VOCATIVE MARKERS IN OLD ROMANIAN[1]

BLANCA CROITOR
„Iorgu Iordan – Alexandru Rosetti" Institute of Linguistics, Romanian Academy

The vocative, the case employed for nominals directly addressed at someone (the addressee), expresses the pragmatic relation between the speaker and the addressee; by this feature it differentiates itself from the other cases, which express syntactic relations inside the clause. A nominal in the vocative case has several types of markings (see Croitor, Hill 2013): prosodic markings (the intonation, a pause which separates the vocative from the rest of the utterance), morphological markers (specific case endings) and lexical-pragmatical markers (interjectional particles). A vocative noun can have all these types of markers or only some of them. In this paper I will discuss the last two types of markers of the vocative (the morphological and the lexical-pragmatical markers) in old Romanian, the period until around 1640 (see Frâncu's 2009 periodization of old Romanian).

1. Morphological markers

1.2. *Case endings*

The vocative case displayed case endings, the same as in contemporary Romanian, but the unmarked (nominative) form could also be used.

1.1.1. *Masculine singular*

● The ending *-e*

The endings for the masculine singular nouns were *-e* and *-ule*. The ending *-e* is inherited from Latin, from the nouns of the second declension ending in *-us* (*lupus*, V. *lupe*; *dominus*, V. *domine*). Some linguists have sustained that it may have been borrowed from Slavic (Tiktin 1905; Meyer-Lübke 1890–1900; Bourciez 1930 *via* Tucker 1944) or that a Slavic borrowing may have reinforced the ending inherited from Latin (Rosetti 1947). Tucker (1944) points out that in old Bulgarian, the ending *-e* was limited to a class of nouns which had the stem in *-o*; the ones with the stem in *-jo* and *-u* had the vocative ending *-u*, the ones with the stem in *-i*, the vocative ending *-i*, and consonantal stems had in the vocative case the same form as in the nominative case. Therefore, only a class of nouns from old Bulgarian could have influenced the vocative masculine singular nouns in Romanian.

In the corpus of old Romanian texts we find various masculine nouns with the ending *-e*: *domn**e*** 'sir' (DÎR, C, 1594), *făcătoar**e** de păcate* 'sinner' (Ev.1642, 71), *împărat**e*** 'emperor' (FD, 571v), *învățătoar**e*** 'teacher' (CC[2], 76, 78, 87, 91), *om**e*** 'man' (CC[2], 25; FD, 468r).

[1] This paper was supported by a postdoctoral grant offered by the Romanian Ministry of National Education, CNCS – UEFISCDI, project no. PN-II-RU-PD-2012-3-0490.

BDD-V1111 © 2014 Editura Universității din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-21 12:26:01 UTC)

In contemporary Romanian, some of these vocative forms are not used any more, as they were replaced by forms with the ending *-ule*: *ome* / *oame* was replaced by *omule*; the nouns with the suffix *-tor* (*învățător*, *făcător*) prefer the ending *-ule* for two reasons: (i) this ending does not trigger vocalic changes on the suffix; (ii) the addition of *-e* would lead to a homonymy with the feminine form (*învățătoare*, *făcătoare*).

● The ending *-ule*

It is almost generally accepted that the ending *-ule* was formed by the attachment of the ending *-e* to the definite article *-ul*. The source of this innovation seems to have been the nouns ending in *-u* in the nominative form, followed by the definite article and the ending *-e* (*Lupu* > *Lupul* > *Lupule*; *Iancu* > *Iancul* > *Iancule*, see Tiktin 1905; Paul 1932; Tucker 1944). It was also shown that the origin of this ending could have been a Bulgarian hypocoristic suffix *-le*, attached to names of persons when they were invited to speak (Densusianu 1901). Miklošič (1882) considers that the segmentation of the Romanian ending should be *-u-* + *-le*; *-u* is part of the word stem, and *-le* is an interjection which could be related to the word *lele* (a respectful term used to address to an old woman), the interjections *alei*, *alelei* (expressing anger, sorrow or enthusiasm) and also the Bulgarian *-le* (Tucker 1944).

In the texts that I have researched, the ending *-ule* is less frequent than *-e* with simple nouns (not including the contexts in which the noun has adjectival modifiers): *făcători**ule** de păcate* 'sinner' (Ev. 1642, 84), *fi**ule*** 'son' (CC[2], 23, 55, 56, 57; Ev.1642, 24), *împărat**ule** al sfinților* 'emperor of the saints' (Ev.1642, 40), *om**ule*** 'man' (Ev.1642, 70).

In contemporary Romanian, the ending *-ule* is used mostly in certain phonological contexts (for instance, with the nouns ending in *-u* in the nominative, which could not take the ending *-e*); otherwise, the nouns either take the ending *-e* (1a) or have the unmarked form, homonymous to the nominative:

(1)	a.	*băiete!,*	*prietene!,*	*vecine!*	
		boy.V	friend.V	neighbour.V	
	b.	*chelner!,*	*șofer!,*	*domnu'!,*	*băiatu'!*
		waiter.N	driver.N	mister.DEF.N	boy.DEF.N

The forms with *-ule* have a predicative value in contemporary Romanian, not the appellative (identification) value that is typical for vocatives:

(2) *Împăratule!*
emperor.M.VOC
'You are / behave like an emperor!'

● The ending *-o*

This ending was borrowed from the feminine nouns; it is rare, used only by a small group of masculine nouns which end in *-a* in the nominative: *popo* 'priest' (CC[1], 25v), *satano* 'Satan' (CC[2], 64).

1.1.2. *Feminine singular*

● The ending *-o*

The origin of this ending is not very clear: it could be a Slavic borrowing (Tiktin 1905) or the vocative form of the definite article, which has the form *-a* in the Nominative (Gaster 1891, *apud* Tucker 1944).

BDD-V1111 © 2014 Editura Universității din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-21 12:26:01 UTC)

In the corpus, the feminine nouns in the Vocative case are not frequent. I found the ending *-o* with proper names (*Tavito,* see below,§ **1.1.5**).

It is worth mentioning a grammatical curiosity from a narrative text, FD: in the following passage, the feminine singular nouns with a vocative function have forms identical to the genitive / dative ones. The homonymy Vocative = Dative is common for plural nouns (see below), but it is very unusual here, for singular nouns. Notice that all the vocative nous are preceded by the interjection *o* 'oh' (with an expressive value; more about its use with vocative nouns below, § **2**):

(3) *Venic dzise: „O,* ***întunecate<i>*** *de minte, o,* ***giudecatei*** *năpăstuitoare, o, a*
Venic said oh dark.D of mind oh judgement.D oppressing oh A_G
bună-rudă ***pierdzătoare****, o,* ***frumuseațeei*** *gonitoare, o,* ***bucuriei*** *jeluitoare,*
good relative loser oh beauty.D chaser oh joy.D moaning
o, ***îndrăznireei*** *fugătoare, ce va face lume de acmu înainte, deca muri*
oh audacity.D chasing what will do world from now on if died
Alexandru, marele împărat!" (FD, 484v)
Alexandru great.DEF emperor
'Venic said: Oh, dark mind, oh, oppressing judgement, oh, loser of the good relative, oh, fading beauty, oh, moaning joy, oh, fading audacity, what will the world do from now on, if Alexandru the great emperor died!'

I consider that these unexpected forms can be explained by the homonymic dative forms. In general, the Dative case is associated with the thematic roles of Beneficiary (*Îi fac* ***lui George*** *o cafea* 'I am making George a coffee'), Goal (*Îi trimit* ***mamei*** *o scrisoare* 'I send my mother a letter'), and Experiencer (***Copiilor*** *le place ciocolata* 'Children like chocolate'). The first two thematic roles imply the general idea on a *transfer* and this is the general meaning of the dative case (the same as the genitive is the case of possession, the vocative is the case of appellation, the nominative is the unmarked form etc.). This is the reason why *dicendi* verbs require a dative argument; the act of saying something to someone involves a *transfer* of information from one source to a recipient; in Romanian, the argument encoding the recipient with verb of saying is in the dative case (*spun* ***băiatului*** 'I tell the boy', *zice* ***fetei*** 'he says to the girl', *explică* ***studenților*** 'he explains to the students', *s-a adresat* ***tribunalului*** 'he addressed the court'). The act of addressing someone can be construed as an act of transfer from one source to a recipient. Therefore, it is understandable why the vocative nouns could 'borrow' the dative endings (as I've mentioned, this type of borrowing is systematic, grammaticalized, in the plural). An additional argument comes from the syntax of some interjections. In old stages of Romanian, several interjections were followed by a dative nominal:

(4) *Vai* ***mie****!; Amar* ***nouă****!; Adio* ***prietenilor****!; Bravo* ***gimnastelor*** *care au*
ohI.D bitter we.D farewell friends.D bravo gymnasts.D who have
luat medalia de aur!
taken medal of gold
'Oh poor me!; Poor us!; Farewell to our friends!; Bravo to the gymnasts who took the gold medal!'

These are not appellative interjections (like *măi, bre* 'hey' etc.) but they are directed at someone, as they are used in the oral registry, therefore, they imply the act of addressing

BDD-V1111 © 2014 Editura Universității din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-21 12:26:01 UTC)

someone (see Hill's 2007 article where the interjections *o, vai, aoleu* 'oh; oh dear' are considered particles of indirect address). It is relevant that in the example above, all the vocatives are preceded by the interjection *o* 'oh', which signals the address speech act (more about this interjection in section **2** below).

1.1.3. *Plural nouns*

The vocative plural desinence found in old Romanian is *-lor*. Its homonymy with the dative / genitive desinence was explained by the reinterpretation of some structures with apposition: a noun in the dative case was followed by an appositional noun, which was also in the dative case (agreement in case between the base and the apposition was common in old Romanian); after a while, the apposition was interpreted as a vocative (Vasiliu 1956):

(5) *rogu-mă* ***voao, fraților,*** *ispovediți-vă* *lu Dumnezeu* (CC[2], 10)
pray=I.REFL you.D brothers.D confess=you.REFL to God
'I pray you, brother, confess to God'.

In our corpus, only some plural nouns with vocative function had the vocative endings: *creștinilor* 'christians' (CC[2], 65), *ziditorilor* 'masons' (CB, 38). Other plural nouns were unmarked (see below, **1.2**).

1.1.4. *Neuter nouns*

In our corpus, neuter nouns in the vocative case are rare; this is expected if we consider that neuter nouns typically denote inanimate entities, which are very rarely the 'recipients' of the addressation: *murmânte* 'tomb' (Ms. sl. 494).

1.1.5. *Proper names*

In old Romanian, proper names had the same endings as common nouns. Masculine singular nouns had the desinence *-e* if their stem ended in a consonant or in the consonantic group *muta cum liquida* followed by *-u*: *Doamne* 'God' (FD, 506r), *Lazare* (CC[2], 99), *Pavle* (CV, 40v), *Petre* (CB, 107; CP, 107), *Savle* (CV, 20r, 39r).

The masculine proper names with the unmarked (nominative) form in *-a* (*Catinda*, *Anania*, *Eneia*) have the desinence *-o* if the stem ends in a consonant, *-e* or *-ule* if the stem is vocalic: *Ananie* (CB, 95; CP, 95), *Catindo* (FD, 591v), *Eneiule* (CB, 101).

Sometimes, proper names with vocative function have the unmarked form: *Enea* (CP, 101), *Petru* (CB, 119).

Feminine proper names with vocative function take the ending *-o* (*Tavito*, in CB, 103) or have the unmarked form (*Tavita*, in CP, 103).

1.2. ***The unmarked form***

In some contexts from the corpus, the nouns with a vocative function could have the unmarked form. In the singular, the unmarked forms are not definite (if they don't have modifiers or adjuncts): *fiiu* 'son' (CC[2], 50, 52, 54), *moarte* 'death' (MI, 189r; FD, 504v).

I didn't find vocative nouns in the unmarked form with the definite article (without modifiers or adjuncts), such as the ones in contemporary Romanian (the colloquial registry):

(6) a. ***Băiatu',*** *cât* *e ceasu'?*
boy.DEF how much is hour
'Boy, what time is it?'

BDD-V1111 © 2014 Editura Universității din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-21 12:26:01 UTC)

b. ***Fata / Păpuşa,*** *câți* *ani* *ai?*
girl.DEF doll.DEF how many years have.2SG.
'Hey girl / pretty girl, how old are you?'

The plural unmarked nouns are more frequent than the singular ones: *bărbați* 'men' (CB, 152; CP, 152), *frați* 'brothers' (CB, 32; MI 190v).

1.3. ***Vocative adjectives***

Adjectives used as vocatives, with an appellative or a predicative function, have the same endings as the nouns. Masculine singular adjectives takethe endings *-e* and *-ule* (both are equally employed): *becisnice* 'helpless' (Ev.1642, 95), *nesocotite* 'unwise' (Ev. 1642, 46), *procleate* 'damned' (Ev.1642, 75), *puternice* 'strong' (FD, 484r), *striinate* 'estranged' (Ev.1642, 95); *despuitoriule* 'master' (Ev.1642, 51), *direptule* 'just' (Ev.1642, 40), *neascultătoriule, trufaşule şi batjocuritoriule* 'disobedient, haughty and scornful' (Ev.1642, 75), *nemilostivule* 'unforgiving' (Ev.1642, 70). I didn't find feminine singular adjectives in the vocative case in the fragments I researched.

Plural nouns prefer the forms marked with the special vocative endings, which are twice more frequent than the unmarked forms: *blăstemaților* 'damned' (CC^2, 26), *neplecaților* 'disobedient' (Ev.1642, 74), *nesocotiților* 'unwise' (CB, 145), *procleaților* 'damned' (Ev.1642, 53); unmarked forms are unsually indefinite, but sometimes they take the definite article: *nesocotitori* 'unwise' (CP, 145), *păcătoşi* 'sinners' (CV, 64v), *blagosloviții de părintele mieu* 'blessed by my father' (CC^2, VIII).

Unlike in old Romanian, in contemporary language the vocative adjective must be markedwith the specific case endings, with very few exceptions (*iubita* loved.F.DEF 'my love').

1.4. ***Extended DPs***

We include here DPs with adjectival or prepositional modifiers and with possessives, various binominal phrases, and coordinated DPs. DPs formed with a noun and an adjective could mark the vocative case on both words, irrespective of word order. For the masculine singular, the ending taken by both words is *-e*: *deşarte ome* 'vain man' (Ev.1642, 83), *hicleane diavole* 'wicked devil' (Ev.1642, 48), *milostive şi luminate doamne* 'merciful and enlightened God' (DÎR, CVI*), *noule Israile* 'new Israel' (Ev.1642, 100), *oame deşarte* 'vain man' (Ev.1642, 8; CV, 60v), *părinte svinte* 'saint parent' (FD, 558v). At the same time, masculine singular DPs could be unmarked for vocative case on all its components: *dulce rob şi credincios* 'sweet and loyal slave' (CC^2, VIII), *duh mut şi surd* 'dumb and deaf spirit' (CC^2, 77, 82, 83), *om nemulțemitoriu* 'unpleased man' (Ev.1642, 44), *tată sfânt şi direpț* 'saint and just father' (Ev.1642, 43); in some contexts, only the head noun is marked: *duh**ule***$_V$ *necurat şi surd şi mut* 'dishonest, deaf and dumb spirit' (CC^2, 82).

Feminine singular DPs are unmarked for case: *O, rudă necredincioasă!* 'Oh, unfaithful relative' (CC^2, 76), *O, rudă necredincioasă şi întoarsă!* 'Oh, disloyal and insidious relative' (CC^2, 80), *Voi, sămânță aleasă, împărătească sfinție, limbă sfântă* 'You, chosen seed, imperial sanctity, holly language' (CV, 73v).

Plural DPs are generally unmarked for case: *bărbați iudeeşti* 'Jewish men' (CB, 17; CP, 17), *bărbați israilești* 'Israeli men' (CB, 19), *blagosloviții soții miei cei iubiți* 'my beloved and blessed husbands' (Ev.1642, 79), *hii omeneşti* 'sons of men' (MI, 170v), *oameni nebuni* 'crazy men' (MI, 173r, 181v), *oameni buni* 'good folks' (FD, 557v), *tarii biruitorii de lume*

BDD-V1111 © 2014 Editura Universității din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-21 12:26:01 UTC)

'strong conquerors of the world' (Ev.1642, 80–81). In some contexts, only one of the components is marked for case (either the noun or the adjective): *bărbați izraili**lor*** 'Israeli men' (CP, 19), *bogați**lor** nemilostivi* 'merciless rich men' (Ev.1642, 77), *direpț judecători**ule** Doamn**e*** 'just judge, God' (Ev.1642, 74), *iubiți**lor** creştinii lu Dumnezeu* 'beloved christians of God' (CC[2], VIII).

În contemporary Romanian, structures with double marking of the vocative case are restricted to some fixed phrases, such as: *iubit**e** cititor**ule*** 'beloved reader', *Doamn**e** sfint**e**!* 'Holly God', *Doamn**e** Dumneze**ule**!* 'God'.

Binominal phrases, which have as a distinctive feature the fact that they have one referent, are formed with a categorial noun, a proper name, an appellative noun etc. In our corpus, singular binominal phrases frequently have a double mark for the vocative case, on each noun. For the masculine singular, the ending *-e* is preferred (except the nouns in *-a*, which take the ending *-o*): *Doamne împărate* 'God, emperor' (FD, 592r), *Doamne Isuse* 'God, Jesus' (CB, 81; CP, 81), *Isuse Hristoase* 'Jesus Christ' (Ev.1642, 47); *Agripo împărate* 'emperor Agripa' (CV, 36v; 38r), *împărate Agripo* 'emperor Agripa' (CV, 37r). Plural binominal phrases are more frequently unmarked: *bărbați frați* 'fellow men' (CB, 144; CP, 144).

In contemporary language, in binominal phrases the case is marked only on the first noun (*domnule director* 'Mr. director') or both nouns are unmarked (*doctoranzi asistenți!* 'teaching assistants and PhD students').

When the vocative noun was followed by a possessive, it was always unmarked for case: *feții mei* 'my sons' (FD, 512v), *fii<i> mii* 'my sons' (MI, 181v), *fiiul meu* 'my son' (Ev.1642, 41), *frații miei* 'my brothers' (CC[2], 27, 60).

In the corpus of old Romanian, singular coordinated DPs are morphologically marked for the vocative case: *frate şi soro* 'brother and sister' (Ev.1642, 71). Plural coordinated DPs are more frequently unmarked for vocative case; in a fragment of our corpus, for 3 marked contexts(see an example in (7)), there are three 11 unmarked contexts (exemplified in (8)):

(7) *Derepților şi curaților* (CC[2], 24)
just.PL.V and honest.PL.V
'just and honest [men]'

(8) *Judeci omineşti şi bătrânii israileşti* (CB, 37)
judge.PL human and old men Israeli
'human judges and Israeli old men'.

In some contexts, a marked DP can be coordinated with an unmarked one: *răi**lor** şi făcători răi* 'bad people and evildoers' (MI, 173r; 181v).

In contemporary Romanian, the masculine singular DPs are both marked for the vocative case, if the coordinated phrase has a joint reading (see (9)). If the coordinated phrase has a split reading, the DPs are usually unmarked (morphologically) for the vocative case (10). Notice that the types of vocative in the two examples are different (predicative vs. identificational):

(9) *Neascultătorule şi neghiobule!* – joint reading
disobedient.V and fool.V
'You disobedient and fool!'

(10) *Maria şi Ioana / ??Mario şi Ioano, veniți la mine!* – split reading
Maria.N and Ioana.N Maria.V and Ioana.V come to me
'Maria and Ioana, come to me'.

BDD-V1111 © 2014 Editura Universității din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-21 12:26:01 UTC)

An exception from the generalization above is the appellative masculine noun *domn,* which is marked for the vocative case in coordinations (with split reading):

(11) *Doamnă şi domnule, vă rog să luaţi loc!*
lady and sir.V you.ACC please $să_{SUBJ}$ take place
'Lady and sir, please take a seat!'

Plural coordinated DPs are marked for case in contemporary Romanian. The phrase in (12a) is a fixed structure; for the structure in (12b), the joint reading is prefered; for the split reading, juxtaposition is prefered if both nouns are marked for the vocative case, as in (12c).

(12) a. *Doamnelor şi domnilor, începe spectacolul!*
ladies.V and gentlemen.V begins show.DEF
'Ladies and gentlemen, the show begins'
b. *Leneşilor şi tâlharilor!*
lazy.PL.V and thief.PL.V
'You lazy and fool [men]'
c. *Leneşilor, tâlharilor!*
lazy.PL.V thief.PL.V
'Lazy, fool [men]'

2. Interjectional markers

The vocative, which is essentially employed in the oral registry, has more case markers than the other cases. In addition tothe morphological endings, the vocative is marked prosodically, by intonation and (in some contexts) by pause; in some contexts, the vocative also has lexical-pragmatical markers, under the form of interjections. In contemporary Romanian, vocatives are frequently preceded by an appellative interjection: *mă, măi, bă*, *băi, bre, fă* ('hey'). In some structures, the interjection is repeated after the vocative. The noun can be morphologically marked for the vocative or not:

(13) a. *Măi fat**o**, (măi)!*
hey girl.V hey
'Hey, girl'
b. *Măi fată, (măi)!*
hey girl.N hey
'Hey, girl'

The appellative interjection acts like a true mark for the vocative case (see Croitor 2004; Hill 2007; Croitor, Hill 2013), especially in those contexts where the vocative nouns do not have morphological markings for the vocative case (see example (13b) above). In the written text, when the morphological markers are absent, as well as when they are present, the pragmatic relation between the speaker and the addressee is marked by the appellative interjection. In Romanian, appellative interjections add a familiarity note to the speach. Other languages do not employ interjections, but personal pronouns (see example (14a) for English). Romanian displays the pronominal pattern as well (14b):

BDD-V1111 © 2014 Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-21 12:26:01 UTC)

(14) a. *You John come here!* (Hill 2007)
b. *Tu Maria, vino aici!*
you Maria.N come here
'Maria, come here'

In the corpus of old Romanian texts, I didn't find the appellative interjections mentioned above (they may have been too familiar or too colloquial to be employed in written texts). There is another interjection which is frequently used before vocatives in our corpus: *o* 'oh'. Its primary value is not appellative, but expressive (it relates to the speaker's emotions at the time of the utterance). In writing, *o* becomes a marker of address (indirectly). Hill (2007) considers that expressive interjections *o* 'oh', *vai* 'oh my', *aoleu* 'oh dear' are 'particles of indirect address', while the appellative interjections *măi, băi* 'hey'etc. are 'particles of direct address'. The interjection *o* is very frequent in our corpus, especially in the narrative texts. It can double the morphological marker of the vocative case (see examples (15)), or it can be the only marker of this case, as in (16) (when the unmarked form of the noun is employed for the vocative function):

(15) *o Petre* 'oh, Peter' (CC^2, 64), *o ome* 'oh, man' (CC^2, 73), *o trufaşule* 'oh, arrogant [man]' (Ev.1642, 16), *o, păcătoşilor* 'oh, sinners' (Ev.1642, 24), *o, omule* 'oh, man' (Ev.1642, 70);

(16) *o ucenici* 'oh, disciples' (CC^2, 91 / 92), *o, iubiț cetitori* 'oh, beloved readers' (Ev.1642, IIr), *o, dragii miei* 'oh, my dear' (Ev.1642, 14), *o, moarte* 'oh, death' (FD, 484r), *o, județ direpț!* 'oh, just council' (Ev.1642, 73), *o, iudei* 'oh, Jewish men' (CV, 1r), *o, bărrbați* 'oh, men' (CV, 44v).

In one context from the corpus I found the structure in which the interjection precedes the vocative noun and is repeated afterwardsm just like in the structure from contemporary Romanian with the appellative interjection *măi* (see (13) above):

(17) *feciu cuvântu de toate, **o, Teofile, o**, de cealea ce începu a face*
make.1SG word about all oh Teofil.V oh about those that begin A_{INF} make
Isus (CP, 5)
Jesus
'Oh Teofil, I speak about the things that Jesus began to do'

3. Final remarks

Our research on the vocative markers in old Romanian showed that the morphological markers of the vocative in old Romanian were present in many contexts. The vocative endings were quite frequent, especially in the singular, unlike contemporary language which tends to use the unmarked forms (but in Croitor 2004 I showed that certain registries revitalized the morphological markers, due to their expressivity). I found forms which are no longer employed in contemporary language: *ome, învățătoare, făcătoare* (m.sg.), *împăratule* (with an appellative value), and also some grammatical 'curiosities': the use of the dative form for the feminine singular. For the vocative adjectives, I found that the endings *-e* and *-ule* (for m.sg.) are equally employed; plural adjectives prefer the unmarked forms. For extended DPs,

BDD-V1111 © 2014 Editura Universității din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-21 12:26:01 UTC)

I found that the double marking of the vocative case is more frequent in the singular, but rare in the plural (with adjectival modifiers, the double marking of the vocative is not found at all in the plural). The research helped us identify an interjectional marker of the vocative case, *o* 'oh', which in some case doubles the morphological marker.

CORPUS

CB – *Codicele popii Bratul* [1559–1560], ed. Al. Gafton, http://media.lit.uaic.ro/gafton.

CC[1] – Coresi, *Tâlcul evangheliilor* [1567–1568], ed. V. Drimba, *Tâlcul evangheliilor și Molitvenic românesc*, București, Editura Academiei Române, 1998.

CC[2] – Coresi, *Carte cuînvățătură* [1581], eds Sextil Pușcariu, Al. Procopovici, vol. I, Textul, București, Atelierele Grafice Socec & Co., 1914.

CP – Coresi, *Apostol* [1566–1567], ed. I. Bianu, Texte de limbă din secolul XVI, IV, Lucrul apostolesc tipărit de diaconul Coresi la 1563, București, 1930.

CV – *Codicele Voroneţean* [1563–1583]. Ediție critică, studiu filologic şi studiu lingvistic de Mariana Costinescu, Bucureşti, 1981.

DÎR – *Documente şi însemnări româneşti din secolul al XVI-lea* [1521–1600], eds Gheorghe Chivu, Magdalena Georgescu, Magdalena Ioniță, Alexandru Mareș and Alexandra Roman-Moraru, introducere de Alexandru Mareș, București, Editura Academiei, 1979.

Ev.1642 – *Evanghelie învățătoare* (Govora, 1642). Ediție, studiu introductiv, note şi glosar de Alin-Mihai Gherman, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române, 2011

FD – Floareadarurilor [1592–1604], ed.: Alexandra Roman Moraru, Bucureşti, Minerva, 1996 (Cele mai vechi cărți populare în literatura română, I).

MI – *Manuscrisul de la Ieud* [aprox. 1630], text stabilit, studiu filologic şi indice de Mirela Teodorescu şi Ion Gheție, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 1977.

Ms. sl. 494 – A. Roman, "Un text românesc precoresian", *Limba română,* 25, 1976, p. 463–467.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bourciez, Edouard, 1930, *Eléments de linguistique romane*, Paris.

Croitor, Blanca, 2004, "Vocativul în româna actuală", în Gabriela Pană Dindelegan (ed.), *Tradiție şi inovație în studiul limbii române,* Bucureşti, Editura Universității din Bucureşti, p. 73–78.

Croitor, Blanca, Virginia Hill, 2013, "Vocatives", in Carmen Dobrovie Sorin, Ion Giurgea (eds), *A Reference Grammar of Romanian.* Vol. I, *The Noun Phrase*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing Company, p. 801–826.

Densusianu, Ovid, 1901, *Histoire de la langue roumaine*, Paris, Leroux.

Frâncu, Constantin, 2009, *Gramatica limbii române vechi (1521–1780)*, Iaşi, Casa Editorială Demiurg.

Hill, Virginia, 2007, "Vocatives and the pragmatics – syntax interface", *Lingua*, 117, p. 2077–2105.

Gaster, Moses, 1891, *Crestomație română,* Leipzig / București, F. A. Brockhaus / Socec & Comp.

Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm, 1890–1900, *Grammaire des langues romanes*, Paris, Welter.

Miklosich, Franz, 1882, Beiträge zur Lautlehre der rumunischen Dialekte, în Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Gerold, Wien, p. 3−94.

Paul, Radu I., 1932, *Flexiunea nominală internă în limba română,* Bucureşti, Monitorul Oficial şi Imprimeriile statului.

Rosetti, Al., 1947, "Sur le vocatif des noms masculins en roumain", *Bulletin linguistique*, XV, p. 103–105.

BDD-V1111 © 2014 Editura Universității din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-21 12:26:01 UTC)

Tiktin, Hariton, 1905, *Rumänisches Elementarbuch*, Heidelberg, Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung.
Tucker, R. W., 1944, "The Roumanian Vocatives", *Language*, 20, 1, p. 22–27.
Vasiliu, Laura, 1956, "Observații asupra vocativului în limba română", *Studii de gramatică,* vol. I, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, p. 5–23.

VOCATIVE MARKERS IN OLD ROMANIAN

(*Abstract*)

Starting from a corpus of old Romanian texts (the 16th c. and the 17th c. until 1640), we present the distribution and use of the vocative markers: morphological endings and lexical-pragmatical markers (interjections marking the address). A vocative noun could have all these types of markers or only some of them. Our research on the vocative markers in old Romanian has shown that the morphological endings of the vocative in old Romanian were present in many contexts, especially in the singular, unlike the contemporary language, where the unmarked forms are preferred (with some exceptions). We have found forms which are no longer employed in the contemporary language. The research has helped identify an interjectional marker of the vocative case, *o* 'oh', which in some case doubles the morphological marker.

BDD-V1111 © 2014 Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-21 12:26:01 UTC)