Tracing the genealogy of the genitive *-ovo* in Russian adjectival declension

В поисках родословной окончания род. падежа *-ovo* в склонении русских прилагательных

Elena Bratishenko

Abstract The article addresses a long-standing problem of the history of Russian: the origin of *v* in place of the etymological *g* in the Gen. sg. masc./neut. ending of adjectives and non-personal pronouns. This change is treated as conflation of inflectional and derivational morphology through analogy. The analogical substitution first occurred within multi-item personal names where non-Christian (byname) patronymics were used alongside Christian (baptismal) ones. Besides their etymological and morphological differences (quantitative vs. possessive adjectives respectively), the two types of patronymics differed syntactically. Christian patronymics were coordinated with the first name, while non-Christian patronymics were subordinated to the Christian ones as apposition in the Gen. case. If, in addition to the name bearer's own patronymic/s, his father's patronymic was used to identify him more precisely, it too would be in the Gen. Written records reveal that the cases of the patronymics were frequently confused, and both types eventually became coordinated with the first name. This triggered an abductive innovation, whereby the derivational morpheme—the possessive adjective-forming suffix *-ov-*—of one type of patronymics contaminated the Gen. ending *-ogo*, as well as the Nom. *-oj* in another type. The formant *-ov-* became the morphological marker of a Russian surname, while the new Gen. ending spread to regular adjectives.

Аннотация Статья посвящена давней проблеме истории русского языка: происхождению *v* на месте этимологического *g* в ед. числе род. падежа муж. и ср. рода прилагательных и неличных местоимений. Эта замена рассматривается как слияние словоизменительной и словообразовательной морфем вследствие аналогии. Аналогия произошла в многосоставных личных именах, где нехристианское отчество (образованное от прозвания) могло употребляться наряду с христианским (образованным от календарного имени). Кроме разницы в происхождении и форме (качественные и притяжательные прилагательные), два типа отчеств отличались синтаксически. Христианское отчество согласовывалось с именем, а нехристианское служило приложением к христианскому и стояло в род. падеже. Если, помимо собственных отчеств носителя

E. Bratishenko (✉)
Department of Germanic, Slavic & East Asian Studies, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada
e-mail: bratishe@ucalgary.ca

имени, употреблялось еще и отчество его отца, с целью более точной идентификации, оно тоже находились в род. падеже. По показаниям письменных источников, падежи отчеств употреблялись непоследовательно, и оба типа в конце концов стали согласовываться с именем. Это вызвало абдукционное изменение, когда под влиянием словообразовательной морфемы—притяжательного суффикса *-ov-*—одного типа отчеств изменились окончания род. падежа *-ovo* и им. падежа *-oj* в другом типе отчеств. Формант *-ov-* стал при этом морфологическим признаком русской фамилии, а новое окончание род. падежа распространилось в обычные прилагательные.

Prevraščus'
ne v Tolstogo, tak v tolstogo[1]

V. Majakovskij
Melkaja filosofija na glubokix mestax
(1925)

1 Introduction

The origin of *v* in place of the etymological *g* in the Gen. sg. masc./neut. ending of adjectives and non-personal pronouns is one of the most difficult questions in the history of Russian (Černyx 1927, 43). It has been most commonly regarded, albeit to varying degrees, as a matter of phonology.[2] Since it was the Gen. of the demonstrative pronoun *tъ* 'that one' (*togo*) that provided the model for the East Slavic adjectival *-ogo* (in contrast to the Old Church Slavonic (OSC) *-ago*),[3] some researchers considered the Gen. of the Proto-Indo-European pronoun **tosi̯o* or **toso* and its phonological evolution the source of *v*.[4] The hypothesis that had, in Flier's (1983, 86) words, "withstood the test of time" until he proposed his own, treated this change as a gradual process of intervocalic weakening and loss of *g* with the subsequent insertion of *v* to avoid hiatus: *ogo > oγo > oo > ovo*.[5]

Besides Russian, a similar *-eho/-eo/-ewo* Gen. ending is found in some Northern Kashubian dialects (Baudouin de Courtenay 1897), but it hasn't been established whether it shares its origin with the Russian *v*, or is a result of an independent development (Černyx 1927, 42; Filin 1972, 411). Flier (1983, 86) is inclined to think that these changes are typologically parallel. In light of the present study, language-specific factors account for the rise of *-ovo* in Russian. As for Kashubian, there are also multiple factors that may have caused the change in the ending.[6] What is proposed here comes from the analysis of

---

[1] *'I will turn into a fat one, if not into Tolstoy.'*

[2] Kryński (1916) provides a comprehensive survey of the earliest works on the subject. Tolkačev (1960) summarizes all the major hypotheses in existence to-date. See Filin (1972) for a short overview.

[3] This is also related to the question of whether this ending first arose in adjectives or pronouns. See, for example, Kuznecov (1959, 168–169), Tolkačev (1960, 249), or Flier (1983, 87) regarding the state of this argument.

[4] See Tolkačev (1960, 236–239) for more detailed information on this group of approaches.

[5] Some of the early proponents of this idea were Kolosov (1877) and Sobolevskij (2004[1907]).

[6] However, the adoption of the adjectival declension by neuter nouns outside of the Nom. case in Kashubian (Baudouin de Courtenay 1897, 99) represents an interesting merger of nominal and pronominal declensions—not unlike what happened in Russian, as argued in this study.

Russian factors and thus concerns only Russian, which does not necessarily weaken the argument.

An alternative set of approaches considers the form *togo* a result of compounding of pronouns, or of the pronoun *to-* and the emphatic particle *-go* (etymologically related to *že*) as a possible source (Tolkačev 1960, 239–246). The most notorious of these was developed early on by Il'inskij (1905, 1906) who vehemently opposed the generally accepted phonological accounts. On his part, Il'inskij claimed that the *-ovo* ending was archaic and not a reflex of *-ogo*, originating instead in the pronoun **vъ* which, in his opinion, participated in the formation of another pronominal type of adjectival declension in Proto-Slavic, alongside the pronoun **jь*.[7] The premise of Il'inskij's theory was deemed highly dubious (Tolkačev 1960, 239; Kuznecov 1959, 167; Frolova 1960a, 70).

Irrespective of the lack of success of this particular hypothesis, there is no doubt that the problem can not be adequately understood in isolation from morphology. Subsequently, and undoubtedly more satisfyingly, elaborations on the problem take into account the conspicuous fact that the reflexes of this change are limited to a single morphological environment.[8] Huntley (1968, 501) considers it an example of "morphologically conditioned sound changes". Flier (1983, 100) too views it as "morphophonemic exploitation of phonetic variation". Flier's "direct phonemic reindentification" (1983, 86) of the consonant (*ogo > ovo*) is the most recent treatment of the problem.

There exists, however, a hypothesis that stands out from the rest. It was put forward long ago by Malinowski (1876) who was the first one to doubt the phonological essence of this phenomenon and thought instead that the ending may be due to analogy to the Gen. of possessive adjectives with the suffix *-ov*, particularly those serving as surnames (*Ivanov*, etc.).[9] Malinowski's view was initially met with great enthusiasm and praised for its utmost originality (Kryński 1916, 477). For example, Il'inskij (1905, 6f.) reports that Baudouin de Courtenay first took this hypothesis to be 'almost beyond any doubt'. Even its most famous opponent Kolosov (1877, 72, 73) was careful not to reject it entirely, repeatedly admitting that 'a certain degree of probability cannot be denied to such an explanation' and saying that he 'doesn't find it improbable'. Il'inskij (1905, 168), too, recognized that his own ideas, such as the correlation of the ending *-ovo* with possessive meaning, pointed in the same direction as those of Malinowski: 'Malinowski was not far from the truth'. Ironically, the same author, in a subsequent publication (Il'inskij 1906) on the subject, brought up the possibility of analogical substitution on the model of possessive adjectives-surnames as potentially the simplest explanation, only to dismiss it, being unable to part with his earlier hypothesis.[10] Despite all this, Malinowski's proposition was soon

---

[7]The pronominal type of declension is characteristic of long-form (definite) adjectives and non-personal pronouns, as it comes from adding the demonstrative pronoun **jь* to the short-form (indefinite) adjective or pronoun. It differs from the nominal type characteristic of nouns and short-form adjectives. As already mentioned, the East Slavic Gen. *-ogo* is an analogical substitution.

[8]Some of the alleged counterexamples, such as Old East Slavic *povostъ* (vs. *pogostъ*) 'remote churchyard' and dialectal *korovodъ/karavodъ* (vs. *karagodъ*) 'traditional round dance with signing' (Sobolevskij 2004[1907], 126) can be explained by folk etymology. See Il'inskij (1905, 5) and Tolkačev (1960, 251).

[9]See Baudouin de Courtenay's (1897, 100–101) criticism of Malinowski and his own interpretation of this in Kashubian. See also Kryński (1916, 443) on the mechanism of the change in Kashubian.

[10]See Frolova's (1960a, 69) reaction to Il'inskij's reasoning.

put to rest. Although the idea of analogy to possessive adjectives was duly mentioned in most overviews of the subject,[11] and occasionally even found a sympathetic ear, for example, Černyx (1954, 199), it was never reconsidered, not to mention developed.

Perhaps the time has come to reopen the old discussion of this peculiar and elusive change, for there still remain under-explored areas, in particular, the history of surnames that originate as adjectives other than possessive, such as *Smirnov* (< *Smirnoj* < *smirnoj* 'quiet, obedient'). These are clearly hybrid forms exhibiting the suffix *-ov* where it did not arise etymologically, just like the Gen. *-ovo*. Perhaps Malinowski's idea warrants another look because "it is the simpler hypothesis in the sense of the more facile and natural, the one that instinct suggests, that must be preferred; for the reason that, unless man have a natural bent in accordance with nature's, he has no chance of understanding nature at all" (Peirce cited in Anttila 1977, 95).

Perhaps a further investigation, beyond the immediate morphological context of the Gen. sg. masc./neut. pronominal declension, will reveal previously unrecognized forces in the emergence of the new ending.

In general terms, the hypothesis developed in this paper reinstates the idea of analogy, because a "morphologically conditioned rule is just description, whereas analogy provides an explanation" (Anttila 1977, 71). However, it goes beyond the rehabilitation of previously discarded points. This change is treated as conflation of inflectional and derivational morphology and, related to this, of two types of adjectival declension—nominal and pronominal, and an illustration of Andersen's (1973) abductive innovation in language change.

The present analysis integrates various factors that appear to have converged to produce this change during the Middle Russian stage (13–17th century).[12] These include primarily morphosynactic and semantic factors illuminating some of the most interesting facets of this phenomenon, but also social. Social factors receive greater prominence in this study not only because it focuses on personal names and they belong to the social sphere more than other classes of words; due to the pressures of prestige and class stratification, they are subject to more conscious innovation and idiosyncrasies. This is also because no analogy occurs without social factors. To invoke Kuryłowicz's (1973[1949], 85) colourful image, they constitute the 'gutters' waiting to collect 'the rain' of the analogical change, should it happen.[13] Phonological factors are, of course, of less importance in analogical substitution, yet they too may have contributed to the process. By looking at a broader picture it may be possible to arrive at an account that is more agreeable than those proposed so far. Last but not least, the analogy hypothesis finds support in previously uncited onomastic data.

In sum, it appears that, since early times, personal names in general and patronymics in particular have been rather unstable, varying in their linguistic provenance (native vs. borrowed), morphological shape and syntactic structure, while also carrying social connotations. As will be explained shortly, the coordinated and subordinated forms of patronymics were frequently confused. It is highly likely that the cumbersome naming practices resulted in the contamination of the Gen. ending *-ovo* by the possessive suffix *-ov*. The analogy cul-

---

[11] Although Kuznecov (1959), for example, doesn't mention it at all.

[12] On periodization see Vlasto (1986, 33). Compare Borkovskij (1968, 287–288).

[13] "Il en est comme de l'eau de pluie qui doit prendre un chemin prévu (gouttières, égouts, conduits) *une fois qu'il pleut*. Mais la pluie n'est pas une nécessité." 'It is like rain water, which must take a certain path (gutters, spouts, conduits) *once it rains*. But the rain is not a necessity.'

minated in the substitution of subordination by coordination within the multi-item personal name and the appearance of non-etymological surnames in *-ov*.

2 The evolution of Russian surnames

2.1 Naming practices on the adoption of Christianity

The adoption of Christianity by the *Kievan Rus'* in the 10th century was accompanied by the influx of Christian personal names of foreign provenance (mostly Greek and Hebrew), prescribed henceforth as baptismal, or calendar, names.[14] A baptismal name was given to every child at birth by a priest (Tupikov 1989[1903], 3–21; Čičagov 1959, 11–12; Seliščev 1968, 106–107; Unbegaun 1972, 9). Since the inventory of such names was limited, and due to their foreignness and lack of transparent lexical meaning, unlike that of the native names (e.g. the compounds of the kind *Svjatoslav*, *Volodimir*), they were often supplemented, or even substituted, by non-Christian bynames in everyday usage:[15]

(1) Mitja Maloi
'Mitja the Little' (306, c. 1462–63, ASEH)

(2) Fedko Britoi
'Fedko the Shaven' (274, 1455–66, ASEH)

This practice of double-, or occasionally, triple-naming (with not just one but two bynames (Tupikov 1989[1903], 8; Čičagov 1959, 24) continued well into the 17th century (Sokolov 1891, 1; Tupikov 1989[1903], 5; Unbegaun 1972, 8). Tupikov (1989[1903], 4) points out that, during the first few centuries after the adoption of Christianity, baptismal names, even though obligatory, were not common in everyday life. A baptismal name sometimes remained unknown even within its bearer's close social circle, and was used only in official birth and death records.[16] It is only in the 13th century that baptismal names become more widespread.

Many bynames of the same root existed in a variety of morphological shapes, depending on suffixation. Nouns were used alongside adjectives, for example: *Bělъ*, *Bělъko*, *Běljava*, *Beljaj*, *Běljakъ* 'White'; *Gladko*, *Gladkoj*, *Gladunъ*, *Gladyšъ* 'Smooth'; *Rjaboj*, *Rjabъ*, *Rjabuxa* 'Freckled'; *Xudoj*, *Xudjakъ*, *Xudjačъko*, *Xudjaško*, *Xudoša*, *Xudyka* 'Skinny'.[17] The majority of bynames were descriptive, focussing on some prominent, often physical (especially negative) characteristic of the name bearer (Seliščev 1968, 109): *Kosoj* 'Cross-eyed' or *Rjaboj* 'Freckled'. Consequently, adjectives, especially qualitative ones, constituted a great many bynames. Other adjectival types–compounds such as *Dolgorukij* 'Long-armed', ordinal numerals *Pjatoj* 'Fifth', possessive pronouns *Nesvoj* 'Not ours', or participles *Parenoj* 'Steamed', were also common. Of course, as names, adjectives were substantivized.

---

[14]Bæcklund (1959) examines in detail naming practices in medieval Novgorod.

[15]Bynames also helped in distinguishing between several siblings that shared the same baptismal name (Čičagov 1959, 17).

[16]Čičagov (1959, 28) mentions a 17th century boyar *Bogdan Matveevič Xitrovo* whose 'real' name—*Iov*—became known only after his death.

[17]Examples of proper names without a source of citation come from Tupikov's (1989[1903]) dictionary which, despite its various shortcomings, is nonetheless an ample and the best available reference source on the subject of Russian personal names.

2.2 Patronymics

A patronymic [Fa][18] provided still more precise identification.[19] If the lineage was famous, a patronymic was also a matter of prestige. Tupikov (1989[1903], 23, 25) observes that, among nobility, patronymics became standard by the 13th century Members of the lower classes adopted the practice a little later (13–14th century), but were often referred to only by their first name still in the 16th century.[20]

The oldest attested type of patronymics were nouns derived with the help of the suffix *-ič* from the nominal, typically compound, stem of a proper noun (e.g. *Volodimeričъ*, *Svjatoslavičъ*), or from the stem of the possessive adjective formed from a proper noun (*Olgovičъ*, *Vasilkovičъ*) (Jakobson 1962, 14; Unbegaun 1972, 12). Jakobson (1962, 15) surmises that, initially, only compound stems may have participated in the formation of patronymics in *-ič*. Simple (monothematic) stems first combined with possessive suffixes (*Olьgovъ*) from which new patronymics in *-ič* could then be formed.[21] Patronymics in *-ič* are attested as early as the 11th century: *Sъnovidъ Izečevičъ*, *Ivanъ Voitěšičъ*, *Izjaslavъ Davydovičъ* (Tupikov 1989[1903], 22). This type of patronymic became socially restricted as it was associated with the *knjazoe imja*.[22]

Besides the patronymics in *-ič*, the reference to the father could be made simply by means of a possessive adjective formed with the help of the suffixes *-*jь*,[23] *-ov* or *-in* from the stem of the father's baptismal name (*Davydovъ* 'David's', or *Olьgovъ* 'Oleg's') and modifying the noun *syn* 'son' (or *děti* 'children' for plural referents). *Syn* could also be omitted:[24]

(3)   Jur'a Dolgorukago Vladimeriča Manomaša
       'Jur'i, the Long-armed, Vladimerič, (son) of Monomax' (1157, PNChron)

Patronymics with the suffix *-ov* were the most productive (Čičagov 1959, 47). The growing productivity of the suffix *-ov* is also demonstrated by the fact that, beginning in the 13–14th century, the morphemic composition of the compound patronymics in *-ič* parallels

---

[18]The shorthand notations [Fa] and [FaFa] are used here to distinguish the name bearer's patronymic from the patronymic of his father.

[19]On the history of patronymics see Tupikov (1989[1903], 23). Seliščev (1968, 99–101) and Čičagov (1959, 47) discuss the formation of patronymics with various suffixes. Patronymics and later surnames were also important when bond slavery became hereditary.

[20]It should be noted that for the lower classes, such as bond slaves, one instance when precise identification was crucial was in official records of bondage (Miroslavskaja 1962, 129, 130). Another important point is that the use of patronymics and, later, surnames became especially important when bond slavery no longer ended at the debtor's death but was passed on to the next generation.

[21]Compound stems represent the most common type of native East Slavic pre-Christian personal name, being also traditional in other Indo-European languages, especially among aristocracy—hence *knjažoe imja* 'princely name' (Unbegaun 1972, 9). See also Seliščev (1968, 117–120) on compound and simple names.

[22]See Čičagov's (1959, 47–49) list of higher classes with the right to patronymics in *-ič* during the Middle ages and later. Unbegaun (1972, 15) speaks of Catherine II's decree stipulating that only members of the first five classes in the Table of Ranks were entitled to *-vič*. Note especially the reanalysis of *-ov-ič* into *-vič* as in *imenovat'sja s -vičem* 'to have a name with *-vič*' and the persistence of *v*.

[23]Although unattested as such at the time of the records, this suffix accounts for the consonant alternation between the source noun and a corresponding possessive adjective: *Jaropolkъ* vs. *Jaropolčъ*, *Jaroslavъ* vs. *Jaroslavlь*, *Borisъ* vs. *Borišъ*, *knjazъ* vs. *knjažъ*.

[24]Bæcklund (1959, 53–54) notes the difference in possessive adjectives used as patronymics between men and women in Medieval Novgorod in that "the development of the compound expressions into real, substantivized patronymics was confined [...] to men only".

the structure of the simple ones in that they too could now be formed from the stem of a corresponding possessive adjective: *Volodimerovičь*, instead of the original *Volodimeričь*, or *Mьstislavličь* instead of *Mьstislavičь* (Jakobson 1962, 18f.).

2.2.1 Possessive adjectives

The possessive adjective and the adnominal Gen. case have long been associated with each other syntactically, semantically, and, in the case of the adjectives with the suffix *-ov*, even morphologically. Originally, possessive (denominal)[25] adjectives were the only means of expressing individual personal reference in Slavic. Only under certain syntactic conditions, that is: when the attributive modifier was itself modified, was the possessive adjecitve substituted by the Gen. case of the corresponding noun. Compare the following examples:[26]

(4a) Andrěj Bogoljubьskij, Jurьjevъ synъ Dolgorukago
      'Andrej the God-loving, Jurji's son the Long-armed' (1157, PNChron)

(4b) Andrěj Bogoljubivyj, synъ velikogo knjazja Jurьja Dolgorukago, vnukъ Vladimera Manomaxa
      'Andrej the God-loving, the son of the great prince Jurji the Long-armed, grandson of Vladimer Monomax' (1158, PNChron)

As Zverkovskaja (1978, 256–257) notes, the evolution of the adjectives with the suffix *-ov-* that began during the Proto-Slavic period is complicated. The suffix **-ovo*, abstracted from the **u*-stem declension, is primarily associated with personal **o*-stems. It appears in several morphemes, such as the possessive adjective-forming suffix *-ov-* itself; the Dat. sg. masc. ending *-ovi*; the Nom. pl. *-ove*; and the Gen. pl. masc. *-ov*.[27] The association may have begun in the **ju*-stems, with the formant *-ov-*, due to the semantics of the nouns in this declensional paradigm (names of persons, agents, such as those with the suffixes *-teljь* or *-arjь*) adopting a primarily possessive meaning.[28] At the time of the earliest records, the suffix *-ov-* is highly productive with personal proper, common or personified **o*-stems, especially of foreign origin (Zverkovskaja 1978, 258).[29] The latter were, of course, the source of baptismal patronymics, and later also of surnames. The high markedness value of the suffix *-ov-* for agentivity is suggested not only by the fact that it replaced the older *-*jь* in the same stems (*Adamlь* vs. *Adamov* 'Adam's', Bratishenko 2005, 364),[30] but also

---

[25]Although possession was not the only meaning of the denominal adjectives, as modifiers of deverbal nouns they could stand for the subject or the object of an action—it is the one relevant for the present topic.

[26]Note the variants of the byname: *Bogoljubьskij* (4a) and *Bogoljubivyj* (4b) 'God-loving'.

[27]For more on relic morphemes originating in the **u*-stem declension, such as *-ov*, as markers of FIGURE (based on the FIGURE-GROUND scale) see Janda (1996, 101). Compare Bratishenko's (2005, 362) Possessor hierarchy.

[28]This prehistoric type of declension is postulated by some scholars as a palatalized stem subtype of the **u*-stems (Janda 1996, 88). The proclivity of this suffix for the palatalized stems may be related to the difficulty of adding the other possessive suffix **-jь* to such stems, because it would result in any phonetic alternation: for example, *cěsarь* 'caesar/caesar's'.

[29]The same holds true for the Dat. in *-ovi*—predominant in borrowed proper **o*-stems (Kuznecov 1959, 20).

[30]According to Seliščev (1968, 99), the older patronymics with consonant alternations—reflexes of the suffix *-*jь*—become unproductive by the 13th century.

by its ability to combine, instead of the expected suffix *-in*, with **a*-stems, for example *Iudin* and *Iudov* 'Judas's/Judean' (Vaillant 1958, 604).

Historically, possessive adjectives in Russian were replaced by the bare (unmodified) adnominal Gen. case. While the suffix *-in* remains relatively active, since possessive adjectives can still be formed from the former **a*-stems (kinship terms like *papa* and *mama* and hypocoristic forms such as *Kolja*), the only function of the suffix *-ov-* has become derivation of surnames (Unbegaun 1972, 17).

Many scholars consider possessive adjectives a variety of the Gen. case within the nominal paradigm.[31] The fact that, in OCS, the possessive adjective is frequently attested as an antecedent to the relative clause, or governs an attributive modifier, prompted Vaillant (1958, 600) to maintain that these adjectives were not 'ordinary derivations, but substitutes for personal nouns, most frequently—the proper ones'. Frolova (1960b, 328) goes so far as to call them 'coordinated derived Genitives'—'the category that could not typically represent either nouns or adjectives'.

Huntley (1984, 219–221) comments on the morphosyntactic ambiguity arising from the ability of the possessive adjective to govern. While the translator, working from the Greek original, may have been unaware of the ambiguity in his OCS outcome, later readers would encounter great difficulty in deciphering the message. Especially when the head noun of the possessive adjective is itself in the Gen., the ambiguity would be impossible to resolve if it weren't for pragmatic knowledge, as the following examples illustrate. The participles, in apposition to the adjective, could either be governed by or agree with the head noun:

(5)   kъnigy rodьstva isuxristova syna davydova syna avramlja
      'the book of the genealogy of Jesus Christ, son of David, son of Abraham'
      (Mt 1.1 *Assemanianus*, *Savvina kniga*, Huntley 1984, 223, ex. 26)

(6)   vъ četvrъtoje lěto markianja cěsarьstva bogomъ ljubimago
      'in the fourth year of the reign of Marcianus who was loved by God' (*Suprasliensis*,
      279.2–3, Huntley 1984, 222, ex. 23)

Huntley's (1984, 222f.) examples provide a diachronic parallel to the multi-item personal names that arise in Middle Russian, as will be shown in the next section. The difficulty in decoding the syntactic relations of subordination and coordination within personal names results from the routine juxtaposition of two morphologically and etymologically different types of adjectives: possessive and qualitative—baptismal and byname patronymics.

2.3 Syntactic relations within multi-item personal names

A byname patronymic [Fa2] could be used in addition to, or sometimes instead of, the baptismal one [Fa1], in the same way as first names. It is interesting that, as Čičagov (1959, 27, 45) notes, a byname patronymic differed in its main function from a baptismal patronymic. A byname patronymic didn't so much establish the paternal lineage as serve additional personal identification—a function similar to modern surnames. This is understandable: the meanings of the bynames are much more concrete and their number practically unlimited, which makes them a convenient resource for means of precise identification. This factor may have positively affected the subsequent conversion of byname patronymics into surnames, as will be explained shortly. In connection with this,

---

[31]Trubetskoy's assertion to this effect is widely quoted. See Frolova (1960a, 76) for this and other references.

it is indicative that, while bynames themselves haven't survived widely in Russian, by-name patronymics have, and even gained an official status, albeit as surnames.

Being in apposition to the baptismal patronymic (possessive adjective by origin), the byname patronymic (more often than not—a qualitative adjective by origin) was in the Gen. case (Seliščev 1968, 101; Unbegaun 1972, 10–12):

(7)   Semen Vasi*l*(ь)evъ syn Borodatog(o)
       'Semen, the son of Vasilij the Bearded' (430, c. 1474–75, ASEH)

(8)   Agofo*n* Mixale*v* s(y)nъ To*l*stog(o)
       'Agofon, the son of Mixal' the Fat' (607, 1496–98, ASEH)

Sometimes, the father's patronymic [FaFa], baptismal or byname, or both, also needed to be added to the name bearer's own patronymic/s [Fa] to establish an earlier pedigree. This was particularly desirable for persons of high social standing (Tupikov 1989[1903], 23). According to Unbegaun (1972, 13), the use of the father's patronymic/s became the most common practice from 14th century on. The patronymic/s of the father [FaFa] would then be in apposition to the name bearer's own patronymic/s [Fa], and therefore in the Gen. case. It goes without saying that, at least as far as byname patronymics [Fa2] and [FaFa2] are concerned, their identical Gen. form would make it very difficult to decipher which of them referred to the father and which to the grandfather.[32]

Ideally, in such multi-item personal names with multi-generational references, the baptismal patronymic of the name bearer [Fa1] would be the only coordinated item agreeing with the head noun *syn*. In contrast, the rest of the patronymics—all appositions to the baptismal patronymic [Fa1]—would be in the subordinated Gen. case. Accordingly, as Unbegaun (1972, 13) points out, if a baptismal patronymic appeared in the Gen. case, it must be interpreted as referring to the grandfather [Fa1Fa1], never to the father [Fa1].[33] The following is an example of when the Gen. must be a baptismal patronymic of the father [FaFa1] while the Nom. is the name bearer's own baptismal patronymic [Fa1]:

(9)   Vasilei dija*k* Jakovlь sy*n* Mixailova
       'Vasilej the deacon, son of Jakov Mixail's-GEN (son)' (542, 1498–1503, ASEH)

However, these syntactic relations weren't strictly observed (Seliščev 1968, 102; Čičagov 1959, 43, 46). Contrast the attestations of the same patronymic in the Gen. (10a) and in the Nom. (10b):

(10a) Okson ь Iva*n*(o)vъ s(y)nъ ‖ Parьfenьeva
       Oksen, son of Ivan, Parfen's-GEN (son)

(10b) jaz, Okse*n* Parfe*n*(ь)ev
       I, Oksen, Parfen's-NOM (son) (488, c. 1470–1500, ASEH)

Instead of being governed by the baptismal patronymic [Fa1], the father's patronymic [FaFa1] agrees with it. The same inconsistency shows up in byname patronymics ([Fa2] & [FaFa2]) as well. The originally subordinated Gen. apposition (11a) appears as coordinated Nom. attributive modifier (11b):

---

[32]For more on the shortcomings of such names see Unbegaun (1972, 13).

[33]Unless, of course, the whole phrase was in the Gen. Recall Huntley's (1984) OCS examples of irresolvable morphosyntactic ambiguity. Unfortunately, in personal genealogy, pragmatic knowledge may be less available than in biblical contexts.

(11a) Kožu*x* Grigo*r*(ь)evъ synъ ‖ Krotkogo
        'Kožux, the son of Grigorij the Meek-GEN' (327, 1462–78, ASEH)

(11b) Kožux Grigorьev syn Krotkoi
        'Kožux, the son of Grigorij the Meek-NOM' (247, Oct. 15, 1453, ASEH)

This syntactic vacillation between Nom. and Gen. reflects the ambiguity and weakness inherent in the morphologically diverse multi-item reference to several predecessors. As an extreme example of potential confusion, if a byname appears in the Nom., it may be either the person's own byname, or his father's, or his grandfather's (or, occasionally, even his great-grandfather's):

(12)   Mikula Korobь*in* Brjuxatoi
        'Mikula, of Korob'ja, the Pot-bellied-NOM' (20, 1485–88, ASEH 5)

Ambiguity would be especially high when the whole noun phrase is in the Gen./Gen.-Acc.:

(13)   da ‖ Boriska Suxo*g*(o)
        'and Boriska, [of?] the Dry'

(14)   da Ivaška Golovu Ivanova s(y)na Gorbatogo
        'and Ivaška the Head, the son of Ivan [of?] the Hunchbacked'

(15)   da Ivaška Rědko*g*(o) Mixaleva s(y)na
        'and Ivaška [of?] the Rare, [of?] Mixal's son' (612, before Jan. 27, 1497, ASEH)

It is hardly surprising that such complicated naming practices would lead to the gradual breakdown of the original relations of subordination in favour of those of coordination resulting in a more coherent means of personal identification.[34]

There were two additional factors that might have advanced coordination. According to Seliščev (1968, 101–102), the attributive modifier (a baptismal patronymic [Fa]) was initially post-posed to the noun *syn*, as in the following example from Seliščev (1968, 101): *Aleksa syn Lazorev prozvutora* (1125). By the 15th century the word order changed to pre-position. This inversion obscured the original syntactic relations when *syn* used to be the head noun of an attributive modifier only—the baptismal patronymic [Fa1], a possessive adjective by origin. In turn, the baptismal patronymic [Fa1] governed the following Gen. forms that might be in apposition to it, such as a byname patronymic [Fa2] and/or father's patronymic/s ([FaFa1] [FaFa2]). After the switch, the noun *syn* is prone to be reinterpreted as governing the Gen. forms as well; especially if it itself is in the Gen., cf. (16):

(16)   k Ofrěmo‖vě nivě Ivanova s(y)na Xitrovo
        'towards Ofrem's field, the son of Ivan, the Sly's' (608, 1496–98, ASEH)

Furthermore, if, as was often the case, *syn* could be omitted altogether, the baptismal patronymic [Fa1], and the patronymic/s in the Gen. ([Fa2]/[FaFa2] and/or [FaFa1]), would be adjacent, as in (17):

---

[34]Borkovskij (1968, 85) also notes 'mistakes in agreement' where the attributive modifier of the noun in Gen. case assimilates to the possessive adjective that also modifies this noun: *prijezdu k<ъ>n<ja>zja velikomu Vitovъtovu*.

A breakdown of syntactic relations, when the formal relations between components in a noun phrase with subordination is not as solid as the semantic one, has been documented for Old Czech (Skorvid 1981, 45f.).

(17) oko‖lo nivy Ofrěma Xitrovo
        'next to the field of Ofrem the Sly/'s' (608, 1496–98, ASEH)

This proximity, with genealogical clarity either lacking or becoming unimportant (or else due to the overall restructuring of nomenclature), would also promote coordination for the sake of semantic cohesion, to show that all forms belonged together and served as alternate designations of the same name bearer.

The shift from the original mixture of coordinated and subordinated items to sole coordination transformed patronymics into fixed hereditary surnames. According to Sokolov (1891, 2), surnames began coming into use in late 14th century. Normally, it was the patronymic of the father [FaFa] that became a surname, but it could also be the patronymic of the grandfather [FaFaFa] or even a more distant forbearer. Recall that byname patronymics were well-suited to becoming surnames, because they really functioned more like additional means of identification, rather than linking the person to his father. The shift to coordination began around the 15th century in names of aristocracy and only by 19th century was over in names of lower classes (Unbegaun 1966, 415). Idiosyncratic fluctuations between subordinated and coordinated forms of the surname, or a preference for patronymics over surnames continued for several centuries, especially as a privilege of the nobility (Unbegaun 1972, 14).

It is important to keep in mind that the syntactic restructuring within the multi-item name, whereby the two types of patronymics (etymological possessive adjectives and qualitative adjectives) became coordinated, was a consequence of a broader process within the language at the time. The ability of the possessive adjective to govern other parts of speech or subordinate clauses was considerably weakened as it was losing ground to the adnominal Gen. of possession. All this created conditions for an abductive innovation.

3 The forms with *-ov-* as a contamination of inflection and derivation

As Anttila (1977, 18) declares, analogy "feeds on abduction, and there is its glory". Andersen's foundational theory of language change foregrounded abduction, a mode of inference introduced by Peirce in addition to the other two, induction and deduction, as a crucial source of innovation: "Abduction proceeds from an observed result, invokes a law, and infers that something may be the case [. . .]. Since abductive inference goes beyond what is given to suggest that something may be the case, it is always a weak argument, sometimes a reasonable guess, but often a mere surmise. Still, abduction justly holds the prominent place in a theory of scientific method which Peirce accorded it, for it alone of the three modes of inference can originate new ideas; it alone gives us an understanding of things" (Andersen 1973, 775).

Ambiguity creates conditions for abductive guesses. The morphosyntactic instability and referential ambiguity of the multi-item personal name manifested by the indiscriminate use of subordinated and coordinated forms described in the preceding section was accompanied by an abductive innovation. The innovation was the rise of contaminated non-etymological indeclinable Gen. forms in *-ovo*, as well as coordinated forms with Nom. in *-ov*, such as *Tolstovo/Tolstov*, in byname patronymics by analogy to baptismal patronymics—etymological possessive adjectives. Following Andersen's reasoning, the following propositions could be identified as participating in the abduction in question:

i) the law: *-ov-* marks a possessive adjective/patronymic/surname;
ii) the case: *-ov-* is added to the stem of a personal proper noun;
iii) the result: adding *-ov-* to a proper personal stem of a baptismal name makes a possessive adjective.

By an abductive guess, the result iii) is matched with a wrong case: *-ov-* gets associated with a stem of a byname in order to form a possessive adjective. The Gen. forms in *-ovo* then could be considered a kind of hybrid possessive adjectives, limited to the sphere of personal nomenclature.[35] In contrast to genuine possessive adjectives derived from the stems of nouns, these are formed from substantivized adjectives (especially qualitative) used as byname patronymics, with the help of the same formant *-ov-*.[36] A close syntactic, semantic and morphological affinity between the possessive adjective in *-ov* and the adnominal Gen. case discussed earlier favoured the analogy.[37] In essence, this was contamination of inflection by derivation, and of pronominal by nominal declension, due to functional association. The process can also be represented using Hermann's formula (given in Anttila 1977, 73):

(18) $A_C :: B_C \longrightarrow A_C :: A'_C$
      'Under a condition C a formally different B becomes more similar to A.'

The ongoing interchangeability between the *-ovo* and the *-ov* forms (Seliščev 1968, 104), a by-product of the interchangeability between subordinated and coordinated patronymics, suggests something akin to allomorphic variation. Incidentally, one of the earliest attestations outside of proper names also appears as *-ovъ*, not *-ovo*: *rukoju ubogovъ kalujera* in the 1434 inscription on the cross cited by Sobolevskij (2004[1907], 126) who simply assumes that ъ stands for *o*. Eventually, due to the advantage of formal cohesion present in coordination, the 'pseudo-Nom.' (Unbegaun's [1972, 16] term) surnames in *-ov* prevail over the indeclinable Gen. in *-ovo* (Seliščev 1968, 104).[38] Frolova (1960a, 79) sees a

---

[35]Frolova (1963, 59), illustrating the 'energetic' productivity of the suffix *-ov* manifested in innovative possessive forms derived from substantivized adjectives or participles, gives a 17th century example *vybornova* 'elected's' (from *vybornyj* 'an elected official').

Il'inskij (1906, 148–149), although from a different perspective, remarks on the 'strong possessive sense' in qualitative adjectives used as patronymics in *-ovo*. Compare Frolova (1960a, 76).

A similar phenomenon is reported for Modern Serbian. According to Ivanova (1974, 36), in the press one comes across possessive adjectives formed from adjectival family names, such as *Vujanski > Vujanskov*, etc.

[36]Although several adjectival varieties, such as relative adjectives (*Dolgorukov*) or comparatives (*Menšovъ*), participles (*Sečenovъ*), ordinal numerals (*Šestovъ*), and possessive pronouns (*Nesvoevъ*) all exhibit the same non-etymological *-ov* forms (as listed in Tupikov's dictionary), qualitative adjectives are the most prototypical. Their prototypicality is further confirmed by 'a somewhat unclear orthographic phenomenon' mentioned by Frolova (1960a, 74) with reference to Tolkačev's unpublished manuscript. In the texts of the 16–17th century the surnames based on qualitative adjectives are spelled with *-ovo*, those ending in *-skij/-ckij* with *-ogo*.

[37]The analogy may have also been influenced by the need to distinguish between a byname in *-oj* and a surname in *-ov* formed from the corresponding byname in *-oj*.

[38]Compare modern Russian substandard *evonnyj*, *ixnij*, etc. (Šaxmatov 1957, 313–314). Vascenco (Vasčenko 1968, 160) provides interesting statistics regarding the types of final morphemes in modern Russian surnames: *-ov* has the highest absolute frequency (7, 959), while *-ovo*—the lowest (2).

The only remnants of the old usage in the sg. may be the names of the type *Durnovo*—very few in number. In addition to *Durnovo*, Unbegaun (1972, 173) lists *Blagovo*, *Xitrovo*, *Nedobrovo*, *Ploxovo*. Note that they all have stems of qualitative adjectives. What appears as Church Slavonic variants of such names (for example, *Živago*) may either originate as nouns with the suffix *-aga*, or be altogether artificial forms (Unbegaun 1972, 174); see also Il'inskij (1906, 148).

'strong association' between the element *-ov-* of the ending *-ovo* and the possessive suffix *-ov* in the 'mass conversion' of the surnames in *-ovo* into those in *-ov*.

Surnames, in contrast to patronymics, have group, not individual personal reference. The existence of homonymous Gen. pl. in *-ov*, also with group reference, must have promoted *-ov* as well. Conversely, a factor contributing to the abandonment of patronymics in *-ovo* may have been the frequency of place names, possessive adjectives by origin, especially the homonymous neut. sg. in *-ovo*, often indeclinable appositions:

(19a) zemlja La‖ptevo
       'the land Laptevo'

(19b) seliščo Laptevo
       'the village Laptevo' (340, c. 1464–78, ASEH)

Janda (1996), in an extensive elaboration of Andersen's (1973) theory, studied the consequences of the disappearance of several "defunct paradigms", including the **u*-stem declension, on inflectional morphology in Slavic. The rise of the analogical *-ovo* and *-ov* in Russian is another example, albeit overlapping with derivation, of longevity and the high markedness value of "extra pieces of morphology" (Janda 1996, 7) this declension left behind.

Janda (1996, 5) writes that "analogical change occurs when there is an opportunity to recognize a new prototype". It follows from what has been said above that the semantic conditions for the analogy to take place in proper personal names were prepared for by the fact that the formant *-ov-*, in several morphological manifestations, had long been associated with masc. personal, especially proper, **o*-stems, to the extent that it became a ubiquitous marker of (male) personhood, or of the prototypical agent/possessor. Judging by the overall trends in the history of Russian, the formant *-ov-* seemed to be destined for extinction. The period immediately preceding the appearance of written attestations of the ending *-ovo*, that is, 13–14th century, was the time of profound morphological changes in Russian, involving both nominal declension and derivation (Zverkovskaja 1986, 88). Not only possessive adjectives were coming out of usage with the steady advance of the denominal Gen. case, but both the Dat. in *-ovi* and the Nom. pl. in *-ove* were becoming increasingly rare. The semantic salience of the formant *-ov-* accounts for the fact that it came "back from the brink", as Janda (1996, 6) puts it, in another incarnation.

While the formant *-ov*, in some cases etymological, and in others, analogical, acquired the status of a marker of the prototypical Russian surname, patronymics became unified along different lines—by the suffix *-ovič* (Bæcklund 1959, 56), first, again, as a "privilege of the upper classes" (Unbegaun 1972, 12). In the meantime, the Gen. *-ovo* spread to ordinary adjectives (first qualitative)—a process greatly facilitated by habit ("the only cosmological category without exception", Anttila 1977, 54) and hypercorrection, leaving the forms in *-ov* as the sole option in names.

Morphophonemic parallelism between the two monosyllabic Nom. affixes (especially if stressed, which was typical for adjectival bynames)[39] [-oj] vs. [-ov]/[-of][40] and the two

---

[39]Ickovič (1963, 59) believes that the hybrid surnames in *-ov* first appeared in Northern Russian dialects where the stress commonly shifts to the final syllable: *novoj* 'new', *pervoj* 'first', etc.

[40]Kiparsky (1979[1963], 136f.) speaking about the frequent spellings of *u* instead of *v* in texts from southwest Russia, the first of which is reported by Sobolevskij (2004[1907], 121) as dating from 1164 in the *Dobrilo Gospel*, is of the opinion that "in most North, Central and South Russian dialects old /w/ had in all positions become /v/". If this is the case, the Nom. ending of the possessive adjective would be pronounced

disyllabic Gen. (with the stress on the first vowel: [-ogə/oɣə] vs. [-ovə]), may have also facilitated the morphemic reanalysis and analogical substitution.[41]

It should also be mentioned that some bynames of the same root existed in short and long forms: *Beznosъ*, *Beznosoj* 'Noseless'; *Bezsonъ*, *Bezsonoj* 'Sleepless', *Gluxъ*, *Gluxoj* 'Deaf'; *Kosъ*, *Kosoj* 'Cross-eyed'; *Xorošъ*, *Xorošej* 'Good'.[42] When substantivized, as is the case in onomastics, short-form adjectives are indistinguishable from nouns and can thus form possessive adjectives.[43] The existence of short- and long-form doublets acted as a catalyst, if not a trigger, in the conflation of derivation and inflection.

Zverkovskaja (1986, 90) mentions that, in contrast to possessive adjectives, relative and qualitative adjectives 'have vague borders', that is, they aren't as well-defined morphologically, which would explain why they were prone to contamination. This also played a role in the subsequent spread of the new Gen. ending outside of personal names, since, according to Borkovskij (1968, 60f.), qualitative adjectives kept their short form longer than other types of adjectives.

4 Chronological and geographic correspondences between the rise of *-ovo* and the formation of surnames

During 15th–16th centuries bynames underwent significant changes (Čičagov 1959, 29). Unbegaun (1972, 4) observes that Russian surnames "were formed during a period when the rule of the centralized Muscovite State was being extended over vast territories of the European plain and Siberia". Historical records point to Moscow as the epicentre of the rise of *-ovo*. In non-Muscovite documents of the 15th century this ending is very rare (Filin 1972, 413). Zaliznjak (2004, 681f.) notes only three attestations in a single Novgorod birch bark document (#496, 2nd quarter/middle of 15th century). These are *d*[*vo*]*rъno*[*v*] (= *-ovo*) 'homestead keeper' (substantivized adjective), *ni*[*ko*]*e*[*v*] (= *-evo*) (negative pronoun) and *jevo* (possessive pronoun). The fact that it is written in ink, unlike the majority of the birch barks, may indicate that it does not come from the area.[44] The phrase containing the first attestation is *na s̃na evo na iva*(*n*)[*ka*] *d*[*vo*]*rъno*[*v*] 'onto his son, Ivanok, the homestead keeper'. If the reading offered by the editor happened to be incorrect (for many fragments of the text are missing), the last item may well be a byname patronymic, especially since the document contains many personal names, including patronymics.

Xaburgaev (1980, 154f.) writes that the general direction and the intensiveness of the isogloss 'expansion' of North Eastern dialectal phenomena correspond to the territorial expansion of Moscow in the 14–15th century. In the course of this expansion, previously

---

as [of] due to final devoicing following the fall of the *jers*. On the subject of voiced/unvoiced *v* in modern Russian dialects see Andersen (1969).

Related to this, it is surprising that Tolkačev (1960, 250) claims that in the 15th century the final *g* sounded as such. Flier (1983, 91) too lists the masc. sg. *strog* 'strict' with the final consonant pronounced as [g].

[41] Incidentally, the view proposed here is in agreement with Flier's (1983) conclusion of direct phonemic reidentification, except that the mechanism is seen as entirely different.

[42] Stating that adjectival bynames were always in the long form, Unbegaun (1972, 12) must consider the short forms nouns.

[43] See Jakubinskij (1951) on the shared origin of nouns and adjectives; see also Kuznecov (1959, 140).

[44] Zaliznjak (1995), i.e. the first edition of Zaliznjak (2004), recognized only two, instead of the three, *-ovo* attestations in this document.

heterogeneous dialects were pulled into a single 'ethnogonal' process regulated by newly-formed trends in political, economic and cultural development. In a similar vein, Filin (1972, 418) notes that in the 14th century the Northern (with the plosive [g]) and the Southern (with the fricative [γ]) varieties of Russian 'collided' in and around Moscow, resulting in the transitional and initially unstable character of the Moscow speech. The transitional character of the Moscow dialect, combined with the nascent state of personal nomenclature consisting of a first name, a patronymic and a surname (not to mention the relative novelty of the pronominal Gen. ending itself: *-ogo* replaces *-ago* not much earlier, in the 13th century, cf. Vlasto 1986, 112) would predispose its speakers towards innovation.

There is no doubt that, besides being affected by the general tendencies of language change, names are also subject to conscious innovation. Superanskaja (1969, 3f.) states that 'the stress, declension, gender, and structure of personal names changed in time, due both to purely linguistic factors and to particular 'fashions' or trends in the social attitudes towards/perception of certain groups of names'. She goes on to say (Superanskaja 1969, 18) that, since surnames are more 'native' in Russian than first names—which are predominantly borrowed—the phonemic *valeur*, as she calls it, is higher in the former than in the latter. Trubačev (1968, 11), too, speaks of 'a clearly expressed markedness' of the surnames, their 'originality unencumbered by canon' even in comparison with first names. Čičagov (1959, 11) mentions that the same person under the same circumstances could call himself differently. Indeed, attestations of signatures exhibit the highest degree of flux. *Dolgorukov* side by side with *Dolgorukij* is a famous example of two variant forms still used inconsistently by the name bearer himself in the 18th century (Čičagov 1959, 124f.; Unbegaun 1972, 19).

Names signal social status. Based on her observations that surnames were rare in medieval Novgorod, Bæcklund (1959, 54) concludes that their use originated in the upper classes. The 'class conception' of the patronymics in *-vič* (Unbegaun 1972, 15; Čičagov 1959, 47–51) has already been mentioned. A class prestige element is also evident in the rare surnames in *-ovo*, as well as *-ago*. Among the indicators of the artificiality of such names, Unbegaun (1972, 16) counts the stress on the final *-o*—never possible for the Gen. of adjectives—and assigns this to the same manipulation.[45] This well-documented predisposition towards innovation further strengthens the hypothesis proposed in this paper that personal names were where the ending *-ovo* first appeared.

In surnames, the analogy went father than in ordinary adjectives. Many surnames in *-ov* based on qualitative adjectives exist in Modern Russian, for example: *Smirnov*, *Belov*, *Černov, Krasnov*, *Širokov*, *Sedov*, etc. They exhibit, of course, the same nominal declensional pattern, except in the Instr., as do surnames based on baptismal patronymics. In contrast, adjectival surnames, such as *Tolstoj*, that preserved their original byname form are very few (Ickovič 1963, 63).

Trubačev (1968, 4), in pondering the answer to the question: 'What is a Russian surname?', mentions that it is the suffix *-ov* that 'guarantees it an official status'.[46] Unbegaun (1972, 16) speaks of the "notable accession to the dominant *-ov* type" that began in the absorption of the adjectival surnames, and concludes (1972, 14) as well that "[t]his type of surname is, indeed, the Russian surname *par excellence*". There are numerous examples

---

[45]Sobolevskij (2004[1907], 276), however, is of the opposite opinion: he thinks that the family names in *-ovo* preserve the original stress, not the other way around.

[46]See also Čičagov (1959, 47), Unbegaun (1972, 2, 16f.).

of adaptation to this standard: *-skij/-ckij* becoming *-skov/-ckov*; Ukrainian *-enko* is routinely changed to *-enkov*. This suffix combines with a vast number of non-Russian names, as in Trubačev's example *Fanardžev* vis-à-vis Armenian *Fanardžjan*.[47] In the process of Russification, a foreign name may become unrecognizably corrupted. The most amusing and oft-cited examples are *Pogankova* (originally *Pagenkampf*) and *Xomoltov*, *Gamantov*, *Gamatov* and eventually *Xomutov* (originally *Hamilton*) (Ickovič 1963, 55; Seliščev 1968, 106). Unbegaun (1972, 17) observes that 90% of most common surnames recorded in the St. Petersburg directory of 1910 (*Ves' Peterburg*) end in *-ov* and only six in *-in*. The unfailing ascent of the formant *-ov-* towards the status of a prototypical marker of Russian surnames,[48] increasingly irrespective of morphological limitations, is a clear continuation of its semantic salience and productivity with stems of agentive, particularly proper, nouns.

4.1 Previously uncited onomastic data

It is usually reported that attestations of *v* appear in the 15th century (Kolosov 1872, 141; Sobolevskij 2004[1907], 126). Černyx (1954, 199) moves the date even later, stating that 'the first, (scarce and unconvincing), attestations of the new ending are no older than the end of the 15th century.' This chronology is called into question by the previously cited onomastic evidence. The earliest attestation of the new ending is *Xorobrova* in (19):

(19) A se daju svoei knjagině: svoi primyslъ […] Želěskova slobodka z bortьju, sъ-Yvanovy*m* selo*m* s Xorobrova, […].
'And this I grant to my wife/princess: my possessions […] the village *Želěskova* with the beehive, with Ivan's village, with the Brave's.' (PrCh,[49] April 13–May 16, 1389)

Notably, this attestation predates what has been so far considered the earliest instance of the ending *-ovo*, namely *velikovo Novagoroda* (1396) (Filin 1972, 413; Flier 1983, 87), which is not reliable in the first place, because it survives only in a 15th century copy. In contrast, the attestation in (19) above comes from an original document.[50] Regarding the spelling *-ova* rather than *-ovo*, it may have various explanations. First of all, it may indicate that this form is not an indeclinable Gen. patronymic, but the Gen. of the new surname— a coordinated form in *-ov*. However, it would probably be going too far to presume that by that time the analogical substitution already occurred in the Nom., based on this one example, even though it is the earliest attestation of the non-etymological Gen. ending ever, and even though this is what it appears to suggest.

In general, orthography greatly obscures the picture: *-ovo* can only be taken at face value when it is spelled out. Most commonly, the Gen. pronominal ending is abbreviated as *-o^g*. This, of course, is an orthographic convention and does not reveal the actual pronunciation.[51] When the ending is abbreviated to *o^v*, at least the consonant is clear; but it is impossible to reconstruct with certainty what vowel, if any, is in the last syllable.

---

[47]For other kinds of examples of adaptation to the Russian prototype, many morphologically 'malformed', such as oriental names in *-a* or *-i*, see Unbegaun (1972, 17).

[48]See Unbegaun (1972) for a detailed typology of surnames with the suffix *-ov*.

[49]Princes' Charters.

[50]Note also the native East Slavic reflex of the *tort formula in *Xorobrova* lending additional weight to its authenticity and reliability.

[51]Even five centuries later it is still spelled *-ogo*.

Judging from the fact that, when unabbreviated, the spelling *-ovo* for the contaminated Gen. ending is predominant in records examined in the course of this investigation, and that most *-o/ago* endings are abbreviated as *-o/a^g*, it would be prudent to suppose that the abbreviation *-o^v* represents *-ovo*. On the other hand, the abbreviation *o^v* is also common in the Nom. and Gen. sg. endings of possessive adjectives, including indeclinable neut. sg. place names (*-ov*, *-ova* and *-ovo* respectively). It can also stand for the Gen. pl. *-ov* of the *o-stem nouns; or just for the syllable *-ov*. Perhaps this liberty indicates the commonplace nature of the variation between the indeclinable *-ovo* and the coordinated *-ovъ*.

Alternatively, it could be postulated that *Xorobrova* is the Gen. of the possessive adjective derived from the short-form adjective cum noun *Xorobrъ*. However, except for the South Slavic cognate *Xrabr*, no *Xorobrъ* is attested in East Slavic, while both *Xorobrojь* (*jaša Dmitra Xorobrogo* 'they captured Dmitr Xorobroj', Hypatian Chronicle 1171) and [*Andrěj*] *Xorobrovъ* (1438, PNChron) are.

Yet another possibility is that it is a scribal error due to assimilation to the fem. ending of a preceding item *Želěskova*. Finally, this spelling may be taken as supporting Černyx's (1954, 199) proposition that the original analogical Gen. ending was in fact *-ova*. According to him, the final *o* was reinstated later under the influence of the ending of non-personal pronouns such as *togo* where it was stressed. In the light of the fact that in many (or even most) Northern dialects without *akan'e* the only variant of the Gen. ending is *-ova*, this is especially likely.[52]

Whatever the case may be, it's the consonant that is the most unequivocal indicator of the fact that the change has already taken place. This attestation corroborates the hypothesis that the *g* of the etymological pronominal Gen. ending *-ogo* was first substituted by *v* in byname patronymics, qualitative adjectives by origin.

Frolova (1960a, 77) finds it natural that 15th century texts reflect the Gen. ending with *v* in proper names 'more energetically' than in ordinary adjectives. Moreover, it is evident that many earliest examples other than names can be traced to typical byname patronymics, particularly qualitative adjectives and possessive pronouns.

In the 16th century *Domostroj*, well-known for its abundance of the ending *-ovo*, there are many attestations in substantivized adjectives with personal reference, such as *tyseckovo* 'military unit commander', *postelničevo* 'courtier responsible for bedding and other personal needs of the prince', and the most frequent *novobračnovo* 'newly-wed (man)'. The latter has *-ovo* in 78% of its 30 attestations, and accounts for 55% (26 out of 47) of the total *-ovo* attestations in the text. With inanimates, on the one hand, *-ovo* is also attested in substantivized adjectival forms, e.g. *pridanovo* 'dowry' and *vetšanovo* 'rags'; and on the other, many *-ovo* attestations are found in qualitative adjectives, such as *glupovo* 'foolish', *melkovo* 'small', *prostovo* 'simple, plain', *zelenovo* 'green'.[53]

---

[52]While Filin (1972, 416) is skeptical of this possibility, other researchers, for example Frolova (1960a, 77) treat *-ovo/a* as variants of the same ending.

Tolkačev (1960, 262–264) reviews possible explanations of this phenomenon and arrives at the conclusion that it 'remains a mystery', although he offers a tentative phonological explanation of his own, namely 'progressive dissimilation'. He also states that both *-ovo* and *-ova* appear in records more or less simultaneously.

[53]Another interesting group of attestations are in pronouns *ni/kakova* 'no/some kind' and *takova* 'such/this'—also indicating the merger of nominal and pronominal declension, cf. Černyx (1927, 44).

5 Conclusion

To recapitulate the argument presented in this paper, the essence of the substitution is conflation of inflexion and derivation, whereby a derivational morpheme—the possessive adjective-forming suffix *-ov-*—in combination with the Gen. ending *-a* of one type of adjectives, contaminated the Gen. ending *-ogo* in another type. The first lexical and morphological category adopting the new Gen. ending were byname patronymics—substantivized qualitative adjectives; they also served as a vehicle for its subsequent spread to homonymous adjectives outside of the sphere of personal onomastics. The model for analogy was provided by baptismal patronymics—possessive adjectives by origin. Anttila (1977, 55–57), speaking of the constant conflict between the need for one-to-one symbolization between meaning and form and its impossibility in the language, concludes that "the creativity of language depends on this breaking up of one-to-one relations, and usage pulls the variety towards the one-to-one configuration. The ultimate forces here are similarity/analogy and association".

The syntactic environment for the analogy was prepared by

- a frequent employment of a second (byname) patronymic [Fa2] in the Gen. case in apposition to the first (baptismal) one [Fa1] in the Nom.; and
- the custom of using a patronymic of the father [FaFa1 and/or FaFa2] in the Gen. case, in addition to the referent's own.

Eventually, subordinated Gen. forms disappeared while coordinated forms took their place. The switch to coordination transformed patronymics into surnames. A side-effect of this process was the hybrid Gen. ending *-ovo* and Nom. *-ov*. The semantic basis for the analogy was the prominent association of the formant *-ov-* with noun stems denoting the prototypical agent/possessor. The surnames in *-ovo/-ov*, not derivable morphologically from ordinary long-form adjectives, were in essence innovative possessive forms of substantivized adjectives referring to the name bearer's family of origin. The fact that, in general, possessive adjectives were synonymous with the adnominal Gen. case and in morphosyntactic variation with each other at the time predisposed the Gen. of byname patronymics to the contamination. While the formation of surnames was unified by *-ov* becoming the 'anthroponymic formant' (Ščetinin 1968, 105), *-ovo* spread to the Gen. of homonymous adjectives used as attributive modifiers.

Primary Sources

ASEH: (1952). *Akty social'no-ėkonomičeskoj istorii severo-vostočnoj Rusi konca XIV–načala XVI v. Tom 1.* Moskva.
Domostroj: (1971[1882]). *Domostroj. Po spisku Imperatorskago Obščestva Istorii i Drevnostej Rossijskix.* Letchworth.
Hypatian Chronicle: (1908). *Ipat'evskaja lětopis'* (Polnoe sobranie russkix lětopisej, 2). Sankt-Peterburg.
PrCh: (1970[1950]). *Duxovnye i dogovornye gramoty velikix i udel'nyx knjazej XIV–XVI vv.* Moskva.
PNChron: (1965[1862]). *Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej. Letopisnyj sbornik, imenuemyj Patriaršej ili Nikonovskoj letopis'ju. Tom 9, 10.* Moskva; (2000[1901]). *Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej. Letopisnyj sbornik, imenuemyj Patriaršej ili Nikonovskoj letopis'ju. Tom 12.* Moskva.

References

Andersen, H. (1969). The phonological status of the Russian 'labial fricatives'. *Journal of Linguistics*, *5*(1), 121–127.

Andersen, H. (1973). Abductive and deductive change. *Language*, *49*(4), 765–793.

Anttila, R. (1977). *Analogy*. The Hague.

Bæcklund, A. (1959). *Personal names in medieval Velikij Novgorod. I. Common names* (Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis. Études de Philologie Slave, 9). Stockholm.

Baudouin de Courtenay 1897: Boduėn de Kurtenė, I. A. (1897). Kašubskij "jazyk", kašubskij narod i "kašubskij vopros" (okončanie). *Žurnal ministerstva narodnago prosveščenija*, *111*, 83–127.

Borkovskij, V. I. (1968). *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskij sintaksis vostočno-slavjanskix jazykov. Členy predloženija*. Moskva.

Bratishenko, E. (2005). Denominal adjective formation and suffix hierarchy in Old East Slavic. *Slavic and East European Journal*, *49*(3), 361–377.

Černyx, P. (1927). *Očerki po istorii i dialektologii severno-velikorusskogo narečija. I. "Žitie protopopa Avvakuma, im samim napisannoe" kak pamjatnik severno-velikorusskoj reči XVII-go stoletija*. Irkutsk.

Černyx, P. Ja. (1954). *Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka*. Moskva.

Čičagov, V. K. (1959). *Iz istorii russkix imen, otčestv i familij (Voprosy russkoj istoričeskoj onomastiki XV–XVII vv.)*. Moskva.

Filin, F. P. (1972). *Proisxoždenie russkogo, ukrainskogo i belorusskogo jazykov*. Leningrad.

Flier, M. F. (1983). The origin of the desinence *-ovo* in Russian. In V. Markov & D. S. Worth (Eds.), *From Los Angeles to Kiev. Papers on the occasion of The Ninth International Congress of Slavists, Kiev, September 1983* (UCLA Slavic Studies, 7) (pp. 85–104). Columbus.

Frolova, S. V. (1960a). K voprosu o proisxoždenii russkix neizmenjaemyx familij na *-ovo/-evo. Učenye zapiski Kujbyševskogo Gosudarstvennogo Pedagogičeskogo Instituta*, *32*, 67–80.

Frolova, S. V. (1960b). K voprosu o prirode i genezise pritjažatel'nyx prilagatel'nyx russkogo jazyka. *Učenye zapiski Kujbyševskogo Gosudarstvennogo Pedagogičeskogo Instituta*, *32*, 323–340.

Frolova, S. V. (1963). Istorija obrazovanija pritjažatel'no-otnositel'nyx prilagatel'nyx s suffiksom *-ov/-ev* v russkom jazyke. In V. A. Malaxovskij (Ed.), *Sbornik statej po teorii i metodike russkogo jazyka* (Učenye zapiski, *38*) (pp. 7–77). Kujbyšev.

Huntley, D. G. (1968). Two cases of analogical feature substitution in Slavic. *Language*, *44*(3), 501–506.

Huntley, D. (1984). The distribution of the denominative adjective and the adnominal genitive in Old Church Slavonic. In J. Fisiak (Ed.), *Historical syntax* (pp. 217–236). Berlin.

Ickovič, V. A. (1963). Udarenie v familijax v russkom jazyke. In S. I. Ožegov et al. (Eds.), *Voprosy kul'tury reči. Vol. 4* (pp. 53–65). Moskva.

Il'inskij, G. A. (1905). *Složnyja městoimenija i okončanija roditel'nago pad. ed. č. m. i sr. r. neličnyx městoimenij v slavjanskix jazykax*. Moskva.

Il'inskij, G. A. (1906). Patronymica na *-ovo* v russkom jazykě. *Izvestija otdelenija russkago jazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoj akademii nauk*, *11*(4), 144–156.

Ivanova, T. A. (1974). Nekotorye osobennosti upotreblenija roditel'nogo prinadležnosti v sovremennyx slavjanskix jazykax. *Voprosy filologii*, *4*, 33–40.

Jakobson, R. (1962). On the morphological structure of the Old Russian patronymics. O morfologičeskom sostave drevnerusskix otčestv. *Michigan Slavic Materials*, *1*, 14–23.

Jakubinskij, L. P. (1951). Iz istorii imeni prilagatel'nogo. *Doklady i soobščenija instituta jazykoznanija Akademii Nauk SSSR*, *1*, 52–60.

Janda, L. (1996). *Back from the brink: a study of how relic forms in languages serve as source material for analogical extension* (LINCOM Studies in Slavic Linguistics, 1). München, Newcastle.

Kiparsky, V. (1979[1963]). *Russian historical grammar, Vol. 1: the development of the sound system*. Ann Arbor.

Kolosov, M. (1872). *Očerk istorii zvukov i form russkago jazyka s XI po XVI stoletie*. Warszawa.

Kolosov, M. (1877). Počemu v roditel'nom padežě edinstvennago čisla prilagatel'nyx i městoimenij okončanie go (ago, ogo) směnilos' na vo (avo, ovo)? *Filologičeskie zapiski*, *16*(2), 71–74.

Kryński, M. Z. P. (1916). Końcówka *-go* w dopełniaczu deklinacji zaimkowej języków słowiańskich (Genet. sg. m. et n. pron. slav.). Część I-sza. *Prace filologiczne*, *8*(2), 439–526.

Kuryłowicz, J. (1973[1949]). La nature des procès "analogiques". In J. Kuryłowicz (Ed.), *Esquisses linguistiques* (International Library of General Linguistics, 16, 1) (pp. 66–86). München.

Kuznecov, P. S. (1959). *Očerki istoričeskoj morfologii russkogo jazyka*. Moskva.

Malinowski, L. (1876). Ueber die endung des genitiv sing. masc.-neutr. der pronominalen und zusammengesetzen declination im russischen und kaschubischen. *Beiträge zur vergleichenden Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der arischen, celtischen und slawischen Sprachen*, *8*(3), 356–362.

Miroslavskaja, A. N. (1962). Ešče raz o drevnerusskix imenax i prozviščax. *Učenye zapiski Baškirskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, 9. Serija filologičeskix nauk*, *3*(7), 127–138.

Šaxmatov, A. A. (1957). *Istoričeskaja morfologija russkogo jazyka*. Moskva.

Ščetinin, L. M. (1968). *Imena i nazvanija*. Rostov.

Seliščev, A. M. (1968). Proisxoždenie russkix familij, ličnyx imen i prozvišč. In E. A. Vasilevskaja (Ed.), *A. M. Seliščev. Izbrannye trudy* (pp. 97–128). Moskva.

Skorvid, S. S. (1981). O sintaksičeskix svojstvax pritjažatel'nyx prilagatel'nyx v drevnečešskom jazyke. *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta, 9*(4), 43–50.

Sobolevskij, A. I. (2004[1907]). Lekcii po istorii russkago jazyka. In A. I. Sobolevskij (Ed.), *Trudy po istorii russkogo jazyka. Tom 1* (pp. 1–297). Moskva.

Sokolov, A. (1891). Russkija imena i prozvišča v XVII veke. *Izvestija Obščestva arxeologii, istorii i etnografii pri Imperatorskom Kazanskom universitete, 10*(1), 1–16.

Superanskaja, A. V. (1969). *Struktura imeni sobstvennogo. Fonologija i morfologija*. Moskva.

Tolkačev, A. I. (1960). Ob izmenenii *-ogo > -ovo* v roditel'nom padeže edinstvennogo čisla mužskogo i srednego roda člennyx prilagatel'nyx i mestoimenij russkogo jazyka. In R. I. Avanesov (Ed.), *Materialy i issledovanija po istorii russkogo jazyka* (pp. 235–267). Moskva.

Trubačev, O. N. (1968). Iz materialov dlja ètimologičeskogo slovarja familij Rossii (Russkie familii i familii, bytujuščie v Rossii). *Etimologija 1966*, 3–53.

Tupikov, N. M. (1989[1903]). Istoričeskij očerk upotreblenija drevne-russkix ličnyx sobstvennyx imen. In N. M. Tupikov (Ed.), *Slovar' drevnerusskix ličnyx sobstvennyx imen (1903). Mit einem Nachwort von Ernst Eichler* (pp. 1–28). Leipzig.

Unbegaun, B. O. (1966). Les noms de famille russes en *-ágo*. *Studia Slavica, 12*(1–4), 415–418.

Unbegaun, B. O. (1972). *Russian surnames*. Oxford.

Vaillant, A. (1958). *Grammaire comparée des langues Slaves. Tome 2/2: flexion pronominale*. Lyon, Paris.

Vasčenko, V. (1968). O morfemnoj strukture russkix familij. *Romanoslavica, 16*, 137–160.

Vlasto, A. P. (1986). *A linguistic history of Russian to the end of the eighteenth century*. Oxford.

Xaburgaev, G. A. (1980). *Stanovlenie russkogo jazyka. Posobie po istoričeskoj grammatike*. Moskva.

Zaliznjak, A. A. (1995). *Drevnenovgorodskij dialekt*. Moskva.

Zaliznjak, A. A. (2004). *Drevnenovgorodskij dialekt. Vtoroe izdanie, pererabotannoe s učetom naxodok 1995–2003 gg.* Moskva.

Zverkovskaja, N. P. (1978). K istorii suffiksa *-ov-* v drevnerusskom jazyke. *Obščeslavjanskij lingvističeskij atlas. Materialy i issledovanija 1976* (pp. 256–262). Moskva.

Zverkovskaja, N. P. (1986). *Suffiksal'noe slovoobrazovanie russkix prilagatel'nyx XI–XVII vv.* Moskva.