

UDK 37.091.64:811.163.42

811.163.42'373.46

Izvorni znanstveni rad / Original scientific paper

Primljeno 10. 4. 2023. / Received 10-04-2023

DOI: 10.38003/zrffs.17.2

Petra Božanić

Sveučilište u Splitu, Filozofski fakultet

HR-21000 Split, Poljička cesta 35

petboz@ffst.hr

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6904-3867>

Jadranka Nemeth-Jajić

Sveučilište u Splitu, Filozofski fakultet

HR-21000 Split, Poljička cesta 35

jadranka@ffst.hr

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5358-8598>

LINGUISTIC TERMS IN CONTEMPORARY HIGH SCHOOL TEXTBOOKS OF THE CROATIAN LANGUAGE

Abstract

The aim of this paper was to investigate the level of uniformity in the use of linguistic terminology in contemporary high school textbooks of the Croatian language created according to the 2019 subject curriculum guidelines. Previous research has pointed to a significant lack of uniformity and inconsistency in the use of linguistic terminology, especially seen in using several admitted terms, i.e. pairs and sequences of synonyms. To obtain a complete picture of the uniformity of linguistic terms in contemporary textbooks of Croatian, which provides insight into the ways of shaping textbook discourse, the research was conducted in two phases, whereby this paper is part of the second research phase. The first phase included contemporary primary school textbooks of Croatian for grades 5–8. The second phase, presented in this paper, includes contemporary high school textbooks of Croatian, i.e. four sets of textbooks, which makes a total of 16 textbooks. The research results were compared with the terminology in the 2019 Croatian language subject curriculum, the former *Teaching Program for Grammar Schools* from 1994, and contemporary school language manuals, more precisely school grammars and orthography and spelling books. The analysis was conducted by examining textbook linguistic terminology at the phonological level, morphological level, level of word formation, syntactic level, lexicological level, and orthographical level. Compared to primary school textbooks, significant inconsistencies have been found in high school textbooks in the use of linguistic terms at all observed levels, except for the orthographical level, where terminological uniformity can be noticed at both educational levels. In addition to the lack of uniformity among the textbooks, there is also a lack of uniformity in relation to the subject curriculum and the approved language manuals, which is most often reflected in the use of terminological pairs. However, certain different terms are the result of theoretical dilemmas that have not yet been resolved.

Key words: linguistic terminology, Croatian language, curriculum, teaching Croatian language, textbooks

1. Introduction

Although many teaching resources are available today and teaching technology has improved, with significant advancements in information and communication technologies, textbooks are still an indispensable source for acquiring the student's language education and the foundation of lesson planning and conducting done by teachers. The textbook discourse in the linguistic sense should be shaped by student age-appropriate standard language, and some of the main requirements include uniformity and consistency in the use of linguistic terms that students adopt as part of the teaching content. Previous research has analyzed the use of linguistic terminology in educational practice, i.e. at the primary, secondary, and higher education levels, to establish the opposite – a significant lack of uniformity of linguistic terms at all linguistic levels, which is reflected in the use of different terms or synonymous and similar terms (cf. Hudeček, Mihaljević, and Vidović 2006; Hudeček and Mihaljević 2020: 2, 8). The lack of uniformity in the textbook terminology is partly due to the lack of agreement within the linguistic profession, in grammar and orthography books. However, an agreement should be reached at least in the textbook discourse, as advocated by Hudeček, Mihaljević, and Vidović (2006: 120). The need to establish a more systematic Croatian linguistic terminology presented an incentive for the Institute of Croatian Language and Linguistics to launch the project *Croatian Linguistic Terminology – JENA* (24 May 2019 – 23 December 2020), which is part of the wider project *Croatian Special Field Terminology – STRUNA* (cf. Mihaljević, Hudeček, and Jozić 2020).

In the educational context, the school year 2018/2019 saw the beginning of the *Curriculum Reform* with the experimental program *School for Life* launched by the Ministry of Science and Education of the Republic of Croatia. The reform, at the time of writing this paper, covers the vertical of the Croatian educational system, which is unified in the *National Curriculum* (2019), a program document with whose adoption the previous teaching plans and programs ceased to be in force. The subject curricula imposed the need to create new textbooks. Thus, based on the *Curriculum of the Subject Croatian Language for Primary Schools and Grammar Schools* (2019), new sets of textbooks have been published to date, which are used in primary and secondary schools. Therefore, the question arises as to whether significant inconsistencies in the use of linguistic terminology occur in the new generation of textbooks, bearing in mind that linguists have warned about this problem, or the terminological dilemmas have been eliminated. That is why we believe it is worth exploring and identifying the level of uniformity in the use of linguistic terminology in the new textbooks of Croatian.

2. Methodology

The research was conducted in two phases. The first phase included contemporary primary school textbooks of the Croatian language for grades 5–8 (Nemeth Jajić and Božanić 2022). The second phase, which is presented in this paper, includes contemporary high school textbooks of the Croatian language, i.e. four sets of textbooks, which is a total of 16 textbooks (*Table 1*). This phase of the research

enables a comprehensive insight into the issue by using the comparative method, i.e. comparing linguistic terms at the primary and secondary textbook levels. In the analysis of linguistic terms in high school textbooks, special attention was paid to those terms that differ in the mentioned textbooks, primary school textbooks, language manuals, or program documents based on which textbooks were created. The obtained results were compared with the results of the analysis of primary school textbooks in the research by Nemeth Jajić and Božanić (2022). Furthermore, the results of the research on linguistic terms in high school textbooks have been compared with the terms used in contemporary grammar manuals, including *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika za gimnazije i visoka učilišta* by Josip Silić and Ivo Pranjković (2007), *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika: priručnik za osnovno jezično obrazovanje* by Stjepko Težak and Stjepan Babić (2016), *Školska gramatika hrvatskoga jezika* by Sanda Ham (2017), and *Hrvatska školska gramatika* by Lana Hudeček and Milica Mihaljević (2019), as well as with the terms used in contemporary orthography and spelling manuals, including *Hrvatski školski pravopis* by Stjepan Babić, Sanda Ham, and Milan Moguš (2005), *Hrvatski pravopis* by Lada Badurina, Ivan Marković, and Krešimić Mićanović (2008), *Hrvatski pravopis usklađen sa zaključcima Vijeća za normu hrvatskoga standardnog jezika* by Stjepan Babić and Milan Moguš (2010), and *Hrvatski pravopis* by the Institute for the Croatian Language and Linguistics (Jozić, 2013), which was approved for use in schools. The results of the textbook analysis were also compared with the 1994 *Teaching Program for Grammar Schools* (hereinafter referred to as the Teaching Program) and with the Croatian language subject curriculum titled *Curriculum of the Subject Croatian Language for Primary Schools and Grammar Schools* (hereinafter referred to as the Curriculum).

Table 1. Research sample – high school textbooks

textbook	author(s)	publisher
<i>Fon-fon 1, 2, 3, 4</i>	Dujmović Markusi, Dragica; Španjić, Tanja	Profil Klett
<i>Hrvatski jezik i književnost 1, 2, 3, 4</i>	Serdarević, Korana; Čubrić, Marina; Gligorić, Igor Marko; Medić, Igor; Popović, Jelena	Školska knjiga
<i>Lica riječi 1, 2, 3, 4</i>	Zrinjan, Snježana; Glušac, Maja; Sajko, Nataša	Alfa
<i>Putokazi 1, 2, 3, 4</i>	Marčan, Tanja; Grubišić Belina, Linda	Školska knjiga

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Terms at the phonological level

Terms at the phonological level used in high school textbooks are more inconsistent compared to the terms in primary school textbooks. Such result is expected because high school teaching content is more extensive, especially for Grade 4 (Curriculum 2019: 94). It can be noticed that almost all textbooks include many terminological pairs, i.e. pairs of synonyms for phonological terms consisting of a Croatian and an adapted foreign term, except in the textbook *Lica riječi 4*, where preferred term is the Croatian word. In the three other textbooks analyzed here, in most cases the

preference is given to the Croatian term, accompanied by the terms of foreign origin. This is particularly evident in the classification of sounds according to certain categories, which is detailed in *Table 2*. As for the sounds classified according to the passage of air flow, dominant are Croatian terms *otvornik* and *zatvornik*, and the category of *zatvornik* includes *zvončanik* (*sonant*) and *šumnik* as preferred terms, although there are certain alternations in the form of using pairs of synonyms *otvornik* and *vokal*, *zvončanik* and *sonant*, *šumnik* and *opstruent*. Considering the criterion of (not) having a syllabic feature, *samoglasnik* and *suglasnik* can be found in two of the four textbooks, and admitted terms in one of the four textbooks are the synonyms *slogotvorni glas* and *samoglasnik*, *neslogotvorni glas* and *suglasnik* (*Table 2*). Compared to the three previously described textbooks, *Putokazi 4* offers a different basic classification of sounds according to their acoustic properties as it uses sequences of synonyms *suglasnik*, *konsonant*, *zatvornik* and *samoglasnik*, *vokal*, *otvornik* (2021: 188), which have been also found in grammar books by Hudeček and Mihaljević (2019: 24), Težak and Babić (2016: 50), and Silić and Pranjković (2007: 11). Still, when listing pairs of synonyms *samoglasnik* and *vokal* as well as *suglasnik* and *konsonant*, the latter authors leave out the terms *otvornik* and *zatvornik*. The subject curriculum, however, includes only the terms *otvornik* and *zatvornik* (2019: 94) while admitted terms in the Teaching Program are pairs of synonyms *samoglasnik* and *vokal* as well as *suglasnik* and *konsonant* (1994: 151). Thus, most contemporary high school textbooks rely on the opposition between sounds according to the criteria of (not) having a syllabic feature (*samoglasnik* and *suglasnik*) and sound articulation characteristics (*otvornik* and *zatvornik*), and in one textbook, these two criteria are equated. It has been observed that in addition to the lack of terminological uniformity, there are also theoretical inconsistencies in the textbooks of the Croatian language, as already pointed out by Hudeček, Mihaljević, and Vidović (2006).

Table 2. Terms for sounds according to different classification criteria¹

classification criterion	<i>Fon-fon 4</i>	<i>Hrvatski jezik i književnost 4</i>	<i>Lica riječi 4</i>	<i>Putokazi 4</i>
free passage of air flow	otvornik, vokal (50)	otvornik (87)	otvornik (41)	suglasnik, konsonant, zatvornik (188)
	zatvornik (50)	zatvornik (87)	zatvornik (41)	suglasnik, konsonant, zatvornik (188)
groups of consonants	zvončanik, sonant (50)	zvončanik, sonant (89)	zvončanik 46	zvončanik, sonant (188)
	šumnik (50)	šumnik, opstruent 89	šumnik (46)	šumnik, opstruent (188)

1 In all tables, when referring to a specific term, the corresponding textbook page number is given in parentheses.

classification of consonants according to the point of articulation	usnenik, labijal (51)	usnenik (89)	/	usnenik, labijal (189)
	jezični (51)	usnik (89)	/	jezični (189)
classification of 'usnenici'	dvousnenik, bilabijal (51)	dvousnenik, bilabijal (89)	dvousnenik (47)	dvousnenik, bilabijal (189)
	zubno-usnenik, labiodental, usnenozubnik (51)	zubnousnenik, labiodental (89)	zubnousnenik (47)	zubnousnenik, labiodental (189)
classification of 'usnici'	zubnik, dental (51)	zubnik, dental (89)	zubnik (47)	zubnik, dental (189)
	desnik, alveolar (51)	nadzubnik, alveolar (89)	desnik (47)	desnik, alveolar (189)
	nepčanic, palatal (51)	prednepčanic, palatal (89)	nepčanic (47)	nepčanic, palatal (189)
	jedrenik, velar (51)	jedrenik, velar (89)	jedrenik (47)	jedrenik, velar 189
classification of consonants according to the manner of articulation	praskavac, okluziv (54)	praskavac, okluziv (90)	zapornik, praskavi, okluziv, eksploziv (47)	zapornik, okluziv, zatvorni suglasnik (188)
	tjesnačnik, frikativ (54)	tjesnačnik, frikativ (90)	tjesnačnik, strujnik, frikativ, škripavac (47)	tjesnačnik, frikativ, zatvorni suglasnik (188)
	slivenik, afrikat (54)	slivenik, afrikat (90)	slivenik, afrikat, polutjesnačnik (47)	slivenik, afrikat, poluzatvorni suglasnik (188)
classification of consonants according to voicing	zvučni (51)	zvučni (90)	zvučni (46)	zvučni (188)
	bezvučni (51)	bezvučni (90)	bezvučni (46)	bezvučni (188)
syllabic feature	neslogotvorni glas, suglasnik (53)	suglasnik (87)	suglasnik (45)	/
	slogotvorni glas, samoglasnik (53)	samoglasnik (87)	samoglasnik (45)	/

Table 3 shows inconsistency in high school textbooks terminology, where synonymous terms are used to denote two consecutive sounds (*dvoglas*, *dvoglasnik*,

diftong), two consecutive graphemes (*dvoslov*, *digram*, *digraf*), and the relationship between two opposing phonemes (*fonološka opreka/opozicija*). Alternations in terminology can be seen in recording pairs or sequences of synonyms in which one term is most often of Croatian origin and the other of foreign origin, except in the textbook *Putokazi 4* in which only Croatian terms are consistently used (Table 3). In all textbooks with admitted different terms, the preference is given to Croatian terms. Terminological inconsistencies also appear in several considered grammar manuals in which these terms have been confirmed. Thus, Težak and Babić (2016: 43, 50) and Hudeček and Mihaljević (2019: 24) record *dvoslov* and *digraf*, but the term *dvoglasnik* in Težak-Babić's grammar is recorded without the synonymous term *diftong*. Regarding the dilemmas about the term *fonološka opreka/opozicija*, Silić-Pranjković (2007: 15) and Težak-Babić (2016: 77) use the term *opreka*, while this term is missing in Hudeček and Mihaljević.

Table 3. Inconsistent terms at the level of phoneme and grapheme

<i>Fon-fon 4</i>	<i>Hrvatski jezik i književnost 4</i>	<i>Lica riječi 4</i>	<i>Putokazi 4</i>
dvoslov (51)	dvoslov, digram (83)	dvoslov, digram, digraf (41)	dvoslov (335)
dvoglasnik (50)	dvoglas(nik), diftong (83)	/	dvoglasnik (188)
fonološka opreka/opozicija (55)	fonološka opreka (83)	fonološka opreka/opozicija (42)	fonološka opreka (190)

In primary school textbooks, a more pronounced terminological inconsistency related to the accentual system can be seen in using the terms *duljina* and *dužina* (cf. Nemeth-Jajić and Božanić 2022), but this has not been confirmed in high school textbooks. Namely, the preferred term in all four textbooks is *dužina*, but two textbooks record the name *zanaglasna dužina*, while the other two textbooks include synonyms *nenaglašena dužina* and *zanaglasna dužina* (Table 4). Thus, a comparison of primary and secondary school textbooks reveals the lack of uniformity on two levels: with regard to the prosodic feature of the unit (*nenaglašena*, *zanaglasna*) and with regard to expressing the feature of quantity (*duljina*, *dužina*). In the subject Curriculum (2019: 94) and the Teaching Program (1994: 152), the term *dužina* has been confirmed, while the Curriculum also records the component *naglasna (dužina)*, which has not been confirmed in any of the analyzed textbooks. As for grammar manuals, only Ham (2017: 28) records the term *duljina*, while Silić and Pranjković (2007: 18), Težak and Babić (2016: 81), and Hudeček and Mihaljević (2019: 32) in this context use the term *dužina* exclusively. Moreover, in the professional literature in the field of linguistics, there has been a discussion about the terms *duljina* and *dužina*. According to Babić, both terms are admitted, but the preferred term is *dužina*, which is more in line with the systematic word formation in the Croatian language (1963: 63). It can be noticed that the analyzed grammars and program documents give preference to the term *dužina*. High school textbooks follow this

prevailing current, but terminology-wise, the problem with the first part of the term containing the component *naglasna*, *naglašena*, or *zanaglasna* remains unresolved. A lack of uniformity is also manifested when referring to a group of words with a single accent. Admitted terms in three of the four textbooks are synonyms *izgovorna cjelina* and *naglasna cjelina*, while preferred term in one of the four textbooks is *izgovorna cjelina* (Table 4). The Curriculum (2019: 94) and the grammar by Težak and Babić (2016: 82) also record *izgovorna cjelina*, while in the grammars by Silić and Pranjković (2007: 21) and Hudeček and Mihaljević (2019: 33), *naglasna cjelina* is used. Since grammar manuals are not uniform on this issue, it is not surprising that different terms (*izgovorna* or *naglasna cjelina*) can be found in textbooks.

All four textbooks consistently use two synonymous terms for an accentuated word, namely *naglasnica* and *tonička riječ* (Table 4). When it comes to an unaccentuated word, the situation is somewhat more complicated. Admitted terms in two textbooks are synonyms *nenaglasnica* and *atonička riječ*, one textbook adds the term *klitika*, and one records a sequence of synonyms *nenaglašena riječ*, *klitika*, *atonička riječ* (Table 4). If we look at the grammar books in question, we will also find a lack of uniformity with regard to this issue. Silić and Pranjković (2007: 21) use the synonymous terms *nenaglašena riječ* and *atonička riječ* analogously to *naglašena riječ* and *tonička riječ*. Težak and Babić (2016: 82) record *naglasnice* and *nenaglasnice*, *klitike*. In Hudeček and Mihaljević (2019: 32), there is a sequence of three synonyms, *nenaglasnica*, *klitika*, *atonička riječ*, along with the admitted terms for the accentuated word, *naglasnica*, *tonička riječ*. Similar to examples referring to an accentuated word, textbooks almost uniformly use two terms for types of unaccentuated words, *prednaglasnica* and *proklitika*, and *zanaglasnica* and *enklitika*, with an exception in one textbook where additional admitted terms are *prislonjenica* and *naslonjenica*, which have been confirmed in the grammars by Silić and Pranjković (2007: 21), Težak and Babić (2016: 82), and Hudeček and Mihaljević (2019: 32). Although confirmed in the grammar manuals, the terms *prislonjenica* and *naslonjenica* have clearly not been affirmed in textbook discourse, nor in the Curriculum (2019: 77), where admitted terms are synonyms *nenaglasnica/klitika*, while the Teaching Program (1994: 152) records *proklitika* and *enklitika*. This is an example of multiple terminological inconsistencies in textbooks, grammar manuals, and at the general educational level.

Table 4. Terms referring to post-accent length and accentual unit

Fon-fon 4	Hrvatski jezik i književnost 4	Lica riječi 4	Putokazi 4
zanaglasna dužina (73)	nenaglašena/ zanaglasna dužina (108)	zanaglasna/ nenaglašena dužina (81)	nenaglašena dužina (258)
izgovorna/naglasna cjelina (81)	izgovorna cjelina (109)	naglasna/izgovorna cjelina (87)	naglasna/izgovorna cjelina (260)
naglasnica, tonička riječ (81)	naglasnica, tonička riječ (109)	naglasnica, tonička riječ (87)	naglasnica, tonička riječ (260)

nenaglašena riječ, klitika, atonička riječ (81)	nenaglasnica, atonička riječ (109)	nenaglasnica, tonička riječ, klitika (87)	nenaglasnica, atonička riječ (260)
prednaglasnica, proklitika (81)	prednaglasnica, proklitika, prislonjenica (109)	prednaglasnica, prislonjenica, proklitika (87)	Putokazi 2 proklitika, prednaglasnica (74)
zanaglasnica, enklitika (81)	zanaglasnica, enklitika, naslonjenica (109)	zanaglasnica, naslonjenica, enklitika (88)	enklitika, zanaglasnica (73)

Phonologically conditioned alternations related to assimilation of the point of articulation and voicing assimilation in all four textbooks are referred to differently with regard to the units affected by the alternation (*glasovi, suglasnici, zatvornici*), but the alternation process in all textbooks is called *jednačenje*, as shown in Table 5. The lack of uniformity is also noticeable in grammar manuals. Thus, admitted terms in Silić and Pranjković (2007: 25) are *izjednačivanje ili asimilacija po zvučnosti* and *izjednačivanje ili asimilacija po mjestu tvorbe*, while Težak and Babić (2016: 66, 67) record *jednačenje suglasnika po zvučnosti* and *jednačenje suglasnika po mjestu tvorbe*. Hudeček and Mihaljević (2019: 34, 35) record *jednačenje po zvučnosti* and *jednačenje po mjestu tvorbe*, the same as the textbook *Lica riječi 4* (Table 5). It can be seen that deprecated term in contemporary textbooks is *asimilacija*, which was recorded in pre-reform textbooks (Mihaljević and Prce 2014: 65). In the subject Curriculum, these terms are not mentioned, but admitted terms in the former Teaching Program (1994: 152) were *jednačenje/asimilacija po zvučnosti* and *jednačenje/asimilacija po mjestu tvorbe*. Furthermore, the problem also arises when referring to a phonologically conditioned alternation in which there is a complete sound reduction, which is called *ispadanje/gubljenje glasova/zatvornika* (Table 5). The preferred term in grammars by Silić and Pranjković (2007: 25), and Hudeček and Mihaljević (2019: 36) is *ispadanje suglasnika*, while Težak and Babić (2016: 68) and the Curriculum (1994: 152) record *gubljenje suglasnika*. Professional literature refers to this alternation using a terminological pair *ispadanje/gubljenje glasova* (Mihaljević and Horvat 2007: 290). The lack of agreement among grammarians and linguists in these cases has led to inconsistencies in the use of the mentioned terms in textbooks.

Morphologically conditioned alternations and those conditioned by word formation in which there are terminological inconsistencies in high school textbooks include mobile *a* and vocalization. Namely, the preferred term in three of the four is *nepostojani 'a'*, but admitted terms in one of the textbooks are *umetanje 'a'* and *nepostojani 'a'* (Table 5). In almost all grammar manuals and program documents, admitted terms are *nepostojani 'a'* (Hudeček and Mihaljević 2019: 41; Curriculum 2019: 54) or its variant *nepostojano 'a'* (Silić and Pranjković 2007: 23; Težak and Babić 2016: 62). The term *umetanje 'a'* was proposed by Mihaljević and Horvat (2007: 302) to clearly distinguish between movable sounds and alternations in which the movable sounds are added or lost, but this theoretical implication clearly has not been accepted in textbook discourse. This example also reflects the influence of the lack of linguistic agreement on the design of teaching content, more precisely, of the linguistic terminology in textbooks.

Table 5. Inconsistent terms for sound alternations

<i>Fon-fon 4</i>	<i>Hrvatski jezik i književnost 4</i>	<i>Lica riječi 4</i>	<i>Putokazi 4</i>
jednačenje glasova po mjestu tvorbe (61)	jednačenje zatvornika po mjestu tvorbe (94)	jednačenje po mjestu tvorbe (54)	jednačenje suglasnika po mjestu tvorbe (269)
jednačenje glasova po zvučnosti (61)	jednačenje zatvornika po zvučnosti (94)	jednačenje po zvučnosti (51)	jednačenje suglasnika po zvučnosti (268)
ispadanje/gubljenje glasova (61)	ispadanje glasova (94)	ispadanje glasova/zatvornika (56)	ispadanje/gubljenje glasova (270)
nepostojani <i>a</i> (60)	umetanje <i>a</i> , nepostojani <i>a</i> (94)	nepostojani <i>a</i> (67)	nepostojani <i>a</i> (263)

3.2. Terms at morphological level and level of word formation

The Croatian linguistic tradition records several terms for non-inflected words used for the (re)formulation of sentences and for the expression of the sentence mode: *čestica*, *modalna riječ*, *partikula*, *riječca* (cf. Josić 2011), and non-inflected words that express feelings and attitudes towards the previously said or the situation: *usklik*, *uzvik*. In Silić and Pranjković (2007: 253), admitted terms for particle are *čestica* and *partikula*, and Težak and Babić (2016: 165) add the term *riječca*. The preferred term in Ham (2017: 113), Hudeček and Mihaljević (2019: 140), and the program documents (Teaching Program 1994: 154; Curriculum 2019: 147) is *čestica*. Primary school textbooks give preference to the use of the term *čestica*, and admitted terms in one textbook include a pair of synonyms *čestica*, *riječca* (cf. Nemeth-Jajić and Božanić, 2022). There is a similar situation in high school textbooks. In three of the four textbooks, the preferred term is *čestica*, while *čestica* and *riječca* are used in one textbook (Table 6). When it comes to terms for interjections, in some grammar manuals this part of speech differs from the category of exclamation; therefore, the name *uzvik* is used (Silić and Pranjković 2007: 258; Ham 2017: 114), while in other grammars the name *usklik* has been confirmed (Težak and Babić 2016: 164; Hudeček and Mihaljević 2019: 138), and the latter is preferred by Lazić and Mihaljević (2020) who analyzed *JENA*, older and newer linguistic manuals, and textbook discourse. The Curriculum (2019: 147) also contains the term *usklik*, and the former teaching program contained *uzvik* (1994: 154). All primary school textbooks are uniform when it comes to using the term *uzvik* (cf. Nemeth-Jajić and Božanić, 2022), but in high school textbooks the situation is more complicated. The preferred term in two of the four textbooks is *uzvik*, while the other two textbooks record pairs of synonyms *usklik* and *uzvik*. Yet, one of them gives preference to the term *usklik*, and the other to *uzvik* (Table 6). Although the terms in primary school textbooks have been unified, in high school textbooks, there are inconsistencies and deviations from the guidelines in the curriculum and grammar books.

Table 6. Terms for particles and interjections

Fon-fon 2	Hrvatski jezik i književnost 2	Lica riječi 2	Putokazi 2
čestice, riječca (93)	čestica (195)	čestica (227)	čestica (214)
usklik, uzvik (116)	uzvik (191)	uzvik (227)	uzvik, usklik (216)

Among Croatian linguists, there were discussions on the use of the name *lice* and *osoba* in the context of the verbal category and type of pronouns. Thus, Stjepan Babić (1995), Mile Mamić (1997), and Sanda Ham (1998, 2002) advocated the revival of the traditional Croatian terminology, including the term *glagolska osoba* and *osobna zamjenica*. Their argument was based on the belief that the term *osoba* encompasses all three 'lica', that the term was confirmed in older Croatian language manuals, and that the contemporary Croatian paradigm related to linguistic terminology is based on the concept of *osoba* (cf. Babić 1995; Ham 2002). Therefore, the terms *osobna zamjenica* and *glagolska osoba* have been confirmed in the grammars by Težak and Babić (2016: 126, 137) and Ham (2017: 67, 85). On the other hand, preferred terms in the grammar by Silić and Pranjković (2007: 117, 38) are *lična zamjenica* and *glagolsko lice*, and the same terms were used in the Teaching Program (1994: 154). Hudeček and Mihaljević (2019: 78, 103) and the Curriculum (2019: 40, 47) use the terms *osobna zamjenica* and *glagolsko lice*. Primary school textbooks give preference to the term *osoba* (cf. Nemeth-Jajić and Božanić 2022). In contrast, admitted term in all high school textbooks is *lice*: *lična zamjenica* and *glagolsko lice* (Table 7). More specifically, admitted terms for the type of pronouns in all high school textbooks are *osobna/lična zamjenica*. When it comes to the terms for *glagolsko lice/osoba*, two textbooks mention only *glagolsko lice*, and the other two record a pair of synonyms *glagolsko lice* and *glagolska osoba*. It is evident that no agreement has been reached on the use of the term *lice/osoba* at the theoretical and textbook level.

Table 7. Terms that include the component 'lice'/'osoba'

Fon-fon 3	Hrvatski jezik i književnost 3	Lica riječi 3	Putokazi 3
osobna/lična zamjenica (87)	lična/osobna zamjenica (182)	osobna/lična zamjenica (112)	lična/osobna zamjenica (143)
glagolsko lice (99)	glagolsko lice, glagolska osoba 189	glagolska osoba, glagolsko lice (137)	glagolsko lice (149)

At the level of word formation, minor inconsistencies in terminology are noticeable, but certainly worth considering. They are mainly related to the use of synonymous terms (e.g. *ništični morfem*, *nulti morfem*), or different terms that include pairs of synonyms (*tvorbena porodica*, *porodica riječi*) have been confirmed, and there is a frequent alternation between the terms of Croatian origin and adapted loanword

(e.g. *morfološka analiza/raščlamba*, *tvorbena analiza/raščlamba*; *izvođenje/derivacija*; *slaganje/kompozicija*). *Alomorf* is the preferred term for morpheme variant form in only one textbook, whereas the other three textbooks give preference to the descriptive terms *izmijenjeni morf* or *varijanta morfema*, while *alomorf* is used as a synonym of the terms (Table 8). This can be explained by the terminology in the Curriculum (2019: 85), which records the terms *izmijenjeni morf* and *alomorf*, probably to create a counterpart to the term *osnovni morf*. In contrast, in the former Teaching Program (1994: 154) the morpheme variant was called *alomorf* and *morfemska inačica*. Thus, *alomorf* was preferred. It is necessary to analyze grammar manuals as well. The preferred term in Silić and Pranjković (2007: 37) and Hudeček and Mihaljević (2019: 52) is *alomorf*, which is more accepted than the term *izmijenjeni morf* found in the Curriculum. A minor inconsistency has been noted in the use of the term *supletivni alomorf*, with one of the four textbooks allowing two terms, i.e. *supletivni alomorf* and *zamjenjivi morfem* (Table 8). Admitted terms for a morpheme that is not visible in certain forms of the word, but does occur are *ništični/nulti morfem* and *nulti gramatički morfem/nastavak* (Table 8). Mostly the two components *ništični* and *nulti* are alternated, but attention should also be paid to the part of the term that refers to (*gramatički*) *morfem* or *nastavak*. Namely, the preferred term in the grammar by Silić and Pranjković (2007: 111) is *gramatički morfem -Ø*, and *ništični/nulti nastavak* in the grammar by Težak and Babić (2016: 91). The term *nastavak* is also used in Hudeček and Mihaljević (2019: 52). This suggests a theoretical dilemma that has obviously not yet been resolved, which is reflected in the inconsistency of the textbook terminology, and refers to the question of denoting a morpheme that marks grammatical language categories and has exclusively grammatical meaning. From the above, it can be concluded that textbooks give preference to the term *morfem*, not *nastavak*.

There is also a disagreement about terms for the types of word bases. In high school textbooks, the part of the word that is common to the base word and its derivative is called *rječotvorna osnova* and/or *tvorbena osnova* (Table 8). Silić and Pranjković (2007: 146) use the term *rječotvorna osnova*, just like the former Teaching Program (1994: 154),² and Hudeček and Mihaljević use the term *tvorbena osnova* (2019: 144), which is more common in textbook discourse as it has been found in three of the four analyzed textbooks (Table 8). The part of the word to which endings for different forms of the same word are added is mainly called *oblikotvorna osnova*, but admitted terms include also *oblična osnova* and *morfološka osnova* (Table 8). The term *oblikotvorna osnova* can be found in Silić and Pranjković (2007: 146), the Teaching Program (1994: 154), and the Curriculum (2019: 85); therefore, it is more affirmed than the terms *oblična osnova* and *morfološka osnova*, which is ultimately reflected in the textbook context (Table 8).

Inconsistencies have been found in the use of terms for formation units in high school textbooks. In all textbooks, admitted terms are *prefiks* and *sufiks*, along with their synonyms: *predmetak*, *tvorbena predmetak*, *prefiksalni morfem* and *dometak*, *tvorbena nastavak*, *sufiksalni morfem* (Table 8). Pairs of synonyms *prefiks* and

2 Admitted terms are derivational and inflective morphemes, which implies the terms' derivational and inflectional base.

predmetak, and *sufiks* and *dometak* are used in Težak-Babić's grammar (2016: 169, 176), but Silić and Pranjković (2007: 285, 293), and Hudeček and Mihaljević (2019: 144) record only the terms *prefiks* and *sufiks*, which have also been found in the Teaching Program (1994: 156) and the Curriculum (2019: 164). Moreover, there is a disagreement in using the term for the sound that links the base and the suffix. The preferred term is *spojnik*, but the admitted terms include also *interfiks* and *spojni morfem* (Table 8). The terminological pair *spojnik*, *spojni morfem* has been confirmed in Silić and Pranjković's grammar (2007: 162), but Težak and Babić (2016: 207), and Hudeček and Mihaljević (2019: 144) use only *spojnik*, which as a Croatian term was accepted in school practice. Inconsistencies are also noticeable in the use of the term which explains the meaning of derivative words. The preference is given to the term *preobljka*, which has been recorded in Težak and Babić (2016: 170), but admitted terms are also *tvorbena preobljka* and *semantička analiza* (Table 8). The term *tvorbena preobljka* can be found in Hudeček and Mihaljević (2019: 144).

Table 8. Inconsistent terms at the level of word formation

Fon-fon 3	Hrvatski jezik i književnost 3	Lica riječi 3	Putokazi 3
rječotvorna osnova (48)	rječotvorna osnova, tvorbeno osnova (96)	tvorbena osnova (186)	tvorbena osnova (61)
oblikotvorna osnova (48)	oblikotvorna osnova (96)	oblična osnova, morfološka osnova (186)	oblikotvorna osnova (61)
izmijenjeni morf, alomorf (39)	izmijenjeni morf, alomorf (97)	alomorf (69)	varijanta morfema, alomorf (63)
supletivni alomorf (42)	supletivni alomorf (97)	supletivni alomorf, zamjenjivi morfem (69)	supletivni alomorf (63)
prefiks, tvorbeni predmetak (145)	prefiks, predmetak (98)	predmetak, prefiks 190	prefiksadni morfem, prefiks (61)
sufiks, tvorbeni nastavak (145)	sufiks, dometak (98)	tvorbena nastavak, sufiks (191)	sufiksadni morfem, sufiks (61)
spojnik, interfiks (145)	spojnik, interfiks (98)	spojnik (193)	spojnik, spojni morfem (61)
ništični, nulti morfem (43)	ništični, nulti morfem (97)	ništični, nulti morfem (68)	nulti gramatički morfem, nulti nastavak (62)
morfemska analiza (41)	morfemska analiza, morfemska raščlamba (98)	morfemska raščlamba, morfemska analiza (67)	morfemska analiza (64)
tvorbena porodica (144)	porodica riječi (99)	tvorbena porodica (185)	tvorbena porodica (231)

tvorbena analiza (145)	tvorbena raščlamba, tvorbena analiza (291)	tvorbena analiza (187)	tvorbena analiza (232)
izvođenje (147)	izvođenje, derivacija (292)	izvođenje (188)	izvođenje (233)
slaganje (147)	slaganje, kompozicija (292)	slaganje (188)	slaganje (233)
preoblika (141)	tvorbena preoblika (291)	preoblika, semantička analiza (185)	preoblika (233)

3.3. Terms at the syntactic level

In the context of sentence parts, in primary school textbooks, there have been found inconsistencies in naming the type of the object: *izravni/bliži objekt* and *neizravni/dalji objekt* (cf. Nemeth-Jajić and Božanić, 2022). These pairs of synonyms have been confirmed in Hudeček and Mihaljević (2019: 175). They are admitted terms also in two high school textbooks, in the sequence of synonyms containing the terms *direktan objekt* and *indirektan objekt*, and in the grammar by Silić and Pranjković (2007: 300, 301), while the other two textbooks use only *izravni objekt* and *neizravni objekt* (Table 9), the terms also recorded by Ham (2017: 130, 131). Težak and Babić (2016: 233) distinguish between *izravni/direktni objekt* and *neizravni/indirektni objekt*. Furthermore, inconsistency was observed in naming types of attributes. In primary school textbooks, admitted terms are *imenični/imenički atribut* (cf. Nemeth-Jajić and Božanić 2022), but high school textbooks reflect bigger dilemmas with regard to the criterion of the (lack of) congruence of the noun and attribute; therefore, there are different terms for both types of attributes: *imenični/imenski/nesročni atribut* and *pridjevni/sročni atribut* (Table 9). Interestingly, in high school textbooks *imenički atribut* has not been confirmed, unlike *imenski atribut*, which cannot be found in primary school textbooks (cf. Nemeth-Jajić and Božanić 2022). However, all these terms have been confirmed in the grammar manuals, but there are also differences. Silić and Pranjković (2007: 309, 311) record *sročni/kongruentni atribut* and *nesročni/nekongruentni atribut*, admitted terms in Ham are *pridjevni/sročni atribut*, *imenski/nesročni atribut* (2017: 144, 145), and Hudeček and Mihaljević prefer *pridjevni* and *imenički atribut* (2019: 181). Therefore, significant differences at the grammar and textbook levels are repeatedly present.

Table 9. Terminological differences at the level of sentence parts

<i>Fon-fon 1</i>	<i>Hrvatski jezik i književnost 1</i>	<i>Lica riječi 1</i>	<i>Putokazi 1</i>
izravni objekt (105)	bliži objekt, izravni objekt, direktni objekt (337)	izravni objekt (240)	izravni objekt, direktni objekt, bliži objekt (244)

neizravni objekt (105)	dalji objekt, neizravni objekt, indirektni objekt (337)	neizravni objekt (240)	neizravni objekt, indirektni objekt, dalji objekt (244)
pridjevni atribut (111)	sročni atribut (363)	pridjevni atribut, sročni atribut (247)	sročni atribut (241)
imenični atribut, nesročni atribut (111)	nesročni atribut (363)	imenski atribut, nesročni atribut (247)	nesročni atribut (241)

Differences in high school textbooks terminology also occur at the level of word junction and syntagm. Preferred terms for constituents of a syntagm are *glavna sastavnica* and *zavisna sastavnica*, but the terms *glavni tagmem*, *određenica*, *jezgrena sastavnica* and *zavisni tagmem*, *odrednica* (Table 10) have also been confirmed. Thus, Silić and Pranjković (2007: 261) use the term *glavni/jezgreni tagmem* and *zavisni tagmem*. Hudeček and Mihaljević (2019: 168) call these constituents *glavni dio* and *sastavni dio*. Considering that the Curriculum (2019: 181) mentions *sastavnice sintagme*, the terms *glavna sastavnica* and *zavisna sastavnica* were certainly given preference, which is reflected in most high school textbooks. In all four textbooks, admitted terms for the relationships between the syntagm constituents according to the type of grammatical agreement between them, with the exception of the relationship of *pridruživanje*, include pairs of synonyms: *sročnost/kongruencija* and *upravljanje/rekcija* (Fon-fon 2: 94, 96, 97; Hrvatski jezik i književnost 2: 262, 263; Lica riječi 2: 255; Putokazi 2: 219). Minor inconsistencies occur when using the term for the relationship between the syntagm constituents according to the function of the dependent constituent in relation to the main constituent. Admitted terms in one of the four textbooks are pairs of synonyms: *odredbena/atributna*, *dopunska/objektna* and *okolnosna/adverbijalna*, while in the other three textbooks only Croatian names can be found: *odredbena*, *dopunska*, *okolnosna* (Table 10).

Table 10. Terminological differences at the level of word junction and syntagm

Fon-fon 1	Hrvatski jezik i književnost 1	Lica riječi 1	Putokazi 1
glavna sastavnica (95)	glavna sastavnica (263)	glavni tagmem, određenica (254)	glavna/jezgrena sastavnica (219)
zavisna sastavnica (95)	zavisna sastavnica (263)	zavisni tagmem, odrednica (254)	zavisna sastavnica (219)
odredbena/atributna (98)	odredbena sintagma (265)	odredbena sintagma (260)	odredbeni spojevi riječi (264)
dopunska/objektna (98)	dopunska sintagma (265)	dopunska sintagma (260)	dopunski spojevi riječi (264)

okolnosna/ adverbijalna (98)	okolnosna sintagma (265)	okolnosna sintagma (260)	okolnosni spojevi riječi (264)
---------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------

In primary school textbooks, minor differences in the terms for the word order in a sentence have been found. Preferred terms are *stilski obilježen red riječi*, *stilski neobilježen red riječi*, and *obvezan red riječi* (cf. Nemeth-Jajić and Božanić, 2022). An analysis of high school textbooks reveals certain deviations. When referring to *stilski neobilježen red riječi* in high school textbooks, the preferred term is *neobilježen red riječi*, and one of the four textbooks also includes a sequence of synonyms: *običan/(stilski) neobilježen/neutralan red riječi*. *Stilski obilježen red riječi* is generally referred to as *obilježen red riječi*, and larger inconsistencies can be noticed in naming the so-called automated word order: preferred term in one half of the textbooks is *obvezatni red riječi*, and in the other half it is *obvezni red riječi* (Table 11). The Teaching Program (1994: 156) mentions *osnovni* and *aktualizirani red riječi*, and admitted terms in the Curriculum (2019: 77) include *neobilježeni*, *obilježeni*, and *obvezatni red riječi* at the secondary school level, which shows that almost all textbooks follow the curriculum guidelines, but there is also a deviation in the case of *obvezatni/obvezni red riječi*. A comparison with grammar manuals regarding this issue is not possible because most of them mention two types of word order, stylistically marked and stylistically unmarked. When referring to making compound and complex sentences, high school textbooks use different terms. The formation of compound sentences is referred to using terms *povezivanje*, *pridruživanje*, and *sklapanje povezivanjem* (Table 11). Grammar manuals give preference to the term *povezivanje* (Ham 2017: 150; Hudeček and Mihaljević 2019: 188). The preferred term in Silić and Pranjković (2007: 319) is *sklapanje povezivanjem*, and *sklapanje* in Težak and Babić (2016: 257). The grammar books analyzed here do not use the term *pridruživanje*. Admitted terms in textbooks for the formation of complex sentences include *uvrštavanje*, *uklapanje*, and *sklapanje uvrštavanjem*. The preferred term in textbooks and grammars is *uvrštavanje* (Težak and Babić 2016: 257; Hudeček and Mihaljević, 2019: 188), but the term *uklapanje* has been recorded in Ham (2017: 150), and *sklapanje uvrštavanjem* in Silić and Pranjković's grammar (2007: 319). The preferred term for the formation of sentences without using conjunctions is *nizanje* in high school textbooks and in Težak and Babić (2016: 257), yet one of the four textbooks mentions *sklapanje bez veznika* (Table 11), which is the preferred term in Silić and Pranjković (2007: 319).

High school textbooks are almost uniform in naming single-word or multi-word components that link clauses to form compound or complex sentences. The preferred term in three of the four textbooks is *vezno sredstvo*, while the fourth textbook uses the term *vezničko sredstvo* (Table 11). The term *vezno sredstvo* is advocated by Hudeček and Mihaljević (2019: 190) to avoid misidentifying with the conjunction as a part of speech, and the term has also been confirmed in Silić and Pranjković (2007: 320). In addition, this is an admitted term in the Curriculum (2019: 77).

Primary school textbooks contain inconsistencies in the use of the term *pogodbena* or *uvjetna rečenica*, but the preferred term is *pogodbena rečenica* (cf. Nemeth-Jajić and Božanić 2022). In all high school textbooks, admitted term is *pogodbena*

rečenica, but in two of the four textbooks, another admitted term is *uvjetna rečenica* (Table 11). In the Teaching Program (1994: 156), this type of complex sentence is referred to using the term *pogodbena rečenica*, which is also preferred in Težak and Babić (2016: 269) and Ham (2017: 166), while preferred term in the subject Curriculum is *uvjetna rečenica* (2019: 172). The term *uvjetna rečenica* is admitted in the grammars by Silić and Pranjković (2007: 347) and Hudeček and Mihaljević (2019: 210), who also add a synonymous pair *kondicionalna rečenica*, which has not been found in textbooks. Therefore, although the term *pogodbena rečenica* was not recorded in the Curriculum, its use in textbook discourse is still justified by the use in grammar manuals.

Table 11. Terminological differences at the level of sentence

<i>Fon-fon 2</i>	<i>Hrvatski jezik i književnost 2</i>	<i>Lica riječi 2</i>	<i>Putokazi 2</i>
obvezatni red riječi (106)	obvezni red riječi (32)	obvezatni red riječi (236)	obvezni red riječi (73)
neobilježeni red riječi (105)	neobilježeni red riječi (31)	običan/(stilski) neobilježen/neutralan red riječi (236)	neobilježeni red riječi (71)
obilježeni red riječi (106)	obilježeni red riječi (32)	(stilski) obilježen red riječi (236)	obilježeni red riječi (71)
sklapanje povezivanjem (103)	povezivanje (156)	povezivanje/ pridruživanje (153)	povezivanje (112)
sklapanje uvrštavanjem (103)	uvrštavanje (156)	uvrštavanje/ uklapanje (154)	uvrštavanje (112)
sklapanje bez veznika (103)	nizanje (156)	nizanje (154)	nizanje (113)
pogodbena rečenica (122)	uvjetna/pogodbena rečenica (279)	pogodbena rečenica (197)	pogodbena/uvjetna rečenica (123)
vezno sredstvo (116)	vezničko sredstvo (160)	vezno sredstvo (228)	vezno sredstvo (60)

3.4. Terms at the lexicological level

Older professional literature³ and primary school program documents (*Teaching Plan and Program for Primary School 2006: 33, 35*) record the term *književni jezik* as a synonym for the term *standardni jezik*; therefore, it is necessary to see how contemporary textbooks and school grammar manuals approach this issue. Namely, it has already been established that the term *standardni jezik* is consistently used

3 Cf. for example: "Temelj je školskoga predmeta koji se zove hrvatski jezik zajednički jezik svih Hrvata, tj. književni ili standardni hrvatski jezik" ("The basis of the school subject called Croatian language is the common language of all Croats, i.e. the literary or standard Croatian language") (Težak 1996: 87).

in primary school textbooks (cf. Nemeth-Jajić and Božanić 2022), which is also required by the Curriculum (2019: 182). The same has been confirmed in all high school textbooks, which distinguish between the term *književni jezik*, as the language of literature and literacy in general, and the term *standardni jezik*, as an autonomous, standardized, and multifunctional supra-regional idiom, i.e. the language of public communication (*Fon-fon 1: 47; Hrvatski jezik i književnost 1: 51; Lica riječi 1: 22; Putokazi 1: 9*). The term *standardni jezik* has also been confirmed in the grammars by Silić and Pranjkić (2007: 375) and Hudeček and Mihaljević (2019: 2). On the other hand, Težak and Babić (2016: 30) believe that there is no reason to suppress the term *književni jezik* due to its usual and general acceptance. Therefore, the preferred term in their grammar is *književni jezik*.

As for using the terms to denote the meaning of words and the relations between them, admitted terms in almost all textbooks are pairs, and less often sequences of synonyms, in which one name is of Croatian origin and the other name is an adapted loanword (e.g. *jednoznačnost/monosemija; homofon/istozvučnica; homograf/istopisnica; osnovno/denotativno značenje*) or both names are synonyms of Croatian origin (e.g. *jednoznačna riječ, jednoznačnica; višeznačna riječ, višeznačnica*) (Table 12). Thus, in most textbooks, i.e. in three of the four, when referring to the meaning of words, preferred terms are *jednoznačnica* and *jednoznačna riječ*, and *višeznačnica* and *višeznačna riječ*, but in one textbook admitted terms are *jednoznačni/monosemni leksem* and *višeznačni/polisemni leksem* (Table 12). Mihaljević (1984: 59) discussed the terminological inconsistency in the use of terms *riječ* and *leksem*, concluding that the term *leksem* is superfluous because its meaning can be covered by the word *riječ*. The accompanying phenomena in most textbooks are also referred to using two terms: *jednoznačnost/monosemija* and *višeznačnost/polisemija* (Table 12). The former Teaching Program (1994: 157) and the Curriculum (2019: 69) prefer the Croatian terms *jednoznačnost* and *višeznačnost*. When referring to literal and figurative meaning, admitted terms are *denotativno/osnovno/neutralno značenje* and *konotativno/izvedeno/obilježeno značenje* (Table 12). The textbooks give preference to *denotativno značenje* and *konotativno značenje*, which is justified because they can be found in the Teaching Program (1994: 157) and in the Curriculum (2019: 69). In primary school textbooks, there are terminological differences related to synonymy and antonymy, where in the distribution of synonyms, admitted terms are terminological pairs *istoznačnica/potpuni sinonim, blisko značnica/djelomični sinonim*, while synonymous terms *antonim* and *suprotnica* are used when referring to antonyms in all textbooks (cf. Nemeth-Jajić and Božanić 2022). In three high school textbooks, in the context of the division of synonyms, the aforementioned terminological pairs have also been confirmed (Table 12), which leads to the conclusion that in school practice, the efforts of certain linguists to distinguish synonymy as a paradigmatic lexical-semantic relationship from synonymy at a syntagmatic level were not accepted, rejecting the existence of absolute synonyms and near-synonyms as a type of synonymy (cf. Tafra 1996, 2003, 2018). In contrast, in the educational context, more meaningful and transparent terms are used with the aim of perceiving, understanding, and mastering in practice the different relationships between words to acquire basic knowledge (cf. Jelaska 2007). In the

context of synonyms, there are differences in using the terms *sinonimni/sinonimski par* and *sinonimni/sinonimski niz* (Table 12). Namely, the adjective *sinonimni* is the preferred term in one of the four textbooks, and three textbooks use the adjective *sinonimski* (Table 12). The adjective *sinonimni* has also been used in the term *sinonimni frazem* (*Lica riječi 4*: 117). This is an issue of word formation of adjectives with suffixes *-ni* and *-ski*. Babić (2002: 429, 439) claims that both suffixes can be attached to the same word base in practice, but emphasizes that it is necessary to give normative preference to the suffix *-ni* in situations where it is easy to derive an adjective with this suffix, which is certainly the case with the adjective *sinonimni*, as confirmed in linguistic papers (cf. Hudeček, Mihaljević and Vidović 2006). Consequently, it is surprising that in high school textbooks the adjective *sinonimski* is preferred in the terms *sinonimski par* and *sinonimski niz*.

Furthermore, in contrast to the admitted terms *antonim/suprotnica* in primary school textbooks, in secondary school textbooks *antonim* is preferred (*Fon-fon 1*: 70; *Hrvatski jezik i književnost 1*: 125; *Lica riječi 1*: 164; *Putokazi 1*: 16), and this term was recorded both in the Teaching Program (1994: 157) and the Curriculum (2019: 61).

Table 12. Terminological differences in terms that denote relationships between words and the meaning of words

<i>Fon-fon 1</i>	<i>Hrvatski jezik i književnost 1</i>	<i>Lica riječi 1</i>	<i>Putokazi 1</i>
jednoznačna riječ, jednoznačnica (63)	jednoznačni/monosemni leksem (88)	jednoznačna riječ, jednoznačnica (153)	jednoznačnica (13)
višeznačna riječ, višeznačnica (63)	višeznačni/polisemni leksem (88)	višeznačna riječ, višeznačnica (153)	višeznačnica (13)
jednoznačnost (57)	jednoznačnost/monosemija (88)	jednoznačnost/monosemija (165)	jednoznačnost/monosemija (13)
višeznačnost/polisemija (64)	višeznačnost/polisemija (88)	višeznačnost/polisemija (165)	višeznačnost/polisemija (13)
sinonimni par (69)	sinonimski par (116)	sinonimski par (161)	sinonimski par (15)
sinonimni niz (69)	sinonimski niz (116)	sinonimski niz (161)	sinonimski niz (15)
/	potpuni sinonimi, istoznačnice (116)	istoznačnice, potpuni sinonimi (161)	potpuni sinonimi, istoznačnice (15)
/	djelomični sinonimi, bliskozačnice (116)	bliskozačnice, djelomični sinonimi (161)	djelomični sinonimi, bliskozačnice (15)
homofoni/istozvučnice (71)	homofoni/istozvučnice (159)	homofoni/istozvučnice (166)	homofoni (16)

homofoni/ istozvučnice (71)	homografi/istopisnice (159)	homografi/istopisnice (166)	homografi (16)
/	osnovno/denotativno značenje (89)	denotativno značenje (169)	denotativno/ neutralno značenje
/	izvedeno/konotativno značenje (89)	konotativno značenje (169)	konotativno/ obilježeno značenje (14)

Minor differences have been observed in the terms related to phrasemes. This mainly includes a reference to a Croatian and an adapted foreign term such as *frazemska inačica* and *frazemska varijanta* or *frazemski sinonim* and *frazemska istoznačnica*, but admitted terms in the form of a syntagm include *frazemski sinonim* and *sinonimni frazem* as well as *frazemski antonim* and *antonimni frazem* (Table 13).

Table 13. Terminological differences related to phrasemes

<i>Fon-fon 2</i>	<i>Hrvatski jezik i književnost 2</i>	<i>Lica riječi 2</i>	<i>Putokazi 2</i>
frazemska inačica/ varijanta (145)	frazemska inačica (146) frazemska	frazemska inačica (117)	frazemska inačica (178)
frazemski sinonim/ istoznačnica (145)	istoznačnica/ frazemski sinonim (147)	sinonimni frazem (117)	frazemski sinonim (178)
frazemski antonim (145)	frazemski antonim (147)	antonimni frazem (117)	frazemski antonim (179)

3.5. Terms at the orthographical level

In contemporary Croatian orthography and spelling manuals, there is a dilemma about using the terms *dvotočje/dvotočka* and *trotičje/trotička* when referring to punctuation marks, which has also been addressed in scientific papers in the field of linguistics (cf. Bagdasarov 2008). Babić, Ham, and Moguš (2005: 61), and Babić and Moguš (2010: 95, 96) use the terms *dvotočje* and *trotičje* in their orthography and spelling manuals, and these terms were recorded in the Teaching Program (1994: 156). Badurina, Marković, and Mićanović (2008: 74, 84) and the authors of *Hrvatski pravopis* published by the Institute of Croatian Language and Linguistics (2013: 100, 101) prefer the terms *dvotočka* and *trotička*, confirmed in the subject Curriculum (2019: 155), which in this context follows the current orthography and spelling manual published by the Institute of Croatian Language and Linguistics approved for school use. It seems that the terms *dvotočje* and *trotičje* are slowly being suppressed from use even though no agreement has yet been reached on their normative status. Since these terms have been affirmed in the Croatian linguistic tradition and are also formally uniform with the related word derivatives (cf. Nemeth-Jajić, 2022), the justification of their suppression can be questioned. Preferred terms in primary

school textbooks are *dvotočka* and *trotočka* (cf. Nemeth-Jajić and Božanić 2022) and the same terms are preferred in all analyzed high school textbooks. Therefore, the dilemma about the use of the terms for these two punctuation marks has been fully resolved in the educational context, in accordance with the Institute's orthography and spelling manual.

Various terms have been used for a punctuation mark containing a semicolon (;), such as *točka-zarez*, *točka sa zarezom*, *točka i zarez*, especially in older orthography and spelling manuals (cf. Mamić and Lukenda (1992). In recent manuals, the preferred term is *točka sa zarezom* (Babić, Ham, and Moguš 2005: 13; Babić and Moguš 2010: 111; Jozić 2013: 100), which is also found in the Curriculum (2019: 155), but not in the orthography and spelling manual written by Badurina, Marković, and Mićanović (2008: 62), which prefer the term *točka-zarez*. Primary school textbooks uniformly use the term *točka sa zarezom* (cf. Nemeth-Jajić and Božanić 2022), which has also been confirmed in all high school textbooks.

Dilemmas also arise when using a term for a letter omission mark ('). In earlier manuals, the preferred term was *apostrof* (cf. Mamić and Lukenda 1992), while more recent manuals (Babić, Ham, and Moguš 2005: 13; Babić and Moguš 2010: 111; Jozić, 2013: 110) give preference to the term *izostavnik*, which has also been recorded in the Curriculum (2019: 171). Both are admitted terms in Badurina, Marković, and Mićanović (2008: 105), but they give preference to *apostrof*. Primary school textbooks alternate between the two terms (cf. Nemeth-Jajić and Božanić 2022). As for high school textbooks, the term for this punctuation mark appears in two of the four textbooks (*Hrvatski jezik i književnost 2*;⁴ *Lica riječi 2*: 273), which both use *izostavnik*, thus following the opinion of the majority of Croatian linguists on the term for this punctuation mark.

Similar to primary school textbooks (cf. Nemeth-Jajić and Božanić 2022), high school textbooks (*Fon fon 3*: 172; *Hrvatski jezik i književnost 3*: 292; *Lica riječi 4*: 13; *Putokazi 3*: 70) also accepted the proposal of the Institute's manual (Jozic 2013: 76, 78) to distinguish between *kratice*, which are shortened forms of one or more words, not capitalized, not declinable, and written with a full stop, from *pokrate*, which are capitalized and declinable, and written without a full stop, except for Latin-borrowed ones. All textbooks approved for use in Croatian schools, as well as the Curriculum, are uniform regarding this issue (2019: 163).

4. Conclusion

The research on the terminological uniformity of Croatian language textbooks has shown that there are still many critical points which reflect the inconsistencies in the use of linguistic terms. The terms used in primary school textbooks are significantly more uniform than in previous textbooks, yet a complete uniformity has not been achieved. In high school textbooks, a higher level of inconsistency has been found, which is understandable given the extensiveness of the teaching content. The highest level of uniformity in all textbooks has been recorded at the orthographical and spelling level. Dilemmas about using terms for certain punctuation marks were resolved by opting for the terms *dvotočka*, *trotočka*, and *točka sa zarezom*. At the

4 The terms are not listed in the textbook, but in the digital content featuring the set of textbooks.

phonological level, there are dilemmas about using the terms *naglasna duljina* or *naglasna dužina* and about naming certain sound alternations, and a more significant synonymy has been observed in the classification of sounds according to certain criteria, where most often admitted terms are both the Croatian term and the adapted loanword. The lack of agreement among linguists over (not) distinguishing between the terms *otvornik* and *samoglasnik* as well as *zatvornik* and *suglasnik* has led to terminological inconsistencies, but this is not the only such example. The discussion about the terms *lice* and *osoba* has resulted in a different and inconsistent use of the terms *glagolsko lice* and *glagolska osoba* as well as *osobna/lična zamjenica*. At the morphological level, different terms for interjections have been found. Inconsistencies in word formation are mainly related to using double terms with the same meaning or different terms that represent pairs of synonyms, and there is a frequent alternation between the name of Croatian origin and the adapted loanword. At the syntactic level, differences have been observed in the terms used to denote sentence parts and the terms at the levels of syntagm, word junctions, and sentences. At the lexicological level, the greatest deviation has been recorded in the terms referring to the meaning of words and the relationships between words, and there are inconsistencies in the use of linguistic terms related to phrasemes.

This research has revealed terminological dilemmas in both primary and secondary school textbooks which have not been resolved despite all the efforts of Croatian linguists aiming to systematize professional terminology, and it can be noticed that the textbooks deviate to a greater or lesser extent from the curriculum guidelines and proposals of the Institute's language manuals approved for use in schools. Thus, there are differences in the use of linguistic terms in primary school textbooks, then in secondary school textbooks, and finally between primary and secondary school textbooks. Moreover, a comparison of language manuals reveals a number of inconsistencies.

Many inconsistently used terms have been confirmed at almost all considered linguistic levels: phonological, morphological, word formation, syntactic and lexicological. This is not negligible and indicates a serious problem regarding the (im)possibility to systematize textbook linguistic terminology at the national level. It is evident that textbook discourse is mostly slow to accept novelties that are trying to impose themselves as potential unique choices and that it reflects traces of the development of linguistic terminology with deeply rooted solutions within the Croatian grammar tradition. Therefore, there is a long and uncertain path ahead of linguists, textbook authors, and educational policy makers trying to create a uniform Croatian linguistic terminology, including a large part of the textbook discourse.

References

- Babić, S. 1963. "Duljina ili dužina?" *Jezik*, 11, 2, 62–63.
- Babić, S. 1995. "Vraćeni nazivi osoba i osobne zamjenice". *Jezik*, 43, 4, 160–160.
- Babić, S. 2002. *Tvorba riječi u hrvatskome književnome jeziku*. Zagreb: Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti – Nakladni zavod Globus.
- Babić, S.; Ham, S.; Moguš, M. 2005. *Hrvatski školski pravopis*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Babić, S.; Moguš, M. 2010. *Hrvatski pravopis usklađen sa zaključcima Vijeća za normu hrvatskoga standardnog jezika*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Badurina, L.; Marković, I.; Mićanović, K. 2008. *Hrvatski pravopis*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Bagdasarov, A. 2008. "O neujednačenosti inačičnih ostvaraja u jezikoslovnim radovima". *Fluminensia*, 20, 1, 55–60.
- Ham, S. 1998. "Osoba, osobno, neosobno". *Jezik*, 46, 3, 94–103.
- Ham, S. 2002. "O licu osobe, posljednji put". *Jezik*, 49, 2, 66–71.
- Ham, S. 2017. *Školska gramatika hrvatskoga jezika*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Hudeček, L.; Mihaljević, M. 2019. *Hrvatska školska gramatika*. Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje.
- Hudeček, L.; Mihaljević, M.; Vidović, D. 2006. "Sinonimni parovi i nizovi u temeljnome jezikoslovnom nazivlju". *Filologija*, 46/47, 101–122.
- Jelaska, Z. 2007. "Teorijski okviri jezikoslovnemu znanju u novom nastavnom programu hrvatskoga jezika za osnovnu školu". In Marijana Češi and Mirela Barbaroša-Šikić (Eds.), *Komunikacija u nastavi hrvatskoga jezika: Suvremeni pristupi poučavanju u osnovnim i srednjim školama* (pp. 9–33). Jastrebarsko i Zagreb: Naklada Slap i Agencija za odgoj i obrazovanje.
- Josić, Lj. 2011. "Obradba čestica u suvremenim gramatika hrvatskoga jezika". *Jezik*, 58, 7–16.
- Jozić, Ž. (Ed.). 2013. *Hrvatski pravopis*. Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje.
- Lazić, D.; Mihaljević, M. 2020. "O nekim problemima morfološkoga nazivlja". In Milica Mihaljević, Lana Hudeček i Željko Jozić (Eds.), *Hrvatsko jezikoslovno nazivlje* (pp. 137–167). Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje.
- Mamić, M. 1997. *Jezični savjeti*. Zadar: Zadarska tiskara.
- Mamić, M.; Lukenda, M. 1992. "Brozovo pravopisno nazivlje". *Jezik*, 40, 2, 41–48.
- Mihaljević, M. 1984. "O terminološkom nizu: leksem – riječ – termin – naziv – ime – znak – izraz". *Jezik*, 32, 2, 57–59.
- Mihaljević, M.; Horvat, M. 2007. "Glasovne promjene: nepostojano *a* i *e* (problematizacija naziva, definicija i međuodnosa glasovnih promjena)". *Rasprave*, 33, 289–304.
- Mihaljević, A.; Prce, M. 2014. "Glasovne promjene u udžbenicima hrvatskoga jezika". *Luč*, 2, 61–73.
- Ministarstvo znanosti i obrazovanja Republike Hrvatske. 2019. *Kurikulum nastavnog predmeta Hrvatski jezik za osnovne škole i gimnazije*. Zagreb: Ministarstvo znanosti i obrazovanja Republike Hrvatske.
- Ministarstvo kulture i prosvjete Republike Hrvatske. 1994. *Nastavni program za gimnazije*. Zagreb: Ministarstvo kulture i prosvjete Republike Hrvatske.
- Ministarstvo znanosti, obrazovanja i športa Republike Hrvatske. 2006. *Nastavni*

- plan i program za osnovnu školu*. Zagreb: Ministarstvo znanosti, obrazovanja i športa Republike Hrvatske.
- Nemeth-Jajić, J. 2022. "U prilog *dvotočju i trotočju*". *Jezik*, 69, 125–134.
- Nemeth-Jajić, J.; Božanić, P. 2022. "Jezikoslovni nazivi u suvremenim udžbenicima hrvatskoga jezika". *Školski vjesnik*, 71, 1, 124–138.
- Silić, J.; Pranjković, I. 2007. *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika za gimnazije i visoka učilišta*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Težak, S. 1996. *Teorija i praksa nastave hrvatskoga jezika 1*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Tafra, B. 1996. "Bliskoznačni odnosi u leksiku". *Filologija*, 26, 73–84.
- Tafra, B. 2003. "Leksičke pogreške zbog sličnosti". *Govor*, 20, 1/2, 431–448.
- Tafra, B. 2018. Razgraničavanje istozačnosti i bliskoznačnosti. In Diana Stolac (Ed.), *Od fonologije do leksikologije: Zbornik radova u čast Mariji Turk* (pp. 341–356). Rijeka: Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Rijeci.
- Težak, S.; Babić, S. 2016. *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika: priručnik za osnovno jezično obrazovanje*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

Sources

High school textbooks

- Dujmović Markusi, D. 2021. *Fon-fon 4: udžbenik hrvatskoga jezika za četvrti razred gimnazije i četverogodišnjih strukovnih škola (140 sati godišnje)*. Zagreb: Profil Klett.
- Dujmović Markusi, D. 2022. *Fon-fon 1: udžbenik hrvatskoga jezika za prvi razred gimnazije i četverogodišnjih strukovnih škola (140 sati godišnje)*. Zagreb: Profil Klett.
- Dujmović Markusi, D.; Španjić, T. 2022. *Fon-fon 2: udžbenik hrvatskoga jezika za drugi razred gimnazije i četverogodišnjih strukovnih škola (140 sati godišnje)*. Zagreb: Profil Klett.
- Dujmović Markusi, D.; Španjić, T. 2022. *Fon-fon 3: udžbenik hrvatskoga jezika za treći razred gimnazije i četverogodišnjih strukovnih škola (140 sati godišnje)*. Zagreb: Profil Klett.
- Glušac, M.; Zrinjan, S. 2021. *Lica riječi 4: udžbenik iz hrvatskoga jezika za četvrti razred gimnazije i četverogodišnjih strukovnih škola (140 sati godišnje)*. Zagreb: Alfa.
- Marčan, T. 2019. *Putokazi 1: udžbenik za hrvatski jezik, književnost i komunikacijske vještine 21. stoljeća za 1. razred strukovne škole na razini 4.2*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Marčan, T.; Grubišić Belina, L. 2020. *Putokazi 2: udžbenik za hrvatski jezik, književnost i komunikacijske vještine 21. stoljeća za 2. razred strukovne škole na razini 4.2 i gimnazije*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Marčan, T.; Grubišić Belina, L. 2021. *Putokazi 3: udžbenik za hrvatski jezik, književnost i komunikacijske vještine 21. stoljeća za 3. razred strukovne škole na razini 4.2 i gimnazije*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Marčan, T.; Grubišić Belina, L. 2021. *Putokazi 4: udžbenik za hrvatski jezik, književnost i komunikacijske vještine 21. stoljeća za 4. razred strukovne škole na razini 4.2 i gimnazije*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Sajko, N.; Zrinjan, S.; Glušac, M. 2019. *Lica riječi 1: udžbenik iz hrvatskoga jezika za prvi razred gimnazije i četverogodišnjih strukovnih škola (140 sati godišnje)*. Zagreb: Alfa.
- Serdarević, K.; Čubrić, M.; Gligorić, I. M.; Medić, I.; Popović, J. 2019. *Hrvatski jezik i*

- književnost 1: integrirani udžbenik hrvatskoga jezika za prvi razred gimnazije.* Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Serdarević, K.; Čubrić, M.; Gligorić, I. M.; Medić, I. 2021. *Hrvatski jezik i književnost 2: integrirani udžbenik hrvatskoga jezika za drugi razred gimnazije.* Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Serdarević, K.; Čubrić, M.; Gligorić, I. M.; Medić, I. 2021. *Hrvatski jezik i književnost 3: integrirani udžbenik hrvatskoga jezika za treći razred gimnazije.* Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Serdarević, K.; Čubrić, M.; Gligorić, I. M.; Medić, I. 2021. *Hrvatski jezik i književnost 4: integrirani udžbenik hrvatskoga jezika za četvrti razred gimnazije.* Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Zrinjan, S.; Glušac, M. 2020. *Lica riječi 2: udžbenik iz hrvatskoga jezika za drugi razred gimnazije i četverogodišnjih strukovnih škola (140 sati godišnje).* Zagreb: Alfa.
- Zrinjan, S. 2020. *Lica riječi 3: udžbenik iz hrvatskoga jezika za treći razred gimnazije i četverogodišnjih strukovnih škola (140 sati godišnje).* Zagreb: Alfa.

JEZIKOSLOVNI NAZIVI U SUVREMENIM SREDNJOŠKOLSKIM UDŽBENICIMA HRVATSKOGA JEZIKA

Sažetak

Cilj ovoga rada bio je istražiti koliko su suvremeni srednjoškolski udžbenici hrvatskoga jezika, izrađeni prema smjernicama predmetnoga kurikula iz 2019. godine, usklađeni u uporabi jezikoslovnoga nazivlja. Dosadašnja su istraživanja ustvrdila znatnu razinu neujednačenosti i nedosljednosti pri uporabi jezikoslovnoga nazivlja, poglavito u vidu pojave dvojnih naziva, odnosno sinonimnih parova i nizova. Kako bi se stekla cjelovita slika o usklađenosti jezikoslovnih naziva u suvremenim udžbenicima hrvatskoga jezika, što pruža uvid u načine oblikovanja udžbeničkoga diskursa, istraživanje je provedeno u dvjema fazama, a ovaj je rad dio druge faze istraživanja. Prva faza istraživanja obuhvatila je suvremene osnovnoškolske udžbenike hrvatskoga jezika od petoga do osmoga razreda. Druga faza istraživanja, koja se prikazuje u ovome radu, obuhvaća suvremene srednjoškolske udžbenike hrvatskoga jezika, odnosno četiri udžbenička kompleta, što je ukupno 16 udžbenika. Rezultati istraživanja uspoređeni su s nazivljem u predmetnom kurikulu za Hrvatski jezik (*Kurikulum nastavnoga predmeta Hrvatski jezik za osnovne škole i gimnazije*) iz 2019., nekadašnjim *Nastavnim programom za gimnazije* iz 1994. te sa suvremenim školskim jezičnim priručnicima, točnije školskim gramatikama i pravopisima. Analiza je provedena razmatranjem udžbeničkoga jezikoslovnog nazivlja na fonološkoj, morfološkoj i rječotvornoj, sintaktičkoj, leksikološkoj i pravopisnoj razini. U odnosu na osnovnoškolske udžbenike, u srednjoškolskim su udžbenicima uočene znatnije nepodudarnosti prilikom imenovanja jezikoslovnih naziva na svim razmatranim razinama, izuzev pravopisne razine na kojoj je primjetna ujednačenost nazivlja na objema obrazovnim razinama. Osim neusklađenosti među udžbenicima, razvidna je i neusklađenost u odnosu na predmetni kurikulum i odobrene jezične priručnike, što se najčešće ogleda u uporabi terminoloških parova. Međutim, određeni su različiti nazivi rezultat teorijskih nedoumica koje još uvijek nisu razriješene.

ključne riječi: jezikoslovno nazivlje, hrvatski jezik, kurikulum, nastava hrvatskoga jezika, udžbenici

Tables

- Table 1. Research sample – high school textbooks
- Table 2. Terms for sounds according to different classification criteria
- Table 3. Inconsistent terms at the level of phoneme and grapheme
- Table 4. Terms referring to post-accent length and accentual unit
- Table 5. Inconsistent terms for sound alternations
- Table 6. Terms for particles and interjections
- Table 7. Terms that include the component 'lice'/'osoba'
- Table 8. Inconsistent terms at the level of word formation
- Table 9. Terminological differences at the level of sentence parts
- Table 10. Terminological differences at the level of word junction and syntagm
- Table 11. Terminological differences at the level of sentence
- Table 12. Terminological differences in terms that denote relationships between words and the meaning of words
- Table 13. Terminological differences related to phrasemes