

# The typology of vocative formation

Jakob Maché

`jakob.mache@letras.ulisboa.pt`

Centro de Linguística da Universidade de Lisboa

41<sup>o</sup> Encontro Nacional  
da Associação Portuguesa de Linguística  
Escola Superior de Educação e Ciências Sociais  
do Instituto Politécnico de Leiria  
25<sup>th</sup> October 2025



**Centro de Linguística**  
da Universidade de Lisboa



CLUL

## Overview

Calls, (non-initial) addresses and how they are realised

### Parameters of variation

- Optionality

- Degree of Autonomy

- Position

- Definiteness

- Non-at-issue content

- Physical distance

- Specification of the addressee

- Syntactic host

- Orientation

### Forms of marking

- Particles

- Concatenative vocative forms

- Non-concatenative vocative forms

  - Vowel lengthening

  - Ablaut

  - Tonal inflection and Grammatical tone

Stress-shift

Truncation

Vocative chants

Reduplication

Suppletion

Summary



`https://dkaramasov.github.io/mache/assets/pdf/25-the  
-typology-of-vocative-formation-ENAPL.pdf`

Special issue of Catalan Journal of Linguistics,  
on *The phonology-morphology interface in word-formation*,  
edited by Eulàlia Bonet and Claudia Pons-Moll



<https://revistes.uab.cat/catjl/issue/view/v24-n1>



- ▶ Continuum of vocative marking: complex vocative chants to affixes.
- ▶ All these markers are morphemes. They form meaning pairs (cf. Haspelmath and Sims 2010, pp. 2, 11, 41)
- ▶ Range of realisation: (Almost) the whole spectrum of concatenative and non-concatenative morphological processes described in Haspelmath and Sims (2010, pp. 34–39).
- ▶ which may convey the following aspects:
  - ▶ Mark nouns as 2<sup>nd</sup> PERSON
  - ▶ Description of the relationship between SPKR and ADDR
  - ▶ Message is addressed at referent not ratified as speech participant overhearer
  - ▶ Other not-at-issue meaning regarding shared expectations
- ▶ Based on 9 parameters: comparison of about 150 markers and show their close relatedness

- ▶ Grammars and case studies for about 200 languages studied
- ▶ For 108 languages marked vocatives were mentioned
- ▶ Corpus study for European Portuguese (João Azevedo)

# Basic terminology: Calls and Addresses I\*

Zwicky (1974, p. 787), Leech (1999, pp. 116–117), Stavrou (2013, pp. 328–329): Phrases marked as vocatives can occur in two functions:

## 1. **Calls:**

- ▶ Only utterance initial
- ▶ Designed to catch attention
- ▶ Often/(?)always independent intonation phrase  $\iota$
- ▶ Conative interjection *hey* has a similar function Zwicky (1974, p. 787), Portner (2007a, p. 411)
- ▶ May involve optional lengthening of short vowels in English (Ladd 1978, p. 518 and Hayes and Lahiri 1992, pp. 78, 81–83 for English, Sóskuthy and Roettger 2020, pp. 141–143 )
- ▶ Also observed in animal communication

(1) Hey lady, you dropped your piano.



## 2. Addresses:

- ▶ Also utterance medial (parenthetical) and utterance final
- ▶ Designed to maintain attention, reinforcing social relationship (cf. Droste and Günthner 2021, Leech 1999, pp. 116–117, Stavrou 2013, pp. 328–329)
- ▶ Conative interjection *hey* less felicitous
- ▶ Vowel lengthening appears to be less felicitous
- ▶ Often unstressed, prosodic clitics (cf. Beckman and Pierrehumbert 1986, pp. 293–298 and Gussenhoven 2004, pp. 291–294)

(2) I'm afraid, sir, that my coyote is nibbling on your leg.

- ▶ Goffman (1976, p. 260), Goodwin (1982, pp. 3–6): Three types of listeners.
  1. Overhearer.
  2. Ratified listener.
    - 2.1 Directly addressed.
    - 2.2 Not specifically addressed, but part of a group of discussion participants.

# Parameters of variation\*

1. Optionality
2. Degree of Autonomy
3. Position
4. Definiteness
5. Non-at-issue content
6. Physical distance
7. Specification of the addressee
8. Syntactic host (noun vs. utterance)
9. Orientation

Marking of vocative nouns (phrases):

- ▶ In most languages **optional**
- ▶ In a few languages **mandatory in every context**: vocative suffixes in Czech and Greek, vocative particles in Baoulé and Umbundu (Atlantic-Congo) or Maori (Austronesian)
- ▶ In some languages **mandatory in specific contexts**: vocative particle *o* as a marker of politeness in Attic Greek, particle *á* García-Fernández (2023, p. 226) with H+L\*L% vocative chants in Asturian

- ▶ Many vocative particles such as *hey* in English or *ya* Arabic in can occur as an **independent utterance** with an **independent intonation phrase**  $\iota$
- ▶ Other vocative markers cannot occur independent of a host: Old Bulgarian suffix *-le*, the Modern Bulgarian suffix *-be*, the Umbundu prefix *a* (cf. Hill 2007, pp. 2087–2090, 2022, pp. 2–3, 9)

# Three positions\*

Leech (1999, pp. 107–108, 114–115), Stavrou (2013, pp. 323–329) and López and Schmid (2022, pp. 78–80) differentiate between three types of vocatives:

- ▶ **Utterance initial:** Typically separate prosodic unit (intonation phrase  $\iota$  with complete contour)
- ▶ **Utterance medial:** Often a separate prosodic unit, type of parantheticals, constraint to particular positions – much rarer (cf. Dehé 2009, pp. 570–571, 575, 610, Espinal 2013, pp. 310, 315–316, Stavrou 2013, pp. 325–326, Slocum 2016, pp. 159–196 and D'Alessandro and Oostendorp 2016, p. 69)
- ▶ **Utterance final:** most often as a prosodic clitic, integrated into boundarytone of preceeding intonation phrase (cf. Beckman and Pierrehumbert 1986, pp. 293–298 and Gussenhoven 2004, pp. 291–294)



- (3) [voc Ty n'ivy-a] t'a ykyn-dox  
this man-VOC NEG elder.brother-DAT/ADD  
t'axta-ja.<sup>1</sup>  
be.angry-IMP  
'This man, don't be angry at [your] elder brother.' NIVKH
- (4) [voc Nya jìdó!] Ge mi-ya:m-ay-ng-yó?<sup>2</sup>  
my mother.VOC.DIST how 2-go-FUT-2-Q.VOC.DIST  
'My mother! (I can't see you, but I know you are somewhere  
out there) Where are you going?' HUALAPAI

---

<sup>1</sup>As cited in Gruzdeva (1998, p. 20)= ex. (19).

<sup>2</sup>As quoted in Watahomigie, Bender, and Yamamoto (1982, pp. 74–75) = ex. (63).

- (5)      ħKo ħaro'a    'ana   e   koe, e                    Hana ē?<sup>3</sup>  
PRF perceive CONT AG 2S.S VOCPRT Hana VOCPRT  
'Did you hear that, Hana?' [R485.016]                    RAPA NUI
- (6)      Ciamar a    tha    thu, [VOC a                    Mhórag]<sup>4</sup>.  
how        PRT be.2S 2S.S                    VOCPRT VOC.Morag  
'How are you, Morag?' MacKinnon (1971, pp. 171–174) SC.  
GAELIC

---

<sup>3</sup>As quoted in Kieviet (2017, pp. 440–441) = ex. (225).

<sup>4</sup>As quoted in MacKinnon (1971, p. 171).



- (7) a. Thelo            na    se            do,    [voc Maria],  
want.PRS.1S SBJV 2S.ACC see.1S            Maria.VOC  
avrio.<sup>5</sup>  
tomorrow  
'Mary, I want to see you tomorrow'
- b. \* Thelo            na,    [voc Maria],    se            do  
want.PRS.1S SBJV            Maria.VOC 2S.ACC see.1S  
avrio.<sup>6</sup>  
tomorrow
- c. \* Thelo            na    se,            [voc Maria],    do  
want.PRS.1S SBJV 2S.ACC            Maria.VOC see.1S  
avrio.<sup>7</sup>  
tomorrow

---

<sup>5</sup>As quoted in Stavrou (2013, p. 325) = ex. (45b).

<sup>6</sup>As quoted in Stavrou (2013, p. 325) = ex. (45a).

<sup>7</sup>As quoted in Stavrou (2013, p. 325) = ex. (45a).

# Medial vocatives and parantheticals

- ▶ Espinal (1991, pp. 741–744), Dehé (2009, p. 325), Stavrou (2013, p. 325): medial vocatives behave like parentheticals
- ▶ Stavrou (2013, p. 325) medial vocatives in Greek
  - ▶ Possible
    - ▶ After preverbal TOP
    - ▶ After preverbal SUBJ
    - ▶ After V before OBJ
  - ▶ Impossible
    - ▶ After subjunctive complementizer *na*
    - ▶ After object clitics e.g. *se* ‘ACC.3s’
    - ▶ After complementizer *oti* ‘that’
- ▶ ??Vocatives cannot serve as host for prosodic clitics that occur in the clause

# Functions\*

Two main functions of vocative nouns (cf. Schegloff 1968, pp. 1080–1081, Zwicky 1974, pp. 787–788, Levinson 1983, pp. 70–73, Leech 1999, pp. 108–109, 116–117, Sonnenhauser and Noel Aziz Hanna 2013, pp. 14–15, d'Avis and Meibauer 2013, pp. 191–197, Stavrou 2013, pp. 305–306, 327–329 and Slocum 2016, pp. 3–5, 10–12):

1. **Calls (Summonses):** To attract attention of an overhearer, always utterance initial.
2. **Addresses:** Maintain attention, can be utterance medial (parenthetical), or utterance final
  - ▶ Leech (1999, pp. 116–117): Addresses more used to establish and perform social relations.
  - ▶ Levinson (1983, pp. 70–73): No term of address is neutral with respect to social hierarchies.

# Global preferences?

- ▶ Most grammars only have examples of utterance initial vocatives
- ▶ Stavrou (2013, pp. 324, 327–328): Initial position most common and typical in Modern Greek Greek
- ▶ Leech (1999, pp. 114–115): Corpus of 400 vocatives of British and American English: 45 stand alone: initial 46; 37 medial; 272 final.
- ▶ Strong preference for final position in Tzotzil (Mayan, cf. Cowan 1969, p. 22) and Wandala (Afroasiatic, Chadic cf. Frajzyngier 2012, pp. 538–540)

# No determiners\* I

Vocative nouns are not compatible with determiners, noun-class affixes and related markers required in argument position. In many spoken varieties of Hungarian, proper names are preceded by the definite determiner *a*:

- (8) a. Jön a Péter.<sup>8</sup>  
comes DET Péter  
'(The) Péter comes' HUNGARIAN
- b. \* A Péter, gyere.<sup>9</sup>  
DET Péter come-IMP.2S  
Intended meaning '(The) Peter come!' HUNGARIAN
- c. Péter, gyere.<sup>10</sup>  
Péter.VOC come-IMP.2S  
'Péter come!' HUNGARIAN

---

<sup>8</sup>As quoted in Szabolcsi (1994, p. 215) = ex. (84)

<sup>9</sup>As quoted in Szabolcsi (1994, p. 215) = ex. (86)

<sup>10</sup>As quoted in Szabolcsi (1994, p. 215) = ex. (86)

Similar incompatibilities (classifiers, quantifiers) attested with many unrelated languages:

- ▶ Italian (cf. Longobardi 1994, 626–627 Fn.20)
- ▶ Hungarian (Szabolcsi 1994, pp. 215–216)
- ▶ German (cf. Schaden 2010, p. 179, Göksel and Pöchtrager 2013, p. 89, Stavrou 2013, p. 329)
- ▶ Catalan (cf. Espinal 2013, pp. 110, 112, 117, 123, Borràs-Comes, Sichel-Bazin, and Prieto 2015, p. 70),
- ▶ English (cf. Leech 1999, p. 107)
- ▶ Modern Greek (cf. Stavrou 2013, pp. 304, 319, 329–337)
- ▶ East Bantu (cf. Ndayiragije, Nikiema, and Bhatt 2012, pp. 116–117, Hill 2014, pp. 126–128)
- ▶ Mossi (Gur, Atlantic-Congo) (cf. Rennison 2013, p. 80)

- ▶ Gawwada (East Cushitic) (cf. Tosco 2023, p. 172): drops mandatory gender and singulative markers in VOC-use
- ▶ Ngandi (cf. Heath 1978, pp. 35–37, 48, 52) and Wubuy (cf. Heath 1984, p. 217) (both Gunwinyguan)
- ▶ Tzotzil (Mayan, cf. Cowan 1969, pp. 70–71)
- ▶ Chuckchi (cf. Dunn 1999, p. 318).
- ▶ Kilivali (Austronesian, Oceanic, cf. Senft 1986, pp. 43–44)

The cross-linguistically attested incompatibility of vocatives with determiner as feature clash:

- ▶ Fink (1972, pp. 65–67): **vocative nouns** as exponent of 2<sup>nd</sup> PERSON.
- ▶ Bernstein (2008, pp. 1251, 1257–1262) and Hill (2022, pp. 4–5): **determiner** as exponents of 3<sup>rd</sup> PERSON.
- ▶ Bobaljik (2008, pp. 206–207):
  - ▶ 2<sup>nd</sup> PERSON as [–SPKR,+ADDR]
  - ▶ 3<sup>rd</sup> PERSON as [–SPKR,–ADDR].



Zwicky (1974, pp. 796–797), Dascălu (1985, p. 317), Serbat (1996, pp. 101–102) Implicit statements about:

- ▶ Physical distance
- ▶ Social distance
- ▶ Reference to shared expectations
  - ▶ European (L+)H\*!H-% vocative chant: routine/shared expectations fulfilled, no new commitment, beneficial outcome (cf. Ladd 1978, pp. 520–524, Jeong and Condoravdi 2017)
  - ▶ Asturian H+L\*L% vocative chant: speaker expectations violated (cf. García-Fernández 2023, p. 219)
- ▶ Many languages have other types of calls and addresses with more specific nai meaning
- ▶ Similar claims by Eckardt (2014, pp. 224–226), Gutzmann (2019, pp. 247–250)

# Physical distance

In some languages, vocative markers indicate a specific physical distance between speaker and addressee:

- ▶ Distal vocatives:
  - ▶ European (L+)H\*H!-% vocative chant
  - ▶ Central Alaskan Yupik: vowel lengthening (cf. Miyaoka 2012, pp. 859–863)
  - ▶ Gwa (Atlantic-Congo, Kwa, Nyo) particle *xùúúù* (cf. Painter 1975, pp. 19–20)
- ▶ Proximal vocatives:
  - ▶ European Portuguese *ó* (underspecified)
  - ▶ Central Alaskan Yupik: truncation (cf. Miyaoka 2012, pp. 859–863)
  - ▶ Gwa (Atlantic-Congo, Kwa, Nyo) particle *yèééè* (cf. Painter 1975, pp. 19–20)

# Specification of the addressee

- ▶ NUMBER-marking: post-nominal vocative particles -ee ‘-VOC.S’ and -ke ‘-VOC.P’ in Dinka (Nilotic), (cf. Nebel (1948, p. 102)) and Hualapai (cf. Watahomigie, Bender, and Yamamoto 1982, pp. 71–75)
- ▶ GENDER-marking: e.g. M *bǎ(i)* and F *fǎ(i)* (cf. Hill 2007, p. 2080, 2022, p. 8).
- ▶ Relationship:
  - ▶ Honorific/formal Attic Greek *ō* (cf. Schwyzer 1950, pp. 60–61)
  - ▶ Familiarity/informal Portuguese, *ó*, and in Modern Greek, *vre* (cf. Schwyzer 1950, pp. 60–61)
  - ▶ Children, the Korean particle (y)a (cf. Sohn (1999, pp. 341–343))
  - ▶ Gods deceased lovers, the Korean particle *i(si)e* (cf. Sohn 1999, pp. 341–343)

- ▶ Evident, for most languages: nouns phrases
- ▶ Some language allow application of identical markers to more complex utterances: Vocative chants in many Indo-European languages.
- ▶ Allocutive markers in Basque, only to verbs (cf. Antonov 2015)


# Vocative chants with complex utterances\*

In many languages, calling contours are compatible with different speech acts/sentence types, such as German (cf. Gibbon 1976, pp. 274–287), English (cf. Ladd 1978, pp. 520–525; Jeong and Condoravdi 2017, 2018) and Hungarian (cf. Varga 2008, pp. 480–481, 492–494):

speech act	default	calling contour	
GREETINGS	<i>Hallo</i> <sup>H*L-L%</sup>	<i>Hallo</i> <sup>L+H*!H-%</sup>	'hello'
ADDRESS	<i>Susi</i> <sup>H*L-L%</sup>	<i>Susi</i> <sup>L+H*!H-%</sup>	
wh-Q	<i>Wo bist Du?</i> <sup>H*L-L%</sup>	<i>Wo bist Du?</i> <sup>L+H*!H-%</sup>	'Where are you?'
POLAR Q	<i>Kannst Du mich hören</i> <sup>L*H-!H%</sup>	<i>Kannst Du mich hören</i> <sup>L+H*!H-%</sup>	'Can you hear me?'
ASSERTION	<i>Das Essen ist fertig</i> <sup>H*L-L%</sup>	<i>Das Essen ist fertig</i> <sup>L+H*!H-%</sup>	'The food is ready'.
DIRECTIVE	<i>Komm nach Hause</i> <sup>H*L-L%</sup>	<i>Komm nach Hause</i> <sup>L+H*!H-%</sup>	'Come home!'

- ▶ No strict selectional restrictions
- ▶ Basic illocutionary force remains intact (cf. Ladd 1978, pp. 525–526, 535 for similar observations)
- ▶ Puzzle: how to build same utterance with diverging intonations? Is the default intonation overridden? constituent with underspecified intonation??

# Vocative chants with clauses



# Sentential calls – across languages I\*

Some grammars explicitly mention (vocative or related) markers applicable to exclamatives, imperatives and other more complex utterances, **directed at overhearers/addressees out of sight**:

- ▶ Hualapai (Yuman–Cochimí, Southern California): suffix -ó with VOC, other utterances including Q (cf. example Watahomigie, Bender, and Yamamoto 1982, pp. 74–75).
- ▶ Kobon (Nuclear Trans New Guinea): particle o with VOC and other utterances including (cf. Davies 1981, pp. 6, 123–124)
- ▶ Amele (Nuclear Trans New Guinea): e/o with VOC and other utterances including (cf. Roberts 1987, p. 272).
- ▶ Tzotzil (Mayan): e with VOC and sentential utterances (cf. Cowan 1969, pp. 21–22)
- ▶ Yorùbá (Western-Benue): ocative chant which manifests as a register raise, also with IMP *^wá* ‘come.DIST’ (cf. Oláwalé 2022, pp. 4–5, Manfredi 2003)

# Sentential calls – across languages II\*

- ▶ Ngardi (Pama-Nyungan): clitic =*wu* predominantly with IMP and HORT, with (cf. Ennever 2021, pp. 104–105, 627)
- ▶ Warlpiri (Pama-Nyungan): ‘exclamation’/‘intensifyer’ suffix =*wu*, with stress-shift to penultimate syllable EXCL, (cf. Jagst 1975, p. 44)
- ▶ Wubuy (Gunwinyguan): vocative chant lengthening of final syllable + high pitch + marker *u*, found with VOC, EXCL, IMP (cf. Heath 1984, p. 86)
- ▶ Morphologically marked alarm calls in Ancient Greek *Io Bacchus!* ‘PRT Bacchus.NOM’, Middle High German *fiur=â* ‘fire=PRT’ and Early New High German *Feind=io* ‘enemy=PRT’ (cf. J. L. C. Grimm 1850, p. 112)



- ▶ Morphologically marked alarm calls in Ancient Greek *Io Bacchus!* ‘PRT Bacchus.NOM’, Middle High German *fiur*=â ‘fire=PRT’ and Early New High German *Feind*=*io* ‘enemy=PRT’ (cf. J. L. C. Grimm 1850, p. 112)

# Sentential calls – across languages IV\*

Grammars in which vocative markers are observed to occur with IMP or EXCL, without explicitly claiming that they are addressed at listeners out of sight:

- ▶ Chukchi: vowel lengthening with VOC, IMP, EXCL (cf. Dunn 1999, pp. 54–55, 87, 90)
- ▶ Makah, Nitinat and Nuu-chah-nulth: Ablaut with VOC, IMP (cf. Jacobsen 1994, pp. 28, 29, 31, 34)
- ▶ Sardinian, Catalan: Truncation with VOC, IMP (cf. Floricic and Molinu 2012, 2018, pp. 272, 276)
- ▶ Nivkh: Same suffix + stress shift with VOC, IMP (cf. Gruzdeva 1998, p. 12)
- ▶ Yorùbá (Atlantic-Congo): Particle ò with VOC, DECL, IMP (cf. Brown 2010, pp. 10–12)
- ▶ Gyele (Bantu): suffix o with VOC, IMP (cf. N. Grimm 2021, p. 249)

# Sentential calls – across languages V\*

- (9) Nya jìdó!                      Ge mi-ya:m-ay-ng-yó?<sup>11</sup>  
my mother.VOC.DIST how 2-go-FUT-2-Q.VOC.DIST  
'My mother! (I can't see you, but I know you are somewhere  
out there) Where are you going?'                      HUALAPAI
- (10) mùdì              kí      tàtò      wúó<sup>12</sup>  
CL1-person NEG scream there-VOC-DIST  
'Nobody scream over there!'                      GYELE

---

<sup>11</sup>As quoted in Watahomigie, Bender, and Yamamoto (1982, pp. 74–75) = ex. (63).

<sup>12</sup>As quoted in N. Grimm 2021, p. 249 = ex. (13).

# Sentential calls – across languages VI\*

- (11) riga::u!<sup>13</sup>  
mother.VOCPRT  
'(my) mother!' WUBUY
- (12) n<sup>9</sup>ura::u!<sup>14</sup>  
fire.VOCPRT  
'Fire!' WUBUY
- (13) wuɿ=ri-n<sup>y</sup>      jiɿ-na::u!<sup>15</sup>  
???.VOCPRT  
'They are fighting' WUBUY

## Sentential calls – across languages VII\*

- (14) a. A: Ban a g-an o. Ban a  
who QUOT do-PST.2S VOC-DIST who QUOT  
g-an o. Ban a g-an  
do-PST.2S VOC-DIST who QUOT do-PST.2S  
o.<sup>16</sup>  
VOC-DIST
- b. B: Augi o. Augi o. Augi o.<sup>17</sup>  
Augi VOC-DIST Augi VOC-DIST Augi VOC-DIST  
A: 'Who did you say [has died]?'  
B: Augi. KOBON

<sup>17</sup>As quoted in Davies 1981, p. 6 = ex. (11c).

The parallel behaviour of vocatives and imperatives:

- ▶ Both have a close connection to the 2<sup>nd</sup> PERSON, (cf. Stavrou 2013, p. 323)

Moro (2003, pp. 248–249), Stavrou (2013, pp. 216–219):

- **intradeictic**: VOC corresponds argument:

(15)      Petro<sub>i</sub>,      \_\_\_<sub>i</sub> ela      [na  
             Petros.VOC      come-IMP.2S SBJV  
             fas].  
             eat.SBJV.AOR.3S  
             ‘Petros come to eat!’

M. GREEK

- **extradeictic**: VOC not co-referrent with any arg

(16)      Petro<sub>i</sub>,      I      Maria<sub>j</sub>      prepei [na  
             Petros.VOC DET.F Maria.NOM must    SBJV  
             fiji].  
             leave.SBJV.AOR.3S  
             ‘Petros, Maria must leave!’

M. GREEK

Evident, for most languages: nouns phrases, for some also more complex utterances

1. Particles
2. Concatenative extra slide on case
3. Non-concatenative forms
  - 3.1 base modification: vowel lengthening
  - 3.2 base modification: ablaut
  - 3.3 base modification: stress shift
  - 3.4 base modification: tonal inflection extra slide: on grammatical tone, tonal inflection
  - 3.5 reduplication
4. Suppletion



- ▶ Most common form of marking
- ▶ Tend to convey not-at-issue meaning, specification of the relation
- ▶ Tend to be optional
- ▶ More common with calls, than with addresses
- ▶ Areal preferences for order
  - ▶ Preference for prenominal particles in European languages
  - ▶ preference for postnominal particles in African languages

# Vocative as case?

- ▶ Some traditional grammars take vocative to be case.
- ▶ New approaches: case assigned by speech act projection (cf. Hill 2007)
- ▶ Dryer (2005, pp. 210–211) and Spencer (2009, pp. 185–186): 431 out of 480 languages with case employ suffixes, only 35 with prefixes
- ▶ Pro argument: VOC comes as a suffix in many (ancient) Indo-European languages that attaches on noun stems like case suffixes

# Case-like suffix or derivational suffix?

Motivation to classify VOC-markers as case:

1. If a language has case paradigm, VOC-marker automatically considered as one of the cases (cf. van Driem 1987, pp. 33–52, Fähnrich 1987, pp. 47–62, 150 or Hewitt 1995, pp. 33–41)
2. Languages with case paradigm can have VOC-marker that are not part of the case paradigm (cf. Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001, pp. 106, 340–341, 470, Gruzdeva 1998, pp. 18–22, Nedjalkov and Otaina 2013, p. 55, Fortescue 1984, pp. 205–209, 225, Dench 1994, pp. 59–60, 63–94, 100–103, 107–112, Merlan 1989, pp. 56–57, Crazzolara 1960, pp. 20–24, 140)

# Arguments against VOC as case

1. Lots of languages with rich case paradigm lack parallel vocative marking (Uralic, Turkic, various languages from Australia and Siberia, Central Alas)
2. Case-less languages with VOC markers Bulgarian, many Atlantic-Congo languages
3. In many languages VOC involves morphological irregularities not found with case inflection.
4. VOC markers often convey not-at-issue meaning
5. VOC not dependent from any overt syntactic head (But see Hill 2007 on particle *hai* in Romanian)
6. VOC affixes often additionally involve non-concatenative processess

- ▶ Most frequent type non-concatenative process in the formation of vocatives
- ▶ Often result of grammaticalisation through assimilation of a post nominal VOC-particle

Rare but found in Wakashan branch (cf. Jacobsen 1994) with ablaut from *a* > *e* and *u* > *o* among others:

- (17)       $\text{ʔuʃax} \cdot \text{uda} \rightarrow \text{ʔuʃax} \cdot \text{ude}^{18}$   
         child.NOM      child.VOC  
         ‘Child.’

MAKAH

- (18)       $\text{ʔa} \cdot \text{si} \cdot \text{qsu} \rightarrow \text{ʔa} \cdot \text{si} \cdot \text{qso}^{19}$   
         niece.NOM      niece.VOC  
         ‘Niece.’

NUU-CHAH-NULTH

---

<sup>18</sup>As quoted in Jacobsen (1994, p. 27) =ex. (28).

<sup>19</sup>As quoted in Jacobsen (1994, p. 29) =ex. (53).

# Grammatical tone and tonal inflection

Some language families have been observed to make use of pitch to mark grammatical functions, referred to as *grammatical tone* by people working on African languages Rolle 2018, pp. 3–6, 19, 53–54.

- ▶ Dogon languages (cf. Heath and McPherson 2013, McPherson and Heath 2015 Heath 2015): verb derivation processes, purposive clause formation and possessor NPs are marked by a distinguished tonal pattern
- ▶ Chalcatongo Mixtec (Oto-Manguan, Central Mexico) adjectives derivation can be derived from nouns by the application of a non-concatenative derivational morpheme replacing all the tones of the noun stem with high tones (cf. Macaulay 1996, pp. 64–65)
- ▶ Also with case marking in Ripuarian (cf. Gussenhoven and Peters 2004, pp. 255–256) and Limburgian Dutch attributive adjectives (cf. Van Oostendorp 2005, p. 108).

Definition grammatical tone by Rolle (2018, p. 19):

*Grammatical tone (GT): a tonological operation which is not general across the phonological grammar, and is restricted to the context of a specific morpheme or construction, or a natural class of morphemes or constructions (i.e. grammatically conditioned tone addition, deletion, replacement, shifting, assimilation, dissimilation, etc.)*

Replacive-dominant grammatical tone Rolle (2018, pp. 4–6, 53–57):

*Replacive-dominant: the automatic replacement of the underlying tone of the target, revalued with a grammatical tune*



Found in many language families

- ▶ Turkic Turkish Göksel and Kerslake (2005, p. 27), Uzbek Noel Aziz Hanna and Sonnenhauser 2013, p. 284
- ▶ Nivkh Gruzdeva (1998, p. 12) and Nedjalkov and Otaina (2013, p. 55)
- ▶ Some Australian languages

Another fairly wide spread strategy

- ▶ Aleghrese Catalan in North West Sardinia (Cf. Vanrell and Cabré 2011, D'Alessandro and Oostendorp 2016, pp. 63–65, 72–78, Floricic and Molinu 2018, pp. 272–278)
- ▶
- ▶ Central Alaskan Yupik
- ▶ Övdelian
- ▶ Yapese (Austronesian, Oceanic), Indonesian (Austronesian, Malayo-Chamic)

## \*Vocative chants

Combination of several non-concatenative processes which may involve the following aspects:

- ▶ Vowel lengthening
- ▶ Grammatical Tone
- ▶ Suffixation (e.g Australian languages)

- ▶ Yorùbá, with downstep, endearment, playful admonishment: Bọ̀sẹ̀, 'Bọ̀sẹ̀

# Suppletion

- ▶ Kulina (Arawakan): *bedi* ‘daughter’ → *asi* ‘daughter.VOC’ (cf. Dienst (2014, pp. 275–276))
- ▶ Basque 2<sup>nd</sup> PERSON: *hi* (INTM) *zu* (FRML) pronouns: *to* M.VOC *no* F.VOC (cf. Haddican 2018, pp. 3–4, Hualde and Ortiz de Urbina 2003, pp. 150–152)
- ▶ Leyew and Allene (2023, pp. 155–156): Awngi (Central Cushitic) has separate suppletive vocative pronouns for genders M and F: *yandza* ‘you.M’ and *yana* ‘you.F’, whereas regular 2S pronouns lack gender distinction: *int* ‘you.NOM’
- ▶ Treis (2023, p. 215): Kambaata (East Cushitic) has separate suppletive vocative pronouns for genders M and F: *kóo* ‘you.M’ and *tée* ‘you.F’, whereas regular 2S pronouns lack gender distinction: *at* ‘you.NOM’, *kées* ‘you.ACC’
- ▶ **ShafiMeyer** Mesqan (Ethiosemitic): suppletive vocative forms for some kinship terms: *ajjo* ‘mother.VOC’ ← *imm* and *qaffä* ‘elder brother.VOC’ ← *qobbe*

# Vocative particles in (Indo-)European languages

language	item	optionality	autonomy	position	address	call	distance	social relation	host
Portuguese	<i>ó</i>	✓	—	pre-N	(✓)	✓		intimate	n
Asturian	<i>á</i>	✓/—	—	pre-N	—	✓	?	?	?
Catalan	<i>eh</i>	✓	✓	pre-N	?	✓	?	?	?
	<i>ey</i>	✓	✓	pre-N	?	✓	?	?	?
Sardinian	<i>ɔ</i>	✓	—	pre-N	—	✓		?intimate	?
Scots Gaelic	<i>a</i>	?	?	pre-N	✓	✓	?	? formal	?
Irish	<i>a</i>	?	?	pre-N	✓	✓	?	?	?
English	<i>hey</i>	✓	✓	pre-N	—	✓		informal	?
Viennese German	<i>heast</i>	✓	✓	pre-N	—	✓		intimate	n+cl
	<i>heans</i>	✓	✓	pre-N	—	✓		informal	n+cl
	<i>ge</i>	✓	✓	pre-N	—	✓		informal	n+cl
Albanian	<i>o</i>	?	?	flexible	?	?	?	?	?
Old Bulgarian	<i>-le/le</i>	✓	—	post-N	?	✓	?	?	?
Bulgarian	<i>be</i>	✓	—	post-N	?	✓	?	?	?
Romanian	<i>bre</i>	✓	✓	pre-N	?	✓	?	informal	?
	<i>măi</i>	✓	✓	pre-N	✓	✓	?	informal	?
	<i>bă(i)</i>	✓	✓	pre-N	?	✓	?	inf. M.	?
	<i>fă(i)</i>	✓	✓	pre-N	?	✓	?	inf. F.	?
Greek, Attic	<i>ō</i>	—	?	pre-N	✓	✓	?	formal	?
Modern Greek	<i>vre</i>	✓	✓	pre-N	✓	✓	?	informal	?
	<i>o</i>	✓	✓	pre-N	✓	✓	?	?	?
	<i>e</i>	✓	—	pre-N	—	✓	?	?	?
Persian	<i>ey</i>	✓	?	pre-N	✓	—	?	archaic	?

**Table:** Vocative particles in (Indo-)European languages

# Vocative particles in Asian and Oceanic languages

language	item	optionality	autonomy	position	address	call	distance	social relation	host
Mari	-j	✓	—	post-N	?	✓	?	intimate	?
Lezgian	ja	✓	?	pre-N	✓	✓	?	?	?
Arabic	ya:	✓	✓	flexible	✓	✓	?	?	n+imp
Nivkh AD/ESD	-a/-aj	?	?	post-N	?	✓	?	?	?
Nivkh AD	-o/-ǵo	?	?	post-N	?	✓	?	?	?
Mandarin	a	✓	?	post-N	?	✓	?	formal	?
Korean	(y)a	?	?	flexible	?	✓	?	children	?
	i/∅	?	?	flexible	?	✓	?	adolescent	?
Karbi	ó	?	?	pre-N	?	✓	?	?	?
Dumi	e:	?	?	pre-N	?	✓	?	?	?
Lao	ʔe:j	?	?	post-N	?	✓	?	?	?
Indonesian	nah	✓	?	pre-N	?	✓	?	?	?
	hai	✓	?	pre-N	?	✓	?	?	?
Maori	e	—	?	pre-N	?	✓	?	?	?
	wa:	✓		flexible	✓	✓	?	?	?
Rapa Nui	e	?	?	pre-N	?	✓	?	?	?
	e...ē	?	?	post-N	✓	(✓)	?	?	?
Amele	o	✓	?	flexible	?	✓	?	?	n+cl
Kobon	o	✓	?	post-N	?	✓	distal	?	n+cl
	e/melrō	✓	?	post-N	✓	✓	?	?	?
Coastal Marind	ay	?	✓	post-N	?	✓	?	?	
	aw	?	✓	pre-N	?	✓	?	?	?

Table: Vocative particles in Asian and Oceanic languages

# Vocative particles in Native American languages

language	item	optionality	autonomy	position	address	call	distance	social relation	host
Hualapalai	é	?	?	post-N		✓	prox	?	?
	(y)é	?	?	post-N	?	✓	prox	?	?
	(w)ó	?	?	post-N	—	✓	dist	?	n+cl
Tzotzil	e	✓	?	post-N	✓	(✓)	dist	?	n+cl
Cl. Nahuatl	-é	?	?	post-N	?	✓	?	M. SPKR	?
Aymara	-ya	✓	?	post-N	?	✓	?	(intimate)	?

**Table:** Vocative particles in Native American languages



# Vocative particles in Atlantic-Congo languages

language	item	optionality	autonomy	position	address	call	distance	social relation	host
Kissi	wéi	✓	?	post-N	?	✓	?	children	?
	é	✓		pre-N	?	✓	?	?	?
Mani	-yò, -yè	✓	?	post-N	?	✓	?	?	?
Koromfe	é	✓		pre-N	?	✓	?	?	?
Baoulé	-à	—	?	post-N	?	✓	?	?	?
Ewe	ée	✓	?	post-N	?	✓	dist	?	?
Gwa	yèé	?	?	?	?	?	prox	?	?
	yèééè	?	?	?	?	?	dist	?	?
	xùúúù	?	?	?	?	?	dist	?	?
Yorùbá	ò	✓	✓	post-N		✓	?	?	n+imp
Ijò	-àa	✓	?	post-N	?	✓	?	?	?
Eton	á	✓	?	pre-N	?	✓	?	?	?
Gyele	-ò	✓	?	post-N	?	✓	prox	?	?
	-ó	✓	?	post-N	?	✓	dist	?	n+cl
ɓaka	-ó	?	?	post-N	?	✓	?	?	?
Umbundu	á-l'	—	—	pre-N	✓	✓	?	?	?
Rufumbira	yee (we)	?	?	pre-N	✓	✓	?	?	?
Tswana	-a	?	?	post-N	✓	✓	?	intimate	?
Zulu	e	✓	?	pre-N		✓	prox	intimate	?
	we	✓	?	pre-N	?	✓	dist	?	?
	au	✓	?	pre-N	?	✓	?	solemn	?

**Table:** Vocative particles in Atlantic-Congo languages

# Vocative particles in North and East African languages

language	item	optionality	autonomy	position	address	call	distance	social relation	host
Naro	-è	?	?	post-N	?	✓	?	?	?
Lugbara	<i>la/là</i>	✓	?	post-N	?	✓	?	?	?
Dinka	-ee	✓	—	post-N	?	✓	dist	singular	?
	-ke	✓	—	post-N	?	✓	dist	plural	?
Tarifit Berber	<i>a-</i>	?	?	pre-N	?	✓	?	?	?
Tashlhiyt Berber	<i>wa-</i>	?	?	pre-N	?	✓	?	?	?
	<i>taba</i>	✓	?	pre-N	?	✓	?	senior.F	?
	<i>(da)dda</i>	?	?	pre-N	?	✓	?	senior.M	?
Somali	<i>-èey/-àay/-òoy</i>	✓	—	post-N	?	✓	dist	hon. F.	?
	<i>-òw</i>	✓	—	post-N	?	✓	?	hon. M.	?
	<i>-yahay</i>	✓	—	post-N	?	✓	?	inf. F.	?
	<i>-yohow</i>	✓	—	post-N	?	✓	?	inf. M.	?
Sahoo	<i>-o</i>	?✓	?	post-N	?	✓	?	?	?
Oromo	<i>yaa</i>	?✓	?	pre-N	?	✓	?	?	?

**Table:** Vocative particles in North and East African languages

# Vocative suffixes in (Indo-)European languages

language	item	optionality	position	address	call	distance	social relation	host
Czech		—	stemfinal	✓	✓			n
Polish		✓	stemfinal	✓	✓	?	formal	n
Croatian		✓	stemfinal	✓	✓	?	?	n
Romanian	-e	✓	stemfinal	✓	✓	?	informal	n
Bulgarian	-o	✓	stemfinal	✓	✓	?	intimate	n
	-e	✓	stemfinal	✓	✓	?	intimate	
Modern Greek		—	stemfinal	✓	✓	?	?	n
Lithuanian		?	stemfinal	✓	✓	?	?	
Urdu		?/✓	stemfinal	✓	✓	?	?	n
Hindi		?	stemfinal	✓	✓	?	?	
Basque	-n	✓	post-V	✓	—	?	ADDR.F	decl
	-k	✓	post-V	✓	—	ADDR.M	archaic	decl
	-sy	✓	post-V	✓	—	formal	archaic	decl

**Table:** Vocative suffixes in (Indo-)European languages

# Vocative suffixes in Asian, Australian, Native American and African languages

language	item	optionality	position	address	call	distance	social relation	host
Georgian	-o	✓–	stemfinal	✓	✓			n
Limbu	-e	?✓	stemfinal	✓	✓	?	?	n
Ket	-á/-ó	✓	stemfinal	?	✓	prox	?	n
	-á/-ó	✓	stemfinal	?	✓	distal	?	n
Udihe	-i	✓	stemfinal	✓	✓	?	intimate	
	-e	✓	stemfinal	✓	✓	distal	?	
Itelmen	-el/-a	✓	stemfinal	✓	✓		?	n
Martuthunira	-yi	?	stemfinal	?	✓	?	?	
Mangarrayi	-y	✓	stemfinal	?	✓	?distal	?	n
Nez Perce	-e	?	stemfinal	?	✓	?	intimate-jun	n
	-e?	?	stemfinal	?	✓	?	intimate-sen	n
Central Alaskan Yupik	-mi	?	stemfinal	?	✓	?	formal	n
Gawwada	-a	?	stemfinal	?	✓	?	?	n
Oromo	-na/-nana	✓	?stemfinal	?	✓	?	?	n
Kistane	-o	?	?stemfinal	?	✓	?	?intimate	n
Mesqan	-o	?	?stemfinal	?	✓	?	?intimate	n
Zay	-o:	?	?stemfinal	?	✓	?	ADDR.M	n
	-e:	?	?stemfinal	?	✓	?	ADDR.F	n
Kafa	-cho	?	stemfinal	?	✓	?		n
Sezo	-à	?	stemfinal	?	✓	?		n
Northern Mao	-ol/-a	?	stemfinal	?	✓	?		n
Wolaytta	-oo	?	stemfinal	?	✓	?		n

**Table:** Vocative suffixes in Asian, Australian, Native American and African languages

# Non-concatenative vocative realisations I

language	type	optionality	address	call	distance	social relation	host
Sahoo	vowel length.	?✓	?	✓	?	?	?
Karo Batak	vowel length.	?	?	✓	?	?	?
Chuchki	vowel length.	?	?	✓	?	?	n+imp+excl
Central Alaskan Yupik	vowel length.		?	✓	dist	intimate	?
Chipewyan	vowel length.	?	?	✓	?	?	?
Sierra Miwok	vowel length.	?	?	✓	?	?	?
Mohawk	vowel length.	?	?	✓	?	?	?
Hidatsa	vowel length.	?	?	✓	?	?	?
Wakashan	ablaut u>o, i>e	?	?	✓	?	?	n+imp
Kistane	ablaut V>-o	?	?	✓	?	?intimate	n
Kafa	ablaut -i>-o	?	?	✓	?	?	n
Turkana	tonal infl.	?	?	✓	?	?	?
Shilluk	tonal infl. H	?	?	✓	?	?	?
Ngiti	tonal infl. H	?	?	✓	?	?	?
Sheko	tonal infl. $\acute{V}C\grave{n}$	?	?	✓	?	?intimate M	n
Sheko	tonal infl. $\hat{V}(C)\bar{m}$	?	?	✓	?	?intimate F	n
Karbi	tonal infl. M	?	✓	✓	?	?	?

Table: Non-concatenative vocative forms I

@@@NEWNEW @@@Tosco (2023, pp. 172–173)

(19) a.       20  
              VOC  
              “

---

<sup>20</sup>As quoted in Banti and Vergari (2023, p. 319).

@@@NEWNEW @@@Wakasa (2023): language with  
'word-accent' JM: to me many of the examples could also be  
looked at as case

@@@Wakasa (2023, p. 1091) Wolaytta common nouns inflect  
for five cases

COMPLEX formation: suffixation, stressshift

ABSOLUTE

OBLIQUE

NOMINATIVE

INTERROGATIVE

*The interrogative case is used when the noun is the  
predicate of an affirmative interrogative sentence.*

VOCATIVE: stress shift

(20) a.       <sup>21</sup>  
                  VOC  
                  '

---

<sup>21</sup>As quoted in Banti and Vergari (2023, p. 319).

# Non-concatenative vocative realisations II

language	type	optionality	address	call	distance	social relation	host
Indo-European, Hungarian, Turkish	L+H*!H%	✓	—	✓	dist	intimate	n+cl
German	L*+H L-H%	✓	—	✓		intimate	n
Yorùbá	register rise	✓	—	✓	dist		n+cl
Thai	leveling of H,M,L	✓	—	✓	?	?	?
Mandarin	final L%	✓	—	✓	?	?	?
Wolof	final sustained H%	?	?	✓	?	?	?
Mani	final sustained H%	?	?	✓	?	?	?
Daakaka	vocative chant	?	?	✓	?	intimate	?
Wubuy	vocative chant + =u	?	?	✓	?		cli
Ngardi	vocative chant + =wu	?	?	✓	?		(n+)cl

Table: Non-concatenative vocative forms II



# Non-concatenative vocative realisations III

language	type	optionality	address	call	distance	social relation	host
Elfdalian	stress-shift	✓	✓	✓	?	?	n
Persian	stress-shift	?	?	✓	?	?	?
Turkish	stress-shift	?	?	✓	?	?	?
Uzbek	stress-shift	?	?	✓	?	?	?
Nivkh	stress-shift	?	?	✓	?	?	?
Nahuatl	stress-shift	?	?	✓	?	?	?
Somali	?stress-shift	✓	?	✓	?	?	?
Wolaytta	?stress-shift	?	?	✓	?	?	?
Sardinian	truncation	?	✓	✓	?	?	n+imp
Elfdalian	truncation	✓	✓	✓	?	?	n
Faroese	truncation	?	?	✓	?	?	n
Central Alaskan Yupik	truncation		?	✓	?prox	intimate	?
Seediq	truncation	?	?	✓	?	intimate	?
Kilivila	truncation	✓	✓	✓	?	?	?
Yapese	truncation	?	?	✓	?	?	?
Indonesian	truncation	?	?	✓	?	?	?

Table: Non-concatenative vocative forms II

## \*Exclamatives and vocatives

- ▶ Identical marking in many languages: Svennung (1958) and Hill (2007, pp. 2078, 2080–2082, 2086–2090, 2092–2098) for Romanian, Abreu de Carvalho (2013, p. 53) for European Portuguese, Stavrou (2013, pp. 311–315) for Modern Greek, Akinlabí and Liberman (2000, pp. 43–44) and Ọláwalé (2022, p. 2) for Yorùbá, Dunn (1999, pp. 87, 90) for Chukchi and Miyaoka (2012, pp. 794–798)
- ▶ Reference a salient expectation within the shared belief space of the speaker and the addressee.
  - ▶ EXCL: Violation of speaker expectation.
  - ▶ L+H\*!H% Vocative chant: confirmation of speaker expectation.
  - ▶ Asturian H+L\*L% Vocative chant: violation of speaker expectation.

- ▶ Longobardi (1994): vocatives lack DP layer
- ▶ Hill (2007, 2014, 2022): vocatives merged in SpeechAct Phrase, as addressee complement of the abstract speech act predicate
- ▶ Espinal (2013)
- ▶ Stavrou (2013)
- ▶ Ritter and Wiltschko (2020)
- ▶ Portner (2007b)
- ▶ Predelli (2008)

## \*Six key findings I

1. The marking of calls and addressess is particularly prone to atypical morphological strategies (cf. Spencer 2009, p. 186 and Floricic and Molinu 2018, pp. 273–278)
2. Systematic parallels exist between vocatives and exclamatives
3. Calls (?and addressess) can function as independent speech acts or sentence types (cf. Paul, 1880, pp. 192–193, 1920, p. 130, Delbrück 1901, pp. 143–145, Wundt 1901, pp. 74–75, Levinson 1983, pp. 71, 281, 308–312, following Schegloff 1972, pp. 357–359; Asher and Kumari 2013, p. 186 and Borràs-Comes, Sichel-Bazin, and Prieto 2015, p. 70)

## \*Six key findings II

4. In many languages vocative markers can apply to more complex syntactic hosts and utterances
5. Vocative nouns are systematically incompatible with determiners holds in most language (but see Svennung 1958, Schaden 2010, p. 180, Eckardt 2014, 226–227, Fn. 2, Ritter and Wiltschko 2020, pp. 8–9)
  - ▶ Mostly in languages/cultures that allow 3s as form of formal/distant address
6. Vocatives share essential characteristics with smaller parentheticals (comment clauses)
  - ▶ They tend to integrate into host intonation phrases (cf. Dehé 2009, p. 325)
  - ▶ They are to a lesser degree integrated in the syntactic and semantic structure of the utterance conveying not-at-issue meaning/act as conventional implicatures (cf. Gutzmann 2019, pp. 172–260 Eckardt 2014, pp. 225–226), like as-parentheticals and other appositives (cf. Potts 2002)

# Summary tendencies

1. ??Most common examples in grammars involve vocatives in utterance initial position
2. The most common strategy of marking vocatives is the use of particles.
3. Most vocative particles are optional since they tend to carry more specific not-at-issue meanings.
4. Particles are more commonly used to convey the social superiority of the speaker rather than that of the addressee
5. Particles are more commonly used for calls than for addresses.
6. Suffixes are less like to carry not-at-issue meaning, suggesting a stronger degree of grammaticalisation and integration.
7. Mandatory vocative markers tend to bear little or no specific not-at-issue meaning.
8. Intonation contours are only attested in the call function.
9. Non-initial addresses are often realised as prosodic clitics.





Abreu de Carvalho, Ana Sofia (2013). “An overview of vocatives in European Portuguese”. In: *Linguistica Atlantica* 32, pp. 42–58.



Akinlabí, Akíbiyì and Mark Yoffe Liberman (2000). “The tonal phonology of Yorùbá clitics”. In: *Clitics in phonology, morphology and syntax*. Ed. by Beadtrice Gerlach and Janet Grijzenhout. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 31–62. DOI: 10.1075/la.36.04aki.



Antonov, Anton (Jan. 2015). “Verbal allocutivity in a crosslinguistic perspective”. In: *Linguistic Typology* 19.1, pp. 55–85. DOI: 10.1515/lingty-2015-0002.



Asher, R. E. and T. C. Kumari (2013). *Malayalam. Descriptive Grammars*. London: Routledge.



Banti, Giorgio and Moreno Vergari (2023). “Saaho”. In: *The Oxford Handbook of Ethiopian Languages*. Ed. by Ronny Meyer, Bedilu Wakjira, and

Zealelem Leyew. Oxford:  
Oxford University Press,  
pp. 294–319. DOI:  
10.1093/oxfordhb/978  
0198728542.013.16.



Beckman, Mary E. and  
Janet B. Pierrehumbert  
(1986). “Intonational  
structure in English and  
Japanese”. In: *Phonology  
Yearbook* 3, pp. 255–309.  
DOI: 10.1017/S0952675  
70000066X.



Bernstein, Judy B. (Nov.  
2008). “Reformulating the  
Determiner Phrase  
Analysis”. In: *Language  
and Linguistics Compass*  
2.6, pp. 1246–1270. DOI:

10.1111/j.1749–818x  
.2008.00091.x.



Bobaljik, Jonathan David  
(2008). “Missing persons: a  
case study in  
morphological universals”.  
In: *The Linguistic Review*  
25, pp. 201–230. DOI: 10  
.1515/TLIR.2008.005.



Borràs-Comes, Joan,  
Rafèu Sichel-Bazin, and  
Pilar Prieto (2015).  
“Vocative intonation  
preferences are sensitive  
to politeness factors”. In:  
*Language and Speech*  
58.1, pp. 68–83. DOI:  
10.1177/002383091456  
5441.





Brown, Jason (2010).

“Evidentiality and polarity in Yorùbá”. In: *Evidence from Evidentials*. Ed. by Tyler Peterson and Uli Sauerland. Vol. 28. UBC Working Papers in Linguistics. Vancouver: University of British Columbia, pp. 9–28. URL: <https://lingpapers.sites.olt.ubc.ca/files/2018/01/EvidenceFromEvidentials.pdf>.



Condoravdi, Cleo and Sunwoo Jeong (2018).

“Imperatives and intonation: the case of the down-stepped level

terminal contour”. In: *West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics (WCCFL) 35*. Ed. by William G. Bennet, Lindsay Hracs, and Dennis Ryan Storoshenko. Somerville, Mass: Cascadilla Proceedings Press, pp. 214–223.



Cowan, Marion M. (1969). *Tzotzil grammar*.

Oklahoma: Summer Institute of Linguistics.



Crazzolar, Joseph Pasquale (1960). *A study of the Logbara (Ma'di) language. Grammar and vocabulary*.



London: Oxford University Press (OUP).



D'Alessandro, Roberta and Marc van Oostendorp (Nov. 2016). "When imperfections are perfect: Prosody, phi-features and deixis in Central and Southern Italian vocatives". In: *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 10*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 61–82. DOI: 10.1075/rllt.10.04da1.



d'Avis, Franz-Josef and Jörg Meibauer (2013). "*Du Idiot! Din idiot!*" Pseudo-vocative

constructions and insults in German (and Swedish)".

In: *Vocative! Addressing between system and performance*. Ed. by Barbara Sonnenhauser and Patrizia Noel Aziz Hanna. Trends in Linguistics Studies and Monographs 261. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 189–217. DOI: 10.1515/9783110304176.189.



Dascălu, Laurenția (1985). "Romanian call contours". In: *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 30.4, pp. 317–320.



Davies, John (1981).  
*Kobon*. Amsterdam: North  
Holland Publishing  
Company.



Dehé, Nicole (Sept. 2009).  
“Clausal parentheticals,  
intonational phrasing, and  
prosodic theory”. In:  
*Journal of Linguistics* 45.3,  
pp. 569–615. DOI: 10.1017/  
S002222670999003x.  
URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S002222670999003x>.



Delbrück, Berthold (1901).  
*Grundfragen der  
Sprachforschung*.  
Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner.



Dench, Alan Charles  
(1994). *Martuthunira. A  
language of the pilbara  
region of Western  
Australia*. Pacific  
linguistics, Series C 125.  
Canberra: Australian  
National University.



Dienst, Stefan (July 2014).  
*A Grammar of Kulina*.  
Mouton Grammar Library  
66. De Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/  
9783110341911.  
URL:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/9783110341911>.



Droste, Pepe and  
Susanne Günthner (2021).  
“Enacting ‘Being with You’:

Vocative uses of *du* ('you') in German everyday interaction". In: *Pragmatics* 31.1, pp. 87–113. DOI: 10.1075/prag.19030.dro.



Dryer, Matthew S. (2005). "Position of Case Affixes". In: *The World Atlas of Language structures*. Ed. by Martin Haspelmath et al. Oxford: Oxford University Press (OUP), pp. 210–213.



Dunn, Michael John (1999). "A grammar of Chukchi". PhD thesis. Australian National University.



Eckardt, Regine (Jan. 2014). "Dear Edel!: Semantics and Pragmatics of Vocatives". In: *Approaches to Meaning. Composition, Values, Interpretation*. Ed. by Daniel Gutzmann, Jan Köpping, and Cécile Meier. BRILL, pp. 223–249. DOI: 10.1163/9789004279377\_011.



Ennever, Thomas (Oct. 2021). *A Grammar of Ngardi: As spoken by F. Tjama, M. Yinjuru Bumblebee, D. Mungkirna Rockman, P. Yalurrngali Rockman, Y. Nampijin, D.*



Yujuyu Nampijin, M.  
Mandigalli, K. Padoon, P. P.  
Napangardi, P. Lee, N.  
Japaljarri, M. Moora, M.  
Mudgedell and P. Smith.

Mouton Grammar Library  
92. Berlin: De Gruyter. DOI:  
10.1515/978311075243  
4. URL:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/9783110752434>.



Espinal, Teresa M. (Dec.  
1991). “The  
Representation of Disjunct  
Constituents”. In:  
*Language* 67.4,  
pp. 726–762. DOI:  
10.2307/415075. URL:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/415075>.



— (2013). “On the  
structure of vocatives”. In:  
*Vocative! Addressing  
between system and  
performance*. Ed. by  
Barbara Sonnenhauser  
and

Patrizia Noel Aziz Hanna.  
Trends in Linguistics  
Studies and Monographs  
261. Berlin: Mouton de  
Gruyter, pp. 109–132. DOI:  
[doi.org/10.1515/9783110304176.109](http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/9783110304176.109).



Fährnich, Heinz (1987).  
*Kurze Grammatik der  
georgischen Sprache*.

Leipzig: VEB Verlag  
Enzyklopädie.



Fink, Robert O. (Jan.  
1972). “Person in Nouns: Is  
the Vocative a Case?” In:  
*The American Journal of  
Philology* 93.1, pp. 61–68.  
DOI: 10.2307/292901.



Floricic, Franck and  
Lucia Molinu (2012).  
“Romance monosyllabic  
imperatives and  
markedness”. In:  
*Monosyllables*. Ed. by  
Thomas Stolz, Nicole Nau,  
and Cornelia Stroh.  
Beihefte STUF 12. Berlin:  
Akademie Verlag,  
pp. 149–172.



— (Dec. 2018). “Chapter  
18. Are Sardinian  
vocatives perfectly  
regular?” In: *Structuring  
Variation in Romance  
Linguistics and Beyond*.  
Ed. by Mirko Grimaldi et al.  
Linguistik  
Aktuell/Linguistics Today  
252. Amsterdam: John  
Benjamins Publishing  
Company, pp. 271–282.  
DOI: 10.1075/la.252.c  
18flo.



Fortescue, Michael (1984).  
*West Greenlandic*. Kent:  
Croom Helm.



Frajzyngier, Zygmunt (May  
2012). *A Grammar of*



Wandala. Mouton  
Grammar Library 47.  
Berlin: De Gruyter. DOI: 10  
.1515/9783110218411.  
URL:  
[http://dx.doi.org/10](http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/9783110218411)  
[.1515/9783110218411.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/9783110218411)



García-Fernández,  
Eduardo (2023). “The  
intonational form of  
Asturian vocatives and  
their contribution to  
utterance meaning”.  
PhD thesis. Amherst:  
University of  
Massachusetts Amherst.  
DOI: 10.7275/32559232.



Gibbon, Dafydd (1976).  
*Perspectives of intonation  
analysis*. Bern: Lang.



Goffman, Erving (Dec.  
1976). “Replies and  
responses”. In: *Language  
in Society* 5.3,  
pp. 257–313. DOI: 10.101  
7/s0047404500007156.  
URL: [http://dx.doi.or](http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500007156)  
[g/10.1017/S004740450](http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500007156)  
[0007156.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500007156)



Göksel, Aslı and  
Celia Kerslake (Aug.  
2005). *Turkish: A  
Comprehensive Grammar*.  
Routledge Comprehensive  
Grammars. London:



Routledge. DOI: 10.4324/  
/9780203340769.



Göksel, Asli and Markus A. Pöchtrager (2013). “The vocative and its kin: marking function through prosody”. In: *Vocative! Addressing between system and performance*. Ed. by Barbara Sonnenhauser and Patrizia Noel Aziz Hanna. Trends in Linguistics Studies and Monographs 261. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 87–108. DOI: 10.1515/9783110304176.87.



Goodwin, Charles (1982). *Conversational organization. Interaction between and hearers.*

Language, thought, and culture. Advances in the Study of Cognition. New York: Academic Press.



Grimm, Jacob Ludwig Carl (1850). “Über das Feuergeschrei”. In: *Monatsberichte* 21. März, pp. 111–115.



Grimm, Nadine (2021). *A grammar of Gyeli*. en. Comprehensive Grammar Library. Berlin: Language Science Press. DOI: 10.5281/ZENODO.4737370.





Gruzdeva, Ekatarina (1998). *Nivkh*. Languages of the World/Materials 111. Lincom Europa.



Gussenhoven, Carlos (2004). *The phonology of tone and intonation*.

Research Surveys in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511616983.



Gussenhoven, Carlos and Jörg Peters (Aug. 2004). “A tonal analysis of Cologne Schärfung”. In: *Phonology* 21.2, pp. 251–285. DOI: 10.1017/s0952675704000211.



Gutzmann, Daniel (2019). *The Grammar of Expressivity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780198812128.001.0001.



Haddican, Bill (Sept. 2018). “The syntax of Basque allocutive clitics”. In: *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 3.1. DOI: 10.5334/gjgl.471.

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.471>.



Haspelmath, Martin and Andrea E. Sims (2010). *Understanding Morphology*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.





Hayes, Bruce and  
Aditi Lahiri (1992).

“Durationally specified  
intonation in English and  
Bengali”. In: *Proceedings  
of the 1990 Wenner Gren  
Center Conference on  
Music, Language, Speech  
and the Brain*. Ed. by  
Rolf Carlson,  
Lennart Nord, and  
Johan Sundberg.  
Houndsmill: Macmillian,  
pp. 78–91.



Heath, Jeffrey (1978).  
*Ngandi grammar, texts,  
and dictionary*. Australian  
Institute fo Aboriginal  
Studies.



— (1984). *Functional  
grammar of Nunggubuyu*.  
Australian Institute fo  
Aboriginal Studies.



— (Jan. 2015). “Dogon  
noncompositional  
constructional tonosyntax”.  
In: *Journal of African  
Languages and Linguistics*  
36.2. DOI: 10.1515/jall  
-2015-0010. URL: [https  
://doi.org/10.1515%2  
Fjall-2015-0010](https://doi.org/10.1515%2Fjall-2015-0010).



Heath, Jeffrey and  
Laura McPherson (2013).  
“Tonosyntax and reference  
restriction in Dogon NPs”.  
In: *Language* 89.2,



pp. 265–296. DOI: 10.1353/lan.2013.0020.



Hewitt, George B. (1995). *Georgian. A structural reference grammar*. London Oriental and African Language Library 2. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.



Hill, Virginia (Dec. 2007). “Vocatives and the pragmatics–syntax interface”. In: *Lingua* 117.12, pp. 2077–2105. DOI: 10.1016/j.lingua.2007.01.002.



— (2014). *Vocatives. How syntax meets with pragmatics*. Leiden: Brill.



— (July 2022). “The syntactization of kinship in vocative phrases”. In: *Volume 77.1*, pp. 1–24. DOI: 10.16995/glossa.6557.



Hualde, José Ignacio and Jon Ortiz de Urbina (Dec. 2003). *A Grammar of Basque*. Mouton Grammar Library 26. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110801118. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/9783110801118>.





Jacobsen, William H. Jr. (1994). “Nootkan vocative vocalism and its implications”. In: *Sound Symbolism*. Ed. by Leanne Hinton, Johanna Nichols, and John Ohala. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (CUP), pp. 23–39.



Jagst, Lothar (1975). “Ngardilpa (Warlpiri) Phonology”. en. In: *Papers in Australian Linguistics No. 8*. Ed. by M. Sharpe, Lothar Jagst, and D. Birk. Pacific Linguistics. The Australian National University, pp. 21–57. DOI:

10.15144/PL-A39.21.  
URL: <http://sealang.net/archives/pl/pdf/PL-A39.21.pdf>.



Jeong, Sunwoo and Cleo Condoravdi (2017). “Imperatives with the calling contour”. In: *Berkeley Linguistics Society (BLS) 43*. Ed. by Julia Nee et al. Vol. 1. Somerville, Mass: Cascadilla Proceedings Press, pp. 185–210.



Kieviet, Paulus (2017). *A Grammar Of Rapa Nui*. Studies in Diversity Linguistics 12. Berlin: Language Science Press.



DOI: 10.5281/ZENODO.235525. URL:

<https://zenodo.org/record/235525>.



Ladd, Robert D. (1978).

“Stylized intonation”. In: *Language* 54.3, pp. 517–540. DOI:

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/412785>.



Leech, Geoffrey N. (1999).

“The distribution and function of vocatives in American and British English conversation”. In: *Out of corpora: Studies in Honour of Stig Johansson*. Ed. by Hilde Hasselgård and Signe Oksefjell.

Amsterdam: Brill, pp. 107–118. DOI: 10.1163/9789004653689\_013.



Levinson, Stephen (1983).

*Pragmatics*. Cambridge textbooks in linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.



Leyew, Zelealem and Yaregal Allene (2023).

“Awngi”. In: *The Oxford Handbook of Ethiopian Languages*. Ed. by Ronny Meyer, Bedilu Wakjira, and Zelealem Leyew. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 146–164. DOI:



10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198728542.013.11.



Longobardi, Giuseppe (1994). "Reference and proper names: A theory of N-movement in syntax and logical form". In: *Linguistic Inquiry* 25.4, pp. 609–665. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4178880>.



López, Laura González and Svenja Schmid (Dec. 2022). "Vocative, where do you hang out in *wh*-interrogatives?" In: *The Linguistic Review* 40.1, pp. 77–106. DOI: 10.1515/tlr-2022-2106. URL:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/tlr-2022-2106>.



Macaulay, Monica (1996). *A grammar of Chalcatonga Mixtec*. University of California Publications in Linguistics. Berkeley: University of California Press.



MacKinnon, Roderick (1971). *Teach yourself Gaelic*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.





Manfredi, Victor (2003). *Afro-American Studies 90r (Yorùbá)*. Class handout 2003/2004, Harvard University.





McPherson, Laura and Jeffrey Heath (Aug. 2015). “Phrasal grammatical tone in the Dogon languages”. In: *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 34.2, pp. 593–639. DOI: 10.1007/s11049-015-9309-5.


 Merlan, Francesca (1989). *Mangarayi*. Vol. 4. *Lingua Descriptive Studies*. London: Routledge. DOI: 10.1515/9783110871371.

 Miyaoka, Osahito (2012). *A grammar of Central Alaskan Yupik*. Mouton Grammar Library 58. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

DOI: 10.1515/9783110278576.



Moro, Andrea (2003). “Notes on vocative case. A case study in clause structure”. In: *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2001*. Ed. by Josep Quer et al. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 247–262.

 Ndayiragije, Juvénal, Emmanuel Nikiema, and Parth Bhatt (2012). “The Augment in Kirundi: When Syntax Meets Phonology”. In: *Selected proceedings of the 42<sup>nd</sup> Annual*



*Conference on African Linguistics: African Languages in Context.* Ed. by Michael R. Marlo et al. Cascadilla Proceedings Project, pp. 112–121.



Nebel, Arturo (1948). *Dinka Grammar (Rek-Malual Dialect) with Texts and Vocabulary.* Verona: Missioni Africane.



Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. and Galina A. Otaina (Sept. 2013). *A Syntax of the Nivkh Language: The Amur dialect.* Studies in Language Companion Series 139. Amsterdam:

John Benjamins Publishing Company. DOI: 10.1075/slcs.139.



Nikolaeva, Irina and Maria Tolskaya (Dec. 2001). *A Grammar of Udihe.* Mouton Grammar Library 22. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. DOI: 10.1515/9783110849035.



Noel Aziz Hanna, Patrizia and Barbara Sonnenhauser (2013). “Vocatives as functional performance structures”. In: *Vocative! Addressing between system and performance.* Ed. by



Barbara Sonnenhauser  
and Patrizia Noel Aziz  
Hanna. Trends in  
Linguistics Studies and  
Monographs 261. Berlin:  
Mouton de Gruyter,  
pp. 283–304. DOI: 10.1515/  
5/9783110304176.283.



Oláwalé, Rukayat (2022).  
“Une étude perceptive de  
l’influence du contexte  
pragmatique sur  
l’expression du vocatif en  
Yorùbá”. In: *Actes du  
congrès annuel de  
l’Association canadienne  
de linguistique*. URL:  
<https://cla-acl.ca/p>

[dfs/actes-2022/Olawale-CLA-2022.pdf](#).



Painter, Colin (1975). “/m  
hm/, /!m !m/ and some  
forms of ‘yes’ and ‘no’ in  
Gwa”. In: *Anthropological  
Linguistics* 17.1, pp. 19–23.



Paul, Hermann (1880).  
*Prinzipien der  
Sprachgeschichte*. Halle a.  
d. Salle: Niemeyer.



— (1920). *Prinzipien der  
Sprachgeschichte*. 8th ed.  
Tübingen: Niemeyer.



Portner, Paul (Nov. 2007a).  
“Imperatives and modals”.  
In: *Natural Language  
Semantics* 15.4,



pp. 351–383. DOI: 10.1007/s11050-007-9022-y.



Portner, Paul (2007b). “Instructions for interpretations as separate performatives”. In: *On Information Structure, Meaning and Form*. Ed. by Kerstin Schwabe and Susanne Winkler. John Benjamins, pp. 407–426. DOI: 10.1075/la.100.22por.



Potts, Christopher (Aug. 2002). “The syntax and semantics of As-parentheticals”. In: *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 20.3,

pp. 623–689. DOI: 10.1023/a:1015892718818.



Predelli, Stefano (Apr. 2008). “Vocatives”. In: *Analysis* 68.2, pp. 97–105. DOI: 10.1093/analysis/68.2.97.



Rennison, John (2013). *Koromfe*. Descriptive Grammars. London: Routledge.



Ritter, Elizabeth and Martina Wiltschko (2020). “Interacting with vocatives!” In: *Actes du congrès annuel de l’association canadienne de linguistique 2020*. URL: <https://cla-acl.ca/pdfs/actes->



2020/Ritter\_Wiltschko\_CLA-ACL2020.pdf.



Roberts, John R. (1987). *Amele*. Beckenham, Kent: Croom Helm.



Rolle, Nicholas Revett (2018). “Grammatical tone: Typology and theory”. PhD thesis. Berkeley: University of California Berkeley. URL: <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8907602d>.



Schaden, Gerhard (2010). “Vocatives: a note on addressee-management”. In: *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 16,

pp. 176–185. URL: <http://repository.upenn.edu/pwpl/vol16/iss1/20>.



Schegloff, Emanuel Abraham (1968). “Sequencing in conversational openings”. In: *American Anthropologist* 70, pp. 1075–1095.




— (1972). “Sequencing in conversational openings”. In: *Directions in sociolinguistics*. Ed. by John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., pp. 346–380.





Schwyzer Eduard  
und Debrunner, Albert  
(1950). *Griechische  
Grammatik. Auf der  
Grundlage von Karl  
Brugmanns Griechischer  
Grammatik II. Syntax und  
syntaktische Stilistik.*  
München: C.H. Beck'sche  
Verlagsbuchhandlung.

 Senft, Gunter (Dec. 1986).  
*Kilivila: The Language of  
the Trobriand Islanders.*  
Mouton Grammar Library  
3. Berlin: De Gruyter  
Mouton. DOI: 10.1515/97  
83110861846. URL:  
[http://dx.doi.org/10.  
.1515/9783110861846.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/9783110861846)



Serbat, Guy (1996).  
*Grammaire fondamentale  
du Latin.* Vol. 6. Louvain:  
Éditions Peeters.



Slocum, Poppy (2016).  
“The syntax of address”.  
PhD thesis. Stony Brook,  
NY: Stony Brook  
University.



Sohn, Ho-Min (1999). *The  
Korean language.*  
Cambridge: Cambridge  
University Press (CUP).  
Sonnenhauser, Barbara  
and Patrizia Noel Aziz  
Hanna (2013).



“Introduction: Vocative!” In:  
*Vocative! Addressing  
between system and*

performance. Ed. by Barbara Sonnenhauser and Patrizia Noel Aziz Hanna. Trends in Linguistics Studies and Monographs 261. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 1–25. DOI: 10.1515/9783110304176.1.



Sóskuthy, Márton and Timo B. Roettger (Aug. 2020). “When the tune shapes morphology: The origins of vocatives”. In: *Journal of Language Evolution* 5.2, pp. 140–155. DOI: 10.1093/jole/lzaa007.



Spencer, Andrew (2009). “Case as a morphological phenomenon”. In: *The Oxford Handbook of Case*. Ed. by Andrej Malchukov and Andrew Spencer. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 185–199. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199206476.013.0013.



Stavrou, Melita (Nov. 2013). “About the Vocative”. In: *The Nominal Structure in Slavic and Beyond*. Ed. by Lilia Schürks, Anastasia Giannakidou, and Urtzi Etxeberria. Studies in Generative

Grammar 116. Berlin:  
Mouton de Gruyter,  
pp. 299–342. DOI: 10.1515/9781614512790.299.



Svennung, Josef (1958).

*Anredeformen :  
vergleichende  
Forschungen zur indirekten  
Anrede in der dritten  
Person und zum Nominativ  
für den Vokativ.* Uppsala:  
Almqvist & Wiksell.



Szabolcsi, Anna (1994).

“The noun phrase”. In: *The syntactic structure of Hungarian*. Ed. by Ferenc Kiefer and Katalin É. Kiss. Syntax and Semantics 27. New York:

Academic Press,  
pp. 179–274.



Tosco, Mauro (2023).

“Gawwada”. In: *The Oxford Handbook of Ethiopian Languages*. Ed. by Ronny Meyer, Bedilu Wakjira, and Zelealem Leyew. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 165–197. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhnb/9780198728542.013.12.



Treis, Yvonne (2023).

“Kambaata”. In: *The Oxford Handbook of Ethiopian Languages*. Ed. by Ronny Meyer, Bedilu Wakjira, and

Zealelem Leyew. Oxford:  
Oxford University Press,  
pp. 198–226. DOI:  
10.1093/oxfordhb/978  
0198728542.013.13.



van Driem, George (1987).  
*A grammar of Limbu*.  
Mouton Grammar Library  
4. Berlin: Mouton de  
Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/97  
83110846812.



Van Oostendorp, Marcel  
(Dec. 2005). “Expressing  
Inflection Tonally”. In:  
*Catalan Journal of  
Linguistics* 4.1,  
pp. 107–126. DOI: 10.556  
5/rev/catjl.115.



Vanrell, Maria del Mar and  
Teresa Cabré (2011).

“Troncamento e  
intonazione dei vocativi in  
Italia centromeridionale”.  
In: *Contesto comunicativo  
e variabilità nella  
produzione e percezione  
della lingua, Atti el 7  
convegno AISV(26-28  
January 2011, Lecce)*.

Ed. by Barbara Gili Fivela,  
Antonio Stella Garrapa,  
and Mirko Grimaldi.



Varga, László (2008). “The  
calling contour in  
Hungarian and English”.  
In: *Phonology* 25,

pp. 469–497. DOI: 10.1017/S0952675708001607.



Wakasa, Motochimi (2023). “Wolaytta”. In: *The Oxford Handbook of Ethiopian Languages*. Ed. by Ronny Meyer, Bedilu Wakjira, and Zelealem Leyew. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 1079–1104. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198728542.013.45.



Watahomigie, Lucille J., Jorigne Bender, and Akira Y. Yamamoto (1982). *Hualapai reference grammar*. Los Angeles: American Indian Studies Center UCLA.



Wundt, Wilhelm (1901). *Sprachgeschichte und Sprachpsychologie*. Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann.



Zwicky, Arnold M. (1974). ““Hey, Whatsyourname””. In: *Papers from the Tenth Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society. April 19-21, 1974*. Ed. by Michael La Galy, Robert A. Fox, and Bruck Anthony. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, pp. 787–801. URL: <https://web.stanford.edu/~zwicky/hey-whatsyourname.pdf>.

