Sonderdruck/Off-print

David Stifter, ‘Vocative for nominative’, 43–85

in:

Vocative!Addressing between System and Performance

Hrsg. v. Sonnenhauser, Barbara / Noel Aziz Hanna, Patrizia

Reihe: Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs [TiLSM] 261

de Gruyter Mouton 2013

Contents

Vocative for nominative*

David Stifter

Abstract

This study examines the use of morphologically marked vocative forms, mostly of personal names, as new nominatives or inflectional base forms, language-externally in situations of linguistic contact and, to a lesser extent, language-internally. This phenomenon (*Vocatiuus pro Nominatiuo* = VpN) has received some attention in previous scholarship, but it is here for the first time studied in a wide typological context, involving appr. two dozen languages of various genetic affiliation from Europe, Northern Africa and the Near East, and covering a period of almost 4.000 years. The aim of this paper is to collect a large sample of VpN and to draw typological conclusions about its development and the situations in which it normally occurs. VpN emerges as a frequent phenomenon, especially in situations of linguistic exchange, and not as a rare and marginal one.

1. Introduction

This study takes its starting point in the observation that in several languages forms, mostly of personal names, are encountered which look like vocatives, either in those same or in neighbouring languages, but which are used in functions and syntactic positions other than those of address. Less cautiously formulated, under certain circumstances vocatives of personal names have been reinterpreted as new nominatives or unmarked base forms. With a term that is meant in a purely descriptive sense the phenomenon can be called *Vocatiuus pro Nominatiuo* (VpN; after Wackernagel 1920: 310). This paper has two aims: to collect examples of VpN from a wide range of languages in time and space, and to try to highlight its development and the situations in which it typically occurs. Before that, an overview of the research history will be given, and VpN as understood in a narrow sense in this article will be delimited against related phenomena.

2. Research history

References to VpN are extant in works as early as those of Greek and Latin grammarians of the Roman imperial period. Apollonius Dyscolus, living in the 2nd c. A.D., states in his *Syntactica* 214 b, 3 ff.:

> ἢ ἀνεστραμμένως, ὅτε ἡ κλητικὴ ἀντ᾽ εὐθειῶν παραλαμβάνεται κατὰ Μακεδονικὸν ἔθος ἢ Θεσσαλικόν, ὡς οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν τὸ τοιοῦτον ἐπιστώσαντο:
> αὐτὰρ ὃ αὖτε Θύεστ᾽ Ἀγαμέμνονι [λεῖπε φορῆναι; add. DS]
>
> [Or in a contrary fashion, when the vocative is used in a Macedonian or Thessalian manner instead of the nominative, like our predecessors have recognised:
> *autàr hò aũte T^{h}ýest' Agamémnoni [leĩpe p^{h}orē̃nai]*][1]

Apollonius' 'predecessors' are likely to be Aristarchus of Samothrace (220?–143? B.C.) and Aristonicus of Alexandria (Augustan period), whose treatises on the Homeric poems are lost. Similar statements can be found in the works of other Greek grammarians, e.g. in *De Vita et Poesi Homeri* 2, 48, by the roughly 1st-century Plutarch, or as late as in the works of the 12th-century Eustathius of Thessalonica (see Hedberg 1935: 76–77, 80 for quotations). This tradition was also taken up in the Latin world; the immediate use of Apollonius is palpable in book 17 of the *Institutiones Grammaticae* 'Grammatical Foundations', a Latin grammatical handbook by the early medieval Priscianus Caesariensis (around 500 A.D.):

> Macedones autem et Thessali e contrario uocatiuos solebant pro nominatiuis proferre. Homerus: "αὐτὰρ ὃ αὖτε Θύεστ᾽ Ἀγαμέμνονι δῶκε φορῆναι". hic uocatiuus est pro nominatiuo: Θύεστα dixit pro Θυέστης. unde Romani frequentissime huiuscemodi nomina, et maxime appellatiua per uocatiuum Graecum etiam pro nominatiuo suo proferunt: sophista, citharista, poeta, Scytha, Sarmata, Sosia. Persius tamen indubitanter uocatiuum pro nominatiuo posuit: "censoremue tuum uel quod trabeate salutas?" trabeate pro trabeatus. et Horatius: "macte uirtute esto" pro mactus uirtute. (*Institutiones Grammaticae* 17, 190 = *Corpus Glossarum Latinarum* 3, 208)
>
> [In a contrary fashion, moreover, the Macedonians and Thessalians used vocatives for nominatives. Homer (said): "*autàr hò aũte T^{h}ýest' Agamémnoni dõke p^{h}orē̃nai*". Here, the vocative stands for the nominative: he said *T^{h}ýesta* for *T^{h}yéstēs*. For this reason, the Romans use very often names of this sort, and especially appellative nouns in the Greek vocative

for their nominative: *sophista*, *citharista*, *poeta*, *Scytha*, *Sarmata*, *Sosia*. Persius, however, undoubtedly placed the vocative for the nominative: "*censoremue tuum uel quod trabeate salutas*?"[2] [*Saturae* 3, 28; DS] ([voc.] *trabeate* for [nom.] *trabeatus*). And Horace: "*macte uirtute esto*"[3] [*Satira* 1, 2, 31; DS] for [nom.] *mactus uirtute*.]

Actually, these apparent ancient instances of VpN are mostly of a different nature from the phenomenon discussed here. While some Greek forms in -τᾰ (-*tă*) do probably continue earlier vocatives (Brugmann and Delbrück 1892: 651; Sihler 1995: 274; differently Schwyzer 1939: 560–561), in other cases, notably in Latin where words in -*ta* systematically correspond to Greek ones in -*tēs*, we are simply looking at different inflectional morphology. The endings of the nominative of the one group of languages are incidentally similar to those of the vocative of a culturally dominant idiom, i.e. Greek, thereby prompting a false etymological conclusion by the grammarians. In Priscian's quote from Persius, a Roman poet, voc. *trabeate* instead of nom. *trabeatus* is a poetic licence. While usually in Latin the nominative serves as the case of predication after the copula,[4] in this instance the nominative is exceptionally attracted to the vocative in the context of address, thereby creating a predicative vocative (see Brugmann and Delbrück 1892: 647, 1893: 398; Wackernagel 1920: 308–309; Löfstedt 1956: 103–106; Svennung 1958: 406–409; Hofmann and Szantyr 1965: 25–26). The same is true for *macte uirtute esto* 'be blessed by excellence', a phrase originating in the religious sphere, but transferred to mundane usage as an exclamation of praise or approval. Such rare examples of case attraction occur mainly in syntagms involving second-person verbs, but are not re-interpretations of vocatives as nominatives in the strict sense. The vocative has not taken over the full set of functions of the nominative, but only functions as a predicative case in a stylistically very highly marked construction when dependent on second-person verbs.

In contrast to those ancient examples, this paper will be concerned with examples where new inflectional base forms are derived from vocatives in all, not only in a single syntactic context. The number of previous studies of the problem is limited. In various studies and grammars of Indo-European languages of the 19th and 20th centuries the observation is made that the attested nominatives of the names of humans and gods can be traced back to earlier vocatives. Typically mentioned in this context are Latin *Iuppiter* 'Jupiter' (see paragraph 8.1. below) and personal names like Μεννει, Τιμολλει in Boeotic, a dialect of Ancient Greek (see 9.1. below). The underlying process is that of hypostasis or conversion (Brugmann and Delbrück 1892: 651; for the term 'hypostasis', see Bloomfield 1933: 148, 180; pers. comm. Paul Widmer), the transference and re-interpretation of a

form that originally belonged to one grammatical category to another one. As far as I can see, the first person who devoted more than a passing remark to the phenomenon was Heinrich Zimmer (1893: 190–196). The first full and truly profound treatment of VpN is an article by the famous orientalist Enno Littmann from 1916 in which he formulated a number of fundamental insights into the involved processes. He discussed both the transference of forms of address to new base forms, as well as the re-interpretation of vocatives as nominatives in contact situations. Littmann adduced a large collection of examples mainly from languages of the Near East and north-western Africa. Most of what was said about VpN in the following years and decades is directly or indirectly derived from Littmann, as can easily be recognised from the fact that only rarely new forms were introduced into the discourse (e.g., Wackernagel 1920: 309–310; Löfstedt 1956: 102–103; Svennung 1958: 394–403). While isolated references to VpN are scattered throughout the 20th century, only the nineties of the last and the first decade of this century saw the resurgence of interest in it, and new languages and original observations were added to the discourse (e.g., Rix 1963, 1994; Petersmann 1998; Dunkel 1998; Malzahn 2000; Adams 2003: 512–515, 2007: 97–100, 570–571; Schumacher 2004: 295–296; Straxov 2004; despite its late appearance, the observations in Stifter 2008 [2010] date from 2001). However, hardly anyone discussed the phenomenon in a wider typological, cross-linguistic context.

3. Definitions

Several of the early studies mention VpN as part of the broader phenomenon of using forms of address outside their original domain, that is, as subjects, objects or other phrases. In fact, the terms 'forms of address' (*Anredeformen*) and 'vocatives' may be used interchangeably, and they often are.[5] However, in the present study a distinction will be made between the two. Only such forms of address that are morphologically, i.e. inflectionally marked with overt endings[6] will be called 'vocatives'. All vocatives are by their nature forms of address, but the reverse is not true, not all forms of address are morphologically marked vocatives.

One can distinguish broadly the following types of re-interpretation of forms of address:

1. Transference of a true vocative → nominative:[7] the previous studies make one expect that this happens mostly language-externally, i.e. in situations of language contact, but instances of language-internal developments can be found, too.[8]

2. Transference of other forms of address → nominative: very often, this involves collocations with first-person possessive pronouns followed by kinship terms, titles or terms of deference. Cross-linguistically, it is particularly frequent with words for 'master' or 'mistress'. Many examples are found with reference to rulers or religious leaders and dignitaries, e.g. Hebrew *rabbī* 'lit. my lord' → 'teacher'. In the strict sense, such expressions are proper only to situations of personal communication, but they can become stereotyped, and can turn into titles themselves or into mere referential terms, e.g. when French *madame* 'lit. my lady' on its own is used in German conversation as a pointer to a particular person, almost like a pronoun. Such constructions may on occasion form the basis of proper names, e.g. Welsh *Angharad* < *(f)y ngharad* 'my beloved', Old Irish *Mérnóc* < *mo Érnán-óc* 'my little Érnán' (Zimmer 1893); or English *Ned* < *mine Edward*, *Nol* < *mine Oliver* (Wackernagel 1920: 310; Svennung 1958: 394). Littmann (1916) and Svennung (1958: 395–403) provide wealthy collections for this phenomenon from a wide range of languages. This kind of transference is likely to happen both language-internally and externally, but of course the detachment of such expressions from their original pragmatic constraints is easier in loan situations. In language-internal examples, it has been observed that there is a preference for certain superlatives in acts of address:

   (1) German *(mein / ihr)* *Lieb-st-er*
   1sg.poss / 3sg.f.poss dear-superlative-m.nom.sg
   '(my/her) dearest'

   (2) Greek *φέριστ-ε (p^{h}érist-e)*
   good.superlative-m.voc.sg.
   'best one'

   Such expressions could then be transferred to other contexts, without necessarily transferring vocative morphology (Leumann 1939: 10).

3. Transference of vocatives and other forms of address → interjections: because of their high emotive value, forms of address, especially of transcendental entities, can be detached from their original uses and can become semantically depleted phrases and interjections whose primary

function becomes to reflect the high degree of emotional involvement of the speaker in a particular situation, e.g.

(3) Hungarian *jó* *Isten-em*
good God-1sg.poss
'my good God!'

(4) Latin *me-hercl-e*
1sg.acc-Hercules-voc.sg
'by Hercules'

or Austrian German *Oida* 'old man', a form originating in slightly derogatory situations of direct address,[9] but having by now turned into an empty phrase of amazement or a call for attention. In such stereotyped expressions, morphologically marked vocatives may survive as isolated relics even in languages that have lost vocatives as an inflectional category, e.g. Russian *Боже мой* (*Bože moj*) 'my God' or Slovenian *bože* 'God', beside nom. *bog* 'God' in both languages.

This paper will be limited to cases of type 1 where morphologically marked vocatives are re-interpreted as nominatives or as morphologically unmarked base or citation forms (VpN). Unless otherwise stated, the discussion will always focus on the singular. For convenience's sake, the term 'nominative' will be used throughout, even for languages with little or no inflection where the term 'nominative' is not strictly appropriate. VpN is something entirely different from the rather common, if not trivial use of the nominative in place of the vocative, a use which is basically the extension and generalisation of the unmarked base form to a pragmatically marked environment. This phenomenon will not be treated here. As shall be seen, the use of the vocative for the nominative is fundamentally different in its character. It has nothing to do with the loss of markedness or with the shift of markedness from morphology to syntax, and unlike the use of nominatives for vocatives, VpN is not a primarily language-internal process, but one that is more at home in situations of linguistic contact and borrowing.

The following survey will partly consist of previously identified examples, partly of new cases that have not yet been mentioned in the literature. Because of my background in Indo-European historical linguistics, many examples will be taken from past contact situations in Europe and its vicinity, but a number of modern examples will also be cited.

The examples mostly involve the vocatives of nouns that belong to the Indo-European *o*-stem declension. In Proto-Indo-European, the vocative singular of this class ended in the bare stem-class vowel, which, probably for suprasegmental reasons connected with the placement of the stress, surfaces as *-e* in absolute final position. There is no particular system in the arrangement of the following chapters. Sometimes the languages given in the titles will refer to the recipient, sometimes to the donor languages. No consistent system was adhered to in this, but the arrangement is oriented to practical aspects.

4. Etruscan

The survey will start with Etruscan, partly because the documentation of this language is much better than that of other fragmentarily attested languages of antiquity, partly because VpN has been especially well studied for this language before and can therefore be demonstrated in an exemplary fashion. Etruscan is a non-Indo-European language spoken in the early historic period, i.e. in the 1st mill. B.C., over a large area in Northern Italy. It was eventually superseded by Latin around the beginning of the Common Era. Prior to its disappearance, it had extensive and long-standing contacts in particular with the Indo-European languages Greek, Umbrian, Latin, both belonging to the Italic sub-branch of Indo-European, and Gaulish. Through these contacts, a very large number of personal names were borrowed into Etruscan. It has been long observed that Greek *o*-stem names borrowed into Etruscan regularly appear as *e*-class nouns, e.g. Gr. Δίφιλος (*Díp^{h}ilos*) → Etr. *tiφile*, Λύκανδρος (*Lýkandros*) → *licantre* (de Simone 1970: 94–95). Likewise, Etruscan names in *-e* have a large number of correspondences in Latin or Osco-Umbrian names in *-us*/*-os* and are indeed best regarded as loans from those languages (Rix 1963: 226–238), e.g. Etr. *tite* ← *Titus*, *prute* ← *Brutus*, *palpe* ← *Balbus*, *macre* ← *Macer* etc. (see also Rix 1995: 723; Steinbauer 1993: 288). The case of Italic **i̯o*-stems is slightly more complex. In early loans, Etruscan *-ie* represents Italic ** ⁻ii̯o-* (Wallace 2008: 93), e.g. Etr. *numesie* continues Latino-Faliscan **Numesios* (Lat. *Numerius*), *spurie Spurius*, etc. In younger loans, Etruscan has an *-i* where Latin gentilic names end in *⁻ius*, e.g. *fapi* ← *Fabius*, *φisi* ← *Fisius* (Rix 1963: 258–260, 1994: 63–64; Kaimio 1970). But not only Greek and Latin names were treated in this manner, it also applies to loan names from Celtic languages, e.g. Etr. *eluveitie* ← Celtic ethnonym **eluei̯tii̯os* 'Helvetian' used as a personal name, *nemetie-ś* (*-ś* = genitive ending added to the base form) ← Gaulish **Nemetii̯os* (de Simone 1980).

It has been suggested (e.g., de Simone 1970: 142) that these correspondences are due to a mechanical morphological transformation, i.e. to the transference of Indo-European *o*-stems to the Etruscan *e*-class. Etruscan possessed an inherited class of words ending in overt *-e*, e.g. *flere* 'divinity' (Rix 1963: 230–231). In addition to this, there was another, only diachronically tangible, *e*-class where the final vowel had been dropped in consequence of "a prehistoric sound change that eliminated word-final vowels" (Wallace 2008: 44–45). In such words, the original class is recognisable only in those cases where the stem vowel is protected by a consonantal ending, e.g. **aise* > Etr. *ais* 'god', but pl. *aiser* 'gods',[10] or gen. *meθlumes* vs. nom. *meθlum* 'city' (Wallace 2008: 45, 49). However, this hypothesis cannot explain why Latin gentilic names in *-ius* are represented by Etruscan *-i*. Therefore according to an alternative solution, widely accepted today, this is not the substitution of the suffix of one language by a functionally corresponding one of another, but rather the re-interpretation of the Italic vocative ending as that of a new nominative in the recipient language (Rix 1981: 124, 1994: 63 fn. 32; Steinbauer 1993: 288; Adams 2003: 514, 2007: 97–100). The speakers of Etruscan, which had no vocative in its grammatical system, were not sensitive to the pragmatic role of the forms in *-e* and could employ it for other functions. This hypothesis not only accounts neatly for the preponderance of *-e* in loan names over other possible stem endings, but it also explains why sometimes *-ie*, sometimes *-i* is found for Italic names ending in **-iio-*: **-iie* is the Common Italic, *-ī* the regular Latin reflex of the vocative of these stems,[11] and the distribution reflects diatopically and diachronically different layers of loans.

It is of course possible that we are looking at a complex phenomenon whereby the vocative of the donor language was preferred because of its compatibility with an already existing inflectional class which in turn was awarded greater pragmatic prominence in the recipient language and eventually became productive even inside native Etruscan word-forms (Adams 2003: 514, 2007: 97–98; Wallace 2008: 93 with reference to the onomastic suffix *-ie*).

The correspondence described above pertains to personal names only. Although quite often they can be traced back to descriptive adjectives or ethnonyms (see the lists in Rix 1963: 227–228, 231), it is apparent that these words had been in use as personal names in their original languages. Names of Italic gods, on the other hand, were taken over in the nominative. This is evident from Etruscan *neθuns* (corresponding to Latin *Neptūnus*) whose name was perhaps borrowed from hypothetical Umbrian **Nehtuns* (de Vaan 2008: 406), and from Etruscan *selvans*, a god of the nature corresponding to Latin *Siluānus*. In the same vein, *velχans* may be an equivalent of Latin *Vulcānus*. It seems that no common nouns in * *-os* were bor-

rowed from Indo-European languages into Etruscan (except for the possible but special case of **aisos* 'god' mentioned above). Thus it remains unclear whether these would have been treated differently from personal names. Neuter *o*-stem nouns in **-om* or *-ov* were taken over in a form that is reminiscent of the nominative/accusative singular of the original language, e.g. Greek κῶθον (*kō̆t^{h}on*) 'drinking vessel' → Etruscan *qutum*, λήκυθον (*lē̆kyt^{h}on*) 'oil flask' → *leχtumuza*, πρόχουν (*prók^{h}oun*) 'jug' → *pruχum*, Italic (?) *uīnum* 'wine' → *vinum*, and perhaps Italic **pōtlom* 'drinking vessel' → *putlumza* (Wallace 2008: 127–129).[12] The lack of substitution of **-om* by something like **-e* may indicate that this substitution pertained to personal names only, thereby lending support to the theory of its origin in the vocative.

In Etruria, the re-interpretation of Lat. vocatives as new Etruscan nominatives was occasionally carried even a step further in that the use of vocative forms was extended even to Latin funeral inscriptions composed, in some likelihood, by native speakers of Etruscan with insufficient command of Latin (Adams 2007: 98–99), e.g.

(5) *Sex.* *Gegan-i* *P.* *f.* *Gall-e*
Sextus Geganius-voc.sg Publius-gen.sg. son-nom.sg. Gallus-voc.sg.
a(nn-os) *u(ix-it)* *LXX*
year-acc.pl live.pst-3sg 70
'Sextus Geganius Gallus, son of Publius, lived 70 years' (CIL 11, 2979)

From a sociolinguistic point of view it is worth noting that the contacts to the different languages correspond to different types of social and linguistic relationships. Speakers of Greek, often traders and artisans, represented a culture that exerted considerable influence on Etruscans and from which Etruscans borrowed intentionally cultural artifacts and words. Relations with speakers of Italic languages were much more imbalanced, in that especially Umbrians formed part of the lower class of Etruscan society. They held subjugated positions where they were able to exert substratum influence. A very early cultural superiority by Etruscans over Italic peoples is also evident from the fact that several of them took over the art of writing from Etruscans. Despite this, the main mode of communication would of course have stayed oral, and with this the pragmatic prominence of vocatives. With the rise of Roman power Etruscans came to be on the receiving end and Latin became the dominant language. While evidence for the early period is lacking, it seems that mutual knowledge of the languages seems to have been surprisingly limited in the historical period (Adams 2003: 159–183). With Celtic peoples, relations, as far as we can judge them, seem to have been hostile initially, but the possibility must be granted that after the

initial period of Celtic invasions more peaceful exchange situations arose. In any case, despite these very different types of contact, the mechanics of how names were borrowed into Etruscan remained the same in all situations, giving evidence of the persistence of the fundamental principle underlying the borrowing of names.

5. Raetic

After Etruscan, it is convenient to look at a closely related language next, Raetic. It is attested in short inscriptions in an epichoric alphabet in the Alpine valleys of Northern Italy and the Tyrol, dating to the 2nd half of the 1st mill. B.C. Its affiliation had remained a mystery until rather recently it was demonstrated on the basis of morphofunctional correspondences to be a cognate of the non-Indo-European language Etruscan (see Rix 1998; Schumacher 2004: 294–318). The small surviving corpus of Raetic contains a handful of names that have the appearance of having been borrowed from neighbouring Indo-European languages like Venetic, Celtic or some other language. The inscription from Steinberg in the Tyrol contains two names that could be of Celtic origin (Schumacher 2004: 300, 353). One is *esimnesi* (ST-3), the pertinentive of *esimne**, corresponding to *Essimnus/Essibnus*. This latter name, which is attested several times in Latin inscriptions, shows a strong connection to the probably Celtic-speaking Vindelici in modern-day Bavaria.[13] The other name is *rit*^{l}*auiesi* (ST-2), the pertinentive of *rit*^{l}*auie**, whose Latinised cognate *Ridaus* is known from Gaimersheim near Ingolstadt (CIL III 5905), again in the Vindelician area. *Kat*^{2}*iave* in Sanzeno (SZ-8) is possibly of Celtic origin (cp. Middle Welsh *Keidyaw*, Schumacher 1998). *Klevie* (MA-17) evidently continues the Indo-European formation **kleu̯i̯os* ‘having fame’ (cp. *Cleuius* in CIL 5, 4717, Brescia, and *Cleuia* in CIL 5, 1816, Friuli), but the identity of the donor language is unknown, it could be any old Indo-European language. With a good deal of speculation, one could see behind *φeluriesi φelvinuale* (NO-13) two formations from the Proto-Celtic base **φelu-* ‘many’ (= Gaulish *elu-*); the first name could then be set up as Proto-Celtic **φeluri̯os* (= Gaulish **elurios*). For more Raetic names ending in *-e* see Schumacher (2004: 295–296 fnn. 172–173), but their possible external relations are not so clear.

6. Iberian and Basque

The Iberian Peninsula provides valuable insights into the processes at work in anthroponymic borrowing, depending on the morphological characteristics of the borrowing languages.

6.1. The treatment of several Celtic, Latin and Greek names in Iberian, an ancient non-Indo-European language spoken in the east and southeast of the peninsula, attested in epichoric texts from the 4th/5th–1st c. B.C., follows the pattern established above for Etruscan and Raetic. The affiliation of Iberian had remained a mystery for a long time, but it is starting to emerge now that it may have been an early relative or even precursor of modern Basque. The Iberian numerals show striking similarities with those of Basque (Orduña Aznar 2005), and there seem to be correspondences in the verbal system (pers. comm. Kim McCone). Foreign names in the Iberian corpus are recognisable not only from parallels or etymons in languages like Latin, Gaulish, etc., but sometimes also by sound combinations that are foreign to the other Iberian material (Untermann 1980: 47; e.g., *u* before a vowel, the sequences *śk* and *ŕn* in the names below). Two factors complicate the identification of foreign names: sound substitutions (e.g., Iberian had no sound *m*, but wrote *b* or the digraph *mb̄* in substitution for it; and it made no phonemic distinction between voiceless and voiced consonants) and the unsuitability of the semisyllabic Iberian script for writing consonant clusters (consonants were either omitted in writing or empty vowels had to be written). In consequence, some of the identifications below may be circular, and not all equations can lay claim on an equal amount of certainty. Still, it is clear that Iberian *-e* systematically replaces the masculine endings Latin *-us*, Celtic and Greek *-os* in the donor languages (Untermann 1980: 48; Ruiz Darasse 2010: 341–342, following Correa 1993, regards this as a phonetic process). Relatively regularly, *-i* can be found for Latin *-ius*; very rarely Iberian shows *-oś*,[14] apparently corresponding to the nominative singular ending of the donor languages. The following Latin names have been identified (here and below, identifications by Untermann 1980: 48,[15] unless otherwise stated; for southern France, sigla of the type B.x.x, the examples are comprehensive): *[.]uke koŕneli* [C.1.1] = *Lucius Cornelius* (*-e* for *-ius*!), *balante* [B.1.125] = *Blandus*, *kai* [C.7.6, C.11.5] = *Caius*, *luki* [A.6–11, D.1.1] = *Lucius*, *mb̄asi* [B.1.125] = *Massius*, *mb̄aske* [B.1.269] = *Mascus*, *seśte* = *Sextus* or *sextus* (a monetary unit)? (Ferrer i Jané and Giral Royo 2007: 96), *tibeŕi* [A.12–17] = *Tiberius*. In one case, fragmentary *]itoŕ* [F.11.8] seems to correspond to Greco-Latin *Isidorus* in a bilingual text.[16] From Celtic, the following loan names have been proposed: *anetilike* [B.1.39] = *Aneχtlicos*, *aśetile* [B.1.42] = *Assedilos*, *auŕtemb̄aŕe*

[B.1.258] = *-māros*? (unclear first element), *betukine* [F.17 2,B] = *Medugenos*? (my suggestion; but perhaps Iberian, see Stifter forthc.), *eśkinke* [B.1.268] = *Eχscingos*, *itutilte* [B.1.9] = *Indutillos*?, *kaŕate* [B.1.33] = *Carantos*, *kasike* [B.1.33] = *Cassicos*, *katubaŕe* [B.1.373] = *Catumāros* (Solier and Barbouteau 1988: 61), *katuŕe* [B.1.51] = *Caturos*, *kobakie* [B.1.53] = *Comagios*?, *latubaŕe* [B.1.364] = *Latumāros*, *]mbaŕe[* [B.1.174] (uncertain) = *-māros*?, *ośiobaŕe* [B.1.59] = *Oχsiobarros* or *Oχsiomāros*, *śeŕtubaŕe* [B.1.257] = *-māros*? (unclear first element).

The situation resembles very strongly that of Etruscan. The equivalents in Iberian of Indo-European *o*-stem names are names ending in *-e*, homomorphous with the vocatives of the donor languages, with the exception of Latin names in *-ius* which are mostly represented by names in *-i*, incidentally the ending of the vocative in this sub-type of names. This rule of equivalence seems to pertain to anthroponyms only; so far no common nouns have been identified with certainty. The sole possible exception would be *seśte* if it stood for the monetary unit *sextus*, which is far from certain. In one respect, the situation in Iberian differs from that in Etruscan. Whereas in the latter there arguably pre-existed in the recipient language an inflectional class ending in *-e*, this is not so in Iberian. The words in *-e* are an entirely new morphological class specifically for loan names.

6.2. Two features of loan names on the Iberian Peninsula make them even more valuable for this study. Celtic names that belong to other than the *o*-stem declension and which therefore have no vocative that would formally differ from the nominative, are most revealingly borrowed in a form resembling their nominative: *atetu* [B.1.26] = *Ateχtū*, *auetiŕiś* [B.1.15] = *Aduexχtirīχs*, *kabiŕilo* [B.1.272] = *Cabril(l)ō*, *kaŕtiŕiś* [B.1.28] = *-rīχs* (unclear first element), *tiuiś* [A.1–5, B.1.331] = *Dīuiχs*, *untikoŕiś* [B.1.333] = perhaps *Tincorīχs* (unclear first element); de Hoz (2008) added the name *smertaz* = *Smertans* [B.1.2].

This means that if there was a morphologically distinct vocative of a name in Celtic, it was borrowed into Iberian, but if there was not, the nominative was used, which is thus shown to have served as the case of address in the donor language as well.[17] The other observation relates to the treatment of loan names in different languages. In a few instances, the same Greek and Latin names were borrowed both into Celtiberian, a Celtic language spoken in the centre of the peninsula, and into Iberian. The Greek name Φιλόνικος (*P*^{h}*ilónikos*) was borrowed into Iberian as *bilonike* [K.1.7], as could be expected. However, in Celtiberian texts it appears as *bilonikos* [K.1.3, III-28, -51]. Latin *Licinus* appears as *likine* [E.7.1 = K.28.1, K.5.3] in Iberian, but six times as *likinos* in Celtiberian [K.1.3, I-29, ‑40, II-6, -35, III-49, IV-36]. Again, this double treatment of the names in the two lan-

guages is significant and revealing. Celtiberian, as an old Indo-European language, most likely possessed a vocative and had an inflectional system that was recognisably cognate to that of Greek and Latin. Therefore, speakers of Celtiberian either borrowed the nominative directly from those languages or, if they, too, were primarily exposed to vocatives of such personal names, were able to decode them in their communicative function and identified them with the appropriate grammatical category of their own speech. For speakers of Iberian, which most likely did not have a vocative, this option was not open and they reverted to the vocative as the *Nennform* at face value, the one they were most frequently exposed to.

6.3. Basque, which is spoken in northeastern Spain and southwestern France today, is famous for being the sole survivor of the pre-Indo-European languages of Europe. Like Iberian, to which it is perhaps related, it has no morphologically marked vocative case. For areal and typological reasons, one could *a priori* expect the same to have happened to Latin loan names and words like in Iberian, but I could find only very few examples for this. The old accusative underlies most of the countless loanwords of Latin into Basque (Trask 2008: 62). Only Basque *done* 'saint' can be derived from Proto-Romance **donne* via syncope and assimilation of the Latin vocative *domine* 'lord'[18] (Meyer-Lübke 1935: nr. 2741; Michelena 1961; Trask 1997: 338; 2008: 157), and Basque *agure* 'old man' comes from the Latin vocative *auule* 'grandfather' (Trask 2008: 79). Everything else is open to doubt: the Latin agentive suffix *-ārius* was borrowed into Basque as *-ari* (Trask 2008: 104), but this could be the regular outcome of **-āriu(m)* and need not reflect the Latin vocative in *-ī*. If the medieval Basque names *Martie* or *Mikele* do indeed exist, as claimed by Trask (1997: 348), at least the first of the two can be straightforwardly derived from the Latin vocative *Martine* via regular loss of intervocalic *n*, i.e. Michelena's Law, but I could find no independent support for those names.[19]

7. Punic

Even though the power of the Punic town of Carthage was broken by the Romans in the 3rd Punic War (149–146 B.C.), the Punic language, a daughter of Phoenician and thus a member of the Semitic family of languages, continued to be spoken in North Africa for a long time afterwards, at least until the 5th c. A.D. For the most part, it was written in the autochthonous Punic script, but in the final period the Roman script was also used.

7.1. The extended contact with Latin over more than half a millennium meant that Punic and Neo-Punic, its late variant, experienced linguistic influence from the dominant language in various areas of the grammar (Adams 2003: 214–235). Since Punic possessed no vocative case, it can by now be expected that it showed VpN in relation to names borrowed from Latin, and this is exactly what is found. Adams (l.c.) provides many examples for monolingual Punic and bilingual Punic-Latin texts where Roman names are rendered in Punic by forms that reflect the Latin vocative. "The ending *-e* instead of *-us* is represented by -' and *-i* instead of *-ius* by *-y*" (Adams 2003: 218 fn. 428). For example, in the bilingual KAI 117, what corresponds to Latin

(6) *Q. Apule-us* *Maxssim-us* *qui* *et*
Quintus Apuleius-nom.sg Maximus-nom.sg rel con
Ride-us *uoca-ba-tur*
Rideus-nom.sg call-impf-3sg.pass
'Quintus Apuleius Maximus who also was called Rideus'

is *'pwl'ỷ m'k[šm]' ryd'y = Apulei Maxime Ridai* in Punic, with endings that resemble those of the Latin vocative. The same inscription demonstrates another peculiarity, already observed in Iberian (section 6.2.), namely that names which belong to inflectional classes of the donor language without a morphologically marked vocative are borrowed in a form that reflects the nominative. The sons of Q. Apuleius Maximus Rideus are called *Pudens*, *Seuerus* and *Maxsimus* in the Latin part of the text. As could be expected, the latter two appear as *š'w'w'r' = Seueuere* [sic!] and *m'k[šm]' = Maxime* in the Punic section, whereas the first of the three is written *pwdnš = Pudens* (Adams 2003: 217–218). The same pattern is encountered in the bilingual epitaph KAI 142 (= CIL 8, 793). *Gadaeus* and *Saturius* are rendered in Punic as *g'[d]'y/g'dy = Gadai* and *š'ṭry = Saturi*, but *Felix* as *plkš = Felix* (Adams 2003: 225). Like in the case of the Iberian inscriptions, this different treatment, depending on the stem-class of the names in the donor language, is an indicator that the names were not merely adapted to inflectional classes of the recipient language, but rather directly reflect morphological properties of the names in the donor language.

There is some evidence that the borrowing of vocatives as base-forms occurred in the living language, in the communicative interchange of people. Latin names that do not belong to the everyday life of the average speakers of Punic, notably the titles and names of members of the Roman imperial families, with which they would be more familiar in official, written form, are rendered in Punic in forms that reflect the Latin nominative: *grm'nyqs = Germanicus*, *dr'ss = Drusus* (Adams 2003: 218 fn. 428).

In the latest phase of the language, Neo-Punic, written in Roman letters, when the language was under great pressure from Latin and bilingualism and good knowledge of Latin became widespread, Latin nominatives were more regularly employed as base-forms in Punic (Adams 2003: 233), although even at this stage the forms reflecting the Latin vocative are in preponderance.

7.2. If Latin influenced Punic, the reverse could be expected to be true, too. Indeed, substitution of the vocative for the nominative in vulgar texts has been claimed to be a feature of African Latin since the end of the 19th century. Marx (1894: 2) discusses the expression *Romaniane uiuat* 'may Romaniane (vocative for nominative Romanianus) live' in the subscription of a manuscript, syntactically wrong according to the grammatical rules of standard Latin, and compares it with seven instances of vocatival forms instead of nominatives[20] among the approximately 30.000 lapidar inscriptions from the Roman province of Africa. He then uses this parallel to ascribe the subscription to an African author. Referring to the same seven texts, Adamik (1987: 1) maintains that the statistically very small number of examples should not be used to draw conclusions about the grammatical features of spoken African Latin. Instead of accepting them as instances of VpN, Adamik (1987: 5) connects these grammatically aberrant inscriptions with the so-called *signa*, super-nomina that are infrequently found on Roman inscriptions in addition to the civil names of the deceased. They sometimes stand – unsyntactically – in the vocative[21] and represent clearly some kind of pet names by which the deceased were known during their lifetimes. Adamik is quite vague about the exact usage and the formal side of the *signa*. Furthermore, he mixes quite diverse phenomena, i.e. true vocatives addressing the deceased, possible cases of VpN, and pet names stereotyped in the vocative (= *signa*), to support his hypothesis that those African names are true vocatives, intended as forms of address of the dead. Adamik's account is briefly reviewed by Petersmann (1998: 133–134) who critically remarks that Adamik overlooked several more inscriptions where the interpretation as true vocatives is excluded on syntactical grounds. Adams (2003: 512–514), too, notes that the important corpus of texts from Sirte had apparently been unknown to Adamik. These texts, written in Neo-Punic and Latin, contain a substantial number of vocatival names in unambiguous nominative function. Nevertheless, in (2007: 570–571, 574–575) Adams does not want to make a decision and takes an ultimately cautious position regarding VpN in Punic and African Latin by maintaining that the case has not been decisively proven yet.

8. Latin and Romance

8.1. Having discussed numerous examples of external relations of Latin above, it is time to take a brief look at Latin and her Romance daughter languages themselves. The case of the nominative *Iūpiter*, *Iuppiter*, alluded to in the introduction, has served as the classical example of VpN in most of the literature devoted to the phenomenon since the end of the 19th century (Wackernagel 1920: 310; Svennung 1958: 395; Hofmann and Szantyr 1965: 23–24; Hermann 1937: 72–73, to name but a few). *Iūpiter* directly continues the PIE vocative collocation **dii̯eu̯ ph₂ter* 'oh father sky!'[22] (cp. Greek vocative Ζεῦ πάτερ [*Zeũ páter*]), instead of the expected nominative †*Diuspiter* < †*Dii̯ou̯s patēr* (Leumann 1939: 9–11).[23] Furthermore, Leumann makes the valuable observation that the use of certain superlative attributes accompanying divine names must have originated in acts of addressing the divinities. Fixed expressions such as *Iuppiter Optimus Maximus* 'best, greatest Jupiter' would thus have been formed on the analogy of vocatives like *Iuppiter Optime Maxime*.

The only other relevant example in Latin that I have come across is the generalisation of the collocation *domine deus*[24] 'Lord God' outside of addresses to the Christian god, thus giving rise to Romanian *dumnezeu*, Italian *domineddio*, Old Fr. *damnedeu*, *damledieu*, Provenzal *dompnedeu*, all 'God' (Meyer-Lübke 1935: nr. 2734; Svennung 1958: 398–399). A similar use of *domine* as base form of words referring to clerics or other venerable, learned persons like schoolmasters, e.g. in English, German, Dutch or Italian, is frequently cited in the early literature about VpN (e.g., Brugmann and Delbrück 1892: 651, 1893: 398; Littmann 1916: 95; Wackernagel 1920: 309; Svennung 1958: 398; Straxov 2004: 125), notably with reference to the novel *Guy Mannering* by Sir Walter Scott where this expression found its way into world literature.

8.2. To conclude the survey of Latin and Romance, and to demonstrate how careful one has to be, I want to draw attention to two only apparent examples of VpN, the Spanish names *Lope* < Latin *lupus* 'wolf' and *Felipe* < *Philippus*. Instead, they are the product of the so-called 'apocope extrema', a phonological phenomenon in Castillian in the 11th century. The final vowel had first been weakened and become a mere prop vowel in the 10th century (cp. the record *Lope Garsea*, 978 A.D.), eventually to become completely apocopated in proper names in the 11th century. In the case of **Lobo* > **Lob* this also entailed devoicing of the now final consonant, i.e. *Lop*. This phenomenon first occurred when the names stood in proclitic position, but it was then extended to other positions as well (e.g., *Don Lop*). Apocope extrema appears to have been a diastratic phenomenon, perhaps

confined to the higher layers of society. Some of the forms thus created are still in use, e.g. *Hernan* < *Fernando*. When the social factors that had favoured apocope extrema changed, the effects of the sound change were undone. While most names that were so affected were refurbished with their original *-o*, in the case of *Lope* and *Felipe* an unetymological *-e* was added, after the model of words like *prinçep* > *principe* 'prince' where the *-e* is historically justified (Lapesa 1951, 1975). This process has nothing to do with VpN.

9. Greek

We will turn to various instances of VpN involving Greek next.

9.1. The possibly language-internal case of the Boeotian nominatives in ˉε (*-e*) (6th century B.C.), then ˉει (*-ei*; both = [ɛː]), later also -ι (*-i*; reflecting the development of the vowels to [iː]), and finally also sigmatised -η(ς) (*-ē(s)*) and -εις (*-eis*; Vottero 1985: 407) was already pointed out in the introduction; cf. examples like Θιττε (*T^{h}itte*), Πτωιλλει (*Ptōillei*), Μεννει (*Mennei*), Τιμολλει (*Timollei*). It is widely agreed that these names are backformed from vocatives in -ε (*-e*), by lengthening the vowel in the nominative (e.g., Zimmer 1893: 190–197; Brugmann and Delbrück 1893: 397–398; Wackernagel 1920: 309; Schwyzer 1939: 636; Sihler 1995: 224; critical Kretschmer 1895 and Solmsen 1906: 181–182). An indicator for the origin of those names in forms of address is that almost all of them display geminate consonants, typical of hypocoristics and terms of endearment (Vottero 1985: 407).

9.2. Greek forms ending in -ᾰ (*-ă*) like ἱππότα (*hippóta*) 'rider', δέσποτα (*déspota*) 'lord' or νύμφα (*nýmp^{h}a*) 'nymph' probably continue earlier vocatives of *ā*-stems (Brugmann and Delbrück 1892: 651; Sihler 1995: 274; differently Schwyzer 1939: 560–561), but, as mentioned in section 2, this explanation must not be extended to similarly-looking forms in other languages like Macedonian or Latin where the ˉ*a* has different origins. It is notable that this case does not involve personal names, but common nouns with animate reference.

9.3. In a small number of cases there is evidence that the base forms of theonyms were influenced by their respective vocatives. Whereas the usual Greek name of the god Apollo is Ἀπόλλων (*Apóllōn*), in the Thessalian dialect he is called Ἄπλουν (*Áploun*). This has been explained as regular accent retraction in the vocative with subsequent syncope of the medial

vowel in allegro style, i.e. *Ἄπελλον (**Ápellon*) > *Ἄπλον (**Áplon*). This stem was eventually generalised (Kretschmer 1905: 134; Fraenkel 1956: 83–84; Dunkel 1998: 80). Fraenkel even argues that the Attic form Ἀπόλλων (*Apóllōn*) itself instead of older Ἀπέλλων (*Apéllōn*; attested in the Doric dialect) owes its medial *o* to the assimilation in unstressed position to the following vowel in the vocative *Ἄπελλον (**Ápellon*). Finally, Dunkel (1998: 79–81, with reference to previous literature) explains the peculiar vocalism of compound names like Ποσειδῶν (*Poseidō̃n*), Ποτειδάων (*Poteidáōn*) and Ἡρᾰκλῆς (*Hēraklē̃s*) as original vocatives of divine names.

9.4. Now to examples of VpN in situations where names were borrowed from Greek into other languages, in particular in the context of Christianisation. In Syriac, the vocatives of Greek names like *Paule*, *Aleksandre* etc. serve as nominatives beside *Paulōs* and *Aleksandrōs*, etc. (Littmann 1916: 97; Adamik 1987: 4). Since final *-ī* was lost in Syriac, names going back to Latin vocatives in *-ī* or Greek vocatives in -ιε (*-ie* > **-ī*) end in plain consonants, e.g. *mwryḳ* beside *mwryḳys* < *Μαυρίκιος* (*Mauríkios*). When the knowledge of Greek as a spoken language waned and Syriac itself developed into a written, learned language, these 'popular' forms retreated from the literature and the number of Greek names in *-os* increased (Littmann 1916: 98).

9.5. In Coptic, Greek and Latin loan names continuing the vocative like *Geōrge*, *Maximine* etc. are very frequent, even though in high, literary style forms in *-os* also occur (Littmann 1916: 102; Adams 2003: 515). This reinforces the impression that VpN is a phenomenon originating in spoken language contact.

9.6. In Georgian, nominatives like *iv kʿe = Iesu Kʿriste*, *iowane*, *pawle*, *petr*^{e} are again based on Greek vocatives (Littmann 1916: 101; Wackernagel 1920: 310), whereas in neighbouring Armenian Greek names in *-os* preponderate, although occasionally forms occur that could go back to Greek vocatives (Littmann 1916: 101).

9.7. The preceding examples come from countries with more or less intensive linguistic contacts with Greek. Ethiopia lies on the margins of the ancient Greek cultural sphere and the exchange was more via the written than the spoken word. Therefore it comes as no surprise that Greek names in Ethiopian (Amharic) sources generally have the 'learned' ending *-ōs* (Littmann 1916: 104–105).[25]

9.8. Finally, a modern instance of VpN. Except for masculine *o*-stems, which mostly retain the inherited ending *-e*, the vocative of Modern Greek is identical with the accusative and ends in the bare stem vowel (Ruge 1997: 32–37). Only one subclass of masculine *o*-stem nouns forms its vocative according to the same, clearly productive, pattern. This includes γέρος (*géros*) 'old man', but also many personal names, like Αλέκο (*Aléko*), Γιόργο (*Giórgo*), Πέτρο (*Pétro*). The linchpin for the extensive merger of accusative and vocative may perhaps be sought in the question πως σε λένε (*pōs se léne*) 'what's your name?', which literally means 'how does one call you?' and asks for the accusative. Alternatively, the identity of vocatives and accusatives in stem-classes with vowel-final base forms may have been the trigger for this phenomenon. In any case, the Modern Greek vocative underlies the names of many Greek emigrants in modern Germany: countless people with the name Γιάννης (*Giánnēs*, pronounced ['janis]) are more or less officially known as *Janni* in German; the German pop singer *Costa Cordalis* was born in Greece as Κονσταντίνος Κορδάλης (*Konstantínos Kordálēs*). Κόστα (*Kósta*) is the vocative of Κόστας (*Kóstas*), the hypocoristically shortened form of the first name. It is noteworthy that the surname, which is not used in familiar forms of address, is retained in the nominative in the German version of the name.

10. Slavic

The Slavic languages, medieval and modern, provide numerous and diverse examples for VpN, some of them certain, some more hypothetical and amenable to alternative explanations. This makes research into aspects of the Slavic vocative a particularly interesting field because many Slavic languages retain it as a vivid and morphologically rich category, whereas those languages that do not have it any more lost it relatively recently in the historic period. Thus its demise can be studied in the extant documents. Neither is VpN restricted to situations of language contact in Slavic, but there are more or less clear examples of language-internal cases as well.

10.1. A language that is said to have lost the vocative very early is Russian. First traces of this process have been claimed to be observable as early as the 11th century (see the literature cited in Straxov 2004: 111–112). Straxov (2004) subjects the problem of the interchange of vocatives and nominatives, and of vocative morphology, to a detailed investigation and comes to the dissenting conclusion that the alleged cases of early loss of vocatives are rather due to certain practices in the translation and transliteration of Greek texts into Russian and other Church Slavonic

traditions (Straxov 2004: 111–115). Of interest for the present study are those cases where vocatives appear in positions where nominatives or other cases would be expected. Again, Straxov's approach is the same: partly, the examples have nothing do to with linguistic phenomena as such, but are due to the slavish translation and mechanical transliteration from Greek into Russian (Straxov 2004: 115–116),[26] or they result from misunderstandings (Straxov 2004: 117), or they find some other bookish explanation. For example, he argues that the abbreviation *апло* (*aplo*) referring to the female saint Thekla, renders the Greek masc. *ἀπόστολος* (*apóstolos*; with omission of the final *-s*) and must not to be understood as the feminine Church Slavonic vocative *апостоло* (*apostolo*; Straxov 2004: 118–119). In some instances, vocative forms in place of other cases seem to be triggered by a laudatory context, that is to say, in a context that is fundamentally that of eulogy, whereby the name of the praised saint may be syntactically attracted to the address inherent in the situation (Straxov 2004: 122). As Straxov puts the matter, the question of these apparent vocatives is not one pertaining to 'language', but to 'texts' and to the mechanics of textual translation and transmsission. It is noteworthy that the phenomenon seems to be restricted to the names of Christian saints in hymnography and literature derived from it (Straxov 2004: 119–120).

10.2. In the second part of his study, Straxov (2004: 124–133) makes reference to another, related phenomenon that is more *sprachwirklich* than the previous ones. In various medieval Slavic church traditions, members of the clergy bore names that were properly the vocatives of their patron saints' names. These names could be used in all syntactic functions in written documents. Examples of this type can be explained by the transposition of forms by which the saints were addressed in the church service, first to anthroponomy, then into written texts. Unlike the examples described in the preceding paragraph, such names are genuine examples of VpN. Their learned origin, however, is betrayed by their morphology. Names like *Гєѡргиє* (*Geōrgije*) or *Николае* (*Nikolae*) are formally Greek vocatives; the proper Slavic vocatives would be *Гєѡргию* (*Geōrgiju*) or *Николаю* (*Nikolaju*). For a subgroup of such names, a predilection for 'vocatival' forms may have been prompted because of phonotactic reasons: after the loss of final *-ъ* (*-ŭ* = 'yor') in the spoken Slavic languages, names like *Петре* (*Petre*), *Павле* (*Pavle*), *Митре* (*Mitre*) etc. had the advantage of ending in an open syllable instead of a consonant cluster.

10.3. In Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian epic poetry, vocatives can be used in subject position, but this is restricted to masculine nouns, overwhelmingly

personal names and titles, rarely animals or things, ending in consonants, e.g.

(7) *vino pije silan-ø car-ø Stjepan-e*
wine.acc.sg drink.3sg strong-nom.sg emperor-nom.sg Stjepan-voc.sg
'the strong emperor Stjepan is drinking wine'

(only *Stjepane* being in the vocative, but not the title *car*, nor the adjective *silan*),

(8) *netko bješe Strahinić-u ban-e,*
someone.nom.sg be.pst.3sg Strahinić-voc.sg ban-voc.sg
bješe ban-e u malen-oj Banjsk-oj
be.pst.3sg ban-voc.sg in little-loc.sg Banjska-loc.sg
'there was a Ban Strahinić, he was Ban in little Banjska'

(both the name *Strahinić* and the title *ban* are in the vocative). This usage, which is not a feature of the spoken language, may have its origin in performances during which the praised hero was actually present and addressed by the singer, but it developed into an artificial device with the practical metrical advantage of providing the desired trochaic rhythm where the nominative would not yield it (Leskien 1870: 174; Brugmann and Delbrück 1893: 398; Vondrák 1906–1908, 2: 261–262; Vaillant 1977: 24; Vermeer 1994: 152). Svennung (1958: 410) mentions the same phenomenon also for Ukrainian popular songs.

10.4. Less certain and, at any rate, more complex is the possible case for VpN in the Slavic language of medieval Novgorod and neighbouring towns. This North-Russian dialect has been transmitted on birch bark letters from the 11th–15th centuries. In these documents, the ending of the nominative of masculine *o*-stem nouns is unexpectedly *-e*, in contrast to *-ъ* (*-ŭ*) in all other Slavic languages (Zaliznjak 2004: 99–106). Numerous explanations have been proposed for which at first sight looks like a mysterious ending. Relevant for the present study are the ones advocated by Vermeer (1991, 1994) and recently by Kwon (2009). Both scholars argue for the analogical introduction of the ending *-e* of the vocative into the nominative, albeit with differences in the paths chosen. The starting point for both explanations is the paradigm of masculine *o*-stem nouns in Proto-Slavic. The inherited Proto-Indo-European nominative singular **-os* developed regularly into Proto-Savic **-o* (or **-ă* at an early period), the accusative **-om* into short **-ŭ*, traditionally written **-ъ* in Slavic linguistics. This state of affairs is not attested in Slavic as such, but it can be

reconstructed fairly securely for Proto-Slavic.[27] Since the resulting masculine ending *-*o* (*-*ă*) was identical with that of the neuter *o*-stems, there was pressure within the system to differentiate the two categories, in order to maintain a morphological distinction between masculines and neuters. In all Slavic languages with the exception of the dialect of Novgorod and the surrounding area, this end was achieved by introducing the nominative ending of the *u*-stems -ъ (see Majer 2011 for various hypotheses relating to this replacement). Only occasionally have traces of the earlier ending -*o* survived (for one of them, see section 10.5. below).

The solution for the origin of nominative -*e* in the dialect of Novgorod, proposed by Vermeer (1991, 1994), is that this ending had been taken over analogically from the *i̯o*-stems. The reason why speakers of Slavic in Novgorod did not proceed in tandem with the rest of Slavic, is, according to Vermeer (1994: 148–149), that the language of Novgorod built on a strong Finnic substrate. Although Finnic languages possess an elaborate case system, this system differs from that of Slavic in two essential points: the Finnic system has no vocative, but uses the nominative in situations of address; and in Finnic, the object is usually marked by an overt ending different from that of the nominative in the singular (Vermeer 1994: 149; Hakulinen 1957: 62). Common Slavic *-ъ for the nom. would have obliterated the distinction between the nominative, the subject case, and the accusative, the object case, which was also -ъ < *-*om*. Therefore *-*e*, the nominative of the masculine *i̯o*-stems, suggested itself, which in the situation of language shift had the advantage for speakers of Finnic of introducing the familiar formal identity of nominative and vocative into the *o*-stems. Note, however, that the ending *-*e* of the *i̯o*-stem nominative and vocative required by Vermeer's analogy is merely reconstructed. Although its previous presence in the language is not implausible, the fact remains that it is not attested as such.

Therefore a different explanation, likewise invoking the vocative as linchpin for the change, was proposed by Kwon (2009). He makes the observation that the nominative singular ending -*e* of the *o*-stems is best attested among personal names, and is longest retained there, whereas the standard Russian ending -ъ/-Ø encroached slowly upon common nouns. He argues that the vocative ending was introduced as an animacy marker on personal names in this dialect, i.e. as a differential subject marker, to rescue masculines from being confused with neuters, at an early period when the nominative ending of *o*-stems was still inherited *-*o*. There is further evidence that animacy had a great – and early – salience in the dialect of Novgorod, in contrast to the other Slavic languages (Kwon 2009: 50–51). During a liminal period, when the vocative as a morphological category faded out, that is, at a time when some speakers still used the mor-

phologically marked vocative in its original function, but when it had already disappeared from the active grammar of others, "the ending could have embraced all *o*-stem nouns and further agreeing parts of speech" (Kwon 2009: 49), in a process of over-generalisation. Like Vermeer (1994), Kwon reckons with the substratal influence of speakers of Finnic.

Even though Vermeer's and Kwon's accounts differ in the details, the precise details are of no concern for the present study. What is important is that both accounts reckon with a situation of language shift to Slavic by speakers of Finnic languages who were unfamiliar with the distinction between nominative and vocative in their original languages, and for whom therefore the formal identity of the two cases would have been no matter for concern. Thus, if one of these two explanations of Novgorodian *-e* is correct, we are not looking at a simple case of VpN, but rather at the spread of the vocative ending within the paradigm, triggered by complex inter-paradigmatic analogies, possibly crossing linguistic borders.

10.5. Leskien (1870: 173–174) cites Russian dialectal forms like *(o)ратаюшко* (*(o)ratajuško*) 'dear ploughman', which is not only used as the regular *ā*-stem vocative of *(o)ратаюшка* (*(o)ratajuška*) 'ploughman' (term of endearment beside unmarked *оратай* (*orataj*)), but which gave rise to a new paradigm *(o)ратаюшко*, gen. *-ка* (*(o)ratajuško, -ka*), i.e. inflecting like a neuter *o*-stem. To this may perhaps be added the Ukrainian surnames in *-nko* that may ultimately find their origin in a similar process. Furthermore, Leskien (l.c.) suggests that Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian masculine names in *-o*, like *Ivo*, *Mirko*, *Ranko*,[28] be regarded as original vocatives of *ā*-stems, used in hypocoristic function for male persons (cp. *Ivo* beside *Ivica*, both from *Ivan*, or *Joško* beside *Joška*, both from *Josip*).[29] An argument against this explanation is that even though Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian is a language where the inflectionally marked vocative is quite alive, in the current grammar the vocative is identical with the nominative exactly in the masculine hypocoristic names ending in *-a*. Furthermore, relatively few variant forms in *-o* and *-a* can actually be found side by side of each other, derived from the same onomastic base (like *Ivica* beside *Ivo*). Leskien (l.c.) provides the alternative explanation that the feminine vocative ending *-o* had been analogically transferred to masculine names, for which he adduces further support from Modern Bulgarian (e.g. *безаконико* (*bezakoniko*) as vocative of *безаконик* (*bezakonik*) 'lawless man'). Vondrák (1906–1908, 1: 401) provides more Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian words of this structure, not restricted to anthroponyms, but all, often in a derogatory manner, referring to persons: *gúbo* 'mangy one', *gúšo* 'cankery one', *krézo* 'toothless one', *bráto* < *brȁt* 'brother', *médo* <

mèdvjed ‘bear’, but he does not specify whether these words can be inflected.

However, an altogether different explanation is available for those names. The *-o* could simply be the regular outcome of Proto-Indo-European *-*os*, the ending of the masculine *o*-stems (see section 10.4. above), which survived marginally in anthroponomy, whereas the inherited ending was replaced by analogical *-ъ elsewhere. Similar-looking names like *Marco* in Romance languages in contact with South Slavic may have reinforced the resilience of the names in *-o* against the spread of the new ending *-ъ. In the same manner, the Serbian nominatives *Miloje*, *Blagoje*, for which Leskien also assumes a vocative origin, can be regarded as the regular outcomes of names in *-i̯os*.

10.6. In Slovene, which lost the vocative some time after the 14th century (Vaillant 1977: 22), there is a group of names that have an *-e* in the nominative, but whose stems end in *-et-* in the oblique cases, e.g. *France* (gen. *Franceta*), *Tone*, *Lojze*, but also *oče* ‘father’. The straightforward explanation of such forms is that the productive suffix *-et-* < *-ęt-, which attached to words for little animals in Proto-Slavic, was extended to names of persons as well. A more circuitous way to account for them is to assume that when the inherited vocative became obsolete in Slovene, the forms ending in *-e*, the erstwhile vocatives of *o*-stem nouns, were no longer understood as such and were accordingly reinterpreted as nominatives of *et*-stems. Straxov (2004: 131 fn. 31) makes a similar observation regarding the anthroponyms of 15th-century Dubrovnik, but seems to decide against the origin of names like *Лавре* (*Lavre*), *Жоре* (*Žore*), *Мароє* (*Maroje*) etc. in vocatives.

10.7. In colloquial Polish, the vocative can be used as subject, e.g.

(9) *Lechu* *nie* *przyszed-ł*
Lech-voc.sg neg come.pst-m
‘Lech has not come’

vs. standard *Lech nie przyszedł* (Kwon 2009: 48 fn. 6).

10.8. Modern Russian and its dialects provide a few further examples of VpN. High dignitaries of the Russian orthodox church are addressed as *владыко* (*vladyko*), the vocative of *владыка* (*vladyka*) ‘ruler’. This vocative is often incorrectly used for the nominative with reference to bishops and patriarchs. Straxov (2004: 125) quotes an example of VpN from dialectal Russian of the 20th century:

(10) *шчо-бы* *да-л* *тибе* *Господ-и*
ščo-by da-l t'ib'e Gospod'-i
that.subj give.pst-m 2sg.dat Lord-voc.sg
'may the Lord give you'

where *Господи* (*Gospod'i*) is vocative. Even though these examples from Russian may look like language-internal instances of VpN at first sight, they are more correctly ascribed to language contact. The vocatives do not originate in Russian itself, but rather have been borrowed from Church Slavonic, the language of the church, a related but nevertheless foreign idiom in which the vocative as a grammatical category still survives.

11. Finnish

In Finnish, which in the course of its history absorbed a large number of loanwords from its neighbouring languages, I identified two or three possible instances of VpN. Whereas Slavic words of the *o*-declension are usually borrowed as words ending in *-a* or *-u* in Finnish (see footnote 22 above), Slavic **pǎpъ*, later *popъ* 'priest', appears in Finnish as *pappi* 'cleric'. In view of the change of final **-e* > *-i*, which Finnish underwent in its prehistory (Hakulinen 1957: 22), the explanation suggests itself that the word for 'cleric' was borrowed from the Proto-Slavic vocative **pǎpe*. Since Finnish does not have a vocative case, this reinterpretation can be considered trivial by now. Something similar may underly the personal name *Petri* 'Peter' < **Petre* (cp. what was said about *Petre* in section 10.4. above). Finally, perhaps this explanation extends also to the common noun *risti* 'cross', which is usually derived from Old Russian *крьстъ* (*krьstъ*) 'cross', itself a loan from Old High German *krist* 'Christ, crucifix' (Kallio 2006: 156). However, perhaps the borrowed form was rather the vocative **kriste*, the form of address of the crucified 'Christ'. A difficulty with this explanation of *pappi* etc. resides in the fact that the stem vowel of those nouns remains *-i-* throughout the paradigm, e.g., gen. *papin*, *Petrin*, *kristin*, whereas in inherited '*e*-stems' *-i* in the nominative alternates with *-e-* elsewhere, e.g., *vesi*, gen. *veden* 'water'. In order for the present explanation to be correct, it must be assumed that the vowel *i* of the nominative was generalised throughout the paradigm. Seeing that the '*i*-stem' declension has become productive in Finnish, especially for loanwords, the explanation advanced here is a reasonable alternative to an exclusively phonological account of equations like *popъ* ~ *pappi* (see, e.g., Kallio 2006: 156).

12. Old Prussian

Old Prussian is an extinct Baltic language, closely related to Lithuanian and Latvian, spoken east of modern Gdańsk. It died out in the 17th or 18th century. The earliest extensive document about Prussia is the 14th-century *Cronica Terre Prussie*, an account of the Teutonic Order's crusade against the non-Christian Prussians, written by the German Peter of Dusburg. The chronicle contains a considerable number of Old Prussian male personal names (collected in Stifter 2008: 291–293), a large portion of which ends in *-e*. This is surprising, inasmuch as Old Prussian had no inflectional class that ended in *-e* in the nominative. However, like all Baltic languages, Old Prussian possessed a vocative case, while Middle High German did not. Therefore I proposed to regard at least a subset of those names in *-e* as Old Prussian vocatives, most probably of the *o*-stem declension, mistaken for nominatives by the Teutonic knights. Such an explanation suggests itself, for example, for the name *Wilke*, which looks like the expected Old Prussian vocative of *wilkis* 'wolf'.

13. Old English

Old English provides one somewhat uncertain example of VpN. The 8th-century manuscript N of *Caedmon's Hymn* uses the noun *scepen* 'creator' for the subject in line 6, where the other manuscripts have the grammatically expected form *sceppend*. Notwithstanding the divergence in the single *p*, Jiriczek (1912: 279) refers to other examples of OE vocatives in *-n* (identified by Bülbring 1896) and suggests that scribe N, writing in the Northumbrian dialect of Old English, had used the form of the vocative for the nominative in this particular instance. However, this instance of VpN is different from most others discussed in this paper in that it is not a case of simple transference of the vocative form to the nominative, but in that it is rather due to the analogy of other stem classes where the two cases were identical, so that the formal distinction between them could get blurred. Furthermore, it is not completely ruled out that *-n* < *-nd* is simply an early example of a phonetic development that became more widespread in later Middle English.

14. Celtic

From the Neo-Celtic languages, i.e. the medieval Middle British and the modern Gaelic languages, several examples of VpN can be cited, both of language-external and language-internal nature.

14.1. The British Celtic languages lost all final syllables, i.e. the endings inherited from Proto-Celtic, in their prehistory. Nevertheless, on occasion these lost endings have left synchronic effects, inasmuch as grammatical categories that historically ended in a vowel trigger lenition (or 'soft mutation') on a following word. While masculine nouns and names typically continue non-leniting categories, male personal names (but also place names) – in all syntactical contexts – may trigger lenition on nouns and adjectives standing in apposition to them, e.g. Welsh *Dafydd frenin* 'King David' (< *brenhin* 'king'), *Hywel Dda* 'Hywel the Good' (< *da* 'good'), *Llandeilo Fawr* 'Great Llandeilo' (< *mawr* 'big, great'), *Llundain dref* 'London town' (< *tref* 'town'); Middle Breton offers *Ian Vadezour* 'John the Baptist' (< *badezour*) (Strachan 1909: 12; Morris Jones 1931: 42–43; Evans 1964: 15; Hemon 1975: 17). This behaviour could find its explanation in a generalised vocative form of the personal name,[30] the vocative having ended in **-e* in Proto-Celtic *o*-stem nouns. But caution needs to be applied: this special rule of lenition "only applies when the noun is a title or epithet specially applicable to the proper name; when it is an adventitious addition, inserted as it were parenthetically by way of explanation, it is generally not mutated" (Morris-Jones 1931: 43), e.g. unmutated *Paul gwas Duw* 'Paul, the servant of God' (not †*was*), *Rolant tywyssawc lluoed* 'Roland, the leader of the hosts' (not †*dywyssawc*).[31] Furthermore, in very old names, the adjectival epithet is also often unmutated, e.g. *Rhodri Mawr* 'Rhodri the Great' or *Dyfnwal Moelmud* 'Domnall the Bald and Silent'; names of major religious significance like *Iesu* 'Jesus' and *Duw* 'God' also show exceptional behaviour. Williams (1938: lxxix–lxxx) makes similar remarks about the fact that the presence of lenition after personal names is not as regular in early Middle Welsh as it appears in the classical language. Taking this as his starting point, Zimmer (1997: 1038–1044) proposes that the synchronically rather unpredictable presence of lenition after names in early texts could reflect the complex mutational effects of the names according to their syntactic function, i.e. lenition after old genitives, datives and vocatives, but non-lenition after nominatives and accusatives of male names, parallel to the systematic distribution of these effects obtaining in Old Irish. Even though Zimmer's statistics, derived from the early Middle Welsh tale *Culhwch ac Olwen*, are slanting towards his suggestion, the evidence does not unequivocally bear out the idea and

could perhaps be explained differently. Ultimately, because of the complex distribution of the phenomenon in British, the situation is not easy to assess. However, even Zimmer is ready to accept that VpN may be invoked as the explanation at least for the lenition following divine or mythical names (1997: 1041).

14.2. The re-interpretation of vocatives as nominatives is not restricted to the pre-modern period, cp. the recent case *Hamish*, a name current in modern Scotland, which is the anglicised spelling of *á Sheumais* [(ə) heːməʃ], the Scots-Gaelic vocative of nominative *Seumas* [ʃeːməs] 'James'. A similar process lies behind the anglicisation *Vaughn* ← Welsh *fychan* [vəxan], vocative of *bychan* 'small one', and the anglicisation *Vevin* ← Irish *á Bhéibhinn* [(ə) vʲeːvʲənʲ], vocative of *Béibhinn* [bʲeːvʲənʲ], Old Irish *Bé Find* [b$^{(j)}$eː v$^{(j)}$ind] 'fair woman', and its modern and purely superficial association with the Norman name *Vivian*.

15. Tocharian

For the Indo-European branch of Tocharian, a family comprising the two extinct languages Tocharian A ('Turfanian') and Tocharian B ('Kuchean'), spoken in the 1st mill. A.D. in the Tarim Basin, Malzahn (2000) made the pertinent proposal that in Tocharian B the three duals *ñaktene* 'pair of gods', *eṅwene* 'pair of men', *pacere* 'parents (lit. pair of fathers)' show the unexpected ending *-e*. Whereas the regular ending, i.e. various allophonically conditioned reflexes of Proto-Tocharian *-*ä* [ə], can be traced back directly to the PIE *o*-stem nominative dual ending *-*oh*$_1$, this is not possible for -*e*. Malzahn suggests that it continues the allomorph *-*o*, regularly shortened from *-*oh*$_1$ in pausa, i.e. in vocative usage. This explanation is phonologically possible, but see below for the plausibility of this explanation against the typological background.

16. Varia

Finally, I want to refer to a few isolated instances of VpN or phenomena that are reminiscent of it:

16.1. In Assyrian, the vocative of divine names, consisting of the bare stem, has become the usual form of those names, cp. *Bēl* 'God Lord', but *bēlu* 'lord' or *Šamaš* 'God Sun', but *šamšu* 'sun' (Littmann 1916: 96; Wackernagel 1920: 310).

16.2. In Hittite 'naming constructions', endingless forms, identical with the vocative, are used to introduce new names. This applies to names of persons, e.g. *MUNUS-aš ŠUM=šet* ^{f}*Šintalimeni* '(there was) a woman, her name was Šintalimeniš' (KUB 33.121 ii 5), as well as to non-anthroponyms, e.g. *URU-aš ŠUM-an=šet* ^{UR}*[*^{U}*Š]udul*, '(there was) a town, its name was Šudul' (KUB 24.8 i 7) (Hoffner and Melchert 2008: 244–245).

16.3. It is possible that the hypocoristic suffix *-i* of South German, which can be attached to almost any truncated name (e.g., *Michaela* → *Michi*, *Rudolf* → *Rudi*, *Eleonora* → *Elli*, *David* → *Dadi*),[32] finds its origin in the Latin vocative of such *i̯o*-stem gentilic names which became recycled as individual names after the demise of the classical Latin naming formula. The pattern could have been set by *Antonius*, vocative *Antoni* → truncated *Toni* (Petersmann 1998: 134) whence it became extremely productive.

17. Evaluation

We can now proceed to an assessment of the material collected in the preceding sections. The examples have been taken from a relatively small area (Europe, North Africa, Near East). They span almost 4,000 years and are taken from the Indo-European, Afro-Asiatic, Finno-Ugric and Tyrsenian language families and from the isolates Iberian and Basque. More than twenty languages have been cited as recipients of VpN, and around fifteen as donors. I am confident that much more material from all regions and linguistic families of the world could be added to the collection.[33] I am furthermore confident that – how ever limited – the sample is representative enough to allow the drawing of some preliminary generalisations concerning the phenomenon of VpN:

1. VpN occurs particularly often in language contact, i.e. language-externally, but it can also be found, albeit with less frequency, in non-contact situations, i.e. language-internally. Some of the cited language-internal cases are ambiguous, however, e.g. British (14.1.), Old English (13.), Slovene (10.6.), or difficult to assess, e.g. Old Novgorodian (10.4.).

2. Language-external VpN typically happens when the donor language possesses a morphologically marked vocative and the recipient language does not.[34] The reason for this is obviously that, given the token frequency of vocatives, especially of personal names, in natural conversation when calling for the attention of the

partners in conversation, speakers of languages without vocatives would not be able to expect that the very frequently used form of a name was not actually the base form. It is noteworthy that the possible, but ambiguous language-internal cases of British, Old English and Slovene occurred in languages that have lost the vocative; they are thus equivalent to external loans into languages without vocative.

3. VpN seems to be restricted to the singular. There are two obvious reasons for this: vocatives are typically used in the personal address of individuals, and, intimately connected with this, morphologically marked vocatives of non-singular numbers are lacking in many languages. The alleged case of VpN of three dual nouns in Tocharian B (15.) is peculiar in that it would be the only such non-singular example in the sample. This fact casts some doubt on the explanation, but does not falsify it. Maybe better examples for non-singular VpN will be discovered elsewhere in the languages of the world.

4. VpN typically affects personal names. Names of humans make up the bulk of the material, names of gods are far behind in second place.[35] This tendency finds a natural explanation in the frequency of vocatives of personal names in natural speech, whereas the use of theonyms is restricted to much more specific contexts.

5. VpN of names of humans occurs mostly language-externally, whereas VpN of names of gods tends to occur predominantly language-internally (e.g., 4. Etruscan which borrowed Italic theonyms in the nominative). The reason for this lies perhaps in the fact that situations that entail the invocation of deities are rarer in language-contact scenarios than those which entail direct interpersonal contact.

6. Much rarer are cases of VpN of non-anthroponymic or non-theonymic nouns. Where certain examples can be found, these typically involve referents high up on the animacy hierarchy, e.g. titles (e.g., 8.1. Latin *domine* ‘master’ in various languages, 10.3. Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian *bane* ‘lord’), agent nouns (e.g., Greek 9.2. ἱππότα (*hippóta*) ‘rider’, 11. Finnish *pappi* ‘cleric’, 13. Old English *scepen*) or terms for classes of people (6.3. Basque *agure* ‘old man’), which in natural discourse would have a reasonably

high token frequency in forms of direct address. If the explanation of the three Tocharian B duals *ñaktene* 'pair of gods', *eṅwene* 'pair of men', *pacere* 'parents' (15.) should be correct, it is noteworthy that they also fall in this class of words. Isolated instances of VpN of non-human referents are very uncertain (e.g., 6.1. Iberian *seśte* as a numismatic term). The possible case of Finnish *risti* 'cross' (11.) is only an apparent exception since it ultimately goes back to the name of Christ.

7. The only systematic exception to the restriction against VpN of inanimate nouns are the Old Novgorodian nouns and participles in *-e* (10.4.), but it must be noted that their explanation as continuing vocatives is only a possibility. It is possible that VpN was one or *the* factor that created the starting base among personal names, from which the nominative ending *-e* eventually spread to all masculine *o*-stem nouns in an analogical extension which as such has nothing to do with VpN. I therefore draw the tentative conclusion from the case of Novgorodian that where VpN of common nouns seems to be attested, it is best ascribed to a secondary, analogical overgeneralisation that has to do with language-internal morphological rules, but not with VpN proper. This could also apply to 13. Old English *scepen* 'creator', if it belongs here at all.

The more general conclusion of the foregoing survey is that instead of being a rare phenomenon, the re-interpretation of vocatives of one language as nominatives in another language seems to be rather the rule in situations where languages with morphologically encoded vocatives come into contact with languages without it, and that similar things can occur, albeit under slightly different conditions, in language-internal developments. VpN tended to be treated as a marginal, if not exotic aberration in that it seemed to disregard the inflectional morphology and the grammatical categories of the donor languages. I hope to have demonstrated in this paper that quite to the contrary VpN is a widespread and – if I may say so – trivial phenomenon. In situations of language contact, not the category as such is borrowed in VpN, but a categorial marker of L1 is re-interpreted by speakers of L2.[36] This type of re-interpretation is more likely to occur when knowledge of L1 is limited or lacking (which in itself is indicative of not very intensive bilingualism; e.g., 4. Etruscan, 12. Old Prussian, 14.2. Gaelic). A situation where VpN obtains does not preclude the possibility that at the same or in a different period under sociolinguistically different

circumstances nominatives can be borrowed as base forms as well (e.g., 7.2. Neo-Punic, 9.4. Syriac). For situations of language contact about which only insufficient historical information is available these broad tendencies may allow to make inferences about the level of knowledge of the target languages.

Notes

* The work on this paper was undertaken as part of the project P20755-G03 'Old Celtic language remains in Austria' (http://www.univie.ac.at/austria-celtica/), funded by the FWF (Austrian Science Fund). I thank Anna Adaktylos, Joaquín Gorrochategui, Anders Jørgensen, Corinna Scheungraber, Stefan Schumacher, Rex Wallace and Paul Widmer for help and input.
The following abbreviations are used:
X = reconstructed form; X = reconstructed form that as such happens not to be attested in the historic corpus of a language but which can be generated with great confidence by synchronic grammatical rules; †X = wrong form (re)constructed for the sake of making a point; gen. = genitive, Gr. = Greek, Lat. = Latin, nom. = nominative, PIE = Proto-Indo-European, voc. = vocative, VpN = Vocatiuus pro Nominatiuo.

1. 'And Thyestes left it in turn to Agamemnon to carry', a quote from *Iliad* 2, 107. *T^{h}ýest'* is for unelided *T^{h}ýesta*, the vocative of nominative *T^{h}yéstēs*, which would be expected here. Note that Priscian's text below, although quoting the same passage, differs in the verb.

2. (i) *censor-em=ue* *tu-um* *uel* *quod*
censor-acc.sg=or 2sg.poss-acc.sg or because
trabeat-e *salut-as*
wearing a trabea-voc.sg.pred greet-2sg
'or because you, wearing a trabea [a knight's robe], (can) greet your censor'

3. (ii) *mact-e* *uirtut-e* *es-to*
blessed-voc.sg.pred excellence-abl.sg be-2sg.imp
'be blessed by excellence!'

4. (iii) *tu* *quam* *grat-us* *erga* *me*
2sg.nom how grateful-nom.sg.pred towards 1sg.acc
fueri-s
be.pst.subj.-2sg
'how grateful you were towards me' (Cicero, *ad Atticum* 9, 11, A, 3)

5 . There is a conceptual overlap of vocatives and imperatives. Littmann (1916: 110–111) draws attention to a number of cases where borrowing of the im-

perative as stem form of verbs has taken place (e.g., Greek loan verbs in Coptic). Cp. also Svennung (1958: 411).

6. Including zero-endings, as long as they are distinct from nominatives or the stem forms of the words.
7. Naturally, the reverse may also happen, that is, a nominative of the donor language being re-interpreted as a vocative in the recipient language because of surface similarity. A new nominative could then be backformed, like Oscan nom. *Herklos** ← Etruscan *Hercle* (Devoto 1928: 321).
8. One subtype of this is the typically language-internal generalisation of 'internal shortening' ("innere Kürzung", Kretschmer 1905: 132–134; Fraenkel 1956: 82–83). It involves the extension of originally intimate hypocoristics to general use, like German *Kurt* < *Kuonrât*, Italian *Dante* < *Durante*, French *sire* < *seniorem* etc.
9. The vocative-like status of this form can for example be seen in the fact that it cannot be used as the subject of a sentence.
10. Matters are complicated by the fact that the word for 'god' may itself be a loan from a Sabellic language (Wallace 2008: 128), originally perhaps an *o*-stem **aisos* (Untermann 2000: 68–69). If this is the case, Proto-Etruscan **aise* could again be due to the borrowing of a vocative.
11. There may have been a variant nominative singular of Latin gentilic names ending in *-i* instead of *-ius*, but its exact assessment is difficult. See Kaimio (1970) for a study of the phenomenon.
12. Etruscan had no vowel *o*, it is substituted by *u* in loans. The fact that the final nasal in Greek words shows up as *-m* in Etruscan may be due to an Italic language as mediator.
13. Schürr (2003) ascribes the origin of *Esimne* to Euganean, an otherwise unknown language in the Alps. For a different, more cautious assessment of *Essimnus*/*Essibnus* see Stifter forthc.
14. Untermann (1980: 48) mentions four possible instances of retention of Gaulish *-os*, viz. *anaioś* [B.1.36, .37], *biulakoś* [A.33–13], *botilkoś* [A.100–10,–11], *noukoś* [B.5.1.]. The first of these is surely to be connected with the Latin(ised) gentilic name *Annaeus*, for *botilkos* Untermann compares Gaul. *Bodilicus*; the others are without obvious parallels.
15. A longer list of Celtic names in Iberian texts from Ensérune in southern France was compiled by Ruiz Darasse (2010), but this article came to my attention too late to be fully included here. For a fuller treatment of the topic see also Stifter forthc.
16. On the picture of the inscription (http://www2.uah.es/imagines_cilii/fotos_cilii/14/cilii14,0301.jpg), I am only able to make out the final *ŕ*.

17. At the same time, these loans show that the involved Old Celtic languages had no *s*-less vocative in the consonantal-stem declension, i.e. the vocative of this declension did not consist of the plain stem.
18. Cp. section 8.1. on Latin below.
19. In particular, Karen Larsdatter's website *Basque Onomastics of the Eighth to Sixteenth Centuries* (http://larsdatter.com/basque/) records no instance of *Martie*.
20. For example:
    (iv) *C. Fuf-i Maxim-e uix-it an(nos) XXXV*
    Caius Fufius-voc.sg Maximus-voc.sg live.pst-3sg year-acc-pl 35
    'C. Fufius Maximus lived 35 years' (CIL 8 1,2110).
    See also Svennung (1958: 395).
21. As such, the *signa* themselves appear to represent instances of VpN; cp. Adams (2003: 512 fn. 295).
22. Szemerényi (1977: 153–154) wants to derive the basic kinship terms of Indo-European from vocatives, too, but his etymological proposals strain credulity on formal grounds and will therefore not be included in this survey.
23. Incidentally, in the corresponding Vedic vocative *dyauḥ pitar* exactly the opposite happened: the vocative was supplanted by the form of the nominative.
24. Latin *deus*, unlike all other *o*-stem nouns, has no vocative distinct from the nominative.
25. Where Ethiopian sources have forms that look more vocatival, e.g. *Anṭōnā* and *Anṭōnī* beside regular *Anṭōniōs*, Littmann (1916: 105) suspects Coptic, Arabic or Syriac intermediaries.
26. Note also that some of the vocative forms used in Russian texts do not conform with Russian morphophonology, but are rather borrowed as such from Greek, cp. the vocative архистратиге (*arxistratige*) < ἀρχιστράτηγε (*ark^{h}istrátēge*) instead of expected архистратиже (*arxistratiže*) with palatalised guttural, or Тимоѳеѥ (*Timoθeje*) < Τιμόθεε (*Timót^{h}ee*) instead of Тимоѳею (*Timoθeju*) with the ending appropriate to the 'soft' stem (Straxov 2004: 120–121).
27. This is not the place to go into the details of the fundamental problems besetting the reflex of Proto-Indo-European **-os* in Slavic. An extensive literature devoted to this question exists, as do alternative accounts of the developments; see, e.g., Vermeer (1991: 280–281), Kwon (2009: 46–47), and Majer (2011: 353) for further literature and for weighty arguments in favour of the assumption presented above. I want to add a further argument, apparently not mentioned in the literature so far: whereas in early loans from Slavic into Finnic the ending of the *o*-stem masculine nominative singular -ъ is usually represented by *u* (cp. *Turku* [name of a town] < Sl. *tъrgъ* 'marketplace'), in some loanwords this ending is reflected by *-a* which points to early

Slavic *-*ă* (later > -*o*), i.e. *pakana* ‘pagan’ < Sl. **păgānă/ъ* (later *poganъ*), *kuoma* ‘godparent, friend’ < Slavic **kōmă/ъ* (cp. Old Russian *кумъ* [*kumъ*] ‘godfather’), unless the feminine form **kōmā* (cp. Old Russian *кума* [*kuma*]) was borrowed. This Slavic *-*ă* could be the inherited vowel *-*o*, before it was replaced by -ъ.

28. Regarding the frequent use of *Марко* (*Marko*) instead of the expected *Маркъ* (*Markъ*) for the name of the evangelist Mark in Church Slavonic literature, Straxov (2004: 128–129) ascribes it to ‘hellenising’ orthography, i.e. spelling Μάρκος (*Márkos*) with omission of the final -ς.
29. I had independently suggested something similar in Stifter (2008: 289), but I now regard this hypothesis as false and adopt the explanation at the end of section 10.5.
30. Zimmer (1997: 1038–1039) calls it “[d]ie traditionelle Erklärung” (‘the traditional explanation’), but he does not specify the sources for this traditional explanation. Morris-Jones (1931: 42) explains this behaviour as being due to the fact that “[t]he epithet probably formed a compound with the name in Brythonic, so that its initial was softened, and this became the rule”. However, the sequence of elements in British compounds is usually the reverse, the determinor preceding the determinate. Morris-Jones’ explanation can therefore not account for the facts.
31. Morris-Jones goes on to qualify the previous statement by saying that the “adventitious addition […] is, however, often mutated, especially when vocative” (i.e. in situations of address), e.g. *o Dduw gwyn, feddyg einioes* ‘oh fair God, doctor of life’ (< *meddyg*) or *Daniel, ŵr anwyl* ‘Daniel, bold man’ (< *gwr*). This tendency in Welsh for lenition in the “vocative” cannot, however, continue the old morphosyntax of the Proto-British vocative, as the lack of lenition on *gwyn* ‘fair’ (not †*wyn*), the attribute immediately following *Duw* ‘God’, betrays.
32. I want to add that German names like *Otti*, *Edi*, *Gusti*, *Willi*, cited by Zimmer (1893: 197) as examples of a particular type of hypocoristic formation, but derided as entirely alien and unfamilar to himself and to all of his acquaintances in the following volume of the same journal by Kretschmer (1895: 269), are perfectly normal formations for my German *Sprachgefühl*, and are indeed all well-known to me.
33. E.g., Vondrák (1906–1908, 1: 401) mentions Aleksej I. Sobolevskij who provides Old Indic examples in *Лекции по истории русского языка*, *Москва* 1903, 148 (‘Lessons on the history of the Russian language, Moscow’). I was not able to follow up this reference.
34. Strictly speaking, in the case of fragmentary or ill-understood languages like Iberian and Raetic it cannot be said with certainty whether they possessed morphologically marked vocatives or not.

35. The particular factors obtaining in the languages chosen for this study do not provide a large enough basis to make wide-sweeping generalisations in the regard of theonyms. Names of gods may be underrepresented in the sample, either because of insufficient evidence (e.g. in the case of the very fragmentary Raetic language) or because of the historico-religious contexts (in Christian societies, names of non-Christian gods are unlikely to be borrowed in the forms of address; on the other hand, the name of the Christian god is notoriously vocative-less in Latin *deus*).
36. This suggestion builds on the hypothesis that in natural situations of contact speakers of L2 are exposed to the vocatives of names of L1 in a particularly high frequency. This needs to be tested in empirical studies.

References

Adamik, Tamás
1987 *Romaniane vivat* – Bemerkungen zum Gebrauch des Vokativs und zur afrikanischen Latinität. In *Latin vulgaire – latin tardif. Actes du Ier Colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif (Pécs, 2–5 septembre 1985)*, József Herman (ed.), 1–9. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Adams James N.
2003 *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Adams James N.
2007 *The Regional Diversification of Latin 200 BC–AD 600*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bloomfield, Leonard
1933 *Language*. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Brugmann, Karl
1903–1904 *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. 2. und 3. Lieferung. Von den Wortformen und ihrem Gebrauch und Lehre von den Satzgebilden*. Strassburg: Trübner.

Brugmann, Karl and Berthold Delbrück
1892 *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. Zweiter Band. Zahlwortbildung, Casusbildung der Nomina, Pronomina, verbale Stammbildung und Flexion (Conjugation). Zweiter Theil*. Strassburg: Trübner.

Brugmann, Karl and Berthold Delbrück
1893 *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. Dritter Band. Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen. Erster Theil*. Strassburg: Trübner.

Bülbring, Karl
1896 Vokativformen im Altenglischen. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 6: 140.

Correa, José Antonio
1993 Antropónimos galos y ligures en inscripciones ibéricas. In *Studia Palaeohispanica et Indogermanica J. Untermann ab amicis hispanicis oblata*, Ignacio-Javier Adiego Lajara, Jaime Siles, and Javier Velaza (eds.), 101–116. Barcelona: Universidad de Barcelona.

de Hoz, Javier
2008 A Celtic personal name on an Etruscan inscription from Ensérune, previously considered Iberian (MLH B.1.2b). In *Celtic and Other Languages in Ancient Europe*, Juan L. García-Alonso (ed.), 17–27. Salamanca: Publicaciones Universidad de Salamanca.

de Simone, Carlo
1970 *Die griechischen Entlehnungen im Etruskischen. Zweiter Band. Untersuchung*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

de Simone, Carlo
1980 Gallisch **Nemeti̯os* – etruskisch *Nemetie*. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 94: 198–202.

de Vaan, Michiel
2008 *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages.* (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 7.) Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Devoto, Giacomo
1928 L'Etrusco come intermediario di parole greche in latino. *Studi etruschi* 2: 307–341.

Dunkel, George
1998 On the short vowel in the name Ἡρακλῆς. *Museum Helveticum* 55: 76–83.

Evans, Daniel Simon
1964 *A Grammar of Middle Welsh*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.

Ferrer i Jané, Joan and Francesco Giral Royo
2007 A propósito de un semis de **ildiŕda** con leyenda **erder**. Marcas de valor léxicas sobre monedas ibéricas. *Palaeohispanica* 7: 83–99.

Fraenkel, Ernst
1956 Zur griechischen Wortforschung. *Glotta* 35: 77–92.
Hakulinen, Lauri
1957 *Handbuch der finnischen Sprache. 1. Band*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
Hemon, Roparz
1975 *A Historical Morphology and Syntax of Breton*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
Hedberg, Torsten
1935 *Eustathios als Attizist*. Inaugural-Dissertation. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells.
Hermann, Eduard
1937 Zwei Analogiebildungen. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 64: 72–75.
Hoffner, Harry and H. Craig Melchert,
2008 *Grammar of the Hittite Language. Part 1. Reference Grammar*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
Hofmann, Johann B. and Anton Szantyr
1965 *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
Jiriczek, Otto
1912 *Scepen* in Caedmons Hymnus Hs. N. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 30: 279–282.
Kaimio, Jorma
1970 The nominative singular in *-i* of Latin gentilicia. *Arctos* N.S. 6: 23–42.
Kallio, Petri
2006 On the Earliest Slavic Loanwords in Finnic. *Slavica Helsingiensia* 27: 154–166.
Kretschmer, Paul
1895 Die boiotischen kosenamen auf *-ει*. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 33: 268–272.
Kretschmer, Paul
1905 Etymologien. 2. *Mavors, Mars, Mamers*. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 38: 129–134.
Kwon, Kyongjoon
2009 The early development of animacy in Novgorod: Evoking the vocative anew. In *Grammatical Change in Indo-European Languages. Papers Presented at the Workshop on Indo-European Linguistics at the XVIIIth International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Montreal, 2007*, Vit Bubenik, John

Hewson, and Sarah Rose (eds.), 43–53. (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 305.) Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Lapesa, Rafael
1951 La apócope de la vocal en castellano antigo. Intento de explicación histórica. *Estudios dedicados a Menendez Pidal* 2: 185–226.

Lapesa, Rafael
1975 De nuevo sobre la apócope vocálica en castellano medieval. *Nueva revista de filología hispánica* 24 (1): 13–23.

Leskien, August
1870 über den dialekt der russischen volkslieder des gouvernements Olonec. *Beiträge zur vergleichenden Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der arischen, celtischen und slawischen Sprachen* 6: 152–186.

Leumann, Manu
1939 Literaturbericht für das Jahr 1937. Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre. *Glotta* 28: 1–21.

Littmann, Enno
1916 Anredeformen in erweiterter Bedeutung. In *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse*. Berlin: Weidmann, 94–111.

Löfstedt, Einar
1956 *Syntactica. Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins. Erster Teil. Über einige Grundfragen der lateinischen Nominalsyntax. 2. erweiterte Auflage*. Lund: Gleerup.

Majer, Marek
2011 PIE **so*, **seh₂*, **tod* / PSl. **tъ*, **ta*, **to* and the development of PIE word-final **-os* in Proto-Slavic. In *Indogermanistik und Linguistik im Dialog. Akten der XIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 21. bis 27. September 2008 in Salzburg*, Thomas Krisch and Thomas Lindner (eds.), 352–360. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert Verlag.

Malzahn, Melanie
2000 Toch. B *ñaktene* ‘Götterpaar’ und Verwandtes. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 9: 45–52.

Marx, Friedrich
1894 *De ratione dicendi ad C. Herennium*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm
1935 *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. 3. vollständig neubearbeitete Auflage*. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung.

Michelena, Luis
1961 A propósito de *done* ‘santo’. *Boletín de la Real Sociedad Vascongada de los Amigos del País* 17: 222–224.

Morris-Jones, John
1931 *Welsh Syntax. An Unfinished Draft*. Cardiff: The University of Wales Press Board.

Orduña Aznar, Eduardo
2005 Sobre algunos posibles numerales en textos ibéricos. *Palaeohispanica* 5: 491–506.

Petersmann, Hubert
1998 Gab es ein afrikanisches Latein? Neue Sichten eines alten Problems der lateinischen Sprachwissenschaft. In *Estudios de lingüística latina. Actas del IX Coloquio Internacional de Lingüística Latina. Universidad Autonóma de Madrid, 14–18 de abril de 1997*, Benjamín García-Hernández (ed.), 125–136. Madrid: Ed. Clásicas.

Rix, Helmut
1963 *Das etruskische Cognomen. Untersuchungen zu System, Morphologie und Verwendung der Personennamen auf den jüngeren Inschriften Nordetruriens*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Rix, Helmut
1981 Rapporti onomastici fra il panteon etrusco e quello romano. *Gli Etruschi e Roma: Atti dell’incontro di studio in onore di Massimo Pallottino. Roma, 11–13 dicembre 1979*, 104–126. Roma: Bretschneider.

Rix, Helmut
1994 *Die Termini der Unfreiheit in den Sprachen Alt-Italiens.* (Forschungen zur antiken Sklaverei 25.) Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Rix, Helmut
1995 Etruskische Personennamen. In *Namenforschung. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Onomastik*, Ernst Eichler, Herold Hilty, Heinrich Löffler, Hugo Steger, and Ladislav Zgusta (eds.), 719–724. (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft 11.1.) Berlin/ New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Rix, Helmut
1998 *Rätisch und Etruskisch.* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft. Vorträge und kleinere Schriften 68.) Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

Ruge, Hans
1997 *Grammatik des Neugriechischen. Lautlehre, Formenlehre, Syntax. 2. Auflage*. Köln: Romiosini Verlag.
Ruiz Darasse, Coline
2010 Les ibères en Languedoc: L'onomastique celtique d'Ensérune en écriture paléohispanique. *Palaeohispanica* 10: 335–354.
Schumacher, Stefan
1998 Sprachliche Gemeinsamkeiten zwischen Rätisch und Etruskisch. *Der Schlern* 72: 90–114.
Schumacher, Stefan
2004 *Die rätischen Inschriften. Geschichte und heutiger Stand der Forschungen*. 2d. ed. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft 121 = Archaeolingua 2.) Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
Schürr, Diether
2003 *Esimne*: Ein alpiner Name und seine Verbreitung. *Beiträge zur Namensforschung* N.F. 38 (4): 379–399.
Schwyzer, Eduard
1939 *Griechische Grammatik. Erster Band. Allgemeiner Teil. Lautlehre. Wortbildung. Flexion*. München: C.H. Beck.
Sihler, Andrew L.
1995 *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. New York/ Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Solier, Yves and Henri Barbouteau
1988 Découverte de nouveaux plombs, inscrits en ibère, dans la région de Narbonne. *Revue archéologique de Narbonnaise* 21: 61–94.
Solmsen, Felix
1906 Review of Brugmann 1903–4. *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* 26: 176–185.
Steinbauer, Dieter
1993 Untersuchungen zu Texten und Grammatik des Etruskischen. Habilitationsschrift. Universität Regensburg.
Stifter, David
2008 [2010] OPr. *kellewefze* 'Driver of a Cart'. *Historische Sprachforschung* 121: 281–296.
Stifter, David
forthc. Two Continental Celtic studies: the vocative of Gaulish, and *Essimnus*. In *Continental Celtic Word Formation. The Onomastic Data*, Juan Luis García Alonso (ed.). Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.

Strachan, John
1909 *An Introduction to Early Welsh*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Straxov 2004 = Страхов, Александр Б.
2004 О вокативе и номинативе в древнерусских текстах и языке [On the vocative and nominative in Old Russian texts and the Old Russian language]. *Palaeoslavica* 12 (1): 111–136.
Svennung, Josef
1958 *Anredeformen. Vergleichende Forschungen zur indirekten Anrede in der dritten Person und zum Nominativ für den Vokativ.* (Skrifter utgivna av K. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Uppsala 42.) Uppsala/Wiesbaden: Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri/Otto Harrassowitz.
Szemerényi, Oswald
1977 Studies in the Kinship Terminology of the Indo-European Languages, with special references to Indian, Greek and Latin. *Acta Iranica* 16 (Acta Iranica: Série 3, Textes et mémoires 7): 1–240.
Trask, Robert Lawrence
1997 *The History of Basque*. London/New York: Routledge.
Trask, Robert Lawrence
2008 *Etymological Dictionary of Basque*. Edited for web publication by Max W. Wheeler. Sussex: University of Sussex. www.sussex.ac.uk/english/documents/lxwp23-08-edb.pdf, 14.10.2012.
Untermann, Jürgen
1980 *Monumenta Linguarum Hispanicarum 2. Die Inschriften in iberischer Schrift aus Südfrankreich*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
Untermann, Jürgen
2000 *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter.
Vaillant, André
1977 *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves. Tome V: La syntaxe*. Paris: Klincksieck.
Vermeer, Willem
1991 The Mysterious North Russian Nominative Singular Ending *-e* and the Problem of the Reflex of Indo-European **-os* in Slavic. *Die Welt der Slaven* 36: 271–295.
Vermeer, Willem
1994 On explaining why the Early North Russian nominative singular in *-e* does not palatalize stem final velars. *Russian Linguistics* 18: 145–157.

Vondrák, Václav
1906–1908 *Vergleichende Slavische Grammatik. 1. Band: Lautlehre und Stammbildungslehre. 2. Band: Formenlehre und Syntax*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Vottero, Guy
1985 Procedes d'expressivite dans l'onomastique personelle de Beotie. In *La Beotie antique. Lyon – Saint Etienne. 16-20 mai 1983*, Gilbert Argoud and Paul Roesch (eds.), 403–417. Paris: Éditions du CNRS.

Wackernagel, Jacob
1920 *Vorlesungen über Syntax mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch*. Basel: Emil Birkhäuser.

Wallace, Rex E.
2008 *Zikh Rasna. A Manual of the Etruscan Language and Inscriptions*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Beech Stave Press.

Williams, Ifor
1938 *Canu Aneirin gyda rhagymadrodd a nodiadau* [The Poems of Aneirin with introduction and notes]. Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.

Zaliznjak 2004 = Зализняк, Андрей А.
2004 *Древненовгородский диалект. 2. изд., переработ. с учетом материале находок 1995–2003 гг.* [The dialect of Old-Novgorod. 2d ed., supplemented with material from the 1995–2003 excavations]. Москва: Языки славянской культуры.

Zimmer, Heinrich
1893 Keltische studien. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 32: 155–240.

Zimmer, Stefan
1997 Archaismen in *Culhwch ac Olwen*. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 49–50: 1033–1054.