Responses re distance distinctions in vocatives.

I would like to express my deep thanks to all who provided comment and data. Here is a summary of the responses and some commentary.

1 / Harold Koch (ANU) pointed out that for Kaytetye, where all words end in /e/ = schwa, he analyses two "distortions" as: -*aye* address = vocative 'hey you!' and -*awe* exclamative 'hey, its X!'

Additionally, he thought some South Australian languages have a clitic =yV in this function. and that Arandic may have borrowed or inherited this, but with all final vowels neutralised to schwa, or [a] when stressed], they reanalysed ..a=yV as =aye and generalised this form with inherent stressed /a/.

2/ Peter Austin (Humboldt Fellow) pointed out the pattern in Diyari, which is to distort the final syllable of words when shouting by adding -ayi or -awu, as in: wilhapinayi! "Hey, old lady" or wilhapinawu! "Hey old lady" (root wilhapina 'old woman'). You can do this with pronominal/demonstrative elements too, e.g. nhawuparrawu! "It's this one!" (Shouted). Note that a final u or i vowel is replaced by ayi or awu in shouted forms. He doesn't think there's any distance difference between the alternative forms. His opinion is that this phenomenon is phonological rather than grammatical (i.e. not a locative case), pointing out that the phenomenon is also found in demonstratives and locative nominals and may be related to an emphatic form of the imperative.

Peter also pointed to Hercus' grammar of Arabana-Wangkangurru which has a similar pattern, e.g. mathapurtawu! "Hey, old man". His view is to consider these as "areal features" that don't involve borrowing but are probably due to multilingualism and sharing of common ways of speaking. He is unaware of anything similar in the WA languages he is familiar with.

AR comment on 1 and 2: the (V)y(V) is more widespread than SA and Arandic. There

seems to be a question as to how much of these forms are morphology vs distortion or prosody. Also the *awV* form is found in various languages, often in tandem with the *ayV* form but generally with more of an exclamatory / emphatic sense than vocative. It seems that in Diyari at least this distinction does not exist. The extent of borrowing and phonological change needs to be explored.

3/ Nick Enfield (University of Sydney) referred to a suggestion by Tanya Stivers (now at UCLA) that there are two distinct prosodic profiles in English for calling out to someone by name: 'Alice!' 1. Means 'Hey Alice!' 2. Means 'Hey Alice for the second time because the first time you didn't respond!' such that if you didn't hear the first one at all, you could tell by how this one sounds that it's being done 'for a second time'. He was unsure if the prosodic distinction had been defined but this could be a useful avenue to explore.

Also, he suggested checking whether volume was a necessary feature in the Wik Mungkan case, as seems possible elsewhere.

AR comment: Alas, there is no evidence either way on volume or prosody in the Wik-Mungkan resources I have available.

4/ Stef Spronck (University of Helsinki) has noticed some variation in Ngarinyin vocatives as well, which he thought related to various degrees of urgency when drawing someone's attention, but had not appreciated that the semantic distinctions in vocatives might be more systematic.

AR comment: I look forward to finding out more on this.

5/ Frans Plank (Oxford) suggested looking at vocative chants as well and helpfully provided a list of references.

AR comment: definitely needs to be looked into and many thanks for the extensive reference list.

The remaining input concerned non-Australian languages and shows that at least two-way distance distinctions (i.e. proximal / distal) occur in genetically and geographically diverse languages.

6/ Laura Arnold (University of Edinburgh) described a two-way distance distinction in Ambel (Austronesian > South Halmahera-West New Guinea); *e* is the vocative particle used over short distances, and *u* is used over greater distances.

7/ Grant Aiton (ANU College of Asia and the Pacific) said that Eibela (Trans-New Guinea) also has a proximal vs. distal vocative contrast. Proximal vocative suffix is -ja:, while distal vocative is -jo:.

8/ Joseph Brooks (USC, Santa Barbara) pointed to the example of Chini (Ramu family, PNG) which has a proximal vocative =ga and a distal vocative =i, which only attach to people's names. There is a vocative =ma as well which attaches to pronouns does not distinguish distance.

9/ Ellen Basso, University of Arizona Department of Anthropology, provided data from Kalapalo, Southern Cariban (Brazil) which has a three way distance distinction in the pronominal paradigm.

10/ Liu Danqing (Danny) of the Institute of Linguistics, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, provided the following:

In some Gan dialects (spoken in Jiangxi Province) of Chinese, there is vocative case with distinction between proximal and distal addressees.

In the Anfu Gan dialect, the proximal vocative suffix is -e (after a stem ending with i) or -a (for other stems) while the distal one is ei (after a stem ending with i) or -o (for others stems). For details, see Hu and Lei's paper published in Chinese in *Yuyan Yanjiu* (Studies in Language and Linguistics） 2018 Vol.38-3.

The Yujiang Gan dialect is similar case; see Danny's paper in Chinese in *Hanyu Xuexi* (Chinese Language Learning) 2012:3.

22/02/20 16:36:08