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# List of abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABBR</td>
<td>abbreviated so that the morphological ending cannot be discerned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJ</td>
<td>adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>dominion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>denominal adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA/GEN</td>
<td>[DA, N-GEN, NP] construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA/PRON</td>
<td>[ADJECTIVAL PRONOUN DA NP] construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative; adnominal dative construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN_FREE</td>
<td>free adnominal genitive construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN_RESTR</td>
<td>restricted adnominal genitive construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN_COMPLEX</td>
<td>occurrence that may be either an instance of GEN_RESTR or a complex instance of GEN_FREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>instance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTR</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td>landmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASC</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>modifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUT</td>
<td>neuter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>noun phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>oblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCS</td>
<td>Old Church Slavic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>prepositional phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRON</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>personal sphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSL</td>
<td>Proto-Slavic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFL</td>
<td>reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESTR</td>
<td>restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>reference point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP_INST</td>
<td>reference point situation on instance level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP_TYPE</td>
<td>reference point situation on type level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBJ</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUS</td>
<td>strong unit status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>trajector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNS</td>
<td>tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDECL</td>
<td>declined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>vocative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 Introduction

The subject of this dissertation is one of the major syntactic differences between the earliest attested Old Russian and modern Russian: In early Old Russian, possession and a range of related meanings could be expressed not only by adnominal genitive constructions, but also by constructions with various types of denominal adjectives and an adnominal dative construction. The relationship between these constructions was quite intricate: In some functions, there was rather a clear division of labour between adjective and genitive constructions, where a genitive construction would normally only be used if an adjective construction was unavailable. Examples (1) and (2) illustrate a context where an adjective construction would be used when the possessor was unmodified, but where a genitive construction was preferred when the possessor was modified in some way.

(1) посланни иша корабль Глѣбовъ
sent-NOM.PL. took boat-ACC.SG. Gleb-masc-ACC.SG.
“the envoys took Gleb’s boat” PVrL 136/17–18, period 1

(2) и собра раздроблены уды
and he-gathered chopped-up-masc-acc.pl. limb-acc.pl.
брата своего благовѣрнаго и
brother-gen.sg. his-masc.gen.sg. pious-masc.gen.sg. and
христолюбиваго князя Олга Ингоревича
“and he gathered up the chopped-up limbs of his brother, the pious and Christ-loving Prince Oleg Ingorevič” PBR 358/6–7, period 1

In other functions, either adjective or genitive constructions would dominate: Example (3) illustrates how adjective constructions were virtually the only option for constructions denoting types or categories of things. In (4) we find an example of the

---

1 The earliest attested Old Russian, that of the 11th–14th centuries, is often and with justice called Old East Slavic by many scholars, since all the first texts are Kievian in origin, and since the dialectal differences within East Slavic were only beginning to appear in this period. The Russian term is drevnerusskij jazyk, “Ancient Russian”, as opposed to the starorusskij jazyk “Old Russian” or srednerusskij jazyk “Middle Russian” of the 15th–17th centuries. I have chosen to retain the term “Old Russian” for the entire period from the 11th century through the 17th century, since I am following a linguistic phenomenon from the earliest attestations and into what would become Russian.
dominance of genitive constructions in expressing the relationship between a deverbal noun and its “object”.

(3) мученицькимь втнцьмь увязостась
martyr-MASC.INSTR.SG. crown-INSTR.SG. were-bound-DUAL.
“they were bound with a martyr’s crown” SBG 49/7, period 1

(4) въ опущенье грњховь
for forgiveness-ACC.SG. sin-GEN.PL.
“for the forgiveness of sins” PVrL 121/3, period 1

In many functions, the dative construction seemed to be a free competitor to one or several of the other constructions. Example (5) corresponds closely to examples (1) and (2) above.

(5) Котянъ [...] бї тесь Мстиславу
Kotjan-NOM.SG. was father-in-law-NOM.SG. Mstislav-DAT.SG.
“Kotjan was Mstislav’s father-in-law” PBK 202/11, period 1

In modern Russian, on the other hand, the adnominal genitive construction dominates. The dative construction is gone, and although most of the adjective constructions remain, they are in far more restricted use today: Some are gone altogether, some have had their semantics narrowed, and some have become restricted to quite a narrow stylistic sphere (cf. Kopčevskaja-Tamm and Šmelev 1994).

As will be seen in Chapter 2, there is naturally an extensive literature on such a central syntactic change. However, this literature still leaves many central questions unresolved: What was the exact nature of the distributions and interrelationships of all these constructions that could express possession to some extent in 11th–14th century Old Russian? Did the distributions and interrelationships of these constructions match those of the corresponding Old Church Slavic (OCS) possessive constructions? How and at what rate did the changes affecting their distributions and interrelationships proceed through the centuries? What can reasonably be counted as causal factors behind these changes? In addition to these crucial questions, the available literature also reveals the need for a fine-grained tool of analysis for a set of very complex linguistic data, and above all a clear definition of the concept of possession.
1.1 Possession

As will be shown in Chapter 2, “possession” is a problematic concept, which is used very differently by different scholars, and often goes undefined. Nevertheless “possessive constructions” is a very useful shorthand for the constructions under consideration in this dissertation. If one is to use such a term, it must be properly defined. I will use Taylor’s representation of possession as “a cluster of independent properties, whose frequent or typical co-occurrence constitutes an ‘experiental gestalt’” (Taylor 1996:339) as a starting point. Taylor argues that it is possible to view the notion of possession as a family resemblance category, “unified by a crisscrossing of similarities, rather than by a common defining feature, or set of common defining features” (1996:340). Taylor identifies the following properties of possession:

- a. The possessor is a specific human being.
- b. The possessed is an inanimate entity, usually a concrete physical object.
- c. The relation is exclusive, in the sense that a possessed entity usually has only one possessor.
- d. The possessor has exclusive rights of access to the possessed.
- e. The possessed is typically an object of value, whether commercial or sentimental.
- f. The possessor’s rights of access to the possessed are invested in him through a special transaction, such as purchase, inheritance, or gift, and remain with him until the possessor effects their transfer to another person by means of a further transaction.
- g. Typically, the possession relation is long term, measured in months and years, not in minutes and seconds.
- h. In order that the possessor can have easy access to the possessed, the possessed is typically located in the proximity of the possessor. In some cases, the possessed may be a permanent, or at least regular accompaniment of the possessor. (Taylor 1996:340, somewhat abridged).

When all properties are present, we have a case of what Taylor calls “paradigmatic possession”. Paradigmatic possession is not a sufficient tool to account for the Old Russian constructions under consideration in this dissertation, because there will be plenty of constructions which do not have any of the properties in the list. However, the notion can be used for a terminological purpose. Throughout this dissertation, I will use the term “possessive construction” repeatedly. With the discussion above in mind, a possessive construction is a construction that may be used to convey
paradigmatic possession (in addition to other meanings). Thus, the constructions are not possessive only, but the expression of paradigmatic possession is one of their important common features. In chapters 5–7 the full semantic scope of the Old Russian and OCS possessive constructions will be analysed in detail.

1.2 Construction grammar

The theoretical tool of this dissertation will be the cognitive variety of construction grammar, in line with the work of Ronald Langacker (1987, 1991), Adele Goldberg (1995, 2006) and William Croft (2001). Both construction grammar and Langacker’s mostly compatible Cognitive Grammar take the view that a uniform type of description is possible for all linguistic units: Anything from a dependent morphological element or lexical item to a complex and abstract syntactic pattern may be described as a symbolic unit or a construction, a pairing of form and meaning.

One of the most important implications of this view for the present dissertation is the notion that even a relatively abstract syntactic pattern, a complex and (partially) schematic construction, has a semantic side to it that may well be more schematic than that of a lexical item, but in principle is of the same kind. An important consequence is that complex and schematic constructions may be and often are polysemous, and that such constructions may be in relationships of partial synonymy with other constructions. The meanings associated with a single construction, and the meanings shared by a group of formally unrelated, but partially synonymous constructions, are expected to cluster together in a section of conceptual space, and each construction’s distribution may be plotted onto a semantic map of this section of conceptual space.

The constructions are organised in networks, interconnected with schematic links (between instances and generalisations over them), semantic extension links and links that generalise over parts of different constructions. The model is usage-based, that is, the storage and prominence of a construction depends on its actual use and frequency. Schematicity relations, semantic extensions and the results of usage frequencies will be important in the analysis of the diachronic development of the Old Russian possessive construction.

Finally, construction grammar allows a careful analysis of the respective contributions of a construction schema and of its component parts. This is particularly important in dealing with possessive constructions, which are expected to have quite schematic meanings and where particularly the head noun is expected to contribute considerably to the meaning of each instance of the construction.
1.3 Construction grammar meets philology

The construction grammar framework was chosen because it is a good tool when dealing with a complex set of data such as that pertaining to the Old Russian possessive constructions. The possibility to plot a construction onto a semantic map and follow it diachronically or compare it synchronically to other constructions present in the same conceptual space is a good way of visualising changes in its distribution and its interrelationship with other constructions. A careful analysis of the respective contributions of construction schemas, head nouns and modifiers to a particular construction is vital in order to arrive at a full understanding of the distributions and meanings of each construction. Thus, the theoretical orientation of this dissertation is a product of an earnest wish to understand the Old Russian constructions better, and to describe their distributions and history as clearly as possible to anyone interested in Russian historical syntax.

At the same time, the Old Russian possessive constructions were chosen for study because they are theoretically interesting linguistic data. They offer an opportunity to use semantic maps, which are most frequently used for typological comparisons, for a comparison of partially synonymous constructions in a single language, and also to use them diachronically. The map of the possessive conceptual space used in chapters 4–7 is also intended as a small contribution to an understanding of how the meaning elements involved cluster together cross-linguistically. Moreover, construction grammar has mostly been applied to synchronic data, and diachronic studies based on the usage-based model have mostly had to do with grammaticalisation. The history of the Old Russian possessive construction does not involve changes that can reasonably be analysed as instances of grammaticalisation. The syntactic change in question must therefore be put in usage-based construction grammar terms in a different way.

For this reason, the dissertation is meant to appeal to at least two separate audiences: on the one hand Slavic philologists and others interested in the specific history of Russian, on the other hand general linguists, perhaps with only a little experience with Slavic languages, but with an interest in construction grammar and its application to historical data. The dissertation should be possible to read for both these groups, and meet the standards they expect. This means that chapters 2 and 3, which deal with the previous accounts of the problem and the selection of the corpus, may probably seem long-winded to the general linguist, but hopefully adequate to the philologist. Conversely, Chapter 4, “Theory”, may seem complex to the philologist, but hopefully adequate to the general linguist. As a help to the non-Slavicist, but also as a device to make the examples maximally clear to all readers, all examples are glossed with morphological information, and provided with English translations.
1.4 Aims

The main aims of this dissertation are as follows:

a) To give a maximally clear description of the distributions and interrelationships of 11th–14th century Old Russian possessive constructions, placing them on semantic maps and involving schematic networks in the exposition when useful. An important hypothesis is that the choice of construction is conditioned not only by the semantics of the “possessor” noun (stem), but also to a large extent by the type of head noun.

b) To compare the possessive constructions of 11th–14th century Old Russian with those of canonical OCS, both due to the possibility that OCS possessive constructions might reflect an earlier stage of Slavic than those in Old Russian, and to the undoubted influence that (Old) Church Slavic exerted on Old Russian, at least on the literary language.

c) To describe the changes occurring to the Old Russian possessive constructions from the earliest attested texts (11th–14th century) up to 1700, and formulate the changes in cognitive construction grammar terms.

d) To base the analyses sketched in a–c on representative text corpora, and to quantify the results as far as deemed possible and useful.

e) To evaluate the causal factors that in the previous literature have been suggested to lie behind the changes to the Old Russian possessive constructions. This evaluation will be carried out in the light of three analyses performed within a construction grammar framework: i) a synchronic analysis of 11th–14th century Old Russian possessive constructions, ii) a comparative analysis of early Old Russian and OCS possessive constructions, and iii) a diachronic analysis of the development of the Old Russian possessive constructions up to 1700.

1.5 The structure of the dissertation

Chapter 2 is a discussion of the literature on possessive constructions in the history of Russian and in a wider Slavic context, with focus on the main aims of the present dissertation.

Chapter 3 is an account and critical discussion of the principles behind the selection of the Old Russian and OCS text corpora of this dissertation.

Chapter 4 gives the theoretical background of the dissertation, with an introduction to construction grammar, a discussion of the role of schematic networks, a look at the relative contributions of the component parts of constructions, a discussion of the relevant constructional meanings, and a sketch of the possessive conceptual space.
Chapter 5 is an analysis of the possessive constructions found in a 11th–14th century Old Russian corpus, presented in construction grammar terms.

Chapter 6 is a comparative analysis of the possessive constructions in a corpus of OCS canonical texts, where they are compared to the constructions found in Old Russian with the aid of semantic maps.

Chapter 7 is a diachronic analysis of Old Russian possessive constructions based on 15th, 16th and 17th century Old Russian text corpora, in addition to the 11th–14th century corpus of chapter 5. The changes are described by means of semantic maps, and in terms of schematicity relationships and degree of entrenchment.

Chapter 8 is an evaluation of the various causal factors suggested in the literature to lie behind the changes to the Old Russian possessive constructions, in the light of the results arrived at in chapters 5–6.

Chapter 9 is the conclusion.
2 Previous research

The issue of competition between adnominal genitive, adnominal dative and denominal adjectives in the history of Russian has naturally been much discussed in the literature. Being a striking and central syntactic change, it is mentioned in most general works on Russian historical grammar (at least those with any focus on syntax, such as Buslaev 1881/1959:421–422, 459–460, 464; Potebnja 1899/1968:383–390; Bulachovskij 1958:319–321; Borkovskij and Kuznecov 1963:422–432; Ivanov 1990:380–381), and all works on Russian historical syntax (such as Lomtev 1956:438–440, 453–470, 474–478; Sprinčak 1960:118–122, 131–140; Borkovskij 1968:79–89, 164–178, 197–204 and 1978:149–159; briefer textbooks on historical syntax such as Georgieva 1968:56–63 and Stecenko 1977:59–62). As the competition is observed in the earliest Slavic sources, and as all Slavic languages have departed to a greater or lesser extent from what must have been the Common Slavic situation (cf. Corbett 1987), it is also an issue in the literature on Common Slavic grammar/syntax and literature dealing with the historical branching of Slavic (Miklosich 1883:7–17, 447–474, 605–611; Vondrák 1928:229–234, 319–320; Meillet 1934/2000:374–375; Vaillant 1958:595–605 and 1977:51–52, 87–88) and Old Church Slavic grammar and syntax (Flier 1974; Huntley 1984, 1993:176–180; Večerka 1993:186–216). There are also several special works on possession and related issues in Slavic in general (Comrie 1976, Corbett 1987, Ivanov 1989). Seemingly, the distribution and use of the adnominal genitive, the adnominal dative and the denominal adjectives in many of the same functions is quite unique to Slavic in an Indo-European perspective. Therefore, there is also a substantial amount of literature on this situation of competition as a Slavic innovation, and investigation of (and speculation on) its roots (Wackernagel 1908, Uryson 1980, Ivanov 1989, Marojević 1989).

Finally, there are a number of specialised works on the development of the interrelationship between the adnominal genitive, the adnominal dative and denominal adjectives in the history of Russian. These works all focus on a specific facet of the competition and/or development. Bratishenko 1998 is a thorough and mostly synchronic treatment of the interrelationship between the adnominal genitive and denominal adjectives in the earliest attested Old Russian (Old East Slavic);
Bratishenko examines the way in which the same semantic features affected the rise of the genitive-accusative. The study is limited to animate masculine singular *o*-stem nouns, and does not take into account the role of the adnominal dative. Bratishenko’s dissertation is both theoretically and empirically oriented, and will be extensively quoted throughout this chapter. Bratishenko 2003 is a summary of the 1998 dissertation, including some new arguments. Bratishenko 2005 is a closer look at Old East Slavic denominal adjective formation. Marojević 1983a and 1983b focus on the category of possession in the history of Russian. Makarova 1954 looks at the development of the possessive genitive in the history of Russian up to 1700. Widnäs 1958 looks at the development of the possessive genitive in the 18th and 19th centuries. Pravdin 1957 is an influential article on the place of the possessive dative in Old Russian. Zverkovskaja 1986 is a thorough examination of the formation, origins and diachronic development of derived adjectives in Old Russian (11th–17th centuries). Nilsson 1972 is a synchronic generative analysis of the syntax of Old Russian deverbal nouns that naturally touches upon the means of realising their subjects and objects. Richards 1976 is a brief diachronic survey of the development of possessives in the history of Russian, based on rather limited data. Uryson 1980 is an analysis of the formation and function of denominal adjectives in the Uspenskij sbornik, with ample (and rather speculative) comments on their origins and further history.

The present chapter is an examination of the works of the above-mentioned scholars on the core issues of this dissertation:

Section 2.1 deals with the various theoretical approaches that have been taken to the question of possessive constructions in Old Russian and OCS.

Section 2.2 looks at views on the formation and role of denominal adjectives in Old Russian (and OCS).

Section 2.3 examines approaches to the role of the adnominal genitive.

Section 2.4 concerns discussions of the role of the adnominal dative.

Section 2.5 deals with analyses of the interrelationship between the denominal adjectives, the genitive and the dative.

Section 2.6 is a survey of comparisons of the Old Russian system with OCS.

Section 2.7 compares previous descriptions of the diachronic development of the Old Russian system in the period 1000–1700.
2.1 Theoretical approaches to the problem

2.1.1 On noun phrase structure and semantics

2.1.1.2 Traditional approaches and the concept of possession

Most of the work done on the Old Russian possessive constructions is based in a traditional Russian grammatical framework. This work has reached many important insights, but at the same time, the lack of precise definitions of central concepts and a principled view on noun phrase structure has been a detriment to much of it.

One of the most important problems is that the term “possessive” is regularly used undefined, with different researchers operating with various implicit working definitions of the term, and thus getting rather different results. Their statistics can turn out quite worthless, as in Richards 1976:268: We simply do not know what kind of examples have been counted. An illustration of this is that Richards reports that the share of of possessive adjectives (presumably as opposed to other means of expressing adnominal possession) is 30–70 % in early Old Russian texts. In comparison, the figures given by Makarova 1954:28 (and quoted by Richards) for early Old Russian texts are quite different: Makarova reports that the share of possessive adjectives is 76–85 %. The same phenomenon is found in general works on Russian historical syntax such as Lomtev 1956, Borkovskij 1968 and others, where the data are not even explicitly counted. Often the researcher’s ideas of what is possessive emerge only indirectly, as when Richards 1976:264 quotes the examples stolp cerkvi “pillar of (a/the) church” and syn otečestva “son of (the) fatherland” from Lomonosov, and remarks that such examples “are very similar in meaning to possessives”. Thus, her working definition of possession seems rather strict, perhaps involving animate possessors only. Another problem is that many works, such as Makarova 1954 and Marojević 1983a, b and 1989 only take the “possessive” function into consideration, although adjectives, genitive and dative actually compete in a much wider field than that, as pointed out in Bratishenko 1998:49 and Eckhoff 2001.

True, some scholars attempt to refine the concept of possession to various extents. Zverkovskaja (1986:39–40), for instance, defines possession proper as “принадлежност[ь] единичному владельцу” – “belonging to a single possessor” (including inalienable possession), and seems to consider this the core of possession. The same means of expression (here: denominal adjectives in -ov-), she writes, may have a meaning that extends to expressing any relation to the person. In her examples, she employs the following subdivision:

a) Possession (proper)

b) Subjective or objective relations

c) A broad relatedness to the person
2.1.1.2 Theoretically oriented approaches to noun phrase syntax and adnominal possession in Slavic

There are also some works that touch upon possessive constructions in Old Russian and in a wider Slavic context with the aid of a more modern theoretical apparatus, in particular Uryson 1980, Flier 1974, Nilsson 1972, Huntley 1984 and Bratishenko 1998. All of these works (except the dated generative approach of Nilsson 1972) have affinities to the approach chosen in this dissertation, to a smaller or greater extent.

Uryson 1980 is interesting in taking a specifically Russian theoretical approach to the problem of the status and meaning of denominal adjectives. Uryson’s point of departure is Ju.D. Apresjan’s work on valence. Thus she analyses constructions with denominal adjectives in terms of the valence of the head nouns. She distinguishes between non-lexical valences and lexical valences: Non-lexical valence is merely any word’s ability to subject another word to itself. Lexical valence is closer to the traditional meaning of valence or semantic roles: a lexical valence is a necessary element of the described situation in relation to the given word. All nouns, then, have non-lexical valences, but only some nouns have lexical valences. Thus Uryson gives sovmestnaja pomoš’ “joint help” as an example of a non-lexical valence, and pomoš’ Ivanu “help for Ivan” as an example of a lexical valence (Uryson 1980:111). Denominal adjectives are analysed in terms of whether they fill lexical or non-lexical valences. This is an approach akin to the one adopted in this dissertation, where the difference between relational and non-relational nouns is important (cf. section 4.3.1). Unfortunately, Uryson does not distinguish between the properties of the various adjective suffixes, and does not take into consideration the semantics of the nouns from which they are formed.

Flier 1974, in his study of the OCS noun phrase, chooses a now somewhat dated generative semantics approach. However, one of the core features of his analysis is a referential hierarchy, close to the spirit of Bratishenko 1998 and of the present dissertation. He focuses on the status of both head and modifier, as will be done in this dissertation, but his main interest is not denominal adjectives, but the realisation of the feature “definite” in the OCS adjective system.

Pravdin 1957 is a rare exception in that he does not talk about “possessive” dative and genitive, but prefers the more precise term “determining” (opredelitel’nyj), which is in fact rather close to the terminology employed in Eckhoff 2001 and also akin to the one which will be used in this dissertation.

2 Uryson uses the term “relative adjectives” (otnositel’nye prilagatel’nye), and does not make a distinction between possessive and relative adjectives.
Bratishenko 1998 is the most detailed and nuanced of all accounts of the semantic relationship between genitives and denominal adjectives in early Old Russian, and also the account that is closest in spirit to the present dissertation theoretically. Therefore, it will be presented at some length here and throughout the chapter. Bratishenko chooses what is essentially a Cognitive Grammar prototype approach, where the role of the human mind as a categoriser is crucial. She considers it possible to deduce a prototypical concept of possession in a language, and is of the opinion that all constructions formally equivalent to constructions expressing possession may be considered non-prototypical instances of the phenomenon by extension. She takes the following semantic indicators of prototypical possession from Cienki (1995:81; this is a simplification of Taylor’s possessive gestalt [1989:202–206] seen in chapter 1):

– the possessor is a specific human being
– the possessed is an inanimate object or collection of objects (Bratishenko 1998:51)

Her position is that the use of the constructions examined in her dissertation is influenced by lexical, morphological, referential and syntactic features alike, and that this conflicts with a view on language based on clear-cut distinctions and strict rules. Rather, we observe a complex interplay of features and fuzzy borders between levels (Bratishenko 1998:2). In her view, the assumption that language consists of discrete levels is untenable: The interrelationship between syntax and morphology is clearly very complex, and within morphology, there is no clear division between inflection and derivation (1998:6–8).

Though her analysis is essentially prototype-based, Bratishenko chooses to represent it visually in the form of a hierarchy of features with the prototype on top, instead of as a radial network (1998:201). Also, she chooses to retain the notion of linguistic features (1998:9), though she emphasises that the presence of a particular feature is a matter of degree.

Bratishenko 1998 is an analysis both of the interrelationship between denominal adjectives and adnominal genitives, and of the rise of the genitive-accusative. The core of her analysis of both issues is a hierarchy of differently ranked lexical, morphological, referential and syntactic features: the agent/possessor hierarchy, represented below. It is deemed to control both phenomena in question (Bratishenko 1998:46, hierarchy representation taken from Bratishenko 2003:85).
On the basis of this hierarchy of features, Bratishenko sets up both a hierarchy of suffixes and an agent/possessor hierarchy, to be discussed more closely in sections 2.2 and 2.3. The degree of prototypicality decreases downwards in the hierarchy. Agentivity may be found non-prototypically at the bottom of the hierarchy. The most numerous instances of morphosyntactic variation are to be found at the middle level of the hierarchy (Bratishenko 1998:47).

Thus, Bratishenko focuses very much on the role of the modifier, but hardly at all on the properties of the head noun. In the present dissertation, the status of the head noun will be taken into consideration on a par with Bratishenko’s interesting conclusions on the semantics of the modifier. This will in my opinion give a deeper understanding of the distribution of the adnominal genitive, the adnominal dative and the denominal adjectives.

### 2.1.2 On diachronic syntax

There are very few of the authors that have a principled approach to diachronic syntax, and almost none of them are explicit on this point. Remarks on mechanisms and general tendencies of syntactic change are generally rather haphazard in the literature, and many of the scholars offer “explanations” which are very vulnerable to the type of criticism found in Harris and Campbell 1995, particularly in that they appeal to general “principles” of syntactic change that are poorly backed by facts.

The two exceptions are Sprinčak 1960 and Richards 1976. Sprinčak has an entire introductory chapter (chapter 1, pp. 3–48) on theoretical historical syntax. However, his principles of historical syntax are highly dated and bound to Marxism, and mostly amount to a strong faith of progress in diachronic syntax: In his opinion, syntactic change makes the syntax better for communicative purposes. This is a point of view that has very little support among modern linguists. He also formulates a number of “laws” of diachronic syntax, such as the “law” of development from parataxis to hypotaxis, which is harshly criticised in Harris and Campbell 1995:25–
27. Richards 1976, on the other hand, is an essentially structuralist approach to the
diachronic development of the competition between the various possessive
constructions in the history of Russian. Richards has a principled view on syntactic
change, and sees the whole change as an extension of the genitive at the expense of
the possessive adjectives. A commendable feature of Richards’s study is that she
separates change mechanisms from causal factors.

2.2 Adjective formation

A number of suffixes are involved in the formation of the adjectives that to a greater
or lesser extent compete with the adnominal genitive and the adnominal dative.
Different authors tend to include different selections of suffixes in their analyses.
Some authors, such as Corbett 1987, include only the unequivocally possessive
adjectives in -ov- and -in-, others, such as Richards 1976, Uryson 1980 and
Bratishenko 1998 and 2005, include varying numbers of additional suffixes, while
others again, such as Widnäs 1958 and Comrie 1976, do not specify what suffixes
they are talking about at all. Zverkovskaja 1986 is a detailed analysis of all suffixes
that could be used to form denominal adjectives in Old Russian, and the relevant
portions of her monograph will be discussed in some detail in this section.

2.2.1 The suffixes involved

Zverkovskaja (1986) examines in detail all suffixes forming adjectives from nouns,
looking at their distribution with various noun types and at their interrelated
meanings. I will go through the suffixes briefly here, due to the importance of
establishing what suffixes should be included in the analysis in chapters 5–7 of the
present dissertation:

The suffix -*jb- (and its variant -bjb-) was inherited by Proto-Slavic (PSL) from
the Indo-European (IE) suffix -*jo- (*ij o-). In PSL hard final consonants were
č’, x – š’). In historical times, the suffix only appears as a consonant alternation at the
morpheme border. For practical reasons Zverkovskaja refers to this derivational
device as the suffix -*j- being a reflex of the PSL suffix -*jb- (Zverkovskaja 1986:6).

The model was productive, as shown by many derivations from designations
for persons borrowed from Greek in the 10th–11th centuries. That it was independent
in Old Russian (not dependent on Church Slavic) is proven by the fact that the suffix
triggered characteristic Old Russian alternations such as t – č (instead of the Church
Slavic alternation t–št).
The suffix -ь is an etymologically related variant of -*j-. Its derivates in Old Russian include those with stems in d, t, s, z, b, m, v that were retained without “iota” alternations. In cases where there were stem-final velars or the sonorants r, l, n (dujačii, děvičii, igumenii), the derivates may be considered either long (pronominal) adjective forms with the suffix -*j- or forms with -ь- (Zverkovskaja 1986:10).

The suffix -ov/-ev- is relatively young and probably comes from derivates in -o, -a from the old stems in -*ǔ. The suffix may have been isolated earlier from the soft stem variants. The Proto-Slavic stems in -*ǔ were mainly agent nouns in -*tel’ў, -*ar’ў and some others. It is not surprising that a suffix isolated from derivates from such stems might gradually be permeated by the meaning of such derivates. This was a type of meaning that allowed the adjectives formed with the suffix to replace the adnominal genitive of nouns denoting persons in the various functions of the genitive, including the possessive function (Zverkovskaja 1986:38).

As the possessive meaning was typical for the majority of such formations, the isolated suffix could naturally spread to personal nouns or nouns denoting personified objects of other declension types. Primarily this would mean masculine personal proper names, particularly borrowed ones, even though some of them already had formed adjectives with the ancient suffix -*j-. The suffix -ьн’- has a disputed origin. In Old Russian as in OCS the suffix was used to form adjectives which could replace the genitive of the original noun, not only in the possessive function, but also in other functions (Zverkovskaja 1986:45).

The suffix -ьsk- is one of the oldest and most productive suffixes forming relative adjectives in Slavic and specifically in Old Russian. Most researchers consider the suffix, originally -*sko-, either a specific Germanic and Balto-Slavic formant, or as a common European innovation. In Old Russian and OCS the suffix forms adjectives mainly from nouns denoting persons and also animals. Already in

---

3 The long adjective forms were the result of the grammaticalisation of a postposed determinative pronoun, and in the beginning expressed definiteness. Short adjective forms were declined as nouns.
the Old Russian texts of the 11th–12th centuries the suffix encompasses all possible
variants of common noun stems, which is an indication of the old age of the suffix
(Zverkovskaja 1986:50).

The suffix -ьн- is able to unite with nominal stems as well as verbal stems. The suffix remains stable from the earliest attestations throughout the period considered by Zverkovskaja. It rarely forms adjectives from animate nouns, thus complementing the suffix -уск- (Zverkovskaja 1986:24–37).

All these suffixes can denote possession to some extent, and are in partial
competition with the possessive genitive and the possessive dative, and thus these are the suffixes that were counted in the material of this dissertation. The suffixes -ов-, -ин- and -ьн'- were only counted when denoting persons or personifications (see section 3.6).

2.2.2 The distinction between possessive and relative adjectives
In traditional Russian grammar, denominal adjectives are grouped into possessive and relative adjectives. Most of the general works on Russian historical syntax just use this traditional distinction without stopping to reflect on whether such a distinction is relevant to Old Russian. This approach is opposed by Zverkovskaja 1986.

Zverkovskaja (1986:4–5, 88) refines the traditional distinction considerably. She concludes that the boundaries between the three traditional groups of adjectives (qualitative, relative and possessive) are not only historically changeable, but also rather unclear and conditional even in a synchronic examination of a given period in the history of the language. For the most ancient period in the history of Old Russian, she finds it difficult to presume the existence of just those three groups of adjectives: Besides the relative and qualitative adjectives, there existed a peculiar group of adjectives formed from nouns denoting persons, animals and (seldom) plants with the suffixes -ьн-, -ьнъ-, -ов-/ев-, -ин-, partially -ьн'- — adjectives that were functionally close to the adnominal genitive of possession. Later, the group of possessive adjectives proper was formed on the basis of this (dissolved) group.

Other denominal adjectives are then classified as either relative (formed with the suffixes -ов-/ев-, -ьн-, -овън-/евън-, -уск-, -ан-/ен-, -ьн','- -ьн'-) or qualitative (Zverkovskaja 1986:89–90). Unlike the lexical-grammatical group of possessive adjectives, the groups of relative and qualitative adjectives have imprecise borders, Zverkovskaja concludes.

Richards 1976 uses the term “possessive adjectives” only, but she does distinguish between “the possessive suffixes par excellence” -ов-/ев-, -ин- and -ьн and
the suffixes -bn-, -bsk-, -bj-, which “are ambiguous in that they are used to derive both possessives and adjectives with other meanings” (Richards 1976:267).

For the OCS denominal adjectives, Flier chooses a broader term, “adjectives of affiliation and apposition”, which “roughly correspond to those labeled ‘relational’ (Russian otnositel’nye)” (1974:73). Such denominal adjectives do not have a qualification relationship to their noun, according to Flier, but rather an affiliation relationship, or even an equivalence relationship, as in gradь nazaretnьskь “the city of Nazareth”, where the city and Nazareth are identical, and the adjective is in semantic apposition to the head noun (Flier 1974:74, footnote 12). Flier (1974:80) defines them by saying that adjectives of affiliation affiliate the head noun with particular locations, nationalities, persons, titles, trades/labour and so forth. Flier’s description of the function of the adjectives of affiliation is interesting: “The modifying noun itself, as an appositive or underlying ‘genitive’ modifier, functioned to mark the head noun as one focused upon”. Thus Mk 5:38 νδομь archisunagovь (eis ton oikon tou archisunagögou) characterises a particular house, that of the ruler of the synagogue. The grammar of OCS will, in Flier’s words, have “transformational rules to convert semantic complexes underlying two nouns connected by <AFFIL> or <EQUIV> to a head noun plus adjective, unless external Greek influences intervene.”

The derivational endings involved, according to Flier, are -bsk-, -j-, -ij-, -ov- and -in-; there is no mention of -bn- and -bn’. He does, however make a distinction between adjectives in -bskь and the other adjectives of affiliation (Flier 1974:82): Adjectives in -ov/-j/-ij/-in- are mostly derived from animates (human beings, religious spirits, plants). Flier claims that the relationship between head nouns and animate noun( stem)s is tighter than between head nouns and inanimate noun( stem)s, since true possession may often be involved, which is probably the strongest form of affiliation, according to Flier. Adjectives in -bsk-, Flier claims, are mostly formed from nouns denoting inanimate things like locations. The animate nouns represented, he claims, are of a more abstract nature than those underlying the adjectives of the animate group.

---

4 Richards actually uses the non-existent adjective božь as an example of an adjective derived with -jо, although the actual adjective božii is of course derived with the suffix -jо-. Likewise, she does not include the suffix -bn’, but lists the -bn’- adjective otnьnь as an example of the suffix -bn-.

5 Semantic appositions will be treated in detail in section 4.3.4.

6 This is a rather accurate description of the reference point situation, cf. Chapter 4, but this situation hardly holds for all instances of adjectives of affiliation and apposition in Flier’s terms.

7 Note the marked contrast of Flier’s analysis to that of Zverkovskaja, who in fact shows that -bsk- adjectives are mostly formed from animate nouns, or inanimates such as locations, which may be taken as metonymic for the people inhabiting them.

8 He seems to mean “generic”.

The two groups behave differently when it comes to long form versus short form. Adjectives in -ov/-j/-ij/-in- virtually always occur in short form, whereas the -bsk- adjectives, those denoting the weakest affiliation, i.e. non-possession, were the most subjected to influences effecting the appearance of long form, and show considerable vacillation between long and short form.

An example of Flier’s treatment of -bsk- adjectives vs. the others can be seen in what he writes about adjectives referring to religious sects:

it would seem that bsk was used when the adjective referred to the Pharisees as a group, and ov when it referred to one particular member. [...] ov in the above example refers to true possession (the Pharisee’s house) while bsk conveys a broader affiliation (ruler of the Pharisees, leaven of the Pharisees and the Sadducees) (Flier 1974:91).

However, the distinction here seems to be one between singular and plural of the referent involved, not between the problematic “true possession” and “looser affiliation”, as at least the latter example with -bsk- must be called possession in a narrow sense. A group of people can certainly possess something in quite a strict sense, although plural possessors are less typical than singular ones (cf. Taylor’s possession gestalt outlined in section 1.1).

Uryson 1980:113 makes no distinction between possessive and relative adjectives, but refers to all adjectives formed with the suffixes -bn-, -bn ‘’, -b’n ‘’, -bsk-, -ov/-ev-, -in-, -j/-bj-, or by a compound suffix such as -ovbn-, as relative. The adjective does not have to be formed from a noun stem, nor from a single stem – Uryson also examines adjectives formed from compound stems or prefixed stems.

Bratishenko (1998) includes the following suffixes in her analysis: Adjectives formed with the suffixes -ov/-ev-, -in-, -j/-bj- are termed “individual personal adjectives” rather than “possessive”. Adjectives in -bsk- are also included in the analysis, but are not considered to be exclusively or predominantly referring to an individual person, and do not fall under this term (Bratishenko 1998:19, footnote 1). Mostly, Bratishenko refers to all these adjectives by the more general term “denominative adjectives”. Note that her analysis does not include the suffix -in-, as it is only used with a-stem nouns, which are not considered in her dissertation. Nor does she include the suffix -bn-, which is sometimes used interchangeably with -bsk-, but rarely with animates (Bratishenko 1998:71)

Bratishenko ranks her chosen suffixes (and -in- and -bn-, which are excluded from her attention due to their distribution) in a hierarchy:
According to Bratishenko, the suffix hierarchy is regulated mostly by the lexical features “proper”, “personal” and “mature”. The more of these features a noun stem has, and the greater the degree in which they are present, the more likely the noun stem is to combine with suffixes at the top of the hierarchy, and vice versa. Morphological features such as declensional membership may sometimes override lexical features, but they may also occasionally rank lower than the lexical features and produce unexpected results (Bratishenko’s examples are *Iudovъ* formed from *Iuda* and the productivity of *-bn’-* with kinship and clan terms irrespective of declensional membership [1998:84]). Referential definiteness is also said to be prominent in the hierarchical organisation of these suffixes – adjectives formed with the top suffixes are virtually always definite, while Bratishenko claims that *-bsk*-adjectives hardly ever have definite reference (1998:85). Thus, the suffix hierarchy is aligned with a possessor hierarchy, where proper personal nouns are the most prototypical possessors: proper personal < common personal < animate < inanimate (Bratishenko 2005:372). Bratishenko repeatedly emphasises that the correlations between nominal stems and suffixes are not strict, but tendencies.

To sum up, it seems reasonable to divide the Old Russian and OCS denominal adjectives into two main groups based on the suffixes with which they are derived. In the present dissertation, adjectives formed from nouns denoting persons (directly or metonymically) and personification with the suffixes *-j-*, *-ov-* and *-in-* and adjectives formed from nouns denoting persons with the suffix *-bn’-* will be referred to as group 1 of denominal adjectives (DA1). Adjectives derived from nouns with the suffixes *-bj-*, *-bsk-* and *-bn-* will be referred to as group 2 of denominal adjectives (DA2). The main reason for doing this, as will be shown in detail in chapters 5–7, is that the distributions of the two groups of adjectives differ quite a lot, while the distributions of each suffix within each of the groups differ comparatively little, as the suffixes generally have quite a neat division of labour as to which types of noun stems form adjectives with which type of suffix. However, the terms “possessive” and “relative” are avoided, as they are misleading as to the actual functions of each group of adjectives.

---

9 This claim is certainly an exaggeration, as will be demonstrated in chapters 5–7.
2.2.3 “Adjectivity”
One issue that has been much debated is the degree of “adjectivity” of the denominal adjectives. Trubeckoj (1937:16) argued that they should actually be included in the noun paradigm, just like participles are included in verb paradigms (similar thoughts are found in Vaillant 1958:600, see also Ivanov 1989:21). This view is formally worked out by Uryson 1980, who claims that relative adjectives (by her definition, given in section 2.2.2) have no semantic elements not present in the noun from which they are derived – they are merely the form of the noun to be used when it is dependent on another noun (Uryson 1980:120, 130–131). This is taking Trubeckoj’s position very far.

Corbett 1987 is a very interesting discussion of the significance of Slavic possessive adjectives10 for the division between inflectional and derivational morphology. The point of departure is the fact that possessive adjectives in all Slavic languages may control personal pronouns, relative pronouns in quite a number of them (including Old Russian and OCS), and even attributive modifiers in a few (sporadically observed in Old Russian). This is a very noun-like property. By some criteria (change of word-class membership, appearance of suffix before inflectional suffix), the suffixes involved are clearly derivational. By other criteria (the adjectives’ productivity, transparency to syntax, dependence on non-inherent features of the underlying noun and the possibility in some Slavic languages to form possessive adjectives from phrases, rather than single nouns), the suffixes seem to be inflectional. Corbett concludes that no clear dividing line can be found between derivational and inflectional morphology, as the possessive adjective has different status according to different criteria. Thus, the difference between inflectional and derivational morphology must be one of degree (Corbett 1987:327–329). This is of course a position in accordance with the cognitive construction grammar framework advocated in this dissertation.

The discussion is not very relevant to the subject of this dissertation. The forms discussed are clearly adjectives in the sense that they agree with their head nouns in case, gender and number, despite their semantic synonymy with case forms and sometimes very regular formation. However, the special status of the denominal adjectives has led some scholars to assume that these “anomalies” were among the causal factors behind the changes in the Old Russian system of possessive constructions, cf. section 8.2.2.

10 Corbett only discusses adjectives in -in-/yn- and -ov-/ev-/ow-, and remarks that the literature is full of confusing references to “possessive adjectives”, which may involve any number of suffixes (1987:307).
2.2.4 The importance of the noun stem from which the adjective is formed
Generally, the literature makes much of the semantics of the noun stems from which
the denominal adjectives are formed. Especially animacy/personhood and
specificity/definiteness are much discussed.

2.2.4.1 Personhood/animacy
As Bratishenko (1998:21) notes, the features personal and/or animate are in fact
central in most studies of denominal adjective formation and distribution in Slavic. A
good example is Corbett (1987:324), who makes it clear that the formation of
possessive adjectives\(^{11}\) is highly dependent on the various properties of the noun
involved, both inherent and contextual: There is a general requirement in all Slavic
languages that the referent must be animate, and preferably human (though some
languages also allow animals and even inanimates). In all the languages he reviews,
the referent must be singular. Many of the languages also require that the referent
must be specific, while the other languages have a marked preference for specific
referents. Corbett proposes two hierarchies:

Human < Animal < Inanimate
Specific < Non-Specific

The higher the referent is on the hierarchies, the more likely the possessive adjective
is to be used, the prototypical case being reference to a specific human (Corbett

Thus, it is natural to look for animacy effects in all the possessive
constructions under consideration in this dissertation, and not only in those that
involve denominal adjectives.

2.2.4.2 Specificity/definiteness
The other semantic feature under frequent discussion in the literature is definiteness or
specificity. As seen, the distinction between specific and non-specific referents is
important in Corbett’s work. A closely related phenomenon is that of definiteness.
Vaillant (1958:600) notes the definite reference of the possessive adjectives (in -j-,
-ov-, -in-, -bn’ and -ij-) in Slavic in general. In his work on possession in OCS,
Huntley 1984 and 1993 concludes that individual reference in NPs containing a
common noun is expressed through the use of a bare genitive, whereas denominal
adjectives formed from such stems tend to have indefinite or random reference.
Bratishenko (1998:31) reports that data from early Old Russian also conform to such

\(^{11}\) Adjectives in -in/-ov-, by his narrow definition.
a conclusion. Ivanov (1989:240) compares the examples professorskaja doč’ (with adjective in -ьsk-) and doč’ professora (with genitive), noting that the former is a representative of the category “professors’ daughters” – “a professor’s daughter”, while the latter is a specific referent, “the professor’s daughter”. When adjective-forming suffixes other than -ьsk- are involved, the situation is the reverse. Denominal adjectives formed from common personal noun stems tend to indicate definite reference, while the genitive may or may not manifest such a feature. Bratishenko takes this as evidence that the feature of definiteness is clearly relevant to the choice between denominal adjective and genitive.

Bratishenko (1998:32–33) goes on to say that definiteness is salient for the speaker, irrespective of its actual correlation with a certain morphosyntactic form. Some suffixes are associated with inherently highly definite nouns, and the suffix -ov- may therefore be considered “more definite” than the suffix -ьsk-. In OCS, Flier (1974:81) observes that adjectives in -ьsk- exhibit the greatest fluctuation between long and short forms, suggesting that they lack inherent definiteness and that a long, pronominal adjective ending must be added to indicate it.

Thus, an analysis of possessive constructions in Old Russian should certainly also accommodate for definiteness-specificity effects.

2.3 The role of the genitive

2.3.1 The origins of the possessive genitive

There are quite radical differences in opinion on the question of the place of the possessive genitive in pre-attested Slavic. Uryson 1980, leaning partially on Widnäs 1958, goes as far as to claim that the adnominal genitive was not a possibility in Proto-Slavic, not even when modified further. Her claim is based almost exclusively on theoretical considerations. She finds it odd that the literary language (referred to as Church Slavic) found in the Uspenskij sbornik should have such complex rules for filling the (lexical and non-lexical) valences of nouns, and formulates the rules as follows (Uryson 1980:122–126): 1) All valences of all nouns can be filled by a relative adjective. 2) Some valences of some nouns can be filled by a (n unmodified) genitive or dative. 3) Any valence of a noun is filled not by a relative adjective, but by a noun (in the genitive or sometimes dative) if the latter has a dependent word itself (including appositions). She observes that rules 1 and 2 are synonymous, since some of the same nouns can have their valences filled by either adjectives or genitives or datives, and that this is a situation that requires an explanation.

---

12 Cf. the distinction between Deictics and Classifiers in Eckhoff 2001 and the distinction between reference points on instance level and reference points on type level in this dissertation (Chapter 4).
Her solution to the problem (Uryson 1980:127–128) is that rule 1 was the only possible one in Proto-Slavic. The adnominal dative, she claims, was “recent”, and the use of adnominal genitive appeared exclusively as a result of the contact with Greek. She dismisses on theoretical grounds the view that rule 3 was also part of the Proto-Slavic system, claiming that a more complex variant of a construction (such as a noun modified by a modified genitive) is unlikely to exist when the simpler variant of the construction (such as a noun modified by a bare genitive) is absent. Her entire conclusion seems to be a result of an overly strong faith in her own theoretical considerations, and a blatant disregarding of the data, which show that exactly this “impossible” situation was prevalent both in OCS and the earliest attested Old Russian.

A similar, but better argued and less radical view is found in the works of Marojević. He claims that at a certain point in the development of Proto-Slavic, nouns in the possessive genitive became impossible to use – “стало грамматически невозможным употребление родительного принадлежности существительного” (Marojević 1989:124), and links this to the merger of the Indo-European genitive and ablative in Slavic. However, the claim is immediately modified, as he goes on to describe a system of expressing possession where the genitive is not absent, only severely restricted. He sketches a Proto-Slavic system where the genitive could only be used

a) with those personal pronouns which had no corresponding possessive pronoun

b) with substantivised adjectives

c) in the fixed expression vъ + gen. + město “in the place of, instead of”

d) with female patronymics and names after the husband such as Ivanjaja

e) with attributes of the possessor: Marojević claims that when the possessor had an agreeing modifier, the possessor would be realised by a denominal adjective, whereas the modifier would be rendered as a genitive, as in bratъ Jakunovъ (adj.) slěpago (gen.) “the brother of Jakun the blind” (Marojević 1989:130). Marojević considers this last “contamination” of the genitive and denominal adjectives to be the source of the further expansion of the possessive genitive.

Most scholars have a much less radical view on the Common Slavic genitive, and consider it a means to be used in the same functions as the denominal adjectives have, when a denominal adjective cannot be used (e.g. Richards 1976).

We can be quite sure that Proto-Slavic had the possessive genitive, but equally sure that it must have been quite restricted. A look at Indo-European (IE) evidence

---

13 “the possessive genitive of nouns became grammatically impossible to use” (my translation).
14 Such a conclusion seems unlikely in the light of the data in Corbett 1987.
gives no certain answers. The abundant sample material in Delbrück 1893 (cf. table 2 in Eckhoff and Berg-Olsen 2002:190) shows that the possessive genitive has a consistently strong position in most of the earliest attested IE languages, even in the earliest Slavic texts. Denominal adjectives, on the other hand, mostly function as what will be referred to in the present dissertation as “reference points on a type level”, i.e. in constructions denoting categories of referents rather than individual referents. Also, they are largely limited to personal names. This would suggest that the genitive had a historically strong position. Wackernagel 1908, on the other hand, assumes that the adnominal genitive in the IE “Grundsprache” was very limited, as so many IE languages have archaic remnants of possessive adjectives and an adverbal genitive. He takes this to suggest that these constructions are very old, and that it was the partitive and adverbal functions of the IE genitive which were in fact primary in the “Grundsprache”, and not the possessive function (Wackernagel 1908:145–146). Nonetheless, he considers the genitive to have been obligatory when the modifier consisted of more than one word, and also deems it possible that the use of denominal adjectives may have expanded and become more dominant in Slavic than in the “Grundsprache” (Wackernagel 1908:146). Večerka (1993:201) argues against such a view, considering the genitive to have had adnominal functions from the beginning, and that the possessive adjectives in Slavic, Tocharian and some Greek dialects might be a loan or a secondary development in these branches of Indo-European.

An interesting point here (explored further in Eckhoff and Berg-Olsen 2002, see also Vaillant 1958:601–602) is the extreme contrast between the early Slavic and the modern Baltic languages in this respect, considering that the Slavic and Baltic branches are closely related in an IE perspective. Particularly modern Latvian uses genitives practically in every environment where Old Russian uses denominal adjectives, even where denominal adjectives are the only option in Old Russian. The modern Latvian denominal adjectives are quite marginal. This would suggest that the languages have roots in a system where both options were available, but have then evolved in radically opposite directions. In Russian, the pendulum then seems to have swung back, but not to such extremes as in Latvian.

### 2.3.2 The role of the adnominal genitive

In much of the literature, it is merely pointed out that the genitive is used when denominal adjectives are unavailable for some reason, and in the same contexts as the denominal adjectives. It is also generally remarked that the genitive is used freely when a partitive shade of meaning is involved. Bratishenko 1998, on the other hand, offers a detailed analysis of the occurrences of bare genitives in her corpus.
In her analysis of the (bare) adnominal genitive, Bratishenko again refers to her hierarchy of features (see section 2.1.2), as well as the closely related suffix hierarchy (see section 2.2.2) and the agent/possessor hierarchy:

**Agent/Possessor Hierarchy**
- proper personal
- supernatural
- common mature
- common immature
- infants
- animals (Bratishenko 1998:162)

With noun stems from the top of the agent/possessor hierarchy, and features from the top of the hierarchy of features, bare genitives are hardly ever used.

According to Bratishenko (1998:92–93), one of the features influencing the use of the bare genitive is, again, definiteness. She claims that adjectives formed from common noun stems tend either to have random singular reference, or to refer to a group of individuals, or simply denote a quality.\(^{15}\) In order to express a definite reference to a specific individual, the adnominal genitive tends to be employed. In contrast, a modifier expressed by a proper personal noun consistently takes the form of an adjective. Proper nouns are, of course, not usually modified, except by a limited range of adjectives. But modification as a syntactic feature is not the only reason for such nouns to appear as denominal adjectives: Proper personal nouns are inherently definite – there is no need to express definiteness by any additional means.

In Bratishenko’s examination of all bare adnominal genitives in her material (1998:98–117), she concludes that there may be only two more or less reliable attestations of a bare genitive modifier among proper personal nouns in early Old Russian, something which strengthens the claim that nouns at the top of the hierarchy form individual personal adjectives and tend not to be used in the form of the unmodified genitive case.

With common nouns, she finds a higher frequency of bare genitives, and thinks it fair to speak of a tendency for the modifier to adopt the form of a bare genitive when its referent is definite, “since the denominative adjective inherently lacks such reference” (Bratishenko 1998:105). The majority of attestations belong to a class of nouns in -k/-c-, which are of adjectival origin and therefore “refer […] to the whole class of individuals characterised by a certain quality” (Bratishenko 1998:105–106). Adjectives formed from their stems also lack definite reference. In fact, all but

\(^{15}\) Such claims are an exaggeration, cf. chapter 5.
one of the unambiguous attestations of bare genitive among common personal nouns in her material involve the noun *otrokъ* “youth, boy” and are from the *Life of Theodosius* (Bratishenko 1998:111–112, examples [55–57] and [59–60]). *Otrokъ*, Bratishenko writes, is quite low on the hierarchy, due to the lexical features common and immature. Children and socially unfree individuals are also, in legal terms, rather possessors than possessees, which also contributes to a low position on the agent/possessor hierarchy. Moreover, *otrokъ* has a neuter doublet of the same stem: *otročě/-ă*, which is also attested in *Life of Theodosius*. This may to some extent be responsible for the pattern of attestations of its masculine counterpart, lowering it on the hierarchy (Bratishenko 1998:113–114).

Inanimate masculine and neuter nouns of the *o*-stem declension are placed at the bottom of Bratishenko’s hierarchy of features, and are indeed attested as bare genitives (Bratishenko 1998:114, examples [63–67]).

Overall, Bratishenko notes that the instances of attestation of a bare genitive modifier increase when an adjective formed from the nominal stem contains one of the suffixes lower on the hierarchy. The feature motivating this phenomenon, she says, is definiteness, otherwise lacking in both the suffixes lower on the hierarchy and in the noun stems with which they correlate. The unmodified genitive case is practically unattested with nouns at the top of the hierarchy, but more often alternates with denominal adjectives formed from noun stems lower on the hierarchy, and from suffixes occupying the bottom of the suffix hierarchy (Bratishenko 1998:85–86).

However, despite her focus on the semantics of the possessor noun( stem)s, Bratishenko does not look systematically at the types of head nouns involved in the possessive constructions. Many of her examples are in fact headed by deverbal nouns or nouns denoting inherent parts of wholes. In chapters 5–7 the analysis will take the types of head nouns involved into account, as well as the semantics of the possessor noun( stem)s.

### 2.4 The role of the dative

There are a lot of opinions on the status of the “possessive” dative in the Old Russian system. There is no doubt that it is a Slavic phenomenon. It was frequent in OCS, and was often used to translate Greek genitives – Greek did not have possessive datives (Mrazek 1963:247). However, it is often considered a Balkanicism, as it is particularly frequent in East Bulgarian texts (Večerka 1963:222, 1993:198; Chodova 1963:134).

The general works on Russian historical syntax differ quite a lot in their analyses of the adnominal (“possessive”) dative. Lomtev (1956:438) says that it was
widely used in Old Russian, and Borkovskij (1968:197–198) states that it was used fairly frequently in Old Russian texts. However, Borkovskij points out that only one instance of the possessive dative has been found in the Old Russian charters (gramoty) (cf. Borkovskij 1949:362), and concludes that the construction must have been little used in the spoken language. Sprinčak and Stecenko, on the other hand, say that the possessive dative was rare in Old Russian (Sprinčak 1960:120, 140; Stecenko 1977:54, 101). In some general works, such as Ivanov 1990:380–381, the possessive dative is not even mentioned. These differences are probably due to the total lack of quantitative analysis of data in these works, as well as to differences in selection of the source material and in their respective tacit working definitions of the term “possessive”. Interestingly, Borkovskij 1968 points out that one may differentiate a so-called “dative of relation” (datel’nyj otnošenija) from the possessive dative. This function expressed “степень родства, отношения дружбы и вражды, господства и подчинения и т. д.” (Borkovskij 1968:199). Most of the authors have examples of subjective and objective datives.

Uryson (1980) includes the dative in her analysis, placing it on a par with the genitive in her distributional rules. She considers it a recent development and not a part of Proto-Slavic (1980:128), but her reason for thinking so is merely Vaillant’s (1977:87) remark that such datives are originally datives of purpose, which have developed into replacers of the possessive genitive. Interestingly, she observes that there are no certain instances of datives filling non-lexical valences in her material (Uryson 1980:124). This is in accordance with my findings in chapters 5–7: possessive dative constructions are nearly always headed by relational nouns.

Richards (1976) does not look specifically at the dative, dismissing it as a South Slavic development. She does, however, find quite a lot of datives in her Old Russian texts; even for the Russkaja pravda, which shows very little Church Slavic influence, she reports that 7.1 % of all possessive constructions are datives (Richards 1976:261–262), a figure which does not tally with the one in her table of frequencies (p. 268), where she reports them to comprise 2.4 %. She also reports the possessive dative to decrease gradually, being virtually non-existent in the 19th century.

Bratishenko (1998:48–49) merely observes that the adnominal dative is similarly attested as the denominal adjectives and the adnominal genitive, though not as frequently, and that it is less productive than in Bulgaro-Macedonian and not subject to the same constraints as the genitive. Due to its infrequency in early Old Russian, the possessive dative is omitted from her discussion. Karskij (1962:82) considers the possessive dative an integral part of Old Russian as well as of OCS, and

16 “the degree of kinship, relations of friendship and enmity, of domination and subjection etc.” (My translation.)
17 I myself have found none at all in the Russkaja pravda.
is of the opinion that it developed from the locative meanings of the dative. Ivanov (1989:152–153) is uncertain of its status.

Perhaps the most nuanced view is found in Pravdin’s influential article on the place of the possessive dative in Old Russian:

В истории русского языка дательный падеж определительного типа постоянно находился в синонимических отношениях с определительным родительным падежом и другими грамматическими средствами […] Однако дательный падеж в русском языке (в отличие от старославянского языка) никогда не был вполне равнозначен родительному определительному падежу.18 (Pravdin 1957:106–107)

In Pravdin’s opinion, then, the “real” possessive dative, the type which is in no way dependent on the predicate of the sentence (Pravdin 1957:107–108), was possibly not a category of Old Russian. However, given the wide use of the possessive dative with pronouns in Old Russian texts, he concedes that it may have been a feature of Old Russian, independent of Church Slavic, in that environment (Pravdin 1957:109–110). A similar opinion is voiced with more strength by Marojević, who says that the possessive dative was a living and in some syntactic environments productive category in Old Russian, listing some examples with dative pronouns and some examples of objective datives with deverbal nouns (Marojević 1983b:57). Borkovskij and Kuznečov (1963:431) note that the possessive dative lingers on as late as in 17th–18th century texts, but that it is genre-dependent and rare in texts that are close to the spoken language.

Such great differences of opinion certainly warrant further investigation of the Old Russian possessive dative.

2.5 The interrelationship of the denominal adjectives, the genitive and the dative

Most scholars conclude that the interrelationship of the denominal adjectives and the adnominal genitive is one of complementary distribution, formulated in different detail in different works. This is particularly the case in the general works on Russian historical syntax, but also in Richards 1976 and Uryson 1980. Other scholars, such as Ivanov (1989) and Bratishenko (1998), are more critical.

---

18 “In the history of Russian, the dative of the determinative type was constantly in relations of synonymy with the determinative genitive and other grammatical means […]. However, the dative in Russian (unlike OCS) was never a complete synonym to the determinative genitive” (my translation).
Borkovskij 1968:165–166 says that in the overwhelming majority of cases, the possessive genitive is found when the possessor is modified in some way, or is an adjective or participle, and that bare genitives are extremely infrequent (cf. also Sprinčak 1960:119). Stecenko 1977:60 states that the genitive was used primarily when modified, but notes that adjectives and genitives could be used together. Lomtev (1956:476), too, states that the genitive was mainly used when the possessor could not be expressed in one word. However, he also notes (without substantiating his claim) that bare possessive genitives could be found when the possessor was not a person, but a thing or phenomenon (Lomtev 1956:477). All authors observe that possessive adjectives and genitives could be used together, but they evaluate this construction differently, either as a regular construction (Borkovskij 1968:164, Lomtev 1956:463) or as a “contamination” (Sprinčak 1960:119).

A typical formulation of the complementary distribution rule is given by Makarova (1954:11–15), who says that the genitive could be used

a) when it had an attribute

b) when it had an apposition

c) when realised by a proper name consisting of more than one word

d) with substantivised adjectives or participles, and

e) in cases where something belonged to two or more persons.

In Uryson’s version of the complementary distribution rule (1980:122–124), she concedes that bare genitives (and datives) are possible in the literary language, but she claims that any modifier consisting of more than one word must be realised as a noun in the genitive or sometimes dative.

Richards (1976) reconstructs a system with complementary distribution for Common Slavic, as reflected in OCS:

The possessive genitive in OCS, then, we find used essentially only when a possessive adjective cannot be [used], when:

1) The possessor expression consists of more than one word;

2) A possessive adjective cannot be derived from the possessor noun; or

3) It is necessary to avoid a potential ambiguity (Richards 1976:262)

However, she claims that Old Russian did not have complementary distribution in the same degree as Common Slavic/OCS:

---

19 This observation tallies well with the claims of Bratishenko 1998.
Whereas in OCS, the genitive was, with very few exceptions outside of the dative, the only means of expressing possessive if the possessor consisted of more than one word, in Old Russian we find, with relatively greater frequency, also combinations of adjective + genitive and adjective + adjective with N+N possessors. (Richards 1976:262)

Richards sees this as a first breach in the complementary-distribution rule in Old Russian. This is actually the opposite conclusion of the one reached by Bratishenko (1998), who, as we shall see below, concludes that Old East Slavic is much closer to complementary distribution than OCS, OCS having numerous attestations of bare genitives. Corbett (1987:324) also points out that both OCS and Old Russian allowed adjective + genitive and adjective + adjective constructions.

Ivanov (1989:146), forming one of the exceptions to all this focus on complementary distribution, observes that the distribution of denominal adjectives vs. adnominal genitives is regulated by a tendency rather than a strict rule – common nouns gravitating towards the genitive, and proper nouns towards the possessive adjective. Corbett (1987:324) also notes that the distribution of possessive -ov/-in- adjectives vs. genitives was not regulated by a hard and fast rule even in OCS and Old Russian, but was influenced by two hierarchies:

Human > Animal > Inanimate
Specific > Non-specific

He also notes that OCS and Old Russian allowed possessive adjectives combined with genitive appositions of various kinds, and that Old Russian also allowed genitive attributive modifiers controlled by possessive adjectives to some extent. This is certainly not consistent with a situation of strict complementary distribution, even though Bratishenko claims that he supports such a view (Bratishenko 1998:87).

Comrie (1976) notes the competition between possessive adjectives, adnominal genitive and adnominal dative. (He never defines exactly what adjectives he has in mind.) He claims that they are used in parallel as unmarked adjuncts of a head noun, irrespective of whether the adjunct is possessive, subjective, objective etc., and considers this to be strong evidence in favour of his analysis, namely that all these adjuncts arise from the same syntactic position as unmarked adjuncts of the head noun (Comrie 1976:185–186). This is definitely a simplistic view of the interrelationship between the three, but is interesting in its willingness to place the adnominal dative on a par with the adnominal genitive and the denominal adjectives.
Bratishenko firmly points out that there are quite a number of counterexamples to the alleged complementary distribution, and that these counterexamples are frequently underestimated or disregarded altogether. Her position is, as we have already seen, that the interrelationship between the denominal adjectives and the adnominal dative is more complex, tendency-based and dependent on more factors than has previously been assumed. The main bulk of violations of the complementary distribution in fact consists of instances where denominal adjectives are used even though the modifier in question is modified in some way. Bratishenko quotes a number of examples with denominal adjectives, rather than nouns in the genitive, in apposition with a noun phrase, such as

(1) **до первого л[ьт] [а] Олгова**

**рускаго князя**

until first-MASC.GEN.SG. year-GEN.SG. Oleg-ov-NEUT.GEN.SG. Rus’-ьск-MASC.GEN.SG. prince-GEN.SG.

“until the first year of Oleg, the Rusian prince” (Codex Laurentianus, l 126, in Bratishenko 1998:95)

Denominal adjectives are also attested when modified by a dative personal pronoun, as in

(2) **в ОТНИ ЕМУ Манастыри**

**ему**

in father-ьн-MASC.LOC.SG. 3MASC.DAT.SG. monastery-LOC.SG.

“in his father’s monastery” (Suzdal’skaja letopis’ 1154, l 114, in Bratishenko 1998:95)

The attestations of bare genitives in the earliest East Slavic are also scarce, but they do occur, and instead of disregarding them as scattered exceptions, Bratishenko finds a pattern, as seen in section 2.3: Bare genitives are virtually unattested with nouns at the top of the agent-possessor hierarchy, but more often alternate with denominal adjectives formed from noun stems lower on the hierarchy, and with suffixes occupying the bottom of the suffix hierarchy (Bratishenko 1998:85–86). Although inanimate nouns are not systematically examined, she notes that there are more bare genitive attestations among them (Bratishenko 1998:114, examples [63–67]).

Thus, the pattern of attestation of all the bare genitives found by Bratishenko suggests that lexical, morphological, referential and syntactic features simultaneously
determine the morphosyntactic form in the possessive constructions. Certainly the syntactic constraint noted by all previous scholars is present – there is a strong tendency in OESl for the modifier to appear in the form of a denominal adjective when it is not modified in its turn. However, proper personal nouns, at the top of the hierarchy, may still adopt adjectival form, even when further modified, Bratishenko claims. In contrast, proper nouns are hardly ever attested in the form of a bare genitive. Common nouns tend to take the genitive case when further modified, and may sometimes occur as bare genitives when other factors favour it (Bratishenko 1998:116): features from the bottom of the hierarchy of features, stems from the lower end of the agent-possessor hierarchy and adjectives formed with suffixes low on the suffix hierarchy.

Bratishenko’s conclusion, then, is that only certain tendencies can be traced in the pattern of attestations in possessive constructions: a) One cannot speak of complementary distribution. b) No clearly delineated borders can be established on the hierarchy: even proper nouns may have attestations of bare genitive. There are also instances of both morphosyntactic alternatives attested interchangeably when all other specified features are identical. c) Tendencies are stronger at the poles of the hierarchy. Common nouns in the middle range may even exhibit free variation between denominal adjective and bare genitive (Bratishenko 1998:117).

One very interesting observation of Bratishenko’s, directly relevant to the analysis in this dissertation, is that subject-object ambiguity is a factor not only relevant to the rise of the genitive-accusative (the other main theme of her dissertation), but also to possessive constructions (Bratishenko 1998:153–158). Subject-object ambiguity may have been indirectly involved in the formation and distribution of denominal adjectives as opposed to the bare genitive case of a noun. This ambiguity has actually been suggested as a contributing factor in the progressive increase in bare adnominal genitive attestations (Lomtev 1956:456–457).

Bratishenko also refers to Comrie (1976), who observes that in Slavic languages with both possessive adjectives and genitive, it is usually the object that is expressed by the genitive case, while the subject, all other conditions being equal, is predominantly expressed by a denominal adjective. Czech, for example, avoids denominal adjectives as objects, employing the genitive instead (Comrie 1976:188). In several Slavic languages, NPs headed by deverbal nouns thus deviate from the structure of other NPs, in that possessive adjectives and the genitive seem to have specialised in expressing subjects and objects of deverbal nouns respectively. Comrie claims that “with other noun phrases the possessive adjective is nearly always preferred to a

---

21 Lomtev’s suggestion is rather crude, he takes very little heed of the disambiguating power of the context.
22 He does not define what adjectives he has in mind.
definite genitive noun phrase” (Comrie 1976:188). He does not consider any possible semantic reasons for this distribution. Corbett (1987) goes on to make a generalisation claimed to hold for all Slavic languages (including OCS and Old Russian): “The range and frequency of use of the PA\textsuperscript{23} for the subjective genitive are at least as great as for the objective genitive” (Corbett 1987:330). In all the Slavic languages, there is a tendency for the -ov-/-in- adjective to be subjective, and the adnominal genitive to be objective with action nominals, he notes (1987:331; much the same observation is made for modern Russian in Kopčevskaja-Tamm and Šmelev 1994:223–224).

Bratishenko makes a similar generalisation, that the Old Russian genitive was the case compatible with object use typical of the patient, but not with subject use, while denominal adjectives were correlated with the agent and thus the subject (Bratishenko 1998:157 and 2003:100–101). Bratishenko does not really investigate this observation – she does not examine modifiers of deverbal nouns separately, though several of her bare genitive attestations on pp. 111–112 are in fact objects of deverbal nouns. However, her conclusions tally rather well with my own in Eckhoff 2001: Objects of deverbal nouns tend not to occur as denominal adjectives. The bare genitive is overrepresented here, and so are adnominal datives, which Bratishenko does not examine at all. Interestingly, this point is completely disregarded by Uryson (1980), despite her valence-based approach, and also by Nilsson (1972), even though her monograph is an in-depth study of the syntax of deverbal nouns in -nie and -tie, and a whole chapter is devoted to attributes of such nouns. The point is also contradicted outright in some of the works on general historical syntax: Borkovskij 1968:170, Lomtev 1956:474 and Sprinčak 1960:137 claim the objective genitive to have been very rare before the 17th century, and Borkovskij even seems to think that the subjective genitive started expanding sooner than the objective genitive did (1968:169).

Thus, there is good reason to believe that the complementary distribution analysis obscures more than it clarifies, as the interrelationship of the Old Russian possessive constructions is clearly more complex than that. In particular, the observations that denominal adjectives are dispreferred for expressing “objects” of deverbal nouns have been an important motivation for the present dissertation’s emphasis on the types of head nouns involved in the constructions.

2.6 Comparisons of the OCS and early Old Russian systems

Most comparisons of the OCS and the earliest Old Russian system of possessive constructions seem to be at best impressionistic. The majority of scholars simply

\textsuperscript{23}Possessive adjective, i.e. adjective in -ov-/-in-.
assume the systems to be parallel (Trubetzkoy 1937, Večerka 1963, Huntley 1984). It is usually noted that the possessive dative is more widespread in OCS, and its status in early Old Russian is, as we have seen, disputed.

As we have seen, Richards 1976 assumes OCS to have been closer to complementary distribution (and to the Common Slavic state) than early Old Russian was. Bratishenko, on the other hand, leaning on Huntley 1984, points out that the OCS data show “a number of attestations manifesting mutual encroachment upon domains of complementary distribution”, and that these data have been largely neglected in previous research (Bratishenko 1998:91). As a matter of fact, she writes, the situations in OCS and earliest Old Russian (Old East Slavic) differ considerably. Early Old Russian is much closer to complementary distribution, while OCS has more instances of clear interchangeability among common nouns, some even with no semantic consequences (Huntley 1984, Corbett 1987). Bratishenko supposes such free variation to be a much later phenomenon in Old Russian, quoting Widnäs 1958, who does not find it until the late 17th century Povest’ o Savve Grudcine (see also Borkovskij 1978:152, Makarova 1954:28). This suggests that early Old Russian is more conservative than OCS in its employment of the bare genitive modifier. The exceptions from the alleged complementary distribution are fewer in early Old Russian than in OCS, and almost exclusively concern common nouns. On the other hand denominal adjectives, particularly with individual personal reference, are attested in early Old Russian instead of the genitive even when further modified (Bratishenko 1998:91–93). Corbett thinks that in Old Russian possessive adjectives apparently had greater control possibilities than in OCS, as Old Russian has some rare examples of possessive adjectives controlling genitive attributive modifiers, whereas OCS has none (Corbett 1987:309, 313–314).

Thus, at least some of the literature leads us to expect clear differences between the OCS and the Old Russian system. Mainly, one would expect a more frequent and flexible possessive dative in OCS than in Old Russian, but a higher share of bare genitives is also indicated for OCS. These assumptions form the background of Chapter 6 of the present dissertation, where 11th–14th century Old Russian and OCS possessive constructions are compared.

2.7 Development of the Old Russian system 1000–1700

The diachronic development of the interrelationship between denominal adjectives, the adnominal genitive and the adnominal dative in Old Russian is an issue of much disagreement, both as to chronology and causal factors.
2.7.1 Chronology

2.7.1.1 A brief note on the histories of the various adjective-forming suffixes

Zverkovskaja 1986 gives a detailed description of the separate histories of all the adjective-forming suffixes involved in the adjective-genitive-dative competition, although she in no way embarks on an analysis of their interrelationship with the adnominal genitive and dative. However, it is interesting to note the contrast in the histories of the suffixes that will be grouped together as group 1 and 2 respectively in this dissertation (cf. section 2.2.2).

Group 1, the suffixes -*jь, -bn’, -inь, -ovь/-evь, encompasses a row of suffixes which differed in origin, but were close in that they could express possessive relations, including individual possession. The oldest derivates with these suffixes form a particular group in Old Russian, which had common tendencies of development: Each of them had an original “synchretism” of meanings, but then developed at least two differentiated types: one narrowly possessive from personal or personified nouns, and one tending towards the relative (possessive-relative) type, generally derived from nouns denoting animals and plants. There then developed an increasingly clear formal and semantic distinction between the types in the period up to 1700, i.e. the period which is the focus of Zverkovskaja’s work (Zverkovskaja 1986:50). The group of possessive adjectives proper were characterised by special possessive suffixes (-*jь, -ovь, -inь) and short form, i.e. special declension. The remaining adjectives formed with the same suffixes were derived from plant and animal nouns, and were increasingly characterised by long form. The suffix -bn’ (Zverkovskaja 1986:16–24) differed somewhat from these core possessive adjectives, in that it was generally used with quite a narrow range of nouns denoting kinship and other human relationships, and that it tended towards a generic meaning, rather than an individual. This suffix is also found in derivates from adverb and noun stems denoting space and time; these adjectives are not involved in the adjective-genitive-dative competition situation, and have not been registered in this dissertation.

The adjectives in group 2, which are formed with the suffixes -bsk- and -bn-, and also -bj-, have quite a different history. The suffixes -bsk- and -bn- both remained relatively stable throughout the period under consideration in Zverkovskaja 1986, and complemented each other to a large extent. Both suffixes had a very wide semantics. -bsk- (Zverkovskaja 1986:50–59) is mostly found in adjectives formed from noun stems denoting persons, occasionally animals and very rarely inanimates. -bn- (Zverkovskaja 1986:25–37), on the other hand, is mostly used with inanimate nouns. The two suffixes have coexisted since deep antiquity, and remained very stable in the period 1000–1700 as well.
2.7.1.2 The interrelationship between denominal adjectives, genitive and dative

There is considerable disagreement as to when the adnominal genitive started expanding. Some scholars consider the expansion of the bare adnominal genitive a very late and externally motivated change. A radical version of this stance is found in Uryson 1980, who does make some diachronic remarks, but not based on research of her own. As pointed out in section 2.3.1, she believes that the only adnominal option in Proto-Slavic was the adjective, i.e. that there was no competition in Proto-Slavic. She views the adnominal dative as a recent, semantically motivated development, and the possibility of modified adnominal genitives as a mere loan from Greek. Leaning partially on Widnäs 1958, she also claims that the use of bare genitive modifiers was a very late development, found only in the 18th century as a result of influence from Western European languages (Uryson 1980:126–127). Bratishenko 1998, quoting data from Ivanov 1989, also seems to believe that free variation between genitive and adjectives was a late phenomenon, but then she allows for much semantically conditioned use of bare genitives already in the earliest texts. She does not resort to explaining the change as influence from French and other Western European languages.

Other scholars consider the restructuring of the interrelationship between the possessive constructions a slower and more gradual change, which can be discerned earlier and is at least partially internally motivated. Borkovskij (1968:166) reports an increasing use of bare possessive genitives, and a tendency for the genitive to replace the denominal adjectives, in the 15th–17th centuries, and a far more pronounced tendency in this direction in the 18th–19th century texts, but these claims are not backed by any quantitative data.

Richards 1976 sketches the following development, with some quantitative backing: Old Russian as first attested had already departed from complementary distribution, allowing N+N possessors to be expressed either as adjective + adjective, adjective + genitive or genitive + genitive. This is particularly pronounced in 15th–17th century texts.

With the advent into the system of non-grammatically-determined, and thus non-arbitrary, alternatives for expressing the same meaning, there began to exist the possibility of stylistic variation and semantic shading between possessive adjectives and genitives where this was previously impossible. (Richards 1976:195)

In the 15th–16th centuries, Richards observes an increase in the use of the ambiguous suffix -sk- in possessive adjective derivation, apparently at the expense of the -jbo- suffix, and a concomitant significant increase in the use of possessive genitives in
general, although the genitive alone is still quite rare. On the basis of these data, she hypothesises a change in the rule for creating possessives from one-word possessors taking place during the 15th–17th centuries: “an extension of the paradigmatic association of possessive adjectives and genitives from N+N to N possessor structures, while still preserving the original surface distribution of the two forms, adj./one word possessor, gen./possessor in more than one word” (Richards 1976:264). The share of bare genitives increases in the 18th century, and throughout the 19th century, Richards finds adjectives and genitives in stylistic variation in one-word possessor expressions, while the possessive adjective has essentially disappeared among 20th century writers. She does not look into the history of the dative particularly, but notes that it decreases steadily, and is gone by the 19th century.

Thus, there is good reason to take an in-depth look at the development of the interrelationship between the possessive constructions in the history of Russian. Again, part of the reason behind the different opinions may very well be the various tacit working definitions of the concept of possession and the different selections of source material. Therefore, it is the task of Chapter 7 of the present dissertation to give a diachronic analysis of the Old Russian possessive constructions based on a balanced corpus and on counts of the data organised by clearly defined semantic categories.

2.7.2 Causal factors behind the changes
When it comes to explaining the changes in the Old Russian system of possessive constructions, various causal factors are proposed in the literature. They encompass semantic factors, analogues (cf. Harris and Campbell 1995:51), morphological factors, language contact and appeals to allegedly universal tendencies in linguistic change.

2.7.2.1 Semantic factors
The semantic causal factor most frequently proposed in the various works is that of ambiguity, particularly that of the denominal adjectives, but also the potential ambiguity following from the wide semantic fields of the genitive and the dative. Borkovskij (1968:205) sees the development of the adnominal dative as semantically caused: it lost those of its functions that did not correspond to the “basic meaning”.

As for the Old Russian denominal adjectives, they have often been claimed to have been so vague and “undifferentiated” (Stecenko 1977:61) that it simply made communication difficult (cf. also Lomtev 1956:453 and Sprinčak 1960:122). As will be pointed out in section 2.7.2.5, this type of argumentation is hardly very fruitful. However, the adjectives in -ъск- and -ън- certainly can be ambiguous.
A different type of semantic causal factor is used by Corbett (1987) when he sums up the history of the competition between possessive adjectives (in -ov-/in-) and the adnominal genitive. The possessive adjective, he notes, has competed with the genitive with varying degrees of success in the development of the modern Slavic languages. The general trend of development has been against the possessive adjective, particularly in East Slavic. As mentioned earlier, Corbett proposes two hierarchies: Human < Animal < Inanimate and Specific < Non-Specific. The history of the competition between the possessive adjective and the genitive, Corbett claims, can be seen as a progressive tightening of the restrictions on the possessive adjective in terms of the two hierarchies above, though their influence was evident even in OCS (Corbett 1987:326)

2.7.2.2 Language contact and borrowing

The general works on Russian historical syntax make surprisingly little of the possibility of syntactic borrowing or other effects of language contact in the development of possessive constructions. It is only brought up in the discussion of the status of the possessive dative, which is suggested to be a syntactic loan from OCS (Borkovskij 1968:197–198).

Uryson (1980), on the other hand, has great faith in the potency of syntactic borrowing, not only believing that the possibility of using the adnominal genitive in Slavic at all was a mere result of Greek influence, but also considering the expansion of the bare adnominal genitive a result exclusively of influence from Western European languages in the 18th century.

Uspenskij (1987) names the influence of Greek as the main reason why the genitive started spreading in the written language, through the reforms of the second half of the 17th century, when Patriarch Nikon’s scribes started correcting datives and denominal adjectives into genitives. He also states that the increasing influence from Western European languages worked in the same direction as the Greek-inspired Nikonian reforms (Uspenskij 1987:301–306).

Widnäs (1958) considers the spread of the possessive genitive, which she dates as late as the 18th century, a result of “foreign” influence (she specifies French as one of the sources), and claims that the possessive genitive was originally alien to Russian.

2.7.2.3 Analogues

Many scholars emphasise that the expansion of the genitive was aided by the strong position the genitive already had in the same functions as the denominal adjectives
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and dative. Richards 1976 makes a point of the Old Russian situation where N+N possessors could be expressed as adjective + adjective, adjective + genitive and genitive + genitive. Thus, “the possessive adjective and the genitive were already in paradigmatic variation” (Richards 1976:264), a situation which could be extended to one-word possessors. Richards also makes a point of constructions such as *množestvo naroda* “multitude of people”, *stolp cerkvi* “pillar of (a/the) church”, *syn otečestva* “son of (the) fatherland” Bratishenko (1998:157 and 2003:100–101) has perhaps the most elaborate suggestion of this kind: She hypothesises that the possibility of subject–object ambiguity with deverbal nouns may have led to the favouring of adjectives for subjects and genitives for objects. This use of bare genitives in possessive-related constructions may then have served as yet another analogue furthering the expansion of the possessive genitive in the history of Russian.

2.7.2.4 Morphological factors

Many scholars put forward the various “inadequacies” of the denominal adjectives to explain the expansion of the genitive. Richards 1976 notes that the unambiguously possessive adjectives are an anomaly “in that they express both the gender of the noun from which they are derived and number and gender agreement with their heads” (1976:264–265). By the 15th–17th centuries, they are also an anomaly in that they are declined only as short-form adjectives, the long form having been generalised for attributives with all other adjectives. There was nothing essentially new about these anomalies, but when the possessive adjective grew superfluous as the genitive became an option for one-word possessors, this “could be sufficient to cause its elimination” (Richards 1976:265).

2.7.2.5 Universal tendencies in language change

Most of the general works on Russian historical syntax (except Borkovskij 1968, which very soberly sticks to pragmatic, small-scale explanations) to some extent try to explain the change in terms of supposedly universal tendencies of syntactic change or linguistic change in general, primarily a very strong faith in progress: Languages change for the better, and become gradually better suited for the communicative purposes of the speakers. This faith is very ideologised in some of the works (particularly Sprinčak 1960 and Stecenko 1977), as there was a strong pressure to develop a Marxist theory of the historical development of languages (Sprinčak 1960:15). This optimistic view of language change tends to result in explanations of the following kind: The fact that the denominal adjectives had so many functions complicated mutual understanding and often produced ambiguity, as Lomtev 1956:453 characteristically puts it: “Такое многообразие назначения имен
прилагательных при именах существительных в процессе общения создавало многочисленные трудности в деле взаимопонимания говорящих.”

Such explanations are at best naïve, especially the claim that people in past times did not understand each other as well as we do today. The notion of progress in language change is generally rejected in modern work on the subject, rather every language is considered to be in a “perpetual stalemate” of opposing forces (Aitchison 1991:214–215).

2.8 Conclusions and research questions

As we can see, much has been written on the competition between the adnominal genitive, the adnominal dative and the denominal adjectives in the history of Russian. However, this chapter has made it clear that a lot of work still remains on this problem. The work examined shows various flaws and lacunae which should be filled.

2.8.1 Theory

We have seen that much of what is written is based in a traditional framework. A particularly problematic concept is that of “possession”, which is used by most authors without definition (but with rather varying tacit working definitions), making it quite difficult to compare their results. A good account of the problem must provide a clear definition of this term, or dispense with it altogether.

The scholars who did choose a theoretical approach to the problem have mostly focused on the properties of the modifier. Only a very few have focused on the properties of the head noun. I consider it important to do both, and believe such an approach will supplement and improve on the interesting conclusions of Bratishenko 1998.

Hardly any authors have a principled view of syntactic change. Needless to say, this is necessary in any serious work on diachronic syntax.

Chapter 4 provides the solutions of the present dissertation to these problems: As seen in section 1.1, Taylor’s possessive gestalt has been used for terminological purposes, but the concept of possession will not be very important in the actual analyses in chapters 5–7. Instead, an analysis based on the two schematic notions of reference point and intrinsic relationship is proposed (section 4.4). The analysis will also focus on the contributions of both head nouns and modifiers (section 4.3). The approach to diachronic syntax is discussed in section 4.6.

24 “Such a variety of denotations of adjectives modifying nouns created numerous difficulties in the matter of mutual understanding in the process of communication” (my translation). (See Stecenko 1977:61 and Sprinčak 1960:122 for even more radical formulations.)
2.8.2 The phenomena under consideration
As seen, there is much variation in the range of phenomena actually examined by the various scholars, and quite a lot of disagreement as to their interrelationships.

It is very important to make clear exactly what phenomena are considered, something which is often not completely clear in the works examined. Some authors do not say what adjectives are subsumed under the term “possessive adjectives”, and those who do, include a rather varying selection of adjective suffixes.

Most scholars, as pointed out by Bratishenko 1998, lightly dismiss all findings of bare adnominal genitives as “exceptions”, and focus on the complementary distribution “rule”. I agree with Bratishenko that the “exceptions” should be given a thorough treatment.

Many of the authors do not look at the role of the adnominal dative at all, or dismiss it cursorily. As we saw, there is also a lot of disagreement on the exact role and status of the possessive dative, and it seems important to take a proper look at it and compare it with the adnominal genitive and the denominal adjectives.

In the present dissertation, all Old Russian and OCS constructions that have the possibility of expressing paradigmatic possession (cf. section 1.1) will be considered.

2.8.3 Comparison of the OCS and Old Russian systems
As observed, most comparisons of the possessive constructions in OCS and early Old Russian are rather impressionistic, and give very varying results. I consider a thorough comparison of OCS and the oldest attested Old Russian necessary, and this is the task of Chapter 6. The comparison will naturally also take into consideration the fact that the OCS corpus is translated from Greek.

2.8.4 Chronology
As seen in section 2.7.1, there are serious discrepancies in the various accounts of the chronology of the changes under consideration in this dissertation. Many of the accounts are based on either flimsy or unspecified data, and most works do not quantify their data nor attempt any accurate dating of the changes. This dissertation will give a more reliable chronology, outlined in Chapter 7, based on a representative corpus of quantified data from the period 1000–1700 (see Chapter 3).
2.8.5 Possible causes of the changes
As seen in section 2.7.2, various authors offer various suggestions of possible causal factors behind the changes. None of them is particularly systematic about this, and some authors (Uryson, Widnäs, Uspenskij) offer very simplistic explanations based on language contact. I believe that the causal factors behind the changes in question were complex and many-layered, and consider it very unlikely that the final spread of the adnominal genitive was the exclusive result of language contact in the 17th–19th centuries. Chapter 8 is an evaluation of the causal factors that have been suggested in the literature, in the light of the findings of chapters 5–7.
3 Corpus

3.1 Introduction

This is a corpus-based study. The aims of the present dissertation include both an in-depth synchronic analysis of the system of possessive constructions in the earliest attested Old Russian texts, with a comparative analysis of canonical Old Church Slavic, and a diachronic investigation of the development of the interrelationship of the possessive constructions in the period up to 1700. The theoretical model to be employed in the analyses (outlined in chapter 4) is both as yet untried on this type of material, and quite detailed and subtle. At the same time (as seen in chapter 2) there is little consensus among scholars on the details of the diachronic development, such as the dating of the changes and the causal factors behind them (though naturally, given the historic nature of the subject matter, there is no disputing the eventual outcome). Therefore, the dissertation must be based on a fairly extensive and representative text corpus.

There is no such thing as a standard corpus that should be used for any diachronic study of Old Russian. The size and composition of the corpus should always be selected in accordance with the nature and frequency of the specific phenomena under scrutiny. The Old Russian and OCS possessive constructions that are the subject matter of the present dissertation are highly frequent in all styles of writing, but with different distributions in different genres. This justifies the selection of a medium-sized, but stylistically varied corpus. The selection of texts for such a corpus is rather a sensitive matter, and it is also a point where a dissertation of this kind is potentially vulnerable to criticism. Unless the researcher includes all available texts within the geographical and chronological limits of the study, there is always the possibility that someone may consider the number of selected texts inadequate, or the actual selection of texts faulty or unreasonable in some respect. The task of this chapter is therefore to substantiate my claim that this limited selection of the available

25 Some of the reasoning in this chapter is taken from Eckhoff 2004. The chapter also shares some basic themes with Chapter 2 of Eckhoff 2001, since the corpus of that study overlaps considerably with that of the present dissertation.
26 For an example of such criticism in most respects imaginable, see Krys’ko’s (2002) scathing and unreasonable review of Eckhoff 2001. This criticism was countered on every point in Eckhoff 2004.
texts is a judicious one and sufficient to provide a fair picture of the first documented situation in Old Russian and in OCS, as well as of the further development of the Old Russian possessive constructions.

### 3.2 General principles of text selection

The sources of linguistic data will always pose a series of problems to the historical linguist: There are simply no living informants, and normally no records of natural speech. The written sources to past stages of a language may be less than representative. We have no direct access to the language systems of the past. The linguistic situation only peeps through a veil of written norms, the illiteracy of the main bulk of the speakers, copyists’ habits and interpretations, late copies and good or bad editing. The task of the historical linguist is to make this veil as thin as possible, but it will always be there.

In the following some general principles for the selection of texts are listed. To some extent I have had to deviate from these principles for various reasons, to be specified in the rest of the chapter, but they have always been the ideals. More specific argumentation for the selection of texts is found in sections 3.4 (on the Old Russian texts) and 3.5 (on the OCS texts). A full list of all Old Russian texts in the corpus, with descriptions of texts, manuscripts and editions, is found in the Appendix. The list is sorted by period and genre.

#### 3.2.1 Fair representation of each period

Each of the selected periods must be fairly equally represented. A longer time span requires a larger corpus distributed evenly over the entire period. This is mainly relevant for the Old Russian texts, as we are dealing with texts from seven centuries: Period 1, which spans 400 years, is naturally covered by a considerably larger corpus than those of the 15th, 16th and 17th centuries. The 17th century corpus is larger than those of the 15th and 16th centuries, to make the final conclusions more certain, and because many of the changes become very pronounced in the 17th century. The canonical OCS sources span a much shorter period of time than the Old Russian material, but there is some variation in the archaicness of the language even between these texts, and this will also be given due attention.

#### 3.2.2 Geographical considerations

Geography must be taken into consideration. In the case of OCS, this means selecting texts with extant manuscripts from both the Ohrid (Macedonian) and Preslav (East Bulgarian) schools, which, although linguistically very close, do have some
differences (cf. e.g. Schenker 1995:188). In the case of Old Russian, the oldest texts are naturally mostly Kievan in origin, such as *Skazanie o Borise i Glebe* (SBG), *Povest’ vremennykh let* (PvRL), *Russkaja pravda* (RP). From the 13th century onwards, the selected texts are generally from central/northern Russia (Moscow, Murom, Vladimir, Suzdal’, Rjazan’, Novgorod, Tver’, Pskov, Smolensk), in order to avoid Belorussian and Ukrainian linguistic features, though some dialectal variation is naturally observed. A related ideal is that the author of each text should be a *native speaker* of the language in which he writes. This is fairly easily achieved with the Old Russian original texts, but probably not always the case with the OCS translations.

### 3.2.3 Fair representation of literary genres

A fair representation of the main literary genres in the language and period in question is very important. The language in general, and in particular the frequency of the constructions sought, may vary greatly from genre to genre. This is particularly important in Old Russian, where the proportion of Church Slavic linguistic elements is highly genre-dependent. The OCS corpus, on the other hand, should include both biblical (selections from the Gospels) and non-biblical texts (vitae), as the translation technique may differ.

### 3.2.4 The quality of the text editions

The editions of the texts ought preferably to be linguistic, ideally with textological comments, and the manuscripts used should be as old and close to the original as possible. This is a particularly problematic point, and will be discussed in more detail in section 3.3.

### 3.2.5 Text volume

The extent of each text (excerpt) should be counted accurately and stated clearly. A standard page of 2000 characters (including blank spaces) was established for the texts to make them more readily comparable. This is important in order to ensure that each genre and period is represented in a balanced way. Without counting, it is

---

27 The latest text from the Kievan area is *Prodažnaja Chon'ki Vaskovoj na Kalenikov monastyr’* (PChV), a brief business letter from 1378. The letter does have some Ukrainian features, but the 11 examples of possessive constructions in the text are perfectly in keeping with those found in Central Russian texts from the same period.

28 Two texts, *Povest’ o vzjatii Car’građa* (PVC) and *Povest’ o Karpe Sutulove* (PKS) have authors whose geographical origins are unknown.

29 The calculation was done in the following way: In each text the signs and blank spaces in five representative lines were counted, and the number was divided by five to arrive at the average number of signs per line. Then the lines in the entire text (or excerpt) were counted and the number multiplied by the average number of signs in a line. The sum was then divided by 2000 to arrive at the number of standard pages.
far from obvious that, for instance, *Russkaja pravda* (RP) and *Poučenie Vladimira Monomacha* (PVM) are almost identical in volume (about 11 standard pages each). An exact quantification of the texts is also important due to the statistical approach taken in the analyses in chapters 5–7.

### 3.2.6 Other principles of corpus selection

Apart from these considerations, the selection of texts should in principle be random. It is neither necessary nor possible to include *all* texts within the temporal, linguistic, literary and geographical frames of the dissertation. The task must be to select a corpus which is reasonable considering the frequency of the constructions in question. The more frequent the construction, the smaller the corpus can be. Discussing the corpus of his frequency dictionary of Russian, Lönngren describes such considerations very precisely:

> На вопрос, достаточно ли этого [1 милли. словоупотреблений], однозначного ответа нет: все зависит от того, для каких исследований будет употребляться материал корпуса. Например, для изучения относительно высокоочастотных явлений в языке достаточно и меньшего объема выборки. С другой стороны, даже корпус, во много раз превышающий 1 миллион словоупотреблений, не может гарантировать “правильное” ранжирование низкочастотных лексем (Lönngren 1993:13–14).30

The constructions in question are so frequent that my Old Russian corpus of 412.5 standard pages, yielding 4581 instances of possessive constructions, should be quite sufficient to give a fair picture of the interrelationships between the constructions. For the same reasons that there is no need to include *all* available texts in the corpus, it is also unnecessary that every text should be analysed in full: to quote Lönngren again, “целостность текстов не является необходимой или даже желательной”31 (Lönngren 1993:14). In order to achieve a reasonably representative corpus, it is actually a necessity to read only excerpts of some of the longer texts. With an Old Russian corpus of 412.5 standard pages, and an OCS corpus of 130.3 standard pages,

---

30 “To the question of whether or not this [1 million words] is sufficient, there is no unambiguous answer: everything depends on what kind of investigations the material of the corpus is to be used for. For example, an even smaller sample would be sufficient for the study of phenomena of relatively high frequency. On the other hand, even a corpus many times exceeding 1 million words cannot guarantee the ‘correct’ ranking of low-frequency items” (my translation).

31 “It is not necessary, or even desirable, that texts should be used in full” (my translation).
it would clearly be unreasonable that any one text (excerpt) should be much longer than 30 standard pages.32

3.3 Manuscripts and editions as a source of problems

There are two important problems to be discussed here: Firstly, some texts exist only in quite late copies, although it is well substantiated that they were originally composed centuries earlier. Is it justifiable to use such late copies as sources to the syntax of the language of the time when the text was composed? Secondly, many important Old Russian texts are available only in non-linguistic editions, and sometimes quite unsatisfactory ones. Does such editing detract so much from the reliability of the text that it must be discarded as source material for a dissertation like the present one?

3.3.1 Late copies

This is no doubt the most serious problem of the two. Particularly when it comes to the earliest Old Russian texts, the gap between the time of composition and the time of the extant copy may be several hundred years. Likewise, the canonical OCS texts are mostly extant in 11th century copies, but the original translations date back to the ninth and tenth centuries. However, here the gap is not so great, and the the distance in time between original and copy is quite similar for all the texts, unlike the Old Russian situation. As for the Old Russian texts, Uspenskij takes a maximally strict position in this question, and claims that “мы не можем использовать их [более поздние списки] для исследования языка того времени, когда они [произведения] были созданы”33 (Uspenskij 1987:57). His main argument is that the notion of personal authorship did not exist in Russian mediaeval literature. This, he claims, lead to a situation where there was no clear distinction between copying and revising texts. One must assume that quite a lot of changes may have found their way into the copies, and it is a fact that such changes sometimes affect syntax as well as phonology and morphology. A comparison of the Codex Laurentianus from 1377 with the Codex Hypatianus from around 1420 makes this clear: Very often the non-prepositional locatives of Codex Laurentianus appear with prepositions added in the Codex Hypatianus. The scribe of the Codex Laurentianus has clearly been more faithful to the original than the scribe of the Codex Hypatianus.

32 The longest excerpt is in fact the 35 standard pages taken from various parts of the PVrL, due to the length, importance and stylistic variation of this text.
33 “we cannot use them [later copies] to study the language of the time when they [the works] were created” (my translation).
Nonetheless, I have chosen to select texts by the time of creation rather by the date of the manuscript. There are several reasons for this.

Firstly, we must ask whether scribal changes are likely to have had much impact on the constructions in question. We have seen that the scribes sometimes did change syntax and were not unlikely to change case constructions. Nonetheless, syntax would probably be less affected than phonology and morphology. As for the possessive constructions, there is little evidence that they were much affected, as shown by a comparison of older and newer copies of various texts: The textual variants from 16th century copies in the edition of Russkaja pravda (RP) based on a manuscript from 1282 (Karskij 1930) provide very few variants involving possessive constructions in a wide sense, and these variants are almost exclusively found in new headings added in the later copies. A look at the textual variants from later copies in Abramovič’s edition of Skazanie o Borise i Glebe (SBG) based on the Uspenskij sbornik of the 12th–13th century (Müller 1967, reprint edition with Müller’s corrections and comments in extensive footnotes) gives almost identical results. Of course, early texts only extant in late manuscripts cannot be checked in that way, but it seems unlikely that the situation should be very different. It is certainly a possibility that late copyists might have felt tempted to substitute adnominal datives with genitives, and one should certainly be very cautious of drawing far-reaching conclusions from unusual examples from texts extant only in late copies. Nevertheless, I believe that these texts provide an (admittedly somewhat blurred) picture of the syntax of the original author, far more than of that of the copyist.

Secondly, the scarcity of early manuscripts of Old Russian original texts is an important argument in favour of including late copies of early texts. From the 11th century there is very little: a few inscriptions, marginal notes and a few birch bark letters. From the 12th century there is some more, including charters (gramoty) and the important Uspenskij sbornik (dated to the turn of the 13th century). From the 13th and 14th centuries there are a fair number of manuscripts, such as the Codex Laurentianus of 1377. Many of the 13th and 14th century manuscripts actually render 11th and 12th century texts, and, more importantly, many of the very earliest texts known to us are extant only in even later manuscripts. The extreme case is the 12th century Slovo o polku Igoreve (SPI), of which our only sources are actually a manuscript copy from 1793 (according to Svane 1989:221; Kuskov 1989 claims it to be from 1795–96) and a printed edition from 1800 – a late 15th/early 16th century manuscript was lost when Moscow burnt down in 1812.34 I have chosen to include some of the most important texts, even when they were extant only in quite late

34 Despite our late sources, the syntax of this text appears to be typical of the 12th century, cf. Žolobov and Krys’ko’s conclusions on the use of the dual in the text (2001:186–192).
manuscripts. Otherwise a lot of text would have to be excluded from consideration altogether: A 15th century manuscript of an 11th century text can hardly be considered a reliable source to the language of the 15th century.

The problems inevitably connected with such a practice are lessened by the fact that the 11th through 14th centuries will be treated as one synchronic stage of Old Russian; see section 3.4.2.1 for the motivation for doing this.

3.3.2 Unsatisfactory editions

Ideally, the editions of the texts in the corpus should be linguistic, i.e. faithful to the manuscript’s orthography and preferably with an apparatus of critical textological notes. Unfortunately, for many of the Old Russian texts used, such editions simply do not exist. As far as possible, linguistic editions have been used, but in some cases editions more suitable for historians have been used when nothing else was to be had. These editions normally have a simplified orthography. Editions where corrections have been introduced without comment have been avoided. Some charters and documents have been taken from Obnorskij and Barchudarov’s excellent collection of Old Russian texts (1999), rather than from specialised editions. This collection can hardly be called a non-linguistic edition.

Non-linguistic editions of texts are undoubtedly a possible source of error. A phonologist could certainly not use such editions. However, the syntax of the texts is unlikely to be affected by the type of editing applied in such editions, and the subject matter of this dissertation is of course syntactic. The lack of a critical apparatus will be a loss, particularly in the more obscure passages of the texts, but there is little to be done about that. The use of manuscript originals is certainly an undertaking far beyond the scope of this dissertation.

3.4 The Old Russian corpus

As this is an analysis of aspects of the history of the Russian language system, the main bulk of texts are naturally Old Russian original texts, written and originally

35 For a detailed survey of the quality of each edition, see the description of the sources in the Appendix.
36 In the preface to the first edition of the book, the editors write the following about their principles of text edition: “Памятники древнейшей поры (до XV в. включительно) печатаются главным образом по рукописям, фототипическим изданиям, фотографическим снимкам. Памятники XVI–XVII вв. приводятся по авторитетным научным изданиям и по рукописи. Тексты печатаются с точностью, какая необходима при изучении письменных памятников со стороны языка” (Obnorskij and Barchudarov 1999:8). (“The texts of the oldest period (up to the 15th century) are mainly printed in accordance with manuscripts, facsimile editions, photographic records. The texts of the 16th–17th centuries are given in accordance with trustworthy scientific editions and manuscripts. The texts are printed with the precision necessary for studying written sources from a linguistic point of view”, my translation.)
composed by native speakers. As mentioned, the Old Russian original corpus consists of 412.5 standard pages, and yielded 4581 instances of possessive constructions.

3.4.1 Genres
Old Russian literature is traditionally divided into three main genres, or rather groups of genres (see for instance Vlasto 1988:346–349), which may be termed the religious genre, the narrative genre and the business/legal genre respectively. It is essential to have all three genres represented in a balanced way, as they correlate neatly with the degree of Church Slavic linguistic influence on Old Russian. The religious texts and the business/legal texts are the two extremes on a continuum ranging from (almost) pure Church Slavic to (almost) pure Old Russian. The religious texts – not only the translated liturgical texts, but also to a lesser extent original texts such as saints’ lives and homilies – are written in comparatively pure Church Slavic, which to some degree show signs of East Slavic influence. The business/legal texts, on the other hand, are written in relatively pure East Slavic, though traces of Church Slavic are evident even here. These texts are primarily codes of law, donation charters and treaties. The third genre, broadly called narrative texts and mainly consisting of chronicles, occupy an intermediate position between the two other genres. These texts are written in a fluctuating mixture of East Slavic and Church Slavic – even within a single text the language can vary considerably, depending on the subject matter. An extreme example of this is The Instruction of Vladimir Monomach (PVM), where the language spans from a rather colloquial East Slavic in the autobiographical hunting episodes, to high Church Slavic in the prayers at the end. A heterogeneous and subject-dependent language is characteristic of the more regular chronicle texts as well.

Two important questions should be asked, pertaining to the two extremes of this linguistic continuum: a) Should the religious texts be used at all, being so strongly permeated by Church Slavic features? b) Ought not the business/legal texts be used as the main body of evidence, since this apparently is the purest extant source to Old Russian?

The first question is one to which different scholars have different answers. Many have excluded a large part of the religious text from consideration in their studies of Old Russian syntax, while others have included them. This practice has influenced their respective results; a very relevant example is the varying treatment of the Old Russian possessive dative in general works on historical syntax, see chapter 2. Scholars working on historical syntax who have kept such texts in their corpora, include Bratishenko (1998) and Krys’ko (1997), and this is my choice as well. To choose otherwise would mean excluding a large bulk of the extant sources. As for the
question of whether the possessive dative is a syntactic loan or not, it will be necessary to compare the situation in each genre to get a reliable answer, if such an answer is at all possible.

The answer to the second question is much simpler. The language of the business/legal texts is stiff, brief and formulaic, and many important constructions are very rare in the texts – not because these constructions were rare in Old Russian, but simply because of the style and subject matter of this genre. No matter how large the corpus, it is unlikely that sufficient good examples of for instance genitive constructions headed by deverbal nouns would be found. Therefore the proportion of business/legal texts in the corpus is actually smaller than the proportion of religious and narrative texts, simply because very few interesting examples pertaining to the main questions of this dissertation will be found no matter how many pages of such texts are read. For the same reasons, the Novgorod birch bark letters are excluded altogether, since the constructions examined in this dissertation are so rare in them.

Finally, it should be made clear that the three main genres dissolve and change in the text material of the latest centuries under consideration. Particularly in the 17th century, all sorts of new types of texts appear (see for instance Kuskov 1989:14). Linguistically, these texts are often written in very colloquial Russian, and are therefore most closely related to the business/legal texts. Texts that might be described as publicistic are ascribed to this genre, whereas the fictional tales that start appearing are taken to be narrative texts. Even the religious texts are far more colloquial in this period.

3.4.2 Periodisation of Old Russian texts

3.4.2.1 The earliest texts: 11th–14th centuries

As mentioned in section 3.3.1, the 11th–14th centuries are considered a single period and are given a synchronic analysis in chapter 5. This is the usual practice, this period traditionally being labeled drevnerusskij jazyk (literally Ancient Russian), whereas the 15th through 17th centuries are labeled either starorusskij jazyk (literally Old Russian) or srednerusskij jazyk (Middle Russian). The main advantage of this periodisation is that such an analysis does away with some of the problems connected with late copies of early texts: When this rather long period is considered as one synchronic stage, many (but not all) of the late copies used fall within its limits. There are indeed good arguments for dividing this period further into two: The 11th and 12th centuries correspond roughly to the Kievan period, whereas the 13th and 14th centuries are the period of the Tatar invasions and the development towards

---

37 Bratishenko 1998 includes birch bark letters in her corpus, but have very few references to them in her survey of possessive constructions. Zaliznjak (1995:139–40) reports that the genitive is severely restricted in the birch bark letters.
consolidation under Moscow. Linguistically there is no doubt that the oldest texts tend to have more archaic features than the 13th and 14th century texts. The development of dialectal features leading to the splitting of Old East Slavic into the separate languages of Russian, Belorussian and Ukrainian are discernible as early as in the 11th–13th centuries, growing more and more pronounced throughout the 14th century (Ivanov 1990:12–13, Issatschenko 1980:129) but in practice, the limit is often drawn between the 14th and 15th centuries, as in Borkovskij 1968. Nevertheless, the source problems are a good reason for treating this period as one. The worst risk one takes by doing this is, as Faarlund (1990:16) says, “to construct a grammar which generates too many ‘generations’ of the language, and as a consequence treats chronologically separate forms as synchronic variation”. Given that the period in question is rather long, this is a decided risk. The findings of Eckhoff 2001, where this oldest period was separated into two, does however suggest that the interrelationship of the possessive constructions remained relatively stable throughout these 400 years.

This first, long period is represented by eight texts from each genre. As the business/legal texts are naturally shorter, the bulk of such texts (22.3 standard pages) is considerably smaller than the bulk of religious texts (111.3 standard pages) and that of narrative texts (79.4 standard pages). For a detailed description of the texts, see the Appendix.

3.4.2.2 Texts from the 15th, 16th and 17th centuries

The 15th, 16th and 17th centuries are analysed one by one in the diachronic analysis in chapter 7, for which the synchronic analysis of chapter 5 is the natural starting point. The 15th and 16th centuries are represented by 1–3 texts from each genre, whereas the 17th century is analysed in more depth, with three religious texts, three narrative texts and five business/legal/publicistic texts. This overrepresentation is justified by the many interesting features of the 17th century: the appearance of more colloquial texts and new genres, the increased influence of Western European languages, the Nikonian writing reforms where possessive dative and adjective constructions were actively corrected into genitive ones (Uspenskij 1987:302–306). The 15th century corpus consists of 76 standard pages and yielded 697 occurrences, the 16th century corpus consists of 59.9 standard pages and yielded 516 occurrences, and the 17th century corpus consists of 81.9 standard pages and yielded 1045 occurrences. A detailed description of the texts is, again, given in the Appendix.
3.5 OCS corpus

The analysis of Old Church Slavic possessive constructions in chapter 6 is not an independent study of the problem, but a basis for comparison with the Old Russian system. An independent study should have been supported by a larger corpus, but for the purposes of the present dissertation, the choice of a more limited corpus is justifiable. The aim of the analysis is to establish similarities and differences between the OCS system and the Old Russian system as far as possible, in order to assess the possible influence of OCS on Old Russian, and also in view of the diachronic relationship between the two. OCS is considered to be closer to Common Slavic than Old Russian, unsurprisingly, as the extant OCS texts from the 10th and 11th centuries (copies of 9th century texts) are considerably older than most of the Old Russian (original) texts.

The corpus consists of 130.3 standard pages, and yielded 1286 examples. The corpus is about two-thirds of the size of the Old Russian corpus of period 1. It is smaller not only because of the comparative aim of the analysis, but also because the OCS texts cover a shorter period of time, and because they are less varied linguistically and stylistically, and all belong to the religious genre. The 1287 examples document all the main construction types sufficiently to get a good picture of the OCS situation.

All the texts chosen are from the OCS canon, and all texts are translations from Greek. The relationship between the Greek original and the OCS translation will naturally be taken into consideration; all texts have been read in parallel in Greek and OCS.

Care has been taken to include both texts with extant manuscripts of the Preslav/East Bulgarian school and texts with extant manuscripts of the Ochrid/Macedonian school, as these differ to some extent. An important point to consider here is that the possessive dative is often considered a Bulgarianism\(^{38}\), and that it is considerably more frequent in the East Bulgarian Savvina kniga than in Codex Marianus, Codex Zographensis and Codex Assemanianus, which all have manuscripts of Macedonian origin (see Večerka 1963:200 for figures). This is a strong argument for including Savvina kniga, which might otherwise have been excluded on the grounds that the translation has clearly been much modified in the copying process.

Both biblical and non-biblical texts have been included, as it has been suggested that the translation technique may differ – that biblical texts are translated

---

\(^{38}\) In time, the dative and the genitive merged in Bulgarian, and were then both ousted by a prepositional construction.
more literally than other texts. The biblical texts are all excerpts from the Gospels. As far as possible, different excerpts have been chosen from each manuscript, but there are some overlaps. For the exact selections, see Chapter 10. The non-biblical texts are two vitae from the Codex Suprasliensis. It has been suggested that some texts in theCodex Suprasliensis have more archaic features than the others (Blagova 1980:120–121). This has been taken into consideration when texts were selected: Vita nr. 11 (Passion of St. Sabinos) is one of the texts claimed to be more archaic, whereas vita nr. 16 (Life of Isaac) has been assigned to the newer layer of texts.

3.6 Method of data registration and analysis

All instances of noun phrases with genitive, dative or denominal adjective modifiers are registered if

– the noun phrase is headed by a noun
– the modifier is not a single pronoun
– the modifier could be replaced by at least one of the other modifier types under consideration

This means that only instances where the genitive, dative or denominal adjectives could possibly compete with at least one of the other modifier types under consideration, are registered. This will for instance exclude genitive constructions headed by quantifying nouns bordering on numerals, such as:

(1) МНОЖЕСТВО ЛЮДИ
multitude-NOM.SG. people-GEN.PL.
“a multitude of people”

Here, a genitive modifier is the only possibility. Constructions headed by nouns denoting inherent parts of wholes were included, since adjective constructions were also represented. Note that the two groups of denominal adjectives under consideration are morphologically defined: Only adjectives formed with the suffixes -j-, -ov-/ev-, -in-, -ён- (group 1) and -бj-, -бsk- and -бш- (group 2) are registered. Adjectives in -ov-/ev- and -ин- are only registered when they are formed from a noun denoting a human being, or a noun that can be considered a personification or to denote human beings by metonymy. The adjective božii “God’s” is included in group 1 due to its distribution, even though it is derived with the suffix -бj-.

Texts of the Old Russian religious genre particularly, but also texts of the narrative genre, quite often contain quotations from other texts, usually religious
Church Slavic texts. Such quotations are treated just like regular text, since it is far beyond the boundaries of this dissertation to identify all possible quotations and exclude them or analyse them in special terms. Such quotations also evolved with the text through the repeated copying processes, and there is no way of knowing whether they were quoted from memory or from a physical book. Thus, the quotations are integrated parts of the texts. Very special features in obvious quotations are of course treated with caution.

All instances are registered in a database on my personal computer, where each record provides enough context to be intelligible as well as an English translation. The following information is also included in each entry in the database, in accordance with the theoretical principles of Chapter 4: the morphology of the example, the abbreviated name of the text, exact page and line reference, the period and genre of the text, the function (and possible subfunction) of the modifier, the type of head noun, the type of relation between modifier and head. Moreover, each record has a field for possible other comments. All this information is searchable, and the entries may be sorted by all these parameters.

The OCS translated texts are registered in the same way, and in addition, the corresponding piece of the original Greek text is also registered. Examples of Greek genitive constructions translated by other means than genitive, dative or denominal adjective constructions were also registered, with the corresponding piece of the OCS text.

The examples are given in the orthography of the edition that has been used. References to texts give the abbreviated title, the page number of the edition and the number of the line on that page, divided by a slash (e.g. AN 35/10). If there are two text columns on a page, the left one will be referred to as a, and the right one as b, unless the columns are numbered separately (e.g. 24a/15). When the edition gives line numbers in accordance with the manuscript, these numbers are used in the reference. The 17th century letters and documents taken from Kotkov et al. 1968 had their lines numbered text by text rather than page by page (e.g. GG a:2). References to New Testament texts are given by manuscript, gospel, chapter and verse (e.g. Zogr. John 5:12). As mentioned in Chapter 1, all examples are glossed with morphological information, and provided with English translations. The examples are always given with some context if this is necessary to understand them properly. The context is deliberately glossed in less detail than the example itself. The example itself is underlined.
4 Theory

The main theoretical tool of this dissertation is construction grammar. This approach to language provides a precise and many-faceted way of analysing the complex interrelationship between the possessive constructions (as defined in chapter 1) at hand, both synchronically and diachronically. It will allow an analysis of the data in terms of construction type, type of head noun, type of modifier, and place in the conceptual space where the overlapping semantics of the constructions are found (Croft 2001:92–96). The conceptual space is expected to remain constant over time, even though the individual semantics of each construction changes.

The phenomena dealt with in this dissertation must surely be characterised as syntactic. The competition and interaction between Slavic possessive constructions is to some extent conditioned by what, in the terminology of some, might be called “purely syntactic factors”, such as the absence or presence of a modifier with a possessor. However, the interplay of the constructions is certainly also, and probably more importantly, conditioned by a series of semantic factors. Therefore, a constructional approach to language, where complex constructions are held to be pairings of form and meaning, just like regular lexical items, seems ideal for the purposes of this dissertation.

The chapter is organised as follows: Section 4.1 is a brief introduction to construction grammar. Section 4.2 looks at how constructions are organised in schematic networks. Section 4.3 looks at the elements of the possessive constructions, their heads and modifiers. Section 4.4 is a discussion of the types of constructional meanings we are dealing with. Section 4.5 deals with the notions of constructional polysemy and synonymy, and gives a sketch map of the relevant part of conceptual space, which will be referred to as the possessive conceptual space. Finally, section 4.6 is a discussion of how diachronic syntax may be dealt with within a construction grammar framework.
4.1 An introduction to cognitive construction grammar

Construction grammar, just like Ronald Langacker’s fully compatible Cognitive Grammar, does not accept that there is a clear boundary between syntax and semantics, as it considers all linguistic units to be symbolic units, consisting of a phonological form and a semantic meaning. Nor does it accept that there is a clear boundary between grammar and lexicon. Instead, they are seen as poles in a continuum of symbolic units, where the units with the more schematic meanings are closer to the grammatical pole, and the units with the more concrete and specific meanings are closer to the lexical pole. It is the phenomena usually ascribed to the syntactic component in most grammatical theories that are focused on within the framework of construction grammar. Construction grammar is a reaction to the componential theory of grammar, and shuns the idea that a particular set of phenomena should be relegated to a separate syntactic component (Croft 2001:14–15).

In this way, the term “construction” is merely a different word for “symbolic unit”. Goldberg (2006:3) defines constructions as “conventionalized pairings of form and function”. Croft (2001:17) emphasises that “construction grammar has generalized the notion of a construction to apply to any grammatical structure, including both its form and its meaning”.

The emergence of construction grammar (Croft 2001:14–18) started with the study of idioms such as kith and kin and all of a sudden. Because idioms of these types are complex, they should belong to the syntactic component in a componential view of grammar. However, their internal structure is problematic: Kith and kin is unusual because it contains the idiosyncratic lexical element kith, which does not exist elsewhere. All of a sudden, on the other hand, is syntactically idiosyncratic, since sudden does not normally behave like a noun. Furthermore, there are idioms that are partially schematic, such as the x-er, the y-er, as in The longer you practice, the better you will become. The solution of Fillmore et al. 1988 is that we must accept that such idioms are constructions: objects of syntactic representation that also contain semantic and even phonological information. In the same way as lexical items, they link together idiosyncratic and arbitrary phonological, syntactic and semantic information. This makes lexical items and constructions the same kind of representation object:

---

39 Symbolic unit is first and foremost a Cognitive Grammar term (see e.g. Langacker 1987:58), but the idea of language as a system of form–function pairings is retained in all varieties of construction grammar (Goldberg 2006:215).

40 A schema is a coarse-grained as opposed to a fine-grained description of something (Langacker 1991:552). A schema–instance relationship may be defined like this: “A unit which is specified in greater detail may count as an instance of another unit, which is specified in lesser detail, and which is schematic for the former” (Taylor 2002:23).
They are both symbolic units. The only difference is that lexical items are substantive and atomic, whereas constructions can be at least partially schematic. This way of thinking has certain logical consequences:

– regular syntactic patterns and the corresponding regular rules of semantic interpretation are also constructions, but wholly schematic
– the internal structures of words are also constructions, but made up of bound elements only, while the syntactic constructions are largely made up of independent words.

It is this kind of reasoning that brings us to the type of definition found in Goldberg 2006: Since constructions are simply any kind of form–meaning pairing, all symbolic units are constructions. This provides a uniform representation of all types of grammatical structures from words to syntactic and semantic rules, in a syntax–lexicon continuum:

Table 4.1 The syntax–lexicon continuum (Croft 2001:17)\textsuperscript{41}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction type</th>
<th>Traditional name</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complex and (mostly)</td>
<td>syntax</td>
<td>[SB1 be-TNS VERB-en by OBL]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schematic</td>
<td>idiom</td>
<td>[pull-TNS NP-’s leg]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex and (mostly)</td>
<td>morphology</td>
<td>[NOUN-s], [VERB-TNS]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specific</td>
<td>syntactic category</td>
<td>[DEM], [ADJ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atomic and schematic</td>
<td>word/lexicon</td>
<td>[this], [green]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These various constructions then form a taxonomic network, where each construction is an instance of the more schematic constructions in the chain, and where less complex constructions are parts of more complex constructions.

Construction grammar has evolved into different varieties. The most important distinction is between Construction Grammar as developed by Charles Fillmore, Paul Kay and others on the one hand, and the closely related approaches of Adele Goldberg’s Cognitive Construction Grammar, William Croft’s Radical Construction Grammar and Ronald Langacker’s Cognitive Grammar on the other hand. The most important difference between the two main varieties is in the attitude to the usage-based model, and in the formal apparatus of description.

As pointed out by Goldberg (2006:214–217), Fillmore and Kay aim to account for grammar in a non-redundant way in their Construction Grammar, and do not represent frequency of use in their models. Croft, Goldberg and Langacker, on the other hand, all integrate their versions of construction grammar with the usage-based model (Bybee 1985, Langacker 1987): The level of representation in a speaker’s mind

\textsuperscript{41} Croft’s Radical Construction Grammar does not accept that atomic schematic constructions, i.e. syntactic categories, actually exist, but I will not go into that debate here.
is determined by patterns of frequency in actual language use. This means that grammatical information both can and often should be redundantly represented in the taxonomic hierarchy.

Fillmore and Kay’s Construction Grammar has also adopted a complex formalism, partly due to their strong links with computational linguistics, and partly for the sake of clarity and explicitness. Goldberg (2006:216–217) points out some disadvantages of the formalism. She argues that by using a fixed set of features, one will have trouble capturing detailed lexical semantic properties, and that the formalism is at odds with Croft’s (2001) position that grammatical categories and roles are not general across constructions, but defined with respect to particular constructions. She concludes that the formalism may not be the best method “if one wishes to concentrate on subtle differences in meaning between different constructions, or on subtle differences in syntactic patterning across different constructions” (Goldberg 2006:216–217), and that it may also be daunting to linguists unfamiliar with it. Goldberg herself, just like Croft and Langacker, does not adopt this formalism, but uses only whatever notation is necessary to ease the exposition.

This dissertation follows the usage-based, non-reductionist, non-formal approaches of Goldberg (2006) and Croft (2001), and is deeply indebted to and fully compatible with Ronald Langacker’s Cognitive Grammar. I will draw heavily on Langacker’s (1991:167–180; 2000:73–90, 171–201) and Taylor’s (1996) work within Cognitive Grammar on possessives in English.

The approach to syntax employed in this dissertation will thus be to look at syntactic phenomena in general, and noun phrases in particular, as complex and more or less schematic constructions. An important contribution of construction grammar is the insight that constructional meaning and lexical meaning – or more precisely, the meanings of complex and atomic constructions respectively42 – work together and influence each other. A good example is Goldberg 1995, a study of verbs and argument structure. Goldberg’s project consists very much in seeing how constructional meaning can add to lexical meaning, e.g. how verbs can “acquire” new roles, simply by occurring in a particular construction. The constructions dealt with in this dissertation will give the analysis a different slant. As is the conclusion of most scholars addressing possessive constructions, these constructions are notoriously open-ended, and the interesting question may in fact rather be how different types of lexical meaning add to the constructional meaning. Taylor (1996) attempts to answer this question in his thorough study of one single construction (the English [NP’s N] construction). He considers the construction itself to have a very general meaning.

42 I will go on using the term “lexical meaning” as a practical shorthand for the more precise “meaning of atomic, specific constructions”. Likewise, I will use the term “constructional meaning” to refer to the meaning of complex constructions.
namely that sketched in the reference point analysis: [NP’s] is a device to access [N] in mental space. With such a general constructional meaning, lexical meaning must play a larger role, and the array of semantic noun types and their influence on constructional meaning becomes very important. A similar approach, but more clearly formulated in construction grammar terms, is found in Stefanowitsch 2003.43

At the same time, we are dealing with several constructions which are not only polysemous, but which also compete and interact in some of the same functions: The possessive constructions in Old Russian have considerable semantic overlaps. To deal with this situation of varying degrees of polysemy within constructions, and partial synonymy between constructions, I will employ Croft’s (2001:92–96) notion of conceptual space: “Conceptual space is a structured representation of functional structures and their relationships to each other” (2001:93). That is, various functions are clustered together in conceptual space according to how they pattern with constructions in different languages. Croft (2003:134–135) uses plural inflection as an example: It varies from language to language to what extent nominals have plural inflection. However, there is a region in conceptual space that all these distributions can be mapped onto, namely an “extended animacy hierarchy”: first/second person pronoun – third person pronoun – human N – animate N – inanimate N. The “functional structures” in conceptual space are meant to include not only a narrow understanding of semantics, but also conventional pragmatic, discourse-functional, information-structural or even stylistic or social dimensions of the use of a construction. A particular region of conceptual space relevant to a particular (set of) construction(s) is also called a conceptual space in Croft’s terminology. The distribution patterns of constructions may then be plotted onto a semantic map of the relevant conceptual space. Croft is primarily interested in the usefulness of conceptual spaces and semantic maps in typological research (as thoroughly discussed in Chapter 5 of Croft 2003), but it is obvious that they are just as useful in dealing with language-internal synchronic variation and language change, the issues at hand in this dissertation: The conceptual space remains the same, but the distributions of the constructions change.

Thus, in my analyses of the synchronic and diachronic data, the distributions of the various constructions will be plotted onto maps of the relevant part of conceptual space throughout, and supplemented by charts illustrating the frequencies of the main subtypes of meaning.

43 Unlike Taylor 1996, Stefanowitsch views the English ‘s construction as a semantic role construction, assigning the role of “possessor” to the ‘s-marked NP.
4.2 Constructions and schematic networks

As can be deduced from the discussion in section 4.1, this dissertation adopts a view of constructions as identical with symbolic units, but organised after their degree of complexity and schematicity in the syntax-lexicon continuum in table 4.1. A construction is thus merely a form–meaning pair, which may be either highly schematic or completely specific, highly complex or atomic.

The constructions are organised in schematic networks, in which “any kind of linguistic structure – semantic, phonological or symbolic – can function as a node” (Langacker 1987:378). This means that both the semantic side of the construction, the phonological side of the construction, and the symbolic unit as a whole are nodes in a greater interconnected schematic network. The networks are schematic because the nodes are organised hierarchically by their degree of specificity or generality. For instance, using nodes from the phonological pole of Old Russian NP constructions, \([N_{head}, MOD]\) is schematic for both \([N_{head}, NP_{mod}]\), \([N_{head}, ADJ_{mod}]\) and \([N_{head}, PP_{mod}]\). \([N_{head}, NP_{mod}]\) is schematic for \([N_{head}, NP_{gen}]\) and \([N_{head}, NP_{dat}]\), whereas \([N_{head}, NP_{gen}]\)\(^{44}\) again is schematic for specific occurrences such as (1)

\[
(1) \quad \text{церкви} \quad \text{Бога} \quad \text{живаго}
\]

\[
\text{church-NOM.PL.} \quad \text{God-GEN.SG.} \quad \text{living-MASC.GEN.SG.}
\]

“churches of the living God” ŻD 356/1

Figure 4.1 is an incomplete sketch of such a network. The solid-line arrows indicate a relationship of full schematicity. The lower the nodes are in the network, the more detailed and specific they are.\(^{45}\)

\(^{44}\) The commas between the elements of the constructions indicate that the order of the elements is not fixed.

\(^{45}\) For a similar network of English verb constructions, see Croft 2001:56, figure 1.15.
Figure 4.1 Schematic network of Old Russian noun phrases, incomplete

![Diagram of schematic network]

Figure 4.2 is an example of a schematic network where the nodes are semantic entities. The figure is taken from Berg-Olsen 2005:82, and is an illustration of some of the meanings of the Latvian dative case. In this network we see not only the full-drawn arrows that indicate full schematicity, but also stipled arrows indicating extensions. The role “target person” (Wierzbicka 1988, Dąbrowska 1997) is schematic to the roles “recipient”, “experiencer” and “debitor”, but the roles “recipient”, “possessor” and “debitor” are also described as semantic extensions from the role “experiencer”.

"cerkvi Boga živago"
When constructions are related both phonologically and semantically, i.e. in a schematic network where the nodes are symbolic units, Goldberg (1995:75–81) posits inheritance links between the constructions: A construction that is both phonologically and semantically related to a more schematic construction is motivated by that construction. The more specific construction inherits the more schematic form, such as [N\text{head}, MOD], but has its own specifications, such as the exact type of modifier, as in [N_{\text{head}}, N_{\text{prep}}] (cf. Stefanowitsch 2003:417). Construction grammar also allows generalisations over parts of constructions, as illustrated in figure 4.3. Goldberg posits inheritance links in these cases too – constructions with the same types of subparts are linked, and may motivate each other.
It should be noted that some nodes in a schematic network are far more important than others, both cognitively and linguistically. Langacker (1987:380) points out that category prototypes and the highest-level schema are such nodes. The prototype is the center of gravity for the category, as the primary base for extensions. The highest-level schema is important because it is the maximal generalisation that can reasonably be used to characterise the members of the category. Another factor that makes certain nodes in a network more important than others is the fact that the networks are usage-based (cf. Bybee 1985) and dynamic. “A schematic network is shaped, maintained and modified by the pressures of language use” (Langacker 1987:382). That means that some nodes – at various levels of schematicity – will be more entrenched than others, because they are in more frequent use. The degree of entrenchment will be illustrated by the weight of the borders of the boxes in the networks. The bolder the border, the more entrenched it is.

This brings us to the important notions of type frequency and token frequency. When a schema has a large number of different instantiations, such as the English past-tense schema in -ed, the schema has high type frequency and is deeply entrenched:
When a schema only has a few different instances, and those instances are very frequent and highly entrenched themselves, the instances have high *token frequency*, and the schema will not be very strong. This is the case for the tenses of many English strong verbs, for instance. The pattern in *swim* – *swam* – *swum* and *sing* – *sang* – *sung* is a typical weak schema with a few very frequent and highly entrenched instances:

In the usage-based model, type frequency, token frequency and differences in entrenchment between instance and schema are most commonly used to describe productivity in terms of the usage-based model (e.g. Bybee 1995). However, these notions are also highly important when it comes to describing syntactic change in construction grammar terms, as we shall see in section 4.6.

### 4.3 The units of constructions: heads and modifiers

The possessive constructions that are the subject of this dissertation are expected to have quite schematic meanings. This makes their component units important. In particular, the head nouns of the constructions are expected to contribute substantially
to the meaning of each instance of each construction. Likewise, it is important to work out what types of head nouns and what semantic types of modifiers go with what constructions.

4.3.1 Relational nouns

Valence is a term usually associated with verbs, not nouns, or in Cognitive Grammar terms, relations, not things.\(^{46}\) However, it is a well-known fact that some nouns also exhibit valence properties. This is most obvious with deverbal nouns, which clearly have “slots” that can be filled by elements that would have been the subjects and/or objects of the corresponding verb, such as in *Columbus’s discovery of America*. But also other groups of nouns, such as kinship terms, seem to have such “slots”. These are nouns that may be called relational nouns: All nouns profile things, i.e. construe the referent as a region in some domain. An inherently relational noun also does this. However, the noun has a base of predication\(^{47}\) containing an unprofiled relation to an unprofiled relatum: “[Relational nouns] construe the designated thing in terms of a relation to another entity. The relation, and the relatum, are not designated by the relational nouns, nevertheless these aspects are salient elements in the unprofiled base of predication of a relational noun” (Taylor 1996:239). The unprofiled relatum is the relational noun’s *elaboration site*. When this elaboration site is filled, the meaning of the entity filling it is highly conditioned by the relational noun. Figure 4.6 illustrates the base of predication of two kinship terms, *niece* and *uncle*. An entity filling the elaboration site of e.g. *niece* must either be an aunt or an uncle:

---

\(^{46}\) Langacker (1991:552, 555) defines *thing* as “a region in some domain”. A *relation*, on the other hand, is “a set of interconnections among conceived entities”. This is a major distinction in Cognitive Grammar, since all linguistic units belong to one of these two categories. Nouns and nominal expressions designate things, whereas verbs, prepositions, adjectives and adverbs designate relations. The region profiled by a noun may well contain some kind of relation, for instance in the case of deverbal nouns. The difference between *destruction* and *destroy* is not one of conceptual content, but lies in the structuring of that content. Thus, *destruction* profiles the region comprising the related entities, whereas *destroy* profiles the interconnections among these entities (cf. Taylor 1996:82).

\(^{47}\) Langacker (1991:551) defines *profile* as “the entity that an expression designates. A substructure within its base that is obligatorily accessed, accorded special prominence, and functions as the focal point within the immediate scope of predication”.

\(^{48}\) Langacker (1991:544) defines the *base* as “[t]hose portions of active cognitive domains that a predication specifically invokes, providing the background against which some entity stands out as the profile”.

Figure 4.6 Profiles of relational nouns

Apart from kinship terms and deverbal nouns, relational nouns include for instance nouns denoting inherent parts of wholes and representation nouns such as portrait. In Langacker’s and Taylor’s terms, then, such nouns have one or more schematically characterised elaboration sites, and impose a sometimes quite specific interpretation on entities filling these elaboration sites. Stefanowitsch (2003:428) has a similar view of relational nouns, saying that relational nouns, like verbs, evoke semantic frames with roles that vary from noun to noun.

The distinction between relational and non-relational, and particularly deverbal and non-deverbal, nouns has led to a tradition of giving different analyses for each of the types. As Taylor puts it:

a feature of just about all subsequent [to Chomsky’s “Remarks on nominalization”, 1970] generative treatments has been a reluctance to offer a unified account of expressions with the schematic structure [NP POSS N']. A major division has been between possessives that are headed by derived nouns (which are presumed to have an argument structure) […] and those that are headed by nouns which lack an argument structure (Taylor 1996:151).

The stance of the present dissertation is that the main division is found between relational and non-relational nouns. This division is hardly clear-cut: Some nouns which would normally be considered non-relational can in some instances be construed as relational nouns. For instance, nouns that are not inherently parts of wholes may appear in constructions which add this feature to their meaning. Other nouns may not be relational in a strict sense, but may invoke relationships more weakly, which may lead them to be construed as relational nouns given the right context (Stefanowitsch 2003:435, cf. also Delsing 1993:147–148). For instance, items of clothing have some of the same associations as body parts and may in some
contexts be construed as such. In dealing with inalienable possession, Heine (1997:17) gives a German contrastive example: *Ich zerriß meine Hose* vs. *Ich zerriß mir die Hose* (both sentences are translated into English “I tore my pants”). The first example has a possessive pronoun, and does not tell us anything about whether the trousers were worn or not when they were ripped. The second example is a dative construction, the so-called “external possession construction”, which is reserved for inalienable possession: The trousers are conceptualised as a body part, and they must have been worn by the *I* in the sentence in order for the construction to be possible. On the other hand, clearly relational nouns can sometimes be found in constructions where their elaboration sites are not filled.⁴⁹

### 4.3.2 Non-relational nouns

These are nouns such as *book, dog, car*, or, with examples from my material, *domъ “house”, stolъ “throne”, zemlja “land*. Nouns of this type do not necessarily invoke any specific relation to another entity. Therefore there is no relatum inherent in the nouns’ semantic base which could function as an optimal reference point (Taylor 1996:241). The meaning of such nouns contributes far less to the meaning of the constructions in question than do relational nouns. However, other cases are less clear. Quite a lot of nouns look like potential deverbal result nouns (cf. section 4.3.1), which means that their base of predication might include the agent that brought about the action which produced them. Examples taken from my material are *pёsъ “song*, which might imply a singer, *çjudo “miracle*, which might imply a miracle-worker, *slovo “word*, which might imply a speaker, even *kniga “book*, which might imply an author (note that Taylor (1996:241) takes *book* to be a clear example of a non-relational noun). The nouns are not necessarily morphologically related to verbs (only *pёsъ “song* of the examples above is related to the corresponding verb). Similarly, as mentioned, some nouns appear to be construed as parts of wholes in some cases, but not in others: Words denoting time units, such as *day*, are good examples. In phrases such as *the seventh day of the month, day* is clearly construed as an inherent part of *month*, i.e. the part-whole relationship between them is evoked. In phrases such as *a beautiful day*, on the other hand, *day* is clearly viewed as a whole in itself, not a building-block in a larger unit. This problem is probably most easily resolved as Stefanowitsch 2003 does it, by assuming that these nouns invoke relationships to other entities more weakly than regular relational nouns. A relational (sometimes) and

---

⁴⁹ Some examples of kinship terms in a kindergarten context: Request from the administration to the parents’ representative: “Please inform your parents of this.” The parents are of course *not* the representative’s own parents, but the parents she represents. Also: “All the children in this department are siblings.” Again, the children are *not* each other’s siblings, but siblings of children in older children’s departments. (The examples cropped up in a conversation with Ellen Hellebostad Toft.)
a non-relational reading (perhaps most frequently) may then be invoked in different
contexts.

4.3.3 Types of relational nouns
What is special about relational nouns, then, is that they have one or more elaboration
sites available in their semantic base, or, as Stefanowitsch puts it (2003:430), they
invoke semantic frames with roles in them. Deverbal nouns are prime examples of
relational nouns, but there are also plenty of other types, some of them bordering on
deverbal nouns.

4.3.3.1 Deverbal nouns
Taylor (2000:242–243) provides a classification of deverbal noun types, based on the
type of profile shift vis-à-vis the base form, i.e. according to which facet of the verbal
predication is singled out for profiling. He lists seven major types, which are also
graded from more nominal (a–e) to more verbal (f). The types are listed below with
examples.

   a) Agent nouns profile the trajector\(^\text{50}\) of the process, such as invader, narrator,
or, with an Old Russian example:

   (2) творець небу и земли
       creator-NOM.SG. heaven-DAT/GEN.SG. and earth-DAT/GEN.SG.
       “the creator of heaven and earth” AN 24/4, 15th century

   b) Patient nouns profile the landmark of the process. English examples are
draftee, appointee.

   (3) ідё положи жертвући бви авраа
       where put sacrifice-ACC.SG. God-DAT.SG. Abraham-NOM.SG.
       “where Abraham put his sacrifice to God” ChID 22r/6, period 1

   c) Result nouns profile an entity that comes into existence as a consequence of
the process. Taylor gives bruise, dent, photograph as examples. This is a category
very much bordering on non-relational nouns.

\(^{50}\) Langacker defines the trajector as “the (primary) figure within a profiled relation” (1991:555),
whereas the landmark is a “salient substructure other than the trajector of a relational predication or the
profile of a nominal predication” (1991:549). More simply put: We tend to view events as scenes, and
one of the participants of the event as the central element of a scene – a figure that stands out against a
background of other entities. This more salient entity is the trajector, while salient elements of the
background are called landmarks (cf. Dąbrowska 1997:8).
d) **Manner nouns** profile the manner in which a process is carried out by the trajector. Taylor’s English example is *walk* as in *He has a peculiar walk*.

(5) житие i власть имѣя царскую
life-ACC.SG. and power-ACC.SG. having tsar-insk-FEM.ACC.SG.
“having the lifestyle and power of a Tsar” RCAM 16/7, 17th century

e) **Ability nouns** profile the ability of the trajector to perform the activity. Taylor’s English example is *speech* as in *He lost his speech*. (There were no good Old Russian examples in my corpus.)

f) The final type of deverbal noun listed by Taylor are those that do not single out a particular facet of the process, but instead reify the process itself, and demote both trajector and landmark to unprofiled elements in the noun’s base of predication. They may, however, be specified periphrastically. Based on aspectual differences particular to English, Taylor distinguishes between two types of such action nouns: **Episodic nouns**, such as the noun *destruction*, he claims, reify a single instance or episode of the process. These nouns, like noun types a–e above, have a high degree of entrenchment and are established lexical items with idiosyncratic morphology and semantics. The so-called **process nouns**, on the other hand, allegedly differ from episodic nouns in that what is nominalised, “i.e. construed as a thing, is an internally homogeneous process, rather than a completed event with its successive temporal stages” (Taylor 1996:269). That is, episodic nouns are deemed to have a perfective aspectual meaning, whereas process nouns have an imperfective meaning related to the English present progressive tense. Also, English process nouns, such as in *the burning of witches*, are derived with the suffix *-ing*, which is fully productive and completely regular, in contrast to the idiosyncratic morphology of the episodic nouns. They also generally have a more verbal character than other deverbal nouns, and are in some constructions able to take regular objects with no preposition.

As for Old Russian, a prominent group of deverbal nouns are those ending in *-ie*. This is a very productive and regular derivation suffix, and does seem to produce nouns with a more verbal character than deverbal nouns with idiosyncratic derivational morphology (cf. Nilsson 1972, who in an early generative account actually takes these nouns and their modifiers to be derived directly from underlying sentences). In Old Church Slavic they are even sporadically observed with accusative objects. In the Old Russian corpus of this dissertation, they are very frequent in the purpose construction exemplified in (7), which has a very pronounced verbal
character. However, the aspectual difference maintained by Taylor is likely to be language-specific to English. In Old Russian it will probably be more fruitful to distinguish between action nouns with idiosyncratic morphology on the one hand, such as in (6), and productive action nouns on the other, such as in (7):

(6) 
гневь Божий на тебя
wrath-NOM.SG. God-MASC.NOM.SG. on you-LOC.SG.

“God’s wrath at you” PVC 37/21, 15th century

(7) 
повелъ звонити по всему граду на
he-ordered ring over all-DAT. city-DAT. on
собраніе людемь
collecting-ACC.SG. people-DAT.PL.

“he gave orders to ring all over town to collect people” PVC 28/22, 15th century

The type of construction found in (7) contains a deverbal noun which will have to be translated as an infinitive in English and several other languages, which indicates that it has a strong verbal character. The -ie nouns probably have a special, maximally verbal status, and this is reason enough for distinguishing them from other action nouns.

This exact classification is just an illustration of the various types of deverbal nouns that can typically be found. The corpus did not afford a sufficient number of examples to go into detail on the differences between various subtypes of deverbal nouns. It is also likely that the subtle differences between some of the types (manner nouns, ability nouns) may stem from the constructions they occur in rather than from the nouns themselves. Still, it is crucial to realise that the verbal character of these nouns, and the number of elaboration sites available with each type, is a matter of degree. Such an approach captures many of the same insights as Grimshaw 1990 concerning the ambiguity and gradient number of verbal characteristics typically found with deverbal nouns, without the strict formalism of Grimshaw’s approach. It also has a strong affinity with Apresjan’s work on valence (e.g. Apresjan 1995).

4.3.3.2 Other relational nouns
Deverbal nouns are perhaps the clearest examples of relational nouns, but as we saw, even they sometimes border on non-relational nouns, particularly the result nouns. There are also a number of other types of relational nouns, bordering on the non-relational nouns with varying degrees of fuzzyness. A number of types are listed below. Most of the types are taken from Taylor 1996, but some types stem from my own work with the corpus, sometimes with counterparts in Stefanowitsch 2003. The list does not aim to be complete.
a) *Kinship terms and terms denoting other human relationships*. Kinship terms always have the relative(s) by which they are defined in their semantic base, i.e. *sister* always implies one or more siblings, *mother* implies children, *uncle* implies nephews/nieces. Thus they are obviously relational, and are used repeatedly as examples by Taylor. They are also very frequent in the Old Russian and OCS corpora.

(8) мати женихова
mother-NOM.SG. groom-ov-FEM.NOM.SG.
“the bridegroom’s mother” D 171/14–15, 16th century

There are also quite a number of nouns denoting various human relationships other than kinship which have an elaboration site in their base of predication. Obvious examples are *friend, neighbour*, but also words denoting rulers, leaders etc. have such relata:

(9) старѣишина клирикомь
elder-NOM.SG. priest-DAT.PL.
“the head of the clergy” SBG 58/19, period 1

Nouns such as *otrokъ* “boy, servant” may also have this interpretation. Neither *старѣишина* “elder, head” nor *отрокъ* are related to verbs meaning “serve” or “lead”, but are obviously *semantically* related to agentive nouns derived from the verbs. However, a morphological relationship to the corresponding verb must be a prerequisite to call a noun deverbal. Thus, *наслѣдникъ* “heir” in the example below would be an agentive deverbal noun, since it is derived from a verb, but it is also very similar to non-deverbal relational nouns denoting human relationships:

(10) иѣбитъ всѣ наслѣдники
he-will-kill all-MASC.ACC.PL. heir-ACC.PL.
отца своего
father-GEN.SG. his-MASC.GEN.SG.
“he will kill all the heirs of his father” SBG 32/10–11, period 1

b) *Nouns denoting inherent parts of wholes*. Nouns such as *side, edge, corner*, and names of body parts\(^{51}\) must necessarily have the whole as an unprofiled relatum in their scope of predication.

---

\(^{51}\) Note that body parts are not necessarily physical: Nouns such as *голосъ* “voice”, *умъ* “mind” and *душа* “soul” must be counted as body parts as well. Interestingly, so must *тело* “body, corpse”, particularly in the mediaeval context where human beings so clearly consist of bodies and souls.
(11) на конце гроба
at end-LOC.SG. grave-GEN.SG.
“at the end of the grave” PJul 114/16, 17th century

This is a group of relational nouns particularly prone to attract nouns that are normally non-relational, cf. the discussion of day in section 4.3.2.

c) Representation nouns and information nouns. These two noun types are closely related, and border on deverbal result nouns. Representation nouns designate “artefacts which represent, in some medium, another entity” (Taylor 1996:259), and examples such as portrait, photograph, statue, biography, history, sketch, painting, sculpture, story and tale are given. Some, such as photograph, are result nominals, but many are underived. In their unprofiled base, they make reference to the creator of the artefact and to the entity that the artefact represents, and thus, as deverbal nouns, they have two potential candidates for elaboration by a possessor nominal. (12) is a typical Old Russian example.

(12) икона стыны бица
icon-NOM.SG. holy-FEM.GEN.SG. mother-of-God-GEN.SG.
“an icon of the holy Mother of God” ChID 13v/4–5

Information nouns, such as report and version, are quite similar, and may be regarded as a subcategory of representation nouns (Taylor 1996:260).

d) Deadjectival nouns, such as strength, beauty and similar nouns. This group of nouns is not included by Taylor, but it is a logical consequence of the tenets of Cognitive Grammar that they should be relational. In Cognitive Grammar, adjectives are relations, not things. In Taylor’s classification, they are atemporal relations with incorporated landmarks and nominal trajectors (Taylor 1996:91). Take an example such as a beautiful girl: The trajector is the girl, the thing qualified by the adjective. The landmark incorporated in the semantics of the adjective is the quality specified in the adjective beautiful, that is “beauty”. When the adjective is nominalised, then, the holder of the quality remains in the deadjectival noun’s base of predication, i.e. “the pagans’” in the pagans’ insolence below correspond to “pagans” in the insolent pagans. The landmark – the quality “insolence” – is incorporated in the noun as it was incorporated in the adjective:

(13) дурьость поганьскую низьлагаемь
insolence-ACC.SG. pagan-isk-FEM.ACC.SG. we-will-bring-down
“we will bring down the pagans’ insolence” SBG 49/19–20, period 1

52 See the definition of things and relations in footnote 46.
Stefanowitsch (2003:428–429) also lists nouns “denoting attributes” as relational, giving examples of deadjectival nouns.

e) **Nouns denoting influence without being deverbal.** This is a category of miscellaneous nouns particularly denoting power and control, which have two elaboration sites in their base of predication: the one who has power/control and the one who is under his power/control. These nouns are not derived from verbs, but are semantically related to deverbal nouns with similar meanings. The category is not listed by Taylor, but is prominent in the data on which the present dissertation is based.

(14) 

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{превъмъ} & \text{въсью} & \text{власть} & \text{Русъкы} & \text{землътъ} \\
\text{having-taken} & \text{all-FEM.ACC.SG.} & \text{power-ACC.SG.} & \text{Rus’-ssk-FEM.GEN.SG.} & \text{land-GEN.SG.} \\
\text{“having taken all power over the land of Rus’”} & \text{SBG 60/16}
\end{array}
\]

### 4.3.4 The modifiers of relational and non-relational nouns

The great difference between relational and non-relational nouns lies in the effect of adding modifiers to them respectively. When you add a modifier to a non-relational noun, the meaning of that modifier is not determined by the head noun. In the example *John’s car*, for instance, the noun *car* does not contribute much to the interpretation of *John’s*. John may be the owner of the car, but he may also well be someone who has rented or borrowed the car, or put money on it in a car race, or even someone who is just standing next to it.

With a relational noun, matters are different. All relational nouns have at least one elaboration site, an unprofiled relatum in their semantic base. When you modify a relational noun, then, the modifier may elaborate that elaboration site. If this happens, the relational noun will force a specific interpretation of the modifier. In *John’s aunt*, *John’s* fills the elaboration site of *aunt*, and John must therefore be interpreted to be the nephew of this aunt. She may not be someone else’s aunt, whom John has incidentally taken out for dinner.

It is important to observe that a modifier of a relational noun does not necessarily have to fill its elaboration site. In example (15) below, the head noun is certainly deverbal, but the genitive modifier does not fill the subject elaboration site. Instead, it is a semantic *apposition* to the head noun: “Two items are in apposition if they both designate the same entity, and their profiles are unified to produce a richer conception of the designated entity” (Taylor 1996:96–97, cf. Langacker 1991:432). “Possessive” appositions are possible both in English and in Old Russian, Taylor lists examples such as *the city of London* and *a scoundrel of a man*. The noun *mrakъ* “darkness” in
(15) неведения мраком покрывающа
ignorance-GEN.SG. darkness-INSTR.SG. they-are-covered
“they are covered by the darkness of ignorance” PMM 111/33, 17th century

is a deadjectival noun, but the genitive-marked noun does not elaborate its elaboration site, rather it defines and further specifies its meaning, and has the same referent: The ignorance is the darkness, metaphorically. A relational noun may also have a modifier which does not fill its elaboration site and is not an apposition. In (16) the genitive-marked noun clearly does not fill the elaboration site of the noun starějšina “elder”, which would have to be filled by a word denoting a person who is younger than the elder.

(16) старѣйшина уношти моєя
elder-VOC.SG. youth-GEN.SG. my-FEM.GEN.SG.
“o, elder of my youth” SBG 41/21, period 1

In these cases, the head noun’s status as a relational noun becomes less important and less pronounced.

The semantics of the noun( stem)s modifying the head nouns are also likely to be of importance when dealing with constructions which may express paradigmatic possession (as defined in Chapter 1). As seen in Chapter 2, several scholars have emphasised the importance of the possessor’s specificity/definiteness and animacy in the choice of possessive construction type in Slavic, and have arrived at important insights. Thus, in chapters 5–7, the semantics of the modifier noun( stem)s will be considered throughout.

4.4 Constructional meanings: reference points and intrinsic relationships

Although the head nouns of the Old Russian possessive constructions may undoubtedly contribute considerably to their meanings, the constructions themselves also have meanings, which will be most clearly seen with non-relational head nouns (cf. Stefanowitsch 2003:429). However, these meanings are likely to be quite schematic.

When dealing with possessive constructions, one would think that the constructions contribute a possessive meaning. However, as seen in chapter 2, possession is a problematic concept. Far too many accounts of “possessive” phenomena in general, and of Slavic possessive constructions in particular, are diminished in value because the term is left undefined. The number of functions that may be subsumed under the term is very great, and on the other hand, a narrow
understanding of “possessive” may be very narrow indeed. Thus, when the term is not properly defined, the reader does not know what the author is talking about.

In Chapter 1, we looked at Taylor’s “experiental gestalt” representation of possession (Taylor 1996:339–340). If a construction had all the features on the list, it would be an example of “paradigmatic possession”:

a. The possessor is a specific human being.
b. The possessed is an inanimate entity, usually a concrete physical object.
c. The relation is exclusive, in the sense that a possessed entity usually has only one possessor.
d. The possessor has exclusive rights of access to the possessed.
e. The possessed is typically an object of value, whether commercial or sentimental.
f. The possessor’s rights of access to the possessed are invested in him through a special transaction, such as purchase, inheritance, or gift, and remain with him until the possessor effects their transfer to another person by means of a further transaction.
g. Typically, the possession relation is long term, measured in months and years, not in minutes and seconds.
h. In order that the possessor can have easy access to the possessed, the possessed is typically located in the proximity of the possessor. In some cases, the possessed may be a permanent, or at least regular accompaniment of the possessor.

In most cases, however, only some of the properties will be present. As mentioned in section 1.1, paradigmatic possession is not a sufficient tool to account for the Old Russian constructions under consideration in this dissertation, because there will be plenty of constructions which do not have any of the properties in the list. This is, as Stefanowitsch (2003:422–423) points out, a general problem with prototype-based accounts of genitive-like constructions such as Taylor’s (1989) and Nikiforidou’s (1991). Taylor, too, eventually chooses a different solution for accounting for the English ’s-construction, in Taylor 1996. Here he chooses to follow Langacker (1991:167–180 and 2000:73–90), who characterises (schematically) and delimits possessive constructions with the aid of the two notions of reference point and intrinsic relationship.53

Taylor 1996 is not a study of possessive constructions cross-linguistically, as Taylor himself emphasises (1996:14–15). Rather, it is a very detailed study of one

---

53 Note that such an analysis is reminiscent of the analysis of noun phrases offered in Halliday 1994, which was used in Eckhoff 2001. However, the reference point/intrinsic relationship analysis is far better argued and much more stringent, and therefore absolutely to be preferred.
single possessive construction in English, [NP’s N], which has a constructional meaning which only partially overlaps with that of e.g. the Old Russian genitive construction(s). Nevertheless, Taylor’s effort to define what separates [NP’s N] from possessive compounds, regular compounds and of-constructions obliges him to discuss phenomena which bring us close to a full account of possession-related constructions in English, and he suggests that his analysis would be a good starting point for contrastive and typological studies in other languages (Taylor 1996:14–15).

In my opinion, the reference-point analysis, Langacker’s and Taylor’s key to the possessive constructions in English, is an equally good tool applied to the constructional meanings of the Old Russian possessive constructions.

The reference point analysis is illustrated in figure 4.7 below. The reference point is used to access a less available entity: A conceptualiser (speaker) first establishes mental contact with the possessor entity, which serves as a reference point (RP) for the identification of the target entity (T), i.e. the possessee.

*Figure 4.7 Langacker’s reference point analysis of POSS (Taylor 1996:136, after Langacker 1991:172)*

The dotted arrow illustrates the path taken by the conceptualizer in establishing mental contact, first with the reference point (RP), then with the target (T). The region marked D is the “dominion” of the reference point, i.e. the set of entities that are close to the reference point, and that may be located from its vantage (Taylor 1996:136). In other words, in using the possessive construction, the speaker “invites the hearer to first conceptualize […] the one entity (the possessor), with the guarantee that this will facilitate identification of the target entity (the possessee)” (Taylor 1996:17). This
analysis of the possessive construction, Taylor argues, is both sufficiently general to cover the range of attested uses of the possessive construction, and at the same time sufficiently specific to derive constraints on the acceptability and interpretation of the construction (Taylor 1996:18). It is thus also a middle way between taxonomic or prototype-based semantic approaches and approaches denying that the possessive construction is associated with any inherent semantic content at all. According to Taylor, the former focus too much on the semantic relations between possessor and possessee and tend to neglect the construction’s discourse function, thus ignoring “the possibility that there might be a unifying principle which sanctions the range of attested semantic relations” (Taylor 1996:15, 348). The latter approach, on the other hand, is accused of disregarding the fact that the possessive semantic relation does emerge as the default interpretation of some possessives, and the fact that it “is certainly not the case that any two nominals can be adjoined in a possessive construction, just in case they can be linked by some relation of association” (Taylor 1996:9). Thus they fail to account for the constraints on the construction.

Taylor specifies some properties of the possessor which follow from the reference point analysis, namely what he refers to as topicality and cue validity. The first property is that possessors are topical, because the reference point/possessor needs to be more easily accessible than the target (Taylor 1996:210). To be easily accessible, possessors must have either discourse-conditioned topicality (i.e. be accessible through the discourse context, directly or indirectly) or inherent topicality (i.e. be “automatically more easily accessed than others, regardless of discourse context” [Taylor 1996:219], which is possibly the case of nominals designating human beings, for instance).

The second property of possessors pointed out by Taylor is cue validity: In addition to being topical, the possessor needs to give reliable cues for the identification of the target, i.e. have high cue validity (Taylor 1996:238). This explains why some entities with a clear semantic relation to the target are excluded from functioning as reference points. Possessors must be informative. In relational nouns (nouns which invoke an unprofiled relation, Taylor 1996:92–93), the relatum\(^{54}\) is usually so informative/has such high cue validity as to exclude other interpretations, i.e. John’s wife will hardly be open to the interpretation “the wife (of somebody else) that John is sitting next to”, or other interpretations available with non-relational nouns. Expressions with non-relational head nouns, however, “are typically interpreted in terms of a relation of possession” (Taylor 1996:241). However, they are normally not primarily possessible entities. Nevertheless, Taylor argues that the legal owner of such entities “is a natural reference point, with high cue validity for the

\(^{54}\) If there is a single relatum, that is.
identification of the referent” (Taylor 1996:261). This status, he claims, follows from
the fact that “a possession relation is typically an exclusive relation between a thing
and a person. […] each item is typically possessed by only one individual” (Taylor

This view is one of the few things that separates Taylor’s account from that of
Stefanowitsch 2003. In Stefanowitsch’s opinion, the English ‘s-construction has the
schematic meaning “possession”, and imposes the role “possessed” on the non-
relational head noun and “possessor” on the modifier. When there is a relational head
noun involved, Stefanowitsch claims, these roles are overridden by those in the
semantic frame of the relational noun (2003:430). However, Stefanowitsch must
modify this claim by specifying that in constructions with non-relational head nouns
denoting persons, the interpretation of a construction will be one of kinship, not one
of possession, such as in Martha’s girl. Nor does he take into account the many cases
where there is a non-relational, inanimate head noun, but where the meaning is not
one of possession in a prototypical sense, such as in Peter’s car came in last, where
the car is one Peter has laid a bet on, not one he owns. Thus, Taylor’s account seems
to cover the facts better. When a reference point is used to access a non-relational
noun, the construction is given the interpretation that is most likely from the context –
often one of possession in a strict sense, but certainly not always.

An important point about topicality and cue validity in Taylor’s analysis is that
they have different status. It is necessary for a reference point to have high cue
validity, but it is not sufficient. In addition, the possessor must be topical to qualify as
a reference point, and very high topicality may even reduce the demand for cue
validity. The distinction between non-topical possessors with high cue validity and
real reference-point possessors with both qualities will be quite important in the more
detailed analysis below, in the discussion of construction pairs such as the president’s
assassination vs. the assassination of the president (section 4.4.3).

In addition to the reference point analysis, the notion of intrinsic relationships
is necessary to account for the various meanings of the possessive constructions in
Old Russian. This concept is used by Langacker (2000:73–90) in his account of the
English preposition of. If an entity X cannot be conceptualised without reference to
some other entity or entities, X is conceptually dependent, and there is an intrinsic
relationship between X and the other entity or entities. An intrinsic relationship may
be diagrammed thus:
When it comes to possessive constructions, the notion of intrinsic relationship is most clearly seen with relational nouns, which all have one or more elaboration sites in their semantic bases (cf. section 4.3.3). Deverbal nouns have elaboration sites for the subject and the object(s) found with the corresponding verb (the destruction of the city), deadjectival nouns have elaboration sites for the nominal head found with the corresponding adjective (Mary’s beauty), nouns inherently denoting parts have elaboration sites denoting the wholes of which they are parts (a slice of cake), see Old Russian examples in (2)–(14). In these cases there is an intrinsic relationship between head and modifier. But there may also be an intrinsic relationship of identity, as in apposition-type constructions, as the city of London, see the Old Russian example in (17). “Possessive” constructions are often used for very salient qualities of the head nouns, even when there is no actual elaboration site in the semantic base of that noun, as in a man of property, Joan of Arc and others.

I shall consider such relationships intrinsic as well.

In the following, a series of schematic meaning subtypes regularly found with possessive constructions will be established from the two concepts of reference point and intrinsic relationship. Reference points may occur with or without an intrinsic relationship, and vice versa. They may also be used to refer to something on an instance or a type level, and the construction as a whole may or may not have conventionalised strong unit status.

4.4.1 Reference points on instance level (RP_{INST})
A reference point (topical and with high cue validity), which is one particular (group of) referent(s), is used to access a target, which is one particular (group of) referent(s).

Reference points may or may not fill the elaboration sites of relational nouns, but they are never appositions, as the elements in appositional constructions have the
same referent and therefore no cue validity. A tricky question is whether elaborations of relational nouns corresponding to direct objects can be reference points. Taylor argues that they can be in English, citing examples such as *Rome’s destruction* (as opposed to *the destruction of Rome*, which would involve an intrinsic relationship only (Taylor 1996:253). I will return to this question in section 4.4.3.

All the Old Russian possessive constructions could apparently have the RP<sub>INST</sub> function, as seen in examples (18)–(20). Examples (18) and (20) also involve intrinsic relationships.

(18) братъ Володимирь
brother-NOM.SG. Volodimir-j-MASC.NOM.SG.
“Volodimir’s brother” SBG 27/12, period 1

(19) церкви Бога живаго
church-NOM.PL. God-GEN.SG. living-MASC.GEN.SG.
“churches of the living God” ŽD 356/1, period 1

(20) невѣролюбіемъ погибающіймъ несмысьльство есть
unbelief-INSTR.SG. perishing-DAT.PL. absurdity-NOM.SG. is
“the lack of faith of those who perish is an absurdity” SBG 53/7–8, period 1

4.4.2 Reference point on type level (RP<sub>TYPE</sub>)
Some reference points refer to types, rather than instances, and the targets they identify are also types. In his analysis of English possessive compounds (*woman’s magazine*) and regular compounds (*dog food*), Taylor points out that there is both unity and difference between English possessives and possessive compounds, which are morphologically the same ([NP’s N]), but behave differently syntactically:

Their unity lies in the reference point relation; the difference lies in the instance vs. type status of the reference point and target. […] In the compound, the initial nominal […] designates a type, which serves as a reference point for the identification of a further type (Taylor 1996:293).

This distinction is also very relevant for some of the Old Russian possessive constructions involving denominal adjectives.

Taylor lists a number of diagnostics to separate possessives from possessive compounds. Most of them stem from the fact that a construction with the RP<sub>TYPE</sub> function will have a much stronger unit status than one with the RP<sub>INST</sub> function. This means that constructions with RP<sub>TYPE</sub> are rarely internally complex, that other linguistic material will seldom come between the type-level reference point and the
head noun (*cow’s cold milk), and that adjectives and determiners will modify the entire unit, not just the reference point ([this] [woman’s magazine]) (Taylor 1996:288–291). Many Old Russian constructions with type 2 adjectives also denote RP\textsubscript{TYPE} situations.

(21) \begin{tabular}{ll}
\textit{ovoqnoe} & \textit{xraniliqe} \\
vegetable-\textit{kn}-NEUT.NOM.SG. & storeroom-NOM.SG. \\
\end{tabular}

“a vegetable storeroom” PVC 6/20, 15th century

An RP\textsubscript{TYPE} construction, then, just like Taylor’s possessive compounds, has both a possessor and a possessee on type level. This is the case of \textit{woman’s magazine}.

However, the function is closely related to cases where both the possessor and the possessee may be on instance level, but where the construction as a whole still has very strong unit status and a restricted interpretation. Taylor exemplifies this with so-called onomastic compounds, such as \textit{Halley’s comet}, \textit{Occam’s razor}. Very similar to these are Old Russian constructions with nationality adjectives, particularly when used to name countries. The regular way to do this is to form a denominal adjective from the name of the people and modify the word \textit{zemlja} “land” with this adjective:

(22) \begin{tabular}{ll}
\textit{do} & \textit{Grychsky} \\
\textit{to} & Greek-\textit{lsk}-FEM.GEN.SG. \\
\textit{zemlja} & land-GEN.SG. \\
\end{tabular}

“to Greece” SBG 61/28–29, period 1

In some cases, such as \textit{Adam’s apple}, the possessor may be on instance level, but with very weak referentiality, whereas the possessee is on type level, as is the whole expression. In all of these examples, we are dealing with reference points on instance level, but in constructions which have strong conventionalised unit status, mostly due to the fact that they are used as a whole to name something, and/or occur in a larger set. We will see that such constructions behave much like constructions with regular RP\textsubscript{TYPE}. These constructions are likely to have high token frequency and are strongly entrenched. When they are members of larger sets, there is also a partially specific lower-level construction schema which is strongly entrenched, as in the \textit{zemlja} construction (cf. section 4.2).

4.4.3 Intrinsic relationships without reference points (INTRINSIC)

Constructions which can express paradigmatic possession, in Old Russian and in many other languages, can regularly also express intrinsic relationships without involving reference points. In these cases, the modifier is \textit{not} used for accessing and identifying the head noun, but for filling it out, and providing additional information about it.
Most frequently, the intrinsic relationship involved is between a relational head noun and the modifier filling its elaboration site. However, the intrinsic relationship may also be between a non-relational noun and its modifier, in which case these two elements may either be in semantic apposition (*that scoundrel of a man*), or have some other salient relationship, such as that between an entity and the material from which it is made (*a ring of gold*), or between an entity and one of its essential (as opposed to accidental) qualities (*a man of integrity*) (Langacker 2000:77). This is the function of the Old Russian possessive constructions that is the farthest from paradigmatic possession.

If a construction clearly does not code reference-point situations only, how are we to decide whether a reference point is involved, or just an intrinsic relationship? In English, Taylor posits a very subtle difference between relata which serve as reference points and relata which do not: With many relational nouns, both the [NP’s N] and the *of*-construction are available, with alternations such as *Rome’s destruction/the destruction of Rome*. According to Taylor, the choice of construction is determined by whether the relatum of the relation noun is topical or not. Being intrinsic to the relational noun, the relatum has very high cue validity, but it is topicality which determines whether the relatum is a reference point or not.55

The *of*-phrase fleshes out the meaning of the head noun, by elaborating an entity that is highly intrinsic to its semantic structure. The function of the possessor phrase is to facilitate identification of the head noun’s referent, by naming an entity that not only has to be topical, and therefore independently accessible to the conceptualizer, but which is also highly informative with respect to the head noun (Taylor 1996:253).

In Old Russian, the relationship between a head noun and the elaborating entity may apparently be expressed by all the possessive constructions, albeit with varying frequency. However, the same constructions may equally well denote an intrinsic relationship also involving a reference point, so that there is no obvious morphological distinction between the two functions. Intuitively, it seems likely that “subjects” of deverbal nouns will normally be topical (in Eckhoff 2001 they were all subsumed under Deictics, the Hallidayan function corresponding to RP_inst), whereas “objects” of deverbal nouns will rarely be so. This is the way it normally is in sentences: subjects tend to be given: “Subjects are highly differentiated from direct objects. Direct objects introduce entities that tend to be new to the discourse,  55 This is surely not the only factor regulating the distribution of [NP’s N] and [N of NP]. It seems clear that [N of NP] is preferred with heavy possessor NPs, regardless of topicality. It also seems to be very prevalent in English biblical style, which will be the style used in the translations of much of my source material, which is often written in a high religious style.
furthermore direct object entities tend to be dropped fairly quickly in immediately following discourse” (Taylor 1996:213). Therefore it seems to be a viable solution – in the lack of reliable evidence – to assume that object-like elaborations of relational nouns are not reference points, unless they are obviously topical, and that other elaborations of relational nouns are reference points, unless they are clearly non-topical.

4.5 The possessive conceptual space

Most of the constructions which could express paradigmatic possession in the earliest Old Russian texts could have most of the construction meanings posited in section 4.4, and most of the constructional meanings could be expressed by more than one of the possessive constructions. That is, each construction was polysemous, and all constructions were partially synonymous. This is characteristic of constructions in general, according to Goldberg (1995:31, 33), and far more typical than situations where each form has a single, fixed abstract sense, the way syntax is often described.

To account for both constructional polysemy, partial constructional synonymy and also diachronic changes in the distributions and interrelationships of the various constructions, semantic maps are good tools. They have been used to great effect in typological studies, such as Haspelmath 1997. The use of semantic maps is also incorporated in Croft’s Radical Construction Grammar (Croft 2001), as well as in his typological work (cf. Croft 2003, chapter 5). Croft posits a conceptual space, “a universal structure of conceptual knowledge for communication in human beings” (Croft 2001:105). The conceptual space represents more than semantics in a traditional, truth-functional sense, as it also includes pragmatic, discourse-functional and even stylistic and social dimensions of the use of a construction (Croft 2001:93). Croft then hypothesises that language-specific and construction-specific grammatical categories should “map onto connected regions of conceptual space”, and that “diachronic changes in the distribution of a construction should follow connected paths in conceptual space” (both quotes Croft 2001:105). Such a bounded region is also called a conceptual space. One can then draw semantic maps of the distributions of particular constructions in a particular conceptual space.

In my analysis, I will assume that the three main constructional meanings discussed in sections 4.4.1–3 may be considered to cluster together in conceptual space, and thus form a bounded region that I shall call the possessive conceptual space, illustrated in figure 4.9. It must be understood that this conceptual space is not

---

56 Admittedly, this is more the case in English, which is very apt to passivise sentences to get topical subjects, than in Old Russian, where passives are relatively rare, because the free word order is used to code information structure. Nevertheless, the tendency is present in Old Russian as well.
backed with enough empirical data to be called universal, although it works well with the English data of Taylor 1996 and Stefanowitsch 2003 and with the Old Russian and Old Church Slavic data of this dissertation, and would certainly work well with a number of Indo-European languages such as Ancient Greek (analysed indirectly in this dissertation) and Norwegian, my native tongue. It is likely that the same conceptual space could also work quite well with data from a non-IE language such as Japanese, which has a set of particles that express meanings very similar to those of the typical IE case systems. It should also be noted that the illustration of the possessive conceptual space is not based on calculations of any sort, although it is possible to do so (Croft and Poole forthcoming, Clancy 2006), and that the exact positions and distances in the illustrations are impressionistic. Finally, the illustrations do not much resemble Croft’s drawings of conceptual spaces, but are drawn by me in order to clarify the analysis of the Old Russian and Old Church Slavic possessive constructions as much as possible.

The polysemy of each construction may be illustrated by plotting its distribution onto a semantic map of the possessive conceptual space:

*Figure 4.9 The possessive conceptual space.*

The possessive conceptual space consists of a cluster of interrelated schematic meanings: RP_{TYPE} and RP_{INST} are of course closely linked by the reference point
situation. They are also linked by the fact that the conventionalised strong unit status which is characteristic of \( \text{RP}_{\text{TYPE}} \) is sometimes also present with \( \text{RP}_{\text{INST}} \), and even marginally with INTRINSIC. \( \text{RP}_{\text{INST}} \) and INTRINSIC, on the other hand, overlap to a large extent.

The map of the possessive conceptual space is of course equally suited to illustrate constructional synonymy. All the Old Russian constructions which can express paradigmatic possession may be plotted onto the map together, to illustrate the extent of the semantic overlaps.

The notions of constructional synonymy and polysemy will be very important in the analysis of the changes involving the possessive constructions. The map of the possessive conceptual space can be put to use in tracking changes in the distributions and interrelationships of the possessive constructions. It seems likely that the constructions and the construction meanings posited were constantly shifting relatively to each other from century to century, yielding new synonymy and polysemy patterns all the time. By classifying my data by 1) construction type, 2) noun type, 3) modifier type, and 4) constructional meaning, I hope to have a tool accurate and many-faceted enough to capture these shifts.

4.6 Construction grammar and syntactic change

Construction grammar provides a uniform representation of all types of grammatical structures in a syntax–lexicon continuum (table 4.1), from specific and atomic words at the one extreme to complex and sometimes fully schematic constructions at the other. The obvious polysemy and synonymy of the Old Russian possessive constructions makes such an approach particularly attractive. The notion of conceptual space will be the central tool in the analysis of the changes. However, the constructions are clearly located towards the syntactic (complex, schematic) end of the continuum. When dealing with change in the distributions and interrelationships of these constructions, it is useful to look at previous approaches which deal with diachronic syntax in a principled way, and adopt important notions which are compatible with the Cognitive Grammar approach.

This section is an appraisal of Harris and Campbell 1995 in constructionist terms. The book is a thorough and functionally oriented attempt at reducing all syntactic change to three mechanisms: reanalysis, extension and borrowing, and the authors do not take a strict view of autonomous syntax. The mentioned three mechanisms are by no means new discoveries. Reanalysis has been a central term in most approaches to diachronic syntax for many years (see for instance Langacker 1977, Lightfoot 1979, Timberlake 1977). Extension is a close relative of analogy, and
might be dubbed “analogical extension”, see for instance Haspelmath 1998. The possibility of syntactic borrowing has also been much debated throughout the history of linguistics. The most important merit of the model is rather that it reduces syntactic change to these three mechanisms only, and that it strictly separates the mechanisms from the often complicated and bewildering array of causal factors which trigger the mechanisms. This distinction is an important one, and will be maintained in this dissertation as well.

4.6.1 Harris and Campbell’s mechanisms of syntactic change

Reanalysis is defined as

a mechanism which changes the underlying structure of a syntactic pattern and which does not involve any modification of its surface manifestation. We understand underlying structure in this sense to include at least (i) constituency, (ii) hierarchical structure, (iii) category labels, and (iv) grammatical relations. Surface manifestation includes (i) morphological marking, such as morphological case, agreement, and gender-class, and (ii) word order (Harris and Campbell 1995:51).

A reanalysis, Harris and Campbell argue, can only take place if there is a possibility of more than one analysis of an expression. Also, they say, a reanalysis in itself is invisible. After the reanalysis, the surface manifestation is often modified, but that is in their opinion not part of the reanalysis itself, but a consequence of it, its actualisation. For instance, a reanalysis is very often followed by one or more extensions. This is Harris and Campbell’s way of dealing with the seeming paradox between abruptness and gradualness in syntactic change: The reanalysis in itself is abrupt, but its actualisation is gradual.

An example of reanalysis by this definition is the development of the French ne ... pas construction, where the element pas was reanalysed from a reinforcing element to a necessary part of the negation (Harris and Campbell 1995:73).

Extension, on the other hand, is defined as “change in the surface manifestation of a syntactic pattern that does not involve immediate or intrinsic modification of underlying structure” (Harris and Campbell 1995:97). Because of the strict separation between mechanisms and causal factors in the model, extension cannot be said to be the same as the traditional concept of analogy (see further in section 4.6.2.2). Rather, Harris and Campbell claim, the mechanism changes the syntax by generalising a rule. Thus it may also remove exceptions and irregularities caused by reanalysis (or borrowing) “by bringing the new analysis into line with the rest of the existing grammar” (Harris and Campbell 1995:97). Harris and Campbell
maintain that “the process of extension is systematic, and the environment into which a rule may be extended is restricted by the nature of the rule in the particular language” (Harris and Campbell 1995:101). They state the following constraint on extension: “Extension of a rule R is limited to removing a condition from R” (Harris and Campbell 1995:114). Some changes proceed by gradually removing condition by condition over time. Harris and Campbell specifically note that the conditions need not be syntactic, but can be semantic or lexical. Extensions quite often proceed by lexical diffusion, where the conditions on a rule take the form of a list of lexemes encompassed by or excepted from the rule. The lexemes may then be removed from the list, gradually or all at once (see Harris and Campbell 1995:113–114).

A good example of extension by this definition is the spread of the genitive-accusative in the history of Russian. The genitive-accusative was at first reserved for singular masculine o-stem nouns denoting free, adult males, but was gradually extended to include other nouns denoting animates, and also animate plurals.

Borrowing is defined as “a mechanism of change in which a replication of the syntactic pattern is incorporated into the borrowing language through the influence of a host pattern found in a contact language” (Harris and Campbell 1995:51). This is a case where it is particularly important to separate mechanism from cause, Harris and Campbell point out, as language contact can also trigger other mechanisms than borrowing (see section 4.6.2.3, Harris and Campbell 1995:51). This is the most controversial of the three mechanisms in the model, and Harris and Campbell discuss at length other scholars’ attempts to delimit and constrain the possibility of syntactic borrowing (Harris and Campbell 1995:122–141). Their conclusion is, however, “that given enough time and intensity of contact, virtually anything can (ultimately) be borrowed […] grammatical borrowing can be a very powerful force that must be reckoned with in framing theories of grammatical change” (Harris and Campbell 1995:149–150).

A fairly uncontroversial example of syntactic borrowing is the appearance of nominative objects with infinitives in Northern Russian dialects (voda pit’ “to drink water”). In all likelihood, this is a syntactic loan from West Finnic (Harris and Campbell 1995:142).

In a construction grammar approach, these mechanisms are not irrelevant, but the definitions of reanalysis and extension must be stated in different, less rule-based terms. Although Harris and Campbell’s approach is reasonably functionally oriented, it certainly has a much narrower view of syntax than construction grammar has, and in particular, one misses the semantic dimension. Thus, Croft (2000:120) simply defines form–function reanalysis as a “(re)-mapping of form–function relations of combinations of syntactic units and semantic components”. That is, reanalysis is a
strategy of understanding (cf. Detges and Waltereit 2002:155–158): the hearer assigns a (partially) different meaning to a phonological string than that found in the mind of the speaker. However, such a definition does not cover all of Harris and Campbell’s concept of reanalysis. At least when reanalysis affects what they call hierarchical structures and category labels, the change has to do with levels of schematicity. Such reanalyses will often involve cases where the hearer reinterprets concrete instances of schematic constructions as partially specific constructions, so that they emerge as new nodes in the schematic network. For such an analysis of the history of the French ne ... pas construction, see Rostila 2006, see also Detges and Waltereit 2002:165 on the taxonomic aspect of reanalysis. For changes in schematicity relations, it is clear that frequency and entrenchment must be important parts of the process.

When it comes to a construction grammar definition of extention, schematicity relations are again important. Extension defined as the removal of conditions on rules, as sketched by Harris and Campbell, must be stated as a change in the degree of schematicity of the construction. When “exceptions” are “removed”, the construction becomes less “demanding” as to what types of entities may appear in it, and therefore also less specific and more schematic. But at the same time, there is no doubt that constructions can undergo regular semantic extensions, just like any other symbolic unit. In these cases, we are always dealing with two or more constructions competing in the same sections of conceptual space. A construction may then be extended in the sense that it comes to cover a larger share of the relevant part of conceptual space (often at the expense of the other construction(s) close to it). A construction may of course also narrow its distribution, i.e. the opposite of semantic extension. Thus, Harris and Campbell’s extention mechanism must actually be considered to be two separate types of processes: semantic extension (the semantic pole of the construction becomes more inclusive) and schematisation (the phonological pole of the construction becomes more inclusive

Borrowing is unproblematic in construction grammar terms – a form inspired by a host language, but untypical of the target language, becomes associated with roughly the same part of conceptual space as in the host language, and thus a new construction is born. The problem of identifying syntactic loans remains, however.

In the course of this dissertation we shall primarily see examples of semantic extension and narrowing of the distributions of the possessive constructions. However, parts of the changes may also be described as schematisations of constructions (Harris and Campbell-style extension), and there is also evidence of

---

57 This article is quite messy and unfinished, but the analysis of ne ... pas turning into a partially specific construction on its own, and gaining in schematicity, seems sound.
58 Such a phonological schematisation would probably often be accompanied by semantic change.
new, partially specific constructions emerging through reanalysis of highly frequent instances of more schematic constructions.\textsuperscript{59}

4.6.2 Causal factors
Analysing and classifying syntactic changes in terms of Harris and Campbell’s mechanisms or in construction grammar terms is comparatively easy. Dealing with the various causal factors potentially triggering them is a far more complicated task. This also provides ample justification for Harris and Campbell’s strategy of separating mechanisms and causes: If causal factors were involved in the classification of the mechanisms, the model could have run the risk of becoming more complex and difficult to handle.\textsuperscript{60} Harris and Campbell emphasise that there “is increasing evidence that most changes in language structure can have multiple causes, and often these are quite complex” (Harris and Campbell 1995:53). Harris and Campbell place especial emphasis on three types of causal factors that are apparently particularly linked to the three mechanisms respectively: surface ambiguity to reanalysis, analogues to extension and language contact to borrowing. It is however a crucial point that all of these three types of causal factors may (contribute to) trigger other mechanisms as well. I will deal with these factors in more detail below.

4.6.2.1 Surface ambiguity
Harris and Campbell deem what they call “surface ambiguity”, or at least the possibility of more than one analysis of an expression, to be a prerequisite for reanalysis.\textsuperscript{61} However, Harris and Campbell emphasise the point that the possibility of two analyses does not need to involve opacity. They illustrate this with an example from Finnish, where an originally locative-marked noun has a new reading as a postposition, but retains both the old and the new reading:

\begin{align*}
(23) \quad \text{lapse-n} & \quad \text{rinna-l}l\text{a} \\
& \quad \text{child-GEN} \quad \text{chest-LOC} \\
& \text{“on the child’s chest”}
\end{align*}

\textsuperscript{59}The approach to syntactic change most closely linked to Cognitive Grammar, construction grammar, and most of all, the usage-based model, is of course grammaticalisation. However, the changes under consideration in this dissertation do not lend themselves easily to a grammaticalisation interpretation, and grammaticalisation is therefore deliberately not discussed in this chapter.

\textsuperscript{60}This is apparently what happens in Croft 2000, an attempt at creating a similar model for language change in general, which features a rather large number of mechanisms, apparently named by what causes them – the mechanism of reanalysis is for instance divided into hyperanalysis, hypoanalysis, metanalysis and cryptanalysis by criteria which include both causes and typical environments.

\textsuperscript{61}Note that such a possibility depends on the semantic equivalence of the two possible analyses (cf. Detges and Waltereit 2002).
As Harris and Campbell say, there is “absolutely nothing opaque about [(22)], the original and literal reading, which would require the inception of [(23)]. The lack of opacity can be clearly seen in the fact that [(22)] is still perfectly valid, alongside innovative [(23)]” (Harris and Campbell 1995:70).

Some ambiguities can survive for centuries without triggering changes, others suddenly do. It is also a well-established fact that phonological and morphological change can create new ambiguities which may trigger reanalysis, or contribute to trigger extensions (to “avoid” the ambiguity) or syntactic loans (for instance to “replace” a distinction that may be lost). For instance, the fact that the nominative and accusative singular of masculine o-stems in Slavic became homophonous due to phonological processes, is frequently quoted as an important cause of the reanalysis that lead to a genitive-shaped accusative for animates (e.g. Bratishenko 1998 120–152).

4.6.2.2 Analogues

The term analogue is defined by Harris and Campbell expressly in order to avoid the traditional concept of analogy. They define an analogue as

a condition where a structural similarity exists between two (or more) items, or classes, or constructions, etc. The existence of the analogue often stimulates change through extension, but it may also prompt change through reanalysis or through borrowing; it is not however necessary for any change to occur (Harris and Campbell 1995:51).

Analogues are, however, a prerequisite for extension, but they are not a mechanism in themselves. In our terms, an analogue must be defined as the presence and overlap of two or more constructions in the same part of conceptual space.

4.6.2.3 Language contact

As with analogues, it is important to point out that language contact is not in itself a mechanism of change, but a (powerful) stimulant which may trigger any of Harris and Campbell’s three mechanisms. Language contact is defined as “a situation in which the speakers of one language are familiar in some way with another. […] Language contact is often a catalyst to change through reanalysis or extension, while borrowing,
of course, can come about only through language contact” (Harris and Campbell 1995:51).

Old Russian certainly found itself in various degrees of contact with various languages throughout the period examined in this dissertation, most importantly with the closely related Church Slavic, but also with Greek, and later with various Western European languages. The complex contact situation has been invoked repeatedly as an explanation of various aspects of the changes in the Old Russian system of possessive constructions.

4.6.3 Harris and Campbell 1995 vs. construction grammar
As we have seen, the mechanisms of change in Harris and Campbell 1995 do not work very well with a construction grammar framework. The main reason for this is that the model, although non-generative and reasonably functionally oriented, has quite a narrow view of syntax, and therefore of the mechanisms and causes involved in syntactic change. In a construction grammar account of diachronic syntax, changes must mainly be seen in terms of changes in schematicity/specificity of nodes in the schematic networks, of the birth of new nodes, and of the narrowing or widening of the meanings of individual constructions. Harris and Campbell’s typology of causal factors is much more useful than their proposed mechanisms, but these as well are coloured by their narrow definition of syntax. However, their central insight – that it is comparatively easy to describe changes, but difficult and complicated to pin down their causes – remains, and should be taken into consideration by any scholar dealing with changes at the syntactic end of the syntax–lexicon continuum.

4.6.4 On explanation
The possibility of explaining linguistic change has long been a hotly debated issue in linguistics, particularly since the appearance of Lass 1980. The main disagreement has been on the question of what it means to explain something. Lass’s (deliberately provocative) point of view is that only deductive-nomological explanations, explanations that enable us to predict whether the law involved is absolute and not statistical, can be called explanations from a scientific point of view. Such explanations, he argues, are impossible in linguistics, as there are no laws strong enough to provide them in this domain (Lass 1997:329).

When it comes to syntactic change, Lass is obviously right in claiming that there are no “laws” involved strong enough to predict the changes. We can say a lot about the mechanisms and causal factors involved, and what factors are likely to bring about change, but we can never predict that the changes will take place, what changes exactly, and when they will take place – “whatever cause we are able to establish, that
cause never seems to be a sufficient condition for the event. We can always find languages where the change does not seem to have taken place” (Faarlund 1990:41).

Thus, the aims in a work of diachronic syntax must be more modest. The level of ambition in Harris and Campbell’s (1995) approach seems reasonable: One should first aim to classify and describe the changes carefully and in a principled manner. Secondly, the possible causal factors behind the changes should be examined separately. This is a far more difficult task. Still, it should be possible to at least identify most of the causal factors involved in a well-attested change. To some extent it should also be possible to assess their relative weight. But we will never know what was the final straw, so to speak. Such an approach can make a lot of processes clearer and more understandable, though there will be problems that we will never get to the bottom of. As for prediction, it should not be “the major goal for diachronic syntax, or indeed for any retrospective science” (Harris and Campbell 1995:5).

4.7 Summary

The synchronic analysis of the possessive constructions in the earliest Old Russian texts in Chapter 5, the comparative analysis of Old Church Slavic in Chapter 6 and the diachronic analysis of 11th–17th century Old Russian in chapter 7 will be conducted in accordance with the theoretic tenets of this chapter. All occurrences of possessive constructions are sorted into the main types of constructional meanings (RP\text{TYPE}, RP\text{INST}, INTRINSIC). The head nouns are sorted according to type, whether relational or non-relational, and relational head nouns are also subcategorised according to type. The modifiers of the constructions are checked for animacy effects and other semantic commonalities. All constructions are placed in the possessive conceptual space, which is used both for synchronic comparisons of different constructions and diachronic investigations of individual constructions. Schematic networks are employed where needed to clarify synchronic or diachronic phenomena. Thus, all the main theoretical tools discussed in this chapter will be put to use.
5 Possessive constructions in the earliest Old Russian texts (1000–1400)

This chapter is a synchronic analysis of the possessive constructions found in the Old Russian material of period 1 (11th–14th century), in terms of the theory presented in Chapter 4. The analysis will place the constructions within the possessive conceptual space, and take into account the interplay between various types of head nouns and modifier types in the selection of possessive constructions. Special emphasis will be placed on the semantic contributions of relational head nouns in the constructions.

5.1 The possessive conceptual space

The possessive conceptual space introduced in section 4.5 has two overlapping semantic centres – reference point situations and intrinsic relationships. The overlap is due to the fact that noun( stem)s filling elaboration sites of relational head nouns are often very suitable reference points to identify these head nouns, but the intrinsic relationship between head and modifier obviously remains as well. In addition, reference point situations on type level (RP_{TYPE}) border on reference point situations on instance level (RP_{INST}). RP_{TYPE} is also characterised by *conventionalised strong unit status*, which may also be found with RP_{INST} and INTRINSIC.
5.2 How many possessive constructions?

The first thing to be established is the number of constructions within the possessive conceptual space. Strictly speaking, there is rather a large number of constructions involved, since a whole range of constructions with denominal adjectives formed with (at least) seven different productive suffixes all fall within the possessive conceptual space. In my material, constructions with the following suffixes were counted (although it is possible to argue in favour of including even more): -*j-, -ov-, -in-, -bn’, -bj-, -bšk- and -bn-. However, there are good reasons to simplify the analysis by separating these suffixes into two groups.

The first group of suffixes consists of -*j-, -ov-, -in- and -bn’ (forming adjectives such as Rostislavь from Rostislavь, Oльgovь from Olegь, bogorodicinь from bogorodica “mother of God”, gospодьнь from gospodь “lord”). Adjectives formed with these suffixes from a noun stem denoting a person or something personified will be grouped together and called DA1. As seen in section 2.7.1.1, Zverkovskaja 1986 shows that these suffixes all have a lot in common. When combined with personal or personified noun stems, they tend to be possessive in a rather narrow sense, and interchangeable with the genitive. They also almost
exclusively appear in short form. These four suffixes are also at the top of Bratishenko’s suffix hierarchy (1998:83; cf. section 2.2.2), indicating that they are the most likely to combine with noun stems denoting persons, particularly mature persons, and with proper names. We will see that this group of denominal adjectives has a quite different distribution from the second group posited. The adjective božij was included in this group due to its distribution, which clearly patterns with other DA1, even though it is derived with the suffix -ьж.

The second group of suffixes consists of -ьж-, -ьск- and -ьн- (forming adjectives such as волчий from волк “wolf”, женский from жена “woman”, небесный from небо “heaven, sky”). Again, Zverkovskaja 1986 shows that the suffixes have a lot in common: They all have a rather wide semantics, and are not narrowly possessive. -ьж- mostly forms adjectives from noun stems denoting animals, -ьск- mostly from common nouns denoting persons, and -ьн- mostly from inanimates. Thus the suffixes complement each other to a large extent. These are also the three suffixes found at the bottom of Bratishenko’s suffix hierarchy (1998:83), and therefore according to her less likely to be combined with proper noun stems or other stems denoting persons, particularly if mature and with definite reference. The adjectives formed with these suffixes will be referred to as DA2.

DA1 and DA2 correspond rather accurately to the traditional Russian distinction between possessive (притяжательные) and relative (относительные) adjectives. As discussed in Chapter 2, I prefer to avoid these labels, as they entail too much about the function of the adjectives. The so-called relative adjectives may certainly denote paradigmatic possession (as discussed in Chapter 1), and there are many such examples in my material.

Thus, only two schematic adjective constructions will be posited in this analysis, the DA1 construction [DA1, NP] and the DA2 construction [DA2, NP].

When it comes to the genitive, on the other hand, I find it reasonable to posit two separate genitive constructions. There is ample evidence that [NP-GEN, NP] is used freely in some parts of the possessive conceptual space, whereas in other parts it is hardly used at all unless the NP-GEN is expanded in some way, i.e. consists of more than a single genitive-marked noun, or consists of a word from which a DA cannot be formed. Thus, two constructions should be posited, the free genitive construction (GENFREE) and the restricted genitive construction (GENREST). The constructions are distinct both at the semantic pole, because they have different distributions and pattern differently on the map of the possessive conceptual space, and at the

62 When combined with noun stems denoting animals or plants, however, these suffixes produce adjectives that would almost exclusively appear with RP_TYPE semantics, and normally in the long form. Such animal and plant adjectives (e.g. лебединый) were quite rare in my corpus, and were not included in either of the two groups of denominal adjectives, and therefore not counted.
phonological pole, because GEN_{RESTR} is more specific than GEN_{FREE}, entailing a formal restriction on the types of genitive-marked NPs that can occur in it (the NP must usually be complex).

Finally, there is the dative construction [NP-DAT, NP], which will be referred to as DAT.

In addition, several types of “mixed” constructions are found within the possessive conceptual space, such as (1), where the noun *slava* is modified both by a DA1 and a genitive:

(1) видите славу Божию и святою
    do-you-see glory-ACC.SG. God-j-FEM.ACC.SG. and
    holy-MASC.GEN.DUAL.

“do you see the glory of God and the two saints” SBG 62/21–22

Such constructions will be commented on in section 5.8.

5.3 DA1

In figure 5.2, the DA1 construction is placed in the possessive conceptual space, where the lighter red field shows the entire distribution, while the darker red field is the semantic centre of gravity in terms of frequency. Chart 5.1 below indicates the more precise distribution of DA1 in my material from the 11th–14th centuries.63

---

63 As pointed out in section 4.5, the semantic maps are impressionistic illustrations based on the hard data given in the charts. The exact extent and centres of the distributions in the maps are not based on calculations.
As we can see, the semantic centre of gravity, in terms of frequency, is very clear for this construction. The great majority of DA1 constructions involve the notion of RPₜₚₑᵗₑ, with or without an intrinsic relationship. This was expected, bearing in mind
earlier accounts: Bratishenko 1998, leaning on Huntley’s work on OCS (1984 and 1993) finds that early Old Russian denominal adjectives formed from personal stems, with suffixes from the top of her suffix hierarchy, strongly tend to have definite reference. These suffixes, which are those included in the DA1 group, are associated with inherently highly definite nouns (Bratishenko 1998:32–33). Likewise, Corbett (1987:326) finds that for Slavic in general, a possessive adjective (only those in -ov- and -in- are considered in his article) is more likely to be used the more specific the referent is. Definiteness and specificity are very good qualifications for a reference point. They clearly overlap with Taylor’s (1996) absolute claim that reference points must be topical (cf. section 4.4): The reference point needs to be more easily accessible than the “target” (Taylor 2000:210). To be easily accessible possessors must have either discourse-conditioned topicality (i.e. be accessible through the discourse context, directly or indirectly) or inherent topicality (i.e. be “automatically more easily accessed than others, regardless of discourse context” (Taylor 2000:219). DA1s are typically formed from noun stems with inherent topicality (the prime example must be Bogь “God”, but proper names also have inherent topicality), or from stems that are very well suited as topics (common nouns denoting persons).

In the following subsections, we will take a detailed look at the various attestations.

5.3.1 RP_TYPE and RP_INST with strong unit status
Instances of DA1 constructions expressing RP_TYPE or RP_INST bordering on RP_TYPE were extremely rare in my corpus. In fact, there was only one instance of RP_TYPE in the entire material of period 1. Here, it is quite clear from the context that this is a general, theoretical discussion of a particular type of inheritance:

(2)  а Задница съи Мужна
     but inheritance-NOM.SG. she-DAT husband-ьn’-FEM.NOM.SG.
не надобь
not necessary
“but the husband’s inheritance is not necessary to her” RP 46/659–660

There were nine instances of DA1 constructions conveying RP_INST with strong unit status, and thus bordering on RP_TYPE. They were all instances of onomastic DA1 constructions, which served as names of places or church holidays:

(3)  в Костантинъ гра
     in Constantine-j-MASC.LOC.SG. city-ABB.R.
     “in Constantinople” PVrL 113/26
5.3.2 RP\textsubscript{INST} without intrinsic relationship
There were 148 instances of RP\textsubscript{INST} without an intrinsic relationship between DA1 and head noun. These are the instances that are closest to possession in a prototypical sense. However, in example (4), there is no clear evidence that Gleb is the legal owner of the boat (but he was using it), in (5), one is hardly the legal owner of one’s own grave, and in (6), Christ is certainly not the legal owner of the nails, in fact, these are the nails that were used when he was crucified. However, a DA1 serves as a reference point in each of the three examples, and in none of the examples does it fill an elaboration site of the head noun.

(4) послалии яша корабль Глебовь
sent-NOM.PL. took boat-ACC.SG. Gleb-ov-MASC.ACC.SG.
“the envoys took Gleb’s boat” PVrL 136/17–18

(5) како т[огды мы] ц..ловали крть оу
how then we-NOM. kissed cross by
отна гроба
father-ин’-MASC.GEN.SG. grave-GEN.SG.
“how we then kissed the cross by (our) father’s grave” DSG 94/8

(6) елена [...] вложила во утны гвозди
Elena-NOM put-in in-there holy-MASC.ACC.PL. nail-ACC.PL.
хви
Christ-ov-MASC.ACC.PL.
“Elena put the holy nails of Christ into it” ChID 15v/16–17

5.3.3 RP\textsubscript{INST}/INTRINSIC
This is the DA1 construction’s semantic centre of gravity, with more than half of the occurrences. There were 247 instances of DA1 constructions where the DA1 functioned both as a reference point and as a filler of an elaboration site in the semantic base of the relational head noun. They were found with several types of relational nouns: deverbal nouns, kinship terms, nouns denoting other human relationships, nouns denoting body parts and deadjectival nouns.

There were 88 instances where the DA1 filled the “subject” elaboration site of a deverbal noun:

\textsuperscript{64} Grobn “grave” is certainly a deverbal result noun, but is probably not derived from a verb meaning “bury”; but from a verb meaning “dig”, and the noun should therefore not have an object elaboration site. Nonetheless, any reference point identifying grobn is highly likely to be interpreted as the person who is lying or is going to lie in the grave. Thus, the noun is a borderline case between relational and non-relational nouns, but was classified as non-relational.
There is a wide range of deverbal nouns participating in these constructions, from the very verb-like and productive nouns in -ie (vozvrashenie “return”), via verb-like, but non-productive action nouns (strastь “suffering”), to more typically nominal, but still deverbal nouns expressing the for instance the result (kljatva “curse”), the patient (učenikъ “pupil”) or the manner of the action (končina “end, manner of death”).

There were 66 instances of DA1 filling the elaboration site of a kinship term:

(9) жена Иванова
wife-NOM.SG. Ivan-ov-FEM.NOM.SG.
“Ivan’s wife” Z 32/253

(10) сынъ Соломонь
son-NOM.SG. Solomon-j-MASC.NOM.SG.
“Solomon’s son” ŽD 362/23

Ten instances of relational nouns denoting other types of human relationships than kinship were also found in DA1 constructions:

(11) рабъ бжǐн
slave-NOM.SG. God-uj-MASC.NOM.SG.
“God’s servant” ŽSP 17/9

Nouns denoting body parts are typical heads of RP\_INST/INTRINSIC constructions, 28 were found:

(12) от руки господня
from hand-GEN.SG. Lord-kn’-FEM.GEN.SG.
“from the Lord’s hand” PBR 346/34

(13) не презр я кровь праведничу
not despising blood-ACC.SG. righteous man-j-FEM.ACC.SG.
“not despising the righteous man’s blood” ŽAN 175/6

---

65 Pilatova in a manuscript variant.
Note that тело “body” and душа “soul” were also considered body parts, as they were clearly perceived as such in mediaeval Rus’.

Deadjectival nouns also typically occur in DA1 constructions with RP_{INST}/INSTRinsic semantics, 23 were found in the corpus from period 1.

(14) Дай же князю нашему [...] хитрость
give PARTICLE prince-DAT. our-DAT. cunning-ACC.SG.
Давидову
David-oV-FEM.ACC.SG.
“Give our prince David’s cunning” SDZ 35/5

(15) да зрю красоты Гна
that I-see beauty-GEN.SG. Lord-ун’-FEM.GEN.SG.66
“that I may see the Lord’s beauty” ́ŽSP 6/26–27

5.3.4 INTRINSIC
As expected, DA1 constructions were quite rare in the corpus when there was no reference point situation present. 34 were found where there was deemed to be only an intrinsic relationship present, and no obvious reference point. All of these involved a relational head noun. As will be seen in the discussion below, there are good arguments in favour of viewing this number as artificially high, since a disproportionately large share of them comes from one single text.

31 of the instances had a DA1 filling an elaboration site of a deverbal noun. Mostly (25 instances), the DA1s corresponded to regular accusative objects:

(16) написано снáе Гнěс
is-painted taking-down-NOM.SG. Lord-ун’-NEUT.NOM.SG.
“the taking down of the Lord is painted” ChID 21v/7

Now, as discussed in section 4.4.3, objects in sentences are seldom topical. It is therefore reasonable to assume that most “objects” of deverbal nouns are not topical either, and if they are not topical, they cannot be reference points. In a mediaeval text corpus, such as that of the present dissertation, it is not always easy to determine whether an entity is topical or not. In cases where “objects” of deverbal nouns are not obviously topical, I have therefore chosen to assume that there is no reference point involved. Let us look at this type of DA1 construction in some detail.

In example (16) above, there are no obvious problems with such an analysis. Apart from its tendency to inherent topicality and its unique reference, the adjective господь is not topical in the context, as it is not an outline of the sufferings of

66 May also be fem.acc.pl., and should in that case be translated “that I may see the Lord’s beauties”.
Christ, but rather a detailed description of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. However, there are a number of instances that are less straightforward.

It should be pointed out that a full 18 of the 25 examples with “objects” are in fact from the same text as example (16), *Choždenie igumena Daniila v svjatuju zemljju* (ChID). In a number of these examples, the focus is not at all on the process denoted by the deverbal noun, rather the constructions serve as names of places or paintings/mosaics:

(17) a ðō распåа гђа дò
but from crucifixion-GEN.SG. Lord-іп’-NEUT.GEN.SG. to 
сñаíd гђа естъ. еа сагжё
taking-down-GEN.SG. Lord-іп’-NEUT.GEN.SG. is 5 fathoms-GEN.PL.
“and from the crucifixion of the Lord to the taking-down of the Lord there are five fathoms” ChID 21v/15–16

What Daniil refers to as “the crucifixion of the Lord” in this example is actually the place within the Church of the Holy Sepulchre where the crucifixion is deemed to have taken place. Similarly, “the taking-down of the Lord” refers to a mosaic, not to the action itself. Such readings are very clear for 11 of the 18 examples in this text. As seen in sections 4.4.2 and 5.3.1, whole constructions serving as names (onomastic constructions) have strong unit status, and often have high token frequency and are highly entrenched. These 11 examples at least have high token frequency in Abbot Daniil’s context, as a pilgrim to Jerusalem, and are well entrenched as names of works of art and places. However, I would hesitate to say that the adjectives serve as reference points. They do not seem to be topical, rather, the entire construction serves as a conventionalised name of a place or an object. The possibility for constructions with no reference point involved to have strong unit status shows us that not only RP* INST borders on RP* TYPE, but INTRINSIC too, as indicated in the drawing of the possessive conceptual space in figure 5.1.

These examples are not the only ones that may be said to have strong unit status. Five of the examples with deverbal heads are instances of the construction in (18):

(18) страхь Божиим имёйте
fear-ACC.SG. God-ій-MASC.ACC.SG. have
“have fear of God” PVM 246/28

A fair interpretation is that the adjective *Božij* “God’s” corresponds to the genitive object of the verb *strachovatisja* “fear” (and of the morphologically unrelated verb *bojatisja* “fear”). *Božij* does not seem to be particularly topical in the context, and is
not used to identify what fear we are talking about, but rather to flesh out the relational noun. On the other hand, as indeed in modern English, strachь Božij “the fear of God” is a fixed and reasonably frequent expression, and thus must have strong unit status.

Thus, constructions with strong unit status accounted for more than half of the findings of DA1 constructions that were classified as involving an intrinsic relationship and no reference point. Strong unit status is usually combined with a reference point situation, either on type or instance level, and this connection may possibly have increased the use of DA1, which was closely linked to reference point situations. DAT and GEN\textsubscript{FREE}, on the other hand, the constructions most frequently found with INTRINSIC without reference point, were not at all suitable for expressing reference points and strong unit status. GEN\textsubscript{FREE} was also avoided with animates. This will be further discussed in sections 5.6 and 5.7.

The remaining examples do not have strong unit status. They were all categorised as not involving reference points, but in some of the examples, a reference point analysis is possible, if less likely than the INTRINSIC analysis.

(19) 

\begin{tabular}{lll}
\textbf{vь} & \textbf{олтарё} & \textbf{велице} \\
\text{on} & \text{altar-LOC.SG.-PARTICLE} & \text{great} \\
\textbf{написано} & \text{is} & \\
\text{Adamovo} & \text{lifting-up-NOM.SG.} & \\
\textbf{вьздвижен\textbf{с}е} & \\
\text{Adam-ov-NEUT.NOM.SG.} & \text{lifting-up-NOM.SG.} & \\
\end{tabular}

“but on the great altar the lifting-up of Adam (Adam’s ascension) is painted”

ChID 18v/8

Here the DA1 may alternatively be argued to serve as a reference point, as ascensions, in a Biblical context, are not uncommon, and the object site filler Adam may or may not have been used to identify exactly which ascension the author had in mind.

Similarly, in (20) below, the name Nevrjun (one of Batyj’s commanders) is topical, having been mentioned in the sentence before,\textsuperscript{67} and may or may not be used as a reference point in the beginning of the next sentence:

(20) 

\begin{tabular}{lll}
\textbf{пово} & \textbf{плъннении} & \textbf{же} \\
\text{after} & \text{capture-LOC.SG.} & \text{PARTICLE} \\
\textbf{Неврюновь} & \text{Nevrjun-ov-NEUT.LOC.SG.} & \\
\end{tabular}

“but after the capture of Nevrjun/Nevrjun’s capture” ŽAN 175/1

In other examples, the possibility of a reference point is less obvious:

\textsuperscript{67}По се\textsuperscript{м} же раззнѣвъся царь Батый на брата его меньшаго Андрѣя, и послѣ воеводу своего Неврюна повоевать землю Суздальскую. “After this, king Batyj became angry with his youngest brother Andrej, and sent his commander Nevrjun to defeat the land of Suzdal’.”
(21) тёплотоу вёры Хвым разжегся
warmth-INSTR.SG. faith-GEN.SG. Christ-ov-FEM.GEN.SG. flared up
“he flared up with the warmth of the faith in Christ” ŽSP 13/29

There were three instances of INTRINSIC with relational heads other than deverbal nouns. All three heads were representation nouns:

(22) пре’ образомь Хвымь
before image-INSTR.SG. Christ-ov-MASC.INSTR.SG.
“before the image of Christ” PVrL 41/23

In these cases it was not obvious that the DA1 should function as a reference point, though the possibility is not excluded.

5.3.5 Are DA1 constructions obliged to involve a reference point?
The discussion in section 5.3.4 raises the question as to whether Old Russian DA1 constructions always involve reference points. My material from period 1 does not yield an unequivocal answer to this question, but indicates that this is not an absolute prerequisite. Firstly, DA1 constructions may clearly involve an intrinsic relationship but no reference point if they have strong unit status. We saw that strong unit status and reference points are strongly associated through RP_TYPE, and it is not surprising that the construction should be extended to the rather rare instances of strong unit status without reference point. The DAT and GEN_FREE constructions, on the other hand, are very seldom, if at all, used in instances with strong unit status. Secondly, there seem to be scattered attestations of the DA1 construction with an intrinsic relationship only, but no reference point and no strong unit status, even though it is difficult to be absolutely certain about this. Recall that a DA1 is almost always formed from a prime candidate for reference point status, a noun stem denoting a (mature) person, and often from proper nouns. It is not unexpected that the device used for reference-point stems should sometimes also be used in the rare instances where such stems actually do not serve as reference points, particularly since GEN_FREE is apparently dispreferred for use with animates.

However, the general conclusion must be that in my material from period 1, the DA1 construction is used with reference point semantics in the overwhelming majority of cases.

5.4 DA2
Figure 5.3 places the DA2 construction in the possessive conceptual space. The lighter red field shows its full distribution, and the darker red field its semantic centre
of gravity. Chart 5.2 shows the more precise distribution of DA1 in my material from the 11th–14th centuries.

*Figure 5.3 DA2 in the possessive conceptual space, 11th–14th century.*
Figure 5.3 shows that the DA2 construction has a very wide distribution indeed. In fact, a DA2 construction may have semantics from any part of the possessive conceptual space. Chart 5.2, on the other hand, makes it obvious that, like the DA1 construction, the DA2 construction has a very clear semantic centre of gravity, in terms of frequency. 53.9% of all DA2 constructions found in my corpus from period 1 are either RP_{TYPE} or RP_{INSTANCE} with strong unit status bordering on RP_{TYPE}.

5.4.1 RP_{TYPE}

206 instances of DA2 constructions with RP_{TYPE} semantics were found, such as (23), (24) and (25) below.

(23) идеё мученическим вёньцым увязостася
where martyr-masc-instr.sg. crown-instr.sg. they-were-tied “where they were bound with a martyr’s crown” SBG 49/7

In this example, it is clear that we are not talking about the particular crown of a specific martyr; rather, the reference point “martyr” appears on type level, and identifies a subcategory of crowns, namely “martyr’s crown”. Similarly, the cow in example (24) is not a particular cow:

(24) за коровиє молоко

Quite frequently, the reference point on type level is the material something is made from or consists of:

(25) стрти злыя ицляща кплами
suffering-acc.pl. evil-fem.acc.pl. curing drop-instr.pl.
кровными стыми
blood-fem.instr.pl. sacred-fem.instr.pl. “curing evil sufferers with sacred blood drops” PVrL 138/25–26

5.4.2 RP_{INST} with strong unit status

This is the most frequent meaning of the DA2 constructions in the Old Russian material of period 1. 253 instances of DA2 were found with RP_{INST} semantics and strong unit status. In these examples, the construction does have a particular referent, but functions as a whole as a name or label for the referent in question. Examples (26), (27) and (28) below are members of the same set of unique referents: the DA2 construction is the typical way of naming countries in Old Russian.
In all these examples, the name of the ethnic group is used as a reference point to identify the country in question, but at the same time, they belong to a set of parallel constructions, which gives them strong unit status. As discussed in section 4.4.2, we are probably dealing with a partially specific construction in its own right, [INHABITANT-ъск-FEM., землja]. This lower-level construction schema has high type frequency in its own right, and the different instances have varying token frequency, with Russьskaja zemlja “the land of Rus’” as particularly strongly entrenched. There were 212 instances of this kind.

There were also 40 instances of onomastic DA2 constructions with strong unit status, similar to the ones seen in section 5.3.1. In these cases, there were no strong lower-level schemas, but each construction has high token frequency and is strongly entrenched as a unit:

(29) еже яя лобно место Голгоша
which is scull-ъск-NOM.SG. place-NOM.SG. Golgotha-NOM.
“which is the Place of the Scull, Golgotha” ChID 21v/15

Here, both reference point (the alleged scull of Adam) and target are quite specific, but the construction has strong unit status because it, as a whole, is the conventionalised name of the place. Similarly, the construction in (30) below, gothskyi beregъ, occurs 31 times in the treaty between Smolensk, Riga and Gotland (SRG) as the conventionalised name of the island of Gotland:

(30) на готскомь берегъ
on Gothъск-MASC.LOC.SG. coast-LOC.SG.
“on Gotland (on the coast of the Goths)” SRG 46/17

Example (31) seems neither to be a set member nor an onomastic construction, but has strong unit status all the same, due to its frequency:
5.4.3 RP

There were 54 instances of DA2 constructions with RP

semantics, but without an intrinsic relationship between DA2 and head noun, and without strong unit status. As mentioned in 5.3.2, these are the instances that are the closest to be possessive in a prototypical sense. The adjectives were formed from a wide range of noun stems, denoting animate singulars and plurals, and concrete and abstract inanimates.

When a DA2 is formed from an animate noun stem and has RP

semantics, it often has a plural/collective meaning:

(32) граноу́ша […] бода́ны бёсермень́скы́
resounded armour-NOM.PL. Muslim-sk-FEM.NOM.PL.
“the Muslims’ armours resounded” Z 29/197

Sometimes, the DA2 has generic reference, but is still a reference point on instance level:

(33) разумь́ члв́чкь
understanding-NOM.SG. human-sk-MASC.NOM.SG.
“the understanding of man/human understanding” PVM 244/10

Constructions with animate DA2 and singular, definite reference are not excluded, however:

(34) онъ же по матерных день нача
he PARTICLE after mother-sk-MASC.LOC.PL. day-LOC.PL. began
дёти продавати
children-ACC. sell
“but after the mother’s days [when she was dead] he began selling the children” SDZ 32/7–33/1

There were also a number of examples with type 2 adjectives formed from inanimate stems, which may have singular or plural interpretations depending on the construction:

(35) узорочье резанскоке храбрых
treasure-NOM.SG. Rjazan’-sk-NEUT.NOM.SG. brave-MASC.GEN.PL.
удалцев
daredevil-GEN.PL.
“Rjazan’s treasure of brave daredevils” PBR 356/26
In the corpus texts belonging to the religious genre, we find a lot of DA2 constructions with adjectives formed from inanimate, abstract stems:

(37) Что [...] не примиете [...] ярма саконного
what not you-accept yoke-GEN.SG. law-insk-NEUT.GEN.SG.
“why do you not accept the law’s yoke” ŽSP 13/14

5.4.4 $R_{INST}$/INTRINSIC
There were 83 instances of DA2 constructions with both $R_{INST}$ semantics and an intrinsic relationship between adjective and head noun (without strong unit status) in the material from period 1. They were found with a number of types of relational nouns, such as deverbal nouns, nouns denoting kinship and other human relationships, nouns denoting body parts and other inherent parts of wholes, and deadjectival nouns. The adjectives were formed from a wide range of noun stems: stems denoting animates, mostly with plural reference, but also singular, and stems denoting concrete and abstract inanimates.

28 of the constructions had adjectives filling the subject elaboration site of a deverbal noun. Not unexpectedly (cf. section 5.2), the adjectives were mostly formed from animate nouns stems, and the majority of them had plural reference:

(38) Оужасеся небо и земля трепещет
was-horrified heaven-NOM. and earth-NOM. trembles
иодеисого не терпяще безаконного
Jew-insk-NEUT.GEN.SG. not enduring unlawful-NEUT.GEN.SG.
дрызнования
being-insolent-GEN.SG.
“heaven was horrified and the earth trembles, not enduring the Jews’ unlawful insolence” SKT 19/16–17

(39) Богъ единь вѣсть помышленных
God-NOM. alone-NOM. knows thinking-ACC.PL.
члець книга
human-NEUT.ACC.PL.
“God alone knows the thoughts of men” PVrL 179/1

Some had singular reference:
There were also several examples of adjectives formed from inanimate noun stems. Some of these were clearly metonymic for a group of people:

(41) приемлю црквна и преданы
I-accept church-м-NEUT.ACC.PL. tradition-ACC.PL.

“I accept the traditions (the handed-down rules) of the Church” PVrL 113/20

Others were not:

(42) не огонь творить раженение железу,
not fire-NOM makes being-red-hot-ACC. iron-DAT.
но надымание мѣшное
but blowing-NOM.SG. bellow-м-NEUT.NOM.SG.

“it is not the fire that makes the iron red-hot, but the bellows’ blowing” SDZ 25/7

There were only three DA2 constructions with RP_INST/INTRINSIC headed by a kinship term, all of which were instantiations of the construction in (43):

(43) отъ Русскіыхъ стновь
from Rus’-м-MASC.PL. son-GEN.PL.

“from the sons of Rus’” PVrL 120/31

The adjective is probably formed from Rus’ in the collective sense of “the people of Rus’”, that is an animate noun stem with a plural/collective reading.

Four constructions were headed by nouns denoting other human relationships than kinship, three with adjectives formed from animate noun stems, and one from an inanimate stem, but with a clear metonymic reference to a group of people:

(44) церковніи друэи
church-м-МASC.NOM.PL. friend-NOM.PL.

“friends of the church” ŽD 365/5

There were 12 instances headed by nouns denoting body parts. The adjectives were mostly formed from animate noun stems and had plural reference:
and head-NOM.PL. Tatar-ьск-FEM.NOM.PL. like stones-NOM.

“and the Tatars’ heads were lying about like stones” ŽD 354/21

“and the blood of the Christians was flowing like a strong river” PBR 348/30–31

However, there were also constructions with adjectives formed from inanimate nouns, with singular reference and (necessarily) metaphorical interpretation:

“the heart’s eyes” SL 466/33

“for through those two we defeat the Pagans’ impudence” SBG 49/19–20

Several had adjectives formed from inanimate noun stems:

“to show them the beauty of the church” PVrL 38/2–3

“For he learned the power of books” ŽSP 5/8–9

There were 14 instances headed by nouns denoting inherent parts of wholes, mostly parts of buildings, such as doors and gates. Naturally, most of the adjectives in these constructions were formed from inanimate noun stems:
(51) к дверям гробниy
towards door-DAT.PL. tomb-ин-ФЕМ.DAT.PL.
“towards the doors of the tomb” ChID 7r/3

(52) врата неба
gate-NOM.DUAL. heaven-ин-NOM.DUAL.
“Heaven’s gate” ChID 27r/2

The remaining instances were headed by relational nouns denoting rulers, offspring, names or non-deverbal results. The distribution of relational head noun types and adjective types is summarised in table 5.1:

Table 5.1: Old Russian DA2 constructions with RP_{INST/INTRINSIC}: types of head nouns and adjectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Animate sg.</th>
<th>Animate pl./collective</th>
<th>Concrete inanimate</th>
<th>Abstract inanimate</th>
<th>All types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deverbal w. subject</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinship/human rel.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadjectival noun</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body part</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other part of whole</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other rel. noun</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.5 INTRINSIC

Unlike the DA1 constructions, DA2 constructions often denote an intrinsic relationship without involving a reference point. 153 such instances were found in the material from period 1. However, there is not a great deal of variety in the examples, which makes it necessary to look for unity and depart somewhat from the classification in the preceding sections. There are clear commonalities between many of the occurrences, regardless of whether the head noun is relational or not.

As many as 72 of the instances have adjectives filling the elaboration sites of ruler nouns:

(53) царица Сфиопская
empress-NOM.SG. Ethiopia-инск-FEM.NOM.SG.
“the Empress of Ethiopia” PVrL 62/9

(54) великий князь Киевский
great-MASC.NOM.SG. prince-NOM.SG. Kiev-иск-MASC.NOM.SG.
“the Grand Prince of Kiev” PBK 203/1–2

33 of the other instances were very similar, in that the head noun normally denoted a person, and the adjective the person’s place of origin. Often a ruler noun (the title of the person) is implicitly understood:
There is also a number of examples where no ruler noun is understood. In these cases, the construction is analysed to carry intrinsic-relationship semantics by itself, and the person is interpreted to be in an intrinsic relationship with the place denoted by the adjective. That the place should be the person’s place of origin/abode seems to be the most available interpretation in these cases:

\[(56) \text{ к великому чюдотворцу Николе}}
\]  
\[\text{to great-MASC.DAT.SG. miracle-performer-DAT.SG. Nikolay-DAT.SG.}
\]  
\[\text{Корсунскому}}
\]  
\[\text{Korsun-мск-MASC.DAT.SG.}
\]  
\[\text{“to the great miracle-performer Nikolay of Korsun” PBR 358/15}
\]

Having thus accounted for 105 of the 154 instances of DA2 constructions with INTRINSIC in the material of period 1, I will now return to the classification adopted in the previous section, and look systematically at the remaining 49.

Apart from the 71 constructions headed by ruler nouns, there were only seven instances of DA2 constructions where the adjective filled the elaboration site of a relational noun. Four of these filled object elaboration sites of deverbal nouns. The adjective in (57) corresponds to a regular accusative object:

\[(57) \text{И аби сувьр […] мечное опьщешение}}
\]  
\[\text{and immediately he-saw sword-мск-NEUT.ACC.SG. sharpening-ACC.SG.}
\]  
\[\text{“And immediately he saw the sharpening of swords” SBG 35/668}
\]

In (58) below, the adjective corresponds to the dative object of the verb учити “teach”:

\[(58) \text{и дать нача на обученье книжное}}
\]  
\[\text{and give he-began to teaching-ACC.SG. book-мск-NEUT.ACC.SG.}
\]  
\[\text{“and he started sending (them) to teaching of books (to be taught book learning)” PVrL 118/26–119/1}
\]

In both these examples, an RP\text{\textsubscript{TYPE}} reading is not impossible.

---

68 The context makes it quite clear that the noun stem from which the adjective мечное is formed has plural reference: “И аби узвьр тежуших къ шатру блящение оружья и мечное ощущение” “And immediately he saw the ones running towards the hut, the gleaming of the weapons and the sharpening of swords” (SBG35/5–6).
The remaining two instances have adjectives corresponding to the genitive object of the verb strachovatisja “fear” (or of the morphologically unrelated verb bojatisja “fear”):

(59) други страха ради жидовьскаго
others-NOM. fear-GEN.SG. because-of Jew-þsk-MASC.GEN.SG.

отвержесас клятвою
renounced-REFL. with oath-INSTR.

“others renounced you with an oath because of their fear of the Jews” SKT 20/26

In these cases, an RP_type interpretation seems unlikely. All in all, the scarcity of the examples in my material suggests that the DA2 construction was avoided with deverbal nouns and their “objects”, just like the DA1 construction.

Three instances remain, which were headed by relational nouns other than ruler nouns and deverbal nouns. Two of them were again rather like the instances with ruler nouns or with place-of-origin semantics:

(60) рюсти сноб прикуймыш тогда
Rus’-þsk-MASC.NOM.PL. son-NOM.PL. appeared then

“some sons of Rus’ then appeared” ChID 8v/4

(61) и прииму власть Русскую ёдинь
and I-will-take power-ACC.SG. Rus’-þsk-FEM.ACC.SG. alone-NOM.

“and I will take the power over Rus’ alone” PVrL 139/28–29

In example (60), we have a kinship term where the adjective filling its elaboration site is clearly not a reference point, but denotes a place of origin rather than an actual parent. In example (61), we have a power noun, which is clearly semantically related to the ruler nouns.

The final example is headed by a deadjectival noun with an elaboration site for an “object”:

(62) Глад же глю не гладь
hunger-NOM. PARTICLE I-say not hunger-NOM.SG.

хлебный
bread-þsk-MASC.NOM.SG.

“but the hunger I speak of is not the hunger for bread” ŽSP 18/2

Again, it is possible to give this construction an RP_type interpretation.
To sum up, very few DA2 constructions denoting an intrinsic relationship were headed by relational nouns other than ruler nouns. When it comes to DA2 constructions headed by non-relational nouns, the picture is quite different.

There were 81 instances of such constructions denoting an intrinsic relationship. 33 of these had place-of-origin semantics and have already been shown to be closely linked to the constructions with ruler nouns. Of the remaining 48, 16 had a relationship of semantic apposition between head noun and adjective, i.e. both elements of the construction had the same reference. Recall the definition from section 4.3.4: “Two items are in apposition if they both designate the same entity, and their profiles are unified to produce a richer conception of the designated entity” (Taylor 1996:96–97, cf. Langacker 1991:432).

(63) ввергъше и в пропасть смртную
having-thrown him into abyss-ACC.SG. death-FEM.ACC.SG.
“having thrown him into the abyss of death” PVrL 175/3

(64) въ днѣ суботный
on day-ACC.SG. Sabbath-MASC.ACC.SG.
“on the day of the Sabbath” SBG 58/17

In (63) above, the abyss and death are identical, the former being a metaphor for the latter. In (64), the day (less specific) and the Sabbath (more specific) are one and the same.

There were also seven instances where it was not clear whether the intrinsic relationship between non-relational head noun and adjective was one of semantic apposition. Six of them were instances of the expression “the kingdom of heaven”:

(65) и цртво нбное принимши
and kingdom-ACC.SG. heaven-NEUT.ACC.SG. you-will-receive
“and you will receive the kingdom of heaven” PVrL 110/5

It is not entirely clear whether the kingdom and heaven are identical (this is perhaps the most likely interpretation), or whether heaven is the location of the kingdom.

The remaining 25 instances of DA2 constructions with an intrinsic relationship between a non-relational noun and a DA2 mostly had locative interpretations:

(66) есъ знаменье нбнаго Гд
is sign-NOM.SG. heaven-MASC.GEN.SG. God-GEN.SG.
“it is a sign of God in heaven” PVrL 179/19

The location could also be in time, not in space:
POSSESSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN 11TH–14TH CENTURY OLD RUSSIAN

To sum up, DA2 constructions with INTRINSIC semantics are overwhelmingly either headed by ruler nouns, or denote an intrinsic place-of-origin or other locative relationship between a non-relational noun and an adjective formed from a toponym. Relationships of apposition are also quite common. It is clear that these construction types are related by more than the intrinsic relationship. All of them tend to involve adjectives formed from toponyms. In addition, constructions headed by ruler nouns are obviously closely related to place-of-origin constructions without relational heads, and somewhat less closely to constructions where the adjective denotes the location of the non-relational head noun. It is also important to note that these constructions often tend towards strong unit status, and that several partially specific and strongly entrenched lower-level construction schemas are involved. [RULER NAME COUNTRY-ьск-] (such as (53)–(55) above) is usually a standard way of referring to a particular person. The same is often the case with the place-of-origin construction [NAME TOPONYM-ьск-] (as in example (56)). Likewise, apposition constructions [CITY/COUNTRY/OCEAN/RIVER ... TOPONYM-ьск-] (example (68) below) and even the locative construction [NP, TOPONYM-ьск-] (example (69) below) may well serve as fixed names of places, and have strong unit status.

5.4.6 DA2 constructions with uncertain semantics

Chart 5.2 shows us that quite a lot of DA2 constructions defied classification, compared to the other constructions. As many as 106 instances of the DA2 construction (12.4 %) were deemed to have uncertain semantics, so many that it requires special mention. The ambiguity almost always concerns whether or not a

---

69 Cf. Kopčevskaja-Tamm and Šmelev’s (1994:213–214) discussion of appositional constructions in modern Russian: They argue that constructions such as baba Tanja “Granny Tanja” are different from constructions such as devočka Anja “the girl Anja”, since the first type means “the woman whom I call “Granny Tanja”, while the second means “the girl who is called Anja”. In the terms of this dissertation, this means that baba Tanja is a construction with strong unit status, while devočka Anja is not.
reference point is present (70), and/or whether or not that reference point is on type level or on instance level (71).

(70) положиша [...] плоть прьбны твой
    they-put flesh-ACC. holy-GEN.PL. your-GEN.PL.
    звёрё земны
    beast-DAT.PL. earth-MASC.DAT.PL.
    “they left the flesh of your saints for the beasts of the earth” SL 463/36

Is “the earth” a reference point (on instance or type level) pointing out exactly what animals the author had in mind, or is it just additional information, perceived to be in an intrinsic relationship with the head noun, which would have a locative reading? Similarly, it is not clear whether the reference point involved in (71) is on type or instance level.

(71) и жены боларских моужеи
    and wife-NOM.PL. Boyar-FEM.NOM.PL. husbands-ACC.=GEN.
    своих и уподарёв остали
    their-ACC.=GEN. and lords-ACC.=GEN. lost
    “and the boyars’ wives/boyar women have lost their husbands and masters” Z 32/257

The high number of uncertain instances is probably a consequence of the very wide distribution of the DA2 construction: It is present in the entire possessive conceptual space, and it is up to the context to clarify what part is meant in any given instance. However, it is important to keep in mind that the wavering is normally between only subtly different semantic alternatives, which would cause correspondingly subtle misunderstandings, if “misunderstanding” is not too strong a word.

5.5 GENrestr

In section 5.2, it was assumed that 11th–14th century Old Russian had two adnominal genitive constructions, one restricted (GENrestr) and one unrestricted (GENfree). GENrestr interacts closely with the two groups of adjective constructions, as the genitive construction is essentially used when an adjective construction is impossible, i.e. when the possessor is complex or belongs to some word class or noun category which cannot form denominal adjectives for some reason or other. (As already mentioned in section 5.2, the picture is more complex than this, as various “mixed” constructions are possible to various extents. This will be further explored in section 5.8)
Although there are good formal and semantic reasons to distinguish between GEN\textsubscript{RESTR} and GEN\textsubscript{FREE}, there is no obvious way to tell whether an occurrence of [NP-GEN\textsubscript{complex}, NP] is an instance of the one or the other, since complex genitive-marked NPs are allowed in both constructions. As implicated in its abbreviation, GEN\textsubscript{FREE} is freely used, whether the genitive-marked NP is complex or not. GEN\textsubscript{RESTR}, on the other hand, is restricted in that the genitive-marked NP must either be complex, or consist of a single word (e.g. an adjective, a participle) from which a DA cannot be formed. How, then, can we get a reliable count of GEN\textsubscript{RESTR}?

My solution to the problem has been to count all constructions that could possibly be instances of GEN\textsubscript{RESTR}, i.e. all constructions containing a complex genitive-marked NP or a genitive-marked adjective or participle. Such constructions will be labeled GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} throughout the rest of the dissertation. Since the occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{RESTR} cannot be counted directly, figure 5.4 and chart 5.3 are based on a count of occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX}, which will also include complex occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{FREE}. When discussing the various semantic subtypes, I have kept an eye on the presence and frequency of DA1, DA2 and certain occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} in the same functions, and evaluated to what extent the figures are a realistic representation of GEN\textsubscript{RESTR}. Again, the lighter red area illustrates the full distribution of the construction, whereas the darker red area marks its semantic centre of gravity.

*Figure 5.4 Occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} in the possessive conceptual space, 11th–14th century*
Figure 5.4 suggests that GEN\textsubscript{RESTR} is a construction with a wide distribution, encompassing every part of the possessive conceptual space except RP\textsubscript{TYPE}. If we take the more exact distribution in chart 5.3 to be representative for the construction, we find that GEN\textsubscript{RESTR}, just like DA1 and DA2, seems to be a construction with a very clear semantic centre of gravity in terms of frequency: RP\textsubscript{INST}/INTRINSIC is by far the most frequent semantics found with genitive constructions where the genitive-marked NP is either complex, or consists of a single word from which a DA cannot be formed (e.g. an adjective or a participle). The construction seems to have its centre of gravity right in the middle of our map of the possessive conceptual space, and decreases in frequency both to the left (towards RP\textsubscript{TYPE}) and to the right (towards INTRINSIC without a relational noun).

In the following, we will see how this first impression holds up when the occurrences of DA1, DA2 and certain instances of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} constructions in the same parts of the possessive conceptual space are taken into account.

### 5.5.1 RP\textsubscript{TYPE} and RP\textsubscript{INST} with strong unit status

There was not a single instance of GEN\textsubscript{RESTR} with RP\textsubscript{TYPE} semantics; in fact, this part of the possessive conceptual space is as good as the exclusive domain of the DA2 construction.

However, RP\textsubscript{INST} semantics with strong unit status was found with 45 instances of constructions with complex genitive-marked NPs or with genitive-
marked adjectives/participles (labelled GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} in the following) in the material of period 1. All of these were onomastic constructions, where the whole construction is a name, often of a place, building or church holiday:

(72) къ църквi святого Георгия
    to church-DAT.SG. holy-MASC.GEN.SG. Georgij-GEN.SG.
    “to the Church of St. Georgij” SBG 59/16

(73) на стго Бориса днь
    on holy-MASC.GEN.SG. Boris-GEN.SG. day-ACC.SG.
    “on St. Boris’s day” PVM 249/21

There were no occurrences at all of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} with such semantics, suggesting that all constructions with complex genitive-marked NPs in this category are instances of GEN\textsubscript{RESTR}. This is supported by the findings of onomastic DA1 and DA2 constructions with the same semantics: There were 9 onomastic DA1 constructions and 40 onomastic DA2 constructions. This means that 52.1 % were adjective constructions and 47.9 % GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} constructions. In this part of the possessive conceptual space, then, DA1, DA2 and GEN\textsubscript{RESTR} seem to have a very clear division of labour.

5.5.2 RP\textsubscript{INST} without intrinsic relationship

There were 123 instances of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} with RP\textsubscript{INST} semantics, but without strong unit status or an intrinsic relationship. Some of them are possessive in a strict sense:

(74) павла апъа домь
    Paul-GEN.SG. apostle-GEN.SG. house-NOM.SG.
    “Paul the apostle’s house” ChID 25v/4

(75) и книги одараша · и порты блины
    and books-ACC. they-stole and robe-ACC.PL. blessed-MASC.GEN.PL.
    и первы и кназии
    first-MASC.PL. prince-MASC.PL.
    “and they stole books and the robes of the blessed first princes” SL 463/29

Some examples are clearly on the outskirts of what may be called possession proper:

(76) у гробу святою
    by grave-GEN.DUAL. holy-MASC.GEN.DUAL.
    “by the two saints’ graves” SBG 54/22
Other examples, particularly ones where the genitive-marked NP is inanimate, have reference point semantics without involving possession in any strict sense:

(77) где отошли есте сокровища живота моего where gone you-are treasure-NOM.PL. life-GEN.SG. my-MASC.GEN.SG. “where have you gone, my life’s treasures?” PBR 356/3

Again, it is clear that we are mostly dealing with a genitive construction that alternates with DA1 and DA2, i.e. GEN\_RESTR. Looking at all constructions involving genitives or adjectives and expressing RP\_INST, 59.4 % were adjective constructions (148 DA1 and 54 DA2), 36.2 % were instances of GEN\_COMPLEX, and 4.4 % were instances of GEN\_FREE. This suggests that some of the GEN\_COMPLEX occurrences may have been complex instances of the GEN\_FREE construction, but that the overwhelming majority must have been instances of GEN\_RESTR.

5.5.3 RP\_INST/INTRINSIC

If we are to trust the number of occurrences of GEN\_COMPLEX, RP\_INST/INTRINSIC is the semantic centre of gravity of the GEN\_RESTR construction. 267 such instances were found in the material of period 1. Looking at all genitive and adjective constructions with such semantics, we find a picture that is quite similar to the one found with non-intrinsic RP\_INST: There were 52.8 % adjective constructions, 42.7 % GEN\_COMPLEX and 4.5 % GEN\_FREE. That is, the adjective constructions were a little less frequent than with RP\_INST, the share of GEN\_COMPLEX was a little higher, and the share of GEN\_FREE was virtually the same. Again, the figures indicate that most of the GEN\_COMPLEX occurrences were instances of GEN\_RESTR. However, as we shall see, the situation varied somewhat according to the type of relational head noun in the constructions. Also, the semantic range of genitive-marked nouns in the GEN\_FREE constructions was wider with RP\_INST/INTRINSIC than with non-intrinsic RP\_INST, as will be shown in section 5.5.4.

The 267 occurrences were headed by a range of different relational nouns, such as deverbal nouns, kinship terms and nouns denoting other human relationships, deadjectival nouns, body parts, the noun imja “name”, and nouns denoting other inherent parts of wholes.

107 of the instances had a genitive-marked NP filling the subject elaboration site of a deverbal noun (vs. 88 DA1, 28 DA2 and 7 GEN\_FREE):

(78) казнить на Бь · нахоженьё поганьки punish us God-NOM. invasion-INSTR.SG. Pagan-MASC.GEN.PL. “God is punishing us with the Pagans’ invasion” SL 462/35–36
(79) по возвращении с победы князя
after return-LOC.SG. from victory-GEN.SG. prince-GEN.SG.
Александра
Aleksandr-GEN.SG.
“after prince Aleksandr’s return from victory” ŽAN 169/1–2

(80) молитвы святой няня
prayer-INSTR.PL. holy-FEM.GEN.SG. Mother-of-God-GEN.SG.
“by the prayers of the holy Mother of God” PVrL 158/19–20

18 of the instances were headed by kinship terms, vs. 66 DA1, 3 DA2 and 2 GENFREE. It is not unexpected that the DA1 construction was so clearly preferred, as the “possessor” is so often the name of a single person. The instances of GENCOMPLEX mostly contain names modified by titles (81), more than one possessor (82), or an inanimate possessor (with metaphorical interpretation) (83):

(81) сын великого царя Владимирова
son-VOC.SG. great-MASC.GEN.SG. tsar-GEN.SG. Vladimir-GEN.SG.
“o son of great tsar Vladimir” SDZ 11/2

(82) привезли ему на брак […] дочь
they-brought he-DAT. to marriage-ACC. daughter-ACC.SG
великого князя Дмитрия Костянтиновича,
great-MASC.GEN.SG. prince-GEN.SG. Dmitrij-GEN.SG. Konstantinovič-GEN.SG.
матери великой княгини Анны
mother-GEN.SG. great-FEM.GEN.SG. princess-GEN.SG. Anna-GEN.SG.
“they brought him to marry the daughter of grand prince Dmitrij Konstantinovič, of (her) mother grand princess Anna” ŽD 352/20–21

(83) сын нашего смирения
son-NOM.SG. our-NEUT.GEN.SG. humility-GEN.SG.
“the son of our humility” ŽSP 15/2

There were also four instances of GENREST with a head noun denoting other human relationship than kinship (vs. 10 DA1, 4 DA2 and no GENFREE):

(84) раби великого князя Юрия
slave-NOM.PL. great-MASC.GEN.SG. prince-GEN.SG. Jurij-GEN.SG.
Ингоревича Резанского
Ingorevič-GEN.SG. Rjazan’-ьск-MASC.GEN.SG.
“the slaves of grand prince Jurij Ingorevič of Rjazan’” PBR 352/7–8

81 of the instances of GENCOMPLEX were headed by nouns denoting body parts, vs. 28 DA1, 12 DA2 and 5 GENFREE. Thus, the share of GENCOMPLEX is rather large
compared to the figures for many of the other relational heads, suggesting that some of the occurrences are really complex instances of $\text{GEN}_{\text{FREE}}$.

(85) \[\text{мышца грьшны} скрушитсya} \]
\[\text{muscle-NOM.SG. sinful-GEN.PL. will-be-destroyed} \]
“the sinners’ muscle will be destroyed” PVM 242/4

(86) \[\text{предь лицьм} матеря своєа} \]
\[\text{before face-INSTR.SG. mother-GEN.SG. his-FEM.GEN.SG.} \]
“before his mother’s face” SBG 28/23

32 instances of $\text{GEN}_{\text{COMPLEX}}$ were headed by deadjectival nouns, vs. 23 $\text{DA1}$, 12 $\text{DA2}$ and as many as 11 $\text{GEN}_{\text{FREE}}$. Again, this indicates that a fair share of the occurrences of $\text{GEN}_{\text{COMPLEX}}$ may well be complex instances of $\text{GEN}_{\text{FREE}}$:

(87) \[\text{помышляше о красот} і о доброт} \]
\[\text{he-thought of beauty-LOC.SG. and of goodness-LOC.SG.} \]
“he thought of his body’s beauty and goodness” SBG 31/3–4

(88) \[\text{Увьдав силу ратных} \]
\[\text{having-found-out strength-ACC.SG. soldier-MASC.GEN.PL.} \]
“having found out the strength of the warriors” ŽAN 165/1

12 of the occurrences of $\text{GEN}_{\text{COMPLEX}}$ with RP\text{INST}/INTRINSIC semantics were headed by the noun $\text{имя}$ “name”, which is semantically rather close to a body part, vs. 4 $\text{DA1}$, 1 $\text{DA2}$, but no $\text{GEN}_{\text{FREE}}$. As with body part heads, the number of $\text{GEN}_{\text{COMPLEX}}$ is somewhat higher than expected from the number of $\text{DA1}$ and $\text{DA2}$ constructions, but the overall figures are rather low.

(89) \[\text{во има стьны} биа} \]
\[\text{in name-ACC.SG. holy-FEM.GEN.SG. Mother-of-God-GEN.SG.} \]
“in the name of the holy Mother of God” PVrL 158/18

The remaining occurrences of $\text{GEN}_{\text{COMPLEX}}$ with RP\text{INST}/INTRINSIC semantics were headed by various relational nouns, including nouns denoting results (non-deverbal) and inherent parts of wholes.

(90) \[\text{словеса усть моих} \]
\[\text{word-NOM.PL. lip-GEN.PL. my-GEN.PL.} \]
“the words of my lips” SDZ 22/6
The context of example (91) shows that the great altar is clearly topical, and therefore a reference point rather than just a filler of the elaboration site of the head noun.

As was stated in the beginning of section 5.5.3, an overall comparison of adjective and genitive constructions with RP\textsubscript{INST}/INTRINSIC indicated that most of the occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} were probably instances of GEN\textsubscript{RESTR}. The share of corresponding DA1 and DA2 constructions was generally larger than the share of occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX}, and there were not that many certain occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{FREE}. There is good reason to believe that RP\textsubscript{INST}/INTRINSIC is really the semantic centre of gravity of the GEN\textsubscript{RESTR} construction. However, a more detailed look showed us that occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} greatly outnumbered DA1 and DA2 when the constructions were headed by a noun denoting a body part. Even though the number of certain instances of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} was low with body part heads, this could indicate that a fair share of the GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} occurrences might actually be complex instances of GEN\textsubscript{FREE}. A similar tendency might also be present with constructions headed by \textit{imja} “name” or deadjectival nouns. We will keep this in mind when looking at GEN\textsubscript{FREE}.

### 5.5.4 INTRINSIC

187 instances of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} involving an intrinsic relationship, but no reference point, were found in the material of period 1. As long as a reference point was involved, we saw that, on the whole, the share of occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} was a bit lower than the share of corresponding DA1 and DA2 constructions, whereas the share of unequivocal instances of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} was generally low. Thus, the occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} seemed to coincide roughly with the occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{RESTR}. With no reference points, but only intrinsic relationships involved, this is no longer the case. Only 34 DA1 constructions with INTRINSIC semantics only were found in the material of period 1. As for DA2 constructions, they were quite abundant with INTRINSIC semantics, 153 occurrences, but as we saw in section 5.4.5, the occurrences belonged to very few and specialised types. Certain instances of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} were quite copious, with 98 occurrences. Thus, in this category, a fair share of the occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} were probably complex instances of GEN\textsubscript{FREE}. 

(91) 

\begin{verbatim}
(91) ддп днѣръ вѣликаго олтара

to door-GEN.PL. great-MASC GEN.SG. altar-GEN.SG.

“to the great altar’s doors” ChID 20v/8–9
\end{verbatim}
5.5.4.1 Intrinsic with relational head

Again, we find a good range of relational heads involved in the constructions: deverbals, nouns denoting inherent parts of wholes, ruler nouns, representation nouns and some others.

63 of the occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} had genitive-marked NPs filling an elaboration site of a deverbal noun. In comparison, there were only 31 corresponding DA1 constructions, and just four corresponding DA2 constructions, but 22 certain instances of GEN\textsubscript{FREE}. Recall from sections 5.3.4 and 5.4.5 that many of the DA1 constructions in question had strong unit status, and that RP\textsubscript{TYPE} readings were possible for at least two of the DA2 constructions. Therefore, there are quite strong arguments in favour of the hypothesis that the majority of the occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} with genitive-marked NPs filling elaboration sites of deverbal nouns are in fact not instances of GEN\textsubscript{RESTR}, but of complex GEN\textsubscript{FREE}.

Most of the occurrences have genitives corresponding to regular accusative objects of the counterpart verbs. The deverbal nouns involved are often very productive (formed with the suffix -ie) and “verbal” in character:

(92) на похваление предобраго господина
to praising-ACC.SG. excellent-MASC.GEN.SG. lord-GEN.SG.
“in order to praise the excellent lord” ŽD 363/7

(93) Не бысть памяти ни единому же о
not was memory-GEN. not one-DAT. PARTICLE about
възискании телесе святаго
searching-for body-GEN.SG. holy-MASC.GEN.SG.
“No one had any idea of looking for the saint’s body” SBG 44/3

We also find deverbal nouns that are quite “verbal” in character, but of non-productive types:

(94) любвь р̆а ст̆ы т̆х̆ь
love-GEN.SG. for-the-sake-of holy-NEUT.GEN.PL. that-NEUT.GEN.PL.
мѣсть
place-GEN.PL.
“for the sake of the love for those holy places” ChID 10r/11

Agent nouns are also common:

(95) да будеть в̆мѣстьникъ б̆ крове
may be avenger-NOM.SG. God-NOM. blood-GEN.SG.
There were also a few $\text{GEN}\text{COMPLEX}$ constructions with elaboration sites corresponding to genitive objects (96), and, surprisingly, also to dative objects (97), even though the dative construction seems to have been perfectly available for use in such cases.

(96) 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>чаюне надежи</th>
<th>велика</th>
<th>[Бěа]</th>
<th>и</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hoping</td>
<td>hope</td>
<td>great</td>
<td>God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>спса</td>
<td>our</td>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td>Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>нашего</td>
<td>your</td>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td>Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ИсХа</td>
<td>Jesus-ABB</td>
<td>Christ-GEN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“longing for the hope of the great God and of our saviour Jesus Christ” PVrL 131/26–27.

(97) 

| Да  не  будет [...]  рука  тваа  согбена  на |
| may  not  be  hand-NOM  your-NOM  closed  to |
| подание  убогих       |
| giving  poor-MASC-GEN-PL |

“may your hand not be closed to giving to the poor” SDZ 16/1

61 occurrences of $\text{GEN}\text{COMPLEX}$ were headed by relational nouns that were not deverbal. In comparison, there were only three instances of corresponding DA1 constructions, and although there were 75 corresponding DA2 constructions, as many as 72 of these were headed by ruler nouns. There were 35 certain occurrences of $\text{GEN}\text{FREE}$, but 29 of these were headed by nouns denoting inherent parts of wholes, and only 3 by ruler nouns. Therefore, there is reason to believe that most of the instances not headed by ruler nouns are actually instances of $\text{GEN}\text{FREE}$ rather than $\text{GEN}\text{RESTR}$.

37 of the occurrences were headed by nouns denoting inherent parts of wholes (no instances of DA1 or DA2, 29 certain occurrences of $\text{GEN}\text{FREE}$):

(98) 

| на  бреть   | быстрои  | Каялы |
| on  bank-LOC  | fast-FEM  | Kajala-GEN |
| бреть        | bank-LOC  | Kajala-GEN |

“on the bank of the fast Kajala” SPI 49/3

There are many instances where days and years are clearly understood as parts of wholes:

---

(99) да живоу в домоу Гвни вса
that I-live in house-LOC. Lord’s all-MASC.ACC.PL.
дни живота моего
day-ACC.PL. life-GEN.PL. my-MASC.GEN.PL.
“that I may live in the house of the Lord all the days of my life” ŽSP 6/26

There were ten instances of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} with an intrinsic relationship between a ruler noun and its subjects. As there were as many as 72 corresponding DA2 constructions, and only three certain occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{FREE}, it is fair to interpret most of these as instances of GEN\textsubscript{RESTR}:

(100) велики князь Дмитрий Иванович
great-MASC.NOM.PL. prince-NOM.PL. Dmitrij-NOM.PL. Ivanovič-NOM.PL.
все Руси
all-FEM.GEN.PL. Rus’-GEN.PL.
“grand prince Dmitrij Ivanovič of all Rus’” ŽD 358/19

Seven of the occurrences were headed by representation nouns (vs. three DA1, no DA2 and one certain GEN\textsubscript{FREE}):

(101) пред икону госпожа наша, пречиста
before icon-ACC.PL. lady-GEN.PL. our-FEM.GEN.PL. immaculate-FEM.GEN.PL.
Богородица
mother-of-god-GEN.PL.
“before the icon of our Lady, the immaculate Mother of God” BNS 446/14

The remaining seven occurrences were headed by miscellaneous relational nouns, such as a kinship term with a clearly non-reference-point genitive (102), and an offspring noun (103):

(102) аже буудоутъ двою моужъ дтъи а
if they-will-be two-MASC.GEN. man-GEN.DUAL. child-NOM.PL. but
одиной мтри
one-FEM.GEN.PL. mother-GEN.PL.
“but if they should be the children of two men but one mother” RP 47/705–706

(103) уже ли забыли есте [...] единые
already QUESTION PARTICLE forgotten you-have one-FEM.GEN.PL.
утробы честнаго плода матери
womb-GEN.PL. honourable-MASC.GEN.PL. fruit-GEN.PL. mother-GEN.PL.
нашей велики княгини Агрепины
our-FEM.GEN.PL. great-FEM.GEN.PL. princess-GEN.PL. Agrepena-GEN.PL.
Ростиславна
Rostislavna-GEN.PL.
“Have you already forgotten the honourable fruit of the one womb of our mother – grand princess Agrepena Rostislavna” PBR 356/7–9

Thus, it seems quite clear that the GENFREE construction, as expected, is used with relational head nouns denoting parts of wholes. However, it is also used to a great extent with deverbal head nouns, when the genitive-marked NP fills some kind of object elaboration site. When the head noun is a ruler noun, however, we see a clear division of labour between the DA2 construction and the GENRESTR construction.

5.5.4.2 INTRINSIC with non-relational head
There were 62 instances of GENCOMPLEX where there was deemed to be an intrinsic relationship, not involving a reference point situation, between a non-relational head noun and a genitive modifier. There were no examples at all of corresponding DA1 constructions, but as many as 81 instances of corresponding DA2 constructions, and 41 certain occurrences of GENFREE. That is, of all adjective and genitive constructions of this category, 44 % were DA2, 33.7 % were GENCOMPLEX, and 22.3 % were certain instances of GENFREE. This suggests that some of the occurrences of GENCOMPLEX are instances of GENRESTR and correspond with the DA2 constructions, while others must be instances of complex GENFREE constructions. The more a construction tended towards strong unit status, the more likely it would be to be an occurrence of GENRESTR, since it would then normally correspond to DA2 constructions and not to constructions with bare genitive-marked nouns.

In 11 of the instances, the relationship was one of identity, i.e. the genitive-marked NP was in semantic apposition to the head noun (vs. 16 DA2 and 27 certain GENFREE):

(104) а родился помощевого 9 куны
and from fine-GEN.SG. fee-MASC.GEN.SG. 9 kuna-GEN.PL.
“and of the fine there is a nine kuna fee” RP 31/155–156

(105) и взято от земли о совокуплении
and rejoiced all-NOM. land-NOM. about union-LOC.SG.
брока ею
marriage-GEN.SG. they-GEN.DUAL.
“and all of the land rejoiced at the union of their marriage” ŽD 352/21

In the remaining 51 instances, the intrinsic relationships had various interpretations, depending on the nature of head noun and modifier. The most frequent interpretation was place of origin (106), and the related origin (107) and source (108). There were 28 such instances (vs. 33 DA2 instances and 13 certain GENFREE).
(106) Михаил чернец манастира Студиискаго
Michaił NOM.SG. monk NOM. SG. monastery GEN.SG. Studiiskij-MASC. GEN.SG.
“Michail, a monk of the Studiiskij monastery” PVrL 160/4

(107) государи рода Владимера Святославича
lord NOM.PL. lineage GEN.SG. Vladimer GEN.SG. Svjatoslavić GEN.SG.
“lords of the lineage of Vladimir Svjatoslavić” PBR 358/21

(108) и всего народа людии
and all-MASC. GEN.SG. people GEN.SG. person- NOM.PL.
“and persons from all of the population” SL 463/12–13

The GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} occurrences could also have locative/temporal interpretations (like the many corresponding DA2 constructions):

(109) Отцу же его [...] оставлюшо житие
father-DAT. PARTICLE his having-left-DAT. life ACC.SG.
свёта сего
world GEN.SG. this MASC. GEN.SG.
“But when his father had left the life in this world” ŽD 352/4

The remaining occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} with an intrinsic relationship but a non-relational head had miscellaneous interpretations that are familiar from the semantics of the genitive case on the whole. The genitive-marked NPs tended to express what the head nouns were part of (110), consisted of (111), contained (112) and similar meanings. These occurrences are most likely to be instances of GEN\textsubscript{FREE}, not GEN\textsubscript{RESTR}, since they generally correspond to constructions with bare genitive-marked nouns, not with DA constructions, and since their semantics are generally closely related to the part–whole semantics so central to the GEN\textsubscript{FREE} construction.

(110) многие книги почитавшо, вестхаго
many FEM ACC.PL. book ACC.PL. having-read DAT. ancient MASC. GEN.SG.
и новый завет
and new MASC. GEN.SG. testament GEN.SG.
“having read many books of the Old and New Testament” ŽSP 5/10

(111) о селище народе людей
about such MASC. LOC.SG. people LOC.SG. person GEN.PL.
православных
orthodox MASC. GEN.PL.
“about such a population of Orthodox people” PBR 354/12

\textsuperscript{71} Žitie “life” is of course a deverbal noun, but světa sего does not fill an elaboration site in its semantic base, at least not one corresponding to an obligatory argument of the noun’s verbal counterpart.
5.5.5 Reappraisal of the distribution of GEN\textsubscript{RESTR}

As we have seen, the distribution of GEN\textsubscript{RESTR} is not identical to that of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX}. GEN\textsubscript{RESTR} has a division of labour with DA1 and DA2, but GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} was found with several types of semantics that were very rare or not found at all with DA1 and DA2. DA1 was almost absent with INTRINSIC semantics, and DA2 was also rare or absent with a non-RP intrinsic relationship between adjectives and deverbal nouns, nouns denoting inherent parts of wholes, and possibly also representation nouns. DA2 was fairly frequent when there was an intrinsic relationship between a non-relational head noun and an adjective, but only with a place-of-origin/locative interpretation. Thus, it seems fair to say that in general, INTRINSIC without reference point is not the domain of GEN\textsubscript{RESTR}. The exception is constructions headed by ruler nouns and constructions with the related place-of-origin/location semantics: Here the GEN\textsubscript{RESTR} construction interacts closely with DA2.

As with DA1 constructions, RP\textsubscript{INST} and RP\textsubscript{INST}/INTRINSIC certainly make up the semantic centre of gravity of the GEN\textsubscript{RESTR} construction. However, even with RP\textsubscript{INST}/INTRINSIC we found a discrepancy in numbers between DA1/DA2 and GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX}: With nouns denoting body parts, the number of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} occurrences was clearly higher than expected from the number of DA1 and DA2 constructions. Also, the certain occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} with RP\textsubscript{INST}/INTRINSIC had a semantically wider range of genitive-marked nouns than those with non-intrinsic RP\textsubscript{INST}. Thus, the RP\textsubscript{INST}/INTRINSIC column in chart 5.3 is probably taller than it should be in a correct representation of the distribution of GEN\textsubscript{RESTR}.

5.6 GEN\textsubscript{FREE}

As with the GEN\textsubscript{RESTR} construction, there is no sure-fire way to get an exact count of the occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{FREE}. However, if one counts all instances of constructions involving a single genitive-marked noun, one is bound to count only, but not all, occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{FREE}. Thus, the distribution sketched in figure 5.5 and more accurately illustrated in chart 5.4, is probably quite reliable, even though the figures they are based on do not involve GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX}, and therefore probably constitute only a part – perhaps roughly half or even less – of the real occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{FREE}. 

I did not place tables of manifold foods before them” SDZ 9/2
Figure 5.5 The GEN_{FREE} construction in the possessive conceptual space, 11th–14th century

Chart 5.4 The distribution of the Old Russian GEN_{FREE} construction, 1000–1400

GEN_{free}, 1000–1400 (n=149)
Again, figure and chart reveal a construction with a very clear centre of gravity: 65.8% of the certain occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} in the material of period 1 had INTRINSIC semantics without a reference point situation. A little more than half of these constructions were headed by relational nouns, whereas a little less than half had non-relational heads.

5.6.1 RP\textsubscript{TYPE} and RP\textsubscript{INST} with strong unit status
There were no instances at all of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} constructions denoting RP\textsubscript{TYPE} or RP\textsubscript{INST} with strong unit status in the material from period 1.

5.6.2 RP\textsubscript{INST} without intrinsic relationship
15 instances were found of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} involving only a reference point on instance level, with no intrinsic relationship. Five of them occurred in the [въ NP-GEN место] construction, which means “in the place of/instead of NP-GEN” and clearly is a partly lexically specific construction in its own right, consistently occurring with the genitive, whether the genitive-marked NP is complex or not:

(113) въ пса место
in dog-GEN.SG. place-ACC.SG.
“instead of a dog” RP 37/370

(114) въ исака место сын свое
in Isaac-GEN.SG. place-ACC.SG. son-GEN.SG. his-MASC-GEN.SG.
“instead of Isaac, his son” ChID 22r/7

In the remaining ten instances of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} of this category, the genitive-marked noun is always inanimate, and mostly abstract. Three of the constructions are [день NP-GEN] “the day of x” constructions:

(115) въ день же торжества
on day-ACC.SG. PARTICLE triumph-GEN.SG.
“on the day of triumph” ŽD 363/12

(116) не пожънъте класса не уже съзърѣвша, нь млечо безълюбия носяща
not you-cut ear-GEN.not already having-ripened-GEN. but milk-ACC.SG. innocence-GEN.SG. carrying-GEN.
“do not cut the ear of corn which has not yet ripened, but is still carrying the milk of innocence” SBG 41/10

\(^{72}\) This example comes from an unclear passage and is not wholly reliable.

\(^{73}\) This example may also be interpreted as an appositional construction, where the milk and the innocence are metaphorically the same.
None of the examples outside the \[\nu\v\text{NP-GEN} \text{město}\] construction denote concrete objects.

Taking a closer look at the ten inanimate and mostly abstract genitive-marked nouns involved in these constructions, we find that many of them do not easily form denominal adjectives, and that several of them have a corresponding adjective with either a purely qualitative meaning, or an ambiguous adjective. A look in Sreznevskij 1893–1912/1989 and SRJa yields no denominal adjective formed from \textit{tvržestvo} “triumph”; only corresponding, but clearly qualitative adjectives to \textit{bezvlobie} “innocence”, \textit{sila} “strength”, \textit{and zarja} “dawn”; and ambiguous adjectives for \textit{nečeste} “sin” and \textit{mir} “peace”, with both a qualitative and a “relative” reading: for instance, \textit{mirnyi} can mean “peaceful” as well as appearing in DA2 constructions within the possessive conceptual space. However, both SRJa and Sreznevskij do have examples of DA2 constructions with RP\textit{INST} semantics featuring unambiguous adjectives formed from three of the nouns in question: \textit{postnyi} (from \textit{post} “Lent”), \textit{pokajannyi} (from \textit{pokajanie} “remorse”) and \textit{všekrěsnyi} (from \textit{všekrěsenie} “resurrection”). Thus it is not \textit{impossible} to form denominal adjectives even from some highly abstract and regular deverbal nouns in \textit{-ie}, but the authors do seem reluctant to do it.

These findings accord well with Bratishenko’s observations. Her analysis (Bratishenko 1998:85–86) is that the number of attestations with bare genitive modifiers increases when an adjective formed from the noun in question involves one of the suffixes lower on the hierarchy (i.e. \textit{-ěsk-}, \textit{-bn-}). The feature motivating this phenomenon is definiteness, in her opinion, which she considers to be lacking in both the suffixes lower on the hierarchy and in the noun stems with which they correlate. That is, when an inanimate noun is definite, it is more likely to occur as a bare genitive than as a denominal adjective with a type 2 suffix. In the terms of the present dissertation, this could be reformulated to a claim that GEN\textit{FREE} constructions are much more likely to appear with RP\textit{INST} semantics than DA2 constructions when a noun (stem) is low in animacy/personhood: the GEN\textit{FREE} construction being, in a manner of speaking, the lesser of two evils. However, the situation seems to be more complex, as there are clearly some noun stems that for semantic and possibly other reasons do not form denominal adjectives, even with the suffixes at the bottom of Bratishenko’s hierarchy. Also, as we shall see in the three following subsections, the

\footnote{This is not surprising, as all of these nouns are deadjectival.}
feature of definiteness (or the presence or absence of a reference point) is probably not enough to account for the preponderance of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} with INTRINSIC semantics.

5.6.3 RP\textsubscript{INST}/INTRINSIC
There were 28 instances of non-complex GEN\textsubscript{FREE} constructions involving both a reference point on instance level and an intrinsic relationship in the material of period 1 – almost twice as many as the occurrences with only RP\textsubscript{INST}. Again, the constructions involved a number of types of relational head nouns, such as deverbal nouns, nouns denoting inherent parts of wholes and body parts, and deadjectival nouns.

Seven of the occurrences had a genitive-marked noun filling the subject elaboration site of a deverbal noun. The genitive-marked nouns involved are very different from those involved in constructions with non-intrinsic RP\textsubscript{INST}: Three of them were actually animate, though none of them were proper nouns. Two of them had clearly definite reference:

(118) пріймь заповдь Съдѣтеля
having-received commandment-ACC.SG. creator-GEN.SG.
“having received the Creator’s commandment” ŽD 365/8

(119) преизлишныя любве и добродѣтели царя
most-copious-GEN.FEM.SG.love-GEN.SG. and virtue-GEN.SG. tsar-GEN.SG.
nиктоже прилагаю
nobody-NOM. adding
“nobody adding to the Tsar’s immense love and virtue” ŽD 361/6\textsuperscript{75}

The third animate genitive-marked noun seems to have generic reference, and is approaching RP\textsubscript{TYPE}:

(120) дѣло сотвори благовѣстника
deed-ACC.SG. do preacher-GEN.SG.
“do the preacher’s deed” ŽSP 15/17

The remaining four occurrences had genitive-marked inanimate, but concrete nouns:

(121) оть болѣни сердца
from pain-GEN.SG. heart-GEN.SG.
“from the(ir) heart’s pain” SKT 19/9

\textsuperscript{75} This example comes from an unclear passage.
(122) И абиye узъyë [...] блистание оружия
and immediately he-saw gleaming-ACC.SG. weapons-GEN.SG.
“and immediately he saw the gleaming of the weapons” SBG 35/5

Not unexpectedly, there were some instances headed by nouns denoting inherent parts of wholes. All four of them involved inanimate, concrete genitive-marked nouns:

(123) до устья Волги
to mouth-GEN.SG. Volga-GEN.SG.
“to the Volga’s mouth” ŽAN 174/8

Findings of GENFREE with nouns denoting body parts were also expected, due to the discrepancy of occurrences of GENCOMPLEX compared to DA constructions with such head nouns. Four such examples were found, three of which had animate genitive-marked nouns, including one proper noun (124):

(124) лице же его - аки лице Иосифа
face-NOM. PARTICLE his like face-NOM.SG. Joseph-GEN.SG.
“but his face was like Joseph’s face” ŽAN 160/13

(125) has an animate, but collective noun:

(125) глась народа
voice-NOM.SG. people-GEN.SG.
“the people’s voice” SBG 66/1

In (126), the genitive-marked noun is inanimate and abstract, and the construction has a metaphorical reading:

(126) да не придетъ на ны нога гордыня
that not will-come on us-ACC. foot-NOM.SG. pride-GEN.SG.
“that the foot of pride may not come upon us” SBG 51/1

Quite unexpectedly, there were as many as nine examples of GENFREE with RPINST/INTRINSIC headed by deadjectival nouns. However, all of these had inanimate genitive-marked nouns, and eight of them were abstract, much like the situation with GENFREE with non-intrinsic RPINST. Also, the examples came from two texts only, both of the religious genre: seven from the Life of Prince Dmitrij (ŽD) and two from the Life of Stefan of Perm’ (ŽSP). (127) is a typical example:
There was only one instance headed by a kinship term, with a somewhat unclear meaning.

To sum up, GEN\textsubscript{FREE} was more frequent with RP\textsubscript{INST}/INSTR\_FREE than with non-intrinsic RP\textsubscript{INST}. Also, the occurrences seemed to be considerably less motivated by the semantics of the genitive-marked noun and the possibility of forming a denominal adjective.

5.6.4 INSTR\_FREE with relational head
This is the unequivocal semantic centre of gravity of the GEN\textsubscript{FREE} construction: there were 57 occurrences (38.3 % of all certain GEN\textsubscript{FREE} occurrences) in the material of period 1. This was fully expected, as GEN\textsubscript{FREE} is the obvious, if not only, choice with relational nouns denoting inherent parts of wholes. Recall that GEN\textsubscript{FREE} constructions headed by a noun denoting measure were not counted, since the genitive has no competition here, as with the closely related construction with substantival numerals. If constructions with numeral heads and numeral-like heads, such as in (128), had been included, this would have strengthened this impression even more:

(128) множество змий и скорпиони
multitude-ACC.SG. snake-GEN.PL. and scorpion-GEN.PL.
“a multitude of snakes and scorpions” PVrL 39/23

However, the well-known “partitive” constructions are not solely responsible for the prevalence of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} with this type of semantics. 22 of the examples actually had a genitive-marked noun filling an object elaboration site of a deverbal noun, 19 of them corresponding to regular accusative objects:

(129) в пущенье грехов
in forgiveness-ACC.SG. sin-GEN.PL.
“for the forgiveness of sins (in order to have their sins forgiven)” PVrL 121/3

(130) не крове дела пролитых помазаник
not blood-GEN.SG. because-of shedding-GEN.SG. anointed-one-NOM.
Божий Давид прелюбодейниє створи
God’s David-NOM. adultery-ACC. committed
“it was not because of the shedding of blood that God’s anointed one, David, committed adultery” PVM 253/27
The remaining three constructions had genitive-marked nouns corresponding to dative/locative/PP objects. Recall that the verb *nadějatisja* “hope”, corresponding to *nadeža* “hope” in (130), may take genitive, dative, locative or PP objects (cf. Sreznevskij 1902/1989:284, SRJa 10 (1983):68–69):

(130) **въ надежду въскрещения**
in hope-ACC.SG. resurrection-GEN.SG.  
“in the hope of resurrection” SBG 52/17

The verb *služiti* “serve”, corresponding to *sluga* “servant” in (131), takes a dative object.

(131) **о врагъ и слугъ злобы**
by enemy-GEN.PL. and servant-GEN.PL. evil-GEN.SG.  
“by the enemies and the servants of evil” PVrL 41/10

When it comes to the semantics of the genitive-marked nouns involved, we see much the same as in GEN\_FREE with non-intrinsic RP\_INST: None of the nouns are animate, and a full 18 of them are abstract, as in (129), (131) and (132), whereas only four are concrete. This is probably also due to the typical semantics of objects, not only the semantics of the GEN\_FREE construction.

35 GEN\_FREE constructions with INTRINSIC were headed by non-deverbal relational nouns. As expected, the overwhelming majority of these relational nouns denoted inherent parts of wholes; this was the case in 29 of the examples.

(133) **о б онь полъ города**
at that-MASC.ACC.SG. half-ACC.SG. city-GEN.SG.  
“at the other part of the city” PVrL 109/4

(134) **при край моря**
by edge-LOC.SG. sea-GEN.SG.  
“by the edge of the sea” ŽAN 165/2

(135) **до конца своду**
to end-GEN.SG. interrogation-GEN.SG.  
“until the end of the interrogation” RP 35/295

Of the remaining six constructions, three were headed by ruler nouns (136), two by nouns denoting fruit/offspring (137), and one by a representation noun (138):
5.6.5 INTRINSIC with non-relational head

There were 41 instances of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} with an intrinsic relationship between a non-relational head and a non-reference point genitive-marked noun. In 27 of these instances, the head and the genitive-marked noun were in semantic apposition, i.e. had the same referent. In fact, these occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} constitute 49.7 % of all constructions with an intrinsic relationship of apposition in the material of period 1.

13 occurrences had intrinsic relationships other than apposition between the elements of the construction. In four of the examples, the genitive-marked noun expressed what the head noun consisted of:
There were three examples of the emphatic construction seen in (143). This type of construction clearly has something in common with constructions with a relationship of apposition between the elements; the referent is the same, and even the noun is identical:

(143) в вёкы вёка
in eternity-ACC.PL. eternity-GEN.SG.
“in all eternity” PVM 242/15

Three of the examples are actually headed by deverbal nouns, but the genitive-marked nouns do not fill the elaboration sites of the deverbal nouns in these constructions. In (144), the genitive-marked noun expresses the purpose of the action:

(144) ыкоже пре' пряхъ д тебе [...] 
like before I-accepted from you-GEN.
роукоположение сьенства
consecration-ACC.SG. clergy-GEN.
“like I formerly accepted the consecration to the clergy from you” ŽSP 17/13

The genitive-marked nouns in the final three examples are best interpreted as expressing a whole, such as in (145), and attending circumstances, such as in (146):

(145) А новгородцевъ паде пятьнадесять мужь
but Novgorodian-GEN.PL. fell fifteen man-GEN.PL.
“But of the Novgorodians fifteen men fell” BNS 444/13

(146) предс'ланьемь словесь оучитель препираша 
mastery-INSTR.SG. word-GEN.PL. teachers-ACC.=GEN. he-convinced
“with his mastery of words he convinced the teachers” ŽD 361/26

5.6.6 GEN_free and GEN_restr

GEN_free, then, seems to be a construction strongly conditioned by the presence of an intrinsic relationship of some kind. True, a few instances were found where the construction expressed a reference point situation only. Mostly, such instances were found in cases where the choice of GEN_free was apparently the lesser of two evils, as a DA construction was either unavailable, ambiguous or undesirable for other reasons. This chiefly occurred with abstract genitive-marked nouns. However, when an intrinsic relationship was involved, the motivation for using GEN_free certainly changed: When the construction expressed the relationship between a deverbal noun

76 The construction is a calque from Greek, where it in its turn is a calque from Hebrew, and has come into Old Russian from the OCS translations of the New Testament (Večerka 1993:195).
77 The verb form looks like 3rd person plural, but it is clear from the context that it must be singular.
and a genitive-marked noun which filled the subject elaboration site of the deverbal noun, at the same time as serving as a reference point, I found several animate genitive-marked nouns. This was also the case with constructions headed by nouns denoting body parts. With constructions which expressed only an intrinsic relationship between genitive-marked noun and relational head noun, there seemed to be few restrictions on the semantics of the genitive-marked noun. With head nouns denoting inherent parts of wholes, there certainly were no restrictions. When the genitive-marked noun filled the object elaboration site of a deverbal noun, the occurrences in my material were all inanimate and mostly abstract. However, the scarceness of DA constructions with the same semantics suggests that this may have been due more to the prototypical features of objects, than to a semantic restriction on what genitive-marked nouns can appear in a GEN\textsubscript{FREE} construction. In cases of intrinsic relationships between a non-relational head noun and a genitive-marked noun, GEN\textsubscript{FREE} occurred quite freely with various interpretations, most of which were related to the notion of partitivity, so central to most constructions involving the genitive. The notion of the genitive expressing the whole of which something is a part is very close to the notion of the genitive being what something consists of. Likewise, it is no wonder that the use of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} to express the relationship between a relational noun denoting a part and a noun filling the elaboration site denoting the whole, should be extended to other relational nouns. This may be illustrated in a tentative semantic network for GEN\textsubscript{FREE}. The schema “intrinsic relationship” is schematic not only to part–whole relationships, but also to relationships between other types of relational nouns and the entities filling their elaboration sites (cf. sections 4.2 and 4.3.1).
This impression tallies well with the appraisal of the distribution of GEN\textsubscript{RESTR} in section 5.5.5. GEN\textsubscript{RESTR}, like DA1, is mostly a construction for reference point situations on instance level, sometimes with strong unit status. In addition, it shares with DA2 the job of expressing the relationship between ruler nouns and the noun filling their elaboration site, and related relationships without ruler nouns, and also some kinds of appositional relationships. The DA2 and GEN\textsubscript{RESTR} constructions that do not involve a reference point situation are generally of a kind that often has strong unit status. Thus, like DA1 and DA2, GEN\textsubscript{RESTR} has only limited use where there is no reference point situation present, only an intrinsic relationship, and it seems to have much less of the typical genitive semantics of GEN\textsubscript{FREE}.

5.7 DAT

The DAT construction is much less frequent than the constructions we have discussed so far. Whereas there were 450 instances of DA1 constructions, 852 DA2 constructions and 787 GEN\textsubscript{RESTR} and GEN\textsubscript{FREE} constructions put together, there were only 150 fairly certain instances of DAT constructions within the possessive conceptual space. A problem in identifying these constructions is the frequency of variants of the construction that is often called the external possession construction (Payne and Barshi 1999). In Old Russian, the construction is typically [NP-NOM, V, NP-DAT, NP-ACC], where the accusative-marked NP is the object, and the dative-marked object is more like an affected dative object of the verb than a dative

\textsuperscript{78} An ellipsis (three dots) in a box indicates that the type of head noun is not specified.
possessor. It is often very difficult to decide whether we are dealing with a [NP, NP-DAT] construction in its own right, or just a part of the external possession construction:79

(147) притрепа славу дёду своему
he-ruined glory-ACC.SG. grandfather-DAT.SG. his-MASC.DAT.SG.

Всеславу
Vseslav-DAT.SG.
“he ruined the glory of/for his grandfather Vseslav” SPI 53/11–12

This makes the number of DAT constructions with uncertain semantics quite high.

In figure 5.7, the DAT construction is placed in the possessive conceptual space, and its distribution is more accurately illustrated in chart 5.5. Again, the lighter red field illustrates the full distribution of the construction, while the darker red field marks it semantic centre of gravity.

Figure 5.7 The DAT construction in the possessive conceptual space

---

79 In any case, the DAT construction and the external possession construction must have been closely linked in the greater network of dative constructions, and it is reasonable to assume that the distinction was rather fuzzy, with intermediary occurrences.
Chart 5.5 The distribution of the Old Russian DAT construction, 1000–1400

Chart 5.5 shows a distribution that is remarkably like that of GEN_{FREE}. INTRINSIC with relational head, but without a reference point situation, is clearly the semantic centre of gravity of DAT as well, constituting 47.3% of all occurrences of DAT. Likewise, RP_{INST}/INTRINSIC is frequent with DAT, whereas INTRINSIC with non-relational head is even rarer than with GEN_{FREE}. However, there is a central difference between GEN_{FREE} and DAT: The DAT construction has strong links with other dative constructions, and with the pervading and homogeneous dative semantics associated with all of them, where most dative-marked NPs are affected target(s) in some way (cf. Dąbrowska 1997). DAT has a strong flavour of being the result of a natural semantic extension of such typical dative meanings, and inadvertently ending up in the possessive conceptual space, and finding itself in competition with the other possessive constructions. The strong links with other dative constructions also makes the DAT construction very suitable with animate “possessors”, as opposed to the GEN_{FREE} construction, which tends to be avoided with animates. In figure 5.7, an attempt has been made to illustrate this point: While GEN_{FREE} was located right in the centre of the possessive conceptual space in figure 5.5, DAT is peripheral, and located on the outskirts of the possessive conceptual space.

5.7.1 RP_{TYPE} and RP_{INST} with strong unit status
No DAT constructions were found with this type of semantics.
5.7.2 RP_{INST} without intrinsic relationship

Only eleven instances of DAT could be argued to involve a reference point, but no intrinsic relationship. Several of these still appear to have a clear “dative flavour”, with the possibility of a benefactive interpretation. (148) and (149) below have a fairly unequivocal reference point reading, although they are far from involving prototypical possession:80

(148) Нъ уже, княже, Игорю утръпѣ
but already prince-VOC. Igor-DAT. vanished
солнцю свѣть
sun-DAT.SG. light-NOM.SG.
“but already, o prince, the light of the sun had vanished for Igor” SPI 52/26

(149) прежде приближення браку чистотоу
before closeness-GEN.SG. marriage-DAT.SG. purity-ACC.SG.
съхранившимъ
having-preserved-INSTR.SG.
“having preserved his purity before the closeness of marriage” ŽD 364/21

(151) зерцало житю
mirror-NOM.SG. life-DAT.SG.
“(he is) life’s mirror” ŽD 355/12

(152) вѣнець побѣде
crown-NOM.SG. victory-DAT.SG.
“(he is) victory’s crown” ŽD 355/10

An interesting point is that ten out of the eleven examples contained a bare dative-marked noun. In fact, this is a general tendency for DAT constructions from all parts of the possessive conceptual space: Out of 151 occurrences, 103 contained bare dative-marked nouns. This suggests that DAT was a construction one could resort to when an adjective construction was unavailable or undesirable, and GEN\textsubscript{FREE} did not seem suitable either.

80 Světъ “light” in example (148) could be argued to be a relational noun, if the source of the light were considered as a necessary part of the noun’s semantic base, though I have decided not to do so. Približenje “closeness” in example (149) is clearly a deverbal noun, but the dative-marked noun braku “marriage” does not fill any of its elaboration sites.
5.7.3 RP\text{\textsubscript{INST}}/INTRINSIC

38 of the DAT constructions in the material of period 1 were deemed to involve both a reference point situation and an intrinsic relationship. The constructions were headed by relational nouns of various types, most of which were highly compatible with the very core of dative semantics: that of a person surrounded by a personal sphere, and affected by something happening or located in that personal sphere (cf. Dąbrowska 1997, who borrows the concept from Wierzbicka 1988, but in a wider sense). A DAT construction may be drawn as in figure 5.8:

![Figure 5.8 Typical dative semantics: A noun is located in the personal sphere of a dative referent, affecting it (based on Berg-Olsen 2005)](image)

The relational nouns found most frequently in DAT constructions with RP\text{\textsubscript{INST}}/INTRINSIC denote kinship, body parts or names, or are deadjectival nouns or deverbal nouns with the dative filling a subject elaboration site. All of these would typically have an animate and affected noun filling their elaboration sites.

There were nine DAT constructions with dative-marked nouns filling subject elaboration sites of deverbal nouns. Věra “faith” is a deverbal noun requiring an experiencer subject, a typical affected dative referent:

(152) \text{а} въроно спасаемымь сила Божия
\text{but} faith-INSTR. saved-DAT.PL. power-NOM. God’s

есть
is
“but God’s power exists through the faith of the saved” SBG 53/8

In (153), the DAT construction lends a flavour of modality to the deverbal nouns involved, the dative referent is \textit{obliged} to rise:

(153) сеи лежать на востание. и на
this-NOM. lies to rising-ACC.SG. and to
In (154), again, we find the possibility of a benefactive interpretation or at least nuance. (The example is from the same series of praising epithets to Dmitrij Donskoj as examples (150) and (151) in section 5.7.2. *Pristanišče* is a deverbal locative noun, denoting the place where one docks.)

(154) плавающимь пристанище
sailing-DAT.PL. haven-NOM.SG.
“(he is) the haven of/for those who sail” ŽD 355/10

Five of the constructions were headed by kinship terms:

(155) Сии бо государи рода Владимера
these-NOM. PARTICLE lord-NOM.PL. lineage-GEN. Vladimir-GEN.
Святославича - сродника Борису и Глебу
Svjatoslavic-GEN. kinsman-GEN.SG. Boris-DAT.SG. and Gleb-DAT.SG.
“For these are the lords of the lineage of Vladimir Svjatoslavic – the kinsman of Boris and Gleb” PBR 358/21–22

Here as well, benefactive readings are possible in constructions denoting metaphorical kinship. In (156), the person referred to is of course not the biological father of the orphans, but like a father to them.

(156) зраще отца сирю
seeing father-ACC.=GEN.SG. orphan-DAT.PL.
“seeing the orphans’ father” SL 466/30

Six of the constructions were headed by nouns denoting body parts, and four were headed by the noun *imja* “name”, which, as mentioned, is rather like a body part in many ways, as a person’s name is almost as inalienable as her limbs, and carried around everywhere. Again, the typical referent filling these nouns’ elaboration sites would be animate, having control over and depending on the head noun, though many of the dative-marked nouns involved are inanimate.

(157) бяху бо сердца их, акы сердца
were PARTICLE heart-NOM.PL. their like heart-NOM.PL.
лвомь
lion-DAT.PL.
“for their hearts were like the hearts of lions” ŽAN 170/11
Seven of the constructions were headed by deadjectival nouns. Again, such nouns would typically have animate nouns filling their elaboration sites, affected by the quality denoted by the deadjectival nouns. However, several of the occurrences have inanimate dative-marked nouns:

(158) имя дрёво том зигиа
name-NOM.SG. tree-DAT.SG. that-NEUT.DAT.SG. Zigija-NOM.SG.
“the name of that tree is Zigija” ChID 14v/13–14

Solnc˙ dobrota и величьство
sun-DAT.SG. goodness-NOM.SG. and greatness-NOM.SG.
xvalitsÏ
“the sun’s goodness and greatness are praised” ŽD 364/23–24

The remaining occurrences of DAT with RPINST/INTRINSIC were headed by nouns denoting inherent parts of wholes, offspring, other human relationships than kinship and topical objects of deverbal nouns.

5.7.4 INTRINSIC with relational head

This is the obvious semantic centre of gravity of the DAT construction, with 71 instances, or 47.3 % of all DAT occurrences. As many as 61 of these occurrences are headed by deverbal nouns, with the dative-marked noun filling an object elaboration site of some sort, mostly corresponding to regular accusative objects.

(160) придоша послания о Створополка на
came sent-MASC.NOM.PL. by Svjatopolk-GEN. to
погубленье Глѣбу
destruction-ACC.SG. Gleb-DAT.SG.
“those who were sent by Svjatopolk in order to kill Gleb (for the destruction of Gleb), came” PVrL 136/16–17

(161) икъ Сына и Бога нарицае […]
who-NOM. son-ACC.=GEN. and God-ACC.=GEN. called
gрехом потребителя
sin-DAT.PL. defeater-ACC.=GEN.SG.
“who called the Son and God the defeater of sins” SKT 20/8

In fact, the DAT construction is the most frequent way (31.8 % of all constructions in this function) of expressing the intrinsic relationship between a deverbal noun and a noun filling its object elaboration site. Why should this be so? Again, we are dealing with a semantic situation highly compatible with general dative semantics, as the
noun which fills the object elaboration site is typically affected in some way by the action denoted by the deverbal noun, even though the dative-marked noun is often inanimate. As there is no adnominal accusative construction available,\(^{81}\) the normal way of dealing with this type of relationship between verb and object, the DAT construction was apparently a good choice. Also, the DAT construction does not depend on carrying reference point semantics (as DA1 and DA2 do to a large extent), nor is it avoided with animate nouns, as GEN\(_{\text{FREE}}\) seemingly is.

As was expected, the DAT construction was the most frequent way of expressing the relationship between a deverbal noun and the noun filling an elaboration site corresponding to the dative object of the counterpart verb. 15 such instances of DAT were found, constituting 71.5 % of all occurrences with such semantics.

(162) идě положи жєртвоу ви авраа
where put sacrifice-ACC.SG. God-DAT.SG. Abraham-NOM.
“where Abraham put his sacrifice to God” ChID 22r/6

DAT was not very frequent with non-deverbal relational heads; only ten such instances were found in the material of period 1. Six of them were headed by ruler/leader nouns, and three of these were starějšina “elder”. Again, rulers typically affect their subjects very much, making the DAT construction a well-motivated choice.

(163) призвá стареишина конохо
he-summoned elder-ACC.SG. groom-DAT.PL.
“he summoned the head of the grooms” PVrL 38/28

(164) сущио самодржжкjo въсєи Русьскѣ
being-DAT. sovereign-DAT. all-FEM.DAT.SG. Rus-іск-FEM.DAT.SG.
земли Володимиру
land-DAT.SG. Volodimir-DAT.
“when Volodimir was the sovereign of all the land of Rus’” SBG 27/4–5

The last four occurrences were headed by one source noun, one instance of *имja* “name” without reference point, and two instances of nouns denoting, quite unexpectedly, inherent parts of wholes:

(165) начнѣмь основѣ словѣ и зачало
we-will-begin foundation-ACC.SG. word-DAT.SG. and beginning-ACC.

\(^{81}\) Actually, there are two attestations of accusative objects with deverbal nouns in my excerpts from the *Povest’ vremennykh let* (PVrL 33/8–10, 33/28–34/1).
5.7.5 INTRINSIC with non-relational head

37 instances were found of the DAT construction with no reference point situation and no relational head. It would, however, be wrong to call all these occurrences instances of intrinsic relationships between head noun and dative-marked NP. In fact, in most of these cases, the DAT construction contributes regular dative semantics, so that most of the dative-marked NPs denote purpose, recipient, benefactive and addressee, functions that are certainly bordering on the possessive conceptual space, but not within it. Such constructions are clearly the source of the DAT construction entering the possessive conceptual space, as discussed in sections 5.7 and 5.7.3.

There are, however, some instances of DAT which must be interpreted as INTRINSIC without relational head. These are the emphatic constructions parallel to the ones seen with GEN_{FREE}, where both nouns in the construction are identical. Ten such were found:

(166) 

\[ \text{въ вѣкѣ вѣкѣ} \]

in eternity-ACC.PL eternity-DAT.PL.

“in all eternity” ŽSP 17/9

There was also a construction where the dative-marked NP must be interpreted as the cause of the action expressed by the head noun, an interpretation hardly contributed by central dative semantics:

\[ \text{вѣзмѣдѣе труду своему прямооть Господа} \]

reward-ACC.SG. work-DAT.SG. their-MASC.DAT.SG. directly from Lord-GEN.

вѣспришаша

they-received

“they received the reward for their work directly from the Lord” SBG 52/8

5.7.6 DAT vs. GEN_{FREE}

As noted before, the DAT construction and GEN_{FREE} have very similar distributions, at least at first glance. Both constructions are firmly centered in INTRINSIC, as both of them lend themselves very well to expressing the relationship between many relational nouns and the nouns filling their elaboration sites, whether that noun serve as a reference point or no. Both constructions are well suited for this purpose because of important semantic elements central to the greater family of dative and genitive constructions respectively. The dative’s typical affectedness semantics is easily
extended to these constructions, as is the genitive’s tendency to denote a whole of which something is a part, or a whole which is only partially affected. However, they are also quite different in that dative referents are typically animate and agent-like, whereas genitive referents are very often inanimate and passive. This is apparent in the respective distributions of the two constructions. Also, the DAT construction may have a number of affectedness-based readings (benefactive, addressee, recipient), whereas GEN\textsubscript{FREE} tends to have readings related to part–whole semantics, such as source, content etc.

An interesting aspect is that the genitive and the dative also overlap morphologically to some extent, particularly with feminine nouns and adjectives. There is really no way of telling whether (168) and (169) are genitive or dative constructions:

(168) князь у земли у моей
prince-NOM.PL. land-GEN./DAT.SG. my-FEM.GEN./DAT.SG.
“princes of my land” ŽD 357/21

(169) понеже та глава есть земли
as that-NOM. head-NOM.SG. is world-GEN./DAT.SG.
“because he is the head of the world” PVrL 140/1

Such ambiguities are particularly frequent with bare genitive- or dative-marked nouns, as in (169); 28 such instances were found. The two charts below show the exact distribution of ambiguous genitive or dative constructions, with complex and bare modifiers respectively. As we can see, the distribution resembles that of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} and DAT a great deal.
Chart 5.6 Distribution of ambiguous constructions with complex genitive- or dative-marked NPs, 11th–14th century Old Russian

Chart 5.7 Distribution of ambiguous constructions with bare genitive- or dative-marked nouns, 11th–14th century Old Russian
### 5.8 “Mixed” constructions

As seen in chapter 2, most accounts of Old Russian possessive constructions have been very preoccupied with the alleged complementary distribution of denominal adjectives and genitives. One of the most serious arguments against such an account is the existence of several types of “mixed” constructions, which could be used when a possessor consisted of more than a bare noun (stem). In the material of period 1, two such construction types were found, the double adjective construction [DA, DA, NP] (170), and the DA/GEN construction [DA, N-GEN, NP] (171). The 13 occurrences of the double adjective construction in the material of period 1 are all paratactic, i.e. there are two separate “possessors” on an equal footing:

(170)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>слово</th>
<th>собою</th>
<th>Володимера ⋅ Юрьєвица ⋅ брата Всеволода ⋅ Мстислава</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>water with self-INSTR. Volodimer-ACC.=GEN. Jur’evič-ACC.=GEN. brother-ACC.=GEN.SG. Vsevolod-j-MASC.ACC.=GEN.SG. and Mstislav-j-MASC.ACC.=GEN.SG.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“bringing with them Volodimer Jur’evič, the brother of Vsevolod and Mstislav” SL 461/23–24

Of the occurrences of the DA/GEN construction, eleven had a relationship of apposition between the denominal adjective and the genitive (i.e. the referents were identical) (171), whereas four were paratactic (172).

(171)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>от</th>
<th>полку</th>
<th>Еупатиева</th>
<th>Коловрата</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of army-GEN.SG. Eupatij-ov-MASC.GEN.SG. Kolovrat-GEN.SG.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“from Eupatij Kolovrat’s army” PBR 352/8

(172)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>і</th>
<th>тако измороша</th>
<th>оубиваєми</th>
<th>гнєво</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and thus</td>
<td>they-died</td>
<td>killed-NOM.PL.</td>
<td>wrath-INSTR.SG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Бййимь ⋅ і</td>
<td>причїны</td>
<td>юго</td>
<td>Мтре</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God-ij-MASC.INSTR.SG. and</td>
<td>immaculate-FEM.SGEN.SG.</td>
<td>his</td>
<td>mother-GEN.SG.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“and thus they died, killed by the wrath of God and his immaculate Mother” PBK_L 446/16

Looking at the distributions of these constructions within the possessive conceptual space, we find that it corresponds pretty closely to those of the DA1 and DA2 constructions. The double adjective construction has occurrences of denominal adjectives of both type 1 and 2, and therefore the chart rather resembles that of the DA2 construction, since we get occurrences from most parts of the possessive conceptual space.
Chart 5.8 The distribution of the Old Russian double adjective construction, 1000–1400

With the DA/GEN construction, on the other hand, only two of the 15 occurrences contained denominal adjectives of type 2, and accordingly, we get a chart with only RP_{INST} occurrences without strong unit status.

Chart 5.9 The distribution of Old Russian DA/GEN constructions, 1000–1400
The conclusion, then, must be that when a complex possessor consisted of two nouns paratactically joined, or of two NPs in apposition, the double adjective construction and the DA/GEN construction were available, if not very frequent, as alternatives to the GEN\textsubscript{RESTR} construction. It is particularly interesting that these constructions are mostly found when a reference point situation was involved, where GEN\textsubscript{FREE} and DAT appear to have been less suitable.

5.9 The interplay of the constructions

To sum up our survey of the possessive constructions in 11th–14th century Old Russian, let us plot in all the constructions in the map of the possessive conceptual space in figure 5.9. The coloured lines represent the outer boundary of the distribution of each construction. The coloured fields represent the semantic centre of gravity of each construction.

*Figure 5.9 Distributions of all possessive constructions in the possessive conceptual space*
The figure shows that none of the constructions overlap completely, meaning that none of them are wholly synonymous. Even the DA1 construction and the GENRESTR construction, so often, and for good reason, argued to be in complementary distribution, are no perfect match. The GENRESTR construction actually has a wider distribution, including intrinsic relationships with non-relational head nouns. In that area of the possessive conceptual space, it has a neat division of labour with the DA2 construction, not the DA1 construction. At the same time, all of the possessive constructions overlap to some extent. In fact, there are attestations of all five construction expressing both non-intrinsic RPINST, RPINST/INTRINSIC, and INTRINSIC without reference point situation.

As became clear from the column charts in this chapter, each construction had an obvious semantic centre of gravity in terms of frequency. In figure 5.9 these centres are roughly indicated. The semantic centres are actually quite scattered in the possessive conceptual space. The DA1 construction is very firmly centred in the reference point situation, both with and without intrinsic relationship. The DA2 construction, despite a very wide distribution, has RPTYPE and the closely related RPINST with strong unit status as the obvious semantic centre of gravity. The GENRESTR construction is, again, similar, but not identical to the DA1 construction, having its semantic centre of gravity a little closer to the middle of the map of the possessive conceptual space, as intrinsic relationships were involved more frequently than with the DA1 construction. The GENFREE construction and the DAT construction both have INTRINSIC with relational head as the obvious semantic centre of gravity, but GENFREE is more frequent with INTRINSIC with non-relational head. As will be discussed further in section 5.10, they also differ as to the semantics of the genitive-marked or dative-marked noun.

Is there, then, a situation of complementary distribution between some of the possessive constructions in the earliest attested Old Russian (11th–14th century texts)? If we are to have a strict understanding of complementary distribution, the answer must certainly be no. However, when there is a reference point situation involved, there is certainly a strong tendency towards complementary distribution. In this part of the possessive conceptual space, a DA1 or DA2 construction is used in most cases when the possessor consists of a single noun stem, whereas the GENRESTR is normally used when the possessor is complex or of a word class or noun type from which a denominal adjective cannot be formed. There is also a clear tendency towards complementary distribution between DA2 and GENRESTR when the head noun is a ruler noun, or when the modifier expresses place of origin. However, the complementary distribution is not at all complete. As seen in sections 5.6.2 and 5.6.3, constructions with bare genitive-marked nouns certainly do turn up with RPINST.
semantics, even when a denominal adjective can be formed from that noun stem. Also, the double adjective construction and the DA/GEN construction are possible options with possessors consisting of more than a bare noun. I believe that an exaggerated focus on complementary distribution probably obscures more than it illuminates. As this chapter has shown, it is far more fruitful to look at the possessive constructions in 11th–14th century Old Russian as five separate polysemous, but partly overlapping constructions, each with a clear semantic centre of gravity, competing and interacting in the possessive conceptual space.

5.10 The relative importance of head nouns and modifier nouns

This chapter has focused greatly on the interaction between constructions and head nouns, and particularly on the semantic contributions of relational nouns (not unlike Goldberg’s (1995 and 2006) treatment of argument structure constructions and verbs). Bratishenko 1998 has rather the opposite approach, looking mainly at the semantics of the modifier noun stems involved. Her results are certainly very interesting, and I find her observations of the effects of animacy and definiteness of the modifier noun stems very insightful. In my approach, the question of “definiteness” is dealt with by the concept of reference point: Reference points are topical and have cue validity enough to identify a target. This would probably in most cases involve Bratishenko’s notion of “definiteness”, which is also a purely semantic concept, as definiteness is hardly ever explicitly expressed in the early Old Russian possessive constructions. I also believe that the notion of reference point is more useful than the notion of definiteness in an analysis of possessive constructions, as it is so directly relevant to what possessive constructions are prototypically used to express.

Like Bratishenko, I have noted animacy effects throughout the discussion of the possessive constructions. DA1 constructions certainly had denominal adjectives formed almost exclusively from animate noun stems with singular reference. DA2 constructions with adjectives formed from animate noun stems tended strongly to have a plural interpretation, and constructions with such plural-reference adjectives were the DA2 constructions that most frequently had a RP_{INST} interpretation. The GEN_{FREE} construction was certainly more frequent with inanimate (and often abstract) genitive-marked nouns, particularly with the more peripheral parts of its semantics, such as non-intrinsic RP_{INST}. Conversely, the DAT construction (in keeping with general dative semantics) very often had animate dative-marked nouns, or tended to be used with relational head nouns which would typically have an animate noun.

82 Bratishenko 1998 deals with both the possessive constructions and genitive-accusative objects, so the concept of definiteness is much more relevant to her agenda.
filing its elaboration site. As the GEN\textsubscript{FREE} construction and the DAT construction otherwise had very similar distributions, this may have caused the former to be preferred with inanimates, and the latter with animates.

Thus, the semantics of the modifier noun( stem)s is clearly of importance in the selection of possessive constructions, but it is certainly not the only factor of importance. I have shown that the presence or absence of a reference point situation, as well as the semantic impact of relational nouns, are at least equally important factors. The interrelationship of the 11th–14th century possessive constructions is complex, and requires a detailed and many-faceted analysis to do it justice.

5.11 The reliability of the source material: Genre effects

As pointed out in Chapter 3, the corpus texts were selected with the three main literary genres of mediaeval Rus’ in mind: religious, narrative and business/legal texts are all represented. The material from each genre was expected to give somewhat different results, and this turned out to be the case. The most striking deviations from the overall figures are found in the business/legal texts: The DAT construction has only three attestations, two with dative-marked nouns filling the object elaboration site of deverbal nouns, and one with uncertain semantics. 21 out of 27 certain occurrences of the GEN\textsubscript{FREE} construction have a genitive-marked noun filling the elaboration site of a noun denoting an inherent part of a whole. All occurrences of DA1 constructions have RP\textsubscript{INST} semantics, and there are only four out of 54 DA2 constructions which denote a reference point situation on instance level and without strong unit status. In a way, the distribution of the constructions approaches the “ideal” situation sketched by many earlier approaches, that of genitive and possessive adjectives in neat complementary distribution, and with the dative as good as absent. However, even though the language of the business/legal texts is undoubtedly more purely East Slavic than that of the narrative, not to mention the religious texts, one must remember that the genre poses severe limitations on the subject matter. To a large extent, these texts are dealing with legal issues and are consistently kept on type level much of the time. Also, things are measured and counted to a great extent. Specific possessors are rare, yet they are the prototypical possessors! This makes it unsafe to place too much faith in figures taken only from such texts. It is also a fact that the language of the business/legal texts is formulaic to a great extent, and that the vocabulary is small. For instance, such an interesting noun type as deverbal nouns is hardly attested at all (only three occurrences in my business/legal corpus).

The situations in the narrative and religious texts are much more like the overall picture, and also rather similar to each other. There are a few clear differences,
though. The DAT construction and the GEN\textsubscript{FREE} construction are certainly a good deal more frequent in the religious texts than in the narrative texts. Also, they are more frequently found with semantics farther from their semantic centre of gravity in the religious texts, notably with reference point semantics. It is tempting to view such an expanded use of the two constructions as the result of Church Slavic influence. This will be further investigated in the comparative view on Old Church Slavic possessive constructions in Chapter 6.
6 The OCS system – a comparative view

This chapter is a comparative analysis of the possessive constructions in Old Church Slavic (OCS) which correspond to the Old Russian possessive constructions analysed in Chapter 5. The emphasis will be on the points where the two languages differ. The analysis is based on a representative corpus of canonical OCS texts, about half the size of the 11th–14th century Old Russian corpus, cf. section 3.5.

There are a number of reasons for comparing OCS and Old Russian possessive constructions. Firstly, OCS is the earliest attested Slavic language. Therefore, the hypothesis that the OCS possessive constructions may reveal an earlier stage of the typologically and genetically quite exotic system in Old Russian seems tempting. In reality, though, scholars disagree on this issue. As seen in section 2.6, Richards (1976) assumes OCS possessive constructions to have been closer to an alleged Common Slavic state of complementary distribution. Bratishenko (1998:91), on the other hand, comes to the opposite conclusion; “exceptions” from the complementary distribution “rule” are less frequent in Old Russian than in OCS. In fact, neither Richards nor Bratishenko base these claims on independent research on an OCS corpus. This is quite symptomatic of the comparisons of OCS and Old Russian possessive constructions in the literature: They are mostly quite impressionistic, and in fact most scholars just assume that the situation is more or less identical in the two languages.

To be able to assess the similarities and differences between the two, and, if possible, come to any conclusions about archaisms and innovations in the possessive constructions, a quantitative approach to both languages is certainly needed.

Secondly, there is no doubt that the language of the OCS texts and of the subsequent non-canonical Church Slavic religious texts has had a vast influence on particularly the earliest, but also somewhat later Old Russian. This influence was of course chiefly on the literary language, but probably the spoken language was influenced as well. Several scholars (e.g. Borkovskij 1968:197–198) have cited (Old) Church Slavic influence as an explanation to phenomena within the possessive conceptual space. The most frequent hypothesis is that the possessive dative construction could be a Balkan innovation, and might be a pure syntactic loan from (O)CS. To evaluate to what extent this is true, and whether other phenomena related
to possessive constructions may be due to OCS influence, an OCS corpus is necessary.

Finally, there is the fact that almost the entire OCS canon consists of translations from Greek. Now, Greek has a typical Indo-European situation with a genitive construction virtually alone in the possessive conceptual space. The OCS situation cannot be assessed properly with regard to its proximity to Common Slavic and its influence on Old Russian without taking the possible effects of translation on the language into account. The claims of various authors that the expansion of the genitive in Slavic was due to Greek influence (Uryson [1980], who claims that the genitive was *not* used possessively in Slavic before the Greek influence; Uspenskij 1987:301–306) can only be evaluated by looking at the actual translations of Greek genitives. It should also be mentioned that the Greek original text is a valuable clue as to what the scribe actually meant to say. This reduces the number of constructions with uncertain semantics considerably, compared to the figures from the corpus of Old Russian texts from period 1.

As seen in section 2.6, the literature leads us to expect that the differences between possessive constructions in Old Russian and OCS will be subtle. The inventory of constructions should be more or less the same. One would clearly expect more instances of the GEN\_FREE constructions, and a more frequent and less semantically peripheral DAT construction than in Old Russian.

### 6.1 Inventory of OCS possessive constructions

The inventory of OCS counterparts of the Old Russian constructions within the possessive conceptual space is morphologically exactly the same.

As in Old Russian (see section 5.2), there is a range of adjective constructions [DA, NP] involving productive and regular adjectives formed with the seven suffixes -j-, -ov-, -in-, -bn’, -bj-, -bsk- and -bn-. As in Old Russian, these adjective constructions can be divided into two groups: The DA1 construction involves adjectives with the suffixes -j-, -ov-, -in-, and -bn’, and noun stems denoting a person or something personified.\(^{83}\) Such adjectives tend to be possessive in a rather narrow sense, and almost exclusively appear in short form. The adjective božij was included in this group as it clearly patterns with other DA1, even though it is strictly speaking derived with the suffix -bj-.

DA2 constructions involve the suffixes -bj-, -bsk- and -bn-. This group of adjectives has rather wide semantics, and unlike the DA1 constructions, they are not

---

\(^{83}\) The rare OCS constructions with animal and plant adjectives with the same suffixes were not counted, and mostly had RP\_TYPE semantics, just like in Old Russian.
narrowly possessive. Also, they are formed from a wide range of noun stems, but rarely with proper nouns.

Again, for the same reasons as given in section 5.2, two genitive constructions will be posited: the free genitive construction (GEN\text{FREE}) [NP-GEN, NP] and the restricted genitive construction (GEN\text{RESTR}) [NP-GEN\text{COMPLEX}, NP]. The constructions are distinct both semantically and formally.

Finally, there is the dative construction [NP-DAT, NP], which will be referred to as DAT.

In addition, as in Old Russian, several types of “mixed” constructions are found within the possessive conceptual space

6.2 DA1

Figure 6.1 places the OCS DA1 construction in the possessive conceptual space. When we compare with the distribution of the occurrences of the DA1 construction found in the Old Russian material of period 1 (figure 5.2), we see that the occurrences of the OCS DA1 construction cover a slightly wider part of the possessive conceptual space: Unlike in the Old Russian material, a few instances of INTRINSIC with non-relational head nouns were found.

*Figure 6.1 DA1 in the possessive conceptual space, OCS*
Looking at the more precise distribution of the OCS DA1 construction, however, we find that its semantic centre of gravity in terms of frequency is even clearer than in the Old Russian material. To an even greater extent, the predominant function of the DA1 construction is to express reference point situations on instance level, with an intrinsic relationship (1) or without (2):

(1) ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰακὼβ in house-LOC.SG. Jacob-j-MASC.LOC.SG.


(2) η)findViewById proposals 100,000

we Moses-ov-MASC.NOM.PL. are disciples-NOM.PL.

hêmeis de tou Môuseōs esmen mathêtai “we are Moses’ disciples” Zogr. John 9:28

The 184 DA1 constructions with RP_{INST}/INTRINSIC are headed by much the same range of relational nouns as the corresponding constructions in the Old Russian material from period 1. 32 occurrences had an adjective filling the subject elaboration site of some kind of deverbal noun (2). As many as 69 occurrences were headed by

\[84\] The translation follows the OCS text if there are any discrepancies between the OCS translation and the Greek text.
kinship terms (3), and twelve by relational nouns denoting other kinds of human relationships (4).

(3) ὀνάζων Ἀβραὰμ
child-NOM.PL. Abraham-j-NEUT.NOM.PL.
tekna tou Abraam
“Abraham’s children” Zogr. John 8:39

(4) ὄδυριῦ 
having-struck slave-ACC=GEN.SG. high priest-ov-ACC=GEN.SG.
pataxas ton doulon tou archiereōs
“having struck the slave of the high priest” Ass. Matthew 26:51

23 of the occurrences were headed by nouns denoting body parts:

(5) ὁ πρῶτος
by finger-LOC.SG. God-ij-MASC.LOC.SG.
en daktulο(i) theou

There were five occurrences headed by deadjectival nouns:

(6) ἀκούσαν τὴν ισχίαν Σολομὼν
hear wisdom-GEN.SG. Solomo-j-FEM.GEN.SG.
akousai tēn sofian Solomōnos
“to hear the wisdom of Solomo” Mar. Luke 11:31

27 of the occurrences were headed by a noun denoting a realm, and all these 27 examples were variants of the construction in (7):

(7) ἐς τὴν βασιλείαν 
in kingdom-ACC.SG. God-ij-NEUT.ACC.SG.
eis tēn basileian tou theou
“into the kingdom of God” Zogr. John 3:5

There were also constructions headed by nouns denoting offspring, results, names, and representation nouns.

As shown in chart 6.1, there were few examples with other types of semantics than RP_{INST}(/INTRINSIC). There were no examples at all of RP_{TYPE}. However,

85 There were in fact six examples of RP_{TYPE} constructions with adjectives formed with the suffixes found in DA1 constructions, but all were formed from animal or plant noun stems, and were thus excluded from the count, since only adjectives derived from nouns denoting persons or personifications were counted, cf. section 3.6. A typical example:
there were 19 occurrences of DA1 constructions with RP_{INST} semantics combined with strong unit status, and thus bordering on RP_{TYPE}. As in the Old Russian material, most of these constructions were onomastic, i.e. the whole construction functioned as a name, mostly a toponym:

(8) Κτή προφοράς σολομών
in portico-LOC.SG. Solomo-j-MASC.LOC.SG.
en τῇ(stoai) tou Solomōnos
“in the portico of Solomo” Zogr. John 10:23

As in the Old Russian material from period 1, DA1 constructions denoting an intrinsic relationship without a reference point situation were quite rare. 17 such occurrences were found. Seven of them had adjectives filling the object elaboration sites of deverbal nouns:

(9) Υαμαθείας φθυρώνης Ισραήλ
longing-for consolation-GEN.SG. Israel-ov-FEM.GEN.SG.
prosdekhomenos paraklēsin tou Israēl
“longing for the consolation of Israel” Mar. Luke 2:25

(10) Η σε νύχτα Μην ιππος Κτή Μπαλάχ
and was at night-ACC. in prayer-LOC.SG. God-sj-FEM.LOC.SG.
kai ēn diānuktereuōn en τῇ(proseukhē) tou theou
“and all night he continued in prayer to God” Mar. Luke 6:12

Now, unlike many of the examples found in the Old Russian material of period 1, none of these examples seem to have strong unit status or involve reference point situations.

Unlike in the Old Russian material of period 1, DA1 constructions were also found with ruler nouns. However, the two adjectives involved (Izrailevъ “Israel’s” and Ijudovъ “Judah’s”) were both derived from noun stems denoting peoples/nations/countries, and were thus equivalent to the very frequent DA2 constructions denoting the intrinsic relationship between rulers and their subjects.

(11) Κτή Κλέαχατρός Ιουδαίας
in lord-LOC.PL. Judah-ov-MASC.LOC.PL.
en τοις hēgemosin Iouda
“among the rulers of Judah” Ass. Matthew 2:6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ΝΙΤΑΔΑΚΕ</th>
<th>ΕΙΓΗΑΛΟΝΑ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>offspring-NOM.PL.</td>
<td>viper-ov-NEUT.NOM.PL.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the Old Russian material of period 1, all DA1 constructions denoting an intrinsic relationship were headed by relational nouns. In the OCS material, there were eight instances with an intrinsic relationship between an adjective and a non-relational head. In three of these instances, an adjective formed from a proper noun modified another proper noun, and a kinship term was understood:

(12) **Simon** V. **Jonah** M.
Simon-VOC.SG. Jonah-in-MASC.VOC.SG.
Simōn Iōannou
“Simon (son) of Jonah” Zogr. John 21:17

All in all, the differences between the DA1 constructions found in the Old Russian material of period 1 and the OCS material respectively appear to be very small, or even only apparent. In both corpora, the construction is overwhelmingly a construction for reference point situations on instance level, with few examples from other parts of the possessive conceptual space.

### 6.3 DA2

Figure 6.2 places the OCS DA2 construction in the possessive conceptual space, and is very similar to figure 5.3. The lighter red field illustrates the full distribution of the OCS DA2 construction, showing that it covers parts of all domains in the possessive conceptual space, just like the DA2 constructions found in the Old Russian material of period 1. The darker red fields shows that, unlike the Old Russian DA2 construction, the OCS DA2 construction appears to have two semantic centres of gravity: both RP INST with strong unit status and INTRINSIC with non-relational head. However, as we shall see, these two centres are united by the presence or possibility of strong unit status for the construction as a whole.

---

86 Here Iōnin seems to be derived from the name Iona “Jonah”, not Iōannē “John”, even though the Greek text has Iōannou.
Figure 6.2 DA2 in the possessive conceptual space, OCS

Chart 6.2 11th–14th century Old Russian and OCS DA2 constructions compared
The more exact distribution shown in chart 6.2 makes this difference clear. Unlike the Old Russian DA2 construction, the OCS DA2 construction does not seem to have a single semantic centre of gravity in terms of frequency. Instead, it seems to have two: on the one hand RP\textsubscript{INST} with strong unit status and the adjoining RP\textsubscript{TYPE}, on the other hand INTRINSIC with non-relational head. The latter is in fact the most frequent function of the DA2 construction in the OCS material.

6.3.1 RP\textsubscript{TYPE} and constructions with strong unit status
The OCS occurrences of DA2 constructions with RP\textsubscript{TYPE} semantics are very similar to the ones found in the Old Russian corpus from period 1.

(13) ἡ βασιλεύς σύνδοσις ἐπίσκοπον ἐποίησεν
emperor-NOM. congregation-ACC.SG. bishop-\textsubscript{MASC}.ACC.SG. made
ho basileus sunodon episkopōn epoiēsato
“the Emperor made a bishop congregation” Supr 16:201/1–2

(14) τοῦ στάδος σίνος
into herd-ACC.SG. pig-\textsubscript{NEUT}.ACC.SG.
eis tēn agelēn tôn khoirôn
“into the pig herd” Ass. Matthew 8:31

DA2 constructions with RP\textsubscript{INST} and strong unit status are very frequent. As in Old Russian, such constructions are very often used to name things, particularly places and days. Countries/regions and cities named with a DA2 construction are also member of larger sets, with partially specific and highly entrenched lower-level construction schemas, [CITIZEN-\textsubscript{MASC}., grad-\textsubscript{MASC}.] and [CITIZEN-\textsubscript{MASC}., zemlj-\textsubscript{MASC}.].

(15) ὁ Αλεξάνδρου ἀνθρώπος
from Alexandrian-\textsubscript{MASC}., city-GEN.SG.
apo tēs Alexandroēn poleōs
“from the city of the Alexandrians/Alexandria” Supr. 16:189/9

(16) ὁ ἡμέρας ἐκχειρίας
on day-ACC.SG. judgement-\textsubscript{MASC}.ACC.SG.
en hēmera(i) kriseōs
“on the day of judgment” Ass. Matthew 12:36

The most frequently occurring construction, however, is the one denoting “the son of man”. Here, we have a kinship term with an elaboration site filled by a noun with generic reference. The whole construction has very high token frequency as a “name” for Christ, giving it very strong unit status. As many as 66 examples were found in the
OCS material, and thus this construction accounts for the lion’s share of the 79 OCS DA2 constructions with RP\textsubscript{INST} and strong unit status.

(17) ὁ ἴδιος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
son- NOM.SG. man-ask-MASC.NOM.SG.
ho huios tou anthrōpou
“the son of man” Savv. Matthew 26:45

6.3.2 RP\textsubscript{INST} without strong unit status
As in the Old Russian material from period 1, DA2 constructions with RP\textsubscript{INST}, but without strong unit status, do occur, but they are not very frequent. The OCS occurrences of DA2 constructions with non-relational heads and RP\textsubscript{INST} involved a narrower range of adjectives than the Old Russian occurrences. All the 27 examples had adjectives formed from either stems denoting persons and with plural reference (18), inanimate and abstract stems (19), or inanimate and concrete stems (20).

(18) τὰ βιβλία τῶν προφητῶν
book-NOM.PL. prophet-ask-FEM.NOM.PL.
hai graphai tōn prophētōn
“the prophets’ scriptures” Savv. Matthew 26:56

(19) ἔχει τὸ φῶς τῆς ζωῆς
he-will-have light-GEN.SG. life-in-MASC.GEN.SG.
hexei to phōs tēs zōēs
“He will have the light of life” Zogr. John 8:12

(20) καὶ δεῦρες τὸν θυραύλων καὶ τὴν ναῶν ἐκσχίσθη
cand behold curtain-NOM.SG. church-in-FEM.NOM.SG. was-torn
kai idou to katapetasma tou naou eskhistē
“And behold, the curtain of the temple was torn” Savv. Matthew 27:51

There were also 25 instances of DA2 constructions with RP\textsubscript{INST}/INTRINSIC, headed by relational nouns. The relational nouns involved were mostly deverbal nouns with the adjective filling the subject elaboration site, deadjectival nouns and nouns denoting body parts, plus scattered occurrences of other types of relational nouns also found in the corresponding Old Russian constructions (ruler nouns, offspring nouns, nouns denoting inherent parts of wholes etc.). When it comes to the adjectives involved, we find exactly the same pattern as with the constructions with non-relational heads: The adjectives were either formed from noun stems denoting persons and with plural reference (21), from inanimate abstract noun stems (22), or from inanimate concrete noun stems (23).
6.3.3 INTRINSIC

As in the Old Russian material from period 1, the OCS DA2 constructions often denote an intrinsic relationship without involving a reference point. However, the distribution of DA2 for this purpose is somewhat different in the OCS material than in the Old Russian corpus from period 1. Recall that a great majority of the Old Russian occurrences involved an intrinsic relationship between ruler nouns and their subjects, or between a non-relational noun denoting a person and that person’s place of origin. As discussed in section 5.4.5, such constructions are linked not only by similar semantics, but also by a tendency towards strong unit status. Such constructions are often used as a whole to name persons, and are often quite fixed. The same type of occurrences are found in the OCS material as well:

(24) ῶς ἥν ἐσύ πρῶτος Ἰουδαίῳ
you QUESTION PARTICLE are king-NOM.SG. Jew-masc.NOM.SG.
σὺ εἰ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν λαῶν Ἰουδαίων
“are you the king of the Jews” Zogr. John 18:33

(25) ὥστε Ἰησοῦς Γαλιлейν
with Jesus-INSR.SG. Galilee-issk-masc.INSTR.SG.
μετὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Γαλιλαίου
“with Jesus of Galilee” Ass. Matthew 26:69

However, they are far less dominant here, accounting for only 36 of the 140 DA2 constructions denoting an intrinsic relationship but not involving a reference point situation. Recall that the corresponding figures from the Old Russian material were
There were 13 instances of DA2 constructions where the adjective filled the elaboration site of a relational noun other than a ruler noun, without being a reference point. Five of these constructions had adjectives filling the object elaboration sites of deverbal nouns. The adjectives were either formed from noun stems denoting persons and had plural reference (26), or from inanimate noun stems and had singular reference (27). The object elaboration site would correspond either to a regular accusative object (27), or to a genitive object (26).

(26) ζα στραχ’ ινδέικη
for fear-ACC.SG. Jew-MASC.ACC.SG.
dia ton phobon tôn Ioudaíōn
“for the fear of the Jews” Zogr. John 19:38

(27) οτ’ ήγα κ’ήθη κ’τροποτέλλου ΠΕΡΙΔΑΝΗΗ
from God-GEN. be faith-NEUT.DAT.SG. transfer-DAT.SG.
theothen huparkhein tēs pisteōs paradosin
“who, having received and believed the transfer of faith to be from God” Supr. 16:189/23–24

There were four occurrences with head nouns denoting inherent parts of wholes:

(28) ηλ’ιζε ζα ο’κ ηπά ονζηκη
having-grabbed by both-FEM. half-ACC.DUAL robe-ON-FEM.ACC.DUAL.
sphiggonta to rhēgma tou kolobiou
“having grabbed both parts of the robe” Supr. 16:187/7

The OCS corpus had as many as 103 occurrences of DA2 constructions denoting an intrinsic relationship without involving a relational noun, constituting 30.1% of all OCS DA2 occurrences. The corresponding Old Russian constructions constituted only 9.5% of all DA2 occurrences. In 34 of the cases, the relationship was one of identity, the adjective and the head noun having the same referent, and thus being in semantic apposition. To an overwhelming extent, this is due to the fact that the texts in the corpus contain a lot of Hebrew and other foreign toponyms, which regularly have an explanatory apposition added to them, clarifying whether we are dealing with a country, a city, a mountain or a lake.
Note that this type of construction is certainly very close to the frequent Old Russian DA2 construction type used to name countries, where an adjective formed from the name of the people is a reference point on instance level, and the whole construction has strong unit status. The apposition constructions are used in exactly the same way, as complex toponyms, and have reasonably high token frequencies. In some cases it is also reasonable to posit a partially specific and highly entrenched construction schema above a group of such constructions, e.g. [CITY NAME-ьsk-, gradь] for occurrences such as (29). The prevalence of apposition constructions probably accounts for the low number of strong-unit-status RP_INST constructions in OCS, and is due to the number of foreign and unfamiliar toponyms.

There were 29 occurrences where it was not clear whether the intrinsic relationship was one of semantic apposition, and as in Old Russian, 28 of them were instances of the expression “the kingdom of heaven” – again, it is not entirely clear whether the kingdom and heaven are identical, or whether heaven is the location of the kingdom:

(30) ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ ουρανοῦ
“the kingdom of heaven” Savv. Matthew 25:1

The remaining 50 occurrences of DA2 constructions denoting an intrinsic relationship without a relational noun had, to an overwhelming extent, either a place-of-origin interpretation, as already pointed out (12 instances), or a locative interpretation (25 instances). As pointed out in section 5.4.5 and earlier in this section, such constructions may also quite frequently have strong unit status, which is probably the case with the locative construction in (31):

(31) ὁ παγάλας τῆς Γαλιλαίας
“from Nazareth in Galilee” Savv. Matthew 21:11

6.3.4 Comparison with Old Russian

In figure 6.2, we saw that the DA2 constructions in the OCS material spanned the entire possessive conceptual space, just like their 11th–14th century Old Russian
counterparts. The more exact distribution shown in chart 6.2, on the other hand, suggested that there might be a clear difference between the two languages at this point, as the OCS construction seemed to have two semantic centres of gravity, both $\text{RP}_{\text{TYPE}}/\text{RP}_{\text{INST}}$ with strong unit status and INTRINSIC without a relational head, whereas the Old Russian DA2 construction apparently only had one centre of gravity, $\text{RP}_{\text{TYPE}}/\text{RP}_{\text{INST}}$ with strong unit status. However, a closer look at the occurrences revealed a very similar status in both languages. As in Old Russian, the DA2 constructions found in the OCS material turned out to have a rather limited set of functions, even though they did span the entire possessive conceptual space: The great majority of DA2 constructions were either $\text{RP}_{\text{TYPE}}$ or $\text{RP}_{\text{INST}}$ with strong unit status, or they had an adjective filling the elaboration site of a ruler noun, or they denoted an intrinsic relationship between a non-relational noun and its place of origin or location. As seen in sections 5.4.5 and 6.3.3, these constructions also had at least the potential for strong unit status. The difference in distribution seems to stem mostly from the large number of constructions with explanatory appositions due to the amount of foreign and unfamiliar toponyms in the OCS texts. The OCS DA2 construction’s two semantic centres of gravity were also closely linked by the presence or possibility of strong unit status.

There was a fair share of DA2 constructions with $\text{RP}_{\text{INST}}$ without strong unit status in both languages – about 15% of all DA2 in both. There was a tendency for the adjectives in such constructions to either be formed from stems denoting persons and with plural reference, or from either concrete or abstract inanimate stems with singular reference. This tendency appears to be much clearer in OCS, where it is also easier to spot, due to the Greek original text, which in most cases makes the number reference clear.

### 6.4 GEN$_\text{RESTR}$

As in the analysis of the Old Russian material from period 1, we will assume the existence of two adnominal genitive constructions, one restricted (GEN$_\text{RESTR}$) and one unrestricted (GEN$_\text{FREE}$). Again, the difference between them is that GEN$_\text{RESTR}$ interacts closely with the DA1 and DA2 constructions, and constitutes an important option when an adjective construction is deemed impossible by the author, particularly when the possessor is complex or from some word class or noun category which does not (easily) form denominal adjectives.

As in Old Russian, we find that there is no way to get an exact count of the GEN$_\text{RESTR}$ construction, since it is impossible to be certain whether a construction [NP-GEN$_\text{complex}$, NP] is an instance of GEN$_\text{RESTR}$ or of GEN$_\text{FREE}$. Therefore, as in
section 5.5, the problem has been solved by counting all constructions that could possibly be instances of GEN\textsubscript{RESTR}, i.e. all constructions containing a complex genitive-marked NP or a genitive-marked adjective or participle. Again, such constructions are labeled GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX}. Since the occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{RESTR} cannot be counted directly, figure 6.3 and chart 6.3 are based on a count of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX}. When discussing the various semantic subtypes, I have kept an eye on the presence and frequency of DA1, DA2 and indisputable occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} in the same functions, and evaluated to what extent the figures for GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} are a realistic representation of GEN\textsubscript{RESTR}. In figure 6.3, the lighter red area illustrates the full distribution of the occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX}, whereas the darker red area marks its semantic centre of gravity.

*Figure 6.3 GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} in the possessive conceptual space, OCS*
Figure 6.3 and chart 6.3 both show a distribution that is nearly identical to that found in the Old Russian material of period 1. Again, RP<sub>INST</sub>/INTRINSIC is the obvious semantic centre of gravity, and there is also a fair number of occurrences of non-intrinsic RP<sub>INST</sub> on the one hand, and of INTRINSIC without a reference point situation on the other hand. The only difference seems to be that the OCS material has very few instances of RP<sub>INST</sub> with strong unit status.

### 6.4.1 RP<sub>TYPE</sub> and RP<sub>INST</sub> with strong unit status

As in Old Russian, there were no occurrences of GEN<sub>COMPLEX</sub> with RP<sub>TYPE</sub> semantics in the OCS corpus. There were only two occurrences with RP<sub>INST</sub> and strong unit status, both naming the same church:

(32) ἐν τῷ ἡγιαστῷ πρῶτοι μάρτυρι τοῦ ἱεροῦ μαρτυρίου Παύλου
in church-LOC.SG. holy-MASC.GEN.SG. first-martyr-GEN.SG.

Stephanos-GEN.SG.

en tô(i) marturíō(i) tou hagiou prōtomarturos Stephanou
“in the (martyr-)church of the holy first-martyr Stephanos” Supr. 16:209/8–9

This is a marked contrast to the 45 GEN<sub>COMPLEX</sub> occurrences with RP<sub>INST</sub> and strong unit status in the Old Russian material of period 1, corresponding to 17 DA1 occurrences and 79 DA2 occurrences. In the OCS corpus, there were only 14 instances of DA1 and five instances of DA2 with strong unit status and an onomastic
meaning. In the Old Russian material, the corresponding occurrences of GEN\textsc{complex} were mostly names of churches, similar to (32), and such church names – for obvious reasons – do not turn up in the excerpts from the Gospels, only in the vitae of Codex Suprasliensis. Thus, this may very well be a difference due to the subject matter, and not necessarily a real, linguistic difference between OCS and Old Russian.

6.4.2 $\text{RP}_{\text{INST}}$ without strong unit status

As in the Old Russian material from period 1, about 20 % of all OCS occurrences of GEN\textsc{complex} denoted a non-intrinsic reference point situation (33), whereas about 40 % involved both a reference point situation and an intrinsic relationship between a relational noun and a genitive-marked NP filling (one of) its elaboration site(s) (34).

((33) $\text{en oikō(i) Dāuid paidos autou}$


((34) $\text{hē adelphē tou tetteleutēkotos}$

“the deceased’s sister” Zogr. John 11:39)

Looking at all OCS occurrences of adjective and genitive constructions denoting non-intrinsic $\text{RP}_{\text{INST}}$, we find that 63.8 % (171) were DA1 constructions, 10.1 % (27) were DA2 constructions, and 22.4 % (60) were occurrences of GEN\textsc{complex}, while 3.7 % (10) were certain occurrences of GEN\textsc{free}. This is, at least on the surface, very similar to the situation found in 11th–14th century Old Russian, as seen in section 5.5.2. The same conclusion may be drawn: Some of the GEN\textsc{complex} occurrences may have been complex instances of the GEN\textsc{free} construction, but the overwhelming majority must have been instances of GEN\textsc{restr}.

The situation is somewhat different when it comes to OCS adjective and genitive constructions denoting $\text{RP}_{\text{INST}}$/INTRINSIC: 51.8 % (184) were DA1 constructions, 7 % (25) were DA2 constructions, and 35.2 % (125) were occurrences of GEN\textsc{complex}, while 5.9 % (21) were certain occurrences of GEN\textsc{free}. Thus, although the share of certain occurrences of GEN\textsc{free} is only slightly larger than with non-intrinsic $\text{RP}_{\text{INST}}$, the overall share of genitive constructions is considerably larger.
Table 6.1. Shares of all adjective and genitive constructions expressing non-intrinsic and intrinsic $RP_{INST}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DA1</th>
<th>DA2</th>
<th>GEN\text{COMPLEX}</th>
<th>Certain $GEN_{FREE}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$RP_{INST}$</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$RP_{INST}/INTRINSIC$</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This suggests that a number of the occurrences of $GEN_{COMPLEX}$ with both a reference point situation and an intrinsic relationship are really instances of $GEN_{FREE}$, not $GEN_{RESTR}$. As seen in section 5.5.3, this tendency is much less obvious in the Old Russian material of period 1, and was only discernable when taking a more detailed look at the various types of relational nouns involved.

Looking at the relational nouns involved in the occurrences of $GEN_{COMPLEX}$ with $RP_{INST}/INTRINSIC$, we find the familiar range of relational nouns that were involved in the corresponding constructions in the Old Russian material from period 1, and also in the corresponding OCS DA1 constructions: there are deverbal nouns with the genitive-marked NP filling the subject elaboration site (35), kinship terms ([34] above) and nouns denoting other human relationships (36), deadjectival nouns (37), nouns denoting body parts (38), the noun *imja* “name” (39), and a few others.

1. (35) ΠΡΟΣΘΕΣΚΗΤΕ ΟΙΟΝ ΥΓΑ ἡ παρούσα του ἑυγενείου του ἀνθρώπου “the coming of the son of man” Ass. Matthew 24:27

2. (36) ΜΕΝ ΠΡΟΣΘΕΣΚΑΙΕ ΕΝΗΝΟΣ ΚΟΙΝΟΣΚΕΠΟ ἡ ΝΑΙΖΥΠΠΗΤΕ και προσκαλέσας ήνα ἡκαστον τῶν χρεωφειτῶν του κυρίου ἑαυτοῦ “and having summoned his master’s debtors one by one” Mar. Luke 16:5


4. (38) ΣΩΤΗΡ ΚΡΙΣΙΣ ΑΒΕΛ ΠΡΑΒΕΔΥΠΗΤΗΣ ἀπὸ τοῦ ΕΛΙΜΑΤΟΣ ΗΒΕΛΗΣ ΤΟΥ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΥ “from the blood of Abel the righteous” Ass. Matthew 23:35

5. (39) ΔΟΝΤΗΣΕ ΠΡΩΤΗΣ ΗΠΩΚΚΕΣΤΗΣ ΗΜΑ ΓΑ “unless first he-professes name-ACC.SG. lord-GEN.SG.
ei mé proteron homologēsē(i) to onoma tou kuriou mou
“if he does not first profess the name of my Lord” Supr. 11:152/1

There are generally more DA1 and DA2 occurrences than GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} occurrences with each noun type in the OCS corpus. However, as in the Old Russian material from period 1, there was a clear discrepancy with constructions headed by nouns denoting body parts. There were 41 such occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX}, but no more than four corresponding DA1 and seven DA2 constructions. Even though there was just a single certain occurrence of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} headed by a noun denoting a body part, the disproportionately large share of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} occurrences suggests that with such head nouns, authors tended to choose a GEN\textsubscript{FREE} construction.

6.4.3 INTRINSIC
101 instances of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} involving an intrinsic relationship, but no reference point, were found in the OCS material. Both in the Old Russian material of period 1 and in the OCS material, we saw that the DA1/DA2 constructions mostly outnumbered the occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} when a reference point was involved. There were also relatively few certain occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{FREE}. However, with no reference point involved, this is no longer the case in either language. Looking at all adjective and genitive constructions with INTRINSIC semantics in the OCS material, we find that 30.1\% (101) of them were occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX}, and 23.2\% (78) were certain instances of GEN\textsubscript{FREE}. Only 5.1\% (17) were DA1 constructions. The share of DA2 constructions was as high as 41.7\% (140 occurrences), but these were almost exclusively headed by ruler nouns or non-relational nouns. With other relational head nouns, the occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} and the certain instances of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} outnumbered the adjective constructions so clearly that most of the occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} should be considered complex instances of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} rather than GEN\textsubscript{RESTR}, just as in the Old Russian material.

Out of 52 adjective and genitive constructions where the modifier filled some kind of object elaboration site of a deverbal noun, there were 26 occurrences (50\%) of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} with a genitive-marked NP filling the elaboration site:

\begin{align*}
\text{razdru<enie hraminwI} & \text{toñ,} \\
\text{destruction-NOM.SG.} & \text{house-GEN.SG.} \\
\text{that-FEM.GEN.SG.} & \text{to rhēgma tēs oikias ekeinēs} \\
\text{to rhēgma tēs oikias ekeinēs} & \text{“the destruction of that house” Mar. Luke 6:49}
\end{align*}
In comparison, there were 26.9 % (14) certain occurrences of \( \text{GEN}_{\text{FREE}} \), and only 13.5 % (7) DA1 and 9.6 % (5) DA2 constructions of the same type. Thus, it is likely that most of the \( \text{GEN}_{\text{COMPLEX}} \) occurrences were complex instances of \( \text{GEN}_{\text{FREE}} \).

With head nouns denoting inherent parts of wholes, the discrepancy was even clearer, 33.9 % (20) were occurrences of \( \text{GEN}_{\text{COMPLEX}} \). 59.3 % (35) were certain instances of \( \text{GEN}_{\text{FREE}} \), whereas there were only 6.8 % (4) DA2 constructions, and no occurrences at all of DA1. In this case, it seems safe to assume that as good as all occurrences of \( \text{GEN}_{\text{COMPLEX}} \) were really complex instances of \( \text{GEN}_{\text{FREE}} \). This was expected from the literature, where the genitive is universally observed to be used freely when partitive semantics is involved:

(41) ΠΡΟΚΟΞΣ ΚΑ Κ.bmp;ΗΦΗΜΞΗ ΣΗΗΑ ΕΙΓΟ
she-touched fringe-GEN.PL. robe-GEN.SG. his
hēpsato tou krapedou tou himatiou autou
“she touched the fringe of his garment” Ass. Matthew 9:20

When the head noun denotes a ruler or leader, the situation is quite different. Out of all adjective and genitive constructions expressing the intrinsic relationship between a ruler noun and its elaboration site, only 21.7 % (10) were occurrences of \( \text{GEN}_{\text{COMPLEX}} \), and no more than 15.2 % (7) were certain instances of \( \text{GEN}_{\text{FREE}} \). Due to the large number of corresponding adjective constructions – 52.2 % (24) DA2 constructions and 10.9 % (5) DA1 constructions – it is reasonable to interpret most of the occurrences of \( \text{GEN}_{\text{COMPLEX}} \) as instances of \( \text{GEN}_{\text{RESTR}} \):

(42) ΓΡΔΑΔΓΗ ΚΟ ΣΕΓΟ ΛΗΓΑ
comes PARTICLE this-MASC.GEN.SG. world-GEN.SG.
ΚάηΗΑΣΗ prince-NOM.SG.
erkhetai gar ho tou kosmou arkhōn
“for the ruler of this world is coming” Zogr. John 14:30

There were also scattered occurrences of \( \text{GEN}_{\text{COMPLEX}} \) headed by various other relational nouns, but they were far too scarce to base any conclusions on.

With the adjective and genitive constructions expressing an intrinsic relationship between a non-relational head noun and the genitive-marked NP, the situation is quite similar to the situation found with constructions headed by ruler nouns. Out of the 160 adjective and genitive constructions in this category, 21.7 % (34) were occurrences of \( \text{GEN}_{\text{COMPLEX}} \). In comparison, there were 9.6 % (15) certain instances of \( \text{GEN}_{\text{FREE}} \), 3.2 % (5) DA1 constructions and 65.6 % (103) DA2 constructions. The large share of DA2 constructions is mostly due to the 34 DA2 constructions where the adjective and the head noun had the same referent and
therefore were in semantic apposition, and the 29 ambiguous DA2 constructions where this *may* be the case.

There were nine occurrences of $\text{GEN}_{\text{COMPLEX}}$ where the head noun and the genitive-marked NP were in semantic apposition and had an intrinsic relationship of identity. Recall that the corresponding DA2 constructions were mostly unfamiliar toponyms with an explanatory apposition, corresponding to (43). Now, most occurrences of $\text{GEN}_{\text{COMPLEX}}$ are not like that, they are usually metaphors, and a relationship of identity is assumed between something concrete and something abstract (44).

(43) \[ \text{kê} \, \text{strany} \, \text{kêsariñ}, \, \text{fIlipovwi} \, \text{to} \, \text{land-ACC.SG. Caesarea-GEN.SG. Philip-ov-FEM.GEN.SG. eis ta merê Kaisareias tês Philippou} \]
“into the district of Caesarea Philippi” Ass. Matthew 16:13

(44) \[ \text{na} \, \text{Kalêmih} \, \text{kêrê} \, \text{Gêpiônâ} \]
“on the rock of the faith in the Lord” Supr 16:208/8

In (43) it seems fairly obvious that the toponym is genitive-marked just because it consists of more than one word, and that the construction is an instance of $\text{GEN}_{\text{RESTR}}$. In (44), this is less obvious, as there are no DA2 constructions of the same category in the OCS material. The Old Russian material from period 1, on the other hand, does have some DA2 constructions with such a metaphorical relationship of identity between adjective and head noun, which might suggest that the Old Russian use of the DA2 construction was more liberal than that in OCS on this point.

The remaining 25 instances had intrinsic relationships with various interpretations, depending on the nature of head noun and modifier. As in the Old Russian material of period 1, the most frequent interpretation was (place of) origin and the related source ([45] and [46]), accounting for ten of the occurrences (cf. 12 corresponding DA2 constructions). Thus it is not unreasonable to see these occurrences of $\text{GEN}_{\text{COMPLEX}}$ as instances of $\text{GEN}_{\text{RESTR}}$.

(45) \[ \text{kê} \, \text{ovcamw} \, \text{pogwibw}<\text{domu} \, \text{to} \, \text{sheep-DAT.PL. perished-FEM.DAT.PL. house-GEN.SG. HzAka} \]
Israel-ov-MASC.GEN.SG.
“to the lost sheep of the house of Israel” Ass. Matthew 10:6
Just as in the Old Russian material of period 1, several of the remaining occurrences had interpretations typical of genitive semantics, with the genitive-marked NP denoting what the head noun was part of, consisted of or contained. These occurrences were probably instances of GENFREE.

6.4.4 Comparison with Old Russian

As in the Old Russian corpus from period 1, we found that the distribution of the OCS GENRESTRICT construction was not identical to that of GENCOMPLEX. GENCOMPLEX is found with several meanings that are rare or absent with DA1 and DA2 constructions, particularly when an intrinsic relationship, but no reference point situation, is involved. DA1 was generally almost absent with INTRINSIC semantics, and DA2, though frequent, had a very specific and narrow distribution: To an overwhelming extent it was found either with ruler nouns, or with non-relational head nouns, in which case the adjective denoted either place of origin, location or an unfamiliar toponym with the same reference as the explanatory head noun. All these construction types shared at least the possibility of strong unit status so typical of DA2 constructions. Thus, INTRINSIC without a reference point is probably not part of the domain of GENRESTRICT, excepting its close interaction with the DA2 construction when ruler nouns and the related place-of-origin/location semantics are involved. However, even the RPINST/INTRINSIC column in chart 6.3 is probably too tall if taken as a representation of GENRESTRICT, as the number of GENCOMPLEX occurrences was generally higher than expected from the number of corresponding DA1, DA2 and GENFREE constructions, and in particular when the head noun denoted a body part.

The distribution of GENRESTRICT thus seems to be remarkably similar in the Old Russian material of period 1 and in the OCS material.

6.5 GENFREE

As seen in section 2.6, previous comparisons of possessive constructions in Old Russian and OCS differ in their conclusions. Richards 1976 assumes OCS adnominal genitives and possessive adjectives to have been closer to complementary distribution than their Old Russian counterparts, whereas Bratishenko 1998, leaning on Huntley 1984, comes to the opposite conclusion, that Old East Slavic is closer to
complementary distribution than OCS, which displays considerable interchangeability between genitive and adjective constructions. Either way, one would expect the distribution of the GEN\textsubscript{FREE} to differ in the two languages. The more inclusive the semantics of GEN\textsubscript{FREE}, the further from complementary distribution we are.

A first indication that there may be a difference between the OCS GEN\textsubscript{FREE} and the Old Russian GEN\textsubscript{FREE} is the fact that the construction is slightly more frequent in the OCS corpus than in the Old Russian corpus from period 1. There were 119 certain occurrences of the OCS GEN\textsubscript{FREE} construction, constituting 9.3% of the total of 1286 occurrences, whereas 6.4% (149 occurrences) of all 2323 occurrences in the Old Russian material of period 1 were certain instances of the GEN\textsubscript{FREE} construction.

However, figure 6.4, which places the OCS GEN\textsubscript{FREE} construction in the possessive conceptual space, is identical to figure 5.5, which illustrates the corresponding Old Russian construction. Both constructions cover exactly the same parts of the possessive conceptual space (the lighter red field), and have the same semantic centre of gravity in terms of frequency (the darker red field).

Figure 6.4 GEN\textsubscript{FREE} in the possessive conceptual space, OCS
Chart 6.4, however, which compares the more accurate distributions of the Old Russian and OCS constructions, does seem to indicate some differences. Although the OCS and Old Russian constructions clearly have the same centre of gravity, this centre is much clearer in OCS. \( \text{GEN}_{\text{FREE}} \) appears to be more frequent when denoting a non-reference-point intrinsic relationship with a relational head in OCS than in Old Russian. Conversely, the Old Russian construction seems to be more frequent with intrinsic relationships with non-relational heads than the OCS construction. Apparently, then, the presence of a relational head noun is more important to the OCS construction than to the Old Russian construction.

6.5.1 \text{RP}_{\text{TYPE}} \text{ and RP}_{\text{INST}} \text{ with strong unit status}

There is one single example of a \( \text{GEN}_{\text{FREE}} \) construction which must be considered to have \( \text{RP}_{\text{TYPE}} \) semantics in the OCS corpus:

(47)  ἔστιν ἐπάνω εἰς τῇ ὁπαξ ἐκ τῆς ἀρτοῦ τῆς ἑλάσθεν ἐπίθετη
      bread-ACC.PL. offering-GEN.SG. he-took and he-ate
      tous artous tēs prosthēsēs labōn ephagen
      “he took and ate the offering bread/the bread of the Presence” Mar. Luke 6:4
It seems likely that the translator was reluctant to form a denominal adjective from the noun in -enie, and therefore resorted to this highly unusual use of GENFREEd. There are no certain GENFREEd occurrences of RPINST with strong unit status in the OCS corpus.

6.5.2 RPINST without intrinsic relationship  
There were ten instances of GENFREEd involving only a reference point situation on instance level, without an intrinsic relationship, in the OCS material. Two of them were instances of the partly lexically specific construction [vъ NP-GEN město] “in the place of/instead of NP-GEN”. Recall that this construction was found in the Old Russian material as well, and that it consistently occurs with the genitive, whether the genitive-marked NP is complex or not:

(48) kъ yheJI město změsto  
in fish-GEN.SG. place-ACC.SG. serpent-ACC. he-will-give he-DAT  
anti ikthuos ophin autō(i) epidōsei  
“he will give him a serpent instead of fish” Mar. Luke 11:11

In the Old Russian material of period 1, all examples except the occurrences of [vъ NP-GEN město] had inanimate and abstract genitive-marked nouns. In the OCS material, however, this was not the case. There were three instances with nouns denoting persons, all of them in the genitive plural (49), and one denoting a group of people, always occurring in the plural in this sense (50):

(49) hie cn̄k̄ λαίκτη who devour house-ACC.PL. widow-GEN.PL.  
hoi karesthiou αις των κήρων  

(50) na περ construcción  
on road-ACC.SG. Gentile-GEN.PL. not you-walk  
eis hodon ethnē mē apelthēete  
“do not walk onto the road of the Gentiles” Ass. Matthew 10:5

The number of occurrences is too small for us to be certain that GENFREEd is more prevalent with genitive-marked common nouns denoting persons in OCS than in Old Russian.

According to SJS (III:429), both Zogr., Mar. and Ass. have a genitive construction in the same place, and the same construction is also found in Matthew 12:4 in Zogr. and Mar., and in Mark 2:26 in Zogr., Mar. and Ass. Mark 2:26 in Savv. has chleby předlúženýe, where předlúženýe is interpreted as a participle in SJS III:429, but it might possibly be taken to be a denominal adjective instead.
The remaining four occurrences were headed by inanimate nouns with singular reference, both concrete and abstract. An abstract example is given in (51).

(51) Ράχ Παντών Ποτόπα
in day-ACC.PL. flood-GEN.SG.

en tais ἡμέραις [ekteinais] tais pro tou kataklusmou
“in the days of the flood (Gr.: in those days before the flood)” Savv. Matthew 24:38

All these four genitive-marked nouns were ones that could easily form denominal adjectives, unlike what we found in the Old Russian material of period 1. Again, however, the number of occurrences is too small to make certain that this is a real difference.

6.5.3 RP_{INST}/INTRINSIC
There were 21 occurrences of non-complex GEN_{FREE} constructions involving both RP_{INST} and an intrinsic relationship, with the genitive-marked noun filling the elaboration site of a relational noun. Thus, as in 11th–14th century Old Russian, these constructions were about twice as frequent as those involving only RP_{INST}. The constructions involved the typical range of relational nouns found with RP_{INST}/INTRINSIC: kinship terms, deadjectival nouns, deverbal nouns with the genitive-marked noun filling the subject elaboration site, nouns denoting body parts etc.

There were five occurrences headed by nouns denoting inherent parts of wholes, where the whole was topical and functioned as a reference point. As in Old Russian, this strongly favours the use of a GEN_{FREE} construction.

(52) Πρόκορεν Πρόκεν Πρόκεν
by root-LOC.SG. tree-GEN.SG.

pros tēn rhizan tôn dendrōn
“by the root of the tree” Ass. Matthew 3:10

Not unexpectedly, all five occurrences had inanimate, concrete genitive-marked nouns.

There were four occurrences with kinship terms (53), and four occurrences with deadjectival nouns (54). The remaining eight occurrences all had different relational head nouns.
immediately cried-out father-NOM.SG. child-GEN.SG. euthus kraxas ho patēr tou paidiou “immediately the father of the child cried out” Savv. Mark 9:24

on all-FEM.ACC.SG. strength-ACC.SG. enemy-GEN.SG. epi pasan tēn dunamin tou ekththrou “on all the power of the enemy” Mar. Luke 10:19

Looking at the genitive-marked nouns involved, however, there are markedly more animate nouns involved than in the Old Russian material of period 1. Ten of the GENFRE constructions with RP_{INST}/INTRINSIC had animate, genitive-marked nouns. Nine of these denoted persons, eight in the singular (such as [53], [54] above), and one in the plural.

Eight out of nine of these nouns were common nouns ([53]–[55] above); only one was a proper noun, and that one occurred in the partially lexically specific construction [vβ slēdθ NP-GEN] “in the track of/after”, which would require a genitive whether the NP were complex or not:

There was also a common noun denoting an animal:

The remaining 11 constructions had inanimate, singular genitive-marked nouns. Six of them were concrete, five of them were abstract. Only the latter five could be
perceived as difficult to form denominal adjectives from. Three of them were occurrences of тъщость запустеница “the abomination of desolation”, as in (58).

(58) егда же θυσίαν θεὸν ἐν τῇ θυσίαν ἐν τῇ θυσίαν θεὸν ἐν τῇ θυσίαν θεὸν ἐν τῇ θυσίαν θεὸν ἐν τῇ θυσίαν θεὸν ἐν τῇ θυσίαν θεὸν ἐν τῇ θυσίαν θεὸν ἐν τῇ θυσίαν θεὸν ἐν τῇ θυσίαν θεὸν ἐν τῇ θυσίαν θεὸν ἐν τῇ θυσίαν θεὸν ἐν τῇ θυσίαν θεὸν ἐν τῇ θυσίαν θεὸν ἐν τῇ θυσίαν θεὸν ἐν τῇ θυσίαν θεὸν ἐν τῇ θυσίαν θεὸν ἐν τῇ θυσίαν θεὸν ἐν τῇ θυσίαν θεὸν ἐν τῇ θυσίαν θεὸν ἐν τῇ θυσίαν θεὸν ἐν τῇ θυσίαν θεὸν ἐν τῇ θυσίαν θεὸν ἐν τῇ θυσίαν θεὸν ἐν τῇ θυσίαν θεὸν ἐν τῇ θυσίαν θео

hotan oun idete to bdelugma tēs erēmosiōs

“so when you see the abomination of desolation”

Thus, as in the Old Russian material of period 1, GENFREE was more frequent with RP<INST>/INTRINSIC than with non-intrinsic RP<INST>, and apparently also much less dependent on the semantics and derivational properties of the genitive-marked noun. However, this tendency seems clearer in OCS, particularly due to the quite liberal use of genitive-marked nouns denoting persons. It should be noted that most of these occurred in the singular, something which may well be connected with the fact that type 2 adjectives formed from common noun stems were more consistently used with plural reference in the OCS material than in the Old Russian material of period 1.

6.5.4 INTRINSIC with relational head

Even more so than in the Old Russian material of period 1, this is the indisputable semantic centre of gravity of the OCS GENFREE construction, comprising 63 (52.9 %) of all 119 occurrences. Again, this was fully expected, as this construction is the obvious choice with head nouns denoting inherent parts of wholes. As in the Old Russian material (cf. section 5.6.4), GENFREE constructions headed by nouns denoting measure or by substantival numerals were not counted, since the genitive has no competition in these cases. Including them would have given an even higher percentage.

35 (55.6 %) of the occurrences in this group were headed by nouns denoting inherent parts of wholes.

(59) ὀπῇ ἐκ τῶν περατῶν τῆς γῆς

“from the ends of the earth” Mar. Luke 11:31

88 The main translation into English in Nestle-Aland is “So when you see the desolating sacrilege ...”, which is a reading quite different from my interpretation of a deadjectival head noun plus a genitive-marked noun filling its elaboration site. The phrase is from the prophet Daniel, and therefore in itself a translation into Greek, and the passage may well have been unclear to at least one of the translators.

89 Note that Huntley (1984:226–232), in his exploration of the impact of specificity and animacy in the choice of possessive construction, lists a number of examples with bare genitives, of which all but one are headed by relational nouns (mostly deverbal and deadjectival).
Of the remaining occurrences, 14 were headed by deverbal nouns. In all of them, the genitive-marked noun filled elaboration sites corresponding to regular accusative objects. Most of the genitive-marked nouns were inanimate and singular, concrete (60) or abstract (61). There was only one occurrence with an animate genitive-marked noun (62). Thus, there was a more varied selection of “objects” than in the Old Russian material of period 1, where the genitive-marked nouns were almost exclusively abstract.

(60) **-sama NOM.SG.** **-world GEN.SG.**
ho sōtēr tou kosmou
“the saviour of the world” Zogr. John 4:42

(61) **and for increasing** ACC.SG. **lawlessness GEN.SG.**
dries-out
**love NOM.SG.** **many GEN.PL.**
ki dia to plēthunthēnai tēn anomian psugēsetai ĕg apē tōn pollōn
“and because wickedness is multiplied, the love of many will wither away” Savv. Matthew 24:12

(62) **about** **catch LOC.SG.** **fish GEN.PL.**
epi tō(i) agra(i) tōn i̇kthuōn

The last 14 occurrences were headed by various relational nouns, including seven ruler nouns (63), three kinship terms where the genitive-marked noun was clearly not a reference point (64), and two representation nouns (65).

(63) **by** **Beelzebul LOC.SG.** **prince** LOC.SG. **demon GEN.PL.**
de-Beelzeboul tō(i) archonti tōn daimoniōn ekballei ta daimonia
“he casts out demons by Beelzebul, the prince of demons” Mar. Luke 11:15

(64) **and if** **will-be** **there** **son NOM.SG.** **peace GEN.SG.**
kai ēan ekei ĕ(i) huios eirēnēs
“and if a son of peace is there” Mar. Luke 10:6
All in all, the situation was not very different from that found in the corresponding Old Russian constructions of period 1. There were more occurrences with head nouns denoting inherent parts of wholes in OCS, and possibly a little more flexibility as to the semantics of the genitive-marked nouns, but otherwise the pattern was much the same.

6.5.5 INTRINSIC with non-relational head
There were 15 occurrences of GENFREE with an intrinsic relationship between a non-relational head and a genitive-marked noun which was not a reference point. This is a markedly lower figure than that found in the Old Russian material of period 1. The difference is mostly due to the fact that only two instances with an intrinsic relationship of apposition were found in the OCS material, as opposed to the 27 instances in the Old Russian material of period 1. Note, however, that 21 of the Old Russian occurrences were of a very specific kind and only from the Russkaja pravda (section 5.6.5, example [141]). The two OCS instances (66, 67) were very like the remaining six Old Russian occurrences (section 5.6.5, examples [139] and [140]).

(66) προαναγγέλλω <κρώττις> <εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας>
preaching <kingdom-GEN.SG.> “preaching the gospel of the kingdom” Ass. Matthew 9:35

(67) τὸ ἑορτά τοῦ πάσχα

The remaining occurrences had intrinsic relationships with various interpretations. There was one example of an emphatic construction. This construction is clearly related to appositions, as the referent of the two (closely related) nouns is the same:

(68) ἀναθέματι τοῦ παρακαλεόντα
to praising-GEN.SG. “to the praise of praise” Supr. 16:194/18
The remaining instances mostly had typical genitive interpretations of the intrinsic relationships involved, where the genitive-marked noun denoted what the head noun was part of, consisted of or contained (69), but also more unexpected interpretations such as purpose or goal (70).

(69) ἐκλεκτὴς ὁ ἥλιος
net-ACC.SG. fish-GEN.PL.
surontes to dīktuon tôn ikhthuôn
“dragging the net (full) of fish” Zogr. John 21:8

(70) ἡδὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ θαλάσσης
road-NOM.SG. sea-GEN.SG.
hodon thalassēs
“the road to the sea/toward the sea” Ass. Matthew 4:15

6.5.6 Comparison with Old Russian
As seen in the beginning of section 6.5, the literature might lead us to expect that the OCS GEN<sub>FREE</sub> construction would differ from its Old Russian counterpart, probably by having a wider distribution and being more frequent. To some extent, this seems to hold true: GEN<sub>FREE</sub> was slightly more frequent in the OCS material, and there were some signs that its semantics was somewhat more inclusive. However, the main impression is, again, that the two constructions were very similar. They were both strongly conditioned by the presence of an intrinsic relationship of some kind, and both had the same semantic centre of gravity: INTRINSIC with a relational head. This was actually even clearer in the OCS material.

Both languages had occurrences of GEN<sub>FREE</sub> with RP<sub>INST</sub> without an intrinsic relationship. In the Old Russian material of period 1, these mostly seemed to occur because a DA construction was either unavailable, ambiguous or undesirable for other reasons. This was not at all the case in the OCS material, where all the occurrences involved nouns which could easily form denominal adjectives, and four of them even denoted persons, all of them in the plural. Thus, the GEN<sub>FREE</sub> construction was not more frequent in this function than in the Old Russian material, but it nonetheless appeared to be used more freely.

Both in the Old Russian and OCS material, the GEN<sub>FREE</sub> construction was used more freely when an intrinsic relationship was involved in addition to the RP<sub>INST</sub>, with fewer restrictions on the types of genitive-marked nouns that could

---

90 In example (70), the choice of construction is clearly influenced by the Greek text, where ἡδὸν “road-ACC.” is used as a preposition with the genitive, meaning “towards”, under Hebrew influence (Bauer and Danker (eds.) 2000:691).
occur. However, the tendency was clearer in the OCS material, particularly due to the high proportion of genitive-marked nouns denoting persons.

When no reference point was involved, only an intrinsic relationship, with or without a relational head noun, the OCS and Old Russian occurrences were, again, very similar, with only subtle differences. GEN\textsubscript{FREE} was used freely with nouns denoting inherent parts of wholes, but was also extended to other intrinsic relationships between relational nouns and their elaboration sites. When no relational noun was involved, the construction would take on typical genitive interpretations, all closely related to the part–whole relationship. A tentative semantic network for the OCS GEN\textsubscript{FREE} construction might look something like this:

\textit{Figure 6.5 Semantic network for GEN\textsubscript{FREE}, OCS}

![Semantic network for GEN\textsubscript{FREE}, OCS]

The only difference from the Old Russian network in figure 5.6 on page 154 is that the box representing non-intrinsic RP\textsubscript{INST} has continuous borders rather than dashed ones, as the presence of such semantics with GEN\textsubscript{FREE} constructions is clearly less tenous in OCS.

6.6 DAT

As in the Old Russian material of period 1, the DAT construction is not very frequent in the OCS corpus, accounting for 7.3 % (94) of all occurrences, as compared to 6.5 % of the Old Russian possessive constructions of period 1. This similarity is actually quite surprising, as the use and frequency of the DAT construction is perhaps the point where the Old Russian and OCS systems are expected to differ the most. Recall
from section 2.4 that many scholars have considered the Old Russian possessive dative a loan from OCS, and a quite infrequent one at that, according to some. The fact that the construction is only slightly more frequent in the OCS material than in the 11th–14th century Old Russian corpus indicates that this is not the case.

The place of DAT in the possessive conceptual space is illustrated in figure 6.6, which is very like the figure illustrating the place of its Old Russian counterpart (figure 5.7). However, figure 6.6 indicates that the semantics of the OCS construction is somewhat wider than that of the Old Russian construction, and this is confirmed in Chart 6.5, giving the more accurate distribution of DAT. In the figure, the lighter red field indicates the full distribution of the construction, and the darker red field marks its semantic centre of gravity in terms of frequency.

*Figure 6.6 DAT in the possessive conceptual space, OCS.*
Chart 6.5 shows us that the distributions of DAT in the Old Russian material of period 1 and the OCS material do differ to some extent: Non-intrinsic RP\textsubscript{INST} is somewhat more frequent in OCS than in 11th–14th century Old Russian, and though INTRINSIC with a relational head noun is the obvious semantic centre of gravity of both constructions, it is even more markedly so in the 11th–14th century Old Russian material than in the OCS corpus. The similarities are far greater than the differences, however. In particular, both DAT constructions share the same strong link with other dative constructions and their pervading and homogeneous semantics. The OCS DAT construction, just as its Old Russian counterpart, is clearly the result of a natural semantic extension of typical dative meanings. This also means that we have the same difficulties in being certain that we are really dealing with [NP, NP-DAT] constructions as in the Old Russian material (cf. section 5.7), and this makes the number of constructions with uncertain semantics quite high.

6.6.1 RP\textsubscript{TYPE} and RP\textsubscript{INST} with strong unit status
There were no instances of DAT with RP\textsubscript{TYPE} in the OCS corpus, and only one with RP\textsubscript{INST} and strong unit status. The construction is onomastic, as it is the name of a field:

(71) \begin{tabular}{lllll}
\textbf{ТРЯЖЕ} & \textbf{НАРЬЕ} & \textbf{ЧА} & \textbf{ЧЕЛО} & \textbf{ТО} \\
therefore & called & REFL. & field-NOM.SG. & that-NOM.SG.
\end{tabular}
This single occurrence was not represented in figure 6.6, as, in my opinion, extending the field of distribution would be a misrepresentation of the tendency in the material.

6.6.2 RP\textsubscript{INST} without intrinsic relationship

There were eleven instances of DAT which involved a reference point, but no intrinsic relationship, a slightly higher proportion than in the Old Russian material of period 1 (11.7% vs. 7.3%). All of them correspond to Greek genitive constructions, but it is nonetheless easy to see possible benefactive interpretations with several of them. (72) has a fairly clear reference point reading, but examples such as (73) have the possibility of a benefactive reading, besides the more likely reference point reading:

(72) \varepsilon\varphi\alpha\omicron\tau\omicron\alpha\varsigma\nu \chi\varsigma\zeta\nu \iota\omicron\nu\varsigma \varsigma\tau\alpha\nu\omega\nu \tau\omicron\nu o\varsigma\iota\nu\varsigma \\
\text{eternal-FEM.DAT.SG.} \text{life-DAT.SG.} \text{crown-ACC.SG.} \text{take} \\
\text{ton stephanon tēs aiōniou zōēs} \\
"the crown of eternal life" Supr. 11:154/14–15

(73) \varepsilon\kappa\rho\iota\pi\alpha\lambda\nu\iota\kappa\iota\nu\kappa \tau\alpha\omicron\eta\omicron \iota\omicron\omicron \iota\omicron\nu \omicron\omicron \\
lamp-NOM.SG. \text{body-DAT.SG.} \text{is} \text{eye-NOM.SG.} \\
\text{ho lukhnos tou sōmatos estin ho ophthalmos} \\
"the lamp of the body is the eye" Ass. Matthew 6:22

There were 24 occurrences involving both a reference point on instance level and an intrinsic relationship, and as in the Old Russian material of period 1, the constructions were headed by relational nouns which were mostly highly compatible with the core dative semantics of a person surrounded by a personal sphere and affected by something in that sphere (figure 5.8, p. 158). Much like in the Old Russian material, the most frequently occurring relational nouns were nouns denoting body parts (almost half of the occurrences), deverbal nouns (with “subjects”) and nouns denoting kinship and other human relationships.

Nouns denoting body parts typically have their elaboration sites filled by animate referents, who have control over and depend on the head noun, and are therefore very suitable heads of DAT constructions:
(74) **ἐπιστρέψαι καρδίας πατέρων επί τέκνα**

**to turn the fathers’ hearts to the children** Mar. Luke 1:17

It is interesting to note that none of the four occurrences where the dative-marked NP fills a subject elaboration site of a deverbal noun involves an agent role. The dative-marked NPs are either themes or experiencers, and thus at least in the latter case conform to typical dative semantics.

(75) **ἐπίθετον ἀνθρώπου [...] τοὺς ἐπί τέκνα**

**of the children**

“there lay a multitude waiting for the moving of the water” Zogr. John 5:3

Similarly, the relative denoted by a kinship term would typically be located in the personal sphere of and affecting the person denoted by the dative-marked noun filling its elaboration site – this is one of the rare instances where the Greek text also has a dative construction:

(76) **καί ἰσόποιον τι θαυμάσσειτε τῆς δόξης**

**and behold they carried out having died the only son of his mother** Mar. Luke 7:12

As in the 11th–14th century Old Russian material, constructions with RP INST/INTRINSIC also sometimes had possible benefactive readings, but less frequently than when no intrinsic relationship was involved.

With the occurrences with RP INST/INTRINSIC, there was a clear tendency for the dative-marked NP to be a bare noun, rather than to be complex. This tendency goes for the DAT constructions in general (75.5 % of all OCS DAT constructions involved a bare dative-marked noun), both in the OCS and the Old Russian material. It seems likely that the DAT construction in both languages was a possible resort

---

91 There were three such occurrences in the OCS corpus: this one, one headed by a noun denoting a human relationship other than kinship, and one with the dative-marked NP filling the object elaboration site of a deverbal noun.
when both an adjective construction and a GEN\_FREE construction were difficult or inconvenient to use.

### 6.6.3 INTRINSIC

In OCS, just as in Old Russian, the obvious semantic centre of gravity of the DAT construction is INTRINSIC with a relational head noun. 40 such occurrences were found in the OCS material. In the Old Russian material, the relational nouns involved in such constructions are mostly deverbal, with the dative-marked NP filling an object elaboration site. In the OCS material, we find a more balanced and varied selection of relational nouns in these occurrences.

There were 19 occurrences with the dative-marked NP filling some kind of object elaboration site of a deverbal noun. Eleven of them had dative-marked NPs corresponding to regular accusative objects (77), whereas the remaining eight instances all were examples of (78), where the head noun is derived from the verb *skržžtati* “gnash”, which takes an instrumental object.

(77) H СЪТРОЖКยก K’I ΑΟΡΙЯ ТИΟΛΑΡI
and 1-will-make you-ACC.PL. catcher-GEN\=ACC.SG. man-DAT.PL.
kai poiēsō humas halieis anthrōpōn
“and I will make you catchers of men” Ass. Matthew 4:19

(78) ΤΟΥ ΚΩΔΑΤ’h ΠΑΛΛ’h Η ΟΚΡΑΖΗΤ’h
there will-be weeping-NOM.SG. and gnashing-NOM.SG.
ZΧΚΡΟΛ’h
tooth-DAT.PL.
ekei estai ho klauthmos kai ho brugmos tōn odontōn
“there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth” Savv. Matthew 25:30

In the Old Russian material of period 1, the DAT construction was the most frequent way of expressing the relationship between a deverbal noun and a noun filling its object elaboration site. In the OCS material, this was not so: DAT was clearly less frequent than GEN\_COMPLEX (which constituted 34.7 % of all constructions of this type), and a little more frequent than the indisputable cases of GEN\_FREE (25.4 % DAT, 18.7 % GEN\_FREE). Nonetheless, the DAT construction was clearly an important option, and the motivation would be the same as sketched in section 5.7.4: The noun which fills the object elaboration site is typically affected in some way by the action denoted by the deverbal noun, that is, it has a type of semantics very compatible with the dative case. The higher frequency of DAT in these cases in Old Russian may be related to the fact that genitive constructions seem to have been avoided with animate genitive-marked nouns to a greater extent in Old Russian than in OCS.
There were 21 occurrences with non-deverbal relational nouns. Of these, as in Old Russian, the most frequent were nouns denoting rulers/leaders (seven occurrences). As rulers typically affect their subjects very much, and are clearly located within their personal sphere, such a use of the DAT construction is well motivated. However, the dative-marked nouns in such constructions were not always animate:

(79) ἡ διπλασία τοῦ βασιλέα

lord-NOM.SG. vineyard-DAT.SG.
ho kurios tou ampelōnos
“the master of the vineyard” Savv. Matthew 21:40

Interestingly, the only other type of relational noun with more than scattered occurrences were nouns denoting inherent parts of wholes. However, four out of six occurrences had nouns denoting “beginning” and “end”, and were deverbal as well (80). The two remaining occurrences might alternatively be interpreted as external possession constructions (cf. section 5.7) (81).92

(80) ἀρχὴ τῶν σιγήρων

all-NOM.PL. PARTICLE this-NOM.PL. beginning-NOM.SG.

panta de tauta archē ódinoṅ
“But all this is the beginning of the pains” Ass. Matthew 24:8

(81) το ἱματόν ἄρπαν ἀρτακάρσιον

untie strap-GEN.SG. boot-DAT.SG. his
lusai ton imanta tōn hupodēmatōn autou
“to untie the strap of his boot” Savv. Mark 1:7

Apart from this, there were two attestations with nouns denoting body parts, and single occurrences of some other relational nouns.

There were only eight occurrences of DAT with an intrinsic relationship between a non-relational head noun and the dative-marked NP, and without an obvious semantic contribution from dative semantics outside the possessive conceptual space (such as purpose, recipient, benefactive and addressee). In three of these, the head noun and the dative-marked NP were in semantic apposition. No such instances were found in the Old Russian material of period 1. In (82), the resurrection is the judgement:

92 External possession constructions typically have animate possessors, but inanimate ones are not out of the question (Payne and Barshi 1999:14).
(82) ἐκπορευόμενοι […] καὶ ἐκ προσώπου […] ἐκ προσώπου καὶ ἐκ προσώπου 
they-will-go-out to resurrection-ACC.SG. judgement-DAT.SG. 
“they will come forth to the resurrection of judgement” Zogr. John 5:29

There was also an example of the related emphatic construction, which was well attested in the Old Russian material of period 1 (section 5.7.5). The last four examples all had temporal readings; three of them were instances of the construction in (83):

(83) ἁρχιερεὺς οὗ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ εἰκονοῦ 
high priest-NOM.SG. being year-DAT.SG. that-NEUT.DAT.SG. 
“who was high priest of that year” Zogr. John 11:49

6.6.4 Comparison of Old Russian and OCS
The OCS DAT construction was expected to be both more frequent and semantically more inclusive than its Old Russian counterpart, but the data show far greater similarities than differences. Once again, we are looking at two constructions with nearly identical distributions, with the same semantic centre of gravity, and with only subtle differences between them. Also, the two DAT constructions were about equally frequent compared to the other constructions in the possessive conceptual space: 7.3% in the OCS material and 6.5% in the Old Russian material of period 1. There was a strong tendency in both corpora for the dative-marked NP to be a bare noun, suggesting that the construction was often resorted to when both a DA construction and a GEN construction were problematic, due to the restrictions on these constructions.

As for the differences, the DAT construction was slightly more frequent in the OCS material when denoting RPINST without an intrinsic relationship. However, as in the Old Russian material of period 1, such constructions were prone to typically dative shades of meanings. When an intrinsic relationship was involved, the DAT construction was equally frequent and involved the same types of relational nouns in both corpora.

When only an intrinsic relationship, and no reference point, was involved, the two DAT constructions differed somewhat. In the Old Russian material of period 1, DAT was far more frequently used with deverbal heads than with other relational heads, and it was the most frequent way of expressing the relationship between a deverbal noun and its “object”. When no relational head was involved, DAT would almost always be an emphatic construction where the head noun and the dative-marked noun were the same. In the OCS material, however, there was more variation. The DAT construction was less important as a means for expressing the deverbal
noun–object relation, and was as frequently found with other relational nouns. When no relational noun was involved, there was also more variation; apposition constructions and constructions with temporal readings were found, as well as an emphatic construction.

The attestations of DAT in the OCS corpus, then, show us a construction which is no more frequent and only slightly more flexible than the one found in the Old Russian material of period 1 as a whole. However, it should certainly be kept in mind that the frequency of the DAT construction does differ from genre to genre in the Old Russian material: It is nearly twice as frequent in religious texts than in narrative ones, and in the business/legal texts, it is only attested twice. However, the distribution does not differ much between the data from the two Old Russian genres and the OCS corpus, as illustrated in chart 6.6.

Chart 6.6 Distribution of the DAT constructions in 11th–14th century Old Russian narrative and religious texts, and in the OCS corpus

6.7 “Mixed” constructions

In chapter 5, we saw that in addition to the five main constructions, two types of “mixed” constructions were found in the possessive conceptual space in the Old Russian material of period 1: the double adjective construction [DA, DA, NP] and the
DA/GEN construction [DA, N-GEN, NP]. 93 Both constructions violate the complementary distribution “rule” (denominal adjectives are used even though the possessor consists of more than one word). Both of these constructions were found in the OCS material as well, and they were about as (in)frequent as in the Old Russian corpus. 94

In the Old Russian material, all examples of the double adjective construction are paratactic. In the OCS material, all the six double adjective constructions involving denominal adjectives of type 2 only are also paratactic, with two separate “possessors” on an equal footing:

(84) ὀτῷ ἐλευθερινίκης ἔνθις ὀτῷ ἀρχηγοποιήσις
from Ἑλλησπόντικης-ΜΑΣC.ГЕN.PL. and from Ἀσία-ίσκ-ΜΑSC.ГEΝ.PL.
Ῥωμαίος
city-GEN.PL.
tὸν περὶ Ἑλλησπόντων καὶ τὴν Ἀσιαν πόλιν
“from the cities around the Hellespont and Asia” Supr. 16:201/20–21

Of the five double adjective constructions involving only type 1 adjectives, three were paratactic, and two had a relationship of apposition between head noun and denominal adjective. However, in both those cases, one adjective seems to have been formed from both the nouns that were in apposition at once (85).

(85) Ἰησοῦς Ἰησοῦν-ΝΕΥT.NOM.SG. ζῆς ὅτε ἠγέρθη καὶ
Jesus-Christ-ov-NEUT.NOM.SG. PARTICLE birth-NOM.SG. such-NOM.
καὶ;
was
tοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡ γέννησις οὕτως ἔν
“now the birth of Jesus Christ was like this” Ass. Matthew 1:18

There were two constructions involving one adjective of each type, and in both cases, the DA2 modified the DA1. In (86), Ἰσκαριώτισκουεμοῦ denotes the place of origin of the Simon in Ἰσμανοῦ, even though it agrees (and has to agree) in case and number with Ἰουδα. 95

93 This is of course a simplification. Just like the DA1 and DA2 constructions, the DA/GEN and double adjective constructions are schematic constructions that generalise over groups of constructions, as various adjective types are involved, and also various relationships between the adjectives and genitives.
94 The double adjective construction accounted for 0.6 % (13) of all constructions in the Old Russian material, and 1 % (13) in the OCS corpus, the DA/GEN construction accounted for 0.6 % (15) and 0.9 % (11) respectively.
95 It is not impossible to interpret the adjective Ἰσκαριώτισκουεμοῦ as denoting Judas’ place of origin, and Ἰσμανοῦ just as a patronym, but that would contradict the Greek original.
Thus, the OCS construction might be more flexible than the Old Russian construction when it came to the semantic interrelationship between the two adjectives. However, the distribution of relationships with the head nouns in the constructions was quite similar to that found in the Old Russian material of period 1, apart from the fact that there were no instances of INTRINSIC with non-relational heads in the Old Russian corpus (four in the OCS material), and no instances of RP_{TYPE} in the OCS corpus (three in the Old Russian material).

The eleven DA/GEN constructions found in the OCS material were very like those of the Old Russian material of period 1: Only two involved denominal adjectives of type 2, and both of these were paratactic (87). The remaining occurrences involved type 1 adjectives; three were paratactic, and in six of them the adjective and the genitive were in apposition (88)

(86) κην κρινηνης ανακρινηνης ανακρινηνης
  in heart-ACC.SG. Judas-DAT.SG. Simon-ov-MASC.DAT.SG.

Iscariot-isk-MASC.DAT.SG

eis tēn kardian […] Ioudas Simōnos Iskariōtou
  “into the heart of Judas (son) of Simon Iscariot” Zogr. John 13:2

(87) ουστροφεινην πρωκεινηνγκεινην και πρωκεινην
about ordering-LOC.SG. church-in-NEUT.LOC.SG. and true-FEM.GEN.SG.

κηρην
faith-GEN.SG.

epi tē(i) katastasei tōn … ekklēsiōn kai tēs orthodoxou pisteōs
  “about the ordering of the churches and the true faith” Supr. 16:203/3–4

(88) ηα αριστερηνηκην αριστερηνηκην
  in palace-ACC.SG. high priest-ov-MASC.ACC.SG. called-MASC.GEN.SG.

Καιαφηι
Caiaphas-GEN.SG.

eis tēn aulēn tou archierēōs tou legomenou Kaïapha
  “into the palace of the high priest, who was called Caiaphas” Savv. Matthew
  26:3

The OCS distribution was very like the one in the Old Russian material of period 1, in that all constructions but one ([87] above) involved reference points on instance level, both with and without intrinsic relationships.

6.8 The interplay of the constructions

Again, we will sum up the survey of OCS possessive constructions by plotting in all the five main constructions in the map of the possessive conceptual space. The
coloured lines represent the outer boundary of the distribution of each construction. The coloured fields represent the semantic centre of gravity of each construction.

Figure 6.7 Distributions of OCS possessive constructions in the possessive conceptual space

Unsurprisingly, the figure is very similar to figure 5.9, which illustrates the Old Russian distribution. Only two constructions are near a complete overlap: the DA1 construction and the GEN$\text{RESTR}$ construction do cover the same parts of the possessive conceptual space. However, GEN$\text{RESTR}$ is considerably more frequent with INTRINSIC with a non-relational head, and in that part of the possessive conceptual space, as in Old Russian, the construction interacts neatly with the DA2 construction, not the DA1 construction. Still, all of the possessive constructions overlap to quite a large extent. The only part of the map which does not have attestations of all five constructions is RP$\text{TYPE}$ and the adjoining RP$\text{INST}$ with strong unit status.

Looking at the frequencies of the constructions, we find that each construction except the DA2 construction has one obvious semantic centre of gravity, and that these centres of gravity are very similar to the ones found in Old Russian. The centres
of gravity are roughly indicated in figure 6.7. The OCS DA2 construction seems to have two semantic centres, both \( \text{RP}^{\text{TYPE}}/\text{RP}^{\text{INST}} \), as in the Old Russian material of period 1, and also INTRINSIC with non-relational head, but these two centres are closely bound by the presence or possibility of conventionalised strong unit status, which is so central to the DA2 construction.

Is there a situation of complementary distribution between some of the possessive constructions in OCS? Again, the answer must be no if we are to have a strict understanding of the term. As in 11th–14th century Old Russian, there is a fairly strong tendency towards complementary distribution between DA1, DA2 and \( \text{GEN}^{\text{RESTRI}} \) when a reference point on instance level is involved. The adjective constructions are used when the possessor consists of a single noun stem, whereas \( \text{GEN}^{\text{RESTRI}} \) is reserved for complex possessors and possessors of a word class or noun type from which a denominal adjective cannot be formed. However, this tendency is weakened when an intrinsic relationship is also involved, and even when it is not, constructions with bare genitive-marked nouns do turn up. These cases are not more frequent in the OCS corpus than in the Old Russian one, but they are clearly less dependent on the semantics of the possessor, and include animates and other noun stems which can easily form denominal adjectives. Also, the “mixed” DA/GEN and double adjective constructions are as frequent in OCS as in Old Russian, and both violate the alleged complementary distribution. Thus, even more so than when dealing with Old Russian, there is no reason to exaggerate the focus on complementary distribution. Such an approach only obscures the fact that OCS, just as Old Russian, has five possessive constructions that are separate, but partly overlapping, polysemous, but with clear semantic centres of gravity, and that compete and interact in many ways in the possessive conceptual space.

6.9 The relative influence of head nouns and modifiers in the possessive constructions

This chapter, just as chapter 5, has focused mostly on the relative semantic contributions of constructions and their head nouns. However, Huntley 1984 looks at OCS possessive constructions from the opposite angle – just like Bratishenko 1998 (inspired and supervised by Huntley) does with the Old Russian system: Huntley looks mainly at the semantics of the modifier noun stems involved, pointing out considerable definiteness and animacy effects, and in a very insightful way.

As mentioned in section 5.10, the “definiteness” effects can, in my opinion, be better dealt with by the concept of reference point: Reference points are topical and
have cue validity enough to identify a target. And not least, they are directly relevant to what possessive constructions are prototypically for.

As for animacy effects, they have been noted throughout the chapter. As in Old Russian, type 1 denominal adjectives were to an overwhelming extent formed from noun stems denoting persons with singular reference, mostly proper nouns. There were also some rare instances such as Izrailevъ “Israel’s” and Iodovъ “Judah’s”, denoting peoples/population groups, and metonymically also the places they inhabit. Type 2 adjectives denoting persons strongly – even more so than in Old Russian – tended to have plural reference when they were reference points on instance level or filled object elaboration sites of deverbal nouns.

In the Old Russian material of period 1, we saw that the GEN\textsubscript{FREE} construction was seldom found with animate genitive-marked nouns, and that this tendency was stronger the further away from the construction’s semantic centre of gravity we got. In the OCS material, there was no such obvious tendency. Therefore the OCS GEN\textsubscript{FREE} construction did not have the obvious division of labour – seen in the Old Russian material of period 1 – with the DAT construction, which (in keeping with typical dative semantics) often had animate dative-marked nouns, or was headed by relational nouns which would typically have an animate noun filling its elaboration site. The importance of animacy effects is actually one of the (subtle) differences in distribution of the OCS and Old Russian possessive constructions: The choice of possessive construction seems to be slightly less affected by the animacy/inanimacy of the possessor noun in OCS than in 11th–14th century Old Russian.

Thus, as in 11th–14th century Old Russian, we may conclude that the semantics of possessor noun (stem) is of importance in the selection of possessive constructions. However, as I have shown, the presence or absence of a reference point situation as well as the semantic contribution of relational nouns are of at least equal importance if one is to do the complex interrelationship of OCS possessive constructions justice.

6.10 Interrelationship between Greek original and OCS NPs

The overwhelming majority – 88.3 % – of the occurrences of OCS possessive constructions in my corpus are translations of Greek adnominal genitive constructions [NP, NP-GEN]. There is a bit of variation from construction to construction: The two constructions that are most consistently translations of the Greek genitive constructions are DA1 (94.3 %) and DAT (93 %). Interestingly, the two genitive constructions put together are actually less consistent: 87.6 % of all the genitive occurrences are translations of Greek genitive constructions. The DA2 construction is
clearly the least consistent one, 80.9 % of all DA2 constructions are translations of a Greek genitive construction. However, this is still a very high figure.

A few of the OCS adjective constructions (1.2 % of the DA1 constructions and 6.2 % of the DA2 constructions) were translations of Greek adjective constructions, and three dative constructions (and one genitive construction!) were translations of Greek dative constructions. However, in most cases where the Greek original did not have a genitive construction, it had some other construction from outside the possessive conceptual space instead, such as a prepositional phrase:

(89) ορ κ από τον Ποταμό του Iordana
by that-MASC.ACC.SG. half-ACC.SG. Jordan-GEN.SG.
peran tou Iordanou
across the-MASC.GEN.SG. Jordan-GEN.SG.
“on the other side of the Jordan” Zogr. John 1:28

All in all, the Greek of the original texts obviously had a genitive construction that was much more semantically inclusive and freely used than the OCS genitive constructions, or for that matter any of the other constructions in the possessive conceptual space. It also seems likely that in the translation, the typically Indo-European genitive construction found in Greek has had very little impact on the complex Slavic system of possessive constructions. This system is as clearly displayed in the OCS translated texts as in the Old Russian original texts, which were under a considerably weaker influence from Greek.

6.11 Summary: Comparison of the two systems

All in all, the conclusion to the comparison of Old Russian and OCS possessive constructions must be that the two systems are remarkably similar. There are more differences in frequency than in distribution, and the distributional differences are mostly quite subtle.

The DA1 construction has a virtually identical distribution in both languages, although it was considerably more frequent in the OCS material (30.7 % of all occurrences) than in the Old Russian material of period 1 (19.4 % of all occurrences).

The DA2 construction, on the other hand, is more frequent in the 11th–14th century Old Russian material (36.7 % of all occurrences) than in the OCS material (26.6 % of all occurrences). The differences in distribution are probably mostly due to the subject matter (the high number of foreign toponyms in the OCS texts). However, the OCS texts were also more consistent in forming type 2 adjectives from animates only if they had plural reference.
The GEN restraint construction was remarkably similar both in distribution and frequency (OCS 22.9%, Old Russian 27.5% of all occurrences[^96]) in both corpora. The GEN free construction, on the other hand, was slightly more frequent in the OCS material (9.3% vs. 6.4% of all occurrences), and was also apparently somewhat more available for use with animate possessors, even when no intrinsic relationship was involved. However, the same tendencies were present in the Old Russian material as well, though more weakly expressed.

The DAT construction was, quite surprisingly, about equally frequent in both corpora (7.3% of all OCS occurrences, 6.5% of all Old Russian occurrences). Both corpora showed a strong tendency for the DAT construction to have bare dative-marked nouns instead of complex NPs. This suggests that it had a status as a “last-resort” construction in both languages. The OCS construction did seem to be slightly more semantically flexible than the Old Russian one, but again, the differences were subtle.

Finally, both corpora had about the same proportions of “mixed” possessive constructions, with about the same distributions.

With this in mind, we can return to the reasons listed in the beginning of this chapter for comparing OCS with Old Russian.

Firstly, the two systems were compared because OCS is the earliest attested Slavic language, and therefore might reveal an earlier stage of the Old Russian system of possessive constructions. However, given the overwhelming similarities of the two systems, it is fair to say that the claim of Richards 1976 – that OCS adjective and genitive constructions were closer to a Common Slavic state of complementary distribution than the Old Russian ones – is almost certainly false. Rather, the two languages seem to deviate about equally (OCS slightly more) from a perfect complementary distribution, and the concept of complementary distribution is probably an equally oversimplifying strategy for describing both languages.

Secondly, an OCS corpus was deemed necessary in order to evaluate the claims of Church Slavic influence on Old Russian possessive constructions. Again, the strong similarities of the two systems do not suggest any great pressure from Church Slavic. However, it is a fact that the DAT construction is considerably more frequent in the Old Russian religious texts than in the narrative texts, and that it is nearly absent in the business/legal texts. The strong East Slavic features of the business/legal texts are not the only factor that can motivate the scarcity of DAT constructions in them. It is equally plausible that the low number of DAT constructions is due the contents of the texts: In a legal codex or a business document,

[^96]: These figures refer to the share of GEN complex occurrences, as GEN restr construcations could not be counted directly.
there is little room for the typical affectedness semantics permeating the use of the DAT construction. Relational nouns are quite scarce in these texts. The most pervading semantics in these texts is actually $\text{RP}_{\text{TYPE}}$ and $\text{RP}_{\text{INST}}$ with strong unit status (about half of the occurrences), meanings quite untypical of the DAT construction in both languages. However, the fact that the DAT construction is more frequent in the religious texts than in the narrative ones would suggest that the frequency of the 11th–14th century Old Russian DAT construction was increased by the Church Slavic influence, and also that the construction may have gained more semantic flexibility. Still, it seems quite unlikely that the construction should be a pure syntactic loan, when it is used so freely and in such accordance with other domains of the dative semantics as it is even in the narrative Old Russian texts.

Finally, an OCS corpus was included in order to look at the possessive constructions in the Greek original texts. As seen in section 6.10, the Greek seemed to have little influence on OCS when it came to possessive constructions. In the overwhelming majority of cases, a genitive construction was found in the Greek original text, no matter which of the wide spectre of OCS possessive constructions it was translated into.
7 The development in Old Russian (1000–1700)

This chapter deals with the diachronic development of the Old Russian possessive constructions, from the earliest texts (11th–14th century) up to the end of the 17th century. Chapters 5 and 6 show clearly that the five main possessive construction types interacted in a complex and subtle way in the earliest Old Russian texts, as well as in the Old Church Slavic canon. In this chapter, maps of the possessive conceptual space will be used to chart the diachronic development of the constructions and their interrelationships. I will examine in detail how the ground was prepared for the much simpler system of possessive constructions found in modern Russian, where a single genitive construction does most of the work, and the other construction types are relegated to the outskirts of the possessive conceptual space – or beyond.

The constructions will be discussed one by one first, and the history of their competition and interrelationships will be studied at the end of the chapter.

7.1 The DA1 construction

Figure 7.1 (figure 5.2 repeated) recapitulates the distribution of the DA1 construction as found in the oldest Old Russian texts. The lighter red area illustrates the full distribution of the DA1 construction, showing that the construction was present in all parts of the possessive conceptual space except RP_{TYPE} and INTRINSIC with non-relational head. However, its obvious centre of gravity was the reference point situation, and it was particularly frequent when an intrinsic relationship was also involved.
Chart 7.1 illustrates the diachronic development of the DA1 construction from period 1 through the 15th, 16th and 17th centuries. A brief look at the chart is enough to tell that the distribution is much the same in the 17th century texts as it was in the corpus of period 1. The centre of gravity is exactly the same, and the DA1 share of all constructions in the possessive conceptual space is also very much the same in all periods, at around 20%. However, there is a clear increase in the percentage of DA1 constructions with a reference point on instance level with strong unit status, and also a bit of a decrease in the proportion of constructions involving reference points, but without strong unit status.
A closer look at the material also reveals a general trend for the construction type to be more and more lexically specific. The range of noun stems from which the adjectives in the constructions are formed gradually becomes narrower, suggesting that the productivity of the suffixes involved was steadily on the decrease, even though the share of DA1 constructions in the possessive conceptual space is almost exactly the same in the material of period 1 and the 17th century corpus.

7.1.1 RP\textsubscript{TYPE} and RP\textsubscript{INST} with strong unit status
As in the corpus of period 1, RP\textsubscript{TYPE} is quite marginal with the DA1 construction in the material from the 15th, 16th and 17th centuries, with one, zero and two examples respectively.

\begin{equation}
\text{а бдеть какие гдравы}
\end{equation}

and will-be some-MASC.NOM.PL. sovereign-ov-MASC.NOM.PL.

debt-NOM.PL.

“and there will be some sovereign’s debts” DG 194/17, 17th century

When it comes to RP\textsubscript{INST} constructions with strong unit status, on the other hand, we see a clear change: In the material of period 1, only 2 % of the DA1 occurrences had
such semantics. In the 17th century material, on the other hand, the share of such constructions is 18.5 %, and in the 16th century material it was as high as 25.5 %.

*Chart 7.2* The share of DA1 constructions with RP$_{INST}$ and strong unit status, 1000–1700

In both the material of period 1 and of the 15th century corpus, all the occurrences of DA1 with strong unit status and an intrinsic relationship are names of days, places, monuments etc.:

(2) душа столпа ИВДЯ

to column-GEN.SG. David-ov-MASC.GEN.SG.
“to David’s column” ChID 23v/12–13, period 1

(3) на ПЕТРОВЪ день

on Peter-ov-MASC.ACC.SG. day-ACC.SG.
“on Peter’s day” AN 26/22, 15th century

In the 16th century material, the majority of the occurrences (21 out of 26) are names of days and places, but there are also five occurrences where the denominal adjective fills the elaboration site of a kinship term, and where the whole construction serves as a patronym (4). In the 17th century material, the majority of occurrences (22 out of 35) are patronyms of this kind.
This example also illustrates that bare adjectives in -ov- (and -in-) were in use as surnames by this time. Technically, these adjectives (Djatlovъ in the example) probably modify the given name of the person (Boris, in this case), but occurrences of such surname constructions in the corpus were not counted as DA1 constructions, as the adjectives in many cases are far removed from the noun stem from which they were originally formed, and the meaning is on the very fringes of the possessive conceptual space. If these occurrences were to be counted as DA1 constructions, they would also have strong unit status, and would only strengthen the impression that the DA1 construction had an increasing tendency to have strong unit status and an onomastic function. As with the patronymic construction in (4), such constructions would also be partly lexically specific, in that the head noun would have to be a given name, just as it would have to be a kinship term in the patronymic construction.

DA1 constructions with RP INST and strong unit status almost always involve adjectives derived from personal names.

7.1.2 RP INST without intrinsic relationship

The proportion of DA1 constructions involving a reference point, but no intrinsic relationship and no strong unit status, is clearly and consistently lower in the 15th, 16th and 17th century texts than in the corpus of period 1.

Chart 7.3 The share of DA1 constructions with non-intrinsic RP INST, 1000–1700

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DA1, non-intrinsic RPINST, 1000–1700</th>
<th>period 1: n=148, 15th century: n=33, 16th century: n=18, 17th century: n=45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Period 1</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th century</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th century</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th century</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, the proportions of the stem types from which the adjectives are formed changes in the period 1000–1700. The share of constructions with the adjectives božij “God’s” (6), господні “the Lord’s”, Christovъ “Christ’s” and Isusovъ “Jesus’s” has a clear increase, from 45.9 % in the material of period 1, to 59.2 % in the 17th century material. Conversely, there is a drop in the share of constructions with adjectives formed from personal names, from 33.8 % in the material of period 1 to 10.2% in the 17th century material. There is also an increase in the share of constructions with adjectives formed from common nouns (not denoting deities), from 20.3 % in the material of period 1 to 30.6 % in the 17th century corpus. The development is illustrated in chart 7.4.

**Chart 7.4 The proportions of the stem types from which the adjectives in DA1 constructions with RP_{INST} were formed, 1000–1700**
7.1.3 RP_{INST}/INTRINSIC
The proportion of DA1 constructions involving both a reference point and an intrinsic relationship remains quite stable throughout the entire period under consideration:

*Chart 7.5 The share of DA1 constructions with RP_{INST}/INTRINSIC, 1000–1700*

However, as with DA1 constructions with RP_{INST}, but without intrinsic relationships, there is a clear change in the range of possessor noun stems involved, as illustrated in chart 7.6.
Chart 7.6 The proportions of stem types from which the adjectives in DA1 constructions with $R_{INST}/INTEGRIC$ were formed, 1000–1700

The share of constructions with the adjectives božij “God’s” (8), gospodnij “the Lord’s” (9), Christovъ “Christ’s” and Isusovъ “Jesus’s” has a very clear increase, from 46.6 % of all DA1 $R_{INST}/INTEGRIC$ constructions in period 1, to a full 74.5 % in the 17th century material.

(8) на милость божию
on grace-ACC.SG. God-iij-FEM.ACC.SG.
“on God’s grace” IG/VG II 254/32, 16th century

(9) по г(о)с(по)дню речению
by lord-ин*-NEUT.DAT.SG. saying-DAT.SG.
“according to the Lord’s saying” ŽAvv 28/1, 17th century

At the same time, the share of constructions with adjectives formed from personal names sinks quite dramatically, from 40.5 % in the material of period 1 to 5.3 % in the 17th century corpus. (10) is one of only five examples in the 17th century corpus:

(10) про Иваннову смерть
about Ivan-ov-FEM.ACC.SG. death-ACC.SG.
“about Ivan’s death” PMM 107/24, 17th century
It should be noted that the total number of denominal adjectives derived from personal names is quite as high in the 15th, 16th and 17th century material as in the corpus of period 1, but to an increasing extent they occur in constructions with strong conventionalised unit status, as seen in section 7.1.1. In particular, the patronymic construction seen in example (4) must be considered a partially specific construction in its own right: [DA1, N\textsubscript{SON/DAUGHTER/CHILD}].

The proportion of constructions with adjectives derived from common noun stems is also quite clearly on the increase. In the material of period 1, they constitute 13 % of all DA1 constructions with RP\textsubscript{INST/INTRINSIC}, in the 16th century corpus they peak at 39.6 %, whereas the share in the 17th century corpus is 20.2 %.

(11) по повелению девицу
by ordering-DAT.SG. maiden-j-NEUT.DAT.SG.
“according to the maiden’s order” ŽPF 216/28, 16th century

Looking at the types of relational head nouns involved in the constructions, we see few changes. The noun types involved do not change much from period 1 and up to 1700. The main types are still deverbal nouns with the DA1 filling a subject elaboration site ([9]–[11] above), kinship terms (12) and nouns denoting other human relationships, deadjectival nouns ([8] above) and nouns denoting body parts (13):

(12) на отца и матери невестиных
on father-ACC=GEN.SG. and mother-ACC.SG. bride-in-ACC=GEN.PL.
“for the bride’s father and mother” RCA 21/27–28, 17th century

(13) на руку чудотворцу
on hand-ACC.SG. miracle-performer-ov-FEM.ACC.SG.
“on the miracle-performer’s hand” PBSV 559/16, 16th century

The relative proportions of the different noun types do show some changes. Not unexpectedly, the share of kinship term heads decreases (from 26.7 % in the material of period 1 to 10.6 % in the 17th century corpus), as constructions headed by kinship terms denoting sons, daughters and children to an increasing extent have strong unit status and function as patronyms. The share of deadjectival head nouns, on the other hand, shows a clear increase (from 9.3 % in the material of period 1 to 26.6 % in the 17th century texts). However, looking at the 25 instances of DA1 constructions with RP\textsubscript{INST/INTRINSIC} headed by deadjectival nouns in the 17th century corpus, we find that 24 out of 25 occurrences are in fact instances of
(14) **МЛЫНЬ** бжия mercy-NOM.SG. God-н-ЕФЕС.NOM.SG.  
“God’s mercy” GG 1:15, 17th century

All of them are from one and the same text. This is symptomatic of a general tendency: Fewer and fewer individual head nouns are found to be involved in the constructions, particularly when the possessor adjective is either божий “God’s”, господний “the Lord’s”, Christовъ “Christ’s” or Исусовъ “Jesus’s”. Formulaic, deeply entrenched specific constructions such as (15) and (16) constitute an increasingly large bulk of all DA1 constructions.

(15) мы [...] живы до воли бжия we-НOM. alive-НOM.PL. to will-GEN.SG. God-н-ЕФЕС GEN.SG.  
“we are alive, according to God’s will” GG 2:6, 17th century

(16) имя Господне name-NOM.SG. Lord-н-ЕУТ.NOM.SG.  
“the Lord’s name” PBSV 559/9, 16th century

Notably, these entrenched constructions are still in use in modern Russian, although genitive constructions such as volja Boga “God’s will” and имя Gospoda “the Lord’s name” are used as well.

7.1.4 INTRINSIC

DA1 constructions remain very rare when no reference point is involved, and, save one occurrence in the 17th century corpus, were only found with relational head nouns. The low percentage of such instances largely remains the same in the entire Old Russian corpus, maybe declining slightly through time (7.6 % in period 1, 2.5 % in the 15th century corpus, 2.9 % in the 16th century corpus, and 5.3 % in the 17th century corpus). As in the material of period 1, a fair share of the occurrences have strong unit status:

(17) страх Божий fear-NOM.SG. God-н-МASC.NOM.SG.  
“the fear of God” PJul 104/23, 17th century

There are also some occurrences where a reference point interpretation seems to be a quite likely alternative:
(18) възмислихся [...] по крещение Христовъ
I-began-thinking about baptism-LOC.SG. Christ-ov-LOC.SG.
“I began thinking about the baptism of Christ/Christ’s baptism” AN 30/4–5, 15th century

In this case, Christové “Christ’s” fills the object elaboration site of the deverbal noun, and is not particularly topical in the text. However, it certainly has sufficient inherent topicality in the Old Russian mediaeval setting to serve as a reference point. What exact shade of meaning Afanasij Nikitin originally intended to convey remains unknown.

7.1.5 Summary

Figure 7.2 is a sketch of the observed changes in the distribution of the DA1 construction from period 1 to the 17th century. The semantic centre of gravity remains the same: the chief function of the construction is still to express reference point situations. However, there is a clear increase in the share of DA1 constructions with strong unit status, which shifts the distribution to the left in the map of the possessive conceptual space. The lighter red field indicates the full distribution of the DA1 construction in the material of period 1, and the darker red field is its semantic centre of gravity, both in period 1 and in the 17th century. The yellow field indicates the construction’s full distribution in the 17th century corpus.

Figure 7.2 DA1 in the possessive conceptual space, period 1 and 17th century
The partially specific patronymic construction [DA1, N_{SON/DAUGHTER/CHILD}] accounts for the main part of the increased share of DA1 constructions with strong unit status. However, this tendency goes with a shift in the range of possessor noun stems involved in the construction when it does not have strong unit status. There is a marked drop in the share of type 1 adjectives formed from personal names, and a corresponding rise in the share of adjectives formed from a narrow set of religious noun stems (God, Lord, Christ, Jesus). There is also a clear rise in the share of adjectives formed from common nouns denoting persons. In addition, the adjectives božij “God’s”, gospodny “the Lord’s”, Christov “Christ’s” and Isusov “Jesus’s” tend to occur more and more frequently in formulaic and strongly entrenched constructions which are still in use in modern Russian.

All these findings indicate that the DA1 construction, though still in frequent use in the 17th century texts, is becoming less and less productive and useful in the possessive conceptual space. The usage-based model (cf. section 4.2) advocated in the present dissertation is a good tool for describing this process: Lower-level schemas and instantiations (with strong unit status, or involving particular adjectives or combinations of particular adjectives and particular head nouns) are becoming much more entrenched than the higher-level construction schema. Figure 7.3 is an illustration of a possible schematic network of the DA1 construction in period 1, where the schematic construction [DA1, NP] is highly entrenched and productive. The weight of the lines indicates the degree of entrenchment.

**Figure 7.3 Partial schematic network of the DA1 construction, period 1 (1000–1400)**

Figure 7.4 is a sketch of the possible state in the 17th century, where various types of lower-level schemas have higher type frequency and are hypothesised to be more deeply entrenched than the schematic construction. Some of the instances of the

---

97 As type 1 adjectives are virtually always formed from noun stems denoting persons (or person-like religious beings), even the top-level schema is not fully schematic. One could never form a DA1 from just any noun stem.
lower-level schemas have high token frequency as well, something which further weakens the higher-level schema.

Figure 7.4 Partial schematic network of the DA1 construction, 17th century

7.2 The DA2 construction

Figure 7.5 (figure 5.3 repeated) recapitulates the distribution of the DA2 constructions found in the Old Russian corpus of period 1. The lighter red field illustrates the full distribution of the DA2 construction, showing that the DA2 construction was present in the entire possessive conceptual space. The darker red field again marks the semantic centre of gravity in terms of frequency. It is very clear that the main task of the DA2 construction in the oldest extant Old Russian texts was to denote reference point situations with strong unit status, either on type or instance level.
Chart 7.7 illustrates the diachronic development of the distribution of the DA2 construction from period 1 and up to 1700. Several clear tendencies are immediately evident: the sharp rise in the share of RP_{TYPE} constructions, the corresponding sharp decrease in constructions denoting RP_{INST} with strong unit status, and also the clearly decreasing share of constructions with unclear semantics. In the 17th century material we are left with a construction which in the majority of cases denotes a reference point situation on type level. Throughout the entire period under consideration, the share of DA2 constructions in the possessive conceptual space remains quite stable at about 35 % of all constructions.
Chart 7.7 Diachronic development of the distribution of the DA2 construction, 1000–1700

DA2 1000–1700 (period 1: n=852, 15th century: n=237, 16th century: n=163, 17th century: n=373)


7.2.1 RP\textsubscript{TYPE}

The clearest diachronic tendency for the Old Russian DA2 construction is the near-doubling of the share of constructions with RP\textsubscript{TYPE}. As seen in chart 7.8, the rise is very evenly distributed over the centuries.
The main bulk of the increase is due to a great rise in the number of complex titles, which are abundant in the 17th century corpus.

(19) дь́мнои́ дворанинъ
duma-nom.SG. nobleman-nom.SG.
“duma nobleman” DG 196/4, 17th century

(20) дети́ боя́рские
child-nom.pl. boyar-nom.pl.
“boyar children” PBSV 552/40, 16th century

The 17th century corpus also has a large share of occurrences where the type-level reference point is the material that the target head nouns is made from, which is perhaps the most typical kind of DA2 RP_TYPE construction in the entire Old Russian corpus:

(21) кр́сть [..] кипариснóи
cross-nom.sg. cypress-nom.sg.
“a cypress cross” DG 193/9–10, 17th century

7.2.2 RP\textsubscript{INST} with strong unit status

The clear increase in the share of constructions with \textit{RP\textsubscript{TYPE}} is matched by an equally clear decrease in the share of constructions with \textit{RP\textsubscript{INST} and strong unit status}. As shown in chart 7.9, the share of such DA2 occurrences in the 17th century corpus is less than half the share in the material of period 1.

\textit{Chart 7.9 Share of DA2 constructions with RP\textsubscript{INST} and strong unit status, 1000–1700}

Most of the decrease appears to be due to the fact that the partially specific DA2 construction [\textit{CITIZEN-ьsk-FEM.SG. zemlja}] is used less and less as the conventional way of naming countries or regions. This is particularly clear in the ways Russia itself is referred to in the texts. In the corpus of period 1, Russia is consistently referred to as \textit{rusьskaja zemlja} “the land of Rus’” (cf. section 5.4.2). During the 15th, 16th and 17th centuries, however, it is more and more frequently referred to as \textit{Rus’}, \textit{Rusija} and \textit{Rosija}, even though the old name is still found in 17th century texts.

(22) \textit{во всей Русстей земли} “in all the land of Rus’” PJul 111/8, 17th century

(23) \textit{вся Россия [...] зряче} “All of Russia looking towards the house of the great miracle-performer” SAP 130/16, 17th century
Apart from this, the share of DA2 constructions with strong unit status used to name places, churches and other buildings remains quite stable from period 1 through the 17th century, such as in example (24).

(24) за Тверскими вороты
behind Tver'-isk-INSTR.PL. gate-INSTR.PL.
“behind the Tver’ gates” ZhAvv 23/39, 17th century

7.2.3 RP<sub>INST</sub> without strong unit status
The share of DA2 constructions involving a reference point on instance level, but without strong unit status, was low in the material of period 1, and remains low in the 15th, 16th and 17th centuries. The figures even indicate a slight decrease, from 6.3 % to 2.7 % of all DA2 constructions when no intrinsic relationship was involved (25), and from 9.7 % to 7.2 % when the construction denoted both a reference point situation and an intrinsic relationship (26).

(25) смертный чась, конець приближается
death-lt-MASC.NOM.SG. hour-NOM.SG. end-NOM. is-approaching
“the hour of death, the end is approaching” PBSV 561/32, 16th century

(26) носа молитвы братьскы
 carrying prayers-ACC.PL. brother-isk-FEM.ACC.PL.
“carrying the brothers’ prayers” ŽZS 11/10, 15th century

However, looking at the stems from which the type 2 adjectives in the constructions are formed, we see quite clear changes. Recall from sections 5.4.3 and 5.4.4 that DA2 constructions of this category were found with adjectives with quite a wide range of semantics in the material of period 1. The noun stems from which the adjectives were formed were either animate with singular (and quite often generic) reference (27), animate with plural/collective reference (28), inanimate and concrete (29), or inanimate and abstract (30).

(27) печаю юрьскою
seal-INSTR.SG. tsar-isk-FEM.INSTR.SG.
“with the Emperor’s seal” ChID 6r/14, period 1

(28) сле не суть очуенны апьльска
where not are teaching-NOM.PL. apostle-isk-NEUT.NOM.PL.
“where do the apostles’ teachings not exist” PVrL 118/4–5, period 1

(29) показати и црьвнюю красотою
show they-DAT. church-ин-FEM.ACC.SG. beauty-ACC.SG.
“to show them the church’s beauty” PVrL 38/2–3, period 1
(30) изъи́рать сла́дость словесную
choosing sweetness-ACC.SG. word-пL.FEM.ACC.SG.
“choosing the words’ sweetness” SDZ 33/6, period 1

All these semantic types were about equally represented in the material of period 1. However, looking at the 15th, 16th and 17th century corpora, we find that the range of stem types narrows down quite dramatically. Already in the 15th century corpus the abstract stems are virtually gone (two attestations), and the 16th and 17th century corpora have only two and three attestations respectively.

(31) пламень огня страстного угаси́ша
flame-ACC.SG. fire-GEN.SG. passion-ин-MASC.GEN.SG. they-extinguished
“they extinguished the flame of the fire of passion” PoslMD 195a/11–12, 16th century

The share of noun stems denoting inanimate, concrete objects remains quite high in the 15th century texts, but is almost gone in the 16th and 17th century corpora.

(32) како бы́ти сть́намь и стрь́льницамь и врата́мь
how be wall-DAT.PL. and tower-DAT.PL. and gate-DAT.PL.
градцыми
city-юск-DAT.PL.
“what the city’s walls and towers and gates would be like” PVC 2/27–28, 15th century

(33) очи сердечные
eye-NOM.DUAL. heart-ин-NEUT.NOM.DUAL.
“the heart’s eyes” ZAvv 19/1, 17th century

The share of occurrences with adjectives formed from noun stems denoting animates (almost always persons) with singular reference is very low in the 15th century texts, inconclusive in the 16th century texts, and suddenly quite high again (more than half of the occurrences) in the 17th century corpus. Most of the sudden increase is due to the fact that the type 2 adjective carskij “tsar’s” (15 occurrences) seems to have all but replaced the type 1 adjective carevъ “tsar’s” (only one occurrence).

(34) а сами ожива́ют царское пришестви́я
and themselves-NOM. await tsar-юск-NEUT.GEN.SG. coming-GEN.SG.
“and they themselves await the Tsar’s coming” RCAM 22/25–26, 17th century
Throughout the period 1000–1700, the possibility remains for DA2s formed from animates with plural reference to be reference points on instance level.

The analysis above is valid for all DA2 constructions in the corpus with reference points on instance level, whether they involve intrinsic relationships or not. There seem to be only slight differences between constructions with non-relational and relational head nouns. Adjectives formed from abstract noun stems seem more frequent with non-relational heads in all periods, just as adjectives formed from animate heads with plural reference are consistently more frequent with relational heads. There seem to be no great changes in the range of relational head nouns involved in the DA2 constructions with RP_{INST}/INTRINSIC. Deverbal nouns with the adjective filling a subject elaboration site, kinship terms, nouns denoting other human relationships, body parts and other inherent parts of wholes are all present in the 17th century constructions, just as in the material of period 1. Deadjectival heads are absent in DA2 RP_{INST}/INTRINSIC constructions both in the 16th and the 17th century material.

**7.2.4 INTRINSIC**

There is no obvious tendency in the development of DA2 constructions denoting intrinsic relationships with no reference point involved, as sketched in chart 7.7. The share of DA2 constructions denoting an intrinsic relationship between the adjective and a relational noun seems to decline slightly from period 1 to the 17th century, but peaks sharply in the 16th century.
"Chart 7.10 Share of DA2 constructions denoting an intrinsic relationship between the adjective and a relational head noun, 1000–1700"

The share of constructions with an intrinsic relationship between the adjective and a non-relational noun, on the other hand, increases gently from period 1 to the 16th century, only to drop quite sharply in the 17th century texts.
Chart 7.11 Share of DA2 constructions denoting an intrinsic relationship where the adjective does not fill an elaboration site of a relational noun, 1000–1700

In section 5.4.5, we saw that DA2 constructions denoting an intrinsic relationship in the material of period 1 to an overwhelming extent (91.2 % of all DA2 INTRINSIC constructions) involved either a) a ruler/leader noun ([39], 16th-century example in [37] above), b) a non-relational head noun with a place-of-origin reading (40, 41), c) a non-relational head noun, but a locative reading (as in [42], and in [38] above), or d) a relationship of apposition between head and modifier, mostly used with toponyms (43, 44).

(38) медин большой съкой
gelding-NOM.SG. big-MASC.NOM.SG. grey-MASC.NOM.SG.

Степановской
Stepanovo-usk-MASC.NOM.SG.
“the big, grey gelding in Stepanovo” DIG 235/18–19, 16th century

(39) црца Ефиопская
empress-NOM.SG. Ethiopia-usk-FEM.NOM.SG.
“the Empress of Ethiopia” PVrL 62/9, period 1

(40) к велико му чудотворцу Николе
to great-MASC.DAT.SG. miracle-performer-DAT.SG. Nikola-DAT.SG

Корсинскому
Korsun-usk-MASC.DAT.SG.
“to the great miracle-performer Nikola of Korsun” PBR 358/15, period 1
As noted in section 5.4.5, these construction types are related by more than the intrinsic relationship. All of them tend to involve adjectives formed from toponyms, and more importantly, they tend towards strong unit status. [RULER NAME COUNTRY-ьск-] (39) is usually a standard way of referring to a particular person. The same is often the case with the place-of-origin construction [NAME TOPONYM-ьск-] (40). Likewise, the apposition construction [CITY/COUNTRY/OCEAN/RIVER ... TOPONYM-ьск-] (44) and even the locative construction [NP, TOPONYM-ьск-] (45) may serve as fixed names of places, and have strong unit status.

The tendency for these four construction types to dominate remains throughout the period 1000–1700. They constitute between 80 and 90 % of all DA2 constructions with INTRINSIC in the 15th, 16th and 17th century corpora. The proportions of the four subtypes do fluctuate to some extent, but there are no obvious tendencies of change.

Among the remaining DA2 constructions denoting intrinsic relationships (10–20 % in each period), only those with the adjective filling an object elaboration site of a deverbal noun catch the eye. Looking at percentages, there is an apparent increase of such constructions (from 2.5 % of all DA2 INTRINSIC constructions in period 1 to around 11 % in the 16th and 17th centuries), which would be quite a surprising
development, considering the low share of such constructions in period 1 and the even lower share of such constructions in modern Russian. However, the number of occurrences is very low in all periods (4, 2, 7 and 7), making any conclusions as to the actual proportions very uncertain. Also, most of the apparent increase is due to one fully specific construction with strong unit status (both 15th century occurrences, two out of seven 16th century occurrences and five out of seven 17th century occurrences):

(46) о крестном целовании

about cross-loc-neut.sg. kissing-loc.sg.

“about the kissing of the cross/the swearing of the oath” SAP 134/12, 17th century

There is therefore no indication that the DA2 construction is becoming a more productive means of expressing the relationship between a deverbal noun and the filler of its object elaboration site.

7.2.5 DA2 constructions with uncertain semantics

Section 5.4.6 showed us that the share of DA2 constructions that were ambiguous even in context was very high in the material of period 1. It is interesting to note that the share of DA2 constructions with uncertain semantics decreases steadily in the period up to 1700, to 5.9 % in the 17th century corpus. This is probably a direct consequence of the consolidation of the DA2 constructions with the types of semantics that were the most central to it already in the material of period 1.

7.2.6 Summary

Figure 7.6 is a sketch of the observed changes in the distribution of the DA2 construction from the material of period 1 (marked in red) to the 17th century corpus (marked in yellow). As we can see, the 17th century DA2 construction is still present in all the subparts of the map of the possessive conceptual space. However, the semantic centre of gravity has moved very clearly. In the 17th century corpus, 54.4 % of all DA2 occurrences involve reference points on type level. The other parts of the map have only between 2.7 and 12.3 % each. In addition, the share of constructions that do not involve strong unit status in some way has clearly shrunk. In particular, non-intrinsic RP_{INST} is almost gone.
More important than the slight decrease in the number of DA2 occurrences with RP\textsubscript{INST} and no strong unit status is the narrowing of the adjective types involved in the constructions: DA2 constructions are used less and less with RP\textsubscript{INST} when the adjective is formed from an inanimate noun, whether concrete or abstract. Thus, there are two main tendencies for the DA2 construction: Firstly, there is a consolidation of the construction’s most typical semantics. RP\textsubscript{TYPE} becomes the obvious semantic centre of gravity in terms of frequency, and other occurrences tend to have strong unit status or belong to a subgroup that often has it. Secondly, the construction withdraws more and more from RP\textsubscript{INST}, the part of the possessive conceptual space where prototypical possession is found. The range of adjectives in this part of the map narrows down, leaving mostly adjectives formed from noun stems denoting persons.

7.3 The genitive constructions

In chapters 5 and 6, two separate genitive constructions were postulated, for both formal and semantic reasons: One was the restricted genitive construction, GEN\textsubscript{REST}, which would only appear when no denominal adjective could be formed from the possessor NP. This would mostly be the case when the possessor NP consisted of
more than one word, but also when it was an adjective or participle, or a noun which had no corresponding denominal adjective. The other one was the free genitive construction, GEN\textsubscript{FREE}, which could be used without restrictions on the possessor NP. The only unequivocal examples of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} would be constructions with bare genitive-marked nouns.

The main reason for postulating the two separate constructions was the fact that constructions with complex genitive modifiers or genitive-marked adjectives (labeled GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} in the following) have a distribution which differs quite a lot from the distribution of the constructions with bare genitive modifiers. This is illustrated in figure 7.7, which is a combination of figure 5.4 and figure 5.5. The light red field is the full distribution of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX}, the darker red field is its semantic centre of gravity. Likewise, the light blue field is the full distribution of the certain GEN\textsubscript{FREE} constructions, while the darker blue field is the semantic centre of gravity of GEN\textsubscript{FREE}.

*Figure 7.7 GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} and GEN\textsubscript{FREE} in the possessive conceptual space, period 1*

![Diagram](image)

The genitive constructions with bare genitive-marked nouns cover much less of the possessive conceptual space than the GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} constructions do. The difference in distribution becomes even more obvious when we make a combined chart:
Representing the relationship between \( \text{GEN}_{\text{RESTR}} \) and \( \text{GEN}_{\text{FREE}} \) as found in the material of period 1 in a simplified and partial schematic network, we might get something like figure 7.8:

**Figure 7.8 Tentative network representation of the relationship between \( \text{GEN}_{\text{RESTR}} \) and \( \text{GEN}_{\text{FREE}} \)**

The schematic network shows two well-entrenched and quite schematic constructions with different semantic centres of gravity, \( \text{GEN}_{\text{RESTR}} \) to the left and \( \text{GEN}_{\text{FREE}} \) to the right. \( \text{GEN}_{\text{RESTR}} \) may or may not be the result of a semantic extension from \( \text{GEN}_{\text{FREE}} \).
It has a wider range of related meanings on the semantic side, but is at the same time more specific on the formal side, in that it only allows particular types of genitive-marked NPs: complex ones or bare ones from which no denominal adjective may be formed. From these two constructions it would be possible to posit a more schematic construction like the one in a dotted box at the top of the network. The data, however, do not support a hypothesis that such a schema was present with any degree of entrenchment, since the language users clearly avoided using constructions with bare genitive-marked nouns when reference points were involved, and particularly reference point situations without intrinsic relationships.

In the following, I shall compare the diachronic development of the distributions of \textit{GEN}^{\text{COMPLEX}} and \textit{GEN}^{\text{FREE}}, and reassess the set of posited constructions and their interrelationships at the end of the period.

Charts 7.13 and 7.14 give an overall sketch of the respective developments of \textit{GEN}^{\text{COMPLEX}} and \textit{GEN}^{\text{FREE}} from period 1 through the 17th century.

\textit{Chart 7.13} The distribution of \textit{GEN}^{\text{COMPLEX}}, 1000–1700

\begin{itemize}
\item Series 1: period 1
\item Series 2: 15th century
\item Series 3: 16th century
\item Series 4: 17th century
\end{itemize}
We see that the GEN\text{COMPLEX} chart does not show any very obvious tendencies. Chart 7.14, on the other hand, quite surprisingly shows that the instances of GEN\text{FREE} are becoming increasingly centered around denoting intrinsic relationships with relational head nouns. The respective shares of GEN\text{COMPLEX} and GEN\text{FREE} among all the possessive constructions under consideration do not seem to change significantly from the material of period 1 to the 17th century corpus.\(^9^9\)

In the following, we will compare the development of GEN\text{COMPLEX} and GEN\text{FREE} in detail.

7.3.1 $\text{RP}_{\text{TYPE}}$ and $\text{RP}_{\text{INST}}$ with strong unit status

There are no occurrences of either GEN\text{COMPLEX} or GEN\text{FREE} expressing reference point situations on type level in the entire Old Russian corpus. However, there are occurrences of $\text{RP}_{\text{INST}}$ with strong unit status in the corpora of all four periods under consideration, but all but one are occurrences of GEN\text{COMPLEX}. There is only one single GEN\text{FREE} example, from period 1:

\[^{99}\] GEN\text{COMPLEX}: Period 1: 27.4 \%, 15th century: 26 \%, 16th century: 27.9 \%, 17th century: 24.8 \%.
GEN\text{FREE}: Period 1: 6.4 \%, 15th century: 10.2 \%, 16th century: 7 \%, 17th century: 8.4 \%.
This example is actually one of a fully specific construction, an idiom, and is not very similar to the typical GEN\text{COMPLEX} examples. The GEN\text{COMPLEX} occurrences in all periods overwhelmingly name churches (48) or monasteries (49), and also church holidays (50) and various places, landmarks and objects of importance (51).

(47) \begin{align*}
\text{в} & \text{ мегновений} \text{ оча} \\
\text{in} & \text{ blinking-LOC.SG. eye-GEN.SG.}
\end{align*}

“in the blink of an eye” PVM 253/9, period 1

(48) \begin{align*}
\text{у} & \text{ великия} \text{ церкви} \text{ Премудрости} \\
\text{by} & \text{ great-FEM.GEN.SG. church-GEN.SG. wisdom-GEN.SG.}
\end{align*}

Божія

God-кj-FEM.GEN.SG.

“by the great Church of God’s Wisdom” PVC 24/3, 15th century

(49) \begin{align*}
\text{манастьрь} & \text{ свята} \text{ Богородица} \\
\text{monastery-NOM.SG.} & \text{ holy-FEM.GEN.SG. mother-of-God-GEN.SG.}
\end{align*}

“the Monastery of the Holy Mother of God” BNS 446/28, period 1

(50) \begin{align*}
\text{въ} & \text{ льнь святаго} \text{ Николы} \\
\text{on} & \text{ day-ACC.SG. holy-MASC.GEN.SG. Nikola-GEN.SG.}
\end{align*}

“on St. Nikola’s day” SBG 58/6, period 1

(51) \begin{align*}
\text{хочу его} & \text{ благословити} \text{ крестомь} \text{ Петра} \\
\text{I want him} & \text{ bless} \text{ cross-INSTR.SG. Petr-GEN.SG.}
\end{align*}

чудотворца

miracle-performer-GEN.SG.

“I want to bless him with the cross of Peter the Miracle-Performer” PBSV 559/35, 16th century

The tendency of development of this group of constructions is not obvious; their share of all GEN\text{COMPLEX} wavers up and down from period to period (7.1 %–5 %–7.6 %–2.7 %)

7.3.2 RP\text{INST} without intrinsic relationship

GEN\text{COMPLEX} is well represented with this type of semantics, and the share of such constructions remains stable throughout the period under consideration (19.3 % of all occurrences of GEN\text{COMPLEX} in period 1, 17.3 % in the 17th century material).

Looking at the types of genitive-marked nouns involved in the constructions, we find a wide range: There are proper nouns (personal names) (52), animates with singular and plural reference (53, 54), concrete (55) and abstract inanimates (56).
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(52) к двору боярина княя Але́ксе́я
k dvoru boyarina knya Aleksej

to court-DAT.SG. boyar-GEN.SG. prince-GEN.SG. Aleksej-GEN.SG.

Jur’evich-SG. Sitekij-MASC-GEN.SG.

“to the court of the boyar Prince Aleksej Jur’evich Sitekij” ČBK 3:14, 17th century

(53) изьде́ё о земли твоёа и домъ
you-went-out from land-GEN. your-GEN. and house-GEN.SG.

отца́ твоего́
father-GEN.SG. your-MASC-GEN.SG.

“you went away from your land and your father’s house” ŽZS 20/27, 15th century

(54) въ прежнихъ духовныхъ громотехъ
in previous-FEM.LOC.PL. spiritual-FEM.LOC.PL. letter-LOC.PL.

отецъ нашихъ и правородительнъ
cfather-GEN.PL. our-MASC-GEN.PL. and forefather-GEN.PL.

“in the previous testaments of our fathers and forefathers” PBSV 560/28–29, 16th century

(55) и б́гъ мнѣ законь ость твой
and good I-DAT. law-NOM.SG. lip-GEN.PL. your-GEN.PL.

“and your lips’ law is good for me” ŽSP 17/19–20, period 1

(56) о в´здъхе дыханіа моего́
from air-GEN.SG. breathing-GEN.SG. my-NEUT-GEN.SG.

“from the air of my breathing” ŽSZ 15/22–23, 15th century

Clearly, the examples with animate possessors are closer to paradigmatic possession than the examples with inanimate possessors, but in all examples, the genitive-marked NP is used as a reference point to identify the target, the head noun of the construction.

Mostly, the shares of each noun type are either stable or vary unsystematically from period to period. However, there is a clear increase in the share of genitive-marked NPs headed by personal names, as in (52), from 17.5 % of all GEN_COMPLEX with RP_INST in the material of period 1, to 47.8 % in the 17th century corpus. This is interesting, because it corresponds to the decrease in the number of type 1 adjectives formed from personal names. As seen in section 7.1.2, 33.8 % of the DA1 constructions with RP_INST and no strong unit status in the material of period 1 have adjectives formed from personal names, but in the 17th century material, this figure is down to 10.2 %.

The share of certain instances of GEN_FREE (i.e. with bare genitive-marked nouns) with non-intrinsic RP_INST is low in all periods, and quite stable at about 10 %
of all occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{FREE}. Thus, the share of such constructions is lower than the share of the corresponding GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} occurrences, but the share remains quite stable over time in the same fashion.

However, the range of genitive-marked nouns involved in this group of constructions is very different from that of the corresponding GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} constructions. As seen in section 5.6.2, the range of bare genitive-marked nouns involved in such constructions was very limited in the material of period 1. Except for five occurrences of the partially specific construction [в НП-GEN место] "in the place of/instead of NP-GEN", all the genitive-marked nouns involved were inanimate and abstract. Recall that several of them had a corresponding adjective with either a purely qualitative meaning, or an ambiguous adjective.

This tendency remains strong in the 15th and 16th century corpora. In the 15th century corpus, there is a lone example of a bare, genitive-marked personal name (57), but the remaining eight occurrences are all inanimate, both concrete and abstract (58, 59).

(57) \textit{из орды Асаньбega}
\textit{from horde-GEN.SG. Asanbeg-GEN.SG.}
"from Asanbeg’s horde" AN 31/13, 15th century

(58) \textit{вси людие града}
\textit{all-MASC.NOM.PL people-NOM.PL. city-GEN.SG.}
"all the city’s people" PVC 6/26, 15th century

(59) \textit{но убо еще часу суда не приспѣвшу}
\textit{but PARTICLE yet hour-DAT.SG. judgment-GEN.SG. not having-come-DAT.}
"But as the hour of doom had not yet come" PVC 28/15, 15th century

In the 16th century material, there are only three occurrences, all with inanimate and abstract genitive-marked nouns:

(60) \textit{в день избавленія}
\textit{on day-ACC.SG. liberation-GEN.SG.}
"on the day of liberation" PoslMD 196b/19, 16th century

In the 17th century material, however, there are more animate genitive-marked nouns than inanimate: six animate common nouns with singular reference, one inanimate concrete noun, and three inanimate abstract nouns. Certainly, the figures are still very low, and the six occurrences with animate genitive-marked nouns are all instances of
(61), but still, it seems to be an indication of a less semantically restricted GEN\textsubscript{FREE} construction. It is perfectly possible to form a type 1 adjective from the noun čjuzotvor'ь "miracle-performer" occurring in the six instances like (61), the corresponding adjective is even found in the same text (62):

\begin{multicols}{2}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \text{vo} \text{обители} čjuzotvor'ca
\item \text{y} čjuzotvor'covy raki
\end{enumerate}
\end{multicols}

\begin{enumerate}
\item “in the miracle-performer’s monastery” SAP 130/19, 17th century
\item “by the miracle-performer’s coffin” SAP 134/18, 17th century
\end{enumerate}

To conclude, in the 17th century texts, the GEN\textsubscript{FREE} construction is still as rare as it ever was with non-intrinsic RP\textsubscript{INST}, but there are indications that the construction might allow a wider range of genitive-marked nouns than it did in the material of period 1. It is also interesting that the increase of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} with personal names corresponds to a decrease of the use of DA1 with adjectives formed from personal nouns. Likewise, it is interesting that there is a sharp decrease in the number of DA2 constructions with adjectives formed from inanimate nouns, as this indicates that GEN\textsubscript{FREE} is in the process of replacing them.

7.3.3 RP\textsubscript{INST}/INTRINSIC
Reference point situations also involving intrinsic relationships remain the obvious semantic centre of gravity with GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX}. The share of such constructions is fairly stable from period 1 and up to 1700 (41.8 \% of all occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} in the material of period 1, 35.1 \% in the 17th century corpus), just like the share of DA1 constructions with RP\textsubscript{INST}/INTRINSIC, with which the GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} occurrences are expected to alternate.
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Chart 7.15 Share of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} occurrences with RP\textsubscript{INST}/INTRINSIC, 1000–1700

The share of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} constructions, on the other hand, shows a steady increase up to the 16th century, and then an unexpected drop in the 17th century corpus:

Chart 7.16 Share of certain instances of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} with RP\textsubscript{INST}/INTRINSIC, 1000–1700
It should also be noted that the share of GENFREE is consistently much higher with RP\textsubscript{INST}/INTRINSIC than with non-intrinsic RP\textsubscript{INST} in the material of period 1 and the 15th and 16th century corpora. In the 17th century corpus, however, they are about equally represented:

Chart 7.17 Share of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} constructions with RP\textsubscript{INST} and RP\textsubscript{INST}/INTRINSIC, 1000–1700

In dealing with constructions involving both a reference point situation and an intrinsic relationship, it is necessary to take into consideration both the semantic types of genitive-marked nouns that occur, and the types of relational head nouns involved.

Looking at the various types of genitive-marked nouns involved in the GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} occurrences with RP\textsubscript{INST}/INTRINSIC in the material of period 1, we see that they are pretty evenly distributed: There are personal names (63, 64), animate common nouns with singular reference (65, 66), animate common nouns with plural reference (67, 68), concrete inanates (69, 70) and abstract inanates (71,72). Each type has a share of the total between 8.6 % (abstract inanates) and 27.6 % (animate common nouns with singular reference).

(63) по возвращении с побёды князя

\begin{verbatim}
Александр
Александ-GEN.SG.
“after prince Aleksandr’s return from victory” ŽAN 169/1–2, period 1
\end{verbatim}
(64) после смерти тестя моего
after death-GEN.SG. father-in-law-GEN.SG. my-MASC.GEN.SG.
Миня Грязева
Minya-GEN.SG. Grjazev-GEN.SG.
“after the death of my father-in-law, Minya Grjazev” DG 194/38, 17th century

(65) пред лицьмъ матерегъ своегъ
before face-INST.SG. mother-GEN.SG. his-FEM.SG.
“before his mother’s face” SBG 28/23, period 1

(66) о клеветахъ брата своего
about slander-LOC.PL. brother-GEN.SG. his-MASC.SG.
“about his brother’s slander” PoslMD 197a/8, 16th century

(67) мышца грбшнъ скрупитьса
muscle-NOM.SG. sinful-GEN.PL. will-be-destroyed
“the sinners’ muscle will be destroyed” PVM 242/4, period 1

(68) благочестивъ родителю сынъ и богатъ
noble-MASC.GEN.DUAL. parent-GEN.DUAL. son-NOM.SG. and rich-MASC.GEN.DUAL.
“the son of (two) noble and rich parents” ŽZS 18/15–16, 15th century

(69) до дврей великаго алтара
to door-GEN.PL. great-MASC.GEN.SG. altar-GEN.SG.
“to the great altar’s doors” ChID 20v/8–9, period 1

(70) тварь проповъдуешь погибели града
creation-NOM. prophesises perdition-GEN.SG. city-GEN.SG.
сего
that-MASC.GEN.SG.
“creation prophesises that city’s perdition” PVC 33/30, 15th century

(71) съ нашеговъ смиреновъ
son-NOM.SG. our-NEUT.GEN.SG. humility-GEN.SG.
“the son of our humility” ŽSP 15/2, period 1

(72) О отечествии же имян ею
about fatherland-LOC.SG. PARTICLE name-GEN.PL. their-GEN.DUAL.
“about the native land of their names” PMM 107/6, 17th century

Through the period 1000–1700, the only change that seems to be of any importance is an increase in the share of genitive common animate nouns with singular reference, from 27.6 to 41.8 % of all occurrences of GEN\textsc{complex}. 
Looking at genitive constructions denoting non-intrinsic reference point situations in the preceding section, we saw that the range of genitive-marked nouns involved was much wider in the GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} occurrences than in the GEN\textsubscript{FREE} occurrences in the material of period 1. When both a reference point situation and an intrinsic relationship is involved, this is not so: The occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} in the material of period 1 include all the noun types counted: personal names, common nouns denoting animate singulars, common nouns with plural or collective reference, concrete inanimate nouns and abstract animate nouns. There were two personal names (73), five common animate singular nouns (74), two common animate nouns with plural or collective reference (75), ten concrete inanimate nouns (76) and nine abstract inanimate nouns (77). That is, not only were GEN\textsubscript{FREE} constructions with RP\textsubscript{INST}/INTRINSIC considerably more frequent than with RP\textsubscript{INST}, but the range of possible genitive-marked nouns was also much less restricted, even in the earliest texts.

(73) лице жégо - ацы лице Иоосифa
face-NOM. PARTICLE his like face-NOM.SG. Joseph-GEN.SG.
“but his face was like Joseph’s face” ŽAN 160/13, period 1

(74) преизлишъна любов и добротéли царай
most-copyous-GEN.FEM.SG.love-GEN.SG. and virtue-GEN.SG. tsar-GEN.SG.
nикто жé прилагая
nobody-NOM. adding
“nobody adding to the Tsar’s immense love and virtue” ŽD 361/6, period 1

(75) гласъ народа
voice-NOM.SG. people-GEN.SG.
“the people’s voice” SBG 66/1, period 1

(76) отъ болéни сердцa
from pain-GEN.SG. heart-GEN.SG.
“from the(ir) heart’s pain” SKT 19/9, period 1

(77) быстротéю смысла превосход
quickness-INSTR.SG. mind-GEN.SG. surpassing
“surpassing them in quickness of the mind” ŽSP 4/29, period 1

This distribution of genitive-marked nouns is quite stable all the way up to 1700. 15th–17th century examples of the same types are found in (78–82):

(78) Меликтучарь пошёл воевати Чюндара
Meliktučar-NOM. went vanquish Čjunedar-GEN.SG.
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“Meliktučar went to vanquish Čjunedar’s great realm of India” AN 27/23–24, 15th century

“po повелению девицы” (79) by order-DAT.SG. maiden-GEN.SG. “according to the maiden’s order” ŽPF 216/25, 16th century

“po otvestviu же гостей” (80) after departure-LOC.SG. PARTICLE guest-GEN.PL. “but after the guests’ departure” P-Jul 114/8, 17th century

“от благоизволения сердца” (81) from goodwill-GEN.SG. heart-GEN.SG. “from the heart’s goodwill” PoslMD 195b/11–12 16th century

“сын тьмы” (82) son-NOM.SG. darkness-GEN.SG. “the son of darkness” SAP 130/40, 17th century

One can perhaps detect a tendency for genitive-marked inanimate nouns to become relatively less prominent in the constructions of this category. In period 1, they are present in 19 (67.8 %) of 28 occurrences of GEN FREE with RP INST/INTRINSIC. In the 17th century material, 4 (36.4 %) of 11 occurrences contain inanimate genitive-marked nouns.

Looking at the types of relational head nouns involved in the occurrences of GEN COMPLEX and GEN FREE, we find that roughly the same types are involved in both, and in roughly the same proportions. The types are much the same as the ones found in the corresponding DA1 constructions. The most frequent type of head noun in all periods is the group of deverbal nouns with the genitive-marked NP/noun filling the subject elaboration site:

“за молитву святых отец наших” (83) for prayer-ACC.SG. holy-MASC GEN.PL. father-GEN.PL. our-MASC GEN.PL. “for the sake of our holy fathers’ prayer” AN 9/1, 15th century

“видив премениение воздѣха” (84) having-seen change-ACC.SG. air-GEN.SG. “having seen the air’s change” ŽZS 16/25, 15th century

Deadjectival nouns (85, 86) and nouns denoting body parts (87, 88) are also well represented in all periods.
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(85) велика́го и всеблагого Бога

great-MASC.GEN.SG. and all-good-MASC.GEN.SG. God-GEN.SG.

милостию

grace-INSTR.SG.

“by the great and all-good God’s grace” PoslMD 194a/10–11, 16th century

(86) от недоразуме́ния и простоты сердца

from misunderstanding-GEN.SG. and simplicity-GEN.SG. heart-GEN.SG.

“due to misunderstanding and to (his) heart’s simplicity” ŽAvv 30/31, 17th century

(87) от утроб мате́ри мо́я

from womb-GEN.SG. mother-GEN.SG. my-FEM.GEN.SG.

“from my mother’s womb” ŽZS 22/9–10, 15th century

(88) сердца врагов завистию ужаса́уся

heart-NOM.PL. enemy-GEN.PL. envy-INSTR.SG. were-horrified

“the enemies’ hearts were horrified by envy” SAP 130/13, 17th century

Kinship terms are less frequent, but occur to about an equal extent both with GENCOMPLEX and GENFREE in all periods:

(89) к жене кня́зя того

to wife-DAT.SG. prince-GEN.SG. that-MASC.GEN.SG.

“to that prince’s wife” ŽPF 211/23, 16th century

(90) древолазца дщи пояти себе жену

lumberjack-GEN.SG. daughter-GEN.SG. take himself-DAT.SG. wife-ACC.SG.

“to take a lumberjack’s daughter as a wife for himself” ŽPF 215/29

Head nouns denoting other human relationships occur only in instances of GENCOMPLEX in my material, but the figures are consistently low even there:

(91) от недру́говь велико́го кня́зя и вс́я земли

from enemy-GEN.PL. great-MASC.GEN.SG. prince-GEN.SG. and all-FEM.GEN.SG. land-GEN.SG.

“against the enemies of the Grand Prince and of all the land” PBSV 563/18–19, 16th century

The only noun type that shows any noteworthy difference of distribution between the genitive constructions is, as could be expected, the group of nouns denoting inherent
parts of wholes, which are more frequent with $\text{GEN}_{\text{FREE}}$ than with $\text{GEN}_{\text{COMPLEX}}$ in the material of period 1 and the 15th and 16th century corpora.

(92) къ стѣнамь града
to wall-DAT.PL. city-GEN.SG.
“to the city’s walls” PVC 23/20, 15th century

There do not seem to be any reliable indications of systematic changes within the range of relational head nouns occurring with $\text{GEN}_{\text{FREE}}$ and $\text{GEN}_{\text{COMPLEX}}$. The proportions of each type either remain stable throughout the period 1000–1700, or vary unsystematically.

7.3.4 INTRINSIC with relational head
This is the obvious semantic centre of gravity of the $\text{GEN}_{\text{FREE}}$ construction in period 1, and this tendency grows even stronger all the way up to 1700, as illustrated in chart 7.18.

Chart 7.18 Share of certain instances of $\text{GEN}_{\text{FREE}}$ denoting an intrinsic relationship between a genitive-marked noun and a relational head noun, 1000–1700

Expressing intrinsic relationships between relational heads and modifiers filling their elaboration sites also remains an important, though less central, function of the occurrences of $\text{GEN}_{\text{COMPLEX}}$. 
As discussed in section 5.5.4, there is good reason to believe that a fair number of these occurrences are in fact complex instances of the GEN\textsubscript{FREE} construction, since the two groups of adjective constructions hardly alternate with the genitive at all with this type of semantics, and since the corresponding certain instances of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} are quite abundant.

Looking more closely at the occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} and certain instances of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} (i.e. with bare genitive-marked nouns), we see that there are few obvious changes in the interrelationship of their distributions when the genitive-marked NP/noun fills the elaboration site of a relational noun. As concluded in section 5.6.6, GEN\textsubscript{FREE} is used quite freely in these functions already in period 1, and meets little competition from the two adjective constructions.

Both with GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} and GEN\textsubscript{FREE}, in all periods, there are two main types of intrinsic relationship involved: The genitive-marked NPs/nouns mostly fill the object elaboration sites of deverbal nouns (93, 94), or the elaboration sites of nouns denoting inherent parts of wholes (95, 96).

(93) \text{на въззскаение тѣхь инок}\n\[
\text{to finding-ACC.SG. that-MASC.GEN.PL. monk-GEN.PL.}
\]
\text{“in order to find those monks” PMM 110/14, 17th century}
Most of the certain occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} with INTRINSIC belong to one or the other of these two groups, with only scattered occurrences of other relational head nouns. With GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} there are also a fair number of ruler nouns (97) and representation nouns (98), and scattered occurrences of other types. Occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} headed by ruler nouns are on the increase in the period up to 1700, probably due to the long titles of rulers common in the 16th and 17th century texts (99).

Looking at the two main types of relational heads, we find that nouns denoting inherent parts of wholes account for a considerably larger share of the occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} than of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} throughout the period 1000–1700.\textsuperscript{100}

\textsuperscript{100}On the whole, that is. For unclear reasons, the share of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} where the genitive-marked noun fills the elaboration site of a noun denoting an inherent part of a whole is considerably lower in the 15th century corpus than in the other Old Russian corpora.
Chart 7.20 Share of the occurrences of \( \text{GEN}_{\text{COMPLEX}} \) and the certain instances of \( \text{GEN}_{\text{FREE}} \) where the genitive-marked NP/noun fills an elaboration site of a noun denoting an inherent part of a whole, 1000–1700

Looking at the shares of \( \text{GEN}_{\text{COMPLEX}} \) and \( \text{GEN}_{\text{FREE}} \) with deverbal heads, on the other hand, we find that they are consistently quite equal throughout the period 1000–1700.
Chart 7.21 Share of occurrences of $\text{GEN}_{\text{COMPLEX}}$ and $\text{GEN}_{\text{FREE}}$ denoting an intrinsic relationship between the genitive-marked NP/noun and a deverbal head noun, 1000–1700

Looking at the respective shares of all genitive constructions denoting an intrinsic relationship between a relational head noun and a genitive-marked modifier, we see that when headed by a deverbal noun the actual frequency of $\text{GEN}_{\text{COMPLEX}}$ is generally quite a bit higher than that of $\text{GEN}_{\text{FREE}}$ in all periods.
Looking at the genitive constructions with deverbal heads, there is also a clear animacy effect. Out of all the certain instances of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} in the entire Old Russian corpus, there is not a single instance of a bare genitive-marked and animate noun filling an object elaboration site of a deverbal noun. All the examples from all periods have inanimate genitive-marked nouns, with varying shares of concrete (100) and abstract (101) nouns.

(100) на омовение рук
for washing-ACC.SG. hand-GEN.PL.
“for the washing of hands” PJul 105/27, 17th century

(101) къ созиданию вѣры
to creation-DAT.SG. faith-GEN.SG.
“towards the creation of faith” PoslMD 196b/17, 16th century

Looking at the occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX}, the genitive-marked NPs involved filling the elaboration sites of deverbal head nouns are also mostly inanimate in all periods.\textsuperscript{101} After all, objects very often are inanimate and passive entities. However, in all periods there are also occurrences with animate modifiers, both personal names and common nouns with singular and plural reference.

\textsuperscript{101} Period 1: 59.7 \%, 15th century: 70 \%, 16th century: 66.7 \%, 17th century: 47 \%.
(102) Видя князь великий убиение брата
seeing prince-NOM. great-NOM. killing-ACC.SG. brother-GEN.SG.
своего князя Давида Ингоревича
his-MASC.GEN.SG. prince-GEN.SG. David-GEN.SG. Ingorevič-GEN.SG.
“The Grand Prince seeing the killing of his brother, prince David Ingorevič”
PBR 348/10–11, period 1

(103) на погребение брата своего
to burial-ACC.SG. brother-GEN.SG. his-MASC.GEN.SG.
“to the burial of his brother” RCAM 16/26, 17th century

(104) посёщеніа ради т'ї православныхъ христіаъ
visiting-GEN.SG. for-sake-of there orthodox-MASC.GEN.PL. Christian-GEN.PL.
“for the sake of visiting the Orthodox Christians there” ŽZS 14/15, 15th century

7.3.5 INTRINSIC with non-relational head
Both GEN<COMPLEX> and GEN<FREE> are found in all periods expressing intrinsic relationships between non-relational head nouns and genitive-marked NPs/nouns.

(105) Се язь, государь, града сего
this I-NOM. lord-NOM. city-GEN.SG. this-MASC.GEN.SG.
гостиная жена
merchant-in-FEM.NOM.SG. wife-NOM.SG.
“This is me, Lord, a merchant’s wife of this city” PKS 69/15, 17th century

(106) два дни шествіа имаше
two day-ACC.PL. walking-GEN.SG. he-had
“he had two days of walking” ŽZS 10/5, 15th century

This type of semantics was not very prominent with the occurrences of GEN<COMPLEX> found in the material of period 1, and mostly, the occurrences seemed to correspond to occurrences of DA2 with the same type of semantics. The sketch of the diachronic development of such constructions in chart 7.23 shows unsystematic variation from period to period, notably the very large share of such occurrences in the 15th century corpus and the very small share in the 16th century corpus. Nevertheless, the 17th century share is considerably larger than that of period 1.
Chart 7.23 Share of occurrences of GEN$_{\text{COMPLEX}}$ with INTRINSIC and non-relational head noun, 1000–1700

The diachronic sketch of GEN$_{\text{FREE}}$ with this type of semantics, on the other hand, shows a considerably larger share of such constructions in the material of period 1 than in the 15th, 16th and 17th century corpora. However, recall from section 5.6.5 that more than half of the occurrences in the material of period 1 were from one and the same text, and of exactly the same type. Thus, it is reasonable to suppose that there are no great changes in the frequency of this type of semantics with GEN$_{\text{FREE}}$.

102 There were 21 examples of the type 7 kounь prodaže “seven kuna as a fine” in the Russkaja pravda (RP).
Looking at the various subtypes of INTRINSIC with non-relational heads, we find that they, too, are stable throughout the period under consideration. With GEN\text{COMPLEX}, we find three main types of relationships between head noun and genitive-marked NP: a) Semantic apposition, where the head and the modifier have the same referent (107). b) A relationship of origin, where the genitive expresses the head noun’s place of origin, or origin or source in some other sense (108). This type clearly alternates with DA2 constructions throughout the period under consideration. c) Various typical “genitive” relationships, such as part–whole and what the head noun contains or consists of (109).

(107) на камень веру твою
on stone-LOC.SG. faith-GEN.SG. your-FEM.GEN.SG.
“on the rock of faith in you”103 ŽZS 22/10, 15th century

(108) вских чинов людь
all-sorts-MASC.GEN.PL. rank-GEN.PL. people-NOM.PL.
“people of all ranks” RCAM 18/31, 17th century

(109) къмгать воды теплой бассейн
basin-NOM.SG. water-GEN.SG. warm-FEM.GEN.SG. big-MASC.NOM.SG.
“a big basin of warm water” D 174/1–2, 16th century

103 This passage is from a prayer, and is addressed to God, hence the translation.
The certain occurrences of GEN$_{FREE}$, on the other hand, were only of type a) appositional (110), and c) partitive and related meanings (111) in all periods. In addition, there were some instances of emphatic constructions where the head noun and the genitive-marked noun were the same word. The $věk$ construction in (112) is a fully specific construction, and a calque from Hebrew via Greek.

(110) очи мысленни невĕдения мраком
eye-NOM.PL. thought-NN-NEUT.NOM.PL. ignorance-GEN.SG. darkness-INSTR.SG. покрывающа are-covered
“the mind’s eyes are covered by the darkness of ignorance” PMM 111/33, 17th century

(111) бьло двести восемидесят человек татар
was 200 80 man-GEN.PL. Tatar-GEN.PL.
“there were 280 men of the Tatars” IG/VG II:254/20, 16th century

(112) вĕк вĕка
in eternity-ACC.SG. eternity-GEN.SG.
“in all eternity” ŽSP 7/1, period 1

Thus, we see that GEN$_{COMPLEX}$ stably interacts with DA2 constructions in the entire 11th–17th century corpus when it comes to expressing a relationship of origin. There are no occurrences of GEN$_{FREE}$ with this sort of interpretation in the entire corpus. With other types of meanings, there is no competition from any of the adjective constructions, something which would indicate that all genitive constructions denoting either apposition, emphasis or various meanings typical of the genitive are instances of GEN$_{FREE}$.

7.3.6 Summary: One or two constructions?
Are we still dealing with two separate genitive constructions: one restricted (GEN$_{RESTR}$) and one non-restricted (GEN$_{FREE}$) in the 17th century corpus? The findings of this chapter strongly indicate that we are. Placing the 17th century findings of GEN$_{COMPLEX}$ and GEN$_{FREE}$ on the map of the possessive conceptual space, we get a figure which is remarkably similar to the map of the situation in the material of period 1, as sketched in figure 7.7.
There are not many differences. The semantic centre of gravity of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} is more unequivocally RP\textsubscript{INST}/INTRINSIC in the 17th century corpus than in the material of period 1. This is illustrated by moving it a little to the right on the semantic map. There are also fewer GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} occurrences with strong unit status. Finally, GEN\textsubscript{FREE} is more evenly represented when reference points are involved: the number of occurrences without an intrinsic relationship is about the same as the number of occurrences with an intrinsic relationship. A more accurate account of the differences in distribution is found in chart 7.25. The difference in distribution is as obvious as in the material of period 1.
When we look at each subtype in more detail, we get a picture of surprising stability. RP\textsubscript{INST} with strong unit status is only found with GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} in all periods. The share of such constructions is considerably lower in the 17th century corpus than in the material of period 1, but there is a lot of unsystematic variation from period to period.

With non-intrinsic RP\textsubscript{INST}, the share of occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} is stable. The only notable phenomenon is an increasing share of genitive-marked NPs headed by personal names, which corresponds to a decrease in the corresponding DA1 constructions with adjectives formed from personal names. The occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} are also stable in number throughout the period 1000–1700. In the material of period 1, occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} with RP\textsubscript{INST} mostly had inanimate genitive-marked nouns, but the share of animate possessors increases in the following centuries.

With RP\textsubscript{INST}/INTRINSIC, we saw that GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} again was stable. From period 1 to the 16th century, the overall share of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} increases noticeably, but drops suddenly in the 17th century material. At the same time, the certain occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} become about as frequent as GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} with this type of semantics. Looking at the genitive-marked NPs/nouns in the genitive constructions, we find a similar range of animates and inanimates for both throughout the period under consideration. However, here as well, inanimates seem to become less prominent with GEN\textsubscript{FREE} as we proceed through time.
INTRINSIC with relational head becomes slightly more frequent with both GEN\textsubscript{FREE} and GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} in the period up to 1700. There is a stable tendency for GEN\textsubscript{FREE} constructions to be headed by nouns denoting inherent parts of wholes more frequently than for occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX}. There is an equally stable tendency for both GEN\textsubscript{FREE} and GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} to have about equal shares of deverbal head nouns in all periods. Looking at animacy effects, we find only inanimate genitive-marked nouns filling the object elaboration sites of deverbal nouns in the certain instances of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} in all periods (cf. section 7.3.4). The occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} show a wider range of genitive-marked NPs, including animates. With INTRINSIC, there is hardly any competition from adjective constructions, except when the relational head noun is a ruler noun.

INTRINSIC with non-relational head remains stable: GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} interacts with DA2 when the relationship involved is one of origin. Otherwise, both GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} and GEN\textsubscript{FREE} occur, with little or no competition from the adjective constructions.

Thus, the genitive constructions seem to have changed little throughout the period 1000–1700. Recall figure 7.8, a tentative network representation of the relationship between the two posited constructions, GEN\textsubscript{RESTR} and GEN\textsubscript{FREE}, in period 1:

Figure 7.10, figure 7.8 repeated

The network shows a situation with two separate, well-entrenched constructions, GEN\textsubscript{RESTR} and GEN\textsubscript{FREE}, which are formally and semantically distinct. However, it is doubtful whether there is a schema over GEN\textsubscript{RESTR} and GEN\textsubscript{FREE}. There is, however, an increasing tendency in the 15th–17th century corpora for GEN\textsubscript{FREE} to be possible
with animate genitive-marked nouns when a reference point is involved. This suggests that such a superschema can be hypothesised for the situation in the 17th century corpus, as illustrated in figure 7.11:

*Figure 7.11. Tentative network of GEN\textsubscript{RESTR} and GEN\textsubscript{FREE}, 17th century*

In order for the distributions of GEN\textsubscript{COMPLEX} and GEN\textsubscript{FREE} to differ as much as they do in the 17th century texts, such a schema would have to be less entrenched than the two lower schemas. But its presence, combined with the decreasing flexibility of the two adjective constructions, must be the early forerunner of the system of possessive constructions in modern Russian today.

### 7.4 The dative construction

Figure 7.12 (figure 5.7 repeated) recalls the distribution of the DAT constructions [NP-DAT, NP] found within the possessive conceptual space in the material of period 1, with the lighter red field illustrating the full distribution of DAT, and the darker red field marking its semantic centre of gravity in terms of frequency.
The figure illustrates the rather peripheral status of the DAT construction in the earliest Old Russian texts. The construction has a distribution that is remarkably like that of GENFREE, and has about the same overall frequency (6.5% of all constructions in the possessive conceptual space) in period 1, but most occurrences have a flavour of typical dative semantics, and are clear results of a natural semantic extension of such meanings into the possessive conceptual space.

Chart 7.26 illustrates the diachronic development of the distribution of DAT construction from period 1 to the 17th century. The obvious tendency is that the construction becomes more and more centered on INTRINSIC with a non-reference point relationship between relational head and dative-marked NP. The occurrences of DAT with reference point semantics are all but gone in the 17th century corpus. It is also important to note that the DAT construction is generally on the decrease throughout the period under consideration, accounting for 6.5% of all constructions in the possessive conceptual space in the material of period 1, 3.7% in the 15th...
century corpus, 3.5% in the 16th century corpus, and only 2.4% in the 17th century corpus.

*Chart 7.26 The distribution of the DAT construction, 1000–1700*

![Chart 7.26 The distribution of the DAT construction, 1000–1700](image)

Series 1: period 1, series 2: 15th century, series 3: 16th century, series 4: 17th century

### 7.4.1 RP*TYPE* and RP*INST* with strong unit status

There are no instances of DAT with RP*TYPE* in the entire Old Russian corpus, and only a single, 16th century occurrence of DAT with RP*INST* and strong unit status:

(113) и ту пра́знóва Покрову святéни
and there he-celebrated intercession-DAT.SG. holy-FEM.DAT.SG.

Богородицы
mother-of-God-DAT.SG.

“and there he celebrated the Intercession of the Holy Mother of God” PBSV 553/35–36, 16th century

This is the name of a Russian church holiday, and the GEN*RESTR* construction is normally used. It should be noted that even here, the dative-marked noun phrase fills the subject elaboration site of a deverbal noun.

### 7.4.2 RP*INST* with and without relational head

In the material of period 1, only 11 (7.3%) of 151 occurrences of DAT could be argued to involve a reference point, but no intrinsic relationship. Several of these had the possibility of a benefactive interpretation in addition to a (more likely) reference...
point reading. None of the examples involved possession in a prototypical sense. In chart 7.26, we see no obvious change in this, but it should be noted that there are no such occurrences in the 15th century corpus, and only one each in the 16th and 17th century corpora:

(114) избранни Богу святи
chosen-MASC.NOM.PL. God-DAT.SG. holy-MASC.NOM.PL.

возлюбленни
beloved-MASC.NOM.PL.

“God’s chosen, holy, beloved ones” PoslMD 196a/38–39, 16th century

(115) A какъ прип’єть днъ женидб црскої
and when comes day-NOM.SG. wedding-DAT.SG. tsar-Itsk-FEM.DAT.SG.

“and when the day of the tsar’s wedding comes” RCAM 21/26, 17th century

We see that (114) is not the clearest of examples (it might have a benefactive, or even agentive reading), and that (115) may have a purpose reading, “the day intended for the wedding”, which might distinguish it from the usual use of a genitive construction in similar cases. It seems clear that by the 17th century, the DAT construction is virtually gone with non-intrinsic RP\textsuperscript{INST}.

In the material of period 1, RP\textsuperscript{INST}/INTRINSIC was considerably more frequent than non-intrinsic RP\textsuperscript{INST}, accounting for 25.3 % (38) of all occurrences of DAT. In the following centuries, however, we see a steep decrease, with three occurrences in the 15th century corpus, one in the 16th century corpus, and none at all in the 17th century corpus. The 15th and 16th century occurrences either have the dative-marked NP filling a subject elaboration site of a deverbal noun (116), or are headed by a deadjectival noun (117).

(116) Но на пребыванє виноческомъ чинъ
but on habitation-ACC.SG. monk-Itsk-MASC.DAT.SG. rank-DAT.SG.

оустроиса мє сто сє
may-be-ordered place-NOM. this-NOM.

“but may this place be ordered for the habitation of the monastic rank” ŽZN 13/30–31, 15th century

(117) ненавидя добра роду человечю
hating-MASC.NOM.SG. good-ACC.PL. race-DAT.SG. man-Itsk-MASC.DAT.SG.

“hating the goods of humankind” ŽPF 211/21–22, 16th century

Again, we see that the examples have possibilities of benefactive readings, in addition to the more likely reference-point readings.
By the 17th century, then, the DAT construction is at best a marginal option for expressing reference point situations, regardless of the status of the head noun in the construction.

7.4.3 INTRINSIC with relational head

We have seen that in the course of the 15th–17th centuries, the DAT construction is as good as ousted when a reference point is involved. However, when the dative-marked NP fills an elaboration site of a relational noun without serving as a reference point, we get a quite different picture. Looking at chart 7.26, we see that the share of all DAT constructions expressing INTRINSIC with relational head wavers up and down a bit from period to period, but there are no indications that the share becomes any smaller. However, due to the overall decrease in the frequency of the DAT construction, it is better to compare the occurrences of DAT to the total number of constructions expressing INTRINSIC with a relational head in each period. As chart 7.27 shows, DAT is on the decrease with this type of meaning as well, but it is still an option in considerable use in the 17th century corpus, constituting 7.6 % (14 of 184) of all constructions with relational heads and INTRINSIC.

Chart 7.27 Share of DAT constructions among all constructions expressing INTRINSIC with relational head, 1000–1700
In the material of period 1, the overwhelming majority (84.7%) of the occurrences in this category were headed by deverbal nouns, with the dative-marked NP filling an object elaboration site of some sort. This tendency remains.\textsuperscript{104}

(118) наставнича инокомь и сбеседнице ангеломь
teacher-VOC.SG. monk-DAT.PL. and interlocutor-VOC.SG. angel-DAT.PL.
“to teacher of monks and conversation partner of angels” PBSV 562/12, 16th century

(119) на исцеление недугомь и разрушение
healing-ACC.SG. disease-DAT.PL. and destruction-ACC.SG.
страже м и бесомь на проняние
passion-DAT.PL. and demon-DAT.PL. to banishing-ACC.SG.
“in order to heal diseases and destroy passions and banish demons” PMM 110/12, 17th century

The only other type of relational noun found with some regularity in these constructions are ruler nouns (6 in period 1, 4 in the 15th century, none in the 16th century, and 1 in the 17th century). In these cases, there is sometimes a possibility present that the dative is part of a larger verb-based construction [V, NP-ACC, NP-DAT] instead of the smaller unit [NP, NP-DAT]

(120) Давыда пророка и цара
David-ACC.=GEN.SG. prophet-ACC.=GEN.SG. and king-ACC.=GEN.SG.
сътвори праведная родъ љевреискъ
you-made righteous-MASC-ACC.=GEN.SG. race-DAT.SG. Jew-ISK-DAT.SG.
“you made David the prophet and righteous king of/for the Jewish race” ЗЗS 20/38, 15th century

In section 5.7.2, we noted a tendency for DAT constructions in general to involve bare dative-marked nouns more frequently than complex dative-marked NPs, suggesting that the DAT construction was a last resort when an adjective construction or GEN\textsubscript{FREE} seemed unsuitable to the writer. This is a tendency that remains in the corpus all the way up to 1700 with constructions where the dative-marked NP fills an object elaboration site of a deverbal noun. It is also interesting to look at animacy again. Recall from section 7.3.4 that all certain occurrences of GEN\textsubscript{FREE} expressing the relationship between a deverbal noun and its object involved inanimate genitive-marked nouns. With the DAT construction, this is not so: the dative-marked “objects” are animate as often as not in the corpora of all periods.\textsuperscript{105} This suggests that one of

\textsuperscript{104} 15th century: 64.7%; 16th century: 100%; 17th century: 85.7%.

\textsuperscript{105} Period 1: 37.7%; 15th century: 54.5%; 16th century: 66.7%; 17th century: 38.5%.
the reasons why the [DEVERBAL NOUN, NP-DAT] construction lingered on in the Old Russian texts for so long, was that animates that were involved in an intrinsic relationship, but were not reference points, were problematic both with GEN\_FREE and the adjective constructions: DA1 strongly favoured reference points, DA2 strongly favoured reference points and strong unit status, GEN\_FREE strongly favoured inanimates. This, perhaps, left the writers with the DAT construction.

### 7.4.4 INTRINSIC with non-relational head

Looking at chart 7.26, there is an apparent increase in the share of DAT constructions expressing intrinsic relationships where the dative-marked noun does not fill the elaboration site of a relational noun. However, this apparent increase is mostly a product of the fact that the DAT construction’s meanings are narrowing down to INTRINSIC only. Also, the number of occurrences in the 15th, 16th and 17th century corpora is very low (4, 3 and 4), and in more than half of these, it is uncertain what the nature of the intrinsic relationship is. Apart from that, there are some occurrences of emphatic constructions in each period. These constructions are fixed and highly entrenched:

(121) во вёки веком
in eternity-ACC.PL. eternity-DAT.PL.
“in all eternity” PMM 111/44, 17th century

### 7.4.5 DAT with uncertain semantics

Not unexpectedly, the share of DAT constructions with uncertain semantics increases quite sharply during the 15th–17th centuries as compared to the situation in the material of period 1. The share rises from 12.7 % in the material of period 1 to 28 % in the 17th century corpus. This is in vein with the general tendency for the dative to withdraw from the possessive conceptual space, and the tendency for the occurrences to carry “dativic” shades of meaning in addition to reference-point and intrinsic-relationship readings. As in the material of period 1, possible external-possession constructions make up a large share of the uncertain instances in the 17th century corpus:

(122) прерѣзали тому црвичу гортан
they-cut that-MASC.DAT.SG. tsarevič-DAT.SG. throat-ACC.SG.
“they cut the throat of/on that tsarevič” RCAM 16/13, 17th century

### 7.4.6 Ambiguous constructions, dative or genitive?

In section 5.7.6, we discussed the presence of a share of morphologically ambiguous constructions: They could contain either genitive-marked or dative-marked NPs. The
share of such constructions remains quite stable throughout the period of consideration, at about 2 % of all constructions in the possessive conceptual space in each period. In all periods, there are examples of such constructions from all parts of the possessive conceptual space except RP\textsubscript{TYPE}. However, given the development of the DAT construction just surveyed, it seems much more likely that the occurrences involving reference points in the later texts are actually genitive constructions, and not DAT constructions.

7.4.7 Summary
The diachronic tendency of the DAT construction, then, is obvious: The construction is on the way out of the possessive conceptual space. By the 17th century, it is all but gone when reference points are involved. It still has a foothold as a means of expressing the intrinsic relationship between a deverbal noun and the entity filling its object elaboration site, but it is on the decrease even there. This final foothold may be due to the DAT construction’s ability to handle animates which are not reference points. The development is illustrated in figure 7.13, where the lighter red field is the full distribution of the DAT construction in period 1, the darker red field is its semantic centre of gravity in period 1, the lighter yellow field is the DAT construction’s full distribution in the 17th century corpus, and the darker yellow field is its (very concentrated) semantic centre of gravity in the 17th century corpus.
7.5 “Mixed” constructions

In section 5.8, we looked at two “mixed” construction types occurring in the material of period 1: the double adjective construction [DA, DA, NP], and the DA/GEN construction [DA, N-GEN, NP]. The same types of constructions were also found in the 15th–17th century corpora, as in (123) (double adjective construction) and (124) (DA/GEN construction).

(123) 
`зъ гсдрва свтителскова па триарша
двара`

from lord-ov-MASC.GEN.SG. bishop-isk-MASC.GEN.SG. patriarch-j-MASC.GEN.SG.

court-GEN.SG.

“from his lordship the Bishop (and) Patriarch’s court” ČBK 2:10, 17th century

(124) `турк-жъ [...] пустиша сурны и
Turk-NOM.PL.-PARTICLE let-loose flute-н-MASC.ACC.PL. and`
“but the Turks let loose the voices of flutes and trumpets and countless drums”

PVC 9/19, 15th century

In the material of period 1, both construction types were quite marginal, the double adjective construction constituting only 0.6% of all constructions in the possessive conceptual space, and the DA/GEN construction constituting 0.7%. These constructions are, however, interesting in a diachronic perspective. Particularly the DA/GEN construction, but also the double adjective construction is on the increase in the 15th–17th century corpora.

Chart 7.28 Frequencies of “mixed” constructions among all possessive constructions, 1000–1700

As seen in chart 7.28, a third construction type also appears on the stage, the DA/PRON construction [ADJECTIVAL PRONOUN DA N]:

(125) на твою государеву землю
against your-FEM.ACC.SG. sovereign-ov-FEM.ACC.SG. land-ACC.SG.
“against your, the sovereign’s land” IG/VG III:259/34, 16th century

In the material of period 1 and the 15th century corpus, this construction does not appear at all. In the 16th century corpus, however, it constitutes 4.3% of all
constructions within the possessive conceptual space, decreasing to 1.7 % in the 17th century corpus.

In the material of period 1, we saw that there were two subtypes of the double genitive construction and the DA/GEN construction respectively: They were either paratactic, with two “possessors” on an equal footing (DA/GEN example in [124] above, [126] below), or appositional, i.e. both modifiers referred to the same referent, usually in titles and complex personal names (double adjective example in [123] above, [127] below). This tendency remains throughout the 15th–17th centuries: Double adjective constructions are predominantly paratactic in all periods, whereas DA/GEN constructions are mostly appositional (this tendency is somewhat weaker).

(126) отъ пушенчаго бо и пищалнаго
from cannon-мъ-MASC.GEN.SG. PARTICLE and gun-мъ-MASC.GEN.SG.
стуку
hammering-GEN.SG.
“from the cannon(s’) and (the) gun(s’) hammering” PVC 9/20–21, 15th century

(127) ото княж Андрѣева княени Петровича
from prince-j-UNDECL. Andrej-ov-FEM.GEN.SG. princess-GEN.SG. Petrovič-GEN.SG.
“from Prince Andrej Petrovič’s princess” DIG 235/37–38, 16th century

The undeclined adjective knjaʐь “prince’s” in example (127) is typical of the DA/GEN constructions of the 16th and 17th century texts.

All occurrences of the DA/PRON construction are, unsurprisingly, appositional. The great majority of them are clearly standard formulae used in referring to the Tsar (and other high-ranking persons, such as the Patriarch), as in example (125) above (see also Borkovskij 1968:88–89), but the construction is also found sporadically in other uses (128).

(128) на мои Василев дворь
on my Vasilij-ov-MASC.ACC.SG. court-ACC.SG.
“to my, Vasilij’s court” DG 194/33, 17th century

Placing the “mixed” constructions in the possessive conceptual space, we find that their distributions differ quite a bit. Since the double adjective construction involves denominal adjectives of both type 1 and type 2, we get occurrences from most parts of the map in all periods: reference point situations both on type (129) and instance level, with or without intrinsic relationships ([123] and [126] above); intrinsic relationships without reference points, with or without relational heads – mostly with ruler nouns or with a place-of-origin reading (130).
(129) Царь, жд позлохившее вские
Crow-DAT, particle having-postponed all sorts of NEUT ACC PL.
государственные и семские дела
state IN - NEUT ACC PL, and country - sk - NEUT ACC PL matter ACC PL.
“the Tsar having postponed all sorts of state and provincial matters” RCAM
20/5, 17th century

(130) Русских князей Мстиславъ Кьєвскій и
Russian princes Mstislav of Kiev and Mstislav of and
Мстиславъ Торопичскій Черниговскій
Mstislav NOM PL Toropeck sk MASC NOM SG and
Черниговскій
Chernigovskiy MASC NOM SG
“the Russian princes, Mstislav of Kiev and Mstislav of Toropec and
Černigov’” PBK L 446/25–26, period 1

The DA/GEN construction has a narrower distribution in all periods. RP INST, with or without an intrinsic relationship, is the obvious semantic centre of gravity (examples [124] and [127] above). There are, however, also some constructions without a reference point, mostly headed by ruler nouns (131).

(131) патриарха Московского и все
patricarch NOM SG Moscow - sk - MASC NOM SG and all FEM GEN SG.
Руси
Russia GEN SG
“Patriarch of Moscow and all Russia” DG 196/44, 17th century

The DA/PRON construction is only found when a reference point on instance level is involved, as seen in (125) and (128) above.

Thus, we have a growing group of constructions violating the assumed complementary distribution in its core domain; these constructions make it possible to use denominal adjectives even with complex NPs denoting reference points on instance level. This does not open any doors for the GEN FREE constructions in a direct sense, as it is actually various types of adjective constructions that are being used more in this central possessive domain. However, it certainly makes an already complex and subtle situation even more complex and subtle.

7.6 The interplay of the constructions
Recall figure 5.9 from chapter 5, repeated here: We see that in the Old Russian corpus of period 1, all the constructions in the possessive conceptual space overlap, although all of them have distinct semantic centres of gravity in terms of frequency. They are
five separate, polysemous constructions competing and interacting in the possessive conceptual space in subtle and complicated ways.

*Figure 7.14 Distributions of the five main constructions in the possessive conceptual space, period 1*

Figure 7.15 is a map of the distribution of the same five constructions as found in the 17th century corpus.
We see that figure 7.15 still shows considerable overlaps, although it is clearly less messy than figure 7.14. The most obvious changes are the shift of the DA2 construction towards the part of the map where strong unit status is involved, and the move of its centre of gravity, and the DAT construction’s gradual shrinking its way out of the possessive conceptual space altogether. Looking at the overall frequencies of each construction, we also find little change, with two exceptions: the sharp decrease of the DAT construction, and the increasing importance of the three “mixed” constructions not included in figure 7.15. However, there is more to the development than what can be shown in this sketch map or by overall frequencies.

The DA1 construction does not change its distribution much, and its semantic centre of gravity stays the same, but the small change in the boundaries of its distribution is quite characteristic of the other changes happening to it: Not only does the share of DA1 constructions with strong unit status increase steadily, but we also
find that the construction becomes less and less productive: Apparently, the higher-level construction schema is weakened as various lower-level schemas are becoming more entrenched: constructions involving denominal adjectives formed from a small group of nouns denoting divine beings (God, Christ, Jesus, the Lord) and a limited set of head nouns, and the patronymic construction \[\text{DA1}_{\text{PROPER, NP_{SON/DAUGHTER/CHILDREN}}}.\]

The DA2 construction consolidates its most typical semantics, \(\text{RP}_{\text{TYPE}}\) becoming its obvious semantic centre of gravity, and other occurrences tending to have strong unit status or belong to a group that often does. The number of occurrences with \(\text{RP}_{\text{INST}}\) decreases, and involves adjectives formed from a gradually narrowing range of noun stems. Thus, the construction moves farther and farther away from \(\text{RP}_{\text{INST}}\) and paradigmatic possession in Taylor’s terms (cf. section 1.1).

The two posited genitive constructions, \(\text{GEN}_{\text{RESTR}}\) and \(\text{GEN}_{\text{FREE}}\), change remarkably little throughout the period 1000–1700, and must still be regarded as two separate constructions in the 17th century texts. However, there are signs that changes are at hand: By the 17th century, \(\text{GEN}_{\text{FREE}}\) seems to have lost at least some of the restrictions on the types of genitive-marked nouns involved when the construction expresses a reference point situation without an intrinsic relationship: there are more animate nouns to be found. It also seems that \(\text{GEN}_{\text{COMPLEX}}\) is in the process of replacing DA1 with personal names that serve as reference points on instance level, and that \(\text{GEN}_{\text{FREE}}\) replaces DA2 when an inanimate reference point on instance level is involved. These tendencies suggest that a superschema over the two genitive constructions may be hypothesised to be present, if not very entrenched, in the 17th century speakers’ minds.

The DAT construction decreases steadily throughout the 15th–17th centuries, and in the 17th century corpus it is found virtually only as a means of expressing the intrinsic relationship between a deverbal noun and the entity filling its object elaboration site, perhaps due to the construction’s ability to accommodate non-reference point animates. Thus, it is shrinking neatly out of the possessive conceptual space.

Finally, there is a quite sharp increase of three main types of “mixed” constructions, all involving denominal adjectives, towards the end of the period under consideration. These constructions all violate the complementary distribution traditionally posited between genitive and adjective constructions, and they violate it at the very spot in the possessive conceptual space where the interaction between the genitive and adjective constructions was always at its neatest: Their primary function is to express reference points on instance level.
Thus, by the 17th century, the scene is ready for the change that is to come: The adjective constructions are becoming less useful for expressing $\text{RP}_{\text{INST}}$, and the dative construction is shrinking away. The distribution of genitive constructions with complex genitive-marked NPs still differs quite radically from those with genitive-marked bare nouns, but the genitive constructions are fast becoming the most flexible option.

7.7 A snapshot of the 18th century: When did the genitive start expanding?

As we have seen, the possessive constructions in the 17th century corpus differ quite a lot from those in the 11th–14th century corpus. Particularly the denominal adjective constructions and the DAT construction have changed considerably. Nevertheless, the situation is still far from that in modern Russian, and the main difference lies in the place and status of the genitive constructions. 17th century Russian still seems to have two genitive constructions, $\text{GEN}_{\text{RESTR}}$ and $\text{GEN}_{\text{FREE}}$, with different distributions. Modern Russian, on the other hand, quite indisputably has one single genitive construction which can be used in all parts of the possessive conceptual space. It meets only marginal competition from the DA2 construction and competition in a very restricted sphere, and apparently only with RP semantics, from the DA1 construction (cf. Kopčevskaja-Tamm and Šmelev 1994).

We saw in Chapter 2 that many scholars have found the expansion of the bare possessive genitive in Russian to be a quite recent change: Widnäs (1958) says that the change starts in the 18th century, but the perceived starting point varies considerably from author to author. Borkovskij (1968:166) reports an increased tendency to use genitives instead of denominal adjectives in the 18th–19th centuries. Richards (1976) sees a clear increase in the share of bare genitives in the 18th century, and finds denominal adjectives and bare genitives in stylistic variation throughout the 19th century. Only Richards backs her claims with quantified data. Again, none of them define the concept of possession, so that it is hard to compare their claims to the findings of the present dissertation. For this reason, I have used the theoretical tools of the present dissertation on two 18th century texts in order to look for obvious differences between 17th and 18th century Russian. The texts were the preface to V.I. Lukin’s comedy *Mot, ljuboviju ispravlennyj* (1765; Makogonenko 1970:145–151, 13.7 standard pages), and an excerpt from M.D. Čulkov’s tale *Prigožaja povaricha* (1770; Makogonenko 1970:185–191, 14.5 standard pages).

Looking at this small corpus, there are indeed quite dramatic changes to be found: The total share of genitive constructions (both occurrences of $\text{GEN}_{\text{COMPLEX}}$ and
certain instances of GEN_{FREE} in the possessive conceptual space has increased considerably, from 33.2 % in the 17th century to 60.2 % in the 18th century. The share of DA1 constructions is down from 18.1 % of all possessive constructions in the 17th century to 9.8 % in the 18th century. The share of DA2 constructions is down from 35.7 % to 26.6 %, and they express RP_{TYPE} to an even greater extent than in the 17th century corpus.

However, looking at constructions where a bare, genitive-marked noun is a reference point, the differences are not dramatic. The number of such constructions is very low in the two 18th century texts – only 2 occurrences with non-intrinsic RP_{INST} (8 % of all RP_{INST}) and 6 with RP_{INST}/INTRINSIC (24 % of all RP_{INST}/INTRINSIC). In the 17th century corpus, there were 11.4 % GEN_{FREE} with RP_{INST} and 12.5 % with RP_{INST}/INTRINSIC. That is, there was no obvious increase of GEN_{FREE} with non-intrinsic RP_{INST}, and both occurrences had abstract, inanimate genitive-marked nouns. The low number of occurrences of GEN_{FREE} with RP_{INST}/INTRINSIC makes it impossible to tell whether the apparent increase is real. However, looking at the genitive-marked nouns involved in these constructions, four of them are inanimate. Of the two remaining occurrences, one has a genitive-marked surname in -овъ, which means that the genitive construction was the obvious choice (132). The other example has a generic singular animate possessor, and is quite close to RP_{TYPE} in meaning (133). Thus, no dramatic changes could be discerned in the types of genitive-marked nouns that were acceptable in GEN_{FREE} constructions with reference point semantics.

(132) включил я раскаяние Добросердова
included I-NOM. remorse Dobroserdov-GEN.SG.
“I included Dobroserdov’s remorse” (Makogonenko 1970:148a/25)

(133) но в должности любовника показался мне еще чуднее
but in duty-LOC.SG. lover-GEN.SG. seemed I-DAT. even more-wonderful
“but in the lover’s duty he seemed even more wonderful to me”
(Makogonenko 1970:189a/25)

These results confirm the general trend observed in the present dissertation: The changes that happened to the constructions in the possessive conceptual space in the history of Russian were slow and gradual. It seems very clear that the adjective constructions had to be considerably weakened before the GEN_{FREE} construction became an acceptable option in the core domain of the DA1 construction: reference point situations with an animate reference point, particularly a personal name. In the 18th century texts, we see much more dominant genitive constructions and much
diminished and more restricted adjective constructions compared to the situation in the 17th century corpus. Nonetheless, the authors are still quite reluctant to use bare genitive-marked nouns as reference points.
8 Evaluation of proposed causal factors behind the changes

In Chapter 7, we looked at the changes in the system of Old Russian possessive constructions without taking into consideration their possible causes. This approach was motivated by the lesson learned from Harris and Campbell 1995: Given enough data, it is simple enough to be reasonably certain about what happens during a linguistic change. It is much harder to know for certain why they happen. Harris and Campbell use this basic insight as an argument for separating mechanisms of change from the causal factors behind them in their model: Including the causes in the classification would complicate the model, and make it difficult to classify changes when their causes are unclear – as they very often are. Harris and Campbell’s mechanisms have not been used in the analysis of the present dissertation, instead the changes were analysed in construction grammar terms (cf. section 4.6). Nor will their exact classification of the various causal factors behind syntactic change be used. Nonetheless, their classification has been an inspiration to the structuring of this chapter, and will be referred to throughout.

In the following, we will look at what possible causal factors have been suggested by previous scholars for the changes in the interrelationship between the Old Russian possessive constructions. In the light of the findings in chapters 5, 6 and 7, we will try to evaluate their relative importance.

8.1 Factors concerning the semantic poles of the constructions

Many of the attempts at explanations of the changes in the system of Old Russian possessive constructions focus on various semantic aspects of the constructions. Some of the reasoning also touches on what Harris and Campbell 1995 call analogues: “a condition where a structural similarity exists between two (or more) items, or classes, or constructions, etc” (Harris and Campbell 1995:51). In our case, this would mostly mean the flourishing partial constructional synonymy within a part of conceptual space, but there is also the obvious semantic and phonological similarity of the two genitive constructions.
EVALUATION OF PROPOSED CAUSAL FACTORS BEHIND THE CHANGES

8.1.1 Overlapping functions of the adjective and genitive constructions

As we saw in chapter 4, many scholars emphasise that the expansion of the genitive was aided by the strong position the genitive already had in many of the same functions as the denominal adjectives and dative (e.g. Borkovskij and Kuznecov 1963:425–426). Richards 1976 also makes a point of the Old Russian situation where N+N possessors could be expressed as adjective + adjective (the double adjective construction in the terms of this dissertation), adjective + genitive (the DA/GEN construction in our terms) and genitive + genitive (GEN\text{RESTR}). Thus, “the possessive adjective and the genitive were already in paradigmatic variation” (Richards 1976:264), a situation which could be extended to one-word possessors. According to her, constructions which mostly do not alternate with adjective constructions, such as množestvo naroda “multitude of people”, stolp cerkvi “pillar of (a/the) church”, syn otečestva and “son of (the) fatherland”, also provide models for the use of the genitive with one-word possessors. Bratishenko (1998:157 and 2003:100–101) has perhaps the most elaborate suggestion of this kind: She hypothesises that the possibility of subject–object ambiguity with deverbal nouns may have led to the favouring of adjectives for subjects and genitives for objects. This use of bare genitives in possessive-related constructions may then have served as a further analogue furthering the expansion of the possessive genitive in the history of Russian.

The findings of chapters 5–7, which deal with exactly these kinds of semantic overlaps, indicate that the constructional synonymy that holds between the two genitive constructions and the two main groups of adjective constructions certainly are a prerequisite for the observed changes. However, this is hardly the triggering cause. As seen in section 7.3, the distributions of the two genitive constructions are remarkably stable throughout the period 1000–1700, even though the overlap between GEN\text{RESTR} and DA1 and DA2 was present throughout the whole 700-year period, and also in the earliest attested Slavic, OCS (9th century). Similarly, occurrences of GEN\text{FREE} that were semantically closely related both to GEN\text{RESTR} and the adjective constructions were present both in the OCS corpus and in Old Russian texts from all four periods: In all the corpora GEN\text{FREE} was sporadically found with RP\text{INST}, which was the core semantics of the DA1 construction and also one of the DA2 construction’s possible meanings. This was particularly so when the head noun of the construction was relational and/or the genitive-marked noun was inanimate, but DA constructions were also quite frequent under these circumstances. Given the small-scale and slow changes found with the genitive constructions up to the 17th century, mostly affecting the types of possible genitive-marked nouns in constructions with non-intrinsic RP\text{INST}, it seems unlikely that the considerable semantic overlaps of the
genitive and adjective constructions were a triggering factor behind the eventual spread of the single possessive genitive construction.

The increase in the share of “mixed” constructions, on the other hand, may well have been one of several such triggering causes. As shown in section 7.5, and also pointed out by Makarova 1954 and Richards 1976, there is a clear rise in the share of the DA/GEN, the double adjective and the DA/PRON constructions in the 16th and 17th centuries. These constructions provided an alternative to GEN-right in the semantic centre of gravity of the DA1 constructions, as they were mostly used when a reference point on instance level was involved. If we are to illustrate Richards’s claim by way of a schematic network, what she says is that the speakers must have formed a schema over all the constructions which involved denominal adjectives, and which could express a reference point situation:

*Figure 8.1 Tentative schematic network of constructions involving denominal adjectives and denoting reference point situations on instance level, 16th–17th centuries*

The presence of the superschema means that if a reference point situation is present, it can be expressed with some kind of DA construction, whether the entity serving as a reference point is modified or not. This would only hold when the reference point was a person, preferably referred to by a personal name. The presence of the superschema over the various DA constructions would then, adapting Richards’s reasoning, make it more likely that a similar superschema was formed over the two genitive constructions, since they are also present in the same part of the possessive conceptual space. If the DA constructions could be used regardless of whether the reference point was modified or not, why not the genitive constructions?
Why would the complex DA constructions be so clearly on the increase in the 15th–17th centuries? An explanation that seems quite feasible is suggested by Makarova (1954:29), leaning on Borkovskij (1949:355): During the same period, it became more and more common to refer to persons with more than a bare name – usually, it was also necessary to also include the person’s patronym and/or family name and/or title when the person was referred to in a public setting, such as in written documents.

```
(1)  княжъ prince-j-MASC.NOM.SG.  Андреевъ Андреj-ov-MASC.NOM.SG.  Ивановичъ Ivanovič-GEN.SG.
    дьякъ clerk-NOM.SG.
    “prince Andrej Ivanovič’s clerk” PGMK 359/34–35, 17th century
```

Apparently, the reluctance to use the genitive with a bare personal name is extended to complex units consisting of several names and/or titles. That this should in its turn contribute to the great expansion of a single genitive construction in the possessive conceptual space, is something of a paradox, but all the same seems quite likely. The need to use complex names/titles in the public space was probably also a reason behind the subsequent withdrawal of the DA1 construction to the intimate sphere, where people could be referred to by a single name, as seen in modern Russian (cf. Kopčevskaja-Tamm and Šmelev 1994:224–225).

### 8.1.2 Specialisation

A related strain of argument is Makarova’s (1954:17–18) and Marojević’s (1983b:61) focus on the increase of bare genitives with type 1 denominal adjectives that serve as
surnames (cf. also Bulachovskij 1958:321). Surnames in -ov- and -in-, naturally, did not form adjectives in -ov- and -in-, although adjectives in -sk- were occasionally formed. Mostly, however, these surnames (Aleksandrovn, Lukin etc.), would occur in genitive constructions, not DA2 constructions, and were thus examples of bare genitive-marked personal names, something that hardly occurred at all in the earliest Old Russian texts.

However, it seems that constructions with bare, genitive-marked surnames in -ov-/in- are quite rare. In my entire Old Russian material, there is actually only one such example:

(2) был у меня [...] Сопрыкин сын
was with me Sopykin-NOM.SG. son-NOM.SG.

Труфо́нова
Trufónov-GEN.SG.
“Sopykin, Trufonov’s son was with me” IG/VG III:258/23, 16th century

The reason for this scarcity of examples is probably the one we discussed in section 8.1.1: In the written texts of this period, people are more and more frequently referred to with a complex name and/or title rather than with a single name. As this type of surname is typically an addition to the Christian name, it is unsurprising that it would rarely occur alone, as seen in example (4) in section 7.1.1, repeated here as (3).

(3) по Бориса по Васи́льева
for Boris-ACC.=GEN.SG. for Vasilij-ov-MASC.ACC=GEN.SG
сына Дятло́ва
son-ACC=GEN.SG Djatlov-ACC=GEN.SG.
“for Boris Vasilij’s son Djatlov” PBSV 554/6, 16th century

However, there is another important implication of type 1 denominal adjectives being used as surnames, which was touched upon in section 7.1, namely specialisation: Two partially specific DA1 subconstructions with adjectives formed from (mostly male) personal names turn up. The first is the surname construction discussed above, [NP_PERSONAL_NAME, DA1_PERSONAL_NAME]. The second is the patronymic construction discussed in section 7.1.1 and seen in example (3) above, [DA1_PERSONAL_NAME, NP_SON/DAUGHTER/CHILDREN]. This construction was probably the forerunner of the surname construction. Both have strong unit status and are quite specific, and thus contributed strongly to changing the distribution of the DA1 construction and weakening the schematic construction at the top of its schematic network. Thus the maximally schematic construction became less productive. We also saw that the presence of the surname construction and the patronymic construction seemed to inhibit the number of other occurrences of DA1 constructions with
adjectives formed from personal names. This general weakening of the usefulness of
the DA1 construction as a means of expressing reference point situations, including
paradigmatic possession, must surely have been one of the factors behind the
emergence and strengthening of a schematic genitive construction that could freely
express meanings from all parts of the possessive conceptual space except RP_{TYPE}.

8.1.3 Ambiguity of the various constructions
Many scholars use the wide polysemy of the early Slavic non-prepositional cases as
an explanation of sorts of various changes occurring to them, in that they tend to view
all the changes as symptoms of a (necessary) narrowing of the semantics of each case,
“вызванные стремлением языка к большей четкости выражения определенных отношений”\(^{106}\) (Stecenko 1977:97). This type of “explanation” is naturally not
applied to the genitive constructions under consideration in this dissertation, as their
semantics actually widen instead of narrowing (but cf. Borkovskij 1978:154 on the
“disadvantages” of the genitive’s wide semantics as opposed to the DA1
construction). However, this sort of reasoning \textit{is} applied to the DAT construction; its
withdrawal from the possessive conceptual space is characterised as a part of a
general narrowing of the non-prepositional dative’s meanings “за счёт утраты тех
значений, которые не отвечали основному значению дательного падежа –
обозначать лицо или предмет, в сторону которого направлено какое-либо
действие или признак”\(^{107}\) (Borkovskij 1968:205).

The wide polysemous character of the DAT construction and the two genitive
constructions, as well as of the dative and genitive cases on the whole, were certainly
prerequisites for the changes in the system of Old Russian possessive constructions.
However, it can hardly be claimed that this was a \textit{triggering} factor for the rise of a
single genitive construction and its virtual ousting of the other possessive
constructions. A wide polysemy may perfectly well persist for centuries. That a
particular construction narrows its distribution is merely a \textit{description} of its history,
not an explanation. In the case of Borkovskij, it is probably not meant as much more
than that, but in the case of Stecenko, it probably is.

The same kind of reasoning is applied by many scholars to the distribution of
the constructions with denominal adjectives, to much worse effect. In dealing with
DA constructions, several scholars have been tempted to claim that the Old Russian
denominal adjectives were so vague and “undifferentiated” (Stecenko 1977:61) that it

\(^{106}\) “caused by the language’s striving towards expressing certain relations with greater precision” (my translation).
\(^{107}\) “at the cost of the loss of those meanings that did not correspond to the basic meaning of the dative
case – to express a person or an object towards whom or which some action or characteristic is
directed” (my translation).
simply made communication difficult (cf. also Lomtev 1956:453 and Sprinčak 1960:122).

Such an “explanation” is quite unreasonable. Only the fact that the two main groups of adjective constructions persisted for centuries in the possessive conceptual space is enough to disprove it. There is no way a development that seriously complicated communication would have survived for any stretch of time. Certainly, the DA2 construction had a very wide distribution at its peak, which would open for ambiguities. Also, as seen in chapters 5 and 7, there were quite a number of occurrences that to the 21st-century scholar are difficult to classify. However, there is an overwhelming likelihood that most of these generally subtle ambiguities would be neutralised in context, particularly in speech as opposed to writing.

Nonetheless, the wide distribution of DA2 may serve as a partial explanation of why it was replaced by the genitive in a small section of the possessive conceptual space during the 15th–17th centuries, i.e. before the great expansion of the schematic genitive construction. We saw in section 7.2.3 that there was a clear change in the range of adjectives involved in DA2 constructions denoting reference point situations on instance level and without strong unit status: During the 15th–17th centuries, adjectives formed from inanimate stems virtually disappeared, while they were well represented in the Old Russian material of period 1. The fact that the distribution of DA2 constructions was very wide and could entail ambiguities, coupled with the fact that GENFREE was quite an acceptable choice in all periods, even with RPINST, when the genitive-marked noun was inanimate, was a good reason why GENFREE should be preferred more and more. However, this was a very gradual and small-scale change, and could hardly be the answer to a major communication problem.

8.2 Factors concerning the phonological pole of the constructions

In this section, we will first look at cases of morphological homonymy which could have contributed to the changes in the distribution of constructions in the possessive conceptual space. In doing this, we also touch on phenomena that would fall under Harris and Campbell’s (1995) label “surface ambiguity”, i.e. the possibility of more than one analysis of an expression, a prerequisite of reanalysis, a central concept in most accounts of diachronic syntax. We will then look at suggestions that other types of morphological factors may also have been involved.

8.2.1 Homonymy

There are two cases of morphological homonymy that have been invoked in the literature as causal factors behind the changes in the system of possessive
constructions. Firstly, I myself have argued that the quite extensive and increasing dative-genitive homonymy found mainly with feminine nouns may have played a role in the development (Eckhoff 2001:125–127). Secondly, Marojević (1983b:61) points out that the homonymy between denominal adjectives in -овъ in masc. nom. sg. and the new genitive plural in -овъ of masculine nouns may also have contributed to the changes by providing models of previously “impossible” form-meaning correspondences (cf. also Bulachovskij 1958:321).

The genitive-dative homonymy is quite extensive, and was on the increase in the period 1000–1700, mostly with feminine singulars. The i-stems had complete homonymy between the genitive and dative singular; kosti may be either gen.sg. or dat.sg. (with the same accentuation, see Bulachovskij 1958:265) of kostь “bone”. The i-stems had an early influence on the feminine consonant stems and ū-stems, resulting in a homonymous genitive singular and dative singular there as well (Kiparsky 1967:101). With feminine ja-stems, homonymy also gradually arose (Kiparsky 1967:86). Adjectives in the genitive and feminine singular could be homonymous to some extent too, as the pronominal long endings of the feminine dative singular and the feminine genitive singular both evolved into -øj/-ej during the period 1000–1700 (Kiparsky 1967:165–166; Bulachovskij 1958:457) and are found in both cases even in the earliest of Old Russian texts (Śachmatov 1957:341). Thus, the homonymy was clearly on the increase.

Looking at the genitive-dative homonymy, this is quite a visible factor in my Old Russian material. As seen in sections 5.7.6 and 7.4.6, about 2 % of all constructions in each of the four periods were ambiguous, in that they contained an NP that could either be genitive-marked or dative-marked.

(4) вникнуши въ помыслы дши
penetrating in thought-ACC.PL. soul-GEN./DAT.SG.
своеи
self’s-FEM.GEN./DAT.SG.
“penetrating into their soul’s thoughts” PVM 253/22–23, period 1

As seen in example (4), the homonymy could extend to a full, complex NP, but in most cases, the ambiguous constructions contain a bare dative- or genitive-marked noun:

(5) естество старости юности твораше
nature-ACC.SG. old-age-GEN./DAT.SG. youthful making
“making the nature of old age youthful” ŽZS 12/2, 15th century
Thus, one could argue that the ambiguous constructions do provide extra models of constructions with bare genitive-marked nouns. However, looking at the occurrences, we find that most of them are of a kind very typical both with GEN\textsubscript{FREE} and DAT, namely, constructions where the “possessor” is inanimate and usually abstract, and where the head noun is relational. The same factors would also make the constructions highly literary. Thus, there is little in the Old Russian corpus of this dissertation to suggest that the increasing homonymy between the feminine genitive singular and the feminine dative singular had much effect on the development of the system of possessive constructions.

Looking at the homonymy between denominal adjectives in \textit{-ovъ} in masc. nom. sg. and the genitive plural in \textit{-ovъ} of masculine nouns, we find that this, too, is a morphological development that coincides with the developments under consideration in this dissertation. Instances of genitive plural in \textit{-ovъ} with other stems than \textit{u-}stems are reported both in OCS and the earliest Old Russian texts, but the suffix expanded considerably in the period from the earliest Old Russian attestations and up to 1700, and came to be found with the majority of masculine stems (Kiparsky 1967:50–51). The spread of the genitive plural in \textit{-ovъ} from the \textit{u-}stems to other masculine stem types may also have contributed to the changes by providing models of previously “impossible” form-meaning correspondences, since \textit{-ov-} adjectives in the masculine nominative/accusative singular could now be mistaken for bare genitive plurals of the corresponding nouns.

According to Marojević (1983b:61), this homonymy influenced the decline of the adjectives in \textit{-ov-}, making them disappear sooner with common nouns that had a plural form, and also motivating the difference between adjectives in \textit{-ov-} and \textit{-in-}, the former losing their productivity, the latter remaining quite productive even today, although in a much more restricted sphere.

Looking at my Old Russian corpus, there is little to indicate that the problem of confusing adjectives in \textit{-ovъ} with genitive plurals in \textit{-ovъ} can have been very prominent: There are only two examples of bare genitive plurals in \textit{-ovъ} in the entire corpus, both from the same 17th century text.

(6) сердц\textsubscript{a} врагов зависти\textsubscript{ю} ужасахуся
heart-NOM.PL. enemy-GEN.PL. envy-INSTR.SG. were-horrified
“the hearts of the enemies were horrified with envy” SAP 130/13, 17th century

(7) о думе панов
about counsel-LOC.SG. gentleman-GEN.PL.
“about the gentlemen’s counsel” SAP 134/26, 17th century
In both examples morphology (the head nouns of the constructions are not masculine nominative singulars) as well as context make it perfectly clear that the forms in -овъ are genitive plurals and not denominal adjectives. Thus, it seems that the occasions where the two forms might be confused were quite rare. If the homonymy influenced the development in any way, then, it was hardly by providing extra models of bare, genitive-marked animate nouns in GEN\textsubscript{FREE} constructions, but by mere similarity in both form and meaning.

8.2.2 “Anomalities” of the denominal adjectives
Several scholars note various “inadequacies” of the denominal adjectives, and use them to explain the expansion of the genitive. Richards (1976) points out that the unambiguously possessive adjectives (in -ов/-ин) are an anomaly “in that they express both the gender of the noun from which they are derived and number and gender agreement with their heads” (1976:264–265). By the 15th–17th centuries, they are also an anomaly in that they are declined only as short-form adjectives, the long form having been generalised for attributives with all other adjectives. There was nothing essentially new about these anomalies, but when the possessive adjective became superfluous by the genitive becoming an option for one-word possessors, this “could be sufficient to cause its elimination” (Richards 1976:265). In a similar vein, Borkovskij (1978:154) argues that the genitive is “проще по формальной структуре”; \textsuperscript{108} “не требует от говорящего (пишущего) акта словообразования, иногда […] довольно затруднительного”.\textsuperscript{109}

It seems highly unlikely that features such as these, which persist for centuries, should suddenly go on to trigger changes (cf. also Borkovskij 1978:156), and particularly since the analysis in the present dissertation, as well as those of for instance Makarova (1954) and Marojević (1983b), strongly suggests that the denominal adjectives were weakened first, and then the single genitive construction emerged and spread. However, once a linguistic unit loses frequency, morphological irregularities are certainly likely to be lost, cf. Bybee 1985.

8.3 Language contact
Harris and Campbell (1995:51) put forward language contact as an important causal factor behind many types of syntactic change, not only direct syntactic borrowing, but also extensions and reanalyses. Throughout the period 1000–1700, Old Russian was in at times intense contact with other languages, and various phases of contact have

\textsuperscript{108} “simpler in its formal structure” (my translation).
\textsuperscript{109} “it does not demand the act of derivation from the speaker (writer), which is sometimes […] quite troublesome” (my translation).
been put forward by scholars in order to explain several of the changes to the system of Old Russian possessive constructions. The strongest influence was no doubt the closely related Church Slavic, the language of the christening of Rus’, and the foundation of the Old Russian literary language. Through Church Slavic, Old Russian was also in (mostly) indirect contact with Greek. Later on, Old Russian came into contact with several Western European languages, such as German, Dutch and French.

8.3.1 The DAT construction
Many scholars, such as Borkovskij (1968:198, 1978:151) and Pravdin (1957:109–110), suggest that the possessive dative may not have been a living category of Old Russian at all, but a mere result of Church Slavic influence. Such a point of view would suggest that the DAT construction’s withdrawal from the possessive conceptual space was merely the symptom of the Old Russian literary language freeing itself from Church Slavic influence. Other scholars are more open to the idea that the DAT construction was as much a feature of Old Russian as it was of OCS, e.g. Marojević (1983b:57), who describes it as a living and in some environments productive category of Old Russian (see also Bratishenko 1998:48–49, Karskij 1962:82). Others again are uncertain of its status, such as Ivanov (1989:152–153).

Looking at the comparison of the DAT construction in the OCS corpus and the Old Russian material of period 1 (section 6.6.4), it is hard to believe that the Old Russian construction should be a mere loan from Church Slavic. In fact, the comparison shows us two constructions that are remarkably similar in both languages: The overall share of DAT constructions among all constructions in the possessive conceptual space is about the same size, 7.3 % in the OCS corpus and 6.5 % in the Old Russian material of period 1. The distributions of the two constructions are also remarkably similar, as seen in chart 6.5. on page 205.

True, there are differences in the distributions, but they are quite subtle: The OCS construction on the whole seems to be a little more flexible. There are slightly more occurrences of OCS DAT constructions denoting reference point situations on instance level without involving a relational head, but as in Old Russian, they tend to have the possibility of a “dative” reading, such as benefactive. Also, the OCS construction is less specialised when it comes to expressing an intrinsic relationship between the dative-marked NP and a relational head, whereas the Old Russian DAT constructions very strongly tend to denote the relationship between a deverbal head and its object elaboration site. In the OCS corpus, the DAT construction was found as frequently with other types of relational heads, such as ruler nouns.
It is also a fact that the frequency of the DAT construction varies from genre to genre in the Old Russian material of period 1. It is twice as frequent in the religious texts as in the narrative texts. In the business/legal texts, there were only two occurrences. As the religious texts are clearly much more influenced by Church Slavic across the board than the narrative texts, it seems very likely that the higher frequency of DAT constructions in these texts are a result of the Church Slavic influence. However, although the DAT construction is only about half as frequent in the narrative texts, which are written in a language with a considerably more East Slavic flavour, the distribution of the occurrences is very much the same as in OCS and in the Old Russian religious texts, as seen in chart 6.6 on page 211. Nor are the occurrences of DAT in the narrative texts restricted to passages in high, religious style. This would indicate that the Church Slavic influence only affected the frequency of a construction that was present in Old Russian already. The fact that there are hardly any occurrences of the DAT construction in the business/legal texts does not necessarily mean that the construction was very rare in everyday speech, as is the conclusion of Borkovskij (1968:198). Rather, we find that the parts of the possessive conceptual space where the DAT construction is strong in the religious and the narrative texts are very poorly represented in the business/legal texts. Only three out of 213 occurrences denote an intrinsic relationship between a deverbal head noun and its object elaboration site, a very central meaning of the DAT construction in the other texts. And in fact, the two DAT occurrences in the Old Russian business/legal texts of period 1 actually account for two of these three instances:

(8)  

ка́л буде́ть  оби́да  нову́городу  

where will-be insult-NOM.SG. Novgorod-DAT.SG.

“if there should be an insult to Novgorod” DTN 63/15, period 1

Likewise, there are comparatively few constructions denoting reference point situations on instance level involving relational head nouns, the typical domain of the DAT construction in addition to that of denoting deverbal noun–object relationships. In fact, the overwhelming majority of constructions in the business/legal texts have meanings with strong unit status, most frequently with reference points on type level. That is the nature of legal codices, testaments and business documents: they deal with the general and classifiable, and not with personal affectedness. This is simply a genre where the DAT construction is not expected to occur much, and can therefore tell us little about the frequency of the construction in the spoken language.

110 In this case, there is a clear malefactive tinge to the DAT construction, but the verb corresponding to the deverbal head noun takes the accusative.
Finally, the generally strong semantic links between all kinds of dative constructions both in OCS and in the earliest Old Russian is an argument in favour of the DAT construction’s presence in the Old Russian system. Its diachronic tendency, as seen in section 7.4.7, confirms this: The DAT construction lingers on for a long time in the Old Russian texts. It loses ground with the most untypical dative semantics first (reference point situations, first without, then with relational heads), but holds its ground in expressing the intrinsic relationship between deverbal nouns and the dative-marked NPs filling their object elaboration sites even in the 17th century. This is an area where the DAT construction is particularly well suited. It has strong links to the affectedness semantics typical of most dative constructions in Old Russian (cf. figure 5.8, page 158). At the same time it is unproblematic to use when no reference point is involved, unlike the DA constructions, and it is also unproblematic to use when the noun filling the object elaboration site is animate, unlike the GENFREE construction.

To sum up, then, it seems unlikely that the DAT construction was an outright loan from Church Slavic. Rather, it was probably a construction that was present in the pre-Christian Old Russian language, and that became more frequent and perhaps more flexible under Church Slavic influence. Its subsequent shrinking away from the possessive conceptual space was probably conditioned by the decreasing pressure of Church Slavic, but is also likely to have had to do with the slow expansion of the GENFREE construction, which became more available with animate reference points during the 15th–17th centuries.

8.3.2 The genitive

When it comes to the genitive constructions, scholars have used language contact as an explanation both for the possessive genitive’s presence in Slavic at all, and for the later expansion in the history of Russian of the possessive genitive at the expense of the nominal adjective and dative constructions.

There are not many scholars that suggest that the presence of Old Russian or OCS genitive constructions in the possessive conceptual space has anything to do with language contact. An exception is Uryson (1980:128), who believes that the possibility of using the adnominal genitive in Slavic at all was a mere result of Greek influence. However, her reasons for believing this appear to be purely theoretical, and are not based on, but rather in conflict with the empirical facts. Most other scholars seem fairly certain that the possessive adnominal genitive was firmly based, but clearly restricted, in Slavic before the Greek influence, and that Greek apparently had little influence on the Slavic system of possessive constructions (e.g. Makarova 1954:7–8, leaning on Buslaev 1881/1959:421). This is the impression received by the analysis in this dissertation as well, particularly the figures discussed in section 6.10:
The overwhelming majority – 88.3 % – of the occurrences of possessive constructions in the OCS corpus are translations of Greek adnominal genitive constructions [NP, NP-GEN]. Even more interestingly, OCS DA1 and DAT constructions are more consistently translations of genitive constructions than GEN\textsubscript{RESTRICTED} and GEN\textsubscript{FREE} are, 94.3 and 93 % vs. 87.6 % (for both genitive constructions taken together). Thus, the translators obviously felt free to translate genitive constructions with non-genitive constructions, literal and rigid though they might be in other respects. The contrast between the semantically inclusive, free and typically Indo-European genitive construction in Greek and the complex and subtle Slavic system of possessive constructions must have been very clear to them.

A more widespread opinion is that the expansion of the possessive genitive in the history of Russian is the result of contact with Western European languages. This hypothesis is advocated by Widnäs 1958 and Uryson 1980, who both consider the spread of the genitive an 18th century phenomenon, and the result of contact with French and other Western European languages. Uspenskij (1987:301–306), on the other hand, names the influence of Greek as the main reason why the genitive started spreading in the written language, through the reforms of the second half of the 17th century, when Patriarch Nikon’s scribes started correcting datives and denominal adjectives into genitives. These corrections were strongly conditioned by Greek as a linguistic ideal, and Greek had a strong possessive genitive. Uspenskij also states that the increasing influence from Western European languages coincided with the trend of the Nikonian reforms in this respect, and that this influence was the main reason for the expansion of the possessive genitive in the 18th century.

As we saw in chapter 7, the rise and spread of a single schematic genitive construction in the possessive conceptual space was still in an early phase by the end of the 17th century, and probably even in the mid-18th century. However, we saw considerable changes to its competitors in the 15th, 16th and 17th centuries, as summarised in section 7.6. The DA1 construction was becoming less and less productive, and more and more of the instantiations were actually instantiations of strongly entrenched and lexically partially specific lower-level constructions. The DA2 construction was becoming less and less able to express reference point situations on instance level without strong unit status, and the range of noun stems from which the adjectives involved could be formed also narrowed in this function. As for the DAT construction, by the 17th century, it had almost withdrawn from the possessive conceptual space altogether. At the same time, there was a rise in various “mixed” constructions involving denominal adjectives, which might be a model for the emergence of a schematic and unified genitive construction. All this suggests that though contact with Western European languages in the 18th century and before
might well have been a stimulant for the spread of the schematic genitive construction, the ground was also well prepared for the change by various language-internal and society-internal factors. The same can be said about the Nikonian corrections; they were probably not inspired by the Greek system only, but also by the trend in their contemporary Russian: By the end of the 17th century, the genitive’s competition was seriously weakened.

8.4 Appeals to universal tendencies in language change

In addition to the language- and situation-specific explanation attempts reviewed in sections 8.1–3, many scholars resort to supposedly universal tendencies in linguistic change when trying to explain the diachronic development of the Old Russian possessive constructions. As seen in section 2.7.2.5, most of the general works on Russian historical syntax (except Borkovskij 1968, who sticks to pragmatic, small-scale explanations) tend to resort to this type of explanation. The tendency invoked is primarily a very strong faith in progress: Languages change for the better, and become gradually better and better suited for the communicative purposes of the speakers. In many of the works, this view has a strong Marxist flavour (particularly Sprinčak 1960 and Stecenko 1977). The resulting explanations are generally claims that certain linguistic phenomena, particularly the wide semantics of the denominal adjectives, complicated mutual understanding.

The analysis of chapters 5–7 strongly suggests that such explanations do not stand up to the data. As emphasised throughout the present dissertation, constructional synonymy and polysemy were abundant throughout the 11th–17th centuries. The cluster of possessive constructions remained in subtle and complex part-competition, part-division of labour for centuries. This would surely not have been the case if mutual understanding were really compromised. The complexity of the situation was certainly a prerequisite for the changes to come, but it seems that an external push was required for changes to occur. The case of the Old Russian possessive constructions supports the general rejection of the notion of progress in language change in modern work on the subject, being a typical example of how a language responds to the “perpetual stalemate” of opposing forces (Aitchison 1991:214–215).

A much more reasonable kind of appeal to general tendencies in linguistic change is the invocation of typologically valid semantic hierarchies: Certain semantic properties seem to be ranked in a certain way cross-linguistically, and linguistic change tends to follow such paths. Such semantic hierarchies are actually small connected regions in the greater conceptual space (Croft 2003:133–135; cf. section 4.1), and therefore close in spirit to the theoretical approach in the present
When Corbett sums up the history of the competition between possessive adjectives (in -ov/-in-) and the adnominal genitive in Slavic in general, he proposes two such hierarchies: Human < Animal < Inanimate and Specific < Non-Specific. The history of the competition between the possessive adjective and the genitive is then analysed as a progressive tightening of the restrictions on the possessive adjective in terms of the two hierarchies above (Corbett 1987:326): Possessive adjectives move towards denoting specific human beings. Similar hierarchies are proposed by Huntley (1984) and Bratishenko (1998), but not used diachronically.

Looking at the history of the DA1 construction in Old Russian, we see that the same parameters have been important in our analysis. Specificity is a prerequisite for an entity to serve as a reference point, and animacy effects have been noted for the various constructions throughout the dissertation. However, even in the earliest extant Old Russian texts, the DA1 construction seems confined to the top of the two hierarchies. The adjectives are virtually always derived from nouns denoting specific human (or divine) beings, and in the overwhelming majority of cases, they serve as reference points. Even the earliest attested Old Russian, then, has a system where the DA1 construction plays a limited role, compared to many other Slavic languages.

8.5 Summary

The analysis in chapters 5, 6 and 7 has made it abundantly clear that the five main constructions in the possessive conceptual space had a complex and subtle interrelationship, with partial competition, partial division of labour and partial peaceful coexistence. All of the constructions were wide and polysemous in the outset, each covering a considerable area of the possessive conceptual space. All of them also overlapped to various extents, resulting in extensive constructional synonymy. Many of the scholars who have been looking at the changes in the system of possessive constructions have focused strongly on these features. The considerable overlap of genitive and adjective constructions, and the wide semantics of the adjective constructions, have been seen as factors complicating understanding.

Leaning on a strong belief in progress driving linguistic change, many scholars have seen the changes as a way of “repairing” a dysfunctional part of the language. However, the analysis in this dissertation strongly suggests that the constructional polysemy and synonymy were merely a prerequisite for the changes, not in any way a triggering factor. The main piece of evidence for such a point of view is the remarkable overall stability of the interrelationships between the constructions, and the way they persisted for centuries. This is not a conclusion that holds for this particular phenomenon in the history of Russian alone, it supports a general insight
about linguistic change. At the same time, a certain drift of the various constructions is observed, particularly of the DA2 and DAT constructions, which shrink back towards their semantic centres of gravity with little obvious external motivation.

Several of the factors suggested in the literature seem likely to have had an impact on the development of the Old Russian possessive constructions in the light of the analysis in this dissertation. The increasing frequency of the "mixed" constructions involving denominal adjectives may well have provided a model for a united schematic genitive construction. This increase seems to be induced by the tendency to use complex names and titles when referring to people in a public sphere. The increasing specialisation of DA1 constructions, also linked to the development of Russian names, in its turn served to weaken the schematic DA1 construction and make it a less useful alternative to the genitive constructions. The increasing homonymy of feminine singular genitives and datives, and of masculine genitive plurals in -ovъ and -ov- adjectives might have provided extra models of genitive use where it was previously not expected, but this was hardly a decisive factor. Language contact certainly played a certain role: The DAT construction was clearly made more frequent by the strong Church Slavic influence in the earliest texts, and its shrinking back from the possessive conceptual space during the 15th–17th centuries was probably also linked to the weakening of that pressure. However, it seems unlikely that it was a mere loan. As for the suggestion that the expansion of the genitive in the 18th century was a direct consequence of the lively contact with Western European languages that flourished at that time, this seems something of an overstatement. The contact situation may certainly have played a role, but the ground was thoroughly prepared for this change by the systematic weakening of the genitive’s competitors in the preceding centuries.

Thus, we see that the changes in the system of Old Russian possessive constructions had a cluster of possible triggering causal factors behind them, but that the most weighty ones seem to be the ones that contributed to weakening the DA1 construction and making the most general DA1 construction schema less productive.
9 Conclusions

In Chapter 1, the following aims were set up for the dissertation:

a) To give a maximally clear description of the distributions and interrelationships of 11th–14th century Old Russian possessive constructions, placing them on semantic maps and applying schematic networks in the exposition when useful. An important hypothesis was that the choice of construction was conditioned not only by the semantics of the “possessor” noun (stem), but also to a large extent by the type of head noun.

b) To compare the possessive constructions of 11th–14th century Old Russian with those of canonical OCS, both due to the possibility that OCS possessive constructions might reflect an earlier stage of Slavic than those in Old Russian, and due to the undoubted influence that (Old) Church Slavic exerted on Old Russian, at least on the literary language.

c) To describe the changes occurring to the Old Russian possessive constructions from the earliest attested texts (11th–14th century) up to 1700, and formulate the changes in cognitive construction grammar terms.

d) To base the analyses sketched in a–c on representative text corpora, and to quantify the results as far as deemed possible and useful.

e) To evaluate the causal factors that in the previous literature have been suggested to lie behind the changes to the Old Russian possessive constructions. This evaluation was to be carried out in the light of three analyses performed within a construction grammar framework: i) a synchronic analysis of 11th–14th century Old Russian possessive constructions; ii) a comparative analysis of early Old Russian and OCS possessive constructions, and iii) a diachronic analysis of the development of the Old Russian possessive constructions up to 1700.

9.1 The analysis of possessive constructions in 11th–14th century Old Russian

This was the task of chapter 5. We saw that the strong focus on complementary distribution between genitive and adjective constructions found in so much of the
work on Old Russian possessive constructions (cf. section 2.5) is not entirely justified. Rather, we are dealing with five separate polysemous, but partly overlapping constructions, each with a clear semantic centre of gravity, competing and interacting in the possessive conceptual space, as illustrated in figure 9.1 (figure 5.9 repeated):

Figure 9.1 Distributions of all Old Russian possessive constructions in the possessive conceptual space, 1000–1400

In one part of the possessive conceptual space, in reference point situations on instance level, there is certainly a strong tendency towards complementary distribution. Here, DA1 or DA2 constructions are used in most cases when the possessor consists of a single noun stem, whereas the GEN\textsubscript{RESTR} construction is normally used when the possessor is complex or of a word class or noun type from which a denominal adjective cannot be formed. A clear tendency towards complementary distribution between DA2 and GEN\textsubscript{RESTR} was also found when the head noun was a ruler noun, or when the modifier expressed place of origin. However, as seen in sections 5.6.2 and 5.6.3, constructions with bare genitive-marked nouns certainly do turn up with RP\textsubscript{INST} semantics, even when it is possible to form a
denominal adjective from that noun stem. Also, we found two types of “mixed” constructions, expanded adjective constructions, that could be used with possessors consisting of more than a bare noun: the double adjective construction and the DA/GEN construction. These constructions violated the alleged complementary distribution in its core domain, RP_{INST}. Thus, chapter 5 showed that an exaggerated focus on complementary distribution probably obscures more than it illuminates, since it only concerns a part of the possessive conceptual space, and since it is not complete by any means.

In addition to this emphasis on the syntactic restrictions on the distribution of adjective and genitive constructions, much of the literature also had a strong focus on the semantics of the possessor. As seen in section 2.2.4, many scholars deem the choice of construction to be strongly conditioned by the animacy/personhood and the definiteness/specificity of the possessor NP or noun stem. I believe that this analysis is very insightful, but have chosen to refine it by giving a three-dimension construction grammar analysis, taking constructional meanings, the semantics of the modifiers (“possessors”) and the types of head nouns into account.

I posited a set of interconnected schematic construction meanings, the possessive conceptual space (section 4.5). In the possessive conceptual space, the reference point situation on instance level deals with what previous scholars have labelled definiteness or specificity effects: A reference point on instance level is a specific entity which is used to identify the target, the head noun of the construction. As illustrated in figure 9.1, this constructional meaning was found to be particularly central to the DA1 and GEN_{RESTRICTION} constructions, and possible with, but not at all central to, the DA2, GEN_{FREE} and DAT constructions. Both GEN_{FREE} and DAT had intrinsic relationships as their semantic centre of gravity, whereas the DA2 construction had as its centre reference point situations with strong conventionalised unit status, either on type level or on instance level.

The modifiers in the constructions were checked for animacy effects. As seen in section 5.10, DA1 constructions consistently had adjectives formed from nouns denoting persons and with singular and specific reference. DA2 constructions quite often had adjectives formed from animate nouns, but frequently with plural reference. Constructions with such plural-reference adjectives were the DA2 constructions that most frequently had an RP_{INST} interpretation. The GEN_{FREE} construction was found to be considerably more frequent with inanimate (and often abstract) genitive-marked nouns. Interestingly, there was a clear difference between RP_{INST} and RP_{INST}/INTRINSIC: When an intrinsic relationship was involved as well as a reference point, the genitive-marked noun was more likely to be animate. Conversely, the DAT construction (in keeping with general dative semantics) often had animate
dative-marked nouns, or tended to be used with relational head nouns which would typically have an animate noun filling its elaboration site. As the GEN\textsubscript{FREE} construction and the DAT construction otherwise had very similar distributions, they seem to have supplemented each other, the former construction being preferred with inanimates, and the latter with animates.

The types of head nouns in the constructions were found to be of great importance. As discussed in section 4.3.1, a relational noun has an unprofiled relation and one or more unprofiled relata in its semantic base: The noun has one or more elaboration sites, and imposes a quite specific interpretation on the entity filling that elaboration site. Thus, when a construction had a relational head, its schematic semantics would be supplemented by the semantics of the head noun: A reference point used to identify e.g. a kinship term such as “wife” will be interpreted to have the relevant relationship to the head; in this case the reference point will be her husband. We saw that the choice of construction was frequently conditioned by the type of head noun involved: The DAT and the GEN\textsubscript{FREE} construction both strongly tended to occur with relational head nouns. The DAT construction rarely had reference point semantics unless it was headed by a relational noun. The GEN\textsubscript{FREE} construction was, as expected, often headed by nouns denoting inherent parts of wholes, but also by other relational nouns. In particular, GEN\textsubscript{FREE} constructions often had deverbal heads and genitive-marked nouns filling an elaboration site corresponding to an object. We also saw that a GEN\textsubscript{FREE} construction was more likely to have an animate reference point when the head noun was relational than when it was not.

In sum, I believe this tripartite construction grammar analysis has done considerable more justice to the intricate interrelationships between the 11th–14th century Old Russian possessive constructions than previous approaches have.

9.2 The comparative analysis of OCS possessive constructions

This was the task of chapter 6. The main conclusion of the chapter was that the OCS possessive constructions were remarkably similar in distribution to those found in the 11th–14th century Old Russian material, as illustrated in figure 9.2 (figure 6.7 repeated). There were more differences in frequency than in distribution, and the distributional differences were mostly quite subtle.
The analysis in chapter 6 showed that the DA1 construction was virtually identical in distribution in both languages, but that it was considerably more frequent in OCS. The DA2 construction, on the other hand, was more frequent in the 11th–14th century Old Russian material. The DA2 constructions differed somewhat in distribution and in terms of centres of gravity in the two languages, but the dissimilarities were found to be mostly due to differences in subject matter (the high number of foreign toponyms in the OCS texts). However, the OCS texts were probably more consistent in forming type 2 adjectives from animates only if they had plural reference. The GEN Restr construction was found to be remarkably similar both in distribution and frequency in the two corpora. The GEN Free construction was slightly more frequent in the OCS material, and was also apparently somewhat more available for use with animate possessors, even when no intrinsic relationship was involved. The DAT construction was, quite surprisingly, about equally frequent in both corpora overall, but as seen in section 6.6.4, it was overrepresented in the religious texts of the 11th–14th century Old Russian corpus, texts heavily influenced by Church Slavic. The OCS DAT
construction seemed to be slightly more semantically flexible than the Old Russian one, but again, the differences were subtle. Finally, both corpora had about the same proportions of “mixed” possessive constructions, with about the same distributions.

As for the question of whether OCS reflects an earlier stage of the Slavic system of possessive constructions than the 11th–14th century Old Russian texts do, the answer is almost certainly no: The two languages are remarkably similar when it comes to the distribution of possessive constructions. They seem to deviate about equally (OCS perhaps slightly more) from a perfect complementary distribution (which is not even posited for Proto-Slavic). Again, the concept of complementary distribution is probably an equally oversimplifying strategy for describing the possessive constructions in both languages.

The analysis of the OCS corpus was deemed necessary in order to evaluate the claims of Church Slavic influence on Old Russian possessive constructions. The strong similarities of the two systems do not suggest any great pressure from Church Slavic. However, the DAT construction is considerably more frequent in the Old Russian religious texts than in the narrative texts, and is nearly absent in the business/legal texts. This would suggest that the frequency of the Old Russian DAT construction was increased by the Church Slavic influence, and also that the construction may have gained more semantic flexibility. I found it quite unlikely that the construction should be a pure syntactic loan, when it is used so freely and in such accordance with other dative semantics as it is even in the narrative Old Russian texts.

The OCS corpus was also included in order to look at the possessive constructions in the Greek original texts. As seen in section 6.10, the Greek seemed to have had little influence on OCS when it came to possessive constructions. In the overwhelming majority of cases, a genitive construction was found in the Greek original text, no matter which of the wide spectre of OCS possessive constructions it was translated into.

9.3 The diachronic analysis of 11th–17th century Old Russian possessive constructions

This was the task of chapter 7. The main conclusion of that chapter was that by the 17th century, considerable changes had happened to the two adjective constructions and the DAT construction, but that the two genitive constructions had changed remarkably little. The distributions of the possessive constructions in the 17th century Old Russian corpus are illustrated in figure 9.3 (figure 7.15 repeated):
We found that the DA1 construction’s distribution and semantic centre of gravity did not change much during the 15th–17th centuries. However, the share of DA1 constructions with strong unit status was seen to increase steadily, and the construction also became less and less productive: The higher-level construction schema was weakened as various lower-level schemas became more entrenched, namely constructions involving denominal adjectives formed from a small group of nouns denoting divine beings (God, Christ, Jesus, the Lord), and the patronymic construction [DA1\text{PROPER}, \text{NPSON/DAUGHTER/CHILDREN}].

The DA2 construction was found to consolidate its most typical semantics, RP\text{TYPE} becoming its obvious semantic centre of gravity. Other DA2 occurrences increasingly tended to have strong unit status or belong to a group that often had such status. The number of occurrences with RP\text{INST} decreased, and came to involve adjectives formed from a gradually narrowing range of noun stems. Thus, the construction moved farther and farther away from RP\text{INST} and paradigmatic possession.
The two genitive constructions were found to change remarkably little throughout the period 1000–1700, and must still be regarded as two separate constructions in the 17th century texts. However, by the 17th century, GENFREE seems to have lost at least some of the restrictions on the types of genitive-marked nouns involved when the construction expresses a reference point situation without an intrinsic relationship; there were more animate nouns to be found. GENFREE was also replacing DA2 when an inanimate reference point on instance level was involved. These tendencies suggest that a superschema over the two genitive constructions may be hypothesised to be present, if not very entrenched, in the 17th century speakers’ minds.

The DAT construction was found to decrease steadily throughout the 15th–17th centuries, and by the 17th century was found virtually only as a means of expressing the intrinsic relationship between a deverbal noun and the entity filling its object elaboration site. Thus, it was clearly on its way out of the possessive conceptual space.

The frequency of “mixed” constructions involving denominal adjectives was found to increase quite sharply in the 15th–17th centuries (cf. chart 7.28). These constructions violated the tendency to complementary distribution at the very spot in the possessive conceptual space where the interaction between the genitive and adjective constructions was always at its neatest, since their primary function was to express reference points on instance level.

Thus, by the 17th century, the great expansion of the genitive construction(s) had still not occurred, but the scene was found to be ready for the change: The adjective constructions were less useful than before for expressing RPINST, and the dative construction was shrinking away. The genitive constructions were fast becoming the most flexible option. However, a great reluctance to use bare genitive-marked nouns as reference points was observed as late as in 18th century texts.

9.4 Evaluation of suggested causal factors behind the changes

This was the task of chapter 8. Many previous scholars were found to attempt to explain the changes that happened to the possessive constructions in Old Russian by considering the wide polysemy and considerable synonymy of the constructions as causal factors. The considerable overlap of the genitive and adjective constructions, and the wide semantics of the adjective constructions, were seen as factors complicating understanding, and, leaning on a strong belief in progress driving linguistic change, many scholars saw the changes as a way of “repairing” a dysfunctional part of the language. However, the analysis of the present dissertation
strongly suggests that the constructional polysemy and synonymy were merely prerequisites for the changes, not a triggering factor. The main argument in favour of this is the fact that the polysemy and synonymy in most cases persisted for centuries.

A number of factors suggested in the previous literature appeared likely to have been involved in triggering the changes, considered in the light of the analysis in chapters 5–7.

The increasing frequency of the “mixed” constructions involving denominal adjectives may well have provided a model for a united schematic genitive construction. This increase seemed to have been induced by the growing tendency to use complex names and titles when referring to people in a public sphere.

The increasing specialisation of the DA1 constructions served to weaken the schematic DA1 construction and make it a less useful alternative to the genitive constructions.

The increasing homonymy of the genitive and the dative with many feminine singulars, and of the genitive plural in -ovъ and the -ov- adjectives, might have provided extra models of genitive use where it was previously not expected, but this was not considered to be a decisive factor.

Language contact was deemed to have played a certain role: The DAT construction was clearly made more frequent by the strong Church Slavic influence in the earliest texts, and its shrinking back from the possessive conceptual space during the 15th–17th centuries was probably also conditioned by the weakening of that pressure. That the construction should be an outright loan was, however, deemed to be unlikely. The suggestion that the expansion of the genitive in the 18th century was a direct consequence of contact with Western European languages at that time, was considered to be something of an overstatement: The contact situation may certainly have played a role, but the ground had already been thoroughly prepared for this change by the systematic weakening of the genitive’s competitors in the preceding centuries.

9.5 Construction grammar meets philology: an appraisal

As mentioned in Chapter 1, the present dissertation was written within the theoretical framework of construction grammar for two reasons: Firstly because it was deemed to be a good tool for dealing with a complex set of data, such as that pertaining to the Old Russian possessive constructions, and secondly because the Old Russian possessive constructions were deemed to be theoretically interesting linguistic data, and could put the framework of construction grammar to the test.
In my opinion, the combination of a construction grammar approach and a corpus-based study of a complex diachronic material was justified on both accounts. The apparatus of usage-based construction grammar proved capable of giving a fine-grained analysis of the interrelationship and history of possessive constructions in Old Russian. The use of semantic maps provided good illustrations of both synchronic and diachronic relationships. Thus, the theoretical framework was a very useful tool in this typically philological endeavour.

At the same time, the data put the framework of usage-based construction grammar to the test in interesting ways: The use of maps of connected regions in conceptual space proved as useful for synchronic language-internal comparison of constructions and for tracking diachronic change in the semantics of a particular construction, as they have for typological comparison.

Several of the changes were also fruitfully analysed in terms of schematicity relations: We saw that new, partially specific construction schemas such as the patronymic construction \([\text{DA1}_\text{PROPER}, \text{NP}_\text{SON/DAUGHTER/CHILDREN}]\) could emerge from instances of a more schematic construction. In the analysis of the “mixed” constructions, we saw that a schema generalising over a number of lower-level construction schemas might be part of the cause of a similar superschema emerging over another group of constructions in the same part of conceptual space, cf. section 8.1.1. In the analysis of the development of the DA1 construction, we saw that the increasing entrenchment of a group of partially specific lower-level construction schemas might weaken a more general higher-level construction schema, and thus reduce the construction’s productivity, cf. section 7.1.5.

In my view, then, the framework of construction grammar is perfectly suited for analysing complex syntactic change.

### 9.6 Issues for further research

The findings of the present dissertation suggest several issues for further research. The most obvious task is perhaps the analysis of the possessive constructions in a corpus of 18th–20th century Russian texts along the same lines, in order to describe the actual consolidation of a single schematic genitive construction in similar detail. As far as I can see, the exact time of this change has not as yet been established. A synchronic in-depth study of possessive constructions in modern Russian within the same framework would also be of interest.

A closer look at the causal factors behind the changes might also be a rewarding task. In particular, it would be of great interest to study a corpus of 15th–
20th century Russian translations from Western European languages, in order to assess the impact of language contact.

This dissertation has shown that modern linguistic theory can shed new light on a problem that has been described repeatedly with traditional philological methods since the 19th century. The issue of Old Russian possessive constructions is surely not the only subject within the field of Slavic philology that would benefit from such treatment.
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Appendix on the Old Russian sources

The texts are listed by the assumed dates of creation, the oldest texts first, in addition to being arranged by genre and period. The dating of the manuscript is given in parentheses.

11th–14th century

i) Religious texts

1. ca. 1006–1010 (ms. second half of the 16th century): Choždenie igumena Daniila v svjatuju zemlju/Hegumen Daniil’s Pilgrimage to the Holy Land (ChID): 13.9 standard pages. In 1004–1006 or 1006–1008 the Russian hegumen Daniil went on a pilgrimage to Palestine. The short, but detailed tale of his journey is probably written soon after his return (Svane 1989:297–298).

Edition: Löfstrand 1993, which is based on a manuscript kept in Stockholm. The edition is very faithful to the manuscript, all that is done is dividing the text into words and writing out ligatures. The abbreviations are retained. The edition gives textual variants from several other manuscripts.

2. ca. 1050–1110 (ms. 12th century): Skazanie o Borise i Glebe/The Tale of Boris and Gleb (SBG): 28.7 standard pages. The dating of this text is disputed, but it is normally assumed to have been written some time in the second half of the 11th century. The miracle tales at the end are supposed to be additions from the beginning of the 12th century (Svane 1989:152). The tale recounts how the two first Russian saints, Boris and Gleb, were killed by their brother Svjatopolk in 1015. The author is anonymous.

Edition: Ludolf Müller’s reprinting of Abramovič’s Žitija svjatych mučenikov Borisa i Gleba i služby im from 1916 (1967). The edition is based on the oldest extant manuscript of the tale, which is found in the Uspenskij Sbornik from the 12th century.

See section 2.2.3

This edition was chosen instead of the 1971 edition of Uspenskij sbornik (Kotkov et al. 1971) because of the critical apparatus. The 1971 edition is much more faithful to the orthography of the original, but a comparison of the five first standard pages of the two editions did not reveal any discrepancies between the two editions as to the number and types of occurrences of possessive constructions.
century. It gives textual variants from a number of other manuscripts. The orthography is clearly somewhat simplified – abbreviations are written out and letters such as $\omega$, $\emptyset$ and $\alpha$ are replaced by $\omega$, $\emptyset$ og $\alpha$.

3. ca. 1150 (ms. 16th century) *Kirill Turovskij: Slovo vo svjatuju velikuju subotu/The Sermon on the Holy Great Saturday* (SKT): 3.8 standard pages. The sermons of Bishop Kirill of Turov were written around the middle of the 12th century in a highly ornate rhetorical style (Kuskov 1989:116–117; Svane 1989:121).

   Edition: Šljapkin 1889. This edition is based on a manuscript from the 16th century. The orthography has been simplified somewhat, but it does not say to what extent. Abbreviations have clearly been dissolved, and what is considered scribe’s errors are corrected, but clearly marked. The edition does not give textual variants.

4. 1213–1236 (ms. early 17th century): *Slovo Daniila Zatočnika/The Word of Daniil the Exile* (SDZ): 6.9 standard pages. This work exists in two redactions, with the titles *Slovo Daniila Zatočnika* and *Molenie Daniila Zatočenika*. The first of the two redactions is used in this dissertation. It is addressed to prince Jaroslav Vsevolodčik of Perejaslav, who reigned in the period 1213–1236, and is dated to this period. The text is highly rhetorical and full of biblical and other quotations (Kuskov 1989:123; Svane 1989:199).

   Edition: Zarubin 1932. The orthography of the edition is simplified: All abbreviations are written out, letters such as $\omega$, $\emptyset$ and $\alpha$ are replaced by $\omega$, $\emptyset$ og $\alpha$, and modern punctuation has been introduced. The edition gives textual variants from several other manuscripts, but orthographic, phonetic and morphological variants are ignored.

5. ca. 1263 (ms. 1468): *Žitje Aleksandra Nevskogo/The Life of Aleksandr Nevskij* (ŽAN): 8.3 standard pages. This life was probably written soon after the death of Aleksandr in 1263. Although the prince was canonised later on, Kuskov (1989:135) considers the life a work of historiography rather than hagiography, and thinks this may be the reason why the life so often is found in chronicles (there is a version in the Codex Laurentianus as well).

   Edition: I have used the edition found in Begunov 1965. It is based on the second Pskov chronicle from around 1486. The orthography of the edition is somewhat simplified: letters such as $\omega$, $\emptyset$, $\alpha$ and others are replaced by modern equivalents. The editor has introduced punctuation, all abbreviations are written out in full, and several “obvious errors” have been corrected, but are clearly
marked in the text. The edition provides a lot of textual variants, but has unfortunately normally ignored orthographical and morphological variants.

6. ca. 1389 (ms. 1475–1500): Slovo o žitii i o prestavlenii velikogo knjazja Dmitrija, carja Rusinskago/The Life of Prince Dmitrij (Donskoj) (ŽD): 14.6 standard pages. The life was probably written soon after the death of Great Prince Dmitrij Donskoj of Moscow in 1389. It was clearly inspired by The Life of Aleksandr Nevskij and by the literature around Boris and Gleb (Kuskov 1989:152–154).

   Edition: Novgorodskaja četvertaja letopis’ 1925. The edition is generally faithful to that of the original manuscript, but all abbreviations have been written out, superscript letters have been taken down, and the orthography is slightly simplified. All corrections to the manuscript are placed in brackets.

7. ca. 1396 (ms. early 16th century): Excerpt from Žitie Stefana Permskogo/The Life of Stefan of Perm’ (ŽSP): 16.6 standard pages. This life was written immediately after the death of Stefan in 1396 by the monk Epifanij Premudyj (the Wise), who was also the author of the life of Sergij Radonežskij. Much of the life is a eulogy of Stefan’s work as a missionary among the Komi (Kuskov 1989, s. 155).

   Edition: The edition is a reprint of the edition of Družinin from 1897 (Družinin 1959). This edition gives no information on what manuscript it is based on, but according to Terras (1985:128) it is from the early 16th century. The orthography appears to be an exact rendition of that of the manuscript. Only to a very small extent does it give textual variants.

   ii) Narrative texts

8. ca. 1100–1118 (ms. 1377): Poučenie Vladimira Monomacha/The Instruction of Vladimir Monomach (PVM): 11.8 standard pages. This is a text from the hand of Great Prince Vladimir Monomach of Kiev. It is found in the Codex Laurentianus from 1377 under the year 1096, but must probably be dated to the period 1100–1118. The Instruction contains a political letter, an admonishing speech to Monomach’s children, an autobiographical part as well as some prayers (Kuskov 1989:69; Svane 1989:185).

   Edition: Codex Laurentianus in Polnoe sobranie russkich letopisej (1962). The edition is very faithful to the orthography of the original, and all additions from other sources are clearly marked. It also includes a comprehensive set of footnotes with textual variants.
9. 1116 (ms. 1377): Excerpts from Povest’ vremennykh let/The Primary Chronicle (PVrL): 35.0 standard pages. This is the Kiev chronicle, the oldest official chronicle of Rus’, which records the country’s history from the earliest times till the early 12th century. It was created through a series of compilations of material not extant elsewhere. The final compilation was made by the monk Nestor in the Cave Monastery in Kiev in 1113. This redaction did not survive, but the second redaction of the chronicle from 1116 is extant in the Codex Laurentianus from 1377 (Svane 1989:406–409). I have made a varied selection from the chronicle.

Edition: Codex Laurentianus 1962, cf. 8.113

10. 1185–1187 (ms. 1800!): Slovo o polku Igoreve/The Igor Tale (SPI): 9.0 standard pages. This is probably the most controversial text in the Old Russian literature – for a very long time it has been debated whether it is genuine or a forgery. It was supposedly found by Count Musin-Puškin in the late 1780s in a late 15th/early 16th century manuscript. Today, however, our oldest sources are a printed edition from 1800 and a manuscript copy from 1793 (Svane 1989: 221; Kuskov 1989 claims it to be from 1795–96). The original manuscript was supposedly lost in the fire in Moscow in 1812. Most scholars now seem to agree that it is genuine.

The text is a poetic tale of Prince Igor’ Svjatoslav’s unsuccessful campaign against the Poloevtians and his subsequent flight from imprisonment in 1185. Its style is quite different from most of what we know of Old Russian literature. If it is genuine, it must have been written between 1185 and 1187 because of historical references. Because of the authenticity debate it may seem questionable to include the text in my corpus. However, in my opinion it has earned its place: If it is genuine, it is practically a genre of its own, written in a language with a strong Russian colour. If its authenticity were undisputed, it could never be omitted from such an investigation. If it were false, my investigation might offer new arguments to the debate.114

Edition: Dmitriev and Lichačev 1967. This edition is based on the first edition from 1800, but certain things that are clearly the work of the first publishers have been omitted or changed: The letters <и> og <и> are replaced with the original <и>. The text is also sometimes divided into words differently, and the punctuation is changed (the original manuscript did not have word divisions or punctuation). The edition gives textual variants from the 1790s edition and from copies of excerpts in various other books.

113 When a text is taken from an edition which has already been described in this appendix, the description will not be repeated.
114 As a matter of fact, there is no discernible difference between the NP pattern of the SPI and that of other narrative texts of period I, except perhaps that preposed datives are slightly more frequent in the SPI.
11. 1223 (ms. 1377/1475–1500): *Povest’ o bitve na reke Kalke/The Tale of the Battle by the River Kalka (PBK^L/PBK^N):* 1.1 + 1.3 standard pages. This is a short chronicle tale about a battle between Russian forces and the Mongols in 1223. It is found in several chronicle compilations.

   Editions: I have chosen to use two different editions of this short text: PBK^L in *Codex Laurentianus* 1962, cf. 8, and PBK^N in *Novgorodskaja četvertaja letopis’* 1925, cf. 6.

12. 1237 (ms. 1377): Excerpt from *Suzdal’ skaja letopis’/The Suzdal’ Chronicle* (SL): 5.8 standard pages. The excerpt is a description of a Tatar attack in 1237.


13. 1300–1350 (ms. mid-16th century): *Povest’ o razorenii Batyem Rjazani/The Tale of Batu’s Sacking of Rjazan’* (PBR): 9.4 standard pages. This is the tale of how the Golden Horde, lead by Batu Khan, attacked Rjazan’ in 1237. It is found in a variety of manuscripts.

   Edition: Dmitriev and Lichačev 1969. The orthography is much simplified: Not only are all letters absent from the modern Russian alphabet, except <$ë$>, replaced with their modern equivalents, all abbreviations written out and modern punctuation added, but final <$ъ$>s have been removed. Also, some corrections and additions have been introduced on the basis of another manuscript, without being clearly marked.

14. 1340–50 (ms. 14th century): *Skazanie o bitve novgorodcev s suzdal’cami/The Tale of the Battle of the Novgorodians against the Suzdalians* (BNS): 2.6 standard pages. In 1170 Novgorod was sieged by an alliance of Russian principalities, but defeated the attackers. This is the pro-Novgorod version of the tale, which has been expanded with the legend of how an icon (*Znamenie Bogorodicy*) miraculously protected the Novgorodians (Lichačev et al. 1999:569).

   Edition: Lichačev et al. 1999. The orthography of the manuscript is simplified by replacing all letters absent from the modern Russian alphabet, except <$ë$>, with their modern equivalents. All abbreviations are written out, and modern punctuation is introduced. No textual variants are given.

15. ca. 1400 (ms. the 1470s): *Zadonščina (Z):* 3.5 standard pages. This is a poetic tale about the Russians’ and Dmitrij Donskoj’s victory over the Tatars at Kulikovo by the river Don. Its style shares clear similarities with *The Igor Tale,* and has been used in
the argumentation of both camps in the discussion of the authenticity of the latter. *Zadonščina* is assumed to have been written in the end of the 14th or the beginning of the 15th century (Kuskov 1989:144–147).

Edition: Simoni 1922. The edition is a very accurate rendition of the manuscript, and is also provided with a facsimile of the manuscript itself. No textual variants are given.

iii) Legal/business texts

16. ca. 1100 (ms. 1282): *Russkaja pravda/The Law of Rus’* (RP): 11.2 standard pages. This is a code of laws which came into being during the 11th and beginning of the 12th century. It is written in a very archaic East Slavic and shows only few signs of Church Slavic influence (Svane 1989:465–470).

Edition: Karskij 1930. The edition is based on the oldest extant manuscript, from 1282, is very faithful to the original orthography and gives textual variants from a number of other manuscripts.

17. ca. 1130 (orig.): *Mstislavova gramota/Mstislav’s Donation Charter* (MG): 0.4 standard pages. A charter of donation from 1130.

Edition: Obnorskij and Barchudarov 1999. The edition is an exact rendition of the orthography of the charter.

18. ca. 1192 (orig.) *Vkladnaja Varlaama Chutynskomu monastyrju/Varlaam’s Donation Charter to the Monastery in Chutyn* (VChM): 0.4 standard pages. A charter of donation, probably dating from 1192.

Edition: Obnorskij and Barxudarov 1971. The edition is an exact rendition of the orthography of the charter.


Edition: Obnorskij and Barchudarov 1999. The edition is based on a contemporary manuscript, now kept in the city archives of Riga, and is an exact rendition of the orthography of the manuscript.

20. ca. 1294–1301 (orig.): *Dogovor Tverskogo knjazja Michaila Jaroslaviča s novgorodcami/The Treaty of Prince Michail Jaroslavič of Tver’ with the People of*
Novgorod (DTN): 0.9 standard pages. A short treaty dating from between 1294 and 1301.

   Edition: Obnorskij and Barchudarov 1999. The edition is an exact rendition of the orthography of the treaty.

21. 1327–1328 (orig.): Duchovnaja gramota Moskovskogo kniazja Ivana Daniloviča Kality/The Will of Prince Ivan Danilovič Kalita of Moscow (DIK): 2.5 standard pages. Parts of the manuscript of this compact will from 1328/1329 were illegible.

   Edition: Obnorskij and Barchudarov 1999. The edition is an exact rendition of the orthography of the will.


   Edition: Obnorskij and Barchudarov 1999. The edition is an exact rendition of the orthography of the will.


15th century

i) Religious texts


   Edition: Mineeva 2001. The edition is an accurate rendition of the orthography of the original, with manuscript variants.

ii) Narrative texts

25. soon after 1453 (ms. beginning of 16th century): Povest’ o vzjatii Car’grada/The Tale of the Capture of Constantinople (PVC): 30.6 standard pages. This is an eyewitness description of the fall of Constantinople in 1453, written soon after the
Russian Nestor-Iskander, who participated in the siege on the Turkish side after converting to Islam.

Edition: Archimandrit Leonid 1886. The orthography is simplified by replacing letters absent from the Russian orthography of the 1880s with their current counterparts. Abbreviations are apparently written out, and punctuation introduced. No textual variants are given.

26. the end of the 15th century (ms. 16th century): Afanasij Nikitin: Choženie za tri morja/A Journey Beyond the Three Seas (AN): 21.3 standard pages. This is the Russian merchant Afanasij Nikitin from Tver’s account of his not always straightforward journey to India, his stay there and his homeward journey in the period 1466–1472 (or 1468–1475) (Kuskov 1989:185–188). He died before he reached Tver’.

Edition: Grekov and Adrianova-Perete 1948. I am using their edition of the Troica manuscript (Troickij spisok) from the 16th century, which is the oldest and most reliable. The edition is faithful to the orthography of the original, apart from replacing <θ> with <ф> and <оу> with <у>. The editions gives textual variants from several other manuscripts, and also prints an edition of another manuscript of AN in full.

iii) Business/legal texts
27. 15th century (ms. 16th century): Pskovskaja sudnaja gramota/The Pskov Legal Letter (PSG): 1.9 standard pages. This is a short collection of laws.


16th century

i) Religious texts
28. first half of the 16th century (ms. 17th century): Poslanie mitropolita Daniila/The Epistle of Metropolitan Daniil (PoslMD): 8.9 standard pages. This epistle is one of many in the authorship of Metropolitan Daniil. It is an exhortation to all Russians to follow the Orthodox articles of faith.

Edition: Kušelev-Bezborodko 1862. The editor has clearly simplified the orthography of the manuscript by replacing letters absent from the Russian orthography of the 1860s with their current counterparts. Abbreviations are apparently written out, and punctuation introduced, but the principles behind the simplification are not accounted for. No textual variants are given.
29. ca.1550 (ms. mid-16th century): Žitie Petra i Fevronii/The Life of Petr and Fevronija (ŽPF): 9.8 standard pages. Prince Petr of Murom and his wife Fevronija died in 1228 and were canonised in 1547. Soon after the canonisation, Ermolaj-Erazm wrote what was distributed as a life, but it is actually closer to a collection of legends in style (Kuskov 1989:210–211).

Edition: Dmitrieva 1979. The edition gives a number of redactions of the vita. The first redaction text based on a manuscript from a compilation of Ermolaj-Erazm’s work, mostly gathered and copied by himself, was chosen. (The introduction and the eulogy at the end were omitted.) The orthography of the text has been simplified, all letters absent from modern Russian orthography being replaced by their modern counterparts. <ъ> has been omitted word-finally, but is kept inside words. Copious manuscript variants are given, and the book includes a very careful textological survey of the manuscripts of the vita.

ii) Narrative texts
30. 1533 (ms. late 16th century) Povest’ o bolezni i smerti Vasilija III/The Tale of the Illness and Death of Vasilij III (PBSV): 18.3 standard pages. This description of Grand Prince Vasilij III’s illness and death was written soon after his death by an eyewitness, probably as a preparation for writing a full vita (Lichačev et al. 2000:563).

Edition: Novgorodskaja četvertaja letopis’ (2000). The edition is generally faithful to that of the original manuscript, but all abbreviations have been written out, superscript letters have been taken down, and the orthography is slightly simplified. All corrections to the manuscript are placed in brackets.

iii) Business/legal/publicistic texts
31. mid-16th century (ms. second half of 16th century): Excerpt (“The order of weddings/Čin svadebnoj”) from Domostroj: (D): 14.3 standard pages. Domostroj is a 16th century compilation of rules for good management of the household, and gives an interesting picture of the lives of wealthy Russians at the time.

Edition: Domostroj 1971. The manuscript is a very accurate rendition of a manuscript consisting of several parts written at different times. The manuscript of my excerpt is an addition from the second half of the 16th century. No textual variants are given.

32. 1574–1576 (orig.): Perepiska Ivana Groznogo s Vasiliem Grzaznym/The Correspondence of Ivan Groznyj and Vasilij Grzaznyj (IG/VG I, II, III): 7.6 standard
APPENDIX ON THE OLD RUSSIAN SOURCES

pages (I: 1.2, II: 3.8, III: 2.6). The background of this correspondence was that Vasilij Grjaznyj was sent to Crimea in an official errand, and there was captured by the Crimeans. He then sent a letter to Ivan Groznyj, asking to be exchanged for one of the Crimean Khan’s associates, who was then in prison in Moscow. The letters are written in a lively colloquial style.

Edition: Obnorskij and Barchudarov 1999. The orthography of the letters has clearly been somewhat simplified: All letters absent from the modern Russian alphabet, including <ь>, have been replaced with the modern equivalents. Final <ъ>s have been removed. All abbreviations have been written out in full and modern punctuation has been introduced.


Edition: Obnorskij and Barchudarov 1999. The edition appears to have a slightly simplified orthography, with abbreviations written out and some unusual letters replaced by their modern Russian counterparts.

17th century

i) Religious texts

34. 1620–30 (ms. 17th century): Povest’ o Julianii Lazarevskoj/The Tale of Julianija Lazarevskaja (PJul): 7.9 standard pages (the short edition of the text, with heading and miracle tales omitted). This is the story of Julianija Lazarevskaja’s exemplary domestic life written within the hagiographical conventions of the time, defining her as a saint although she was neither a nun nor a princess (Terras 1985:524–525).

Edition: Rudi and Dmitrieva 1996. All letters absent from modern Russian orthography have been replaced by their modern counterparts, and word-final <ъ> has been omitted. The edition publishes both a short and a long edition of the text, has a very careful analysis of the textology of the text, and gives copious manuscript variants.

35. 1675 (orig.): Excerpt from Žitie protopopa Avvakuma/The Life of Protopope Avvakum (ŽAvv): 12.9 standard pages. Protopope Avvakum’s lively autobiography. One of Avvakum’s original manuscripts.

Edition: Malyšev et al. 1975. The main part of the edition is a facsimile of the entire Pustozerskij sbornik. There is also, however, a faithful printed version of the text, which I have used. This is not, the editors write, a linguistic edition, but nevertheless they found it vital to preserve everything the authors wrote in the lines,
including the letters Ё, ъ, ъ in all positions. <ω>, <о>, <о>, <ε>, <а>, <ε>, <о>, <ξ>, <ψ> have been replaced with modern equivalents. <Ъ>, <ы> have been kept. Short i (<й>) is marked everywhere except in present participles.


Edition: Dmitriev and Lichačev 1988. Orthographically much simplified, but ъ and Ь are retained in all positions. Errors are corrected by comparison with other 17th century ms., these corrections are marked by italics.

ii) Narrative texts

37. 1609–1620 (ms. 1620s): Excerpt (ch. 8–13) from Skazanie Avraamija Palicyna/Avraamij Palicyn’s Tale (SAP): 10.2 standard pages. This is a historical tale of the Time of Troubles (smutnoe vremja). Although it covers a longer period, its main subject is the siege of the Troice-Sergiev monastery by the Poles in 1608–1610. The excerpt used in this thesis is the beginning of the tale of the siege. The final redaction of the SAP was finished in 1620.

Edition: Deržavina and Kolosova 1955. The orthography of the edition is very simplified: All letters absent from the modern Russian alphabet, including <Ъ>, have been replaced with the modern equivalents. Final <Ъ>s have been removed. All abbreviations have been written out in full and modern punctuation has been introduced. The edition gives textual variants from several other manuscripts.

38. 1666–1667 (orig.): Excerpt from Grigorij Kotošichin: O Rossii v carstvovanie Alekseja Michajloviča/About Russia during the Reign of Aleksej Michajlovič (RCAM): 11.3 standard pages. Written by Kotošichin in 1666–1667. Description, probably written on assignment, of the Moscow state, for foreigners. Kotošichin’s original manuscript.

Edition: Kotošichin 1980. Abbreviations not expanded, but titlos are not written. No simplification of orthography. Superscript letters are printed in the line in italics. Superscripts <``> and <‡> are rendered as <i>. Capital letters introduced only for proper names, and for the first letter of each chapter and article.

39. end of 17th century/beginning of 18th century (ms.18th century): Povest’ o Karpe Sutulove/The Tale of Karp Sutulov (PKS): 7.0 standard pages. The text belongs to the new “novella” genre, and is an example of both anti-clerical democratic satire and the belles-lettres of the new era (Dmitriev and Lichačev 1988:609).
Edition: Dmitriev and Lichačev 1988. The orthography is obviously much simplified, but ъ and Ѱ are retained in all positions, and the errors of previous editions (all based on the weak edition of Sokolov from 1914) are removed, and thus this edition is superior.

### iii) Business/legal/publicistic texts


41. 1677 (orig.): T.I. Golicyna V.V. Golicynu. 6 August, 13 August–22 September 1677./From T.I. Golicyna to V.V. Golicyn (GG): 7.1 standard pages.


These four texts (40–43) are a selection of personal correspondence, petitions and legal documents from various years.

Edition: Kotkov et al. 1968. The texts are reproduced letter by letter, including all the more exotic ones. Supralinear letters are given in the line, but in italics. Ligatures are opened. Abbreviation marks and other supralinear marks are omitted and not mentioned. In a few instances there is no difference between <ъ> and <ь>. In that case they are placed by etymology, except in positions where variation is observed, in that case the sign <h> is used. The manuscripts are originals (presumably).

44. ms. end of 17th century: Pravaja gramota Michailu Kaznakovu po kabale v dvuch s polovinoju rubljach (PGMK): 2.1 standard pages. Court letter, description of a lawsuit.