

CLS 10 (1974)

Hey, Whatsyourname!*

Arnold M. Zwicky
Ohio State University

1. Vocatives. Linguists have given considerable attention to the choice among various address forms in particular languages, but this attention has focused almost entirely on two questions: (a) What are the conditions on the use of 'familiar' (T) versus 'polite' (V) pronouns, like the French tu and vous? (b) What are the conditions on the use of address forms that include proper names, like Professor Whozis, Ms. Apthecker, Uncle Herman, Hester?¹ My interest here is in the full range of nouns and noun phrases used vocatively in English, in their general properties, and in their internal and external syntax.

I must first clarify some terms I will use in this discussion. I distinguish vocative NPs from referential NPs (though both, of course, in some sense refer); a vocative in English is set off from the sentence it occurs in by special intonation (see Downing 1969:574-8) and it doesn't serve as an argument of a verb in this sentence. Compare the underlined forms:

- (1) Jacquie, your grammar leaks.
- (2) I'm going to tell Jacquie that her grammar leaks.

A vocative NP necessarily refers to the addressee of its sentence, while a referential NP may so refer (but, as in (2), doesn't necessarily do so). Compare:

- (3) You, hand me those forceps.
- (4) You should hand me those forceps.

Vocatives serve at least two functions: they can be calls or addresses,² illustrated by (5) and (6) respectively:

- (5) Hey lady, you dropped your piano.
- (6) I'm afraid, sir, that my coyote is nibbling on your leg.

Calls are designed to catch the addressee's attention, addresses to maintain or emphasize the contact between speaker and addressee. Of course, these ends can be served by constructions other than NPs, and also by nonlinguistic means. I could get someone's attention with any of the items in (7), or with a touch on the shoulder or a wave:

- (7) hey, yoo hoo, oh, I say, excuse me, pardon me

In more specific circumstances, I could use

(8) Help! Look out! Now hear this!

Maintenance of contact between speaker and addressee can be achieved with the following items as well as with vocatives:

- (9) look, look here, listen, say, hey [from the speaker]
 (10) uh-huh, oh, sure, OK, yeah [from the addressee]

or by smiling, nodding the head, or other conventionalized gestures. In any event, NPs are very commonly used in English as both calls and addresses.

2. Idiomacity. The most striking general property of vocatives is their extraordinary idiomacity. This is manifested in three ways: (a) vocatives often have properties distinct from the corresponding referential NPs; (b) semantically parallel items often have distinct properties; and (c) morphologically related forms typically have distinct properties. Thus it seems that the list of vocative NPs in English is largely learned item by item.

2.1. Vocative vs. referential NPs. There are some generalizations to be made here, most notably

- (11) All vocatives with names as parts are also usable as referential NPs.

To see this, consider the nine types of English vocatives containing proper names (FN = first name, LN = last name):³

- (12) a. Title + LN : Professor Llewellyn
 b. Prefix + LN : Mr./Ms./Mrs./Miss Pandit
 c. Kintitle + FN : Uncle Robert, Uncle Bob
 d. FN : Margaret, Peggy
 e. Kintitle + LN : Grandmother Rice, Grandma Myshkin
 f. Title + FN : Lady Jane, Reverend Bob
 g. Prefix + FN : Mr. Albert, Miss Susan
 h. FN + LN : Herbert Hanson, Herbie Hanson
 i. LN : Abercrombie

All of these can occur as both vocatives and referential NPs, as in

- (13) Grandma Myshkin, tell me about Lublin.
 (14) Grandma Myshkin told me a lot about Lublin.
 (15) I imagine, Lady Jane, that you will find the sherbet pleasant.
 (16) I imagined that Lady Jane would find the sherbet pleasant.

Moreover, in general the conditions on the use of an NP as a vocative to someone are the same as the conditions on its use to refer to someone; if it is appropriate to speak to someone as

Grandma Myshkin in (13), then it is appropriate to speak of the same person as Grandma Myshkin in (14), other things being equal. However, even here there are exceptions: for the last two types in (12), the conditions on vocative and referential use are quite different. As a vocative, FN + LN is peremptory, in contrast to its referential use:

- (17) William Bright, I want you to publish this article.
 (18) William Bright will publish this article.

And vocative LN is used by superiors to inferiors (in school and military situations, for instance) or by colleagues (schoolboys, teammates) among themselves, while referential LN is neutral or respectful; compare

- (19) Chomsky, you've written a masterful article.
 (20) Chomsky has written a masterful article.

For other vocative NPs (those not including proper names as parts), the correspondence with referential NPs is even poorer. In some cases, both forms are possible, but the conditions on their use are different; compare

- (21) a. Boys, we need a leader.
 b. Boys need a leader.
 (22) a. My friend, you gotta buy this car!
 b. My friend just has to buy this car.

In many other cases, only the vocative is possible:

- (23) I wonder, mac/amigo/ma'am/love/you idiot (you)/
 kiddo/cocksuck/toots, if you'd like a blintz.
 (24) *Mac/*Amigo/*Ma'am/*Love/*You idiot (you)/
 *Kiddo/*Cocksuck/*Toots should have a
 blintz .
 (25) {One } *mac/*amigo/*ma'am/*love/*you idiot (you)/
 Each
 *kiddo/*cocksuck/*toots should have a blintz.

The examples in (24) show that amigo, ma'am, etc. don't behave like proper nouns, and the examples in (25) show that they don't behave like count nouns. The pattern in (23)-(25) thus contrasts with patterns for many other vocative NPs, some of which have the syntax of proper nouns (cf. (26) and (27)), some the syntax of count nouns (cf. (28) and (29)):

- (26) Look, buster/sonny/Joe/Mary/Blondie/Stretch,
 I need that monkey wrench.
 (27) Buster/Sonny/Joe/Mary/Blondie/Stretch needs
 that monkey wrench.

In these examples, the 'pseudo proper name' buster can be used to an adult male;⁴ sonny to a young male; Joe to a man, to a soldier, or to any American (different speakers have somewhat different conditions on the use of Joe); Mary, like Grace and Ella, can be used by one male homosexual to another as a joking term of address or reference (see Farrell 1972); Blondie can be used to a blond or blonde; Stretch to a tall male.

(28) Say, lady/fellow/dope/doctor/waitress, how about a drink?

(29) { One } lady/fellow/dope/doctor/waitress took a
 { Each } drink.

Notice that even in examples like (28) and (29), the conditions on the use of a vocative can differ from the conditions on the use of a referential NP; lady in (28) is 'a woman who has aroused the speaker's ill will, often expressed by sarcasm or insult' (Wentworth and Flexner 1967:311), while lady in (29) is a fairly refined general term for woman.

I have observed that some vocative NPs do not occur as referential NPs (and that others have different meanings in vocative and referential uses). It is also true that some referential NPs do not occur as vocatives; the case of occupational titles has been discussed by Schegloff 1968:fn. 3. For instance, although doctor is good both referentially and vocatively, physician, pediatrician, and surgeon are referential only:^{5,6}

(30) Tell me, doctor/*physician/*pediatrician/
 *surgeon/professor/*assistant professor, why do my armpits itch?

Notice again that even in the cases in which an NP can occur both referentially and vocatively, the two occurrences don't necessarily have the same conditions on their use; for instance, driver as a referential NP can refer to the professional driver of a taxicab or truck, or to someone who happens to be driving a private car, whereas driver as a vocative is restricted (for me) to cab drivers, as in

(31) Driver, what's the best route to San Jose?

Finally, as Schegloff notes, some vocative NPs, like cabby and ice cream man, are usable as calls but not as addresses:

(32) Cabby, take me to Carnegie Hall.

(33) *I don't think, cabby, that the Lincoln Tunnel is the best way to go to Brooklyn.

Interestingly enough, the two pure second-person NPs you and

whatsyourname⁷ differ from one another in this respect, since you can be used as a call only:

- (34) Hey {^{you}whatsyourname}, give me that boat hook!
- (35) What I think, {^{*you}whatsyourname}, is that we ought to take the money and run.

I know of no cases of vocatives that are exclusively addresses, and venture the following hypothesis:

- (36) All address forms are usable as calls.

2.2. Parallel items. One indication of idiomaticity for any construction is the failure of semantically parallel items to behave in the same way. We can argue that kick the bucket is an idiom by pointing out that substituting hit, boot, punch, and the like for kick eliminates the fatal sense of kick the bucket, as does substituting pail, hod, bowl, and the like for bucket. In the same way, we can argue that most vocative NPs are idioms. I've already pointed out that parallel occupational titles do not behave in the same way; note (30), and compare (31) with (33). It is also true that only certain kin titles are usable as vocatives:

- (37) I wonder, grandmother/*great aunt/?brother⁸/
father/*brother-in-law, if you recall the 1915
flood?

and only certain nonrelational count nouns:

- (38) You know, man/*gentleman/boy/woman/lady/*person/
girl/?guy/*dame, this reindeer soup is really
delicious.

and only certain 'pet' adjectives:

- (39) Tell me, sweet/pretty/*cute/*kind, if that's
soft enough for you.

and only certain descriptive adjectives:

- (40) Say, slim/skinny/*thin/tiny/*little/*short/
stupid/*dumb/red/*chestnut/*white, can you
give me a boost?

There are some regularities--for instance, a whole class of reduced relative constructions with you can be used as calls:⁹

- (41) You with the sweater on/(standing) on the
stairs/wearing the green hat/over there,
move about a foot to the left.

And the following generalizations concerning the less savory elements in the English lexicon appear to hold:

- (42) All evaluative nouns can occur as vocatives.
- (43) All disparaging names for racial or national groups can occur as vocatives.

By 'evaluative noun' I refer to nouns that can occur in sentences like

- (44) He's a real *slowpoke/meathead/faggot/punk/fatso/prick/fuck-off*.

when they are paraphrasable by adjectival sentences like:

- (45) He's really *slow/stupid/effeminate/worthless/fat/nasty/incompetent*.

respectively.¹⁰ Apparently, any evaluative noun can be used vocatively:

- (46) According to my records, *imbecile/blockhead/smarty pants/bitch/asshole*, you don't belong in this class.

Similarly, disparaging names like Honkie, Hunkie, and Frog can all be used vocatively:

- (47) Hey, Jap/Nigger/Wop/Dago, get your ass off that bench!

Note that (42) and (43) express exceptions to the generalization that semantically parallel items have similar syntactic behavior, but since these exceptions are systematic and based on the semantic content of nouns, they don't give us an argument for the idiomaticity of vocatives. Without this systematicity, the failure of fool to behave like imbecile, or homosexual like faggot, or Italian like Wop would be further evidence that which items can occur vocatively is largely a matter of lists:

- (48) From what you've said, ?fool/*homosexual/*Italian, I think you should take up purse-snatching.

There are some proper noun constructions for which vocatives appear to lack systematicity, but here referential NPs show the same gaps as vocatives, so that the idiomaticity resides in the constructions rather than their vocative use. By generalization (11), we would expect that constructions that aren't usable as referential NPs aren't usable as vocatives either. I give some examples for illustration. First, combination (12a), Title + LN:

- (49) Bartender/Waiter/Attendant, who's that sitting by the door making Sex Life in Ancient Rome faces?
- (50) *Bartender Nussbaum/*Waiter Petree/*Attendant Grey, I'd like a glass of water.
- (51) I asked *Bartender Nussbaum/*Waiter Petree/*Attendant Grey to sing 'The Rose of Tralee'.

(49) shows that the titles occur alone as vocatives, but in (50) they are barred when combined with LN; however, (51) indicates that the combination fails for referential uses too.
Then (12f), Title + FN:

- (52) Driver/Bartender/Conductor, what's that green cloud in the sky?
- (53) *Driver Georgette/*Bartender Melissa/*Conductor Arthur, who wrote the Waverly novels?
- (54) *Driver Georgette/*Bartender Melissa/*Conductor Arthur told my wife an obscene story.

Next, two cases involving Kintitles. The judgments here are my own; other speakers have somewhat different sets of forms.
First, (12c), Kintitle + FN:

- (55) {Grandmother
Unc }, why are your eyes so big?
- (56) {*Grandmother Susannah
*Unc Herbert }, who won the pennant in 1948?
- (57) {*Grandmother Susannah
*Unc Herbert } invented the left-handed screwdriver.

Then, (12e), Kintitle + LN:

- (58) {Uncle
Mommy }, what makes thunder?
- (59) {*Uncle Coleman
*Mommy Longll }, how come you never cook dinner?
- (60) I can't imagine why {*Uncle Coleman
*Mommy Long } likes demolition derbies.

Finally, the titles, kintitles, and prefixes that occur with proper names are different for FN and LN. Only a few titles occur with FN; compare

- (61) Professor/Congressman, I have a very interesting offer for you.
- (62) Professor Lehiste/*Professor Ilse/Congressman Devine/*Congressman Sam, could I have a copy of that report?

- (63) We saw Professor Lehiste/*Professor Ilse
Congressman Devine/*Congressman Sam capping
wine bottles.

As for kintitles, there are some, like aunt and uncle, that occur with FN but not LN, as well as others, like grandmother and grandfather, that occur with LN but not FN (see (55)-(60)). There is also a gap in (12g), Prefix + FN, since forms like *Mrs. Jane don't occur even in those contexts in which Mr. John or Miss Janet are appropriate. In all of these cases, the gaps in vocative NPs are matched by gaps in referential NPs.

2.3. Morphologically related forms. Other things being equal, we expect morphologically related forms to show parallel syntactic behavior, so that differential behavior indicates an idiom; the fact that kick two buckets lacks the fatal sense of kick the bucket is another indication of its idiomatic character. For their part, vocatives often fail to show parallel behavior in the singular and plural.

First, there are cases in which singular and plural vocatives are both possible, but have quite different conditions on their use. Compare the following pairs:

- (64) a. Kid }, you should take it easy.
b. Kids
(65) a. Say, boy }, how about a bite to eat?
b. Say, boys }
(66) a. Woman }, get up and fight!
b. Women }
(67) a. Come on, man }, it's time to move.
b. Come on, men }

The last two examples will do to illustrate the point. (66a) is addressed by a man to his female partner; like (66b) or (67b), but unlike (67a), it expresses the superior position of the speaker over the addressee. (66b) involves a preemptory address by someone in authority to a group of women. (67a) is addressed by someone of either sex to a male (or to anyone: some speakers can use man, like guys, to addressees of either sex); there is no necessary authority difference between speaker and addressee. (67b) is addressed by someone in authority to a group of men. In (66) and (67), the singular forms are not understood parallel to the plural forms (nor are the two singular forms understood in a parallel way)

In at least two cases--gentleman and constructions of the form you N, where the N is not evaluative--only the plural form can be used vocatively:

- (68) Let me know, { *gentleman }, if you hear from the
gentlemen
Black Prince again.
(69) Now, you *man/men/*lady/ladies, come along to
the Blue Room.

In other cases--in particular, nouns used only vocatively--the plural is missing:

- (70) { ^{Ma'am}
*^{Ma'ams} }, dinner is ready.
- (71) Here, { ^{miss}
*^{misses} }, is the very harpsichord Soler practiced on.

The plural is, of course, missing for vocative NPs that behave like proper nouns in their referential uses (cf. (26) and (27)):

- (72) Hey, { ^{buster}
*^{busters} }, move that car!

and for the adjectival vocatives (cf. (39) and (40)):

- (73) Tell me, { ^{handsome}
*^{handsomes} }, how do I get out of here?

3. Sociolinguistic markedness. Another striking characteristic of vocatives is the extent to which they provide information about the speaker and his opinions about the discourse: vocative NPs, much more than referential NPs, locate the speaker and the discourse in a particular social world. They may express any of the following (not entirely independent) aspects of an interaction ((74)-(81)):

- (74) the general attitude of the speaker toward the addressee--positive, as in honey, my dear, and beautiful, or negative, as in buster, bastard, and dumbass;
- (75) the level of politeness adopted by the speaker toward the addressee--from quite polite (sir and ma'am) to sarcastic (one use of sister) or insulting (Jew-boy);
- (76) the level of formality adopted by the speaker--from quite formal (my lord, your honor) to quite casual (fellas, baby);
- (77) the speaker's estimate of his status with respect to the addressee--inferior, as in sir and professor; or superior, as in FN + LN (Franz Kafka), woman, cabbie, and you; or equal, as in guys and man;
- (78) the speaker's opinion about the degree of intimacy between him and the addressee--close, for endearments like honey, for FN (Renata), and for some uses of some insults, like motherfuck(er), shithead, and fuck-face; or distant, as in Title + LN (Professor McCawley), you, and reduced relative constructions with you (like you standing on the turtle);

- (79) the speaker's estimate of the type of interaction going on and his and the addressee's roles in this interaction--for example, a service encounter, with the speaker as customer and the addressee as server, in the case of waiter, waitress, and one use of miss; or a short-term encounter with some specific aim, between non-intimates, in the case of fellow, buster, mac, buddy, and dude; and so on;
- (80) the speaker's judgments about various properties of the addressee--(a) sex, as in the difference between son, pop, chief, ace, and sister, doll, madam, daughter; (b) age, as in the difference between boys, son (not addressed to one's son), young man, and gramps, dad, granny (none of these addressed to relatives); (c) occupation, as in doc, swabby, father (to a priest), officer; (d) various physical characteristics, as in carrot-top, skinny, big boobs, shrimp; (e) various personal characteristics, as in creep, fathead, dope; (f) family relationship to the speaker, as in some, though by no means all, uses of father, uncle, gramps, auntie; (g) marital status, as in Miss Fonda versus Mrs. Hayden; and so on;
- (81) And the speaker's belonging to a particular subculture (dude is appropriate only for speakers in the American high school/college subculture, comrade for Communist cell members, Mary, Grace, Ella for men in the gay world), social class (British love and ducks are lower or lower-middle class, as are American toots and mac), or geographical dialect (love addressed to non-intimates of either sex is British).

In addition, many speakers have what amounts to a personal style in their selection of vocatives, using forms like old buddy, duck, my friend, kiddo, amigo, and boss even when no one around them uses such forms.

Now referential NPs convey information about various properties of the person referred to, and a fair number of nouns mark the speaker as belonging to a subculture, social class, or geographical dialect. Some referential NPs indicate attitude, politeness, formality, status, intimacy, or a particular role relation between the speaker and the person referred to. What is unexpected is that vocative NPs in English are almost never neutral: they express attitude, politeness, formality, status, intimacy, or a role relationship, and most of them mark the speaker. As a result even though English is enormously rich in vocative NPs (I have already cited dozens), there is virtually no affectively neutral vocative. To see this, imagine that you are trying to catch the attention of a stranger who isn't looking at you (so you can't gesture) and who isn't close to you (so you can't touch the

stranger on the shoulder). If the stranger is female and young, you might shout miss (though this might be too polite). If she is older, you might shout ma'am (but this is definitely too polite, unless--in the world I grew up in--you are young, male, and deferential). In either case, lady would do, except that it is sarcastic (unless it has a rising, wheedling, intonation, in which case you are locked into a deferential position with respect to your addressee). If the stranger is male, your best choices are sir (very polite and deferential), mister (somewhat polite), or fella (casual). If you can't tell the stranger's sex, you are stuck with you, which is impertinent. In fact, for a stranger of indeterminable age, sex, and social class, the best call is no vocative at all (\emptyset)--a touch, hey, or excuse me.

Although I haven't surveyed languages in this respect, I would imagine that many do not have the same degree of sociolinguistic markedness and idiomaticity in vocative NPs. The English situation is particularly striking since English speakers are required to use vocative expressions quite a lot; speakers of some other languages (for example, Finnish, as reported to me by Lauri Karttunen and Paul Kiparsky) are much more sparing in their addresses and calls. It is not, of course, surprising that many vocatives are marked, since they directly concern the relationship between speaker and addressee. Nevertheless, it is surprising that attitudes of deference, politeness, and the like are often expressed quite unnecessarily, as in brief exchanges with total strangers.

4. Syntactic comments. In earlier sections I pointed out several aspects of the internal syntax of vocative NPs. There is a good deal more to be said on this point, as well as on their external syntax. A few brief remarks are all I can give here.

4.1. External Syntax. Because of their function, calls are essentially restricted to discourse-initial position, though they may be preceded by a handful of other attention-getters:

- (82) {^{Hey}_{Oh}} Lord Darnley! Watch out for your head!
- (83) You, punk, you wanna earn some easy money?

When calls occur within sentences, they signal the interruption of one discourse by another:

- (84) As I was saying--Oh Sharon! Come here and let us see that marvelous new dress!--you can't believe a thing you read these days.

Addresses, on the other hand, have a much wider occurrence--after the introducing elements in (9), as well as after well, why, please, come on, tell me, you know, after greetings (hi, hello, good morning), after exclamations (wow, atta girl, dammit, oh boy), and in positions open to parenthetical elements; compare the a and b pairs below.

- (85) a. You must realize, I'm sure, that this can't go on.
 b. You must realize, honey, that we can't keep meeting like this.
- (86) a. June should stop fighting with Henry, don't you think?
 b. Henry will probably storm out of the apartment. June.
- (87) a. *Mark assured us that, I imagine, the spiders were friendly.
 b. *Melinda maintained that, dumbass, the bite was negligible.
- (88) a. ?He kissed, I don't doubt, the winner.
 b. ?She beat, my friend, everyone who challenged her at chess.

The fact that vocatives do not occur in embedded clauses, as in (87), is well known; a recent discussion can be found in Banfield 1973.

4.2. Internal Syntax. Perhaps the most interesting problems in this area concern the distinction between various NP constructions with you¹²--referential NPs, as in

- (89) You Arabs should be pleased.

imperative-heading NPs, as in

- (90) You (idiots) give me that jelly roll!
 (91) Don't you (fools) handle the rattlesnakes!

exclamatory NPs, as in

- (92) You bastard!
 (93) You great big beautiful baby!

and vocative NPs, as in

- (94) Come here, you sons-of-bitches!

One striking difference has to do with the ability of you plus a singular noun to appear in the various constructions. Such NPs occur freely as exclamatory or vocative NPs when they convey a strong negative or positive feeling, as in (92), (93), and--parallel to (94)--

- (95) Get out of here, you son-of-a-bitch!
 (96) Look here, you (goddam) Communist, nobody can talk that way in this bar.

Referential and imperative positions reject such NPs:

(97) *You bastard should be satisfied with the stock market.

(98) *(Don't) you idiot pick up that flask!

The parallelism of (97) and (98) is what one would expect from the analysis of imperative-heading NPs given by Downing 1969, who argues that imperative-heading NPs in sentences like

(99) Someone close the door!

(100) Those near the front leave by the side exits.

represent the subjects of their verbs, not vocatives associated with the imperative sentences as wholes.¹³

The parallelism of these vocative and exclamatory constructions suggests that the former are derived from the latter. But all of these constructions with you require much further study.

Footnotes

*Quite a few people--too many, in fact, for me to list them here, even if I could manage to recall them all--have offered useful comments and suggestions about this paper. To all of them, my thanks.

1. The impetus for recent work on these topics comes from Brown and Gilman 1960, on T and V pronouns, and Brown and Ford 1961, on address forms.

2. The distinction between addresses and calls is made by Schegloff 1968, who refers to terms of address and summonses.

3. Erwin-Tripp 1972:218-25 gives a detailed account of the conditions for the American English use of types (a)-(d) in (11), as well as for \emptyset (no address form).

4. Wentworth and Flexner 1967:80 say that buster is used 'almost always in direct address to a stranger, usu. one who has aroused the speaker's anger'.

5. However, many terms that are barred from use as vocatives in spoken English are permitted in salutations of letters. A letter sent to all members of the AMA could begin Dear physician, even though the chairman of a session at an AMA meeting would never address a member as physician.

6. Geoffrey Nunberg has reminded me of examples like Physician, heal thyself! I don't know of any speech register in which such examples can be used appropriately by modern speakers, though they can of course be inserted into discourses as quotations. Another type of noncounterexample to the observations in (30) is illustrated by Physician! Surgeon! and the like, which are calls for a physician, surgeon, etc., not calls to them (compare: Forceps! Two fish sandwiches to go! and so on).

7. Whatsyourname has a number of variant forms, like whatsyourface (reported to me by Elizabeth Zwicky) and howchama-callit or hoochamacallit (reported to me by William Cantrall).

8. Brother is, of course, usable as a vocative in other senses (referring to a monk, for instance; or used by one member of an ethnic, religious, or social group to another, as in the use of brother by black males and by fundamentalist church members; or directed towards males in general, as in Brother, can you spare a quarter?).

9. But not as addresses, just as in (35).

10. I mean specifically to exclude nouns that merely convey evaluations. Thus, the fact that some speakers can use Arnold is a real linguist to convey that Arnold is boisterous in argument and inclined to eat and drink too much doesn't make linguist an evaluative noun.

11. The point here is that I couldn't use Mommy + LN to distinguish a mother from a stepmother, nor as an alternative to Mother + LN 'Grandmother LN'.

12. The deeper analysis of NPs like you men and we linguists is a point of controversy, with Postal 1966 treating the surface pronouns as remote determiners and Dougherty and Delorme 1972 deriving the constructions from underlying appositives.

13. Downing cites the relevant earlier literature on these 'third-person imperatives' (in particular, Thorne 1966 and Bolinger 1967) and treats quite a wide range of data. See also the brief treatment in Stockwell, Schachter, and Partee 1972:648.

References

- Banfield, Ann. 1973. Narrative style and the grammar of direct and indirect speech. *Foundations of Language* 10.1.1-39.
- Bolinger, Dwight. 1967. The imperative in English. To honor Roman Jakobson, 335-62. Mouton, The Hague.
- Brown, Roger, and M. Ford. 1961. Address in American English. *J. Abnorm. Soc. Psych.* 62.375-85. Reprinted in Laver and Hutcheson 1972:128-45.
- Brown, Roger, and Albert Gilman. 1960. The pronouns of power and solidarity. In Sebeok 1960:253-76. Reprinted in Laver and Hutcheson 1972:103-27.
- Dougherty, Ray C., and Evelyne Delorme. 1972. Appositive NP constructions: we, the people; we men; I, a man; etc. *Foundations of Language* 8.1.2-29.
- Downing, Bruce T. 1969. Vocatives and third-person imperatives in English. *Papers in Linguistics* 1.3.570-92.
- Ervin-Tripp, Susan. 1972. On sociolinguistic rules: alternation and co-occurrence. In Gumperz and Hymes 1972:213-50.
- Farrell, Ronald A. 1972. The argot of the homosexual subculture. *Anthropological Linguistics* 14.71-109.
- Gumperz, John J., and Dell Hymes (eds.). 1972. *Directions in sociolinguistics: the ethnography of communication*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- Jacobs, Roderick A., and Peter S. Rosenbaum (eds.). 1970. *Readings in English transformational grammar*. Ginn, Waltham, Mass.

- Laver, John, and Sandy Hutcheson (eds.). 1972. *Communication in face to face interaction*. Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, Middlesex.
- Postal, Paul M. 1966. On so-called 'pronouns' in English. *Georgetown MSL* 19.177-206. Reprinted in Jacobs and Rosenbaum 1970:56-82 and Reibel and Schane 1969:201-24.
- Reibel, David A., and Sanford A. Schane (eds.). 1969. *Modern studies in English*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1968. Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist* 70.6.1075-95. Reprinted in Gumperz and Humes 1972:346-80 and Laver and Hutcheson 1972:374-405.
- Sebeok, Thomas A. (ed.). 1960. *Style in language*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Stockwell, Robert P., Paul Schachter, and Barbara Hall Partee. 1972. *The major syntactic structures of English*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- Thorne, James P. 1966. English imperative sentences. *Journal of Linguistics* 2.69-78.
- Wentworth, Harold, and Stuart B. Flexner. 1967. *Dictionary of American slang*. Supplemented ed. Thomas Y. Crowell Co., New York. (1st ed., 1960)