The prosodic vocative and its kin

In both Austrian German (AG) and Turkish (TR) the vocative is expressed exclusively by prosodic means (Zimmer 1970). Also, names are associated with other semantic/pragmatic categories, such as surprise, calling, exasperation, etc. (Demircan 1975, 1996) all of which are marked by prosody. In this talk we aim to discuss the prosodic contours that occur with names in AG and TR. In particular, we will investigate how languages with different word level stress systems behave and how the various prosodic patterns that are used with names interact with their 'syllable' structure (Hameed 1985, Inkelas 1996, Underhill 1988), cf. the following contours:

	σ	AG	TR	σ σ	AG	TR	σ σ σ	AG	TR	σ σ σ σ	AG	TR
Nom.	Háns Cán			Márkus Aslí			Flórian Hüseyín			Alexánder Hüsamettín		
Voc.	Háns Cán			Márkus Áslı			Flórian Hüséyin			Alexánder Hüsámettin		
Surprise address	Háns Cán			Márkus Áslı			Flórian Húseyin			Alexánder Húsamettin		
Calling	Há-ans Cá-an			Márkus Áslı			Flórian Hüséyin			Alexánder Hüsaméttin		

(Above we show the nominative only in terms of its stress; other forms are supplemented by rough pitch contours.)

Our findings point to the following:

(i)   There are striking parallels in the contours in AG and TR, which might be derivable from more general (pragmatic) principles. This is a surprising result, given that AG and TR do not share word level stress.

(ii)   The point where the two languages differ is when names are integrated into syntactic structures. For cases that are syntactically independent, there is virtual identity.

(iii)   Certain contours modify a word in ways that regular phonological processes can not, cf. e.g. the calling intontation. This suggests a prosodic template as the expression of the relevant category.

The larger implications of our findings are as follows:

•   Given that the patterns are (i) robust, (ii) systematic and (iii) in their definition crucially rely on linguistic notions (syllable, word edges etc.), they must be seen as part of the language system, not just as functional structures manifesting themselves in language use only.

•   The rich array of categories expressed only by prosody, e.g. the vocative, argues against a notion of morphology that relies on strict serialisation of morphological markers; rather, the phonological material representing different categories is superimposed over each other.

References: Demircan, Ö. 1975. Türk Dilinde Vurgu: Sözcük Vurgusu. Türk Dili 284. 333–339. • Demircan, Ö. 1996. Türkçenin Sesdizimi. İstanbul: Der Yayınevi. • Hameed, J. 1985. Lexical Phonology and Morphology of Modern Standard Turkish. Cahiers Linguistiques d'Ottawa 14. 71–95. • Inkelas, S. 1996. The exceptional stress-attracting suffixes in Turkish: Representations versus the grammar, in R. Kager, H. Van der Hulst and V. Zonneveld (eds.) The Prosody-Morphology Interface. 134–187. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. • Underhill, R. 1988. A lexical account of Turkish accent, in A. Sezer (ed.): Studies in Turkish Linguistics. 387–406. Ankara: METU Press • Zimmer, K. E. 1970: Some Observations on Non-Final Stress in Turkish. Journal of the American Oriental Society 90: 1, 160–162.