The vocative and the left periphery

Assumption: The vocative phrase is syntactically integrated into phrasal structure.

Previous Proposals:
Hill (2007): Vocatives are associated with RoleP_HEARER, in the Speech Act Phrase (SAP) (Speas & Tenny 2003) which is projected above the CP.

→ Both proposals above place vocatives in the highest functional projection which hosts lexical material. Hill (2007) does suggest, however, that a TopP could be projected above the SAP.

Portner (2004): Vocatives (like subjects of imperatives) are specifiers of a functional head, addr°, which is projected directly above IP.

Present Proposal:
Vocatives are associated with a functional head (call it Voc°). VocP is in a hierarchical relationship lower than the high TopP and higher than FocP in the functional hierarchy proposed in Rizzi (1997, 2004)).

| Force°  | (Top°  | Voc°  | Foc°  | Top°  | Fin°  |

B. Vocatives
• Refer to the addressee. Often the addressee is already identified
  1) (John,) The time has come (John,) for all good men (John,) to come to the aid of the party (John).

C. Calls
• Address + additional pragmatic function
  2) REQUESTING HEARER’S ATTENTION
     Dude! I’m over here!
     RECOGNIZING HEARER’S PRESENCE
     Jessica! So good to see you!
     DELIVERING URGENT IMPERATIVES
     Paul! Get out of the way!
• Less lexically restricted than vocatives (Zwicky 1974)
  3) CALL
     a. Cabby! Take me to Carnegie Hall.
     VOCATIVE
     b. *I don’t think, cabby, that the Lincoln Tunnel is the best way to get to Brooklyn.

• Incompatible with subordinating adverbs (which depend on previous discourse)
  4) VOCATIVE
     a. But/however/anyway/equally, Bill, we’re all ready to go.
     CALL
     b. *Bill! But/however/anyway/equally we’re all ready to go.

C. Subjects of imperatives
• Identify the INTENDED AGENT of the verb (Jensen 2003)
• Can appear in nominative case

KOREAN
  5) a. Inho-ka ney chinkwu-lul teyliko o-ala.
     Inho-NOM your friend-ACC bring come-IMP
     ‘Inho bring your friend.’ (Pak, et al. 2010)

I. Defining Vocatives

A. Terms of address
• DPs which identify the addressee
  - Calls
  - Vocatives
  - Subjects of imperatives
b. Inho-ya, ney chinkwu-lul teyliko o-ala.
   Inho-VOC your friend-ACC bring come-IMP
   ‘Inho bring your friend.’ (Sun, PC)

- In some cases may antecede 3rd person pronouns
6) SUBJECT OF AN IMPERATIVE
   a. Everybody, gather your,/*their, weapons VOCATIVE
   b. Everybody, it’s time to gather your,/*their, weapons

D. Differences between vocatives and subjects of imperatives
- Vocatives must be definite, subjects of imperatives need not be
7) a. A representative from Virginia, speak up!
   b. *A representative from Virginia, it’s time to speak up!

8) a. Somebody help grandma!
   b. *Somebody, the dog bit grandma

9) a. Nobody touch the computer!
   b. *Nobody, John broke the computer

- Subjects of imperatives must be preverbal (in English)
10) a. Nobody help me with the dishes
    b. *Help me, nobody, with the dishes
    c. *Help me with the dishes, nobody

11) a. Everybody, gather your,/*their, weapons (= 5a)
    b. Gather your,/*their, weapons, everybody, i

Interim Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calls</th>
<th>Vocatives</th>
<th>Subject of Imp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• serve additional pragmatic functions</td>
<td>• must be definite</td>
<td>• identify intended agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• are incompatible with subordinating adverbs</td>
<td>• cannot antecede 3rd person pronouns</td>
<td>• need not be definite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• are more lexically restricted than calls</td>
<td>• may antecede 2nd or 3rd p. pronouns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Vocatives in the left periphery

12) Rizzi 1997
   Force° > (Top° > Foc° > Top° >) Fin° ...

- Moro (2003) argues that vocatives are in a position above Force° using data from Italian.
13) a. O Maria, i ragazzi, li aiuta Gianni.
    o Maria the boys them helps Gianni
   b. ?I ragazzi, o Maria, li aiuta Gianni.
       the boys o Maria them helps Gianni
    ‘Maria, the boys, Gianni helps them.’  (= Moro (12))

→ Vocatives are degraded to the right of topics. Voc > Top

14) a. O Maria, i RAGAZZI, Gianni aiuta, non i conigli.
    o Maria, the boys Gianni helps not the rabbits
   b. *I RAGAZZI, o Maria, Gianni aiuta, non i conigli.
       the boys o Maria Gianni will help not the rabbits
    ‘Maria, THE BOYS Gianni will help, not the rabbits.’  (= Moro (13))

→ Vocatives are illicit to the right of focused DPs. Voc > Foc

    Gianni thinks o Maria that Pietro has read a book
   b. *Gianni pensa che, (o) Maria Pietro abbia letto un libro.
       Gianni thinks that o Maria Pietro has read a book
    ‘Gianni thinks, Maria, that Pietro has read a book.’  (= Moro (17))

→ Vocatives are illicit to the right of complementizers. Voc > Force

- In English, however, the above generalizations do not hold.
16) a. John, it’s ASPARAGUS that I hate, not green beans.
    b. ??It’s ASPARAGUS, John, that I hate, not green beans.
17) a. John, which book did you read?
   b. *Which book, John, did you read?
   → Vocatives are illicit to the right of focused DPs. \( \text{VOC} > \text{FOC} \)

18) a. John, at this cafe, everyone drinks sweet drinks.
   b. At this cafe, John, everyone drinks sweet drinks.
   c. Candy, boys, all children love, but it’s sure to ruin your teeth.
   → Vocatives may appear to the left or right of topics. \( \text{TOP} > \text{VOC} > \text{TOP} \)

19) a. I think, Paul, that Congress will pass the bill.
   b. *I think that, Paul, Congress will pass the bill.

20) a. I think that eventually, Paul, Congress will pass the bill.
    b. I think that, in the winter session, Paul, Congress will pass the bill.
    → Vocatives must appear to the left of the complementizer (\( \text{Force}^\circ \)) (18) unless there is intervening material (19).

Conclusions about English:
- \( \text{TOP} > \text{VOC} > \text{TOP} \)
- \( \text{VOC} > \text{FOC} \)
- \( \text{FORCE} > X > \text{VOC} \)

Theoretical conclusions:
- \( \text{VOC} \) cannot be above \( \text{FORCE} \) (contra Moro (2003) and Hill (2007))
- \( \text{VOC} \) must be in the exploded CP (contra Portner (2004))

III. Analysis

21) \( \text{Force}^\circ > (\text{Top}^\circ > \text{Voc}^\circ > \text{Foc}^\circ > \text{Top}^\circ > \text{Force}^\circ > \text{X} > \text{VOC} > \text{FOC} > \text{TOP}) \) \( \text{Fin}^\circ \) ... 

- The ungrammaticality of (18b), in which a vocative phrase immediately follows a complementizer, does not reflect the order of the functional heads, but is rather the result of a that-trace violation (see section IV).

- Hill’s (2007) analysis of vocatives actually applies to calls.
  Speas and Tenny (2003) propose a Speech Act shell (parallel to the VP shell) which takes 3 pragmatic roles, speaker, utterance (or sentence), and hearer.
  Hill argues that the hearer role can be realized by vocatives.

Hill (2007) (inspired by Speas & Tenny (2003))

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{SAP} \\
\text{Speaker} & \quad \text{SA'} \\
\text{SA} & \quad \text{SA}^* \quad \text{SA}^* \quad \text{P} \\
\text{Hearer} & \quad \text{SA}^* \\
\text{Utterance} & \quad \text{SA}^* \quad \text{Utterance}
\end{align*}
\]

- \( \text{Hearer} \) raises and adjoins to \( \text{SA}^* \) in some cases

The utterance role is checked by \( \text{Force}^\circ \). We have seen that vocatives, as I defined them in section I, are within \( \text{Force}^\circ \) and therefore cannot be an argument of the Speech Act head. However, calls do seem to fit this analysis, in that they are obligatorily utterance initial.

IV. Mid-sentential Vocatives

The puzzle:

22) ’I want to go, Jessica, to a movie

Solution 1:

→ Ashdowne (2002) provides evidence against analyzing vocatives as parentheticals
23) a. The time has come, Mary, for all good men to come to the aid of the party.
   b. The time has come for all good men, my friends, to come to the aid of the party.
   c. *The time has come, Mary, for all good men, my friends, to come to the aid of the party.

   → Multiple vocatives are possible, and in various positions, but only ONE position

Solution 2:
• Phrasal movement to FocP followed by remnant movement of TP to the highest TopP (similar to an analysis mentioned in Hill (2007))

24) I want to go, Jessica, to a movie

25) "I think that, Paul, Congress will pass the bill.

   • The above analysis reduces the ungrammaticality of (18b) to a that-trace violation

26) a. *I think that, Paul, Congress will pass the bill. (=18b)
   b. I think that eventually, Paul, Congress will pass the bill. (=19a)

27) a. *An amendment which they say that t will be law next year
   b. An amendment which they say that, next year, will be law

   (= Rizzi 1997 (83))

V. Conclusions

• Calls, vocatives, and subjects of imperatives must be treated independently
• Calls may be located outside of the CP domain (à la Hill (2007))
• Vocatives are CP internal
• Mid-sentential vocatives are derived though phrasal movement to FocP followed by remnant movement of TP to highest TopP
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