ON NOMINATIVES JOINING OR 'REPLACING' VOCATIVES

Summary

The construction Ζεῦ πάτερ ... 'Ηέλιός τε may probably be explained by the tendency to avoid 'Übercharakterisierung', the nominative often replacing other forms of a noun. With regard to the grammatical form of an attribute of a vocative there does not seem to have been a generally accepted idiom in prehistoric times. Scholars are however too often inclined to pose questions of this character in terms of chronology. The views upheld in connection with construciions such as γέρον φίλε, φίλος ὦ Μενέλαε etc. are open to criticism. It may also be doubted whether a proper name added to verbs of calling etc. originally was in the voca-tive. Finally some remarks are made on the 'nominative instead of a vocative'.

Although the curious ancien. Indo-European construction Ζεῦ πάτερ ... 'Ηέλιός τε (Homer, Il. 3, 276 f.), i.e. the avoidance of a pair of vocatives connected by the particle $*k^u e$ (or... $*k^u e$... $*k^u e$), has often attracted the attention of linguists and philologists, the final word does not yet appear to have been spoken in regard to it [1]). Sanskrit scholars usually confine themselves to the remark that two vocatives cannot be connected with *ca,* one of them being replaced by the nominative: RV. 1, 2, 5 *váyav índraś ca cetathaḥ* "O Vāyu (voc.) and Indra (nom.), ye know" [2]). So did Reichelt [3]) in describing the analogous phenomenon in the language of the Avesta, and – to mention only the chief recent books on Greek syntax – Humbert and Chantraine [4]) in dealing with the above Greek construction and its parallels in the language of ancient Hellas; see also Hirt [5]) in his

---

[1]) For references see E. Schwyzer-A. Debrunner, Griechische Grammatik II, (1950), p. 63. See also D. B. Monro, Homeric grammar, § 164; a list of the Greek instances – the rule was also observed by the Attic dramatists – was given by A. Plate, in the Classical Review, 23 (1910), p. 105 f.; for the Vedic instances see W. Haskell, Journal Amer. Or. Soc. 11 (1885), p. 66.

[2]) See J. S. Speyer, Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax, p. 7; A. A. Macdonell, Vedic grammar for students, p. 299; however, not all books make mention of this construction.

[3]) H. Reichelt, Awestisches Elementarbuch (1909), p. 226.

[4]) J. Humbert, Syntaxe grecque (1954), p. 252 f.; P. Chantraine, Grammaire homérique II, (1953), p. 36.

[5]) H. Hirt, Indogermanische Grammatik VII, p. 6 f.

Indogermanische Grammatik. Schwyzer-Debrunner [6]) however, reproduced the explication which was at the time proposed by Delbrück [7]): "die Sonderbarkeit wird durch die Überlegung verständlich, dass idg. *$k^u e$ ursprünglich nur Satzglieder, keine Sätze (und dies sind eben die Vokative) verband". As however *$k^u e$ can connect sentences in the oldest documents of Sanskrit, Iranian, Greek, Gothic, Latin (neque... neque) it can hardly be a matter for dispute that this construction belonged to the common inheritance of these languages [8]). If we conclude from the striking correspondence between Skt. sūryaś ca candraś ca "sun and moon", Gr. ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε "men and gods", Lat. noctesque diesque "days and nights" and so on the existence of original Indo-European... *$k^u e$... *$k^u e$ groups, we should draw the same inference from the no less striking similarity existing between such sentences as, in Vedic, ṚV. 1, 35, 11 rákṣā ca no ádhi ca bruhi deva "protect us and intercede for us, O god"; in Greek, Od. 3, 22 πῶς τ' ἄρ' ἴω; πῶς τ' ἄρ προσπτύξομαι αὐτόν; "how shall I go, and how shall I greet him"; 2, 388 δύσετό τ' ἠέλιος σκιόωντό τε πᾶσαι ἀγυιαί; Il. 24, 156 οὔτ' αὐτὸς κτενέει, ἀπό τ' ἄλλους πάντας ἐρύξει "he both will not kill and will keep all others (from slaying)"; Od. 9, 147 ἔνθ' οὔτις τὴν νῆσον ἐσέδρακεν... / οὔτ' οὖν κύματα... εἰσίδομεν "then no man saw that island..., nor did we see the waves"; in Vedic, ṚV. 3, 53, 20 má ca hás má ca rīriṣat "... must neither leave nor hurt us"; in Latin, Plaut. Trin. 134 neque emeres neque venderes; Curc. 480 sunt qui dant quique accipiunt; in Gothic, Luke 17, 20 f. ni qimiþ ... nih qiþand "(it) does not come... nor will they say" (nih < *ne-$k^u e$); and in many other instances attention to which has been directed in other publications [9]).

---

[6]) Schwyzer-Debrunner, o.c., II, p. 63.

[7]) B. Delbrück, Vergleichende Syntax, I, p. 396; vgl. auch Syntaktische Forschungen IV, p. 28; V (= Altindische Syntax), p. 105 f. (where no explication is given).

[8]) J. B. Hofmann, in Stolz-Schmalz, Lateinische Grammatik, p. 656 likewise expressed the opinion that *$k^u e$ as a 'Satzpartikel' was not original, observing that this function of -que was a Latin development: before the 1st cent. B.C. the particle does not appear to connect sentences of a certain extent, cf. e.g. Sall. B. I. 104, 4 ex eis Bocchus... lubens accipit. Romaeque legatis eius... petentibus hoc modo respondetur. The length and degree of complexity of the sentences may, however, be considered points of minor importance.

[9]) See 'The history and original function of the I.E. part. $k^u e$, esp. in Greek

There is on the other hand no denying that the occurrence of the nominatives *indraḥ* and Ἥλιος in the above formulas was determined by the use of the particle τε. If this particle is wanting two vocatives may follow each other freely: e.g. RV. 5, 71, 3 *ā gataṃ váruṇa mítra* "approach, O Varuṇa, O Mitra"; 5, 46, 2 *ágna índra váruṇa mítra dévāḥ śárdhaḥ prá yanta márutotá viṣṇo* "Agni, Indra, Varuṇa, Mitra, ye gods, ye host of the Maruts and also Viṣṇu, extend to us..."; in Homer vocatives are not rarely connected by καί or τε καί: Il. 6, 77 Αἰνεία τε καὶ Ἕκτορ "Aeneas and (also) Hector"; Od. 4, 341 Ζεῦ τε πάτερ καὶ Ἀθηναίη καὶ Ἄπολλον "O father Zeus and (also) Athene and (in addition to these) Apollo"; cf. also Arist. Ach. 55 ὦ Τριπτόλεμε καὶ Κελεέ...; Vesp. 136 etc. [10]).

The conclusion therefore appears to be that the curious occurrence of the nominative in the above combination of invocations was determined by the very character of the particle *$k^u e$* which – if the author's views of it [11]) are in the main correct – was a means of indicating complementary unity: *$k^u e$* was essentially a marker pointing to, or emphasizing, the fact that two (or more) elements of the same category (nouns, verbs, word groups etc.) were not only regarded as belonging together, but constituted a complementary pair (or set).

Now it is a well-known fact that two persons or entities which form a pair or are often mentioned together were very often indicated by the name of, or term for, one of them, which then took the outward form of the dual: in Vedic *pitárā* means "father and mother", *mitrá* "Mitra and his 'colleague' Varuṇa"; *dyávā* "heaven and earth". This elliptical type of the dual, which has its widest application in naming pairs of deities by means of one of them, shows us that a pair of companions could be indicated by a special (dual) form of the word-stem denoting the name of one of them. From the psychological point of view it may be said that the identity of the other is for a moment lost in the personality of him whose name represents both of them. That the other member of the pair is, for the sake of completeness or other motives – e.g. in order to facilitate the addition of an epithet –,

---

and Latin', Mnemosyne IV, 7 (Leyden 1954) p. 196 ff.; 'The use of the particle *ca*', which is to appear in Vāk, Poona.

[10]) Platt, o.c., p. 106 is probably right in believing that τε is never used to connect two persons addressed in prose.

[11]) See the articles referred to in note 9.

sometimes added 'epexegetically' cannot be adduced as an argument against this interpretation: RV. 8, 25, 2 *mitrá... váruṇo yáś ca sukrátuḥ* "Mitra-and-Varuṇa... and (especially) the very wise Varuṇa'". Since Wackernagel's explication of the Homeric Αἴαντε (δύω) as Aias and Teucer, the sons of Telamon [12]), and the discovery of other parallels by various scholars writing after him [13]), this use of the dual may be considered to have belonged to original and prehistoric Indo-European in general. In a similar way a plural stem, whether in succession to a dual or not, may serve to convey the idea of a pair or plurality of entities which form unity or constitute a complementary set: Gr. οἱ βασιλεῖς "king and queen"; Lat. *fratres* and Gr. (Eur. El. 536) ἀδελφοί "brother and sister"; Germ. *Geschwister*, originally "the totality of sisters, the sisters together" (cf. *Gebrüder*), now "brothers and sisters"; in Latin, *Quirini* stands for Romulus and Remus, the former being also called *Quirinus*.

Even a singular form of a proper name may under certain circumstances suffice to address a group of persons, or perhaps we should rather say to include a group of companions in the name or title of him who is regarded as their representative. Thus we find Homer Od. 12, 82 ἦ περ ἂν ὑμεῖς νῆα... ἰθύνετε, φαίδιμ' 'Οδυσσεῦ "where you (plur.) shall steer your... ship, glorious Odysseus"; cf. e.g. also 2, 310; 20, 97 ff.

Would it be too bold a supposition to explain the construction *váyav índraś ca cetathaḥ* in a similar way, the vocative being in a way an 'elliptical expression' for the person denoted and his companion, whose name, when added, does not – for reasons which are to follow further on – need to be in the special form used in calling or addressing a person? For an 'elliptical' use of the vocative attention may be drawn to RV. 7, 97, 9 *iyáṃ vām brahmaṇas pate suvṛktír bráhméndráya vajríṇe akāri*, literally: "this song of praise, (this) 'holy text' has been made for both of you, O Brahmaṇaspati, (and) Indra, the wielder of the thunderbolt", i.e. either "this song of praise, O B. is (destined for) both of you, for Indra... this h. t. has been made" [14]), – which does not completely convince the critical reader who, observing that *suvṛkti* and *brahma* refer to the same 'text', to wit the 'hymn' in which

[12]) J. Wackernagel, Kuhn's Zeitschrift 23 (1877), p. 302 ff.
[13]) I refer to the bibliography given by Schwyzer-Debrunner, o.c., II, p. 51.
[14]) Thus K. F. Geldner, Der Rig-veda übersetzt III, Harvard 1951, p. 267.

this stanza occurs, might object that Indra who is included in the former part of the utterance would be alone in deriving benefit from the poet's activity in the latter –, or, rather, "O B. this s., (this) h. t. is dedicated to both of you, Indra included". Or rather, was not, in pairs of names of a more or less fixed nature [15]), more than one special reference to this syntactic character of the group – in addition to the tone etc. – a superfluity? As is well known the occurrence of "Über-charakterisierung [16])" was avoided also in cases such as N.T. Rev. 18,20 οὐρανὲ καὶ οἱ ἅγιοι (cf. also the Attic phrase Πρόξενε καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι [17]), and in a variety of other cases which at the time were studied by Havers [18]): in an apposition the nominative often appears after another case: Od. 1, 50 f. νήσῳ ἐν ἀμφιρύτῃ . . . / νῆσος δενδρήεσσα "in a sea-girt island..., a wooded island"; in Latin Defix. Tab. 270, 12 *anima et cor uratur Sextili, Dionysiae filius* [19]); in German, *Dem Herzog von ..., Königliche Hoheit* [20]), and, in connection with a vocative, Plautus, Asin. 691 *mi Libane, ocellus aureus*. Specially interesting are also such Irish cases as *fechta cath Muighe Tuired etorra ocus Fir* (nom. plur.) *Bolcc* "the battle of M. T. was fought between them and the F. B.": the nominative occurring when a noun stands as

---

[15]) It may be observed that the above words Ζεῦ πάτερ . . . 'Ηέλιός τε occur at the beginning of an oath; similarly, Aesch. Prom. 88 ff. with an interesting succession of 'conjunctions': ὦ δῖος αἰθὴρ καὶ ταχύπτεροι πνοαί / ποταμῶν τε πηγαὶ ποντίων τε κυμάτων / ἀνήριθμον γέλασμα παμμῆτόρ τε γῆ, and in the solemn invocation: Arist. Nub. 264 f. ὦ δέσποτ' ἄναξ . . . λαμπρός τ' αἰθήρ, σεμναί τε θεαὶ Νεφέλαι. Compare also Aeschines, Ctes. 260 where τε – which was avoided by the authors living after Thucydides, Xenophon, and Plato – was replaced by καί: ἐγὼ . . . ὦ γῆ καὶ ἥλιε .. καὶ σύνεσις . . . βεβοήθηκα. The passage Od. 19, 406 γαμβρὸς ἐμὸς θύγατέρ τε (var. lect. θυγάτηρ τε), τίθεσθ' ὄνομ' ὅττι κεν εἴπω "my son-in-law and my daughter, give him whatsoever name I say" must be considered a special case: ἐμός has no vocative.

[16]) See W. Horn, Sprachkörper und Sprachfunktion, Berlin 1921, p. 54; E. Fraenkel, Indog. Forsch. Anz. 43, p. 46.

[17]) See also F. Blass-A. Debrunner, Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch[4], p. 90.

[18]) W. Havers, Zur Syntax des Nominativs, Glotta 16 (1927), p. 105 ff., who, like E. Fraenkel in Indog. Forsch. Anz. 41, p. 16, is likewise inclined to explain the construction at issue from the tendency to avoid 'Übercharakterisierung'.

[19]) See also E. Löfstedt, Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae, 1,11, p. 50 f.

[20]) Se also H. Wunderlich-H. Reis, Der deutsche Satzbau[2], II, p. 20.

second co-ordinate member after a conjugated preposition [21]); or the Old Ch. Slav. phrase *Gospodi, Bogŭ moi* "O Lord (voc.), my God (nom.)", which however is the Greek Κύριε ὁ θεός μου [22]). An argument in favour of the above explication may be derived from the Vedic accent: whereas two or more vocatives at the beginning of a sentence are all accented (if they are not used attributively), dual compounds of the type *mitrā-varuṇā* "O Mitra and Varuna" representing a 'tautological' double elliptical dual, the nominative form of which is *mitrā-váruṇā* (doubly accented), have one accent, the ˴words, like the beings for whom they stand, constituting a united whole. This accentual unity may in a way be compared to the combination vocative + nominative in closely united groups: in both cases a single indication of a characteristic feature appears to have sufficed. It may finally be observed that there are also cases of a nominative instead of, and after, a vocative in asyndetic sequences [23]).

Having returned to the vocative we might subjoin a note on another disputed problem relating to the same tendency to use the nominative as adjunct of a vocative. With regard to the grammatical form of an attribute of a vocative there does not seem to have been a generally accepted idiom in prehistoric times. Whereas the Vedic usage may be illustrated by the phrases RV. 8, 48, 7 *sóma rājan* "O king Soma" and 1, 91, 4 *rájan soma* [24]), the attribute being in the vocative and both words forming an accentual unity – we even find 10, 115, 8 *úrjo napāt sahasāvan* "O mighty (s.) son (n.) of strength (ū.)" (here the corresponding nominative would be *ūrjó nápāt sáhasāvā*) and 4, 4, 11 *hótar yaviṣṭha sukrato* "O youngest wise hotar", the adjective being, in the middle of a verse, accented if it precedes: *víśve deváḥ* "(the) all-gods" [25]); compare also the similar Avestan Yt. 17, 6 *aši srīre* "O prosperous Aši" [26]) –, the Baltic and Slavonic languages gave reality to both possibilities: both words may be expressed

---

[21]) See R. Thurneysen, A grammar of Old Irish (Dublin 1946), p. 156.

[22]) I also refer to A. Vaillant, Manuel du vieux slave, i, p. 169.

[23]) See e.g. W. Vondrák, Slavische Grammatik II, p. 226.

[24]) In both cases the first word, occupying the first place after a caesura, is accented.

[25]) For particulars see B. Delbrück, Altindische Syntax, p. 34.

[26]) See also Reichelt, o.c., p. 226. In this language an adjective in the vocative may even accompany a substantive in the nominative.

by a vocative, but in the majority of cases the attribute is in the nominative [27]). In the Baltic languages the adjective has practically speaking no vocative: in phrases such as Lith. *gerbiamas* or *gerbia-masis pone* "honoured lord" the substantive *pone* is in the vocative; the adjective may be undetermined or determined, but it is in the nominative [28]).

In the ancient German idioms the nominative of the weak adjective often appears as a companion of a substantive in the vocative: Goth. John 17, 11 *atta weiha* "holy Father", (but πάτερ ἄγιε in the Greek text) [29]). As is well known the weak declension is from the historical point of view identical with the *-en-/-on-* stems which in Greek and elsewhere constitute a class of individualizing and characterizing substantives which are in frequent use as proper names, sometimes as familiar, 'abbreviated' or 'hypocoristic' names: στράβων "squinting" beside στραβός, also Στράβων; γνάθων "full-mouth": γνάθος "jaw"; Φείδων: φειδός "thrifty"; *Rufō*: "Red-head": *rufus* "red"; *bibō* "tippler." Although Behaghel seems to overstep the mark in contending that these German adjectives generally speaking originated in 'Koseformen' [30]), the character of these *-en-/-on-* stems in the related languages sheds much light on the preference for the weak adjective in this position. In the above *atta weiha* the weak or 'determined' adjective refers to a definite, individual being, which is characterized by being "holy". But it is – like the single weak adjective if used in addressing: Matth. 5, 22 *dwala*: μωρέ "fool" – in the nominative, that is to say in the common form for subject position and address or invocation. Besides, the adjective is, in Old English, Old Saxon, and Old High German often in the flexionless form which was apt to serve as an 'absolute form' expressing the adjectival idea by itself and independent

---

[27]) Cf. Vondrák l.c.; E. Fraenkel, Die baltischen Sprachen, 1950, p. 121 ff.; A. Meillet, Recherches sur l'emploi du génitif-accusative en vieux slave (Paris 1897), p. 139.

[28]) See also: Meillet, Bull. Soc. Ling. 28, p. 227; M. Endzelin, Lettische Grammatik (1922), p. 294; 454; E. Berneker, Die preussische Sprache (1896), p. 178.

[29]) See e.g. W. Krause, Handbuch des Gotischen, p. 162; O. Behaghel, Deutsche Syntax, I, p. 171; 175 ff.

[30]) Behaghel, in Paul und Braune's Beiträge, 42, p. 155; Deutsche Syntax, I, p. 178. – See also E. Prokosch, A comparative Germanic grammar, 1939, p 260 f., and especially O. Erdmann-O. Mensing, Grundzüge der deutschen Syntax, II, p. 53.

of any syntactic relation [31]), and, moreover, to indicate that the idea expressed by the substantive is characterized by a quality irrespective of a process which might have led to that result [32]).

In Greek and Latin both constructions are possible. In the latter language, which according to Hofmann is, in this point, characterized by a "starkes Schwanken" [33]), we find Plaut. Poen. 798 *quid nunc sceleste leno*; Cic. Arch. 24 *o fortunate... adulescens* beside Hor. A.P. 291 f. *vos, o | Pompilius sanguis* and Verg. Aen. 1, 664 *nate, meae vires, mea magna potentia solus, | nate...*; in Greek Il. 24, 650 γέρον φίλε "dear old sire" beside Il. 4, 189 φίλος ὦ Μενέλαε "dear Menelaus": "ein attributives Adjektiv zu einem Vokativ steht (in Greek) gewöhnlich ebenfalls im Vokativ, kann aber auch im Nominativ erscheinen" [34])

In cases like that at issue students of syntax are often inclined to pose the question in terms of chronology, taking for granted that, if there exist in the same language two constructions at the same time, one of these must be older or more 'original' than the other. Syntax, however, is no (historical) phonology. Not rarely the speakers of a language can make their choice of two or even more possibilities which often are – and sometimes are not – in a perceptible way distinguished from one another semantically or stylistically. Not rarely both possibilities may have been co-existent for long years.

According to Brugmann [35]) the type γέρον φίλε necessarily presupposes a more original γέρον! φίλε!: "da ursprünglich jede Vokativform für sich interjektionalen Charakter gehabt hat, so war z.B. φίλε κασίγνητε ursprünglich 'Lieber! Bruder'". It would appear to the present author that Brugmann lays too much stress on the interjectional character of the vocative. The vocative may be accompanied by a genitive which, like the adjective, loses its accent [36]) in Vedic: sūno sahasaḥ "O son of might"; cf. the Greek Il. 14, 102 ὄρχαμε λαῶν "leader of men". Why could it not be preceded or followed by an

---

[31]) See e.g. H. Paul, Deutsche Grammatik II, p. 164; Behaghel, Deutsche Syntax I, p. 176.

[32]) See also Erdmann, o.c., I, p. 30.

[33]) Hofmann, o.c.,p. 374.

[34]) Schwyzer-Debrunner, o.c., p. 63.

[35]) K. Brugmann, Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogerm. Sprachen, II², 2, p. 647.

[36]) For particulars see Delbrück, Altind. Syntax, p. 33 f.

adjective in the same form at least in those cases in which the vocative form of the adjective existed because the adjective could occur in a substantival function?: φίλος can mean "friend" already 'in Homer and φίλε as an independent vocative "O friend" appears in the Odyssey 14, 115 [37]). This is not to deny that sometimes the vocative phrase under discussion must be regarded as twofold: Hor. Od. 2, 7, 5 *Pompei, meorum prime sodalium*, but the occurrence of sentences of this type in historical times does not prove that it was at the root of the groups of the type γέρον φίλε [38]).

With reference to the type φίλος ὦ Μενέλαε Brugmann [39]) expressed the opinion that originally the nominative might have been predicative: „der du das und das bist". This view was recently endorsed by Schwyzer-Debrunner [40]) in a more definite form. Although there is more to say for this expl_ation in regard to the construction at issue than to the above Ζεῦ . . . 'Ηέλιός τε which is explained by the same scholars as "Zeus und du, der du Indra bist" – "thou" is not in the text, and a predicative translation by means of a relative clause is as a rule only admissible if the nominative is either preceded by the pronoun *ịo- [41]) or 'absolute' and placed at the beginning – it can hardly be regarded as final. It is true that there are sentences which cannot be interpreted otherwise: Aesch. Pers. 674 ὦ πολύκλαυτε φίλοισι θανών "O thou that art much lamented by thy friend, who (because thou) hast died". But instances such as Eur. Adr. 348 ὦ τλῆμων ἄνερ "O miserable man" showing the inverse order of words present difficulties, unless they are considered a secondary development. Besides, the usual translation by means of a relative clause is apt to suggest more than is implied in the original text. RV. 6, 16, 10 *ní hótā sátsi barhíṣi* is "setz dich als Hotṛ auf das Barhis" (Geldner) rather than "setz dich, der du Priester bist, nieder auf die Opfer-

---

[37]) It should be remembered that the attributive phrase voc. + voc. was, in Brugmann's view (l.c.), modelled upon the group adj. + subst. in the nom. and the other cases. Of course the possibility of analogical influence need not be excluded.

[38]) I for one can hardly imagine that a phrase such as Od. 6, 57 πάππα φίλε "papa dear" has ever meant "papa! O friend", but this may be a matter of opinion!

[39]) Brugmann, o.c., p. 648.

[40]) Schwyzer-Debrunner, l.c.

[41]) See Lingua 4 (1954), p. 9 ff.

streu" (Brugmann), however insignificant the difference may be [42];
similarly, 4, 4, 11 *tvám no asyá vácasaś cikiddhi hótar yaviṣṭha sukrato
dámūnāḥ* "do take notice of these words of ours, O priest, youngest,
very wise one, as a friend of the house". I am, in contradistinction to
these authors, under the impression that the main factor in the origin
and spread of these phrases has been the aversion to 'over-characteri-
zation', the nominative by itself being frequently used in addressing
or invoking persons or deities, in exclamations and so on [43].

There seems on the other hand to be no reason to deny, tentatively
with Wackernagel [44] or positively with Ernout and Thomas [45], the
existence, in 'original Indo-European' of an adjectival vocative: the
degree of correspondence between the ancient Indian, Iranian, Greek,
and Slavonic idioms seems to point to at least a limited use of this
form, which however does not appear to have been of frequent occur-
rence [46]. The conclusion might be that in prehistoric times both con-
structions were within certain limits possible: if the adjective was in
the nominative, i.e. in the naming case used, inter alia, to refer to
a concept out of any syntactic connection, the vocative form of the
substantive could in addition to tone, pauses, etc. suffice to characterize
the phrase as a mode of address or invocation. In these cases the
adjective no doubt often had the character of an apposition. If the
adjective was also in the vocative the phrase was uniform and probably
as a rule more coherent: γέρον φίλε. It would be imprudent to be more
assertive on this point [47].

---

[42] For δὸς φίλος (Od. 17, 415) see also Wackernagel, Bezzenberger's Bei-
träge 4 (1878), p. 280 f.

[43] See also J. Wackernagel, Vorlesungen über Syntax, I², p. 305 ff.; R.
Kühner-B. Gerth, Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache I, p. 46;
Schwyzer-Debrunner, o.c., p. 64; Delbrück, Vergl. Syntax, I, p. 397 f.

[44] Wackernagel, o.c., p. 307.

[45] A. Ernout and F. Thomas, Syntaxe latine², p. 15.

[46] Pronominal vocatives never, or hardly ever, existed: γαμβρὸς ἐμός "O my
son-in-law", τέκνον μοι "O my child", etc.; ἐμός and *meus* have no doubt exerted
influence upon the form of the words with which they formed a group, cf. e.g.
Plaut. Cas. 134 ff. *mi animule... meus pullus passer.*

[47] If two adjectives are connected by τε, both of them can be in the vocative:
e.g. Arist. Thesm. 315 Ζεῦ μεγαλώνυμε χρυσολύρα τε "O Zeus, whose name is great,
whose lyre is made of gold": here both words characterize one person as being
on the one hand such, and on the other such: "O Zeus, thou that art on the
one hand, great of name, on the other, possessed of a golden lyre". — Cf. also

Certain phenomena exhibited by non-Indo-European languages may be quoted in illustration of a similar tendency not to repeat the characteristic element if a substantive used in addressing a person is accompanied by an adjunct: in the Indonesian Bimanese the so-called vocative particle *e* which is added to the noun (*ina* "mother": *ina-e* "mother!") is usually attached only to the last word of a group of words used to address a person: *ai ana Kio-e* "my son Kio!"; it can also be omitted [48]). This reminds us of the Lithuanian phrases *ponàs daktarai* "Herr Doktor" etc. "wo von zwei in habitueller Verbindung stehenden Wörter nur das zweite flektiert ist" [49]).

It may perhaps be doubted whether Schwyzer and Debrunner [50]) are right in asserting that a proper name added to καλέω "to call", καλέομαι "to be called" etc. originally was in the vocative, the acc. and nom. having replaced this form "durch Einbeziehung in die Satzkonstruktion" [51]). The isolated Indian parallels – e.g. ŚB. 3, 3, 4, 19 *gaútama bruvāṇa* "O thou, who callest thyself Gautama" (but here the participle also is in the vocative) [52]) – could hardly be adduced in substantiation of this view. What would appear to be more probable is a rather frequent use of the nominative in prehistoric times. In OChSl. we find a stereotyped nom.: *narèšę imę Simonu Petrŭ* [53]); similarly, in Lithuanian [b·] in Gothic: *gasatida Seimona namo Paitrus* (Mark 3, 16 ἐπέθηκε· τῷ Σίμωνι ὄνομα Πέτρον; in German (especially in connection with reflexive forms: Wolfram, Parzival 276, 21 L. *der nennet sich der riter rot.* "Neben *heissen* und *nennen*, danach auch neben *taufen* stehen Namen in flexionsloser Form, doch ein beigefügtes Pron. oder Art. normalerweise im Akk." [55]). Ancient-Indian

---

Löfstedt, Syntactica I¹, Lund 1928, p. 74 ff.; ²p. 97 ff.: "Als allgemeine Tendenz gilt..., daß der Vok. gern sozusagen auf einen einzigen Begriff konzentriert ist (was gewissermaßen schon in seiner emphatischen Natur liegt)".

[48]) I refer to J. C. G. Jonker, Bimaneesche Spraakkunst, Verh. Batav. Gen. v. K. en W., 48, p. 233.

[49]) See M. Niedermann, Festschrift-Wackernagel, 1924, p. 161.

[50]) Schwyzer-Debrunner, o.c., II, p. 62.

[51]) The same supposition is ventured by Behaghel, Deutsche Syntax, I, p. 699.

[52]) Delbrück, Altindische Syntax, p. 106.

[53]) Vondrák, o.c., II, p. 228. See also Havers, Glotta 16, p. 95.

[54]) See e.g. E. Fraenkel, K.Z. 53, p. 59; Arch. f. slav. Phil. 40, p. 86 f.

[55]) H. Paul, Deutsche Grammatik, III, p. 260.

instances are e.g. Taitt. Br. 1, 1, 2, 5 *sá índro brāhmaṇó bruvāṇaḥ...* "Irdra passing himself off as a brahman..."; Mbh. 3, 133, 10 *kasmād bālaḥ sthavira iva prabhāṣase* "why do you call yourself an old man, whilst being a child?" [56]; and in Greek we find N.T. Joh. 13, 13 φωνεῖτέ με ὁ διδάσκαλος καὶ κύριος [57]; Eur. Troad. 1233 ἰατρὸς ὄνομα ἔχουσα "having the name of being a physician". Proper names are, generally speaking, often disconnected from the syntactic structure of the sentence: cf. e.g., in a Latin inscription C.I.L. 13, 1968, V. 8 *ad flumen Macra*. The Indians have themselves created the interesting construction with *iti* [58]) which, properly meaning "thus", is not only used to characterize a direct construction or quotation, but also to quote or mention a name, which is in the nominative whatever its syntactic position in the sentence might be: RV. 8, 92, 2 *puruhūtám índra iti bravītana* "call the much invoked one Indra", to mark an onomatopoeia, or to indicate a gesture. The nominative can also be a literal quotation of an address: Got. Luke 6, 46 *hva mik haitid frauja, frauja*: τί δέ με καλεῖτε, Κύριε, Κύριε.

The nominative may indeed be assumed to have been of frequent occurrence in this connection: whereas it has been retained in Sanskrit which however has as a rule added *iti* – e.g. Manu 2, 129 *tāṃ brūyād bhavatīti* "he should address her: 'Lady'" – and Latin has largely replaced it by other constructions, the Greek Od. 1, 180 Μέντης... εὔχομαι εἶναι may be explained as a traditional mechanisation of an original: "I declare that I am: 'Mentes' "; 5, 450 ἱκέτης δέ τοι εὔχομαι εἶναι "I declare that I am: 'your suppliant' ". The nominative is, generally speaking, apt to turn up in a variety of other constructions expressing the thought or opinion of a person with regard to himself: in contradistinction to οἶδά σε θνητὸν ὄντα Greek has οἶδα θνητὸς ὤν (cf. e.g. Thuc. 4, 27), which exactly corresponds to the Vedic *manyate papivān* "he believes that he has drunk" and similar constructions in Avestan [59]). Originally representing an "I know: (I am) mortal" this turn of speech stands nearer to the direct con-

---

[56]) Delbrück, o.c., p. 104; Speyer, Indogerm. Forsch. 31, p. 108 f.

[57]) See also Blass-Debrunner, Gramm. des neutestamentlichen Griechisch (1913), § 143.

[58]) For particulars see Speyer, Sanskrit Syntax, p. 380 ff.; Renou, Grammaire sanscrite, p. 502.

[59]) I refer to H. Reichelt, Awestisches Elementarbuch (1909), p. 224 f.

struction "I know: 'I am mortal' " which with *iti* is usual in Sanskrit, than to the (acc. c.) inf. or "that" construction which have come to prevail elsewhere. There seem to be no good grounds for holding this nominative a case of 'attraction' under the influence of the governing verb.

Finally there may be room here for some tentative observations in connection with the 'nominativus pro vocativo'. An instance of this is Plato, Symp. 172 A οὗτος 'Απολλόδωρος, οὐ περιμενεῖς; Here the nominative is exclamative, (for οὗτος see also Soph. Ai. 89 ὦ οὗτος Αἴας), and the verb expressive of impatient incitement. When accompanying an imperative the nom. with the definite article expresses, as some authors rightly remark, a somewhat severe order, anyhow the person speaking does not expect to have a reply: cf. Arist. Ran. 521 ὁ παῖς, ἀκολούθει δεῦρο "servant, follow hither"; Av. 665 f. ἡ Πρόκνη, ἔκβαινε "Procne, come out..." [60]). Incidentally this construction may have resulted from blending the types ὁ παῖς ἀκολουθείτω and ὦ παῖ ἀκολούθει, but Schwyzer and Debrunner [61]) probably go too far in considering this the sole origin. The construction, which also attracted the attention of Havers, is widespread: compare in German, Nib. 1543, 4 *nu zeige uns überz wazzer, daz aller wiseste wip* [62]); in French, La Fontaine, F. 3, 1 *passe votre chemin, la fille* [63]). Now, it is often 'familiar' – Fr. *tais-toi, la mère*; cf. also *bonjour, l'ami* instead of *b. mon ami* [64]) –, "herrisch", for instance when used in warning – Germ. *die Dame!*; *der Dritte!* – or ordering – *na, vorwärts, der Einjährige!* –; very often the context makes it clear that the speaker does not expect any answer: Fr. *debout, les morts!*; *en avant, les gars!* Part of these instances cannot, or can hardly, be explained from a blend of constructions. This use must not, I am sure, be disconnected from a peculiarity of, for instance, the Polish language, in which subordinates are addressed or called by means of the nominative; the vocative which can be used instead is more polite. On the other

---

[60]) Cf. also Ach. 242 πρόιθ' ὡς τὸ πρόσθεν ὀλίγον ἡ κανηφόρος according to the codices.

[61]) Schwyzer-Debrunner, o.c., II, p. 64.

[62]) For other examples see Behaghel, Deutsche Syntax, I, p. 73 f., who is also inclined to explain the construction from 'contamination'.

[63]) See K. Nyrop, Gramm. hist. de la langue française V, p. 175.

[64]) See F. Brunot, La pensée et la langue, Paris 1936, p. 260.

hand the construction at issue is, in a natural way, resorted to in addressing a person whose name is unknown – Fr. *hé l'homme, venez ici* [65]. Now the nominative with the article defines an individual, distinguishing him from other persons belonging to the same category; in using the vocative the article is a redundancy because the determination and individualization are implied in the situation. Unlike the nominative with the article which generally speaking is not even a mode of address, the vocative serves to bring the person addressed into immediate personal contact with the speaker. In using the nom. if a voc. might be expected the person speaking gives evidence of a certain desire to keep a person at a distance: hence the above phrase ὁ παῖς, the Polish usage etc., and the more or less ill-bred German *adieu, die Herren* [66]) – cf. in Dutch: *ik heb het de heren gezegd* instead of *ik heb het U gezegd, (heren)* –, the 'familiarity' or rather incorrectness of the French idiom etc. In connection with a proper name the article may, in languages which as a rule do not admit of this addition to a name, even express a certain want of esteem or contempt on the part of the speaker: in French: *La Thénardier*.

If these considerations are not altogether unfounded we may connect these constructions with the well-known instances of what at first sight appears the opposite phenomenon: the avoidance of the voc. for the sake of politeness. In many languages the voc. implies a degree of intimacy or personal contact which makes it unsuited for formal, solemn, or public use: in Sanskrit a teacher would say, for instance *uttaṅka kiṃ te priyaṃ karavāṇi* "Uttaṅka, how can I please you?", the pupil *ājñāpayatu bhavān* "sir, command me". *Bhavān* "sir, your honour", though being exponent of the second person, takes in accordance with its origin the third person of the verb; the ancient voc. of this word, **bhavas* is in the form *bhos* retained as an interjection or voc. particle used in addressing: *bho uttaṅka* [67]). Being a general term *bhavān* is, however, in its turn, as a rule less respectful than special titles. Compare also the Polish *Pan* "the Lord" with the

---

[65]) See Littré, Dict. de la langue française s.v.

[66]) O. Erdmann-O. Mensing, Grundzüge der deutschen Syntax, II, 1898, p. 55. The parallel construction in Dutch, if containing the demonstrative pronoun – e.g. *ha, die Piet!* – is decidedly colloquial and even breezy.

[67]) Cf. Mahābhārata 1, 3, 91; 95; 100. For particulars see Wackernagel-Debrunner, o.c., III, p. 486.

third person of the verb, which in familiar speech can be replaced by the second person [68]). In languages which possess a definite article a title with the article is not infrequently used in solemn or polite address, on formal occasions etc.: in Dutch, *mijnheer de Ambassadeur* "Mr. Ambassador"; *mijnheer de voorzitter* "Mr. Chairman" – notice the different emotional value in *Mijnheer de Baron* and the more or less intimate (often only dialectal) *meneer pastoor, meneer dokter* –; in German: Frankfurts Reichskorrespondenz 1, 322 (1418) *lyeben herren die burgermeister*; v. Eyb,. 1, 54, 35 *Herr der Fürst* [69]). "Dieser Gebrauch hat sich formelhaft ziemlich lange erhalten" [70]) and an analogical spread beyond its original employment may of course be assumed. In French *monsieur le maire* is the usual correct construction, and the addition of a proper name like a sole so-called vocative, a token of intimacy or familiarity: *Ah! monsieur Dimanche, approchez* [71]). According to the Kauśikasūtra 57, 16 ff. there was in ancient India even a class distinction with regard to the use of *bhavatī* "your

---

[68]) See A. Meillet-H. de Willman-Grabowska, Grammaire polonaise, p. 220 f. For Bulgarian, see Vondrák, o.c., II, p. 226; for Lithuanian see Niedermann, o.c., p. 162 ff. In Dutch the non-intimate pronoun *U* (*<Uwe Edelheit*) with the 3rd pers. (which is losing ground) is more formal than *U* with the 2nd pers. The cases of *bhavān* with the 2nd pers. in Sanskrit (see e.g. Renou, Gramm. sanscr., p. 367) may be explained in a similar way; there is no reason for considering them (with Speyer, Sanskrit Syntax, p. 196) to be "vicious": in Bṛhadār. Up. 6, 1, 5 M. a son is addressing his father: "in this way have you before, declared us (= me) well instructed" (*bhavān... avoca iti*; the K. rec. 6, 2, 3 has *avocat* (3rd p.)); 4, 5, 4 a wife addresses her husband: "what you know, venerable sir, explain that to me": here the K rec. has *bhagavan* (voc.) *vettha* (2nd p.), and the M rec. *bhagavān veda* (nom., 3rd p.), but 4, 2, 1 a king in addressing a sage uses the normal construction nom. + 3rd p. *bravītu* (imp.) *bhagavān*; likewise a priest holding a conversation with a famous brahman: ŚB. 10, 3, 4, 3. Rām. 2, 107, 9 (Rāma addressing a younger brother) *bhavān... arhasi* (the commentary, mentioning a variant *arhati*, regards this construction as archaistic; in the S. recension: 2nd pers. sg. without *bhavān*). Bhāsa, Pañc. 2, 48 (indignant interrogation); Mārk. Pur. 115, 2 (anger); Pañcat. Pūrṇ. p. 194, 24 H. (anger); Bṛhatkathāśl. 5, 110 (authoritative interdiction); Śāṅkh. G.S. 2, 2, 8 are likewise examples of formal speech blended, for obvious reasons, with informality or disregard. See also R. Schmidt, Zs. deutsch. morgenl. Ges. 54, p. 515.

[69]) Behaghel, o.c., I, p. 73; J. Grimm, Deutsche Grammatik, IV, p. 308 ff.; 420; Kleine Schriften, III, p. 250; Deutsches Wörterbuch, II, p. 979.

[70]) Erdmann-Mensing, l.c.

[71]) Cf. also the phrase *oui, mon capitaine* in military colloquial.

ladyship, my lady" (nom.) and *bhavati* "Madam" (voc.), a nobleman saying *bhavatī dadātu* (imp. 3ʳᵈ pers.), other persons belonging to the higher ranks *bhavati* (imp. 2ⁿᵈ pers.) "(give), Madam".

A similar mode of address, consisting of a pronoun followed by a title and the article, is also proper to Greek: Xen. Cyr. 6, 2, 41 ὑμεῖς οἱ ἡγέμονες "you, the leaders"; 6, 3, 33 σὺ δέ, ὁ ἄρχων τῶν ἀνδρῶν, "you who rule the men". While grammarians are right in styling οἱ ἡγέμονες etc. appositions, they are, as far as I am able to see, not right in explaining these phrases by "i.e. ὑμεῖς, οἱ ἡγεμόνες ἐστέ", as opposed to the German: "ihr, o Führer" [72]).

It is interesting to notice that the idiom under discussion is not foreign to non-Indo-European languages. In addressing a person by means of a pronoun and an apposition, the latter is in Old-Javanese preceded by the 'definite article', i.e. the particle *ṅ*: *ko-ṅ nāga* "you serpent-demon". Even if the apposition is a proper name accompanied by a 'personal article', the particle *ṅ* may be added: *kamuṅ hyaṅ Apuy* "O divine Fire" beside *kamu hyaṅ Garuḍa* "O divine Garuḍa" [73]).

Utrecht   J. GONDA

---

[72]) Kühner-Gerth, o.c., I, p. 46.

[73]) See also P. J. Zoetmulder, De taal van het Ādiparwa, Bandung 1950, p. 20