

LINGUISTIC FUNCTIONS OF THE VOCATIVE AS A MORPHOLOGICAL, SYNTACTIC AND PRAGMATIC-SEMANTIC CATEGORY

Glušac, Maja; Mikić Čolić, Ana

Source / Izvornik: **Jezikoslovlje**, 2017, 18, 447 - 472

Journal article, Published version

Rad u časopisu, Objavljena verzija rada (izdavačev PDF)

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:142:855081>

Rights / Prava: [Attribution 3.0 Unported](#)/[Imenovanje 3.0](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2023-06-03**



FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET
SVEUČILIŠTE JOSIPA JURJA STROSSMAYERA U OSIJEKU

Repository / Repozitorij:

[FFOS-repository - Repository of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences Osijek](#)





DIGITALNI AKADEMSKI ARHIVI I REPOZITORIJI



JEZIKOSLOVLJE

18.3 (2017)



JEZIKOSLOVLJE

18.3 (2017)

UDK 811.163.42(05)

ISSN 1331-7202 (Tisak)
ISSN 1848-9001 (Online)

GLAVNI UREDNIK – EDITOR-IN-CHIEF – CHEFREDAKTEUR

Mario Brdar

UREDNIŠTVO – EDITORIAL BOARD – REDAKTION

Branimir Belaj
(Osijek)

Wayles Browne
(Ithaca)

Loretana Farkaš
(Osijek)

Hans Jürgen Heringer
(Augsburg)

Vladimir Karabalić
(Osijek)

Zoltán Kövecses
(Budapest)

Branko Kuna
(Osijek)

Milan Mihaljević
(Zagreb)

Marija Omazić
(Osijek)

Klaus-Uwe Panther
(Hamburg)

Višnja Pavičić Takač
(Osijek)

Ana Pintarić
(Osijek)

Mojca Pecman
(Paris)

Ljiljana Šarić
(Oslo)

Milena Žic Fuchs
(Zagreb)

TAJNIŠTVO – EDITORIAL SECRETARIES – REDAKTIONSSASSISTENZ

Tanja Gradečak-Erdeljić

Gabrijela Buljan
(Osijek)

Goran Tanacković Faletar

OSIJEK

UREDNIČKI SAVJET
BOARD OF CONSULTING EDITORS
WISSENSCHAFTLICHER BEIRAT

Vilmos Ágel (Kassel)	Ferenc Kiefer (Budapest)
Johan van der Auwera (Antwerp)	Katalin É. Kiss (Budapest)
Antonio Barcelona Sanchez (Córdoba)	Ronald W. Langacker (San Diego)
Michael Barlow (Auckland)	Elisabeth Leiss (München)
Douglas Biber (Flagstaff)	Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (Łódź)
Frank Brisard (Antwerp)	Lachlan Mackenzie (Lisbon/Amsterdam)
Bernard Comrie (Santa Barbara)	Christian Mair (Freiburg)
Dmitrij Dobrovolskij (Moskva)	Jan Nuyts (Antwerp)
Adele Goldberg (Princeton)	István Nyomárkay (Budapest)
Susanne Göpferich (Gießen)	Ingo Plag (Düsseldorf)
Elżbieta Górska (Warszawa)	Frans Plank (Konstanz)
Jadranka Gvozdanović (Heidelberg)	Günter Radden (Hamburg)
Hubert Haider (Salzburg)	Gerhard Ressel (Trier)
Peter Harder (København)	Francisco J. Ruiz de Mendoza (Logroño)
Martin Haspelmath (Jena)	Mark Sebba (Lancaster)
Regina Hessky (Budapest)	Ken-ichi Seto (Osaka)
Laura Janda (Chapel Hill/Oslo)	Dan I. Slobin (Berkeley)
Dunja Jutronić (Maribor)	Elżbieta Tabakowska (Krakow)
Damir Kalogjera (Zagreb)	Linda Thornburg (Kendal)
Francis Katamba (Lancaster)	Jef Verschueren (Antwerp)
Suzanne Kemmer (Houston)	Li Wei (London)

SADRŽAJ – TABLE OF CONTENTS – INHALTSVERZEICHNIS

18.3 (2017)

EDITORIAL NOTE

379

IN MEMORIAM

Susanne Göpferich-Görnert
(17.03. 1965 – 30.10. 2017)

381

ČLANCI – ARTICLES – ARTIKEL

ALEXANDER ANDRASON – MAWANDE DLALI

The EK construction in Xhosa:

A cognitive account

383-421

SHALA BARCZEWSKA

Applications of conceptual blending: Headlines and their implicatures

423-446

MAJA GLUŠAC – ANA MIKIĆ ČOLIĆ

Linguistic functions of the vocative as a morphological, syntactic and a semantic-pragmatic category

447-472

MARINA GRUBIŠIĆ

Addressing the notions of convention and context in social media research

473-497

HRISZTALINA HRISZTOVA

Strukturbezogene Klassifikation bulgarischer Sprichwörter:

Ein erster Schritt zu einer systematischen Beschreibung der

textsortenspezifischen syntaktischen Merkmale von Sprichwörtern

499-518

NIKOLINA MILETIĆ

Probleme der deutschen Lexikographie

519-537

KUZMIĆ - ŠIVAK

Fonološko-morfološke osobenosti turopoljskih povijesnih dokumenata 17. stoljeća

539-554

PRIKAZI KNJIGA – BOOK REVIEWS – BUCHBESPRECHUNGEN

ANA KEGLEVIĆ

Litovkina, Anna T: *Teaching proverbs and anti-proverbs*
555-557

MATIJA ZORIĆ

Ziková, Markéta, Čaha, Pavel, Dočekal, Mojmir (eds.): *Slavic languages in the perspective of formal grammar*
558-563

ZAHVALA – ACKNOWLEDGMENTS - DANKSAGUNG

565

UPUTE ZA AUTORE – GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS – HINWEISE FÜR AUTOREN

567-575



UDC 811.163.42'366.542=111

Original scientific article

Received on 16.03. 2017

Accepted for publication on 29.11. 2017

Maja Glušac
Ana Mikić Čolić
University of Osijek

Linguistic functions of the vocative as a morphological, syntactic and pragmatic-semantic category

The vocative as a pragmatic-semantic category, i.e. vocativeness as an appellative category, is a means of expressing many linguistic functions. From the functional point of view, vocative expressions are never monosemic, i.e. they do not serve only a conative function, as explicitly defined in the literature, but they very frequently perform other linguistic functions as well – especially the emotive function (expressing speaker's feelings, personal attitude towards the interlocutor) and the poetic one. As a means of establishing and maintaining communication, i.e. checking the functioning of the communication channel, vocative expressions perform a phatic function as well. The referential function of vocative expressions is confined to the subject and predicative role in the language of folk poetry, and this paper shows that such a role in the contemporary Croatian language can also be performed by vocative expressions in the role of predicate adjuncts and adverbials with certain verbs.

Key words: linguistic functions; the vocative; appellativeness, conativeness, expressiveness.

1. Introduction

In the Croatian language, the vocative, along with the nominative, is considered an independent case. Such definition of case as a morphological category is based on the "relation to other words in the sentence" (Barić et al. 1997: 102), i.e. on the degree of integration into the structure of the sentence. This shifts the basis of differentiation between dependent and independent cases from the morphological



to the syntactic level, since case is simultaneously a syntactic-semantic category. According to this criterion, the vocative and the nominative are also defined as independent or direct cases (as opposed to dependent or oblique cases), with the vocative additionally considered the most independent case (Silić & Pranjković 2005: 199, 200). Other discussions of features of independent cases, particularly the comparisons of the nominative and the vocative, i.e. their mutual differences, are also primarily based on their syntactic role: “The nominative is considered an independent case, since it primarily occupies the position of the sentential subject, and the vocative is an independent case since it remains outside the grammatical structure of a sentence” (Piper et al. 2005: 120). The difference between the nominative and the vocative is, however, more frequently explained with recourse to their linguistic functions. The nominative is used for naming in narration and description, and the vocative for naming in direct reference, for the purpose of addressing and calling (Babić et al. 1991: 487–488, Barić et al. 1997: 102). In addition, the vocative is marked by specific intonation.¹

The specific nature of the vocative as a case is also reflected in the localist approaches, which consider the vocative incapable of functioning as a secondary functional category,² as well as in the structuralist approach where the vocative does not feature in the division of cases into central and peripheral ones, and is therefore placed outside of the schema in the Croatian case system.³ In a similar vein, one can observe interpretations which disqualify the vocative as a “true” case,⁴ being placed in the nominal paradigm solely by virtue of being one of the

¹ Cf. Zwicky (1974), Sonnenhauser & Hanna (2013: 7–9, 15).

Sonnenhauser & Hanna conclude the following concerning the importance of intonation for vocative expressions: “However, intonational marking indeed plays an important role. It is a feature that manifests itself at the utterance level and thus applies to both morphologically marked and morphologically non-marked vocatives.” (Sonnenhauser & Hanna 2013: 8).

² Anderson comments on the subject: “The four secondary functor categories are analyzed in terms of presence/absence of two features with an obvious spatial interpretation: LOC is a place, ABL is a place that is also a source, ERG is a source that is not a place (it is the ‘source of the action’), and ABS is neither. There appears to be no obvious place for VOC in such a system.” (Anderson 2004: 460).

³ Cf. Ivić (1983: 197–205), Piper et al. (2005: 120), Jakobson (2008).

⁴ For example, Jagić (1982 [1865]: 10) argues that the vocative is “no case in the strict sense (...), therefore requires no definition.” The issue is also addressed by Isačenko: “Der Vokativ ist eigentlich gar kein ‘Kasus’, wenn man unter der Kasusform den Ausdruck einer syntaktischen Beziehung zu anderen Wörtern versteht. Der Vokativ drückt nämlich keinerlei syntaktische Beziehung aus, er ist eine in die Rede eingeschobene ‚Anredeform‘ mit deutlicher Appellfunktion.” (Isačenko 1962: 83 quoted after Sonnenhauser & Hanna 2013: 4) Compare also Moro (2003: 253–254).



forms a noun can have, and not by virtue of being its case in the true sense of the word (Belić 1958: 107).⁵ Although Brozović is also prone to doubt that the vocative is a true case, he does eventually conclude that “the vocative is indeed not a ‘true’ case according to semantic and syntactic criteria, nor is it one from a viewpoint of the theory of word classes, it is one according to word formational and formal morphological criteria” (Brozović 1999: 176).

The vocative in Croatian has its case endings, which undeniably makes it a morphological category. However, it is in the very definition of the vocative as case that one points to its syntactic independence and functional peculiarities, as well as to a prominent communicative sinsemantic feature and the related necessary contextual and/or situational involvement (Pranjković 2002). The focus of studying the vocative and vocative expressions is (or should be) directed towards its syntactic-pragmatic functionality, and the suprasentential/textual level should be adopted as the starting point of a description.⁶ What speaks in additional support of this is the fact that it is precisely the communicative function of the vocative⁷ that is quoted as the argument behind the morphological/formal equation of the vocative with the nominative (Badurina 2010: 6). In this respect, some approaches speak of the categorial meaning of vocativeness, seen as a broader than that of the vocative, whereby “the notion of vocativeness is not limited by morphological capacity of many nouns to have a specific morphological form to mark the vocative” (Piper et al. 2005: 654). The grammatical form of vocativeness can, namely, be a vocative expression made up of a noun (in the morphological form of the vocative or the nominative), a vocative sentence, or an autonomous part of a sentence, i.e. the vocative in a narrow sense (Piper et al. 2005: 650). Such an approach enables an analysis of vocative expressions even in languages where the vocative is not a morphological category.

Since “no other case is spoken of in relation to linguistic functions and figures of speech” (Rišner 2006: 132), the present paper aims to explore the possibility of using vocative expressions in the performance of linguistic functions determined with respect to the six parts of the communicative process:⁸ the conative function

⁵ Belić (1959: 107) uses Fortunatov and his followers who call the vocative *the vocative* or *calling form of a word*, which represents nothing more than an interjection used in calling, masked in a sound form of a name or form of address.

⁶ Cf. Pranjković (2002), Badurina (2007, 2010).

⁷ On communicative functions of the vocative in literary works see Ljubibratić (1987), Stolac (2005, 2006), Vlastelić (2013).

⁸ Cf. Jakobson (2008: 105–116).



(orientation to the recipient), the emotive function (orientation to the sender), the phatic function (orientation to the contact), the poetic function (orientation to the message), the referential function (orientation to the context) and the metalinguistic function (orientation to the code). The paper was inspired by a comment that the loss of the vocative as a separate grammatical (morphological) category results from its “weak functional effect”, but that it is kept where it is “semantically enriched, i.e. where it does not solely serve the purpose of calling” and in such cases “usually expresses the speaker’s attitude towards the interlocutor” (Junković 1972: 130). Considering that it was Jakobson (2008: 111) who hinted that the conative function “finds its purest grammatical expression in the vocative and the imperative,” and had thereby marked the vocative as one of the basic means of fulfilling the conative function, the claim regarding a weak functional efficiency of the vocative comes into question. Moreover, the second part of Junković’s claim invites the necessity of viewing vocative expressions as means of serving not only the conative function, but other linguistic functions as well, particularly the emotive one. The importance of the vocative and its direct relationship with the speech act is reflected in the contention that it is precisely this that is the basic function of the vocative and its “raison d’être” (Pranjković 2013: 17). Furthermore, descriptions of the vocative in relation to figures of speech also call for an analysis of the poetic function of vocative expressions, while the sinsemantic communicative feature of the vocative, i.e. the fact that “it does not convey a real message” (Silić & Pranjković 2005: 242) can be interpreted by a lack of a referential function. One can, however, not generalize this, if one takes into consideration vocative expressions which can surface in the sentential structure as dependent/obligatory sentential constituents. Since it is impossible to observe linguistic functions in isolation, each one individually, it is necessary to view them interactionally, since the structure of the message first and foremost depends on the dominant function (Jakobson 2008: 109). The analysis of linguistic functions therefore starts from the conative function as the basic function, also crucially present in vocative expressions used to perform other linguistic functions, with the emotive function given special emphasis.

Based on available research on the vocative in linguistic literature, the paper aims to systematize the description of the linguistic functions of the vocative as a morphological, syntactic and pragmatic-semantic category in the Croatian language. The examples used to corroborate the linguistic functions under investigation have been extracted from the Croatian Language Repository and the hrWac electronic corpus.



2. Linguistic functions of the vocative as a morphological category

The idiosyncrasy of the vocative is confirmed by its morphological features in declension paradigms,⁹ although Samardžija (1986: 15) claims that “the vocative presents no particular problems on the morphological level, leaving aside the fact that it is in fact only masculine and feminine nouns that have the vocative.” This would thus mean that neuter nouns do not, or cannot have a vocative form, which is incorrect. Their vocative form equals the nominative one (which could mean that the nominative form has the function of the vocative). The same interpretation applies to plural vocative expressions, which are equal to the nominative ones. Despite the existence of relatively strict rules in the declension system on the distribution of (vocative) case endings in masculine and feminine nouns, there may be “particular problems” in the form of affixal duality and reluctance in the choice of the vocative ending, as well as the ever-growing syncretism of the nominative and the vocative.¹⁰ One can use the same context to observe functional idiosyncrasies. Research into the use of vocative endings *-e* and *-o* in nouns of pejorative meaning (e.g. *propalica* ‘a bum’, *pijanica* ‘a drunk’), for example, confirm the relation between the degree of abuse and the ending, with the ending *-o* expressing a higher degree of abuse (Rišner 2006: 144). This would mean that the vocative forms *propalico* and *pijanico* activate the emotive function (in the pejorative sense) in comparison to the vocative forms *propalice* and *pijanice*.¹¹

Research into the use of vocative forms indicates an inclination towards both the stress pattern equation and the morphological-derivational equation with the nominative, with considerable differences in the range of vocative equation with the nominative in different dialects and local varieties of the Croatian language (Rišner 2006: 131).¹² The change of vocative endings *-e* and *-u* in masculine nouns,

⁹ Studying the morphological features of certain vocative expressions in French and German (the use of definite and indefinite article, or their absence, with the noun in the vocative) Schaden (2010: 180) also finds this *odd* case peculiar and concludes: “But one can see that these aspects are extremely messy, and that it will be difficult to come up with solid cross-linguistic generalizations on these aspects of vocatives.”

¹⁰ On vocative endings of feminine and masculine nouns see Težak (1990: 85–88). On equalization of the vocative with the nominative “in modern genres of popular culture and tendencies in urban vernaculars” see Žanić (2010).

¹¹ Vocative forms such as *strino jedna*, *babo jedna* (distinct pejorativeness) and *mamo*, *djedo* (distinct endearment) can also be interpreted in the light of enhanced emotiveness (Ljubibratić 1987: 70).

¹² Rišner (2006: 145) speaks of accentual and formational-morphological grammaticalization of the vocative and concludes that the vocative “falling accent is ever more frequently lost, mostly being



as well as the syncretism of the vocative and the nominative, particularly in first names and surnames, can also be observed from the functional perspective.¹³ The reasons for formal equation of the vocative and the nominative are attributed to conversational informality and leisurely communication, administrative practice, as well as to the inclination towards the simplification of the case (Badurina 2010: 4). If we start from the assumption that a vocative expression is never monosemic, i.e. that it fulfils an emotive function alongside the conative one, the afore mentioned reasons for the equation of the vocative and the nominative can be explained by recourse to the emotive function. For example, conversational informality presupposes an informal and personal relationship between interlocutors, and administrative practice an impersonal, formal and distanced relationship of the speaker towards the listener. The formal expression of the emphasized emotive function, i.e. the expression of respect of the speaker to the interlocutor is reflected in the orthographic convention of writing personal pronouns *vi* and *ti* with an initial capital letter (*Vi* followed by the plural form in addressing an individual).

The use of nominative forms instead of the expected vocative ones can also have a poetic function, i.e. can serve as a stylistic instrument contributing to the linguistic characterization of a protagonist. For example, the novel *Kiklop* (*Cyclops*) features this practice as a means of emphasizing the German nationality of Kurt, the innkeeper: *Ah, znate, gospodin profesor* (*Ah, you know, Mister Professor*) (quoted. from Rišner 2006: 134). Whereas the loss of the vocative is, on the one hand, thus interpreted as a consequence of its weak functional effect (Junković 1972: 130), on the other hand it is claimed that there is “indeed no fear of the vocative getting “lost” or ‘vanishing’ from the language, the simple reason being that its communicative function is an undeniable confirmation of the communicative nature of language” (Badurina 2010: 6).

The use of the vocative form instead of the usual nominative one in names such as *Ana, Marija, Ljerka* also has a functional-stylistic effect: “*Ana, Marija, Ljerka*

maintained in older nouns, where speakers produce it automatically. Equalization of the vocative and the nominative form, started in names, also continues. As expected, it is considerably more frequent in the Zagreb and Rijeka area than it is in the area of Osijek.”

¹³ Individual descriptions do not explicitly mention functional reasons, but they are recognizable: Težak (1990: 88) leaves the choice of the nominative or vocative ending(s) in family names to the author or speaker, which could in certain contexts point to functional-stylistic peculiarities, while Šimpraga and Miloš (2014) conclude that the choice of ending depends on the suffix the last name ends in, i.e. its place in the sentence, the structure of the vocative expression, but also on various extralinguistic factors: the type of communication (formal/informal), the speaker’s dialect and his/her level of education.



shall, therefore, be emotively neutral, and *Ano, Marijo, Ljerko* stylistic or poetic vocatives (emotionally amplified or caused by requirements of rhyme and sound)” (Težak 1982: 40). With regards to linguistic functions, besides the conative function, such semantically enriched vocative forms exhibit both a pronounced emotive function (indicating the speaker’s emotional state) and a poetic function (being stylistically marked). A pronounced emotive function is also found in emotionally-enriched syncretic vocative expressions (i.e. nominative forms in the vocative function) used by speakers of Čakavian varieties and the regiolects and vernaculars based on the latter, regardless of the degree of conformity to Štokavian (Žanić 2010). For example, in obituaries and credits in Rijeka-based newspapers Žanić finds expressions such as *Boh, dobri naš nonić [Petar]* or *zadnje boh dragi naš nonić [Ivan]*. In Čakavian-Štokavian speeches with an Ikavian yat-reflex in the Rovinj region one finds confirmation for affective expressions such as *Dragi moj brat/čovik/junak!* or *Brižni moj siromah!*; in coastal Dalmatia and on Dalmatian islands one hears expressions such as *Je, dragi moj čovik, ta ti je izvrsna!*; *Nima meni do tebe, lipi moj čovik!...* (Žanić 2010). Literary works also make use of possibilities of functional-stylistic nuancing by the choice of the vocative/nominative ending.

- (1) *Ivica! Ivica! Ivica!* – *ciknu i vrisnu, zajeca i proplače ona... - Ja sam, Ivica, ja! Oh, tako je htjela sveta bogorodica, kojoj se ja molim dan i noć, da budeš ti danas spasitelj moj!... Ivica ... Ivica – šaputaše djevojčce zamrlim glasićem, privinuvši se uz pobjednika.* (A. Kovačić, *U registraturi*)

Ivica! Ivica! Ivica! – she yelled and screamed, sobbed and wept... - It is I, Ivica, I! Oh, Holy Virgin whom I pray to day and night wanted it to be so, that you should be my savior today!... Ivica ... Ivica – the wench whispered in a deadened voice, clinging to the winner¹⁴

Both possibilities are used in the same reply in the above example: the vocative form emphasizes directiveness and closeness in address, whereas the nominative form features a more imperative address with a visible exclamative character (Ljubibratić 1987: 69).

¹⁴ All translations, unless stated otherwise, were provided by the present authors (for illustrative purposes).



3. Linguistic functions of the vocative as a syntactic category

As mentioned above, the basic characteristic commonly associated with the vocative is its syntactic independence, which makes some approaches view the vocative as standing for the entire sentence and therefore not considered a case form (Belić 1958: 107).¹⁵ This characteristic is particularly emphasized in the description of the vocative as an asyndetic sentence (Katičić 2002: 167; Barić et al. 1997: 458), i.e. a special type of sentence (Silić & Pranjković 2005: 200),¹⁶ which has found reflection in orthography, calling for the separation of the vocative expression by a comma (regardless of its position in the sentence – initial, medial or final).

The syntactic independence and the orthographic rule whereby independent/free-standing sentential constituents¹⁷ are separated by a comma have led to the comparison of the vocative with interjections¹⁸ and modal words (Barić et al. 1997: 594). Furthermore, the functional similarity, i.e. directing of sentential perspective to the second person brings it in relation to the imperative (Silić & Pranjković 2005: 200; Pranjković 2013: 16; Katičić 2002: 73), questions and particles (Pranjković 2013: 16, 22). Due to their relation and interrelatedness, the three semantic categories of vocativeness, imperativeness and interrogativeness, are classified under the categorial complex of appellativeness, whose basic function lies

¹⁵ Belić (1958: 107) uses Brugmann's interpretations as examples.

¹⁶ Katičić (2002: 167) holds that the vocative as sentence is incorporated into an independent complex sentence, and Pranjković (2002: 102) concludes that "complex structures including reference should (...) be described as a special and specific kind of subordinated structures (...) at text level."

¹⁷ Regarding terminology, Pranjković comments that the term *samostalni rečenični član* (independent sentential constituent) is unclear, concessive and contradictory: "The term **samostalni** allows discussion of absence of any relationship with other units (e.g. sentences) and the term **član**, on the other hand, presupposes the existence of a syntactically relevant relationship. The term **samostalni rečenični član**, therefore, allows, and even suggests interpretation according to which what it designates, inexplicably, is an is not a member of the syntactic makeup." (Pranjković 2002: 99)

¹⁸ Numerous linguists pointed to the relationship of the vocative to interjections, e.g. Brugmann, Fortunatov and Belić (cf. Skljarov 1962: 388–389, quoted in Bulić 2014: 141), while Brozović (1999: 159) explicitly states that the vocative is "actually a affix-formed interjection, only technically made from a nominal declension base." The formal, syntactic and functional similarity of vocatives and interjections, as well as the fact that they often appear together is emphasized by Silić and Pranjković: "These words are similar to the forms of vocative (of address) since they often serve to establish contact between interlocutors, call the interlocutor to engage in a communicative act, thus making it not at all unusual for them to co-occur with the vocative, e.g. *Ej, Marko, dođi!* (the interjection *ej* and *oj* is often quoted with vocative forms as a kind of pointer to what is designated by the vocative." (Silić & Pranjković 2005: 259)



in drawing attention to the speaker, and the intention of acting upon the interlocutor and his behaviour (Piper et al. 2005: 649).

Although grammars explicitly maintain that the vocative cannot be a sentential constituent, i.e. cannot occupy any syntactic position in a sentence (Barić et al. 1997: 594; Silić & Pranjković 2005: 200; Težak & Babić 2005: 297), there are three exceptions to the rule, one of which is recorded in grammars, and the other two represented as possibilities. The vocative expression can thus be a sentence constituent in case of the stylistically marked or predicative role¹⁹ of the singular masculine vocative nouns “designating a person, or conceptualized as a person by such address” (Katičić 2002: 83). This use is characteristic to oral folk poetry and the works of famous poets “influenced by the forms of folk poetry” (Težak & Babić 2005: 297) due to matters of meter:²⁰

(2) *Štije knjigu starče Radoslave, knjigu štije, a suze proliva* (A. Kačić Miošić, *Razgovor ugodni naroda slovinskoga*)

‘A book readeth old man Radoslav, a book he readeth, spilling tears’

(3) *Kada li ih okrijepio starče, Sva se družba izljubila redom* (I. Mažuranić, *Smrt Smail-age Čengića*)

‘When the old man gave them nourishment, All the fellows greeted each

¹⁹ Skljarov argues that “the vocative is a case which contains the second person subject” and explicitly concludes that “the vocative (...) in the sentence is the subject (...)” (Skljarov 1962: 402). Such interpretations remained isolated and it is lately held that the vocative remains “out of the paradigm with respect to the category of person” (Junković 1972: 130), i.e. that “addressing does not stand in a direct syntactic relationship with any verb form regardless of the person this form is in” (Pranjković 2002: 101). Moreover, Skljarov (1962: 394–398) describes the forms of pronouns *ti* and *vi* as vocative, not nominative ones. In his opinion, the two pronouns have no form dedicated to the nominative. On the subject, Pranjković states: “With full acknowledgement of the interesting and stimulating nature of such reflections, I think it is necessary to say that they eventually have no odds of being accepted. Address by using these always and necessarily points to (second) person, or, more precisely, they inform of the message being sent, or is about to be sent, to the interlocutor(s) (...), but I do not believe that the claim that the person (second) is designated by the address can be defended.” (Pranjković 2002: 100–101). Apart from the subject and predicative role of the vocative, Skljarov (1962) also distinguishes the attributive role.

²⁰ Jagić states on the subject: “However, one should immediately note that it is not a true vocative, but the verse needed an extra letter, so how would a folk metter help itself but to relace the nominative form by an indifferent one, but one longer by a single letter? And it is there where the vocative form presents itself. That it is really so is clearly evidenced by those vocatives that do not grow by one single letter, and are therefore not needed in folk poetry, i.e. in other words, the replacement of the nominative with the so-called vocative is limited to the first declension.” (Jagić, 1982 [1865]: 11).



other.

- (4) *Misli jadan, da je gorski vuče, / Il još gorji brdjanski hajduče,...* (V. Korajac, *Humoristička djela*)
'Woe to him, he thought it was a mountain wolf / Or worse still an outlaw from the hills, ...'

Such use of vocative expressions lends itself to observation from a functional-stylistic viewpoint: by emphasizing the agent (ex. 2–3) and the action itself (ex. 4) the vocative expression is used to activate the referential function. The poetic function of such examples is also confirmed by their stylistic characterization, the latter being a case of a figure of construction, viz. antiptosis (Bagić 2015: 50), as well as a figure of diction, viz. paragoge (Bagić 2015: 234).

The second case involves the syntactic role of the vocative, which has been addressed in linguistic literature only of late. The received interpretations consider the vocative as "not being in direct syntactic relation with any verbal form, regardless of the person the form is in" (Pranjković 2002: 101), i.e. it can not be a verbal complement. This leads Samardžija to conclude that:

It is not the verb that opens a slot for the vocative as a syntactically independent constituent in the syntactic structure. It is not related in terms of valency to any verbal subclass and do not meet the conditions required of a morphosyntactic unit which would make it eligible for consideration as a complement in a valency theory framework. Samardžija (1986: 17)

However, the vocative expression in (5) cannot be approached if one accepts the abovementioned approach:

- (5) *...donio joj je prekrasan servis za dvanaest osoba, nazvao ju je mala moja papirnata ljepotice i više joj nije spominjao svoje protivljenje,...* (H. Hitrec, *Kolarovi*)
'... he brought her a beautiful 12-person dining set, called her *my little paper beauty* and said no more to her of his objection, ...'

The vocative expression used in this particular way has a role of the predicative adjunct to the verb *zvati*,²¹ and the vocative use instead of the nominative or the instrumental is "further limited to occasions where the addressee is not only named, but also referred to" (Vince 2010: 258). Such forms whose origin may be traced to indirect speech, do not exhibit a high degree of independence and are "better

²¹ The traditional approach "does not speak of the vocative as a case with verbs of incomplete meaning" (Vince 2010: 260).



integrated in the system of a sentence than both the reported speech and the typical vocatives serving the purpose of calling or addressing” (Bulić 2014: 147), illustrated by the absence of pause in pronunciation and separation by a comma, colon or hyphen in writing. The chief piece of evidence which proves the status of the vocatives a part of sentential structure (i.e. a complement), however, is the obligatoriness of its presence.

The third case features vocative expressions (ex. 6 – 8) as also dependent parts of the sentential structure – the vocative expression with the preposition *s* function as adverbials of manner (with a hint of means) with the verbs *oslovljavati* and *obraćati se* (Bulić 2014: 149).²²

- (6) ... *u rat sam otišao da bi ova zemlja bila slobodna, da na svakoj kući budu bar po dva hrvatska grba, i da više nitko nikoga i nikad ne oslovljava s »burazeru«!* (G. Tribuson, *Gorka čokolada*)

‘... and I went to war so that this country would be free, so that there would be at least two Croatian coats of arms on every house and so that no one would address anyone using (lit. with) 'bro'’

- (7) ...*da većina glasača nije glasovala za Josipovića, koji im se fin i uglađen obratio s kolegice i kolege, drugarice i drugovi.* (hrWac)

... that the majority of voters did not vote for Josipović, who, all polite and refined, referred to them as woman colleagues and colleagues, woman comrades and comrades.

- (8) *Oslovljava me s prijateljice moja draga i stvarno ja mislim da me on i vidi tako.* (hrWac)

He addresses me with my dear friend and I really think this is how he perceives me.

However, the examples above could also be interpreted as cases of complements to the two verbs, i.e. as predicative adjuncts. In any case, the obligatory/dependent status of vocative expressions used in this way is corroborated by the absence of comma and specific intonation, but also by the fact that these cases feature autosemantic forms (Silić & Pranjković 2005: 200). Should one accept the claim

²² Bulić argues that the origin of such expressions lie in the instrumental expression in the deep structure of the sentence: “The very preposition *sa* speaks in favour of this. It is well-known that no prepositions are used with the vocative and the nominative, which this particular example seems to counter. However, we can interpret this as an example of analytic declension, where the vocative form is used as a kind of fossilized unit, unopen to declension, with the preposition *sa* serving to provide the form with an instrumental meaning” (Bulić 2014: 149).



that vocative expressions in such contexts can be obligatory parts of the syntactic makeup, one can conclude that they then have a referential function, i.e. refer to the subject matter of the message.

4. Linguistic functions of the vocative as a pragmatic-semantic category

4.2. Linguistic functions of the vocative in literature

Previous research on the functionality of the vocative points to a multitude of various (sub)functions that vocative expressions can perform. The functions of vocativeness, imperativeness and interrogativeness as semantic categories of appellativeness can be supplemented by the function of directiveness (Piper et al. 2005: 649), corresponding to Jakobson's conative function. In general, one may also speak of the communicative function of the vocative (Badurina 2010: 3, Stolac 2005, 2006), whereas some analyses also distinguish the vocative function,²³ serving to call one or attract attention of a person. With regards to the function of vocative expressions, Pranjković maintains that it is better, at the syntactic level, “to speak of addressing than of the vocative, simply because one does not speak of other cases either at that particular level, but rather of their functions (e.g. of the subject, object, adverbial, rather than the nominative, accusative or locative)” (Pranjković 2002: 99). Such definition is unarguable, since addressing is indeed confirmed as one of the basic functions of the vocative. It is, however, only applicable if addressing is understood as a superordinate term., i.e. as the basic function of the vocative, present in the realization of other functions, e.g. addressing (sb.) with the aim of calling, or addressing (sb.) to establish communication, etc. An overview of previous research and descriptions of functions of vocative expressions points to synonymy (e.g. *obraćanje* i *dozivanje* ili

²³ The vocative function (of names) is described with respect to the referential function: “By the vocative function of names is meant their being used to attract the attention of the person being called or summoned. Once again, this function appears to be basic in the sense that it is not reducible to any other semiotic function, though the vocative, like the quasi-referential, utterance of a name may be paralinguistically modulated to give additional, mainly indexical, information.” (Lyons 1977: 217) The vocative function is thus divided into two basic functions: calls and addresses (cf. Zwicky 1974; Anderson 2004: 439). Schaden (2010: 182) considers this classification inadequate and distinguishes between three basic vocative functions: “to *identify* the addressee, to *predicate* a property on the addressee, or to *activate* the addressee.”



obraćanje i *oslovljavanje*), as well as the multitude of functions expressible by the vocative.

The literature overview yields the following functions of the vocative/vocative expressions:²⁴

1. calling: *ej, Jačica!* – *viknu ga starješina*. (hey, Jačica! – the elder called him); *O, Ivane!* – *poviče iza glasa*. (Oh, Ivan! – he cried with full might); *O, bijedni Yoriče!* (Alas, poor Yorick!) (Babić et al. 1991: 487–488; Težak & Babić 2005: 297; Rišner 2006: 133; Ljubibratić 1986: 70; Stolac 2005: 178)
2. addressing the interlocutor by name: *Baš si sila, Pirgo!* (You are something, Pirgo!); *Oduvijek me vukla vruća želja da s tobom, narode, porazgovaram*. (I have always had a burning desire to have a talk with you, people); *Što je novo, rođače?* (What's new, cousin?); *Mrak je, Regoču!* (It is dark, Regoč!); *Zdravo, Jože, župane vrijednih gorostasa* (Greetings, Jože, chieftain of mighty giants); *Ja sam ban, moja banice*. (I am the Banus, my lady Banus); *Što prodaješ, trgovčiću, u šarenom dućančiću?* (What do you sell, little seller, in your colourful store?); *Lovče, lovče, što si ulovio?* (Hunter, hunter, what have you caught?) (Silić & Pranjković 2005: 200; Babić et al. 1991: 487–488; Težak & Babić 2005: 297; Ljubibratić 1986: 71)
3. referring to the interlocutor (Babić et al. 1991: 487–488; Težak & Babić 2005: 297; Rišner, 2006: 132; Ljubibratić 1986: 70; Stolac, 2005: 179)
 - 3.1. as an invitation to participate in communication: *Ivane, reci što se dogodilo*. (Ivan, say what happened.); *Što ima novo, prijatelju?* (What's new, friend?); *Sve je to, dragi moj, već davno dogovoreno* (It has all been arranged long since, my dear); *Zdravo, pjesniče. Kako si? Dugo se nismo vidjeli*. (Hello, poet. How are you? I have not seen you for long time) (Silić & Pranjković 2005: 200; Rišner 2006: 133; Pranjković 2013: 15)
 - 3.2. with the role of singling the interlocutor from a group (Ljubibratić 1986: 71)
 - 3.3. as a reflection of the speaker's polite behaviour and following of norms – without a invitation to establish a speech act: *Dobra večer, gospodine Melikore. Oprostite, ovako sam banuo... Čujem, hodate mi nad glavom, pa rekoh sebi, hajde da mu pravimo društvo*. (Good evening, Mr. Melikor. Excuse me for barging in like this... I hear you walking over my head, and I tell myself, let us keep him company) (Rišner 2006: 133)

²⁴ All the examples have been borrowed from the abovementioned references.



4. naming in direct address: *Ševo, leti visoko!* (Fly high, lark!) (Barić et al. 1997: 102; Babić et al. 1991: 487–488)
5. invocation (opening)
 - 5.1 as a start to speaking/writing, invocation with a greeting: *Dobro jutro, gospone* (Good morning, sir!); *O zdravo, mladi gospodičić!* (O, hello, young squire!) (Stolac 2005: 179; Ljubibratić 1986: 71)
 - 5.2 during a dialogue when a new interlocutor joins the conversation, or there is a change of topic: *Hodmo onda, prijatelj! Ti vre znaš, Favorin, kakov posel zručen imaš.* (Let's go then, friend! You already know, Favorin, what kind of job you have.) (Stolac 2005: 178, 179)
6. call
 - 6.1 as a rhetorical interjection: *O Bože! Bože! ja moram poginuti...*; (Oh God! God! I must die...); *Crni dane, a crna sudbino!* (Oh dark day, and dark destiny!); *O drago more, tebi širim ruke!* (Oh, dear sea, I spread my arms towards you!) (Stolac 2005: 181; Ljubibratić, 1986: 74)
 - 6.2 as part of a rhetorical question: *Pravični Bože, kakvu strahovitu istinu človek ov srcu mojemu dopovedal je!* (Just God, what frighthening truth has this man told to my heart?); *Dokle ćeš najzad, Katilino, zloupotrebljavati naše strpljenje?* (How long will you, Katlina, abuse our patience?); *Ah, čijem si se zahvalila, tašta ljudska oholasti?* (Oh, why have you praised yourself, vain human pride?) (Stolac 2005: 181; Ljubibratić 1986: 74)
7. attraction of (the reader's or listener's) attention: *Znaš, kume...* (You know, mate); *Čujte, gospodine Adame...* (Listen, Mr. Adam...) (Rišner 2006: 134)
8. calling the interlocutor's attention to a part of the message: *Vi, domine Pisarovič, /.../ Vi, domine Koprinovič, /.../ Domine Jugovič, /.../ Gospon Veselkovič, /.../ Sused Vuksan, /.../ Smolko sused, /.../* (You, dominus Pisarovič, / You, dominus Koprinovič, /.../ Dominus Jugovič /.../ Mister Veselkovič, /.../ Neighbour Vuksan, /.../ Smolko neighbour) (Stolac 2005: 178; Ljubibratić 1986: 71)
9. expression of various feelings and personal attitude towards the interlocutor: *Golubo, Golubice, Golubičice moja, žalosnice stara – tepao joj je ganuto.*; (My dovey, dove, dovelet); *Bijedniče, mizerijo, kukavico, ništarijo, gadiš mi se!* (Wretch, misery, coward, scoundrel, you disgust me!); *Eh ti, moržu jedan!* (Oh, you, you walrus!); *O, dragi moj, ovca je vrlo dobra stvar.* (Oh, my dear, a sheep is a very good thing.) (Težak & Babić 2005: 297; Stolac 2005: 181); stylization:



Zar me ostavljate, ljubazni Eustahije? (Are you leaving me, kind Eustahije?); *Pokloni se, nakazni sine gospođe Bačve...* (Bow, freakish son of Lady Barrel); *No, šta je, mazo, vidiš li me?* (What is it, honey, can you see me?); *Obratite pozornost, propalice...* (Pay attention, bums...); *No, kako je, junače?* (Well, how is it going, hero?); *A tebi je zabavno, budalino, da to jedan šašavac zeza pukovnika?* (And you find it funny, dolt, that a simpleton should poke fun at a colonel?); (Rišner 2006: 134; Piper et al. 2005: 657); emotional experiencing: *Ustani, ljubljena moja, ljepotice moja...* (Rise my beloved one, my beauty.); *Oblaci nebeski, vječiti putnici!* (Clouds of the sky, eternal travellers!) (Ljubibratić 1986: 74–76)

10. checking of information flow in the communication process: *Vi, domine Pisarovič, /.../ Vi, domine Koprinovič, /.../ Domine Jugovič, /.../ Gospon Veselkovič, /.../ Sused Vuksan, /.../ Smolko sused, /.../* (You, dominus Pisarovič, /.../ You, dominus Koprinovič, /.../ Dominus Jugovič, /.../ Mister Veselkovič, /.../ Neighbour Vuksan, /.../ Smolko neighbour) (Stolac 2005: 178; Ljubibratić 1986: 71)
11. linguistic characterization of characters: *Ah, znate, gospodin profesor...* (Ah, you know, Mr. Professor...); *Jeste li ikada mislili da se vrtimo u krugu apsurdna, gospodin profesor...* (Have you ever thought that we are spinning in a circle of absurd, Mr. Professor...) (Rišner 2006: 134).

Certain functions serving to direct attention to a particular part of the communication process thus also represent Jakobson's linguistic function: the conative function (1–8), the emotive function (9), the phatic function (10), the poetic function (11). Since the conative function is explicitly determined as the basic function of vocative expressions, as proven by classifications of that function in the descriptions in the literature, we consider it an indispensable function in all vocative expressions. However, the emotive function is very frequently activated in numerous expressions,²⁵ even those aiming solely to name or call the interlocutor, since syntagmatic features can be used to mark/emphasize the emotional attitude of the speaker towards the interlocutor (e.g. their relationship differs in emotional effect if the speaker addresses the interlocutor by first name, only by surname, by title and surname, etc.). Vocative expressions as a means of expressing emotional

²⁵ Zwicky's (1974) observation speaks in favour of this: "What is unexpected is that vocative NPs in English are almost never neutral: they express attitude, politeness, formality, status, intimacy, or a role relationship, and most of them mark the speaker. As a result even though English is enormously rich in vocative NPs (...), *there is virtually no affectively neutral vocative* [emphasis added by M. G. and A. M. Č.]"



attitude of speaker towards interlocutor can be used to mark different feelings, ranging from positive ones (compassion, love, gentleness, closeness, affection, friendship, fondness, intimacy, concern, mourning, excitement, endearment, etc.) to negative ones (tension, anger, reprimand, protest, disapproval, dissatisfaction, loathing, mocking, underestimating, belittling, etc.).

4.2. *Emotive and poetic function of vocative expressions*

The vocative as a pragmatic-semantic category involves the conditioning of the choice of the vocative expression by the pragmatic relationship between interlocutors. The vocative expression is, therefore, influenced by the nature of the relationship between interlocutors (formal, semi-formal, friendly, family relationships, the degree of courtesy, age, gender, social status etc.). Since appellativeness as a category complex (Piper et al. 2005: 649) involves a tight relation between vocativeness, imperativeness and interrogativeness, the relatedness is also reflected with respect to the choice the vocative expression (vocative expressions are often accompanied by interjections, pronouns and second person verb forms, the imperative, or question words, cf. (25)). Under the assumption that every vocative expression (along with the conative function) necessarily presupposes the presence of the emotive function, i.e. the emotional reaction/intention/engagement of the speaker towards the interlocutor (from indifference to explicit emotionality), there are various means of expressing the emotive function/emotionality, viz. syntactic and syntagmatic peculiarities and the position of the vocative expression with respect to syntactic structure. These characteristics should, however, be observed interactionally. Moreover, apart from the conative function, one should also consider the fact that the means of performing the emotive function can also be considered stylemes, i.e. ways of performing the poetic function. The peculiarity of the vocative as the only case whose linguistic functions are explicitly addressed is also reflected in it being the only case also discussed in relation to figures of speech. Numerous figures of speech can be identified in the structure of vocative expressions, with vocative expressions themselves analysable as figures of speech. We shall, therefore, observe the function of vocative expressions with respect to their inclusion in K. Bagić's (2015) *Dictionary of Figures of Speech (Rječnik stilskih figura)*.

4.2.1. *Syntagmatic peculiarities of vocative expressions*

According to their degree of complexity, vocative expressions are divided into single-word (noun, pronoun, personal adjectival head), two-word (a nominal



followed by an attribute or apposition) and multi-word (a nominal followed by several attributes or a more complex attributive postmodifier, several nominals combined):

- (9) *O, Anice!* - *kliknu mladić, uhvativši je svojim bijelim i finim rukama za prstiće njezinih ruku.* (A. Kovačić, *U registraturi*)
 ‘Oh, Anica! - the young man shouted, catching her by the little fingers of her hands with his white and fine hands.’
- (10) *...mati skrsti ruke na trbuhu, pa se rasplače milo i uciviljeno. – Oj, tužni, tužni živote! Što je skrivila Bogu, da joj ne pruži nikakova veselja?* (S. Košutić, *S naših knjiga. Bijele tišine. Treća knjiga*)
 ‘...mother crossed her hands on the belly and started crying dearly and weepingly. - Oh, sad, sad life! What in God's name has she done, that He should grant her no joy?’
- (11) *Poštovani i dragi gospodine profesore, iznenadio me, i obradovao, Vaš članak o »mojoj malenkosti«, kako za se kažu veliki;...* (D. Tadijanović, *Sabrana pisma*)
 ‘Honoured and dear Mr. Professor, I was surprised and delighted by your article about "my humble self", as used by great people to refer to themselves.’
- (12) *On na vrata, ono pismo preporučeno, ispisano don Petrovom rukom, ma od don Petra nije: “Srećo moja preko sedam gora i planina, nisam ti se prije pouzdala javiti ni po knjizi ni po bijeloj ptici:...* (I. Raos, *Prosjaci i sinovi*)
 ‘He goes to the door, only to find a registered letter, written in Don Peter's handwriting, but not from Don Peter: My happiness over seven hills and mountains, I have not dared to contact you either by letter or by a bird.’

Although vocative expressions used to emphasize emotionality are more frequently expanded by attribution, used to additionally emphasize the expression of emotion, such a role can also be performed by the noun itself. The choice of noun as head of the vocative expression also signals the speaker's subjective attitude towards the interlocutor, simultaneously defining the interlocutor along a number of social norms (occupation, kinship, age, gender, etc.). Such vocative is called the vocative of emotional reaction (Babić 2011). For example, honorification, i.e. expression of respect towards the interlocutor in example (11) is marked both by the choice of the noun additionally by attributes (*poštovani, dragi*). The nature of the speaker-interlocutor relationship, as well as various emotions,



moods and degrees of emotional engagement of the speaker are additionally emphasized by the use of lexemes with positive or negative meaning: the negative emotions are emphasized by the use of pejorative expressions, often followed by the attribute *jedan* as an intensifier of pejorative meaning (rather than quantity) (13), as well as positive uses of diminutives and terms of endearment (14). Depending on the meaning, the role can be filled by figurative nouns, and emotionality is also indicated without the specification of a wider context:

- (13) *Pa kakvi li je to pošten i ugodan život, **nakazo jedna**? Prohtije li mi se opet nekog drugog života, s tobom ga lje neću dijeliti, **nitkove i prišipetljo!*** (A. Kovačić, *U registraturi*)
'What kind of honest and comfortable life is this then, you freak? If I should ever desire another kind of life, I will no longer share it with you, you scoundrel and miscreant!'
- (14) *E, pa što ćemo? Svi nijesmo lijepi, **golubice, draga sestrice i prijateljice...*** (A. Kovačić, *U registraturi*)
'What are we doing to do then? We're not all beautiful, dove, dear sister and friend...'

Vocative expressions with explicit expressivity also feature nouns very rarely used outside vocative expressions (e.g. *brale, sele, sinko*), as well as nouns used in one sense within a vocative expression, and in another outside of it, e.g. *maco, šećeru* in endearment, or *brate, buraz, burazeru* in friendly addressing an unfamiliar male person, not akin to the speaker:

- (15) *A lisac: "Jok, **brale**. Medine ludosti svima dodijale!"* (V. Nazor, *Medvjed Brundo*)
'And the fox goes: Nope, brother. Everbody has had enough of Bear's follies!'
- (16) ***Burazeru!** – dovikne Baniću taksist u smeđoj jakni s krznenim ovratnikom. – Ne možeš ovdje parkirati! – Samo deset minuta – otpovrne mu hladno Banić, ali se taksist i dalje pozivao na svoje pravo. – Čuješ, **burazeru!** Vozi to groblje na kotačima!* (G. Tribuson, *Gorka čokolada*)
'Bro! – the taxi driver in a brown jacket with a fur collar shouted to Banić- You can't park here! – Just ten minutes – Banić replied coldly, but the taxi driver still demanded his rights. Do you hear me, bro! Get that junk on wheels away from here.'

The emotive function is particularly emphasized in semantically empty vocative expressions whereby the interlocutor is named, yet is not taken as self-evident, but



generalized. This reflects the emotiveness of the speaker, his emotive off-loading, with the vocative expression functioning as an interjection:

- (17) *Osim toga, broj 7 je sretan broj. **Bože moj**, nećemo to shvatiti tako da nam broj 7 prosto zajemčava besmrtnost!* (V. Desnica, *Proljeća Ivana Galeba*)
 ‘Besides, 7 is a lucky number. My God, we will not take that as if number 7 guarantees immortality!’
- (18) *A što bi tek značilo kad bi se ljudski vijek općenito produžio, neću da kažem ad infinitum, ali za samih petnaest ili dvadeset godina. Ta čovječe, u roku od nekoliko decenija ova bi planeta morala da istodobno hrani dvije kompletne garniture čovječanstva!* (V. Desnica, *Proljeća Ivana Galeba*)
 ‘And what would it mean if the human life span got generally longer, I would say ad infinitum, but for mere fifteen or twenteen years. Well, man, within several decades, this planet would have to simultaneously feed two entire sets of humans!’

Addressing inanimate things, abstract notions or absent person is used to achieve a particular dynamics and emotionality of an utterance. Such vocative expressions emphasize and personify the ideas that hold the greatest value to the speaker (e.g. home, family). They are also used to activate the poetic function, since they are classified in stylistic terms as *apostrophes*,²⁶ to which can also be added personifications and allegories (cf. Bagić 2015: 64). Moreover, prosopopeia is considered a specific figure, a figure of thought, used to refer to absent, gone persons, as well as invisible, supernatural beings, animals, objects or concepts (Bagić 2015: 268). The expressivity and emotional colouring is further enhanced by the use of periphrases, vocative expressions with nouns of figurative meaning. Such expressions are semantically richer, emphasize emotions and add to poetization (Bagić 2015: 241–244):

- (19) *Zagreb-grade divni moj! Zagreb-grade, naša glavo, / Zagreb-grade, štite naš, / Zagreb-grade, naša slavo, / Kao sunce ti nam sjaš.* (A. Šenoa, *Izabrane pjesme*)
 ‘My beautiful City of Zagreb, City of Zagreb, our capital, / City of Zagreb, our shield, City of Zagreb, our glory, / You shine like the Sun.’

²⁶ On the importance of apostrophe, thus also the vocative expressions, in poetry K. Bagić observes: “Since it is used to relate two conflicting worlds – the animate and inanimate, present and absent, concrete and abstract, the world of beings and one of objects – literary theorists see apostrophe as the foundational principle of poetry as a whole.” (Bagić 2015: 66)



- (20) *Tko će nas drugi voditi nego ti, svijetla sabljo naša!* - reče Krupa-kapetan.
(J. E. Tomić, *Zmaj od Bosne*)
'Who els should lead us but you, our saber of light! - said Krupa the
Captain.'

As mentioned above, the use of attributes or apposition with nouns in a vocative expression additionally emphasizes emotiveness and expressivity, which is crucially determined by the (positive or negative) semantics of the attribute. The use of titles, positions, ranks and occupations conveys a more formal relationship between interlocutors and emphasizes distinctions in class, standing and social differences. In literary works, adjectives added to nouns for the purpose of stylistic characterizations of characters are considered epithets, a figure of speech (Bagić 2015: 110–113). Repetition, as a general figurative category (Bagić 2015: 255–256), serves to enhance expressivity and affectiveness in the vocative expression, as well as to emphasize the psychological state and strong (positive or negative) emotions of the speaking individual (ex. 10).

Emphasised emotionality is also achieved by the postposition of the attribute, a syntagmatic inversion which is a particularly common figure of construction aimed at achieving a special rhythmic mood and emphasizing the meaning²⁷ (Bagić 2015: 156) (examples 17, 19–21):

- (21) *Ne plači, dušo moja, golubice moja!* - stade je junak tješiti... (A. Šenoa,
Čuvaj se senjske ruke)
'Do not cry, my honey, my dove! – the hero started consolling her...'

4.2.2. Syntactic peculiarities of vocative expressions

Regarding syntactic peculiarities, vocative expressions can be viewed in two way: first, as sentences without explicit predicativeness (examples 22–23), and secondly, as independent sentence constituents (examples 24–25):

- (22) *Kako si velika u svojoj gluposti, kako čista u svojoj zlobi! O Majko!*
Bolovi tvoji – kolika pjesma! (J. Polić Kamov, *Isušena kaljuža*)
'How great you are in your stupidity, how pure in your malice! O Mother!

²⁷ "In the Croatian language, its origin is related to the biblical style. (...) In literature, this procedure is a self-sufficient styleme which points to the careful choice of language. It is at its most stylogenic when it clearly alludes to the biblical prototext." (Bagić 2015: 156). In addition to biblical and epic postpositions (e.g. *tijelo Kristovo, sabljo okovana*), vocative postpositions are also found in everyday spoken language (e.g. *svinjo debela*) (Marković 2010).



Your pains – such a poem!’

- (23) *Strašna mi tama, od sljepoće gora, Sav um pomuti i na čula leže, I za njom svjetlost ko stotine zora: **Iskro! Strijelo! Plamene! Sniježe! Silno svjetlo bez ijedne sjene**, Ko oštar ubod igle usred zjene.* (I. G. Kovačić, *Jama*)

‘The darkness more disgusting through my blindness, Blasted my mind and cluttered every sense -nd sense beyond a thousand daybreaks cried Intense – O arrow! O flame! O bewildering snow! Light, come at last devoid of any shade, With needles in my aching eyeballs played’²⁸

- (24) *Ah, čijem si se zahvalila, **tašta ljudska oholosti?*** (I. Gundulić, *Osman*)
‘Oh, why have you praised yourself, Vain human pride?’

- (25) *Zašto si tako sveta, tako čista, tako nevina! O **majko**, reci riječ!* (J. Polić Kamov, *Isušena kaljuža*)
‘Why are you so sacred, so pure, so innocent! O mother, say the word!’

The first case emphasizes the conative aspect, whereas emotionality is made explicit by the use of interjections (as markers of various emotional states) and exclamation marks (as a mark of exclamative intonation). Such vocative expressions as rhetorical exclamations or rhetorical questions can on the stylistic level be viewed as apostrophes,²⁹ metaphors and/or personifications, which additionally activates the poetic function. Emotionality, on the other hand, is emphasized by repetition or piling of vocative expressions, whereby there is noticeable gradation (example 23). The syntagmatic characteristics of a vocative expression help achieve additional emotiveness and expressiveness, which is particularly the case in vocative expressions as independent constituents of a sentence, whose emotiveness is further emphasized by the position with respect to sentential structure, as well as the omission of exclamation marks.

4.2.3. *The position of vocative expression with respect to sentential structure*

Vocative expressions occupy three positions in the structure of a sentence: initial (examples 9–12, 16–19, 25), final (examples 13–16, 20, 20, 21, 24) and medial (example 26), which may impact their functionality.³⁰ Initially placed vocative

²⁸ Translation by Alec Brown: <http://www.almissa.com/povijesnitrenutak/jama.htm>.

²⁹ Ljubibratić (1987: 74–78) offers numerous of vocative use in the form of apostrophe with an explicit emotive and poetic function in folk literature.

³⁰ For more views on the subject see Schaden (2010: 184) and Lambrecht (1996).



expressions have a more pronounced conative function, whereas it is syntagmatic features that contribute to emotiveness. The medial and particularly the final position of vocative expressions put special emphasis on the emotive function: coupled with syntagmatic features they emphasize a positive or negative attitude of the speakers towards the interlocutor and simultaneously call the interlocutor's attention to the part of the message in need of emphasizing, or bearing special importance to the interlocutor. Such vocative expressions, as inserted elements, also have a stylistic value since they influence the rhythmic flow of the sentence, introduce an emphatic pause, change of intonation, rhythm and speech intensity:

- (26) *Ne pružaj željnih, bijelih ruku za suncem, boginjo, vilo, nepoznata ženo, jer si ljepša od sunca, od dana i od svjetla. Sunce će ti sutra i opet doći do našeg balkona, tvoga nosioca. Ti si, divna moja gospođo, među dva sunca, ljepša od sunca današnjega i ljepša od sunca sutrašnjega...* (A. G. Matoš, *Odabrane pripovijetke*)

‘Do not reach eager, white hands for the sun, goddess, fairy, unknown woman, for you are more beautiful than the Sun, the day and the light. The Sun again shall come to our balcony, your bearer. You are, my wonderful lady, among the two suns, fairer than the Sun of today and the Sun of tomorrow.’

On the stylistic level these are thus also considered a syntactic figure of inversion, used to give emphasis to the expression (Škarić 2000: 140), which explicitly points to the poetic function. Vocative expressions in the medial position may also have a pronounced phatic function of establishing and prolonging/maintaining communication.

5. Conclusion

The 1980s linguistic literature considered the vocative specific, interesting and underexplored category.³¹ Interest in the category grew with time, however, not

³¹ In her paper *O strukturi srpskohrvatskog padežnog Sistema* (On the structure of Serbo-Croatian case system), M. Ivić (1983: 200, note 3) refrains from a discussion of the vocative and explains: “As one is well-aware, the nature of the vocative is very specific and still insufficiently elaborated in general linguistic theory.” Pragmalinguists also observe that: “Vocatives in general are an interesting grammatical category, again underexplored” (Levinson 1983: 71). On the reasons of omitting the vocative from linguistic research Sonnenhauser and Noel Aziz Hanna (2013: 1) observe: “The lack of morfological vocative marking in many European languages is one of the reasons for this neglect, in additional to the dual status of vocatives between system and preformance.”



only in languages where the vocative is also a morphological category, e.g. Croatian and Polish, but also in those where it is first and foremost a pragmatic-semantic category, e.g. English, German and Russian. Although one could speak of a tendency towards the recession of the vocative as a morphological category, the vocative as a pragmatic-semantic category, i.e. vocativeness as one of the categories of appellativeness is confirmed as a means of realization of all linguistic functions. From a pragmatic/functional viewpoint, vocative expressions are never monosemic, i.e. do not serve only to perform the conative function, as explicitly defined in the literature, but also perform other linguistic functions, particularly the emotive one, the expression of the speaker's (positive or negative) emotions, personal attitude towards the interlocutor, with the emotiveness additionally enhanced by syntactic and syntagmatic features of vocative expressions and their position in the sentence, as well as the use of imperative and interjections. The emotive function is accompanied by a pronounced poetic function, especially in literary works. As a means of establishing and prolonging communication, i.e. checking the functioning of the communication channel, vocative expressions also fulfil their phatic function. The referential function of the vocative expression is reduced to the role of subject and the predicative role in the language of folk poetry, with the role also filled in contemporary Croatian by the vocative expression in the role of predication adjunct and the adverbial with specific verbs. The metalinguistic function can also be attributed to vocative expression, with a wider context needed for its interpretation. For example, in a situation where the speaker calls/addresses the first interlocutor by name (*Ivane!* 'Ivan!'), and the second interlocutor reacts to his address (*Ivane? Ne zove se on Ivan nego Marko!* 'Ivan? His name is not Ivan, it's Marko!'), the vocative expression in the context with explicit orientation to the code fulfils a metalinguistic function.

References

- Anderson, John M. 2004. On the grammatical status of names. *Language* 80(3). 435–474.
- Babić, Milanka J. 2011. Vokativ kao sredstvo za izražavanje ekspresivnosti. *Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta u istočnom Sarajevu* 13(1). 45–66.
- Babić, Stjepan & Brozović, Dalibor & Moguš, Milan & Pavešić, Slavko & Škarić, Ivo & Težak, Stjepan. 1991. *Povijesni pregled, glasovi i oblici hrvatskoga književnog jezika*. Zagreb: HAZU & Globus.
- Badurina, Lada. 2007. Od sintakse prema suprasintaksi – dvosmjerno. In Kuna, Branko (ed.), *Sintaktičke kategorije*, 9–19. Osijek: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje & Filozofski fakultet u Osijeku.



- Badurina, Lada. 2010. Padeži i komunikacija. In Birtić, Matea & Brozović Rončević, Dunja (eds.), *Sintaksa padeža*, 1–14. Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje; Filozofski fakultet u Osijeku.
- Bagić, Krešimir. 2015. *Rječnik stilskih figura*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Barić, Eugenija & Lončarić, Mijo & Malić, Dragica & Pavešić, Slavko & Peti, Mirko & Zečević, Vesna & Znika, Marija. 2007. *Hrvatska gramatika*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Belić, Aleksandar. 1958. *O jezičkoj prirodi i jezičkom razvitku, lingvistička ispitivanja, knjiga I*. Beograd: Nolit.
- Brozović, Dalibor. 1999. O suvremenoj morfološkoj normi hrvatskoga jezičnog standarda i o morfološkim značajkama standardne novoštokavštine uopće. In Samardžija, Marko (ed.), *Norme i normiranje hrvatskoga standardnoga jezika*, 151–181. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Bulić, Halid. 2014. Upotreba vokativa u rečeničnoj strukturi. In Palić, Ismail Drkić, Munir (eds.), *Sarajevski filološki susreti II, knjiga I*, 140–151. Sarajevo: Bosansko filološko društvo, 140–151.
- Čilaš Šimpraga, Ankica & Miloš, Irena. 2014. Vokativ prezimena muških osoba u hrvatskome jeziku. *Výuka jihoslovanských jazyků a literatur v dnešní Evropě*, 611–618. Brno: Občanské sdružení Porta Balkanica,.
- Ivić, Milka. 1983. *Lingvistički ogleđi*. Beograd: Prosveta.
- Jagić, Vatroslav. 1982 [1865]. *Primjetbe s našoj sintaksi s gledišta sravnjujuće gramatike*. Književnik. Reprint in Krtalić, Ivan (ed.), *Polemike u hrvatskoj književnosti, knjiga III*, 7–29. Zagreb: Mladost.
- Jakobson, Roman. 2008. *O jeziku*. Zagreb: Disput.
- Jozić, Željko (ed.). 2013. *Hrvatski pravopis*. Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje.
- Junković, Zvonimir. 1972. Jezik Antuna Vramca i podrijetlo kajkavskoga dijalekta. *Dijakronijska rasprava. Rad JAZU* 363. 5–229.
- Katičić, Radoslav. 2002. *Sintaksa hrvatskoga književnog jezika*. Zagreb: HAZU, Globus.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1996. On the formal and functional relationship between topics and vocatives. Evidence from French. In Goldberg, Addele (ed.), *Conceptual structure discourse and language*, 267–288. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, John. 1977. *Semantics. Volume I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ljubibratić, Radoslav. 1987. Vokativ. *Suvremena metodika nastave hrvatskog ili srpskog jezika* 12(1–2). 67–78.
- Marković, Ivan (2010). *Uvod u pridjev*. Zagreb: Disput.
- Moro, Andrea. 2003. Notes on vocative case: a case study in clause structure. In Quer, Josep & Schrotten, Jan & Scorretti, Mauro & Sleeman, Petra & Verheugd, Els (eds.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2001: Selected papers from 'Going*



- Romance*, Amsterdam, 6–8 December 2001, 251–265. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Piper, Predrag & Antičić, Ivana & Ružić, Vladislava & Tanasić, & Popović, Ljudmila & Tošović, Branko. 2005. *Sintaksa savremenog srpskog jezika (prosta rečenica u redakciji Milke Ivić)*. Beograd: Institut za srpski jezik SANU & Beogradska knjiga & Matica srpska.
- Pranjeković, Ivo. 2002. *Hrvatska skladnja. Rasprave iz sintakse hrvatskoga standardnog jezika*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada.
- Pranjeković, Ivo. 2013. *Gramatička značenja*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Rišner, Vlasta. 2006. *Iz jezične prošlosti i sadašnjosti*. Osijek: Matica hrvatska, Ogranak Osijek.
- Samardžija, Marko. 1986. Dopune u suvremenom hrvatskom književnom jeziku. *Radovi zavoda za slavensku filologiju* 21. 1–32.
- Schaden, Gerhard. 2010. Vocatives: A note on addressee-management. *Penn Linguistic Colloquium* 2009. 16(1). 176–185.
- Silić, Josip & Pranjeković, Ivo. 2005. *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika za gimnazije i visoka učilišta*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Skrljarov, Miho. 1962. O vokativu - problem kategorije II lica u imenica. *Rad JAZU* 327, Zagreb.
- Sonnenhauser, Barbara & Noel Aziz Hanna, Patrizia. 2013. *Vocative! Addressing between system and performance*. Berlin, Boston: Walter de Gruyter GmbH
- Stevanović, Mihailo. 1974. *Savremeni srpskohrvatski jezik II* (2. izd.). Beograd: Naučna knjiga.
- Stolac, Diana. 2005. Komunikacijske funkcije vokativa. In Pranjeković, Ivo (ed.), *Od fonetike do etike*, 173–184. Zagreb: Disput.
- Stolac Diana. 2006. Komunikacijske funkcije osamostaljenih dijelova rečeničnoga ustrojstva u Marulićevu. In Gašpar, Nela Veronika (ed.), *Naslidovan'ju. Tkivo kulture*, 241–252. Rijeka: Kršćanska sadašnjost.
- Škarić, Ivo. 2000. *Temeljni suvremenoga govornišva*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Vince, Jasna. 2010. Nominativ prema ostalim padežima. In Birtić, Matea & Brozović Rončević, Dunja (eds.), *Sintaksa padeža*, 249–265. Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje & Filozofski fakultet u Osijeku.
- Vlastelić, Anastazija. 2013. O Stvoritelju moj, božanstveni goste! Koliko sam zadužan tebi... Komunikacijske funkcije vokativa u Pribogoljubnim bavljenjima za slišati svetu misu fra Petra Bakule. In Knezović, Pavao & Jerković, Marko (eds.), *Zbornik o Petru Bakuli*, 301–311. Zagreb: Hrvatski studiji Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.
- Težak, Stjepko. 1982. Vokativ jednine imenica E vrste. *Radovi Zavoda za slavensku filologiju* 17. 31–42.
- Težak, Stjepko. 1990. *Hrvatski naš svagda(š)nji*. Zagreb: Školske novine.
- Težak, Stjepko & Babić, Stjepan. 2005. *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika*. Zagreb: Školska



knjiga.

Zwicky, Arnold M. 1974. Hey, what's your name!. <https://arnoldzwicky.org/about/papers/>, (accessed on November 21, 2016).

Žanić, Ivo. 2010. Hrvatski jezik danas, Od povijesne tronarječnosti do trokuta standard - Zagreb – Dalmacija. In Mićanović, Krešimir (ed.), *Zbornik radova 38. seminara Zagrebačke slavističke škole*, 103–122 Zagreb: Zagrebačka slavistička škola.

<http://www.hrvatskiplus.org/article.php?id=1755&naslov=hrvatski-jezik-danas>, (accessed on November 21, 2016).

Authors' address:

University of Osijek
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Lorenza Jägera 9
Osijek
E-mail: mglusac@ffos.hr
amikic@ffos.hr

JEZIČNE ULOGE VOKATIVA KAO MORFOLOŠKE, SINTAKTIČKE I PRAGMATIČKO-SEMANTIČKE KATEGORIJE

Vokativ kao pragmatičko-semantička kategorija, odnosno vokativnost kao jedna od kategorija apelativnosti, potvrđuje se kao sredstvo ostvarivanja svih jezičnih funkcija. Promatrani s funkcionalne strane vokativni izrazi nisu nikada jednoznačni, tj. ne služe samo kao sredstvo konativne funkcije, kako se i izrijekom u literaturi određuju, nego se njima vrlo često ostvaruju i ostale jezične funkcije – osobito emotivna (iskazuju se govornikovi osjećaji i osobni stav prema sugovorniku) i poetska. Kao sredstvo uspostavljanja i produženja komunikacije te provjeravanja ispravnosti komunikacijskoga kanala vokativni izrazi ispunjavaju i svoju fatičku funkciju. Referencijalna je funkcija vokativnih izraza svedena na subjektu i predikatnu ulogu u jeziku narodne poezije, a radom se pokazuje da tu funkciju u suvremenom hrvatskom jeziku mogu imati i vokativni izrazi u ulozu predikatnoga proširka i priložne oznake uz određene glagole.

Ključne riječi: jezične funkcije; vokativ; apelativnost; konativnost; ekspresivnost.