

# English Kinship Terms: From Taboo to Syntax

Brett Reynolds 

Humber Polytechnic & University of Toronto

28th December 2025

## Abstract

English-speaking children virtually never address parents by first name – a social prohibition encoding power and solidarity. Separately, English kinship terms like *Mom* and *Dad* permit bare singular use (*Mom called*) where other count nouns don't (*\*Neighbor called*). Nobody has connected these facts. I argue that the naming taboo causes the proper-noun-like syntax: high-frequency use of kinship terms in vocative position – forced by the prohibition on first names – produces grammaticalization toward strong proper name status. The CGEL framework provides the analytical apparatus: kinship terms can function semantically as proper names (bare, unique reference) or retain their relational meaning (with determiner). This functional split reflects positional grammaticalization, not polysemy. The taboo is the engine; the syntax is the sediment.

Keywords: kinship terms, naming taboo, proper nouns, grammaticalization, address forms

## I INTRODUCTION

In *The Parent Trap* (1998), the emotional center of the reunion isn't a revelation of biology; it's a restoration of a word. After eleven years engineered around separation – one parent per child, one child per parent – the father finds himself face-to-face with the daughter who has grown up without him. The dialogue turns on something more miniature and more brutal: what you're allowed to *call* someone.

Nick reaches for the point that matters: “So let me see if I get this – you missed being able to call me Dad?” Annie answers just as plainly: “Yeah. I really have, Dad.”

Nothing in that exchange is about reference; both speakers know exactly who's being talked to. The ache is about a social relation that English encodes – and polices – through address, where *Dad* isn't descriptive content but a licensed stance of affiliation, entitlement, and obligation.

That licensing is tight. A child who replaces *Dad* with *Nick* isn't merely “using a different label”; they're staging distance. And when the kinship term returns, it doesn't just report reconciliation – it performs it. The paper that follows treats that everyday naming taboo as a grammatical force: one reason English *Mom* and *Dad* behave, in key syntactic positions, less like common nouns and more like proper nouns.

### 1.1 *Two facts that should be connected*

Two facts about English kinship terms have been documented extensively. Neither literature cites the other. No one has proposed that they're causally linked.

Fact 1 (Sociolinguistic): English-speaking children virtually never address parents by first name. This is a social prohibition encoding power and solidarity (R. Brown & Gilman, 1960; Dickey, 1997). The asymmetry is stark: parents use children's first names freely; children use kinship terms. Violating the taboo – calling your mother *Sarah* at the dinner table – is face-threatening, marked, and culturally dispreferred across social classes.

Fact 2 (Syntactic): English kinship terms permit bare singular use where other count nouns don't:

- |     |    |                           |                            |
|-----|----|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| (1) | a. | <i>Mom's here.</i>        | (grammatical)              |
|     | b. | ? <i>Teacher's here.</i>  | (marginal without context) |
|     | c. | * <i>Neighbor's here.</i> | (ungrammatical)            |

When used this way, *Mom* functions semantically as a PROPER NAME – picking out a unique, identifiable individual. This semantic function is borne out syntactically: *Mom* appears as a bare proper noun without a determiner, the hallmark of what Huddleston and Pullum (2002) call a STRONG PROPER NAME. With a determiner – *my mom*, *the mom in question* – the same lexical item retains its relational meaning. The bare singular pattern is remarkable because English generally resists bare singular count nouns in argument position (*\*I bought table*) – with limited exceptions in institutional frames (

mentiongo to school,  
mentionin hospital).

The gap: Nobody has connected these facts. The sociolinguistics literature documents the address asymmetry through power/solidarity frameworks. The syntax literature documents the determiner alternation and bare singular behavior. Neither cites the other; neither proposes a causal mechanism.

### 1.2 *The proposed mechanism*

This paper fills that gap. The argument is simple: the social prohibition on first-name use forces high-frequency use of kinship terms in vocative and address position. That frequency – sustained across childhood and into adulthood – produces exactly the conditions under which grammaticalization toward proper-noun-like syntax occurs.

The causal pathway has four steps:

First, *social prohibition*: children can't use parents' first names. The taboo is enforced by correction, by awkwardness, by the visceral wrongness of hearing a peer say "Hey, Nick" to their father.

Second, *address function*: the prohibition forces kinship terms into the slot normally occupied by proper names. *Mom* and *Dad* become the primary vocative forms – the words a child uses to get a parent's attention, to address them directly, to refer to them in third-person conversation with other family members.

Third, *high frequency*: this isn't occasional use. Children say *Mom* and *Dad* hundreds of thousands of times over the course of childhood. Each use is in a slot prototypically occupied by proper names.

Fourth, *grammaticalization*: repetition in a name-like slot produces entrenchment. The form gets stored as an unanalyzed chunk with the distributional privileges of a proper noun – it appears without a determiner, it resists modification in ways that common nouns don’t – while acquiring the semantic function of a proper name: unique reference to a specific individual.

Grammar, on this view, is “sedimented behavior” (Bybee, 2010), not a set of abstract rules that “allow” exceptions. *Mom* isn’t a common noun that the grammar happens to permit in a bare-singular slot. It’s a form that has acquired proper-noun distribution through the pressure of its use.

### 1.3 The CGEL framework

The analytical apparatus comes from *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language* (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002), which maintains strict category–function distinctions that earlier treatments conflate.

Concept	Definition	Example
Proper noun	Noun with proper-name function	<i>John, Mom</i> (bare)
Proper name	NP with unique definite reference	<i>the United Kingdom</i>
Strong proper name	Proper name without article	<i>Paris, Mom</i>
Weak proper name	Proper name with <i>the</i>	<i>the Thames</i>
Bare singular	Count noun without determiner	Normally ungrammatical

Table 1: Key terminology from CGEL

Kinship terms show a functional split:

- (2) a. Proper-name semantics, proper-noun distribution: *Mom called*.
- b. Relational semantics, default distribution with determiner: *My mom called*.

CGEL itself notes this split in its treatment of vocatives (§5.20.5): kin terms are listed alongside personal names as NPs that can serve vocative function, and the text explicitly observes that “the kin terms include those that can be used with the status of proper names” (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002, p. 522). *Mum, Mom, and Mummy* are given as examples. Other kin terms – *son, cousin* – are “hardly possible as proper names,” showing that the category is graded rather than uniform.

This isn’t polysemy in the usual sense. It’s positional: the same lexical item – a common noun – acquires different syntactic privileges depending on whether it’s functioning semantically as a proper name or retaining its default relational semantics. The grammaticalization story explains *why* kinship terms developed this split: the taboo forces them into proper-name function so frequently that they’ve acquired the syntactic distributional properties of proper nouns.

### 1.4 Relation to deictality and definiteness

In a companion analysis, I distinguish DEICTALITY – a morphosyntactic property cluster – from DEFINITENESS – a semantic one. Deictal determiners (*the, this, my*) show distributional restrictions: they resist existential pivots, license partitive complements, host identificational constructions. Definiteness is interpretive: identifiability, uniqueness, anaphoric recoverability.

Proper names occupy a distinctive position in this framework: they're *semantically definite* (they refer to unique, identifiable individuals) but *morphosyntactically non-deital* (they appear without determiners and don't show the distributional restrictions of deital NPs). English kinship terms, when functioning as proper names, pattern exactly this way. They're definite in meaning but bare in form – grammaticalized fossils of the taboo that shaped their use.

This explains why *Mom called* behaves more like *Paris welcomed visitors* than like *My mother called*. Both *Mom* and *Paris* are strong proper names: definite in interpretation, non-deital in morpho-syntax. The kinship term has been pulled toward proper-name status by the social pressure of address.

### 1.5 What follows

The rest of the paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 reviews the sociolinguistic literature on address forms and the naming taboo. Section 3 reviews the syntactic literature on proper nouns, bare nominals, and the CGEL apparatus. Section 4 presents the core argument: the grammaticalization pathway from taboo to syntax. Section 5 addresses the cross-linguistic dimension. Section 6 considers objections and alternative explanations. Section 7 concludes.

## 2 THE NAMING TABOO

The literature on address forms has documented a robust asymmetry in English-speaking families: parents address children by first name; children address parents by kinship term. This isn't a quirk of individual families. It's a social rule, enforced by correction and marked by discomfort when violated.

### 2.1 Power and solidarity

The foundational framework comes from R. Brown and Gilman (1960), who analyzed the pronouns of power and solidarity in European languages. Their T/V distinction – the choice between familiar *tu* forms and formal *vous* forms – revealed that pronoun selection encodes social relationships along two dimensions: POWER (asymmetric, hierarchical) and SOLIDARITY (symmetric, affiliative). Superior-to-inferior relations license non-reciprocal address; equals negotiate mutual forms.

The framework extends readily to names and titles. R. Brown and Ford (1961) applied the power/solidarity model to American English address, documenting a system where first-name (FN) and title-last-name (TLN) usage follows predictable patterns. Superiors give first names and receive titles; intimates exchange first names; formal equals exchange titles. The key finding for our purposes is that address form asymmetry reliably encodes power differentials.

### 2.2 The parent-child asymmetry

Within the family, the parent-child dyad exhibits a paradigmatic power asymmetry. Parents freely use children's first names: *Sarah, time for dinner*. Children virtually never reciprocate: \**Sarah, when's dinner?* (addressed to their mother named Sarah). Instead, children use kinship terms: *Mom, when's dinner?*

This asymmetry persists into adulthood. Even when children are themselves parents, even when they have adult relationships with their aging parents, first-name address remains marked. The taboo isn't about childhood dependency; it's about a social relation encoded in language and maintained across the lifespan.

Dickey (1997) provides a systematic treatment of address forms and terms of reference, documenting the forms available in English and their sociopragmatic conditioning. The kinship-term-for-parent pattern is noted as near-categorical in non-marked contexts. What makes it a TABOO rather

than a mere preference is the affective response to violation: discomfort, face-threat, sometimes correction.

### 2.3 *Politeness and face*

The naming taboo is best understood through politeness theory. P. Brown and Levinson (1987) analyze linguistic politeness as the management of *FACE* – the public self-image that interactants claim and mutually support. Address violations threaten face. A child who calls their parent by first name is, in politeness-theoretic terms, performing a face-threatening act: claiming solidarity equivalence where hierarchy obtains.

This face-threat explains the affective charge of the taboo. The “wrongness” of hearing a peer say “Hey, Nick” to their father isn’t merely unconventional. It indexes a stance – claimed equality, refused deference – that violates expectations about parent-child relations. The discomfort is social, not merely linguistic.

### 2.4 *Implications for frequency*

What matters for the grammatical story is the consequence of the taboo for usage frequency. Because children can’t use parents’ first names, they must use kinship terms. This isn’t a free choice among alternatives; it’s a constrained selection with the constraint enforced by social pressure.

The result is massive frequency differential. A child says *Mom* or *Dad* thousands of times per year, every year, from first words through adulthood. Each use occurs in a slot prototypically occupied by proper names – the vocative position, the subject of address verbs, the referential slot in family conversations. The taboo doesn’t just prohibit one form; it channels usage toward another, creating the conditions for grammaticalization.

## 3 KINSHIP TERMS AS PROPER NOUNS

The syntactic facts about kinship terms have been described, but their significance hasn’t been connected to the sociolinguistic facts reviewed above. This section provides the precise analytical apparatus for characterizing what’s grammatically distinctive about *Mom* and *Dad*.

### 3.1 *The CGEL framework*

*The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language* (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002) distinguishes carefully between lexical category and semantic function. A *PROPER NOUN* is a lexical category – a word class with distinctive morphosyntactic properties. A *PROPER NAME* is a semantic function – an NP that picks out a unique, identifiable referent. The two can come apart.

Consider *the United Kingdom*. The noun *kingdom* is a common noun, but the NP *the United Kingdom* functions as a proper name: it refers to a unique political entity. The lexical category is common; the semantic function is naming.

CGEL further distinguishes *STRONG PROPER NAMES* – those that appear without an article (*Paris, John*) – from *WEAK PROPER NAMES* – those that require *the* (*the Thames, the Hague*). Strong proper names exhibit non-deictal morphosyntax: they’re semantically definite (unique, identifiable) but appear bare, without the determiner that typically marks definiteness.

### 3.2 *The bare singular pattern*

English virtually prohibits bare singular count nouns in argument position. You can say *Dogs bark* (bare plural, generic) and *Water flows* (bare mass), but not *\*Dog barks* or *\*Table broke*.

The exceptions reveal the pattern. Proper nouns resist determiners: *Paris is beautiful*, not *\*The Paris is beautiful*. Bare singulars in argument position are the province of proper nouns: forms that have escaped the determiner requirement because they function as strong proper names.

Kinship terms enter this picture precisely when they function as proper names. In *Mom called*, the kinship term appears bare and refers uniquely – exactly like *John called*. The determiner is absent not because grammar has made a special exception but because the form functions as a strong proper name.

### 3.3 *Gradience across kinship terms*

Not all kinship terms behave alike. CGEL notes this explicitly in its discussion of vocatives (§5.20.5): “the kin terms include those that can be used with the status of proper names”, but the category is graded.

- (3) a. Fully licensed: *Mom, Dad, Grandma, Grandpa*
- b. ? Marginal: *Auntie, Uncle*
- c. \* Unlicensed: *Cousin, Nephew, Sister-in-law*

The hierarchy correlates with address frequency. *Mom* and *Dad* – the kinship terms forced into highest-frequency use by the naming taboo – show the most robust proper-name syntax. Terms used less frequently in address exhibit weaker proper-name properties.

### 3.4 *Vocatives and subjects*

Hill (2022) examines the syntactic structure of vocative phrases and notes that kinship terms occupy a distinctive position. In vocative function, kinship terms pattern with personal names: *Mom, come here* parallels *Sarah, come here*. Both are direct address forms; both trigger the same intonational contour; both resist modification in the same ways.

What Hill’s analysis adds is a structural account: vocative phrases have dedicated syntactic positions, and the forms that occupy those positions share grammatical properties. The vocative slot is a grammaticalization highway – a context where high-frequency forms acquire special privileges.

This matters for the causal story. If kinship terms are used primarily in vocative position (because the naming taboo blocks first-name use), and if vocative position selects for proper-name-like properties, then the taboo creates the grammaticalization pressure. The syntax follows from the usage pattern.

## 4 FROM TABOO TO SYNTAX

The previous sections have established two facts and the analytical apparatus for connecting them. The sociolinguistic fact: children can’t use parents’ first names. The syntactic fact: kinship terms like *Mom* exhibit proper-noun distribution. This section presents the mechanism that links them.

### 4.1 *The frequency argument*

The heart of the proposal is frequency. Bybee (2010) argues that grammatical patterns emerge from usage: forms that occur frequently in particular slots become entrenched in memory, stored as units, and eventually acquire the distributional properties associated with those slots. Grammar isn’t a set of abstract rules that happens to permit certain forms; grammar *is* the sedimented residue of repeated use.



The naming taboo creates massive frequency asymmetry. A child who can't say *Nick* says *Dad* instead – thousands of times per year, from first words through adolescence and beyond. These uses aren't scattered across positions. They're concentrated in slots prototypically occupied by proper names: vocatives (*Dad, look!*), subjects of attention-getting verbs (*Dad says...*), referential uses in family discourse (*Dad thinks...*).

This concentration matters. Bybee (2006) shows that frequency in a particular construction produces entrenchment in that construction. A form used overwhelmingly in name position comes to be *stored as* a name – not analyzed compositionally as “the parent who is my father” but retrieved holistically as a unit with the syntactic properties of proper nouns.

#### 4.2 The grammaticalization pathway

Following Hopper and Traugott (1993), we can map a grammaticalization trajectory for kinship terms:

- (4) a. Stage 1 (Source): Relational common noun with determiner: *my mother*
- b. Stage 2 (Bridging): Vocative/address use without determiner: *Mother, can you...*
- c. Stage 3 (Extension): Referential use in name position: *Mother called*
- d. Stage 4 (Target): Strong proper name: bare, unique reference, proper-noun distribution

The bridging context is crucial. Vocative position licenses bare NPs – you can say *Waiter!* without a determiner. But vocative frequency alone doesn't explain proper-noun syntax. *Waiter* doesn't license bare singular subjects: *\*Waiter called*.

What distinguishes kinship terms is the *sustained frequency* across both vocative and referential uses. The taboo ensures that *Mom* isn't just an occasional vocative; it's the *default name* for referring to one's mother. This pushes the form beyond vocative bridging into full proper-name status.

#### 4.3 Evidence of ongoing grammaticalization

The process isn't complete, and evidence of gradience supports the usage-based account:

- *Mom* and *Dad* – the highest-frequency kinship terms – show the most robust proper-name syntax.
- *Grandma* and *Grandpa* follow closely: high address frequency in families where grandparents are present.
- *Mother* and *Father*, more formal and lower-frequency, are grammatical as bare singulars but marked.
- *Uncle* and *Auntie* are marginal: *?Uncle said so* requires supportive context.
- *Cousin*, *Nephew*, *Niece* – rarely used in address – don't license bare singulars.

This hierarchy tracks address frequency. It's not an arbitrary list; it's a prediction of the mechanism. Terms pushed into name position by high-frequency address acquire proper-noun syntax; terms with lower address frequency don't.

#### 4.4 The taboo as causal engine

The naming taboo isn't incidental to this story. It's the engine that drives the frequency asymmetry. Without the taboo – in a culture where children freely used parents' first names – kinship terms would have lower address frequency. They might still be relational nouns (as they are in *my mom*), but they wouldn't be pushed toward proper-name status.

This proposal makes a prediction: in speech communities where the naming taboo is weaker or absent, kinship terms should show less proper-noun-like syntax. They should require determiners

more often; bare singular subjects should be marked or ungrammatical. Section 5 explores this prediction.

#### 4.5 *Grammar as sedimented behavior*

The theoretical upshot is that proper-noun syntax for kinship terms isn't a stipulated exception to general rules about determiners. It's a predictable consequence of how frequently, in what positions, these forms are used.

Bybee (2010) calls grammar "sedimented behavior": the patterns that emerge when repeated interactions leave traces in cognitive organization. The bare singular licensing of *Mom* is sediment from millions of uses in vocative and referential name position. The taboo created the pressure; frequency created the entrenchment; entrenchment created the syntax.

This framing unifies the sociolinguistic and syntactic facts. The naming taboo and the bare singular pattern aren't coincidentally co-occurring. They're causally connected: the taboo produces the usage pattern that produces the syntax.

### 5 CROSS-LINGUISTIC PERSPECTIVE

The English naming taboo is culturally robust but linguistically moderate. Cross-linguistic comparison suggests that the mechanism proposed here should operate with varying force in different languages, depending on the strength of the naming taboo and the structure of the kinship-term system.

#### 5.1 *Stronger taboos: Chinese and Vietnamese*

In Mandarin Chinese, the naming taboo extends far beyond parent-child address. The traditional system of BÌHUÌ ("name avoidance") prohibited speaking or writing the personal names of emperors, ancestors, and senior family members. Children not only can't address parents by first name; historically, they couldn't use any character appearing in a parent's name. The kinship-term system is correspondingly elaborate: distinct terms differentiate maternal from paternal relatives, older from younger siblings, and generation levels with precision exceeding English.

Vietnamese exhibits similar complexity. Kinship terms function as the primary pronoun system, determining not just address but self-reference. A child speaking to a parent refers to themselves as *con* ("child"), not a generic first-person pronoun. The kinship-term inventory is among the most intricate documented, encoding lineage, gender, relative age, and birth order.

These facts generate predictions. If the naming taboo drives proper-noun syntax through high-frequency use in name position, then languages with stronger taboos and more elaborate kinship-term systems should show correspondingly robust proper-name properties for kinship terms. Testing this prediction requires detailed syntactic analysis of kinship terms in these languages – work beyond the present paper's scope but predicted by the mechanism.

#### 5.2 *Weaker taboos*

The converse prediction is equally important. In speech communities where the naming taboo is weaker – where children sometimes use parents' first names, or where the taboo applies only in formal contexts – kinship terms should show less proper-noun-like syntax.

Anecdotal evidence from some Scandinavian families, where first-name use for parents has become less marked, suggests that kinship terms in those households pattern more like ordinary relational nouns. This would be consistent with the mechanism: reduced frequency in name position means reduced grammaticalization pressure.



### 5.3 Methodological note

Cross-linguistic work on kinship semantics is extensive; cross-linguistic work on kinship-term *syntax* is thinner. The prediction here concerns the interaction between address-form taboos and determiner syntax – a narrower question than the semantic structure of kinship systems. Testing the prediction requires careful attention to bare nominal licensing in each language, controlling for the language's more general patterns of article use (or absence).

The present paper restricts itself to English, where both the sociolinguistic and syntactic facts are well documented. The cross-linguistic predictions are offered as consequences of the mechanism, not as confirmed findings.

## 6 OBJECTIONS AND ALTERNATIVES

The proposal connects sociolinguistic facts to syntactic patterns through a frequency-based mechanism. Several objections and alternative explanations deserve consideration.

### 6.1 Objection: Vocatives don't generalize

Objection: Many nouns occur in vocative position without acquiring proper-noun syntax. *Waiter!* is a perfectly good vocative, but *\*Waiter called* is ungrammatical. Why should kinship terms be different?

Reply: The mechanism requires sustained high-frequency use across both vocative and referential positions. *Waiter* occurs vocatively, but it's rarely used as a referential term for a specific individual across repeated interactions. A customer might call out *Waiter!* once at a restaurant; they don't say *Waiter* hundreds of times a day, every day, for years.

Kinship terms differ because the naming taboo forces them into name position *persistently*. The child who can't say *Nick* says *Dad* – not just vocatively, but as the default referential form. This sustained frequency produces entrenchment that occasional vocative use doesn't.

### 6.2 Objection: The semantics explains it

Objection: Kinship terms permit bare singular use because they denote unique referents within a family. The proper-name syntax follows from the semantics, not from frequency or the taboo.

Reply: The semantic uniqueness story faces empirical problems. First, the gradience: *Cousin* also denotes a unique individual in many families (an only cousin), but *\*Cousin called* is degraded where *Mom called* isn't. Second, the asymmetry: the same lexical item – *mom* – functions as a strong proper name when bare (*Mom called*) but as a common noun with determiner (*my mom called*). If uniqueness licensed proper-name syntax, we'd expect consistency.

The frequency mechanism explains the gradience: terms used more frequently in address show stronger proper-name properties. The semantic account doesn't predict this pattern.

### 6.3 Objection: What about *sir* and *ma'am*?

Objection: Address forms like *sir* and *ma'am* also permit bare use. Does the analysis generalize?

Reply: Yes, appropriately. *Sir* and *ma'am* are high-frequency address forms with their own grammaticalization histories. They show some proper-name-like properties: *?Sir called* is marginal but better than *\*Waiter called*. The mechanism predicts exactly this: forms used frequently in address position should show intermediate proper-noun properties.

The kinship story isn't unique to kinship. It's an instance of a general mechanism – frequency in name position produces proper-name syntax – applied to a case where social prohibition creates the requisite frequency.

#### 6.4 *Alternative: Inherent lexical specification*

An alternative account would treat proper-name syntax as an inherent lexical property of certain kinship terms. On this view, *Mom* is simply listed in the lexicon as a proper noun, distinct from the common noun *mother*.

This analysis captures the synchronic facts but leaves them unexplained. Why should *Mom* be a proper noun when *mother* isn't? Why the gradience across kinship terms? The lexical-specification account treats as brute fact what the frequency mechanism derives from usage patterns.

Moreover, the lexical account doesn't connect to the sociolinguistic facts at all. It treats the naming taboo and the bare singular pattern as coincidental. The frequency mechanism treats them as causally connected – and that connection is the paper's core contribution.

## 7 CONCLUSION

This paper has connected two facts that existing literature treats as unrelated: the English naming taboo (children can't address parents by first name) and the proper-noun syntax of kinship terms (mention *Mom* called is grammatical where ungram mention *Neighbor* called isn't). The connection is causal. The taboo creates the frequency; the frequency creates the syntax.

The mechanism is grammaticalization through usage. When the naming taboo forces children to use kinship terms instead of first names, those terms get used thousands of times in slots prototypically occupied by proper names. Repetition produces entrenchment; entrenchment produces proper-noun distribution. The bare singular licensing of mention *Mom* is sedimented behavior – the grammatical residue of a social prohibition.

Three contributions stand out. First, the paper bridges two literatures that have ignored each other. Sociolinguists studying address forms haven't examined determiner syntax; syntacticians studying bare nominals haven't considered the politics of the family. The connection proposed here invites further work at this interface.

Second, the paper provides an explanatory mechanism, not just a description. Other treatments note that kinship terms can function as proper names; this paper explains *emph*why. The naming taboo is the engine; the frequency is the transmission; the syntax is the sediment.

Third, the paper offers falsifiable predictions. Across kinship terms, gradience in proper-name syntax should track address frequency. Across languages, the strength of the naming taboo should predict the robustness of proper-name properties for kinship terms. Within communities, weakening of the taboo should correlate with weakening of proper-name syntax.

Return to *emph*The Parent Trap. When Annie tells her father *enquote*I really have, Dad, the emotional force isn't in the semantics. Both speakers already know who's being referred to. The force is in the restoration of a license: the right to use that word, in that slot, with that person. The naming taboo made

mention. Dad the only available term; a decade of absence didn't change the form's status as a proper name. It still appeared bare, still referred uniquely, still carried the grammatical signature of frequency-driven grammaticalization.

The syntax is the sediment. And the sediment preserves the social relation that created it.

## REFERENCES

- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511813085>
- Brown, R., & Ford, M. (1961). Address in American English. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 62(2), 375–385. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0042862>
- Brown, R., & Gilman, A. (1960). The pronouns of power and solidarity. In T. A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in language* (pp. 253–276). MIT Press.
- Bybee, J. L. (2006). From usage to grammar: The mind's response to repetition. *Language*, 82(4), 711–733. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2006.0186>
- Bybee, J. L. (2010). *Language, usage, and cognition*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511750526>
- Dickey, E. (1997). Forms of address and terms of reference. *Journal of Linguistics*, 33(2), 255–274. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226797006488>
- Hill, V. (2022). The syntactization of kinship in vocative phrases. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.16995/glossa.5765>
- Hopper, P. J., & Traugott, E. C. (1993). *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge University Press.
- Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (2002). *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316423530>