# Name-calling

## The Russian 'new Vocative' and its status

Laura A. Janda
UiT The Arctic University of Norway

Henning Andersen (2012) points out that the Russian "new Vocative" (e.g., *мам!* 'mama!', *Саш!* 'Sasha!') presents a series of unusual behaviors that set it apart from ordinary case marking. Andersen argues that the Vocative should not be considered a declensional word form of nouns. The Russian Vocative is certainly an uncommon linguistic category, but does this entail setting up a new transcategorial derivation? Similar restrictions are found in other markers that are generally recognized as case desinences. The pragmatic use of virile vs. deprecatory nominative plural markers in Polish and lexical and morphophonological restrictions on the "second Locative" in Russian. The restrictions found in the Vocative are certainly unusual, but no single one of them can be said to exclude a marker from being identified with a case, and one must ask what we gain by inaugurating new derivational types.

**Keywords:** Vocative, transcategorial derivation, speech acts, Russian, Polish, North Saami

### 1. Introduction: What is a Vocative?

This section sets the backdrop for discussion of the Russian "new Vocative" of the type *мам!* 'mama!', *Саш!* 'Sasha!', by broadly classifying the linguistic investigation of the Vocative. Linguists can be said to form two major groups in their approach to the Vocative, according to the part of speech they attribute to the Vocative. There are scholars who treat the Vocative as a case form of nouns, and others who suggest that the Vocative is better classed as a verbal form. Andersen (2012) stands apart from both groups by asserting instead that the Vocative constitutes a transcategorial derivation.

In their introduction to an anthology devoted to Vocatives across a range of languages, Sonnenhauser & Hanna (2013: 3) make the point that despite the important

https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.345.18jan

role of Vocatives in communication and first language acquisition, linguists have paid surprisingly little attention to Vocatives.

Kiparsky (1967) argues that a Vocative is a case because, like a case, it can have a distinct morphological form, and in many languages the Vocative can be replaced by a Nominative form, which no one would class as anything but a case form. Syntactic evidence for this interpretation is offered by Abuladze & Ludden (2013), Hill (2014), and Julien (2014). For example, in some languages the Vocative can show agreement within a noun phrase and can be syntactically integrated via a Vocative Phrase. However, there is also no question that the Vocative stands out as unusual among case forms, and this is pointed out even by those who support the view that the Vocative is a case form. Motivated by the Vocative's non-prototypical behaviors, Daniel & Spencer (2009) call the Vocative "an outlier case". Dissenters from the case-form interpretation of the Vocative argue that it is not syntactically integrated into the clause (cf. Isačenko 1962: 83), or, like Andersen, point to numerous peculiar restrictions associated with the Vocative (see Section 2). A further argument against the Vocative as a case form might be gleaned from diachrony, since Vocatives often behave differently than other cases. The Slavic languages provide at least two indications that the Vocative is on a different historical path than other cases: In some languages (for example Russian and Slovak), all the cases inherited from Common Slavic were preserved while the Vocative was lost (with some Vocatives reinterpreted as Nominative forms in Slovak), while in other languages (such as Bulgarian and Macedonian), the Vocative has persevered as the only form to be marked on nouns while all other cases have been lost.

While there are some merits to the proposal that a Vocative is a verb form, this alternative has fewer adherents and would require us to posit some very defective and unusual verbs with only one form each. Vocatives do mark Second Person reference, and thus share some characteristics with Imperative forms, with which Vocatives often co-occur. This point is made by Fink (1972), Jakobson (1971), and Greenberg (1996). More recently, Julien (2014) has described Norwegian possessive predicational Vocatives such as *Din idiot!* [your idiot] "You idiot!" as equivalent to a copular predication such as *Du er en idiot* [You are.INDC.PRS an idiot] "You are an idiot". However, this semantic equivalence to a copular verb construction does not require us to interpret the Vocative as a predicate. Andersen (2012) does not pursue the predicate option in any detail, but focuses instead on refuting the suggestion that the Vocative is a case form.

Andersen (2012) presents a third option: reanalysis of the Vocative as the product of transcategorial pragmatic derivation. This reanalysis is based on a long list of peculiarities that I will examine in detail in Sections 2 and 3. My aim is to ask whether these peculiarities justify such a reanalysis of the Vocative.

Establishing a new transcategorial derivation may seem to be a convenient solution for a "problem child" like the Vocative, however it comes with a price. If we suggest a new category for something because it does not fit neatly into existing part-of-speech categories, we risk creating a category that lacks a positive definition because it is based on negative values. Ideally, a part of speech should have both a clear semantic basis and a coherent set of formal behaviors. Already among existing, mostly agreed-upon parts of speech, there are items that are problematic, such as "particles", which Zwicky (1985) argued should be eliminated from linguistic analysis given their poor theoretical basis (see also arguments against "particle" as a Russian part of speech in Endresen et al. 2016), and even "adverb", which Herbst & Schüller (2008: Chapter 3) and Faulhaber et al. 2013 find to be far too heterogeneous to justify its use as a classification. From a practical perspective, a part-of-speech category (or a new derivational type within such a category) should be shown to improve, rather than complicate, classification tasks. One such task is Natural Language Processing, which is already plagued with part-of-speech disambiguation errors (Manning 2011), and the establishment of a new underspecified category would add to the existing challenges rather than reducing them. Finally, perhaps the biggest cost in setting up a new category is the fact that assigning Vocatives to a new transcategorial derivation necessitates changing their connection with the nouns that they are transparently related to. We must ask: Is the Vocative really so different from other case forms, does its identification as a separate transcategorial derivation buy us something that is worth the price of distancing it from other wordforms of nouns and further complicating classification?

## 2. The Russian "new Vocative" and its peculiarities

Andersen (2012) neatly details the oddities associated with the Russian "new Vocative", which also motivate his establishment of a separate transcategorial derivation. In his own words, "it is subject to restrictions that are totally alien to case forms" (Andersen 2012: 154). I will give only a brief review of Andersen's much more comprehensive observations here, which pertain to the domains of pragmatics, lexicon, syntax, morphophonology, and phonology.

### 2.1 Pragmatic peculiarities

Unlike other linguistic elements that direct the joint attention of the hearer and the speaker to some referent, with a Vocative "the speaker directly engages the addressee" (Andersen 2012: 135). Andersen distinguishes conative Vocatives that summon the hearer to participate in a verbal exchange with the speaker from phatic

Vocatives that maintain verbal contact in an ongoing exchange, and observes that the Russian "new Vocative" serves both conative and phatic functions. Indeed, the main (perhaps even the sole) purpose of the Vocative is to express pragmatic (as opposed to syntactic) content.

### 2.2 Lexical peculiarities

The Russian "new Vocative" is formed only from names and other nouns that can be used as forms of address, and similar to English (cf. Zwicky 1974), some kinship and common nouns in this group are more likely to appear as Vocatives than others. Andersen identifies these as primarily hypocoristics and diminutives of first names like *Свет!* (< *Света*), *Ваньк!* (< *Ванька*), patronymics both with and without first names like *(Нин) Николаевн!* (< *Нина Николаевна*), kinship terms like *пап!* (< *папа* 'father'), *тёть!* (< *тётя* 'aunt'), and common nouns that can be used in place of a name, like *девушк!* (< *девушка* 'girl'). This Vocative can be extended to some extent to names of pets and inanimate objects (particularly when they can be used to refer metaphorically to people). The "new Vocative" is typically singular, with a few exceptions such as *ребят!* (< *ребята* 'guys').

### 2.3 Syntactic peculiarities

Like any Vocative, the "new Vocative" of Russian does not engage in any syntactic relationship to a predicate or argument or any other part of a clause. It is not syntactically integrated into a clause. The Vocative is clause-independent and can function even without any other words.

### 2.4 Morphophonological peculiarities

The Russian "new Vocative" is largely limited to words ending in *-а* with penultimate or prepenultimate stress (cf. examples in 2.2, all of which conform to this constraint).

### 2.5 Phonological peculiarities

Andersen (2012) asserts that the Russian "new Vocative", as opposed to other case forms, is formed by truncation. Alternatively, one could classify this as the use of a bare stem, or as a zero-suffixation, although Andersen prefers to label it truncation due to the lack of vowel insertion in resulting word-final consonant clusters and

lack of devoicing in final consonants, as in *девушк!* above and *Серёж!* (< *Серёжа*). However, this last feature, the lack of final devoicing, seems to be fading, as these forms tend more and more to conform to the phonotactics of modern Russian, as documented by Danièl' 2009, a fact that Andersen also acknowledges.

## 3. Similar peculiarities elsewhere in Russian and Slavic

The purpose of this section is to challenge the claim that the peculiarities of the Russian "new Vocative" are "totally alien to case forms" as Andersen asserts. Here I will cite phenomena from Russian and other Slavic languages to show that these peculiarities are not entirely unknown in case forms. They remain unusual, but not unattested.

### 3.1 Pragmatic peculiarities

Andersen has not claimed that ordinary case cannot combine with pragmatic factors, but he has set apart the Vocative as being unusual in this way. However, there are at least two examples of other case forms in Slavic that can serve primarily pragmatic purposes rather than syntactic ones: the Polish Nominative Plural and the Czech Dative.

Polish nouns with virile (male human) reference such as *profesor* 'professor' admit up to three Nominative Plural endings: an honorific form as in *profesorowie*, a neutral virile form as in *profesorzy*, and a deprecatory form as in *profesory*. The difference among these forms is largely a matter of what pragmatic relationship to professors the speaker wishes to convey. If the speaker finds professors to be noble and exemplary, the honorific form can be used; by contrast, the deprecatory form quite literally "demotes" professors to the status of females, animals, and inanimate objects (Janda 1996).

Ethical datives likewise express pragmatic relationships. While Russian makes some use of ethical datives in phrases like *Кто-то наступил мне на ногу* 'Someone stepped on my foot', these tend to overlap in meaning with the expression of possession. Czech, for example, presents a more extensive use of ethical datives, including ones that cannot reasonably be interpreted as possessive uses, as in this example (cf. Janda 1993: Chapter 3; Janda & Clancy 2006: 96):

(1) *Pustila jsem dceru na hory a ona **ti** si **mi** zlomila nohu!*
'I let my daughter go to the mountains and dammit, I'm telling you she broke her leg, and boy does this spell trouble for me!' (lit.: she **you-DAT** self-DAT **me-DAT** broke leg)

This sentence has three ethical datives, only one of which, *si* 'self-DAT', expresses possession. The other two have purely pragmatic import. The second person *ti* 'you-DAT' engages the speaker in a way not unlike the phatic use of the Vocative, conveying something like 'I'm telling you this, can you believe it?!'. The first person *mi* 'me-DAT' serves the pragmatic function of a complaint, conveying approximately 'Just imagine what this means for me, how I'm going to suffer for this!'.

Of course, both the Polish Nominative case and the Czech dative case primarily serve syntactic, not pragmatic functions. However, they give evidence that case forms can have pragmatic functions, and that these can even take precedence in some contexts.

### 3.2 Lexical peculiarities

One does not have to look further than Russian to find evidence of lexical restrictions on case forms: both the "second Locative" and the "second Genitive" have lexical restrictions that are at least as strict as those for the Vocative. The second Locative, as in *в снегу́* 'in the snow' is a case form restricted to about 150 nouns that designate concrete locations ("жесткая локализация" according to Plungjan 2002, also Janda 1996). The second Genitive, as in *выпить чаю* 'drink (some) tea', is largely restricted to nouns referring to quantifiable substances (Worth 1984; Janda 1996). Although the second Genitive is productive (admitting both extension to new substances like *анилин* 'aniline' and metaphorical extension to concepts that are perceived of in terms of mass nouns like *пафос* 'pathos'), it is available only to about 1% of masculine inanimate nouns.

### 3.3 Syntactic outliers

The two ethical datives cited as expressing pragmatic functions in (1) are also not syntactically integrated into the sentence. Both *ti* 'you-DAT' and *mi* 'me-DAT' can just as well be removed from the sentence without disturbing its syntactic structure in the least. Here we must admit that being removable is not the same as being independent of the sentence, and that neither of these ethical datives can stand on their own in the same way that a Vocative does. But there are also examples of uses of case that are relatively independent of a sentence, such as *кому как* (lit. who-Dative how) 'to each his own', *кто кого* (lit. who-Nominative who-Accusative) 'who will get who?', and *лыжню!* (lit. ski-track-Accusative) 'Clear the track, coming through!'

### 3.4 Morphophonological outliers

To find precedence for morphophonological restrictions on case forms, we can return to the Russian second Locative, and further cite the Russian Nominative Plural in stressed *-á*.

The second Locative is primarily restricted to monosyllabic masculine animate nouns with mobile stem stress. There are, in addition, ten nouns with polysyllabic Nominative Singular forms that can have a second Locative case form, but most of these nouns are derived from monosyllabic stems: via pleophony (*bergъ* > *берег*, *берегу́* 'river bank'), diminutive formation (*бок*, *боку́* 'side' has diminutive *бочок*, *бочку́*), or prefixation (cf. *порт*, *порту́* 'port' and *аэропорт*, *аэропорту́* 'airport') (Janda 1996).

The Nominative Plural in stressed *-á*, as in *берег*, *берега́* 'river bank', is possible only for nouns with accentual patterns that permit end stress in the Nominative (and Accusative) Plural as opposed to stem stress in the Singular. There are only two exceptions to this rule: two nouns with fixed end stress: *рукав*, *рукава́* 'sleeve' and *обшлаг*, *обшлага́* 'cuff'. Like the second Locative, the Nominative Plural in stressed *-á* is also restricted largely to words that result from pleophony. In addition, this case form can be used with words that partially imitate the segmental phonology of pleophonic forms (such as *потрох*, *потроха́* 'entrail'; *соболь*, *соболя* 'sable') (Worth 1983; Janda 1996).

### 3.5 Phonological outliers

Russian case forms are also known to defy the usual rules of Russian phonotactics. For example, Bethin (2012) notes that "[r]eduction of unstressed /o/ and /a/ to [ɐ] or [ə] after non-palatalized consonants and to [ɪ] after palatalized ones in Contemporary Standard Russian (CSR) is systematic. But in certain inflectional suffixes [ə] occurs instead of the expected [ɪ] after palatalized consonants." For example, the last vowel in *дядя* 'uncle' should be [ɪ], but it is [ə], despite the fact that this runs counter to prevailing иканье in Contemporary Standard Russian. Vowel reduction is an otherwise immutable fact of Russian phonotactics, on a par with final devoicing of obstruents, which is sometimes violated by the "new Vocative".

Another issue is the creation of word-final consonant clusters that are not broken up by vowel insertion, especially the following: *-шк*, as in *девушк!* (< *девушка*), *Машк!* (< *Машка*); *-ньк* as in *Ваньк!* (< *Ванька*); *-вн*, as in *Николаевн!* (< *Николаевна*); and *-йк* as in *хозяйк!* (< *хозяйка* 'hostess'). However, it would be strange to require an innovative form to invoke vowel insertion eight centuries after the fall of the jers. Furthermore, all of these consonant clusters are attested

word-finally in the Russian National Corpus, and while Andersen (2012: 155–156) also acknowledges the presence of similar word-final clusters, further examples are presented here. Word-final *-шк* is found in numerous toponyms like *Кушк*, *Гиришк*, *Хараврешк*, *Дериш*к. Onomatopoeic words for metallic sounds like *дзиньк* and *треньк* give independent justification for *-ньк*. In addition to the word *фавн* 'faun', we find final *-вн* in *королевн*, an alternate Genitive Plural form for *королевна* 'princess' (attested alongside the more frequent *королевен*), and toponyms such as *Фредериксхавн* and *Якобсхавн*. Popular English borrowings provide ample examples for final *-йк* in words like *лайк* 'like (on Facebook)', *кофе-брейк* 'coffee break', *ремейк* 'remake', *стейк* 'steak', *фейк* 'fake', and *шейк* 'sheik', in addition to the toponym *Клондайк*. These four word-final consonant clusters are furthermore not so exceptional, since Russian admits numerous other clusters of two, three, and even four clusters in word-final position, both in native and borrowed words, such as: *жанр* 'genre', *жизнь* 'life', *мысль* 'thought', *цифр* 'number', *кедр* 'cedar', *букв* 'letters (Genitive Plural)', *вопль* 'shriek', *цилиндр* 'cylinder', *фильтр* 'filter', *ансамбль* 'ensemble', *мертв* 'dead', *центр* 'center', *оркестр* 'orchester', *текст* 'text', *спектр* 'specter', *монстр* 'monster', *государств* 'governments (Genitive Plural)', *достоинств* 'virtues (Genitive Plural)', *удобств* 'conveniences (Genitive Plural)', *богатств* 'riches (Genitive Plural)' (cf. Holden 1978).

The final item on our list is truncation, which could also be classed under morphophonology, and which, as mentioned above, could alternatively be interpreted as the presence of a bare stem or as a zero suffix. Floricic (2011) finds that the formation of Vocatives via truncation is a widespread phenomenon typologically. Note that Andersen (2012: 154) accepts the idea of zero suffixes, but rejects the idea that the Vocative has a zero suffix. However, we find such forms routinely in the Genitive Plural of Russian nouns that have Nominative singular in *-а/-я* or *-о*. In fact, for some nouns (particularly common nouns that can be used as forms of address), the "new Vocative" and Genitive Plural are homonymous, as in *мам* (< *мама*) and *пап* (< *папа*), and both Vocative and Genitive Plural forms are robustly attested for these nouns in the Russian National Corpus. Under Andersen's interpretation, these forms are inherently distinct, since he would class the Vocative *мам* as a truncated bare stem (a stem followed by nothing), but the Genitive Plural *мам* as a stem with a zero-ending. However, it is hard to argue that these homonymous forms are indeed perceived distinctly in this way by native speakers. If so, that point would need to be proven.

In sum, yes, the "new Vocative" does present a lot of unusual behaviors for a case form. However, none of these behaviors is without clear parallels in other case forms. From this perspective, the difference between the "new Vocative" and other

cases is more a matter of degree than essence. The "new Vocative" has more unusual features than a typical case form, but no features that can be totally excluded from what we can expect to find among case forms. Furthermore, the diachronic peculiarities are not as clear as might be presumed either. It is not really true that vocative was preserved while all other cases were lost in Bulgarian & Macedonian, since the vocative is marginal and optional in both Bulgarian (Girvin 2013) and Macedonian (Friedman 1993). The diachronic facts show a lot of variation that does not necessarily tell us anything about whether or not the Vocative is a case.

## 4. The emergence of a "new Vocative" in North Saami

North Saami is a Uralic language spoken in Northern Scandinavia. Like its distant relative Finnish, North Saami grammar has traditionally included possessive suffixes that attach to the noun. Without the possessive suffixes, the paradigm of a noun has thirteen cells defined by case and number, and due to syncretisms, there are a total of ten unique forms, as shown in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Paradigm of noun *guoibmi* "partner" without possessive suffixes (NOM = Nominative, GEN = Genitive, ILL = Illative, ACC = Accusative, LOC = Locative, COM = Comitative, ESS = Essive, SG = Singular, PL = Plural)

| | |
|---|---|
| NOM.SG | *guoibmi* |
| GEN.SG=ACC.SG | *guoimmi* |
| ILL.SG | *guoibmá-i* |
| LOC.SG | *guoimmi-s* |
| COM.SG=LOC.PL | *guimmi-in* |
| NOM.PL | *guoimmi-t* |
| GEN.PL=ACC.PL | *guimmi-id* |
| ILL.PL | *guimmi-ide* |
| COM.PL | *guimmi-iguin* |
| ESS | *guoibmi-n* |

If we include the possessive suffixes, which also interact in complex ways with the morphophonemics of both the noun stem and the case endings, we add 81 more unique forms, as in Table 2, and the total number of slots in the paradigm rises to 130.

**Table 2.** 81 additional unique forms for noun *guoibmi* "partner" with possessive suffixes (DU = Dual, 1 = First Person, 2 = Second Person, 3 = Third Person)

| NOM.SG: | GEN.SG=ACC.SG: | ILL.SG: |
|---|---|---|
| 1SG *guoibmá-**n*** | 1SG *guoibmá-**n*** | 1SG *guoibmá-s-**an*** |
| 2SG *guoibmá-**t*** | 2SG *guoimmá-**t*** | 2SG *guoibmá-s-**at*** |
| 3SG *guoibmi-**s*** | 3SG *guoimmi-**s*** | 3SG *guoibmá-s-**is*** |
| 1DU *guoibmá-**me*** | 1DU *guoibmá-**me*** | 1DU *guoibmá-s-**eame*** |
| 2DU *guoibmá-**de*** | 2DU *guoimmá-**de*** | 2DU *guoibmá-s-**eatte*** |
| 3DU *guoibmi-**ska*** | 3DU *guoimmi-**ska*** | 3DU *guoibmá-s-**easkka*** |
| 1PL *guoibmá-**met*** | 1PL *guoibmá-**met*** | 1PL *guoibmá-s-**eamet*** |
| 2PL *guoibmá-**det*** | 2PL *guoimmá-**det*** | 2PL *guoibmá-s-**eattet*** |
| 3PL *guoibmi-**set*** | 3PL *guoimmi-**set*** | 3PL *guoibmá-s-**easet*** |
| LOC.SG: | COM.SG=LOC.PL: | GEN.PL=ACC.PL(=NOM.PL 1SG/DU/PL): |
| 1SG *guoimmi-st-**an*** | 1SG *guimmi-in-**an*** | 1SG *guimmi-id-**an*** |
| 2SG *guoimmi-st-**at*** | 2SG *guimmi-in-**at*** | 2SG *guimmi-id-**at*** |
| 3SG *guoimmi-st-**is*** | 3SG *guimmi-in-**is*** | 3SG *guimmi-id-**is*** |
| 1DU *guoimmi-st-**eame*** | 1DU *guimmi-in-**eame*** | 1DU *guimmi-id-**eame*** |
| 2DU *guoimmi-st-**eatte*** | 2DU *guimmi-in-**eatte*** | 2DU *guimmi-id-**eatte*** |
| 3DU *guoimmi-st-**easkka*** | 3DU *guimmi-in-**easkka*** | 3DU *guimmi-id-**easkka*** |
| 1PL *guoimmi-st-**eamet*** | 1PL *guimmi-in-**eamet*** | 1PL *guimmi-id-**eamet*** |
| 2PL *guoimmi-st-**eattet*** | 2PL *guimmi-in-**eattet*** | 2PL *guimmi-id-**eattet*** |
| 3PL *guoimmi-st-**easet*** | 3PL *guimmi-in-**easet*** | 3PL *guimmi-id-**easet*** |
| ILL.PL: | COM.PL: | ESS: |
| 1SG *guimmi-idas-**an*** | 1SG *guimmi-id-**an**-guin* | 1SG *guoibmi-n-**an*** |
| 2SG *guimmi-idas-**at*** | 2SG *guimmi-id-**at**-guin* | 2SG *guoibmi-n-**at*** |
| 3SG *guimmi-idas-**as*** | 3SG *guimmi-id-**is**-guin* | 3SG *guoibmi-n-**is*** |
| 1DU *guimmi-idas-**ame*** | 1DU *guimmi-id-**eame**-guin* | 1DU *guoibmi-n-**eame*** |
| 2DU *guimmi-idas-**ade*** | 2DU *guimmi-id-**eatte**-guin* | 2DU *guoibmi-n-**eatte*** |
| 3DU *guimmi-idas-**aska*** | 3DU *guimmi-id-**easkka**-guin* | 3DU *guoibmi-n-**easkka*** |
| 1PL *guimmi-idas-**amet*** | 1PL *guimmi-id-**eamet**-guin* | 1PL *guoibmi-n-**eamet*** |
| 2PL *guimmi-idas-**adet*** | 2PL *guimmi-id-**eattet**-guin* | 2PL *guoibmi-n-**eattet*** |
| 3PL *guimmi-idas-**aset*** | 2PL *guimmi-id-**easet**-guin* | 3PL *guoibmi-n-**easet*** |

Under normal conditions, such morphological complexity is neither problematic nor unusual (McWhorter 2007, 2011). However, morphological simplification is expected under conditions of contact pressure, especially when a significant portion of the population is made up of adult learners (Dahl 2004; Bentz & Winter 2013). North Saami is an endangered minority language spoken by survivors of decades of discriminatory language policies with heterogeneous connections to their linguistic heritage. Virtually all speakers are fluent in at least one of the contact languages: Finnish, Norwegian, and Swedish, and many of these speakers have reclaimed or even learned the language as adults. Janda & Antonsen (2016) document an ongoing change in North Saami in which possessive suffixes are being replaced

by an analytic possessive construction consisting of a reflexive Genitive pronoun (inflected for Person and Number) plus the noun (without the possessive suffix, as in Table 1). They show that the timing of this language change coincides with the history of contact pressure and repression of the language. With the exception of a few fixed expressions, the forms in Table 2 are not being propagated by the younger generations of North Saami speakers.

However, there is one use of the North Saami possessive suffix that survives, even in the youngest generation of speakers, namely the use of the First Person Singular possessive suffix on Nominative Singular nouns that are either proper names or can be used as forms of address, as highlighted in the shaded box in Table 2 and illustrated in Example (2):

(2) *Gula,* *máná-ž-an.*
listen.IMP.2SG child-DIM.NOM.SG-1SG.POSS
'Listen, my little child.'
(IMP = Imperative, DIM = diminutive, POSS = possessive)

Unlike the more typical traditional anaphoric use of the possessive suffix, in Example (2), we see an exophoric use depending entirely on the pragmatic relationship of the speaker addressing the hearer. As is common for a Vocative, this use of the possessive suffix co-occurs with both a diminutive suffix (*-š* which becomes voiced *-ž* intervocalically) and an Imperative verb form. Such exophoric Vocatives in North Saami "are restricted to kinship terms, names, metaphorical names for people, and names or words for animals that are addressed as if they were people" (Janda & Antonsen 2016: 357). Janda & Antonsen (2016) argue that the interpretation of (*-ž*)*-an* [-(DIM).NOM.SG-1SG.POSS] as an emerging Vocative case marker in North Saami is in line with the interpretation of other productive forces in the language, such as *-ráigge* [-'hole'] as a "prolative" case marker in examples like *uksa-ráigge* [door.GEN-hole] 'through the door' and *bálgges-ráigge* [path.GEN-hole] 'along the path' (Ylikoski 2014). The reinterpretation of the remaining possessive suffix as a Vocative case is part of the overall loss of the complex portion of the noun paradigm represented in Table 2, with the remaining form being "recycled" into a new role as a case marker (cf. similar examples of "recycling" of linguistic forms over time in Lass 1990 and Janda 1996).

## 5. Conclusions

Andersen (2012) has provided us with a meticulous inventory of the atypical behaviors of the Russian "new Vocative". While this list is certainly impressive and there is clearly no other case in Russian that displays so many unusual features, none of

the peculiarities of the "new Vocative" are entirely without precedent in Russian and Slavic case systems. This means that we can interpret the divergence of the "new Vocative" from other case forms as a matter of degree rather than principle. Floricic (2011) argues that the clearest characteristic of Vocatives is their marginal status in the case system, and that it is natural for a case system to have both central and peripheral members. Janda & Antonsen (2016) have detailed how the emergence of a Vocative can be understood as part of the life cycle of the case system of a language, even one that is under extreme contact pressure.

There are some clear advantages to keeping the Russian "new Vocative" in the family of case forms. On the theoretical level, this preserves the relationship between the Vocative form and the noun that anchors the paradigm. Recognizing the Russian "new Vocative" as a case form makes it possible to avoid proliferation of categories among parts of speech, which are problematic in practical tasks, such as Natural Language Processing. For example, when confronted with a form like *мам*, our task is easier if we have only to distinguish between a Vocative and a Genitive Plural, without the possibility of also making an error at the level of the part of speech. This interpretation is also in line with that of the majority of scholars as well as the authors of the Russian National Corpus.

## References

Abuladze, Lia & Andreas Ludden. 2013. The vocative in Georgian. In Barbara Sonnenhauser & Patrizia Noel Haziz Hanna (eds.), *Vocative! Addressing between system and performance* (= Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 261), 25–42. Berlin: De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110304176.25

Andersen, Henning. 2012. The new Russian vocative: Synchrony, diachrony, typology. *Scando-Slavica* 51. 122–167. https://doi.org/10.1080/00806765.2012.669918

Bentz, Christian & Bodo Winter. 2013. Languages with more second language learners tend to lose nominal case. *Language Dynamics and Change* 3. 1–27.

Bethin, Christina Y. 2012. On Paradigm Uniformity and Contrast in Russian Vowel Reduction. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 30*.2. 425–463. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-012-9166-4

Dahl, Östen. 2004. *The Growth and Maintenance of Linguistic Complexity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.71

Danièl', Mikhail A. 2009. "Novyj" russkij vokativ: istorija formy usečennogo obraščenija skvoz' prizmu korpusa pis'mennyx tekstov. In K. L. Kiseleva, V. A. Plungjan, E. V. Raxilina & S. G. Tatevosov (eds.), *Korpusnye issledovanija po russkoj grammatike*, 224–244. Moscow: Probel 2000.

Daniel, Michael and Andrew Spencer. 2009. The vocative – an outlier case. In Andrej Malchukov & Andrew Spencer (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Case*, 626–634. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Endresen, Anna, Laura A. Janda, Robert Reynolds & Francis M. Tyers. 2016. Who needs particles? A challenge to the classification of particles as a part of speech in Russian. *Russian Linguistics* 40(2). 1–30. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11185-016-9160-2

Faulhaber, Susen, Thomas Herbst & Peter Uhrig. 2013. Funktionswortklassen im Englischen: linguistische und lexikografische Perspektiven. In Eva Breindl & Annette Klosa (eds.), *Funktionswörter|buch|forschung: Zur lexikographischen Darstellung von Partikeln, Konnektoren, Präpositionen und anderen Funktionswörtern. Germanistische Linguistik* 221–222, 59–110. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.

Fink, Robert O. 1972. Person in nouns: Is the vocative a case? *The American Journal of Philology* 93. 61–68. https://doi.org/10.2307/292901

Floricic, Franck. 2011. Le vocative et la périphérie du système des cas: entre archaismes et innovations. *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris, Nouvelle Série Tome XIX: L'évolution grammaticale à travers les langues romanes*. 103–134.

Friedman, Victor A. 1993. Macedonian. In Bernard Comrie & Greville G. Corbett (eds.), *The Slavonic Languages*, 249–305. London: Routledge.

Girvin, Cammeron. 2013. Addressing changes in the Bulgarian vocative. In Barbara Sonnenhauser & Patrizia Noel Haziz Hanna (eds.), *Vocative! Addressing between system and performance* (= Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 261), 157–188. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110304176.157

Greenberg, Robert D. 1996. *The Balkan Slavic Appellative*. Munich: Lincom.

Herbst, Thomas & Susen Schüller. 2008. *Introduction to Syntactic Analysis – A Valency Approach*. Tübingen: Narr.

Hill, Virginia. 2014. *Vocatives. How Syntax Meets with Pragmatics* (= Empirical Approaches to Linguistics Theory 5). Leiden: Brill.

Holden, Kyril T. 1978. Initial and final consonant clusters in Russian and English. *Russian Language Journal* 32 (112). 19–42.

Isačenko, Alexander. 1962. *Die russische Sprache der Gegenwart. Formenlehre*. Munich: Hueber.

Jakobson, Roman O. 1971. Zur Struktur des russischen Verbums. In Roman Jakobson, *Selected Writings*. Vol. II, 3–15. The Hague: Mouton.

Janda, Laura A. 1993. *A Geography of Case Semantics: The Czech Dative and the Russian Instrumental* (= Cognitive Linguistics Research, v. 4). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110867930

Janda, Laura A. 1996. *Back from the brink: A study of how relic forms in languages serve as source material for analogical extension*. Munich: Lincom.

Janda, Laura A. & Steven J. Clancy. 2006. *The Case Book for Czech*. Bloomington, IN: Slavica.

Janda, Laura A. & Lene Antonsen. 2016. The ongoing eclipse of possessive suffixes in North Saami: A case study in reduction of morphological complexity. *Diachronica* 33(3). 330–366. https://doi.org/10.1075/dia.33.3.02jan

Julien, Marit. 2014. Vokativar i norsk. *Norsk Lingvistisk Tidsskrift* 32. 130–165.

Kiparsky, Valentin. 1967. *Russische historische Grammatik*. Vol. 2. *Die Entwicklung des Formensystems*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Lass, Roger. 1990. How to do things with junk: Exaptation in language evolution. *Linguistics* 26. 79–102. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226700014432

Manning, C. D. 2011. Part-of-Speech Tagging from 97% to 100%: Is It Time for Some Linguistics? In Alexander Gelbukh (ed.), *Computational Linguistics and Intelligent Text Processing, 12th International Conference, CICLing 2011, Proceedings, Part I*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science 6608. 171–189.

McWhorter, John H. 2007. *Language interrupted. Signs of non-native acquisition in standard language grammars*. Oxford. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195309805.001.0001

McWhorter, John H. 2011. *Linguistic simplicity and complexity: Why do languages undress?* Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781934078402

Plungjan, Vladimir A. 2002. K semantike russkogo lokativa ("vtorogo predložnogo padeža"). *Semiotika i informatika* 37. 229–254.

Sonnenhauser, Barbara & Patrizia Noel Aziz Hanna. 2013. Introduction: Vocative! In: Barbara Sonnenhauser & Patrizia Noel Haziz Hanna (eds.), *Vocative! Addressing between system and performance* (= Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 261), 1–23. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110304176.1

Worth, Dean. 1983. Conditions on –á plural formation in Russian. *Wiener slawistischer Almanak* 11. 257–262.

Worth, Dean. 1984. Russian GEN2, LOC2 Revisited. In Joost van Baak (ed.), *Signs of Friendship*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Ylikoski, Jussi. 2014. Davvisámegiela -ráigge – substantiiva, advearba, postposišuvdna vai kásus? *Sámi dieđalaš áigecála* 2014(2). 47–70.

Zwicky, Arnold. 1974. Hey, Whatsyourname. In Michael La Galy, Robert A. Fox & Anthony Bruck (eds.), *Papers from the Tenth Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society. April 19–21, 1974*, 787–801. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Zwicky, Arnold M. 1985. Clitics and particles. *Language* 61(2). 283–305. https://doi.org/10.2307/414146