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ABSTRACT

Russian legal-administrative documents from the early fourteenth through the mid-seventeenth century (Middle Russian) show extensive variation in expressing possessivity within the noun phrase. Possessor expressions can be conveyed by morphologically derived possessive adjectives, adnominal genitives, or by combinations of those constructions (“ungoverned” genitives). They can occur before, after, or surrounding the NP head. Previous research has claimed that possessivity was expressed exclusively by possessive adjectives except in cases in which the possessive adjectives could not be formed.

In this study, I offer a critical view on the previous research. After providing a detailed explanations of the available possessive constructions, I demonstrate that choice of any given possessor expression is not just arbitrary, as implied by many earlier studies, but reflects factors present in the immediate or larger discourse context — semantic (the relations that held between the possessor and the possessed entity); syntactic (the role of the noun phrase head denoting the possessed entity); and discourse-pragmatic (the position of the possessive construction vis-à-vis the verb; the informational status of the referents of the noun phrase head and possessor expression; and the genre of the document).
I show that the internal structure of the semantic possessor definitely influences the choice of the construction: possessive adjectives are preferred when the possessor is a bare noun, a forename, or an unmodified title in apposition with a forename. By contrast, the adnominal genitive is overwhelmingly favored when the semantic possessor is an anaphoric pronoun, a patronymic, or a noun phrase consisting of modified nouns, anaphoric pronouns and patronymics. Mixed constructions are conventional when the possessor involves conjoined noun phrases with the same referent and when it involves several noun phrases in apposition.

The main factors in the choice among the different adjectival possessive constructions are discourse-pragmatic. The possessor expression tends to be postposed when it conveys new information or when it is in contrastive focus with another possessor expression. It tends to be preposed when it represents established information or a unique, culturally given entity. It tends to occur as a split construction when all the constituents of the possessor expression carry the same informational weight.

My work also shows that the adnominal genitive construction was not limited or restricted in use, as claimed in some previous research, but had its own typical spheres of use. In fact, adnominal genitives represent the most frequent type of possessive construction in five out of the ten semantic groups that I used in classifying the data.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.0. Purpose of the dissertation

The proposed dissertation will examine the different possessive constructions found within noun phrases in Russian legal-administrative documents (delovaja pis’mennost’) from the fourteenth to the mid-seventeenth century. There was a wide variety of ways how possession could be expressed in Medieval Russian, including but not limited to the adnominal genitive, which is the overwhelming norm in Modern Russian, e.g., земля Симонова монастыря (land-N.SG Simon-POS.G.SG monastery-G.SG) ‘the land of Simon’s Monastery’.¹ For example, the range of usage of possessive adjectives was much wider in Medieval Russian than in modern Russian, which does not permit double-possessive constructions like княгинины Огрофенины земли (princess-POS.NOM.PL Ogrofena-POS.NOM.PL land- NOM.PL) ‘Princess Ogrofena’s lands’. In addition, unlike the modern language, Medieval Russian permitted a mixture of agreeing

¹ Among the ways of expressing possession in Medieval Russian, and other Slavic languages are possessive adjectives and pronouns, adnominal genitives, adnominal datives, prepositional phrases, and predicative constructions with verbs denoting ‘be’, ‘have’, and more narrow concepts like ‘own’ (see Golovčeva, Ivanov, Mološnaja, Nikolaeva, and Svešnikova 1989: 216–61). Predicates of presentation are beyond the scope of this dissertation.

² For simplicity, I will transcribe certain archaic Cyrillic letters (elements of the pre-1918 orthography) with their modern Russian equivalents; this practice is widely accepted in historical studies where details of orthography are not the focus of attention.
possessives and adnominal genitives, a construction that has been called the *ungoverned genitive* — for example, село князе Иванове Васильевича Можайского (village-N.SG prince-POS.NOM.SG Ivan-POS.NOM.SG Vasil’evič-GEN.SG Možajsk-POS.GEN.SG) ‘the village of Prince Ivan Vasil’evič of Možajsk’. Finally, Medieval Russian allowed greater word-order variation within possessive noun phrases than Modern Russian does. For example, besides земля Симанова манастыря (land-N.SG Simon-POS.G.SG monastery-G.SG) ‘the land of Simon’s Monastery’, it was also possible to write Симонова монастыря земли (Simon-POS.G.SG monastery-G.SG land-N.SG) — an order which, if technically possible, is extremely rare and unusual in the modern language.

While possessive adjective and adnominal genitive constructions were widespread in Medieval Russian, they are treated only descriptively and, for the most part, superficially in the existing scholarly literature, including the standard historical grammars of the Russian language. The present dissertation will bring something new to the discussion by going beyond simply cataloguing the attested types of possessives. It will examine the issues raised by the co-occurrence of different possessive constructions within the same text; in particular, it will focus on reconstructing the semantic, syntactic, and discourse-pragmatic factors that influenced the-writers to select one construction over another in a given context. Unlike the previous research, this dissertation also take into consideration complicating factors such as word-order permutations and the repetition of prepositions, which are characteristic in the language of the medieval sources.

It should be noted from the start that possession is not a straightforward concept. As defined by Golovčeva, Ivanov, Mološnaja, Nikolaeva, and Svešnikova (1989), possession is a relation between “objects of an internal world”; in this relation, the object
of possession is treated as “a part of the possessor.” This definition can clearly cover a wide range of semantic relations. Thus, in a given language, the same kinds of expressions can be used for relations ranging from straightforward ownership (*my car*) to authorship (*my dissertation*), kinship (*my brother*), etc. However, some of these relations may be denoted in quite different ways in other languages. For example, in Serbian, ‘my brother’ can be expressed with a dative pronoun: *Brat mi je oženjen Aninom sestrom* ’My brother married Anna’s sister.’ In this example the NP head is *brat* ‘brother-NOM.SG’, while *mi* ‘my-DAT.SG’ is the possessor. The equivalent in Contemporary Standard Russian can only have a possessive pronoun: *мої брат* ‘my-NOM.SG brother-NOM.SG’.3

As my basic definition of possession, I will use Taylor’s (1996: 339) widely accepted cognitive treatment of possession as a continuum of relations. According to Taylor (ibid.), the most central position in this continuum, which he defines as “prototypical” possession, involves the following factors. First, there is only one possessor, who is a human being. Second, the possessed entity is a concrete physical entity — typically, an object of value. Third, the possessor is the only person who has “rights of access” to the possessed. Fourth, the possessor acquires these rights through a special transaction (e.g., purchase, inheritance, or gift), and retains them until s/he transfers them to another person by means of a further transaction. Fifth, typically, the possession relation is long-term. Sixth, the possessed is typically located in the proximity of the possessor, so that s/he can have easy access to it.

3 It was possible to express possession through adnominal datives in premodern Russian (see Eckhoff 2006: 154–64, 272–79); however, the construction is now archaic. I will not discuss this construction for the simple reason that it is not attested in my corpus. The same is true of possession expressed through adnominal prepositional phrases.
1.1. Research questions

The following are the main issues investigated in this dissertation:

What explains the synchronic dynamism in expressions for conveying possession relations in Medieval Russian noun phrases? That is, what factors motivated writers to choose one possessive construction versus another in different circumstances?

To what extent is the variation influenced by semantic factors? syntactic factors? discourse-pragmatic factors? purely idiolectal factors?

To what extent does the behavior of alternative possessor expressions in Medieval Russian support the explanation offered in the previous literature that adnominal genitives replaced adjectival possessives, without regard to function?

This work will seek to go beyond the descriptions found in the previous literature to elucidate the motivations behind and the conditions giving rise to the choice of a particular construction (possessive adjectives, adnominal genitive, or a mixture of the two).

Based on the material gathered, the dissertation will illuminate when and why writers elected to use one possessive construction over another. Further, it will endeavor to set forth the syntactic and discourse conditions for the concurrent use of possessive adjectives and the adnominal genitive within a single noun-phrase ‘ungoverned genitive’. The dissertation will demonstrate that the occurrence of one construction over another was not random but sensitive to the linguistic context.
1.2. Sources

The data for this research were gathered from legal documents from northeast Rus’ (including Moscow) written from ca. 1400–1650. The original texts are held in Russian archives; however, they have been made accessible to scholars in standard diplomatic editions published in the U.S.S.R. from the 1950s to the 1980s.

My source for legal documents from the early period (up to the death of Grand Prince Ivan III the Great in 1505) is volume 1 of Акты социально-экономической истории Северо-восточной Руси конца XIV – начала XVI в. [Acts of the Social-Economic History of Northeastern Rus’ from the End of the Fourteenth to the Beginning of the Sixteenth Centuries] (Moscow, 1952) (hereafter АСЭИ). This material consists of 660 records from the foremost monastery of medieval Russia, Trinity-Sergius’ Monastery, which maintained an extensive archive of documents relevant for its vast land holdings. These writings concern is the monastery's acquisition of and litigation about real estate.

In large part, the records include the years or dates when they were made; where that date is not given in the original document, the editors give a range of dates based on other internal evidence.

For the next period (from 1506 to the end of the Time of Troubles in 1613), my data are taken from volume 1 of Акты феодального землевладения и хозяйства [Acts of Feudal Land-Ownership and Agriculture] (Leningrad, 1983) (hereafter АФЗХ 1). This edition includes 238 documents stored in the archives of another major monastery, Simonov (or Simon’s) Monastery in Moscow. According to the editors of this volume (АФЗХ 1: 3), the Simonov archives contain the most complete surviving collection of

---

4 For complete references, see the bibliography.
records on the ownership of land in Medieval Russia. These records deal with the economic development of the Russian state as well as key changes in domestic politics (ibid.). In the edition, the records are laid out in chronological order by the dates on which they were written.

For the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, I have also used data collected in volume 3 of a collection that, though produced decades earlier than the previous collection, has the same title — Акты феодального землевладения и хозяйства [Acts of Feudal Land-Ownership and Agriculture] (Moscow, 1961) (hereafter АФЗХ 3). This volume includes texts concerning land ownership by the Metropolitan and, later Patriarch of Moscow and All Rus’. The texts are given in chronological order according to the dates on which they were written.

Altogether, I collected all the possessive constructions in 427 documents. I used only texts that were preserved in the original rather than later medieval copies, for two reasons. First, I wanted to avoid the possibility that the copyists updated the language of the documents, which would have made it problematic to draw conclusions based on chronology. Second, I needed to impose limitations on the sheer quantity of my dating. Even using just original documents, I have compiled a database of almost 2000 examples.

1.3. Methodology

The data were first identified by a close reading of the sources described above. As noted above, only texts attested in their original form (autograph) were used. The temporal limitations chosen were 1400–1650 — essentially, the Middle Russian period, apart from the fourteenth century, from which scarcely any northeastern legal documents
have survived. In order to be about to generalize about the chronology of the data, I grouped the examples in 50-year periods (before 1450, 1450–1500, 1500–50, 1550–1600, 1600–50). While these “round” dates were selected for convenience, they are not completely ahistorical. The period 1450–1500 lines up approximately with the reign of Grand Prince Ivan III the Great (1462–1505); 1550–1600 with the period from Ivan IV the Terrible’s coronation as the first tsar (1547) to the death of his son Tsar Fedor I (1598); and 1600–50 with the reign of Boris Godunov (1598–1605), the Time of Troubles (1605–13), and the reign of the first Romanov tsar, Mixail (1613–45). For chronological balance, I compiled my corpus using the same number of documents from each 50-year period.

For the purposes of identification, possessive constructions were defined as noun phrases with: 1) a possessive adjective; 2) a possessive pronoun; 3) an adnominal genitive; or 4) an adnominal dative. As noted above, there turned out to be virtually no examples of adnominal datives in my corpus.

All the possessive noun phrases identified were entered in an Excel spreadsheet; this allowed the data to be sorted by fields. Each of the ten sorting fields was checked to see whether it was a possible factor influencing variation for analysis (Form-to-Function matching, see Collins 2001: 21). The procedure here was to see whether there was a correlation between a particular type of expression and one of the other sorting fields. All this was preliminary to the main task, which was to explain how the different factors could influence the structure of the possessor type.

---

5I will not discuss this construction for the simple reason that it is attested only in isolated examples such as "межа тем деревням … ‘boundary-nom.sg those-dat.pl villages-dat.pl’ (АФХ3 109). The relation between the dative and the NP head is not one of possession of a separate object but rather of a part to a whole. Moreover, in the few examples that I found, there was no variation in the construction; that is, the dative did not alternate with other kinds of expressions.
The specific classifications used in the spreadsheet fields were the following:

A. POSSESSOR TYPE: examples were placed into one of three expression categories — *possessive adjective*, *adnominal genitive*, and *ungoverned genitive (mixed construction)*, *based* on word-order information; each of these was subdivided according to whether the possessor expression preceded or followed the NP head.

B. SEMANTIC TYPE: the semantic relation between the possessor (the referent of the possessor expression) and the possessed (the referent of the NP head):

*Personal Ownership*: the referent of the NP head belongs as property to the referent of the possessor expression, who is an individual (*земля Ивана Петрова* ‘Ivan Petrov’s land’);

*Institutional Ownership*: the referent of the NP head belongs as property to the referent of the possessor expression, which is a corporate body like a monastery or a village (*земля Симонова монастыря* ‘land of Simon’s Monastery’);

*Author*: the referent of the NP head is a text or speech act that “belongs to” (has been created or uttered by) the referent of the possessor expression, who is an individual (*по приказу великого князя* ‘by order of the grand prince’);

*Office*: the referent of the NP head is a social function that “belongs to” (is fulfilled by) the referent of the possessor expression, who is an individual (*Симановского монастыря архимандрит* ‘archimandrite of Simon’s Monastery’);

*Kinship*: the referent of the NP head “belongs to” the family of the referent of the possessor expression, who is an individual (*Данило Васильев сын Сущова* ‘Danilo, son of Vasilij Suščov’);
Residence: the referent of the NP head “belongs to” (is an inhabitant of or official in) the referent of the possessor expression, which is a place (Переяславские люди ‘people of Perejaslavl’)

Saint: the referent of the NP head “belongs to” (is dedicated to) the referent of the possessor expression, who is a holy figure or sacred event commemorated by the Orthodox Church (Петербург день ‘Saint Peter’s day’)

Proxy: the referent of the NP head is a representative or an emblem of the referent of the possessor expression, who is an individual (на свое царево и великого князя имя ‘in his own tsar’s and grand prince’s name’)

Phase of life: the referent of the NP head is an event or time frame in the lifespan of the referent of the possessor expression, who is an individual (по Фетиньи животе ‘after Fetin’ja’s life’).

C. NP HEAD: the grammatical role of the expression denoting the possessed entity (subject, direct object, prepositional object, or constituent in an oblique case).

D. POSITION OF NP HEAD relative to the verb in the sentence.

E. SYNTAX OF THE POSSESSOR EXPRESSION is a structural representation of the possessor expression

F. SEMANTIC COMPONENTS OF THE POSSESSOR EXPRESSION
(animate/inanimate, human/non-human, male/female, individual/collective).

G. INFORMATION STRUCTURE\(^6\): whether the possessor noun phrase was presupposed (old, given), new, asserted, or focal information in the discourse.

H. YEAR OF COMPOSITION.

\(^6\) In discussing the concepts old (or given), new, asserted, and focal information, I am using the approach to discourse information structure given in Birner (1994), Givón (1984), Prince (1981), Roberts (1996), Selkirk (2008), and Ward and Birner (1996).
I. **SCRIBE**: the identity of the writer, if given at the end of the document.

J. **DOCUMENT TYPE**: genre of the document.

I also included a field **SOURCE** in order to keep track of the references for each example; this obviously was not used as a sorting field for linguistic classification.

As it turned out, not all of the fields were demonstrable factors in the variation. For example, the identity of the scribe, which was omitted in many documents, did not prove usable, while the genre of the document generally did not show any correlation with the type of the possessor expression.

After the sorting my database, I determined that the field that was most important for the choice of possessive construction was Semantic Type; therefore, that became the main organizing principle in the chapters in which I discuss the data (Chapters 3–9). For any given semantic type, I looked at the frequency of each of the constructions over the entire period examined (1400–1650). In each semantic type, I identified the most frequent possessive construction overall (which may or may not have been the most frequent possessive construction in any given 50-year period) as the **pattern possessive construction**, that is, the construction that would be taken as the normal or conventional pattern for the semantic type and the standard for legal-administrative writing. I examined the pattern construction for each semantic type by 50-year periods to check for diachronic change. Then I examined the remaining constructions, which I viewed as “residual forms” (see Collins 2001: 22–23). Thus my working hypothesis would be that the exceptions to the pattern construction would not be arbitrary but would reflect special factors present in the discourse context.
1.4. Structure of this dissertation

In Chapter 2 of the dissertation, I will discuss the previous scholarly literature on possessive constructions (possessive adjectives, adnominal genitive and mixed constructions) in the history of the Russian language and also in the more general framework of the Slavic languages. As it is impossible to survey all the works that have been written on possession in Slavic, the focus will be on works that are relevant for the research questions of this dissertation, as laid out in section 1.1.

In the subsequent chapters, I will examine the variation in possessive constructions in Medieval Russian, using semantic class as the main organizing principle. In each chapter, I will begin with a survey of the attested constructions. Then I will determine the pattern construction for the semantic class and its frequency of use over time (as measured in 50-year intervals). Finally, I will examine the other attested constructions in search of the factors that motivated their use as opposed to the pattern construction. I will pay special attention to word order in the sentence/discourse and what it says about information structure.

In Chapter 3, I will analyze possessive constructions that can be viewed as prototypical, according to Taylor’s classification — Personal Ownership (e.g., his/her property). Chapter 4 will deal with a less prototypical type, Institutional Ownership, where the possessor is an organization rather than an individual (e.g., the monastery’s property). In Chapter 5, I will analyze possessive constructions in the group I call Author, where possessive expressions are used in reference to the creators of texts (e.g., his/her document). Chapter 6 will analyze the possessive expressions which denote Office (e.g., the monastery’s archimandrite). Chapter 7 will examine Kinship relations that are
presented as possessive expressions (e.g., *his/her father*). Chapter 8 will be an analysis of the possessive expressions used to denote Residence (e.g., *the region’s governor*). In the Chapter 9 I will analyze other, less frequent types of possessive constructions found in my corpus — saint of dedication (e.g., *Trinity Monastery*), Proxy (e.g., *in his/her place*), and Phase of Life (e.g., *his/her old age*). In Chapter 10, I will offer some concluding generalizations about variation in possessive constructions in Medieval Russian.
CHAPTER 2

PREVIOUS RESEARCH

2.0. Preliminary remarks

In this chapter, I will review published works that have a direct bearing on the problem I am investigating — the different types of possessives within noun phrases in Old Russian. In the sake of brevity, I will not attempt to review the vast literature of possessivity as a general linguistic problem. In addition, I will not discuss works that deal with the dative of possession or possession expressed by prepositional phrases, for the simple reason that those constructions are not attested in my corpus.

2.1. Corbett on the morphology and syntax of Slavic possessive adjectives

The most comprehensive overview of the morphology and syntax of possessive adjectives in the Slavic language family in general can be found in Corbett’s study “The Morphology-Syntax Interface: Evidence from Possessive Adjectives in Slavonic” (1987). As Corbett’s work contains much of relevance for the discussion of possession alternatives in the history of Russian, I will examine it in some detail.

---

7 See Works Cited (below) for a complete list of references.
8 For a general overview of possessivity in Slavic from both a synchronic and a diachronic point of view, see Golovčeva, Ivanov, Mološnaja, Nikolaeva, and Svešnikova (1989).
Corbett’s starting point is the fact that possessive adjectives in Slavic (in his terminology, Slavonic), which are formed from nouns by suffixation, show syntactic properties that are different from those of other semantic classes of adjectives (qualitative and relative). In particular, possessive adjectives in all the Slavic languages can control personal pronouns, and in some they can also control relative pronouns, and attributive modifiers in some Slavic languages; in this respect, they act more like nouns than like the other semantic classes of adjectives. On this basis, Corbett makes the theoretical point that possessive adjectives have different status if viewed from a derivational standpoint (where they resemble adjectives) than if viewed from a syntactic standpoint (where they resemble adjectives with respect to agreement behavior but nouns with respect to control properties). According to Corbett (1987: 307), the control properties of possessive adjectives stem from the syntactic features of the nouns that underlie them.

Corbett begins his discussion by examining the behavior of possessive adjectives in a West Slavic language, Upper Sorbian (ibid.: 300–4), in which possessive adjectives have more noun-like syntactic properties than in other Slavic languages. In Upper Sorbian, possessive adjectives can control attributive modifiers (1a), relative pronouns (1b), and personal pronouns (1c).

(1a) *Mojeho mužowa sotra* (ibid.:303).
my-POS. M.GEN.SG husband’s-POS.F.NOM.SG sister- F.NOM.SG
My husband’s sister

(1b) *Slysetaj Wićazowy hlós, kotryž je zastupil* (ibid.: 304).
(They) hear Wićaz-POS.M.NOM.SG voice-M.NOM.SG, who-M.NOM.SG has gone in
They hear the voice of Wićaz, who has gone in.
To je našeho wučerjowa zahrodka. Wón wjele w njej dzêla (ibid.).
that is our-M.GEN.SG teacher-POS.F.NOM.SG garden-POS.F.NOM.SG he-M.NOM.SG a.lot in
it works
That is our teacher’s garden. He works in it a lot.

In (1a), the possessive adjective mužowa agrees with sotra in case, number, and
gender, but the possessive pronominal adjective Mojeho agrees with the notional (not
actual) possessor {muž-a ‘husband-GEN.SG’}. In (1b), the head of the relative clause is
not hlós ‘voice’, but {Wićaz-}, the notional possessor noun, from which the possessive
adjective Wićazowy is derived. The first sentence in (1c) is similar in structure to (1a); in
the second sentence, the anaphoric subject pronoun Wón refers not to the last noun
(zahrodka), but to the notional possessor {wučerj-} ‘teacher’, from which the possessive
adjective wučerjowa is derived.

2.1.1. Derivational restrictions on possessive adjectives

Corbett (ibid.: 307–40) presents comparative data from all the other Slavonic
languages to show that the possessive adjectives reflect the same kind of
morphology/syntax interface throughout the family. While possessive adjectives are
derived in morphologically similar ways throughout Slavic, the semantic classes of nouns
from which they can be formed differ slightly from language to language.

For example, in Upper Sorbian, which shows the broadest derivational
possibilities, possessive adjectives can be formed from any masculine or feminine noun
that denotes a human: Janowa kniha ‘Jan’s-F.SG book-F.SG’ (ibid.: 302). In some cases,
you can also be formed from nouns denoting animals. By contrast, Contemporary
Standard Russian, an East Slavic language, shows the narrowest derivational possibilities;
the genitive is used much more than possessive adjective. According to Corbett’s data (1987: 308–309) possessive adjectives in Russian can be derived from kinship terms, given names, and hypocoristic of names, but only from those that belong to the first declension (the historic ā- and jā-stems): o Grišinyx delax ‘Griša-POS.M.LOC.PL affairs-M.LOC.PL’ (ibid.: 308). The other East Slavic languages, Ukrainian and Belarusian, show essentially the same restrictions (309).

Turning to the South Slavic languages, in Bulgarian and Macedonian possessive adjectives are formed mainly from kinship terms and given names, e.g., Bulgarian maminijat apartment ‘mother-POS.M.NOM.SG apartment-NOM.SG’ (ibid.: 310), Macedonian majčinioj stan ‘mother-POS.M.NOM.SG apartment-NOM.SG’ (ibid.: 311). In Serbian/Croatian (ibid.311-12), possessive adjectives can be formed from proper names and common nouns that denote humans, as well as from nouns that denote animals:

Jovanova kuća ‘Jovan-POS.F.NOM.SG house-NOM.SG’; sestrina haljina ‘sister-POS.F.NOM.SG dress-NOM.SG’; mačkin rep ‘cat-POS.M.NOM.SG tail-M.NOM.SG’, muvina krila ‘fly-POS.N.NOM.PL wings-N.NOM.PL’; (examples mine — L.D.); these expressions can be used of the parts of a specific cat or fly). Moreover, possessive adjectives can be also derived from proper names that denotes organizations and from the names of some products (especially cars): Tajmsova novinarka ‘The Times-POS.F.NOM.SG journalist-F.NOM.SG’; Opelova auta ‘Opel-POS.N.NOM.PL cars-NOM.PL’ (ibid.).
2.1.2. Frequency of use as compared with adnominal genitives

The frequency of use of possessive adjectives and the extent to which speakers prefer them to adnominal genitives also differs from one Slavic language to another. The maximal case is Upper Sorbian (300-4). By contrast, the use of possessive adjectives is more restricted in the other West Slavic languages; for example, in Polish, the adnominal genitive is generally preferred, and possessive adjectives are infrequent (314).

South Slavic languages, Bulgarian, Macedonian, Slovenian, and Serbian/Croatian all use possessive adjectives extensively (310-12). In Serbian/Croatian, according to Corbett (ibid.: 312), where there is a choice between possessive adjective and adnominal genitive (i.e., when the notional possessor is not modified), possessive adjectives are preferred 95% of the time.

Among the East Slavic languages, possessive adjectives are used more frequently in Belorussian and Ukrainian than in Russian (ibid.: 309). Though Corbett does not provide statistics, he notes that possessive genitives are much more common than possessive adjectives in Russian, and they are obligatory when the possessor noun comes from a declension other than the first or when it is modified (ibid.: 308).

2.1.3. Control possibilities of possessive adjectives

The control possibilities of possessive adjectives also vary considerably from one Slavic language to another. According to Corbett (ibid.: 313), Old Church Slavonic provides the best evidence for the situation in Common Slavic. In that language, possessive adjectives could not control attributive modifiers (2a), as they can in Upper
Sorbian (see (1a) and (1c), above); however, they could be used when the modifier of the head noun was itself modified by a subordinate clause (2b) (ibid.: 313).

(2a)  * Staraago otcov dom  
      old-M,GEN,SG father-POS,M,NOM,SG home-M,NOM,SG  
      *The home of the old father

(2b)  Pristǫpaimǔ kũ trepez hristově, sũ ſimže otcu slava  
      come-IPV.IPL to table-DAT,SG Christ-POS,F,DAT,SG, with whom-M,INS,SG  
      father-D,SG glory-N,SG  
      Let us come to the table of Christ, with whom to the Father [be] glory.’

Possessive adjectives continue to control anaphoric pronouns in the modern South Slavic languages, as in the Macedonian example in (3a). In Macedonian (3b), as in Old Church Slavonic (2b), they can also control relative pronouns (3b) (ibid.: 310–13).

(3a)  Pred nas e majčiniot stan. Taa saka da go prodade.  
      Before us be-PRS.3SG mother-POS,M,NOM,SG,DEF apartment-NOM,SG  
      she-NOM,SG want-PRS.3SG PTC it -M,ACC sell-PRS.3SG  
      Before us is mother’s apartment. She wants to sell it.

(3b)  Pred nas e majčiniot stan koja ſto saka da go prodade.  
      Before us be-PRS.3SG mother-POS,M,NOM,SG,DEF apartment-NOM,SG  
      REL-F,NOM,SG REL want-PRS.3SG PTC it -M,ACC sell-PRS.3SG  
      Before us is the apartment of mother, who wants to sell it.

In Bulgarian (4a) and Slovenian (4b), possessive adjectives can control anaphoric pronouns and anaphoric zeroes in subsequent clauses, but not relative pronouns:
(4a) *Pred nas e maminijat apartament. Tja iska da go prodade.*
before us-GEN be-PRS.3SG mama-POS.M.NOM.SG.DEF apartment-NOM.SG
she-NOM.SG want-PRS.3SG PTC it-ACC sell-PRS.3PL.
Before us is mother’s apartment. She wants to sell it.’

(3b) *To je očkova knjiga. Pozabil jo je.*
That be-PRS.3SG Daddy-POS.F.NOM.SG book-NOM.SG.
Ø forget-PRT.M.SG she-ACC be-PRS.3SG
That is daddy’s book. He has forgotten it.

In modern Serbian and Croatian, speakers readily accept personal pronouns controlled by possessive adjectives (5a), and some speakers also accept sentences in which relative pronouns are controlled by possessive adjectives (5b).

(5a) *To je tatina knjiga. On ju je zaboravio.*
That be-PRS.3SG Daddy-POS.F.NOM.SG book-NOM.SG.
he-NOM she-ACC be-PRS.3SG forget-PRT.M.SG
That is Daddy’s book. He has forgotten it.’

(5b) *Palili su kmetovu kuću koji je potkazao partizane Nemcima.*
Ø burn-PRT.PL be-PRS.3PL headman-POS.F.ACC.SG house-ACC.SG
REL-M.NOM.SG be-PRS.3SG give-away.PRT.M.SG partisans-ACC.PL Germans-DAT.PL
They burned the house of the headman who gave the partisans away to the Germans.

However, none of the South Slavic languages permit possessive adjectives to control attributive modifiers; cf. the Upper Sorbian examples (1a) and (1c).

Among the West Slavic languages, Upper Sorbian shows the widest range of control possibilities (see Section 2.1). In Czech and Slovak, many speakers allow possessive adjectives to act as controllers of personal pronouns. By contrast, in Polish possessive adjectives have lost almost all control possibilities; most speakers do not
accept possessive adjectives as controllers even of personal pronouns, much less relative pronouns or attributive modifiers (ibid.: 314-15).

In the modern East Slavonic languages, possessive adjectives can only control personal pronouns, as in the Russian example in (6a). However, they could still control relative pronouns in Russian until the early nineteenth century (6b) (ibid.: 308).

(6a) Čto-nibud’ o Grišinyx delax iz kinostudii emu otvetili?
Something-ACC about Griša-POS.M.LOC.PL affairs-LOC.PL from film-studio-GEN.SG he-DAT Ø answer-PRT.PL
Did [they] give him any answer from the film studio about Griša’s affairs?

(6b) Iskal pokrovitel’stva Kazimirova, kotoryj postupil črezvyčajno neostoroţno.
[He] sought the patronage of Kazimir, who acted extremely imprudently.

Looking at the possibilities across the Slavic languages, Corbett (ibid.: 318) establishes the following hierarchies of control. Possessive adjectives can control attributive modifiers only if they can also control relative pronouns (thus Upper Sorbian); they can control relative pronouns only if they can also control personal pronouns (thus Old Church Slavonic, Macedonian, and some Serbian/Croatian, Czech, and Slovak dialects)

In view of their control possibilities, Corbett (ibid.: 340) concludes that possessive adjectives in Slavic show a complex interrelationship between morphology and syntax. The fact that the underlying noun is available for syntactic purposes suggests that possessive-adjective formation is an inflectional process, while other factors, such as change of word-class membership from noun to adjective, point just as clearly to a
derivational process. According to Corbett (ibid.), this suggests that there is no strong differentiation between inflectional and derivational morphology.

2.2. Suffixes used in the formation of Old Russian possessive adjectives

Many of the existing works on Old Russian possessive constructions deal exclusively with the derivational morphology of possessive adjectives — in particular, the distribution of derivational suffixes (see, for example, Marojević 1983, 1985).

The most comprehensive study of the derivational morphology of Old Russian possessives is that of Bratishenko (2005), who examines adjectives derived from *oj*-stem nouns by the addition of the suffixes -j-, -ov-/ev-, -nj-, -bť-, -bšk- and –bń- in original texts of the eleventh through fifteenth centuries. According to Bratishenko, the formation of denominal adjectives (including possessives) was rule-governed in Old Russian (in her terminology, Old East Slavic). It depended first of all on the semantic categories of the nouns from which the adjectives were derived. Bratishenko classifies nouns stems on a continuum from the POSSESSOR to POSSESSED, in accordance with the semantic features Animate/Inanimate, Personal/Nonpersonal, Mature/Immature, and Proper/Common. She gives the following Possessor Hierarchy (7):

\[(7) \quad \text{Personal Proper} > \text{Personal Common Mature} > \text{Personal Common Immature} > \text{Non-Personal Animate} > \text{Non-personal Inanimate}.\]

According to Bratishenko (ibid: 361), the choice of the derivational morpheme in Old Russian was regulated, on the one hand, by the semantic proximity of the base noun to the possessor prototype (see also Section 1.0), and, on the other hand, by the degree of
definite or individual personal reference characteristic for the adjective-forming suffix itself. Thus the suffixes -ov- and -in- were used for prototypical possessors (8a), while *-j-, -bý- and –bj- were “less individualizing” (8b–c).

(8a) **положю дому Июдину завѣт новъ** (ibid.: 363)
place-PRS.1SG house-DAT.SG Judah-POS.M.DAT.SG covenant-ACC.SG new-M.ACC.SG
I shall give a new covenant to the house of Judah.

(8b) **Адамле преступлень прости** (ibid.: 364)
Adam-POS.N.ACC.SG transgression-ACC.SG Ø forgive-AOR.3SG
[God] forgave Adam’s transgression.

(8c) … **то мьстити… братню сынови**
PTC avenge-INF brother-POS.M.DAT.SG son-DAT SG
… then a brother’s son… is to avenge [the victim].

(8d) **а за смердии холопъ 5 гривень** (ibid.: 366)
and for peasant-POS.M.ACC.SG slave-ACC.SG 5 grivnas-ACC.PL
… and [he should pay] 5 grivnas for a peasant’s slave.

Farther down the scale, Bratishenko analyzes the adjectives in –bšk- more as
“denominal adjectives” than true possessives; they did not primarily refer to individual persons (9a). Finally, adjectives formed with the suffix –bn- were mainly attested with inanimate stems and mostly expressed qualitative rather than possessive meaning (9b).

(9a) **азь мнѣхъ вѣбрѣте оузрѣти лице твое ангельское** (ibid.: 367)
I thought-AOR.1SG to see-INF. your-PP.N.ACC.SG angelic- POS.N.ACC.SG face-N.ACC.SG soon
I thought to see your angelic face soon.

(9b) **надъ горою дворъ теремный бѣ** (ibid.: 370).
over hill-INS.SG court-NOM.SG palace-M.NOM.SG be-AOR.3SG
The courtyard of the palace was over beyond the hill.

Because of these correlations, Bratishenko (373) concludes that there was a hierarchy of suffixes: -ov-, -in- > (*-j-) > -ьn- > -ьf- > -ьsk- > вп. The choice of suffixes in adjective derivation was generally regulated by the lexical features Proper, Personal and Mature; the more of those features the base noun had, the more likely its stem was to be combined with adjectival suffixes from the top (left) of the hierarchy.

Moreover, according to Bratishenko (373) lexical features could take priority over morphological ones such as declensional membership. For example, the possessive adjective Iudovъ was formed from the a-stem noun Iuda ‘Judas’, even though a-stems ordinarily took the suffix -in-. Likewise, the suffix -ьn- was productive with noun stems that denote kinship and clan, irrespective of their declensional membership.

2.3. The functional distribution of possessive adjectives and adnominal genitives

The inventory of possessive constructions in the history of Russian has been described briefly in numerous works on Russian historical grammar. In this section, I will focus only on more specialized studies that deal with the choice between the adnominal genitive and possessive adjectives — a question that is directly relevant for this dissertation.

---

2.3.1. Makarova (1954)

In her study of the possessive genitive in Medieval Russian (eleventh–seventeenth centuries), Makarova (1954) observes that it was not used as extensively or freely as in Contemporary Standard Russian, where it is the primary way of expressing possession within noun phrases. In the modern language, possessive adjectives are used relatively rarely; they can always be replaced by possessive genitives, whereas possessive genitives can often not be replaced by possessive adjectives (ibid.: 7).

In Old Russian, according to Makarova (ibid.: 9) the relation between the two possessive constructions was different. While the possessive genitive was inherited from Indo-European,\(^{10}\) Makarova believes that in Slavic possessive adjectives displaced it as the preferred way of expressing possession. Thus, in Makarova’s opinion (ibid.: 9), the use of possessive genitives in Old Russian texts was quite restricted; essentially, they were only used in contexts where using possessive adjectives were impossible. This included the following situations:

1) when the possessor expression had an attribute;

2) when the possessor expression had an apposition;

3) when the the possessor expression was a proper name consisting of two or three words: forename + patronymic; forename + surname; or forename + surname + patronymic.

4) when the noun in the possessor expression was a substantivized adjective or participle;

5) when something belonged to two or more persons.

---

\(^{10}\) On the semantics of the genitive case in Indo-European languages, see Nikiforidou (1991).
According to Makarova (ibid.: 17), cases of the possessive genitive without a modifier or appositive were rare in Medieval Russian; however, the number of examples increased in the texts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Makarova claims (ibid.: 18) that this is due to the expansion of complex names (Situation 3), which are mostly found in documents from the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries; surnames, in particular, were not able to form possessive adjectives with the predominant suffixes -ов- or -ин-, since they themselves tended to include one or other of those suffixes.

While Makarova writes at length about the choice of suffixes, she does not really account for the syntax of the constructions. In particular, she does not really explain why, at any given point in time, there could be variation in the choice of constructions, i.e., why writers could choose one construction (e.g., adnominal genitive) in contexts where another (e.g., possessive pronoun) was supposedly the norm. Moreover, Makarova does not take into account possible factors in the syntax or information structure of the texts that may favor the use of a particular construction.

2.3.2. Ivanov (1990)

Ivanov (1990: 380–81) views the variation between denominal (including possessive) adjectives and adnominal genitives in Old Russian essentially as a matter of diachronic competition. Eventually, only possessive adjectives formed by the suffixes -ов- and -ин- were maintained: отца шапка ‘father-F.NOM.SG cap-N.SG’ ~ шапка отца ‘cap-N.SG father-GEN.SG’; сестры шарф ‘sister-POS.M.NOM.SG scarf-N.SG’ – шарф сестры ‘scarf-N.SG sister-GEN.SG’.) Ivanov (ibid.) claims that the competition between the two equivalent constructions gave rise to a contamination, in which both
ways of expressing possession were combined in a single construction, e.g., князь Ивановых дети Щетинина (prince-NOM.SG Ivan-POS.M.NOM.PL children-NOM.PL Ščetinin-GEN.SG) ‘Prince Ivan Ščetinin’s children’. Ivanov does not make any reference to functional factors, nor does he provide any explanation for why the supposed expansion of the adnominal genitive occurred in the first place.

2.3.3. Sannikov

The diachronic replacement of the denominal adjective with the adnominal genitive form is a question discussed in detail by V. Z. Sannikov (in Borkovskij (ed.) 1978: 151-159). According to this author (1978: 152), the replacement of possessive adjectives by the adnominal genitive was a long process; even in the eighteenth century. Thus Russian grammars from the eighteenth and early nineteenth century generally refer to possessive adjectives as one of two equal ways of expressing possession, along with adnominal genitives; indeed, some grammars consider it the primary way. The replacement of possessive adjectives began, in Sannikov’s view (ibid.: 153), with common nouns (приказчиков дом ‘chancellor-POS.M.NOM.SG house-NOM.SG’ > дом приказчика ‘house-NOM.SG chancellor-GEN.SG’), then spread to proper nouns (Ахиллы сапоги ‘Axila-POS.M.NOM.PL shoes-NOM.PL’ > сапоги Ахиллы ‘shoes-NOM.PL Axila-GEN.SG’).

According to Sannikov (ibid.), both possessive adjectives and adnominal genitive had “advantages” which helped them survive through the centuries, despite their competition with one another. Thus, even though possessive adjectives eventually came in second in the competition, they preserved into the modern language because they had
certain functional “advantages”. The possessive adjectives agreed with a specific noun, helping the reader to determine which word conveyed the possessed item. Also, the use of possessive adjectives avoided the ambiguity of the genitive case; for example, the form \textit{bratov} ‘brother-POS’ (ibid: 154) denoted solely something belonging to a brother, while the form \textit{brata} ‘brother-GEN.SG’ could convey not only possessivity but also direct objects under negation and other meanings.

On the other hand, according to Sannikov (ibid: 155), the expression of possession using the adnominal genitive form also presented certain “advantages.” In his view, it was a simpler formal structure, because the formation of the adnominal genitive is “simpler” than that of possessive adjectives, especially when one is dealing with “unknown” names or “names from another language.” In addition, the complexity of the formation, Sannikov claims, is caused by the coexistence of several synonymous “possessive suffixes” (–\textit{ov}– (–\textit{ev}–), –\textit{j}–, –\textit{ьsk}–); thus adjectives with different suffixes could be formed from the same noun stem: \textit{от патриархова двора} ‘from patriarch-POS.M.GEN.SG court-M.GEN.SG’; \textit{двора патриарша} ‘patriarch-POS.M.GEN.SG court-M.GEN.SG’ (ibid). Supposedly, possessive adjectives lost their main “advantage”—uniformity (that is, lack of ambiguity) — once homonymous surnames in –\textit{ov}– and –\textit{ev}– became prevalent and once the ending -\textit{ov} became the normal genitive plural for masculine nouns.

Sannkov (ibid.) also discusses word order in Old Russian possessive constructions. In his view, the preferred position for the adnominal genitive was postposition, though it could also occur in preposed position. Sannikov does not offer any explanation for why postposition became preferred position when both word orders were
attested; nor does he account for why the adnominal genitive shifted out of preposed position.

Sannikov’s account of Old Russian possessive constructions is inadequate. First, he does not offer any functional explanations for the changes in word order. Furthermore, his hypothesis that possessive adjectives lost ground when they “lost their uniformity” to surnames fails to account for the fact that there were other suffixes which were involved in deriving surnames — notably, the possessive suffix –in-. He offers no proof why genitive plural –ov (–ev) should have a negative impact on the existence of possessive adjectives, especially given that possessive adjectives remain productive long after the old ŭ-stem genitive plural in -ovъ became the unmarked hard masculine genitive plural.

2.3.4. Rondestvedt (1976)

Rondestvedt (1976) examines the history of the Russian possessive, focusing on why the function of the possessive adjectives was taken over by the genitive. She also takes into consideration the question of why the genitive is typically postposed. While the most common means of expressing possessivity in Old Russian was a possessive adjective derived from the possessor noun, there were limitations on the use of possessive adjectives. First, they could not be used if the possessor noun was modified in any way. Second, adjectives with the suffixes -ov/-ev-, -in-, and -j- could be derived only from nominal forms; it was not possible to use those suffixes if the possessor noun was a substantivized adjective, a participle, or a name with an adjectival form (ibid.: 261). Third, the distinction of number in the possessor was lost. Fourth, the possessive suffixes
could not combine with every nominal stem. Some classes of nouns formed possessive adjectives with suffixes that could have a broader range of meanings; for example, deverbal nouns with the suffix -telb, which denoted agents, used -sk-, e.g., roditel’skij ‘parent’s, parental’ (ibid.).

According to Rondestvedt, two alternative forms were used when the possessive adjective couldn’t be used — the genitive or the dative of the possessor noun. However, she does not deal with the use of dative in her analysis. In her view, the genitive could be used only when possessive adjective could not be — when the possessor expression consisted of more than one word or when a possessive adjective could not be derived from a given noun. She also claims (ibid.: 262) that the genitive was used instead of the possessive adjective when it was needed to avoid ambiguity.

The next question Rondestvedt examines is the position of the possessor expression relative to its head. According to Rondestvedt (ibid.: 265), the predominant position of both possessive adjectives and possessive genitives in Old Church Slavonic was in preposition, but Old Russian showed greater variation. In some texts, which were influenced by Old Church Slavonic or written in a high style, possessive adjectives could be postposed; otherwise, they were preposed. On the other hand, possessive genitives were generally postposed.

Rondestvedt concludes that, by the beginning of the nineteenth century, possessive adjectives had been restricted primarily to preposed position, and possessive genitives to postposed position (ibid.: 266). Rondestvedt sees the development of possessive genitive postposition and elimination of possessive adjective as related processes, but not predicted by the typological theory of word order theory suggested by
W. Lehmann (1973) and T. Vennemann (1974). According to that theory, Russian, as a basically SVO (Subject-Verb-Object) language, should postpone all nominal modifiers; in fact, the opposite has occurred with possessive adjectives (ibid.).

In sum, Rondestvedt views the relation between possessive adjectives and adnominal genitives as one of complementary distribution both functionally and syntactically. However, as I will show below, there was actually not any complementary distribution. In Old Russian legal language, both possessive adjectives and possessor expressions could occur in preposition or postposition, depending on information structure (new, given/old, asserted or focal), and there is no evidence for word-order change over the 250 years studied (1400–1650). Moreover, there are cases of possessive adjectives occurring where Rondestvedt would predict adnominal genitives and vice versa.

2.3.5. Marojević

In two studies published in 1983 and 1989, Marojević examines the development of Proto-Slavic possessive suffixes, which he transcribes as -j-, -bnj-, -ov-, -in-. He attempts to explain how and when they changed semantically, how and when they lost their possessive functions in Russian, how those changes influenced the broader development of Russian, and what the situation is in modern Russian.

In Marojević’s view (1983: 50; 1989: 124), the use of the possessive genitive was restricted in Proto-Slavic stating that the possessive genitive could only used in the following situations: 1) with those personal pronouns that do not have a corresponding possessive pronoun (that is, with the third person or anaphoric pronouns; 2) when the
object of possession was expressed by a substantivized form from the compound adjective declination; and 3) in fixed or adverbialized constructions, such as \( v \) + gen. + \( město \) “instead of” with feminine patronyms and maritonyms (names derived from husbands’ names, e.g., \( Ivanja \) ‘Ivan’s-wife-F.NOM.SG’). Marojević also points out that, when the underlying possessor expression included a modifier (which directly contradicts previous authors), it could be conveyed by a denominal (possessive) adjective, and the modifier by a genitive, such as \( brat\breve{y} Jakunov\breve{y} \) (adj.) \( slěpago \) (gen.) (brother-NOM.SG Jakun-POS.M.NOM.SG blind-M.NOM.SG) ‘the brother of Jakun the Blind (1989: 130). He considers this last construction, which he calls joining of the genitive and possessive adjectives, as a basis for the expansion of the possessive genitive.

In monograph about possessive derivates in Old Russian, based on material from the \( Slovo \ o \ Polku \ Igorevë \), said to be from late twelfth century, Marojević (1985) synthesizes his previous research about possessive constructions. Among his goals (ibid.:105–140) are (1) to describe the system of possessive constructions in the \( Slovo \ o \ Polku \ Igorevë \) and compare it with the system in other Old Russian texts of the end of the twelfth century; (2) to reconstruct the semantics of the possessive forms found in the \( Slovo \ o \ Polku \ Igorevë \); and (3) to identify and explain the possessive forms in the \( Slovo \ o \ Polku \ Igorevë \) that were \textit{not} characteristic for Old Russian at the end of twelfth century. Such forms, he argues, are the result of changes made during the copying and revising of the text in the sixteenth century.

The suffixes on which Marojević focuses (ibid.: 106–24) are (in his transcription, which is based on orthography and includes endings) \(-j\breve{b}, -\breve{b}n\breve{b}, -ov\breve{b}, -in\breve{b}, -b, -\breve{b}j\breve{b}. \) In discussing the syntax of adjectives formed with these suffixes (ibid.: 125) he repeats the
claim that the use of possessive genitive was restricted. According to Marojević (ibid.: 141), the handful of possessive genitives that can be found in the *Slovo o Polku Igorevě* were not characteristic of Old Russian at the end of the twelfth century but were the result of later copying and editing. For example, the sixteenth-century copyist did not recognize the construction in *о Полку Игореве Святославича* (‘about campaign-LOC.SG Igor’-POS.M.LOC.SG Svjatoslavič-GEN.SG) ‘about the campaign of Igor’ Svjatoslavič; therefore, he added a pleonastic possessive genitive: *о полку Игореве, Игоря Святославича* (‘about campaign-LOC.SG Igor’-POS.M.LOC.SG, Igor’-GEN.SG Svjatoslavič-GEN.SG) ‘about the campaign of Igor’, Igor’ Svjatoslavič’.

Based on my study of Old Russian legal language, I cannot agree with Marojević’s claim that the use of possessive expressions in the genitive was limited. In fact, adnominal genitives serve as the pattern possessive constructions in several of the semantic types that I defined (see Chapters 3–9). Moreover, possession expressions in genitive and possessive adjectives do not preclude each other; they just have different spheres of use. From this reason we shouldn’t see the “ungoverned genitive” as “contamination” of the genitive and possessive adjectives as a starting point/source for the expansion of the possessive genitive.

### 2.3.6. Worth (1992)

Worth (1992) examines possessive constructions in Middle Russian (fourteenth–sixteenth-century) princely wills and treaties, as attested in the collection *Duxovnye i dogovornye gramoty* (Moscow, 1950). He focuses on possessive constructions in which possessivity is marked not just by adnominal genitives (9a) but also by possessive
adjectives formed from the “substantival possessor” — that is, the semantic possessor (9b) — as well as mixtures of these types involving complex noun phrases, which contain personal names, titles, patronymics, and nicknames, e.g., (9c) (ibid.: 173).

(9a) село князя Ивана
village-NOM/ACC.SG prince-GEN.SG Ivan-GEN.SG
the village of Prince Ivan

(9b) село княже Иваново
village-NOM/ACC.SG prince-POS.M.NOM/ACC.SG Ivan- POS.M.NOM/ACC.SG
the village of Prince Ivan

(9c) село княже Иваново Васильевича можайского
village-NOM/ACC.SG prince-POS.M.NOM/ACC.SG Ivan-POS.M.NOM/ACC.SG
Vasil’evič-GEN.SG of-Možajsk-M.GEN.SG
the village of Prince Ivan Vasil’evič of Možajsk

Examples (9a–b) reflect a relatively simple semantic possessor, consisting of a title plus an appositive forename: {князь Иван} ‘Prince Ivan’. By contrast, (9c) reflects an elaborated semantic possessor, including a patronymic and a modifying adjective: {князь Иван Васильевич} ‘Prince Ivan Vasil’evič’. In the realized possessive construction, possessivity is marked by a combination of possessive adjectives and adnominal genitives; the latter cannot undergo further syntactic government — specifically, agreement with the case, number, and gender of the head noun — so Worth calls them ungoverned genitives.

As Worth notes (ibid.), such possessive constructions can be complicated by word-order transformations (10a) and preposition repetition (10b), which split the possessor phrases into non-contiguous parts.11

11 On preposition repetition in Old Russian syntax, see Worth (1982) and Klenin (1989).
Finally, Worth provides numerous examples of possessor phrases embedded within possessor phrases; in other words, the noun in the possessor phrase serves as the NP head of another possessive phrase. In such cases, the possessors are sons, wives, or servants, who are “possessed by” (identified by their relationship to) their fathers, husbands, or masters, respectively, as in (11):

(11) до Васильевы земли Григорьева сына Лазарева (ibid.: 173)
    to Vasilij-POS.F.GEN.SG land-GEN.SG
    Grigorij-POS.M.GEN.SG son-GEN.SG Lazarev-GEN.SG
    to the land of Vasilij, the son of Grigorij Lazarev

Worth’s description of possessive phrases is based on the form of the “noun phrase base unit” and an ordered set of morphosyntactic and word-order rules that operate on this base. For example, the base unit in Ивановское место Старкова (Ivan-N.NOM/ACC.SG place-NOM/ACC.SG Starkov-GEN.SG) ‘Ivan Starkov’s place’ is, in morphophonemic transcription, {место (Иван Старков)} (ibid.: 174). The number and gender of the word denoting the possessed object are mapped onto any parts of the possessor phrase that surface as possessive adjectives; the entire possessive phrase then becomes “transparent” (accessible) to the subsequent case-marking rule, i.e., takes on the case appropriate for its syntactic context.
Worth identifies four types of morphosyntactic and ordering rules that operate on such base units: Possessivity marking (see below); Case-marking, a rule that marks all accessible items within a possessive phrase with the case required by their controllers; Word-order transformation, an optional rule that operates on the output of the case-marking rule; and Preposition repetition, another optional rule, in which prepositions are repeated at specific seams in a prepositional-object phrase (see Section 2.3, below).

According to Worth (ibid.:175) grammatical class of the possessor determines possessivity by the following rules. First, personal pronouns, substantives, and noun phrases that consist only of substantives form possessive adjectives: {казнь (ты, великий князь)} \(\rightarrow\) твою казнь, великого князя (you-SG.POS.ACC.SG treasury-ACC.SG grand-MGEN.SG prince-GEN.SG) ‘the treasury of you, the grand prince’ (ibid.:175). Second, noun phrases with adjectival immediate constituents mark possessivity by the genitive case only: {казнь (ты, великий князь)} \(\rightarrow\) твою казнь, великого князя (your-POS.F.ACC.SG execution-POS.F.ACC.SG grande prince-GEN.SG).

2.3.7. Eckhoff (2006)

Eckhoff’s monograph (2006), written in the framework of Cognitive Linguistics and Construction Grammar, provides the most detailed and nuanced account yet published of the relationship between adnominal genitives and possessive adjectives in Old Russian and modern Russian. According to Eckhoff (ibid.:13), possessive constructions constitute one of the major syntactic differences between the Old Russian

---

12 When a word-order rule is applied, the possessed entity moves to a position followed the first noun phrase of the possessive phrase: {доля (Юрий Ромейкович)} \(\rightarrow\) Юрьева доля Ромейковича (Jurij-POS.F.NOM.SG share-NOM.SG Romejkovič-GEN.SG) ‘Jurij Romejkovič’s share’ (Worth 1992: 177).

13 For a cognitive-linguistic approach to possession in Contemporary Standard Russian, see Cienki (1995).
and modern Russian. She focuses on the distribution and semantics of different possessive constructions in the earliest period of Old Russian (eleventh through fourteenth centuries), then compares them with possessive constructions in canonical Old Church Slavonic. She also examines the changes occurring in the distribution of possessive constructions from the earliest attested texts up to 1700. Her overall goal is to place the different possessive constructions within what she calls “possessive conceptual space” (ibid.: 106–7 and elsewhere).14 Thus the same constructions could express other attributive functions or relations than possessivity.

Eckhoff (ibid.: 107–8) divides Old Russian denominal adjectives into two categories. The first type (DA1) was formed from noun stems denoting individual persons with the suffixes *-j- -ov-, -in-, -bn’, e.g., Rostislavl’ (*-j-) ‘of Rostislav’, Olgov-‘of Oleg’, bogorodičin- ‘of the Theotokos’ (bogorodic-), gospod-bn’ ‘of the Lord’ (gospod-). Such adjectives tended to denote the possessors in prototypical possession relations or relations that were close to the prototype in perceptual space (ibid.: 108). The second type (DA2) was formed with the suffixes -bj-, -bsk-, -bn- from noun stems denoting animals (voblčyj- ‘of/pertaining to a wolf/wolves’), classes of persons (žembsk- ‘of/pertaining to a woman/women’, or inanimate nouns (nebesbn- ‘of/pertaining to the sky/heaven’). While DA2 adjectives often denoted relations that were relatively far from prototypical possession, they could also denote possession in a strict sense (ibid.).

Prior to the fifteenth century, according to Eckhoff (ibid.: 109–), denominal adjectives tended to be used in possessive constructions mostly when the possessor

---

14 While the idea of “conceptual space” allows for more complex mappings of relations between the different types of possessive constructions than Taylor’s (1996) continuum (see Section 1.0), it presents theoretical complications that are beyond the scope of this dissertation.
consisted of a single noun (послания яша корабль глебов ‘the envoys took Gleb’s-м.acc.sg boat-m.acc.sg’) , and the genitive when the possessor was a complex phrase (к църкви святого Георгия ‘to the church-f.dat.sg of St. Georgij-m.gen.sg’). In addition, the choice of particular possessive constructions was frequently influenced by the type of head noun involved. Thus genitive constructions showed a strong tendency to occur with nouns — often, nouns denoting inherent parts of wholes; they were more likely to have animate reference points when their head nouns were relational than when they were not (ibid.:307–9).

Eckhoff (ibid.: 165-171) pays special attention to constructions in which the possessor consisted of more than a single noun stem. She finds two types of mixed construction types in the early Old Russian material that she examines: the double adjective construction: вода с собою Володимера Юревича брата Всеволожа Мстиславля ‘Bringing with them Volodimer-m.gen=acc.sg Jur’evič-m.gen=acc.sg the brother-m.gen=acc.sg of Vsevold-pos.m.gen=acc.sg and Mstislav-pos.m.gen=acc.sg’, and the denominal adjective/genitive construction (Worth’s “ungoverned genitive”): (от полку Еупатиева Колврата ‘from Eupatij’s-pos.m.gen.sg Kolovrat’s-m.gen.sg army-m.gen.sg) (ibid.: 165). According to Eckhoff (ibid.: 309), in the early period the distribution of these constructions in possessive conceptual space is very similar to the distribution of denominal adjectives — not surprisingly, since they include denominal adjectives. The frequency of such mixed constructions significantly increased in the fifteenth -seventeenth centuries (ibid.: 281).

Overall, Eckhoff treats the relation between adnominal genitives and possessive adjectives as one of complementary distribution rather than competition. The choice
between possessive adjectives and the adnominal genitive could depend on various factors, of which the most important are semantic. The need to express grammatical number (non-singular possessors) was one of the most important; that is why the genitive was typically used for expressing dual possessors. The second type of factor can be called morphological-syntactical. These factors influenced the appearance of the genitive when the possessor expression was modified or had an appositive. By contrast, possessive adjectives were used when the possessor expression consisted of an unmodified proper noun.
CHAPTER 3

PERSONAL OWNERSHIP

3.0. Preliminary remarks

The semantic classification Ownership is defined by the possessor type and its relationship to the NP head. The examples I analyzed show that there are two types of ownership in my database: the possessed object can belong to either to a person/human being (земля Ивана Петрова ‘Ivan Petrov’s land’) or to an institution (земля Симонова монастыря ‘Simon’s Monastery’s land’). Since the examples in which the possessor is an individual person represent typologically prototypical possessive constructions, based on Taylor’s (1996: 339) classification of possession as a semantic concept (see section 1.1.), I will divide the Ownership category into Personal Ownership and Institutional Ownership; I will analyze the former in this chapter, and the latter in Chapter 4.

In Personal Ownership group of possessive constructions, the possessor type is the individual human owner of a physical object or real-estate property, while the NP head is the object itself. This is shown in the construction земля Ивана Петрова ‘Ivan Petrov’s land’, in which Ивана Петрова ‘Ivan-GEN.SG Petrov’s-GEN.SG’ is the owner of the land, and земля ‘land-NOM.SG’ is the NP head of the possessive construction.
In this chapter, I first establish the pattern possessive construction for the Personal Ownership group for the period from pre-1450 to post-1600 (section 3.1.).\textsuperscript{15} Then, after establishing the pattern possessive construction, I analyze and explain the semantic or syntactic (functional) conditions motivating the less frequent possessive constructions appearing during this period; I also address the main causes for causes of divergence from/reasons authors do not follow the pattern possessive construction (section 3.2.).

In the database, the Personal Ownership group is represented by 206 examples out of a total of 1700 possessive constructions in all the periods examined. The chronological distribution of the examples by fifty-year periods is presented in Table 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>before 1450</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1450–1500</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>33.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500–1550</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550–1600</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after 1600</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{Table 3.1. Personal Ownership group chronologically}

Looking at each period separately, we see the following distribution of Personal Ownership possessive constructions by time period (Table 3.1.): before 1450 — 28 (13.59%); 1450–1500 — 69 (33.49%); 1500–1550 — 29 (14.07%); 1550–1600 — 38 (18.44%); after 1600 — 42 (20.38%).

\textsuperscript{15}In this case, I will take into consideration both of the possessive constructions (prototypical and non-prototypical) and see whether the pattern construction is the same or different for them.
While selecting the documents for this research, I tried to have each of the given periods be represented by an approximately equal number of documents. Nevertheless, as can be seen from Figure 3.1, these efforts did not result in an equal distribution of the possessive constructions that form the group Personal Ownership for all the time periods though 1500–1550, 1550–1600, and after 1600 are almost comparable. Proportionately, Personal Ownership is least represented before 1450 and most represented 1450–1500.

Based on the classified database, the following types of possessive constructions are found in the group Personal Ownership (Table 3.2.).
### Table 3.2. Types of possessive constructions in Personal Ownership chronologically

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possessor</th>
<th>before 1450</th>
<th>1450-1500</th>
<th>1500-1550</th>
<th>1550-1600</th>
<th>after 1600</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POSAG</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREAG</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSPA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPA + POSAG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSPC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREAG + POSPA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPA+POSRA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relative proportions of the possessive constructions that are found/occur in the Personal Ownership group for the entire period studied is shown graphically in Figure 3.2.
In section 3.1, I will consider the various categories of possessives presented in Table 3.2 and Figure 3.2 for the Personal Ownership group over all periods.

3.1. Pattern possessive construction for the Personal Ownership group

As noted in section 1.3, the most frequent possessive construction in any given semantic group is treated as the pattern possessive construction for that group. As shown in Table 3.2 and Figure 3.2, the POSAG construction (post-posed adnominal genitive) is the most frequent construction for the Personal Ownership group if all time periods taken together (89=43.20%).
3.1.1. Before 1450

In the period before 1450, POSAG constructions in the Personal Ownership group are represented by ten examples in my database.


In (1) ‘enclosed court of mine, the grand prince’, двора (enclosed-court-GEN.SG) serves as the NP head, and моего великого князя (my-M.GEN.SG grand-M.GEN.SG prince-GEN.SG) as the possessor expression.

One of the factors tracked in the database as a possible influence on the choice of possessor type is the syntactic role of the NP head. Closer analysis of constructions like (1), shows that the NP head can play more than one role — subject or predicative nominal (8x) or oblique constituent (2x). Another factor tracked was the placement of the NP head in the sentence; this is a rough indicator of whether the entire possessive construction (head and possessor) are asserted (post-verbal) or presupposed (pre-verbal).

In the given example, the NP head can be found both in pre-verbal position and in post-verbal. In most cases, the postposed adnominal genitive consists of a noun with an agreeing adjective; there can also be a postposed possessive pronoun мой ‘my’, which agrees with the NP head): (Adj-GEN.SG + ) N-GEN or PA-X + (Adj-GEN.SG + ) N-GEN.SG.  

16 Throughout my analysis, I classified the possessive pronominal adjectives (first-person singular мой, second-person singular твой, first-person plural наш, second-person plural ваш, and reflexive свой) as the equivalent of adnominal genitives on the basis of their function, which is comparable to that of the non-agreeing (genitive) anaphoric pronouns его ‘his/its’, ей/ее ‘her’, and ихъ ‘their’. In an example like (1a), двора моего великого князя, the pronominal adjective моего essentially functions as the genitive of the pronoun азъ/я(въ) ‘I’ (whose actual genitive generally does not occur in possessive constructions).
3.1.2. 1450–1500

In the period of 1450–1500, we find 34 POSAG constructions, which makes it the most frequent possessive construction in this period. An illustrative example is given below:


In (2), ‘land of the grand princess’, земля (land-NOM.SG) serves as the NP head, and ВЕЛИКИЕ КНЯНИ (grand-F.GEN.SG princess-GEN.SG) as the possessor expression.

Closer analysis of constructions like (2) shows that the NP head can appear in a variety of syntactic roles: subject or predicative nominal (18x), direct object (8x), prepositional object (2x), or other constituent in an oblique case (6x). As for its placement in the sentence, the NP head is found in pre-verbal position in 12 examples and post-verbal position in 22. The NP head in these constructions represent different types of properties, such as земля ‘land’, село ‘village’, пустошь ‘heathland’, двор ‘enclosed yard (farm compound)’ etc. The postposed adnominal genitive consists of just a postposed adjective with a noun: PA-GEN.SG + N-GEN.SG, PA-GEN.SG, N-GEN.SG + PP-GEN.SG, SK-GEN.SG + N-GEN.SG. Semantically, the author/possessor is human and can be male or female.

Investigating the syntactic conditions why the possessor is postposed, I found that the possessor is postposed in most of the constructions because it represents ‘new’ information in the context; the referents are complete unknowns until they are mentioned.

However, given that the possessive pronominal adjectives agree with the noun phrase head, it would also have been possible to treat them like other adjectives.
for the first time. Even though the phrase великий князь can be considered culturally ‘given information’, there are some constructions in which the possessor is великий князь and still postposed because it also represents new information in the context.

Furthermore, in a couple of cases (4x) the possessor is postposed even though it represents old (already mentioned) information in the contexts. I investigated the texts in which those examples are found, and those examples represent contrastive focus, because the possession of a grand prince is contrasted to the monastery possession. In this case I can say that possessor is postposed because it represents new information. Furthermore, in 3 examples such as в мои села, великого князя the possessor represents given information because it is already mentioned in the context and it is not an example of focus of contrast. I can conclude here, based on the corpus, that in examples with the structure as possessive adjective + noun + adnominal genitive phrases, the adnominal genitive must be postposed.

3.1.3. 1500–1550

The POSAG construction is also the most frequent possessive construction in the period 1500–1550, represented by fifteen examples, as illustrated in (3).


In (3), ‘the black land of the grand prince’, the NP head is земля (land-NOM.SG), and the possessor expression is великого князя (grand-M.GEN.SG prince-GEN.SG).
Closer analysis of constructions like (3) shows that the NP head can appear in a variety of syntactic roles: subject (11x), prepositional object (1x), or direct object (2x), or other constituent in an oblique case (1x). As for its placement in the sentence, the NP head is found in pre-verbal position in five examples, and in post-verbal position in ten. The NP heads in these constructions represent different types of properties, such as земля ‘land’, село ‘village’, луг ‘meadow’, etc. The postposed adnominal genitive consists of a postposed adjective with a noun: PA-GEN.SG + N-GEN.SG, N-GEN.SG + PP-GEN.SG, SK-GEN.SG + N-GEN.SG. Semantically, the author/possessor can be either male or female.

Analyzing the syntactic conditions why the possessor is postposed, I found that the possessor is postposed in most of the constructions because it represents new information in the context (the referents are complete unknowns until they are mentioned for the first time). There are also some constructions in which the possessor is великий князь; even though this is a cultural given, it can be postposed because it also represents a new information in the context but in these examples (4x) the possessor is postposed because they represent examples of focus of contrast.

3.1.4. 1550–1600

The POSAG construction is also the most frequent possessive construction in the period 1500–1550, represented by thirteen examples, as illustrated in (4a–b).

(4a) А на ели грань− направе земли, и нива, и лес [S] царя и великого князя [POSAG], а налеве земля за ручьем за Слюдичным монастырской починок Прыткін…(АФЗХ 108).
(4b) Промежу Ивановым двором Баевым да и двором [PRP] Михайлова сына [POSAG]… (AF3X 103)

In (4a), ‘lands and field and forest of the grand princess’, the head of the possessive construction consists of the three conjoined nouns земли (lands–NOM.PL), нива (field-N.SG), and лес (forest-NOM.SG), while the possessor expression likewise consists of conjoined nouns, царь (tsar-GEN.SG) and великого князя (grand-M.GEN.SG prince-GEN.SG). In (4b), the head is the prepositional object двором (enclosed-yard-INS.SG), and the possessor expression Михайлова сына (Mixail-POS.M.GEN.SG son-GEN.SG).

POSAG constructions like (4a-b) shows that the NP head can appear in a variety of syntactic roles: subject (8x), prepositional object (3x), or direct object (2x). As for its placement in the sentence, the NP head is found in post-verbal position in all examples. The NP heads in these constructions represent different types of properties, such as место ‘place’, земля ‘land’, etc. The postposed adnominal genitive consists of a postposed adjective with a noun: PA-GEN.SG + N-GEN.SG, N-GEN.SG + PP-GEN.SG, N-GEN.SG + {PA-GEN.SG + N-GEN.SG}. Semantically, the author/possessor can be either male or female.

Analyzing the syntactic conditions why the possessor is postposed, I found that the possessor is postposed in most of the constructions because it represents new information in the context; the referents are complete unknowns until they are mentioned for the first time. In 3 examples the possessor is царь и великий князь; in these examples, the possessor is in focus of contrast with another possessor in a separate possessive construction, as in (4a). In Old Russian writing, new and emphasized
information tends to go to the right in its phrase; in cases like (4a), this means that the possessor has to be postposed.

3.1.5. After 1600

The period after 1600 is represented by 17 POSAG constructions, as exemplified in (5):

(5) Направе земля [S] Ивана Григорова [POSAG], а налеве земля [S] Ивана Чернова [POSAG]...(АФЗХ(3) 254).

In this example, there are two possessive constructions in focal contrast; the NP head in both is земля (land-NOM.SG), and the possessor expressions are the proper names Ивана Григорова (Ivan-GEN Grigorov-GEN) and Ивана Чернова (Ivan-GEN Černov-GEN).

POSAG constructions like (5a) show that the NP head can appear in a variety of syntactic roles: subject (15x) and direct object (2x). As for placement in the sentence, the NP head is found in pre-verbal position in three examples and post-verbal in 14. The NP heads in these constructions represent different types of properties, such as луг ‘meadow’, земля ‘land’, etc. The postposed adnominal genitive consists of just a possessive adjective in the genitive or a noun with a postposed postposed adjective (in these examples it represents a name and a patronymic): PA-GEN.SG, N-GEN.SG + PA-GEN.SG.

Semantically, the author/possessor is a human male. For this period, there is only one case of the possessor великий князь (the most common one in earlier periods); elsewhere the possessor is a local person who does not have a higher rank in the society, which is
the opposite of previous periods. The possessor is postposed in most of the constructions because it represents new information in the context; the referents are complete unknowns until they are mentioned for the first time. In 7 constructions in this period the possessor is postposed because it represents a focus of contrast, as in (5a).

3.1.6. Overview of the pattern construction for the Personal Ownership group

As noted above, the POSAG construction is the most frequent possessive construction in the Personal Ownership group; it represents not a majority but a plurality (89/206 =43.20 %) of the examples (based on the total number of occurrences in all periods). The exception are the periods before 1450 and 1550–1600, which are represented by 10 and 13 constructions, respectively; the most frequent construction in these periods is PREAG, as will be explained later (3.2.1.). Looking at the distribution of the POSAG possessive construction by fifty-year periods, it can be seen that the distribution of the examples is almost equal in the periods before 1450, 1500–1550 and 1550–1600 (10, 15 and 13, respectively). The period 1450–1500 shows 34 examples, and the period after 1600 17.

Given the nature of the semantic category, it is not surprising that the owner/possessor is always human; the fact that the majority of possessors are male is probably due to cultural factors (the relatively marginal position of women in Old Russian law). In all the periods the possessor expression is mostly великий князь and великая княгиня. The reason can be found in the different genre of the text, because all examples are found in the text-kind of petitions.
The possessor is postposed in most of the constructions because it represents ‘new’ information in the context (the referents are complete unknowns until they are mentioned for the first time). Even though the phrase великий князь is considered culturally ‘given information’, there are some constructions in which the possessor is великий князь yet it is postposed because it also represents newly asserted information in the context. Furthermore, in some cases the possessor is postposed even though it represents old information in the context because it represents a focus of contrast, as in (4a) and (5a), where two possessors are contrasted with one another.

Some of the previous researchers\textsuperscript{17} have argued that the use of adnominal genitive constructions was not free and widespread in Russian in the fourteenth–seventeenth centuries; they claim that the adnominal genitive was a latecomer that competed with and ultimately displaced possessive adjectives. My data in this chapter do not support this conclusion; the adnominal genitive is the most frequent construction in this group. My work shows that the adnominal genitive is not restricted or limited, as other authors have claimed, but has its own sphere of preferred use, just like the supposedly less restricted possessive adjectives. While it is the norm in situations where possessive adjectives cannot be used (as when the possessor expression reflects a noun phrase with different parts of speech, e.g., an adjective plus a noun), comparison of the examples in this section with those in the following ones will show that the adnominal genitive was not just used when it was impossible to use possessive adjectives and vice versa. Thus, I conclude that the two constructions can occur in the same environments, though they each have their own spheres of preferred use. While other authors have tried to make the distribution into

\textsuperscript{17} Makarova (1954), Marojević (1983), and Rondestvedt (1976) argue that the use of adnominal genitive in Old language was limited and, in most cases, influenced just by the impossibility of using possessive adjectives in specific syntactic environments.
a purely syntactic rule (possessive adjectives are used in syntactic environment X, and
adnominal genitives in syntactic environment Y), that is not a tenable position; scribes
actually could choose one or other construction in some contexts, so pragmatic factors
must be at work.

3.2. Less frequent possessive constructions

As discussed before, POSAG is the pattern possessive construction for the
Personal Ownership group; however, 122 possessive constructions of other types occur in
this semantic class in the database. In the following subsections, I will attempt to explain
what conditions are presented in those examples in order to explain those deviations.

3.2.1. Preposed adnominal genitive (PREAG)

There are 80 possessive constructions in the Personal Ownership/possessor group
in which the possessor is presented as a preposed adnominal genitive. There are 16
tokens in the period before 1450, 24 in the period 1450–1500, 10 in the period 1500–
1550, 14 in the period 1550–1600 and 15 after 1600. The following are representative
examples:

(6a) Что их [PREAG] пустоши [S] в Переславском оуезде оу Соли в пути...(АСЭИ 224).

(6b) Великого князя Дмитрея Ивановича [PREAG] земля [S] с притка со пни з
березового...(АСЭИ 660).
In (6a), the NP head is пустоши ‘uncultivated fields-nom.pl’, and the possessor
expression is the anaphoric pronoun их ‘they-gen.pl’. The third-person anaphoric
pronouns do not form possessive adjectives in Medieval Russian (cf. Serbian njegov ‘his/its’, njen ‘her’, njihov ‘their’, derived from the genitive anaphoric pronouns (n)jega, (n)je, (nj)ih; and substandard Russian ixnij ‘their’, derived from ix ‘they-GEN.PL’). In (6b), the NP head is земля ‘land-NOM.SG’, and the possessor construction consists of three appositive noun phrases, Великого князя Дмитрея Ивановича ‘{grand-GEN.SG prince-GEN.SG Ivanović-GEN.SG} Dmitrij-GEN.SG Дмитрий-GEN.SG Ivanović-GEN.SG’. Note that possessive adjectives derived from forenames like Дмитрий are well attested in my corpus; in (6b), the proper noun perhaps appears as an adnominal genitive because the surrounding appositives are from classes that do not form possessive adjectives.

Closer analysis of constructions like (6a–b), shows that the NP head can appear in a variety of syntactic roles: subject (45x), prepositional object (22x), a constituent in oblique case (7x), and direct object (5x). As for its placement in the sentence, the NP head is found in pre-verbal position in 38 examples and post-verbal in 41. Structurally, the preposed possessive phrase can take five forms: PA-GEN.SG + N-GEN.SG, N-GEN.SG + PP-GEN.SG, N-GEN.SG + appositive, PP-GEN.PL, or PA-GEN.SG + PA-GEN.SG.

Semantically, the possessor is a human male or female.

In most of the examples, the NP head is земля ‘land’ as in the pattern construction POSAG (see z.1.1). There are also other nouns found in both groups of possessive constructions which refer to the possessed objects or properties, such as село ‘village’, место ‘place’, луг ‘meadow’ or хрестьяне ‘peasants’, etc. In analyzing all of the possessor types in this group, I find almost the same the same possessor types in this PREAG possessive construction group as I found in the pattern possessive construction, as illustrated in (6a-b). There are also other possessor types in the PREAG group such as,
possessive pronoun их ‘their’ or его ‘his’ (6a), and also kinship terms such as отец ‘father’, дед ‘grandfather’. Also, the most frequent possessor construction in this group is also великий князь ‘grand prince’. In two examples, an adnominal genitive appears with an appositive, which represents a name + patronymic in the genitive (6b).

I compared the discourse and syntactic contexts in which the POSAG and PREAG appear, and found out that there are conditions that can explain why PREAG construction was chosen instead of the pattern construction POSAG. All the examples of PREAG in which the possessor phrase is великий князь ‘grand prince’ are preposed because they all represent old/given information, because the grand prince has already been mentioned in the beginning of the sentence. Other possessive constructions in which the possessor is a kinship term also represents old/given information in the context, because they are already introduced at the beginning of the text. The same applies to the possessive constructions in which the possessor is anaphoric pronoun их ‘their’ or его ‘his’.

Furthermore, my analysis of these constructions focused on the question, what can be expressed as a possessive adjective and what cannot? Based on the PREAG examples, it can be noticed that the noun князь ‘prince’ when it is a constituent of the phrase великий князь ‘grand prince’ is always found as a adnominal genitive. On the other hand, the noun князь without the adjective великий can form a possessive adjective княжь (which also can be a non-declining component of compounded name such as княж Михайлове). Also, kinship terms do not form possessive adjectives in this category.
3.2.2. Preposed possessive construction (PREPC)

There are 11 possessive constructions in the Personal Ownership group in which the possessor is presented as a preposed possessive construction involving both an agreeing adjective and a non-agreeing genitive. None of the examples occur in the period before 1450; there is one example each in the periods 1450–1500, 1500–1550, and after 1600, and 8 examples in the period 1550–1600. The following are representative examples:

(7a) Тому сельцу учинена межа с царевыми и великого князя [PREPC] деревнями [PRP], что были помесные… (АФХЗ 142).

(7b) Да в Ярославском уезде в моих царевых и великого князя [PREPC] селех и деревнях [PRP]… (АФХЗ 142).

In (7a), the noun phrase head is деревнями ‘villages-INS.PL’, and the possessor expression is царевыми и великого князя ‘tsar-POS.INS.PL and grand-M.GEN.SG prince-GEN.SG’. In (7b), the head is the conjoined nouns селех ‘towns-LOC.PL’ and деревнях ‘villages-LOC.PL’; the possessor expression is моих царевых и великого князя ‘my-LOC.PL tsar-POS.LOC.PL and grand-M.GEN.SG prince-GEN.SG’.

Closer analysis of constructions like (7a–b) shows that the NP head can be a prepositional object (9x) or a subject (2x). As for its placement in the sentence, the NP head is found in pre-verbal position in 2 examples and post-verbal in 9. The NP head is the noun село ‘village’, земля ‘land’, and деревня ‘village’. Semantically, the possessor is a human male. The possessor is a noun phrase царь и великий князь ‘tsar and grand
prince’ or великий князь ‘grand prince’, structurally\textsuperscript{18}, PA + NP- GEN.SG, PP + PA + NP- GEN.SG, PA + PA.

Taking into consideration that the possessor is царь и великий князь ‘tsar and grand prince’ or just великий князь ‘grand prince’ and they can be considered culturally ‘given’ information even if they are mentioned for the first time in the text. However, analysis of all examples in PREPC group shows that the possessor is preposed because it represents old/given information in the context.

As we can see from examples (7a–b), the phrase великий князь ‘grand prince’ marks possessivity by the genitive case, while other nouns found in the PREPC group mark possessivity by deriving possessive adjectives, such as царь (7a–b). It is obvious that noun phrases with an adjectival constituent are always in the genitive. It is also very interesting that in examples such as (7a–b) possessive adjectives agree with the NP head, which is typical for my corpus.

In addition, the possessive pronoun мой ‘my’ is found in some examples (as also in the POSAG, PREAG groups); this also agrees with the NP head. The presence of a possessive pronoun in such constructions seems to emphasis the role of the grand prince and tsar as unique referents and give them special emphasis or solemnity. Considering all the examples that contain grand prince or tsar, it seems that this was a stylistic convention followed by the certain scribes when they mention grand prince or tsar.

Furthermore, as I mentioned earlier in this section, there is a peak of 8 examples of this construction in the period 1550–1600. It seems that the most examples can be connected the result of a change in state writing practices as a result of the centralization

\textsuperscript{18} NP stands for великий князь or a name + patronymic here, PP stands for a possessive pronoun and PA is a possessive adjective. I am using a shorter formula in this section because my examples are in different cases’.
of the government and creation of chanceries by the ruler Ivan IV the Terrible (crowned tsar in 1547).

3.2.3. Postposed possessive adjective (POSPA)

This type of possessive construction is represented by 10 examples. There are 2 examples in the period 1450–1550 and 8 examples in the period after 1600:

(8a) По великого князя слову Василья Васильевича, роз(е)ехал землю [DO] Василеи Оньдреевичь(ь) княгинину Одросинь(ь)ину [POSPA]... (АСЭИ 257).

(8b) Да что имъ жо дал князъ Юрьи Дмитреевичъ дворъ [S] попов Остурин [POSPA]... (АСЭИ 245).

In the underlined construction in (8a–b), the noun phrase head is землю ‘land-ACC.SG, while the possessor expression is the discontinuous княгинину Одросинь(ь)ину ‘princess-POS.F.ACC.SG Ofrosin’ja-POS.F.ACC.SG’. In (8b), the head is дворъ ‘enclosed-yard-ACC.SG’; the possessor expression is попов Остурин ‘priest-POS.M.ACC.SG Ospura-POS.M.ACC.SG’.

The NP head can be a subject (9x) or direct object (1x) in post-verbal position. The possessor is a postposed possessive adjective, given as (PA + PA)-ACC.SG, (PA + PA)-NOM.SG. Semantically, the possessor is a human male or female. The NP head is дворъ ‘yard’ or землиja ‘land’. The only attested possessors are княгиня ‘princess’ (1x) and поп ‘priest’.
Closer analysis of the given examples shows that they are in postposed position because they represent new information in the context; they are mentioned for the first time in the text.

The constructions in which the possessor is княгиня ‘princess’ is a double-possessive adjectives constructions; the possessive adjectives are derived from the title княгиня + a proper name. By contrast, the construction in which a поп ‘priest’ is a referent is one-single possessive adjective derived from the noun поп ‘priest’. The possessive adjectives agree with a NP head, as I explained in the section 1.2.2.

3.2.4. Preposed possessive adjective (PREPA)

There are 9 possessive constructions in the Personal Ownership group in which the possessor is presented as a preposed possessive adjective. This construction is not attested in the database for all the periods investigated. None of the examples occur in the period before 1450; there are 2 examples in the periods 1450–1500, 1500–1550 and 1550–1600, and 3 after 1600. The following are representative examples.

(9a) А зовучи те земли княгин(i)ными Офросин(ь)ными [PREPA] землями [Obl] ...(АСЭИ 257).

(9b) а велел ден им во княже Михайлове [PREPA] да во княже Александрове [PREPA] селе [PRP] кликати биричом не по одно утро...(АФХЗ 137)

In (9a), the NP head is землями ‘lands-INS.PL’, while the possessor expression is княгин(i)ными Офросин(ь)ными ‘princess-F.INS.PL Ofrosin’ja-F.INS.PL’. In (9b), the head is селе ‘village-LOC.SG’, and there are conjoined possessor expressions княже
Михайлове ‘prince-POS Mixail-N.LOC.SG’ and княж Александрове ‘prince-POS Aleksandr-N.LOC.SG’.

Closer analysis of constructions like (9a–b) shows that the NP head can appear as prepositional phrase (5x) or as a constituent in an oblique case (4x). As for its placement in the sentence, the NP head is found in post-verbal position in 6 examples and pre-verbal in 3. The possessor is structurally shown as PA-GEN.SG, PA-INS.SG, PA-LOC.SG, PA-INS. + PA-INS.SG, PA-LOC. + PA-LOC.SG. Semantically, the author possessor is a human male or a human female.

Close analysis of these possessive constructions shows that the NP head in these constructions can be земля ‘land’ село ‘village’, наволок ‘flood-meadow’. The possessor can be князь ‘prince’ (4x) княгиня ‘princess’ (1x), or other owners presented by their names (3x).

Closer analysis of the given examples shows that they are in preposed position because they represent old/given information in the context; that is, they are mentioned earlier in the text.

The constructions in which the possessor is князь ‘prince’ or княгиня ‘princess’ are presented as two-possessive adjectives constructions because the possessive adjective are derived from the noun князь ‘prince’ or княгиня ‘princess’ and their names, such as in (9a–b); they both agree with the NP head, as I explained in section 1.2.2. It is also interesting to note that, in the phrase княгинины Огрофенины ‘princess Ogrofena’s’, the constituents are possessive adjectives formed from the appositives княгиня Огрофена. Furthermore, as it can be seen in example (9b), the possessive form княж- can form a part of a compounded possessive adjective княж-Михайлове. Other possessors in this
group are conveyed by a single possessive adjective; this possessive adjective is derived from the name of the referent, such as Васильев наволок ‘Vasilij’s flood-meadow’.

As noted above, there are only a few PREPA constructions in the Personal Ownership group. The reason for this may be that almost all of the properties discussed in the given contexts belonged either to the grand prince or to a monastery. The construction PREPA was not possible with the phrase ‘grand prince’, which never forms a possessive adjective, or with the name of a monastery because they consist of a noun and adjective. In such cases, possessivity is marked by the adnominal genitive.

3.2.5. Preposed possessive adjective + postposed adnominal genitive (PREPA + POSAG)

This type of possessive construction is represented by just three examples, found in the periods 1450–1500 (2) and 1500–1550 (1):

(10a) И мы тебе межу укажем и отведем со кня(я)же Дмитреевыми [PREPA] землями [PRP] Иванович(а) [POSAG] Зеленево селищо...(АСЭИ 607а).

(10b) Отведите ж в межы троицкие земли Зеленова селища Почапские земли от княж(ь) Ивановы [PREPA] земли [PRP] Константинович(а) [POSAG] ...(АСЭИ 607а).

In (10a), the NP head is землями ‘lands-INS.PL’, while the possessor expression is кня(я)же Дмитреевыми... Иванович(а) ‘prince-POS Dmitrij-POS.F.INS.PL... Ivanovič-GEN.SG’. In (10b), the NP head is земли ‘land-GEN.SG’, while the possessor expression is кня(я)же Ивановы ... Константинович(а) ‘prince-POS Ivan-POS.F.GEN.SG... Konstantinovič-GEN.SG’.
The NP head can be a prepositional phrase (2x) and direct object (1x) in post-verbal position. The possessor is a preposed possessive adjective and postposed adnominal genitive. Structurally, the preposed part is \{PA-INS. + PA-GEN.SG\} + PT - GEN.SG and PA-GEN.SG + PA-INS.PL} + PT GEN.SG, and \{PA-ACC + PA-ACC.SG\} + PT -GEN.SG.

Closer analysis shows that the NP head is земля ‘land’, while the possessor as a noun phrase which includes the title князь ‘prince’ + a proper name + a patronymic. The possessor is a ‘split’ construction in which possessive adjectives (derived from a noun князь ‘prince’ and the first name) are preposed, and a patronymic is postposed and in genitive. In these examples, as in some seen previously, the form княж is a non-agreeing part of a compound possessive adjective кн(я)же Дмитреевыми; the vowel e is not an ending but a linking vowel.

All the examples of the construction convey old information in their context, so the preposition of the possessive adjective is to be expected. Based on my corpus, the regular way of presenting possessor expressions which consist of a possessive adjective derived from a fore name plus a genitive patronymic is the following: the possessive is adjective preposed to the NP head, and the patronymic postposed.

3.2.6. Postposed possessive construction (POSPC)

There are only 2 possessive constructions in the Personal Ownership group in which the possessor a postposed presented as a ‘mix’ of possessive adjective and adnominal genitive. The examples date from the period 1450–1500:
(11a) Зеленево селище княжь Иванова Костянтинович(a)... (АСЭИ 607а).

(11b) Земля [S] княжь Иванова Костянтиновича [POSPC]... (АСЭИ 607а).

The NP head in (11a) is селище ‘village-NOM.SG’, and in (11b) Земля ‘land-NOM.SG’. In both examples, the possessor expression is княжь Иванова Костянтиновича ‘prince-POS Ivan-POS.NOM.SG Konstantinovič-GEN.SG’.

The NP head (селище ‘a small village’ or земля ‘land’) functions as a subject in post-verbal position. The possessor consists of a compound possessive adjective княжь with an appositive forename and an appositive patronymic — structurally, PA-NOM.SG + appositive-GEN.SG.

Closer analysis of the discourse context shows that the possessor is given information; it has already been mentioned in the context. However, both examples are contrastive; the prince’s property is contrasted with the monastery’s property. This focal status is the reason why both the possessors are postposed, a position ordinarily associated with new or asserted information.

3.2.7. Preposed adnominal genitive + postposed possessive adjective (PREAG + POSPA)

There are only two possessive construction of this type, found in the period 1450–1500:

(12a) Куда ходила соха и коса и топор, опрочь моег(о) сыны [PREAG] деревни [Obl] Ондреевы [POSPA]...(АСЭИ 437).

(12b) Ее[о] [PREAG] вотчину [DO] Семенову [POSPA]... (АСЭИ 601)
In (12a), the NP head is деревни ‘village-GEN.SG’, and the possessor expression is моег(о) сына… Ондреевы ‘my-M.SG son-G.SG… Andrej-POS.F.GEN.SG’. In (12b), the NP possessor is вотчину ‘patrimonial property-ACC.SG’; the possessor expression is Его… Семенову ‘he-GEN… Semen-ACC’, reflecting an underlying possessor ‘him, Semen’.

The NP heads are a prepositional object (11a) and a direct object (11b), both in post-verbal position. The possessor is an adnominal genitive in the preposed part and a possessive adjective in the postposed part. Structurally, the possessive construction can be analyzed as {PP-GEN.SG + N-GEN.SG} + PA-NOM.PL and PP-GEN.SG + PA-ACC.SG. The possessor is possessive pronoun его ‘his’ + name in one example and a kinship term мой сын ‘my son’ + appositive; the appositive is a possessive adjective formed from the referent’s name in another.

3.2.8. Preposed possessive adjective + postposed possessive adjective (PREPA + POSPA)

There is only one possessive construction of this type, found in the period 1550 – 1600:

(13) Промежу Ивановым [PREPA] двором[PRP] Баевым [POSPA] да и двором Михаилова сына… (АФЗХ 103)

In (13), the head is the prepositional object двором (enclosed-yard-INS.SG), a prepositional object (13) in post-verbal position; the possessor expression is Ивановым … Баевым (Ivan-POS.M.INS.SG Baj-POS.M.INS.SG), consisting of a preposed possessive adjective in the preposed part and a possessive adjective in the postposed part. The
possessor is thus two appositive possessive adjectives (Иванов-... Байев-) derived from
the proper name Иван Бай.19 Structurally, the possessive construction can be analyzed as
{PA- ins.sg + N- ins.sg} + PA- ins.sg. It is interesting that possessive adjectives are
derived from both constituents of the underlying possessor expression and that one of
them is preposed while another one is postposed. The possessor represents new
information in the context, as he is not mentioned earlier in the document.

3.3. Concluding remarks on Personal Ownership

To sum up the group of possessive constructions in Personal Ownership, the NP
head is always a noun which represents a property (земля ‘land’, село ‘village’, место
‘place’, двор ‘farm compound’, деревня ‘village’, наволок ‘flood-meadow’ etc.). The
possessor in these constructions is always a human being; both male or female possessors
are attested. The most frequent possessor in this group is the noun phrase великий князь
‘grand prince’.

Looking at the structure of the possessor type, based on the 206 examples that
comprise this group, it can be concluded that the postposed adnominal genitive (POSAG)
possessive construction is the pattern construction. This contradicts the claims in earlier
studies that the adnominal genitive was only incipient and limited in this period. The
possessor expression in this construction can be the title великий князь ‘grand prince’ or
великая княгиня ‘grand princess’ or else a kinship term with a reflexive possessive, e.g.,
отец свой ‘one’s father’, дед свой ‘one’s grandfather’ (see 3.1.1.). The title великий
князь is a fixed phrase; the adjective великий is always preposed in my examples.

19 Иван Бай Иванов сын ‘Ivan Baj Ivanov’s son’ (АФЗХ 103).
The possessor is postposed in most of the constructions because it represents new information in its discourse context; its referent is generally mentioned for the first time in the possessive construction. In cases where a given possessor is postposed, it is in contrast with another possessor, so it is actually being asserted as a new focus of attention.

Several other possessive constructions are found in this group. Where the possessor appears as a preposed adnominal genitive (PREAG), it represents old, given information (see 3.2.1.). Alternatively, the possessor can appear as a mixed construction with both a possessive adjective and an adnominal genitive; this so-called ‘ungoverned genitive’ can be attested either preposed (PREPC, 3.2.2.) or postposed (POSPC, 3.2.6.) or postposed to the NP head. In the PREPC type, the possessor is always the noun phrase царь и великий князь ‘tsar and grand prince’ or just князь ‘prince’. In the POSPC construction, the only attested possessor is князь ‘prince’. As expected, in PREPC the possessor comes before the NP head because it represents given information in the discourse context; the examples of POSPC are both in focus of contrast. As in POSAG, the underlying possessor noun phrase can include an adjective or pronoun; modified nouns do not form possessive adjectives in my corpus. Alternatively, the underlying possessor noun phrase can involve nouns in apposition (title + forename + patronymic); first two appositives are reflected as possessive adjectives, but patronymics do not form possessive adjectives in my corpus.

In other kinds of mixed constructions, the possessor expression is ‘split’ into preposed and postposed phrases. In the PREPA + POSAG (3.2.5.) and PREAG + PREPA (3.2.7) constructions, the possessor includes the noun князь ‘prince’ + forename
+ patronymic. All the examples represent old information in the context, which explains why the elements that can form possessive adjectives are preposed. In an interesting variant of this construction, the possessive of ‘prince’, княже-, can occur not as an agreeing adjective but as a non-agreeing form; apparently it compounds with the following proper possessive adjective as in княже Дмитреевыми ‘prince-POS Dmitrij-POS.INS.PL’ (3.2.5.). While all the examples happen to represent old information, in my corpus possessive adjectives derived from proper names are regularly preposed unless they are under some special emphasis, while patronymics, as adnominal genitives, are regularly postposed unless the NP head is under special emphasis.

Where the underlying possessor expression consists of a single noun or a title plus a forename, both elements can be reflected as possessive adjectives. In PREPA (3.2.4.) and POSPA (3.2.3.), all the constituents of the possessor phrase form possessive adjectives. As expected, the possessor expressions are preposed when they represent given information, and postposed when they represent new information in their discourse context. The small number of PREPA constructions in the Personal Ownership group is due, I think, to the fact that the properties discussed in the documents tended to belong either to the grand prince or to a monastery; the construction PREPA was not possible in such cases because the underlying possessor noun phrase consisted of a noun and adjective, so they mark possessivity by the adnominal genitive.
4.0. Preliminary remarks

As noted in the preceding chapter, there are two types of ownership in my database: the possessed object can belong to a person (земля Ивана Петрова ‘Ivan Petrov’s land’) or to an institution (земля Симона монастыря ‘Simon’s Monastery’s land’). In this chapter I will attempt to explain the Institutional Ownership group of possessive constructions. Unlike Personal Ownership, this is not a prototypical possession/possessive construction according to Taylor’s (1996: 339) classification, discussed in Chapter 1. The possessor type for this group is a social collective that holds property in common, and the NP head is the property itself. This is shown in the construction земля Кирилова монастыря ‘land of Cyril’s Monastery’, in which Кирилова монастыря ‘Cyril-POS.GEN.SG Monastery-GEN.SG’ is the owner, and земля ‘land-NOM.SG’ is the NP head of the possessive construction. If the possessor is the institution of the object/property, then all the possessors are expected to be inanimate, even though they represent human collectives.

In this chapter, I will first establish the pattern possessive construction for the Institutional Ownership group for the period from pre-1450 to post-1600 (section 4.1.). After establishing this, I will analyze and explain the semantic or syntactic (functional)
conditions motivating the less frequent possessive construction appearing during this period; I will also address the main reasons why authors did not follow the pattern possessive construction (section 4.2.).

In the database, the institutional ownership group is represented by 165 examples out of a total of 1700 possessive constructions in all the periods examined. The chronological distribution of the examples by fifty-year periods is presented in Table 4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>before 1450</th>
<th>1450–1500</th>
<th>1500–1550</th>
<th>1550–1600</th>
<th>after 1600</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>number of examples</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1. Institutional Ownership group chronologically

Looking at each period separately, we see the following distribution of Institutional Ownership possessive constructions by time period (Table 4.1.): before 1450 — 6 (3.63%); 1450–1500 — 59 (35.75%); 1500–1550 — 55 (33.93%); 1550–1600 — 37 (22.42%); after 1600 — 7 (4.24%).
As noted elsewhere, when I selected the documents for this research, I tried to have each period represented by an approximately equal number of documents. Nevertheless, as can be seen from Figure 4.1, these efforts did not result in an equal distribution of the possessive constructions that form the group institutional ownership. The attestation of the construction is comparable for the periods 1450–1500 and 1500–1550, somewhat less for the period 1550–1600, but significantly less for the periods before 1450 and after 1600. Proportionately, Institutional Ownership is least represented before 1450 and most represented 1450–1500.

Based on the classified database, the following types of possessive constructions are found in the group Institutional Ownership (Table 4.2.).
Table 4.2. Types of possessive constructions in the Institutional Ownership group chronologically

The relative proportions of the possessive constructions that are found/occur in the Institutional Ownership group for the entire period studied is shown in Figure 4.2.
In section 4.1, I will consider the various categories of possessives presented in Table 4.2 and Figure 4.2 for the Institutional Ownership group over all periods.

4.1. Pattern possessive construction for the Institutional Ownership group

In accordance with my methodology, the most frequent possessive construction in any given semantic group is treated as the pattern possessive construction for that group. As shown in Table 4.2 and Figure 4.2 the most frequent construction for the Institutional Ownership group if all time periods taken together is the POSAG construction (post-posed adnominal genitive) (68=41.21%).
4.1.1. Before 1450

In the period before 1450, POSAG construction in the Institutional Ownership group is represented by just one example given below:

(1) А левая сторона земля [S] Запрудна Зеленциског(о) села [POSAG]…(ACSI 110).

In (1), “And the left side is the land [known as] Zaprudna belonging to the village of Zelencino,” the predicate nominal земля (land-NOM.SG) serves as the NP head, and Зеленциског(о) села (Zelencino-POS. village-GEN.SG) as the possessor expression. Structurally, this can be analyzed as SK-GEN.SG + N-GEN.SG. The possessor expression as a whole cannot be realized as a possessive adjective because includes an adjectival modifier, Зеленциског(о) (derived from the toponym Zelencino, which itself contains the possessive morpheme -in-).

The possessor expression in (1) is postposed to the NP head, as expected, because it represents focal (contrastive) information. The context is the demarcation of properties, so the property on the “left side” is contrasted with the one on the “right side” (not quoted in (1)).

4.1.2. 1450–1500

In the period of 1450–1500, we find 18 POSAG constructions, which makes it the most frequent possessive construction for the Institutional Possessor group in this period. Some illustrative examples are given below:
(2a) А грамоту дану писал слуга [S] Сергиева монастыря [POSAG] Гридя Подгубок...(АСЭИ 408).

(2b) Пустошь Лутковъскую [DO] Серьеева монастыря [POSAG] в Дмитровском уезде в лесе в Синкове...(АСЭИ 556).

In (2a) “And the donation charter was written by the servant of Sergius’ Monastery Gridja Podgubok,” the subject слуга ‘servant-nom.sg’ serves as the NP head of the possessive construction, and Сергиева монастыря (Sergius-POS.M.GEN.SG monastery-m.gen.sg) as the possessor expression. In (2b) “the uncultivated land Лутковскайa [or Lutkovo] of Sergius’ Monastery,” the direct object Пустошь Лутковъскую (uncultivated-land-acc.sg Lutkovskaja -f.acc.sg) serves as the NP head, and Сергеева монастыря (Sergius-POS.M.GEN.SG monastery-m.gen.sg) as the possessor expression.

In constructions like (2a–b), the NP head can appear in a variety of syntactic roles: subject (12x), as in (2a); direct object (3x), as in (2b); prepositional object (1x); or other constituent in an oblique case (2x). As for its placement in the sentence, the NP head is found in pre-verbal position in 3 examples and post-verbal position in 15. As elsewhere in the Institutional Ownership group, the NP head in these constructions represent different types of properties, such as земля ‘land’, село ‘village’, пустошь ‘heathland’, двор ‘farm complex’, as well as nouns that denote human chattels, such as слуга ‘servant’. The postposed adnominal genitive consists of just a possessive adjective and a noun: PA GEN.SG +N GEN.SG, SK GEN.SG +N GEN.SG, N GEN.SG +PA-

---

20 I have not classified слуга ‘servant/slave’ in the semantic type Office, because servants (or slaves) were actually owned by the Institution or Person; the possessor/owner could kill them, sell them, or exchange them. Moreover, unlike, say, being an ‘abbot’ or ‘prince’, being a servant or slave is not a social function (office) but a social class.
Semantically, the possessor can be either an institution or a place/location. In most of the examples, the possessor is Сергей (or Сергиев) монастырь ‘Sergius’ monastery’, while in the rest of the examples the possessor is a village. In my corpus, as noted above, whenever the semantic possessor is a noun phrase that includes an adjective, whether possessive or of another type, the possessor expression that reflects it is regularly reflected as an adnominal genitive. Compounds of adjectives and nouns like Modern Russian великомняжеский ‘grand-princely’, derived from {великий князь}, are not attested.

The possessor expressions in this set of examples are all postposed. This is as is expected, because they represent newly asserted information in the context; the given referents are being mentioned for the first time.

4.1.3. 1500–1550

The POSAG construction is also the most frequent possessive construction in the period 1500–1550, represented by 29 examples, as illustrated in (3).

(3) с Сергеевские пустоши [PRP] Симанова монастыря [POSAG]... (АФХЗ 21).

In (3), “from the uncultivated land [known as] Sergeev of Simon’s Monastery,” the prepositional object Сергеевские пустоши ‘Sergeev–POS.F.GEN.SG. пустоши F.GEN.SG’ serves as the NP head, and Симанова монастыря (Simon-POS.M.GEN.SG monastery-GEN.SG) as the possessor expression. In this set of examples, the NP head can appear in a variety of syntactic roles — subject (18x); direct object (4x); prepositional object (4x), as in (3); or other constituent in an oblique case (3x). Thus its particular
syntactic role does not seem to affect the choice of the construction. In terms of its placement in the sentence, the NP head is found in pre-verbal (topic) position in 6 examples, and in post-verbal (comment) position in 23.

The postposed adnominal genitive consists of a possessive adjective with a noun: PA-GEN.SG +N-GEN.SG, SK-GEN.SG +N-GEN.SG. Semantically, the possessor can be an institution or a place. Given the nature of my corpus (land documents, typically stored in monastic archives), the semantic possessor is \{X-о́в монасты́рь\} ‘X’s monastery’ (e.g., Симанов ‘Simon’s’, Кирилов ‘Cyril’s’, and Сергееv ‘Sergius’) in most of the examples.

All of the possessor expressions consist of a possessive adjective plus a noun; in general, when the underlying possessor phrase includes a modifier plus a noun, the possessor phrase is consistently realized as an adnominal genitive. It is interesting that the modifier in these expressions — that is, the name of the monastery — can appear in two variants, one a possessive adjective derived from the name of the monastery founder, and the other an sk-adjective derived from the possessive: Симанов монасты́рь ~ Симановский монасты́рь, Кирилов монасты́рь ~ Кириловский монасты́рь. The apparent equivalence of my data do not support Bratishenko’s (2005) claim that sk-adjectives are less individuating than “true” possessives in -ov- or -in-; in the given cases, they have exactly the same referents. Investigation of the discourse structure did not reveal any specific semantic condition for why a given scribe would choose one of these forms over the other.

Analysis of the information structure in this set of examples reveals that the possessor phrase is postposed in most cases because it conveys new information; that is, the referents are mentioned for the first time in the given context. However, there are
some constructions in which the possessor represents given information in the context, so that it might be expected to precede the NP head (the possessed item). Further analysis did not give me a clear answer why the scribe chooses to postpone information that is already given in the discourse. (Note that examples of PREAG, with the expected preposition of old information, are well attested; see 4.2.1, below.)

4.1.4. 1550–1600

The POSAG construction is also the most frequent possessive construction in the period 1500–1550, represented by 18 examples, as illustrated in (4a–b).

(4a) Дав в Буе внутри городе двор осадной [S] Симанова монастыря [POSAG] …(АФЗХ 130).
(4b) Жалоба мне, государь, на старца на Касьяна, да на слугу Пашка [DO] Симанова монастыря [POSAG]… (АФЗХ 154)

In (4a), “and in Buj, within the citadel, is the fortified enclosure of Simon’s monastery,” the noun phrase двор осадной ‘court-NOM.SG fortified–M.NOM.SG.) serves as the NP head, and Симанова монастыря (‘Simon-POS.M.GEN.SG monastery-GEN.SG’) as the possessor expression. In (4b), “I have a complaint, lord, against the elder Kas’jan and against the servant Pashko of Simon’s monastery’, the prepositional object слугу Пашка (‘servant–M.ACC.SG Pashko–M.ACC.SG’) serves as the NP head, perhaps in conjunction with на старца на Касьяна (‘against elder-ACC.SG against Kas’jan-ACC’), while Симанова монастыря (‘Simon-POS.M.GEN.SG monastery-GEN.SG) functions as the possessor expression.
In POSAG constructions like (4a–b), the NP head can appear as subject (13x) and as prepositional object (5x); judging from this and other sets of data from Institutional Ownership, its syntactic role does not seem to determine its being chosen over other constructions. As for placement in the sentence, the NP head is found in post-verbal position (typically, the rheme or comment portion of the sentence) in 12 examples and in pre-verbal position (typically, the theme or topic portion of the sentence) in 6.

The postposed adnominal genitive consists of a postposed adjective with a noun: PA-GEN.SG +N-GEN.SG and SK-GEN.SG +N-GEN.SG. In the given set of data, the possessor expression occurs in postposed position even when it represents old information. Semantically, the possessor can be either an institution or a place/location as a collective settlement; the possessor is a Симанов монастырь ‘Simon’s Monastery’ in 13 out of the 18 examples — not surprisingly, considering that my principal source of data from this period is a collection of documents from that monastery’s archives. It is interesting that in this period, as opposed to earlier ones (see above), Simon’s Monastery is referred to only as Симанов монастырь; the sk-adjective, which is attested in the previous periods, does not occur. I investigated all texts in my corpus in which the given referent appears; I found that the variant Симановский монастырь does, in fact, occur in the period 1550–1600, but only in semantic classes other than Institutional Possessor.

4.1.5. After 1600

The period after 1600 is represented by only 2 POSAG constructions (5a–b):

(5b) И по нашему указу и по приговору всее земли<sup>21</sup> [Obl] Симанова монастыря [POSAG]... (АФЗХ 236).

In (5a), “the place of Simon’s Monastery,” the direct object место (‘place—ACC.SG’) serves as the NP head, and Симанова монастыря (Simon POS.M.GEN.SG monastery-GEN.SG) as the possessor expression. In (5b) “And by our command and by the adjudication of all the land of Simon’s Monastery,” the oblique constituent всее земли (entire-PRON.F.DAT.SG land-F.DAT.SG) serves as the NP head, and Симанова монастыря (Simon POS.M.GEN.SG monastery-M.GEN.SG) as the possessor expression. In both examples, the possessor phrase is found in post-verbal position (typically, the comment or rheme). The postposed adnominal genitive is a noun phrase consisted of a noun and adjective, structurally shown as: PA-GEN.SG+ N-GEN.SG.

In (5a), which is the first sentence of a document, the possessor phrase represents new information, so it is not surprising that it is postposed — the typical placement for asserted items. In (5b), it is a previously mentioned entity, but there is a special circumstance here: the head of the adnominal genitive possessor phrase is itself an adnominal genitive; presumably, it would have caused an ambiguous or even incoherent structure if Симанова монастыря were placed between по приговору ‘according to adjudication-DAT.SG’ and its adnominal genitive object, всее земли. Thus the violation of the ordinary information-structure rules in (5b) may be caused by the pragmatic consideration of clarity (avoiding processing difficulties).

<sup>21</sup>The possessive construction по приговору всее земли ‘according to adjudication’ expresses the direct object of the deverbal noun приговор ‘adjudication’ and I only noticed one example in my corpus. For a discussion see see Eckhoff (2006: 82-83).
4.1.6. Overview of the pattern construction for the Institutional Ownership group

The fact that the pattern construction in the Institutional Ownership semantic type involves the adnominal genitive shows once again that the given construction was not marginal in Old Russian, as other authors have claimed. As noted above, the POSAG construction is the most frequent possessive construction in the Institutional Ownership group; it represents not a majority but a plurality (68/165 = 45.45%) of the examples (based on the total number of occurrences in all periods). Looking at the distribution of the POSAG possessive construction by fifty-year periods, it can be seen that the distribution of the examples is roughly comparable in the periods 1450–1500, 1500–1550 and 1550–1600 (18, 29 and 18). The exception are periods before 1450 and after 1600, which are represented by only one and two POSAG constructions, respectively; the most frequent construction in those periods are PREAG and POSSK, as will be explained later (4.2.1).

The nature of the semantic category is that the owner/possessor is a human collective — an institution or a village; the fact that the majority of the examples have Sergius Monastery as the possessor is probably due to the content of the collections from which I drew my database. It can be noted Simonov Monastery was a very rich institution with a lot of land and servants; moreover, it seems to have been involved in much litigation over land in the period investigated.

The possessor in the pattern constructed is postposed in most of the examples because it represents new information in the context; postposition is typical for asserted information in Old Russian. However, there are some cases in which the possessor is postposed even though it represents old information. There appear to be no special syntactic conditions (e.g., focus of contrast) why these appear in postposition. One can
hypothesize that, when the entire possessive construction is equally given or equally new, the possessor expression will tend to carry greater informational weight (be of relatively high interest) in the texts included in my corpus, which focus on real estate and were written as deeds, grants, or proofs of ownership.

As mentioned in Chapter 3, some of the previous research has argued that the use of adnominal genitive constructions was not free or widespread in Russian in the fourteen–seventeenth centuries. My data in this chapter do not support this conclusion; the adnominal genitive is the most frequent construction in this group as well.

4.2. Less frequent possessive constructions

While POSAG is the pattern possessive construction for the Institutional Ownership group, there are 97 examples of other types possessive constructions in the database. In the following subsections, I will attempt to explain what conditions are presented in those examples in order to explain the deviations.

4.2.1. Preposed adnominal genitive (PREAG)

There are 36 possessive constructions in the Institutional Ownership/possessor group in which the possessor is presented as a preposed adnominal genitive. None of the examples are attested in the period before 1450; there are 4 in the period 1450–1500, 15 in the period 1500–1550, 12 in the period 1550–1600, and 5 in the period after 1600. The following are representative examples:
(6) И печерской слуга Федько, и Симанова монастыря [PREAG] слуга [S], и спаской протопоп Иван з братьею меж себя просили крестьного целованья да поля... (АФХЗ 154).

In (6), “And the Caves servant Fed’ko, and Simon’s Monastery’s servant, and the Savior archpriest Ivan with the brothers asked for an oath and judicial duel among themselves,” the NP head is one of a series of conjoined subjects, слуга (‘servant-NOM.SG’), while Симанова монастыря (Simon-POS.M.GEN.SG monastery-M.GEN.SG) serves as the possessor expression. Here it can be noted that the preposed adnominal genitive is treated as a parallel to the sk-adjectives печерской (‘Caves-POS.M.NOM.SG’) and спаской (‘Savior-POS.M.NOM.SG’), both referring to other religious institutions.

In the majority of the examples, the NP head is земля ‘land’, but other nouns which refer to possessed objects, properties, or serfs, e.g., село ‘village’, деревня ‘village’, лес ‘forest’ or хрестьяне ‘peasants’; the same nouns also occur as NP heads in the pattern construction, POSAG (see 4.1.1.). The NP head can appear in a variety of syntactic roles: subject (16x), and direct object (10x) and other constituents in oblique case (8x) and prepositional object (2x). Thus we can conclude that the syntactic role of the head does not determine the writers’ choice of PREAG over other constructions. As for its placement in the sentence, the NP head is found in pre-verbal (typically, topic) position in 12 examples and post-verbal (typically, comment) position in 24. This may suggest that PREAG was more favored in the comment (asserted portion) than in the topic (continued/presupposed portion), though it does not imply that the possessor phrase was necessarily the asserted entity, as opposed to the NP head.
Structurally, the preposed possessive phrase can take three forms: PA-GEN.SG + N-GEN.SG, PP-GEN.SG, SK-GEN.SG N-GEN.SG. Semantically, the possessor is a village in one example and an institution elsewhere.

In analyzing the possessor types, I find almost the same set in the PREAG possessive construction as I did in the pattern possessive construction; in the majority of the examples, the possessor is a monastery — specifically, Симанов or Симонов монастырь ‘Simon’s monastery’. The possessor expression can also be a noun which refers to a location or else an anaphoric possessive pronoun (их ‘their’ or ее ‘her’).

Furthermore, apart from the anaphoric pronouns, all the possessor expressions consist of a two-constituent phrase with a modifying adjective and a noun. As mentioned in 4.1.6, semantic possessors consisting of different parts of speech do not seem to be convertible into possessive adjectives in my corpus. (Cf. {великий князь} ‘grand prince’, which cannot form a possessive adjective, unlike the unmodified {князь} ‘prince’, which has the derived adjective княж-.)

I compared the discourse and syntactic contexts in which the PREAG appear, and found out that, in 25 of the 36 examples, the possessor expressions convey given information; this typically goes into preposed position in Old Russian. The anaphoric pronouns, in particular, are by definition given information. However, there are 11 examples, including (6), above, in which the possessor is preposed even though it conveys information that has not yet been mentioned. In these cases, the emphasis is clearly on the possessed entity (the NP head) rather than the possessor expression; as illustrated in (6), the NP heads are appositives to names that are in contrastive focus.
4.2.2. Postposed possessive adjectives with the suffix -sk- (POSSK)

There are 27 possessive constructions in the Institutional Ownership group in which the possessor is presented as a postposed possessive adjective formed with the suffix -sk- ("sk-adjective"). There are three examples in the period before 1450, 19 in the period 1450–1500, and 5 in the period 1500–50, but none after 1550. The following are representative examples:

(7a) Дав иные деревни [S] манастырьскы [POSSK] и пустоши что к тому манастирю потягли... (АСЭИ 246).

(7b) Се яз… дал есмь в дом святои Троице Сергеева манастиря игумену Зиновью з братьею свои пустоши [DO] ярополские [POSSK]...(АСЭИ 96).

In (7a), “And also other monastery villages and uncultivated lands, which belonged to that monastery,” the noun деревни (‘villages–NOM.PL’) serves as the NP head, and манастырьскы (‘monastery-pos.F.NOM.PL’) as the possessor expression. In (7b), “I… have given to the house of the Holy Trinity of Sergius’ Monastery, to the abbot Zinovij with the brothers, my uncultivated lands in Jaropolč,” the direct object phrase свои пустоши (REF-POS.F.ACC.PL uncultivated-lands–ACC.PL) serves as the NP head, and ярополские (Jaropolč-POS.F.ACC.PL) as the possessor expression.

In the given set of examples, the NP head can appear in different syntactic slots — subject (21x), as in (7a); direct object (4x), as in (7b); or prepositional object (2x). Thus its syntactic role does not appear to determine the choice of PREAG over the pattern construction. As for its placement in the sentence, the NP head is found in pre-verbal (topic) position in 10 examples and post-verbal (comment) in 17. The NP head
can be the noun село ‘village’, земля ‘land’, деревня ‘village’, пустошь ‘empty land’, слуга ‘servant’ etc. The possessor is a monastery in most of the examples. Structurally, SK- NOM.PL, SK- ACC.SG and SK- LOC.SG.

The postposition of the possessive expressions is explained by the normal word-ordering principles of Old Russian discourse. Most of this set of possessive expressions (24x), including (7a), are in contrastive focus with other noun phrases. The remainder, including (7b), convey new information that is being asserted (3x).

4.2.3. Preposed possessive adjective with the suffix -sk- (PRESK)

In total, there are 17 possessive constructions in the Institutional Ownership group in which the possessor is presented as a preposed sk-adjective. There are 2 examples in the period before 1450, 7 in the period 1450–1500, and 4 each in the periods 1500–50 and 1550–1600. No examples are found in the period after 1600. The following are representative examples:

(8a) А межа тем деревням от монастырские [PRESK] земли [PRP]...

(8b) А послескои прилучскими даёт перевозником оуглечьским с монастырскихъ [PRESK] хр(e)стьямъ [PRP] оброкъ по двенатцати алтын на лето...(АФЭИ 215).

In (8a), “and the boundary of those villages with the monastery’s land,” земли (‘land-GEN.SG’) serves as the NP head, and монастырские (‘monastery-pos.F.GEN.SG’) as the possessor expression. Similarly, in (8b), “And the Priluka steward gives to the Uglić conveyors each 12 altyns per year with the rent of the monastery’s peasants,” the NP head, which is itself a PREAG possessor expression, хр(e)стьямъ (‘peasants-
M. GEN. PL”), while монастырскихъ (‘monastery-pos.M. GEN. PL’) is the possessor expression.

In these examples, the nouns attested as the NP head are село ‘village’, земля ‘land’, деревня ‘village’, пустошь ‘empty land’, христиане ‘peasants’, and человек ‘person’ (connoting a servant). The head can occur in various syntactic functions — subject (5x); prepositional object (8x), as in (8a); or other constituent in an oblique case (4x), as in (8b). Thus the particular syntactic role of the NP head does not seem to influence the choice of PRESK over other constructions. As for its placement in the sentence, the NP head is pre-verbal in 7 of the examples and post-verbal in 10.

In all of the examples, the possessor is an institution (monastery); the only attested possessor expression is the adjective монастырьский ‘monastery’s’ (with spelling variants), derived from the noun монастырь ‘monastery’ by the suffix -sk–. Structurally, the possessor expression appears as SK- in different cases. In all the examples, the possessor expression conveys information already known in the context, since the monastery has already been named more specifically and is the only monastery to have been identified in the context; therefore, it is not surprising that it is preposed to the NP head.

4.2.4. Postposed possessive construction (POSPC)

There are 10 possessive constructions in the Institutional Ownership group in which the postposed possessor expression is a mixed construction involving of a possessive adjective with the suffix -sk- (see 4.2.3, above) and an adnominal genitive (see 4.1, above). Nine of the examples are found in the period 1450–1500, and one in the
period 1500–1550. The following is a representative example; all of the tokens have the same possessor:

(9) Так рек старець Исая: Жалоба, господине, на того князя Ивана,—пашет, господине, у нас нашу [PP землю [DO] про(е)цкою Сергіева монастиря [POSPC]… (АСЭИ 607а).

In (9), “[We have] a complaint, lord, against that prince Ivan; he is cultivating, lord, among us our land, belonging to Trinity-Sergius’ Monastery,” the direct object землю (’land-ACC.SG’) serves as the NP head, and про(е)цкою Сергіева монастиря (’Trinity-POS.F.ACC.SG Sergius-POS.M.GEN.SG Monastery-GEN.SG’) as the possessor expression. There is an additional possessor expression preposed to the head consisting solely of the pronominal adjective нашу ‘we-POS.ACC.SG’. This may be fully-co-referential with the postposed possessor expression (’land of ours, [that is,] Trinity-Sergius’ Monastery’), or it may denote a subpossessor (’our land, [ultimately] belonging to Trinity-Sergius’ Monastery [of whom we are subjects’]).

The NP head can be a subject (2x), direct object (4x), prepositional (2x) or a constituent in a oblique case (2x). The only lexemes attested in this role in the given set of examples are the nouns земля ‘land’, луг ‘meadow’, and пустошь ‘an empty land’.

In the possessor phrase, the possessive adjective проецкої ‘of the Trinity’, which is formed the with the suffix -sk-, is in apposition to the genitive NP Сергіева монастиря ‘Sergius’ Monastery’, which consists of a possessive adjective plus a noun. The adjective in -sk- agrees with the NP head while the appositive is a two-word noun phrase and it is in genitive. Semantically, the possessor is the focus of attention, which
probably explains the otherwise unexpected postposition of the adjective. Structurally, this can be represented as SK-NOM.SG + [PA-GEN.SG +N-GEN.SG].

4.2.5. Preposed possessive adjective with suffix -sk- + postposed adnominal genitive (PRESK + POSAG)

This type of possessive construction is represented by just 4 examples. There is one example each in the periods 1450–1500 and 1500–50, and two more in the period 1550–1600.

(10a) Ездили бы торговати в монастырьское [PRESK] село [PRP] Симанова монастыря [POSAG] в Весь Егонскую... (АФХЗ 142).

(10b) Да Калина Михаилов сын, троетцкои [PRESK] слуга [S] Сергиеева монастыря [POSAG]... (АСЭИ 599).

In (10a), “They should go to trade in the monastery village of Simon’s Monastery, to Ves’ Egonskaja,” the prepositional object село serves as the NP head, and монастырьское... Симанова монастыря (monastery-pos.N.ACC.SG Simon-monastery-M.GEN.SG) as the possessor expression. In (10b) “And Kalina, Mixail’s son, a servant of Trinity-Sergius Monastery,” the noun слуга (‘servant–M.NOM.SG’) serves as the NP head, and троетцкои... Сергиеева монастыря (‘Trinity-Sergius-monastery–M.GEN.SG’) as the possessor expression.

The NP head can be a subject (1x) ora prepositional phrase (3x); it can be in preverbal (topic) position (1x) or postverbal (comment) position (3x). The attested NP heads are село ‘village’, земля ‘land’, слуга ‘servant' and пустошь ‘uncultivated land’.
The possessor expression involves a preposed possessive adjective with the suffix -sk- plus a postposed adnominal genitive, as seen in (10a–b). Structurally, the preposed part can be represented as SK-INS.PL/ACC.SG, and the postposed part as PA - GEN.SG + N - GEN.SG, SK NOM.SG. +{PA-GEN.SG.+ N-GEN.SG}. More specifically, the possessor expression is a ‘split’ construction with a preposed possessive adjective derived from {монастырь} ‘monastery’ and a postposed adnominal genitive of {Симанов манастирь} ‘Simon’s Monastery’. In (10b), the semantic possessor is a different institution, Trinity-Sergius Monastery. The possessor expression consists of a preposed adjective derived from the first part of the name of the institution (троитково ‘of the Trinity’, from {Троица}) and a postposed adnominal genitive noun phrase conveying the second part of the name of the institution (Сергиева монастыря ‘Sergius’ Monastery’).

In these examples, possessive adjectives are preposed and the adnominal genitives are postposed. This means that the preposition of possessive adjectives and the postposition of the adnominal genitive follow the overall pattern in my data for possessor expressions consisting of unlike parts of speech to be split before and after the NP head. (The only exceptions are cases when the NP head itself is under special emphasis; then the entire possessor expression can be preposed.)

4.2.6. Other constructions

There are other possessive constructions found in my database that belong to the group Institutional Ownership, but they are attested by only one or two examples. This is not sufficient information on which to base any conclusions.
There are only two possessive constructions in the Institutional Ownership group in which the possessor expression consists solely of a preposed possessive construction (PREPC). The examples date to the periods 1500–1550 and 1550–1600.

(11a) А случитца суд сместной тем их монастырским [PREPC] людем [Obl] з городцкими людми... (АСЭИ 637).

(11b) Да их монастырским [PREPC] крестьяном [Obl]... (АФХЗ 121).

In (11a), “And if there is a mixed court for those monastery people of theirs with town people,” the indirect object людем (‘people’-M.DAT.PL.) serves as the NP head, and их монастырским (they-POS.GEN.PL monastery-POS.M.DAT.PL) as the possessor expression. Similarly, in (11b), “And their monastery peasants,” крестьяном (‘peasants-DAT.PL’) serves as the NP head, and их монастырским (they-POS.GEN.PL monastery-POS.M.DAT.PL) as the possessor expression.

The NP heads, which refer to human chattels (хрестыне ‘peasants’, and люди ‘people’, i.e., ‘serfs’), are constituents in oblique cases. One of the examples is in pre-verbal position, and the other in post-verbal. Semantically, the possessor is a monastery. The possessor expression is a noun phrase, which consists of the possessive pronoun их ‘their’ plus a co-referential possessive adjective with the suffix -ьsk–, монастырский ‘monastery-POS’. Structurally, this can be shown as PP-GEN.PL + SK-DAT.PL or PP-GEN.PL + SK-DAT.PL. The possessor expressions are preposed, in accordance with the typical pattern for given information. The presence of the anaphoric pronoun and the non-specific adjective монастырский are clear indicators of givenness.
The PREAG + POSSK construction is represented by just one example, found in the period 1450–1500:

(12) И кто у них в том дворе в манастырском учнеть жи́ти людеи, и тем их [PREAG] людем [Obl] манстырским [POSSK] не надобе моя некоторая дань... (АСЭИ 349).

In (12), “And whatever people begin to live among them in that monastery compound, those monastery people of theirs do not have to pay any of my tribute,” людем (‘people-dat.pl.’) serves as the NP head, and их монастырским (‘they-monastery-pos.pl’) as the possessor expression.

The NP head is a constituent in the dative case (the subject of a modal expression) in postverbal position. The possessor expression consists of a preposed anaphoric pronoun их ‘their’ plus a postposed possessive adjective with the suffix -sk-: PP+SK=DAT.PL. The preposing of the anaphoric pronoun is expected, as it is old information in the context; there is insufficient information to determine why the adjective in -sk- is postposed.

4.3. Concluding remarks on Institutional Ownership

Institutional ownership does not represent prototypical possession, as defined by Taylor (1996: 339), since the possessor is not an individual human being but an institution or collective. Within the possessive constructions of this group, the NP head is almost a noun which represents either real estate (земля ‘land’, село ‘village’, место ‘place’, двор ‘yard/building’, деревня ‘village’, наволок ‘a part of a land near the
water’ etc.) or human chattels (крестьяне ‘peasants’, слуга ‘servant’, человек ‘person’, люди ‘people’).

The possessor is always a monastery or, less frequently, a village. Overall, the most frequent possessor in this group is Симанов манастирь ‘Simon’s monastery’, followed by Кирилов манастирь ‘Cyril’s Monastery’ and Сергееv манастирь ‘Sergius’ Monastery’). The names of these institutions (referents) appear in two variants, one with the founder’s name given as a possessive adjective, the other with it given as an -ьск- adjective: Симанов ~ Симановский монастырь. Investigation of the surrounding discourse did not reveal any reason why a given author would choose one of these forms over the other; this may have been a matter of individual preference or scriptorium practice.

Looking at the structure of the possessor type, based on the 165 examples that comprise this group, it can be concluded that the pattern construction is postposed adnominal genitive (POSAG). The postposing of the possessor expression can be explained, in most of the examples, by the fact that it represents new information in the context. In some of the cases where the possessor expression conveys old information, it may still be asserted in its context; this is likely on generic grounds, since the central concern of the documents is property rights, i.e., who is the rightful owner.

Several other possessive constructions are found in this group. These deviations from the pattern construction can have various motivations. In the POSSK (4.2.2.) and PRESK (4.2.3.), the possessor is an unmodified noun (манастырь ‘monastery’); this follows the general pattern in my data for possessors consisting of bare nouns to be conveyed by possessive adjectives (see Section 4.2.3). The noun манастирь forms a
possessive adjective with the suffix -sk- because it is not just institution but also a residence (see Chapter 8). The placement of the possessor expression before or after the NP head seems to be determined by well-observed patterns of information structure; in PRESK the possessor expression conveys given information, and in POSSK new or newly asserted information. (Givenness is a precondition for preposing, though it may not be a sufficient condition.) The same principles influence the preposing of the possessor in PREAG (4.2.1) and its postposing in POSPC (4.2.4).

A more complicated situation is reflected in the mixed constructions PREPC (4.2.6), POSPC (4.2.4), and PRESK + POSAG (4.2.6), where the possessor expression involves both an adjective with the suffix -sk- and an “ungoverned” adnominal genitive. The possessor expression involves two terms in semantic apposition — the adjective троицкой ‘of Trinity’, derived from Троица ‘Trinity’ (to which the monastery is dedicated) and the noun phrase Sergiev монастырь ‘Sergius’ monastery’, which itself includes a possessive adjective (derived from the name of the founder). The first term agrees with NP head, while its appositive, as a two-word noun phrase, cannot form a possessive adjective and so goes into the genitive. While there are very few instances of these constructions in Institutional Ownership, the examples seem to conform to the general pattern for appositives (see section 4.2.4.): those parts of the possessor phrase that consist of single nouns or adjectives are conveyed with possessive adjectives and agree with the NP head; those that involve a multi-word noun phrase do not agree and are in the genitive.
5.0. Preliminary remarks

The semantic classification Author is defined by the possessor type and its relationship to the NP head. This is not a prototypical possession/possessive construction by Taylor’s (1996: 339) classification, discussed in Chapter 1: while there is an object of possession, it is not (necessarily) in the possessor’s control; most importantly, it does not exist before the “possessor/author” creates it. The possessor type for this group is the author of a text — either a written document or a speech act recorded in writing — and the NP head is the text itself, as shown in the construction по приказу великого князя ‘by order of the grand prince’ in which великого князя ‘grand-GEN.SG prince-GEN.SG’ is the ‘author’ of the text, and приказу ‘order-DAT.SG’ is the NP head of the possessive construction. If the possessor is the author/writer of the text, then all possessors are expected to be human (male or female).

In this Chapter, I establish a pattern possessive construction for the Author group for the period from pre-1450 to post-1600. In addition, after establishing the pattern possessive construction, I analyze and explain the semantic or syntactic (functional) conditions motivating the less frequent possessive construction appearing during this
In the database, the author group is represented by 183 examples out of a total of 1700 possessive constructions in all the periods examined. The chronological distribution of the examples by fifty-year periods is presented in Table 5.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>before 1450</th>
<th>1450–1500</th>
<th>1500–1550</th>
<th>1550–1600</th>
<th>after 1600</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.1. Author group chronologically**

Looking at each period separately, we see the following distribution of Author possessive constructions by time period (Table 5.1.): 23 before 1450 (12.5%); 55 in 1450–1500 (29.89%); 32 in 1500–1550 (17.93%); 34 in 1550–1600 (18.47%); 39 after 1600 (21.19%).
As noted in the chapter on methodology, while selecting the documents for this research, I tried to have each of the given periods be represented by an approximately equal number of documents. Nevertheless, as can be seen from Figure 5.1, these efforts did not result in an equal distribution of the possessive constructions that form the author group for all the time periods though 1500–1550, 1550–1600, and after 1600 are comparable. Proportionately, Author is least represented before 1450 and most represented 1450–1500.

Based on the classified database, the following types of possessive constructions are found in the group Author (Table 5.2.).
| Possessor      | before 1450 | 1450–1500 | 1500–1550 | 1550–1600 | after 1600 | Total |
|               |            |           |           |           |            |       |
| POSAG         | 2          | 20        | 13        | 14        | 24         | 73    |
| PREAG + POSAG | 16         | 16        | 7         | 0         | 0          | 39    |
| PREPA         | 0          | 0         | 0         | 6         | 11         | 17    |
| PREAG         | 5          | 5         | 2         | 2         | 2          | 16    |
| PREPA + POSAG | 0          | 9         | 3         | 3         | 0          | 15    |
| PREPC         | 0          | 3         | 2         | 7         | 2          | 14    |
| POSPC         | 0          | 2         | 5         | 2         | 0          | 9     |

**Table 5.2.** Types of possessive constructions in the Author group chronologically

The relative proportions of the possessive constructions that are found/occur in the Author group for the entire period studied is shown graphically in Figure 5.2.
In section 5.1 I will consider the various categories of possessives presented in Table 5.2 and Figure 5.2 for the Author group over all periods.

**5.1. Pattern possessive construction for the Author group**

As noted in section 1.3, the most frequent possessive construction in any given semantic group is treated as the pattern possessive construction for that group. As shown in Table 5.2 and Figure 5.2, the POSAG construction (post-posed adnominal genitive) is the most frequent construction for the Author group if all time periods taken together (73 = 39.67%).
5.1.1. Before 1450

In the period before 1450, POSAG constructions in the Author group are represented by just two examples in my database.22

(1a) *По приказу [PRP] господа своего князя Дмитрея Ивановича [POSAG], се яз, Еупракс. а [и[но]ка дала есмь в дом живоначалнои Троице с(вя)т(о)му Сергею по своем господине князи Дмитрие Ивановиче… (АСЭИ 160).

(1b) *По приказу [PRP] брата своего князя Дмитрея Юрьевича [POSAG], и по душевной его грамоте, се яз, князь Дмитреи Юрьевичь, дал есмь в домь с(вя)теи живоначалней ||Троицы в домъ село Присецкое… (АСЭИ 164).

In (1a–b), the NP head is a prepositional phrase with the preposition *в* ‘in accordance with’ in pre-verbal position, while the possessor is a post-posed adnominal genitive; thus the basic structure of the possessive noun phrase is N-GEN.SG + PP.23 The NP head is *приказ* ‘order’. Both of the examples are elaborated by appositives24 to the main noun phrase (possessor), which identify the author by naming — in (1a), господа своего князя Дмитрея Ивановича (lord-GEN.SG REFL.GEN.SG prince-GEN.SG Dmitrij-GEN.SG Ivanović-GEN.SG) *‘of my lord, Prince Dmitrij Ivanović’*; in (1b), брата своего князя Дмитрея Юрьевича (brother-GEN.SG REFL.GEN.SG prince-GEN.SG Dmitrij-GEN.SG Ivanović-GEN.SG) *‘of my brother, Prince Dmitrij Ivanović’*. In the semantic domain, both the possessors are human, as expected, and both are males, though

---

22 The most frequent construction in the period before 1450 was the split construction assigned as PREAG/prp/POSAG (pre-posed adnominal genitive/prepositional phrase/postposed adnominal genitive).

23 I am using PP (possessive pronouns) as an abbreviation for all pronouns (его, ее, их) and pronominal adjectives (мой, твой, свой, наш, ваш) found in examples as a possessor or one of the constituents in a possessor noun phrase. I will not distinguish possessive pronominal adjectives from possessive pronouns because that is not relevant for my research.

24 For brevity, I will not discuss appositive phrases in detail if they copy the genitive case of the first possessor noun in the possessive phrase.
this is probably an accident of the corpus. It is relevant to point out that these examples are the first phrases of the document, so that all the information can be treated as new in the context.

5.1.2. 1450–1500

In the period of 1450–1500, we find 20 POSAG constructions, which make it the most frequent possessive construction in this period. Some illustrative examples are given below:

(2a) По грамоте [PRP] м(а)т(е)рі своєве великі кн(я)г(и)ни Соф(ь)и [POSAG], се яз, кн(я)г(и)ні велика Марья, пожаловала есмі Тро(и)цкого Сергєева монастыря игумена Иякима з брат (ь)ею… (АСЭИ 502).

(2b) Се яз, Михаило Власьевъ сынъ, по приказу [PRP] свого отца и своей матери [POSAG], дали есмі в домъ живоначалнеи Троїці Сергіеву монастырю игумену Васіану з брат(ь)ею свои села дмитровские… (АСЭИ 274).

Closer analysis of constructions like (2a–b), shows that the NP head can appear in a variety of syntactic roles: subject (4x), direct object (4x), prepositional object (9x), and other constituent in an oblique case (1x). As for placement in the sentence, the NP head is found in pre-verbal position in thirteen examples and post-verbal position in seven. The NP heads are either грамота ‘document’, as in (2a), or приказ ‘command’, as in (2b). The postposed adnominal genitive consists mostly of just a noun with a postposed adjective: N-GEN.SG +PA-GEN.SG. However, as seen in (2a–b), in some examples the possessor phrase is elaborated by appositives that can include nouns or pronouns: N-
GEN.SG + PA-GEN.SG (or PP-GEN.SG) or PA-GEN.SG (PP-GEN.SG) + N-GEN.SG.

Semantically, the author/possessor can be either a human male or human female.

As can be seen from the examples for this group, there are possessive constructions in which the possessor is presented as a construction with preposed possessive pronouns, such as in example (2b): своего отца от своей матери.

Furthermore, in the same time period (1450–1500) there are the same constructions but with postposed possessive pronouns, as in example (2a): м(a)m(e)ри своее.

Interestingly enough, in other possessive constructions (in the POSAG group), when the adjective великий is one of the constituents of the possessor, it appears in preposed position only, e.g., великого князя ‘grand-M.GEN.SG prince-GEN.SG’ or великие княгини ‘grand-F.GEN.SG princess-GEN.SG’. Furthermore, there is no example of a postposed adjective (not counting possessive pronouns) such as князя великого or княгини великие in this group (though such examples are attested in other text-kinds, e.g., chronicles). In the most of the examples, the possessor expression is either великий князь ‘grand prince’ or великая княгиня ‘grand princess’. These phrases have unique referents (or a very limited set of referents) at any given time; thus they can probably be considered culturally given information, even when they are first mentioned in a text. On the other hand, the phrases are clearly being asserted at the beginning of the text as a way of establishing the authority of the document; thus it makes sense for them to be postposed to their NP head, a position ordinarily reserved for as new or contrastive information. Apart from великий князь and великая княгиня, all the other possessors found in this group undoubtedly represent new information in the context.
It has to be emphasized, then, that the possessive-reflexive pronoun свой can appear either in preposed or in postposed position with regard to other constituents in the possessor phrase. I initially hypothesized that its preposed or postposed position depends on the word order in the sentence — more specifically, on the position of the possessive construction in the sentence in regard to the subject of the sentence. I investigated this question by looking up each example in the original text. However, I did not find any specific factor that influences the position of the controllers. Therefore, my conclusion is that the preposed or postposed placement of свой has to do with scribal preferences rather than syntax or information structure.

5.1.3. 1500–1550

The POSAG construction is also the most frequent possessive construction in the period 1500–1550, represented by thirteen examples, as illustrated in (3a–b).

(3a) Дадь Петр Петрович Головин по духовной грамоте и по приказу [PRP] Ивана Дмитреевича Володимерова [POSAG] дали есмы в дом пречистой на Симанов его куплю село Кузминское...(АФЗХ 95).

(3b) А игумен троецкои и старци положили передо мною на ту землю грамоту [S] дану||ю протопопа Семена Переславского [POSAG]...(АСЭИ 641).

Closer analysis of constructions like (3a-b) shows that the NP head can appear in a variety of syntactic roles: subject (7x), prepositional object (4x), or direct object (2x). As for placement in the sentence, the NP head is found in pre-verbal position in nine examples, and in post-verbal position in four. The postposed adnominal genitive occurs
in two structural variants: N-GEN.SG + PA-GEN.SG or PA-GEN.SG + N-GEN.SG.

Semantically, the author possessor can be either human male or a human female.

Investigation of the POSAG constructions in this period shows that the constructions in which the possessor is not великий князь ‘grand prince’ but somebody else (3b) are postposed in accordance with normal discourse patterns, because the possessor represents new information in the context. In constructions in which the possessor is великий князь, this can be either new or given information, but, as in the examples discussed in section 5.1.2, the possessor expression has a heavy informational load because it is used to establish the authorization for the document; this explains its occurrence in postposition, as information being asserted even though it is, in a sense, culturally given information.

5.1.4. 1550–1600

In the period 1550–1600, POSAG is represented by fourteen examples and is the most frequent type of possessive construction. This is illustrated in (4a–b):

(4a) Били челом мне царю и великому князю архимандрит Феоктист з братьею, что их монастырские села и деревни в Можайском уезде село Вотолинское з деревнями, и на то де село з деревнями у них грамота жалованная [S] великого князя Ивана Васильевича [POSAG]...(АФХЗ 163).

(4b) В Даниловское озеро в Подгорном острову они не слыхали и не знают его, да и по тому положил архимарит симановской грамоту [DO] великого князя Ивана Васильевича [POSAG]...(АФХЗ 154).

Closer analysis of constructions like (4a-b), shows that the NP head can appear in a variety of syntactic roles: subject (5x), prepositional object (6x), direct object (2x), or
some other constituent in an oblique case (1x). Nine of the NP heads are in pre-verbal position, and five in post-verbal position. The postposed adnominal genitive occurs in four syntactic variants: PA-GEN.SG + N-GEN.SG, N-GEN.SG + PP-GEN.SG, N-GEN.SG (where N is a first name), and N-GEN.SG + PA-GEN.SG (where PA is a family name). Semantically, the author/possessor is human; all the cases in the corpus have male referents.

Closer analysis of the adnominal genitives in this period shows that, in the constructions where the possessor is великий князь, the adjective is always preposed (see 5.1.2. above). In similar constructions with kinship terms plus the reflexive possessive pronoun свой, such as отца своего, матери своей, братьи своей, the possessive pronoun is postposed. It should be noted that in this period I did not find the variants своего отца, своей материи, своей братьи; this is probably an accident of the corpus.

Based on the analysis of POSAG constructions in section 5.1.2 and here, I conclude that possessive pronouns can be preposed or postposed in the possessor phrase, while relational adjectives are always preposed. All but two of examples represent new information. In (4a) the possessor expression, though already established information is contrasted with another possessor expression, so postposition is obligatory; in (4b), the possessor/author has mentioned earlier, but not in reference to the document mentioned in the narrative; this is thus another case of special emphasis on the authorization of a document.
5.1.5. After 1600

The period after 1600 is represented by 24 POSAG constructions, exemplified by

(5a–c):

(5a) По грамоте и по приказу [PRP] боярина и воевод князя Семена Григорьевича Звенигородского да Семена Романовича Ладыженского [POSAG]… (АФЗХ 235).

(5b) … по записе [PRP] мужа моего Ивана Семенова [POSAG] (АФЗХ 219).

(5c) … велено ему по челобитью [PRP] вдовы Мавры Ондреевы жены Микитина… (АСЭИ 3: 272).

The NP head in these constructions can appear in a variety of syntactic roles: a prepositional phrase (19x), a subject (3x), a direct object (1x), or some other constituent in an oblique case (1x). Fifteen of the examples are in pre-verbal position, and nine in post-verbal position. The postposed adnominal genitive can take three forms: 1) PA-GEN.SG + N-GEN.SG; 2) N-GEN.SG + PA-GEN.SG; or 3) N-GEN.SG + CONJ + PA-GEN.SG + N-GEN.SG (where the two nouns have the same referent). The NP head can be челобитье ‘petition’, запись ‘record’, грамота ‘document’, or приказ ‘order’. Semantically, the author/possessor is human, either male or female. The possessor is a noun phrase which marks possessivity by the genitive case because it consists of a full proper name or one of the constituents is an adjective or pronominal; they are postposed because they represent new information in the context.
5.1.6. Overview of the pattern construction for the Author group

As noted above, the POSAG construction is the most frequent possessive construction in the Author group; it represents not a majority but a plurality (73/185 = 39.45 %) of the examples (based on the total number of occurrences in all periods). The exception is the period before 1450, which is represented by just three POSAG constructions; the most frequent construction in that period is PREAG/prp/POSAG, as will be explained later (5.2.1.). Looking at the distribution of the POSAG possessive construction by fifty-year periods, it can be seen that the distribution of the examples is almost equal in the periods 1500–1550 and 1550–1600 (13 and 14). Given the nature of the semantic category, it is not surprising that the author/possessor is always human; the fact that the majority of possessors are male is probably due to cultural factors (the relatively marginal position of women of Old Russian law).

The most frequent possessors in the POSAG group are великий князь ‘grand prince’ and великая княгиня ‘grand princess’; though these probably counted as culturally given information, they are under special emphasis in this context as expressions of the authority behind the given document. This emphasis explains the postposition. All the other possessors in POSAG are postposed because they represent new information in the context.

Some of the previous research\(^{25}\) has argued that the use of adnominal genitive constructions was not free and widespread in Russian in the eleventh–seventeenth centuries. My data do not support this conclusion; the adnominal genitive is the most frequent construction in the Author group. Many of the conclusions in prior research are

\(^{25}\) Makarova (1954), Marojević (1983), and Rondestvedt (1976) argue that the use of adnominal genitive in Old language was limited and, in most cases, influenced just by the impossibility of using possessive adjectives in some cases/instances.
drawn simply from general descriptions without detailed classification and analysis, and without the exhaustive use of a database of texts. In Author, as in the semantic groups considered in the previous chapters, there is no indication that the adnominal genitive was anything other than a normal, widespread construction. Moreover, some of the possessor phrases include the genitives of names that, in other contexts, appear as possessive adjectives (e.g., (3b)). Thus the adnominal genitive was not just used when it was impossible to use possessive adjectives; the two constructions could sometimes occur in the same environments. Clearly, however, the likelihood that the adnominal genitive would be used increased when possessor expressions were relatively long and complex. While other authors have tried to make the distribution into a black-and-white syntactic rule, clearly pragmatic factors like complexity are also at work.

5.2. Less frequent possessive constructions

As discussed before, POSAG is the pattern possessive construction for the Author group; however, 111 other possessive constructions occur with this semantic class in the database. In the following subsections, I will attempt to explain what conditions are presented in those examples in order to explain those deviations.

5.2.1. Preposed + postposed adnominal genitives (PREAG + POSAG) and Preposed adnominal genitives + postposed mixed constructions (PREAG + POSPC)

There are 39 possessive constructions in the Author/possessor group in which the possessor is presented as a preposed adnominal genitive and a co-referential postposed adnominal genitive phrase; that is, there are two genitive phrases with the same referent surrounding the head noun. In some cases, the postposed portion also includes a
possessive adjective (derived from a forename) as an appositive, where in other cases there is an adnominal genitive. I have labeled these examples PREAG+POSPC. Because these always occur alongside PREAG+POSAG, I am treating them as a variant of the same construction in my counts.

Such “split” constructions are not attested in the database for all the periods investigated. There are 39 possessive constructions in the Author/possessor group in which the possessor is presented as a preposed adnominal genitive and a co-referential postposed adnominal genitive phrase; that is, there are two genitive phrases with the same referent surrounding the head noun. In some cases the postposed genitive phrase also has a possessive adjective derived forename as a where. However, this “split” construction is not attested in the database for all the periods investigated. The period before 1450 and 1450–1500 each show 16 examples; however, there are only 7 in the period 1500–50, and none occur in the following two periods. The following are representative examples.


(6b) По деда своего [PREAG] грамоте [PRP] великого князя Дмитрия Ивановича [POSAG]…пожаловал есмь игумена Зиновия Сергеева монастыря… (АСЭИ 165).

In all the examples, the NP head in the possessive construction is the dative object of the preposition no ‘in accordance with’, and the prepositional phrase occurs in the pre-
verbal position. In 36 cases, the NP head is the noun грамота ‘document’, and in the remaining 3 the noun слово ‘word’. In all the cases in my corpus, the prepositional phrase appears in the first sentence of the text, either as the opening or following the name of the person who has authorized the document.

The PREAG + POSAG construction always involves noun phrases in apposition; one phrase is placed before the head noun, the other(s) after it. Semantically, the possessor is always human (as always in the Author group). While most of the examples have male referents, some refer to females.

The preposed phrase can be a kinship term (e.g., father, mother, grandfather, or great-grandfather), as in (6a), or a title (e.g., (grand) prince, (grand) princess, sovereign). Structurally, the preposed adnominal genitive phrase is N-GEN.SG + PP-GEN.SG, where PP is the possessive pronoun ‘свой’, agreeing with the noun in case, number, and gender. In all the cases, then, the portion of the possessor phrase that is preposed to the NP head includes an adjectival modifier; this rules out the possibility of the semantic possessor being conveyed by a possessive adjective.

The postposed phrase can include the titles (grand) prince or (grand) princess with a proper name as an appositive (always in the genitive), or else just the proper name of the (grand) prince, (grand) princess (6a–b). Structurally, the examples of the postposed adnominal genitive phrase are (PA-GEN.SG +) N-GEN.SG. Note that the titles prince and prince are among the types of nouns that can form possessive adjectives, as are proper names; thus, in (6a), the name Ivan appears as both a postposed adnominal genitive Иванова and as a postposed possessive adjective Иванове, which occurs amidst a series of adnominal genitives (cf. also (9b) in 5.2.4.). In cases like this, there is no evident
information-structural or semantic difference between the adnominal genitive and the possessive adjective formed from the same name.

The adjective in all the examples is велик- ‘grand’ as a component in the terms grand prince and grand princess; these titles always show adjective-noun word order in my database. As noted above (cross-reference), if there is an adjective in the semantic possessor, it prevents the modified term from appearing as a possessive adjective in the actual possessor phrase.

Analysis of the informational structure of the contexts shows that the possessor in this set of data always represents new information; note that (6a–b) are both in the incipits of documents.

5.2.2. Preposed possessive adjective (PREPA)

There are 17 possessive constructions in the Author/possessor group in which the possessor is presented as a preposed possessive adjective. This construction is not attested in the database for all the periods investigated. None of the examples occur in the periods before 1550; there are only 6 in the period 1550–1600, but 11 after 1600. The following are representative examples:


(7b) и была, государь, на то отца моего и на мое поместейцо патриарша [PREPA] жаловалная грамота [S], и в литовское, государь, разоренье как стоял в Суздале пан Листовскои, и наши домишко пожег и разорил до основанья, и тое, государь, поместную грамоту литовские люди изодрили (АФХЗ 3 263).
(7c) И в цареве государеве [PREPA] грамоте [PRP], по которой нас грамоте Ширяй Лопаков давал на поруки...(АФХЗ 131).

Closer analysis of constructions like (7a–c) shows that the NP head can appear in a variety of syntactic roles: subject (4x), prepositional object (9x), and other constituent in an oblique case (4x). As for its placement in the sentence, the NP head is found in post-verbal position in 11 examples and pre-verbal in 6. Mostly, there is only one preposed adjective (13x), as shown in (7a–b), but there are a few cases of double adjectives (3x), illustrated in (7c): PA-GEN.SG, PA-DAT.SG, PA-GEN.PL or PA-LOC.SG. Semantically, the author possessor is a human male.

In this set of possessive constructions, the NP head in this group is грамота ‘document’ and слово ‘word’. The possessor is conveyed by a possessive adjective derived from the titles государь ‘sovereign’ (13x), патриарх ‘patriarch’ (1x), or писец ‘scribe’ (3x), such as shown in (7a–c). As there are no additional names or appositives in the semantic possessor, it is possible to use the possessive adjectives derived from these nouns rather than adnominal genitives.

Investigation of the examples found in the PREPA group shows that the possessor is preposed because it is represent given information in the context; the referent of the possessor has been mentioned earlier in the text. This is probably the reason why these constructions do not follow the pattern construction. According to Rondestvedt (1976), the preferred position for possessive adjectives in Old Russian is before the NP head. However, based on my research, the real issue is not a syntactic default (“preferred position”) but the information structure in the context; in fact, possessive adjectives can be postposed as well as preposed, depending on the context (see, for example, (6a), above).
The fact that this construction is not attested for the Author group before 1550 may be an accident of the corpus. On the other hand, its increasing frequency from the period 1550–1600 (6x) to the period after 1600 (11x) may well be the result of a change in state writing practices as a result of the centralization of the government and creation of chanceries by the ruler Ivan IV the Terrible (crowned tsar in 1547). In the centralized Muscovite state, the sovereign was the normative “author” of state documents; moreover, any reference to the ‘sovereign’ without further identification would be understood as referring to the current ruler. Thus there was no danger that the identification of the referent would be ambiguous; this made it possible to use государев- ‘sovereign-POS’ without a name. The same would have been true of патриарш- ‘patriarch-POS’ (especially after Patriarch Filaret became co-regent with his son Mikhail Romanov in 1619).

5.2.3. Preposed adnominal genitive (PREAG)

There are 16 possessive constructions in the Author/possessor group in which the possessor is presented as a preposed adnominal genitive. The two periods before 1500 show 5 examples each; there are 2 examples in each of the periods after 1500. The following are representative examples:

(8a) По брата своего старшего великого князя Дмитрия Юрьевича [PREAG] грамоте [PRP], се яз, князь Иван Андреевич, пожаловал есмь игумен Дософея Сергеева манастиря з братью или хто по нем ины игумен будет (АСЭИ 179).
In constructions like (8a−b), the NP head can appear in a variety of syntactic roles: prepositional object (8x), direct object (3x), subject (4x), or constituent in oblique case (1x). Thus the syntactic role of the NP head does not seem to determine the choice of the possessive construction. As for its placement in the sentence, the NP head is found in pre-verbal position in 10 examples and post-verbal in 6. In the majority of the examples, the NP head is грамота ‘document’, as in the pattern construction POSAG (see 5.1.1.). There are also other nouns found in both groups of possessive constructions which refer to the written documents such as приказ ‘command’, слово ‘word’, доклад ‘report’, etc.

Structurally, the preposed possessive phrase can take two forms: PA-GEN.SG + N-GEN.SG; or N-GEN.SG + PP-GEN.SG + appositive. Semantically, the possessor is a human male or female.

In analyzing all of the possessor types in this group, I find the same possessor types in this PREAG possessive construction group as I found in the pattern possessive construction (POSAG), as illustrated in (8a-b). There are kinship terms such as отец ‘father’, брат ‘brother’, дед ‘grandfather’. Also, the most frequent possessor construction in this group is once again великий князь ‘grand prince’. As in the pattern construction, the possessor can be found with appositives (8a) and without them (8b). In example (8b), there is a possessive pronominal adjective мой ‘my’; this agrees with the NP head. This is the only possible possessive form for the first-person singular pronoun.
‘I’ in my texts; an adnominal genitive is never used (cf. colloquial English *You’re not the boss of me.*)

While the PREAG constructions involve the same constituents as the POSAG constructions, in most of the cases of PREAG the preposed possessor represents given/old information in its context. The only exceptions are two examples in which the possessor is *grand prince* and *grand princess*. As I mentioned in previous sections of this chapter, *grand prince* and *grand princess*, if not culturally unique referents, nevertheless members of a very limited set of referents at any given time. Moreover, they are extremely likely to be the authorities named as the “authors” (issuers) of documents. Thus *grand prince* and *grand princess* are often treated as given/old information even in the situations when they are being mentioned for the first time.

### 5.2.4. Preposed possessive adjective + postposed adnominal genitive (PREPA + POSAG)

There are 15 possessive constructions in the Author/possessor group in which the possessor is presented as a preposed possessive adjective with a co-referential postposed adnominal genitive. None of the examples occur in the period before 1450 or after 1600; there are 9 examples in the period 1450–1500, 3 in the period 1500–50 and 3 in 1550–1600. The following are representative examples:

(9a)  

\[По \text{ц(о)д(у)д(а)р(е)ве}} [\text{PREPA грамоте}] \text{велик(о) княз(я)}} [\text{POSAG}], \text{став на земле на Носкове, суд Ондреи Пелешин…(АСЭИ 586).}\]

(9b)  

\[И по княж Иванову слову Юрьевич(а), Володимерь Гаврилов сынъ Зверева Троецкого Сергнева манастьря старца Исаию оправил и земл Зеленево селищо присудил к их земли…(АСЭИ 86).\]
То, господине, Орлово озеро, а не Даниловское, а Даниловское озеро за Печерским манастирем в бѣлановых [PREPA] книгах [PRP] Захарины [POSPA] написано в Ортемьеве лугу на горнѣ стороне...(АФХ 3 154).

In all the examples, the NP head in the possessive construction is the dative object of the preposition no ‘in accordance with’, and the prepositional phrase occurs in pre-verbal position (11x) and post-verbal position (4x). In seven cases, the NP head is the noun грамота ‘document’, in four слово ‘word’, and in the remaining 3 is писмо ‘letter’. In all the cases in my corpus, the prepositional phrase appears in the first sentence of the text, either as the opening or following the name of the person who has authorized the document. Semantically, the possessor is always human (as always in the Author group). All of the examples have male referents.

The semantic possessors are gosudар’ ‘sovereign’ or knjaž ‘prince’ + proper name as a preposed noun phrase of and veliki knjaž ‘great prince’ or a patronymic + surname as a appositives postposed noun phrase. Structurally, the preposed possessive adjective is PA-DAT.SG or PA-DAT.SG + PA-DAT.SG, PA-LOC.PL. The examples of the postposed adnominal genitive phrase are PA-GEN.SG, PA-GEN.SG + N-GEN.SG or PT-GEN.SG + appositive (where PT is patronymic and appositive is a surname in gen. sg). It can be seen from the examples that the preposed possessive adjectives are derived from a title and/or a forename. The possessive form derived from the noun knjaž - княж does not seem to agree with the NP head; as has been seen elsewhere, it evidently compounds with the following forename: княж-Иванову.

The postposed part of the possessor is either a patronymic, as in (9b–c), or the phrase великий князь, as in (9a). These “ungoverned genitives” (to use Worth’s term; see Section 2.3.6) belong to types of noun phrases that are never reflected as possessive
adjectives in my data. The postposition of patronymics appears to be a tendency in my corpus. In the constructions with ungoverned genitives, the title (if any) and forename come before the NP head, and the patronymic after.

5.2.5. Preposed possessive construction (PREPC)

There are 14 possessive constructions in the Author/possessor group in which the possessor is presented as a combination of possessive adjective and adnominal genitive. None of the examples occur in the period before 1450, there are 3 examples in the period 1450–1500, 2 examples in the period 1500–50, 7 in the period 1550–1600, and 2 after 1600. The following are representative examples:

(10a) По государеве великого князя Василиа Ивановича [PREPC] грамоте [PRP] сий суд судил Михайло Губа Микилин сын Стогинина (АФХЗ 3).

(10b) По цареву и великого князя Ивана Васильевича всеа Руссии [PREPC] слову [PRP] царевы и великого князя дяки Меншой Мелентьев да Иван Булгаков дали на оброк за таможные пошлины пречистые Симанова монастыря архимандриту Феоктисту с братьею...(АФХЗ 137).

(10c) по государеве цареве и великого князя Федора Ивановича всеа Руси [PREPC] грамоте [PRP]...(АФХЗ 211).

The construction is attested with the NP head in two syntactic roles—prepositional object (12x) and direct object (2x). As for its placement in the sentence, the NP head is found in pre-verbal position in 12 examples and post-verbal in 2. The NP head can be the nouns грамота ‘document’, слово ‘word’, приказ ‘order, command’, указ ‘edict, ordinance’. Semantically, the possessor is a human male. The possessor is a
noun phrase with a conjunction: царь и великий князь ‘tsar’ and grand prince’, structurally, PA-DAT.SG + CONJ + {PA-GEN.SG + N-GEN.SG} + appositive-GEN.SG; in 10 examples, the appositive is a proper name, always in the genitive case.

Like the examples in 5.2.4, these possessive constructions represent the “ungoverned genitive” construction, in which possessivity is expressed by a possessive adjective and an adnominal genitive in the same construction. As discussed in Chapter 2, Worth (1992: 173) states that the motivations for this pattern are still unclear. Closer analysis of the constructions in my corpus shows that the semantic possessor/author in these examples is царь и великий князь, государь великий князь от государь царь и великий князь; the possessor is preposed even though it represents new information in the context. Since the possessor is a unique referent it can be treated as definite, i.e., given information, even when it represents new information. Furthermore, the structure of PREPC can be explained as follows: there is a noun, царь or государь, and a fixed phrase, великий князь, which has to be in the genitive. The noun, царь or государь, can form a possessive adjective; that possessive adjective follows the case of the preposition in the noun phrase (attributive function). Also, there is an appositive (a proper name plus patronymic), which is always in genitive. My conclusion is that there was a tendency to derive a possessive adjective of the nouns царь or государь (when the possessor is a unique referent) while other constructions within the possessor phrase are in genitive.
5.2.6. Postposed possessive construction (POSPC)

There are 9 possessive constructions in the Author/possessor group in which the possessor is presented as a combination of possessive adjective and adnominal genitive. None of the examples occur in the period before 1450 and after 1600. There are 2 examples in the period 1450–1500, 5 examples in the period 1500–50, 2 in the period 1550–1600. The following are representative examples:

(11a)  По приказу [PRP] своего мужа Иванову Андреевича Слизнева [POSPC], се яз Олена с своими детьми,..., дали есмь в дом живоначалнои Троице в Сергiev монастырь... деревною свою Семково в Бежиском Версе...(АСЭИ 371).

(11b)  А сверх того шлемся [V] на книги [PRP] княж Ондреевы Васильевича Углецкаго [POSPC] перед вами (АФХЗ 63).

In this set of examples, the NP head is always a prepositional object (9x); it is found in pre-verbal position in 6 examples and post-verbal in 3. The attested NP heads are грамота ‘document’, книга ‘book’, and приказ. Semantically, the possessor is a human male or female. Structurally, PA-DAT.SG + CONJ + PA-GEN.SG + N-GEN.SG + appositive-GEN.SG; in ten examples the appositive is a proper name.

The NP heads attested in POSPC possessive constructions are грамота ‘document’ and приказ ‘order’ and книги ‘books’. The possessor, structurally, represents a mix of a possessive adjective and adnominal genitive (ungoverned genitive). Such mixed possessive constructions have already been explained in 5.2.5 but here they occur in posposed position. The question is why these possessive construction deviate
from the pattern possessive construction (POSAG) and why they occur in postposed position.

Investigation of the discourse structure shows that all possessors are postposed because they represent new information in the context. In the previous section I explained PREPC constructions, where the possessor is preposed even though it represents new information, because it has, if not a unique, at least highly predictable referent. In the POSPC constructions, the possessor phrase is postposed for the converse reason: it conveys new information, and the referent is neither unique nor highly predictable referent.

5.3. Concluding remarks on Author

In the Author group, the NP head is a textual-conveyor noun (грамота, приказ, письмо, книга, доклад, слово etc.). The possessor is a human being; both male or female possessors are attested.

Based on the 185 examples that comprise this group, it can be concluded that postposed adnominal genitive (POSAG) is the pattern construction. The semantic possessor here can be either a title (великий князь ‘grand prince’, великая княгиня ‘grand princess’, протопоп ‘archpriest’, боярин ‘boyar’, или воевода’governor’ ) or else a kinship term with the reflexive possessive, e.g., отец свой, дед свой (see in 5.1.1.). The presence of these modifiers blocks the use of possessive adjectives. In most of the examples the possessor phrase is elaborated by appositives which identify the author.

Generally speaking, the possessors in this group represent new information, so the postposition of the possessive construction can be explained by the normal tendencies of
Old Russian discourse. The reason for the order of the elements within the possessive phrase is not as clear. The adjective in the titles великий князь and великая княгиня is always preposed in my corpus, regardless of the information status of the possessor phrase. On the other hand, the possessive reflexive свой can appear in either pre- or postposed position; the choice of position does not seem to be determined by syntax or discourse structure, so it was perhaps due purely to scribal preference or to factors that cannot be reconstructed with the methodology used here.

Several other possessive constructions are found in this group. These deviations from the pattern construction can have various motivations. The PREAG construction (5.2.3.) has the same basic structure as the pattern construction; the preposition of the adnominal genitive is, in most of the examples, explained by the fact that the possessor has been mentioned earlier in the text, i.e., is given information.

In the PREPA construction (1.2.2.), the semantic possessor/author is conveyed solely by a possessive adjective derived from the one of three nouns — государь ‘sovereign’ патриарх ‘patriarch’, or писец ‘scribe’, with no additional names or appositives. The possessor in this group is preposed because it represents given information in the context; that is, the author has been mentioned earlier in the text.

The remaining types are all “split” constructions, in which the possessor expressions include both possessive adjectives and adnominal genitives. The words that appear as possessive adjectives are forenames, sometimes preceded by appositive titles without modifying adjectives. By contrast, titles with modifiers, patronymics, and kinship terms (which are always modified by the reflexive possessive adjective свой) do not undergo conversion to adjectival status but remain as adnominal noun phrases in the
genitive. The most frequent type of split construction is PREPA + POSAG is preferred (5.2.4.), where the portions of the possessor phrase that are in the form of possessive adjectives go before the noun, even if they are contextually new or asserted information, while the remaining appositives appear as adnominal genitives after the head noun. However, there are also cases, evidently dictated by nuances of information structuring (perhaps special emphasis on the NP head) in which all of the possessor phrase is preposed (PREPC, 5.2.5.) or postposed (POSPC, 5.2.6.). A special case is the title of the tsar from 1547 onwards, which conventionally includes conjoined noun phrases plus appositives: (государь) царь и великий князь + name + patronymic + всяя Руси ‘(sovereign) tsar and grand prince + name + patronymic of all Rus’’. The semantic possessor великий князь, as already mentioned, is never realized as a possessive adjective; however, (государь) царь can be so realized. This means that there can be possessive adjectives that are conjoined to (not appositive to) co-referential adnominal genitives.

In this connection, it can be noted that there are no examples of the split construction PREAG + POSAG (5.2.1.) after 1550, and a decrease of more than 50% can be noticed between the fifteenth century and the period 1500–1550 (7 examples). While this could possibly reflect a syntactic change, I think it is more likely to be pragmatic, the result of a change in state writing practices as a result of the centralization of the government and creation of chanceries by the ruler Ivan IV the Terrible (crowned tsar in 1547). In general, the departures from the pattern construction appear to be due to pragmatic constraints on possessor phrases involving appositives, probably with a good measure of chancery standards mixed in.
CHAPTER 6

OFFICE

6.0. Preliminary remarks

The semantic classification Office is not a prototypical possession/possessive construction, based on Taylor’s (1996:339) representation of possession discussed in Chapter 1, since the possessed entity is a person rather than an inanimate object, and s/he “belongs” to the possessor not as a transferable property but as an employee. Thus the referent of the NP head is a person defined by a specific social function — often, identified with a title. In addition, the possessors are often not institutions but individuals; even when they are individuals, they are defined in the given context by their social roles, i.e., are treated as representatives of institutions rather than individuals.

Such possessors fall into two subtypes. First, the semantic possessor can be a specific institution, often identified as a location, where the referent of the NP head is employed in a specific social role (“office”). This is illustrated by the noun phrase Симановского монастыря архимандрит ‘Simon-POS.M.GEN.SG Monastery-GEN.SG archimandrite-NOM.SG’, in which the possessor Simon’s Monastery is the institution to which the archimandrite belongs and in which he fulfills his office.
Second, the semantic possessor can be a person — again defined not as a private individual but as a social function or status — for whom the referent of the NP head works in a subordinate social function (“office”). This is illustrated by the noun phrase архимандрич приказчик (‘archimandrite-POS.M.NOM.SG deputy-NOM.SG’), in which the NP head is приказчик, a subordinate appointed as the possessor’s proxy, while the possessor is архимандрич — a specific individual at the time the document was written, but important in the context not as an individual but as an authority representing an institution (monastery).

In this chapter, I begin by establishing the pattern possessive construction for the Office group for the period from 1400–1650. Then I analyze the semantic or syntactic (functional) conditions motivating the less frequent possessive construction appearing during this period; I also address the main contextual factors that may explain why the exceptions do not follow the pattern possessive construction.

In the database, the office group is represented by 365 examples out of a total of 1700 possessive constructions in all the periods examined. The chronological distribution of the examples by fifty-year periods is presented in Table 6.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>before 1450</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1450–1500</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500–1550</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550–1600</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after 1600</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1. Office group chronologically

Looking at each period separately, we see the following distribution of Office possessive constructions by time period (Table 6.1): before 1450 — 29 (7.94%); 1450–
1500 — 110 (30.13%); 1500–1550 — 103 (28.21%); 1550–1600 — 67 (18.35%); after 1600 — 56 (15.34%).

Figure 6.1. Distribution of Office possessive constructions by time period

While selecting the documents for this research, I tried to have each of the given periods be represented by an approximately equal number of documents. Nevertheless, as can be seen from Figure 6.1, these efforts did not result in an equal distribution of the possessive constructions that form the office group for all the time periods though 1450–1500, 1500–1550, and 1550–1600. Proportionately, Office is least represented before 1450 and most represented in 1450–1500.

Based on the classified database, the following types of possessive constructions are found in the group Office (Table 6.2.).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possessor</th>
<th>before 1450</th>
<th>1450-1500</th>
<th>1500-1550</th>
<th>1550-1600</th>
<th>after 1600</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POSAG</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREAG</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSSK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESK + POSAG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSPA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESK + POSPA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESK + PRESK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2. Types of possessive constructions in the Office group chronologically

The relative proportions of the possessive constructions that occur in the Office group for the entire period studied is shown graphically in Figure 6.2.
In sections 1.1 I will consider the various categories of possessives presented in Table 6.2 and Figure 6.2 for the Office group over all periods.

6.1. Pattern possessive construction for the Office group

As noted in section 1.3, the most frequent possessive construction in any given semantic group is treated as the pattern possessive construction for that group. As shown in Table 6.2 and Figure 6.2, the POSAG construction (post-posed adnominal genitive) is the most frequent construction for the Office group if all time periods taken together (147/365=40.27).
6.1.1. Before 1450

In the period before 1450, POSAG constructions in the Office group are represented by 16 examples in my database. Some illustrative examples are given below:

(1a) Пожаловал есмь игумена [DO] Сергеева монастыря [POSAG] Досифея з братиею …(АСЭИ 189).

(1b) Се яз, Иларion келарь [S] Сергеева монастыря [POSAG], менил есмь с-ыгуменом с Афанасьем..(АСЭИ 173).

In (1a), “I have granted a boon to the abbot of the Sergius’ Monastery, Dosifej, with the brothers,” the direct object игумена (abbot-ACC.SG) serves as the NP head, and Сергеева монастыря (Sergij-POS.M.GEN.SG Monastery-M.GEN.SG) as the possessor expression. In (1b) “I, Ilarion, the cellarer of Sergius Monastery have exchanged with Abbot Afanasij,” the head is the subject келарь (‘cellarer -NOM.SG’), and the possessor expression is Сергеева монастыря (Sergius-POS.M.GEN.SG Monastery-M.GEN.SG).

In constructions like (1a–b), the NP head can appear in a variety of syntactic roles: subject (4x), as in (1b); direct object (10x), as in (1a); or prepositional object (2x). Thus its syntactic function does not seem to determine the choice of the construction. The NP head is found in pre-verbal position in four examples, including (1b), from the opening of a document, and in post-verbal in twelve, including (1a). The only NP heads that appear in this set of data are игумен ‘abbot’ and келарь ‘cellarer’; this is not surprising, since the offices denoted by these nouns were the monastic functions most likely to have authority over monastery property. The postposed adnominal genitive is, in all the examples in this group, the noun phrase Сергеева монастыря (‘Sergij-
POS.M.GEN.SG. monastery-GEN.SG). Semantically, the possessor expression belongs to the first subtype; that is, it is an institution where the referent of the the NP head fulfills a specific social function (“office”).

Throughout this set of data, the possessor expressions are postposed; this is to be expected, given that they represent new information in their contexts. They are all found in the opening sentences of the documents, so that they have not been previously established in the discourse.

6.1.2. 1450–1500

In the period of 1450–1500, we find 55 POSAG constructions, which make it the most frequent possessive construction in this period.

(2) Пожаловала есмь игумена [DO] Мартиниана Тро(е)цьског(о) Сергееева монастыря [POSAG]…(АСЭИ 237).

In (2), “I have granted a boon to abbot Martinian of the Trinity-Sergius Monastery,” the direct object игумена Мартиниана (abbot-ACC.SG Martinian-ACC.SG) serves as the NP head, and Тро(е)цьског(о) Сергееова монастыря (Trinity-POS.M.GEN.SG Sergius-POS.M.GEN.SG Monastery-M.GEN.SG) as the possessor expression.

The NP heads in these constructions represent different titles or social functions, such as посадник ‘mayor’, игумен ‘abbot’, судья ‘judge’, царь и великий князь ‘tsar and grand prince’, and келарь ‘steward’. It can appear in a variety of syntactic roles: subject (22x); direct object (23x), as in (2); prepositional object (7x), as in (2b); or other
constituent in an oblique case (3x). The NP head is found in pre-verbal position in 22 examples and post-verbal position in 33.

Structurally, the postposed possessive expression can be shown as: SK-GEN.SG + N-GEN.SG; SK-GEN.SG + PA-GEN.SG + N-GEN.SG, as in (2a); or PP-GEN.SG + N-GEN.SG, as in (2b). Semantically, the office/possessor is an institution, and there is one human male possessor. In 50 of the examples, the semantic possessor is {Сергиев монастырь} ‘Sergius’ Monastery’. Eleven of these tokens include the sk-adjective Троецкий ‘Trinity-pos’, which agrees with the NP head; this represents part of the name of the monastery {Троецкий Сергии Монастырь} ‘Trinity-Sergius’ Monastery’. In the remaining examples, the semantic possessor is {Кирилов монастырь} ‘Cyril’s Monastery’(2x), {Великий Новгород} ‘Great Novgorod’ (1x), {Александровский монастырь} ‘Alexander’s Monastery’ (1x), and {великий князь} ‘grand prince’ (1x).

Investigating the syntactic conditions why the possessor is postposed, I found that the possessor expression is postposed in all examples because it represents new information in the context. The possessors are mentioned for the first time, since all of the examples appear in the first sentence of the text.

6.1.3. 1500–1550

The POSAG construction is also the most frequent possessive construction in the period 1500–1550, represented by 38 examples, as illustrated in (3a–b).

(3a) и отца своего деля Геронтия, митрополита [Obl] всев Руции [POSAG]...
(AФЗХ 3).
In (3a), “And for my father Gerontij, metropolitan of all Rus’,” митрополита
(‘metropolitan-gen.sg’) serves as the NP head, and всеа Руси ‘all-f.gen.sg Rus’-
gen.sg’ as the possessor expression. In (3b), “I, Archimandrite Gerasim of Simon’s
monastery,” архимандрит Герасим (‘archimandrite-nom.sg Gerasim-nom.sg) is the NP
head, while Симанова монастыря (‘Simon- pos. m.gen.sg monastery- m.gen.sg’) is the
possessor expression.

In this set of examples, the NP head can appear in a variety of syntactic roles:
subject (20x), as in (3b); prepositional object (6x), as in (3a); direct object (9x); or other
constituent in an oblique case (3x). It is found in pre-verbal position in 31 examples, and
in post-verbal position in 7. The NP head in these constructions represent different types
of social positions, such as архимандрит ‘archimandrite’, дьяк ‘clerk’, митрополит
‘metropolitan’, судья ‘judge’, архиепископ ‘archbishop’, and великий князь ‘grand
prince’. In some examples the NP head великий князь ‘grand prince’ appears in
apposition with a proper name in the same case.

The postposed adnominal genitive, expressing the office/possessor, involves a
noun with a modifying adjective: PA-gen.sg + n-gen.sg; SK-gen.sg + n-gen.sg; or PP-
gen.sg + n-gen.sg. Where the officer-holder is великий князь ‘grand prince’, the
semantic possessor is {въся Русь} ‘all Rus’. In other examples, the semantic possessors
are {Симанов монастырь} ‘Simon’s Monastery’, {Сергеев монастырь} ‘Sergius’s
Monastery’, and {великий князь} ‘grand prince’. In all these examples, the possessor
consists of two-word noun phrase that includes a modifying adjective or pronoun; this
precludes conversion of the possessor noun to a possessive adjective. In every case, the possessor expression is postposed because it represents new information in the context.

6.1.4. 1550–1600

The POSAG construction is also the most frequent possessive construction in the period 1500–1550, represented by 27 examples, as illustrated in (4a–b).

(4a) Били челом царю и великому князю архимандрит [S] Симонова монастыря [POSAG] Филофей з братею о том... (АФЗХ 137).

(4b) … да при казначее Селивестре, бывшем игумене [Obl] Колужского манастыря [POSAG]...(АФЗХ 143).

In (4a), “Archimandrite Filofej of Simon’s Monastery and the brothers petitioned the tsar and grand prince about the fact...” the head is архимандрит (‘archimandrite-M.NOM.SG’), and the possessor expression Симонова монастыря (‘Simon-POS.M.GEN.SG monastery-M.GEN.SG’). In (4b), “During the time of the treasurer Selivestr, former abbot of Kaluga Monastery’, бывшем игумене (‘be-PAP.M.LOC.SG abbot-LOC.SG) is the NP head, and the possessor expression is Колужского манастыря (Kaluga-POS.M.GEN.SG monastery-GEN.SG).

Structurally, the possessive expression can be shown as PA-GEN.SG + N-GEN.SG; SK-GEN.SG + N-GEN.SG; or PP-GEN.SG + N-GEN.SG. The NP head can appear in a variety of syntactic roles: subject (8x), as in (4a); prepositional object (12x), as in (4b); direct object (2x); or other constituent in an oblique case (5x). The NP head is found in pre-verbal position in 15 examples and in post-verbal position in 12 examples. The NP heads
in these constructions are, as in the previous periods, titles of social positions, e.g.,
arхимандрит ‘archimandrite’, дьяк ‘clerk’, игумен ‘abbot’, патриарх ‘patriarch’, and
великий князь ‘grand prince’. In some examples, the NP head великий князь ‘grand
prince’ appears with an appositive, which is always a proper name of the grand prince.

Semantically, the office/possessor can be either an institution ({Симанов
монастырь} ‘Simon’s Monastery’, {Колужский монастырь} ‘Kaluga Monastery’) or
the ruler (великий князь) ‘grand prince’). The possessor is postposed in all examples
because it is newly given information in the context.

6.1.5. After 1600

The period after 1600 is represented by 11 POSAG constructions, exemplified by

(5):

(5) Се яз царь и великий князь [S] Дмитрей Иванович всєа Русии [POSAG]
pожаловал есми… (АФЗХ 226).

In (5) “I, the tsar and grand prince Dmitrij Ivanovič of all Rus’, have granted a
boon to…” the subject царь и великий князь (tsar-NOM.SG grand-M.NOM.SG prince-
NOM.SG) serves as the NP head, and всєа Русии ‘all-F.GEN.SG Rus’-GEN.SG’ as the
possessor expression.

In this set of examples, the NP head can be the subject (7x), as in (5a), or a
prepositional object (4x), as in (5b). It is in pre-verbal position in all the examples. The
NP head in all the examples is царь и великий князь ‘tsar’ and grand prince’ plus a
proper name in apposition.
The postposed adnominal genitive is the noun phrase веа Ру<many-line-break>с’-ГЕН.СГ. The possessor is postposed because it represents new information in the context.

6.1.6. Overview of the pattern construction for the Office group

As noted above, the POSAG construction is the most frequent possessive construction in the Office group, based on the total number of occurrences in all periods (147/365 = 40.27%). The possessor is postposed in accordance with the expected norms of Old Russian discourse, because it represents new information in the context; the referents are being mentioned for the first time). These data in this chapter support the position that I advanced in previous chapters: there is no evidence that the adnominal genitive was a marginal construction.

6.2. Less frequent possessive constructions

Besides POSAG, 218 possessive constructions of other types occur in this semantic class in the database. In the following subsections, I will attempt to explain what conditions are presented in those examples in order to explain those deviations.

6.2.1. Preposed adnominal genitive (PREAG)

There are 138 possessive constructions in the Office/possessor group in which the possessor is presented as a preposed adnominal genitive. There are 9 tokens in the period before 1450, 42 in the period 1450-1500, 48 in the period 1500-1550, 24 in the period 1550-1600 and 15 after 1600. The following is representative example:
In (6), the direct object “abbot of Sergius’ Monastery”, игумена (‘abbot-ACC.SG’) is the NP head, and Сергиева монастыря (Sergius-POS.M.GEN.SG monastery-GEN.SG) the possessor expression.

The attested NP heads in PREAG are игумен ‘abbot’, келарь ‘steward’, архимандрит ‘archimandrite’, дьяк ‘clerk’, and приказчик ‘deputy’. The head can appear in a variety of syntactic roles: direct object (72x), subject (42x), prepositional object (7x), or a constituent in oblique case (17x). It is found in pre-verbal position in 36 examples and post-verbal in 102, so it appears more often in the comment (rheme) than in the topic (theme) portion of the sentence.

Structurally, the preposed possessive phrase can be represented as PA-GEN.SG + N-GEN.SG; SK-GEN.SG + N-GEN.SG; PP-GEN.PL; or PP-GEN.SG. The semantic possessors attested in the majority of the examples are multi-term noun phrases that include modifying adjectives {великий князь} ‘great prince’, {Симанов монастырь} ‘Simon’ Monastery’ and {Сергеев монастырь} ‘Sergius’ Monastery’; the name of the latter can include the adjective {Троецький} ‘Trinity-POS’, which agrees with the NP head. It can be noted that the same semantic possessors can appear in the pattern construction (see above). However, in other examples the semantic possessor is an anaphoric possessive pronoun — ego ‘his’ or их ‘their’; these are never found in the pattern construction (in postposition to the NP head).

I compared the syntactic conditions in which the possessor groups POSAG and PREAG appear, and found out that PREAG constructions, in which the possessor are
anaphoric pronouns/pronominals *его* ‘his’ and *их* ‘their’ and *великий князь* ‘grand prince’ are preposed because they represent old, non-asserted information in their context. All the other examples in which the possessor is an institution (*Сергееv монастырь* ‘Sergius’ Monastery’ and *Симанов монастырь* ‘Simon’s Monastery’) are preposed even though they represent new information in the context. These examples occur at the beginning of the text, so all the information counts as new. However, the name of the monastery, though important, bears less emphasis than the identity of the beneficiary of the document.

6.2.2. Postposed possessive adjective with suffix -sk- (POSSK)

There are 30 possessive constructions in the Office group in which the possessor is presented as a postposed possessive adjective with suffix -sk-. This construction is not attested in the database for all the periods investigated. None of the examples occur in the period before 1450; there are only 2 in the periods 1450–1500 and 1550–1600, only 1 in the period 1500–1550, but 25 after 1600. To some extent, this skewed distribution may be an accident of the corpus; the 25 late examples, including (7), below, occur in the salutations of petitions and designate the addressee.


In (7), “To the most sanctified lord Iona, metropolitan of Saraj and [the region] along the Don, the patriarch’s petty noble Vaska Podlesov, son of Roman, makes
petition’, митрополиту (‘metropolitan-M.DAT.SG’) is the NP head, and сарскому и подонскому (‘Saraj-POS.M.DAT.SG and Don-POS.DAT.SG’) is the possessor expression.

In examples like (7), the NP head can appear as the subject (5x), or as a constituent in an oblique case (25x) — the indirect object (dative of addressee). The NP head is found in pre-verbal position in 25 examples and post-verbal in 5. The attested NP heads are игумен ‘abbot’ and митрополит ‘metropolitan’. The possessor is a postposed possessive adjective with the suffix -sk-. Semantically, the possessor is an institution or a bishopric where the referent of the NP head holds office. The possessor phrases occur in postposed position because they convey new information in the context.

6.2.3. Preposed possessive adjective (PREPA)

There are 16 possessive constructions in the Office group in which the possessor is presented as a preposed possessive adjective. Two examples each occur in the period before 1450, 1450–1500 and 1550–1600, and 5 each in the periods 1500–50 and after 1600. The following are representative examples.

(8a) Се яз Родион Костров да яз Варсунофей Гомзяков, троецкие Сергиеева монастыря старци, княгинины Евдоксеины [PREPA] приказщики [S]… (АФЗХ 12).

(8b) А архимандрит [PREPA] приказчик [S] с ними ж судит… (АФЗХ 55).

In (8a) “I, Rodion Kostrov, and I, Varsunofej Gomzjakov, elders of Trinity-Sergius’ Monastery, deputies of Princess Evdokija,” приказцыки (‘deputies-M.NOM.PL’) serves as the NP head, and княгинины Евдоксеины (‘princess-POS.F.NOM.PL Evdokija-
POS.M.NOM.PL) as the possessor expression. In (8b), “And the archimandrite’s deputy is co-judge with them”, приказчик (‘deputy-NOM.SG’) is the NP head, and архимандрич (archimandrite-POS. M.NOM.SG) the possessor expression.

In this set of examples, the NP head can appear as a subject (4x), as in (8a–b), a prepositional object (6x), or as a constituent in an oblique case (6x). It is found in post-verbal position in 10 examples and pre-verbal in 6. The attested NP heads are диак ‘clerk’ and приказчик ‘deputy’.

The possessor phrase consists of a possessive adjective (PA) alone. Semantically, its referent is the human or institution that the referent of the NP head represents. In most of the examples, including (8b) the semantic possessor is {архимандритъ} ‘archimandrite’, whose derived possessive adjective is архимадричъ. There is also one example (8a) involving possessive adjectives derived from a two-term semantic possessor, княгинины Евдоксиины ‘princess-POS.M.NOM.PL Evdoksija-POS.M.NOM.PL’.

The possessor phrases are in preposed position because they represent given information in the context; that is, their referents have been mentioned earlier in the text.

6.2.4. Preposed possessive construction (PREPC)

There are 15 possessive constructions in the Office group in which the possessor is presented as a preposed possessive construction involving both an agreeing adjective and a non-agreeing genitive. None of the examples occur in the period before 1450; there are two examples in the period 1450–1500, 6 in the period 1500–50, 7 examples in the period 1550–1600 and none of the examples after 1600. The following are representative examples:
(9a) A подписал царев и великого князя [PREPC] диак [S] Кожух Григорьев сын Кроткого..(АФЗХ 146).

(9b) И мы княж Михайловы Федоровича Прозоровского [PREPC] приказщики [S]...(АФЗХ 131).

In (9a) ‘And the clerk of the tsar and grand prince Kožuk, son of Grigorij Krotkij, signed,’ the subject диак (‘clerk-M.NOM.SG’) serves as the NP head, and царев и великого князя (‘tsar-POS.M.NOM.SG and grand-M.GEN.SG prince- M.GEN.SG’) as the possessor expression. In (9b), ‘and we, the deputies of Prince Mikhail Fedorovich of Prozorovo’, the subject приказщики (deputies-M.NOM.PL) is the NP head, and княж Михайловы Федоровича Прозоровского (Prince-POS Mikhail-POS.M.NOM.PL Prozorovo-POS.M.NOM.PL) is the possessive expression.

In this set of examples, the NP head can be a subject (14x), as in (9a–b), or a constituent in an oblique case (1x). It is found in pre-verbal position in 6 examples and post-verbal in 9. The attested NP heads are диак ‘clerk’ and приказчик ‘deputy’.

The possessor expressions occur in preposed position because they represent old/given information in the context; that is, their referents have been mentioned earlier in the text. Structurally, the possessor expressions involve several co-referential phrases — either conjoined, as in (9a), or in apposition, as in (9b). Phrases that involve unlike terms (nouns plus modifiers, e.g., {великий князь} ‘grand prince’ in (9a)) or patronymics (e.g., Федорович in (9b) mark possessivity by the genitive case (“ungoverned genitives”), while unmodified nouns mark possessivity by deriving possessive adjectives, which agree with the NP head. Thus {царь ‘tsar’} is reflected as царев in (9a), even though it is conjoined with an adnominal genitive; likewise, in (9b),
‘Prince Mikhail’ becomes the compound possessive княж-Михайловы ‘Prince-Mikhail-POS.M.NOM.PL’, even though this is in apposition with a patronymic in the genitive case. It can also be noticed that the patrial adjective {Прозоровский} Prozorovo-POS in (9b), reflecting Prince Mikhail’s domain, also appears as an ungoverned genitive.

6.2.5. **Preposed possessive adjective with the suffix -sk- (PRESK)**

There are 12 possessive constructions in the Office group in which the possessor is presented as a preposed possessive adjective with suffix -sk-. This construction is not attested in the database for all the periods investigated. None of the examples occur in the period after 1600. One example occurs in the period before 1450; 3 each in the periods 1450–1500 and 1500–50; and 5 in the period 1550–1600. The following are representative examples:


In (10a), “And to the Simon’s [Monastery] archimandrite Filofej and the brothers, or whoever else will be archimandrite at Simon’s after him,” the indirect object архимандриту (‘archimandrite-M.DAT.SG’) serves as the NP head, and симановскому (‘Simon- POS. M.DAT.SG’) as the possessor expression. In (10b), “And the monastery’s clerk’ Biserko Oleksandrov took down the statements,” the subject дияк (‘clerk-
M.NOM.SG’) is NP head, and манастирской (‘monastery-POS.M.NOM.SG’) is the possessor expression.

The NP head can appear as subject (6x), as in (10b); as a prepositional object (1x); or as a constituent in an oblique case (5x), as in (10a). It is found in pre-verbal position in 7 examples and post-verbal in 5. The attested NP heads are приказчик ‘deputy’, архимандрит ‘archimandrite’, and дьяк ‘clerk’.

The possessor, which is always an institution rather than an individual, is conveyed a preposed possessive adjective with the suffix -sk-, e.g., троецкий ‘Trinity-POS’, николской ‘Nicholas-POS’, симановский ‘Simon-POS’; these are all names of monasteries, and the generic adjective монастырской ‘monastery-POS’ is also attested. The possessor phrases occur in preposed position because they represent given information in the context.

6.2.6. Other constructions

There are other possessive constructions in my database that belong to the group Office, but they are attested in only a few examples — too few to draw secure conclusions. The postposed possessive adjective construction (POSPA) is represented by just two examples, found in the period 1500–1550:

(11) Господине, всем деревням давал дьяк [S] княж Ондреев [POSPA] Митя Демидов траву по реке по Кестме... (АФЗХ 63).

In (11), “Lord, Prince Andrej’s clerk’ Mitja Demidov gave the grass along the river Kestma to all the villages,” the subject дьяк (‘clerk-M.NOM.SG’) serves as the NP
head, and княж Ондреев (‘Prince-POS Andrej -POS.M.NOM.SG’) as the possessor expression.

The NP head is a subject in post-verbal position in both examples. The possessor expression is a postposed possessive adjective, given as PA-NOM.SG; the only attested possessor is {князь Ондрей} ‘prince Andrej’, with two nouns in apposition; both of these are reflected as possessive adjectives (or perhaps as a single compound possessive adjective княж-Ондреев ‘Prince-Andrej-POS.M.NOM.SG’). The possessor expressions occur in postposed position because they convey new information in the context.

The remaining constructions are all variants of the type in which the possessor expression is split into two portions, one preceding and the other following the NP head. There are three split possessive constructions involving preposed possessive adjectives with the suffix -sk- + postposed adnominal genitives (PRESK + POSAG); all are found in the period 1450–1500:

(12) Бил ми челом троецкои игуменъ Сергиеева м(а)настыря Спиридон с братьею... (АСЭИ 360).

In (12), “The abbot of Trinity-Sergius’ Monastery Spiridon and the brothers made petition to me,” the subject игуменъ (abbot-M.NOM.SG) is the NP head; the possessor expression is the discontinuous троецкои … Сергиеева м(а)настыря (‘Trinity-POS.M.NOM.SG… Sergius-POS.M.GEN.SG monastery- GEN.SG’).

The NP head is a subject in pre-verbal position in all the examples. The split possessor expression is a possessive adjective with suffix -sk- in the preposed part (троеку ‘Trinity-POS’) and an adnominal genitive in the postposed part (Сергиева
мастыря ‘Sergius-POS.M GEN. SG monastery-GEN. SG’). Structurally, the possessive construction can be analyzed as SK-NOM.SG + {PA- GEN.SG + N-GEN.SG}. The possessor expression represents new information in the text, so hypothetically it might be expected to be entirely postposed; however, as noted elsewhere, it seems to have been normal to prepose any of the terms reflected as possessive adjectives, at least in cases when there was no special emphasis on any portion of the possessive construction.

There is just one possessive construction with a preposed possessive adjective with suffix -sk- + Preposed possessive adjective (PRESK + POSPA). This is found in the period before 1450:


In (13), “to the deputy of the monastery, of the abbot,” the indirect object приказшику (‘deputy-DAT.SG’) serves as the NP head, while the possessor expression consists of two non-adjacent possessive adjectives, Монастырьскому… игуменову (‘monastery-POS.M DAT.SG… abbot-POS.M DAT.SG). Though ‘monastery’ and ‘abbot’ are not co-referential, the representative of the abbot also represents the monastery that the abbot leads.

The NP head here, приказщик ‘deputy’, is a constituent in the dative case in post-verbal position. The preposed portion of the possessor expression is the generic possessive adjective монастырьскому ‘monastery-POS.M DAT.SG’; the postposed portion is the possessive adjective игуменову ‘abbot-POS.M DAT.SG’. The possessor expression represents old/given information in the context.
Finally, there is just one possessive construction involving both preposed and postposed possessive adjectives with the suffix -sk- + (PRESK + POSSK), found in the period 1450–1500:


In (14), посадьником (‘mayors-DAT.PL’) is NP head, and двиньским … колмогорьским (Dvina-POS.M.DAT.PL… Kholmogory-POS.M.DAT.PL) is the possessor expression. Kholmogory is a town located on the banks of the river Dvina, so the two adjectives are not entirely co-referential.

The NP head, посадьником ‘mayor-DAT.PL’, is a constituent in the dative case in post-verbal position. The agreeing possessor expressions are preposed двиньским ‘Dvina-POS.M.DAT.PL’ and postposed колмогорьским ‘Kholmogory-POS.M.DAT.PL’.

Closer analysis of the given example shows that it represents new information in the context; the referent is not mentioned earlier in the text.

6.3. Concluding remarks on Office

In the semantic class Office, the NP head is always a noun which refers to a title or social position. The possessor in these constructions can be the institution or domain where the referent of the NP head holds office or else the authority (often a ruler) whom the referent of the NP head represents.
Looking at the structure of the possessor type, based on the 365 examples that comprise this group, it can be concluded that the pattern construction is the postposed adnominal genitive (POSAG). In all of the examples of POSAG, the semantic possessor is a noun phrase consisting of unlike terms — an adjective or adjectival pronoun modifying a noun. Compounding of some unlike forms, though possible in Modern Russian (cf. великокняжеский ‘grand-prince-POS’, великоновгородский ‘Great-Novgorod-POS’, всерусский ‘all-Russia-POS’), does not seem to have been a productive process in Old Russian legal language, at least judging from my data. For this reason, the unlike-term (adjective + noun) possessors appear as adnominal genitives in all semantic classes for all the periods I investigated.

In the pattern POSAG construction, the possessors are postposed in accordance with the norms of Old Russian discourse, because their referents are being mentioned for the first time in the given document. Conversely, in the variant construction with a preposed adnominal genitive (PREAG), the possessors mostly convey already established information (see 6.2.1.). This is clearly the case with the anaphoric pronouns его ‘his’ and их ‘their’ and царь и великий князь ‘tsar’ and grand prince’. However, some of the PREAG examples, in which the possessor is an institution (Сергееv монастырь ‘Sergius’ Monastery’ and Симанов монастырь ‘Simon’s Monastery’ occur at the beginning of the text and therefore represent new information. The reason is that the given information about monastery is not emphasized because it represents secondary information; the emphasis in these examples is on the name of the beneficiary/person. Where the semantic possessor consists of a single term or two conjoined like terms, it typically appears as either a postposed (POSSK, 6.2.2.) or a preposed (PRESK, 6.2.5.)
possessive adjective with the suffix -sk-. The possessors in these types are all institutional — monasteries (троецкий ‘Trinity-POS’, николский ‘Nicholas-POS’, or the generic монастырский ‘monastery-POS’) or dioceses (сарский и подонский ‘Saraj-POS and along-Don-POS’). The placement of the possessor phrase with respect to the NP head is dictated by the ordinary norms of Old Russian discourse: postposed position is used for new or newly asserted information, and preposed position for given information. When possessors consisting of a single noun or two nouns in apposition have human referents, the norm in the Office class is to use possessive adjectives. In accordance with information-structure norms, these can be in preposed position (PREPA, see 6.2.3.) or, in a few cases, postposition (POSPA, see 6.2.7.). The best attested semantic possessor is the title {архимандритъ} ‘archimandrite’.

For possessors involving multiple co-referential phrases, the general pattern is to have mixed constructions. Single nouns, appositives, and conjoined nouns that do not have modifiers are converted in possessive adjectives. The exception here is patronymics, which never have derived adjectives in my corpus. Such patronymics and also any noun phrases that consist of unlike terms (nouns and adjectival modifiers) alone appear as adnominal genitives (“ungoverned genitives”) in possessive constructions. Thus, in the examples of PREPC in the Office group, the semantic possessor is often {царь и великий князь}; the first of the conjoined co-referential noun phrases, is converted into an agreeing possessive adjective, while the second appears as a non-agreeing genitive. Likewise, in examples in which the possessor consists of the co-referential appositives {князь ‘prince’ + forename + patronymic + substantivized patrial adjective}, the first two terms become agreeing possessive adjectives, while the patronymic and patrial adjective
are put in the genitive (княж Михайловы Федоровича Прозоровского ‘prince-
POS.M.NOM.PL Mixail-POS.M.NOM.PL.Fedorovič-GEN.SG of-Prozorovo-GEN.SG).”

In the PREPC construction, the possessor represents given information in the
context; in addition, the noun phrase head seems to carry more informational weight in
the context. These factors evidently explain why the possesor is preposed. In other
constructions, which are not well attested in the Office group, the mixed construction is
split before and after the NP head (PRESK + POSAG, PRESK + POSPA, and PRESK +
POSSK; see 6.2.6.). This seems to have been the norm when all of the possessive phrase
has an equal information status, perhaps because of pragmatic constraints on the
complexity of groups of possessor clauses.
CHAPTER 7

KINSHIP

7.0. Preliminary remarks

The semantic classification Kinship is defined by the possessor type and its relationship to the NP head. This is not a prototypical possession/possessive construction according to Taylor’s (1996: 339) classification, discussed in Chapter 1. The possessor type for this group is a person who is related to the NP head by some kinship relation, while conversely the NP head refers to someone who is related to the possessor. This is shown in the construction Данило Васильев сын Сущова ‘Vasilij Suschov’s son’ in which Васильев… Сущов ‘Vasilij-POS-NOM.SG… Suschov-GEN.SG’ is the ‘possessor’ of the NP head, and сын ‘son-NOM.SG’ is the NP head of the possessive construction. This makes this group different from other semantic groups; the possessive phrase actually denotes a reciprocal relation between the possessor and the possessed entity. If the possessor is the family member, then all possessors are expected to be human (male or female).

In this Chapter, I first establish the pattern possessive construction for Kinship group for the period from pre-1450 to post-1600. Then I analyze and explain the semantic or syntactic (functional) conditions motivating the less frequent possessive construction
that appear during this period, and I address the main causes of divergence from the pattern possessive construction, i.e., the reasons authors do not follow it.

In the database, the kinship group is represented by 518 examples out of a total of 1700 possessive constructions in all the periods examined. The chronological distribution of the examples by fifty-year periods is presented in Table 7.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>before 1450</th>
<th>1450–1500</th>
<th>1500–1550</th>
<th>1550–1600</th>
<th>after 1600</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1. Kinship group chronologically

Looking at each period separately, we see the following distribution of Kinship possessive constructions by time period (Table 7.1.): 35 before 1450 (6.75%); 85 in 1450–1500 (16.40%); 192 in 1500–1550 (37.06%); 169 in 1550–1600 (32.62%); 37 after 1600 (7.14%).
As noted in the chapter on methodology, while selecting the documents for this research, I tried to have each of the given periods be represented by an approximately equal number of documents. Nevertheless, as can be seen from Figure 7.1, these efforts did not result in an equal distribution of the possessive constructions that form the kinship group for all the time periods: the period 1450–1500 is represented by 85 examples; there are 169 in the period 1550–1600; and 37 after 1600. Proportionately, Kinship is least represented before 1450 (35) and most represented in the period 1500–1550 (192).

Based on the classified database, the following types of possessive constructions are found in the group Kinship (Table 7.2.).
The relative proportions of the possessive constructions that are found/occur in the Kinship group for the entire period studied are shown graphically in Figure 7.2.
In section 1.1, I will consider the various categories of possessives presented in Table 7.2 and Figure 7.2 for the Kinship group over all periods.

7.1. Pattern possessive construction for the Kinship group

As noted in the chapter on methodology, the most frequent possessive construction in any given semantic group is treated as the pattern possessive construction for that group. As shown in Table 7.2 and Figure 7.2, the PREPA + POSAG construction (preposed possessive adjective and post-posed adnominal genitive) is the most frequent construction for the Kinship group if all time periods taken together (312=60.23%).
7.1.1. Before 1450

In the period before 1450, PREPA + POSAG constructions in the Kinship group are represented by just ten examples in my database.

(1a) А на то послуси: Симан [Данилов] [PREPA] с(ы)нъ [S] Верхобеньского [POSAG]... (АСЭИ 68).

(1b) С язъ, Оксинья Иванова [PREPA] жена [S] Андреевича [POSAG], по повелению моужа своего Ивана дала есмь село свое Прилучьское…(АСЭИ 155).

In (1a), “And to that the witnesses are Siman, the son of Danilo Verxobenskij…,” the NP head is с(ы)нъ ‘son-NOM.SG’ (an asserted subject); the possessor expression involves the discontinuous appositives Данилов… Верхобеньского ‘Danilo-POS.M.NOM.SG Verxoben’skij-M.NOM.SG’. The preposed adjective, reflecting the forename of the referent Siman’s father, agrees with the NP head, while the postposed adjective, reflecting the father’s nickname, is an ungoverned genitive. In general, adjectives are never converted into derived possessives in my corpus. In (1b), “I, Oksin’ja, the wife of Ivan Andreevič, in accordance with the command of my husband Ivan, have hereby given my village Priluckoe,” the NP head жена ‘wife-NOM.SG’, and the possessor expression is Иванова… Андреевича ‘Ivan-POS.F.NOM.SG Andreevič-gen.sg’. While the preposed possessive adjective Иванова agrees with the NP head, its non-adjacent appositive Андреевича is an ungoverned genitive. Patronymic nouns, which involve the suffixes (-ov)-иč- (masculine) and (-ov-/иč-)-ьн- (feminine), are already
marked for possessivity; double-marking for possessivity (e.g., a possessive adjective derived from a patronymic noun) is not attested in my corpus.\[26\]

Closer analysis of constructions like (1a-b) shows that the NP head is not restricted by syntactic role; it can be subject (47x), direct object (3x), prepositional object (5x), or a constituent in an oblique case (4x). As for its placement in the sentence, the NP head is found in pre-verbal position in 16 examples, and in post-verbal position in 43. The NP head is represented by the following kinship terms: сынъ ‘son’ (3x), дети ‘children’(2x), жена ‘wife’ (3x).

The PREPA + POSAG occurs in two structural variants: PA-NOM.SG + PT-GEN.SG or PA-NOM.PL + PT-GEN.SG or PA-NOM.SG + SK-GEN.SG. Semantically, the kinship possessor is a human male.

Analysis of the discourse structure shows that the possessor expressions convey new information in both the preposed and postposed positions. Given the fact that all the information in examples like (1b) is equally new (Иванова is as new as жена, and Андреевича как Иванова и жена), we can say that that all of the constituents have equal informational weight. Moreover, judging from the context, there does not seem to be particular stress on any of the words. This means that the word order in these examples (PREPA + POSAG) is dictated by some pragmatic tendency other than information structure. As a rule, when the information value of the is equal, possessive adjectives are preposed and patronymics in the genitive are postposed (except when the NP head is itself stressed).

\[26\] That such formations were possible, at least in some dialects of Russian at some stages in the history of the language, can be seen from surnames such as Fomičev, Mixajlovičov, which are derived from patronymic nouns.
7.1.2. 1450–1500

In the period of 1450–1500, we find 59 PREPA + POSAG constructions, which makes it the most frequent possessive construction in this period. Some illustrative examples are given below:

(2a) Ленко Вasil(ь)ев [PREPA] c(ы)нъ Маринина [POSAG]...(АСЭИ 413).

(2b) Федор Иванов [PREPA] c(ы)нъ [S] Офонасева [POSAG]...(АСЭИ 306).

In (2a), “Lenko, son of Vasilij Marinin,” the subject с(ы)нъ ‘son-nom.sg’ serves as the NP head, and Вasil(ь)ев... Маринина ‘Vasilij-pos.m.nom.sg Marinin-gen.sg’ as the possessor expression. The preposed adjective, reflecting the forename of the referent Lenko’s father, agrees with the NP head, while the postposed adjective, reflecting the name of the father’s mother (Marina- POS), is an ungoverned genitive. In (2b), “Fedor, son of Ivan Ofanas’ev,” the NP head is again с(ы)нъ ‘son-nom.sg’, functioning as the subject. The discontinuous possessive expression is Иванов… Офонасева ‘Ivan- POS.M.NOM.SG Ofanas’ev- GEN.SG’; the first constituent, agreeing with the NP head, reflects the forename of Fedor’s father, and the second, an ungoverned genitive, the name of the father’s own father (Ofanasij- POS).

Closer analysis of constructions like (2a–b) shows that the NP head is the subject in all examples; however, this is apparently an accident of the corpus. As for its placement in the sentence, the NP head is found in pre-verbal position in 14 examples and post-verbal position in 33. The NP head is represented by the following kinship terms: сынъ ‘son’, дети ‘children’, жена ‘wife/spouse’. The PREPA + POSAG occurs in two structural variants: PA-NOM.SG + PT-GEN.SG or PA-NOM.PL + PT-GEN.SG.
All the elements of the possessor expressions present new information in their contexts. The possessive adjectives are preposed, and patronymic nouns as well as patronymic adjectives referring to the father’s father are postposed. As noted in 7.1.1, this order is not entirely explained by the usual discourse pattern, which is that asserted and new information appear to the right of old information. Rather, it is due to a different pragmatic tendency: when everything in the phrase is equally weighted in the information structure, the tendency was to split the multi-term possessor expressions into forename (preposed) and patronymic (postposed) portions.

7.1.3. 1500–1550

The PREPA + POSAG construction is also the most frequent possessive construction in the period 1500–1550; it is represented by 131 examples, as illustrated in (3a–b).


In (3a), “I, Lavr, son of Vasilij Suščov, and I, Maksim, son of Ogafon Suščov,” the two NP heads are both the word сын ‘son- NOM.SG’. In the first phrase, the possessor expression is Васильев… Сущова ‘Vasilij- NOM.M.NOM.SG Suščov- GEN.SG’, and in the second Огафанов… Сущова ‘Ogafon- POS.M.NOM.SG Suščov- GEN.SG’. In both instances, the preposed possessive adjective agrees with the NP head, while the postposed
noun is an ungoverned genitive. The noun may reflect a surname or nickname in -ov- shared by Vasilij and Ogafon’s fathers (who were probably brothers). In (3b), “And to that the witnesses are Ivan and Istoma, the children of Vasilij Monastyrev,” the NP head is дети ‘children- NOM.PL’. The discontinuous possessor phrase is Васильевы...

Монастырова ‘Vasilij- POS.M.NOM.PL Monastyrev- GEN.SG’, where the preposed possessive adjective agrees with the NP head, and the postposed possessive adjective, reflecting the nickname ‘of the monastery’, is an ungoverned genitive. For both examples, it can be noted that possessive suffixes are never formed from stems that already contain a possessive suffix; in other words, derived adjectives *Sušč-ov-ov- and *Monastyr’-ov-ov- would be impossible.

Closer analysis of constructions like (3a-b) shows that the choice of the possessive construction is not limited by the syntactic role of the NP head, which can be subject (97x), prepositional object (22x), direct object (4x), or a constituent in oblique case (8x). It is found in pre-verbal position in 13 examples and post-verbal position in a 118. The NP head is represented by the following kinship terms: сынъ ‘son’, дети ‘children’, жена ‘wife/spouse’ and дочь ‘daughter’. The PREPA + POSAG occurs in two structural variants: PA-NOM.SG + PT-GEN.SG or PA-NOM.PL + PT-GEN.SG. Semantically, the kinship possessor can be either male or female.

Analysis of the discourse structure shows that the possessor expression represents new information in both its preposed and its postposed positions; see the discussion in sections 7.1.1 and 7.1.2.
7.1.4. 1550–1600

In the period 1550–1600, PREPA + POSAG is represented by 100 examples and is the most frequent type of possessive construction. This is illustrated in (4a–b):


In (4a), “the clerk Ofonja, son of Podosen Lazarev, the NP head is the subject сын ‘son-nom.sg’; the discontinous possessor phrase is Подосенов… Лазарева ‘Podosen-POS.M.NOM.SG Lazarev- GEN.SG’, where the preposed possessive adjective agrees with the NP head, and the postposed possessive adjective is an ungoverned genitive. Since the word Lazarev already includes the possessive suffix -ov-, it cannot undergo further derivation for possessivity. In (4b) “I, the wife of Mixail Petrovič Golova Bol’šoj, Nastas’ja, [daughter] of Vasilij…,” the NP head is жена ‘wife- NOM.SG’. The possessor expression is more complex than the other examples considered thus far: Михайлова… Петровича Головина Большого ‘Mixail- POS.F.NOM.SG Petrovič- GEN.SG Golova-POS.F.NOM.SG Bol’šoj- M.GEN.SG. Here the preposed adjective Михайлова and the postposed adjective Головина, derived from the forename Mixail and the nickname Golova ‘head’, respectively, agree with the NP head. As unmodified nouns, these words can be subject to possessive derivation with the suffixes -ov- (for second-declension stems) and -in- (for first- and third-declension stems). By contrast, the remaining postposed constituents are in the genitive because they belong to word classes that cannot
be converted to possessive adjectives; Petrovič is a patronymic noun, and Bol’soj an adjective (an appositive rather than a modifier.)

Closer analysis of constructions like (4a-b) shows that the NP head can be subject (69x), prepositional object (11x), direct object (7x), or a constituent in oblique case (13x); in other words, its syntactic role does not seem to influence the choice of the possessive type. As for its placement in the sentence, the NP head is found in pre-verbal position in 37 examples and in post-verbal position in 63. The NP head is represented by the following kinship terms: сынь ‘son’, дети ‘children’, жена ‘wife/spouse’and дочь ‘daughter’. The PREPA + POSAG occurs in two structural variants: PA-NOM.SG + PT-GEN.SG or PA-NOM.PL + PT-GEN.SG. Semantically, the kinship possessor can be either male or female.

The possessor expression represents new information in the context. The split word order is a result of the same pragmatic tendency noted in the previous sections.

7.1.5. After 1600

The period after 1600 is represented by 12 PREPA + POSAG constructions, exemplified by (5a–b):

(5a) Лука Па́рфениев [PREPA] сын Терентье́ва [POSAG]…(АФЗХ 230).

(5b) Казарин Ива́нов [PREPA] сын Матви́ева [POSAG]…(АФЗХ 219).

In (5a), “Luka, son of Parfenij Terent’ev, the NP head is the subject сын ‘son-nom.sg’; the discontinuous possessor phrase is Па́рфениев … Терентье́ва ‘Parfenij-
POS.M.NOM.SG Terent’ev- GEN.SG’, where the preposed possessive adjective agrees with the NP head, and the postposed possessive adjective is an ungoverned genitive. The same pattern can be seen in (5b), “Kazarin, son of Ivan Matviev”. In both instances, the ungoverned genitives are themselves possessive (patronymic) adjectives — ‘Terentij- POS’ and ‘Matvij- POS’, evidently derived from the forenames of the subjects’ grandfathers. Because their stems already include the possessive suffix -ov-, they cannot undergo further derivation for possessivity. In both these examples, the NP head is the word с(ы)нъ ‘son-NOM.SG’, functioning as the subject of the sentence.

Closer analysis of constructions like (5a-b) shows that the choice of the possessive construction is not limited by the syntactic role of the NP head, which can be subject (4x), direct object (3x), prepositional phrase (1x), or a constituent in oblique case (4x). As for its placement in the sentence, the NP head is found in pre-verbal position in four examples and post-verbal position in eight. The NP head is represented by the following kinship terms: сынъ ‘son’, дети ‘children’. The PREPA + POSAG occurs in two structural variants: PA-NOM.SG + PT-GEN.SG or PA-NOM.PL + PT-GEN.SG.

Semantically, the kinship possessor can be either male or female.

As in previous sections of this chapter, the analysis of the discourse structure shows that the possessor represents mostly new information in preposed and postposed positions.

---

27 I am using the term patronymic for nouns derived from forenames by means of the suffixes (-ov)-ič- for masculine referents and (-ovič-)-nna for feminine referents. There are also names derived from fathers’ names by the suffixes -ov- and -in- that decline as adverbs; I will call these patronymic adjectives. In the subsequent history of the language, these were reanalyzed as surnames. In the PREPA + POSPA group the patronymic adjectives appear as non-agreeing adjectives and refer to the father of the referent’s father.
7.1.6. Overview of the pattern construction for the Kinship group

As noted above, the PREPA + POSAG construction is the most frequent possessive construction in the Kinship group; it represents a majority (312/518=60.23%) of the examples (based on the total number of occurrences in all periods). Looking at the distribution of the PREPA + POSAG possessive construction by fifty-year periods, it can be seen that the distribution of the examples is almost equal in the periods before 1450 and after 1600 (10 and 12). However, there is a significant increase in the periods 1450–1500 (59), and the periods 1500–50 and 1550–1600 (131 and 100), which might be an accident of the corpus.

Given the nature of the semantic category, it is not surprising that the kinship/possessor is always human; the fact that the majority of possessors are male is probably due to cultural factors (the relatively marginal position of women of Old Russian law).

The NP head in the PREPA + POSAG possessive constructions is represented by kinship terms such as сынъ ‘son’, дети ‘children’, жена ‘wife’, and дочь ‘daughter’.

The PREPA + POSAG possessor expression is a ‘split’ construction, in which the preposed part is a possessive adjective derived from a forename, such as Данилов ‘Danilo-POS’ in or Иванов ‘Ivan-POS’, and agrees with the NP head. The postposed possessive adjective is an ungoverned genitive in the form of patronymic nouns or possessive (patronymic) adjectives, derived from the forenames of the referents’ grandparents, e.g., Терентьева ‘Terentij-POS’ and Матвиева ‘Matvij-POS’, or from nicknames such as Головина, a possessive derived from the nickname Golova ‘head’.
The discourse structure shows that the possessor expression represents new information in both the preposed and postposed positions. Closer analysis of the examples shows that all the information in PREPA + POSAG examples are equally new; we can say that that all of the constituents have equal informational weight. The conclusion is that the word order in these examples is dictated by a pragmatic tendency separate from the usual information-structure patterns: when the information value of all the elements in the possessor phrase is equal, possessive adjectives derived from titles and forenames tend to be preposed to the NP head, while patronymic nouns and adjectives derived from the names of the referents’ grandfathers appear in the genitive and are postposed to the head (except when the head is itself stressed).

7.2. Less frequent possessive constructions

As discussed before, PREPA + POSAG is the pattern possessive construction for the Kinship group; however, 206 possessive constructions of other types occur with this semantic class in the database. In the following subsections, I will attempt to explain what conditions are presented in those examples in order to explain those deviations.

7.2.1. Preposed + postposed possessive adjective (PREPA + POSPA)

There are 113 possessive constructions in the Kinship semantic type in which the possessor is presented as a preposed and postposed possessive adjective. This ‘split’ construction is attested in the database for all the periods investigated. The period before 1450 is represented by 8 tokens; 1450–1500 by 10 tokens; 1500–50 by 29 tokens; 1550–
1600 by 46 tokens; and after 1600 by 20 tokens. The following are representative examples:

(6a) А грамоту д(у)ш(е)вную писал Васук поповъ [PREPA] съ(н)ть [S] Иванов [POSPE] … (АСЭИ 11).


In (6a), “And the testament was written by Vasuk, the son of the priest Ivan,” the discontinuous possessor expression is поповъ… Иванов ‘priest- POS.NOM.SG Ivan-POS.NOM.SG’; both adjectives agree with the NP head. The same pattern can be seen in (6b), “Volodimer, son of Grigorij the priest.” (The possessive adjective поповъ, at least in (6a), cannot be taken as a surname, since the convention in legal language is to name a given referent by his/her own forename, then a patronymic expression that includes his/her father’s forename; ‘priest’ is not a possible forename.)

In constructions like (6a–b), the choice of the possessive construction is not restricted by the NP head, which can appear in a variety of syntactic roles: subject (102x), direct object (5x), prepositional object (3x), or other constituent in an oblique case (3x). The NP head, which is the kinship term сынь ‘son’ in all the examples, is found in pre-verbal position in 83 examples and post-verbal in 30.

The two elements in the possessor phrase are in apposition to one another. Semantically, the kinship possessor is a human male. Analysis of the discourse structure shows that all the possessor constructions in this set present new information in the context. As all constituents have equal information structure, the PREPA + POSPA
examples are evidently following the same pragmatic tendency seen in the pattern expression (see 7.1.6.).

7.2.2. **Preposed possessive adjective (PREPA)**

There are 67 possessive constructions in the Kinship/possessor group in which the possessor is presented solely as a preposed possessive adjective. This construction is attested in the database for all the periods investigated. There are 8 examples in the period before 1450, 9 in the period 1450–1500, 28 in the period 1500–1550, 18 in the period 1550–1600, and 4 in the period after 1600. The following is representative example:


In (7), “And to that the witnesses are Timofej, son of Ostafij, Fedko, son of Gnezdnik, and Starko, son of Spirid,” the three NP heads are all сынь ‘son- NOM.SG’.

The possessor expressions consist solely of possessive adjectives derived from the names of the referents’ fathers (‘Ostafij- POS.M.NOM.SG’, ‘Gnezdnik- POS.M.NOM.SG’, and ‘Spirid- POS.M.NOM.SG’, respectively). These adjectives agree syntactically with the NP heads.

The choice of possessive construction does not appear to be constrained by the syntactic role of the NP head, which can be subject (42x), direct object (4x), prepositional object (13x), or other constituent in oblique case (8x). As for its placement in the sentence, the NP head is found in pre-verbal position in 13 examples and post-verbal...
position in 54. The NP head is represented by the kinship terms сынь ‘son’, дочь ‘daughter’, жена ‘wife’, and дети ‘children’; the most frequent is сынъ ‘son’.

Structurally, the PREPA is PA-NOM.SG, PA-GEN.SG, PA-NOM.PL. Semantically, the possessor is a human male in all the tokens — a father or husband.

Closer analysis of the possessor expressions in PREPA group shows that they are preposed even though they represent new information. It is apparent that there is no special emphasis on either the possessor expression or the head, so the default adjective-noun order applies. In these examples the possessor expression is represented just by single possessive adjective (no patronymic noun or patronymic adjective) derived from the forenames and agreeing with NP head. This construction does not really deviate from the pattern construction; it just involves a possessor expression with fewer elements.

7.2.3. Postposed adnominal genitive (POSAG)

There are 9 possessive constructions in the Kinship/possessor group in which the possessor is presented as a postposed adnominal genitive. This construction is not attested in the database after 1550. There are 2 tokens in the period before 1450, 5 in the period 1450–1500, and 2 in the period 1500–1550. The following is representative example:


In (8), “And to that the witnesses are Venedikt Šarapov, Siman, son of Danilo Verxobenskij, and his nephew Grigori the Monk,” the underlined possessor expression is
a genitive anaphoric pronoun referring to the previous possessor, Siman; the NP head is братаничь ‘nephew-NOM.SG’.

Closer analysis of constructions like (8), shows that the NP head can appear in a variety of syntactic roles: subject (6x), direct object (2x) and prepositional object (2x); thus its role does not seem to affect the choice of possessive construction. As for its placement in the sentence, the NP head is found in pre-verbal position in two examples and post-verbal in seven. The NP head can be the following kinship terms: сынъ ‘son’, дочь ‘daughter’, жена ‘wife’, отец ‘father’, and братаничь ‘nephew’.

In most of the examples, the possessor expression is an anaphoric pronoun — его ‘his’, ее ‘her’ or их ‘their’. Structurally, the postposed possessive phrase can take four forms: PA-GEN.SG + N-GEN.SG, PP-GEN.PL, PP-GEN.SG, PT-GEN.SG + PA-GEN.SG. Semantically, the possessor is a human male or female.

Analysis of all the examples in this group shows that the possessor expression actually conveys old information. While preposed position is usual for old information, closer analysis of the context shows that the possessor expressions are in contrastive focus with other possessor expressions or are otherwise under special emphasis; thus they are treated as newly asserted information — hence the postposition.

7.2.4. Preposed possessive construction (PREPC)

There are 8 possessive constructions in the Kinship group in which the possessor is presented as a preposed possessive construction involving both an agreeing adjective and a non-agreeing genitive. None of the examples occur in the period before 1450; there
is one example each in the periods 1450–1500, 1500–50, and after 1600, and 5 examples in the period 1550–1600. The following are representative examples:

(9a) Се яз княж Васильева Васильевича Ушатого [PREPC] княгиня [S] инока старица Феодора… (АФЗХ 135).

(9b) В Настасеине манастирье и преставилась княж Семенова Стародубского [PREPC] княгиня Офросинья [S]… (АФЗХ 177).

These two examples are similar in structure. The NP head in both cases is княгиня (with spelling variants) ‘prince’s-wife- F.NOM.SG’, serving as the subject of the sentence. The possessor expressions include compounds of the indeclinable княж- ‘prince- POS’ with possessives derived from the husbands’ forenames — Васильева ‘Vasilij- POS.F.NOM.SG’ in (9a), and Семенова ‘Semen- POS.F.NOM.SG’ in (9b); these agree with the NP heads. The husbands’ other names belong to classes that cannot undergo further derivation for possessivity and so appear as ungo
erved genitives — the patronymic noun Васильевича ‘Vasil’ević- GEN.SG’ and the adjectival nickname Ушатого ‘big-eared-M.GEN.SG’ in (9a), and the adjective Стародубского ‘of-Starodub-
M.GEN.SG’ in (9b).

Closer analysis of constructions like (9a–b) shows that the NP head can be a subject (3x), direct object (2x), a constituent in oblique case (2x), or prepositional object (1x). As for its placement in the sentence, the NP head is found in pre-verbal position in four examples and post-verbal in four. The NP head is either the noun княгиня ‘princess’ (7x) or сын ‘son’ (1x). Semantically, the possessor is a human male — the possessor’s husband or father. The possessor is a noun phrase which is represented by a noun князь
‘prince’ + appositive or just a proper name. The appositive is a proper name which includes either a first name and a patronymic (9b) or a first name plus patronymic and surname or locational adjective (9a) — structurally\textsuperscript{28}, PA + PA + NP-\textsc{gen}.SG, PA + PA. In these examples, the possessive adjectives derived from the proper names agree with the NP head, but the patronymics and surnames or locational adjectives are in the adnominal genitive. Furthermore, there is a possessive element княж derived from the noun князь ‘prince’ which does not agree with the NP head; it shows no case ending and is apparently part of a compound noun княж-Васильева. Thus, despite its original, it does not act like a separate possessive adjective in these examples.

Analysis of all examples in PREPC group shows that the possessor expression is preposed even though it represents new information (it is mentioned in the first sentence in the text. All the names in this group include княж, the possessive derived from \{князь\} ‘prince’, in its non-declining variant. Thus I conclude that the possessors presented as княж + proper name are preposed even though they represent new information. It may well be the case that the stress in these examples is on the NP head княгиня ‘princess’ because its referent is making the donation discussed in the document or is otherwise the center of attention; the possessor expression refers to the princess’ deceased husband and serves as a form of secondary identification.

7.2.5. Postposed possessive construction (POSPC)

There are 4 possessive constructions in the Kinship group in which the possessor is presented as a postposed possessive construction involving both an agreeing adjective

\textsuperscript{28} N stands for князь, NP stands for a name + patronymic + surname here, PA is a possessive adjective. I am using a shorter formula in this section because my examples are in different cases.
and a non-agreeing genitive. Three occur in the period before 1450, and one in the period 1450–1500. The following is a representative example:

(10) Се яз, княгин(я) Огрофена [S] княжа Афанасева Иванович(а)(POSPC], с своими детми со князем Семеном да со князем Васильем Афанасьевичи...(АСЭИ 103).

In (10), “I, princess Ogrofena, [wife of] Prince Afanasij Ivanovič,” the NP is the subject княгин(я) ‘prince’s wife—NOM.SG’. While this is separated from the possessor expression by the name Огрофена ‘Ogrofena—NOM.SG’, it must be the head because it includes the semantic component ‘wife’, which is the “possessed” relation. In the possessor phrase княжа Афанасева Иванович(а) ‘prince — POS.F.NOM.SG Afanasij-POS.F.NOM.SG Ivanovič-GEN.SG’, the first two constituents agree syntactically with the NP head, while the third is presumably an ungoverned genitive; the ending was actually omitted in the manuscript, but in any case there is no indication of agreement.

Closer analysis of constructions like (10) shows that the NP head is a subject in pre-verbal position. The NP head is the noun княгиня ‘princess’ in all examples.

Semantically, the possessor is a human male. The possessor is a noun phrase which is represented by a noun князь ‘prince’ + appositive. The appositive is a proper name which includes a first name and a patronymic — structurally, PA + PA-GEN.SG + PT-GEN.SG. 29

In these examples the possessive adjectives derived from forenames agree with the NP head, but the patronymic is an adnominal genitive. Furthermore, the possessive княж ‘prince’ agrees with the NP head in some examples, as in (10), but it can compound with the following name, e.g., княж-Офонасиева (2x).

---

29 PT stands for a patronymic here.
The possessor is in postposed position because it represents new information; the referent has not been mentioned earlier in the text.

### 7.2.6. Preposed adnominal genitive (PREAG)

There are 4 tokens of the preposed adnominal genitive in the period before 1450.

The following are representative examples:


(11b) Купил есмь оу игумени оу Орины Александровского манастыря и оу ee [PREAG] сестръ [PRP]…(АСЭИ 240).

In both these examples, the possessor expression is the anaphoric pronoun ee ‘she-gen.sg’, an ungoverned genitive. In (11a), “I have granted a boon to Mar’ja, wife of Vasilij Borisovich Kopnin, and her son Fedor,” the NP head is the direct object сына ‘son-acc.sg’; in (11b), it is the prepositional object сестръ ‘sisters-gen.pl’.

Closer analysis of constructions like (11a–b), shows that the NP head can appear in a variety of syntactic roles: direct object (1x), prepositional object (2x) and a constituent in oblique case (1x). As for its placement in the sentence, the NP head is found in post-verbal position in all examples. The NP head is represented as the following kinship terms: сынъ ‘son’, сестра ‘sister’, брат, ‘brother’, and братаничь ‘nephew’. In all of the examples the possessor is anaphoric pronoun/pronominal его ‘his’ or ee ‘her. Structurally, the postposed possessive phrase is shown as PP-GEN.SG. Semantically, the possessor is a human male or female.
Analysis of all examples in PREAG group shows that the possessor represents old
information in the context (it was mentioned earlier in the text).

7.2.7. Preposed possessive adjective with suffix –sk + Postposed possessive adjective
(PRESK + POSPA)

There is just one possessive construction of this type, found in the period 1500–
1550:

dочь Уньковского с своими детьми с Вергию да с Посником продала есмя в
dом пречистой на Симонов архимодриту Трифону з братею сельцо
Филитово…(АФЗХ 94).

In (13), ‘I, Mar’ja, wife of Mixail Dičkov’, the NP head is жена ‘wife-F.NOM.SG’
and Михайловская … Дичкова ‘Mixail-POS.F.NOM.SG Dičko- POS.F.NOM.SG’

The NP head is a constituent is a subject in pre-verbal position. The NP head is
жена ‘wife’ and a possessor/referent is a possessive adjective with suffix –sk in the
preposed part (Михайловская) and a possessive adjective in a postposed part
(Дичкова). Semantically, the possessor/referent is male. Structurally, the possessive
construction is shown as SK- NOM.SG + PA- NOM.SG. As this example occurs at the very
beginning of the text, the possessive clearly represents new information in the context.

7.3. Concluding remarks on Kinship

To sum up the group of possessive constructions in Kinship, the NP head is
always a kinship term (сын ‘son’, жена ‘wife’, дочь ‘daughter’, брат ‘brother’, сестра
‘sister’, братаничь ‘nephew’, отец ‘father’ etc.). The possessor in these constructions is
always a human being, either male or a female, who is related to the NP head. The fact that the majority of possessors are male is probably due to cultural factors.

Based on the 518 examples that comprise this group, it can be concluded that the preposed possessive adjective + postposed adnominal genitive (PREPA + POSAG) possessive construction is the pattern construction (see 7.1.1.). The PREPA + POSAG possessor expression is a ‘split’ construction, in which the preposed part is a possessive adjective derived from a forename and the postposed possessive adjective is an ungovernmented genitive represented by patronymic nouns or possessive adjectives derived from the forenames or nicknames of the subjects’ grandfathers.

Most of the possessor expressions convey new information in both the preposed and the postposed parts. In Old Russian, it was typical for the new information in a phrase to be placed to the right of old information, so postposition is expected here; however, this pattern tended to be overruled in possessive phrases consisting of possessive adjectives and co-referential patronyms. The conclusion is that the word order in these examples is dictated by a pragmatic tendency other the normal information-structure pattern: when the information value of all the elements in the possessor expression is equal, possessive adjectives are preposed and patronyms in the genitive are postposed (except when the NP head is itself stressed).

Besides the pattern construction, several other possessive constructions are found in this group. These deviations from the pattern construction can have various motivations.

In the PREPA + POSPA construction, the possessor appears as a preposed possessive adjective, and there is a coreferential postposed possessive adjective (PREPA
Most often, the possessors in this group are fathers, e.g., Григорьев сын Попов, or husbands. The possessor expression is a two-word phrase, in which one of the constituents is a possessive adjective derived from the proper name of the possessor, and the other is a patronymic adjective. The postposed part of PREPA + POSPA is an agreeing adjective, not an ungoverned genitive, as in the pattern construction; the postposed portion in PREPA + POSPA does not involve a noun derivationally marked for possessivity (e.g., a patronymic noun). In the pattern construction, the postposed part is so marked, and so it cannot undergo any further derivation for possessivity; it has to be in genitive (Васильевича vs. поп). All the possessive expressions convey new information in the context; the preposition of the first element in contrast to the postposition of the second is apparently due to the same tendency as in the pattern construction.

In the PREPA pattern, the possessor expression is always a single word, a possessive adjective derived from a forename — a father or husband — e.g., Остафиевъ ‘Ostafij’s’ (7.2.2). The possessor is preposed to the head NP even though it represents new information; as noted above, this is the norm for possessive adjectives unless they are in direct contrast with another element. The slight increase in the use of this construction in the period 1500–1550 is probably an accident of the corpus.

The examples in this group are names found at lists of witnesses at the end of documents. The scribal convention was to refer to people by fuller names in the official/formal portion of the document, but there seems to have been less need for specificity in the witness lists.

In the POSAG (7.2.3.) and PREAG (7.2.6.) constructions, the possessor expression likewise consists of a single noun or pronoun. In all the examples of PREAG
and POSAG and most of the examples of POSAG, the possessor is conveyed by anaphoric pronouns in the genitive case (его ‘his’, ее ‘her’ or их ‘their’). The position of the possessive vis-à-vis the head noun seems to be governed by both by general principles of information structure and by conventions of the genres of writing. In the PREAG construction, the possessor expression consistently represents given/old information, so it is not surprising that it occurs to the left of the asserted NP head. Conversely, the possessor expressions in many of the cases of POSAG represent new information in the context; items that are mentioned for the first time ordinarily come later in the phrase in Old Russian. However, there are also cases of POSAG in which the possessor is postposed even though it clearly represents old information, as shown by the use of anaphoric pronouns. In these examples, the possessor expressions are in focus; this is the reason why they are postposed.

Like the pattern construction, PREPC or POSPC are mixed constructions in which possessivity is expressed by both a possessive adjective and an ungoverned adnominal genitives. However, unlike the pattern construction, the possessor expression is not split by the NP head. There are not enough data to establish why these constructions are chosen over the pattern construction.

In both PREPC and POSPC, the underlying possessor consists of the noun князь ‘prince’ plus two appositives — a first name and patronymic, or else a first name, patronymic, and nickname/surname (7.2.4 and 7.2.5.). In the possessive construction, the first two nouns in the underlying possessor are represented by adjectival forms, княж- plus the derived possessive of the forename, while the remaining appositives are conveyed by nouns in the genitive. Over time, the possessive adjective княж-starts not to
agree with the NP head; evidently, it becomes a part of compound name: княж-
 Васильева. In all the examples found in the POSPC group, the possessor is mentioned
 for the first time and is postposed to the head noun, as expected (7.2.5.).
CHAPTER 8

RESIDENCE

8.0. Preliminary remarks

The semantic classification Residence is defined by the possessor type and its relationship with the NP head. This is not prototypical possession according to Taylor’s (1996: 339) classification, discussed in Chapter 1, because the possessor is not a human being but a place, and there possessed entity is not owned by the possessor but rather dwells in the possessor. However, this semantic type is included in my research because the constructions used to express it overlap with the possessive constructions I have discussed in the previous chapters. The possessor type for this group is the name of a place/location where people reside, and the NP head is people/residents themselves. This is shown in the construction переяславьские люди ‘people of Perejaslavl’, in which the sk-adjective переяславьские ‘Perejaslavl’-м.ном.пl denotes the ‘residence’, while люди ‘people-ном.пл’ is the NP head of the possessive construction.

The material that I analyze in this chapter does not include toponymic constructions such as село Нефедьевское, село Клобуково, село Фонино, село Кузнецов ог село Кокошкино, as this type of toponym does not represent the same kind of the possessive construction; even these toponyms are derived from the names of founders, the eponymous Fonja, Klobuk, Kuznec etc. are not residents “belonging to” the
village. My analysis here includes only relative adjectives derived from the names of the locations where people reside, such as переяславъские люди, mentioned above.

Possessive or relative adjectives derived from nouns which refer to institutions rather than geographical locations, e.g., симановскии 'belonging/relating to Simanov Monastery’, are excluded because they are classified as a separate group called Institutional Ownership (Chapter 4).30

In section 8.1, I will establish the pattern possessive construction for the Residence group for the period from pre-1450 to post-1600. Then, in section 8.2, I will analyze and explain the semantic or syntactic (functional) conditions motivating the less frequent possessive constructions appearing during this period; I will also address the main causes of divergence from the pattern possessive construction.

In the database, the residence group is represented by 143 examples out of a total of 1700 possessive constructions in all the periods examined. The chronological distribution of the examples by fifty-year periods is presented in Table 8.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>before 1450</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1450–1500</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500–1550</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550–1600</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after 1600</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.1. Residence group chronologically

Looking at each period separately, we see the following distribution of Residence possessive constructions by time period (Table 8.1.): before 1450 — 29 (20.27%); 1450–

30 I treat sk-adjectives as ‘possessive’ rather than the more general ‘relative’, as they denote relationships of belonging, albeit not prototypical ones, and because adjectives with the same suffix are used in more prototypical possessive constructions. At some level, these adjectives show that there is a certain possessivity in this relation between the NP head and a possessor.
1500 — 41 (28.67%); 1500–1550 — 29 (20.27%); 1550–1600 — 30 (20.97%); after 1600 — 14 (9.79%).

**Figure 8.1. The distribution of Residence possessive constructions by time period**

While selecting the documents for this research, I tried to have each of the given periods be represented by an approximately equal number of documents. Nevertheless, as can be seen from Figure 8.1, these efforts did not result in an equal distribution of the possessive constructions that form the Residence group for all the time periods, though 1500–1550, 1550–1600. Proportionately, Residence is least represented after 1600 and most represented 1450–1500. The underrepresentation of these possessive constructions in the period after 1600 may be an accident of the corpus.
Based on the classified database, the following types of possessive constructions are found in the group Residence (Table 8.2.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possessor</th>
<th>before</th>
<th>1450–</th>
<th>1500–</th>
<th>1550–</th>
<th>after</th>
<th>1600–</th>
<th>1600</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSSK</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESK</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREAG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSAG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSPA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.2. Types of possessive constructions in the Residence group chronologically

The relative proportions of the possessive constructions that are found/occur in the Residence group for the entire period studied is shown graphically in Figure 8.2.
In sections 1.1, I will consider the various categories of possessives presented in Table 8.2 and Figure 8.2 for the Residence group over all periods.

8.1. Pattern possessive construction for the Residence group

As noted in the chapter on methodology, the most frequent possessive construction in any given semantic group is treated as the pattern possessive construction for that group. As shown in Table 8.2 and Figure 8.2, the POSSK construction (postposed possessive adjective with the suffix -sk-) is the most frequent construction for the Residence group, if all time periods are taken together (87=60.83%).
8.1.1. Before 1450

In the period before 1450, POSSK constructions in the Residence group are represented by 21 examples in my database. An illustrative example is given below:

(1) Ни наместници [S] (мои) переяславские [POSSK], и волостели [S] кинельские [POSSK], и их тивуну к темь людем и к пришлым дворян своих не вьылают ни по што…(АСЭИ 30).

In this example, “And my Perejaslav’ governors and my Kinel’ deputies and their lieutenants do not send their officials to those people and to incomers for any reason,” the conjoined subjects наместници ‘governors-NOM.PL.’ and волостели ‘deputies-NOM.PL.’ serve as the noun phrase heads. They are modified by the agreeing sk-adjectives переяславские ‘Perejaslav’-POS.M.NOM.PL.’ and кинельские ‘Kinel’-POS.M.NOM.PL., respectively; these function as possessor expressions denoting the places to which the referents of the heads (officials) “belong,” i.e., where they serve and live.

Closer analysis of constructions like (1a), shows that the NP head is subject in all examples (21x). Also, the NP head is found in pre-verbal position in all examples. The NP head in this group is always наместници ‘provincial governor’ and волостели ‘regional deputy’. The possessor is expressed by a postposed possessive/relative adjective with the suffix -sk-, structurally shown as SK-NOM.PL. Semantically the possessor represents a collective settlement. All the relevant possessive adjectives are formed from the names of places/cities (Kostroma — Kostrom’skyi, Perejaslav’— Perejaslav’skyi, Dmitrov — Dmitrov’skyi, etc.), as seen in the two examples in (1).

31 In my database, волостели always comes after наместници in the same phrase, as in (1). There are no examples in my database in which волостели come before наместници. This suggests that наместници held a higher status in the state hierarchy.
As can be seen from the examples for this group, some of the possessive construction also includes the possessive pronoun моi ‘I-POS’ which is postposed in regard to the NP head, as in example (1): наместници мои переяславские (11x). These pronouns are not co-referential with the sk-adjectives; they denote a relation is closer to the prototype (Personal Ownership, see Chapter 3) than residence, because there is actually a human possessor expression (cf. Office, Chapter 6). The possessive pronoun is actually unnecessary (pleonastic), since the author (the first-person) is the grand prince, the only ruler who can have deputies in the given region. In the same time period (before 1450) there are about the same number of constructions without the possessive pronoun (10x).

The question that still remains why the possessor is postposed. Closer analysis of the discourse structure shows that the two conjoined phrases are in focus with one another. On the basis of their cultural background, the authors and scribes would have presupposed that the grand prince had governors and deputies in the provinces; thus the weightier (more asserted) information would be the specific locations to which those officials belonged. (Cf. English the governor of Ohio, the mayor of Columbus, which are ordinarily definite even when first mentioned, because the existence of such officials is presupposed; generally, in such expressions the emphasis is on the place names.)

8.1.2. 1450–1500

In the period 1450–1500, we find 34 POSSK constructions; this makes it the most frequent possessive construction in this period. A representative example is given in (2):
In this example, “And my Vyšegorod deputies and their lieutenants do not judge Dmitrij and those people of theirs in anything,” the NP head is волостели ‘deputies-NOM.PL’. The agreeing sk-adjective вышогородцкие ‘Vyšegorod-POS.M.NOM.PL’ functions as a possessor expression; the possessive adjective моя ‘I-POS.M.NOM.PL’, which also agrees with the head, refers to a separate possessor, the grand prince (the first person of the document).

In this set of examples, the NP head can appear in a variety of syntactic roles: subject (28x), direct object (4x), prepositional object (1x), or other constituent in an oblique case (1x). As for its placement in the sentence, the NP head is found in pre-verbal position in 31 examples and post-verbal position in 3. The possessor is expressed by a postposed possessive adjective with the suffix -sk-, structurally shown as SK-NOM.PL in (2). Semantically, the possessor represents a settlement. All the possessive adjectives are formed from the names of places/cities, just like the examples in section 8.1.1.

All the possessor expressions in this set of examples represent old information; that is, they have been mentioned in the previous context. However, closer analysis shows that they are all in contrastive focus, like the examples discussed in section 8.1.1, thus they are being re-asserted.

8.1.3. 1500–1550

The POSSK construction is also the most frequent possessive construction in the period 1500–1550. It is represented by 19 examples, as illustrated in (3).
Example (3) can be translated, “And our Galič and Kostroma governors and Soligalič and Likurga deputies and their lieutenants do not collect their sustenance from them.” The first two subjects, наместницы ‘governors-NOM.PL’ and волостели ‘deputies-NOM.PL’, each control two conjoined possessor expressions consisting of agreeing sk-adjectives — галичские и костромские ‘Galič-POS.M.NOM.PL and Kostroma-POS.M.NOM.PL’ and ‘Soligalič-POS.M.NOM.PL and Likurga-POS.M.NOM.PL’, respectively.

Closer analysis of constructions like (3), shows that the NP head appears as subject (17x) and prepositional object (2x). As for its placement in the sentence, the NP head is found in pre-verbal position in 16 examples and post-verbal position in 3. The postposed possessive adjective with -sk- occurs in two structural variants: SK-NOM.PL (17x) and SK-GEN.PL (2x). Semantically, the possessor is a collective settlement, as in the previous periods.

As in the previous subsection, all the possessor expressions in this set of examples represent old information. However, they are also all in contrastive focus, so their postposition follows the normal pattern of Old Russian discourse.

8.1.4. 1550–1600

In the period 1550–1600, POSSK is represented by 9 examples; thus it is not the most frequent type of possessive constructions in this period (see below). The construction is illustrated in (4):
In (4), “And if I grant a boon to any governor of mine belonging to Dmitrov and Berendevo and Povel’skij [Stan]…,” the NP head is the direct object наместника ‘governor-acc.sg’; this controls the agreeing possessive adjectives ‘Dmitrov-pos.m.acc.sg’ and Berendevo-pos.m.acc.sg and Povel’skij-stan-pos.m.acc.sg’.

In this set of examples, the NP heads serve as subjects (6x) or direct objects (3x). As for its placement in the sentence, the NP head is found in pre-verbal position in 8 examples and post-verbal position in 1.

The postposed possessive adjective with the suffix -sk- occurs in two structural variants: SK-nom.pl and SK-acc.sg (3x). Semantically, the possessor is a collective settlement. As in the previous subsections, the possessor expressions are in contrastive focus with one another, which evidently explains why they are postposed.

8.1.5. After 1600

The period after 1600 is represented by only 4 POSSK constructions, exemplified by (5):

(5) Также есмь пожаловал того архимарита Рафаила з братьею: хто у них в монастырских селех и в деревнях учнут жити монастырских слуг, и наместник (наши) володимерской не въезжает ни по что, и не судит их ни в чем…(АФЗХ (3) 44).
In (5), “our Vladimir governor,” the NP head is the subject наместник-NOM.SG, which controls the agreeing possessive adjective володимерской ‘Vladimir-
POS.M.NOM.SG’.

In the given set of examples, the NP head appears as the subject in preverbal position. Structurally, the possessor is expressed in the form SK-NOM.PL or SK-NOM.SG. Semantically, the possessor is a collective settlement, as in the other periods.

In these possessive constructions the possessor expression is postposed because it is in contrastive focus.

8.1.6. Overview of the pattern construction for the Residence group

As noted above, the POSSK construction is the most frequent possessive construction in the Residence group; it represents a majority (87/143=60.83 %) of the examples based on the total number of occurrences in all periods. The only exception is the period 1550–1600, which is represented by nine POSSK constructions; the most frequent construction in this period is PRESK, as will be explained later (8.2.1.). Looking at the distribution of the POSSK possessive construction by fifty-year periods, it can be seen that the distribution of the examples is almost equal in the periods before 1450 and 1500–1550 (21 and 19); the period 1450–1500 shows the highest number of examples (34) and the periods 1550–1600 and after 1600 have the fewest examples (9 and 4). It is very important to notice that the decrease of number of the POSSK constructions occurs after 1550, which can be connected with the period of the ruler Ivan the Terrible (crowned tsar in 1547). During the period of his reforms, the offices denoted by the terms наместници and волостели were replaced by new service categories with different
This historical fact probably explains why the database shows a smaller number of POSSK examples from 1550 onwards. As it can be seen, the majority of the examples found in the texts before 1550 are examples which contain the two terms наместники and волостели together. Given the nature of the semantic category Residence, it is not surprising that the possessor is always inanimate.

In some of the previous research, such as Zverkovskaja 1986, it has been argued that the Old Russian the suffix -sk- is found in adjectives which are usually formed from nouns which refer to people and animals, but very rarely from inanimate nouns. The only inanimate nouns from which the possessive adjectives can be derived with the suffix -sk- are locations, which may be taken as metonymic for the people who reside in them.

Analysis of the discourse structure shows that all possessor expressions in POSSK possessive constructions are treated as newly asserted information (whether or not they are actually new to the discourse) because they are in focus of contrast with other possessive constructions and/or have greater informational weight than their NP heads, which are presupposed (officials in a bureaucratic hierarchy).

According to Bratishenko (2005), even though some of the adjectives with a suffix -sk- are derived from inanimate stems as in rizuškajb ‘of Riga’, they have always indirect reference to a group of persons, either residing in that place or sharing an ethnic identity. I agree with Bratishenko (ibid.) and Zverkovskaja (1986) that these adjectives have indirect reference to a group of persons; these adjectives are derived from inanimate nouns primarily because they have indirect reference to a group of persons, as shown in the sections above.

8.2. Less frequent possessive constructions

As discussed before, POSSK is the pattern possessive construction for the Residence group; however, 56 other possessive constructions occur with this semantic class in the database. In the following subsections, I will attempt to explain what special conditions are present in those examples in order to explain those deviations.

8.2.1. Preposed possessive adjective with suffix -sk- (PRESK)

There are 35 possessive constructions in the Residence group in which the possessor is presented as a preposed (rather than postposed) possessive adjective with the suffix -sk-. There are 7 tokens in the period before 1450, 5 in the period 1450–1500, and 6 in the period 1500–50; then there is a sharp spike to 13 examples in the period 1550–1600, followed by a sharp decline to only 4 tokens after 1600. The following is a representative example.


In (6), “And if a person from the city is [judged] right or wrong, or a person from the region…,” the NP head is the subject человек ‘person-NOM.SG’; the possessor expression is the agreeing adjective городской ‘city-POS.M.NOM.SG’.

In constructions like (6), the NP head can appear in a variety of syntactic roles: subject (23x), prepositional object (3x), direct object (5x), and other constituent in an oblique case (4x). It is found in pre-verbal position in 18 examples and post-verbal in 17.

33Given its meaning, волостной ‘pertaining to an administrative region (волость)’ could potentially be viewed as a type of possessive. However, I chose in advance to exclude denominal adjectives with the suffix -ьn- from my corpus because they generally denote relations that are not possessive.
The following nouns are found as the NP head: крестьяне ‘peasants’, старожильцы ‘longtime residents’, люди ‘people’, человек ‘person’, and писцы ‘scribes’.

Semantically, the possessor is a collective settlement, as always in the Residence group. The possessor is expressed by an adjective formed from the name of a specific settlement or from the common noun город ‘city’ (города). After 1550 no possessive adjectives derived from the noun город ‘city’ are attested in the corpus.

While the pattern construction POSSK discussed in 8.1 occurs exclusively with the nouns наместницы and волостели, it can be noted that PRESK is not found with those nouns in the database.

When the examples of PRESK are examined in context, 33 of them turn out to convey given information; the possessor is mentioned earlier in the text and thus is already accessible to the reader. Preposed position is associated with given information in Old Russian, as in the modern language; the connection is borne out by my data. The two remaining examples — actually, the same phrase found different documents — occur at the absolute beginning of the document, so they convey new information; the same is true of the NP heads. Where both the possessor expression and the head are asserted, the default order in my corpus is adjective — noun.

8.2.2. Preposed adnominal genitive (PREAG)

There are 12 possessive constructions in the Residence/possessor group in which the possessor is presented as a preposed adnominal genitive. There is one token each in

---

34 The adjective городской denotes ‘living in/belonging to a city’, which corresponds to the Residence semantic type. Note that, in context, the reference is always to a specific city identified previously in the document. By contrast, Modern Russian городской can denote the generic ‘urban’.
the periods before 1450 and 1500–50, none in the period 1450–1500, 7 in the period 1550–1600, and 3 after 1600. The following are representative examples:

(7a) Бежицкого Верха [PREAG] люди [DO] игумену или его приказнику в ту слободу к собе не примати… (АСЭИ 179).

(7b) да на Колотовице по реке по Кестме тягались Шипинского села [PREAG] крестьяне [S]… (АФЗХ 63).

In (7a), “The abbot or his deputy is not to receive people of Bežeckij Verx to themselves [i.e., the monastery] in that free settlement,” the NP head is люди ‘people-gen.pl’ (which usually connotes ‘serfs’ or ‘servants’ in legal documents). The possessor expression, Бежицкого Верха ‘Beiçek-POS.M.GEN.SG Verx-GEN.SG’, is a toponym that includes an adjectival modifier; as noted elsewhere, noun phrases involving such modifiers are never converted into possessive adjectives in my corpus. (This is the general tendency in Old Russian, see Frolova 1954: 12). The same observation applies to (7b), “and at Kolotovica, along the Kestma River, the peasants of Šipanskoe village,” where the NP head is the subject крестьяне ‘peasants-nom.pl’, and the possessor expression Шипинского села ‘Šipanskoe-n.GEN.SG village-GEN.SG’.

In constructions like (7a–b), the NP head can appear in a variety of syntactic roles: subject (8x), prepositional object (1x), direct object (1x), or a constituent in oblique case (2x). It is found in post-verbal position in 9 examples and pre-verbal in 3. The NP head can be the nouns крестьяне ‘peasants’, таможники ‘customs officials’, люди ‘people’, and человек ‘person’. Structurally, the preposed adnominal genitive can have
the form SK-gen.sg+N-gen.sg or N-gen.sg+SK-gen.sg (2x), shown in (1a–b).

Semantically, the possessor a collective settlement, as always in the Residence group.

Closer analysis of these examples shows that the possessor expressions are preposed because they represent old information in the context; the given entities have been mentioned earlier in the text and are easily accessible to the reader.

8.2.3. Postposed adnominal genitive (POSAG)

There are 7 possessive constructions in the Residence/possessor group in which the possessor is presented as a postposed adnominal genitive. None of the examples occur in the period before 1450; there is one example in each of the periods 1450–1500 and 1550–1600, 2 in the period 1500–1550, and 3 after 1600. The following are representative examples:

(8a) Дапожню, что косят хрестьяне [S] Петровские стороны [POSAG] (АСЭИ 464).

(8b) Ведомо то, господине, у меня старожильцом людем добрым [Obl] Слободские волости [POSAG]… (АФЗХ 3).

In (8a), “And the field that the peasants of the Petrovo side mow…,” the NP head is the subject хрестьяне ‘peasants-NOM.PL’, and the possessor expression is a phrase with a noun and modifying adjective, Петровские стороны ‘Petrovo-POS.F.GEN.SG side-GEN.SG’. Similarly, in (8b), “That is known, lord, in my domain to longtime residents, reputable peasants of the Sloboda region,” the NP head is the experiencer людем ‘people-DAT.PL’ (with the connotation ‘peasants’), while the possessor expression is again a
phrase with a noun and modifying adjective, Слободицкие волости ‘Sloboda-
POS.F.GEN.SG region-GEN.SG’. In these cases, as in 8.2.3, the modified nouns cannot form
compound adjectives, so the possessor expressions are an adnominal genitive (cf. Frolova
1954: 12).

In this set of examples, the NP head can appear in a variety of syntactic roles:
prepositional object (1x), direct object (1x), subject (2x), or other oblique constituent
(3x). It is found in pre-verbal position in 4 examples and post-verbal in 3. Structurally,
the postposed adnominal genitive is SK-GEN.SG + N-GEN.SG. Semantically, the possessor
is a collective settlement.

Closer analysis of these examples in the context shows that the possessor
expressions represent new information; that is, they have not been mentioned earlier in
the text. This explains their occurrence in postposition.

8.2.4. Other constructions

The one possessive construction that belongs to the group Residence is found in
my database, but it is attested in only one example. I will describe this one here, but I will
not analyze it extensively because there is an insufficient number of examples from
which to draw conclusions.

The POSPA possessive construction is represented by just one example, which is
found in the period 1500–1550:

(9) да приказщику [OBL] городовому [POSPA] Василю Жедринскому… (АФХЗ
81).
This example can be translated, “And to the city’s [Nižnij Novgorod] deputy Vasilij Žedrinskij.” The NP head, приказчику ‘deputy-DAT.SG’, is an oblique constituent in post-verbal position. The possessor is a postposed possessive adjective городовому ‘city-POS.M.DAT.SG’. Semantically, the possessor is a collective settlement.

8.3. Concluding remarks on Residence

To sum up the group of possessive constructions I have called Residence, the NP head is always a personal noun a resident (наместници, волостели, крестьяне, старожильцы, люди, человек, писцы etc.). The precise head noun depends, of course, on the context. The possessor in these constructions is always a place where the personal referents live or are based.

Looking at the structure of the possessor type, based on the 143 examples that represent this group, it can be concluded that the postposed possessive adjective with a suffix (POSSK) possessive construction is the pattern construction. The possessor in POSSK is always a single possessive adjective with the suffix -sk-. On the other hand, it can co-occur with the possessive pronoun мой, which appears in postposed position in regard to the NP head. The only NP heads attested in the POSSK construction are наместници and волостели. The number of these constructions decrease more than 50% after the 1550, which may be connected with historical events — Ivan the Terrible’s governmental reforms, which led to the titles наместници and волостели disappearing.

Closer analysis of the discourse structure shows that the two conjoined phrases are in focus with one another. On the basis of their cultural background, the authors and scribes would have presupposed that the grand prince had governors and deputies in the
provinces; thus the weightier (more asserted) information would be the specific locations to which those officials belonged.

Several other possessive constructions are found in this group. These deviations from the pattern construction can have various motivations. For example, in the PRESK construction, the possessor is structurally the same as in the pattern construction, but it is preposed to the possessed entity. As explained in 8.2.1, the NP head in these examples is never the nouns наместници и волостели, which are the domain of POSSK. The NP head found in the PRESK examples can be крестьяне, старожилцы, люди, человек, писцы etc. None of the fifty-year time periods shows a significant decrease or increase in use of these constructions.

Examination of the discourse structure shows that 33 of the examples convey given information, which is typically associated with preposed position (i.e., placement to the left of less given or asserted words). However, in different documents, the same phrases occur at the absolute beginning of the document, where they must convey new information; the same is true of the NP heads. Where both the possessor expression and the head are asserted, the default order in my corpus is possessor — head, realized structurally as adjective — noun.

In the possessive constructions PREAG (8.2.3.) and POSAG (8.2.4.), the possessor expression appears as an adnominal genitive. In all these cases, the possessor expression reflects a two-word construction in which one of the constituents is already marked for possessivity (i.e., is a possessive adjective), while the other is a noun modified by that adjective. Two tendencies are relevant here. First, throughout my corpus, words already marked for possessivity tend not to undergo further derivation for
possessivity. Second, semantic possessors involving nouns with adjectival modifiers are not reflected as adjectives but consistently appear as adnominal genitives.

In PREAG (8.2.3.) the possessor expression are preposed because it represents old information in the context. In POSAG (8.2.4.) the possessor expression is postposed because it represents new information in the context.
CHAPTER 9

OTHER SEMANTIC GROUPS

In this Chapter I will examine the three remaining semantic types, Saint, Proxy and Phase of Life. As these groups contain only a small number of examples, I will not examine their chronological distribution in the same detail that I used with the previous semantic groups.

9.1. Saint type

The semantic classification Saint is defined by the possessor type and its relationship to the NP head. In this case the relationship between the possessor and a NP head is that referent of the NP head is an entity (an institution or a day) dedicated, in the religious sense, to the referent of the possessor expression, which is either a saint or a holy event that is commemorated in the Orthodox Christian Church calendar. For example, in the expression на Петров д(е)нь ‘on Saint Peter’s day’, Петров ‘Peter-POS.M.ACC.SG’ is the possessor expression, and д(е)нь ‘day-ACC.SG’ is the NP head of the possessive construction. This is not prototypical possession according to Taylor’s (1996:339) classification, discussed in section 1.1. Though in many cases the possessors are human (male or female), in others they are not individuals but events — e.g., монастырь P(о)жества Х(ристо)ва ‘monastery-NOM.SG nativity-GEN.SG Christ-POS.N.GEN.SG. In
either case, the relation between the possessor and the possessed object belongs to
spiritual (transcendent) rather than physical reality, which is not the case in prototypical
possession. Moreover, the possessed objects are not concrete, as in prototypical
possession. This is obvious when they are feast days, but it is also true when they are
institutions (e.g., churches or monasteries), because the emphasis in the relation is on
their social rather than physical dimensions.

In this section, I establish a pattern possessive construction for the Saint group for
the period from pre-1450 to post-1600. Then I analyze and explain the semantic or
syntactic (functional) conditions motivating the less frequent possessive constructions
that appear during this period. I also address the main causes of divergence from the
pattern possessive construction.

In the database, Saint is represented by 56 examples out of a total of 1700
possessive constructions in all the periods examined. The chronological distribution is
shown below:
As can be seen from Figure 9.1, the chronological distribution of the possessive constructions is not equal, even though I tried to have an equal number of documents in each period. The category Saint is least represented in the period before 1450 and most represented in the period 1450–1500.

Based on the classified database, the following types of possessive constructions are found in the group Saint (Table 9.1.).
Table 9.1. Types of possessive constructions in the Saint group chronologically

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possessor</th>
<th>before 1450</th>
<th>1450-1500</th>
<th>1500-1550</th>
<th>1550-1600</th>
<th>after 1600</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POSAG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREAG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSPA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relative proportions of the possessive constructions that are found/occur in the Saint group for the entire period studied is shown graphically in Figure 9.2.

Figure 9.2. Possessive constructions found in the Saint group
9.1.1. Pattern possessive construction for the Saint group

As noted in section 1.4, the most frequent possessive construction in any given semantic group is treated as the pattern possessive construction for that group. As shown in Table 9.1 and Figure 9.2, the POSAG construction (post-posed adnominal genitive) is the most frequent construction for the Saint group if all time periods are taken together (33=58.92%).

Of the 33 examples of the pattern possessive construction, there are only 2 before 1450; 21 examples in the period 1450–1500; 3 in the period 1500–50; 5 in the period 1550–1600; and 2 in the period after 1600. The following are representative examples:

(1a) Что у них монастырь [S] P(o)жества Х(риста)ва [POSAG] в Прилуце... (АСЭИ 189).

(1b) И на том срок: на Покров [PRP] c(вя)теи б(огороди)ци [POSAG]... (АСЭИ 467).

In (1a), ‘As for the fact that they [Trinity-Sergius Monastery] have the Monastery of the Nativity of Christ in the Bow…,’ the NP head is монастырь ‘monastery-NOM.SG’, and the possessor expression is P(o)жества Х(риста)ва ‘nativity-GEN.SG Christ-POS.N.GEN.SG’. In (1b), ‘And for that the deadline is until the Intercession of the Holy Theotokos [October 1],’ the NP head is Покров ‘intercession-ACC.SG’, and the possessor expression is c(вя)теи б(огороди)ци ‘holy-F.GEN.SG Theotokos-GEN.SG.

The NP head can be a subject (10x), as in (1a); a prepositional object (19x), as in (1b); or a direct object (4x). It is found in pre-verbal position in 7 examples and 26 in post-verbal. The NP heads attested in this set of examples are дом ‘home’, церковь ‘church’, деревня ‘village’, монастырь ‘monastery’, and Покров ‘Intercession’. The
postposed adnominal genitive consists of a noun phrase (a noun and an adjective),
structurally shown as: N-GEN.SG + ADJ-GEN.SG (where ADJ stands for a non-possessive
adjective); ADJ-GEN.SG + N-GEN.SG; or N-GEN.SG + PA-GEN.SG.

The attested possessors in the POSAG constructions are noun phrases that include
adjectival modifiers: {живоначальная Троица} ‘life-giving-F.SG Trinity},
{пречистая/святая богородица} ‘entirely-pure/holy Theotokos’ or {Рожество
Христово} ‘Nativity Christ-POS.N.SG}. As has been noted elsewhere, such possessive
phrases do not form compound possessive adjectives (cf. Modern Russian свято-
богородичный ‘holy-Theotokos-POS’); they are consistently realized as adnominal
genitives in my corpus. The possessor expression in this set of POSAG constructions is
postposed because it represents new information in the context; the referent is mentioned
for the first time.

9.1.2. Less frequent possessive constructions

As I noted before, POSAG is the pattern possessive construction for the Saint
possessive group; however, 23 other possessive constructions occur with this semantic
class in the database. In this section, I will attempt to explain what conditions are
presented in those examples in order to explain those deviations.
9.1.2.1. Preposed adnominal genitive (PREAG)

There are 6 examples of the preposed adnominal genitive PREAG. None of the tokens are found after 1550; there are two each in the earlier fifty-year periods. The following is a representative example:

(2) Пречистые ради богородици и ч(е)стнаг(о) ея [PREAG] благов(е)щ(е)ния [Obl]…(АСЭИ 246).

In (2), “For the sake of the entirely pure Theotokos and her honored Annunciation,” the NP head is the prepositional object благов(е)щ(е)ния ‘Annunciation-GEN,’ while the possessor expression is the anaphoric pronoun ея ‘she-GEN’.

In this set of examples, the NP head is either благовещение ‘Annunciation’ or успение ‘Dormition’, feast-days connected with the Theotokos (Virgin Mary); it can be a direct object (4x), a subject (1x), or a constituent in oblique case (1x), as in (2). It is pre-verbal in 3 examples and post-verbal in 3 others. The possessor expression, as in (2), is the anaphoric pronoun ея ‘she-GEN’. Semantically, the possessor is an Orthodox saint. The possessor is preposed to the NP head because, like any anaphoric pronoun, it conveys given information in the context; indeed, its referent occurs in the immediately preceding phrase. Throughout my corpus, in every semantic group, possessor expressions consisting of anaphoric pronouns regularly appear preposed to their NP head.
9.1.2.2. Preposed possessive adjective (PREPA)

There are 12 possessive constructions in the Saint possessive group in which the possessor is presented solely as a preposed possessive adjective (PREPA). None of the examples are attested in the period after 1600; the periods before 1450 and 1550–1600 show two examples, the period 1450–1500 seven, and the period 1500–1550 one. The following is a representative example:

(3) А кто у них и откажется не о Юрьеве [PREPA] дни [PRP] …(АСЭИ 338).

In (3), “And whoever among them refuses not on George’s Day,” the NP head is the prepositional object дни ‘day-LOC.SG’, and the agreeing possessor is Юрьеве ‘George-POS.M.LOC.SG’.

The NP head can be a prepositional object (8x), as in (3), a subject (2x), or a direct object (2x). It is found in pre-verbal position in 3 examples and post-verbal in 9. In all of the examples in the PREPA group, the NP head is день ‘day’.

The possessor in the PREPA group is conveyed by a possessive adjective derived from a name of the saint. The possessor phrase is preposed even though it represents new information in the context (though clearly the referent is culturally given). Given that the possessive constructions denote feast-days of particular saints, it seems likely that the adjectives formed phraseological units with the noun ‘day’; it can be noted that the days are random but those of particular, important saints whose feasts were used to mark seasonal boundaries (St. George on November 26 and St. Peter’s on July 12). Such phraseologisms can be compared with великий князь ‘grand prince’, which in my corpus

—–

35 These days were commonly used as term limits in legal contracts; for example, St. George’s Day was when serfs were allowed to move from one master to another (Daniel E. Collins, personal communication).
always has a preposed adjective. Presumably, the adjective would only be postposed if one saint’s feast were being contrasted with another; otherwise, there is no reason for it to be singled out by postposition as being more asserted than the noun it modifies.

9.1.2.3. Postposed possessive adjective (POSPA)

Finally, there are 5 possessive constructions in the Saint possessor group in which the possessor expression is presented as a postposed possessive adjective. This construction is not attested in the database for all the periods investigated. None of the examples occur in the period after 1550; there is one in the period before 1450 and two each in the periods 1450–1500 and 1500–1550. The following is a representative example.

(4) … на Р(о)ж(е)ство [PRP] Х(ри)с(то)во [POSPA] с дву плуг и полот мясо, мех овса, воз сена...(ACSEI 260).

In (4), “On the Nativity of Christ, [they are to give my representative] from [each] two furlong a piece of meat, the wool of a sheep, a cartload of hay,” the NP head is the prepositional object Р(о)ж(е)ство ‘nativity-ACC.SG’, and the possessor expression is the adjective Христово ‘Christ-POS’. The same possessor is found in the other examples in this set. Also attested as NP head is the noun Крещение ‘baptism’. The NP head can appear as a prepositional object (4x), as in (4), or as a subject (1x). It is found in post-verbal position in all 5 examples. The postposed position of the possessor phrase seems to be phraseological, like the preposed position of those discussed in section 9.1.1.2. It can be noted that there were several church feasts celebrating births; in addition to
Christmas, there was the Nativity of the Theotokos and that of John the Forerunner (John the Baptist). Thus the postposition of the adjectival modifier can perhaps be viewed as a form of contrastive focus.

9.2. Delegant type

The semantic possessor (delegant) in this type is someone who is not present in the narrated legal event but who has delegated someone else to serve as his/her agent or proxy. The delegate (agent or proxy) is not specified within the possessive construction. The NP head is either место (when the delegate is the delegant’s legal proxy) or имя (when the delegate is the delegant’s agent; ‘name’ is a symbol of the delegant’s authority). This is shown in the construction Во имя о(т)ца и с(в)на и с(вя)т(о)го д(ух)а ‘in the Name of the Father and Son and Holy Spirit’ in which отец и сын и святой дух ‘Father and Son and Holy spirit -GEN.SG’ is the possessor expression, and во имя ‘in name - ACC.SG’ is the NP head of the possessive construction, conveying the delegated authority. It is the delegation of power that distinguishes Delegant and Signature type from the more common semantic type Author, discussed in Chapter 5.

In the database, the Delegant type is represented by 15 examples out of a total of 1700 possessive constructions in all the periods examined. In this section I will discuss all the examples found in this group, because they raise interesting issues for the study of possessivity in Old Russian.
9.2.1. Preposed possessive adjective (PREPA)

There is just one possessive construction in the Delegant type in which the possessor is presented as a preposed possessive adjective (5). It can be noted that this is also the only example in the type in which the semantic possessor only consists in a single noun.

(5) Тягался Степанко Понафидин, в старостино [PREPA] место[PRP] и в всех хрестьян место... (АСЭИ 583).

In (5), “Stepanko Ponafadin brought suit, in place of the elder and in place of all the peasants,” the NP head is место ‘place-ACC.SG’, and the possessor/delegant {староста} ‘village headman’ is conveyed by старостино ‘headman-POS.N.ACC.SG’.

The NP head место ‘place’ is a prepositional object. It is found in post-verbal position. The possessor is a possessive adjective derived from the noun староста ‘elder’, structurally shown as PA-ACC.SG. Semantically, the possessor is a human male.

9.2.2. Preposed + postposed possessive adjectives (PREPA + POSPA)

There are three possessive constructions in the Delegant type in which the possessor is presented as a preposed possessive adjective, as in 9.2.1.1, plus a postposed possessive adjective. These constructions occur in the periods 1500–50 and 1550–1600.

(6b) Дай Федор Фалин сын и в приказчиков [PREPA] в место [PRP] старцово Иасафово [POSPA], взяв с собою старожильцов с обе стороны… (АФЗХ 129).

(6c) И Ивашко Косой и Ивашко Каблук в старцово [PREPA] место [PRP] в Федорово [POSPA], так ркли... (АФЗХ 63).

In all these examples, the NP head is the prepositional object место ‘place-ACC.SG’. In (6a), “And on October 1, before the scribes, the constable Ivaško Kzovskoj produced both litigants — in place of Archimandrite Iakim: servant Fed’ko Martem’janov of Pečersk Monastery and archpriest Ivan of Spassky (Monastery) with brothers …,” the discontinuous possessor phrase is архимаричо... Иякимово ‘archimandrite-POS.N.ACC.SG… Iakim-POS.N.ACC.SG’. In (6b), “And Fedor, Fala’s son, in place of the deputy, the elder Iosaf, having brought with himself longtime inhabitants from both sides…,” the possessor phrase, likewise discontinuous, is приказциково… старцово Иасафово ‘deputy-POS.N.ACC.SG elder-POS.N.ACC.SG Iasaf-POS.N.ACC.SG’.

In (6c), the possessor expression is старцово… Федорово ‘elder-POS.N.ACC.SG Fedor-POS.N.ACC.SG’. Thus, in these examples, the semantic possessors/delegants are {архимарит Ияким} ‘Archimandrite Iakim’, {приказчик, старец Иасаф} ‘deputy, Elder Iasaf’ and {старец Федор} ‘Elder Fedor’. It can be seen that possessive adjectives are derived from each of the appositive nouns in the semantic possessor. That pattern can be elaborated with other PAs, reflecting appositive nouns in the semantic possessor. The possessor referent's first title is placed before the NP head; the other PAs, formed from additional titles and proper names, are postposed. Semantically, the possessor is a human male.
9.2.3. Preposed possessive adjective + postposed Postposed possessive construction (PREPA + POSPC)

There are just two possessive constructions of this type, both found in the period 1450–1500.

(7a) Перед князем Михаилом Андреевичем, в-ыгуменово [PREPA] место[PRP] троецког(о), в Пасеино [POSPC], старец троецкой Фегностъ стал… (АСЭИ 467).


In both examples, as throughout the Delegant type, the NP head is в место ‘in place-ACC.SG’. In (7a), “In place of the Trinity abbot Paseja, the Trinity elder Fegnost stood before Prince Mixail Andreevič…” the possessor expression is ыгуменово… троецког(о) ‘abbot-POS.N.ACC.SG Trinity POS.M.GEN.SG Paseja-POS.N.ACC.SG’.

Similarly, in (7a), ‘The elder of Trinity-Sergius’ Monastery Pamla, in place of the Trinity abbot Spiridon, the possessor expression is ыгуменово… троецког(о) Спиридонъево ‘abbot-POS.ACC.SG Holy Trinity POS.GEN.SG Spiridon-POS.ACC.SG’.

The possessors in (7a–b), semantically, are human males. The semantic possessor phrases are {игуменъ троицкий Пасея} ‘Abbot of-Trinity Paseja’ and {игуменъ троицкий Спиридоний} ‘Abbot of-Trinity Spiridonij’. Here the adjective {троицкий} ‘of-Trinity’ modifies the first noun, the title {игуменъ} ‘abbot’; cf. the phrase старец троецкой Фегностъ ‘elder-NOM.SG Trinity-POS.M.NOM.SG Feognost-NOM.SG’ in (7a). It must be emphasized that the adjective is a modifier here and not substantivized; in the documents examined for this dissertation, the adjective Троицкий is never used as a
Thus these examples are significant because they show a departure from the pattern seen elsewhere in my corpus for possessors that include adjectival modifiers to be realized as adnominal genitives (cf. sections 9.2.4–9.2.6, below). In these cases, the nouns in the possessor phrase — the title ‘abbot’ and the name of the given abbot — are realized as possessive adjectives that agree with the NP head; however, the adjective is realized as an ungoverned genitive. This closely resembles the pattern seen in Upper Sorbian, as discussed in Chapter 2. Even though the examples in (7a–b) are exceptional for Old Russian legal language, as represented in my corpus, they show that, at least for some writers, the presence of an adjectival modifier in the semantic possessor phrase did not prevent the modified nouns from being realized as possessive pronouns. Cf. Rondestvedt (1976), Makarova (1954), Ivanov (1990), Sannikov (1978), who claim that modified nouns cannot be converted to possessive adjectives in Old Russian. Clearly, that was not an obligatory syntactic rule but a pragmatic tendency (albeit a very strong one).

9.2.4. Preposed adnominal genitive (PREAG)

There are two possessive constructions in which the possessor is realized as a preposed adnominal genitive:

(8a) Тягался Степанко Понафидин, в старостину и в всех хрестьян [PREAG] место PRP]... (АСЭИ 583).

36 When scribes refer to the institution without the word ‘monastery’, as ‘Trinity’ alone, they use the noun Троица (generally preceded by the modifier святыи ‘holy’), e.g., “Се язь, Семень Федоровичъ, дал есмь с(в)готи Троици” (“I, Semen Fedorovič, have hereby given to the Holy Trinity…”; АСЭИ 3).

In both cases, the NP head is the prepositional object место 'place'. In (8a), which was also discussed in 9.2.1.1, “Stepanko Ponafidin brought suit, in place of the elder and in place of all the peasants,” the possessor phrase is всех крестьян ‘all-

PRON.GEN.PL peasants-GEN.PL). In (8b), “In place of Prince Mixail’s peasants Sobol’, son of Vasilij Listenskij, and Ivan, son of Taras,” the possessor expression includes the preposed phrase княж Михайловых крестьян ‘prince-POS Mixail- POS.M.GEN.PL peasants-GEN.PL’, reflecting the semantic possessor/delegant {княж-Михайловы крестьяне} (with the indeclinable form of the possessive of ‘prince’). This is elaborated by postposed adnominal genitives which specify the identity of Prince Mixail’s peasants — Соболи Васильева сына Листенского, да Ивана Тарасова сына ‘Sobol’-GEN.SG Vasilij-POS.M.GEN.SG son-GEN.SG Listenskij-GEN.SG and Ivan-GEN.SG Taras-POS.M.GEN.SG son-GEN.SG’, reflecting the co-referential possessors {Соболь Васильевъ сынъ Листенскии, да Иванъ Тарасовъ сынъ}.

The possessor phrases represent given information, as their referents have been mentioned in the previous context; moreover, the main stress is on the fact of authorization or the proxy, i.e., the NP head. These factors explain the preposed placement of the possessor expression in (8a) and the main possessor expression in (8b). In the latter example, the elaboration of the possessor expression occurs in postposition, probably due to constraints on the complexity of preposed possessive phrases.
9.2.5. Postposed adnominal genitive (POSAG)

Example (8b) in the previous subsection illustrates the use of postposed adnominal genitives (POSAG) in combination with another construction. The only cases in the Delegant type in which POSAG occurs by itself are in the four occurrences of the fixed formula “In the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit,” which is borrowed from ecclesiastical language (Church Slavonic). There is one example each in the periods before 1450 and 1550–1600, and two others in the period 1450–1500.

(9) Во имя [PRP] отца и сына и святого духа [POSAG] ...(АСЭИ 251).

This formula occurs at the very beginning of certain kinds of documents. The NP head is the prepositional object имя ‘name-ACC.SG’. The semantic possessor is the noun phrase {отец и сын и святой дух} ‘Father and Son and Holy Spirit’. In the possessor expression, the possessivity of the three conjoined terms is marked by the adnominal genitive. This is not surprising, since the first two nouns are kinship terms, which do not convert to possessive adjectives in my corpus; in addition, the final term includes a modifying adjective — a situation in which, as noted elsewhere, favors the adnominal genitive. The possessor represents new information in the context, so its placement in postposition is to be expected. However, it is unclear that the information structure is actually a factor in the word order, since this is a fixed phrase. There are no examples in the corpus in which the given possessor is preposed.
9.2.6. Preposed adnominal genitive + postposed adnominal genitive (PREAG + POSAG)

Finally, there are three examples in which the possessor expression is represented as a ‘split’ construction (preposed + postposed adnominal genitive). All three examples are found in the period 1500–50.

(10) Во господаря своего [PREAG] место [PRP] архиепископа Тихона ростовског(о) и ярoslавског [POSAG]… (АСЭИ 542).

In (10), “In place of his lord, Archbishop Tixon of Rostov and Jaroslav,” the NP head is the prepositional object во место ‘in place-ACC.SG’ , and the possessor expression is господаря своего… архиепископа Тихона ростовског(о) и ярoslавског ‘lord-M.GEN.SG his own – POS.M.GEN.SG … archbishop- M.GEN.SG Tixon- M.GEN.SG Rostov- POS.M.GEN.SG Jaroslav- POS.M.GEN.SG’. The NP head appears as a prepositional object in preverbal positions. The possessor expression structurally is shown as {N-GEN.SG + PP-GEN.SG} + { N-GEN.SG + SK-GEN.SG}. Semantically, the possessor is a human male.

In the given set of examples, the title is modified, so it is not surprising that the possessor expression is an adnominal genitive. The rules for its word order are the same as those discussed in section 9.2.2–9.2.3: the first title appears before the NP head, the appositives after it. A name that occurs between a noun and its modifier (i.e., between adnominal genitives) also remains genitive.
9.3. Signature type

The semantic possessor/signer in this type is the ruler, and the NP head is his name. In these examples, the context is dealing with the tsar’s actual name literally being written on or into a document, such as на свое царево и великого князя имя ‘his own tsar and grand prince’s name’ in which the NP head is the prepositional object имя ‘name-ACC.SG’, while the possessor phrase is царево и великого князя ‘tsar-POS.N.ACC.SG and grand-M.GEN.SG prince-GEN.SG’

There are 14 possessive constructions in the signature type in which the possessor marks possessivity by a combination of a possessive adjective and adnominal genitive in preposed position. None of the examples are attested before 1450. There is just one example in the period 1450–1500, 8 in the period 1500–1550, 3 in the period 1550–1600, and 2 in the period after 1600. The following are representative examples:

(11) Пожаловал велел им сю грамоту подписати на свое царево и великого князя [PREPC] имя [PRP]…(АФЗХ 83).

In (11), “[The tsar] granted a boon; he commanded them to sign this document over to his own tsar and grand prince’s name,” the NP head is the prepositional object имя ‘name-ACC.SG’, while the possessor phrase is царево и великого князя ‘tsar-POS.N.ACC.SG and grand-M.GEN.SG prince-GEN.SG’, reflecting the semantic possessor/delegant {царь и великий князь} (conjoined titles with the same referent).

In all the examples, the NP head is имя ‘name’ and occurs in post-verbal position. The semantic possessor is {мь/я/онь} царь (и великий князь}). The personal pronoun is converted into a possessive personal pronoun — typically, a reflexive, because it is co-referential with the sentence subject); this is the only way to convey
possessivity of a personal pronoun. The term ‘tsar’, as an unmodified noun, is reflected as a possessive pronoun; the term ‘grand prince’, as a modified noun, is reflected as an adnominal genitive, in accordance with the prevailing tendency. (The same pattern has been seen for the given semantic possessor in other semantic types.)

The possessor phrase is preposed because it represents given information; the possessor/signer has been mentioned earlier in the context. The asserted part of the possessive construction is the NP head имя — asserted because it is the crucial item in the action under discussion (the renewal of a previous ruler’s charter by copying it with the addition of the name of the current ruler).

9.4. Phase of Life type

In the semantic classification Phase of Life, the NP head is a phase of life of the possessor referent, who is a human being. This is shown in the construction по Фетиньи-LOC животе-LOC ‘after Fetin’ja-POS.M.LOC.SG life-LOC.SG’. In my corpus, there are just 10 possessive constructions in this group; three occur in the period before 1450, one in the period 1500–50, four in the period 1550–1600, and two in the period after 1600.

The following is a representative example:


In (12), “And after me, in accordance with the testament of my son, Prince Ivan,” the NP head is the prepositional object or душе ‘testament-DAT.SG’ (literally, ‘soul’). The possessor expression consists of two co-referential noun phrases; though these are
adjacent, they are discontinuous due to Preposition Repetition (cf. Worth 1982). The first phrase consists of a noun with a postposed adjectival modifier; the latter reflects genitive agreement (‘I-POS.M.GEN.SG’), even though the noun that it modifies, сыне ‘son’, has been written incorrectly as a locative, the case expected for objects of the preposition по in its temporal meaning (cf. the preceding phrase по мне ‘after I-LOC’). The second phrase consists of a compound possessive adjective, which agrees with the NP head (княжь Иванове ‘prince-POS Ivan-POS.F.DAT.SG). The semantic possessor here is {сынь мои князь Иван} ‘my son, Prince Ivan’, with three appositive noun phrases. In the actual possessor expression, the first noun phrase is realized as an ungoverned genitive; with only a few exceptions (see Section 9.2.3, above), possessors that include adjectival modifiers are not converted into possessive adjectives in my corpus. The second and third noun phrases are not subject to this restriction and are both realized as possessive forms, though only the second declines.

I am not going to identify a pattern possessive construction for this type because there is an insufficient number of tokens to permit any firm conclusions. However, I will list the constructions attested in this group: postposed adnominal genitive (POSAG) (4x), preposed possessive adjective (PREPA) (3x), preposed adnominal genitive (PREAG) (2x), and preposed possessive construction (PREPC) (1x).

37 In reality, the second occurrence of the given preposition has the meaning ‘in accordance with’, which takes a dative object (душе). The possessor expression сыне моего, like the following co-referential phrase княжь Иванове, is actually not an object of the preposition, which is used solely as a phrase marker in the Preposition Repetition construction (see Worth 1982).
9.5. Concluding remarks

In the Saint semantic type, the NP head is a property or institution (дом ‘home’, церковь ‘church’, деревня ‘village’, монастырь ‘monastery’, Покров ‘intercession’) dedicated to the holy person or event named in the possessor expression. The latter includes a noun (Троица ‘Trinity’, богородица ‘Virgin Mary’, Рожество ‘Christmas’) and an agreeing adjectival modifier (живоначальный ‘life-giving’, пречистой ‘most pure’, святой ‘holy’). The pattern possessive construction is POSAG (postposed adnominal genitive), which is in accordance with the prevailing tendency when the possessor includes an adjectival modifier. (There are no cases in my corpus in which the modifier compounds with the noun, though this was possible in ecclesiastical language, at least; cf. Modern Russian свято-богородичный ‘holy-Theotokos-POS’). As for the information structure, the possessor represents new information; it has not been mentioned earlier in the text.

The less frequent possessive constructions in the Saint type are PREPA (9.1.2.1), PREAG (9.1.2.2), and POSPA (9.1.2.3). In the PREPA examples (9.1.2.1), the possessor does not include any modifier; the possessor expression is a possessive adjective derived from the saint’s forename. The examples are all abbreviated ways of denoting the possessor/saint’s feast day; these were probably fixed phraseologies, so that the word order within the possessor expression reflects the default (adjective — noun) rather than pragmatic principles of information structure. On the other hand, in the PREAG group (9.1.2.2), the possessor is preposed because it represents given information; it has already been mentioned in the context. Here the possessor expression is simply an anaphoric pronoun ея (‘she-GEN’). In the POSPA construction (9.1.2.3), the NP head is a noun referring to an event in the life of Christ (Крещение ‘Baptism’, Рождество ‘Nativity’);
the possessor expression is accordingly the adjective Христово ‘Christ’s’. In the examples discussed, the postposition of the adjectival modifier can perhaps be viewed as a form of contrastive focus.

The remaining types are not well attested. In the Delegant type (9.2), the semantic possessor (delegant) is someone who is not present in the narrated legal event but who has delegated someone else to serve as his/her agent or proxy. The attested NP heads are имя ‘name’ (in the figurative sense ‘authority’) and место ‘place’. In the Signature type, the NP head is имя ‘name’, but in the literal sense; the possessor is a ruler who is adding his own name to a document issued by one of his predecessors. In the Phase of Life type, the NP head is живот ‘life’ or душа ‘soul’ (used metonymically for ‘departure of the soul’, i.e., ‘death’), and the possessor is a human being.
CHAPTER 10

CONCLUSION

10.0. Overview of the project

This dissertation has, I hope, shed new light on the variation in possessive constructions in Middle Russian. As discussed in Chapter 1, I investigated three main questions for my dissertation research. First, I set out to uncover the factors that motivated the writers of medieval Russian legal documents to choose a particular construction out of several available options to express the meaning of possessivity within noun phrases. My hypothesis was that choice of any given possessor expression was not just arbitrary, as implied by much of the previous research, but would reflect factors present in the immediate or larger discourse context. Second, I set out to determine to the nature of the factors that influenced the observable variation: were they semantic, syntactic, discourse-pragmatic, purely idiolectal, or a combination of types. Third, I examined whether the alternation of possessor expressions in my data set provided support for the claim made in several previous studies that the variation was essentially diachronic — that innovative adnominal genitives displaced conservative adjectival possessives, without regard to function.
The corpus that I used for my study consisted of legal-administrative documents from the early fourteenth through the mid-seventeenth century — the period sometimes known as *Middle Russian*. As I discovered in my preliminary identification of examples, the writers of these documents displayed extensive variation in how they expressed possessivity within the noun phrase. The possessor expression could be conveyed by morphologically derived possessive adjectives, by adnominal genitives, and by combinations of those constructions, which are known in the literature as *ungoverned genitives*. Another issue that I considered was whether the possessor expression occurred before, after, or surrounding (“split by”) the NP head.

After I gathered the examples through an exhaustive search of the primary documents, I classified them according to a number of possible factors — semantic (the type of relation that held between the possessor and the possessed entity); syntactic (the role of the word denoting the possessed entity — the NP head — in the sentence); and discourse-pragmatic (the position of the possessive construction vis-à-vis the verb, as a approximate gauge of whether it was given or asserted; the informational status of the referents of the NP head and the possessor expression; and the genre of the document). I also classified the examples by date in order to identify evidence of diachronic change — constructions not being attested in specific periods, or constructions showing sudden increases or decreases in usage, as compared with previous periods. Finally, I noted the identity of the scribes, if known, in case idiolectal factors played a role in the variation.

Each of these potential factors became sorting fields in my analysis of the data; I looked for correlations between the factors and the occurrence of specific possessor constructions. In this function-to-form matching, clear correlations would indicate that
the given factors did, indeed, influence the structure of the possessor type. I immediately eliminated two of the factors — the identity of the scribe and the genre of the document. The scribes were named too sporadically to make the given factor a reliable basis for conclusions; the genre of the text was eliminated as a factor because it showed no evident correlation with the choice of possessive expressions.

10.1. Overview of the results

In the following subsections, I will go through each of the possessor constructions attested in my corpus and summarize the identifiable factors that influenced the writers to choose them over their alternatives.

10.1.1. Possessive adjectives

Possessive adjectives have generally been treated as the unmarked type of possessive construction in medieval Russian (see the review of literature in Chapter 2). In my corpus, constructions with possessive adjectives (including adjectives with the suffix -ьск-) are represented by 497 tokens (29.23%) out of the 1700 tokens in my database, not counting toponyms. Of these, 192 (11.70%) are preposed (PREPA and PRESK), 168 (9.88%) are postposed (POSPA and POSSK), and 137 (8.05%) are split, with possessive adjectives before and after the NP head (PREPA/PRESK + POSPA/POSSK).

To begin with the chronological factor, there is no clear evidence of either decline or increase in the use of adjectival possessive constructions during the Middle Russian period, as reflected in my corpus. There are spikes in usage in some of the 50-year
periods, but overall only a few percentage points distinguish the percentage of adjectival possessor constructions before 1450 from the percentage after 1600. All of the constructions mentioned above are attested in each of the 50-year periods with the exception of POSPA, which is not attested after 1600. As that construction is poorly attested overall, there is not enough information to determine whether its absence after 1600 is due to change or to an accident of the corpus. Therefore, I would conclude that the time factor is not important in the choice of one of the adjectival possessive constructions. However, there are many potential complications (e.g., type vs. token frequency) that have yet to be investigated, so this conclusion can only be tentative.

Turning now to semantic factors, the PREPA and POSPA constructions tended to be used with the forenames of individual human possessors, male and female, and also with one-word titles that occur in apposition with forenames (e.g., княж - ‘prince-POS’, княгинин - ‘princess-POS’, игуменов - ‘abbot-POS’, попов - ‘priest-POS’). On the other hand, adjectives in -ьsk- (PRESK and POSSK) are rarely used in those situations, but they are preferred for the semantic type Residence (Chapter 8), where the possessor is not an individual human but a place or, more precisely, a collective settlement. Indeed, the pattern construction in Residence is POSSK; this is actually the only semantic type in which the pattern construction is a bare adjective. Thus, in Middle Russian legal language, as represented by my corpus, there is no real reason to claim that the basic type of possessor construction is a possessive adjective.

With regard to syntactic factors, I found no correlation between the syntactic role of the NP head and the choice of adjectival possessor constructions; the given set of constructions is well attested in subject, direct object, prepositional object, and other
syntactic functions. On the other hand, the syntactic structure of the semantic possessor (i.e., the noun phrase(s) underlying the possessor expression before it is dependent on the NP head) plays a strong role in the choice of constructions. First, possessive adjectives are preferred when the semantic possessor is a bare noun or forename, such as Иванов-‘Ivan-POS’, игуменов-‘abbot-POS’, or коломенск-‘Kolomna-POS’. Second, they are used when the semantic possessor involves an unmodified (one-word) title in apposition with a forename, e.g., княгинины Евдоксиины ‘princess-POS Evdoksija-POS’ (cf. section 6.2.3). The title ‘prince’ has a derived possessive княж-, which can be reflected as an agreeing adjective or as an indeclinable form that compounds with possessive adjectives derived from forenames, e.g. княж-Михайлова ‘prince-POS Mixail-POS.F.NOM.SG’ (see section 3.2.1 and elsewhere). In a few cases, the appositive possessive adjectives can be split before and after the NP head (cf. section 7.2.1).

The main factors in the choice among the different adjectival possessive constructions are discourse-pragmatic. The possessor expression is postposed to the NP head (POSPA and POSSK) when the possessor represents new information, mentioned for the first time in the text, or when the given possessor expression is in contrastive focus with another possessor expression. Conversely, the possessive expressions are preposed to the NP head (PREPA and PRESK) when they convey given information; in addition, certain formulas are always preposed (section 9.1.2.2). Finally, the split constructions (PREPA/PRESK+POSPA/POSSK) tend to represent new information. On first glance, this contradicts the association between preposed position and given information discussed above. Apparently, however, there was a separate pragmatic tendency to split appositives on either side of the NP head when the entire possessive
construction had equal informational weight; for further discussion, see sections 10.1.2 and 10.1.3, below.

The placement of the NP head is also a rough indicator of whether the entire possessive construction (head and possessor) are asserted (post-verbal) or presupposed (pre-verbal).

**10.1.2. Adnominal genitives**

Adnominal genitives are represented by 795 tokens out of the 1700 (not counting toponyms) attested in my database (46.76%). Postposed adnominal genitives (POSAG) account for 458 examples (26.94% of the total possessor expressions); preposed (PREAG) for 298 (17.52%); and split constructions (PREAG + POSAG), with co-referential adnominal genitives before and after the NP head, for only 39 (2.29%).

Chronologically, the POSAG and PREAG constructions are evidently stable through the entire Middle Russian period. While there are fewer tokens in the periods before 1450 and after 1600, this seems to be an accident of the corpus. That must be the case for the later period, at least, since POSAG continues to be well attested in subsequent centuries and, indeed, is the main type in Modern Russian.

However, chronological factors definitely do influence the occurrence of the split construction PREAG + POSAG (see section 5.2.1). The given construction, which is not common in any period, ceases to occur in my corpus after 1550. My methodology does not allow me to determine for sure whether this change is syntactic (loss of the construction in the grammar) or stylistic. However, the cut-off point of 1550 suggests that
it may be stylistic — tied to writing practices in the centralized chanceries that Ivan IV the Terrible (crowned tsar in 1547) created in the 1550s.

Turning now to semantic factors, the most common of the three adnominal genitive constructions, the postposed variety (POSAG), occurs as the pattern possessive construction — i.e., the most frequent type overall — in 5 of the 10 semantic types I used in my classification: Personal Ownership (Chapter 3), Institutional Ownership (Chapter 4), Author (Chapter 5), Office (Chapter 6) and Saint (Chapter 9). Thus it is well attested as an expression of prototypical possessor (Personal Ownership) and also in semantic types that are relatively distant from the prototype. In general, the prevalence of adnominal genitives contradicts the claims made in earlier studies that the adnominal genitive was an incipient or marginal construction in the Middle Russian period (see the discussion in Chapter 3). I would observe, in general, that the previous studies do not pay attention to issues of context and genre, e.g., the fact that legal documents almost always identify referents with multiple names.

All the varieties of adnominal genitives (POSAG, PREAG and split constructions) are possible when the referent of the possessor expression is an individual human — most often, male — or an institution (i.e., a human collective). Overall, the best represented possessor referent is ‘grand prince’ (великий князь), followed by ‘grand princess’ (великая княгиня). The relatively low number of female possessor referents can be explained by purely cultural factors (the marginalization of women in medieval Russian society). In any case, the gender of the possessor does not seem to influence the choice of the possessor expression in any way.
Two other semantic factors seem to favor the adnominal genitive construction. First, when the semantic possessor includes a kinship term, it is always reflected as an adnominal genitive. In my corpus, possessive adjectives derived from kinship terms are entirely unattested. (The given kinship terms are generally modified by a possessive adjective — a condition that would also favor the adnominal genitive; see below.)

Second, when the semantic possessor includes either a patronymic noun (e.g., Иванович ‘son of Ivan’) or a patronymic adjective with the suffixes -ov- and -in-, the possessor expression is always an adnominal genitive. Apparently, as patronymic words are already marked for possessivity, they cannot undergo any further derivation for that meaning. This accounts for a large number of examples of the adnominal genitive; in the documents in my corpus, human possessors are usually referred to by forename and patronymic.

Turning now to syntax, one of the factors that I tracked as a possible influence on the choice of possessor type was the syntactic role of the NP head. I found that POSAG is well attested in noun phrases that played various syntactic roles — subject, direct object, prepositional object, or oblique constituent. Therefore, I concluded that the given factor did not have any influence on the scribes’ choice of POSAG.

By contrast, the internal structure of the semantic possessor definitely does make a difference in the choice of a possessor type. As a rule, semantic possessor phrases that consist solely of single unmodified nouns — e.g., bare forenames or nicknames — are not conveyed by any variety of adnominal genitive (preposed, postposed, or split). As noted above (section 10.1.1), forenames are usually conveyed by possessive adjectives, even when they have appositives that are adnominal genitive. The only exception to this
overwhelming tendency (see section 3.2.1) has an unusual structure in that three appositive phrases all occur on the same side of the NP head: Великого князя Дмитрея Ивановича земля (‘grand-M.GEN.SG prince-GEN.SG Dmitrij-GEN.SG Ivanovič-GEN.SG land-NOM.SG’). In this instance, the forename is surrounded by appositive phrases in the genitive and so surfaces as a genitive noun rather than the expected adjective (cf. section 10.1.1).

Conversely, the adnominal genitive is overwhelmingly favored when the semantic possessor is a noun phrase consisting of unlike terms — a noun modified by an adjective or adjectival pronoun. This structure can be seen in phrases such as the titles великий князь ‘grand prince’ and великая княгиня, as well as the names of institutions like Сергееv монастырь ‘Sergius’ Monastery’. In Modern Russian, it is possible to form derive compound adjectives from such phrases, e.g., великокняжеский ‘grand prince-
POs’; however, this kind of compounding does not seem to have been a productive process in medieval Russian legal language, as reflected in my corpus.

Finally, semantic possessors involving anaphoric (third-person) pronouns are always conveyed by the same pronouns in the genitive case — его ‘he/it’, ее ‘she/it’, их ‘their’. This is definitely a syntactic issue; because there are no possessive pronouns (pronominal adjectives) corresponding to the third-person pronouns, unlike the first- and second-person ones, there was no option but to use the genitive.

There is a very clear correlation between discourse-pragmatic factors and the choice among POSAG, PREAG, and the split construction. In the majority of cases of POSAG, the possessor expressions convey information that has not mentioned earlier in the text. Alternatively, the postposed genitive expression can represent old information
that is in focus — re-emphasized or contrasted with another possessor expression, which typically is also in postposition. In both these situations, the information that is of the higher interest (greater informational weight) in the discourse is postposed. Conversely, in the less common PREAG construction, the adnominal genitive possessor expression is preposed to the NP head because it carries less informational weight in the context. This occurs in the following situations: a) when the possessor expression is an anaphoric pronoun, which by definition conveys given information; b) when the possessor expression represents given information, but the NP new information; c) when the possessed entity (NP head) is emphasized more than the possessive expression, regardless of whether the possessor expression conveys new or given information (cf. section 4.2.1); and d) when the possessor is a unique, culturally given entity and so is treated as given information, even upon its first mention in the text.

Finally, the split construction (PREAG + POSAG) occurs only when both the possessor phrase and the NP head represent new information (e.g., in the incipit of the document). This would seem to contradict the association between PREAG and given information discussed in the last paragraph. However, as noted in section 10.1.1, there seems to have been a separate pragmatic tendency to split appositives on either side of the NP head when the entire possessive construction had equal informational weight; see also the discussion of ungoverned genitive constructions in section 10.1.3, below.

The placement of the NP head in the sentence is a rough indicator of whether the entire possessive noun phrase (head and possessor) is asserted (post-verbal) or presupposed (pre-verbal).


10.1.3. Mixed constructions (ungoverned genitive)

Mixed constructions involving a combination of possessive adjectives and “ungoverned” adnominal genitives represent 408 out of the 1700 tokens in the corpus (24% of the total). The majority of these (341=20.05%) are split constructions, in which appositives in the possessor constructions are distributed on either side of the NP head (PREPA + POSAG, PREAG + POSPA, and PRESK + POSAG). There are relatively few tokens in which the mixed constructions occur completely before or completely after the NP head (PREPC, 38=2.23%; POSPC, 29=1.70%).

With regard to chronological factors, some of the mixed constructions are represented by too few numbers of examples to determine whether any syntactic change is occurring (thus PREAG + POSPA, PREPA + POSAG, and PRESK + POSAG). On the other hand, the PREPA+POSAG construction is quite well attested (319 tokens). This construction peaks in the periods 1500–50 and 1550–1600; there are proportionately fewer examples before 1450 and after 1600. It is also noticeable that the PREPC and POSPC constructions are virtually unattested in the period after 1600. However, as noted in section 10.1.1, there are various potential complications (e.g., type vs. token frequency) that would need to be investigated before any secure conclusions about diachronic change can be drawn.

Turning now to semantics, most of the possessors in the mixed constructions have human referents; as elsewhere, the majority of the possessor referents are males, presumably because of the marginal position of women in medieval Russian law. We can also note that the split construction with preposed possessive adjective and postposed adnominal genitive (PREPA + POSAG) is the pattern possessive construction in the
semantic group Kinship (Chapter 7). In this type, a kinship term serves as the NP head; the “possessor” or reference-point in the kin relation is generally a husband or father. In either case, the tendency in legal documents is to identify the possessor referent by forename and patronymic (noun or adjective). As noted above, forenames are typically realized as possessive adjectives; on the other hand, patronymic words, which are already marked as possessive, do not undergo further derivation for possessivity and generally occur as adnominal genitives. Thus the fact that the mixed construction is the pattern type for Kinship is explained by genre — by the conventions of naming in legal documents.

With regard to syntactic factors, the role of the NP head in the sentence evidently does not play an important role in scribes’ choice of mixed possessive constructions (cf. the adjectival and adnominal genitives discussed in sections 10.1 and 10.2). However, as in the other types, the internal structure of the semantic possessor is definitely a factor which influences the choice of the construction. Thus, there are several situations in which mixed constructions tend to be preferred used in my corpus. First, mixed constructions are conventional when the semantic possessor is \{царь и великий князь\} ‘tsar and grand prince’, where the conjoined noun phrases have the same referent (see section 6.2.4); the first term forms a possessive adjective, in line with the usual pattern for unmodified nouns, while the second, with its modified noun, is only ever realized as an adnominal genitive in the possessive constructions in my corpus. Second, mixed expressions are typical when the semantic possessor involves several noun phrases in apposition — a forename (sometimes preceded by a one-word title) plus a patronymic noun or adjective and/or patrials (substantivized adjectives denoting a domain), e.g., княж Михайловы Федоровича Прозоровского приказчики (‘prince-pos Mxail-
In isolated cases, the titles and forenames are reflected as agreeing possessive adjectives, and the patronyms and patrial adjectives mark as “ungoverned” genitives. In a few cases, adjectives that modify titles in the semantic possessor can also be realized as adnominal genitives; for example, {игуменъ троицкий Спиридоний} ‘Abbot of Trinity Spiridonij’, where троицкий ‘Trinity-POS’ modifies игуменъ ‘abbot’, is reflected as в-игуменово место троецкого Спиридонъево ‘abbot-POS.ACC.SG Holy Trinity POS.GEN.SG Spiridon- POS.ACC.SG’.

The choice among the different varieties of mixed constructions is undoubtedly correlated with discourse-pragmatic factors. Examples in which the entire possessive phrase comes after the NP head (POSPC) represent new information, which is being asserted or emphasized to a stronger degree than the NP head. Examples in which the entire possessive phrase comes before the NP head (PREPC) always represent given information; in addition, the NP head is emphasized, either because it is new information or because it is being contrasted with another element in the context. The split constructions (PREAG + POSPA, PREPA + POSAG, and PRESK + POSAG) can represent new or old information. My conclusion is that they are used when there is no special emphasis on either the possessor expression or the NP head. In such cases, the possessive adjectives derived from titles and/or forenames are preposed to the NP head, while the patronyms are reflected as postposed genitives. This split appears to be the
neutral word order, used when none of the elements in the possessive construction are being emphasized or are in focus.

10.2. Perspectives for further research

My dissertation research has pointed to several issues that could be investigated in the future. In my view, the most important task would be to analyze legal documents from the mid-seventeenth century onwards (the early Modern and Modern Russian periods), in order to describe the long-term change in the distributional preferences that led to the establishment of the adnominal genitive as the only viable possessive construction in Modern Russian (with only a few exceptions). In my data, I did not see clear signs that this process is well under way; however, there are some hints that the adnominal genitive may be taking a slight lead, i.e., increasing in frequency and expanding into the domains associated with possessive adjectives.

Another interesting project would be a study of the discourse-pragmatic factors that influenced the choice of constructions in early Modern and Modern Russian, in order to determine how information structure influences the variation in the later periods.

Finally, as a native speaker of a Slavic language other than Russian, I think that comparable studies of the variation in possessive constructions based on information structure and other pragmatic factors could be conducted on other Slavic languages. Such investigations would be of great interest, in that they would allow for the comparison of patterns and give a more complete picture of the changes in possessive structure from the Common Slavic period to the present-day state of the languages.
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