VOCATIVES AND OTHER DIRECT ADDRESS FORMS: A CONTRASTIVE STUDY

LILLIAN A. PARROTT
Université Paris 8

ABSTRACT

In this paper I analyze Russian direct address forms, both the distinct truncated vocative and nominative-case direct address forms. I contrast the formal and functional restrictions on the truncated vocative with vocatives in other languages (e.g. Czech and Polish), and I compare the interpolation of Russian direct address forms in an utterance to the situation in English. While similarities are found both in the form and the usage of Russian direct address forms with those in other languages, the prosodic and syntactic constraints in English are considerably stronger than in Russian, which means that the punctuating function of direct address forms is considerably more flexible in Russian than in English.

«What do you mean?»
«I'm seriously thinking I may resign, Jim.»
The fact that he used my name seemed almost as important as the statement that preceded it.
Was he saying one thing or two?

Don DeLillo, *The Names.*

[1] INTRODUCTION

The aim of this paper[1] is to compare certain aspects of Russian direct address form usage with that in other languages, especially English, Czech, and Polish. By direct address form I mean any expression used to attract or maintain the addressee's attention, as in (1), as opposed to other, non-address usages (e.g. as arguments), as in (2):

(1)   *Mr. Smith*, could you tell us about your trip to Washington?

---

[1]   I wish to thank the two anonymous reviewers for their detailed comments on an earlier draft of this article.

(2) a. *Mr. Smith* went to Washington.
     b. I saw *Mr. Smith* on the train.

The term *vocative* will, in contrast, be used in a restricted sense to refer only to direct address forms that are formally distinct from the nominative.[2] In Russian there are two types of distinct forms: the truncated vocative (the so-called "neo-vocative"),[3] as in (3), which is the only productive vocative in modern Russian; and the historical Slavic vocative, as in (4), which is found in a few frozen forms used mainly as invocations or interjections:[4]

(3) мам!   Тань!,   Саш!,   Никит!,   теть   Ань!,
     Mom-VOC, Tanja-VOC, Saša-VOC, Nikita-VOC, Aunt-VOC Anja-VOC,
     ребят!
     kids-VOC

(4) боже!,   господи!
     god-VOC, lord-VOC

In the presentation below, we will consider truncated vocatives (as in (3)) and non-truncated direct address forms, but the historical Slavic vocative remnants in Russian, as in (4), will not be discussed further here since they only exist as frozen forms.

[2] THE TRUNCATED VOCATIVE IN RUSSIAN

[2.1] *Formal peculiarities of the Russian truncated vocative*

The Russian truncated vocative presents certain peculiarities that set it apart from other forms (from Parrott (1993, 1995); see Daniel' (2009) for a more recent discussion of these factors):

(a) The truncated vocative is formed on personal names and kinship terms having a penultimate-stressed nominative in -a (e.g. *Petrúšk!* [<*Petrúška*] but not

---

[2] I am following Daniel & Spencer (2009) in reserving the term "vocative" for forms that are distinct from the nominative, but this distinction between vocative and direct address form is by no means widely observed (Daniel and Spencer use the term *form of address* instead of *direct address form*). Linguists working on direct address forms in languages where there is no distinct vocative form generally prefer the term "vocative" over "address form" or "form of address", since the latter terms are commonly used to speak of the choice of expression used to refer to a person, rather than forms used specifically to *address* a person directly. But since Russian can use both distinct vocative forms (as in (3)) and regular nominative-case direct address forms, some terminological distinction needs to be made between the two types, and I hope that choosing the term direct address form will remove some of the potential ambiguity.

[3] As shown in Parrott (1993) and, more recently, Daniel' (2009), the so-called neo-vocative is not so new; it is reported from the mid-19th century (see Obnorskij (1925)) and could be considerably older even though not attested.

[4] I use the exclamation point to mark vocatives and other direct address forms used in isolation even though they need not be uttered as exclamations.

Ivánušk![5] [*<Ivánuška*]), i.e. mostly singular *a*-declension nouns,[6] but the vocative forms *rebjat!* [*<rebjata*] "kids!/guys!" and *devčat!* [*<devčata*] "girls" are irregular plurals.

(b) If a non-diminutive familiar form exists for a first name (e.g. *Jura < Jurij*), truncated vocative are not normally formed from the full name: *Inn!* [*<Inna*] and *Nikit!* [*<Nikita*] are acceptable because they have no familiar forms, only diminutives, but *???-*Ol'g!* [*<Ol'ga*] and *???-*Ann!* [*<Anna*][7] are usually not possible because they have familiar forms *Olja* and *Anja*, which can undergo vocative truncation: *Ol'!, An'!.* This restriction appears to be weakening, however, at least for some names; Daniel' (2009, 233-234) cites some (mostly, but not exclusively, recent) examples from the Russian National Corpus of truncated vocatives from full first names that do have familiar forms (e.g. *Svetlan!*), but their usage remains marginal.

(c) The truncated vocative does not produce vowel-zero alternations (e.g. *Jurk!*), whereas elsewhere in the system such alternations are required (cf. *U nas v detskom sadu neskol'ko Jurok/*Jurk*).

(d) The truncated vocative does not cause mandatory devoicing of consonants word finally (*Nad'!* [nad']/[nat']), whereas elsewhere in the system such devoicing is mandatory (cf. *V klasse bylo mnogo Nad'* [nat']/*[nad']).

In Parrott (1993, 78) it was suggested that the peculiarities given in (c) and (d) could be accounted for by positing a voiceless or devoiced vowel as the ending, which leaves the underlying structure intact, in which case the term "truncated" is something of a misnomer. Daniel & Spencer (2009, 629) consider that the Russian vocative is an example of phonological truncation (as opposed to morphological truncation).

[2.2] *Functional peculiarities of the Russian truncated vocative*
The Russian vocative also presents certain peculiarities in its usage, as compared to vocatives in other languages (from Parrott (1993) and Parrott (1995)).

---

[5]   My Russian examples have been evaluated by a number of different speakers: firstly by a group of speakers who grew up in the Soviet Union (1 female from Leningrad b. circa 1930, 1 male from Moscow b. circa 1940, 1 female from Sotchi b. circa 1950, 2 females from Moscow b. circa 1960, 1 female from Leningrad b. circa 1960), and secondly by a group of speakers who came of age in the post-Soviet period (1 male and 1 female from Moscow b. circa 1980, 1 female from the Petersburg area b. circa c. 1985).

[6]   Russian short first names and diminutives generally belong to this class, and thus most informal or familiar names are open to vocative truncation. See Nesset (2001) on the notion of familiarity associated with the *a*-declension.

[7]   *Ann* exists as the foreign first name *Ann(e)*, and *Ol'g* exists as a last name.

(a) The truncated vocative is only used to address people, or sometimes superior animals, e.g. *sobak!* "doggie!", but not inanimates.[8]

(b) The truncated vocative is optional, and is generally restricted to a relatively informal setting, with a relatively close interlocutor relationship (signalled in part by the usage of familiar first names and ty-address, although these are not absolute indicators);[9] formality or any other kind of (momentary) distancing in the interlocutor relationship or the subject of discourse (respect, solemnity, anger, aggressiveness, etc.) renders its usage impossible or unlikely.

The notions in (b) are of course very fuzzy and the boundaries vary greatly from speaker to speaker and situation to situation, and there are also trends according to generation, region, and social class. Among my informants, the most striking difference has to do with generation: older informants judged (5a) as impossible or nearly so, whereas younger informants, those that came of age in the post-Soviet period, especially in urban centers, were much more lenient in their judgments.

(5)   a.   ?-??? Здравствуйте, *Марь   Иванн!*
                  Hello,   Marija-VOC Ivanovna-VOC!
                  (made-up example) student to distinguished professor (whom s/he does not know well); in a formal setting

       b.   Здрасьте, *Марь   Иванн!*
                  Hi,   Marija-VOC Ivanovna-VOC!
                  (made-up example) to a neighbor in a communal apartment

Momentary distancing can occur in otherwise close interlocutor relationships, due to the formality, solemnity, or seriousness of the particular situation and discourse topic, or due to attitudinal factors such as anger or other intense emotions, in which case the truncated vocative is also unnatural, as shown in the examples below.

---

[8]   See Daniel' (2009) for further discussion of some of the restrictions on the types of address forms that can undergo vocative truncation in Russian; invectives, for example, are generally excluded.
[9]   See Yokoyama (1994) on the truncated vocative as iconic for a close interlocutor relationship.

(6) #[10]*Витя/???-*Вить*, сегодня умер твой отец.[11] *(note the formal word order)*[12]
     #Vitja-NOM/???-*Vitja-VOC, your father died today.

(7) *uttered in anger:*[13]
    a. Миша   / ???-*Миш,   я убью   тебя!
        Miša-NOM / ???-*Miš-VOC, I could kill you!
    b. Я убью   тебя, Миша   / ???-*Миш!
        I could kill you, Miša-NOM / ???-*Miš-VOC!

Note that there are similar pragmatic restrictions on the usage of the English attention-getting particle *hey*, e.g. *Betsy/??Bets/???-*Hey Betsy/???-*Hey Bets, I could kill you!*, although additional factors come into play as well.

We will return to the pragmatic constraints on the truncated vocative further below.

[3] USES OF TRUNCATION IN OTHER LANGUAGES

[3.1] *Elsewhere in Slavic*

Besides Russian, truncated vocatives are marginal in Slavic, and attested examples are hard to come by. Still, Anstatt (2003); Anstatt & Gut (2008) cite truncated forms in Ukrainian and Polish, and Stankiewicz (1977/1986, 316) gives truncated forms from Bulgarian and Belarusian dialects, in addition to Ukrainian dialectal forms where the final syllable is truncated. Stankiewicz also gives examples of truncated imperatives as expressive variants in Bulgarian, Croatian/Serbian, and Ukrainian.[14]

[3.2] *In other languages and dialects*

Vocative truncation is in fact fairly widespread in the languages of the world. In European languages (e.g. Greek, Baltic)[15] truncation of a final consonant (with or without reduction or other alteration of the preceding vowel) is common in vocative formation, as is truncation of entire syllables, which often occurs in im-

---

[10] I use the pound key (#) to indicate a discourse-initial utterance where this is important for the interpretation under consideration.

[11] If the context is slightly changed to render it more informal, with the contact already established (i.e. where it is no longer attention-getting), the usage of the truncated form becomes possible, e.g. Знаешь, *Вить,* сегодня умер твой отец, 'You know, Vitja-VOC, your father died today.' I wish to thank Elizaveta Khachatourian for this observation.

[12] See Yokoyama (1986) on the formality of this word order with type I intonation, and Yokoyama (1993) on the *svoj-čužoj* distinction.

[13] But with different word order, the truncated form becomes possible (and is attested on the internet), when not uttered in real anger: Миш, я тебя убью! 'Misha-VOC, I could kill you!'

[14] On the affinity between the vocative and the imperative, see, for example, Jakobson (1960/1981, 23), Winter (1969), Khrakovskij & Volodin (1986), and also Parrott (1993).

[15] See Winter (1969) for a discussion of vocative formation in the history of Indo-European.

peratives as well (e.g. Sardinian and Romanian dialects).[16] In Russian, vocative truncation of entire syllables is possible with some forms:

(8)   a.   ма!   па!   ба!
           Mom-VOC, Dad-VOC, Gran-VOC
      b.   Ни!   *(not possible for many speakers)*
           Nina-VOC

Vocative truncation of entire syllables is widely attested outside of Indo-European as well.[17]

[3.3]   *Non-vocative truncation*

Truncation of names need not produce exclusively vocative forms, of course. In many languages, including Russian, truncation is used to make short, familiar forms of first names, and diminutive suffixes may or may not be added to the shortened forms, as in (9).

(9)   Russian: *Дмитрий > Дима > Димочка*   "Dimitri"
      English: *Timothy   > Tim   > Timmy*

Again, this is not an exclusively Indo-European phenomenon; truncation is used in Indonesian dialects, for example, to produce more familiar forms of first names as well (cf. Gil (2005)). All such truncation can be viewed as iconic for shortened distance between the speaker and the referent (who is the addressee in the case of truncated vocatives; see Yokoyama (1994)). When diminutive (or augmentative) suffixes are added to the shortened form in languages with productive diminutive (or augmentative) formation, such as Russian, the same form indicates both shortened distance toward the referent (conveyed by the truncation) and the speaker's particular attitude (e.g. affection) toward the referent (conveyed by the diminutive or augmentative suffix).[18]

---

[16]   On Sardinian see Floricic (2002), and on Romanian dialects see Maiden (2006, 52–53).
[17]   See McCarthy & Prince (1998/2001) and (Daniel & Spencer 2009, 629) for examples of vocative truncation in non-Indo-European languages.
[18]   English first (given) names are of course not as freely manipulated as Russian first names, and the use of shortened (familiar) or diminutive forms does not necessarily reflect the SPEAKER'S view of the discourse situation or attitude toward the referent, but often, rather, the NAME BEARER'S choice, so that a male with the name *William* may choose to always go by *William* or *Will* or *Bill* or *Billy*, etc., with very little variation "authorized", although this may evolve over time. The name bearer's choice can also be a factor in Russian when several short forms exist for a single given name.

[4]   COMPARISON OF THE STATUS OF THE VOCATIVE IN RUSSIAN WITH
        THAT OF CZECH AND POLISH

[4.1]   *Czech*

In Czech the vocative is formed by *adding* a vocalic ending to the stem, just like
any other case, rather than truncating (or otherwise reducing) the nominative
form, e.g. *Věra > Věro!, Petr > Petře!.* The vocative endings are the Czech reflexes
of the historical Slavic vocative, and they are fully integrated into the nominal
paradigm. Vowel-zero alternations are found in the vocative, just as with other
cases, although since an ending is added, it is the zero alternation that is found in
the vocative: *Marek* (nominative) > *Marku!* (vocative), *Pavel* (nominative) > *Pavle!*
(vocative). In Czech, then, the vocative functions morphologically just like any
other case (although case-status may not be admitted on theoretical grounds).[19]

   In Czech the vocative is used in all instances of direct address, for inanimates
as well as animates; i.e. its usage is generally mandatory whenever a person or
thing is being addressed. While it is certainly more common to address people
and animals than inanimate objects, when inanimate objects are addressed, for
whatever reason, the vocative is used (although a few noun classes have the voca-
tive syncretic with the nominative), e.g. *kniho!* (<*kniha*) "book!" (Russian **knig!* as
a vocative is impossible), or *hrnečku, vař!* "little pot, boil!" (as in the Grimm tale).

   Finally, the Czech vocative is used in all registers – formal and informal – and
all discourse situations – serious and light –, although in informal speech it may
not be marked on all components of the direct address form. This mainly con-
cerns combinations with *pán* "Mr." (+ last name), where the last name may not
receive vocative marking in informal speech, but vocative is nevertheless marked
on *pán > pane*, e.g. *pane Nováku!* [vocative on both *pán* and *Novák*] / *pane Novák!*
[vocative only on *pán*]. In contrast to the Russian truncated vocative, usage of ex-
clusively nominative direct address forms is usually judged either impossible or
marginal or rude in Czech.[20]

[4.2]   *Polish*

Polish presents a interesting contrast to both Russian and Czech. As in Czech the
vocative in Polish is formed by adding special vocative endings (although, as men-
tioned above, truncated forms do exist dialectally). Unlike the situation in Czech,
however, the vocative is not mandatory in Polish. According to Kottum (1983)
and Anstatt (2003), in Polish the vocative is used for polite address in a formal

---

[19]   See Spencer & Otoguro (2005, 133ff) for a discussion of the theoretical status of the vocative in Czech and
       other languages.
[20]   My informants either ruled them out entirely or admitted them only as highly demeaning expressions of
       power of the speaker over the addressee, as though the addressee did not merit the speaker's recognition
       as an interlocutor, imaginable only in certain environments, such as the military. Such forms have,
       however, been attested elsewhere (cf. the opinion page in Naše řeč 1, ročník 26, 1942).

or distant interlocutor relationship, where the nominative would be perceived as disrespectful or rude; this is almost the exact opposite of the usage of the truncated vocative in Russian. But the situation is in fact more complex: according to Anstatt, in closer or less distant interlocutor relationships, the vocative is also used, but only for addressing close friends or colleagues with whom the speaker is on friendly yet respectful terms. Kottum (1983), moreover, cites examples of the vocative being used in aggressive or insulting address in Polish, although the data are not entirely clear. In any case, vocative usage is marked in Polish, and it is attested on both ends of the address spectrum: for polite (distant) address, on the one hand, and for intimate (close) or rude address, on the other.

[4.3]   *Review*

Russian thus differs from Polish and Czech in two main respects: (a) it has lost the reflexes of the historic Slavic vocative and instead uses truncation to make a special vocative form, and (b) the usage of this special vocative form is reserved for close interlocutor relationships – in its truncation the form is thus iconic for closeness, as noted by Yokoyama (1994). In Czech the vocative neutrally signals direct address, without any special added meanings. In Polish, however, standard vocatives are reserved for non-neutral address: more polite, distant, or respectful address at one extreme; and for insulting, friendly, or intimate address at the other extreme.[21] In short, the usage of the vocative in Polish is also a marked form as in Russian (and unlike Czech), but it can be used at both extremes of the address spectrum (close and distant). In Russian vocative truncation reflects the speaker's view of the interlocutor relationship as being close, in addition to overtly signaling direct address (like all vocative forms), but in Polish the vocative forms signal more generally some special awareness of the addressee on the part of the speaker – either that of respect, intimacy, or disrespect[22] –, again, in addition to signaling direct address.

[5]   POSITIONS, FUNCTIONS, AND PROSODIC REALIZATIONS OF DIRECT ADDRESS FORMS

So far we have focussed on the peculiarities of truncated vocatives; now we will turn to direct address forms in general – not only specially marked vocative forms in Russian but also nominative-case direct address forms, and we will compare these to the usage of direct address forms in English. Direct address forms share a number of features across languages, but we will see further below that there are

---

[21]   Compare last-name direct address in English, which tends to be a sign of disrespect or intimacy (as in male camaraderie).

[22]   It is by no means rare that intimacy and disrespect are signaled by the same forms; cf. the usage of 2nd person singular personal pronouns in languages that have a T/V distinction (Russian, French, German, etc.).

some important differences between English and Russian as concerns the usage these forms.

[5.1]   *Position*

- ABSOLUTE (FREE): direct address forms can be used alone, in absolute position, just like interjections, as in (10a) and (11a), in which case they must be stressed.

- UTTERANCE-INITIAL (LEFT-ADJOINED OR PREPOSED): they can occur utterance-initially, much like left-dislocation of arguments or various types of S-initial discourse markers (of which they are one; cf. *Hey, Listen, OK, Right, Now,* etc.), as in (10b) and (11b).

- MEDIAL: they can occur medially, i.e. interpolated at various points in an utterance, like other kinds of parentheticals, as in (10c) and (11c & d).

- FINAL (right-adjoined or postposed): they can occur utterance-finally, like right-dislocated arguments or other kinds parentheticals, as (10d) and (11e).

(10)   a.   *Маша!*
             Masha!
        b.   *Маша*, поедем! [Чехов, *Чайка*]
             Masha, let's go!
        c.   Поедем, *Маша*, домой! [Чехов, *Чайка*]
             Let's go home, Masha!
        d.   Поедем, *Маша!* [Чехов, *Чайка*]
             Let's go, Masha!

(11)   a.   *John!*
        b.   *John*, come here!
        c.   I think, *John*, we made a mistake when we agreed to this.
        d.   What would you like, *John*, to eat?
        e.   What time is it, *John*?

Note that the Russian truncated vocative can occur in all these positions as well, as shown in the following examples:

(12)   a.   — *Саш*, — сказал он, дрожа, отрыгиваясь и вертя руками, — *Саш*, как перед богом, все одно в грехах как репьях... Раз жить, раз подыхать. Поддайся, *Саш*, отслужу хучь бы кровью... Век его прошел, *Саш*, а дней у бога не убыло... [Бабель, "Вдова"]
        b.   — Куда паруса надула? — сказал сестре Воробьев. — Посиди с нами, *Саш*... [Бабель, "После боя"]

[5.2]   *Functions of direct addres forms: overview*

In terms of function, direct address forms are used to attract, maintain, or focus an addressee's attention, and they can also serve to personalize an utterance in a variety of ways depending on the particular intonational realization.[23] The attention-getting function and the focussing or personalizing function are, however, different sides of the same coin: in all cases, direct address forms are addressee-oriented (like the imperative).

[5.3]   *Correlations between function and prosody*

- ABSOLUTE and UTTERANCE-INITIAL DIRECT ADDRESS FORMS are stressed. Attention-getting direct address forms tend to occupy these positions. Although linguists may allude to "vocative intonation" or "vocative chant", a variety of quite different contours are possible, and these interact with stress, pitch, and vowel lengthening in subtle ways.[24] When the speaker already has the addressee's attention, an utterance-initial direct address form serves to maintain the contact and focus the attention on what follows, and absolute forms can assume a variety of other meanings (in addition to maintaining the addressee's attention) depending on the particular intonational realization (disapproval, begging, surprise, etc.).

- MEDIAL AND UTTERANCE-FINAL DIRECT ADDRESS FORMS tend to be deaccented or pronounced with low pitch,[25] like many kinds of parenthetical material.[26] Utterance-final direct address forms generally focus the attention on the preceding information, but they also personalize the utterance in a variety of ways, depending on the intonation and particular context. Medial direct address forms typically have a focussing function: they orient the addressee's attention to important information at the junction where they occur (i.e. preceding or following the direct address form), such as a preceding theme or a following rheme, or to the link between the preceding and following information. Medial direct address forms thus function like other parentheticals in that they can be interpolated at strategic points in

---

[23]   See Schegloff (1968); Zwicky (1974); Zaitseva (1992); Parrott (1995); Daniel' (2008); Daniel & Spencer (2009).

[24]   For example, calling contours on distal vocatives or direct-address forms (e.g. *Maaaryyy!*) are very different from utterance-final deaccented direct-address forms (e.g. *I love you, Mary*), and although some features are found cross-linguistically, languages of course differ in the ways that direct-address forms are realized prosodically. The intonational realization and prosodic integration of direct-address forms cannot, however, be addressed here; see Cruttenden (1986); Pierrehumbert & Hirschberg (1990); Ladd (1996); Gussenhoven (2004); Hock & Dutta (2010).

[25]   In some analyses utterance-final direct address forms are found to carry an independent (L*) pitch accent (e.g. Beckman & Pierrehumbert (1986); Pierrehumbert & Hirschberg (1990), whereas in others (e.g. Hock & Dutta (2010), and references therein) they are found to be deaccented.

[26]   On the prosody of parentheticals, see Dehé (2007), and references therein.

the host utterance, like linguistic flags marking important landmarks, in order to correctly orient and maintain the addressee's attention.[27]

Direct address forms that appear to occur medially or even finally can, however, serve to (re)capture the addressee's attention, in which case they are stressed, and function like utterance-initial attention-getters, as in the English example below with the informal attention-getting particle *hey*:

(13)   And any time you feel the pain, *Hey Jude*, refrain [....] *(Beatles)*

[6]   COMPARISON OF THE USAGE OF DIRECT ADDRESS FORMS IN ENGLISH
      AND RUSSIAN

Although Russian and English direct address forms function quite similarly in many respects, they do differ in certain ways, especially as concerns medial position. Let us first look more closely at what non-initial direct address forms do.

[6.1]   *The function of direct address forms in non-initial positon*
Consider example (14);[28] Taisa Petrovna is Nikolaj's mother, and Nadja is Nikolaj's girlfriend.

(14)   Надя. У вас садовый? И дом есть? Сколько комнат?
         Таиса Петровна *(ласково)*. А сколько вам надо?
         Николай. *Мама*, я пришел из армии! [Петрушевская, *Уроки музыки*]
         Nadja. Do you have a garden? And a house? How many rooms?
         Taisa Petrovna *(affectionately)*. And how many do you need?
         Nikolaj. Mom, I've come from the army!

         a.   *Мама*, я пришел из армии!
              Mom, I've come from the army!

         b.   *Я, *Мам(а)*, пришел из армии! (Зачем ты так говоришь?)
              ???-*I, *Mom*, have come from the army! (Why do you say such things?)

Ja 'I' cannot host *mam(a)* 'mom' in this particular context, and this has to do with what the speaker is trying to convey overall. The fact that he has just returned from the army is known to the addressee (the speaker's mother). What the speaker wishes to convey is that his mother should make an extra effort to be nice to his girlfriend since he just returned from the army, a difficult experience. But if the context is changed, as in (15), where what kind of person {I} is is at issue in the discourse, then *ja/I* becomes a possible host for the address form, both in Russian and in English.

---

[27]   On parentheticals see Dehé & Kavalova (2007).
[28]   This example is taken from Parrott (1995).

(15)   Я, *Мам(а)*, пришел из армии! Я человек бывалый.
         I, *Mom*, have come from the army! I am an experienced guy.

All the information in *I, mom, have come from the army!* is of course known to the addressee (the speaker's mother). What is at issue is what kind of person the speaker {I} is, and the special attention signalled by direct address form is thus sufficiently motivated in (15), whereas in (14b) it is not, and the medial vocative is not possible.

  Comparison of (14) and (15) suggests that medial direct address forms serve to punctuate or call attention to the preceding information in the utterance, which is thereby placed squarely in the center of the addressee's current concern, and there must be good reason to do so for that particular landing site to be acceptable, as shown by the unacceptability of (14b). But note that in (15) it is not simply the preceding information that is at issue, but the link between the preceding information – {I} – and the information that follows it – the trait {have come from the army} that defines the {I} here. The direct address form thus draws the addressee's attention to a junction in the utterance, and thereby highlights the surrounding information (not only the preceding information but also its link to the following information) and serves as a bridge between the two crucial pieces of information (usually corresponding roughly to theme and rheme). Note that parentheticals in general have been shown to have a similar punctuating or highlighting function (see Dehé & Kavalova (2007)).

  With regard to utterance-final position, it may be the immediate constituent or the entire preceding utterance that is the object of special attention. Compare in this regard the following (made-up) examples:

(16)   *The speaker is unsure whether the lecture is tomorrow.*
         Lunt's lecture is tomorrow, isn't it *Mary*? (↗)

(17)   The speaker knows the lecture is tomorrow; she wishes to correct very
         subtly the addressee's (A) misguided assumption.
         A: This afternoon I'll be at Lunt's lecture, but in the evening I'll be free.
    a.   B1: ???Lunt's lecture is tomorrow, isn't it *Mary*? (↗)
    b.   B2: Lunt's lecture is tomorrow, isn't it? (↗)
    c.   B3: Lunt's lecture is tomorrow, *Mary*.

In the meaning described in (16), no pause or shift in pitch direction occurs between the tag question and the direct address form, and the intonation rise continues from the tag through the direct address form. The direct address form can be attached to the tag in (16) because it is a truly informational (although biased) question. In (17a)-(17b), however, the tag is simply an indirect, polite way of correcting the addressee, and here, if the same contour is maintained (the in-

tonation rise continuing from the tag through the direct address form with no pause or shift), the tag cannot host the direct address form, as shown in (17a). The tag alone is fine, as shown in (17b), and if the tag is omitted, an utterance-final direct address form is also acceptable, as in (17c); it is the combination of a non-informational tag question with the direct address form that is unacceptable. Thus, the function or information value of a final constituent can preclude postposed direct address marking.

[6.2]   *Syntactic and prosodic constraints on medial position in English*
Consider the following series of examples:

(18)   a.   Поедем, *Маша*, домой! =(10c)
        b.   ???-*Let's go, *Mary*, home.
        c.   ???Let's, *Mary*, go home.
        d.   *Mary*, let's go home.
        e.   Let's go home, *Mary*.

(19)   a.   Ешьте, *Надя*, варенье. [Петрушевская, *Уроки музыки*]
        b.   ???-*Eat/???-*Have, *Nadya*, the/some preserves.

(20)   a.   Прости, *Коля*, меня, что я тебя испортила.
        b.   *Forgive, *Kolya*, me for corrupting you.

(21)   a.   Я купила, *Маша/Маш*, новую книгу.
        b.   ???I bought, *Mary*, a new book.

(22)   a.   Я, *Вась*, устала сегодня. (Zaitseva 1992)
        b.   ???I, *Bill*, am tired today.[29]

Whereas medial position is possible for all the direct address forms in Russian, the equivalent English examples are all unacceptable or marginal, and yet the information structure is the same. So in English factors other than the information structure must also play an important role. Whereas Russian allows direct address forms to intervene between the verb and the direct object (19)-(21), English generally does not; such interpolation is particularly bad when the direct object is a pronoun, as in (20b). This is due in part to the more rigid word order of English, and to the tighter syntactic bonds between certain constituents.[30] But the interpolation of direct address forms causes particular problems, as the comparison with parentheticals given in the (b) versions below reveals:

(23)   a.   ???I bought, *Mary*, a new book. (= (21b)) *(spoken with normal tempo)*
        b.   I bought, *by the way*, a new book.

---

[29]   A Google search yielded no examples of "I, Bill" where Bill was a direct address form.
[30]   See Moro (2003) on certain theoretical syntactic constraints on vocative usage, especially in Italian.

(24)   a.   ???I, *Bill*, am tired today. (=(22b)) *(spoken with normal tempo)*
        b.   I, *of course*, am tired today.

(25)   a.   ???John, *Marie*, is mistaken.
        b.   John, *I think*, is mistaken.

As we see in (23)–(25) the issue is not necessarily the position where these direct address forms are interpolated, because the (b) examples with parentheticals are fine. Note that if the tempo is slowed down and the utterance is pronounced slowly and deliberately and perhaps angrily, then direct address forms do become acceptable. But with normal tempo, in examples such as (21b), the lack of case marking on nouns in English may be a source of potential confusion – here between *Mary* as an argument integrated into the syntax of the host clause (i.e. as the beneficiary – *for Mary*) and Mary as the addressee – since these particular landing sites for the direct address forms normally coincide with argument positions in English.[31] If greater informational weight is added, as in (26a), and/or a heavier direct address form is used, especially one that is reserved for direct address, such as *my dear girl* or *your honor*, as in (26b)-(26c), syntactic expectations are overridden, and the examples become acceptable:

(26)   a.   I bought, *Mary*, a new book, and not a pornographic magazine.
        b.   I, *Your Honor*, was tired and fell asleep at the wheel.
        c.   John, *my dear girl*, is mistaken.

Another important factor in the interpolation of medial direct address forms concerns the prosodic structure and stress. Consider example (27), which is taken from Moro (2003):

(27)   a.   There, *Mary*, is a solution to the theorem. (Moro 2003, 256)

The only way this utterance can be acceptable is for *there* to be stressed, which means that we are dealing with locative *there* and not existential *there*, since existential *there* cannot receive stress. This is shown in (28):

(28)   a.   *locative* there (stressed): There, *Mary*, is a solution to the theorem.
              (Moro 2003)

---

[31]   Moro (2003) (citing Rizzi 1997) gives other examples of impossible vocative insertion in English: *Did, *Mary, John read the book?* and *What, *John, did you do today?* (this second example improves considerably if pronounced with slow tempo). He accounts for this impossibility by saying that vocative phrases must occupy higher specifier positions. But note that if heavier direct address forms are used, especially ones that are used exclusively as direct address forms, such as *my dear*, some of these examples become possible, e.g. *What, my dear, did you do today?* Note also that here again parentheticals can be used where direct address forms cannot, e.g.: *Did, by the way, John read the book?*, so that the issue of potential confusion between a direct address form and an argument of the verb may play a role in the unacceptability. It is clear, however, that parentheticals do not all have the same prosodic realizations, and prosody may ultimately prove to be the deciding factor.

b. *existential* there (unstressed): *There, *Mary*, is a solution to the theorem.

c. *existential* or *locative* there: *Mary*, there is a solution to the theorem.

d. *existential* or *locative* there: There is a solution to the theorem, *Mary*.

As the data in (28) show, the host for a medial direct address form must be stressed (or at least stressable). Interestingly, there is not the same restriction on all syntactically external elements; for example, *by the way* (which is generally considered a parenthetical) is perfectly acceptable in this position, as shown in (29):

(29)   *existential* or *locative* there: There by the way is a solution to the theorem.

In the existential reading *is* would normally be stressed, and thus can serve as host to the parenthetical. But this option does not exist for the direct address form, which seems to require a stressed element to its left; this suggests that it is the preceding element that serves as the host to the direct address form. Note that in the discussion of examples (14)-(15) we saw that the informational status of the preceding constituent was crucial in determining possible landing sites for direct address forms, that only an informationally weighty constituent could serve as the syntactic host of an address form. In (28) as well we see that informationally poor and prosodically weak elements cannot normally host direct address forms.

[6.3] *Syntactic and prosodic constraints on medial position in Russian*

Although Russian, with its relatively free word order, distinct case marking, and high tolerance for scrambling, is very flexible when it comes to interpolating direct address forms, it does have some restrictions on the placement of medial vocative expressions, albeit to a lesser extent than in English, as shown in (30):

(30)   a. *Бабушка*, уважай вкусы других людей.
        [Петрушевская, *Уроки музыки*]
        Granny, have some respect for other people's tastes.
        b. *Уважай вкусы других, *Бабушка*, людей.
        *Have some respect for other, *Granny*, people's tastes.

In (30b) the position after *drugix* is low in the syntax, and the insertion of *babuška* is judged impossible, whereas all other medial positions would be acceptable. Interestingly, however, if a more loaded direct address form were used, such as *babulja,* the utterance becomes acceptable, as shown in (31):[32]

(31)   Уважай вкусы других, *бабуля*, людей.
        ???Have some respect for other, *granny dear*, people's tastes.

---

[32]   I wish to thank Elizaveta Khachatourian for this example.

As in the English examples, sufficiently loaded direct address forms can override syntactic constraints, as long as the information contained in the preceding constituent is in some way at stake in the context.

[7] CONCLUSION

In this article we have contrasted the usage of direct address forms in Russian with those in other languages. The Russian vocative is quite unusual in its formal and functional peculiarities, when compared to vocatives in other languages, such as Czech and Polish, which have vocative endings as opposed to truncated forms. Truncation as an iconic device to signal closeness or familiarity with the referent (or addressee in the case of vocatives and imperatives; cf. Yokoyama (1994)) is widespread, and in Russian it is particularly striking. Although the basic functions of direct address forms in Russian are the same as in other languages, Russian is shown to be particularly hospitable in its reception of medial vocatives as compared to English, which has considerably more syntactic and prosodic constraints on hosting direct address forms.

REFERENCES

Anstatt, T. 2003. Der polnische Vokativ: Aussterbende Kasusform oder produktiv verwendetes Wortbildungsmittel? *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 50(3). 328–347.

Anstatt, T. & T. Gut. 2008. Der slavische Vokativ im europäischen Kontext. In L. Geist & G. Mehlhorn (eds.), *Linguistische Beiträge zur Slavistik*, 9–26.

Beckman, M. & J. Pierrehumbert. 1986. Intonational structure in Japanese and English. *Phonology Yearbook* III. 15–70.

Cruttenden, A. 1986. *Intonation.* Cambridge University Press.

Daniel, M. & A. Spencer. 2009. The vocative – an outlier case. In A. Malčukov & A. Spencer (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Case*, 626–634. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Daniel', M. A. 2008. Zvatel'nost' kak diskursivnaja kategorija. Neskol'ko gipotez. In V.A. Plungjan & A.Ju. Umrančieva (eds.), *Issledovanija po teorii grammatiki* 4, Moscow: Gnozis.

Daniel', M. A. 2009. «Novyj» russkij vokativ: istorija formy usečennogo obraščenija skvoz' prizmu korpusa pis'mennykh tekstov. In K.L. Kiseleva, V.A. Plungjan, E.V. Rakhilina & S.G. Tatevosov (eds.), *Korpusnye isslodovanija po russkoj grammatike*, Moscow: Probel.

Dehé, N. 2007. The relation between syntactic and prosodic parenthesis. In N. Dehé & Y. Kavalova (eds.), *Parentheticals*, vol. XII (Linguistik Aktuell 106), 261–284. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Dehé, N. & Y. Kavalova. 2007. Parentheticals: An introduction. In N. Dehé & Y. Kavalova (eds.), *Parentheticals*, vol. XII (Linguistik Aktuell 106), 1–24. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Floricic, F. 2002. La morphologie du vocatif: l'exemple du sarde. *Vox romanica* 61. 151–177.

Gil, D. 2005. From repetition to reduplication in Riau Indonesian. In B. Hurch (ed.), *Studies on reduplication*, 31–64. Berlin: Mouton.

Gussenhoven, C. 2004. *The phonology of tone and intonation*. Cambridge University Press.

Hock, H.H. & I. Dutta. 2010. Prosody vs. Syntax: Prosodic rebracketing of final vocatives in English. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Speech Prosody*, Chicago.

Jakobson, R. 1960/1981. Closing Statements: Linguistics and Poetics. In *Selected writings*, vol. III, 18–51. The Hague: Mouton Publishers.

Khrakovskij, V.S. & A.P. Volodin. 1986. *Semantika i tipologija imperativa. Russkij imperativ*. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo «Nauka».

Kottum, S.E. 1983. In defense of the vocative: The case of modern Polish. *Scando-Slavica* 29(1). 135–142.

Ladd, D. R. 1996. *Intonational Phonology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maiden, M. 2006. On Romanian Imperatives. *Philologica Jassyensia* II(1). 47–59.

McCarthy, J.J. & A.S. Prince. 1998/2001. Prosodic morphology. In A. Spencer & A.M. Zwicky (eds.), *The handbook of morphology*, 283–305. Oxford: Blackwell.

Moro, A. 2003. Notes on the vocative case: A case study in clause structure. In J. Quer, J. Schroten, M. Scorretti, P. Sleeman & E. Verheugd (eds.), *Romance languages and linguistic theory 2001: Selected papers from 'Going Romance' Amsterdam, 6-8 December 2001* Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 247–262. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Nesset, T. 2001. How Pervasive Are Sexist Ideologies in Grammar? In R. Dirven, B.W. Hawkins & E. Sandikcioglu (eds.), *Language and ideology: Theoretical cognitive approaches*, vol. I Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 197–226. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Obnorskij, S. 1925. Die Form des Vokativs im Russischen. *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* I. 102–116.

Parrott, L.A. 1993. The Russian Vocative. In O.T. Yokoyama (ed.), *Harvard Studies in Slavic Linguistics*, vol. II, 69–92. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Slavic Linguistics Colloquium.

Parrott, L.A. 1995. The Form and Usage of Vocative Expressions in Russian. Paper presented at AATSEEL, Chicago.

Pierrehumbert, J. & J. Hirschberg. 1990. The Meaning of Intonational Contours in the Interpretation of Discourse. In P. R. Cohen, J. Morgan & M. E. Pollack (eds.), *Intentions in Communication*, 271–311. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Schegloff, E.A. 1968. Sequencing in Conversational Openings. *American anthropologist* 70(6). 1075–1095.

Spencer, A. & R. Otoguro. 2005. Limits to case – a critical survey of the notion. In M. Amberber & H. de Hoop (eds.), *Competition and variation in natural languages: the case for case*, 119–146. Oxford: Elsevier Ltd.

Stankiewicz, E. 1977/1986. The Slavic Vocative and its Accentuation. In *The Slavic Languages: Unity in Diversity*, 315–326. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Winter, W. 1969. Vocative and Imperative. In J. Puhvel (ed.), *Substance and Structure of Language*, 205–223. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Yokoyama, O. T. 1986. *Discourse and Word Order*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Yokoyama, O. T. 1993. Oppozicija *svoj-čužoj* v russkom jazyke. In R.A. Maguire & A. Timberlake (eds.), *American contributions to the XIthe international congress of Slavists*, 452–459. Columbus, OH: Slavica.

Yokoyama, O. T. 1994. Iconic manifestations of interlocutor distance in Russian. *Journal of Pragmatics* 22. 83–102.

Zaitseva, V.A. 1992. *The Speaker's Point of View as a Regular Component of Grammar and Lexicon*: Harvard University dissertation.

Zwicky, A.M. 1974. Hey, Whatsyourname! In *Papers from the Tenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society*, 767–801. Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society.

AUTHOR CONTACT INFORMATION

Lillian A. Parrott
Université Paris 8
UFR des langues, DEPA
2 rue de la Liberté
93526 Saint-Denis, France
lparrott@univ-paris8.fr
lilli.parrott@gmail.com