

## Vocative!

A widespread view about the vocative is that it is a noun form that doesn't fall within the realm of grammar, its employment being entirely pragmatically conditioned: it tells us about the relationship of the speaker and hearer/addressee. Vocatives have so far been left out of the rest of the 'core' cases (nominative, accusative..).

My primary concern is to do justice to the vocative by taking it back to where it belongs--grammar proper--and try to see more in it than is standardly acknowledged. I will show that vocatives do have a relation with the sentence, even more, they are syntactically constrained. And the best way to bring vocatives into the sentence is by considering the sentence as a domain that encodes the participant roles of hearer and speaker (Speas and Tenny 2005; Hill 2007).

The focus of my research revolves around three interrelated issues: (i) The ways the vocative noun phrase is integrated in the clause and the positions it occupies in it. (ii) A syntactic analysis of the Vocative Phrase (VoP) at the interface of syntax-pragmatics; (iii) The size/status of the nominal category that contains a noun in the vocative: Is it a NP or is it a DP? The present research draws primarily on evidence from Greek, which is compared with other languages, especially as regards issue (iii).

The outline of the analysis comprises the following main points:

- Although vocatives are not part of the theta grid of the predicate, in their intradeictic function they are always co-indexed with an argument of the verb coding 2<sup>nd</sup> person, thus forming part of the sentence (in particular its left periphery). An important fact that supports the vocative's integration into the clause is the obligatory co-reference of the vocative with a(ny) 2<sup>nd</sup> person argument/modifier in the clause.
- Vocative nouns in Greek are heads of NPs, not DPs. Significant cross-linguistic variation here should be explained on the pragmatics and morphology of the definite article in the various languages, as well as the fact that vocatives are often being confused with other types of nominals, e.g. exclamative noun phrases.
- VoPs are elements projected above the by-now-standard Left periphery (Rizzi 1997). They are embedded in a functional domain that comprises a pragmatic category, namely the 'Pragmatic Role<sub>addressee</sub>', the head of which identifies the addressee. In particular, they occupy the specifier position of this projection.
- The category Pragmatic Role<sub>addressee</sub> is dominated by another pragmatically relevant category, which encodes the speaker's state-of-mind or attitude, viz. the category Pragmatic Role<sub>speaker</sub>. The entire functional complex brings into the syntax and, in particular the propositional content, discourse/pragmatic roles (speaker, hearer) and is located at the clausal (left) periphery. Hence, the category PR is added to the inventory of functional heads which connect syntax with discourse (Force, Topic, Focus).
- Utterance initial vocatives are most commonly calls. Their function is to catch the addressee's attention—what Levinson calls summonses (Portner 2004, reference to Zwicky 1974). In intermediary positions, vocatives display the distribution of any other parenthetical (see also Levinson 1983:71 for the same observation), with which they share other features too (e.g. the comma/pause intonation before and after). When utterance final, the vocative is not used to call (a discourse salient addressee) but rather it is employed by the speaker as a means to maintain contact (also Portner 2004) with the addressee (Portner 2004: 4 following Zwicky 1974, assigns final vocatives the label 'tags'). Regarding vocative morphology, I make the (non-trivial) assumption that vocatives in Greek are basically endingless. Vocatives are to be

identified as simply noun stems, something which is obscured by extensive syncretism.