

Original scientific paper

Received: 13 May 2021

Accepted: 23 June 2021

Petra Božanić, Teaching Assistant

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Split

Department of Croatian Language and Literature

petboz@ffst.hr

THE INTERPRETATION OF VOCATIVE LINGUISTIC FEATURES IN CONTEMPORARY TEXTBOOKS AND SCHOOL GRAMMAR BOOKS OF THE CROATIAN LANGUAGE

Abstract: *This paper aims to analyze the interpretation of vocatives and category of vocativeness within the school subject Croatian language regarding phonetic, phonological morphological, syntactic, orthographic and pragmatic-semantic vocative features on the corpus of contemporary Croatian language textbooks for primary and secondary education selected according to the final result of the selection of textbooks from the “Catalog of approved textbooks for the 2020/2021 school year” for primary and secondary schools, and four contemporary school grammar books of the Croatian language by Silić & Pranjković (2007), Težak & Babić (2016), Ham (2017), and Hudeček & Mihaljević (2019). The study results show the presence of the vocative as a case with the emphasis on its morphological features and syntactic autonomy, and the communicative vocative functions have been almost completely neglected.*

Keywords: *cases, Croatian language teaching, vocative*

INTRODUCTION

The category of vocativeness, with the categories of imperativeness and interrogativeness, is part of the category of appellativeness which draws the recipient's attention to the addressee or the message itself, so the vocative can be defined as a grammatical form of the category of vocativeness (Karlić & Cvitković, 2017, pp. 228–229). The property of a case is added to the vocative when the form of address, as a characteristic feature of the semantic-pragmatic category of vocativeness, is included in the case system of a certain language (Daniel & Spencer, 2012, p. 626), but a special grammatical morpheme does not condition the survival of vocative expressions in a particular language (Karlić & Okuka, 2015, p. 32), therefore the vocative as a case is

not necessarily grammaticalized in all languages (Karlić & Cvitković, 2017, p. 228). In addition to morphological specificity, the vocative is recognized in written discourse by its free position in a sentence, writing diacritical marks – commas and exclamation marks, and is prosodically marked by intonation or, for example, frontal¹ accent (Karlić & Cvitković, 2017, p. 231).

In all inflectional languages, the vocative is not realized by a specific grammatical morpheme, therefore in the Croatian language, the vocative represents an unstable morphological category and is partially grammaticalized (Karlić & Cvitković, 2017, p. 229, 240). Namely, nominative and vocative morphological features are levelled (Rišner, 2006, p. 131), which is defined as grammatical homonymy or syncretism (Jelaska, 2006, p. 42), and it is the result of the interaction of foreign language touches, organic idioms, conversational and administrative discourse (Težak, 1982, p. 35; Badurina, 2010, p. 4) and the linguistic economy principle, which, along with punctuation and paralinguistic signs, makes the marking of vocatives with a special grammatical morpheme a redundant feature regarding its communicative functions (Karlić & Okuka, 2015, p. 83). Therefore, in the context of the inherent connection of the vocative with the communicative context (Badurina, 2010, p. 6), it is more appropriate to talk about its demorphologization (Trovesi, 2008, p. 28) than its extinction.

In the sentence structure, the vocative position is free, which means that the vocative can stand at the beginning of the sentence, where its appellative role is best emphasized, and in the middle or at the end of the sentence, where appellation weakens but emphatic is emphasized (Vlastelić, 2013, p. 303). The vocative expression is formed as a monolectic model (anthroponym, appellative, adjective, personal pronoun, collective noun) or syntagmatic model (complex syntagm of a noun and its dependent member of an attribute or apposition) (Babić, 2010, pp. 326–327), and vocative forms are often accompanied by appellative exclamations, the purpose of which is to emphasize certain vocative communication roles (Daniel & Spencer, 2009, p. 626). The syntacticity of the vocative expression is realized considering autosyntacticity or asyntacticity: the vocative is autosyntactic when realized in the form of an independent sentence, and asyntactic when it is part of a sentence structure (Babić, 2010, p. 326), therefore the vocative remains as an external associate member of the sentence structure (Ljubibratić, 1987, p. 67). In this context, it can be viewed as an independent sentence (Marković, 2013, p. 256), a separate syntagmatic/syntactic construction (Ljubibratić, 1987, p. 67; Skljarov, 1962, p. 409) or a special type of sentence or conjunction (Pranjković, 1987, p. 78).

¹ “Morfološki se uvijekovan silazni naglasak zove čelni naglasak. Čelni naglasak nije svaki naglasak na čelu riječi niti svaki naglasak silazne intonacije, već samo onaj silazni naglasak koji u određenim riječima i oblicima riječi dolazi u prvom slogu izgovorne cjeline ili naglasnice kao njihova morfološka oznaka. Čelni je naglasak karakterističan za npr. kategoriju vokativa, aorista, pridjeva radnog i trpnog“ (Barić et. al., 2005, p. 93). For instance, jùnāk > jünāče, vòda > vòdō.

At the semantic-pragmatic level, the vocative can be defined as a polysemic form or expression, which, in addition to the conative function directed at the recipient of the message, implies an emotional, phatic, or poetic function (Glušac & Mikić Čolić, 2017, p. 452). A characteristic feature of the category of vocativeness is its communication function (Badurina, 2010, p. 7), so among the vocative communication functions can be understood addressing, invoking, addressing, drawing the recipient's attention to its specific part, examining the information flow in the communication channel, invocation, and modal function (Ljubibratić, 1987, p. 70-71; Stolac, 2005, p. 178).

The aim of this paper is on the corpus of current Croatian language textbooks for primary and secondary school, selected according to *Konačan rezultat odabira udžbenika iz „Kataloga odobrenih udžbenika u školskoj godini 2020./2021. – osnovne škole“* (*The final result of the selection of textbooks from the “Catalog of approved textbooks in the school year 2020/2021 – primary schools”*) and *Konačan rezultat odabira udžbenika iz „Kataloga odobrenih udžbenika u školskoj godini 2020./2021. – srednje škole“* (*The final result of the selection of textbooks from the Catalog of approved textbooks in the school year 2020/2021 – secondary schools*), and four contemporary school grammar books of the Croatian language, *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika za gimnazije i visoka učilišta (Grammar Book of the Croatian Language for Gymnasiums and Colleges)* (2007) by Josip Silić and Ivo Pranjković, *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika: priručnik za osnovno jezično obrazovanje (Grammar Book of the Croatian Language: Handbook for Basic Language Education)* (2016) by Stjepko Težak and Stjepan Babić, *Školska gramatika hrvatskoga jezika (School Grammar Book of the Croatian Language)* (2017) by Sanda Ham and *Hrvatska školska gramatika (Croatian School Grammar Book)* (2019) by Lana Hudeček and Milica Mihaljević, to analyze the interpretation of vocative and categories of vocativeness within the school subject Croatian language regarding phonetic, phonological, morphological, syntactic, orthographic and pragmatic-semantic vocative features. The initial assumption is that the teaching of vocative and about vocative is focused on the formal-grammatical component, which provides an incomplete image of the position and function of vocative in the Croatian language. Therefore, this paper intends to provide guidelines for a comprehensive approach to teaching vocative characteristics that include the unification of traditional grammatical and modern communication-functional paradigm.²

² „Jezik, smatraju formalni lingvisti, valja opisati nezavisno od njegove uporabe u komunikaciji, a temeljni je zadatak lingvista opisati model jezične sposobnosti, a ne jezične izvedbe (Chomsky, 1965, p. 4). (...) Funkcionalni pristupi, za razliku od formalnih, u žarište stavljaju komunikaciju kao jednu od najvažnijih funkcija jezika u društvu, a značenje pri tome igra veliku ulogu“ (Borucinsky & Tominac Coslovich, pp. 12–13).

METHODOLOGY

The time frame of the selected corpus refers to modern textbooks of the school subject Croatian language for primary and secondary schools and four school grammar books of the Croatian language. The criterion for selecting textbooks for the analysis of the interpretation of vocative features was determined according to *Konačan rezultat odabira udžbenika iz „Kataloga odobrenih udžbenika u školskoj godini 2020./2021. – osnovne škole“* (*The final result of the selection of textbooks from the “Catalog of approved textbooks in the school year 2020/2021 – primary schools”*) and *Konačan rezultat odabira udžbenika iz „Kataloga odobrenih udžbenika u školskoj godini 2020./2021. – srednje škole“* (*The final result of the selection of textbooks from the Catalog of approved textbooks in the school year 2020/2021. – secondary schools*), and considering the teaching content related to the teaching of the vocative, i.e., the educational outcomes of the primary school HJ A.5.5.³ and SS HJ A.3.5.⁴ within the school subject area Croatian language and communication from *Odluka o donošenju kurikuluma za nastavni predmet Hrvatski jezik za osnovne škole i gimnazije u Republici Hrvatskoj* (*Decision on the Adoption of the Curriculum for the School Subject Croatian Language for Primary Schools and Gymnasiums in the Republic of Croatia*) (NN 10/2019), i.e., *Kurikulum nastavnog predmeta Hrvatski jezik za osnovne škole i gimnazije* (*Curriculum for the School Subject Croatian Language for Primary Schools and Gymnasiums in the Republic of Croatia*) (2019) of the experimental programme *Škola za život* (*School for Life*), and the educational outcome of SS HJ A.3.5.⁵ within the school subject area Croatian language and communication from *Odluka o donošenju kurikuluma za nastavni predmet Hrvatski jezik za srednje strukovne škole na razini 4.2. u Republici Hrvatskoj* (*Decision on the Adoption of the Curriculum for the School Subject Croatian Language for Vocational Secondary Schools at level 4.2. in the Republic of Croatia*) (NN 10/2019), i.e., *Kurikulum nastavnog predmeta Hrvatski jezik za srednje strukovne škole na razini 4.2.* (*Curriculum for the School Subject Croatian Language for Vocational Secondary Schools at level 4.2. in the Republic of Croatia*) (2019) of the experimental program *Škola za život* (*School for Life*), primary school textbooks for the fifth grade and secondary school textbooks for the third grade were observed.

³ „Učenik oblikuje tekst i primjenjuje znanja o promjenjivim i nepromjenjivim riječima na ogleđnim i čestim primjerima“ (*Odluka o donošenju kurikuluma za nastavni predmet Hrvatski jezik za osnovne škole i gimnazije u Republici Hrvatskoj*, NN 10/2019).

⁴ „Učenik analizira morfološka obilježja riječi i primjenjuje znanja pri oblikovanju teksta“ (*Odluka o donošenju kurikuluma za nastavni predmet Hrvatski jezik za osnovne škole i gimnazije u Republici Hrvatskoj*, NN 10/2019).

⁵ „Učenik analizira morfološka obilježja riječi i primjenjuje znanja pri oblikovanju teksta“ (*Odluka o donošenju kurikuluma za nastavni predmet Hrvatski jezik za srednje strukovne škole na razini 4.2. u Republici Hrvatskoj*, NN 10/2019).

The corpus of primary school textbooks includes six textbooks, one of which is integrated: *Hrvatski za 5: udžbenik iz hrvatskoga jezika za peti razred osnovne škole* (Družijanić-Hajdarević et. al., 2020), *Hrvatska krijesnica 5: udžbenik iz hrvatskoga jezika za 5. razred osnovne škole* (Kovač and Jukić, 2019), *Hrvatski bez granica 5: integrirani udžbenik hrvatskoga jezika i književnosti za peti razred osnovne škole* (Levak et. al., 2020), *Hrvatske jezične niti 5: udžbenik iz hrvatskoga jezika za peti razred osnovne škole* (Miloloža et. al., 2020), *Volim hrvatski 5: udžbenik hrvatskoga jezika u petome razredu osnovne škole* (Rihtarić et. al., 2020) and *Naš hrvatski 5: udžbenik hrvatskoga jezika u petome razredu osnovne škole* (Šojat, 2020).

The corpus of secondary school textbooks includes five textbooks, three of which are integrated: *Fon-Fon 3: udžbenik hrvatskoga jezika za treći razred gimnazije i srednjih strukovnih škola* (Dujmović Markusi and Španjić, 2020), *Putokazi 3: udžbenik za hrvatski jezik, književnost i komunikacijske vještine 21. stoljeća za 3. razred strukovnih škola na razini 4.2 i gimnazije* (Marčan and Grubišić Belina, 2020), *Hrvatski jezik i književnost 3: integrirani udžbenik hrvatskoga jezika za treći razred gimnazije* (Serdarević et. al., 2020), *Biram knjigu i riječ 3: čitanka i udžbenik iz hrvatskoga jezika za treći razred strukovnih škola* (Zrinjan, 2020a) i *Lica riječi 3: udžbenik iz hrvatskog jezika za treći razred gimnazija i četverogodišnjih strukovnih škola* (Zrinjan, 2020b). Given that the textbooks *Biram knjigu i riječ 3* and *Lica riječi 3* are by the same author, and the first is an integrated textbook for vocational secondary schools with the same more concise teaching content and the second for gymnasiums and four-year vocational secondary schools with the same expanded content, the analysis will for convenience give examples from the textbook *Lica riječi 3*.

The time corpus of school grammars refers to the last editions published in the 21st century, and these are *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika za gimnazije i visoka učilišta* (Silić & Pranjković, 2007), *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika: priručnik za osnovno jezično obrazovanje* (Težak & Babić, 2016), *Školska gramatika hrvatskoga jezika* (Ham, 2017) and *Hrvatska školska gramatika* (Hudeček & Mihaljević, 2019). Silić's and Pranjković's grammar book, originally published in 2005, consists of four parts: Phonology, Morphology, Syntax and Functional Styles of the Croatian Standard Language, which is the first time in the context of grammatical description that it is approached from the level of functional styles, eluding the expectations of traditional analysis of grammatical material (Hudeček, 2007, p. 380). Since all language levels are intertwined, this grammar has managed to meet two goals – to describe phonological phenomena to explain those in the field of morphology and to deepen syntactic concepts by analysis at the text level (Matešić, 2006, p. 142). This paper deals with the second edition of this grammar from 2007. Težak's and Babić's grammar book was first published in 1966, which is the longest-lived and most published school grammar book of the Croatian language, so this paper examines its most

current, eighteenth edition. Sanda Ham's grammar book with its first edition in 2002 represents the first grammar book of the Croatian language in the period of the twenty-first century. Although intended for primary school use, accompanying the program of learning and teaching the school subject Croatian language in primary schools, its purpose extends to its use in secondary schools. The peculiarity of this grammar book is reflected in the concept of presenting the grammatical content so that the titles are formulated with questions to which the answer is given below. Since it is a grammar book intended for school use, this grammar is normative with a tendency to present language advice, while being characterized by simplicity and conciseness (Ham, 2006, p. 240). This paper looks at the fifth, amended edition from 2017. The latest achievement in the field of school grammar books is *Hrvatska školska gramatika* by Lana Hudeček and Milica Mihaljević, and this paper includes its second edition from 2019.

The selected corpus for the analysis of vocative issues is focused on current textbooks in the current school year (2020/2021), as well as recent publications in the field of school grammar books, which seeks to see the current level of persistence of traditional, i.e., the influence of modern theoretical fluctuations into the educational system in the context of interpretation the teaching content related to the vocative and the category of vocativeness in general. In the mentioned corpus, the vocative is observed regarding the representation of the interpretation of phonetic, phonological, morphological, syntactic, orthographic, and pragmatic-semantic features, i.e., by combining the traditional and modern linguistic paradigm. Phonetic vocative features mean the representation of its accented, i.e., pronunciation specifics. Phonological features include vocal changes of vocative forms recorded in the said corpus. Morphological features imply the peculiarities of the distribution of vocative grammatical morphemes and other formative features. Syntactic features are observed regarding the characteristics of vocative expression and the position of vocative in the sentence structure in relation to other members of the sentence structure. Orthographic features mean the rules of writing commas in the form of vocative form or vocative expression, and the analysis of semantic-pragmatic features encroaches on the area of the category of vocativeness, i.e., the level of recognition and definition of vocative communication functions and meanings. In addition, the textbook and grammar corpus analyze the understanding of the concept of cases, as well as the order of teaching cases in primary school textbooks to observe the principles of *vocative teaching*, and in the analysis of secondary school textbooks, the starting point is *teaching about vocative*, which presupposes the development and expansion of the definition of vocative characteristics in relation to primary school.

The overall analysis of the results is divided into two parts with a separate analysis of primary and secondary school textbooks, where the results obtained

in primary school textbooks are compared with those in the *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika: priručnik za osnovno jezično obrazovanje* (2016) and *Školska gramatika hrvatskoga jezika* (2017), and those obtained in secondary school textbooks with the *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika za gimnazije i visoka učilišta* (2007) i *Hrvatska školska gramatika* (2019). It is important to note that the analysis of textbooks is directed towards their interpretation on a scientific-theoretical, not methodological or practical level, bearing in mind the principle of scientificity and the principle of adequacy of Croatian language teaching (see Težak, 1996).

Table 1 Abbreviations that appear in the paper

Abbreviation	Textbook
FF	<i>Fon-Fon 3: udžbenik hrvatskoga jezika za treći razred gimnazije i srednjih strukovnih škola</i>
HBG	<i>Hrvatski bez granica 5: integrirani udžbenik hrvatskoga jezika i književnosti za peti razred osnovne škole</i>
HJK	<i>Hrvatski jezik i književnost 3: integrirani udžbenik hrvatskoga jezika za treći razred gimnazije</i>
HJN	<i>Hrvatske jezične niti 5: udžbenik iz hrvatskoga jezika za peti razred osnovne škole</i>
HK	<i>Hrvatska krijesnica 5: udžbenik iz hrvatskoga jezika za 5. razred osnovne škole</i>
HZ5	<i>Hrvatski za 5: udžbenik iz hrvatskoga jezika za peti razred osnovne škole</i>
LR	<i>Lica riječi 3: udžbenik iz hrvatskog jezika za treći razred gimnazija i četverogodišnjih strukovnih škola</i>
NH	<i>Naš hrvatski 5: udžbenik hrvatskoga jezika u petome razredu osnovne škole</i>
P	<i>Putokazi 3: udžbenik za hrvatski jezik, književnost i komunikacijske vještine 21. stoljeća za 3. razred strukovnih škola na razini 4.2 i gimnazije</i>
VH	<i>Volim hrvatski 5: udžbenik hrvatskoga jezika u petome razredu osnovne škole</i>

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

PRIMARY SCHOOL TEXTBOOKS AND SCHOOL GRAMMAR BOOKS (TEŽAK & BABIĆ, 2016; HAM, 2017)

According to the *Odluka o donošenju kurikuluma za nastavni predmet Hrvatski jezik za osnovne škole i gimnazije u Republici Hrvatskoj* (NN 10/2019), i.e., *Kurikulum nastavnog predmeta Hrvatski jezik za osnovne škole i gimnazije* (2019) of experimental programme *Škola za život*, a proposal for the

elaboration of the educational outcome OŠ HJ A5.5. in the context of case teaching in the fifth grade of primary school, it refers to distinguishing morphological categories that establish connections between words, which in addition to cases includes gender, number, person, and time, and noticing cases as different forms of the same word on frequent and exemplary examples. These outcomes follow the traditional Croatian grammatical thought which defines the case as a grammatical category, i.e. morphological feature of nouns, along with gender and number, defining it as “a morphological category that expresses different relations of what a word means according to sentence content (Barić et al., 2005, p. 101)”, i.e. in the form of grammatical functions and syntactic relations (Babić et al., 2007, p. 304) or as a “form of a word that depends on its service and relation to other words in a sentence” (Težak and Babić, 1996, p. 81). However, in recent times there has been controversy over whether the definition of a case at the morphological and syntactic, i.e., the grammatical level is complete or whether the case should be viewed from a semantic point of view as a “coherent semantic-grammatical category“ marked by general meaning and its concrete realizations in certain communication situations (Belaj & Tanacković Faletar, 2014, p. 230) and, on the other hand, as a “semantic-syntactic category, which may or may not be realized morphologically” (Marković, 2013, p. 246). Given the outcomes, it is expected that the interpretation of vocative in primary school textbooks will be more focused on its morphological and syntactic, and even orthographic (writing commas and exclamation marks) and phonological features (sound changes), than its inherent communication specifics.

In the observed textbooks, the case is defined as a different form of the same noun (HBZ, p. 11; HJZ, p. 32; HK, p. 51; HZ5, p. 98; NZ, p. 33; VH, p. 39), and the case paradigm is even identified with *the multiplication table to be learned and repeated* (NH, p. 32), which results in an abstract formal-conceptual approach and passive adoption, i.e. linguistic reproduction (as opposed to linguistic creativity) of the teaching content that is the foundation of further acquisition of the Croatian language at all levels, i.e. education cycles. Ham (2017, p. 39) in her grammar book defines the case in the context of pronouncing the relationship of nouns with other words in a sentence, therefore the noun changes its relationship to other words by changing the case. A similar definition is offered by Težak and Babić (2016, p. 95) in their grammar book, noting that a case is a form of a word that depends on the service of the word and its relationship to other words in the sentence. Thus, school grammar books touch on the relationship between words, not just changes in their forms as we have seen indicated in all primary school textbooks.

Determining cases and raising awareness of their use that is in accordance with the standard language norm is considered one of the most complex areas of grammar and pragmatics of the Croatian language (Jelaska, 2006, pp. 40–41). In this context, at first glance, different primary school textbook paradigms

of case distribution can be observed during their teaching and vocative place in that system:

Table 2 The case teaching order in primary school textbooks of the Croatian language

Textbook	The case teaching order ⁶	The position of the vocative
HBZ ⁷	N, A, G, D and L, I, V	seventh case
HJN ⁸	N, A, G, D and L, I, V	seventh case
HK ⁹	N and V, A and G, D and L, I	together with N (second case)
HZ5 ¹⁰	N, A, G, D and L, I, V	seventh case
NH ¹¹	N and A, G, D and L, V, I	sixth case
VH ¹²	N, G, D, A, V, L, I	fifth case

Table 2 shows that the vocative in one textbook is taught together with the nominative, more precisely as the second case, then in one textbook traditionally as the fifth case, in one textbook as the sixth case and in three textbooks as the last, seventh case, which leads to three conclusions: the order of teaching all cases, including vocative, is not consistent,¹³ the teaching of vocative as the last case prevails and the vocative is usually taught independently. The teaching of vocative at the end of the case cycle can be explained by the fact that the vocative is not related to characteristic case questions and because it is independent in relation to other members of the sentence structure. The teaching of the vocative as the last case according to the stated criteria implies an orientation towards morphological and syntactic, that is, its grammatical determinants. However, the criterion of the frequency of use of cases should not be neglected, therefore it should be noted that according to the research of case representation in spoken and written texts, the vocative represents the case that is noticeably the least used within both discourses (Bičanić, 2009, p. 39; Kolaković, 2007 p. 268).

For a more detailed interpretation, it is necessary to consider which aspects of vocative features are present in primary school textbooks when teaching vocative. As for its phonological features, in all observed textbooks there was

⁶ N – nominative, G – genitive, D – dative, A – accusative, V – vocative, L – locative, I – instrumental.

⁷ HBZ, p. 17–20, p. 24–28, p. 34–37, p. 40–44, p. 48–51, p. 53–56.

⁸ HJN, p. 95–119.

⁹ HK, p. 53–66.

¹⁰ HZ5, p. 101–112.

¹¹ NH, p. 35–54.

¹² VH, p. 41–65.

¹³ Since the issue of case teaching order exceeds the limits of this paper, it will not be considered in detail.

a change of sounds in the vocative forms of the singular masculine nouns, but with a different number of vowels in the change: three textbooks record a change of sounds *k*, *g* and *h* before the grammatical morpheme *-e* in sounds *č*, *š* and *ž* (*putnik* > *putniče*, *drug* > *družē*, *duh* > *duše*) (HBZ, p. 55; HJN, p. 117; HK, p. 55), two textbooks add the sound *c* to the same sound in the change, which changes to the sound *č* (*starac* > *starče*) (NH, p. 47; VH5, p. 56), and in one textbook, with the sounds *c*, *k*, *g*, they are accompanied by the sound *z* which changes to the sound *ž* (*vitez* > *viteže*) (HZ5, p. 112). In one of the six textbooks, a change in the sounds *k*, *g*, and *h* to the sounds *c*, *z*, and *s*, i.e., assibilation was observed for the vocative of the plural of masculine nouns of the a-declension (*vrag* > *vraže*, *duh* > *duše*) (HJN, p. 117). The same textbook also states the phonological change of the movable *a* for certain plural vocative forms of the masculine nouns of the a-declension (*momak* > *momče*, *momci*) (HJN, p. 117), which was not observed in the other five textbooks. It is interesting how the phonological determinant, i.e., sound changes in the *Školska gramatika hrvatskoga jezika* is determined as a case-differentiating means (Ham, 2017, p. 40–41). Thus Ham (2017, p. 47) in the context of the vocative mentions the change of palatalization stating all sounds (*c*, *k*, *g*, *h*, and *z*) that enter the vocative change of the singular of masculine nouns of the a-declension, as well as the sound change of assibilation for plural forms. The same sound changes were recorded in Težak's and Babić's grammar (2016, p. 65). Only one textbook (HJN) follows the complete determination of sound changes in singular and plural vocative forms – movable *a*, assibilation, and palatalization, with the latter present in the two analyzed school grammar books. However, in the other five textbooks the sounds appearing in the palatalization are reduced, most often to *k*, *g* and *h*, which results in a less focus on vocative phonological features, which is accompanied by the omission of other sound changes (movable *a*, and assibilation), which can be seen from *Table 3*.

Table 3 Vocative phonological features in primary school textbooks

Textbook	Sound change	Sound change of palatalization
HBZ	palatalization	<i>k, g, h</i> > <i>č, ž, š</i>
HJN	movable <i>a</i> palatalization assibilation	<i>k, g, h</i> > <i>č, ž, š</i>
HK	palatalization	<i>k, g, h</i> > <i>č, ž, š</i>
HZ5	palatalization	<i>c i k, g i z, h</i> > <i>č, ž, š</i>
NH	palatalization	<i>c i k, g, h</i> > <i>č, ž, š</i>
VH	palatalization	<i>c i k, g, h</i> > <i>č, ž, š</i>

The change of intonation when pronouncing vocative forms is not mentioned in the textbooks, even in the textbook which provided for the teaching of vocative together with the nominative (HK). In this case, the textbooks refer to the similarity of certain nominative and vocative forms (HK, p. 55; NH, p. 48), even the distinction of their meanings (HBZ, p. 55; HJN, p. 117; HK, p. 55), but not emphasizing separately their pronunciation diversity.¹⁴ From the above, it can be concluded that the textbooks are initially focused on vocative phonological features that affect the change of form, more precisely morphological properties and especially on palatalization in singular forms, and its phonetic and pronunciation features are not considered worthy of special emphasis although they represent one of the specifics vocative features, especially in the form of a characteristic frontal accent.

The registered vocative morphological characteristics refer to the already mentioned syncretism of nominative and vocative forms (HK, p. 55; NH, p. 48), the alternation of grammatical morphemes -e and -u for masculine nouns ending in -ar and -ir (*ribar > ribare/ribaru; pastir > pastire/pastiru*) in two textbooks (HK, p. 56; NH, p. 47), realization of the vocative grammatical morpheme -u for masculine nouns ending in palatal also in two textbooks (*prijatelj > prijateljju, puž > pužu, Zorić > Zoriću*) (HZ5, p. 112; NH, p. 47), distinguishing the declension of the surnames of male and female persons (*Matija Matiču! Matija Matić!*) in one textbook (HZ5, p. 112), the specificity of vocative grammatical morphemes for certain personal names (*Maja > Majo, Goran > Gorane*), but also their equality with nominative ones (*Mama! Tata! Hrvatska!*) in one textbook (NH, p. 48) and finally the formation of vocative forms with the base form and grammatical morpheme regarding noun gender, i.e., distribution of vocative grammatical morphemes in two textbooks (HJN, p. 116–117; NH, p. 47).

¹⁴ The terms *intonation* and *pronunciation* are used because the teaching content on accents in primary school is taught later, in the seventh grade of primary school.

Table 4 Vocative morphological features in primary school textbooks

Morphological feature	Textbook					
	HBZ	HJN	HK	HZ5	NH	VH
N = V			+		+	
N sg. -ar, -er > V sg. -e/-u			+		+	
base form in palatal > V sg. -e				+	+	
base form in non-palatal > V sg. -u				+	+	
surnames in V		+				
names in V					+	
distribution of grammatical morphemes regarding noun gender		+			+	

From *Table 4*, and especially the last category of distribution of grammatical morphemes regarding masculine, feminine and neuter gender, the strong rootedness of the vocative morphological determinant can be seen, which emphasizes the specificity of vocative grammatical morphemes, and thus the correct use of vocative forms, as and their grammatical homonymy with nominatives in certain cases. However, it is not possible to determine which of them are most represented, as was the case with phonological features, i.e., sound changes, which speaks of a different understanding of the importance of emphasizing certain vocative morphological features. Given the tendency of demorphologization of vocative in the Croatian language, especially in everyday communication in which petrification of nominative grammatical morphemes for vocative forms occurs, and thus changes in case functions (Kodrić Gagro & Vraneša, 2016, p. 403) and addressing as the primary function of vocatives, more attention should be paid to the formation of vocative forms for proper names, i.e., anthroponyms. In one of the six textbooks (NH) almost all of the above categories of morphological vocative features are present, thus the textbook reflecting the highest representation of the morphological vocative determinant. Also, it should be noted, because it is extremely indicative, that in two textbooks (HBZ and VH) there is no emphasis on certain rules of distribution of vocative grammatical morphemes, which suggests their greater focus on syntactic and/or communicative vocative features compared to other textbooks, which will be discussed in more detail below.

Furthermore, of the vocative formative features, Ham (2017, pp. 46–47) in her grammar book emphasizes the difference in the distribution of vocative singular grammatical morphemes -e and -u for masculine nouns that in the nominative singular end in a null grammatical morpheme, and whose base form ends in a palatal or non-palatal. Težak and Babić (2016, p. 100) offer a more detailed elaboration of the distribution of the grammatical morpheme -u for

nouns in -ic (*konjicu*), -č(a)c (*Otočcu*), -č(a)k (*mačku*), -ć(a)k (*mučku*), -d(a)k (*pretku*), -dž(a)k (*kovrčku*), -đ(a)k (*omečku*), -t(a)k (*patku*), -z(a)g (*bazgu*, *mozgu* < *mozak*), ethnics and toponyms in -ez (*Englezu*), -iz (*Parizu*) and -uz (*Francuzu*), nouns in -k, -g, -h and -c taken from other languages (*blicu*, *tenku*, *ergu*, *cehu*). Ham (2017, p. 47) records an alternation of grammatical morphemes -e and -u for masculine nouns ending in -ar (*gospodar* > *gospodare* i *gospodaru*) in the nominative singular, and Težak and Babić (2016, p. 101) with double grammatical morphemes for nouns on -ar add those ending in -er (*djevere*, *djeveru*) and -ir (*leptire*, *leptiru*). The grammatical homonymy of nominative and vocative forms in the *Školska gramatika* is given for masculine nouns ending in the grammatical morphemes -e and -o (Ham, 2017, p. 47), and in the *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika* it is mentioned in the context of command (*Vod, stoj!*), invocation types (*Konobar, platio bih!*) and proper names of foreign origin (*Dođi, stari Fritz*) (Težak and Babić, 2016, p. 101). For feminine nouns, Ham (2017, p. 51) states the occurrence of singular grammatical morphemes -a (feminine nouns), -e (nouns in -ic-a) and -o (most frequent for feminine appellatives of the e-declension), which in a more detailed version is recorded by Težak and Babić (2016, p. 110). For female names, the nominative form is assumed, and in proper names formed by shortening (*Mara, Jela*) the vocative grammatical morpheme is -o (Ham, 2017, p. 51). The peculiarity of Ham's grammar book is expressed in the chapter on the declension of male and female proper names, emphasizing the importance of the correct use of vocative forms and the congruence of names and surnames in vocative expression (Ham, 2017, pp. 56–57). The majority coincidence of *Školska gramatika* with textbook solutions of vocative morphological features is visible, especially with the NH textbook in which the largest number of represented vocative morphological specifics was noticed, except for the issue of vocative forms of masculine and feminine proper names, which are elaborated in the grammar book and highlighted in only two textbooks (HJN, p. 117; NH, p. 48). On the other hand, the *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika* provides a more detailed account of the distribution of vocative grammatical morphemes considering the base form ending. The problem of declension of proper names in *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika* is not completely resolved because significant fluctuations of vocative grammatical morphemes for female names of the e-declension were recorded in Croatian grammar books before Croatian National Revival (see Božanić, 2020, p. 44–45), which continue in modern grammar books, with two possible grammatical morphemes -a and -o (*Marija/Marijo, Ljiljana/Ljiljano, Božena/Boženo*) being recorded in Silić's and Pranjković's grammar book for proper female names (Silić and Pranjković, 2007, p. 109), and in Ham (2017, p. 51) only the grammatical morpheme -a was registered, as well as in Težak and Babić (2016, p. 110) for personal names and surnames in -a for the stylistically

unmarked addressing and one of two textbooks stating the correct use of female vocative forms of the e-declension names (HJN, p. 117).

All analyzed textbooks paid attention to vocative syntagmatic and syntactic features, which in all textbooks is accompanied by orthographic rules of comma writing which separates the vocative from the rest of the sentence and is independent in relation to other members of the sentence structure, or as an independent sentence with an exclamation mark (HBZ, p. 54; HJN, p. 116; HK, p. 56; HZ5, p. 111; NH, p. 45; VH, p. 43). Furthermore, it is stated that the vocative expression stands without a preposition (HJN, p. 116; HZ5, p. 111; NH, p. 47) and is most often associated with exclamations not answering case questions, which is emphasized in all textbooks (HBZ, p. 56; HJN, p. 116; HK, p. 52; HZ5, p. 110; NH, p. 46; VH, p. 55). The same definitions can be found in the *Školska gramatika* in which it is noted that the vocative, as well as the nominative, does not stand next to prepositions in the sentence and is the only case that does not support the function of the sentence part, so the vocative expression is not a member of the sentence structure, and is separated from it by a comma (Ham, 2017, p. 40, p. 54, p. 105). In the *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika*, the vocative is defined as an independent case that does not answer questions and is not part of the sentence, which is why it is separated by a comma in the written discourse, and the realization of the vocative form in the service of the subject is highlighted (Težak & Babić, 2006, p. 297). In two textbooks in which a lower level of morphological orientation (HBZ and VH) was previously observed, students are instructed to form a vocative syntagmatic model (noun in the vocative + attribute/apposition) which is also separated by a comma from the rest of the sentence (HBZ, p. 54; VH, p. 56), which has not been observed in other textbooks and therefore represents an upgrade of vocative syntactic and orthographic features. In addition, one of them (VH, p. 44) mentions the free position of vocative in a sentence, more precisely that it can stand at its beginning, middle and end, which further deepens the knowledge of the relationship of words to sentences, more precisely vocative and other sentence members. *Table 5* shows that, in relation to morphological vocative features, a greater similarity was observed for syntactic vocative features among primary school textbooks, which indicates that vocative syntactic features are an extremely important determinant in its teaching. Also, it seems important to emphasize that in one of the textbooks that did not specifically highlight the specifics of vocative grammatical morphemes (VH), more syntactic features were noted compared to the other five textbooks, emphasizing its stronger focus on the syntactic dimension of vocatives, i.e., vocative expression.

Table 5 Vocative syntactic features in primary school textbooks

Syntactic feature	Textbook					
	HBZ	HJN	HK	HZ5	NH	VH
asyntacticity	+	+	+	+	+	+
autosyntacticity	+	+	+	+	+	+
vocative expression without a preposition		+		+	+	
does not answer case questions	+	+	+	+	+	+
sintagmatic model of vocative expression	+					+
position of V in a sentence						+

The analyzed textbooks should also consider the vocative semantic-pragmatic component, which is assumed to be the least represented in relation to previous formal-grammatical determinants due to the tradition of Croatian grammatical thought and the curriculum of the school subject Croatian language, which we found to be also so oriented. Vocative functions are, to a greater or lesser extent, expressed in all textbooks by name. The most frequently singled out vocative communication functions are calling, addressing, and calling interlocutor by name, and they are highlighted in five of the six observed textbooks (HBZ, p. 53; HJN, p. 116; HK, p. 55; HZ5, p. 111) as which is shown in *Table 6*. A similar definition is present in the *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika* in which the vocative is presented as a case of calling by name, addressing, and invoking (Težak & Babić, 2016, p. 297) and in the *Školska gramatika* in which the function of the vocative is the naming of interlocutors with direct address, in which the vocative gives notice of the identity of the person with whom communication is established (Ham, 2017, p. 54). One textbook (VH, p. 43) mentions the difference between two vocative functions (calling and addressing the interlocutor) with examples, which represents a higher level of intrusion into the communicative sphere than the very taxative stating of case functions. Let us remind you, this is a textbook that has dealt with syntactic vocative features in more detail than others. In one of the six textbooks (NH, p. 47) the vocative role is not explicitly stated but is attributed to exclamations that serve to invoke or address whom, however, the vocative form, as well as its pragmatic domain, can be realized without the exclamations, whose function is the intensification of the semantic feature of vocative expression. In four textbooks, the origin of the name vocative is derived, which comes from the Latin *vocare* in the sense of call, which indirectly directs students to the vocative function of invocation (HBZ, p. 53; HZ5, p. 110; NH, p. 46; VH, p. 43). It is interesting to look at what other functions are related to the vocative. In certain textbooks, the emotional function of vocative expression is present, which also hints at the concept of its polysemy, and yet delves deeper into the area of its semantic-pragmatic

features. Namely, in one of the six textbooks (HZ5) it is noted that the vocative serves to express love and liking (HZ5, p. 111), which reveals the subjective motivation of vocative expression and the so-called vocative of emotions (see Skljarov, 1962, p. 409–410). Moreover, also in one of the six textbooks (HBZ) that records a more detailed approach to vocative communication functions, and previously confirmed as one with a lower level of morphological orientation, it is stated that the vocative serves to express different feelings (concern, disappointment, reproach, encouragement) and attitudes towards the interlocutor (HBZ, p. 54). Thus, not only positive but also negative emotions, as well as attitudes, which further deepens the concept of emphatic and semantic marking of vocative expression in the form of vocatives of emotional reaction or vocatives of emotional evaluation by which the speaker denotes the interlocutor (see Babić, 2011, p. 51). In these two textbooks, a significant step forward has been made in relation to other observed textbooks because they consider modern functional case concepts, i.e., its communication functions that are especially important for vocative teaching given its inherent conative¹⁵ language function aimed at the recipient of the message. In addition, the polysemy of the vocative expression in the form of a focus on its emotional domain is clearly emphasized.

Table 6 Vocative communication functions in primary school textbooks

Communication function	Textbook					
	HBZ	HJN	HK	HZ5	NH	VH
calling	+	+	+	+		+
addressing	+	+	+	+		+
invocation	+	+	+			
expressing different feelings and attitudes towards the interlocutor	+			+		

SECONDARY SCHOOL TEXTBOOKS AND SCHOOL GRAMMAR BOOKS (SILIĆ AND PRANJKOVIĆ, 2007; HUDEČEK AND MIHALJEVIĆ, 2019)

According to the *Odluka o donošenju kurikulumuma za nastavni predmet Hrvatski jezik za osnovne škole i gimnazije u Republici Hrvatskoj* (NN 10/2019) and *Odluka o donošenju kurikulumuma za nastavni predmet Hrvatski jezik za srednje strukovne škole na razini 4.2. u Republici Hrvatskoj* (NN 10/2019), i.e., *Kurikulum nastavnog predmeta Hrvatski jezik za osnovne škole i gimnazije* (2019) and *Kurikulum nastavnog predmeta Hrvatski jezik za srednje strukovne škole na razini 4.2.* (2019) of experimental programme *Škola za život*, proposal for elaboration of the educational outcome HJ A.3.5. in the context of case

¹⁵ Classification of language functions according to Jakobson, R. (1966). *Lingvistika i poetika*. Nolit.

teaching in the third grade of high school refers to the distinction of grammatical categories of words on given examples in context. This outcome, to an even greater extent than is the case with primary school, is directed towards a formal-grammatical interpretation of cases, so a solid morphological tendency to interpret vocative features is expected.

The notion of the case in the two analyzed textbooks is determined in the context of changing the form of nouns (P, p. 67) and the grammatical category of words (LR, p. 79), which does not deviate from the flatter primary school textbook definitions. On the other hand, the other two textbooks show a more precise level of definition in the form of pronouncing different relationships between words, i.e., between the meaning of words and sentence content (FF, p. 68; HJK, p. 170) and, moreover, the reference to a particular noun is not used in a particular case because it answers a proper case question but is used in that case because it has a certain meaning (HJK, p. 170). Silić and Pranjković (2007, p. 38) and Hudeček and Mihaljević (2019, p. 54, p. 234) in their grammar books classify the case under a morphological, i.e., grammatical category by which grammatical morphemes establish connections between words decisively emphasizing the formative case determinant. The interpretation of vocative phonological features was observed in one of the four textbooks in the context of the sound change of palatalization in singular vocative forms of masculine nouns (LR, p. 97). Although the peculiarities of nouns of a certain declension type are stated, the vocative phonological features in the other three textbooks (FF, HJK and P) are not highlighted. From this, it can be distinguished that in most high school textbooks phonological features were not assessed as important highlights when teaching vocative specifics, especially in comparison with primary school textbooks. Silić and Pranjković (2007, p. 28, p. 99) in their grammar book note the palatalization which they call the first palatalization with the sounds *c*, *k*, *g* and *h* which in front of the grammatical morpheme *-e* change in the sounds *č*, *ž* and *š* and the second palatalization, i.e., assibilation for plural vocative forms in which the sounds *k*, *g* and *h* in front of the grammatical morpheme *-i* turn into the sounds *c*, *z* and *s* (*junak* > *junaci*, *strateg* > *stratezi*, *zloduh* > *zlodusi*) (Silić & Pranjković, 2007, str. 29). Hudeček and Mihaljević (2019, p. 38) record a sound change of palatalization. Silić and Pranjković (2007, p. 101) also record multiple sound changes in the forms in which the phonemes *stc* and *zdc* are distributed, with the consonant *t* and *d* falling out (*petoprstac* > *petoprstče* > *petopršče*, *grozd* > *grozdče* > *grozče*), then there is an coarticulation of the palatal *s* in front of the palatal *č* in the palatal *š* (*petopršče* > *petopršće*), and in the case of the distribution of phonemes *zdc* this is preceded by voicing assimilation of the sound *b* in front of the soundless *č* in the soundless *s* (*grozče* > *grosče* > *grošče*). They also touch on certain phonetic vocative features, noting that in the forms that in the nominative end in *-ac* in oblique cases there is a sound change of the movable *a* and when the phonemes *dl*, *dr*, *nč*, *sl*, *sn* and

tl are distributed, the accent of these nouns changes (*pòdlac* > *podlàca*), however, in the vocative singular the accent returns, so it is the same as in the nominative (*pòdlac* – *pòdlače*) (Silić & Pranjković, 2007, p. 101–102). Hudeček and Mihaljević (2019, p. 64–65) also mention multiple sound changes in the forms *vrabac* > *vrapče/vrapci* (movable *a*, voicing assimilation, palatalization for the singular form) and *ronilac* > *ronioče/ronioci* (movable *a*, vocalization, palatalization for the singular form). In Silić's and Pranjković's and Hudeček's and Mihaljević's grammar books, a more detailed orientation towards vocative phonetic and phonological features was noted in relation to the previous grammar books, which is partly understandable considering the target group, i.e., higher level of education. However, the presentation of phonological features in these grammar books further emphasizes the neglect of these vocative features in the observed high school textbooks.

As vocative morphological features in three textbooks (FF, LR and P), the grammatical morphemes -a (for nouns such as *tetka*, *ujna*, *strina* and male names in -a such as *Andrija*, *Toma*), -e (appellatives in -ic-a as *mamice*, *sestrice* and male and female names on -a as *Ivice*, *Dragice*) for feminine nouns of e-declension) and -o (as the most frequent grammatical morpheme for feminine nouns) are listed (LR, p. 97), then the vocative singular grammatical morpheme -e for masculine nouns whose base form ends in a non-palatal (FF, p. 72; P, p. 71) and -u for masculine nouns whose base form ends in a palatal (FF, p. 72), then dual forms formed under the influence of the former palatal *r* (*mornare*, *mornaru*) are mentioned (FF, p. 72) and the distribution of grammatical morphemes of masculine nouns: -o, -u and null morpheme (-∅) is also noted (P, p. 71). One of the four textbooks (HJK) does not pay special attention to the specifics of vocative forms, i.e., their grammatical morphemes.

Table 7 Vocative morphological features in secondary school textbooks

Morphological feature	Textbook			
	FF	HJK	LR	P
N sg. -ar, -er > V sg. -e/-u	+			
base form in palatal > V sg. -e	+			
base form in non-palatal > V sg. -u	+			+
surnames in V				
names in V				
distribution of grammatical morphemes regarding noun gender	+		+	+

It can be seen from *Table 7* that the morphological vocative determinants are not consistent in secondary school textbooks either, and it can be noticed that they are incompletely described in relation to primary school textbooks because, for example, they do not mention syncretism of nominative and vocative

forms and specificity of vocative forms of anthroponyms, i.e., names and surnames, which is indicated in some primary school textbooks. Thus, instead of the potentially expected expansion of the teaching content of case morphological features, in secondary school textbooks, there is a reduction of vocative features, which leads to the conclusion that the vocative and the category of vocativeness are not assessed as relevant teaching content. Namely, three of the four textbooks bring two specifics of vocative grammatical morphemes, and in one of the four textbooks, they are not even mentioned, which may, as in primary school textbooks, indicate a greater focus on syntactic and communicative features, which we will see below. Silić and Pranjković (2007, p. 98–99) in their grammar book record the plural syncretism of nominative and vocative grammatical morphemes, as well as the distribution of grammatical morphemes considering (non)palatal base form ending for masculine nouns, which was also recorded in Hudeček's and Mihaljević's grammar book (2019, p. 58–59). As already mentioned, Silić and Pranjković (2007, p. 109) look back at the distribution of grammatical morphemes for female names, noting the dual grammatical morphemes -a and -o, but also the feminine nouns in -ic-a, which otherwise have a grammatical morpheme -e (appellatives – *prijateljice*, female names – *Marice*, male names – *Ivice*), but some of them can mean male and female (*izdajica*, *izjelica*, *kukavica*, *propalica*) with which they record double grammatical morphemes -e and -o (for example, *izdajice/izdajico*)¹⁶ (Silić & Pranjković, 2007, pp. 108–109), which deepens the vocative morphological specifics in relation to the *Hrvatska školska gramatika* in which, in addition to the presentation of declension patterns, the rules of distribution of vocative grammatical morphemes are not detailed.

In the context of syntactic features, all textbooks mention vocative autonomy in relation to other sentence members (FF, p. 68; HJK, p. 170; LR, p. 79; P, p. 71), and in two textbooks the orthography rule of separating the vocative by a comma is emphasized (FF, p. 68; P, p. 71) with an example of the importance of its application in letters and e-mails in one of these textbooks (P, p. 71). All textbooks refer to exclamations as indicators of vocative expression (FF, p. 68; HJK, p. 170; LR, p. 79; P, p. 67), and in one of them it is noted that the vocative does not form a case-prepositional expression. (P, p. 67). As in the case of phonological and morphological features, in secondary school textbooks there is a thorough overview of the syntactic status of vocatives, which again shows vocative features more partially in relation to primary school textbooks, which is clearly indicated in *Table 8*.

¹⁶ The appearance of the grammatical morpheme -o can be explained by its stylogeny with the semantic dispositions of the speaker's antipathetic attitude towards the interlocutor (Težak, 1982, p. 40).

Table 8 Vocative syntactic features in secondary school textbooks

Syntactic feature	Textbook			
	FF	HJK	LR	P
autosyntacticity	+	+	+	+
vocative expression without a preposition				+

In the grammar book of Hudeček and Mihaljević (2019, p. 243), vocative syntactic functions are not emphasized, but vocative is defined as the fifth case that comes with exclamations. However, that is not the case with Silić's and Pranjković's grammar book. Namely, they pay attention to the syntactic service of vocative in a sentence, observing it even as a syntactic-semantic category, which in that case they call addressing because the vocative as a morphological category initially serves to determine the paradigmatic relations of vocative expression to other cases, therefore, a more favourable definition in the syntactic context would be the term address as the realization of relations of the category of vocativeness with other units (Pranjković, 1993, p. 205). This distances them from the traditional grammatical stronghold by opening questions of vocative meanings and relationships with other members of the sentence structure. They compare the vocative with the imperative due to the orientation towards the interlocutor, thus emphasizing his communicative function of addressing and the inherent conative linguistic function (Silić & Pranjković, 2007, p. 200). In relation to other cases, the vocative is described as the most independent, and its syntactic independence in the form of a sentence of a specific type, whose function is to address the interlocutor and vocation to establish a communication act, is separated by a comma as an emphasis on orthographic features, and the free position of the vocative in a sentence is also mentioned (Silić & Pranjković, 2007, p. 200). They state that the vocative often comes together in the construction with an exclamation due to the equivalent function of addressing the speaker with exclamations *ej* or *oj* as signs of recognizability of the vocative expression (Silić & Pranjković, 2007, p. 200). The characteristic of such linguistic structuring is the exclamation determined by a specific exclamatory intonation with increased intensity of speech realization and the exclamation mark or a combination of the question mark and exclamation marks (Silić & Pranjković, 2005, p. 200). Despite its syntactic independence, the vocative is determined by communication synsemanticness,¹⁷ i.e., it belongs to coherent word forms because its function presupposes the realization of a speech situation by inviting the interlocutor to interact (Silić & Pranjković, 2007, p. 242).

¹⁷ „Suznačne (sinsemantične) riječi i, rjeđe, suznačni oblici čine zatvorene skupove jezičnih jedinica. Svima im je zajedničko to što ne mogu zauzimati poziciju ni samostalnih ni nesamostalnih članova rečeničnoga ustrojstva. (...) U prvu skupinu idu izrazito gramatikalizirane, nesamostalne riječi i oblici, i to prijedlozi, veznici i jedan dio čestica (...) te oblici pomoćnih, modalnih, faznih i perifraznih glagola, dok u drugu idu uzvici, oblici vokativa (u službi obraćanja) i dio čestica“ (Silić & Pranjković, 2005, p. 242).

But in certain situations, the vocative acts in the service of a self-meaning form, as is the case when the vocative assumes the function of a nominative in, most often, oral folk poetry where it is stylistically marked, and its service in the sentence represents the subject (*Kada li ih pokrijepio starče, / Sva se družba izljubila redom*) (Silić & Pranjković, 2005, p. 296).

As for the vocative pragmatic-semantic features in secondary school textbooks, they are presented with the basic vocative communication functions of invocation, addressing, and calling (FF, p. 68; HJK, p. 171; LR, p. 79; P, p. 67), which is especially emphasized in *Table 9*. In their grammar book, Hudeček and Mihaljević (2019, p. 55) do not single out vocative communication functions, except for the note that in older Croatian grammar books the vocative was named as *zovnik*, *zvanik* or *zvateljan padež* which can be an indication of its pragmatic features.

Table 9 Vocative communication functions in secondary school textbooks

Communication function	Textbook			
	FF	HJK	LR	P
calling	+	+	+	+
addressing	+	+	+	
invocation	+			

From all the above, it can be noticed that the vocative features in secondary school textbooks are presented rather superficially without major encroachments on phonological, syntactic, semantic-pragmatic, and even expected morphological determinants. Moreover, it is evident that the vocative features listed in primary school textbooks are presented in more detail. Given the higher level of education, one could expect the development and upgrading of case meanings in relation to primary school textbooks, but this was not the case, which indicates a stronger focus of secondary school textbooks on the formal-conceptual approach to vocative interpretation.

CONCLUSION

The paper analyzes Croatian language textbooks for primary and secondary schools that are in use in the current school year (2020/2021) and four school grammars, *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika za gimnazije i visoka učilišta* (2007) by Josip Silić and Ivo Pranjković, *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika: priručnik za osnovno jezično obrazovanje* (2016) by Stjepko Težak i Stjepan Babić, *Školska gramatika hrvatskoga jezika* (2017) by Sanda Ham and *Hrvatska školska gramatika* (2019) by Lana Hudeček and Milica Mihaljević. The analysis criterion was the interpretation of vocative features at the phonetic, phonological, morphological, syntactic, orthographic, and pragmatic-semantic level to obtain a complete picture of the understanding of vocative in Croatian language

teaching and to establish the level of the formal-grammatical or communicative-functional concept of the linguistic paradigm of case teaching.

When defining the concept of the case, it was noticed that all primary school textbooks and half of the secondary school textbooks define the case as a morphological category in the context of changing the form of the same noun, and school grammar books and the other half of the secondary school textbooks base their definitions on pronouncing nouns with other words. Although, according to the principle of adequacy in Croatian language teaching, the first definition may seem acceptable in primary school teaching, at the secondary school level a more detailed explanation of it is needed regarding case functions and meanings.

The teaching of vocative in primary school textbooks is differently organized, considering the order of cases teaching, so in three of the six textbooks, the vocative is taught as the last case, in one of them as the sixth case, in one as the fifth case, and one together with the nominative.

As for the vocative accent features, they are not particularly noted either in the textbooks or in the observed grammar books. Phonological vocative features are associated with sound changes determined by a specific morphological context, and in primary school textbooks it is most often palatalization with confirmation of assibilation and movable *a* in one textbook, which is not specifically indicated in secondary school textbooks, more precisely the sound change of palatalization is recorded in one textbook. It is evident that vocative phonological features are interpreted in more detail in primary school textbooks. In school grammar books, attention is also paid to palatalized vocative forms, but in Hudeček's and Mihaljević's grammar book, multi-syllable sound changes in one vocative form (for example, movable *a*, voicing assimilation, palatalization) are registered. Also, in Silić's and Pranjković's grammar book sound changes coarticulation (and voicing assimilation) in the distribution of the phonemes *stc* and *zdc* are recorded.

Orthographic rules related to the vocative are indicated in all analyzed textbooks regarding comma writing, i.e., separating the vocative form with a comma from the rest of the sentence, and in two primary school textbooks the comma separating of the vocative expression with examples of the structure of the attribute or appositive syntagm, i.e., marking the syntagmatic model of vocative expression is mentioned.

Morphological vocative features in the context of the distribution of vocative grammatical morphemes are discussed in detail in four of the six primary school textbooks, which is the case with the observed school grammar books, especially Težak's and Babić's grammar book, but in the other two primary school textbooks they are not recorded, where they show a more detailed presentation of syntactic or pragmatic-semantic vocative features. In secondary school textbooks, a lower level of interpretation of vocative morphological

characteristics was recorded, i.e., a smaller number of registered morphological features compared to primary school textbooks.

Syntactic features are fully processed in all primary school textbooks by touching the feature of asyntacticity, autosyntacticity, a vocative expression that is formed without prepositions and does not answer case questions, and in one of the six textbooks, the free position of vocative in a sentence is mentioned. In secondary school textbooks, again, a lower level of interpretation of vocative syntactic features is shown in relation to primary school textbooks, to a considerable extent because only vocative autosyntacticity and non-prepositional form of vocative expression are emphasized. As far as school grammar books are concerned, Silić's and Pranjković's brings the concept of the vocative, i.e., the category of vocativeness as *addressing* in the form of a syntactic-semantic category, thus moving away from the formal-grammatical approach.

Pragmatic-semantic vocative features in primary and secondary school textbooks are mainly aimed at stating the communicative functions of invocation, calling, and addressing, but in two primary school textbooks, they are extended by expressing different feelings and attitudes towards the interlocutor, which expresses vocative functional polysemy, as well as and their focus on the communication-functional approach.

Considering the grammatical and textbook definitions of cases as a linguistic concept, as well as curricular guidelines, it is noticeable that the morphological determinant is the main criterion for its definition, thus confirming the initial statement, whereby firmly grounded formal-grammatical attitudes are followed, and the concepts of vocative case meanings, functions and their use in most cases are completely neglected or are modestly noticeable. It is especially indicative that vocative features at all observed levels are interpreted in more detail in primary than in secondary school textbooks.

This paper opens the question of interpretation of vocative features in teaching, as well as the implementation of linguistic case paradigms in Croatian language textbooks. The author wanted to draw attention to the importance of a comprehensive understanding of linguistic phenomena, and especially cases, i.e., vocative in the case system of the Croatian language. For future research on this issue, it would be useful to consider the understanding of the features of other cases, expand the corpus of school grammar books with a diachronic overview, as well as analyze methodological and practical guidelines for interpreting vocative features in Croatian language textbooks.

SOURCES

1. Družijanić-Hajdarević, E., Greblički-Miculinić, D., Matošević, K., & Romić, Z. (2020). *Hrvatski za 5: udžbenik iz hrvatskoga jezika za peti razred osnovne škole*. Profil Klett.
2. Dujmović Markusi, D., & Španjić, T. (2020). *Fon-Fon 3: udžbenik hrvatskoga jezika za treći razred gimnazije i srednjih strukovnih škola*. Profil Klett.
3. Ham, S. (2017). *Školska gramatika hrvatskoga jezika*. Školska knjiga.
4. Hudeček, L., & Mihaljević, M. (2019). *Hrvatska školska gramatika*. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje.
5. Kovač, S., & Jukić, M. (2019). *Hrvatska krijesnica 5: udžbenik iz hrvatskoga jezika za 5. razred osnovne škole*. Ljevak.
6. Levak, J., Močibob, I., Sandalić, J., Pettò, I., & Budija, K. (2020). *Hrvatski bez granica 5: integrirani udžbenik hrvatskoga jezika i književnosti za peti razred osnovne škole*. Školska knjiga.
7. Marčan T., & Grubišić Belina, L. (2020). *Putokazi 3: udžbenik za hrvatski jezik, književnost i komunikacijske vještine 21. stoljeća za 3. razred strukovnih škola na razini 4.2 i gimnazije*. Školska knjiga.
8. Miloloža, S., Cikuša, R., Šimić, D., & Petrović, B. (2020). *Hrvatske jezične niti 5: udžbenik iz hrvatskoga jezika za peti razred osnovne škole*. Alfa.
9. Rihtarić, A., Latin, S., & Majjić, Ž. (2020). *Volim hrvatski 5: udžbenik hrvatskoga jezika u petome razredu osnovne škole*. Školska knjiga.
10. Serdarević, K., Čubrić, M., Gligorić, I. M., & Medić, I. (2020). *Hrvatski jezik i književnost 3: integrirani udžbenik hrvatskoga jezika za treći razred gimnazije*. Školska knjiga.
11. Silić, J., & Pranjkić, I. (2007). *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika za gimnazije i visoka učilišta*. Školska knjiga.
12. Šojat, A. (2020). *Naš hrvatski 5: udžbenik hrvatskoga jezika u petome razredu osnovne škole*. Školska knjiga.
13. Težak, S., & Babić, S. (2016) *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika: priručnik za osnovno jezično obrazovanje*. Školska knjiga.
14. Zrinjan, S. (2020a). *Biram knjigu i riječ 3: čitanka i udžbenik iz hrvatskoga jezika za treći razred strukovnih škola*. Alfa.
15. Zrinjan, S. (2020b). *Lica riječi 3: udžbenik iz hrvatskog jezika za treći razred gimnazija i četverogodišnjih strukovnih škola*. Alfa.

REFERENCES

1. Babić, M. (2010). Obraćanje kao primarna funkcija vokativa. *Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta u istočnom Sarajevu*, 2(12), 325–338.
2. Babić, M. (2011). Vokativ kao sredstvo za izražavanje ekspresivnosti. *Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta u istočnom Sarajevu*, 1(13), 45–66.

3. Babić, S., Brozović, D., Škarić, I., & Težak, S. (2007). *Glasovi i oblici hrvatskoga književnog jezika*. Nakladni zavod Globus.
4. Badurina, L. (2010). Padeži i komunikacija. In M. Birtić & D. Brozović Rončević (Eds.), *Sintaksa padeža – Hrvatski sintaktički dani 2* (pp. 1–14). Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje & Filozofski fakultet u Osijeku.
5. Barić, E., Lončarić, M., Malić, D., Pavešić, S., Peti, M., Zečević, V., & Znika, M. (2005). *Hrvatska gramatika*. Školska knjiga.
6. Belaj, B., & Tanacković Faletar, G. (2014). *Kognitivna gramatika hrvatskoga jezika*. Disput.
7. Bičanić, A. (2009). Imenice hrvatskoga standardnog jezika u nastavi hrvatskoga jezika od petoga do osmoga razreda osnovne škole. *Hrvatski*, 7(1), 33–68.
8. Borucinsky, M., & Tominac Coslovich, S. (2015). Formalno i funkcionalno u jeziku: sistemska funkcionalna gramatika u odnosu na ostale funkcionalne gramatike i kognitivnolingvističke pristupe. *Fluminensia*, 27(2), 11–29.
9. Božanić, P. (2020). Vokativ u hrvatskim dopreporodnim gramatikama. *Mogućnosti*, 60(1/2), 37–55.
10. Daniel, M., & Spencer, A. (2009). The Vocative – An Outlier Case. In A. Malchukov i A. Spencer (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Case* (pp. 626–635). University Press.
11. Glušac, M., & Mikić Čolić, A. (2017). Linguistic Functions of the Vocative as a Morphological, Syntactic and Pragmatic-semantic Category. *Jezikoslovlje*, 18(3), 447–472.
12. Ham, S. (2006). *Povijest hrvatskih gramatika*. Nakladni zavod Globus.
13. Hudeček, L. (2006). Nova gramatika hrvatskoga jezika. *Rasprave*, 32(1), 379–382.
14. Jakobson, R. (1966). *Lingvistika i poetika*. Neolit.
15. Jelaska, Z. (2006). Padežni izazov: hrvatska sklonidba i određivanje padeža. *Metodički profili*, 3–4, 40–42.
16. Karlić, V., & Okuka, M. (2015). Der morphologische Sprachwandel und seine Ursachen im gegenwärtigen Serbischen und Kroatischen. *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach*, 85, 81–92.
17. Karlić, V., & Cvitković, I. (2017). Vokativnost u hrvatskoj i srpskoj jezičnoj normi i upotrebi: morfološki pristup. *Filološke studije*, 15(1), 228–242.
18. Kodrić Gagro, A., & Vraneša, A. (2016). Okamenjivanje: promjene u funkciji padeža u suvremenome hrvatskom jeziku. In S. Botica, D. Nikolić, J. Tomašić & I. Vidović Bolt (Eds.), *Šesti hrvatski slavistički kongres* (pp. 401–411). Hrvatsko filološko društvo.
19. Kolaković, Z. (2007). Zastupljenost padeža u hrvatskome jeziku u pisanim i govornim tekstovima. *Lahor*, 2(4), 242–270.
20. *Kurikulum nastavnog predmeta Hrvatski jezik za osnovne škole i gimnazije* (2019). Republika Hrvatska, Ministarstvo znanosti i obrazovanja.
21. *Kurikulum nastavnog predmeta Hrvatski jezik za srednje strukovne škole na razini 4.2.* (2019). Republika Hrvatska, Ministarstvo znanosti i obrazovanja.

22. Ljubibratić, R. (1987). Vokativ. *Suvremena metodika nastave hrvatskog ili srpskog jezika*, 12(1–2), 67–78.
23. Marković, I. (2013). *Uvod u jezičnu morfologiju*. Disput.
24. Matešić, M. (2006). Gramatika jezične suvremenosti. *Fluminensia*, 18(1), 144–147.
25. *Odluka o donošenju kurikuluma za nastavni predmet Hrvatski jezik za osnovne škole i gimnazije u Republici Hrvatskoj* (NN 10/2019) (2019). Republika Hrvatska, Ministarstvo znanosti i obrazovanja.
26. *Odluka o donošenju kurikuluma za nastavni predmet Hrvatski jezik za srednje strukovne škole na razini 4.2. u Republici Hrvatskoj* (NN 10/2019) (2019). Republika Hrvatska, Ministarstvo znanosti i obrazovanja.
27. Pranjković, I. (1987). Sintaktički status „samostalnih članova rečenice“. *Jezik*, 35(3), 78–84.
28. Pranjković, I. (1993). *Hrvatska skladnja*. Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada.
29. Rišner, V. (2006). *Iz jezične prošlosti i sadašnjosti*. Matica hrvatska, Ogranak Osijek.
30. Skljarov, M. (1962). O vokativu – problem kategorije II lica u imenica. *Rad JAZU*, 12, 381–312.
31. Stolac, D. (2005). Komunikacijske funkcije vokativa. In I. Pranjković (Ed.), *Od fonetike do etike* (pp. 173–184). Disput.
32. Težak, S. (1982). Vokativ jednine imenica E vrste. *Radovi zavoda za slavensku filologiju*, 17, 31–43.
33. Težak, S. (1986). O vokativu. *Jezik*, 34(3), 89–92.
34. Težak, S. (1996). *Teorija i praksa nastave hrvatskoga jezika 1*. Školska knjiga.
35. Težak, S. i Babić, S. (1996). *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika: priručnik za osnovno jezično obrazovanje*. Školska knjiga.
36. Trovesi, A. (2008). Il vocativo nelle lingue slave: un quadro articolato. *Linguistica e filologia*, 26, 207–234.
37. Vlastelić, A. (2013). „O Stvoritelju moj, Božanstveni goste! koliko sam zadužan tebi...“ Komunikacijske funkcije vokativa u „Pribogoljubnim bavljenjima za slišati svetu misu“ fra Petra Bakule. In P. Knezović & M. Jerković (Eds.), *Opus fra Petra Bakule* (pp. 301–311). Hrvatski studiji Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.