<p style="text-align:center">The Vocative and the Left Periphery</p>

The extent to which vocatives are syntactically integrated into the sentence is a much debated issue. In this paper, I argue that vocatives are associated with a functional head projected in the functional hierarchy as proposed by Rizzi (1997, 2004). Contra Moro (2003) and Hill (2007) who propose that the vocative functional head (Vocº) is either above Forceº or the CP domain entirely, I provide evidence that Vocº is projected above Focº and below the higher Topº.

This paper aims to achieve three goals: 1) to syntactically distinguish *vocatives* from other phrases which refer to the addressee (*calls* and *subjects of imperatives*); 2) to provide new evidence for the existence of a functional head VocP and 3) to establish that VocP is in a hierarchical relationship lower than the high TopP and higher than FocP in the functional hierarchy proposed in Rizzi (1997, 2004)).

The term 'vocative' is often loosely used to refer to any DP which refers to the addressee or, in languages with overt vocative morphology, any DP bearing such morphology. I review previous semantic arguments that vocatives should be distinguished from subjects of imperatives, and provide new evidence that they also behave differently syntactically. I present new arguments, in congruence with existing evidence, which establishes that there is a separate category of 'calls' which also must be distinguished from vocatives.

I examine the syntactic restrictions of vocatives. I review three previous proposals concerning the location of a functional head which hosts vocatives (Moro 2003, Portner 2004, Hill 2007), and provide evidence that VocP must be located below the high TopP and above FocP in Rizzi (1997, 2004)'s functional hierarchy. For example, in English, topics are possible before vocatives.

(1) At Starbucks, John, everyone drinks sweet drinks.

Moro (2003) reports that in Italian, unlike in English, topics are not possible to the left of vocatives. He further finds that, in Italian, vocatives must appear to the left of the complementizer in subordinate clauses.

(2) Gianni pensa, (o) Maria che Pietro abbia letto un libro.

   Gianni thinks   o Maria that Pietro has   read a book

   'Gianni thinks, Maria, that Pietro has read a book.'

Moro thus concludes that VocP is above Forceº in the functional hierarchy. I found, however, that in English, vocatives may follow the complementizer if additional material intervenes between them, such as an adverb or topic.

(3) I think that eventually, Paul, Congress will pass the bill.

I propose that VocP is located between the highest Topº and Focº, and that the ungrammaticality of (2) is due to an anti-adjacency effect.

Finally, I argue that, at least in most cases, vocatives remain in spec, VocP. I argue that when vocatives appear to be 'mid-sentential' it is because a phrasal element has moved directly below VocP to spec, FocP, followed by movement of the remnant TP to spec, TopP (above VocP).

Hill, Virginia. 2007. Vocatives and the Pragmatics-Syntax Interface, in *Lingua* 117:2077. Elsevier.

Moro, Andrea. 2003. "Notes on Vocative Case: A Case Study in Clause Structure" in Quer, Josep, Jan Schroten, Mauro Scorretti, Petra Sleeman, and Els Verheugd (eds.) *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2001: Selected Papers from Going Romance*, Amsterdam. John Benjamins.

Portner, Paul. 2004. Vocatives, Topics and Imperatives. *IMS Workshop on Information Structure*, Bad Teinach

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of grammar*, L.