

THE VOCATIVE IN GREEK AND LATIN: SOME REMARKS ABOUT SERGUEY SHARYPKIN'S ARTICLE

by

HUBERT WOLANIN

ABSTRACT: In “Eos” CI 2014 Serguey SHARYPKIN published an article dedicated to the status of the vocative, and actually of the noun forms in vocative, in Greek and Latin. In conclusion the Author states that the vocative is not a case but it is a form of calling and addressing someone, which in certain usages, i.e. with predicatives in the 2nd person or in the imperative, behaves as a case and may be described as a case. He substantiates his opinion by claiming that only in the aforementioned contexts the vocative form manifests a syntactic agreement with the verbal predicate in sentences, while in all other usages it is deprived of such syntactic relationship. The present paper contains some polemical remarks concerning the theoretical status of the case as an inflectional category and the functional status of the vocative forms, as well as the alleged syntactic relationship between the vocative forms and the verbal predicatives, as described by S. SHARYPKIN.

In the second fascicle of “Eos” CI 2014 Serguey SHARYPKIN published an interesting article entitled *Zum kategorialen Status des Vokativs. Der Vokativ in den klassischen Sprachen* (pp. 285–310). It constitutes an in-depth analysis of the grammatical status of the vocative in the Ancient Greek language and in Latin, which was conducted against a broad comparative (Indo-European) background, including the diachronic perspective. By adducing the opinions and positions of other scholars regarding the problem in question, the Author presented his own original methodological and interpretative concept, which in my opinion deserves to be discussed. Therefore below I present a number of reflections and critical remarks concerning S. SHARYPKIN’s article, and at the same time I would like to thank the editors of “Eos” for enabling me to publish them.

The structural axis of the aforementioned article concerns the pursuit of an answer to the question which the Author himself asked in the opening part of the article in question, namely: Is the vocative a case? If so, what type of case is it? If not, what is it? (“Ist der Vokativ ein Kasus? wenn ‘ja’, was für ein Kasus ist es? wenn ‘nicht’, was ist er dann?”, p. 285). As he provides an answer to the first of these questions, the Author reaches the conclusion that the vocative is not a case (“Der Vokativ ist kein Kasus”, p. 310). From the line of reasoning that is presented, it follows that the argumentation which speaks in favour of such