

Review by Martina Wiltschko

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

Yes. The paper addresses the issue of "vocatives" which use reference to the speaker but simultaneously address the addressee. I seek to incorporate the referential properties of vocatives more generally into a conceptual framework that predicts an extension of functional structure for this type of reference (nominal topology and the construction of reference via grammar). As such the paper is a welcome addition to the growing literature on the syntax-pragmatics/discourse interface. It makes an important contribution to our understanding of the syntax, semantics, and pragmatics of vocatives.

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 data upon which the paper is built are largely drawn from the existing literature, with a few examples. Though the discussion of these data, from different sources, some of which are not generally discussed, is welcome. The generalizations regarding the use and differences between the two types of vocatives (addressee vs. speaker reference) is useful.

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]*

Vocatives have notoriously been difficult to analyse within the generative tradition: while they are highly referential (in the sense that they address the addressee, in many languages they are obligatorily used without a determiner. On some accounts the impossibility for a determiner (in some languages) is taken to indicate that vocatives are bare nouns, though this begs the question as to how bare nouns can be interpreted referentially and it runs into problems in languages which do allow determiners in vocatives. The proposed analysis seeks to reconcile this tension by adopting the view that there is even more structure than a DP in the grammar of vocatives (i.e., a vocative Phrase). Assuming with the nominal topology developed in the work of Hinzen (with Martin and Sheehan) the increase in structure immediately derives the increase in referentiality. This sets it apart from other works (like Hill, Espinal) in providing a rationale for the correlation between structure and reference.

A problem with the approach, however, is the fact that the address inversion vocatives are equally referential, yet the author argues that they involve less structure. This should be addressed in more detail (in general I found the analysis of these address inversion vocatives not explicit enough to fully evaluate the proposal).

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

Ritter, E. & M. Wiltschko. 2020. Interacting with vocatives. Proceedings of the Canadian Linguistic Association 2020. available here: https://cla-acl.artsci.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/actes-2020/Ritter_Wiltschko_CLA-ACL2020.pdf

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]

- make the analysis of address inversion vocatives more explicit: how does the reference to the addressee come about

- engage with Ritter & Wiltschko 2020 who provide the argument that we find a nominal speech act structure given the parallelism between nominal and clausal projections more generally. As such their analysis is also not ad hoc (unlike Hill's or Espinal's as criticized in the present paper)

- Ritter & Wiltschko's 2020 structure would have a straightforward position for the address inversion vocatives in that they assume a speaker and an addressee oriented position within the nominal structure

the paper is otherwise well written.