

## Bare nominals, true and fake vocatives

Romance languages, in spite of being languages with determiners, allow bare nominals in predicate position, in object position of prepositions and of a restricted class of verbs (Espinal & McNally 2007, in press), and in vocatives. One of the questions that must be answered is whether these bare nominals are to be attributed the same syntactic structure, in particular, the canonical structure for nominal expressions postulated for languages with number morphology and determiners (see (1); Chierchia 1998, Longobardi 2001, Zamparelli 1995).

Following Dobrovie-Sorin & Laca (2003), Dobrovie-Sorin et al. (2006), and Espinal & McNally (in press) I will assume that bare nominals in object position are NPs or NumPs depending on whether they are unmarked for Number (number neutral bare nominals) or not (bare singulars and bare plurals). Similarly, bare predicates can either be NPs or NumPs, but do not require a DP. What these bare nominals have in common from a semantic perspective is that they denote properties, either properties of kinds of individuals or properties of individual objects (when Number is present).

By contrast, bare nominals in *true vocatives*, either in singular or in plural (see (2a,b)), have the additional restriction that they denote properties that allow the identification of a singular entity or of a sum of individuals that correspond to the hearer(s) or addressee(s). They have often been said to be referential and have a deictic interpretation, like proper names (see (2c)).

In this paper I will focus on the following two questions: **Q1.** What is the internal structure of a phrase interpreted as Vocative? (see Moro 2003, D'hulst et al. 2007, Hill 2007, Stavrou 2009). **Q2.** Is it possible to find a syntactic correlation between Vocatives and other syntactic structures?

I will address these questions within a generative formal syntactic theory, the main ingredients of which are the following: **(i)** VocP is a functional projection (Moro 2003, Stavrou 2009) whose head Voc<sup>o</sup> is defined by [+II,-I] person formal features; **(ii)** Voc<sup>o</sup> can be specified by a vocative particle, and Voc<sup>o</sup> selects a DP (see the structure in (3)); **(iii)** second person strong pronouns, which are standardly assumed to be generated in D<sup>o</sup> (Déchaine & Wiltschko 2002), are postulated to move from this position to Voc<sup>o</sup> in order to be valued appropriately; and **(iv)** N<sup>o</sup> movement to D<sup>o</sup> in the syntax (Longobardi 1994), which is assumed to apply not only to proper names but also to common nouns (Coene et al. 1999, Cabredo Hofherr 2009), is to be extended to Voc<sup>o</sup>. These ingredients will provide an explanation for the syntactic and semantic properties of vocative nominal expressions: both proper names and bare count nominals are incompatible with Ds in a language like Catalan that usually requires Ds, a full DP or NP cannot move to Voc<sup>o</sup>, full indefinite and quantificational expressions cannot be used in true vocative constructions, predicative bare nominals and bare adjectives move neither to D<sup>o</sup> (they are not argumental) nor to Voc<sup>o</sup> (they are not deictic).

Finally, I will focus on the set of vocatives in (4). I will come to some significant structural similarities that hold crosslinguistically between vocatives and copular sentences. Following Higgins' (1979) claim that copular sentences are not uniform, I will discuss, based on Catalan data, that vocatives are not a peripheral phenomenon in the syntax of natural languages, and that three of the four types of copular sentences postulated by Higgins apply to vocative structures as well, namely the identificational,

