

Review by Leonardo Savoia

Does the paper make a novel contribution to the understanding of the topic under investigation? [max 250 words]*

The article treats in terms of the cartographic model vocatives and address inversion formulas, and has recourse to TMT approach in order to relate the syntactic structure to their semantics, even if, on its own, the duplication of the structure seems to add no crucial element save to formalize the semantic value. The merit of this article consists in trying to relate vocatives and address inversion to the same interpretive framework.

Is the empirical content of the paper sound (i.e. the data are collected and presented properly, the experiments are well designed, the statistics is well done, the examples contain no spelling mistakes, etc)? [max 400 words]*

The description of the data and the phenomena could be a little more detailed, because some structural differences in dialects and regional Italian varieties have a role in the vocative structure; however, the discussion is conducted clearly and motivates in a coherent way both the application of TMT to the address inversion and in general to vocatives and the necessity of an internal structured VocP. Substantially, if I did not get it wrong, address inversion activates a classificatory Voc category SPKR where the PRT is inserted: I would expect that this should be the landing site also of the kinship term in simple address inversions...

Is the argument coherent and sound, with no major flaws and/or shortcomings, within the context of the theoretical assumptions made by the author? [max 500 words]*

There is, in my view, a crucial question concerning both the empirical material and the interpretive treatment. Indeed, the author identifies the element 'a' which in many Centro-southern varieties precedes the kinship term causing the RF with an unspecified vocative particle, such as 'o' or 'a' (the latter, for instance, in Romanesco). Considering Savoia 1984 and, more recently Sgroi 2017 (online), this element is clearly the preposition 'a', usually triggering RF (interestingly, in many Southern Italian varieties 'a' introduces types of possession, as in 'figlio a me'; we could think that the inherent relational content of kinship terms is somehow involved in address inversion). This point has to be discussed, since, if 'a' is the preposition, the structure of inverted vocatives is to be rethought. In fact 'a', with RF is different from the vocative 'a', for instance of Romanesco (or 'o' in Standard Italian and in Florentine) that does not trigger RF. Thus the RF would be a clue for a different structure. Naturally the sequence 'a papà' to call her/his father is different, and includes the vocative introducer, as however discussed in the article... The result is that the field of possible inverse structures includes bare noun, Prep+noun, D+noun.

Are there any relevant scholarly works that have been overlooked by the author? If the answer is YES, please provide the full references.*

I do not think so

Have you seen this paper, its content, the proposed analysis, or the conclusions published in other venues? [If your answer is YES, please add the relevant reference.]*

NO

Please list the revisions you would advice (you are not required to proofread the paper) [max 500 words]

The point concerning the nature of 'a' has to be discussed, since, if 'a' is the preposition, the structure of inverted vocatives is to be rethought. In fact 'a', with RF is different from the vocative 'a', for instance of Romanesco (or 'o' in Standard Italian and in Florentine) that does not trigger RF. Thus the RF would be a clue for a different structure. Naturally the sequence 'a papà' to call her/his father is different, and includes the vocative introducer, as however discussed in the article... The result is that the field of possible inverse structures includes bare noun, Prep+noun, D+noun.