii>> pristavok, k prevraščeniju ix v instrument čisto vidovogo sootnošenija form.' 'Prefixes are the primary mechanism of forming new lexical meanings and nuances of identical formations in the RUS verb. The tendency towards a grammaticalization of the prefixes is increasing, towards turning them into the mechanism of purely aspeetual correlation of forms.'

Likewise Comrie (1976:89) contributes the following,

Perfectives are formed from Imperfectives primarily by prefixing, less commonly by suffixing....In Modern Russian, then, Perfective/Imperfective pairs are related primarily either by the Perfective being a prefixed derivative of the Imperfective, or by the Imperfective being a suffixed derivative of the Perfective.

Further, regarding the nature of prefixation as a morphological process, Kuznecov, (cited in Avilova (1968)) writes:

> V sovremennom russkom jazyke každomu glagolu nesov. [eršennogo] vida obyčno sootvetstvuet glagol sov [eršennogo] vida, imejuščij po-suščestvu to že samoe leksičeskoе (realnoе) značenie i otlicajusčijša toľko vidom. Takie glagoly obrazujut, kak prinjato govorit' vidovuju paru.' 'In modern Russian every imperfective verb usually corresponds to a perfective verb, which has essentially the very same lexical (real) meaning and differs only by aspect. Such verbs constitute what is typically called the aspectual pair.'

Further, Veyrenc (1980:115) states:

> On sait que le couple verbal s'est constitué en russe selon deux procédés essentials:
> a. par préfixation d'un imperfectif simple, qui devient ainsi perfectif
b. par suffixation d’un perfectif préfixé, qui devient ainsi imperfectif. One knows that the verb pairs in Russian are composed according to two essential processes. a. by the prefixation of a simple imperfective which then becomes perfective and b. by suffixation of a prefixed perfective verb which then becomes imperfective.

The Kratkaja russkaja grammatika (KRG1986:266) too contends,

 Vidovye pary obrazujutsja s pomoščju pristavok ili suffixov.
 'Aspectsual pairs are formed with the help of prefixes or suffixes.'

In light of the above, I accept that the addition of a prefix to a simple (unprefixed and unsuffixed) verb results in a perfective verb and treat it as an assumption in order to interpret data presented in support of the model of nativization and synchronic variation (see Chapters 3 and 4). I have distinguished between those prefixes that clearly add meaning to the verb, e.g., de-, re-, pere- and those prefixes that may or may not add meaning to the verb, e.g., RUS po-, BLG ot-, MAC is-. I am primarily concerned with morphological changes not semantic. I make such a distinction because the addition of meaning combined with an aspectsual change does not result in a "true" pair.30

1.4.2 Aspectual Pairs: Suffixation

The morphology of suffixation can be considered equally important in the morphology of Slavic aspect. Scatton (1993:212) indicates the presence of general morphological mechanisms which distinguish the aspect of a verb in BLG.

"Morphological processes related to the creation of aspectsual pairs begin with nonprefixed imperfective verbs, from which perfective stems are formed by suffixation or prefixation." In view of the presence of fixed morphological markers of other

30 The notion of the "true" aspectsual pair is a complex and long-debated one. The elements of the "true" aspectsual pair and the pervasive nature of such a pairing in the respective languages are two of the more prominent issues. I do not attempt to answer the question of the aspectsual pair here, rather I recognize that we have long attributed aspectsual pairs to the Slavic verbal systems as a regular feature and thus look to the adaptation and nativization of borrowed verbs for information regarding the status of the aspectsual pair.
verbal categories such as the BLG present active participle, which is marked by Vowel + št (added to the present tense stem), e.g. četa > četjasi, peja > peesišt, imam > imašt and similarly the present active adverbial participle with the suffixes -ejki, -ajki, -ajajki (added to the present stem), četa > četejksi, izpolzuvam > izpolzuvajksi, it is appropriate to consider a similar suffix with aspectual implications. In Slavic aspectual systems, deriving IMP verbs from prefixed PFVs by means of a suffix is a productive process.\textsuperscript{31}

The suffix that is of particular importance to this study is the suffix -va - which is common to all three languages under study here. Ivanchev (1971:197) states:

"osnovno sredstvo za imperfekcivacija v slavjanskez ezici- sufišt va." the basic means for imperfectivization in the Slavic languages is the suffix -va-. Prefixed verbs, excluding prefixed /-uva-/ verbs, tend to be perfective. (See examples 20-22.)

\begin{align*}
20) \text{RUS } & \text{pro-čitat' PFV > pročityvat' IMP 'to finish reading'} \\
21) \text{BLG } & \text{iz-leja PFV > izlivam IMP 'to pour out, empty'} \\
22) \text{MAC } & \text{pro-širi PFV > proširua IMP 'to widen'} \\
\end{align*}

The features inherent to the notion of "category": e., formal oppositions, are further supported by regular processes of deriving imperfective verbs from perfective verbs via the suffixation of the perfective verbs. Remarking on the process in BLG, Pašov (1989:143) maintains that with aspectual pairs the imperfective is always derived from the perfective with aspectual suffixes:

\begin{align*}
23) \text{BLG migna PFV migvam IMP 'to blink'}.
\end{align*}

\textsuperscript{31}There are other tendencies in the suffixation and aspect relationship. Stem alternations SBC sjediti IMP > sjetist PFV 'to sit' for instance shows a stem alteration that also marks an aspectual distinction. Further, verbs with suffix /-n/- tend to be perfective, see examples 14-16:

\begin{align*}
a) \text{RUS } & \text{maxnut' PFV 'to wave'} \\
b) \text{BLG maxna PFV 'to wave'} \\
c) \text{MAC plukne PFV 'to spit'}
\end{align*}
Similarly, Mastov (1963:24) comments on the morphology of aspect: "...there are imperfective forms that appear as suffixed derivations of the perfective form." (See examples 24-26.)

24) RUS pročityvat' IMP 'to read through completely, repeatedly'
25) MAC održava IMP 'to hold'
26) BLG zaminavam IMP 'to leave'

This Slavic morphological generalization may differ slightly in the realization of the specific suffix or prefix from language to language. Nevertheless, the regularity and applicability of the overall general description of the process make it one that I accept. Therefore, for the purposes of interpreting the data (in Chapters 3 and 4), I make the assumption that the addition of a variant of the suffix -va- to a verb results in a verb with an imperfective meaning.32 Specifically, I am interested in the aspectual result of the addition of the suffix and I conclude that given the above examples and discussions, treating this notion as an assumption is warranted.

1.5 The Parameters of the Morphology of Aspect

Thus, we can conclude that the morphology of aspect is based on these derivational relationships between the two aspects of a single verb. Partridge (1982:96) remarks: "[t]here is no one way in which a perfective differs from an imperfective verb but certain features of the system of verb formation very often facilitate recognition of aspect from the infinitive and indicate how one aspect is most likely derived from another."33 Based on the fact that aspect is accepted as a grammatical category and as

32I make no comment on the nature of the imperfectivity, be it iterative, durative or otherwise. Here the concern is not the specific semantics but rather the aspectual status of the verb with the addition of the suffix.

33The lack of a fixed aspectual morpheme that always and only distinguishes aspectual meanings prohibits the notion of a completely morphological category. Some who veer from aspect as a morphological category, or as more than a morphological category, can be found in the recent volumes Scope of Slavic Aspect 1985 and Issues in Russian Morphosyntax 1985. One other note of interest, Bermel 1995 applies the term
such is defined by specific categorial features outlined here, e.g., morphological distinction of aspect, 1A:!V correspondence, aspectual pairs, prefixal and suffixal derivations, it is more appropriate to expect that all verbs, including borrowed verbs, exhibit these features than it is to marginalize borrowed verbs as the grammars cited above do. The approaches discussed here consider and/or incorporate the borrowed verbs into their discussions from only the far end of a borrowing trajectory, i.e., the assimilated (therefore "members of the "center"") and the non-assimilated (therefore the "margins"), rather than incorporating the totality of the data and the factors of borrowing which may explain the gap or those borrowed verbs which are positioned somewhere between the center and the margins. These patterns permit the conclusion that aspect is a morphological category. However, the tendencies described above are not without exception, nor are they fixed; prefixed simplex imperfective verbs do occur (see below). Although Partridge is specifically referring to the SBC verbal system, her statement characterizes other Slavic languages as well (Vinogradov 1947; Beaulieux 1950; Townsend 1980; Koneski 1950; Wade 1992 et al).

The morphological processes that are used by native speakers and noted by scholars and linguists to create and express the different aspectual meanings suggest that aspectual pairs are a feature of aspect in Slavic. The two meanings of aspect in Slavic are realized with two distinct verbs which constitute the aspectual pair.

\[\text{quasi} \text{ morphological to the modern RUS category of aspect based on this lack of a single aspectual morpheme.}\]

\textsuperscript{34}There are exceptions to the morphological rules governing the aspectual distinctions, e.g. prefixed verbs that are imperfective, below:
\begin{itemize}
  \item d) RUS \textit{predvidet} 'to foresee'
  \item e) RUS \textit{sostojet} 'to consist'
  \item f) RUS \textit{vygljadet} 'to look, appear'
\end{itemize}
Both \textit{vygljadet} and \textit{predvidet} are calques; the latter from GER the former from LAT.

\textsuperscript{35}Bermel (1995) refers to the status of aspect in modern RUS as \textit{quasi} morphological. This is an interesting notion that holds a predictive shade in so far as there is an implication that the aspect will continue developing into a fully morphological stage. For the purposes of this study I hold to the traditional discussions of aspect as a morphological category, unqualified.
The morphological status of aspect concedes that within Slavic there are regular structural and morphological markers that indicate the aspctual meaning, even though there is not a single morpheme that always (and only) marks aspect.\(^36\) The lack of a fully grammatical and morphological category of aspect suggests that there are other factors (semantics, syntax) which necessarily may play an integral role in the expression and the grammaticalization of the category of aspect. It is important to note that context is not introduced as a factor of aspctual meaning and expression with regular mono-aspectual Slavic verbs. A study of the adaptation of the borrowed verbs that presumably lack these morphological distinctions may provide information regarding the role and position of these other factors in the aspctual systems.

In short, our understanding of the morphology of aspect is incomplete. Maslov (1963:5) for instance, qualifies the morphological feature to the exclusion of suppletive and bisaspectual verbs. Yet, he still clearly aligns himself with the position of a distinct morphological relationship between the aspects:

\begin{quote}
[z]a isključeniem opjat'-taki slučaev dvuvidovosti i suppletivnosti, o vidovyx formax odnog glagola my budem govorit' liš tam, gde (pri toždestve leksičeskix značenij formy nesoveršennogo vida javljajućja suffikalnymi proizvodnymi ot form soveršennogo vida. 'With the exception again of instances of bisaspectuality and supplativity, we will speak about the aspctual forms of a single verb in cases where given the identical lexical meaning of the form of the imperfective aspect is a suffixed product of the perfective aspect.'
\end{quote}

This speaks to the role of prefixed perfective verbs within the aspctual system which provides a base for imperfective derivations and serves as a starting-point from which to evaluate and reassess the borrowed verbs in RUS, BLG and MAC.

\[^{36}\] For example in Persian the mi-verbal prefix marks only and always the IMP meaning (see Comrie (1976:88)).
1. 6 Summary

In this Chapter I have outlined the terms that will be used throughout this paper and summarized the literature on Slavic aspect in such a way as to make specific distinctions between 1) assumptions which do not challenge linguistic realities and 2) expectations which may or may not challenge linguistic realities. Such a distinction is particularly relevant for Chapters 3 and 4 and an interpretation of the data and the development of the model. Both are based on the pervasiveness of similar statements throughout the prescriptive and scholarly material on Slavic aspect. Based on the existing descriptions, I posit the following expectations: 1) that all verbs in MAC, BLC, and RUS have aspect; and further 2) that all verbs in these languages realize formal oppositions by way of aspectual pairs, one imperfective and one perfective verb. I assume that the addition of a prefix to a simple verb results in a perfective verb. I likewise assume that the addition of the suffix -va- results in an imperfective verb. Such considerations (expectations and assumptions) figure prominently in the discussion of the status and position of borrowed verbs in Slavic precisely because prefixation and/or suffixation serve as a measure of the assimilation to the category of aspect. Moreover, the assumption here is that aspect is primarily a morphological category in Slavic.37

37Later in this study I emphasize the differences among the three Slavic languages under study here: at the same time there are features that I have found common to all three languages based on an evaluation of the languages and a review of literature regarding the individual languages. Each language is viewed independently and therefore I offer the most genderal conclusions concerning the three languages.
CHAPTER 2

THE STATUS AND POSITION OF BORROWED VERBS
IN SLAVIC

2.0 Introduction

This chapter summarizes and reviews the literature concerning borrowed verbs in RUS, BLG and MAC. From this review it is possible again to outline basic "expectations" concerning the treatment and development of borrowed verbs. Due to the fact that I present new data in Chapter 3, I make no "assumptions" concerning the borrowed verbs at this point. Further, from this review, we note two broad tendencies in the approaches to the study of borrowed verbs: scholars either pursue the topic as one of borrowing or as a study of aspect. Specifically, I emphasize the need to integrate both of these approaches into a single comprehensive approach which permits us to better account for the linguistic reality of each language. This chapter serves as the necessary background for interpreting the results of the questionnaires concerning borrowed verbs and the nativization process and subsequent implications for the category of aspect in the respective languages.

2.1 Biaspectual Verbs in Slavic: Some Expectations

In this review of the literature, I find it again necessary to state that much of the literature on aspect focuses on RUS, and that often the references to Slavic aspect are primarily about RUS aspect (see Chapter 1 ft 1 and Friedman's comments regarding
the status of literature and RUS as a focus). Thus, whenever possible I make an effort to bring together a number of the descriptions of the borrowed and biaspectual verbs in RUS, BLG and MAC. The literature on MAC is not as abundant as we find on other Slavic languages. Therefore literature that addresses the topic of borrowed and biaspectual verbs in MAC is limited. Friedman (1985:234) makes the following point: "...the close relationship of Bulgarian and Macedonian has led some scholars to treat them as virtually identical linguistic systems, an approach which is reinforced by official Bulgarian political attitudes." Yet, this is clearly not the case regarding the assimilation of borrowed verbs. As we will see in the data (in Chapter 3), there is a notable difference in the "breadth" of the assimilation between MAC and BLG. One factor that influences this distinction is the different orientations and political influences on the different countries: MAC speakers identify more closely with and have been influenced by SBC given the position of Macedonia within the former Yugoslav Republic contrasted to the BLG orientation to RUS and the Soviet Union.¹

As a result of a review of literature, it is possible to enumerate five features that are universally attributed to biaspectual verbs in Slavic. Unless otherwise noted, a feature is common to all three languages treated here. However, it is also important to note that in the details concerning borrowed verbs in each language there are specific and meaningful differences that are discussed in conjunction with the data (see Chapter 3). For instance, the literature concerning the borrowed and biaspectual verbs in RUS contains more references (and recognition and normativization) of prefixed forms of the borrowed verbs than we find in the literature concerning borrowed and biaspectual verbs in BLG and MAC. Yet, an explanation for the occurrence of such forms remains

¹Before the breakdown of the Soviet Union it was not uncommon to hear reference to Bulgaria as the sixteenth republic of the Soviet Union. Such statements speak to the influence that Russia had on Bulgaria throughout this time; the influence was not only political but is reflected as well in the lexicon.
absent. (See for example Sheljakin (1979;1983), Muchnik (1961;1966), Avilova (1976), Magner (1963), among others).

As stated in Chapter 1, Slavic verbs may be biaspectual, i.e., with a single form for both the perfective and imperfective aspectual meaning. The assumptions and expectations (as defined in Chapter 1) of this class of verbs are of particular concern here.

First, these biaspectual verbs are categorized into two different sub-groups of verbs, 1) native verbs. (See examples 1-3.)

1) RUS kaznit ‘to execute’
2) BLG moga ‘to be able’
3) MAC praša ‘to ask’

and 2) borrowed verbs. (See examples 4-6.)

4) RUS rekomendirovat’ ‘to recommend’
5) BLG agitiram ‘to agitate, bother’
6) MAC analizira ‘to analyze’

For clarification, native here refers to those verbs with native RUS roots, kaz-, mag- compared to kollekt-, plan- which are borrowed/foreign roots. It is interesting to note that -ira- verbs occur in RUS with native (Slavic) roots, bolševizirovat’ ‘to bolshevize’ and skladirovat’ ‘to store’ and in BLG with Slavic roots e.g., obiskiram ‘to search’ skladiiram ‘to store, stock’ as well. There is an example of a TRK borrowing into BLG that has the -ira- suffix basiram ‘to bet’ from TRK bahis ‘bet’. In each Slavic language the first group— the native verbs— is a small, exceptional group of verbs that are considered to be outside the scope of aspect (see Belić 1955; Beaulieux 1950; Muchnik 1961;1966).

The verbs that constitute this group and classification vary from language to language.
in that a biaspectual in one language may be part of an aspectual pair in another. (See Table 2.1: Examples of Native Biaspectual Verbs in Slavic.)

2 Structural clues of some, here, "native" verbs indicate in fact that the verb was borrowed from OCS into RUS, e.g., ženit'sja 'to marry'. One ženjatsya 'they will marry' shows a stress shift back to the stem which is indicative of a Church Slavonicism, see Levin 1978 and Vlasto 1986. I would argue however that it is possible that a speaker does not necessarily have knowledge of OCS and in order for these particular verbs to be recognized as borrowings knowledge of OCS would be required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>RUS</th>
<th>BLG</th>
<th>MAC</th>
<th>SBC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to promise</td>
<td>obeičat'</td>
<td>obeštaja/obeištavam</td>
<td>obešati</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to kiss</td>
<td>celovat/po-</td>
<td>celuvam/celuna</td>
<td>celuva</td>
<td>celovati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to eat</td>
<td>est'/s'est'</td>
<td>jam (IMP)</td>
<td>jade</td>
<td>jesti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ask</td>
<td>sprašivat'/sprosit'</td>
<td>pitam</td>
<td>praša</td>
<td>pitati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to harden</td>
<td>kalit'/zakalit'</td>
<td>kalja</td>
<td>kali (IMP)</td>
<td>kaliti/na-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to hear</td>
<td>slyšat'/uslyšat'</td>
<td>čuja</td>
<td>sluša</td>
<td>čuti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: Examples of Native Biaspectual Verbs in Slavic

Thus, a native Slavic verb may be biaspectual in one Slavic language and imperfective in another Slavic language. (See Table 2.1: Native Biaspectuals in Slavic.)

I suggest that this type of language-specific development indicates that aspect in these historically-related languages does not necessarily develop in the same manner along the same course. Therefore, the over-generalization by many scholars that what holds true for RUS holds true for all Slavic, as indicated by Friedman (1985), needs to be reevaluated. There is no expectation in this investigation that, within genetically-related languages grammars and grammatical categories will develop identically.⁴

Hence, the borrowed verbs appear to be marginal in their respective languages because they occur in both imperfective and perfective contexts; such occurrences do not conform to the expectations of aspect and verbs in the respective languages (as we

---

³This is not an exhaustive list of biaspectual verbs in the languages.

⁴Saussure (1916:313) writes, "[n]o family of languages rightly belongs once and for all to a particular linguistic type." If there were such confines on taxonomy and typology, the question might arise concerning whether English is less Indo-European or less Germanic because of the loss of gender outside of personal pronouns.
saw in Chapter 1). For example, a paired perfective verb does not occur after certain verbs that mean to 'begin', 'continue', 'finish'. (See examples 7-8.)

7) RUS *Ivan načal pročítat' knigu. Ivan started to finish reading the book.

8) RUS Ivan načal čítit' knigu. Ivan started to read the book.

Nor can it denote on-going (actual) present events in all three languages. In RUS a perfective cannot form the analytic future in byt' 'be'. In BLG the perfective cannot form the present participle or adverb nor can it occur as a negated imperative; and in MAC the perfective nonpast cannot occur outside of subordination to a limited set of participles (Friedman 1985; Lunt 1952; Maslov 1959; Forsyth 1970; Kramer 1983). Likewise, an imperfective verb has certain morphosyntactic restraints: it does not occur after RUS uspet'+ inf 'to succeed in X'. However, a biaspectual verb can occur in both grammatical frames, (see examples 9-10):

9) Rabočie načali remontirovat' èto oborudovanie. IMP

'The workers started to fix the equipment.'

10) Rabočie uspeli remontirovat' èto oborudovanie.\(^5\) PFV

The workers succeeded in repairing the equipment.

Specifically, BLG imperfective frames include the present active participle, počna da + verb and verbal nouns in -ne; the MAC IMP frames include počna + IMP; PFV frames include uspee + verb; the RUS frames include načat' + IMP, končit', prodolžit' RUS uspet' + PFV. Sometimes the "biaspectuality" is realized through temporal

\(^5\)Examples 7-8 were provided by native informants.
distinctions, e.g., MAC piše 'to write' is regularly imperfective in the present and perfective in the past (see Lunt 1952; Usikova 1985). The biaspectral verbs are used in all of these frames in all three languages. This is one feature of biaspectral verbs that definitely distinguishes them from the regularity and "predictability" of mono-aspectual verbs.

A second characteristic of the biaspectral verbs is that there are significantly fewer native biaspectuals than borrowed biaspectuals. In Russian, for instance, the number of native biaspectral verbs is between 40-50. Magner (1963:621) suggests that half of the 40-50 verbs can be eliminated from consideration because they have fallen out of usage, become archaic or specialized e.g., izvestkovat' 'to fertilize with lime'; the number of borrowed verbs is well over 500 today and is still very productive (see Demidenko 1966 and Ivanova 1967; and Avilova 1967). Magner's point is well taken and may be applied conversely: if verbs can fall out of use it follows that they can be added to the lexicon. Clearly, the native sub-group of biaspectral verbs is not productive in any of the Slavic languages (see Muchnik 1961; Belić 1959; Beaulieux

---

6Similar usage and tense distinctions have been noted in CZ and SLK by Havranek-Jedlicka (1960:224), whereby the biaspectral simple verbs are being used with the perfective meaning more frequently in the past tense; and the present forms are increasingly felt to be imperfective with the future having a tendency to be periphrastic, e.g. bude se hodit "it will be fit".

7The number of biaspectuals in any of the languages varies according to scholar and the time a certain work was composed. In BLG for example Maslov (1963:39) includes more biaspectuals than Beaulieux (1950:176). Maslov includes verbs that Beaulieux obviously does not; he adds qualifiers to their position such that bija 'to beat' is biaspectral, however it is mostly imperfective; čuja 'to hear' is biaspectral but one hears and finds čuvam 'to hear' IMP. This variation with native verbs speaks to systemic, aspectual, pressures to morphologize and grammaticalize aspect thereby removing any and all ambiguity of aspectual expression.

8See Priestley (1987) for an interesting discussion on the nature and different qualitative evaluations of the productivity of borrowed verbs in Slovenian.
Yet, the borrowed biaspectuals as a class, are a highly productive group (see Magner 1963; Demidenko 1966; Maslov 1965; Scatton 1994). A third characteristic of the biaspectual borrowed verbs is that these verbs are primarily internationalisms and verbs of Western European origin, e.g., RUS *administrirovat* 'to administrate' BLG *parkiram* 'to park' MAC *bajpasira* ‘to bypass’. There are however some Slavic roots that have been combined with the borrowed suffix, e.g., BLG *bulgariziram* 'to bulgarize' RUS *rusificirovat* 'to Russify, Russianize' MAC *slovenizira*. Currently, English (ENG) is a major source of borrowings for the Slavic languages e.g. BLG *startiram* 'to start' RUS *tatuirovat* ‘to tattoo’. 

---

9 It would be interesting to pursue this point and discover whether neologisms are paired by speakers.

10 Here I make the point that the literature that directly addresses the borrowed and biaspectral verbs is from a very narrow time period, (1964-1983) and from a limited number of scholars (less than 10). Further, the general literature concerning aspect in Slavic has a tradition of stating the basic facts concerning borrowed verbs outlined above regardless of the age of the publication. The sources more often cited here are therefore from the period when the borrowed verbs were part of the discussion. There is still the expectation that verbs in Slavic have aspectual pairs composed of one perfective and one imperfective verb. As well it is still the assumption that borrowed, or possibly more specifically newly borrowed verbs do not demonstrate this feature, but instead have a single form for both aspectual meanings.

11 Recall that the Turkish influence on the SSL languages was great; Neikirk (1992) investigates the different assimilatory patterns of Turkish loanwords and English loanwords into SBC and concludes that they show marked distinction in the assimilatory process. The Turkish loans were phonologically and morphologically assimilated whereas the WEur borrowings demonstrate a marked feature (possible [-not mine] to the extent that the default gender of borrowings is masculine whereas at earlier stages of SBC it was neuter. (See Kragalott 1974.)

12 This is not to say that Slavic borrowings are less or more acceptable, e.g, purist movements in BLG to purge the RUS element. However, there is a broad familiarity with RUS among the Bulgarians due to political circumstances of the post-World War II era.

13 The actual language of origin is often difficult to determine in borrowing situations. Items are borrowed in one language and a third language borrows from the second language. For the purposes of this study the language of origin is not relevant.

14 I speculate that one reason for the increased number of direct English borrowings is due to the much greater degree of access to original English electronic and print media sources, MTV, TNT, CNN, VOA, *Time, Newsweek, USA Today*, etc.
A fourth characteristic of this group of BIAS verbs is the shape of the suffix: within Slavic, the borrowed verbs are realized with two basic suffixes. Russian and the South Slavic languages (SSL) use the suffix -ira- (and variants) while Ukrainian (UKR) and Belorussian (BEL) and the West Slavic languages (WSL) use the suffix -ova- (and variants). As Table 2.2 indicates, the languages exhibit variations in the realization of the suffix as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUS</th>
<th>BLG</th>
<th>MAC</th>
<th>SBC</th>
<th>POL</th>
<th>UKR</th>
<th>BEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-irova</td>
<td>-ira</td>
<td>-ira</td>
<td>-ira</td>
<td>-ova</td>
<td>-ova</td>
<td>-ova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-icirova</td>
<td>-izira</td>
<td>-uva</td>
<td>-isa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-izirova</td>
<td>-irva</td>
<td></td>
<td>-izira</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ova</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: Borrowed Verb Suffixes in Slavic

All accounts treated here posit the origin of the -ira- suffix in Slavic as a borrowing from GER based on verbs that end in the suffix -ieren, e.g., GER studieren 'to study' (see Vankov 1959; Jernej 1959; Muchnik 1966; Stefano 1954). It is this -ieren suffix that was borrowed into RUS and SSL (see Jernej 1959; Muchnik 1961; Priestly 1987). In Slavic -ira- is a very productive verbal suffix. (See Table 2.3.)

15Note that in RUS the -irat ending does not occur with borrowed verbs. This class of verbs is composed of native verbs of the type, sobirat' 'to collect' IMP /sobrat/ PFV, zadirat' 'to tease' IMP /zadrat/ PFV.

16 Singh and Kully (1982) discuss the origin of the -ieren suffix as it occurs in GER. In GER, the verbal suffix is a combination of a native verbal suffix -en and the borrowed suffix -ier (the donor of which is the Romance languages). Whereas the productivity of the suffix was initially restricted to "Romance bases" currently the suffix -ieren attaches "freely and productively to recent borrowings (even when they are not Romance), e.g., schampunieren 'to shampoo' from ENG and kutschieren 'to drive a horse-carriage' from Hungarian.

17It has been suggested (see Stefanov 1954:369) that the -is- suffix is from the
Combinations of the suffixes and variants occur in RUS and BLG. (See examples 10-16.)

11) RUS -icirova-, klassificirovat' 'to classify';
12) RUS -izirova-, dramatizirovat' 'to dramatize'
13) RUS -irova, avansirovat' 'to advance'  
14) BLG -iram, transformiram 'to transform'
15) BLG -iziram, signaliziram 'to signal'
16) -irvam, maskirvam 'to mask'

In addition, the placement of stress on the newly borrowed verb is related to the shape of the formant. By this I mean that in the suffixes which include -ira- the stress falls on the first segment of the suffix, -ira-, regardless of the stress pattern of the borrowing language. This fixed stress formant is more distinctive in MAC which otherwise has fixed antepenultimate stress. When verbs are borrowed into MAC they do not conform to the native stress pattern. Thus, the stress on the suffix marks the verb as foreign/nonnative, e.g., analizira 'to analyze' not *analizira.

It is interesting to note that in the 1957 MAC Gramatika, Koneski (1957:137) suggested that the aspectual meanings are distinguished by the placement of the stress in the MAC verb, e.g., telefonira PFV - telefonira IMP. Yet, Koneski does concede that there is no "systematic" application of this distinction. Usikova (1967:40), however, disagrees with Koneski on this matter; she affirms the biaspectuality of these verbs and places primacy upon the role of context in distinguishing aspectual meaning.

Greek (GRK) -iso verbs and that the GER -ieren suffix combined with the -iso and surfaces in modern RUS in -isira- -icira.-

In the 17th century, in RUS as well as in WSL, the -ova- suffix was productive (Vlasto 1986; Netteberg 1953; Vankov 1959). The influence of the GER -ieren does not appear to have spread or included WSL; rather, the productivity of the -ova- remains stable with the most recent borrowings from ENG.
in MAC. The fixed stress of the suffix -ira- also influences the nativization process in RUS because derived imperfective formations with -yva- occur with those verbs that have end stress, e.g., -ovát', see Chapter 1 fn 19, (Wade 1992; Demidenko 1966; Muchnik 1961)). This study follows Usikova in this matter and argues that, in fact, there is no stress distinction for aspectual meaning because I have found no evidence to suggest in fact that this distinction occurs in the speech and usage of native speakers.  

Although the notion of a "single-form-to-a-single-function" is attractive, it is unlikely that speakers of MAC would use stress as a distinguishing feature when the language does not have phonemic stress. Similarly, Korubin (1981) proposes there is evidence of assimilation to the native stress pattern of MAC with borrowed verbs. He (1981:128) notes instances in MAC where there has been a shift to accommodate the native stress pattern with borrowed (bi-aspectual) verbs, e.g., formira 'to form' is more often pronounced förmira and not formìra, and the verb nervira se 'to get nervous' is always nèrvira se. This shift in stress may be related, he suggests, to the time the verb has been in use as well as frequency of use.  

The stress distinction that Koneski (1957) considered applicable for MAC has also been referred to in the BLG Pravogovoren rečnik na Balgarskiia ezik (1975) in regard to the same aspectual distinctions. However, BLG native speakers assert that this particular distinction is not included in later versions of the Pravogovoren rečnik.  

---

19 The Macedonian questionnaire included an inquiry that asked the respondents to mark the stress of given sentences which contained borrowed verbs. The sentences were constructed to represent unambiguously one aspect. Not a single respondent made this stress distinction.

20 I would offer that dialect area may play a role as well in the stress placement for some native speakers. Korubin's (1981) article though unfortunately does not provide information on his sources or method for his conclusions.

21 The effort by speakers (and/or linguists?) to associate different forms with different functions is an interesting example of metalinguistic awareness, e.g., BLG gledàx aor gledáx IMP 'I saw' (see Aronson 1985 and Brecht 1985 for more on the form/function relationship). I discussed this with native speakers who are also professors
Finally, the biaspectual verbs are characterized by the fact that both the native and borrowed verbs are considered marginal within the respective verbal and grammatical systems and, therefore, are outside the scope of the 'regularity' of Slavic or language-specific, aspectual systems. Quite simply, borrowed verbs are considered exceptional by most scholars that discuss biaspectual verbs within the parameters of aspect. For instance, Sheljakin (1979:3) states that the RUS biaspectuals occupy a 'značitel'noe mesto' 'noteworthy position' within the grammatical system. Maslov (1963:12), likewise, places the biaspectual verbs in BLG to be "na forna na ednovidovite" 'against the background of the mono-aspectual verbs.' Ivanova (1964:245) in the same vein, asserts that borrowed verbs are "isolated from the processes of perfectivization and imperfectivization." Hence, these verbs have eluded an adequate systemic description and do not seem to be governed by the organizing role of the category. Yet, the current speech patterns of native BLG speakers provide evidence in support of a different conclusion.\footnote{Horecky (1957) refers to the prefixation of borrowed verbs in POL as an "izčistvanie 'complete cleansing'" of the duality of the aspect of the borrowed verbs. It is an interesting choice of words and indicative of the markedness implications for these verbs in the borrowing languages when they are not completely assimilated.}

Therefore, if we accept the expectations of verbal systems (outlined in Chapter 1) and the generally accepted features of borrowed and biaspectual verbs discussed here, then we should be led to the conclusion that these borrowed verbs lie outside the aspectual system. But borrowed verbs in RUS, BLG and MAC demonstrate, to varying degrees, a development of mono-aspectual verbs. Such a development, I suggest, contradicts the conclusions of previous investigations and the general characterizations of borrowed verbs in Slavic, as biaspectual verbs and as marginal elements within the aspectual system.

\footnote{at Veliko Tarnovo University, some of whom are philologists and linguists; one in particular, is a lexicographer, who at the time was preparing a new dictionary which she assured me did not include the stress/aspect distinctions.}
This brief outline of the literature concerning biaspectuality further reveals a marked distinction between the treatment of the two sub-groups of verbs within the classification of biaspectual verbs, the native and borrowed verbs: 1) whereas the biaspectual borrowed verbs share a shape and stress pattern, the native biaspectual verbs vary in stem classes; and 2) whereas the borrowed biaspectual verbs show a marked productivity, i.e., new verbs enter the class, the native verbs are limited. Further, as the data (presented in Chapter 3) demonstrate, the borrowed biaspectual verbs display a tendency to move out of the biaspectual category, i.e., are not perceived as biaspectual by native speakers or "lose" their biaspectuality over time, whereas the native verbs do not necessarily demonstrate the same. The status of the native biaspectual verbs in the different languages is an interesting point of comparison as well. We see from the data that in RUS the native biaspectual verbs are in fact mono-aspectualized by speakers.\textsuperscript{23} These two distinctions of the subclasses raise questions concerning the taxonomy of borrowed biaspectual verbs along with the sub-class of native biaspectual verbs. What the two classes do share is an expectation that there is a single form for both perfective and imperfective meaning. I propose that a different descriptor and classification may, in fact, be appropriate for the borrowed biaspectual verbs: the term and concept of a-aspectual, i.e., aspectless. (This is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5).

2.2 Borrowed Verbs: Realities

The features of borrowed and biaspectual verbs outlined above are summarized from the treatments of these verbs in literature on aspect in Slavic. It is important to note the lack of reference to forms of borrowed verbs that exhibit nativized features;

\textsuperscript{23}It is further worth pointing out that the native biaspectual list varies among the languages, therefore the plausibility of the native biaspectual verbs being mono-aspectualized is present.
many borrowed verbs have prefixes. Briefly, if we imagine the initial borrowing and a subsequent "assimilation continuum" that charts the nativization path of borrowed verbs, the far left of that trajectory locates the initial stages of borrowing, the verbs that do not distinguish aspect, yet do distinguish the other verbal categories, i.e., person, tense, mood, number. The far right of that trajectory, then, locates the verbs that have been completely assimilated i.e., there is a formalization of aspeсtual meaning, prefixation and/or suffixation and no distinction from native verbs. The prefixation and suffixation are indicative of the nativization of the borrowed verb precisely because they are the mechanisms used with native verbs to formalize aspeсtual meaning, e.g.:

17) BLG zaangażiram 'to engage, reserve'
    iskomentiram 'to comment'

18) MAC isplanira 'to plan'
    isformira 'to form, formulate'

The case of RUS is somewhat different because in some instances the complex mono-aspeсtual form of a borrowed verb is documented in prescriptive and normative sources. For example, prefixed perfectives of borrowed verbs, e.g., zafiksirovat' 'to note down', are no longer marginal elements of the aspeсtual system in RUS. The marginality is dependent upon features which appear to be anomalous with respect to the rest of the verbal system and, as such, the borrowed verbs are anomalous because there is a single form for both perfective and imperfective meaning. Thus, if (or rather when) aspeсtual pairs emerge, the reason for placing them in a marginal category is eliminated. Moreover, what is important to note here is that even though in RUS there is recognition by grammarians and linguists of the development of mono-aspeсtual borrowed verbs from the borrowed biaspeсtual verb, there is no reconciliation of the synchronic variation and coexistence of the two types of borrowed verbs and these
verbs are positioned somewhere between these two points, i.e., nativized and non-nativized.

The existence of the mono-aspectual forms is only sometimes acknowledged by scholars and grammarians, and is considered primarily colloquial and conversational style. Čolakova (1955:279) writes: "...te se upotrebljavat predimno v razgovornata reči v ezika na publistikata." 'these forms are being used primarily in conversational speech and in the language of journalism.' Maslov (1963:127), too, remarks on the presence of the complex forms in BLG: ".. proisxođit v literaturnom [BLG] jazyke s izvestnym zatrudnenijem i nosit v izvestnoj mere prostorečnij karakter." [the complex forms of the borrowed verbs] occur in the literary language with notable difficulty and carry with them a certain degree of the vernacular character.' These scholars in effect, are avoiding the linguistic reality: speakers do indeed use such forms with regularity. The very presence of these forms in speech has significant implications for the structure of the aspectual and verbal systems of these languages (these are discussed in Chapter 5). And if speakers use mono-aspectual forms, it follows that they want to formalize aspectual meaning even when scholars and grammarians do not. Thus, for most linguists, the features of biaspectual borrowed verbs constitute an anomaly within the aspectual system; yet the speaker consistently nativizes the borrowed verb.24

____________________

24Surely then if speakers use the complex forms then other factors must be at work in discourse factors and context. Isačenko (1960:144) writes:

_Vidovoe značenje takix glagolov [biaspectuals] zavisit ot kommunikativnye zadaniya govorkaščego, ot togo, čto govorkaščij xotel vyražit'. Sobesednik že opredeljaet vidovoe značenie odnovidovyx glagolov iz kontekssta 'The aspectual meaning of biaspectual verbs depends on the communicative intent of the speaker and on what the speaker wants to express. The listener then determines the aspectual meaning of the mono-aspectual verbs from context.'
2.2.1 Borrowed Verbs and Biaspectuality

The research on borrowed and biaspectual verbs presents the unified opinion that the status and position of borrowed verbs in the different Slavic languages is marginal. The "problem" of biaspectual verbs within these aspectual systems stems from the descriptions of biaspectual and borrowed verbs themselves. These verbs contradict the basic features of aspect as we understand it as a category, both in terms of morphological distinctions and the formal opposition of aspectual meaning. The absence of formal oppositions with biaspectual borrowed verbs positions context first in a hierarchical structure of aspectual expression. Within the hierarchy of aspectual expression morphology is generally accepted as the primary means with "regular" paired verbs. With the native mono-aspectual verbs, where morphology expresses the aspectual meaning, any emphasis of aspectual meaning is explained by context. With borrowed verbs however, the primary means of expressing aspectual meaning is context, and scholars generally attribute the use of formalized aspectual meaning with borrowed verbs to emphasis on the aspectual meaning (see Mazić 1976; AG 1980; Neikirk 1994). Thus, the borrowed verbs are marginal in this respect as well, and there is a reversal in the hierarchical structure of aspectual expression with borrowed verbs. Perhaps then, it is necessary to either re-examine the definition of a category in general or to reassess the category of aspect within the existing definition and description.

Through the Structuralist's lens, aspect as a grammatical category yields organizing features to which all verbs are subject. This necessarily implies an opposition and an all-inclusive application of the linguistic, i.e. morphological, features of the category outlined above. Yet, this also raises the important question of whether
the scope of aspect includes all verbs in RUS or, instead, is limited to all RUS, i.e., native and nativized, verbs (discussed in Chapter 4). Most native verbs, with very few exceptions, formalize the aspectual opposition by way of morphological distinctions: 1) prefixation čit' IMP /pro-čit' PFV 'to read', 2) suffixation dopit' / dopivat' 'to drink up'. The native RUS verbs are paired; there is one perfective verb and one imperfective verb.

There are, however, native verbs which lack formal aspectual oppositions and therefore are outside the scope of the pairing and opposition features of aspect. Such verbs are considered either:

1) imperfective verbs that do not have perfective meanings (imperfectiva tantum):
   19) RUS imet' 'to have'
   20) RUS prinadležat' 'to own'
   21) RUS janut' 'to pull'

2) perfective verbs that do not have imperfective meanings (perfectiva tantum):
   22) RUS ruxnut' 'to collapse'

or 3) biaspectual verbs that have both an imperfective and a perfective meaning, but lack formal expressions and oppositions:
   23) RUS ranit' 'to wound'
   24) RUS kaznit' 'to execute'

(see Vinogradov 1947; Isačenko 1965; Townsend 1980).

For the biaspectual verbs, then, context alone is thought to express the perfective or imperfective meaning (see Demidenko 1966).

---

Exceptions noted here include suppletive pairs e.g., govoriť/skažť 'to say, tell' and native biaspectuals, e.g., ranit' 'to wound'. The suppletive pairs are only aspectually exceptional because the forms of the verb do not have a morphological and/or derivational relationship.
By such definitions, biaspectual verbs are anomalies within the aspecual system because these verbs do not display the morphological distinctions characteristic of the category. It must be pointed out that according to the logic of the classification of tantum whether perfectiva or imperfectiva, verbs within these groups are mono-aspectual verbs and, therefore, their anomalous character is simply based on the fact that their meaning precludes an aspecual opposition (see Karcevski 1927; Maslov 1963; KRG 1989). Hence, I maintain that semantics plays a role in the category of aspect and more specifically, in the development of aspecual pairs (see Brecht 1985; Merrill 1985). In this regard the position of semantics in the aspecual paradigm mirrors its position in the nominal paradigm and in the assignment of gender to nouns, i.e., the adaptation to the category of gender in borrowed nouns (see Chapter 1).

Borrowed verbs, however, are rarely discussed in terms of these morphological derivations. The Academy Grammar (1983:268) accords these forms marginal status as dialectal forms for some Bulgarians. Hence, the occurrence of similar patterns of quasi-morphological aspecual distinctions—with forms such as angažiram-zaangažiram 'to reserve', planiram-planirvam 'to plan'—necessitates a re-evaluation of borrowed verbs.

2.2.2 Borrowed Verbs: Prescriptive Variation

The variation of descriptions of borrowed verbs within prescriptive and normative grammar and linguistic discussions is indicative of the variation at large with borrowed verb nativization and use. Further, it is interesting to note that the status of a

---

26This can be similarly noted in the assignment of gender to foreign nouns (see Gulová 1987; Priestley 1982).

27Throughout Bremel's (1994) work, the semantics of the verb is a factor in the development of aspecual oppositions. He offers a breakdown of verbs into semantic groups similar to Vendler's work (1967).
borrowed verb varies according to the dictionary. Dictionaries and grammars often omit reference to the aspect of borrowed verbs (see Smirnitsky 1980) or mark them as “biaspectral” (OSRJ 1980; ESRJ 1984). The descriptive sources of RUS, for example, do not offer a consensus of the status and position of the borrowed verb in the aspectual system (see Muchnik 1961; 1966). A comparison of the citations reveal the notable variation and/or fluctuation of the aspectual status of these verbs at a normative level. (See Table 2.3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>U1935</th>
<th>ESRJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bronirovat'</td>
<td>to reserve</td>
<td>BIAS</td>
<td>BIAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dekvalificirovat'sja</td>
<td>to get disqualified</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>BIAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kamuflirovat'</td>
<td>to camouflage</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>BIAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lidirovat'</td>
<td>to lead</td>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>BIAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nikelirovat'</td>
<td>to nickel</td>
<td>BIAS</td>
<td>BIAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gofrirovat'</td>
<td>to crimp, goffer</td>
<td>BIAS</td>
<td>IMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stenografirovat'</td>
<td>to take in shorthand</td>
<td>BIAS</td>
<td>IMP (old PFV)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NF = not found in dictionary

**Table 2.3: Variation Among Dictionary Citations of Borrowed Verbs in RUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>O1952</th>
<th>OSRJ 1963</th>
<th>SSRLJ 1963</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bronirovat'</td>
<td>IMP /za- PFV</td>
<td>PFV</td>
<td>NF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dekvalificirovat'sja</td>
<td>no aspectual notes</td>
<td>PFV</td>
<td>NF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kamuflirovat'</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>IMP w/ PFV za-</td>
<td>IMP₂⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lidirovat'</td>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>BIAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nikelirovat'</td>
<td>IMP /ot- PFV</td>
<td>IMP w/ PFV ot-</td>
<td>BIAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gofrirovat'</td>
<td>BIAS</td>
<td>BIAS</td>
<td>IMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stenografirovat'</td>
<td>IMP / za- PFV</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>BIAS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3 con't

²⁸It is interesting to note that this verb was defined with the borrowed verb maskirovat' 'to mask'.
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While the verb *lidirovat* 'to lead' is IMP in U1935, O1952, OSRJ 1963 it is BIAS in SSRLJ and ESRJ, the verb *gofrirovat* shows the opposite being BIAS in U1935, O1952, and OSRJ 1963 and IMP in ESRJ and SSRLJ 1963. Such varied interpretations of the status of the borrowings are indicative of the questions addressed here: speakers’ use and perception of the status and position of borrowed verbs. There is not a single prescriptive rule regarding borrowed verbs that is intended to guide speakers’ behavior. (See Table 2.4 Variation in Dictionary Citations of Borrowed Verbs in BLG). The status of borrowed verbs in the literature dictionary and grammars appears to be as variable as the usage of borrowed verbs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>datiram</td>
<td>to date</td>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>BIAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matiram</td>
<td>to match, mate</td>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>BIAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dominiram</td>
<td>to dominate</td>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>BIAS</td>
<td>IMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simpatiziram</td>
<td>to sympathize</td>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>BIAS</td>
<td>BIAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>figuriram</td>
<td>to figure</td>
<td>BIAS</td>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>IMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>konstrastiram</td>
<td>to contrast</td>
<td>BIAS</td>
<td>BIAS</td>
<td>IMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administriram</td>
<td>to administrate</td>
<td>BIAS</td>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>IMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akompaniram</td>
<td>to accompany</td>
<td>BIAS</td>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>IMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>čestikuliram</td>
<td>to gesture</td>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>IMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valsiram</td>
<td>to waltz</td>
<td>BIAS</td>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>IMP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2.4 Variation in Dictionary Citations of Borrowed Verbs in BLG

Likewise as we see in the different citations of the RUS verbs, in BLG there is variation among the sources. One point of interest from the table can be noted with the citations of the verbs datiram and matiram. For each verb the 1955 dictionaries cited them as IMP, while the 1994 dictionary cites them as BIAS. The opposite case can be noted with the citations for the verb konstrastiram for which both 1955 sources cite the verb as BIAS while the 1994 dictionary considers the verb IMP. There is no clear direction from a chronological standpoint of the progression of the development of the aspectual status of such verbs from 1995-1994, i.e., not only do the two 1955 sources disagree in some instances (e.g., dominiram 'to dominate') but between 1955 and 1994, some IMP "become" BIAS and some BIAS verbs "become" IMP.
2.3 Borrowed Verbs and Aspect: Different Approaches

Within the vast amount available on Slavic aspect in general there is a relatively small quantity of literature specifically devoted to borrowed verbs and 'biaspectuals'. The discussions of borrowed verbs in RUS constitute the majority of the literature on borrowed verbs in Slavic. Therefore, much of the literature discussed here has RUS as a focus and BLG and/or MAC as a secondary focus. In a review of the works on borrowed and biaspectral verbs, two perspectives emerge concerning the status and position of biaspectuality and borrowed verbs in RUS, BLG and MAC: either the authors approach the borrowed verbs as a study of aspect (Sheljakin 1979; 1983; Ivanchev 1971; Demidenko 1966) or as a study of borrowing (Avilova 1967; Minova-Gurkova 1966; Ivanov 1964).

2.3.1 Borrowed Verbs: A Study in Aspect

The accounts of borrowed and biaspectral verbs in Slavic as a study in aspect is represented by Muchnik (1966), Sheljakin (1979), Kabakchiev (1992), Ivanchev (1971), Maslov (1963) and Demidenko (1966). The stability of the category of biaspectuality emerges as a language-specific development. In a study of RUS these scholars find that biaspectuality is not marginal or anomalous to the RUS aspectual system, i.e., the expression of aspect for biaspectral verbs is relegated to the functional load of context and discourse factors. Both Kabakchiev and Ivanchev, who offer a comparative study of aspect, find that the status of biaspectral verbs is in fact stable in BLG and unstable in RUS. The conclusions of these three researchers converge on the point concerning the instability of biaspectuability in RUS; but each researcher has a different opinion on the specifics of the nature of biaspectuality and its implications for the system.
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Muchnik, although he notes an increase in the number of prefixed forms of
borrowed verbs, suggests that the large and increasing number of biaspectual verbs expands the scope of analytic indicators of aspect, i.e., it is increasingly regular for discourse factors and context to express aspectual meaning. Muchnik (1966:73) remarks:

{o"evidno, $to$ dvuvidovost' onjug' ne isključaet soorvetstvujuščie glagoly iz sfery kategorii vidov, a tol'ko neopredelennym obrazom modificiroet plan ee vyraženija, ras"irjaja krug analiticheskix sredstv i soorvetstvennym obrazom sokraščaja ee affiksal'nye sredstva 'It is obvious that biaspectuality by no means excludes the corresponding verbs from the sphere of the category of aspects, but only in an undefined way modifies the form of its expression, broadening the circle of analytical means and in a corresponding way its affixal means.'

Such analytic means of expressing aspect are presumably sufficient if the category of biaspectuality is stable. Yet, Muchnik himself refers to 150 borrowed verbs in RUS which, at that time, have prefixed perfective forms, verbs which are no longer biaspectual but mono-aspectual. Muchnik concludes that the borrowed biaspectual verbs in RUS are systemically stable, i.e., aspect has a three-way distinction: imperfective, perfective and biaspectral. Such an account suggests that biaspectuality is not anomalous but in fact a regular feature of theaspectual system, i.e., they are fit into an already existing category of (native) biaspectual verbs. He does not however, comment on the incongruity of biaspectuality (a stable and persistent biaspectuality) and Structuralist binarism. The basis for this stability, Muchnik asserts, is grounded in the structural limitations of the language itself (see also Sheljakin 1979; Demidenko 1966). The borrowed verbs demonstrate limited productivity in native derivation processes, both imperfectivizing and perfectivizing.29 The secondary imperfectivization, as a

---

29It is necessary to note that there are borrowed verbs that occur without the suffix -ira- and/or -ova- in RUS, e.g., bombit' 'to bombard' IMP and PFV razbombit', and bankrolit' 'to bankroll' IMP and obankrolit' PFV. This is especially interesting in light of the discussion in Chapter 4 and the notion of [+not mine] as it influences the nativization process. If the -ir(oza)- suffix is a marker of the foreignness of the verb, then the
process, is limited in application to borrowed verbs in RUS because of the stress restrictions of the derivation. The derived imperfective suffix -yv- requires that the stress fall on the final syllable of the prefixed perfect and then retract to the syllable preceding the suffix, -yv- e.g.:

25) \textit{pročítát’} > \textit{pročítývat’} 'to read through, finish reading'

26) \textit{pererisovát’} > \textit{pererisóvyvat’} 'to draw again, copy'

Hence, this process is not applicable to the borrowed verbs in RUS because, as was noted earlier, the stress falls on the -ira- suffix and the stress requirement of the derivation is not met with borrowed verbs. This structural limitation on the derivation of imperfectives is a recurrent argument for those who argue for biaspectuality as a stable feature in RUS and against the notion that borrowed verbs are assimilated and nativized because the borrowed verbs usually have fixed stress on the verbal suffix -ir- (see Sheljakin 1979; Demidenko 1966).

It is generally accepted that borrowed verbs are restricted in imperfective derivation in RUS. However, I would point out that this secondary process is not the only mechanism for aspectual derivation; prefixation is also an avenue for deriving a mono-aspectual verb from the simple (unprefixed) borrowed verb-- a process which does not include structural limitations on its formation with borrowed verbs (although according to Muchnik it has its own set of structural limitations).

A second recurring argument for positing the stability of biaspectuality within the RUS verbal system concerns the "foreignness" of the borrowed biaspectual verb. The implication of this statement is that the suffixes -irova-, -izirova- and -ficirova- themselves are markedly foreign to the system or speaker. Muchnik and Sheljakin
(1979) contend that the foreign nature and the "sivoobrazovat'"na struktura 'word-forming/word-building structure'" of the borrowed verb inhibit or are incongruent with prefixation, i.e., the foreign verbal suffixes (-izov-, -irova-, -izirova-) are incompatible with native prefixes. This argument suggests that there is a need or desire by "the system" and, of course, by speakers, to preserve the foreign nature of the borrowing:

*Dilja soxranenija internacional'noj xaraktera struktury glagolov otnju'd ne be razlizhny put' iz vidovogo oformlenija. O'evdino, cto prisoedinenie k glagolu pristavki otvodit ego ot internacional'noj leksiki." The paths of aspectual formation are no means indifferent for the maintainance of the international character of the verbs [biaspectual and borrowed verbs]. It is obvious that the addition of a prefix to the verb shifts it from the international lexicon.' (Muchnik 1961:35)*

Stefanov (1954) asserts a similar position, only he argues that a native BLG root cannot acceptably be combined with a foreign suffix resulting in a verb such as bolgariziram 'to Bulgarianize'. Stefanov (1954:270) states:

*Nastavkata -iz(ram) se sre'sta samo v sostava na glagoli ot 'zu'd proizvod i zaceta v glagola bolgariziram kom nasija koren bolgar-nejnata upotreba e neopravdana. 'The suffix -iz(ram) is found only in combination with verbs of foreign origin and therefore the use of the verb 'bolgariziram' with our root 'bolgar-' is not justified.'

It is important to note that this is a good example of the kinds of discrepancies that exist between the linguist's view and the speaker's view. Clearly, speakers use the forms, even though linguists argue against the legitimacy of it.

*There are problems with the [+foreign] prototype perceptions; this is a perceptual/cognitive area that poses difficult questions which I discuss in Chapter 4.

*Here I again make the point that such a generalization, that prefixation is not productive with the borrowed verbs, is clearly outdated. However, the opposite—the productivity of the prefixation process with biaspectual and borrowed verbs-- while stated in more recent general literature it is rarely incorporated into our understanding and discussions of aspect. Further, there are no more recent discussions of borrowed and biaspectual verbs.
Muchnik notes that 27% of the borrowed verbs (all of which have one of these foreign verbal suffixes) have combined with native prefixes and formed mono-aspectual verbs. I concede that the addition of native prefixes to the borrowed verb shifts the status of these verbs. Yet, I do not support the idea that this is an impediment to the assimilation of these verbs to the aspectual system. The absence of formal aspect with the borrowed and biaspectual verb does not make the verb "less a verb." Rather, I suggest that the absence of formal aspectual markers (prefixes/suffixes) makes the verb "less RUS", or "less one's own", to the native speaker. The addition of native prefixes to the borrowed verb shifts the status of the verb along a borrowing continuum, (thus removing the marking [+not mine] from the loan verbs) in the adaptation of these borrowed verbs; this is discussed in more detail in Chapter 5).

A second systemic limitation on the borrowed verb in aspectual derivations, Muchnik offers, lies in the resulting syllabic complexity of the borrowed verb should it undergo imperfectivization. The addition of imperfectivizing aspectual suffixes (-yva-) to the verbal suffixes (-irova-, -izirova- and -ficirova-) creates, according to Muchnik, an overly complex verbal suffix. Yet, RUS is not restricted in any way in the number of syllables in a word, neither in the verbal or nominal systems (cf. pereregistrirovyvat' 'to reregister' which is an attested form).

Questions concerning the nature of the aspectual pair and the prefixability of the borrowed verb are the focus of Sheljakin's argument for a stable class of biaspectuals in RUS. He contends that the process of prefixing native verbs is complex and involves factors that exclude borrowed verbs from the process. Interestingly, Avilova (1968) too comments on the complexity of the process of prefixation in RUS, i.e. the polysemy of the native simple imperfective verbs and the pairing of them with different

---

32 This percentage is derived from the total number of verbs Muchnik found and the number of prefixed forms he noted in his 1966 work.
prefixed perfectives, (see examples 16-17 below). Avilova contends that many complications arise when defining an aspectual pair with native RUS verbs because often the native simple imperfective is polysemous. The simple imperfective can serve as the imperfective partner for semantically different prefixed forms: (See examples 27-29.)

27) IMP bit' 'to beat, kill'
   PFV zabit'
   IMP zabivat' p'ricu 'to kill a bird'

28) IMP bit' 'to beat, kill'
   PFV razbit' 'to break'
   IMP razbivat' čašku 'to break a glass'

29) IMP bit'
   PFV zabit' AND
   IMP bit' PFV razbit'

Sheljakin's argument for a stable class of biaspeculals is, in part, grounded in the concept of the aspectual pair. The lack of a consensus on which IMP verb (the simple or derived one) is a component of the true aspectual pair provides some basis for his argument. However, once a position is taken on the issue of the pair (simple or derived) we can take a position on the stability of biaspectuality (see Ivanova 1964; Isačenko 1964; Andrejčin 1958 et al.). Sheljakin (1979:10) argues that the prefixation (and perfectivization) of native simple imperfective verbs is based on a complex semantic model of native paired verbs. He also states that the borrowed verbs have no affiliation to one of his 12 semantic groups of verbs:

... osnovnym faktorom ustoječivosti bespristavočnyx dvuvidovyx glagolov javijaetsja nepredraspoložennost' drug k drugu semantičeskih modelej obrazovanija vidovyx par i značeni zaimstvovanných glagolov
The basic factor in the stability of the unprefixed aspectual verbs lies
in the lack of a predisposition to semantic models of the formation of aspectual pairs with the meaning of borrowed verbs.\textsuperscript{33}

Yet, this assertion is contradicted by current linguistic data; native speakers prefix (and suffix) biaspectual borrowed verbs in RUS (as well as in BLG and MAC) even though normative and prescriptive grammars and dictionaries do not normativize a prefixed form of the verb. (Table 3.4 summarizes the results of the data compared with various normative sources and thus reflects such points of divergence.)

Sheljakin (1979:10-11), like Muchnik, argues that biaspectuality is a stable category in RUS. Sheljakin builds on Muchnik’s argument and introduces the notion of "otnositel’naja dvuvidovost" 'relative biaspectuality.' Relative biaspectuality pertains to those biaspectual verbs which:

\begin{verbatim}
vystupaet to kak glagoly nesovershennoj vid, to kak dvuvidovye i v pervom sluchaj ne otlichajutsja ot zaimstvovannyx glagolov, byvšix, vidimo, kogda-to kakoe-to vremja dvuvidovymi i zatem perešedšix v gruppu glagolov nesoversennogo vida (v svazi s vidovoj preikusaciej).  valit’svalit’ pairs : pikirovat’/spikirovat.  occur sometimes as imperfective sometimes biaspectual and in the first case they do not differ at all from borrowed verbs, the former evidently sometimes somehow shifted into the group of imperfective verbs (in connection with aspectual prefixation) e.g.:
\end{verbatim}

30) **valit’/svalit’** 'bring down, throw down, overturn' pairs:

31) **pikirovat’/spikirovat’** 'thin out',

32) **planirovat’/splanirovat’** 'to plan'.

\textsuperscript{33}He distinguishes twelve different semantic groupings from these verbs in an effort to provide for the borrowed verbs which he contends exist for native verbs. The groups are composed of verbs which share a prefix. For example, verbs with the meaning of a wide and massive adoption, supply/provision that denotes/indicates a nominal part of production fundamentals or addition: evropeizirovat’ 'to Europeanize', anglizirovat’ 'to Anglicize', industrializirovat’ 'to industrialize', pasportizirovat’ 'to get a passport' constitute the group that would be prefixed with ob- if they were to be perfectivized on the model of obohščestvit' 'to socialize', ombmundirovat’ 'to be outfitted, uniformed'. Because these verbs fit this semantic classification and ideally would be prefixed with o- and are not. Sheljakin attaches the label of biaspectual to them; and leaves them there. There is an apparent lack of consideration for other factors that can and do influence the nativization process.
Here Sheljakin, in essence, suggests that there exist degrees of aspectuality. It appears that he is attempting to explain the synchronic variation in the prescriptive sources that Muchnik put forth (1961;1966). This fourth classification of aspectuality, the "relatively biaspectual" verbs, are those that are (presumably) in a period of transition (to mono-aspectual verbs). (See examples 33-38.)

33) *parašjutirovat' / sparašjutirovat' 'to parachute'
34) *koordinirovat' / skoordinirovat' 'to coordinate'
35) *modelirovat' / smodelirovat' 'to model'
36) *blokirovat' / sblokirovat' 'to block'
37) *registrirovat' / zaregistrirovat' 'to register'
38) *foksirovat' / sfoksirovat' 'to focus'

It is interesting to note that the pairs for both *foksirovat' and *blokirovat' occur in the *DRV 1974* as an aspectual pair, i.e. the simple imperfective is not both imperfective and biaspectual. Thus, for Daum (the compiler of the dictionary) these two verbs are at the completely assimilated stage regarding the category of aspect, i.e., formalized aspectual meaning and an aspectual pair.

Like Muchnik and Sheljakin, Demidenko ultimately argues that biaspectuality is a stable feature of the RUS aspectual system. She (1966:152) writes:

_Fakt suščestvovanija dvuvidovyx glagolov i ix sposobnost' vyražat' v kontekste neopredelennoe, dvojstvennoe vidovoe značenie pozvoljajut govorit' skoree o trojstvennom xaraktere vidovogo protivopostavlenija v sovremennom russkom jazyke: glagoly soveršennogo vida- glagoly nesoveršennogo vida- dvuvidovye glagoly._

The fact of the existence of biaspectual verbs and their ability to express in context an indefinite dual aspectual meaning makes it possible to speak of the ternary character of the aspectual opposition in modern RUS: perfective verbs- imperfective verbs -biaspectual verbs.'

Demidenko concedes to the assimilation of some borrowed verbs in RUS. Even in light of the number of assimilated verbs and the increase in borrowing (hence
increased synchronic inventory of biaspectual verbs in RUS) she (1966:151-2) maintains that the rate of nativization (tempy ustranenija) is "črezvyčajno neznačitel'ny po sravneniju s tempami uveličenija obščega količestva dvuvidyvtx glagolov."

'extremely insignificant when compared to the rate of the increase in the general number of biaspectual verbs." Demidenko ignores the existence of synchronic variation, on what is basically a quantitative basis. By this I mean there are not enough examples, in Demidenko's opinion, to substantiate a morphological and formal opposition for borrowed verbs within the RUS aspectual system. And here I take issue with Demidenko's position. She cites the increasing number of newly borrowed verbs as an explanation for the stability of biaspectuality. I suggest that it is precisely because the borrowed verbs are so new that they are not completely assimilated and nativized; in short, the time the verb has been in the language directly impacts the development of prefixed forms. Frequency and exposure to borrowed verbs must be factors that influence the nativization process (see Chapter 4). These newly borrowed verbs are necessarily positioned at the beginning of a borrowing continuum (see Danesi 1983; Holden 1976; Deroy 1956). One inherent problem with Demidenko's conclusion regarding this issue is that her references for the linguistic reality are in fact the prescriptive sources, not necessarily the linguistic reality, i.e., speech behavior of native speakers.

Sheljakin's approach to a synchronic description of the status and position of borrowed verbs is helpful and in some respects corroborates the notion of a nativization process. It is possible to view Sheljakin's otnositel'naja dvuvidovost' as a transition period or a sedimentation stage of the borrowed verb in a nativization process. The verbs are 'settling in' and speakers are 'getting used to' the forms; the verbs have not yet been nativized. It is important to note that in any synchronic picture there is
evidence of the stages of the assimilatory process, revealing the variation in the status of borrowed verbs.

Despite her own conclusions concerning the stability of biaspectuality, Demidenko cites four mechanisms by which the biaspectuality of the borrowed verbs is lost: 1) semantic changes, 2) prefixation, 3) suffixation, 4) contextual influence. Moreover, Demidenko (1966:149) is one of the few scholars that touches on the inadequacy of context as an indicator of aspect.

Odnako i leksiko-sintaksičeskie uslovija konteksta daleko ne vsega sposobstvujut ustraneniju dvuvidovosti: imeetja množestvo kontekstov, v kotoryx dvuvidovoj glagol soxranjaet dvojstvennoe vidovoe značenie i v zavisimosti ot vosprjatiya govorjaščego ili slušajuščego (pišuščego ili citajuščego) možet byt' istolkovan to kak soveršennyj, to kak nesoveršennyj. 'However even the lexical syntactic conditions of the context far from always contribute to the elimination of biaspectuality: there are many contexts, in which the biaspectral verb maintains the dual aspectual meaning and depending on the perceptions of the speaker or listener, (writer or reader) can be interpreted as perfective as well as imperfective'.

She does not though consider this insufficiency significant enough to challenge the stable status of biaspectuality within the aspectual system. She writes (1966:152):

Vse čto ne daet osnovanija čcitat' dvuvidovye glagoly morfoloãieskoj anomaliej v sovremennom russkom jazyke 'None of this provides the basis for considering biaspectral verbs a morphological anomaly in the modern RUS language.'

She concludes that the existing volume of biaspectral verbs (borrowed verbs) and the potential increase in volume of biaspectuals in RUS suggest the appropriateness of discussing the "trojstvennyj xarakter" 'three-fold character' of RUS aspect: perfective verbs, imperfective verbs and biaspectral verbs. Demidenko considers the prefixation of borrowed verbs as a limited process whereby the prefixation occurs within specific and technical speech communities but, for the general public, the borrowed verb is biaspectral. For instance, integrirovat' 'to integrate' has a perfective form.
prointegrirovat' which is predominant in mathematical texts and among math professionals but otherwise it has only an imperfective meaning (cf. Muchnik 1966 in which he contends that the borrowed verbs are not primarily technical and specialized lexicons; the borrowed verbs have, in fact, moved into the general lexicon).

Nonetheless, Demidenko offers a synchronic description of biaspectuality in RUS. One statement, in particular, separates Demidenko's approach from the previous two. She (1966:147) writes:

\[ \text{\v{E}to dajut vozmo\v{z}nost' utver\d{d}dat', c\to <preodolenie> dvuvidovosti putem prefiksacii - to\'k go na\v{c}tnaju\v{s}chij razvivat'sja process 'This makes it possible to affirm that the elimination of biaspectuality via prefixation- is only a process beginning to develop.'} \]

Here Demidenko intimates a process of nativization; she does not, however, give it sufficient consideration in her analysis. Her conclusion-- a three-way aspectual distinction-- is, nonetheless, contrary to the binary opposition that underlies the structuralist binarism that is consistently the framework of the discussions of Slavic aspect.

2.3.2 Convergence and Interdependence of Grammatical Categories

The complexity of the topic complicates any investigation of a particular sub-issue within the study of aspect. The relationships between aspect and tense, aspect and definiteness, aspect and discourse factors are not simple. Rather, no relationship between two categories can be considered thoroughly discussed without its relationship to the other categories. Thus, in the present work I recognize the interconnectedness and interplay of different grammatical categories with aspect and further concede that conclusions regarding this interconnectedness of the categories are outside the scope of the present study. There are instances in the literature where theories appear to converge on the notion of the interconnectedness (if not inter-dependence) of the
different grammatical issues. Here, I present the works of researchers that elaborate on this interconnectedness to once again make the point that speakers must be incorporated into the descriptions of different grammatical topics, in order that our reliance on "the structure" become less so and give way to an incorporation of speakers' perceptions.

Demidenko, Sheljakin, and Muchnik all approach borrowed verbs as a study of aspect. Their points of view further converge on the notion of a stable biaspectual category in RUS. Their accounts of borrowed biaspectual verbs, though, do not incorporate the process of borrowing and the related factors. Their approach is not unique; rather it is a typical starting point for most studies. Ivanchev, Kabakchiev and Maslov also approach the study of borrowed verbs as a study in aspect. Their approach though is more comparative, i.e., they consider more than a single language in their investigations. Their studies further converge on an incorporation of other grammatical (systemic) features that stabilize and equalize the lack of formal aspect with borrowed verbs. Ivanchev posits a relationship between aspect and tense, Kabakchiev between aspect and definiteness, Maslov between aspect and transitivity. The interconnectedness of grammatical and linguistic systems should not be fully unanticipated by linguists, given the complexity of the category of aspect. While each account contributes to the study of aspect, none incorporates the borrowing process and the factors of nativization in their perspective on borrowed verbs.

The notion of the interconnectedness is found in Ivanchev's position on biaspectuality and borrowed verbs. Ivanchev (1973) maintains that biaspectuality is unstable in RUS. He bases his argument on the absence of an aorist/imperfect opposition which he suggests would otherwise compensate for the lack of formal aspe ctual marking in the borrowed verb (cf. his argument for BLG and SBC which do have this verbal opposition).\textsuperscript{34} Ivanchev makes a North and South Slavic language
distinction in his argument. The North Slavic languages, he concludes, lack the aorist/imperfect tense distinction and the South Slavic languages maintain it (from Church Slavonic). Ivanchev posits a stable biaaspectual class of verbs. He (1971:172) states: "...za dvuvidovost može da se govori v sasnost pri vsemi glagoli ot nesveršen vid." "...about biaaspectuality it is possible to posit it for virtually all imperfective verbs." Ivanchev posits three categories of biaaspectuality, 1) traditional, 2) compulsory, and 3) grammatical. Distinctions between the types of biaaspectuality lie in the nature of the aspectual pairing. Ivanchev proposes aspect as both a privative opposition (simple imperfective and prefixed perfective) and an equipollent opposition (prefixed perfective and derived imperfective). For ivanchev, the derived imperfectives are in fact more the focus of a grammatical biaaspectuality because the imperfectives can be used in perfective contexts. These contexts are overwhelmingly historical present contexts. The historical present does neutralize aspect in BLG (as well as RUS and MAC). Within this framework, more verb forms are required to maintain the distinctions. Therefore, Ivanchev posits that the imperfective verbs, both simple and derived, in fact are biaaspectual. Thus, in RUS there are intersystemic pressures, i.e. a need to formally express aspect apart from contextual and discourse factors. Ivanchev argues that in RUS biaaspectuality can only be a temporary state for the borrowed verb because the lack of a tense distinction between the aorist and imperfect impedes a clear expression of aspectual meanings. Based on this argument he maintains that biaaspectuality is stable in BLG. According to Ivanchev two factors essentially stabilize biaaspectuality in a language: 1) the presence of the aorist/imperfect opposition which serves to make tense (and aspectual) distinctions; and 2) the occurrence of word-forming prefixes (in

See also Maslov 1963. Maslov too identifies a 'ssodstvo' 'resemblence' between the perfective aspect and the aorist and the imperfect aspect and the imperfect. For Maslov the aorist and imperfect distinction is an aspectual one, not a temporal relationship: this opposition is not related to the moment of speech.
SSL), rather than prefixes that have aspeccual or temporal functions attached (as in NSL).

We again note the notion of interconnectedness of the categories in Kabakchiev (1992). Kabakchiev maintains that there is a reciprocal relationship between formal articles and formal aspeccual distinctions in a language. His study focusses on ENG, BLG and RUS. (Kabakchiev's conclusions are particularly interesting in light of the data on MAC presented in Chapter 3.) In this respect, Kabakchiev's argument models that of Ivanchev insofar as both scholars posit an interdependence or influence between categories. Whereas Ivanchev perceives a relationship between aspect and tense, Kabakchiev perceives a similar relationship between aspect and definiteness. Kabakchiev (1992) argues that because there are no formal articles to express definiteness, there is systemic pressure to derive mono-aspeccual verbs from the borrowed verb, i.e., to formally express aspect, and further that in MAC and BLG, both languages with formal articles there is less (no?) pressure for mono-aspeccual forms of borrowed biaspectral verbs to emerge.

Kabakchiev (1992) asserts that there is direct relationship between the presence of formal markers of definiteness in a language and formal markers of aspect. According to Kabakchiev, whereas biaspectrality in RUS is not a stable category i.e., a formal opposition of aspect emerges with borrowed biaspectral verbs, and there is an internal systemic pressure to formalize the aspeccual meaning, in BLG however, a language which has formal markers of definiteness, such a pressure is absent. As Kabakchiev views the relationship between aspect and definiteness, the transitivity of verbs is an integral factor for aspeccual meaning. This is not contentious insofar as the perfective aspect applies to actions with an internal limit such that often times that limit and the completeness of the action is expressed with the presence of a definite object.35

______________________________

73
The verb 'to read' in its perfective form in RUS must have an object, implied or stated; a transitive perfective verb then requires an explicit object.

39) *Ja pročital knigu.
I finished reading (read) the book.

40) *Ja pročital.
I finished reading.

The relationships between 1) definiteness and aspect and 2) transitivity and aspect are presented by scholars in a manner that suggests that these relationships neutralize systemic pressure for borrowed verbs to develop formal aspect. The data challenge the validity of these statements by virtue of the fact that they reveal colloquial usage in RUS, BLG and MAC of assimilated forms of borrowed verbs. Kabakchiev's position is further challenged by the presence of intransitive borrowed and biaspectual verbs in -iram that have perfective meanings, e.g., bankrutiiram 'to go bankrupt', emigriram 'to emigrate', kapituliram 'to capitulate', rikosiram 'to ricochet'. Kabakchiev's argument, because it offers a linguistic universal theory is further challenged by the data from MAC (see Chapter 3). Kabakchiev examines the status of aspect and definiteness in RUS, BLG and ENG. Whereas BLG and ENG verbal systems are grammatically similar, i.e., fixed word order, formal articles, complex verbal tenses, MAC offers a much more similar point of comparison for the BLG position. The linguistic and grammatical systems of BLG and MAC are closer than those of ENG and BLG. Therefore, it is to be expected that the languages display a similar realization of a linguistic universal. As we will see (in Chapter 3), the MAC and BLG data on

---

39Belić (1955) offers a similar conclusion regarding the biaspectual borrowed verbs in SBC. However, he as well over-generalizes the position to the point that he maintains that all the borrowed verbs are from nouns and therefore their perfectivity is implied through the internal object inherent in the verb (derived from a noun). However, there are borrowed verbs that are not derived from borrowed nouns in SBC as well as borrowed verbs that are intransitive which Belić's argument does not take into account.
borrowed biaspectual verbs regarding the formalization of aspect do not necessarily
bear out the linguistic universal offered in Kabakchiev's argument.

Thus, according to Kabakchiev, the presence of formal markers of definiteness
in BLG (and ENG) compensate for the lack of formal markers of aspect. In languages
with a formal article, he argues that the aspectual meaning can be clarified with the use
or absence of articles. Moreover, it is important to note that all three scholars, Avilova,
Ivanchev and Kabakchiev, look to some other formal grammatical category to express
aspectual meaning when aspect is not marked with the verb itself. Avilova, like
Ivanchev, looks within the verbal system for a direct marker, while Kabakchiev argues
that the presence of formal expressions of definiteness eliminates the need or pressure
to formalize aspectual markers with the borrowed verbs. It is important to note that all
three approaches suggest a formal marker, direct or indirect, of aspectual meaning.
Yet, they do not consider the borrowed verbs that have formalized the aspectual
distinctions, and that I would argue, speaks to the inadequacy of the positions stated by
Kabakchiev and Ivanchev.

2.3.3 Borrowed Verbs: A Study in Borrowing

In addition to a large body of literature which approaches the study of borrowed
verbs as a study of aspect there is also a great deal of literature which approaches the
study of borrowed verbs as a study of borrowing. This latter approach, I suggest,
icorporates the issues of nativization, i.e., variation, time, use, into the status and
position of borrowed verbs. These issues, as we have noted above, are often
overlooked when the approach to borrowed verbs is from an "aspect" perspective.

Unlike Sheljakin's approach, Avilova (1967;1968) approaches the topic of
borrowed verbs in RUS from the borrowing perspective and offers a more appealing
and integrated account of the issues taken up here. Avilova introduces an important
notion into her analysis of borrowed verbs and aspektual pairs. She distinguishes borrowed verbs from many native verbs, at the semantic level, i.e., on the issue of polysemy; the borrowed verb is usually borrowed with a single meaning. Therefore, according to Avilova (1968), the prefixation and pairing process is simpler with borrowed verbs than with native verbs in RUS; the simple verb and the prefixed verb constitute the aspektual pair. The structural restrictions (i.e., stress) of deriving secondary imperfectives from prefixed perfectives limit the applicability of this process with borrowed verbs. It is Avilova's contention that if the aspektual system is one of binary oppositions, then verbs must formalize this opposition. I concur and offer that this issue in particular is often overlooked in discussions of aspect and biaspectuality. Precisely because we (as linguists and scholars) discuss aspect as a grammatical category we are restricted to the confines of this theoretical position that frames discussions of aspect.

Avilova (1968) asserts that biaspectuality is an anomalous and temporary taxonomy for borrowed verbs. She maintains that mono-aspektual (and paired) verbs are derived from the simple borrowed verb; the previously biaspectual verb is then mono-aspektual (specifically imperfective). Avilova further suggests that in RUS the process of nativizing the borrowed verb, prefixing and perfectivizing it, contributes to the desemanticization of prefixes, i.e., the "lexical load" of prefixes gives way to a perfectivizing function. She supports this assertion based on the process of adaptation and assimilation of borrowed verbs during which, she argues, these borrowed verbs develop aspektual pairs when the original borrowed verb is prefixed. The prefixes are desemanticizing because the prefix that occurs with the borrowed verb is less regulated by systemic norms and is influenced by other factors, such as which prefix a native synonym uses, in the perfectivization process.
Avilova's position as well is one of incorporation. Avilova focuses on the relationship between aspect and biaspectuality and transitivity and the presence of an internal limit and/or object in the development of mono-aspectual borrowed verbs. Avilova (1968:66) states:

Razvitie formal'nogo vyraženija vida proissходит не у всех глаголов с заемствованной основой, а лишь у тех, семантика которых выражает стремленье к достиженiu внутреннего предела деяствия. Таких глаголов бол'шинство...Глаголы с заемствованной основой, не отмечая стремленье к достиженiu предела деяствия, явлпяются глаголами только незауершенного вида и коррелативных пар не образуют. 'The development of a formal expression of aspect does not occur with every borrowed verb, it occurs with those borrowed verbs whose semantics express the attainment of an internal limit of the action. This is present in a majority of the borrowed verbs. The borrowed verbs whose semantics do not include this aspiration towards the attainment of an internal limit occur only as imperfective verbs and do not form a correlated pair.'

Ivanova (1964;1966) too, approaches the study of borrowed verbs from a borrowing perspective. This approach recognizes a process of adaptation and assimilation. Ivanova's position allows that there is a difference, synchronically, between native verbs and borrowed verbs, the difference rests in the notion that the status of the borrowed verb is dynamic, i.e., it does not remain biaspectral. Ivanova's focus is the desemanticization of the prefix in BLG only to the extent that in some instances the semantics of the prefix lie in the 'terminativity' inherent in the perfective aspect. Thus the desemanticization of prefixes can be interpreted as a grammaticalization of the prefixes to the extent that the prefixes are fulfilling a grammatical function, in this case marking the verb for perfectivity with borrowed biaspectral verbs. This is in opposition to both Maslov (1963) and Ivanchev (1971)

36Short (1994:585) notes that in Slovak the prefixation of borrowed verbs is influenced in the same manner: 'The prefixes used, match those in semantically analogous native words: za-protokolovat' 'to put on record' as in za-pisat' 'to note down'. A similar example in RUS, is the verb okseroksovat' 'to xerox, copy' on the model of opisat' 'to copy'.

who find the function of the prefix to be a word-forming one, (a distinction between
BLG (SSL) and RUS (NSL). Ivanova's conclusions exhibit more consideration of the
colloquial usage and the linguistic realities than is found in other descriptions. She
asserts that (1964:246):

"tezi glagoli se protivopostavljat delgo na organiziraštata rolja na
sistemata i označavat, spored konteksta, svaršen ili nesvaršen vid - t.e.
podčinjavaneto im na sistemata delgo (ili vosbšte vse ošte) ne polučava
morfološčen izraz. 'These verbs have long challenged the organizing
role of the system and they designate, according to context the perfective
or imperfective aspect, i.e., the subordination of them to the system for
a long time (or generally speaking still) does not get morphological
expression of aspect.'"

Scholars and linguists attempt to subordinate the borrowed verbs to the systems that
they themselves have constructed (structuralist/binary)- often with too little
consideration given to the speaker's use of the borrowed verbs. Avilova suggests that
mono-aspectual borrowed verbs develop "po silata na analogijata 'under the pressure
of analogy'". The notion of a 'pressure' being exerted on the borrowed verb to express
a specific aspectual (mono-aspectual) meaning is suggestive of an assimilatory
process.37 This pressure then, in Avilova's view, accounts for the occurrence of the
mono-aspectual borrowed verbs.

Minova-Gurkova (1966) is one of the few studies on the borrowed and
biaspectual verbs in MAC. Her approach, like those of Ivanova and Avilova, is one of
integration; she incorporates the issues of borrowing into her discussion of aspect and
the position of borrowed verbs. Like Avilova, Minova-Gurkova suggests the presence
of a pressure to assimilate and conform to the nature of the grammatical category of
aspect in MAC.

37The interesting thing about 'analogy' is that we cannot predict when or if it will
happen, but can guess about what direction it would take should it happen.
Prefiksiranjeto na glagolite na -(iz)ira treba da se posmatra glavno kako proces preku koj glagolske sistemi na slovenskite jazici nastojavaj da gi privedat ovi glagoli kon kategorijata vid. 'The prefixation of the -izira verbs must primarily be viewed as the process by which the verbal systems of the Slavic languages insist on leading these verbs to the category of aspect.' (Minova-Gurkova 1966:119)

Ugrinova-Skalovska (1960:25) on the other hand states the following concerning the assimilation of borrowed verbs in MAC: 38

Takvi [gragoli] što malku ili nikako ne se podložni na prefiksacija sa glagolite na -ira (telefonira, teoretizira, kompromitira, demokratizira, evoluirar.'such [verbs] that rarely if ever have prefixes added to them are the verbs in -ira (telefonira, teoretizira, demokratizira, evoluirar.)'

The borrowing perspective in a study of borrowed verbs addresses issues that otherwise remain overlooked in other discussions, mainly on the notions of variation and assimilation. As is noted above, the discussions of borrowed verbs too many times undervalue the factors involved in nativization as a source of information for linguistic studies. The process of borrowing and nativization must influence the descriptions of borrowed biaспектual verbs. There is variation and there is nativization.

2.4 Borrowed Verbs: The Stability of Biaспектuality

Above all, it must be emphasized that the scholars treated above approach variation among the biaспектual verbs as an aspectual anomaly when, in fact, this study argues that borrowed verbs and the variation may best be approached with an integrated version as a study of both borrowing and aspect. Sheljakin’s approach to a synchronic description of the status and position of borrowed verbs is helpful and, in some respects, corroborates the notion of a nativization process. We can view Sheljakin’s otnositel’no dvuvidovoye glagoly’ as another approach to the sedimentation period in

38I should add here for continuity’s sake that Ugrinova-Skalovska (1960) approaches the subject of borrowed verbs as a study of aspect with little attention to the borrowing factors.
the model of nativization (see Chapter 4). The verbs are "settling in" and speakers are "getting used to" the forms; the verbs have not yet been nativized. It is important to note that in any synchronic picture there is evidence (borrowed verbs) of all stages of the assimilatory process, evidence of variation in the status of borrowed verbs in RUS.

Both positions (aspectual vs. borrowing) have inherent weaknesses: they either: 1) consider only one segment of the linguistic realities: the former the non-assimilated borrowed verbs, the latter the assimilated borrowed verbs, or 2) they do not include speaker perceptions and behavior in their analyses. A more useful approach is one that integrates the borrowing process, the category of aspect, and the native speaker's perceptions and treatment of the borrowed verb.

The literature concerning borrowed verbs in Slavic, for the most part, approaches this class of verbs from a descriptive perspective. These descriptions are valuable in that they provide facts and data concerning this anomalous group of verbs within the verbal and aspectual systems. The stability of biaspectuality is largely (although not exclusively or unanimously) a language-specific issue. In general there is the expectation that biaspectuality is stable in BLG (and MAC), yet unstable in RUS. If the approach is comparative, (Ivanchev, Maslov, Kabakchiev) we note a remarkable consensus: biaspectuality is unstable in RUS based on grammatical interconnections (definiteness or tense and aspect) and biaspectuality is stable in BLG based on the same grammatical interconnections. Many of the works discussed here approach the investigation of borrowed verbs as a study of aspect. The overwhelming position in the descriptions of BLG is that biaspectuality is a stable category (Ivanchev 1971; Maslov 1963; Kabakchiev 1992).

I suggest that much of this stability is rooted in the limited scope of the investigations, i.e., the lack of an integration of the nature of language borrowing and nativization. Ivanchev, Maslov and Kabakchiev approach borrowed biaspectral verbs
within the parameters of a study of aspect. The discussions focus on reconciling the lack of formal markers of aspect with borrowed verbs and the nature of the category of aspect. Therefore in each study the borrowed verbs serve as a supporting factor in the development of the researcher's overall position.

Ivanova, Avilova and Minova-Gurkova incorporate issues of borrowing into the study of the borrowed verbs and aspect. I suggest that more integration of the two perspectives yields a more concise description of the linguistic realities.

Ivanchev (1971:176) argues that the category of aspect..."se stremi da sledva napolno obrazeca na protivopostavjaneto aorist: imperfekt, koeto ot svoja strana dostiga v belgarskiija ezik krajna usložnenost. ' strives to follow completely the model of the aorist: imperfect opposition, which for its part attained extreme complexity in BLG.'

Scholars refer to the prefixation of borrowed verbs, but fail to elaborate on possible implications or to comment on the variation that is present. "There is a tendency in colloquial Bulgarian to integrate them with perfectivizing prefixes or the imperfectivizing suffix /-va/- (Scatton 1993:241). Simjenov (1959:161) remarks on internal pressure to 'regularize' nonconforming elements to the system with reference to an internal pressure. The language "se stremi da podčini i asimilira tazi svoeobrazna kategorija glagoli..." [the language system] strives to subordinate and assimilate this peculiar category of verbs. Even though there is a degree of acceptance of the practice, neither Simjenov nor Scatton incorporate the presence of such forms into their descriptions and accounts of aspect in BLG.

Both Scatton and Simjenov are subtly remarking on the instability of biaspectuality in BLG. It is my view that if we speak in terms of striving to "assimilate" and "analogical pressure" and "subordination to the system", then in fact

---

39 It is more appropriate, in my opinion, to suggest that it is the speakers, not the 'language' that is striving to assimilate and combine these marked foreign elements to their speaking system.
there is an underlying issue of instability to the category because verbs are being shifted from the classification of biaspectuals. The occurrence of mono-aspectual borrowed verbs is in essence the shifting of the borrowed verb from a marked verb to an assimilated verb.

2.5 Borrowed Verbs: Biaspectuality as an Anomaly within the Category of Aspect

As has been noted in the literature above, borrowed biaspectral verbs are anomalous and positioned at the margins of the category because there is a single form in a category of binary oppositions. The accepted features of the biaspectral verbs have been discussed. Since the biaspectral verbs are predominantly of foreign origins, there is a single formant -ira- that was borrowed from GER -ieren. The -ira- suffix is productive and the verbs are biaspectral. There is no expectation that the borrowed verbs develop formal opposition of aspect. Yet, the scholars treated here do recognize such forms exist. The recognition places the borrowed verbs more tightly at the margins by designating the use of such forms as "colloquial", "conversational", or "sub-standard".

There is a paradox in this marginalization of formalized aspectual meaning with borrowed verbs: the borrowed verbs are marginal and exceptional precisely because they do not conform to the binary structure and organizing features of the grammatical category of aspect. However, when the anomalous verb does conform and formalizes aspectual meaning e.g., agitiram / proagitiram 'to agitate, annoy', planiram / planirvam 'to plan', the forms are further marginalized in the descriptive sources. The verbs are considered exceptions because they are "biaspectral" verbs yet mono-

---

40The practice of classifying these verbs as "duvidovi biaspectral" by linguists and grammarians, in my opinion, is partly responsible for the marginal positioning of the borrowed verbs. The term implies conformity to the system by its very composition.
aspectual forms emerge in usage. The descriptions to date seldom incorporate the notion of borrowing into the description of borrowed verbs. Rather, the focus must be on the aspect and biaspectuality. And it is interesting to note that the development of prefixed and/or suffixed forms of the borrowed biaspectual verb mirrors the regular features of the Slavic aspectual systems. The primary manifestation of the marginality of these verbs is the lack of conformity to specific characteristics of the aspect category, e.g. 1A:1V, pairs, (mono-aspectual) and a morphological aspectual derivation and distinction as has been outlined above. If it can be shown that borrowed verbs emerge as mono-aspectual and paired verbs then the marginal and anomalous status is challenged. Such developments further question the taxonomy of the borrowed biaspectual as a biaspectual verb because of the shift away from the distinguishing feature of biaspectuality.

2.6 Summary

The purpose of this chapter has been to review specific approaches to the study of borrowed verbs in RUS, BLG and MAC. Several fundamental expectations come to the fore regarding the treatment and development of borrowed verbs as a result of this review of literature. Specifically, two broad tendencies emerged: researchers either approach the topic of borrowed verbs as a study of aspect, to the exclusion of the factors, namely variation, inherent to borrowing, or they approach the topic as one of borrowing. However, I propose that an incorporation of these approaches is more useful. This chapter further serves to note the absence of an integration of speaker perceptions and speech behavior into the linguistic accounts concerning borrowed verbs. Further, it is noted that there is a tendency in the literature to reify language and suggest that verbs "do" things whereas it is more appropriate to understand that
speakers "do" things to verbs; speakers incorporate and assimilate borrowed verbs into their language.

Thus, the position within the system changes as well (from the margins to the center). What is lacking in the accounts and different approaches of aspect and borrowed biaspectual verbs is an integration of the linguistic realities and the factors involved in the borrowing process. I suggest that the descriptive variation in the literature is confirmation of the need to address and reevaluate the status of borrowed verbs in Slavic.

Hence, three questions arise out of the discussion of expectations and realities of borrowed biaspectual verbs in RUS, BLG and MAC: 1) Do the borrowed verbs formalize aspectual meaning? 2) Is "biaspectral" an appropriate classification for borrowed verbs that develop into mono-aspectual verbs? The answer to the first question provides information regarding the status and position of borrowed verbs in these languages, while the answer to the second question challenges the notion of biaspectuality as an appropriate classification for borrowed verbs and possibly for any verb within the parameters of aspect as a grammatical category. The answers then to these two questions give rise to the third question- 3) What do the answers to questions 1 and 2 reveal about the nature of the category of aspect in RUS, BLG and MAC? Chapter 3, therefore, presents the results of questionnaires from native speakers which provide a basis for answering such questions.
CHAPTER 3

THE STATUS AND POSITION OF BORROWED VERBS IN THE PERCEPTIONS AND USE OF NATIVE SPEAKERS: QUESTIONNAIRE DATA

3.0 Introduction

The review and discussion of the literature on borrowed verbs in RUS, BLG and MAC (in Chapters 1 and 2), demonstrates a need to integrate the existing approaches to borrowed biaspectual verbs and, more importantly, to reassess the perceptions and use of borrowed verbs by native speakers as part of the totality of available data. Overall, the literature treated above only rarely acknowledges the presence of complex forms of the borrowed biaspectual verbs and at best, only superficially explains such occurrences (Lunt 1950; AG 1980; Muchnik 1966 et al.). The paucity of current data concerning borrowed verbs stands out as the component most lacking in the review of the literature; most of the work on borrowed and biaspectual verbs was written from 1960-1966. Hence, this chapter presents new and current linguistic data concerning the use of borrowed verbs in RUS, BLG and MAC, the result of recently conducted self-report questionnaires. The data presented here serve to support the model of nativization and variation (presented in Chapter 4).

As has been discussed throughout the course of this study, we have heretofore assumed that the prefixation of a simple verb in Slavic results in a perfective verb (see Fowler 1996). However, not all verbal prefixation results in a perfective verb. The majority of the other prefixes discussed in this study are foreign prefixes, e.g., de-, re-. Therefore, in summation of the data and interpretation of the results in this chapter, I make the distinction between perfectivizing and other prefixes.
3.1 General Procedural Concerns: The Role of Dictionaries in Constructing the Questionnaires

For RUS, the choice of the specific borrowed verbs that appeared on the questionnaire was motivated by the prescriptive and/or normative variation that is found among the various dictionaries. The standard RUS dictionaries that were used as point of reference include: Daum (1972) *Dictionary of Russian Verbs* (DRV), Evgen'eva four-volume (1983) *Slovar' russkogo jazyka* (ESRJ), Ožegov *Slovar' russkogo jazyka* (OSRJ) 'Dictionary of Russian' (1986) and Tixonov (1985) two-volume *Slovoobrazovatel'nij slovar' russkogo jazyka* 'The Word-formational Dictionary of Russian', (TSOS). These dictionaries were chosen because of the number of entries and content of each. For example, the TSOS, as the title indicates, presents all the possible forms that can be derived for a given entry. The Daum DRV is also a useful tool for a comparison of the status and position of borrowed verbs because its 20,000 entries have been checked against the 17-volume dictionary of modern literary Russian, and the four-volume *Slovar' russkogo jazyka* (SRJ 1963) by the editors. The Evgen'eva ESRJ is the most recent dictionary of this size and, finally, the OSRJ is included as the dictionary that is most common and accessible.

The role of the dictionary in standardizing any language and its role as a reference for the literary language necessarily impact the "acceptability" of forms for its speakers (see Hartmann 1983; Béjount 1983). Therefore, any variation among the prescriptive sources themselves may also be considered indicative of variation among speakers. Such variation at the idiolectal level is further attestation to the transitional (grammatical) nature of borrowed verbs.

The following Table (3.1) clearly emphasizes the variation regarding borrowed verbs in RUS in the common dictionairies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs¹</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>TSOS²</th>
<th>OSRJ</th>
<th>ESJR</th>
<th>DRV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>deducirovat'</td>
<td>to deduce</td>
<td>NPF</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deklarirovat'</td>
<td>to declare</td>
<td>NPF</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garantirovat'</td>
<td>to guarantee</td>
<td>NPF</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gospitalizirovat'</td>
<td>to hospitalize</td>
<td>NPF</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immigrirovat'</td>
<td>to immigrate</td>
<td>NPF</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>informirovat'</td>
<td>to inform</td>
<td>pro-</td>
<td>B/ pro-</td>
<td>B pro-</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>katalogizirovat'</td>
<td>to catalogue</td>
<td>NPF</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meblirovat'</td>
<td>to furnish</td>
<td>o/ob- &amp;</td>
<td>omeblirovyvat'</td>
<td>o/ob- no derived IMP</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koordinirovat'</td>
<td>to coordinate</td>
<td>s-</td>
<td>B/s- bksh</td>
<td>B/s-</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dokumentirovat'</td>
<td>to document</td>
<td>za-</td>
<td>B bksh</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magnetizirovat'</td>
<td>to magnetize</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I old</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paražutirovat'</td>
<td>to parachute</td>
<td>s-</td>
<td>s- spec</td>
<td>s- av</td>
<td>NF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dokumentirovat'</td>
<td>to document</td>
<td>pro-</td>
<td>pro-</td>
<td>pro-</td>
<td>pro-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kommentirovat'</td>
<td>to comment</td>
<td>pro-</td>
<td>B/ pro-</td>
<td>B/pro-</td>
<td>B/pro-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kal'kirovat'</td>
<td>to calque</td>
<td>s-</td>
<td>I/s- spec</td>
<td>B/s- spec</td>
<td>s-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>socializirovat'</td>
<td>to socialize</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B = biaspactual, spec. = specialized, NF = not found in dictionary, bksh = bookish, av. = aviation, NPF = no prefixed form given

Table 3.1: Various Prescriptive Descriptions of Borrowed Verbs: Marked Variation

¹The verbs in this table are verbs from the RUS questionnaire. Those verbs below the bold line appeared in prefixed forms on the questionnaire itself. The dictionary references though are based on the citations for the simple unprefixed form of the borrowed verb.

²This dictionary does not provide any grammatical notes with the listings. Here I have interpreted the absence of a prefixed form with the borrowed verbs to mean that there is no prefixed, i.e., specifically PFV form of the verb, according to this dictionary.
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The notations provided with the citations refer to the primary verb itself. Here I apply the term primary to refer to the verb that I looked up, i.e., from the Table 3.1 koordinirovat' is considered BIAS by the OSRJ while it has a PFV form skoordinirovat', the verb koordinirovat' is considered bookish by the dictionary. There is no comment on the nature or register of the prefixed form. All such notations refer to the verb that was cited. The shaded cells in Table 3.1 indicate the points of convergence in the normative sources; five of the sixteen verbs were presented identically in the dictionaries cited here. All dictionaries cited garantirovat', gospitalizirovat'' etc. as biaspectual verbs. I contend that the variation among the citations is more interesting than the points of convergence because this allows us to understand the transitional and dynamic status of borrowings. For example, we find in some instances, e.g., parashutirovat' 'to parachute' that the verb is not included in a dictionary and such an omission tells us that the prescriptive status of this verb is different from the status of other borrowed verbs included in the dictionary; yet the verb is recognized and assimilated by speakers. This specifically differs from a verb like kommentirovat' which in each dictionary is cited with the prefixed form prokommentirovat'. Although not all dictionaires consider kommentirovat' mono-aspectual, there is recognition of the development of the mono-aspectual PFV verb form. Further, the widest range of variation occurs when one dictionary cites a prefixed perfective form while another only cites the verb as BIAS, e.g., TSOS does not cite informirovat' 'to inform' as a BIAS verb, rather it is paired with proinformirovat' while the DRV only cites it as biaspectral. In roughly a third of the instances, the dictionary citations were in agreement. The variation, then, took on a broad spectrum of differences. It is interesting to note that neither OSRJ nor ESJR veered from the BIAS notation of the borrowed verb. Rather, both dictionaries, on the one hand, maintained the BIAS nature of the verbs, yet offered that prefixed
(perfective) forms do exist. TSRJ, on the other hand, more often than the others paired the borrowed verb with prefixed perfectives.

The content of a given dictionary is typically the result of deliberate selection by the authors, editors and lexicographers. According to Hartmann (1983:7) the intent of a dictionary is "to describe and explain the vocabulary of a language or language variety" and he further states that "[r]egardless of this multiplicity of dictionary types, one point cannot be stressed enough: a language's vocabulary reflects its speakers' knowledge of the world in which it is used." While it is possible to argue that borrowed verbs are not included in many dictionaries-- precisely because borrowings are at the margins of the language system-- grammatically and lexically, it is not possible to argue that they do not exist in the language merely because they are not included in a dictionary. It is also possible to argue, as Ivanchev (1971:182) and others have done, that the borrowed verbs constitute technical and specialized vocabulary, and, therefore, they are not accessible nor used by the general population of speakers. Yet, this fact should not preclude the inclusion of the borrowings, as "difficult" words, into dictionaries. Osselton (1983:16), for instance, defends the appearance of Latinisms in early ENG dictionaries:

[yet it may be said that...the so-called 'hard words' [for ENG - the latinisms] were needed. The cultural and educational function of the earliest English dictionaries - down to 1750 at least- was to enable a wider, unlatined, reading public to understand and to learn to use the new technical and abstract vocabulary of learned words, which in many cases thus became less 'hard' and were assimilated into the language.

While I appreciate the difficulty of incorporating variants into a dictionary, I, nonetheless, offer the following account by Osselton (1983:18-19) of Johnson's compilation of the great 1755 *Dictionary of the English Language* in two volumes:

having stated his sources and process of selection, he kept to them, though clearly at times with some distaste for what he found. For instance, when there were unnecessary double forms in different
writers, such as viscid and viscosity alongside viscous and viscosity, he included them all, because they existed; and a similar spirit of objective observation has been the claim of most lexicographers ever since.

Dictionaries are an important barometer for the status of borrowed words in a language. Lexical items "occur in dictionaries only when they are socialized" according to Béjount (1983:71), that is, when they are used by a sufficient number of speakers. The different representations of the borrowed verbs in RUS in the dictionaries speak to a state of transition and period of fluctuation in the use and acceptability of complex forms of the borrowed verbs.

The first step in constructing the RUS questionnaire was to compile an exhaustive list of borrowed verbs in -ira- from OSRJ (1986), Obratnyj slovar' russkogo jazyka (ObSRJ) 'Reverse Russian Dictionary' (1974), and Daum's DRV (1974) (see Appendix A).\(^3\) Muchnik (1961) provides a similar, but incomplete, compilation of bispectual listings from the following dictionaries: Ushakov's 1935-40 4-volume Slovar' russkogo jazyka and the 1952-3 version of OSRJ.\(^4\) This data will serve a comparative and analytic function with individual borrowed verbs. For instance, as was indicated above, bronirovat' 'to reserve, put one's name down' in a 1953 version of the OSRJ is designated as bispectral, but appears in a more recent edition of an ESRJ (1983) dictionary as a bispectral verb with a perfective partner, zabronirovat' as the PFV; (see Table 2.4), DRV does not refer to bronirovat' as a bispectral verb, i.e., it is merely cited as a mono-aspectual IMP, and further cites the corresponding PFV, zabronirovat'. This kind of development is my reason for veering away from a strictly synchronic approach. Here I compare different synchronic periods in an effort to determine if there has been further assimilation of the borrowed verb.

\(^3\)A reverse dictionary is one that lists the entries alphabetically but from the right end of the word to left, i.e., beginning, of the word.

\(^4\)The lists of borrowed verbs serve as a reference to prescriptive positions of the borrowed verbs. See the appendix for exhaustive lists of the borrowed verbs and their aspectual notations as recorded by the different dictionaries.
Muchnik's data is, of course, from the dictionaries current at that time (1966). He ultimately dispelled the notion that borrowed verbs are mostly specialized lexicon; a significant percentage of the borrowed verbs have moved into the general lexicon (Muchnik 1966). The 'hard' words have moved into less specialized lexicon.

The interconnectedness of the notions of variation and assimilation and nativization are clarified when we add speaker perceptions (see Table 3.4). Hence, whatever position we take regarding the selection of dictionary entries, we must recognize that the role of the dictionary in standardizing and representing the language is very important. Thus, in choosing words for the construction of the questionnaire I first looked to the borrowed verbs (in RUS and BLG) that were and were not included in the dictionaries to identify borrowed verbs which were "more suitable" for my purposes here.

3.2 RUS Data: The General Method

The empirical data presented and analyzed in this study were obtained through questionnaires that were distributed to native speakers of RUS from November 1995 - March 1996 in Columbus, Ohio. Questionnaires were chosen for this project primarily because of the time constraints the respondents were under; the respondents included official representatives of Russia visiting different state agencies. Their schedules were restrictive; I arranged to meet with them for fifteen to thirty minutes at a time. There were two separate questionnaires, one an abbreviated version of the other. The choice of the questionnaire variant distributed to the different groups was entirely dependent on the amount of time the respondents had available to participate. Therefore, the results show a broad range of total number of respondents. I include the totals in all instances when they vary from the total number of respondents (30). The questionnaire format permitted me to distribute the questionnaires to several people at the same time, while also ensuring uniformity in the treatment of all informants.
The sample population consists of native speakers of RUS, none of whom speak ENG with any degree of fluency. When asked, on the questionnaire, if they knew ENG, none of the respondents replied in the affirmative. I specifically did not want a "dominant language-interference effect" to possibly skew the results of the questionnaire. Therefore, I purposely did not use Russian immigrants who have been in the United States for more than six months (see Danesi 1985:2-5).

A total of 30 respondents completed the questionnaire. Of the 30 respondents, nine did not complete the biographical information section; this could be a factor of the time constraint or personal preference. Of those responding, there were 11 females between the ages of 32 and 66, and there were 10 males, ranging in age from 29-75. The respondents responded rather erratically to the place of birth section of the biographical information; only 16 provided this information and two of those simply stated "Russia". As far as the information is available: six of the respondents are from Moscow, Russia, six are from St. Petersburg, Russia, and two from Belarus'.

Of the respondents, 18 were visiting family members of émigrés or had recently (0-6 months) relocated in Columbus. The recent émigrés were met at the Leo Yasenoff Jewish Community Center. In order to distribute the questionnaire, I visited the most introductory English language classes offered to the most recent émigrés with the least knowledge of ENG. The remaining 12 respondents were visitors to the United States on business and diplomatic missions. One such group consisted of Russian communications directors and press secretaries to public officials in Moscow and surrounding areas. This particular group also included journalists who report on the city and legislative issues. Another group consisted of a number of public utility workers, engineers and public officials, who were visiting the Public Utilities

---

5This group visited a number of American cities in order to meet with the political communications people and legislative journalists to discuss freedom of the press issues and freedom of information.
Commission of Ohio. The second group included city officials and engineers from Moscow and surrounding regions.

The questionnaire was designed to examine the status and position of borrowed biaspectral verbs as a morphological category from the speaker's perception.\(^6\) The main aim of the questionnaire was to provide data that might provide further insight into answering the questions posed in Chapter 2: 1) whether borrowed verbs formalize aspectual meaning in RUS, and 2) if the borrowed biaspectral verb should be taxonomically classed as a biaspectral verb in RUS. In effect, I was interested in a comparison of the linguist's set of expectations and assumptions with the speaker's perceptions and linguistic reality (see Greenbaum 1977).

The RUS questionnaire has 3 sections (R1; R2; R3). The first section, R1, was designed to elicit data concerning the prefixability of the borrowed verbs in RUS; R2 was designed to gather data concerning the acceptability of complex forms of the borrowed and native biaspectral verbs in RUS; and finally, R3 was intended to gather data concerning the suffixability of the borrowed biaspectral verb.\(^7\) For purposes of this study, acceptable was defined for the respondents as a word that "they may hear, see or say, but not necessarily use"; a verb can be acceptable even if the native speaker him/herself does not use it. In essence, the verb does not necessarily have to be incorporated into the respondents active speech repertoire to be considered acceptable, but nor does this definition preclude its usage by the speaker. Thus, when I refer to the use of a borrowed verb, I am referring to the acceptability of the borrowed verb. Conversely, application of the term use throughout the course of this study also encompasses the notion here referred to as acceptable. Further, I emphasized to the

\(^6\)The verbs are not presented in specific contexts because I am interested in aspect as a morphological category.

\(^7\)However, the results of this section were such that they inconclusive. Very few of the respondents (6) completed this section.
respondents that I was interested in "how Russians speak at home, among friends, on the street", i.e., my concern was that they understood that I was interested in spoken usage and not necessarily only the prescriptive norms of the literary language.

All directions were provided in standard RUS. The questionnaires were distributed in relatively formal settings, e.g., classrooms at the Jewish Center, a state office building. As mentioned above, there were two separate questionnaires, one long and one short version; the abbreviated version was designed to accommodate a limited time frame of 15 minutes, and the longer questionnaire was designed to be completed in roughly 30 minutes.

3.2.1 Method: R1

Section R1 asks respondents to prefix verbs from a list, as they found the prefixed forms acceptable. The respondents were provided with examples of native verbs and prefixed forms, e.g., pisat' 'to write' plus the prefix, na-, 'to finish writing', the prefix, pere-, 'to rewrite, to correspond', and the prefix, pod -, 'to sign' as a model. There was a total of 13 verbs included in R1 on the longer questionnaire and nine on the shorter version. Some verbs occur on both versions (they are indicated by bold print).

The R1 section was specifically designed to determine the prefixability of the borrowed biaxasptual verbs by asking native speakers to prefix borrowed verbs. There was no prompt for which prefixes to use. I selected the verbs included in R1 because of different reasons which include: 1) an apparent greater frequency of use in speech and print and electronic media; and 2) a marked "foreignness" in the shape of the verb, e.g., parašjutirovat' 'to parachute'. In RUS there is a spelling rule which dictates that the '-ju-' letter never follows the letter '-š-' (or the letters ž, šč, č) rather the letter "u" is used giving '-šu-'. Ultimately, I expected to find that there is a marked degree of prefixability of the borrowed verbs in RUS, and further that there is a marked degree of
variation in this prefixability, not only between the dictionaries and speakers but among the speakers. The verbs in R1 of the RUS questionnaire are the following. (NB: In the summary of the results of R1 I use percentages in place of actual numbers in order to present a consistent and less complicated summary.)

- garantirovat' 'to guarantee'
- gospitalizirovat' 'to hospitalize'
- deklamirovat' 'to recite'
- deducirovat' 'to deduce'
- immigrirovat' 'to immigrate'
- informirovat' 'to inform'
- kaznit' 'to torture, execute'
- katalogizirovat' 'to catalogue'
- meblirovat' 'to furnish'
- no̞čevat' 'to spend the night'
- parašjutirovat' 'to parachute'
- ranit' 'to wound'
- socializirovat' 'to socialize'

The shorter version of R1 included the following verbs, those verbs in bold occur in both versions of R1.

- deklamirovat' 'to recite'
- garantirovat' 'to guarantee'
- informirovat' 'to inform'
- kaznit' 'to torture, execute'
- kolleccionirovat' 'to collect'
- koordinirovat' 'to coordinate'
- meblirovat' 'to furnish'
- obeščat' 'to promise'
- ranit' 'to wound'
3.2.2 Method: \textsuperscript{R2}\textsuperscript{8}

The \textsuperscript{R2} section of the RUS questionnaire asked the respondents to mark, from a list of verbs, those which they found unacceptable. The list consisted of both borrowed and native biaaspectual verbs; the verbs were prefixed and/or suffixed. The inclusion of native biaaspectual verbs was intended to elicit data concerning the shift of native biaaspectual verbs from their biaaspectual status, i.e., becoming mono-aspectual verbs. The complex native biaaspectuals were chosen specifically because of the occasional reference to the presence of such forms as sub-standard and/or colloquial usage (see Maslov 1965; Ivanchev 1971; Vinogradov 1947). The verbs included in section \textsuperscript{R2} of the RUS questionnaire are the following:

- \textit{ispol'zovvat'} 'to use'
- \textit{okoordinirovat'} 'to coordinate'
- \textit{otdokumentirovat'} 'to document'
- \textit{otmagnetirovat'} 'to magnetize'
- \textit{poobes'chat'} 'to promise'
- \textit{pozenit'sja} 'to marry'
- \textit{prodokumentirovat'} 'to document'
- \textit{skal'kirovat'} 'to calque'

\textsuperscript{8}This section of the questionnaire shows fewer results than the other. One group of respondents in particular "discussed" a section of the questionnaire which limited the time they had to complete the questionnaire. The "discussion" proved very interesting in itself. The respondents would attempt to convince each other of the acceptability or unacceptability of different items. Their discussion reiterated the difference of opinion among speakers on the status of borrowed verbs. Although it was as well indicative of the normativized status of other borrowed verbs. It is unfortunate that I did not have a recording device. The results of the data clearly show no consensus was either reached or enforced. Ultimately it appears that the respondents independently completed the questionnaires. The anonymity of the questionnaires makes it difficult to determine if a single person changed his/her opinion concerning the acceptability of specific forms.
I expected to find a degree of variation among speakers with each verb. I further expected to find variation in the acceptability of complex forms of the borrowed verbs for a single speaker.

3.3 The RUS Data: R1 Results

As was noted in section 3.2, the R1 section asked the participants to prefix verbs from a list as they found the prefixation acceptable. Because the intent and format of both (the long and short) versions of the R1 section of the questionnaire are the same, the results of both versions of R1 are summarized together below. The verb is followed by the number of respondents that answered that particular question. The results are listed in such a way as to include the total number of times a verb was prefixed and then below is a breakdown of the specific prefixes used. They are presented in alphabetical order and not necessarily how they appeared in R1.

1) deducirovat' 'to deduce' (12)

This verb was prefixed 4 times:

• pro- 4

2) deklamirovat' 'to recite' (30)

This verb was prefixed 29 times:

• pro- 23
• ot- 3
• raz-3

3) garantirovat' 'to guarantee' (30)

This verb was prefixed 5 times:

• pro- 5

4) gospitalizirovat' 'to hospitalize' (18)

This verb was not prefixed by any of the respondents.

5) immigrirovat' 'to immigrate' (12)
This verb was not prefixed by any of the respondents.

6) *informirovat* 'to inform' (30)

This verb was prefixed 44 times:
- pro- 26
- dez- 18

7) *katalogizirovat* 'to catalogue' (12)

This verb was prefixed 4 times:
- pro- 4

8) *kollekcionirovat* 'to collect' (18)

This verb was not prefixed by any of the respondents.

9) *koordinirovat* 'to coordinate'

This verb was prefixed 4 times:
- ras- 2
- ot- 1
- s- 1

10) *meblirovat* 'to furnish' (30)

This verb was prefixed 4 times:
- pro- 4

11) *parašjutirovat* 'to parachute' (12)

This verb was not prefixed by any of the respondents.

12) *socializirovat* 'to socialize' (12)

This verb was prefixed 4 times:
- pro- 4.

13) *kaznit* 'to torture, execute' (30)

This verb was not prefixed by any respondents.

14) *nočevat* 'to spend the night' (12)

This verb was prefixed 12 times:
- za- 7
• pere- 5

15) oběšcat 'to promise' (18)

This verb was prefixed 21 times:
• po- 12
• na- 9

16) ranit 'to wound' (30)

This verb was prefixed 34 times:
• po-21
• iz- 7
• pod- 6

3.3.1 The RUS Data: R2 Results

As I noted in Section 3.2, the R2 section of the questionnaire was designed to elicite data concerning the acceptability of the prefixed and/or suffixed biaspectual, borrowed and native, verbs in RUS. This section presented a list of verbs and the respondents were instructed to mark any verbs that they found unacceptable, unacceptable being defined in opposition to the parameters of acceptable, i.e., something they would not see, hear or say. There were a total of 12 respondents who completed section R2. Therefore, the percentage indicated in Column D of Table 3.2 is the percentage of respondents that accepted the complex biaspectual verb.

otmagnairovat 'to magnetize'

Of the 12 respondents 3 accepted this verb.

prodokumentirovat 'to document'

Of the 12 respondents 5 accepted this verb.

prokommentirovat 'to comment'

Of the 12 respondents 12 accepted this verb.

otdokumentirovat 'to document'

Of the 12 respondents 8 accepted this verb.
okoordinirovat' 'to coordinate'

Of the 12 respondents 6 accepted this verb, three others suggested

skoordinirovat' as the complex form of the borrowed verb.

skal'kirovat' 'to calque'

Of the 12 respondents 10 accepted this form of the verb.

ispol'zovvat' 'to use'

Of the 12 respondents 2 accepted this form of the verb.

poobesčat' 'to promise'

Of the 12 respondents all 12 accepted this form of the verb.

poženit'sja 'to marry

Of the 12 respondents all 12 accepted this form of the verb.

The results of section R2 are summarized in table form, (see Table 3.2.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R2 Verbs</td>
<td>Gloss</td>
<td># Respondents who Accepted Verb</td>
<td>% of Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>otmagnitirovat'</td>
<td>to magnetize</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prodokumentirovat'</td>
<td>to document</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prokommentirovat'</td>
<td>to comment</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>otdokumentirovat'</td>
<td>to document</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>okoordinirovat'</td>
<td>to coordinate</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skal'kirovat'</td>
<td>to calque</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ispol'zovvat'</td>
<td>to use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poobes'chat'</td>
<td>to promise</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pozenit'sja</td>
<td>to marry</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A= accepted by the respondent as an acceptable form
*3 respondents provided skoordinirovat'

**Table 3.2: Results of R2: Acceptability of Complex Biaspectual Verbs: Borrowed and Native**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1 Verbs</th>
<th>TSOS</th>
<th>OSRJ</th>
<th>ESRJ</th>
<th>DRV</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>deducirovat'</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3 PRO-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deklarirovat'</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>5 PRO-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garantirovat'</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gospitalizirovat'</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immigrirovat'</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>informirovat'</td>
<td>pro-</td>
<td>B pro-</td>
<td>B pro-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>22 PRO/-2 DEZ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>katalogizirovat'</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4 PRO-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meblirovat'</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>o/ob-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3 PRO-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B - Biaspectual P - Perfective I - Imperfective spec - specialized bksh - bookish old

**Table 3.3: Dictionary and Speaker Results: A Comparison of Prefixability**
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3. 4 The RUS Data: Findings of R1

Generally, the prefixation and perfectivization of the borrowed verb is more recognized in RUS compared to the SSL languages (see Chapter 2). Table 3.2 summarizes the results of the R1. In Table 3.2 I have incorporated the responses to R1 from the questionnaire with the dictionaries of Table 3.1. Clearly, the results of the questionnaires add yet another source of variation to the consideration of the status and position of borrowed verbs in RUS.

As we see from the table, speakers and the authors of the dictionaries agree on only three of the verbs: *garantirovat' 'to guarantee*, *gospitalizirovat' 'to hospitalize*, *immigrirovat* to immigrate*. There is some degree of agreement on the *kommentirovat* insofar as all dictionaries offer the form *prokommentirovat* and all of the speakers accepted *prokommentirovat* 'to comment' in R2 as well.

The more interesting points that emerge from these results are those where the dictionaries do not cite a prefixed form of the borrowed verb: *deklarirovat* 'to recite*, *deducirovat* 'to deduce*, *katalogizirovat* 'to catalogue*, and *socializirovat* 'to socialize*. Yet, some speakers supply prefixed forms of these verbs. The variation between prescriptive sources and speakers and from speaker to speaker is significant in terms of the nativization of the borrowed verb. The most likely explanation for such variation is a transitional or sedimentation stage of the borrowing and nativization.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>R1 Verbs</strong></th>
<th><strong>Gloss</strong></th>
<th><strong>Prefixability</strong></th>
<th><strong>Dictionary</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>deducirovat'</td>
<td>to deduce</td>
<td>4 pro-</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deklamirovat'</td>
<td>to recite</td>
<td>23 pro-</td>
<td>DRV pro-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 ot-</td>
<td>OSRJ pro-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 raz-</td>
<td>ESRJ pro-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garantirovat'</td>
<td>guarantee</td>
<td>5 pro-</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gospitalizirovat'</td>
<td>to hospitalize</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immigrirovat'</td>
<td>to immigrate</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>informirovat'</td>
<td>to inform</td>
<td>26 pro-</td>
<td>TSRJ pro-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18 dez</td>
<td>OSRJ B pro-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ESRJ B pro-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DRV B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>katalogizirovat'</td>
<td>to catalogue</td>
<td>4 pro-</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meblirovat'</td>
<td>to furnish</td>
<td>4 pro-</td>
<td>TSRJ o-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OSRJ B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ESRJ o-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DRV B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parasjutirovat'</td>
<td>to parachute</td>
<td></td>
<td>TSRJ NF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OSRJ s-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ESRJ s- av.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DRV NF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>socializirovat'</td>
<td>to socialize</td>
<td>4 pro-</td>
<td>TSRJ o-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OSRJ NF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ESRJ B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DRV B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B Biaspectual and no prefixed form
NF Not found
B Biaspectual
sp. specialized
av. aviation

**Table 3.4: Variation in R1 Verbs: Among Speakers and Among Normative Sources**
The results of R1 demonstrate that borrowed verbs in RUS can be prefixed; and based on our assumptions regarding the perfectivity of borrowed verbs (see Chapter 1) we can conclude that the borrowed verb is therefore perfectivized. More important, there is a large degree of variation in the acceptability of prefixed forms of borrowed verbs, e.g., deducirovat' to deduce, garantirovat' to guarantee. However, the great deal of consensus on the status of other borrowed verbs, e.g., informirovat', deklamirovat' is indicative of progression to nativization and incorporation of the borrowed verb into RUS. Three of the verbs went unprefixed by any of the speakers, whereas only five of the verbs were prefixed by a dictionary showing us that the variation is not irregular, but rather that individual verbs are at different stages in the nativization process.

There is also a great deal of idiolectal variation in the acceptability of the prefixation of borrowed verbs. When we look at the results of R2 there are four of the verbs (deducirovat', garantirovat', katalogizirovat', and socializirovat') that are prefixed by four respondents, however, the four respondents prefixing these verbs are not the same four respondents. For instance, **Respondent 1** prefixed deducirovat' katalogizirovat', but not the other two verbs, whereas **Respondent 9** prefixed garantirovat' but not the others. If we found that in fact all the prefixing came from the same speakers it might indicate that some speakers have a tendency to prefix the borrowed verb when others do not. Instead, what we note is that there is variation at

---

9 While I make this assumption regarding the perfectivization of the biaspectral verb, I would note that ideally specific context and frames which contain prefixed and/or suffixed forms of the borrowed verb would be tested with native speakers concerning the acceptability of specific forms in specific contexts thereby verifying the perfective or imperfective meaning of the verb.
the speaker level on a verb-by-verb basis. This point plays an important role in the model of nativization and variation (see Chapter 4).

3.4.1 RUS Data: The Findings of R2

The results of R2 clearly demonstrate the variable status of borrowed verbs among RUS speakers and are indicative of the status of the verbs in the language (at the center and/or at the margins). First, we find that none of the complex biaxial verbs were unanimously rejected. It is notable that there was unanimous acceptance of two of the complex native verbs, poženit'sja 'to marry' and pooběščat' 'to promise'. It is interesting to note the manner in which the prescriptive sources and linguists differentiate the usage of such forms by speakers. Ushakov 1935 (U1935) for instance, does not cite the form pooběščat' 'to promise' as the PFV of obeščat' under the citation for obeščat'. However, U1935 does include pooběščat' as a citation and only there cites it as the PFV of obeščat', (see Table 3.5). All of the respondents here accepted the complex and mono-aspectual form of the native biaxial and a single respondent accepted all of the forms. Clearly, the most questionable forms include soobrazovvat' 'to form', otmagnetirovat' 'to magnetize', ispol'zovvat' 'to use' for which at least 7 respondents did not accept the forms.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biaspectual form</th>
<th>Mono-aspectual form</th>
<th>OSRJ</th>
<th>U1935</th>
<th>ESRJ</th>
<th>#/30 Accepted and/or Prefixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ispol'zovat'</td>
<td>ispol'zovyat'</td>
<td>NCF</td>
<td>-ovyvat'</td>
<td>NCF</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obeščat'</td>
<td>poobeščat'</td>
<td>B/ po-</td>
<td>poobeščat'a</td>
<td>po- PFV</td>
<td>30 ACC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ženit'(sja)</td>
<td>poženit'sja</td>
<td>NCF</td>
<td>poženit'sja</td>
<td>NCF</td>
<td>30 ACC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaznit'</td>
<td>kaznit'</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B/ NCF</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0/30 No prefixation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nočevat'</td>
<td>IMP PFV pere-</td>
<td>B/ NCF</td>
<td>B pere- PFV</td>
<td>za- 7</td>
<td>pere- 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ranit'</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>poranit'</td>
<td>B po-as PFV separately</td>
<td>po- 21</td>
<td>iz- 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NCF= no complex form listed
B= Biaspectual

*aThis form was listed separate from obeščat' and marked as "conversational".
*bThis form was listed separate from ženit'(sja) but was marked as the PFV of ženit'(sja).
*c The verb perenočevat' was listed separate from nočevat' and there marked as PFV of perenočevyvat'.

Table 3.5: Mono-aspectualization of Native Biaspectual Verbs in RUS
3.4.2 Findings: Native Biaspectuals

The native biaspectual verbs in RUS were included in the questionnaire in order to determine if the native biaspectuals are shifting from the biaspectual class of verbs and if in fact any of the developments that occur with the borrowed biaspectual verb are mirrored with the native biaspectual verbs. The data demonstrate that speakers prefix the native biaspectual verbs and accept prefixed forms of the native biaspectuals unquestionably with some verbs, poobesčat' 'to promise', poženit'sja 'to marry'. The results further indicate that some of these verbs are prefixable considering the prefixation of ranit' 'to wound'. One point of distinction between the borrowed and native biaspectual verbs is the lack of polysemy with the borrowed verbs (see Chapter 2). The polysemy with the native verbs complicates the interpretation of the results of the questionnaire. The native biaspectual verbs have more than a single meaning and in some instances, only a single meaning is biaspectual. And even in a case such as that, there is no unanimous consensus on the status of the biaspectuality of the verb. However, despite the complications, the results indicate that the native biaspectual verbs do indeed demonstrate a high degree of prefixability with the possibility that the verbs are in fact becoming mono-aspectual verbs with a distinctive pair, if not in prescriptive grammars at least in the usage-based grammar of native speakers. (See Table 3.2 and Table 3.4 for a summary of the results.)

3.5 RUS Data: Preliminary Conclusions

The RUS data presented and discussed here demonstrate that there is a marked difference in the perceptions of the status and position of borrowed verbs among the prescriptive and normative sources. The data also reveals variation in the perception of the status of the borrowed verbs among speakers. I interpret the findings to indicate that there is a discrepancy between the normative sources, i.e., linguist's point of view, and what occurs in the spoken language, i.e., speaker's point of view. I further
reiterate the point (discussed in Chapter 2), that the occurrence of the prefixed (and mono-aspectual) forms of the borrowed verbs is not explained in the prescriptive sources. Rather, the prefixed forms of the borrowed verbs are treated as assimilated borrowings and the biaaspectual borrowed verbs are marginalized. There is no discussion of the interim status nor do the authors discuss an explanation for such occurrences. The data further indicates a disparity among the normative sources of the status of the borrowed verbs, i.e., some sources cite the verb unprefix as IMP along with the PFV pair, indicating, I suggest, that the verb is completely assimilated to the category of aspect, while other sources list the verb as biaaspectual, (see \textit{pro}kommentirovat' 'to comment' in Table 3.1). Other verbs, for instance \textit{parašjutirovati}' 'to parachute', demonstrate a different degree or level of nativization insofar as the prefixation of the verb is not very widespread, neither among speakers nor among prescriptive sources, within the parameters of this study. Thus, I would posit that verbs, such as \textit{parašjutirovati}, are at the beginning stages of assimilation to the category of aspect, while verbs such as \textit{kommentirovati} show a "more advanced" degree of nativization. I make this point in order to call attention to issues that are not addressed in the body of literature on borrowed verbs.

Based on the data and mindful of the assimilation continuum (discussed in Chapter 2.2), I suggest that the borrowed verbs are individually assimilated into RUS. By this I mean to say that assimilation and nativization occurs on a verb-by-verb basis; groups of verbs are not assimilated before other groups of verbs. Further, I interpret the data to indicate that the assimilation of a verb occurs on a speaker-by-speaker basis. In this vein, based on the results of the questionnaires, I suggest that speakers do not appear to have an inclination for prefixation, i.e., because a speaker prefixes \textit{deklamirovati}' 'to recite' does not necessarily imply that he/she will simultaneously prefix \textit{garantirovati}' 'to guarantee'. Thus, there is no prevailing equation for the assimilation of borrowed verbs. The data do, though, indicate the different stages or
different positions of borrowed verbs: native speakers prefix, i.e., perfectivize, borrowed biaaspectual verbs.

However, mindful of my "expectations and assumptions" (see Chapters 1 and 2) and the questions posed concerning the status and position of borrowed verbs the data presented here concerning RUS, I offer the following: the expectation that all verbs in RUS have aspect, and aspect being realized by morphological features as the category is defined, on the one hand, is challenged by the data for RUS. Verbs such as parašžutirovat' 'to parachute' offer a marked lack of formal aspeclual oppositions. On the other hand, the borrowed verb kommentirovat' 'to comment' demonstrates unanimous acceptance for the prefixed, i.e., PFV, partner, prokommentirovat'. It is important to note that both these examples are "explained" or "recognized" in the literature. The first is simply regarded as BIAS, while kommentirovat' is not considered BIAS; it is IMP with the PFV pair prokommentirovat'. To some degree, we may suggest that it is not considered "borrowed" because it no longer can be characterized by the features that constitute the borrowed verb, i.e., namely biaaspectuality. The literature, however, does not account for the verbs which fall between these two positions on the borrowing continuum, garantirovat' 'to guarantee', informirovat' 'to inform'; verbs which appear to be in a position of transition.  

In addition, the data that can be characterized by the transitional status, (i.e., variation in the aspeclual status) challenge the second expectation (discussed in Chapter 1 and 2), that all verbs realize this formal opposition of aspect, i.e., formalize aspeclual meaning.

The data regarding the native biaaspectual verbs in RUS suggest that, in fact, the native biaaspectual verbs can and do shift their biaaspectual status as do the borrowed verbs. Speakers formalize aspeclual meaning with these biaaspectual verbs. This fact,

---

10 I stress here that I am not making any prediction on a subsequent position of these verbs.
coupled with the formalization of aspectual meaning with other "biaspectual" verbs, challenge the appropriateness of "biaspectuality" as an aspectual status in RUS.

Finally, the data provide information regarding the question of the taxonomy of the borrowed and native biaspectual verbs in RUS as well. I suggest that because both the sub-groups of biaspectual verbs show a shift from the biaspectual status, in fact is evidence that supports the same classification.

3.6 BLG Data: General Procedural Concerns

The BLG questionnaire consists of three sections; each section targets a specific issue and the three sections are labeled: B1, B2, B3.\textsuperscript{11} The overall purpose of the questionnaire was to gather information concerning the status and position of borrowed verbs in BLG. Specifically, I sought to answer the questions posed in Chapters 1 and 2 regarding the most salient and acceptable features of aspect in Slavic, including the prefixation and suffixation of borrowed and native biaspectual verbs. To this end, each section focused upon a different feature of the borrowed and biaspectual verbs. As was noted in Chapter 2, there is no expectation among scholars that borrowed verbs in BLG formalize aspectual meaning. As stated above, researchers such as Ivanchev (1971) and Kabakchiev (1992), have determined that biaspectuality is a stable feature of BLG. However, complex forms of the borrowed verbs do emerge in BLG and the acceptability of these complex forms is at issue here.

The questionnaire for BLG was distributed in Veliko Târnovo, Bulgaria in September and October 1994. The respondents include 50 students and instructors at the Veliko Târnovo University of Sts. Cyril and Methodius. The sample population consists of non-English-speaking educated native speakers of BLG. These people

\textsuperscript{11}The order in which the sections are presented is not necessarily the order in which they were gathered. For purposes of presenting the data most clearly, I discuss B1 and B2 together, when, in fact, sequentially B2 was a follow-up inquiry to B1.
were asked to complete the questionnaire because I believe they may have a more highly developed sense of meta-linguistic awareness concerning their own language use. The respondents were between the ages of 17 and 33. I targeted a younger group of speakers primarily because I believed that there may be more usage and acceptance of these borrowed elements among this generation due to their greater exposure to and enthusiasm for American and Western European electronic and print media. I did not provide a place on the questionnaire to specify gender. The participants were, however, asked to provide their place of birth in the event that there are dialectal differences in perceptions and acceptance.

In addition to the usual biographical data, the questionnaire also requested the field of study or area of specialization of the respondents. I was careful to include respondents from a wide variety of disciplines. I did this in an effort to determine if speakers in a particular area of specialization are more accepting of borrowed verbs or demonstrate a more productive usage of borrowed verbs than another area of specialization, i.e., if the business students incorporate, and assimilate international lexicon more so than students of philology. For this reason I chose students both from philological studies as well as students of business and finance. The sample population includes 12 respondents from the School of Business and Finance and 26 from Bulgarian philology (including two instructors, five from Russian Philology (including one instructor) and six from the Bulgarian Language and History program and one Geography instructor.¹² ¹³

¹²It will be interesting to compare the responses of the students of Russian Philology with the other responses to determine if the study of RUS influences the acceptability of prefixation given that RUS has, relative to BLG, a stronger practice of prefixing borrowed verbs.

¹³Some speakers chose to respond only to specific questions or sections so the numbers may not always total 50. In instances where there is a different number of respondents it is noted.
For purposes of this investigation, it is most useful and informative to consider the results of B1 which focuses on the prefixability of borrowed verbs and in conjunction with the results of B2 which addresses the prefixability of native biaspectral verbs. One set of data results may not be significant in and of itself. It is the relationship and variation between the two that becomes important in a discussion of the biaspectral classification. When the results of B1 are considered with respect to the results of the second section, B2, there is a meaningful difference. The results of these two specific inquiries speaks to the need for viewing both the assimilated and non-assimilated elements in relation to the entire system and the current linguistic situation.

3.6.1 BLG Data: B1 Method

Section B1 was designed to elicit data regarding the general prefixability of borrowed verbs in BLG. The respondents were issued a task: to provide any prefixes to the verbs provided that they felt were acceptable. Acceptable is again, defined as something they might say, see or hear. The aim of B1 was to determine the acceptability of the prefixation, and not the grammatical position of prefixed forms within the language. Included in B1 are complex borrowed verbs as well as simple borrowed verbs. The choice of verbs included on the questionnaire was based on 1) the formal shape of the verb (it included the -ira- suffix) [NB: some of the verbs have the suffix -irva-, planirvam and -ira- planiram], and 2) the inherent meaning of the verb; I chose to include some verbs which did not have an inherent terminative or resultative meaning, e.g., korespondiram, in an effort to determine if this influenced the prefixability of that verb. I included the suffixed -irva- forms in order to determine what the tendency may be with suffixed borrowed verbs such as kodirvam 'to code'. Some scholars, including Comrie (1976), suggest that verbs like korespondiram can be imperfective only by virtue of the inherent semantics. The semantic nature of the action of the verb 'to correspond' is only processual, not resultative or terminative, it
occurs over a period of time. Likewise there are verbs that have no duration, i.e., punctual verbs, (in Comrie's terms "no internal structure of the situation" therefore punctuality and imperfectivity are incompatible, e.g., ENG 'reached the summit of the mountain' and RUS semelfactives kaščjanut 'to cough once' PFV (see Comrie 1976:42). (As discussed in Chapter 1, I make it an assumption of this study that the prefixation of a simple verb results in an PFV verb.) The verbs in B1 were the following:

- baziram 'to base'
- vaksinirami 'to vaccinate'
- garantirami 'to guarantee'
- eliminiyvam 'to eliminate'
- kanonizirvam 'to canonize'
- kapitalizirvam 'to capitulate'
- kodirvam 'to code'
- komeniram 'to comment'
- korespondirami 'to correspond'
- planiram 'to plan'
- planirvam 'to plan'
- skandaliziram 'to scandalize'
- stabiliziram 'to stabilize'

I expected that the unsuffixed verbs would show some degree of prefixability, but had no preconceived notion as to how "prefixable" these verbs may or may not be. I had no expectations regarding the -irva- suffixed borrowed verbs. Nothing in the literature concerning aspect or borrowed verbs addresses the prefixation of borrowed verbs of this type.

3.6.2 BLG Data: B2 Method

The section B2 was designed to elicit data concerning the prefixability of native biaspectual verbs. This section was used to create a point of comparison for the results
of B1. For the purpose of introducing a more "liberal" character into the sample population, B2 was mainly distributed in Sofia- away from the linguistically conservative Târnovians. The B2 again asked the respondents to prefix any of the verbs listed. The verbs included were the native biaspectual verbs (listed below in Table 3.6) and mono-aspectual verbs as well as three of the borrowed verbs that were included in B1. I opted to include an equal number of native biaspectual verbs, borrowed biaspectual verbs and native mono-aspectual verbs in an effort to veil the specific point of interest. My concern is primarily the prefixation of the native biaspectual verbs and only these results are discussed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native Biaspectual</th>
<th>Borrowed Biaspectual</th>
<th>Native Mono-aspectual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>moga</td>
<td>angażiram</td>
<td>počna 'to begin'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bija 'to beat'</td>
<td>analiziram</td>
<td>leža 'to lie'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>večerjam 'to have dinner'</td>
<td>deklamiram</td>
<td>stoja 'to stand'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kalja 'to harden'</td>
<td>bronziram 'to bronze'</td>
<td>četa 'to read'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.6: B2 Verbs: Prefixability of Native Biaspectuals

If native biaspectual verbs are not acceptable to native speakers (with prefixes) then the "threshold" of relevance and significance for the other borrowed verbs begins with the first collaboration and acceptance of a prefixed form. When these forms begin to appear in print and are cited by grammarians and linguists as colloquial or sub-standard in the grammars, I would suggest that there is already marked variation among speakers and in the language.

14This may be relevant when we consider that Veliko Târnovo is very linguistically conservative. Some V. Târnovians assume the role of "language preservationists" strongly and they are less tolerant to the integration of borrowings. (Fielder, personal communication 1996).
3.6.3 Prefixability: Defining a "Threshold"

A definition of the concept of "threshold" is necessary for an interpretation of the data. A quantitative point at which the acceptability is or becomes suggestive of a language shift or variation is as elusive as it is critical for an evaluation of the data. Based on the expectation that borrowed verbs are stable in BLG, there is further an underlying expectation that there is no acceptability of prefixation. The prefixation of a borrowed verb results in a mono-aspectual verb which, in essence, undermines the concept of biaspectuality at least for that verbs and as a stable feature within the system.

3.6.4 BLG Data: B3 Method

Based on the productive role that secondary imperfectivization plays in the verbal and aspecual system in BLG, the section B3 was designed to investigate if and how the borrowed verbs are adapted to the imperfectivization process of BLG. This inquiry asked respondents to mark verbs they found unacceptable. This section listed ten different sets of synonymous verbs. The verb sets were chosen randomly; I chose verbs that I felt I encountered more often.\[^{15}\] The verbs that were presented included sets of verbs in -ira-/-irva- as well as -ira-/-uva- doublets. The majority (7/10) of the sets were -ira-/-irva-.

Since this inquiry, B3, focuses on the derivation of a distinctive imperfective verb form from a marginal verb, the productivity of this derivational process in BLG and the inclusion of borrowed verbs is very interesting and important to the nativization process of them. The doublets in -ira-/-uva- were included as a kind of meter of the status of -ira-, relative to -uva-, given early attempts by grammarians and purists to

\[^{15}\text{This is based purely on my perception and familiarity with the language. There is no formula or citation that I can refer to to corroborate this perception. On aspect as derivational process see Karcevski (1927).}\]
purge the language of marked foreign elements including -ira- verbs (see Maslov 1963; Beaulieux 1950). The purists' motivation was to make these borrowed verbs appear or seem "more native" based on the suffix itself, such that -uva- is more native than the -ira- suffixed verb forms.\footnote{This type of language manipulation is evidence of the presence of a feature that the native speaker is cognizant of but may not define: I believe it hinges on or is encompassed by the notion of [+not mine].}

Beaulieux (1950:304) notes the use of the suffix -irva- was less frequent at the time of writing than it had been previously, and that the practice at that time was more likely to use prefixation to mark perfectivity thereby relegating the unprefixed form to denote the imperfective meaning. He further, concludes that the most frequent practice is to maintain the biaspectuality of the borrowed verb, i.e., maintain the lack of morphological distinction of either aspect. Beaulieux outlines the following as the possible treatments of borrowed verbs in BLG: 1) suffixation, 2) prefixation or 3) non-assimilation or non-nativization.\footnote{Beaulieux himself does not use the term "nonassimilation". Rather he simply refers to the maintenance of the unadapted borrowed verb in -ira- only, without a suffix or a prefix and designates it as the 'biaspectual' verb.} One possibility that Beaulieux does not consider is the absence of verbal aspect in borrowed verbs. A lack of aspectual grammaticalization can then be interpreted as a "transitional" phase and therefore unable to be classified into the prescribed system, but outside the system.

Thus, an examination of the -ira- /-irva- relationship in B3 is intended to determine if the respondents accepted what amounts to a secondary (or in this case, even a primary) imperfectivization of borrowed verbs. The B3 was intended to determine if there is an overwhelming unacceptability of the application of 'native' elements to borrowed verbs in an effort to produce a more native shape to the otherwise marked borrowed verb. Additionally, section B3 was designed to determine speakers'
resistance to the suffixation of borrowed verbs, as opposed to the prefixation of the borrowed verb. The verb sets are listed below.

- *analiziram/analizirvam* 'to analyze'
- *diskreditiram/diskreditirvam* 'to discredit'
- *eliminiram/eliminirvam* 'to eliminate'
- *insceniram/inscenirvam* 'to stage, to put on'
- *izgraviram/izgravirvam* 'to engrave'
- *kapituliram/kapitulirvam* 'to capitulate'
- *organiziram/organizirvam* 'to organize'

3.7 BLG Data: Results

The B1 section of the questionnaire was completed by 49 respondents; section B2 by 40 respondents. The country as a whole was represented by the respondents of the questionnaire. Of the respondents, nine listed V. Tarnovo as their birthplace.

There were respondents which represented the Western portion of the country: from Sofia (3); the Eastern portion: from Varna (3) and Kavarna (1); the Northern region: from Ruse (5) and Svishtov (2). Central Bulgaria was represented by speakers from Plovdiv (3) and Gabrovo (4); the Southwest was represented with speakers from Blagoevgrad (2).

As mentioned above the results of B1 and B2 are discussed together. The B1 targeted the prefixability of biaaspectual borrowed verbs whereas the B2 targeted the prefixability of native biaaspectual verbs.

3.7.1 BLG Data: Results of B1

The results of the B1 section of the questionnaire regarding the prefixability of the borrowed verbs are listed below. The total number of times the verb was prefixed is listed followed by a breakdown of the specific prefixes used.
baziram 'to base'

This verb was prefixed only once:

• pre- 1

vaksiniram 'to vaccinate'

This verb was prefixed seven times:

• pre- 1
• pro- 1
• re- 4

garantiram 'to guarantee'

This verb was prefixed twice:

• do- 1
• ot - 1

eliminirvam 'to eliminate'

This verb was prefixed once:

• ot -1

It is worth noting that it was acceptable to prefix a verb with the -irvam suffix.

kanonizirvam 'to canonize'

This verb was prefixed three times:

• ot- 2
• de- 1

kapitalizirvam 'to capitalize'

This verb was prefixed four times.

• ot- 2
• re-1
• de- 1

kodirvam 'to code'

This verb was prefixed more times than any other verb on the questionnaire, a total of 37 times.


* za- 16
* ot- 13
* raz- 4
* pre-3
* de- 2

_komentiram_ 'to comment'

This verb was prefixed 18 times:

* iz- 8
* ot- 7
* do- 2
* pro- 1

_korespondiram_ 'to correspond'

This verb was not prefixed at all by any of the respondents.

_planiram_ 'to plan'

This verb was prefixed 17 times:

* za- 9
* do- 2
* ot- 1
* pre- 5

_planirvam_ 'to plan'

This verb was prefixed five times:

* za - 2
* do- i
* ot- 1
* pre-1

This is in direct contrast with the _planiram_ above. This was one point of differentiation that I was especially interested in; I wanted to discover if there was a reluctance on the part of the native speaker to prefix the _-irva-_ verb forms. One native speaker suggested that he would be more likely to prefix and treat as _'svoj_ 'his own' verbs with _-irva-_ because they "felt more native" to him. Hence, prefixability for this speaker is linked to native verbs or at least those verbs he considers to be part of his
language. This section was also an attempt to discern the productivity and acceptability of -irva- forms.\textsuperscript{18} Although this did not produce as many prefixed forms as the -ira- only form, it is interesting to note that all the same prefixes do occur with planirvam. 

*skandaliziram* 'to scandalize'

This verb was prefixed three times:

- do- 1
- iz- 1
- pre- 1

*stabiliziram* 'to stabilize'

This verb was prefixed nine times; seven respondents used de-:

- ot- 1
- za- 1
- de- 7

3.7.2 BLG Data: Results of B2

Regarding the prefixability of the native biaspectual verbs from B2, of the 40 respondents and the native verbs included in the section (*moga* 'to be able'; *bija* 'to beat'; *večerjam* 'to have dinner'; and *kalja* 'to harden'), none of the native verbs were prefixed. The respondents did though prefix the native mono-aspectual verbs and offered prefixes for the borrowed verbs as well.

\textsuperscript{18}These forms were also aimed at gaining some insight into the actual direction of the development of the -irva- suffix. The literature posits a number of scenarios regarding the development of -irva- from -iruva- (where the stress shifts and then the shortened vowel is lost to present the current -irva- form). These forms were included in B1 to not only get a feeling for the acceptability but also for the productivity factor. If, in fact, these verbs were 'prefixable' and therefore were being productive in some manner, I would hesitate to conclude or to support the notion that these are older forms that are falling out of use, as has been suggested by some scholars, see Maslov, Vankov, Ivanchev for more thorough discussions.
3.7.3 BLG Data: Results of B3

The section B3 was completed by all 50 respondents. Of particular interest in this section of the questionnaire was the acceptability of the suffixed borrowed verb in -irva. I expected to find that the complex borrowed verb is less "acceptable" than the simple borrowed verb simply by virtue of the "nativeness" of the -va- suffix and the "foreign-ness" of the borrowed verb. The results of section B3 of the questionnaire are summarized below.

kapitulirm/kapitulirvam

For this verb set 28/50 respondents accepted the -irva- form; that is 56% of those questioned.

insceniram/inscenirvam

For this verb set 33/50 or 66% of the respondents accepted both forms.

analiziram/analizirvam

For this set 30/50 respondents or 60% accepted both forms of the set.

eliminiram/eliminirvam

For these verbs again 30/50 or 60% accepted the -irva- form.

izgraviram/izgravirvam

For this set 25/50 or 50% accepted the -irva- form as well.

diskreditiram/diskreditirvam

For these verbs 23/50 or 46% accepted the -irva- form.
3.8 BLG Data: Findings B1 and B2

None of the respondents offered a single prefixed form for the native biaspectral verbs. Therefore, it is justified to posit that we can set the "threshold" to indicate variation at a quantitatively low level for the borrowed biaspectral verbs. The results of B2 do not demonstrate any variation in the prefixation of native BLG biaspectral verbs. The respondents consistently left the native biaspectral verbs unprefixed, while prefixing the other sets of verbs. This is in direct contrast to the results of B1 in which the borrowed verbs demonstrated a degree of prefixability and acceptance by native speakers.

A survey of the results of B1 in the tables indicates that borrowed verbs are accepted with prefixes by native speakers. The data implies that there is more consistency (in terms of the real number of speakers that use and/or accept these verbs) and frequency than the literature suggests.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B1 Verb</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th># Prefixation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kodirvam</td>
<td>to code</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>komentiram</td>
<td>to comment</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planiram</td>
<td>to plan</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planirvam</td>
<td>to plan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kanoniziram</td>
<td>to canonize</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garantiram</td>
<td>to guarantee</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kapitaliziram</td>
<td>to capitulate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skandaliziram</td>
<td>to scandalize</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stabiliziram</td>
<td>to stabilize</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eliminirvam</td>
<td>to eliminate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vaksiniram</td>
<td>to vaccinate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baziram</td>
<td>to base</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>korespondiram</td>
<td>to correspond</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.7: Prefixation Results of B1

One factor that I considered in the evaluation of the data obtained from B1 was the specific meanings of the verbs: specifically the verb *korespondiram* which was not prefixed by any respondent. Within the scope of this inquiry and data, the absence of a single prefix with *korespondiram* can be either accidental or more meaningful and suggestive than it at first appears. The verb is of particular interest in light of its history as it has been recorded by Vankov (1957). Vankov (1957:142) asserts that *korespondarva*, which appeared in the "Slavenobolgarska gramatika" by Neofit Bozveli in 1835, was the "pervata glagolna zaemka ot zapaden ezik" 'The first verbal borrowing from a Western language.' This early attestation provides significant

---

19The *Wielki słownik polsko-angielski* (1969) cites the the POL *korespondować* as IMP, without a PFV pair.
evidence for placing the semantics of a borrowing as a primary consideration in the development of aspectual pairs with borrowed verbs. By virtue of the fact that this particular borrowing has, if not the longest, then a long, history in the language and still the verb does not demonstrate formal aspectual oppositions suggests that the length of time a borrowing has been in the language does not necessarily lead to an overt marking of aspect. Thus, morphologization of aspect should not be considered only in terms of temporal factors but a combination of all the factors influencing the 'universal acceptance' stage of a borrowing.

The data illustrate that these verbs are not, or are no longer, perceived as outside the scope of native productive verbal derivations. Thus, the borrowed lexeme reaches a point for the speaker when it undergoes a markedness reversal i.e., it loses the feature [+not mine]. The semantic criterion is superordinate in a hierarchical structure to the length of time a borrowing has been attested in the borrowing language. The most conservative conclusion that can be drawn from the data from B1 and B2 is that these verbs do demonstrate further development (if not upon the borrowing) and that there are stages to adaptation and assimilation. The lack of prefixation with korespondiram suggests that some verbs are simply not conducive to a prefixation that entails perfectivization. Within the native biaspectual verbs there are verbs which have telic (goal-oriented) meaning. This is evidenced by the fact that the same native verbs do not comprise the native biaspectual verb class in all the languages under study here, see Table 2.1. The verbs nevertheless do not develop or have formal expression of aspect. Therefore, the semantics of a verb are not the sole determinant for the grammaticalization of the category. I suggest that the treatment and realization of aspect with the native biaspectual verbs is different from that of the borrowed verbs based on the fact that the native biaspectual verbs, regardless of semantics and contexts, do not develop formalized aspect. It is clearly not the shape of the verb that determines the prefixability since all the newly borrowed verbs share the shape (-ira).
Vankov (1957:153) concludes that "Glagolite na -iram malko proizvodni s predstavki." 'The verbs in -iram are hardly productive with prefixes.' It was noted in Chapter 2 that reference to the formalization of aspecual meaning with borrowed verbs was sporadic and for the most part it went unexplained. One question emerges concerning the acceptability of the prefixed borrowed verb: when does the occurrence shift from 'malko' 'hardly, a little' to 'često' 'often'. I suggest that this process may be more acceptable and prevalent and indicative of need for further clarification of the status of aspecual parameters and markers. The anomalous nature of these verbs is not that mono-aspecual verbs develop from them; rather that the formalization of aspecual meaning is a process with borrowed verbs. In this study, 34 of the 47 respondents prefixed at least one verb with one prefix: this supports the hypothesis that borrowed verbs are acceptable with prefixes to native speakers of BLG.

Table 3.6 below shows the total number of times the borrowed verb was prefixed. Although I make the assumption that the prefixation of the borrowed verb results in a perfective verb, there are prefixes that necessarily impart a primarily lexical shift to the borrowed verb as well as perfectivize, e.g., pre-. I also include the foreign prefixes that do not necessarily impart any aspecual meaning to the verb, e.g., de- re-. Thus, a distinction is made between perfectivizing and other prefixes with the borrowed verbs. Even though the overwhelming portion of the existing work on borrowed verbs in BLG states that they are BIAS and that the status of BIAS is stable, the results of B1 and B2 demonstrate that native speakers of BLG prefix borrowed verbs, while they do not prefix the native biaspectual verbs.

One other point to make regarding the results of B1 concerns the response of the respondent mentioned above and the greater prefixability of the borrowed verbs with the suffix -irva- relative to those with the -ira- suffix. The reaction of the respondent and his perception of what constitutes or what it takes to be considered part of "his language" speak to the issue of nativization and assimilation as I address it here.
The fact that his response is not the majority response is not as telling as his ability to express what would prompt (or inspire) him to fully assimilate and accept the borrowed verb. For this speaker prefixability is linked (directly or indirectly) to the notion of native and "my language".

3.8.1 BLG Data: Findings of B3

The section B3 was designed to gather data concerning the acceptability of the suffixation of the borrowed verbs. The izgraviram/izgravirvam set in particular was especially remarkable because of the prefixed form that was presented to the respondents. The acceptability of the prefixed form being secondarily suffixed is very interesting because it further speaks to a pressure to integrate and nativize the borrowed verb, i.e., make it exhibit the same features as other verbs (in this case native verbs). The verb izgraviram was the only -ira- verb form that was unacceptable to any of the speakers. Of the respondents, 5 found both izgraviram and izgravirvam unacceptable. There was a single respondent that did find izgraviram unacceptable, but accepted the opposing izgravirvam form. For that speaker all other -ira- as well as -irva- forms were acceptable.

One avenue for interpreting the data is an enumeration of what the data does not support. This study does not find a complete rejection of suffixed forms of borrowed verbs. This inquiry did not anticipate unanimous agreement on the suffixed borrowed verbs. The fewest acceptances for a suffixed form of a borrowed verb was 23. I once again refer to a quantitative evaluation of the overall sum results of the data. The number of respondents (50) and the number of forms presented for acceptability (7) are multiplied; the resulting optimal number of acceptances is 350. Of the 350 possible acceptances, 169 were found acceptable by native speakers. An average of 48% of the posed forms were found acceptable.20
3.9 BLG Data: Preliminary Conclusions

The data from B1 contradicts the notion that borrowed verbs in BLG are "isolated from the processes of perfectivization and imperfectivization" (Ivanova 1964:245). I suggest that only the native biaaspectual verbs are isolated from these processes, not the borrowed verbs. The data suggest that a single form for both aspects may not be a sufficient characterization of borrowed verbs in modern BLG. There are suggestions by some scholars that the productivity of this process is less so in BLG than in other related languages, i.e., RUS and the West Slavic languages (see Horecky 1957; Netteberg 1953; Grickat 1966). However true, developments in BLG should be viewed first within the scheme of the BLG language system and then for universal conclusions regarding aspect from the perspective of BLG within the scope of Slavic aspect. Any anomalies and patterns should be indicative of the system itself, not based on a similar pattern in a related language. What native speakers of BLG accept, and how they use borrowings is indicative of a specific BLG language situation. There is no expectation that BLG must or should exhibit the same or even like assimilatory and nativizing processes as the other Slavic languages.

One question that follows these prefixability findings is the nature of the aspectual meaning of these complex newly borrowed verbs. The options are limited. They can either add to the lexical meaning of the verb (Aktionsart\(^2\)) or they can clarify

\(^2\)From the sets all the -ira- verbs with the exception of izgraviram were acceptable to the speakers. The prefixation may have influenced the unacceptability. Compare their responses to prefixation specific respondent information.

\(^2\)Aktionsart is not within the scope of this paper. Beyond it often being interwoven into discussions of aspect, it is not relevant. Outside of the fact that these newly borrowed verbs appear to have productive Aktionsart lives we are not concerned with them beyond that. Aktionsart is distinguished from aspect by the lexical differentiation. Aktionsart is considered a lexical category vs. the grammatical category of aspect. The addition of a prefix to the verb changes the meaning of the verb in that it changes the manner in which the action is completed. For an interesting discussion of aspect and Aktionsart in RUS see Hamburger (1984).
or add to the aspectual meaning of the verb or a combination. I am mainly concerned with the perfectivizing feature of the prefixes. In these instances the line is not distinctly drawn. There is much discussion on the topic of the semantics of verbal prefixes (Avilova 1968; Skalovska 1966) and the desemanticizing of the same prefixes (Ivanova 1964). Additionally, the literature is abundant on the components of true aspectual pairs (Maslov 1948; 1962; Ivanchev 1971; Isačenko 1959.) I, therefore, do not attempt to resolve these issues here. The pairing of verbs in Slavic inevitably involves three verb forms, simplex imperfective, prefixed perfective and derived imperfective. Rather I revert to the original motivation of this particular section of the questionnaire; it sought to determine if newly borrowed verbs combined with native prefixes and if so, is it a productive perfectivizing process that results in mono-aspectual verbs and if so what are the implications for the unprefixed simple verb?22

However, there was one exception that was not prefixed by any of the respondents, korespondiram 'to correspond'. This verb is interesting because it brings to the fore of this discussion the role of semantic deteminacy in the formalization of aspect. The verb, korespondiram, does not inherently have a resultative or terminative meaning. The semantics of the verb include the processual, repetitive nature of the act.

In this study of the adaptation to the aspectual systems, the roles of semantics and productivity are functional and influential factors in the development of derivational forms. This data may serve to confirm that the semantics of the verb play a significant role in the development of 'aspectual pairs' as we have seen with korespondiram. In RUS there are a number of borrowed verbs that are classed as IMP without a PFV opposition, not biaspectual, e.g., adminstriram 'to administer'. Such instances are possibly semantically determined and these verbs remain mono-aspectual because of the

22There are numerous issues that are tangential to this topic: borrowing single meaning and polysemanics; Aktionsarten; acceptability issues; marking for /+foreign/
inherent meaning of the verb. Thus the class of *imperfectiva tantum* and *perfectiva tantum* that by their very semantic nature preclude the development of an opposition of aspect, e.g., BLG *jam* IMP 'to eat', BLG *nosja* IMP 'to carry', RUS *prinadležat* IMP 'to own'. The semantics of some borrowed verbs inevitably fit the description of a *tantum* verb. I suggest that *korespondiram* falls into the category of *imperfectiva tantum* verbs. In instances like *korespondiram* it is not a question of the verb being an anomaly or irregularity, but rather the natural yielding to the pressures and structure of the system and the realization of mono-aspectual verbs.

3.10 BLG Data Findings: Type of Prefix Chosen in B1

With reference to the "quality" of the prefixes Ivanova (1964:249) states that *za-*,
*pro-*,-, *iz-*,-, and *ot-* are the more productive prefixes for the borrowed verbs and *na-*,-, *s-*,
*o-*,-, *pre-*,-, and *u-* are the weaker in their frequency of application. Hubenova (1968:56) states: "[t]wo of the prefixes most often used to form perfective verbs from imperfective
ones are *iz*- and *raz*-." The results of B1 in the questionnaire however contradict a few
of Ivanova's assertions, see Table 3.8. *Ot-* was applied to the verbs in 29 instances, *za-*
occurred in 28 which seems to support Ivanova, (see Table 3.8). *Za-*,-, though, occurred
with only four different verbs; and three of those four verbs were also prefixed by *ot-*
and *pre*-. *Ot-* was used with nine of the thirteen verbs.24

---

23 One question that emerges concerning the tantum verbs concerns the origin of
the mono-aspectuality of them. Are these verbs of a specific aspect because they
inherently are defined by that aspect or is because the verbs inherently cannot be defined
by the opposing aspect?

24 One respondent applied *ot-* to all the verbs.. This pattern may be due to the
example provided, *remontiram* > *otremontiram* 'to repair.' Nonetheless that speaker
found it acceptable to use *ot-* with all the verbs in the questionnaire.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker Prefix Application</th>
<th>Ivanova</th>
<th>Hubenova</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ot- 29 times (9 verbs)</td>
<td>za-</td>
<td>iz-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>za- 28 times (4 verbs)</td>
<td>pro-</td>
<td>raz-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iz-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ot-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.8: BLG Data: Prefixation Expectations and Realities

The implications of these choices include that while *ot*- and *za*- are frequently occur, the number of verbs to which they are applied is low. This could be interpreted as a competition between the two prefixes as a perfectivizing mechanism. Even though scholars, Beaulieux (1950), Maslov (1963) generally agree on the restricted nature of 'empty prefixes' in BLG, the perfectivization of borrowed verbs via a prefix is, in my view, the application of an empty prefix thereby resulting in a shift in the aspectual meaning of the verb more than it represents a lexical shift. Generally the result of the combination of a prefix and a native verb is not questionable in terms of the aspectual status of the verb. In such instances it is a question of the resulting lexical meaning because native verbs combine with more than a single prefix and each combination results in a different lexical meaning. There is no competition between prefix choices as this data indicate there may be with the borrowed verbs. The semantic distinction between *otkodirvam* and *zakodirvam* remains unclear from the questionnaire data. I would suggest that the semantics may not be altogether different. The possibility exists that both prefixes are being used to perfectivize the borrowed verb and further that there is no standardization and normativization for the choice of prefix and formalizing aspectual meaning with borrowed verbs.

Ivanova (1964:2249) maintains that there is only a single instance in BLG where a borrowed verb is prefixed with *pre*- , *kopiram*. However, in this survey six different verbs were prefixed with *pre*- . I suggest that this development addresses the
issue of a gradual integration by speakers of the borrowed verbs. I further argue that
the emergence of a prefixed borrowed verb suggests an absence of the marked feature
[+not mine]. At the time of Ivanova's writing the prefix pre- may have been used less
frequently with borrowed verbs.

One point of interest that emerged in the data is that when prefixing the verbs on
the questionnaire native speakers offered the prefixes de- and re-. Usually these
prefixes are considered part of the stem in borrowed verbs i.e., the verb is borrowed in
its entirety, not perceived as a root and affixes of the donor language. This suggests
that these prefixes are accepted as productive morphological units in BLG. De - was
applied to four different verbs, kodrivam, kapitalizirvam, kanoniziram and stabiliziram.
The use of these prefixes with the borrowed verbs is in fact a change in the lexical
aspect of the borrowed verb; the result of the addition of these prefixes is a semantic
shift. Here I note that a change in lexical aspect does not necessarily coincide with a
change in grammatical aspect. In fact it is only when there is no lexical shift is the
change in aspect considered grammatical. It is important to note that the Latin prefixes
do not perfectivize the BLG verb (AG 1983).

The nature of the questionnaire does not provide a basis for semantic analyses
of the prefixes; however, as I stated in Chapter 1, I assume that the prefixation of
borrowed verbs results in a perfective verb. This assumption is based on the numerous
references by scholars to prefixes as perfectivizing mechanisms (see Fowler 1996;
Ivanova 1964; Maslov 1963; Ivanchev 1971; Schuyt 1990) It is common that za - is
used with the ingressive meaning; however, it is not outside the scope of the prefix for
it to carry a purely aspectual meaning (from the 1994 T'Ikoven recnik : zambiram
from maskiram/zamaskirvam). Both of these prefixes were applied to planiram,
kodrivam, stabiliziram and planirvam. Schuyt (1993:44) declares that the prefixation
in Bulgarian with borrowed verbs is for the "explicit expression of perfectivity"
agitiram I(mp) / proagitiram P[fv]."
3.11 BLG Data: Preliminary Conclusions

The questionnaire does provide ample data that supports the notion that borrowed verbs, depending on semantics and an inherent resultative meaning, can and do develop prefixed mono-aspectual verbs. However, native biaspectual verbs, by contrast, do not develop prefixed mono-aspectual verbs, nor are they accepted with prefixes. Questions that are raised by these results include: why does one verb demonstrate relatively more 'prefixability' than another verb? The answer to that question surely involves, to greater and lesser degrees, some of the following factors: semantics, frequency of use, length of time in the language, word complexity (number of syllables), and its appearance in other media and the notion of [+not mine].

Unlike the prefixability threshold in the previous discussion, for the suffixability of these verbs there is no comparable examination of the behavior of the native biaspectual verbs. This is directly related to the fact that native biaspectuals vary in shape and conjugation class. The relationship between suffixability and the other factors that may influence derivation would be difficult to distinguish. Therefore, the analysis of the suffixability of these verbs is based and presented solely on the basis of the data.²⁵

In a speaker-by-speaker analysis of this data some distinct patterns emerge. Of the respondents 14 accepted all suffixed forms while 10 of the respondents did not accept any of the suffixed forms. Of those respondents that were mixed on the acceptability of the different verbs there was an even split between those that found a majority of the suffixed forms acceptable (11) and those that found a majority

²⁵After some consideration for the possibility of forms existing, I asked seven native Bulgarian speakers if such forms were acceptable and if they would or could give me a set of forms that would demonstrate an equitable relationship with the verbs, moga, vija, menja, bija, pija, spija. None of the respondents could come up with an acceptable form.
unacceptable (11). Within these parameters the 'majority' is ascribed to the instances when the respondent found no more than two of the six forms acceptable (or unacceptable as the case may be). Among those that found a majority of the forms unacceptable there was a degree of acceptance of the three verbs: inscenirvam (5), izgravirvam (4) and kapitulirvam (3). While among those that found a majority of the forms acceptable the forms diskreditirvam (5), izgravirvam (4) and analizirvam (3) were unacceptable.

There was a group of five respondents whose responses had no distinguishable pattern. The respondents found three forms that were acceptable and three forms that were unacceptable. The only consistency within this group was that kapitulirvam was accepted by all five.

I propose that without results that reveal an overwhelming unacceptability by speakers for imperfectivized verb forms the current linguistic reality in BLG differs from the ascribed and described linguistic expectations. The native speakers of BLG accept the complex forms of the borrowed verbs. These data clearly speak to the use and more importantly to the current state of variation in the status of borrowed verbs in BLG.

It is Beaulieux's (1950:307) opinion that the development of distinctive imperfectives is obsolete and that the preferred derived form from the borrowed verb is the prefixed perfective; the data suggest the practice may be more prevalent. From these data there does not appear to be a quantitative difference in preference or acceptability of prefixation over suffixation. The findings of this study indicate that there is significant variation among speakers regarding the status of the borrowed verbs and more importantly indicate that speakers choose to distinguish aspectual meaning. If there is no pressure or need for formal aspectual distinctions, then these forms would

---

26 However, it must be noted that this study did not directly address the issue of preference for one or the other derived form. Clearly that is an area for further research.
not necessarily arise nor would they be acceptable. The complex forms would be obsolete.

I posit that the acceptance of certain derived forms of the borrowed verbs is an indicator of the presence of these verbs in the speech and writing patterns of individual BLG speakers. Heretofore, the studies of borrowed verbs and the descriptive grammars have acknowledged the presence of these forms, but have failed to recognize the significance of their presence or acceptance and further have failed to explain the occurrence but are satisfied to describe it.

3.12 MAC Data: General Procedural Concerns

The data were gathered for MAC in Skopje, Macedonia in September-October 1994. The procedure and foci resemble those used for the data for BLG. The questionnaire was a series three sections direct inquires (M1, M2, M3) that elicited specific types of forms, e.g., prefixed borrowed verbs. The questionnaires were distributed to 49 native speakers of MAC ranging in age from 16-42; only 12 of the participants were over the age of 20. The distribution was to different groups over two months, not a single distribution. The participants were students, (secondary school or the university), or assistants or professors at the University of Sts. Kiril and Methodius, Skopje.

3.12.1 MAC Data: M1 Method

The first section (M1) was designed to elicit data to answer the question posed in Chapter 1 regarding MAC: whether the aspectual meaning is formalized with borrowed verbs. To this end, M1 asked the respondents to prefix 15 borrowed biaspectual verbs if they considered it possible that any prefixed forms were acceptable to them. The verbs are listed below:
3.12.2 MAC Data: M2 Method

The M2 section was designed to elicit data regarding the acceptability of suffixed borrowed verbs in MAC by native speakers. This inquiry is again in response to the discussions concerning borrowed verbs in MAC and the notion of biaspectuality. Moreover, this results of this section further serve to answer the question of whether borrowed verbs formalize aspectual meaning in MAC, specifically the imperfective meaning via the suffix -va- (here -uva). The respondents were provided with a list of verbs which consisted of simple and complex borrowed verbs, i.e., prefixed and/or suffixed and asked to mark the verbs they found unacceptable. I would note that the verbs in Columns A and B were found in some printed source including daily newspapers, young peoples' magazines, women's magazines or weeklies. The verbs from Column C were compiled after discussions with native speakers, (see fn 31). A number of the respondents vehemently denied the occurrence of some forms even after I showed them the textual example. The verbs are listed below in Table 3.9:

- **komentira** 'to comment'
- **komponira** 'to compose'
- **kontroilira** 'to check, control'
- **konzervira** 'to conserve'
- **organizira** 'to organize'
- **improisenira** 'to impress'
- **finansira** 'to finance'
- **kompletira** 'to make up a set'
- **planira** 'to plan'
- **profita** 'to profit'
- **stabilizira** 'to stabilize'
- **protestira** 'to protest'
- **sugerira** 'to suggest'
- **paralizira** 'to paralyze'
- **indoktrinira** 'to indoctrinate'
Table 3.9: MAC Data: M2 Verbs and Prefixability and Suffixability of Borrowed Verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple Borrowed Verbs</td>
<td>Prefixed -ira Verbs</td>
<td>Prefixed -iruva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akcentira 'to accent'</td>
<td>isformira 'to form'</td>
<td>iskomentiruva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akcentuva 'to accent'</td>
<td>izdoktrinira 'to indoctrinate'</td>
<td>isplaninuva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indoktrinira 'to indoctrinate'</td>
<td>izorganizira 'to organize'</td>
<td>izanализирува</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interesira 'to interest'</td>
<td>levoorietira 'to be left'</td>
<td>izargumenитуva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interesiruva 'to interest'</td>
<td>poorganizira 'to organize'</td>
<td>izмотивирува</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deformira 'to deform'</td>
<td>samofinansira 'to self finance'</td>
<td>izреализирува</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zagarantira 'to guarantee'</td>
<td>zainteresирува</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.12.3 MAC Data: M3 Method

The M3 section was designed to gather data concerning the relationship of aspect and definiteness and to elicit data that may provide contextual differences for the different aspects in MAC. The M3 asked the respondents to construct sentences using the verb recitira/izrecitira 'to recite'.

---

27 I have chosen to include the verb deformira as a Simple Borrowed Verb here because the source language has the prefix de- as well. Yet given the results of M1 in which speakers applied the prefix de(z)- 17 times to the borrowed verbs suggests that speakers perceive the de(z)- as a prefix and thereby attach some semantic value to the prefix itself, apart from the "root". However, my data were not intended to determine the semantic value of the latinate prefixes therefore I view the borrowed verb deformira as a single semantic unit.

28 Unfortunately I did not prepare a similar task-oriented inquiry for the other questionnaires. In many instances the time I could coordinate with the different groups was limited. The particular group that completed this inquiry for MAC were particularly generous with their time. Although the relationship between aspect and definiteness is not the focus of this study, I had an opportunity here to gather interesting data on the topic.
3.13 MAC Data: Results of M1

Before proceeding to a discussion of the findings of this inquiry, it is necessary to note that in the MAC, more so than in the RUS and BLG data, the respondents used foreign and what I have considered other prefixes: de-, re-, ne-, pre-, samo-. I have included the native prefixes pre- and samo- as other prefixes because of the lexical changes involved with the addition of these prefixes. Therefore, when I discuss the number of times a verb was prefixed I am presenting the number of times the verb was prefixed with a perfectivizing prefix. When specific points of interest arise concerning the nonperfectivizing prefixes I will discuss those separately.

*planira* 'to plan'
  This verb was prefixed 43 times:
  • do- 3
  • is- 40
  • others - 2

*komentira* 'to comment'
  This verb was prefixed 41 times:
  • do- 1
  • po- 1
  • is- 18
  • pro- 21
  • others 4

*kompleitra* 'to make up a set'
  This verb was prefixed 38 times:
  • is- 18
  • do- 20
  • others 5

*komponira* 'to make up'
  This verb was prefixed 31 times:
  • do- 8
  • is- 23
  • others 5
kontrolirë 'to control, test'
This verb was prefixed 28 times:

- do-2
- pro- 8
- is- 18
- others- 5

finansirë 'to finance'
This verb was prefixed 17 times:

- po-1
- pro- 1
- do- 7
- is- 8
- others- 10 (8 of which were samo-)

konzervirë 'to conserve'
This verb was prefixed 14 times:

- do- 6
- is- 8
- others- 5

profitirë 'to profit'
This verb was prefixed 12 times:

- do-1
- is- 11
- others- 1

protestirë 'to protest'
This verb was prefixed 10 times:

- do- 1
- is- 9
- others- 1

organizirë 'to organize'
This verb was prefixed 6 times:

- po- 1
- iz-2
- do-3
- others- 3

paralizirë 'to paralize'
This verb was prefixed 6 times:

- iz- 1
- do- 5
**stabilizira** 'to stabilize'
This verb was prefixed 6 times:
- iz- 1
- po- 2
- do- 3
- others- 11 (10 of which were de-)

**sugerira**
This verb was prefixed 5 times:
- do-1
- pro- 1
- za- 1
- po- 2
- others- 1

**indoktrinira** 'to indoctrinate'
This verb was prefixed 3 times:
- pro- 1
- do- 2

### 3.14.1 MAC Data: Results of M2

The focus of section M2 is the acceptability of complex forms of the borrowed verbs in MAC. The simple borrowed verbs appear in Column A in Table 3.9 and in Table 3.10 below. These are the verbs that I anticipated would be the most acceptable. As expected both the verbs *akcentira* and *interesira* were acceptable by all 49 respondents. However, the verbs *akcentuva*, a doublet for *akcentira* 'to accent', and *indoktrinira* 'to indoctrinate' were not unanimously acceptable. The verb *akcentuva* 'to accent' was only acceptable to 20 of the 49 respondents and *indoktrinira* was accepted by 27. The results are summarized in Table 3.10.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simple Borrowed Verbs</th>
<th>#/49 Accepted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>akcentira 'to accent'</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deformira</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interesira 'to interest'</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indoktrinira 'to indoctrinate'</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akcentuva 'to accent'</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interesiruva 'to interest'</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.10: MAC Data: M2 Acceptability of Simple Borrowed Verbs

The second group of verbs from M2 is the prefixed -ira verbs. The results reveal an unanticipated acceptability of the prefixed borrowed verbs in MAC by native speakers. The least often accepted verb was still found acceptable by over 50% of the respondents, i.e., izdoktrinira 'to indoctrinate' was accepted by 26 respondents. In this group we find foreign verbs combined with a native prefixes; such combinations were acceptable. All of the respondents accepted samoifinansira 'to finance oneself, itself' and 86% of the respondents accepted the verb levoorientira 'to be leftist'. The use of the prefixes samo- and levo- are other examples of lexical aspect (see 3.10 for others). These prefixed forms are not necessarily perfective. Again it is possible to have lexical prefixation without perfectivization.29 The verbs that better represent the prefixed borrowed verb found a definite degree of acceptability among respondents as well. More than half of the respondents accepted the prefixed forms of the borrowed verbs: isformira 'to form' (80%), izorganizira 'to organize' (69%) and poorganizira 'to organize' (67%). (See Table 3.11.)

---

29Given the nature and ultimate goals of the questionnaires, i.e., testing prefixability of borrowed verbs, another more direct approach to determine the aspectual status of borrowed verbs prefixed with native (and lexical) prefixes would be a questionnaire with clear context for each aspect.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefix -ira Verbs</th>
<th>#/49 Accepted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>zagaranira 'to guarantee'</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>samofinansira 'to finance o.s.'</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>levoorientira 'to be leftist'</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isformira 'to form'</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>izorganizira 'to organize'</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poorganizira 'to organize'</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>izdoktrinira 'to indoctrinate'</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.11: MAC Data: M2 Acceptability of Prefixed -ira Verbs

The final group of verbs from M2 is the prefixed and suffixed borrowed verbs from Column C in Table 3.9. This table is constructed to represent the different degrees/levels of assimilation of the borrowed verbs. The verbs in Column C show a lesser degree of acceptability whereas the verbs from Column A and B demonstrate a greater degrees of acceptability. The most complex forms of the borrowed verbs in M2, which appear in Column C, were not attested in written texts. These verb forms rather, were brought to my attention through discussions I had with native speakers. I was told that such forms were in fact occurring in informal speech.30 The results of

30The most detailed discussion I had concerning this data was with Stasha Tofovska, a native speaker of MAC and an assistant at the Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje. As we discussed, this I supplied verbs and she offered her opinion on whether such forms were possible. The borrowed verb koordinira 'to coordinate' for example was acceptable to her as iskoordinira, however, this particular verb was not acceptable to her as iskoordiniruva. Yet, she provided a list of 10 verbs she did find acceptable: iskontroliruva, iskommentiruva, istrukturiruva, iskomponentiruva, izanaliziruva, zaangaziruva, izmotiviruva, izgarantiruva, zaintersiruva, prodefiliruva, izrealiziruva and iskopiruva. When I discussed the issue of a context for such a verb she offered the following: Svojata programa sekogas izrealiziruva. 'His agenda is always fulfilled.' This discussion took place after I had completed the questionnaires thus this information is not more incorporated into the questionnaire for a broader sampling of the acceptability of such forms.
M2 with regard to the acceptability of prefixed and suffixed borrowed verbs are summarized in Table 3.12 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefixed -iruva</th>
<th>#/49 Accepted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>zainteresiruva 'to interest'</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iskomentiruva 'to comment'</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>izanaliziruva 'to analyze'</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>samofinansiruva 'to self finance'</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>izargumentiruva 'to argue'</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#/5 Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isplaniruva 'to plan'</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>izmotiviruva 'to motivate'</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>izrealiziruva 'to realize'</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.12: MAC Data: M2 Acceptability of Prefixed and Suffixe Borrowed Verbs

3.13.2 MAC Data: Results of M3

There were 19 respondents to the M3 section of the questionnaire. There was a one respondent that did not complete this section of the questionnaire and one other respondent constructed a sentence with the simple borrowed verb, recitira, yet did not construct one for the prefixed borrowed verb, izrecitira. The following sentences were constructed by the respondents. The sentences are presented in pairs:

1) Toj recitira mnogu dobro. 'He sings very well.'
   Taa ja izrecitra pesnata. "She sang the song.'

31These last three prefixed and suffixed borrowed verbs I questioned with the final group of participants. I added these verbs to this section of the questionnaire therefore there are only a few respondents to this particular set of verbs. An overarching concern of this study is to include relevant speaker perceptions in my descriptions and explanations of the status and position of borrowed verbs in MAC.
2) *Toj dobro recitira.* 'He sings well.'
   NA

3) *Meri recitira mnogu ubavo.* 'Mary sings very pretty.'
   *Meri ja izrecitira pesnata včera.* 'Mary sang the song yesterday.'

4) *Taa recitira ubavo.* 'She sings/recites well.'
   *Taa izrecitira stixotvorbata brzo.* 'She recited the poem quickly.'

5) *Profesorkata recitiraše stixovi od šopov.* 'The professor was reciting/used to recite poems by šopov.'
   *Marija ja izrecitira stixotvorbata.* 'Maria recited the poem.'

6) *Maja recitira pesna.* 'Maya is singing a song.'
   *Maja ja izrecitira pesnata.* 'Maya sang the song.'

7) *Tome recitira vo pretstavata.* 'Tome sings/recites in the program.'
   *Taa mnogu ubavo go izrecitira tekstovi.* 'He recited the text very well.'

8) *Taa recitira prekrasno.* 'She sings/recites well.'
   *Taa izrecitira stixotvorbata.* 'She recited the poem.'

9) *Toj recitira pred publika.* 'He sings/recites in public (before an audience).'
   *Taa izrecitira ubava stixotvorba.* 'She recited a pretty poem.'

10) *Toj recitira stixotvorba.* 'He is reciting a poem.'
    *Toj ja izrecitira stixotvorbata.* 'He recited the poem.'

11) *Site treba da recitirate po edna pesna.* 'Everyone must sing one song.'
    *Ti odlično ja izrecitira pesnata.* 'You sang the song excellently.'

12) *Sekoj redica recitira ista pesna.* 'Each row recites the same song.'
    *Ja izrecitira pesnata vo eden zrive.* 'He/She sang the song in one breath.'

13) *Deteto ubavo ja recitira pesnata.* 'The child is singing/sang the song well.'
    *Potoa mi izrecitira ušte edna pesna.* 'Then he sang me one more song.'

14) *Ana recitiraše najubavo od site.* 'Ana recited/sang the best of everyone.'
    *Tome beše mnogu vozbudeni. Izrecitira brzo i istrča od scenata.*
    'Tome was very excited. He recited quickly and then ran from the stage.'

15) *Učenikot recitira stixotvorba.* 'The student is reciting a poem.'
    *Učenikot uspešno ja izrecitira stixotvorbata.* 'The student successfully recited the poem.'
16) Viktor recitira gluposti. 'Victor recites stupid things.'
    Viktor ne znaše da ja izrecitira pesnata, pa se flrli vo klozet. 'Victor didn't know how to sing the song, and so he ran to the bathroom.'

17) Taa ja recitira stixotvorbata. 'She is reciting/recites the poem.'
    Taa prekrasno ja izrecitira stixotvorbata. 'She recited the poem splendidly.'

18) Toj recitira pesna. 'He sings/recites a song.'
    Toj ja izrecitira taa pesna. 'He sang/recited that song.'

19) Mira recitira pesna od Šopov. 'Mira is singing a song by Šopov.'
    Mira izrecitira pesna od Šopov. 'Mira sang a song by Šopov.'

3.14 MAC Data: Findings of M1

To generalize the results from M1, we see that borrowed verbs in MAC are prefixable, i.e., speakers do formalize aspectual meaning, i.e., perfective meaning. Though, the notion of prefixability is important with the borrowed verb we still find a high level of variation in this prefixability as is evidenced by the fact that the prefix do- was used with all the borrowed verbs at least once. The most used prefixes are do-, iz-, po-, and pro-.

The prefixation 'doublets' of specific verbs from the data corroborate the notion of a dynamic and transitional status of some borrowed verbs. Speakers are working with their own instinct and, it is fair to suggest, on an analogical basis for their choices. These "doublets" are also indicative of the fact that there is no standard rule for the incorporation of the borrowed verbs as aspectual pairs. For instance, the verbs organizira, finansira, impresionira, konzervira and komponira were prefixed with both do- and iz-. Thus, there is an interesting correspondence in the distribution of these two prefixes. The verb organizira was prefixed nine times with each prefix; finansira was prefixed eight times with is- and seven with do-; impresionira was prefixed three times with do- and two with iz-; konzervira was prefixed six times with do- and eight times with is-. In the other verbs where both prefixes were used there was a marked
preference among those prefixing the verb for one or the other, e.g., planira is prefixed with is- 40 times and with do- three times, paralizira is prefixed with do- five times and with is- once. I propose that this is because one form is prevailing in usage among speakers. The synchronic predominance of a single form does not preclude an earlier state of broader variation as we find with other borrowed verbs.

An interesting question arises concerning the semantic distinction between the two forms, izorganizira and doorganizira. Three native informants in a follow-up interview, for example, could not define a semantic distinction between the two prefixed forms of the verb organizira 'to organize'. They all agreed that the forms were perfective, and further could not precisely distinguish any semantic difference between the two verbs.

In a speaker-by-speaker analysis, there is no striking relationship between age or place of birth in relation to which prefix the respondent used more often. In some instances, respondents only used is-; in only two cases did a respondent use only do- and no is- formations. The respondents who used do- and never is- only used do- a total of two times. One particularly notable point is that a single respondent did, in fact, prefix all of the borrowed verbs. This respondent used is- with 12 of the verbs and pro- with finansira, komentira, and sugerira. Further, if there is no apparent semantic distinction, then it is appropriate to posit that there is competition between the two prefixes for the role of perfectivizing the borrowed verb.

3.14.1 MAC Data: Findings of M2

The data from M2 offers evidence for a positive response to the question concerning the formalization of aspeclual meaning with borrowed verbs in MAC. Based on the assumptions made in Chapter 1 regarding the prefixation and suffixation of verbs in Slavic, it is fitting to conclude that the borrowed verbs in MAC formalize aspeclual meaning to some degree and at some level. A further point to be made here
is that not only are prefixed forms of the borrowed verbs acceptable but also the prefixed and suffixed forms of borrowed verbs; forms which, in essence, copy the formation of a derived imperfective for native MAC verbs.

The results reveal an acceptability of the prefixed and suffixed forms of the borrowed verbs in MAC. The least acceptable form, *izargumentiruva* 'to argue' was still accepted by six (12%) of the respondents. The individual responses are of interest particularly for this group of verbs because there is no distinct pattern of acceptability for an individual speaker. Of the 49 respondents 24 accepted at least one of the verbs from Column C, three accepted all the verbs from Column C and 22 of the respondents did not accept any of the *-iruva* verbs, prefixed or otherwise. From Table 3.11 we can see that the verb *zainteresiruva* was the most accepted; 24 of the 49 respondents accepted this prefixed verb. Factors that may influence the greater acceptability of this particular form include a SBC influence and/or the greater occurrence and "commonness" i.e., non-specialized lexicon, of the word.

The verbs in Column B of Table 3.9, the prefixed *-ira*- verbs are a central focus of this inquiry. The prefixed forms were all attested in either print or on TV (subtitles). Thus, in some instances the prefixed forms of the verbs are not necessarily attested in dictionaries and other prescriptive sources. The issue here is how widely acceptable these forms are to speakers. I had expected to find a conservative acceptance of the prefixed borrowed verbs in the results of the questionnaire given the general discussion of the borrowed verbs in MAC, as biaspectuals and the absence of regular explanations and expectations of nativization (see Kabakchiev and Ivanchev). The structural similarities between BLG and MAC, i.e., verbal system, definite articles, lead one to the expectation that the emergence of mono-aspectual borrowed verbs would be very conservative. However, such a notion is challenged by the results of the data.
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3.14.2 MAC Data: Findings of M3

Overall, a pattern emerged out of the responses to M3 in which the perfective sentences, (i.e., those with the verb izrecitira 'to recite'), were written with a definite article attached to the nominal form. (See examples 1-3.)

1) Meri ja izrecitira pesnata včera. Mary sang the song yesterday.

2) Učenikot uspešno ja izrecitira stixotvorbata. The student successfully recited the poem.

3) Viktor ne znače da ja izrecitira pesnata, pa se frli vo klozet bopčeet. Viktor didn't know how to sing the song, so he threw himself into the bathroom.

One perfective sentence had a sequence of actions in which another perfective verb followed the first, e.g., Tome beše mnogu vozbuden. Izrecitira brzo i istrča od scenata.' Tome was very excited. He quickly recited and then ran from the stage.' In the imperfective sentences only two sentences had objects with definite articles. (See examples 4-5)

4) Deteto ubavo ja recitira pesnata. The child is singing/sang the song beautifully.

5) Taa ja recitira stixotvorbata. She is reciting/recited the poem.32

This correlation between definiteness and PFV aspect is not entirely surprising. While these data are not definitive, they indicate that the perfective aspect does have a correspondence with the use of definite objects, thus supporting Kabakchiev's (1984;1992) position concerning such a relationship. However, these data do not concur with Kabakchiev's assessment of the status of biaspectuality in languages with formal articles. According to Kabakchiev (1984;1992), we should expect that the

32The third person aorist and present tense of this verb class have the same form -a. More context is required to determine accurately the tense of this example.
presence of formal markers of definiteness would be sufficient to mark aspect with the borrowed verbs. Yet, speakers do use prefixed forms of the borrowed verbs in spite of having formal articles.

3.15 MAC Data: Preliminary Conclusions

The data gathered from M1, M2 and M3 were intended to provide information to answer the questions posed in Chapter 1: Do the borrowed verbs in MAC formalize aspectual meaning, i.e., do speakers of MAC formalize aspectual meaning? and 2) Are the borrowed verbs taxonomically similar to the native biaspectual verbs. Regarding Question 1, the data support the notion that speakers do formalize aspectual meaning with borrowed verbs in MAC. Given the results of M1, in which we saw that speakers prefixed borrowed verbs beyond what might be considered nominally, we further note the "competition" between the MAC prefixes iz- and do- with the borrowed verbs as the perfectivizing prefix. The fact that all respondents prefixed at least one of the borrowed verbs and that at least one respondent prefixed all of the borrowed verbs speaks to the wide variation in the status of the borrowed verbs. While no verb elicited a unanimous response and no specific conclusions are possible regarding the prefixation of borrowed verbs, I offer the following general conclusion based on the data presented above: borrowed verbs in MAC emerge with mono-aspectual meaning via prefixation as well as suffixation. The data further illustrate the gap between the linguist's expectations of borrowed verbs and the linguistic reality.

3.16 Summary

This study, by its synchronic nature, does not offer conclusions regarding the outcome of the borrowing process of these borrowed verbs. Rather, it offers a description of the synchronic positioning of some borrowed verbs within the aspectual
system of RUS, BLG and MAC. These data reveal variation among speakers, yet reflect a different status of borrowed verbs than noted in the normative and prescriptive sources. It is possible to conclude that there is significant variation among speakers with regard to the formalization and nativization of aspe ctual distinctions through the processes of suffixation and imperfectivization. Moreover, these data provide the framework for an identification of language change in progress and serves to support a model of nativization and variation. Such broad variation at a morphological level, is either much less common than variation at the phonological level or simply less addressed in the literature concerning borrowing and nativization. Just as the donor and borrowing languages do not share phonological systems, the languages here do not share morphological systems, thus we assume a period of adaptation and assimilation to the native systems. As the data reveal we find a wide range of variation (doublets, acceptance and rejection of specific forms) of the borrowings that regularly goes unaddressed and unexplained in the literature. A primary indicator of changes in progress is a level of variation in which, often times, doublets occur. (Hock 1986:631-55)

In the results of the data, we find a tension between adaptation and nativization or descriptions and explanations of the borrowed verbs by speakers- dictionaries- and linguists. Specifically in the languages under study here, RUS, BLG and MAC, we find borrowed verbs which have been completely assimilated to the category of aspect. The anomaly of borrowed verbs in the nativization process lies in the assimilation to aspect. The borrowed verbs formalize non-aspe ctual features of the verbal systems. The borrowed verbs regularly express number, person, tense, and mood. However, the process of adapting and assimilating verbs to aspect is not synchronized or dependent on the assimilation to other verbal categories; it is not immediate upon borrowing. Hock (1986/91:631) notes that often the adaptation and assimilation to morphological categories lags behind the adaptations to phonological features. If we
view the quantitative results of this study with the conclusions drawn by scholars previously on this topic there is room to interpret the divergence as indicative of shifts and movements toward nativization of these borrowed verbs. The variability occurs to such a degree as to warrant the suggestion that a later synchronic study may show a greater degree of acceptability and productivity of this process with the borrowed verbs. The 'tendencies' to prefix the borrowed verb as Scatton (1993) refers to them are not explained and the "pressures" that subject these verbs to assimilation are not easily quantifiable.

Thus, in Chapter 4 I offer an explanation of the synchronic variation and the nativization process that this variation attests, by incorporating these data into the model of nativization and variation. In this model I further attempt to integrate the ideas inherent in the study of borrowing into the study of aspect with borrowed verbs.
CHAPTER 4

TOWARD A MODEL OF NATIVIZATION AND VARIATION FOR BORROWED VERBS IN SLAVIC

4.0 Introduction

This chapter proposes an explanatory model of nativization and variation for borrowed verbs at the morphological level in the languages under study. This model is supported by the RUS, BLG and MAC data (presented in Chapter 3) to the extent that the results of the questionnaires clearly indicate a great deal of synchronic variation in the status of borrowed verbs at different levels, i.e., prescriptive, systemic and idiolectal which the authoritative sources leave unaddressed, e.g., the acceptability among native RUS speakers of *prodeducirovat* 'to deduce' even though it is not attested in normative sources (see Table 3.3). Again, it bears repeating that grammars and scholarly sources generally discuss only two statuses of the borrowed verbs: 1) non-nativized (biaspectral) and 2) nativized (mono-aspectual) (see Wade 1992; Hubenova 1968; Ivanchev 1971). Yet, the fact that speakers do formalize aspectual meaning coupled with the fact that there are numerous examples of verbs in between these two positions--assimilated and non-assimilated-- tells us that a transitional status for borrowed verbs should be considered neither anomalous nor exceptional.

The model proposed here helps to describe and explain the systemic variation at the idiolectal and prescriptive levels thereby integrating the so-called marginal elements into the analysis of the language and grammatical systems; such an integration is not present in the
work of researchers discussed throughout the course of this study. The model itself is an adaptation of earlier models which focus upon phonological issues (see Danesi 1983; Holden 1976); (see also Weinreich 1957; Hyman 1970). The model which I propose schematizes the process of adaptation and nativization at the morphological level as well as addresses the idiolectal variation that occurs in speech. Thus, I term the model proposed here as the Model of Adaptation and Nativization and Variation (MANAV).\footnote{Parole and langue here are used in the meaning and implications of Saussure's work in \textit{Cours} (1916). I understand this fundamental dichotomy as the basis of subsequent dichotomies drawn in later theoretical approaches: the difference between language and speech (Chomsky’s “competence and performance”) \textit{Langue} refers to language as it is passively assimilated by the speaker (code) and language as a well-defined object of speech facts. The execution is \textit{parole}, the executive side of speaking is referred to by the terms speech patterns or linguistic realities through the course of the present work. For a discussion of continua see Ammon (1989) and Willeymans and Blister in the same volume.} \footnote{Generally discussions of nativization and assimilation are at the phonological level. Discussions of morphological nativization as such are much less frequent.} \footnote{Deroy (1956) provides an in-depth analysis of the influences on the nativization process.}

4.1 Factors in the Nativization Process: The Role of the Speaker Perception

I have indicated that the approaches to studying borrowed verbs are incomplete because they exclude the factors involved in the nativization process. In studies like Muchnik (1961;1966) and Ivanchev (1971), these researchers offer accounts of the borrowed verbs which do not integrate the factors inherent in the borrowing process into their descriptions, e.g., semantics, context, analogy, definiteness and temporality. Therefore, in this section I briefly discuss these factors as they influence the nativization process.\footnote{Deroy (1956) provides an in-depth analysis of the influences on the nativization process.}

As the factors in the nativization process are discussed below, the reciprocal nature and interconnectedness of the factors involved becomes apparent. These factors such as temporality and analogy, are necessarily interrelated because all of these influences play a
part in creating the speaker perception. Yet, what is less apparent and more difficult to define is the nature of the reciprocal relationships at the micro and macro levels—namely between the individual and the group—as factors which influence speaker perception. That is to say, it is perhaps impossible to determine whether the perception of the group as a whole influences and shapes the perception of the individual or whether the perception of the individual influences and shapes the perceptions and norms of the group. Suffice it to say that prescriptive and normative sources represent "ideals" of language use and behavior. But it is virtually impossible to measure the extent to which such ideals influence speech and we can, at best, recognize the existence of such a relationship.

4.1.1 Semantics and Context in the Nativization Process

As was stated in Chapter 3, the basic meaning of a borrowed verb influences the nativization process. Recall that in BLG, the borrowed verb korespondiram 'to correspond' is the oldest attested verb borrowed from a Western language in BLG and it is significant to note that it has not yet developed a PFV opposition (Vankov 1956). There is no reference to this verb as a BIAS verb. This may be explained by the semantics of the verb; the semantic meaning is not inherently telic or bounded, but processual, i.e., it has an internal temporal structure. Moreover, the BLG verb korespondiram is assimilated and should, more appropriately, be considered synchronically an imperfectiva tantum verb.

The assignment of borrowed verbs to the IMP class, without aspectual pairs, does occur in

---

4 It would be particularly helpful here to know the acceptability of the BLG ?Az uspjear da korespondiram... 'I succeeded in corresponding...’ to judge the solely monoaspectual status of this verb. Therefore my conclusion that the verb is monoaspectual is solely dependent on my inability to find it cited as BIAS or used in a PFV context. However this was not part of the questionnaire and is a point for further research.

5 The notion of semantics as the primary factor is evidenced in the nominal systems as well. For instance, in RUS, the borrowed noun 'ledi' is feminine precisely because it has an animate female referent, 'lady', and the modifiers mark it e.g.:

a) RUS Mlaja ledi byla u nas. 'The nice lady was at our house.'

Here, the semantics determine the gender of a borrowed noun, regardless of the shape of the noun itself, and context expresses and marks the gender (see Wade 1992).
RUS, e.g., \textit{val'sirovat}' 'to waltz', \textit{administrirovat}' 'to administrate' (see Appendix C for a more extensive list of borrowed verbs that are considered IMP without a PFV opposition in RUS). Again it is important here to note that the semelfactive verbs illustrate a similar phenomenon whereby the semantics 'to do something once' preclude the IMP meaning.

Further, when we review the expression of aspect with borrowed biaaspectual verbs in the Slavic languages context can be seen as a second factor in the nativization process. It is generally accepted that context expresses the perfective or imperfective meaning with biaaspectual verbs because there are no formal markers of aspectual meaning with them, (see examples 1-2):

1) SBC \textit{Počeo je numerisati stranice}. IMP 'He began to number the pages.'

2) SBC \textit{Čim numerišete stranice, dodijete k meni}. PFV 'As soon as you number the pages, come to my place.'

More often it is the presence of adverbial forms such as BLG \textit{često} 'often', \textit{vinagi} 'always', MAC \textit{sekogaš} 'always' and RUS \textit{často} 'often', that are indicators of the aspectual meaning for a sentence or utterance which contains a borrowed biaaspectual verb (see Wade 1992; Baresic 1988). Given the scholarly accounts of borrowed verbs, and the role of context in expressing aspectual meaning, it is often concluded that context neutralizes the formalization of aspectual meaning with borrowed biaaspectual verbs (see for example Wade 1992; Lunt 1952; Hubenova 1968; Comrie 1976). With the evidence that speaker prefix, and thus perfectivize, borrowed verbs, it is not only possible but necessary to question the adequacy and appropriateness of accepting context as a legitimate and stable means of expressing aspectual meaning (see Merrill 1985) e.g.:

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[\textbullet] Here the double underline serves to mark the element of 'context' that serves as the marker and therefore, expression of aspect. Examples 1-2 are Magner's (1963).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
3) SBC Najzad sam iznumerisao sve stranice.7
'I finally finished numbering all the pages.'

4) BLG Predi da vzeme ot rodbinija dom dešterja si, g-n Gocev šte prokontrolira prexvorljaneo na Efir 2 na sistemata.8
'Before he takes his daughter from the maternity home, Mr. Gocev will check the transfer of Efir 2 of the system.'

5) MAC Jas go zaangažirav Tome za rabotata.9
'I hired (engaged) Tome for the job.'

In such instances as examples 3-5, it is right to conclude that for the speaker context alone is not sufficient to express aspectual meaning. These are not a redundant marking of the aspectual meaning; rather, they should be interpreted as examples of PFV sentences in the respective languages.10 Moreover, the data, i.e., linguistic reality, show that speakers formalize aspectual meaning with borrowed verbs. Thus, the role of context in the nativization process is difficult to define. More importantly, the results of the questionnaire make it possible to propose that speakers look to other mechanisms, i.e., morphological and formal, to express what context presumably already does, e.g., MAC poorganizira 'to organize', BLG zamaskirvam 'to mask', RUS prodokumentirovat 'to document'.

7This example is adapted from examples and patterns in Mazić (1976). It was tested for acceptability with native speakers who found the form acceptable in this usage. The italics are mine.

8This example is from 24 časa 24 September 1994.

9This example was provided by a native speaker of MAC.

10This has been interpreted as an emphatic marking of aspectual meaning. This then reveals a hierarchical reversal in the expression of aspect between borrowed biaspectual verbs and "regular" mono-aspectual verbs (see Neikirk 1992). Herefore it has been customary to reverse the order of the elements in the hierarchy of aspectual expression: for "regular" mono-aspectual verbs morphology is the primary means of expressing aspect and context then is the emphatic means, thus for biaspectual verbs context is the primary means of expressing aspect and morphology emerges as the emphatic means.
4.1.2 Analogy and the Nativization Process

Another factor in nativization of borrowed verbs is the presence of native synonyms for the borrowed word. The native words often serve as a model for the adaptation and assimilation of the borrowings. This was noted in Chapter 2 in RUS and CZ.\textsuperscript{11} \textsuperscript{12} Speakers look to the native synonym and model the adaptation of the borrowed word on the morphology of the native word. This factor then influences generalizations concerning the results of adaptation and nativization because it is a direct result of the speaker perceptions. How speakers incorporate a borrowed verb into "their language"—whether at the individual or group level—is an issue that the Model of Adaptation and Nativization and Variation (MANAV) proposed here addresses.

4.1.3 Aspect and Definiteness in the Nativization Process

In addition to semantics and analogy, another consideration in the nativization process is the interconnectedness of the different grammatical categories; one grammatical category is thought to compensate for the lack of a morphological distinction within another. For example, Kabakchiev (1992;1984) asserts that there is a direct correspondence between aspect and the formal expression of definiteness (see Chapter 2), i.e., if a language has formal markers of definiteness, then the expression of aspektual meaning can be shifted to or made by formal articles (see also Merrill 1985).

6) \textit{Katinka knitted a Norwegian sweater.} \quad \text{PFV but}

7) \textit{Katinka knitted Norwegian sweaters.}\textsuperscript{13} \quad \text{IMP}

\textsuperscript{11}This is specifically noted in the assignment of gender to borrowed nouns, e.g., ENG 'gang' is SBC 'genka.' Genka is assigned the feminine gender most likely on analogy to the native word in SBC, grupa 'group' (see Jutronić-Tihomirović (1982)).

\textsuperscript{12}Jutronić-Tihomirović (1982) provides an interesting study with dialectal variation influencing the adaptation and assimilation of loanwords in which she indicates that the gender of borrowed nouns varies in different SBC dialects, čakavian and kajkavian specifically depending on the gender of the native synonym.

\textsuperscript{13}This example is an oversimplification of Kabakchiev's argument but it exemplifies
Thus, if one accepts Kabakchiev's (1992) position, then the "give-and-take" of the relationship between aspect and definiteness directly influences the formalization of aspectual meaning with borrowed biaspectual verbs (see Chapter 3). Yet, the MAC and BLG data do not corroborate this relationship. These two languages both have formal categories of definiteness and both show the development of mono-aspectual borrowed verbs. The MAC speakers, I suggest, mark the PFV meaning with the borrowed verbs when they use the unambiguously PFV form of a borrowed verb and an object with a formal article.14 Some respondents to the MAC questionnaire distinguished aspectual meaning of a single verb with the addition of an article along with the overt marking of aspect (see, for example, #6 in Chapter 3.14.2). I would therefore argue against these examples being considered redundant marking. I view such examples as a "natural" progression along the nativization and borrowing continuum. While the data challenge Kabakchiev's argument, the interconnectedness of the two grammatical categories-- aspect and definiteness-- is apparent. Thus, the data results are somewhat paradoxical with regard to the influences in the nativization process as they reflect on the nature of aspect: they can be interpreted to indicate the "verb-ness" of aspect insofar as the data clearly indicate that aspect is formalized with borrowed verbs. Yet, in instances where we find borrowed verbs such as BLG korespondiram, it is possible to posit that the semantic category of aspect overlaps and/or impacts the grammatical category of aspect. The interconnectedness and sometimes contradictory nature of these influences reflect the complex nature of the category of aspect.

14Here I again recall the notion of redundantly marking a feature in phonology mentioned in Chapter 1 fn. 7.
4.1.4 Temporality in the Nativization Process

A fourth factor in the nativization process is the element of temporality. Specifically, this factor refers to how long a borrowed verb has been recognized to be used in the language. Logically, the longer the borrowed word has been in the language, the more opportunity for the speaker to be exposed to it (see Aitchison 1992; Danesi 1983). However, as has been noted here, the length of time a borrowing has been attested in a language is not necessarily given more consideration than other influences in the nativization process (see Chapter 3).15 Furthermore, it is imperative to stress that, based on cases like korespondiram, nativization does not always entail a formal opposition, but rather the results of the questionnaires clearly show the emergence and use of mono-aspectual borrowed verbs in the three languages under study. The notion of "impossible nativization" is discussed at the phonological level (see Churma 1984) whereby some phonological elements of a borrowing remain unnativized and/or are altered to accommodate the native phonology.16 Nothing from the data indicates that a borrowed verb cannot be nativized; it is more a question of how one defines nativization. I accept nativization as "adjustment to the native structure of the borrowing language." This stated, it is possible to consider the mono-aspectualization of borrowed verbs as an indicator of complete nativization for those verbs which may be semantically excluded from one or the

---

15 Frequency of usage does not preclude the notion that a borrowed verb could fall out of use before it is completely assimilated. Further, because I consider frequency a factor in the nativization process I do not mean to imply that all verbs are necessarily completely nativized. (See Avilova 1967).

16Churma includes borrowings that have initial šl and /sfl in ENG as examples of impossible nativization to the extent that phonology is learned and we do not "learn" this combination of phonemes in child learning. The "impossibility" of nativization at the morphological level is more difficult to substantiate because the shape and form is identical and some are nativized while others are not in the case of borrowed verbs. On the phonological level it is the "impossibility" or more appropriately the absence of such a phoneme in ENG that requires an alternative mechanism of nativization.
other aspetual meaning. Such forms are regularly considered the *tantum* verbs in the respective languages.¹⁷ ¹⁸

Moreover, a speaker's exposure to and frequency of usage of the borrowed verbs are "temporal" issues in the nativization. The issues of frequency and usage are important in the nativization process to the extent that a speaker *gradually* incorporates borrowed verbs into his/her linguistic repertoire. The more the speaker encounters the borrowing the more likely he/she is, in turn, to accept it and incorporate the borrowing into what he/she perceives as his/her own language.

Clearly the interplay of these factors impacts the nativization process. These factors, when viewed in light of the data, reinforce the notion that the process of nativization is more likely to begin with the individual speaker. Therefore, a model of the nativization process must also take into account the individual speaker and further recognize that speakers perceive their language differently and further that they define "my language" differently.

Thus the model of nativization and variation recognizes and incorporates the "attitude of the speaker" into the linguistic explanation of synchronic variation in the status and position of borrowed verbs in RUS, BLG and MAC.

In the MANAV the notion of "the attitude of the speaker" is represented by the feature [+not mine]. In this way the MANAV recognizes and incorporates the "attitude of the speaker" and therefore shows that the nativization of a borrowed verb is inextricably bound to the absence of a marking for the feature [+not mine].

4.2 Variation: The Margins and the Center

¹⁷Examples in RUS include *voznenavidi* PFV 'to conceive a hatred', *vosprjanut* PFV 'be noticed', *spat* 'to sleep'.

¹⁸I am not fully convinced that "mono-aspectuality" is any more consistent with structural descriptive accounts of aspect than "biaspectuality". 159
This study begins with the premise that borrowings are valuable sources of linguistic information. Therefore, the adaptation and assimilation processes, by their very nature, provide information regarding the synchronic status of a language. Such a notion is attested at both the nominal and verbal levels (see Introduction). And borrowings, as such, are considered by linguists as marginal elements of language. Yet, the fact that borrowings can shift from the margins to the center of a speaker's linguistic repertoire is central to this study. This shift from the margins is an indicator of acceptance by the speaker of the borrowing as part of "my language". The shift from the margins to a "center" (see Chapter 1 fn 1) is represented in the model here as a shift from a marked to an unmarked status and a zero marking for the feature [+not mine].

Finally, it is also possible, from the results of the questionnaires, to state that there are more than two statuses for borrowed verbs in the languages under study here, i.e., assimilated, non-assimilated and transitional. It is also apparent that it is more appropriate to discuss the status of an individual borrowing as opposed to borrowed verbs in general because of the lack of uniformity in the assimilation and acceptability among speakers. Such wide variation in the status of borrowed verbs among speakers further supports an explanatory model of nativization that includes the specific notion of [+not mine] in a borrowing continuum.

4.2.1 Variation: An Indicator of Transitional Status

The variation in the use of borrowed verbs among speakers is evidence of the transitional status of a borrowing. Robins (1964:326) states that it is not unusual to find doublets of foreign words in a language: "assimilated and non assimilated, depending on the attitude of the speaker." For example, in the MAC data there are the instances of

[^19]: It is possible to view the discussions of aspect as if the category of aspect was poured in to a sieve which allows the "unimportant" issues of aspect to fall through. The issues that "leaked through" the sieve are neglected and ignored as sources of information.
"doublets" of the borrowed verbs each of which may be located at different points along the borrowing continuum. Specifically, the borrowed verb konzerviro 'to conserve' in MAC was prefixed six times with do- and eight times with is-. Native speakers did not differentiate the meaning between these two forms. Therefore, they can be considered doublets. What is especially interesting about cases such as konzerviro in MAC, is that we find other cases in MAC in which one form is generally more favored and accepted, e.g., planiro 'to plan' which was prefixed 40 times with is- and only three times with do-; again native speakers did not differentiate meaning between these necessarily competing forms.

My interpretation of the existence of such variation thus focuses upon the speaker's perceptions of aspect and borrowed verbs. Such variation, by its nature, complicates the traditional "grammar" since it very often is difficult for the rigid descriptions in traditional grammars to accommodate variation. There is no apparent purely "linguistic" explanation for the nativization of the borrowed verbs from the data. Nor is there any indication that there is a "predisposition" on the part of speakers to incorporate/nativize a borrowed verb. The data demonstrate in all three languages that assimilation/nativization occurs on a verb-by-verb basis. Further, I suggest that the nativization of borrowed verbs occurs on a speaker-by-speaker basis.\(^{21}\)

The data also concentrate our attention on a comparison of variation in the status of individual borrowed verbs among speakers of each language studied. As stated above, borrowed verbs appear to occur in various stages of transition at many different positions along a borrowing continuum, i.e., some not assimilated, while others completely assimilated. The most important issue that this fact brings to the fore concerns the nature of

\(^{20}\)The emphasis is mine.

\(^{21}\)The normative sources do not distinguish all the levels of nativization of borrowed verbs. The nature of such sources imposes the necessity for setting a norm. The variation among those sources can be viewed as nativization in progress to the extent that there is no consensus on the aspectual status of borrowings. It may seem logical, yet I feel it is important to state that the nativization does not begin with the normative sources but is undoubtedly influenced by them.
the catalyst for the nativization of borrowed verbs: namely, how to explain nativization within the parameters of a linguistic, specifically, structuralist description. The MANAV therefore follows the tenets of structuralism and applies a markedness feature along a borrowing continuum. It is appropriate to account for the nativization process of borrowed verbs by applying markedness theory because the complete nativization of borrowed verbs in these languages ultimately upholds the basic tenets of structuralism and the structural description of aspect.

According to general structuralist concerns and the specifics of the MANAV, borrowed verbs can be synchronically categorized into three different statuses: 1) completely assimilated to the category of aspect; 2) not assimilated (at the initial stages of borrowing) and 3) somewhere between the two. The third status is, of course, a residual status which encompasses verbs in a transitional stage between 1 and 2. I consider the borrowed verbs in this transitional stage to exhibit synchronic variation in the formalization of aspectual meaning, i.e., some speakers and sources nativize the borrowed verb, while other speakers and sources do not, e.g., BLG garantiram 'to guarantee' prefixed by two of the 47 respondents, MAC profitira 'to profit' was prefixed by 12 of the 50 respondents.22

4.2.2 Variation: The Role of Semantics

Chapter 3 presents evidence which suggests that the inherent semantics of the verb may impact the development of a mono-aspectual verb. For instance, BLG korespondiram, is without a perfective pair because of the inherent processual nature of the verb that is semantically encoded. Thus, we must conclude that the nativization of a borrowed verb does not necessarily occur merely with the emergence of a "formal opposition", but very possibly with the speaker's acceptance of a borrowed verb as a

22It is difficult to know the exact point/moment of initial borrowing because these things are rarely recorded or immediately incorporated into authoritative sources. So therefore we look to "indicators" as clues to the process of borrowing and nativization.
mono-aspectual verb. Therefore, while aspect as a category implies an opposition, in the
nativization of borrowed verbs, the development of a formal opposition is not a prerequisite
for complete assimilation. Rather, the recognition of a borrowed verb's mono-aspectuality
which may or may not entail a formal opposition can also be considered an indicator of
nativization. Such an account permits the observation that aspect and aspectral
oppositions, are to some degree, influenced by semantics but a direct correlelation or
hierarchical relation is not distinguishable.

4.3 The Model of Adaptation and Nativization and Variation (MANAV)

Examining the variation among borrowed verbs provides insight into the
intrasystemic pressures and influences of each language in the adaptation and nativization
process. This pressure is especially evident in the assimilation of borrowed nouns to the
different nominal categories such as case, gender, number (see Introduction). However,
the data suggest that borrowings that are not assimilated and are not completely nativized
can be as informative as the assimilatory process itself, e.g., the competition between
forms like MAC dokonzervira and iskonzervira which speak to a synchronic competition
and/or tension between the two prefixes. Non-nativized elements permit us to identify
language change in progress, as we see in the variation that is evidenced in the results of
the questionnaires. While I will not make predictions regarding the future status of aspect
in the respective languages, I will refer to the historical development of the borrowed verbs
in order to demonstrate a documented instance of the development of aspect with verbs and
in this way support the notion that the status of borrowed verbs changes over time.

Borrowed verbs are not borrowed with prefixed PFV forms. This is evident in the
dictionary citations of borrowed verbs, e.g., the 1935 Ushakov dictionary does not cite a
prefixed form of dokumentirovat' "to document" but in the more recent volumes TSOS,
OSRJ, ESJR, this verb is consistently cited with a prefixed prodokumentirovat' "to
document" PFV (Avilova 1967; Maslov 1963). This suggests that they are borrowed
without aspectual oppositions and thus, in turn, borrowed verbs have come to be treated as marginal elements by the researchers discussed here. The data make clear that any prefixation and/or suffixation, i.e., development of formal oppositions, takes place subsequent to the initial borrowing.23 Certainly, once the borrowed verb has entered the language there is variation among speakers concerning the acceptability and usage of complex forms of the borrowed verb. And it is this stage of variation which is most often not incorporated into the linguistic studies of aspect and borrowed verbs because of the challenges that it poses to the traditional descriptions.

Therefore, I propose that the MANAV, which is grounded in the concept of a borrowing continuum more accurately reflects the linguistic reality; it is a better approach because it accounts for speaker perspective and variation. I have constructed this model of a continuum such that the initial stages of borrowing are represented at the far left of the continuum, i.e., unassimilated borrowed verbs. The far right of the continuum represents a state of complete nativization, i.e., the borrowed verb exhibits the most salient features of the category of aspect including a formal opposition, and equally important mono-aspectual status. Any point along the continuum is a point of transition between initial borrowing and nativization, and therefore a borrowed verb occurs in wide variation among speakers. Within the parameters of MANAV, I recognize nativization to have occurred with the emergence of the formal opposition of aspect and/or mono-aspectual borrowed verbs. I define this as the point of nativization. Such a schema helps us to determine the interrelated nexus of factors which influence both the speaker's use and acceptance of a borrowed verb while incorporating it into his/her linguistic repertoire and the intrasystemic linguistic factors which influence the adaptation and nativization of borrowed verbs.

23Once again I make the point that I accept that nativization is a gradual process (see Introduction fn. 10).
4.3.1 Variation as an Indicator of Language Change

Regardless of the seeming irregularity and marginality of borrowed verbs, the data show that mono-aspectual borrowed verbs are used by native speakers, e.g., the results of M3 for which native speakers produced sentences with prefixed borrowed verbs MAC, Ti odlučno izrecitira pesnata. 'You sang that song excellently.' Again, variation at the idiolectal level is significant because this is the level at which language change begins (see Chapter 1). In this study the indicator of "language change" is the morphologization of aspect with heretofore anomalous verbs, i.e., the nativization of borrowed verbs. Therefore, if we accept that language change begins at the idiolectal level, then it is appropriate, if not necessary, to discuss the mechanism of that change at the level of the individual speaker as well. It can be stated that the speaker nativizes only those verbs that he/she perceives to be within his/her linguistic repertoire, i.e., "my language". Stated differently, the native speaker morphologizes i.e., nativizes, those borrowed verbs which are unmarked for the feature [+not mine]. This said, it is right to conclude that the complete nativization of a borrowed verb and the loss of the feature [+not mine] are inextricably bound together. See Figure 4.1.

\[\text{\footnotesize 24 Here and throughout this study 'marked' is viewed as an indication of abnormal or unusual treatment and position within the specific language system by speakers and/or linguists.}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize 25 Another example of this is the \textbackslash{o} palatalization of dentals /\textbackslash{e}/ in RUS. During the Communist revolution speakers started palatalizing to show lack of knowledge of foreign languages but now speakers are not palatalizing the /\textbackslash{e}/ before after the dentals (see Holden 1976).}\]
4.3.2 Speaker Perception: The Feature [+not mine]

The complete assimilation of a borrowed verb is reflected in the absence of a marking for the feature [+not mine]. As was mentioned above, scholars refer to the occurrence of mono-aspectual forms in vague and indefinite terms. For example, the BLG Academy Grammar (1983:269) refers to the development of these forms as a result of the "votrešnata neobxodimost" 'internal necessity' specifically of the BLG verb to differentiate aspect. Mazić (1976:57) further notes that the use of prefixed borrowed verbs in SBC takes place when the "context requires it." The feature [+not mine] applies these broader concepts to the perceptions and attitudes of the individual while explaining the development of prefixed forms of borrowed verbs. The data establishes that the diffusion of nativized forms of the borrowed verbs is on a speaker-by-speaker basis. It is possible to view the "internal necessity" as a "necessity" on the part of the speaker to incorporate or more appropriately "unmark" the borrowed verb that they perceive as part of their linguistic repertoire in so much as speakers do not simultaneously or en masse nativize borrowed
verbs. To "unmark" the borrowing, then, means that it is being treated by the speaker as existing in and accepted as part of his/her linguistic repertoire, i.e., "my language." In sum, the process of eliminating the markedness feature [+not mine] involves a number of elements including the following: 1) how long an item has been borrowed; 2) how often a speaker encounters the item; 3) in which contexts it is encountered 4) the acceptance of the item in prescriptive standards. Thus, the feature, [+not mine] emerges as an incorporation mechanism that more closely delimits the nativization of borrowed verbs at the morphological level.

4.4 Further Support for the MANAV in Historical Discussions of Aspect

The argument supported by the MANAV is further strengthened by the historical development of aspect as a morphological category in Slavic, specifically RUS. The aspectual system of Early Old RUS shows a notable difference from the aspectual system of modern RUS (see Vlasto 1986). Aspect in Early Old RUS was primarily a lexical category versus the grammatical category found in modern RUS.

"The history of Russian aspect is the retreat of a lexically-based aspectual system in favor of one that is more grammatically - and contextually based...it is the interaction of lexical and contextual features that creates the environment for the partial grammaticalization of aspect in Russian" (Bermel 1995:700).

---

26See Henderson (1976) for a discussion of "unmarking" at the phonological level.

27Questions and topics of this nature enter the scope of cognitive categorization of borrowings which is outside the scope of this paper, see Rosch (1990) and Lakov (1992) for more recent discussions of cognitive categorizations.

28Due to the more extensive evidence from extant texts and the prevailing tendency to discuss Slavic in terms of RUS, I defer to the development of aspect in RUS this discussion.

29See Van Wijk (1952) for a discussion of the development of aspect in Slavic. There are differing opinions on the status of aspect as it was or was not inherited from Indo-European. The details, though, are not relevant to this discussion. Suffice it to say that I accept that RUS (and Slavic) did not inherit a fully developed aspectual system from Indo-European.
The partial and quasi grammaticalization that Bermel (1995) posits is based on the absence of formal and fixed markers of aspect as well as the presence and application of discourse factors to express aspectual meaning. More recently these issues have been introduced in the study and discussions of aspect (see Brecht 1985; Timberlake 1985). In some respects the assimilation of borrowed verbs to aspect mirrors the earlier development of grammatical aspect in Old RUS, (see Figure 4.2). The early ORUS aspectual system as a lexical category, according to Bermel and others, was dependent on contextual factors and/or other formal categories to express specific aspectual meaning. In modern RUS aspect is expressed morphologically. The majority of the literature concludes that the aspectual meaning of the borrowed biaspectual verbs is effectively expressed through context. One implication of this position is that the biaspectuality is a stable feature of these verbs. It implies an invariant status of borrowed verbs, i.e., that no further changes and/or adaptations occur. Clearly the data suggest otherwise.
Figure 4.2: Parallel Developments: Historical Development of Aspect as a Morphological Category and the Nativization of Borrowed Verbs

The pattern of prefixation with borrowed verbs shown by the data makes it possible to argue that the aspecectual system is moving away from contextual features as expressions of aspect and towards a grammaticalized system. The importance of Bermel's work is that he provides a plausible finite development of aspect and the grammatical distinctions of aspect in RUS. More importantly his work is significant for the development of aspect as a grammatical category in RUS. And with regard to the MANAV, Bermel's work makes it possible to discuss the development of aspect with borrowed verbs in terms that are consistent with the development of grammatical aspect in RUS.

4.4.1 Historical Development and the Synchronic Function of Prefixation

The historical role and prominence of prefixation as the mechanism for formalizing the aspecectual distinction is particularly helpful for the present work; prefixation is synchronically the primary mechanism of the borrowed verb to formalize aspecectual meaning. Early in the development of aspect in RUS, prefixation played a vital role in morphologizing aspect. "Prefixation, increasingly resorted to in the enlargement of vocabulary, tended more and more to be felt as imposing perfectivization. Some prefixes,
notably *po*- and *o*-, early acquired the purely grammatical role of markers of the perfective, no longer perceptibly modifying the sense of the verb (so-called 'empty prefixes' - *prefixes vides*) (Vlasto 1986:240). 30

Based on research concerning aspect in RUS (Bermel 1994, Van Wijk 1927, Schuyt 1993), earlier states of the category of aspect bear witness to a more lexically-based aspectual system, i.e., certain semantic groups of verbs, for example telic verbs, grammaticalize aspect before other semantic groups (atalic). 31 As Bermel (1994:678) states:

A proto-aspectual opposition based on prefixation and suffixation as aspectualizers develops for non-punctual telic act, and gradually spreads to the remainder of the verbal system.

Here non-punctual classifies those acts for which "reaching the goal inevitably entails the passage of time, e.g., ORUS žiti 'to live', tvoriti kumiry 'to make idols', ubivati 'to kill.' Some scholars (most recently Bermel 1994) assert that the lexically-based system of ORUS evolved into the morphological category that we find in modern RUS. I argue that the data from a current synchronic investigation provides evidence to support the notion that context is not a sufficient means to express aspect for the native speaker (even though it may be for the linguist). A comparison of the synchronic data with the diachronic data further serve the model of nativization and variation to the extent that the diachronic data illustrate a development of aspect with verbs; there is no point at which all verbs simultaneously developed grammatical aspect. Likewise the morphology of aspect with borrowed verbs is also a process that in effect mirrors the historical development of aspect in RUS to the extent that we find aspect being formalized when previously it had not been

30 It is interesting to note that this is the stage at which the Baltic languages have presumably stopped the evolution of aspect with prefixation occurring but a change of aspect not necessarily or even generally occurring (see Comrie 1976:87-88).

31 Here telic is defined as an act that makes reference to the attainment of a goal, e.g., RUS pisati knigu 'to write a book', ORUS iskati 'to search for.'
within the perceptions of the individual speaker it is possible to better understand the process of nativization as it occurs at the level of the language at the prescriptive level.
CHAPTER 5

NATIVIZATION AND THE NATIVE SPEAKER: REASSESSING THEORIES OF BORROWING AND LANGUAGE CHANGE

5.0 Introduction

This chapter summarizes the theoretical framework and the empirical findings that have been presented in order to gain more insight into the process of adaptation and nativization of borrowed verbs in RUS, BLG and MAC. To this end I have developed the MANAV which provides a place for speaker perception as the basis for the feature [+not mine], an important factor in larger patterns of language change.

5.1 A Different Angle of Analysis

The present work is primarily a study of borrowing and nativization of verbs in RUS, BLG and MAC. This study is a departure from traditional studies of borrowing and nativization in three specific ways: 1) this study is synchronic in nature rather than diachronic; 2) this is a study of borrowing in a mono-lingual community rather than a bilingual one; and 3) this study examines borrowing at the morphological level rather than phonological. Thus, while I admit that this study appears to have a non-traditional theoretical framework, its focus on the practical plane has proved invaluable.

Traditionally, borrowing—as a linguistic topic—is approached from a diachronic perspective.1 Such diachronic studies catalog very specific examples of borrowings at a

1 The distinction between diachrony and synchrony is a "fuzzy" or gray area in so far as diachrony includes and/or subsumes synchrony, see Bailey (1973).
descriptive level, e.g., GER verbs in *-ieren* are borrowed into some Slavic languages as *-irc-*, but do not take into account the process of adaptation and change itself. Thus, the corpus of borrowed words used in these approaches have clearly already been nativized; such studies examine nativization as a *fait accompli*. Further, such studies treat borrowings as large homogenour groups, but rarely, if ever, are they borrowed en masse.\(^2\) Rather, borrowings are adapted and nativized one at a time and for different reasons and uses.\(^3\) A synchronic study of borrowing and nativization, by contrast with diachronic studies, yields less specific results because there is a great deal of variation from borrowed word to borrowed word. And such synchronic variation is traditionally not a focus of linguistic studies of borrowing and nativization (see Labov 1972) because it involves process rather than results. Hence, the focus in a synchronic analysis becomes the process and the linguistic information that it is possible to extract from such a process itself.

This study is further distinguished from other studies of adaptation and nativization because it is not concerned with borrowing and nativization in a bilingual community, i.e., the central focus here is a context in which there is no dominant-language interference, e.g., Holden 1976; Jutronić-Tihomirović 1982; Danesi 1983. This study, rather, concentrates upon mono-lingual native speakers who are by and large unaffected by foreign language interference in their own speech. Thus, it is possible for this sort of speaker to realize that a word may be marked for foreignness and/or be outside of their own linguistic repertoire but are not necessarily able to identify the source language. In addition,

\(^2\)Note for example that I have chosen two phrases here that I consider to be marked [+foreign] and not marked for the feature [+not mine], i.e., within my linguistic repertoire. I further point out that authors and editors abide by conventions which indicate that a word and/or phrase is foreign is with the italicization of the ativen phrase. I would suggest that one indicator of the loss of the concept [+not mine] and further the nativization of a borrowing is when it is no longer italicized.

\(^3\)I recognize that there are *periods of time* during which there is incorporation of a large number of borrowings, usually pertaining to similar disciplines or specialized fields, e.g., military terms, computer technology, and other terminological lexicon sets.
concentrating on mono-lingual communities removes the necessity to factor in other socially motivated elements into borrowing and nativization such as the prestige value of another language and code-mixing or switching, (see Labov 1973) (see fn. 2).

While this study draws upon earlier studies concerning phonological adaptation and nativization, it is distinguished from these by virtue of the fact that it is a study of adaptation and nativization at the morphological level. Relatively few studies examine the morphological adaptation and nativization of borrowings (see, for example, Gimpelevič 1982) because it is generally assumed that borrowings are either adapted to the morphological structure of the borrowing language or remain outside of the morphological structure as is the case with RUS indeclinables, e.g., RUS radio 'radio', taksi 'taxi' (see Bailey 1973). Yet, as I have argued borrowed verbs exhibit a delayed pattern of nativization with regard to the morphological category of aspect in the three languages under study here.

5.2 The Scope of Slavic Aspect

What has become clear throughout this discussion is that the borrowed verbs are adapted to the morphological structure of the borrowing verbal systems in RUS, BLG and MAC with one notable exception: aspect. It has also emerged from the data that speakers are incorporating borrowed verbs into their linguistic repertoires. Thus, the results of the data call into question our understanding of the scope of Slavic aspect since all verbs do not necessarily exhibit the most salient features of the category of aspect. The question then arises: what is the distinguishing factor in the perceptions of the speaker between verbs that are completely nativized and those that are not? I have argued that what is meant by nativization for the speaker may be characterized in terms of the privative opposition embodied by the feature [+ not mine]. Moreover, I suggest that the feature [+not mine] at once reflects and influences the complete nativization of the borrowed verbs in Slavic (see
Chapter 4). At the heart of the argument is the fact that speakers do not nativize borrowed verbs that they perceive to be outside their linguistic repertoire. What is at issue here, then, is whether, in fact, all verbs in Slavic have aspect in accordance with the way we have heretofore characterized it as a morphological category. I have developed an argument which posits that for the speaker not all verbs have aspect; only those verbs which are part of "my language" have aspect and therefore are used with formal aspectual marking. Hence, it is possible to limit the scope of Slavic aspect in the following terms and within a speaker perspective: all Slavic verbs have aspect, but all verbs in Slavic do not necessarily have aspect. To the extent that the questions raised here appear to challenge the fundamental theories of structuralism, I contend that, in fact, what the data reveal actually falls within a structuralist perspective and lend further support to the notion that aspect is a morphological and formal category in these three Slavic languages for the very specific reason that speakers formalize aspectual meaning with the borrowed verbs.

Thus, an aim of the MANAV is to define this delimitation of the category of aspect in Slavic. As I have argued above, the feature [+not mine] figures prominently in defining the category of aspect because it is the key to describing and explaining the reciprocal relationship between the speaker, nativization and language change. The scope of Slavic aspect, then, is not constituted by all verbs in Slavic, but rather is constituted by all Slavic verbs, i.e., all RUS verbs, all MAC verbs, all BLG verbs. The nativization of a borrowed verb, i.e., its formalization and/or mono-aspectualization expresses both the absence of the feature [+ not mine] and the incorporation of the borrowed verb into the linguistic repertoire of the speaker. The "Slavic-ness" of a verb is ultimately determined by the individual speaker; when the speaker considers the verb outside the scope of his/her own language, it is marked [+not mine]. This marking is maintained up to the point that the speaker assimilates the borrowed verb.4
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Finally, I propose that borrowed verbs at the initial stage of borrowing are in fact outside the scope of Slavic aspect, e.g., borrowed verbs in RUS are outside the scope of RUS aspect precisely because the borrowed verbs are not perceived by the native speaker as RUS verbs, in the same manner borrowed verbs in BLG are not necessarily perceived by native speakers of BLG as BLG verbs. The period of time a specific borrowed verb remains at the initial stage of borrowing is not fixed or the same for every borrowing. Thus different borrowings move through the nativization process at different rates.

5.3 The "Category-ness" of Aspect

The argument outlined above concerning the scope of Slavic aspect raises a number of important questions with regard to grammatical categories. On the one hand, if we accept that aspect is a grammatical category, then such a position challenges the nature of a grammatical category, i.e., the prototypical attributes of its members. But on the other hand, if we accept the traditional concept of a grammatical category and aspect as a given attribute of a verb, then it follows that aspect does not conform to our traditional notions of what constitutes a grammatical category. Within the framework of the MANAV, the data demonstrate that the scope of Slavic aspect is not necessarily limited by the diachronic evidence. Synchronically it is possible to state that borrowed verbs assimilate to the category of aspect, i.e., formalize aspectual meaning. But the scope of Slavic aspect is, in fact, delimited by the synchronic data presented here. Not all borrowed verbs are nativized by speakers to the category of aspect—thereby allowing the conclusion that all verbs in Slavic have aspect. With regard to the second statement, the diachronic data uphold the notion of aspect as a grammatical category in as much as it shows that borrowed verbs are

\[4\] Here I would note that there is evidence in RUS of the native biaaspectual verbs shifting from their biaaspectual status as well, e.g., \textit{obeščat’/poboeščat’} 'to promise'. Further from the results of the questionnaires in BLG the native biaaspectual verbs were not prefixable but are noted with specifically marked IMP with the -va- suffix, e.g., \textit{čuvam} 'to hear' IMP (see Maslov 1965).
completely assimilated. The synchronic data, however, show a great deal of variation in
the status of the borrowed verbs and further reveal that there is no established pattern of
nativization that may be drawn from the perceptions and language use of the individual
speaker.

Since Slavic aspect has been almost exclusively discussed in the terms of
structuralism and binary oppositions, it is widely assumed that as a category all verbs in
Slavic have aspect and further that all verbs in Slavic exhibit a formal opposition of this
category. Moreover, given these theoretical constructs of the pervading discussions of
Slavic aspect, it is remarkable that the concept and definition of biaspectuality has not been
questioned. The present study has reexamined the status of borrowed verbs precisely
because of the inconsistencies and incongruities inherent in the concept of biaspectuality
within a framework built upon duality and privative opposition. And by questioning the
biaspectuality of the borrowed verbs, we are forced to question the concept of the
grammatical category.

5.4 Borrowed Verbs: Biaspectuality as an Anomaly

Theoretically, biaspectuality is incompatible with the tenets of Structuralism and the
concept of binary opposition because biaspectuality could only be something outside of an
opposition and the acceptance of biaspectuality creates a ternary opposition within a system
traditionally and consistently defined as a binary one.

Given this paradox inherent in the classification biaspectral, I posit that, in fact, it is
possible to propose that the borrowed verbs, as they are outside the scope of aspect, are
without aspect, in effect these verbs are a-aspectual. As speaker perceptions influence
nativization, so these perceptions influence the scope of aspect and can thus be reflected in
our understanding of aspect within the system. If these verbs are outside the scope of
aspect and thus outside the aspectual system, it is logical to posit that borrowed verbs prior
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to nativization are without aspect, and not, as has been suggested elsewhere, biaspectral. The occurrence of borrowed verbs in both perfective and imperfective frames, however, does not necessarily imply that the verbs are of both aspects. They are indifferent to the aspectual distinction. I posit that to suggest that such verbs are "without aspect" is no less contradictory to our traditional discussions than the descriptor biaspectral itself.

Overall, it is fair to say that borrowed verbs within the system of Slavic verbs are "regular", i.e., they are adapted to every verbal category including potentially aspect. Borrowed verbs have been consider anomalous because of their so-called "biaspectral" nature. According to the majority of linguistic analyses and normative sources, biaspectral is a classification which is comprised of primarily, and not arbitrarily, borrowed verbs. To some degree "biaspectral" as an aspectual qualifier comes to be a redundant classification for borrowed verbs even though all borrowed verbs are not necessarily biaspectral nor are all biaspectral verbs necessarily of foreign origin. It is the correlation between biaspectuality and borrowed verbs that makes it logical to look to the borrowing and nativization process for an explanation of the shift from anomalous to regular status. Hence, biaspectuality should not be considered without reference to the origin of its productivity, i.e., the borrowed lexicon.

As the data demonstrate, borrowed verbs in RUS, BLG and MAC shift their aspectual status from a-aspectual to aspectual; they are nativized by speakers and incorporated into the norms of speech and writing with formal oppositions or recognized as mono-aspectual verbs. Thus, if borrowed verbs are anomalous and marginal because they are a-aspectual (biaspectral), then it is important to make the point that such a status can, at best, be temporary and is dynamic, i.e., it does not necessarily have a fixed status and the margins of the category of aspect are fluid.
5.5 Native Speaker Perceptions, Nativization and Language Change

"Putting the speaker back" into a linguistic analysis of borrowing and nativization has broader implications for theories of language change. An important contribution of the MANAV to theories of language change is that it differentiates the feature [+ not mine] from the feature [+ foreign] in an effort to indicate a distinction in the level of their application. By this I mean that the feature [+ not mine] and the feature [+ foreign] are not necessarily mutually inclusive categories for the speaker; recognition that a word is foreign does not mean that it is obligatorily outside one's linguistic repertoire and conversely recognition that a word is [+not mine] does not necessarily mean that it is a foreign word. Thus it is the case that as a native ENG speaker it is possible to both at once acknowledge the foreignness of the FRN phrase en masse and to consider it part of one's own linguistic repertoire.\(^5\) The phrase en masse in my perception is both [+foreign] and not marked for the feature [+not mine]. The change from [+not mine] to an absence of marking for the feature is a better characterization of the nativization and incorporation process of borrowed verbs than the change from [+foreign] to [-foreign] precisely because the former change incorporates the speaker perception while it avoids the overtones and metalinguistic awareness that the designation [+foreign] entails. By not applying the feature [+foreign] it is possible to avoid the implication that the speaker recognizes the word as foreign. Rather what the feature I propose entails is simply that the speaker does not consider the word to be part of his/her language. The cumulative effect of speakers including the word into their

\(^5\)With specific reference to the foreignisms I would suggest that one indicator of the incorporation of the phrase into one's linguistic repertoire would be the absence of overtly marking the phrase as foreign, i.e., one chooses to not italicize the borrowed phrase. Another point of reference that marks a distinction between the features [+foreign] and [+not mine] can be seen in dialectal variants of a standard. For instance, American ENG in the South makes frequent use of the term 'y'all', while I recognize that the term is in fact ENG, specifically American ENG, the word (or phrase) is not in my linguistic repertoire.
linguistic repertoire then shifts the status of the borrowing within the language, i.e., it is incorporated into the standard and prescriptive sources.

Clearly, the perceptions of the speaker regarding whether or not a word falls into his/her linguistic repertoire—whether perceived as foreign or not—affects the way in which a borrowed verb is treated morphologically. And the morphological shape of a borrowed verb, in turn, has an influence upon its perceived aspectual status within the language. As the same borrowed verbs are incorporated into the linguistic repertoires of the same morphological adaptations into ever greater numbers of speakers, the presence and status of these borrowed verbs are reflected in the prescriptive sources.6

Finally, if we view the MANAV as a schema which represents a single speaker's linguistic repertoire then it is possible to also conceptualize the MANAV as but one component point on a larger continuum of nativization and language change. (See Figure 5.1.) In this way the MANAV can be thought of as a microcosm of language change at the community and normative level. Every speaker that accepts the borrowed verb as no longer marked for the feature [not mine] and has nativized the borrowing advances the nativization process for a particular borrowed word further along the continuum. The point at which enough speakers have nativized a borrowing for it to be reflected in the prescriptive sources has yet to be determined. Thus, an understanding of the borrowing and nativization process at the individual level allows us to better understand the nature of language change.

6For some speakers who have not yet incorporated the borrowings into their linguistic repertoire the prescriptive source can serve to influence the morphological adaptation and nativization of the borrowed verb.
Figure 5.1: Speaker Perception and Language Change

5.6 Summary

This study re-introduces the speaker into a linguistic analysis of borrowing and nativization, specifically with regard to borrowed verbs in three Slavic languages, RUS, BLG and MAC in an effort to more accurately describe and explain the linguistic reality and thereby contribute to our theoretical understanding of language change in progress.

In conclusion, the scope of Slavic aspect requires a fine distinction to be made between all verbs in Slavic, (or all verbs in RUS/BLG) and all Slavic verbs, (or all RUS/BLG verbs.) This distinction arose in the examination of theaspectual status of borrowed and biaspectual verbs in Slavic (RUS/BLG). The descriptor 'biaspectual' was reevaluated in light of the data and judged inadequate, as merely a grammatical convention that was applied to borrowed and exceptional verbs so that they conform to structuralist theories such as the notion of category within a system of binary and formal oppositions.
and markedness features. The notion of a-aspectuality was introduced as a more
descriptive analysis of the verbs outside the scope of Slavic aspect. The limitation of the
scope of aspect asserts that aspect is not inherently a feature of borrowed verbs in Slavic,
rather aspect as a Slavic feature and as a formal category is inextricably bound to the
nativization of a borrowing.
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## APPENDIX A
-IRA AND BIASPECTUAL VERBS CITED IN DRY
WITH ASPECTUAL NOTATIONS AND PREFIXATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIASPECTUAL VERB</th>
<th>ASP CITED</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abonirovat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>have on order</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absorbirovat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>absorb</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abstagirovat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>abstract</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avansirovat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>advance</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>automatizirovat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>automate</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avtorizirovat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>author</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agitirovat'</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>agitate</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agonizirovat'</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>be in agony</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agonirovat'</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>be in agony</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adaptirovat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>adapt</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrirovat'</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>administrate</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adresovat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>address</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adsorbirovat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>adsorb</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akklimazirovat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>acclimatize</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akkompanirovat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>accompany</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akkreditovat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>accredit</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akkumulirovat'</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>accumulate</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aktivizirovat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>make more active, stir up</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aktivirovat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>activate</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aktirovat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>certify presence/absence</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akcentirovat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>accent</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akcentovat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>accent</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amal'gamirovat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>amalgamate</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amnistirotov'</td>
<td></td>
<td>give amnesty</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amortizirovat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>amortize</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amputirovat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>amputate</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analizirovat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>analyze</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anatomizirovat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>make anatomical</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>angazirovat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>engage</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anestezirovat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>aestheteize</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anneksirotov'</td>
<td></td>
<td>annex</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annotirovat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>annotate</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annulirovat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>annul</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anonsirovat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>name</td>
<td>sja</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Part of Speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aplodirotav'</td>
<td>applaud</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appercipirovat'</td>
<td>perceive</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aprobirotav'</td>
<td>approve</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aranzirovat'</td>
<td>arrange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>argumentirovat'</td>
<td>give reasons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arendirovat'</td>
<td>rent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arestovat'</td>
<td>I arestovyvat'</td>
<td>P (obs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>armirovat'</td>
<td>reinforce</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>artikulirovat'</td>
<td>articulate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assignovat'</td>
<td>assign, allocate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assimilirovat'</td>
<td>assimilate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assistirovat'</td>
<td>assist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asociirovat'</td>
<td>associate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asfal'tirovat'</td>
<td>asphalt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atakovat'</td>
<td>attack</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atrofirotav'sja</td>
<td>atrophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afisirovat'</td>
<td>parade, make show of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affinirovat'</td>
<td>refine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blokirotav'</td>
<td>block the way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>briketirovat'</td>
<td>make briquettes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bronzirotav'</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bronzirotav' na-</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bronirovat'</td>
<td>Armour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vizirotav'</td>
<td>visa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vizirotav' za</td>
<td>sight a target through apparatus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voenizirovat'</td>
<td>militarize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>votirovat'</td>
<td>vote (on) in parliament</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vulkanizirovat'</td>
<td>vulcanize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vulkanizovat'</td>
<td>vulcanize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vul'garizirovat'</td>
<td>popularize a subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gazificirovat'</td>
<td>gasify, install gas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gal'vanizirovat'</td>
<td>galvanize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garantirovat'</td>
<td>guarantee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>galvanizovat'</td>
<td>galvanize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garantirovat'</td>
<td>guarantee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garmonizirovat'</td>
<td>harmonize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garmonizovat'</td>
<td>harmonize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garmirovat'</td>
<td>garnish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>germanizirovat'</td>
<td>Germanize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>germanizovat'</td>
<td>Germanize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>germanetizirovat'</td>
<td>close hermetically</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geroizirovat'</td>
<td>heroize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gil'otinirovat'</td>
<td>make hypertrophic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gipertrofirotav'sja</td>
<td>hyper trophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glazirovat'</td>
<td>glaze, candy, glossy finish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gospitalizirovat'</td>
<td>hospitalize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gofirovat'</td>
<td>crimp, goffer, corrugate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gradirovat'</td>
<td>graduate, brine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduirovat'</td>
<td>graduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>granulirovat'</td>
<td>granulate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gudronirovat'</td>
<td>tar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gummirovat'</td>
<td>gum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>datirovat'</td>
<td>date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>debatovat'</td>
<td>debit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deblokirovat'</td>
<td>block</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>debjutirovat'</td>
<td>debut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degazirovat'</td>
<td>decontaminate, degas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degenerirovat'</td>
<td>degenerate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degradirovat'</td>
<td>degrade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degustirovat'</td>
<td>taste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deducirovat'</td>
<td>deduce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dezavuirovat'</td>
<td>disavow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desertirovat'</td>
<td>desert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dezinficirovat'</td>
<td>disinfect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dezinformirovat'</td>
<td>misinform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dezorganizovat'</td>
<td>disorganize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dezorientirovat'</td>
<td>confuse, disorient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dekal'kirovat'</td>
<td>apply transfers to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dekatirovat'</td>
<td>sponge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dekatirovát'</td>
<td>sponge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dekvalificirovat'</td>
<td>get disqualified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deklarirovat'</td>
<td>declare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deklassirovat'</td>
<td>declass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dekorirovat'</td>
<td>decorate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dekretirovat'</td>
<td>decree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delegirovat'</td>
<td>send as a delegate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demaskirovat'</td>
<td>unmask</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demilitarizovat'</td>
<td>demilitarize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demobilizovat'</td>
<td>demobilize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demokratizirovat'</td>
<td>democratize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstrirovat'</td>
<td>demonstrate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demontirovat'</td>
<td>demonstrate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demoralizovat'</td>
<td>demoralize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demunicipalizirovat'</td>
<td>return property to private ownership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>denaturalizovat'</td>
<td>denaturalize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>denaturirovat'</td>
<td>denature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>denacionalizirovat'</td>
<td>denationalize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>denonsirovat'</td>
<td>denounce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deponirovat'</td>
<td>deposit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>detaliizirovat'</td>
<td>work out in detail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>detaliizovat'</td>
<td>work out in detail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deformirovat'</td>
<td>sja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decentralizirovat'</td>
<td>decentralize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decentralizovat'</td>
<td>decentralize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desifirovat'</td>
<td>decode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desifrovat'</td>
<td>decode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diagnostirovat'</td>
<td>diagnose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diskvalificirovat'</td>
<td>disqualify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diskontrirovat'</td>
<td>discount</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diskreditirovat'</td>
<td>discredit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diskriminirovat'</td>
<td>discriminate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dislocirovat'</td>
<td>distill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distilirovat'</td>
<td>distill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
disciplinirovat' discipline
differencirovat' differentiate
dokumentirovat' document
dragirovat' drag, dredge
dramatizirovat' dramatize
drenirovat' drain
evropeizirovat' europeanize
ignorirovat' ignore, disregard
idealizirovat' idealize
identificirovat' identify
illuminirovat' illuminate
illuminovat' illuminate
illustrirovat' illustrate
immigirovat' immigrate
immunizirovat' immunize
importirovat' import
improvizirovat' improvise
inventarizirovat' draw up an inventory
inventorzhirovat' draw up an inventory
investirovat' invest
individualizirovat' individualize
industrializirovat' industrialize
industrializovat' industrialize
insakhirovat' collect
inkorporirovat' incorporate
inkriminirovat' accuse of, charge of
inkustirovat' inlay
inkustirovat' inlay
insinuirovat' insinuate
inspinirovat' inspire
instruktirovat' instruct
instrumentirovat' orchestrate
inscenirovat' dramatize, stage, feign
integrirovat' integrate
intensificirovat' intensify
intervjuirovat' interview
internacionalizirovat' internationalize
internirovat' intern
interpiirirot' interpellate
terpolirovat' interpolate
interpretirovat' interpret
informirovat' inform
ionizirovat' ionize
ispovedovat' hear so's confession, question closely
ispol'zovat' utilize, make use of
issledovat' investigate, explore
kazhit' I (also P)

kal'kirovat' trace, 2) calque
kamiflirovat' camoglage
kanonizirovat' canonize
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lincevat'</td>
<td>lynch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>litografirovat'</td>
<td>lithograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logarifmirovat'</td>
<td>logarithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lokalizirovat'</td>
<td>localize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lokalizovat'</td>
<td>localize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lokautirovat'</td>
<td>lock out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lornirovat'</td>
<td>observe through a lorgnette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mankirovat'</td>
<td>neglect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>markirovat'</td>
<td>mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marmorirovat'</td>
<td>marble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>massirovat'</td>
<td>massage, rub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materializovat'</td>
<td>print, make a matrix of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matricirovat'</td>
<td>materialize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mas'finirovat'</td>
<td>equip w/ machinery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meblirovat'</td>
<td>furnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metallizirovat'</td>
<td>metallize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mexanizirovat'</td>
<td>mechanize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>militarizirovat'</td>
<td>militarize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>militarizovat'</td>
<td>militarize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minirovat'</td>
<td>mine, sow with mines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mistificirovat'</td>
<td>mystify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mobilizovat'</td>
<td>mobilize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modelirovat'</td>
<td>model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modernizirovat'</td>
<td>modernize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modernizovat'</td>
<td>modernize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modificirovat'</td>
<td>modify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>molv'</td>
<td>say, utter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>molnirovat'</td>
<td>wire, send telegram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monopolizirovat'</td>
<td>monopolize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motivirovat'</td>
<td>motive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motorizovat'</td>
<td>motorize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mramorirovat'</td>
<td>marble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>numificirovat'</td>
<td>mummify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>municipalizirovat'</td>
<td>municipalize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>napustovat'</td>
<td>speak parting words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narkotizirovat'</td>
<td>anesthetize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nasledovat'</td>
<td>inherit, be heir to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naturalizovat'</td>
<td>naturalize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nacionalizirovat'</td>
<td>nationalize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nacionalizovat'</td>
<td>nationalize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nivelirovat'</td>
<td>level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nokautirovat'</td>
<td>knock out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normalizovat'</td>
<td>normalize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normirovat'</td>
<td>standardize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>notifificirovat'</td>
<td>notify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nocevat'</td>
<td>spend the night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obe'schat'</td>
<td>promise, assure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oborudirovat'</td>
<td>equip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obrazovat'</td>
<td>create, produce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obsledovat' in past</td>
<td>examine, check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ob'ektivirovat'</td>
<td>objectivize</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- obs: absent
- bksh (obs be absent)
- med: medical
- ot: other
- po-: possibly
- sja: return to normal
- obrazovvat: education
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ozonirovat'</td>
<td>ozonize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>okcupirovat'</td>
<td>occupy (a country)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oksidirovat'</td>
<td>oxidize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>okulirovat'</td>
<td>graft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oposredovat'</td>
<td>clothe in words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oposnedstvovat'</td>
<td>clothe in words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optirovat'</td>
<td>opt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optirovat'</td>
<td>adopt a nationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizovat'</td>
<td>organize, prepare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizovvyvat'</td>
<td>organize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orientirovat'</td>
<td>give smb bearings, guide towards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orkestrovat'</td>
<td>orchestrate, score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ornamentirovat'</td>
<td>ornament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ornamentovat'</td>
<td>ornament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parlizovat'</td>
<td>paralyse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parafirovat'</td>
<td>initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parafrazirovat'</td>
<td>paraphrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parašutirovat'</td>
<td>make an abrupt landing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parirovat'</td>
<td>parry, counter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parodirovat'</td>
<td>parody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parcellirovat'</td>
<td>parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pasterizovat'</td>
<td>pasteurize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patentovat'</td>
<td>patent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pelengovat'</td>
<td>take the bearings of, fix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perekvvalificirovat'</td>
<td>train for a new position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pereoborudovat'</td>
<td>re equipt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pereosvidetel'stvovat'</td>
<td>re-examine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pererasxodovat'</td>
<td>spend too much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pereregistrirovat'</td>
<td>re-register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perefrazirovat'</td>
<td>paraphrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perifrazirovat'</td>
<td>paraphrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perkutirovat'</td>
<td>percuss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perljustirovat'</td>
<td>perlustrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personificirovat'</td>
<td>personify, embody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perforirovat'</td>
<td>perforate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pirirovat'</td>
<td>dive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pikirovát'</td>
<td>thin out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pikirovat'sja</td>
<td>exchange caustic remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>platiairovat'</td>
<td>molent in platinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poljazirovat'</td>
<td>polarize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>populjarizirovat'</td>
<td>popularize, disseminate widely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>populjarizovat'</td>
<td>popularize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postulirovat'</td>
<td>postulate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poetizirovat'</td>
<td>poeticize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prezentovat'</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>premirovat'</td>
<td>give/award a bonus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preparirovat'</td>
<td>prepare for publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>privatstvovat'</td>
<td>greet, welcom, salute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provocirovat'</td>
<td>provoke, be provocative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proklamirovat'</td>
<td>proclaim, declare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proletarizirovat'</td>
<td>proletarianize</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Bias
- Past
- phil
- sja
- legis
- av
- bksh
- joc
- mil
prolongirovat' extend, prolong
protezirovat' fit with a prosthesis
protestovat' dispute, protest
protestovat' I only
protokolirovat' take down in minutes, relate
profanirovat' profane, desecrate
profilirovat' roll steel sections
pudlingovat' puddle
pul'verizirovat' pulverize
radiofikirovat' install radio
radiovat' radio, wireless, transmit
rajonirovat' divide into districts
ران' wound, injure
raportovat' report s.t. to
rassledovat' inquire into, investigate
ratificirovat' ratify
rafinitirovat' refine, turn into lump sugar
racionalizirovat' rationalize machines, labour
racionolizovat' rationalize
reabilitirovat' rehabilitate
reabilitirovat'sja be rehabilited
realizovat' accomplish, realize
revizovat' inspect, revise
revolucionizirovat' disseminate revolutionary ideas
reglamentirovat' regulate
redaktirovat' edit a manuscript
redaktirovat' I only preside over the editorship
reduirovat' reduce
rezervirovat' reserve
rezjumirovat' summarize
rekvizirovat' requisition
reklimirovat' advertise, boast
rekognoscirovat' reconnoitre
rekomendovat' recommend
rekomendovat' advise
rekomendovat' introduce
rekonstruirovat' reconstruct
rekrutirovat' recruit
rektificirovat' rectify
remilitarizirovat' remilitarize
remilitarizovat' remilitarize
remontirovat' repair
renaturalizovat' restore s.o. citizenship
reorganizovat' re-organize
repatriirovat' repatriate
repressirovat' subject to repression
reproduktirovat' reproduce
restavrirovat' restore
retirovat'sja retire, withdraw
reutsirovat' retouch
referirovat' 2) be an arbitrator
reformirovat' reform
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>recenzirovat'</td>
<td>review (a book)</td>
<td>pro-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reevakuirovat'</td>
<td>reevacuate</td>
<td>sja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ritumizirovat'</td>
<td>give rhythmic form to</td>
<td>sja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rodit'</td>
<td>give birth</td>
<td>rozat'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rodit'</td>
<td>give rise to</td>
<td>rozat'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rodit'</td>
<td>bear</td>
<td>rozat'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rodit'</td>
<td>I also rozdat'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rodit'sja</td>
<td>be born</td>
<td>rozdat'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rodit'sja</td>
<td>come into being</td>
<td>rozdat'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rodit'sja</td>
<td>grow thrive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rokirovat'</td>
<td>castle</td>
<td>sja</td>
<td>chess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>romanizirovat'</td>
<td>romanize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>romanizovat'</td>
<td>romanize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rusificirovat'</td>
<td>russify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sabotažničat'</td>
<td>sabotage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sabotirovat'</td>
<td>sabotage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saljutirovat'</td>
<td>salute, hoist a flag</td>
<td>ot-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sanirovat'</td>
<td>put on a sound basis, restore</td>
<td>bksh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sankcionirovat'</td>
<td>sanction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sekvestrirovat'</td>
<td>sequestrate, seize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sekvesrovat'</td>
<td>sequestrate, seize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sekulajarizirovat'</td>
<td>secularize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sekulizarovat'</td>
<td>secularize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>separirovat'</td>
<td>extract, separate w/centrifuge</td>
<td>pro-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>servirovat'</td>
<td>serve a meal, lay table</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>signalizirovat'</td>
<td>signal, warn</td>
<td>pro-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simvolizirovat'</td>
<td>symbolize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simulirovat'</td>
<td>simulate, feign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sindicirovat'</td>
<td>make into a syndicate</td>
<td>bksh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sintezirovat'</td>
<td>synthesize, put together</td>
<td>chem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sinxronizirovat'</td>
<td>bring into step</td>
<td>tech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sistematizirovat'</td>
<td>systematize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skal'pirovat'</td>
<td>scalp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skandalizirovat'</td>
<td>cause annoyance</td>
<td>bksh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skandalizirovat'</td>
<td>put smb in an embarrassing</td>
<td>bksh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skarificirovat'</td>
<td>turn over the soil with a cultivator</td>
<td>agr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skladirovat'</td>
<td>stack, store, lay in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sovetizirovat'</td>
<td>establish soviet power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solidarizirovat'sja</td>
<td>declare one's solidarity</td>
<td>bksh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solidarizovat'sja</td>
<td>declare one's solidarity</td>
<td>bksh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solirovat'</td>
<td>sing solo</td>
<td>mus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sobrazovat'</td>
<td>coordinate</td>
<td>bksh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>socializirovat'</td>
<td>nationalize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specializirovat'</td>
<td>give specialized training, concentrate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specificirovat'</td>
<td>draw up a list of parts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stabilizirovat'</td>
<td>stabilize</td>
<td>sja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stabilizovat'</td>
<td>stabilize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standartizirovat'</td>
<td>standardize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standartizovat'</td>
<td>standardize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>startovat'</td>
<td>take off</td>
<td>av</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>steklografirovat'</td>
<td>hectograph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stereotipirovat'</td>
<td>cast stereo plate, make a stereo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sterilizovat'</td>
<td>sterilize</td>
<td>stilizovat'</td>
<td>stylize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stimulirovat'</td>
<td>stimulate</td>
<td>sublimirovat'</td>
<td>sublimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subsidirovat'</td>
<td>subsidize</td>
<td>summirovat'</td>
<td>add together, generalize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sxematizirovat'</td>
<td>schematize</td>
<td>taksirovat'</td>
<td>assess the statutory price of,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tamponirovat'</td>
<td>tampon, plug</td>
<td>tarirovat'</td>
<td>gauge, calibrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tarificirovat'</td>
<td>tariff</td>
<td>tatuirovat'</td>
<td>tattoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teatralizovat'</td>
<td>dramatize</td>
<td>telegrafirovat'</td>
<td>telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>telefonirovat'</td>
<td>telephone</td>
<td>teploficirovat'</td>
<td>provide for a heating system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terrorizirovat'</td>
<td>terrorize</td>
<td>terrorizovat'</td>
<td>terrorize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tipizirovat'</td>
<td>typify</td>
<td>tiražirovat'</td>
<td>determine the print; set the no. of copies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>titrovat'</td>
<td>titrate</td>
<td>titulovat'</td>
<td>address smb w correct title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tonzirovat'</td>
<td>tone up</td>
<td>torpedirovat'</td>
<td>torpedo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transkribovat'</td>
<td>transcribe</td>
<td>translirovat'</td>
<td>transmit, relay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transponirovat'</td>
<td>transpose</td>
<td>transportirovat'</td>
<td>transport, convey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transformirovat'</td>
<td>transform, convert</td>
<td>trassirovat'</td>
<td>mark out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trestitrovat'</td>
<td>combine into a trust</td>
<td>uzurpirovat'</td>
<td>usurp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unificirovat'</td>
<td>unify</td>
<td>utilizirovat'</td>
<td>utilize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>utrirovat'</td>
<td>exaggerate</td>
<td>fal'sificirovat'</td>
<td>falsify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fiksirovat'</td>
<td>fix (a photo)</td>
<td>finansirovat'</td>
<td>finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finisirovat'</td>
<td>finish</td>
<td>flankirovat'</td>
<td>flank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formulirovat'</td>
<td>formulate</td>
<td>forsirovat'</td>
<td>force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fraccionirovat'</td>
<td>fractionate</td>
<td>frankirovat'</td>
<td>stamp, prepay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frappirovat'</td>
<td>take aback</td>
<td>frezerovat'</td>
<td>mill, go over with a miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xarakterizirovat'</td>
<td>characterize</td>
<td>ximizirovat'</td>
<td>introduce chemical process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlorirovat'</td>
<td>chlorinate</td>
<td>xloroformirovat'</td>
<td>chloroform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xodatajstvovat'</td>
<td>past B apply for petition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xromirovat'</td>
<td>chromium plate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
xronometrirovat' | time |
cementirovat' | cement |
centralizovat' | centralize |
centrirovat' | center |
civilizovat' | civilize |
cetvertovat' | quarter, as in hung and quartered |
sossirovat' | macadamize road, ballast |
stabelirovat' | pile 'up |
evakuirovat' | evacuate |
evolyuicinirovat' | evolve |
ekvilibrirovat' | balance |
ekipirovat' | equip, outfit |
ekraiinizirovat' | film, make a film |
ekspatriirovat' | expatriate |
ekspedirovat' | expedite |
eksponirovat' | give an exponent |
eksportirovat' | export |
ekspropirovat' | expropriate |
ekstragirovat' | extract |
elektrizirovat' | make electric |
elektrificirovat' | electrify |
ëliminirovat' | eliminate |
ëmansipirotovat' | emancipate |
èmigrivat' | emigrate |
èskarpirovat' | provide with scarp |
èskortirovat' | escort |
èselonnirovat' | form |
justirovat' | adjust |
jarovizirovat' | veinalize, jarovize |
### APPENDIX B
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avanesov</th>
<th>Muchnik</th>
<th>Sheljakin</th>
<th>Karcevski</th>
<th>Vinogradov</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>darovat'</td>
<td>venčat'</td>
<td>ženit'</td>
<td>vozdejstvovat'</td>
<td>velet'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>velet'</td>
<td>velet'</td>
<td>kaznit'</td>
<td>ispol'zovat'</td>
<td>rodit'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vozdejstvovat'</td>
<td>kaznit'</td>
<td>večnat'</td>
<td>darovat'</td>
<td>darovat'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zenit'sja</td>
<td>velet'</td>
<td>obeščat'</td>
<td>minovat'</td>
<td>ženit'sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaznit'</td>
<td>obeščat'</td>
<td>vozdejstvovat'</td>
<td>nočevat'</td>
<td>minovat'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ispovedovat'</td>
<td>vozdejstvovat'</td>
<td>zaimstvovat'</td>
<td>nasledovat'</td>
<td>kaznit'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ispol'zovat'</td>
<td>zaimstvovat'</td>
<td>ispol'zovat'</td>
<td>krestit'</td>
<td>krestit'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minovat'</td>
<td>issledovat'</td>
<td>issledovat'</td>
<td>obstarOVat'</td>
<td>ranit'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nasledovat'</td>
<td>oborudovat'</td>
<td>rassledovat'</td>
<td>ipovedovat'</td>
<td>rodit'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nočevat'</td>
<td>BUT ALSO CITED</td>
<td>BUT ALSO CITED</td>
<td>ženit'</td>
<td>ust'ar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obrazovat'</td>
<td>poženit'</td>
<td>poženit'</td>
<td>kaznit'</td>
<td>polonit'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUT ALSO CITED</td>
<td>poobeščat'</td>
<td>poobeščat'</td>
<td>rodit'</td>
<td>molvit'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But ALSO CITED</td>
<td>obrazovyvat'</td>
<td>obrazovyvat'</td>
<td>risit'sja</td>
<td>rusit'sja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nasledovat'</td>
<td>BUT ALSO CITED</td>
<td>BUT ALSO CITED</td>
<td>izvolit'</td>
<td>darovat'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but ALSO CITED</td>
<td>poženit'</td>
<td>poženit'</td>
<td>krestit'</td>
<td>minovat'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nasledovat'</td>
<td>po venečat'</td>
<td>perekrstit'</td>
<td>molit'</td>
<td>nočevat'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oblsedovat'</td>
<td>po venečat'</td>
<td>po venečat'</td>
<td>velet'</td>
<td>nasledovat'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ranit'</td>
<td>po venečat'</td>
<td>po venečat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>issledovat'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rassledovat'</td>
<td>po venečat'</td>
<td>po venečat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>rassledovat'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rodit'</td>
<td>po venečat'</td>
<td>po venečat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>ispovedovat'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sočetat'</td>
<td>po venečat'</td>
<td>po venečat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>vozdejstvovat'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>po venečat'</td>
<td>po venečat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>obrazovat'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ablaktirovat'
abonirovat'
abordirovat'
absoljutirovat'
absoljutizirovat'
absorbirovat'
abstragirovat'
adaptirovat'
adoptirovat'
adresovat'
adsorbirovat'
afrinirovat'
apishirovat'
ackzentirovat'
ackzentovat'
akcentovat'
akklimatizirovat'
akklimatizovat'
akkonomirovat'
akkreditovat'
aktirovat'
aktivirovat'
aktivizirovat'
antualizirovat'
aktualizovat'
alkogolizirovat
alkogolizovat'
amal'gamirovat'
amerikanizirovat'
antinirovat'
amortizirovat'
amputirovat'
analizirovat'
anestezirovat'
anestezirovat'
anfilirovat'
angazirovat'
anglizirovat'
aneksirovat'
anektirovat'
anotirovat'
annulirovat'
anonsirovat'
anticipirovat'
apellirovat'
apercipirovat'
apretirovat'
aprobirovat'
aranzhirvat'
arendovat'
arestovat'
argumentirovat'
aritmizovat'
arimirovat'
arxaiizirovat'
arxaizirovat'
arsal'tirovat'
assenizirovat'
assignovat'
asimilirovat'
associrovat'
atakovat'
atestovat'
avansirovat'
avtomatizirovat'
avtorizirovat'
avtorizovat'
azotirovat'
bakterizovat'
bal'zamirovat'
bisirovat'
bjurokratizirovat'
blindirovat'
blokirovat'
bojkotirovat'
bol'sevizirovat'
bombardirovat'
briketirovat'
bronirovat'
bunkerovat'
cementovat'
cementriovat'
centralizovat'
centrifygirovat'
centrirovat'
centrovat'
cetverovat'
civilizovat'
darovat'
datirovat'
dauësizirovat'
debetirovat'
debetovat'
debjutirovat'
deblokirovat'
decentralizirovat'
decentralizovat'
deducirovat'
deformirovat'
degazirovat'
degenerirovat'
degradirovat'
degustirovat'
dekal'kirovat'
dekatirovat'
deklarirovat'
dekorirovat'
dekretirovat'
delegirovat'
demaskirovat'
demilitarizovat'
demobilizovat'
demokratizirovat'
demonstririovat'
demontirovat'
demorlizovat'
dempfirovat'
demunicipalizirovat'
denacionalizirovat'
denaturalizovat'
denaturirovat'
denonirovat'
denonsirovat'
dešifrirovat'
desifrovat'
detalizirovat'
detalizovat'
detektirovat'
dexlorirovat'
dezavuirovat'
dezertirovat'
dezinficirovat'
dezinformirovat'
eczodorirovat'
dezorientirovat'
dagnostirovat'
differencirovat'
diffundirovat'
diplomirovat'
disciplinirovat'
diskreditirovat'
diskriminirovat'
diskussirovat'
diskutirovat'
diskvalificirovat'
dislocirovat'
disputirovat'
dissimulirovat'
dissonirovat'
distillirovat'
dokumentirovat'
dozirovat'
dragirovat'
dramatizirovat'
drazirovat'
drenazirovat'
drenirovat'
èkipirovat'
èkranirovat'
èkranizirovat'
èkranizovat'
èkspatriirovat'
èkspecirovat'
èksplicirirovat'
èksponirovat'
èksportirovat'
èkspriirovat'
èkstragirovat'
èkstrapolirovat'
èkzal'tirovat'
èlektrificirovat'
èlektrizovat'
èliminirovat'
èmancipirovat'
èmansipirovat'
èmigrirovat'
èmittirovat'
èmul'sifirovat'
èmulgirovat'
nglizirovat'
epatirovat'
èrodirovat'
èšelonirotat'
eskamotirovat'
èskarpirovat'
eskortirovat'
ètapirovat'
èvakuirovat'
èvolucionirovat'
evromeizirovat'
evromeizirovat'
fl'sificirovat'
fašizirovat'
favorizirovat'
favorizovat'
federirovat'
feminizirovat'
fetirovat'
fetišizirovat'
fiksirovat'
finansirovat'
fimširvoat'
flankirovat'
fokusirovat'
fonografirovat'
fordizirovat'
formalizirovat'
formulirovat'
forsirovat'
fosfatirovat'
fraccionirovat'
frankirovat'
frankovat'
frappirovat'
frezerovat'
frezovat'
fugirovat'
fundirovat'

gal'vanizirovat'
gal'vanizovat'
gerantirovat'
garmonizirovat'
garmonizovat'
garnirovat'
gazificirovat'
egktografirovat'
generalizirovat'
geranizirovat'
geranizovat'
germetizirovat'
gil'otinirovat'
gipostazirovat'
gipostazirovat'
glazirovát'
glazurovat'
gofrirovat'
golosovat'
gospitalizirovat'
gradirovat'
graduirovat'
granulirovat'
gudronirovat'
gummirovat'
idealizirovat'
identificirovat'
ingoririrovat'
illjuminirovat'
illjuminovat'
illjustirovat'
immiigrirovat'
immobilizovat'
imunizirovat'
importirovat'
improvizirovat'
incenirovat'
individualizirovat'
industrializirovat'
industrializovat'
inficirovat'
informirovat'
inkassirovat'
inkriminirovat'
inkubirovat'
inqecirovat'
insinuirovat'
inspektirovat'
inspirirovat'
instruktirovat'
instrumentirovat'
instrumentovat'
integrirovat'
intensificirovat'
interferirovat'
internacionalizirovat'
internirovat'
interpellirvat'
interpolirovat'
interpretirovat'
interv'juirovat'
intervenirovat'
inventarizirovat'
inventarizovat'
invertirovat'
investirovat'
ionizirovat'
ionizovat'
ipopostazirovat'
ipopostazirovat'
ispol'zovat'
ispovedovat'
issledovat'
izolirovat'
jarovizirovat'
justirovat'
kadansirovat'
kal'cinirovat'
kalibrirovat'
kanalizirovat'
kanalizovat'
kanonizirovat'
kanonizovat'
kapelirovat'
kapitalizirovat'
kapitonirovat'
kapitulirovat'
kapotirovat'
kaptirovat'
karbjurirovat'
karbonizirovat'
karburirovat'
kartelirovat'
kassirovat'
kasirovat'
kasrirovat'
katalogizirovat'
kateterizirovat'
kateterizovat'
kazematirovat'
kinematografirovat'
kinkopirovat'
kinoficirovat'
klassificirovat'
koagulirovat'
koalirovat'
kodificirovat'
kodirovat'
kolesivat;
kollektivizirovat'
kolonizirovat'
kolonizovat'
komandirovat' kommentirovat' kompensirovat' kompostirovat' kondensirovat' kondicionirovat' konfirmováť konfiskováť konkretizirovat' konkretizovat' konservirovat' konsolidirovat' konstatirovat' konstituirat' konstruirat' kontingentirovat' kontirovat' kontrapunktirovat' kontrassignirovat' kontratakovat' konvejerizirovat' konvejerizovat' konvertirovat' kooperirovat' kooptirovat' koordinirovat' kopulirovat' korenizirovat' koronovat' kostjumirovat' kotirovat' kotonizirovat' kreditovat' krekirovat' kristallizirovat' kristallizovat' krokirovat' kul'minirovat'
metastazirovat'
mexanizirovat'
militarizirovat'
militarizovat'
minalizirovat'
minalizovat'
minirovat'
minovat'
mistificirovat'
mistifirovat'
mizanscenirovat
moarirovat'
mobilizovat'
modelirovat'
mordernizirovat'
mordernizovat'
modificirovat'
modifirovat'
monirovat'
monopolizirovat'
motivirovat'
motorizirovat'
motorizovat'
mramorirovat'
muarirovat'
mul'čirovat'
mumificirovat'
nacionalizirovat'
nacionalizovat'
napustrovat'
narkotizirovat'
nasledovat'
naturalizovat'
nazalirovat'
nazalizirovat'
nazalizovat'
redoispol'zovat'
nejtralizirovat'
nejtralizovat'
nikelirovat'
nikorporirovat'
nitrificirovat'
nitrirovat'
nivelirovat'
njuansirovat'
nokautirovat'
normalizirovat'
normalizevát'
normirováť'
notificirovat'
notirovat'
nullificirovat'
ob’ektirovat'
obnarodovat'
oborudovat'
obqektirovat'
obsledovat'
ofuterevát'
okkljudirovat'
okkupirovat'
oksidirovat'
oktroirovat'
okulirovat'
oneirovat'
optirovat'
orkestrovat'
omamentovat'
olakirováť'
etoskopirovat'
etvestysovoat'
ozimizirovat'
ozonirovat'
pal’pirovat'
palatalizovat'
palatizirovat'
panirováť'
peresledovat'
peretelegrafirovat'
perforirovat'
perifrazirovat'
perifrazirovat'
perkutirovat'
perljustirovat'
persifirovat'
personalizirovat'
personificirovat'
pigmentirovat'
pikirovat'
plakirovat'
plasirovat'
platinirovat'
plissirovat'
potetizirovat'
polengirovat'
politexnizirivat'
poljarizovat'
polonizirovat'
popoljarizirovato'
populjarizovat'
powiedovat'
powiedovat'
postulirovat'
potencirovat'
premirovat'
preparirovat'
prezentovat'
privetstvovat'
procentirovat'
prodefilirovat'
producirovat'
profanirovat'
profilirovat'
proklamirovat'
prokonspektirovat'
proletarizirovat'
proletarizovat'
prolongirovat'
promovirovat'
prostituirovat'
protestovat'
protestovat'
protexirovat'
protezirovat'
protolirovat'
provocirovat'
provokirovat'
pul'verizirovat'
punktirovat'
racionalizirovat'
racionalizovat'
racionirovat'
radirovat'
rafinirovat'
raportovat'
raspropagandirovat'
rassledovat'
ratificirovat'
ratifikovat'
ratirovat'
razminirovat'
reabilitirovat'
readificirovat'
realizirovat'
realizovat'
recipirovat'
recitirovat'
redaktirovat'
redizirovat'
reducirovat'
reeksportirovat'
reemigrirovat'
reëvakuirovat'
referirovat'
regenerirovat'
registrirovat'
reglamentirovat'
regulirovat'
rejdirovat'
rekapitulirovat'
reklamirovat'
rekognocirovat'
rekomendovat'
rekonstruirovat'
rekrutirovat'
rektificirovat'
rektifikovat'
rekvizirovat'
remilitarizirovat'
remilitarizovat''
remitirovat'
remontirovat'
renaturalizovat'
rentgenizirovat'
repatriirovat'
repetovat'
replicirirovat'
repressirovat'
repruzentirovat'
repruzentovat'
reproducirovat'
restavrirovat'
restorirovat'
retranslirovat'
retuširovat'
revizovat'
revoljucizirovat'
rezecirovat'
rezervirovat'
rezjumirovat'
rikosetirovat'
ritmizirovat'
рокироват'
romanizirovat'
romanizovat'
romanizirovat'
ruinirovat'
rusificirovat'
шаблонизироват'
sabotirovat'
sal'dirovat'
sal'tirovat'
saljutirovat'
шампанизироват'
sanirovat'
sankcionirovat'
шароват'
satinirovat'
sekuljarizirovat'
sekuljarizovat'
sekvestrirovat'
sekvestrovat'
selitrovat'
sensibilizirovat'
separirovat'
servirovat'
servírovat'
signalizirovat'
signalizovat'
silikatirovat'
silosovat'
simfonizirovat'
simulirovat'
simvolizirovat'
sindicirovat'
sintezirovat'
sintezirovat'
sinxronizirovat'
sistematisirovat'
skal'pirovat'
skandalizirovat'
skandalizovat'
skandirovat'
skarifcirovat'
skicirovat'
skladirovat'
slavjanizirovat'
socializirovat'
socialogizirovat'
solirovat'
sonasledovat'
soobrazovat'
sossirovat'
sovetizirovat'
specializirovat'
specificirovat'
štabelirovat'
stabilizirovat'
stabilovat'
standartizirovat'
stalirovat'
standartizovat'
startovat'
steklografirovat'
steklovat'
stenografirovat'
sterectipirovati'
sterevirovati'
sterevirovat'
stimulirovat'
stornirovat'
stratificirovat'
s'ub'ektivirovat'
sublimirovat'
subsidirovat'
substancializirovat'
substancionalizirovat'
substantivirovat'
sul'fitirovat'
summirovat'
suspendirovat'
suspenzirovat'
svizirovat'
sxematizirovat'
taksirovat'
tamponirovat'
tarifcirovat'
tarirovat'
teatralizirovat'
teatralizovat'
telefonirovat'
telefonizirovat'
telegrafirovat'
temperirovat'
teploficirovat'
terminirovat'
terrasirovat'
terrorizirovat'
terrorizovat'
tezavrirovat'
tezirovat'
tipizirovat'
tirazirovat'
titrivovat'
titrovat'
titulovat'
tonirovat'
tonizirovat'
torkretirovat'
torpedirovat'
traktorizovat'
transformirovat'
transgressirovat'
transkribirovat'
transponirovat'
transportirovat'
trapezovat'  
trassirovat'  
traversirovat'  
travmirovat'  
traxeotomirovat'  
trapanirovat'  
trestirovat'  
tuširovat'  
tyoršonirovat'  
ukrainizirovat'  
unificirovat'  
utilizirovat'  
utrirovat'  
uzurpirovat'  
vakkinirovat'  
virirovat'  
vitamizirovat'  
vizirovat'  
vizirovat'  
voenizirovat'  
votirovat'  
vul'garizirovat'  
vulkanizirovat'  
vulkanizovat'  
ximizirovat'  
xlorirovat'  
xloroformirovat'  
xristianizirovat'  
xristianizovat'  
xromirovat'  
xrcnometirovat'  
zvukoficirovat'  
byballotirovat'  
bypontirovat'  
bytatuirovat'  
b'ylakirovat'  
diskontirovat'  
nabal'zamirovat'
nabrónzirovát'
nadressirovát'
nafantazirovat'
nafantazirovat'
agogofirovat'
nagravirovát'
nagrimirovát'
naimprovizirovat'
nakopirovat'
naiakirovát'
namagnetizirovat'
naplanirovat'
napolirovát'
nasortirovat'
natatrirovar'
natrenirovát'
obmeblirovat'
okompromitirovat'
okul'tivirovat'
omeblirovat'
opomboirovat'
opoëtizirovat'
oprotestovat'
orskal'pirovat'
otbalansirovat'
otborotovat'
otbuksirotat'
ottomirovát'
otdezatirovat'
otderizirovát'
otkomandirovat'
otlavirovat'
otlitografirovat'
otnikelirovát'
otparirovat'
otpirovát'
otpolirovát'
otpreparirovat'
otraportovat'
otrecenzirovat'
otredaktirovat'
otregulirovat'
otremontirovat'
otrepetirovat'
otsortirovat'
otshudirovat'
otvulkanizirovat'
otxromirovat'
pereadministrirovat'
perearanžirovat'
perearestovat'
pereballotirovat'
peredressirovat'
pereformirovat'
peregrimirovat'
peregruppirovat'
perejarovizirovat'
pereobmundirovat'
pereplanirovat'
pereregistrirovat'
peresortirovat'
peretrenirovat'
poagitirovat'
podgrimirovat'
podirižirovat'
podiskutirovat'
podlakirovat'
podregulirovat'
podremontirovat'
podsortirovat'
poekspluatirovat'
pofantažirovat'
pofantažirovat'
poflanirovat'
poflirtovat'
poironizirovat'
polakirováť
polavirovat'
pomassirovat'
pomuzicirovat'
popirováť
popozirovat'
poštudirovat'
potrenirováť
pozondirovat'
pozuïrovat'
pribuksirovat'
prikomandirovat'
priolulirovat'
promagnetizirovat'
promagnetizirovat'
promagnetizirovat'
probalansirovat'
probuskirovat'
prociñirovat'
prodebatirovat'
prodebjutirovat'
prodeklamirovat'
prodeklamirovat'
prodeklamirovat'
prodemonstrirovat'
prodemonstrirovat'
prodirezirovar'
produblirovar'
progalopirovat'
prograduirovar'
proglassirovat'
proilljustrirovat'
proinformirovat'
proinkubirovat'
proinspektirovat'
proinstruktirovat'
proironizirovat'
projarovizirovat'
prokommentirovat'
prokompostirovat'
prokonsul'tirovat'
prokontrolirovat'
prokorrektirovat'
prokulтивirovat'
prolavirovat'
prolessirovát'
prologarifmirovat'
promankirovat'
promarkirovát'
promizanscenirovat'
pronivelirovat'
pronenumber'
propirovát'
prorecenzirovat'
proredakcirovat'
proreklamirovat'
prorepetirovát'
prosignalizirovat'
proskandirovat'
prosortirovat'
prospirtovat'
prostenografirovat'
proštudirovat'
protelefonirovat'
protelegrafirovat'
protranskribirovat'
proval'sirvoť'
proventilirovat'
proxonometrirovat'
prozondirovat'
rasformirovat'
raskassirovat'
raskodirovat'
raskomandirovát'
raskonservirovat'
raskvartirot'
raspikirovát'
rasplanirovat'
rassortirovat'
rassortovat'
razagitirovat'
razanatomirovat'
razblokirovat'
razbronirovat'
razgravirovat'
razgrimirovat'
razgruppirovat'
razreklamirovat'
sagitirovat'
sakkompanirovat'
sbalansirovat'
sblokirovat'
sbriketirovat'
scentrirovat'
scentrirovat'
sdetonirovat'
sdezertirovat'
sfantazirovat'
sfantazirovat'
sfokusirovat'
sformirovat'
sformirovat'
sformulirovat'
sfotografirovat'
sgruppirovat'
skal'kirovat'
skapotirovat'
sklat'kirovat'
skombinirovat'
skompensirovat'
skompilirovat'
skomponirovat'
skomprometirovat'
skoncentrirovat'
skondensirovat'
skonstruirovat'
skooperirovat'
skoordinirovat'
skopirovat'
skorrektirovat'
slavirovat'
smanevrirovat'
smodelirovat'
sparasjutirovat'
spikirovát'
splanirovat'
splasirovát'
sponzirovat'
sproektirovat'
sprofilirovat'
srepetirovat'
srežissirovat'
symprovizirovat'
uregulirovat'
vmontirovat'
vbronzirovat'
vbuksirovat'
vdressirovát'
vgravirovat'
vylavirovat'
v'komandirovat'
v'koppirovat'
v'polirovat'
zaagikirovat'
zaahtirovat'
zaaplodivrat'
zaarestovat'
zaasfal'tirovat'
zaavansirovat'
zabalansirovat'
zaballastirovat'
zaballotirovát'
zabarrikadirovat'
zabazirovat'
zabetonirovat'
zabronirovat'
zacementirovat'
zadeklamirovat'
zadrapirovat'
zafantazirovat'
zafantazirovat'
zafiksirovat'
zagipnotizirovat'
zagrimirovat'
zagudronirovat'
zakamuflirovat'
zakompostirovat'
zakonservirovat'
zakonspektirovat'
zakonspirirovat'
zakonvertovat'
zakul'tivirovat'
zalakirovat'
zalavirovat'
zamarkirovat'
zamoshirovat'
zamunikirovat'
zaminirovat'
zanarkotizirovat'
zapirovat'
zaploombirovat'
zapolirovat'
zaprotektirovat'
zaprostovat'
zaptoxolirovat'
zaregistrizirovat'
zarezerirovat'
zaspirtovat'
zastenografirovat'
zasuflirovat'
zaval'sirovat'
zavibririrovat'
zavizirovat'
zavualiropat'
zaxloroformirovat'
zaxronometrirovat'
zažestikuřovat'
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botanizirovat'
galopirovat'
bombardirovat'
garmonirovat'
ballozirovat'
gastrolirovat'
balansirovat'sja
gektografirovat'
afinirovat'
generirovat'
aferirovat'
gerbalizirovat'
afiširovat'
grassirovat'
affektirovat'
dečsjirovat'
agonirovat'
detonirovat'
administrirovat'
diriširovat'
akkompanirotrovat'
dissonirovat'
aplozirovat'
dogmatizirovat'
artikulirovat'
drápirovat'
assistirotrovat'
dubirirovat'
bazirovat'sja
žestikulirovat'
budirovat'
žirovat'
buksirotrovat'
žonglirovat'
val'sirovat'
žuirovat'
vojažirovat'
imitirovat'
gradirovat'
imponirovat'
gazirovat'
improvizirovat'