Natalia Kobchenko

National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy
Kyiv, Ukraine
n.kobchenko@ukma.edu.ua
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4369-5909

The Use of Corpus Data to Assess the Functional Potential of the Grammeme (On the Basis of the Ukrainian Vocative Case)

Abstract. It is known that changes on the grammatical level of the language system occur less frequently and more slowly than at the lexical level, and, therefore, it is difficult to notice and record them from a synchronic perspective. Observations of certain grammar shifts in communication of some professional or territorial communities do not allow us to fully assess the grammar trend. Thus, this study aims to apply corpus data (in particular, General Regionally Annotated Corpus of the Ukrainian Language (GRAC)) to assess the functional competition between the vocative and nominative in expressing address to the recipient of the speech. The paper proposes a new methodology to assess the functional potential of the grammar form. It is based on the thesis of the correlation between the functional strength of a grammar form and its ability to extend to newly-derived words. A group of feminine personal nouns that came into use in recent decades (not recorded in the Ukrainian Language Vocabulary in 11 volumes) served as lexical data for testing this methodology. The results of analysis of the case forms that are common for feminine personal nouns in the addressee position lead to the following conclusions: 1) refuting the statement about the expansion of the nominative in the modern Ukrainian language due to it displacing the vocative; 2) introducing feminine personal nouns into the address domain of the vocative.

Keywords: corpus; vocative; nominative; address; feminine personal noun; functioning of language units; language ideology; postcolonial state of the language; grammar; pragmatics; Ukrainian language.

1. Introduction

The Ukrainian vocative case is an interesting object of linguistic research both in terms of its functioning and linguistic perception. Only in the last century have scholars observed two opposite trends: 1) from the late Soviet period to the early 2000s, the usage of vocative forms has decreased and has been almost displaced by nominative forms (Dudyk, 1973, p. 269; Horodens'ka, 2017, pp. 41–42); 2) in recent years the vocative case has expanded/restored its functional sphere and begun to dominate over the nominative (Skab, 2007; Boyko, 2017; Horodens'ka, 2021). Both tendencies were caused mainly by extra-linguistic factors. Powerful interference processes in the context of the dominance of the Russian language, the loosening of the language norm for expressing address in grammar textbooks (Kobchenko, 2021), and the introduction of official knowledge about the vocative as a special form that is outside the case paradigm of the noun (Kobchenko et al., 2023, pp. 9–13) led to marginalization of the vocative case in the language practice of Ukrainians. The actualization of the use of the vocative to express address in modern communication is associated with the codification of the "new old"[1] (restored) language norm and to individual language

---

[1] This term belongs to a Croatian scholar A. Peti-Stantić. Analyzing language planning in Croatia, the linguist distinguishes three kinds of language norms: 1) "old language norm" – established before the period of Croatia's political dependence; 2) "new language norm" – the norm that was codified in the process of standardization during the period of Croatia's political dependence; and 3) "new old language norm" – the norm that was valid before the standardization during the period of political dependence of Croatia and that was returned after liberation from this dependence (Peti-Stantić, 2009, pp. 75–77). Accordingly, in relation to Ukrainian realities, the "old language norm" is understood as the norm established before 1933, the "new language norm" as a norm of the Soviet period, and the "new old language norm" as a contemporary norm codified after 1991.

ideology[2] of Ukrainians who perceive the vocative as a unique feature of the Ukrainian language.

On the other hand, it seems incorrect to dismiss the influence of intra-linguistic factors, such as the general tendency to replace the vocative with the nominative, which has reached its completion in many Indo-European and, in particular, in some Slavic languages (Historical Typology, 2008, pp. 21–22; Daniel & Spencer, 2009, p. 627), and lexical and grammatical restrictions of the creation of this form (at the level of the language system, only masculine and feminine singular nouns have special vocative inflections; at the communicative level, this form occurs only in the names of persons). In particular, Yu. Shevelev, who cannot be accused of transmitting the official knowledge of the Soviet authorities, once noted "the limitation of the role of the vocative form" as one of the manifestations of the tendency to reduce the number of cases in the Ukrainian language (Sherekh, 1951, p. 197). P. Selihey, offering a prediction of the development of the Ukrainian language for next two hundred years, calls the expansion of the nominative case to the functions of others one of the main causes of the loss of inflection. The scholar believes that use of the nominative instead of the vocative to address an interlocutor in modern oral communication is one of the most prominent manifestations of this process (Selihey, 2023, p. 336). In this regard, taking into consideration the increasing frequency of vocative addresses in public communication space, it is interesting to trace the unfolding of functional competition between the vocative and the nominative cases at the level of the language system. This study proposes a methodology for determining the systemic parameters of the vocative as a grammatical form, in particular, estimating if its performance is limiting or expanding.

Section 2 of this paper gives a brief overview of studies on the use of the vocative by contemporary Ukrainian speakers and proposes the author's original methodology for determining the strengthening or weakening of the functional potential of a grammatical form. Section 3 substantiates the choice of the research data and describes the procedure of using the General Regionally Annotated Corpus of Ukrainian (GRAC) for data collection and sorting. Section 4 outlines the outcomes of the study, and, finally, Section 5 presents the findings of this research, focusing on two key observations con-

---

[2] The term "language ideology" is used in the meaning of "sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use" (Silverstein, 1979, p. 193).

nected with the peculiarities of the vocative function in the modern Ukrainian language practice.

2. Theoretical and methodological basis

Studies of recent years dealing with the usage of the vocative case are based on two methods. They are observations of language practice in certain social or professional spheres and questionnaires of speakers. In particular, the observation of the means of expressing address in prepared and spontaneous speeches in official communicative situations (speeches of the members of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, journalists' speeches in studios and during live streaming) and in fiction and media texts is outlined in the paper "The Ukrainian Vocative: Changing Views on the Functions of the Morphological Form in the Context of Social Transformations" (Yasakova et al., 2022, pp. 10–12). L. Kolibaba and S. Romaniuk use this method to identify grammatical forms of address in political discourse (Kolibaba & Romaniuk, 2023). K. Horodens'ka traced the grammatical features of expressing an appeal to the interlocutor on the material of the broadcasts of the Public Radio of Ukraine (Horodens'ka, 2021). The study of trends in the morphological expression of the address, conducted by M. Skab using the survey method, is notable for its thoroughness (Skab, 2007). The scholar not only identified the quantitative ratio between the vocative and nominative in the function of address, but also determined the impact of the speaker's level of education, their mother tongue, place of residence (urban/rural dwellers), gender, and age on the choice of a particular morphological form. He has analyzed 500 filled questionnaire forms collected in the Chernivtsi region, and carried out quantitative processing using a specially developed computer program (Skab, 2007, p. 298).

Both of these methods are applied in I. Boyko's dissertation research. Having analyzed the choice of morphological form for expressing address in fiction, the author states that the vocative case predominates significantly in cases of less common addresses (expressed by one word) and the nominative case is more frequent for addresses extended with adjectives (Boyko, 2017, pp. 161–163). The linguist has also observed lexical and grammatical features of expressing address in social media and concluded that while 54,7% of proper-Ukrainian nouns in address position were expressed by the vocative, the functional potential of the nominative is quite strong in this communicative field (Boyko, 2017, pp. 178–181). In the follow-up phase of the

study, I. Boiko has used the survey method to "check the entrenchment of vocative forms in the minds of Ukrainian native speakers" and to find out the impact of the communicative situation on the way of appeal. The results of the questionnaire of 75 respondents aged 14–60 testify that in everyday communication, speakers use the vocative to express addressing the recipient of the speech more frequently than the nominative, although this quantitative advantage is insignificant (Boyko, 2017, pp. 182–200). The final conclusions of this research confirm the scholar's hypothesis about the dominance of the vocative in the function of the address (Boyko, 2017, p. 222).

The outcomes of the above-mentioned studies, suggest that today speakers prefer to use the vocative case in address, in particular in official communication. However, these conclusions are based on the analysis of language practice in communicative situations limited to a specific professional or territorial spheres or a specific speech genre. This data is not enough to make generalizations about the tendencies of limiting or expanding of the vocative function at the level of the language system. Thus, the issue of functional competition between the vocative and the nominative cases requires further research.

The aim of this paper is to determine the tendency to expand or contract the function of the vocative case to express the address. The realization of this objective will help to understand the systemic processes in the noun paradigm, in particular whether there are signs of its movement towards a reduction in the number of cases due to the displacement of the vocative by the nominative.

An original corpus-based methodology has been employed to reach this aim. Its theoretical basis is the statement that the functional strength of a morphological form depends on its ability to extend to new derivatives. In other words, the features of the decline of a certain morphological form in the language system are: 1) the use of this morphological form only for those lexical units that have a long tradition of functioning in a certain syntactic position; 2) the use of a competitive morphological form for new derivatives in this syntactic position. In the context of this study, the task is to find out which case – the vocative or the nominative – predominates in the design of addresses expressed by newly derived nouns. If the vocative case predominates, it may be the evidence of the potential expansion of its function. On the contrary, if the nominative case predominates, it may signify the restriction of the functional potential of the vocative and confirm the assumption about the gradual restriction of its role.

3. The data

Relatively new feminine personal nouns appear to be a useful material for such an analysis. The increase in their amount and frequency, as well as the extension of their areas of use, is one of the most noticeable trends in the development of the Ukrainian language in recent decades. Despite the fact that some linguists still stress their distinct stylistic marking (Arkhanhelska, 2019, pp. 103–108; Brus, 2022, p. 37), language practice demonstrates that they have entered even such conservative discourses as academic and official (see Arkhanhelska, 2019, pp. 109–111). It is evidenced by the appearance of dictionaries (Plachynda, 2018; Synchak, 2022; Slovnyk feminityviv, 2021), changes in the National Classifier of Occupations[3], and the work of the National Commission on Ukrainian Language Standards to standardize the use[4] of feminine gender, as well as its application in the addresses of state leaders, officials, official documentation, and legislation titles[5]. It is

---

[3] On 18 August 2020, the Ministry for Development of Economy, Trade and Agriculture of Ukraine issued Order on Amendment to the Classifier of Professions. The gist of this amendment is to legitimise the use of personal feminine nouns for professions in the field of office work, namely: "At the request of the user, when making a record of the job title in the personnel documentation of an individual employee, professional job titles may be adapted to indicate the female gender of the person performing the relevant work (in accordance with paragraph 4 of paragraph 23 of the Ukrainian spelling approved by the Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine No. 437 dated 22.05.2019). For example, inzhener [engineer] – inzhenerka, a verstatnyk shyrokoho profil'u [generalist machine operator] – verstatnyts'a shyrokoho profil'u, sotsioloh [sociologist] – sotsiolohyn'a" (Order of the Ministry of Economy of 18.08.2020 No. 1574 "On Approval of Amendment No. 9 to the National Classifier DK 003:2010". URL: https://www.me.gov.ua/Documents/Detail?lang=uk-
    UA&id=c1108c0b-54f2-4e12-b196-efe22f195e05&title=NakazMinekonomikiVid18-08-2020-1574-proZatverdzhenniaZmini9-DoNatsionalnogoKlasifikatoraDk003-2010-).
    [4] Rishennia Natsionalnoi komisii zi standartiv derzhavnoi movy vid 10 hrudnia 2021 roku № 339: Rekomendatsii schodo tvorennia ta vzhyvannia nazv profesii u dyplomatychnii sferi dlia utverdzhennia hendernoi rivnosti. URL: https://mova.gov.ua/storage/app/sites/19/rishennja_komisii/desember/dodatok-rekomendatsii-shchodo-tvorennya-ta-vzhivannya-nazv-profesiy-v-diplomatichniy-sferi.pdf; Rishennia Natsionalnoi komisii zi standartiv derzhavnoi movy vid 22 zhovtnia 2021 roku № 238: Rekomendatsii schodo tvorennia ta vzhyvannia nazv profesii u medychnii sferi dlia utverdzhennia gendernoi rivnosti. URL: https://mova.gov.ua/storage/app/sites/19/standarty/feminitivi-rekomendatsii.pdf.
    [5] For instance, on 3 August 2021, the President of Ukraine signed Law No. 1643-IX "On Amendments to Article 73 of the Labour Code of Ukraine". According to this law, the name of the holiday "Den' Zakhysnyka Ukrayiny" [Defender of Ukraine Day] is changed to "Den' Zakhysnykiv i Zakhysnyts' Ukrayiny". URL: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1643-20#Textf.

also worth mentioning that in the new edition of the Ukrainian Pravopys (Ukrainian Spelling Rules), in the paragraph on "Noun Suffixes", there is now a point that defines the peculiarities of combining derivative bases with suffixes with the help of which "masculine nouns are used to form nouns for female persons" (Ukrayins'kyy pravopys, 2019, pp. 39–40). However, discussions about the appropriateness of using such lexemes do not disappear among experts (linguists, editors etc.) as well as among ordinary speakers. Modern language practice and academic discussions demonstrate that a codified linguistic norm is not the main reason in the choice to use or not to use feminine personal nouns, but rather the language ideology of a particular speaker.

Besides the fact that some feminine personal nouns are new lexical units without the tradition of being used in the syntactic function of address, they constitute an appropriate material for clarifying the functional potential of the vocative due to two more factors. Firstly, they represent the same word-formation category, i.e., they belong to the same semantic and grammatical group. Until recently, they were not used at all in official communication, so the Ukrainian language does not have a pattern of their functioning as an address that could be applied to new derivatives of the same semantic and grammatical group. Accordingly, the results of the analysis conducted on the material of this lexico-grammatical type, instead of the material of separate nouns that are different in semantic and grammatical dimension, seem to be more relevant. They allow us to draw conclusions about the tendencies concerning the language system. Secondly, Ukrainian linguistic culture has not formed a tradition of addressing the interlocutor by using his/her occupation title or position (Skab, 2003, pp. 65–67). Consequently, the tradition of using a certain morphological case – the vocative or the nominative – to adapt "occupation titles" to the function of address has not been formed as well. Thus, when a speaker addresses their interlocutor using a feminine personal noun and chooses the morphological case to express this address, they are not guided by a historically established pattern, but rather a speaker's decision is largely caused by their personal language ideology.

Taking into consideration the attitude of some people to the use of feminine personal nouns[6], we are fully aware that speakers can use addresses, expressed by these nouns, not so much as a means of appealing to the recipient

---

[6] See A. Arkhanhel's'ka's work about the attitude of Ukrainians towards the use of personal feminine nouns (Arkhanhel's'ka, 2019, pp. 192–297).

of the speech but as a means of manifestation of their assessment. Therefore, such addresses may be dominated by an evaluative rather than identifying function. But it is important to underline that the focus of this study is not to find out whether it is appropriate/inappropriate to address an interlocutor using a feminine personal noun, but to trace the competition of the case forms in the communicative situation when such address takes place.

Feminine personal nouns were selected with the help of the General Regionally Annotated Corpus of Ukrainian (GRAC). At first, we collected feminine personal nouns that are recorded in the corpus in the vocative case. The search is carried out in the 17th version of the GRAC using a CQL-query that combines semantic (concrete animated noun, occupation) and grammatical (feminine noun in the vocative case) tags, as well as an extraction of occupation titles of adjective type, morphological homonyms (for instance, *poviye* is a noun *poviya* [a *prostitute*] in the vocative case and a verb *poviyaty* [*to start to blow*] in the form of 3rd person, future tense), surnames, nouns that can refer to both genders (for instance, *suddya* [*judge*], *pysaka* [*scribbler*] etc.), nouns of male gender with the suffix -*k*- (for instance, *rybalka* [*fisher*]), etc. The formulation of the request is as follows:

> [tag="noun.*f:v_kly"&semtag=".*conc:hum:prof.*"]!containing[word="patrulna|Patrulna|Slidcha|slidcha|slïdcha|vchena|Vchena|VCHENA|uchena|Uchena|Pionervozhata|pionervozhata|PIONERVOZHATA|Vozhata|vozhata|prydvorna|Prydvorna|*poviye*|*Poviye*|*POVIYE*|rybalko|rybalochko|rybalonko|Rybalko|RYBALKO|sudde|Sudde|radioveducha|Radioveducha|khorunzha|Khorunzha|KHORUNZHA|SHVACHKO|Shvachko|Chabanko|pysako|nyanko|Nyanko|Chernychko|yasnovydo|Yasnovydo|pitiye|pifiye|operupovnovazhena"][7].

After that, some words were removed, namely: surnames ending with -*ko* (for instance, Tetiana Vorozhko, Izabela Pastushko), words with misprints (for instance, *ekonomko* [vocative female form from housekeeper] instead of *ekonomno* [*frugally*]), homonyms (for instance, *Stavalo niyakovo, navit*

---

[7] [tag="noun.*f:v_kly"&semtag=".*conc:hum:prof.*"]!containing[word="патрульна|Патрульна|Слідча|слідча| слïдча|вчена|Вчена|ВЧЕНА|Учена|учена|Піонервожата|піонервожата|ПІОНЕРВОЖАТА|Вожата|вожата|придворна|Придворна|повіє|Повіє|ПОВІЄ|рибалко|рибалочко|рибалонько|Рибалко|РИБАЛКО|судде|Судде|радіоведуча|Радіоведуча|хорунжа|Хорунжа|ХОРУНЖА|ШВАЧКО|Чабанко|писако|нянько|Нянько|Швачко|Черничко|ясновидо|Ясновидо|пітіє|піфіє|оперуповноважена"].

vorozhko[8] [*It is becoming uncomfortable, even hostile*]), as well as search results containing titles of songs and films (for instance, "*Vchytelko moya* [*My teacher*]", "*Proshchavay, moya nalozhnytse* [*Farewell, my concubine*]"), etc.

The results of this search found 1019 occurrences of personal feminine nouns in the vocative; these are 140 personal feminine nouns. For direct analysis, we selected from this list only those nouns that are not in the 11-volume *Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language* (Slovnyk Ukrayinskoyi Movy – SUM) (Bilodid, 1970–1980) – 22 units. Also, *medsestrychka* [diminutive from *nurse*] and *povodyrka* [*guide*] were removed from this list, because the first one is a diminutive form from *medsestra* and the second one is the phonetic variant of *provodyrka*, and both of them are in the SUM (see Table 1). Also, the analysis does not include cases where the feminine in the form of the vocative case is not an address to the recipient of the speech, but a quote of an imaginary or real opponent, for instance, *Filolohy y redaktory! A khto z vas u tramvayi naspravdi kazhe: "Nuzh bo, konduktore, peredayte reshtu?". Abo zvertayetsya "Pani prodavchyne!"* [*Philologists and editors! How many of you really say on a tram: "Hey, conductor, could you pass the change?" or use: "Mrs. saleslady!"*] (O. Nehrebetskyi, HRAK-17, 26.12.2023).

It should be noted that the *Free Explanatory Dictionary* is integrated into the web version of the *Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language*. The purpose of this project is to gradually supplement the 11 volumes of the SUM. Today, the register of the *Free Explanatory Dictionary* comprises 507 entries added between 2013–2018 (https://sum.in.ua/f). Out of the 20 femininities selected for analysis, only 7 are recorded in this register.

The second stage deals with collecting addresses expressed by these personal feminine nouns in the nominative form. For each lexeme, we search by word form (nominative singular) and manually select cases where this word form functions as an address.

---

[8] It is the vocative case of *vorozhka* [*fortune teller* – noun of female gender] and adjective *hostile*.

Table 1. The frequency of the use the vocative form of personal feminine nouns that are not in the SUM

Lexeme	Number of uses in the vocative form	Frequency per million uses	Record in the Free Explanatory Dictionary
doktorka	20	0.01123	+
operatorka	4	0.00225	
voyitelka	3	0.00168	+
prodavchynya	2	0.00112	+
filolohynya	2	0.00112	
prokurorka[9]	2	0.00112	+
zhrekynya	2	0.00112	
vartivnytsya	2	0.00112	
folosofynya	1	0.00056	+
travnytsya	1	0.00056	
strazhnytsya[10]	1	0.00056	
skelelazka	1	0.00056	
reperka	1	0.00056	
piratka	1	0.00056	
psykholohynya	1	0.00056	
myslytelka	1	0.00056	+
luchnytsya	1	0.00056	
dohlyadalnytsya	1	0.00056	
voyinka	1	0.00056	
biolohynya	1	0.00056	+

---

[9] It is interesting that SUM contains the personal feminine noun with the same word base and another suffix, and this noun is marked as colloquial and infrequently used: *prokurorsha* – 1. Lady prosecutor. 2. A prosecutor's wife (Bilodid, 1970–1980, vol. 8, 1977, p. 211. URL: https://sum.in.ua/s/prokurorsha).

[10] There is dictionary entry *strazhnytsya* [*guard*] in the SUM, but there is one meaning of this lexeme only – "room for a watchman or military guards" (Bilodid, 1970–1980, vol. 9, 1978, p. 748. URL: https://sum.in.ua/s/strazhnycja).

4. The case form of addresses expressed by personal feminine nouns

According to the GRAK data, almost all analyzed personal feminine nouns in the posistion of address are used only in the vocative case. That is 20 selected for the analysis feminine personal nouns used in the position of address assume a vocative form in 98% cases. The only exception is the noun *filolohynya* [*philologist*] for which the corpus records two uses in the vocative form (in fiction – (1), (2)) and one in the nominative (comment in the Twitter – (3)).

(1) – Vin poyikhav do dyad'ka Pavla na khramove svyato. / – Khramove svyato ... O-o-o, – holos u Irynky mriylyvo-sonnyy. – U nashomu seli bil'she tak nikhto ne kazhe. Til'ky ty. / – A yak kazhut'? – rozhublyuyusya ya. / – Praznyk. / – Spy vzhe, **filolohyne**... / – Filo... lo... lo... Irynka koshenyam tulyt'sya do mene. Ya hladzhu yiyi po holovi [He went to uncle Pavlo's place for a church festival. / Church festival… O-o-o, – Iryna's voice is dreamy and sleepy. – Nobody else in our village speaks in that way. Only you. / – What do they say? – I am confused. / – A holiday. / – Sleep now, philologist… / – Philo… lo… lo… Iryna is leaning against me like a kitten. I am stroking her head] (V. Lys/ HRAK-17, 26.12.2023)

(2) Natalka naystatnisha sered moyikh ditey. Ob'yektyvno kazhuchy, vona ne krasunya, navit' ne nadto vrodlyva, ale tsya statnist', harna postava y dyvne poyednannya na oblychchi, u vyrazi ochey dytyachosti z yakoyus' azh nache nezemnoyu (ni, ne tochne slovo, **pani filolohyne**) pohordoyu v pohlyadi temno-horikhovykh ochey stvoryuyut' ... yak by tse teper skazaly?.. Sharm, napevne [Natalia is the eldest of my children. Objectively speaking, she is not a beauty, not even remotely, but her stature, her good posture, and on her face, in the expression of her eyes, there is a strange combination of childishness with some kind of unearthly (no, not the word I'm looking for, lady philologist) arrogance in the look of her dark walnut-coloured eyes create... how would one say it now? Charm, I guess.] (V. Lys/ HRAK-17, 26.12.2023)

(3) [2014-08-30 09:57:00][MiLka_V_]: Moya kokhana **filolohynya** @MiraOe, z povernennyam v Ukrayinu! za toboyu tut skuchyly [My beloved lady philologist @MiraOe, welcome back to Ukraine! We miss you here!] (Twitter/ HRAK-17, 26.12.2023)

According to West-European tradition, vocatives as a syntactic catego-ry have two basic semantic functions: calls and addresses (Levinson, 2008, p. 71). Although other classifications are proposed, for instance, G. Schaden claims three functions of the vocative: "to *identify* the addressee, to *pred-icate* a property on the addressee, or to *activate* the addressee" (Schaden, 2010, p. 182). Since Ukrainian belongs to the languages of the inflection-al type with predominance of synthetic means of expressing grammatical relations, in Ukrainian linguistic theory, the tradition to classify vocatives according to the semantic-syntactic principle has been established. Respec-tively, three functions are distinguished: 1) address-potential subject; 2) em-phasized address-neutralized subject; 3) identification (Vykhovanets', 1987, pp. 140–142). As an address-potential subject, the vocative indicates a pos-sible doer of the action a speaker desires. In such constructions a predicate has a form of the 2nd person imperative – (10). As an emphasized address-neutralized subject, the vocative denotes an interlocutor that is not a partici-pant of the described situation. In such cases, there are no formal markers of the syntactic connection of the vocative with any sentence component – (12). Finally, as an identification, the vocative duplicates the 2nd person pro-noun a sentence contains, and through mediation of this pronoun becomes involved in a syntactic connection with the certain sentence component – (11). In fact, vocatives of the first and the third types seem to be similar at the communicative level, for they denote a person who is simultaneously a par-ticipant of the described situation and the addresses of the message about this situation as well. On the contrary, vocatives of the second type relate to a person who is just an address of the message and remains outside the situ-ation described in the sentence. The analysis of feminine personal nouns in vocative shows that the predominant ones are those that refer to a person in-volved in the situation reported by the speaker, i.e., vocatives that are in syn-tactic connections with some sentence components (67%). Namely, speech acts where the vocative denotes an interlocutor whom a speaker applies to with a request or an order to do some action (address-potential subject func-tion) amount to 33%; speech acts where the vocative duplicates a personal or possessive pronoun denoting one of the participants in the situation (identi-fication function) amount to 34%. And 33% of vocatives of feminine person-al nouns nominate a person who is just an addressee of the speech act (em-phasized addressee-neutralized subject).

Analyzed vocative forms are recorded mainly in texts of the early 21st century; however, the form *zhrekyne* [*priestess*] is used in the texts of the early 20th century, namely in the original novel published in 1926 (4) and the translation published in 1927 (5). There are some addresses expressed by personal feminine nouns in the vocative case in the fiction of the Soviet period (6), mostly in translations (7), (8). It is also noteworthy that poetry dominates among them – (5), (6), (8). Instead, in the 21st century, such units are recorded in prose fiction (1), (2), (9), (10), (15) and media texts (3), (11), (12), (16).

(4) – Medom yoho hoduyte. Vin chudotvornyy, akh, dyvit'sya, dvi bdzhilky azh syudy za mnoyu pryletily. / – Dam, dam, spasybi, **zhrekyne**, ale proshu, zaydit' u khatu. / – Ni, ne mozhu, meni treba skoro doma buty… [– Feed him honey. It's miraculous, look, two bees have flown here to fetch me. / – Will do, will do, thank you, **priestess**, but please do come inside. / – No, I can't, I have to be home soon…] (O. Kobylyanska/ HRAK-17, 26.12.2023)

(5) Vona kolykhalasya u bedrakh syudy y tudy, khylyla holovu i pidnosyla yiyi, vyhynala ramenamy u povitri dyvni zmiyini liniyi. A yurba movchala, z zapertym viddykhom – vyzhydayuchy. Tykho proshepotiv odyn: «Blahoslovennoyu bud', Manho, nasha **zhrekyne**!» [She swayed her hips back and forth, bent her head and raised it, in the air, she curved her shoulders in strange snake-like lines. The crowd was silent, waiting with bated breath. Somebody whispered quietly: "Blessed be Mango, our **priestess**!"] (H.H. Evers, translated by I. Kedryn/ HRAK-17, 26.12.2023).

(6) Pytayu yiyi, karooku y rudu, Modernovu krasunyu dostotu, Antykvarno doskipuyus' na bidu: «Zradon'ko, zvidky ty, khto ty?» Katuyu pytannyam huby yiyi – Huby pekuche stoyat' navproty, Rayuyu v lyubovi sered ruyin, Pytayu na dotork, na dotyk. «**Biolohyne**, bohyne, tviy kod, Khromosomni tvoyi turboty...» Ta movchyt' tviy solonyy rot, Tviy haryachyy skeptychnyy rotyk. «Smerton'ko, khto ty?». Til'ky dym nad brovoyu Z rudoho zavoyu [I ask this brown-eyed and red-haired true modern-day beauty, like an antiques dealer searching for a flaw: "Treachery, where are you from? Who are you?" I torture her lips with a question – Her lips are stinging in front of me, I am paradising in love amongst the ruins, I ask her to touch, to feel. "**Biologist**, goddess, your code, your chromosomal concerns..." But your salty mouth is silent, your hot skeptical mouth. "Death, who are you?" Only

smoke above my brow From the reddish curl] (I. Drach 1967 / HRAK-17, 27.12.2023)

(7) Ale tviy narod, Habrielo, neperemozhnyy. Vin pyshayet'sya toboyu. I ty mozhesh pyshatysya z ts'oho, **myslytel'ko** prostoho lyudu Chili [But your people, Gabriela, are invincible. They are proud of you. And you can be proud of that, **thinker** of the common people of Chile] (M. Aguirre / translated by M. Fishbein & L. Olevsky, 1974 / HRAK-17, 27.12.2023)

(8) Vidkynula nazad ty khvylyu teplykh kis; Ya vyyty vzhe khotiv, ty zh movyla: «Lyshys'!». Stoyala, i doshchem z-pid pal'tsiv polylosya, Zapakhshy kvitamy, rozpushchene volossya. Za zbroyu – hrebinets', i chornyy sviy sholom «Bezsmertna» moloda zdiymaye nad cholom. Takoyu ty meni, z lytsia, yak Dezdemona, O **voyinko** moya, z'yavylas' nevhomonna, Bozhestvenna bula... [You threw back a wave of warm braids; I was about to leave, you said: "Stay!". You stood there, and let down your hair from your fingers like the rain, and your hair was fragrant with flowers. Take a comb like a weapon, and the Immortal young lady raises her black helmet above her forehead. You appeared to me like Desdemona, O my **warrior**, restless and divine...] (A. Morois, translated by Y. Kalynychenko, 1971 / HRAK-17, 27.12.2023)

(9) Ado, ty zh v yuniversyti svoyemu navchayeshsya, na psykhiatra… Tak? / – Psykholoha! – pospikhom popravlyayu divchynu. / – Yes, na psykholoha. To, mozhe, poyasnysh, choho my vsi tak trymayemosya za mistse v ts'omu fakin klubi? Mistse zh paskudne. / – Chomu paskudne? Ya bachyla y hirshi, – namahayusya vidpovidaty yakomoha neytral'nishe. / – Okh, nou! Ne zabyvay baky, **psykholohyne**! Prosto day vidpovid': chomu? – ne vhavaye Inna ["Ada, you're studying at your university, to be a psychiatrist, right?" / "To be a psychologist", I hastily correct the girl. / "Ok, to be a psychologist. So, maybe you can explain why we're all holding on to our place in this fucking club? It's a shitty place". / "Why is it shitty? I've seen worse", I try to answer as neutrally as possible. / "Oh, no! Don't bother with it, **psychologist**! Just answer me: why?" Inna does not let up] (D. Korniy / HRAK-17, 27.12.2023)

(10) – Ta ye vzhe v mene dolya, – vidkazala. / – Tobto? / – Dolya – to kokhannya, – Kateryna opustyla holovu i led' sl'ozy vtrymuye. / – Ovva! – otsinyla Zhannochka Katryne zhinoche yestvo. / – Idy spaty, **filosofyne**… ["But I already have a destiny", she replied. / "What do you mean?" / "Destiny is love",

Kateryna lowered her head and barely held back her tears. / "Wow!" Zhanna appreciated Kateryna's feminine nature. / Go to bed, **philosopher** ...] (Luko Dashvar / HRAK-17, 27.12.2023)

(11) Sami obvynuvacheni zayavlyaly, shcho ne zbyrayut'sya tikaty, bo mayut' rodyny v Ukrayini. Vony zaperechuyut' svoyu prychetnist' do zlochynu. «Ya ne mayu zhodnoho stosunku do ts'oho zlochynu, i vy, **prokurorko**, tezh pro tse znayete, ale namahayetesya y dali lipyty tse vse», – skazav u sudi Serhiy Myslyvyy [The defendants themselves stated that they were not going to flee because they had families in Ukraine. They denied any involvement in the crime. "I have nothing to do with this crime, and you, the **prosecutor**, know it as well, but you are trying to continue this case", Serhiy Myslyvyi said in court] (Dzerkalo tyzhnya 2020/ HRAK-17, 26.12.2023)

(12) «Doroha **doktorko** Bayden, miy bat'ko buv doktorom ne medytsyny. I yoho robota prynesla bahato korysti lyudstvu. Y vasha robota takozh», – zvernulasya do maybutn'oyi pershoyi ledi Kinh ["Dear **Dr** Biden, my father was not a doctor of medicine. And his work brought a lot of benefit to humanity. And so has your work", King addressed the future first lady.] (Tablo ID/ HRAK-17, 26.12.2023)

As we can see, in the texts of the 20th century, addresses expressed by the feminine noun that names a person by their occupation maintain a sublime and solemn, sometimes pathetic tone of expression (5), (6), (7), (8). However, this pragmatic effect is caused not so much by grammatical features of the language means to denote the recipient of the speech (feminine gender, the vocative case) as by its lexical ones. Most of these personal feminine nouns (5), (7), (8) are derivatives of historicisms or archaic words that have an emphatic connotation of exaltation in their semantic structure. The analysis of the contexts of the 21st century shows that, quite often, the aim of the speaker using the personal feminine noun denoting occupation as an address to make contact and maintain a dialog in official communicative situations, especially when speaker is not personally acquainted with the addressee (12), (13), (14), (15). However, we can also observe cases when a speaker uses such an address not to make contact or adhere to the rules of etiquette but to express their own assessment of the previous speech act or action of the addressee. Usually, speech acts with this kind of addresses are possible when interlocutors have a close relationship, so an address expressed by a personal

feminine noun performs a characteristic function rather than an identifying one and intimates the utterance (1), (9), (10). Also, it seems to be an exaggeration to claim that this pragmatic effect is achieved exactly by the use of a personal feminine noun in an address function. It is rather due to the context of the communicative event and interaction with the other linguistic means.

(13) – Vash abonent ne vidpovidaye, – povidomyla operatorka. – Chy vy bazhayete, shchoby ya prodovzhuvala vyklykaty? / – Shche paru dzvinkiv, **operatorko**. Vy ne proty? ["Your caller is not answering", the **operator** said. "Do you want me to keep calling?" / "Some more callings, operator. Don't you mind?"] (S. King, translated by O. Krasiuk / HRAK-17, 27.12.2023)

(14) Za dva dni po tomu ya znov pochula yoho holos: – **Prodavchyne**! Mademuazel'! Ya obsluhovuvala molodu zhinku, yaka obrala paru rukavychok iz tonkoyi layky. Kyvnuvshy yomu, ya prodovzhyla oberezhno zahortaty yiyi pokupku. Ale vin ne stav chekaty. – Meni konche potriben ishche odyn sharf, – vyholosyv vin [Two days later, I heard his voice again: „**Saleswoman**! Mademoiselle!" I was attending to a young woman who had chosen a pair of fine leather gloves. Nodding to him, I continued to carefully wrap her purchase. But he didn't wait. "I really need another scarf," he said] (J. Moyes, translated by D. Petrushenko / HRAK-17, 27.12.2023)

(15) – Pidyom, **luchnytse**, – movyv khtos' nadi mnoyu na svitanku tret'oho dnya. Holos buv tykhym, ale vlasnym. Ya povil'no rozplyushchyla ochi, i mymovoli znovu zamruzhylas' – sontse, shcho same vstalo, zalyvalo palatu yaskravym prominnyam. U ts'omu prominni, poryad z moyeyu postillyu, stoyav vysokyy cholovik. Trokhy za sorok, z korotkym kashtanovym volossyam, syvymy skronyamy ta svitlo-karymy ochyma [„Wake up, **archer**", someone said above me at dawn on the third day. The voice was quiet, but overbearing. I opened my eyes slowly and squinted involuntarily again – the sun, which had just risen, was flooding the room with bright rays. In that light, a tall man stood next to my bed. He was a bit over forty, with short brown hair, grey temples and light brown eyes] (Ya. Katorozh / HRAK-17, 27.12.2023)

Observing the language code of communicative acts that contain an address expressed by a personal feminine noun in the vocative case, we can see that 21 of them are produced in the Ukrainian language and 28 are translations from other languages. However, the predominance of these forms

in the translated texts of GRAC is due to the fact that the address *doktorko* [doctor] occurs several times in 3 different texts, in particular – uses 12, 3, and 2. Therefore, if we count the texts, GRAC records the use of feminine vocatives in 18 original Ukrainian texts and 13 translated ones. The distinction seems to be not so significant that we can state a certain dependence.

M. Skab, describing the «profession names» of persons, underlines that they function as an address in the masculine gender only and are combined with lexemes used as etiquette forms of naming the interlocutor. In such cases, lexemes such as *pan* [*mister, sir*], *tovarysh* [*fellow*], *dobrodiy* [*good man*] perform an etiquette and socially-regulatory function, whereas "occupation title" performs an identificatory function (Skab, 2003, p. 64). The GRAC data show that feminine titles that refer to a person by occupation or field of activity are rarely combined with the word *pani* [*Ms, Msr, madam*] or similar in the position of address. There are only 8 such cases with 5 nouns: (*doctorka* [*doctor*], *filologynya* [*philologist*], *prokurorka* [*prosecutor*], *reperka* [*rapper*], *dohlyadalnyts'a* [*nurse*]), which are recorded in the GRAC. The components of some of these addresses have the same distribution of functions, and they support quite naturally the official tone of communication (16), (17). However, in other communicative acts containing such addresses, the condition of sincerity is flouted, because the use of the etiquette unit *pani* [*Madam*] as a means of demonstrating respect for the addressee does not reflect the speaker's true attitude. So, such addresses perform a certain perlocutionary effect – distancing oneself from the addressee and public insult (18), (19).

(16) «**Pani** heneral'na **prokurorko**, za sto dniv, za yaki vy zvituyete, do sudu skerovano vs'oho 2% kryminal'nykh provadzhen' iz tykh, shcho rozsliduvalysya! Reshta yak rozsliduvalysya rokamy, tak i prodovzhuyut' «rozsliduvatysya», azh doky yikh ne zakryyut' za davnistyu. Yak bachymo, tsya hanebna praktyka, koly spravy rokamy valyayut'sya bez nalezhnoho rozsliduvannya u seyfakh slidchykh ta prokuroriv, tryvaye. A shcho za tsym stoyit', nedavno pokazaly suspil'stvu kerivnyky Spetsializovanoyi antykoruptsiynoyi prokuratury Nazar Kholodnyts'kyy ta NABU» – Artem Sytnyk ["**Ms Prosecutor** General, you've been reporting for one hundred days, and in this time, only 2% of the criminal proceedings under investigation have been sent to court! The rest have been investigated for years and continue to be "investigated" until they are closed due to the statute of limitations. As we can see, this shameful practice of letting cases lie in the vaults of investigators and prosecutors for years without proper investigation continues. And

what is behind it has been recently revealed to the public by the heads of the Specialised Anti-Corruption Prosecutor's Office, Nazar Kholodnytskyi, and the NABU", Artem Sytnyk] (Dzerkalo Tyzhnia 2020 / HRAK-17, 27.12.2023)

(17) «Yevku do nas u sadok?». Poblazhlyvyy pohlyad, u yakomu mozhna prochytaty navit' zverkhnist'. «Shche semero ditey zaynyatykh mam pered vamy, **pani doktorko**» ["Will you enrol Evka to our kindergarten?". A condescending look, in which one can even read arrogance. "There are seven more children of busy mothers behind you, **Madam Doctor**"] (Z. Pluharzh, translated by V. Pasichna / HRAK-17, 27.12.2023)

(18) Obureni dryftom na Sofiys'kiy ploshchi i spaplyuzhennyam brukivky komentatory vymahayut' vid reperky ta yiyi komandy yty i vidmyvaty ploshchu vid slidiv shyn. «Dyzlayk za vandalizm», «A teper khochu bachyty video, na yakomu vy, neshanovna **pani reperko**, razom z hydotnym Red-Bull povnistyu vidnovlyuyete Sofiyivs'ku ploshchu» [Commentators, outraged by the drifting on St Sophia's Square and the desecration of the pavement, demand that the rapper and her team go and clean the square of tyre marks. "Dislike for vandalism", "And now I want to see a video in which you, disrespectful **lady rapper**, together with the disgusting RedBull, completely restore Sofia Square"] (NV 2022/ HRAK-17, 27.12.2023)

(19) – Shcho zh, sestrytse, pokazhy nam, na shcho ty zdatna. / – Moye im'ya Kendi Uayt. I proshu zapam'yataty tse. / Yakyy zhakh! To yak, **mis dohly-adal'nytse**? / – Tut neobkhidna operatsiya. / – Nu zh bo , roby yiyi. / – Ale ya… / – Ne mozhesh? / – Tak, ne mozhu. Ale ya mozhu nadaty pershu dopo-mohu. – Todi pishla ty! / – Vy hrubiyan, ser [Well, sister, show us what you've got. / My name is Candy White. And please remember that. / What a horror! Well, **Miss nurse**? / There's an operation to be performed. / Go on, do it. / But I... / You can't? / No, I can't. But I can give you first aid. – Then fuck you! / You're rude, sir] (TET "Candy Candy", translation by PP Fedorinchyk / HRAK-17, 27.12.2023)

5. Discussion and conclusion

Today, the statement about the use of corpus analysis for more valid outcomes of linguistic research hardly meets objections. The development of corpus linguistics and improvement of national corpora expands possibili-

ties for other linguistic disciplines. In particular, corpus data are becoming an unbiased measure in assessing the progress or regression of certain intra-linguistic trends, as they allow us to observe the entire language practice of a particular linguistic community on the synchronic level and as well in the historical perspective.

We consider the use of the corpus to be effective in establishing a methodology for assessing the procedures for activation or decline of a certain grammatical unit in the context of its functional competition with the other grammatical unit. It appears to be logical that when new words in a certain syntactic position are used more frequently in one morphological form than in the other morphological form, it means that the former form is functionally stronger in contrast to the latter. Respectively, the functional strength of the Ukrainian vocative case may be tested by evaluating its engagement in expressing address by means of new nouns. In our opinion, conducting such a test on the material of relatively new personal feminine nouns, has several advantages. Firstly, it eliminates the analogy factor, because these personal feminine nouns are only starting to enter the official communication area, and, therefore, there is no morphological pattern for their accommodation into the address position. Secondly, it eliminates the impact of tradition, since the Ukrainian-speaking community is not generally inclined to address the interlocutor by their occupation.

Therefore, the use of the GRAC corpus to assess the functional activation/decline of the Ukrainian vocative on the material of feminine neologisms, has demonstrated that this case has quite a strong functional position in the language system. When address is expressed by a personal feminine noun, GRAC does not reflect the functional competition between the vocative and the nominative. Almost all 20 feminine nouns selected for the analysis to refer to a person by her occupation in the position of address have the vocative form. GRAC records only one case (against 49 – see Table 1; it is 2%) of the nominative form of a personal feminine noun (*filolohynya* [*philologist*]) in that position. This fact points to the activation of the vocative case in the language system and undermines the statement about the strengthening of the tendency to reduce the number of cases due to the displacement of the vocative by the nominative. The quantitative advantage of vocatives that are involved either directly in a syntactic connection with a predicate (33%) or through the mediation of a pronoun with some sentence components (34%) may be considered evidence of the grammatical activity of this case.

The analysis also allows us to note another peculiarity of contemporary language practice – naming of the addressee by occupation or field of activity, which may be the emergence of a new communication tradition. It is worth noting that the vocative case, which can be interpreted as a nationally marked form, ensures that these lexemes enter the area to indicate address. This activation of the vocative could be due to two factors. The first one is the spread of the restored linguistic norm in expressing address thanks to the education system, and the second one is the language ideology of the Ukrainian speakers themselves, who consciously choose the vocative case to express address to distance themselves from Russian as the language of the colonizer.

On the other hand, two important facts should be taken into account since they may influence the outcomes. Firstly, the formation of feminine personal nouns denoting occupation and their entering into the language practice of Ukrainians is currently in an active phase. Secondly, the tendency to address the interlocutor by their occupation is quite new and not common in Ukrainian society. Therefore, such analysis, conducted on the basis of future versions of GRAC may show different results.

REFERENCES

Arkhanhel's'ka, A. (2019). *Femina cognita. Ukrayins'ka zhinka u slovi y slovnyku*. Kyyiv. [Архангел'ська, А. (2019). *Femina cognita. Українська жінка у слові и словнику*. Київ].

Bilodid, I. K. (Ed.). (1970–1980). *Slovnyk ukrayins'koyi movy: v 11 tt*. Kyyiv. [Білодід, I. К. (Ed.). (1970–1980). *Словник української мови: в 11 тт*. Київ].

Boyko, I. O. (2017). *Funktsional'na sfera apelyatyvnosti u suchasnomu ukrayins'komu rozmovnomu dyskursi*, dys. … kand. filol. nauk (doktora filosofiyi). Kyyiv. [Бойко, I. О. (2017). *Функтсіональна сфера апелятивності у сучасному українському розмовному дискурсі*, дис. … канд. філол. наук (доктора філософії). Київ].

Brus, M. (2022). Diakhronni ta synkhronni vyyavy feminityvotvorennya v ukrayins'kiy medychniy terminolohiyi. *Ukrayins'ka mova*, 4, 24–40. https://doi.org/10.15407/ukrmova2022.04.024. [Брус, М. (2022). Діакгронні та синкгронні вияви фемінітивотворення в українській медичній термінології. Українська мова, 4, 24–40. https://doi.org/10.15407/ukrmova2022.04.024].

Daniel M., & Spencer A. (2009). The vocative – an outlier case. In A. Malchukov & A. Spencer (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Case* (pp. 625–634). New York.

Dudyk, P. (1973). *Syntaksys suchasnoho ukrayins'koho rozmovnoho literaturnoho movlennya: proste rechennya, ekvivalenty rechennya*. Kyyiv. [Дудик, П. (1973). *Синтаксис сучасного українського розмовного літературного мовлення: просте речення, еквіваленти речення*. Київ].

Horodens'ka, K. (2017). Hramatychni normy ukrayins'koyi literaturnoyi movy i su-chasna praktyka profesiynoyi spil'noty. *Dyvoslovo*, 4, 40–45. [Городенс'ка, К. (2017). Граматичні норми української літературної мови і сучасна практика професіиної спільноти. *Дивослово*, 4, 40–45].

Horodens'ka, K. (2021). Hramatychni formy zvertan' u komunikatyvnomu prostori ukrayins'koho suspil'noho radio. *Studia Ucrainica Varsoviensia*, 9, 9–17. https://doi.org/10.31338/2299-7237suv.9.1. [Городенс'ка, К. (2021). Граматичні форми звертань у комунікативному просторі українського суспільного радіо. *Studia Ucrainica Varsoviensia*, 9, 9–17. https://doi.org/10.31338/2299-7237suv.9.1].

HRAK-17 – Heneral'nyy rehional'no anotovanyy korpus ukrayins'koyi movy (HRAK), M. Shvedova, R. Fon Val'denfel's, S. Yaryhin, A. Rysin, V. Starko, M. Voznyak, M. Kruk et al., Kyyiv, L'viv, Yena, 2017–2021. URL http://uacorpus.org (28.07.2022–24.08.2022). [ГРАК-17 – Генеральнии регіонально анотовании корпус української мови (ГРАК), М. Шведова, Р. Фон Вал'денфельс, С. Яригін, А. Рисін, В. Старко, М. Возняк, М. Крук та ін., Київ, Л'вів, Єна, 2017–2021. URL http://uacorpus.org (28.07.2022–24.08.2022)].

Kobchenko, N. (2021). Vokatyv i nominatyv u funktsiyi zvertannya: formuvannya movnoyi normy v radyans'kyy period. *Mova: klasychne – moderne – postmoderne*, 7, 68–91. https://doi.org/10.18523/lcmp2522-9281.2021.7.68-91. [Кобченко, Н. (2021). Вокатив і номінатив у функтсії звертання: формування мовної норми в радянс'кии період. *Мова: класичне – модерне – постмодерне*, 7, 68–91. https://doi.org/10.18523/lcmp2522-9281.2021.7.68-91].

Kobchenko, N., Yasakova, N., & Ozhohan, V. (2023). The interpretation of the vocative case in Ukrainian language education: Scientific foundations and socio-political factors. *Cognitive Studies | Études cognitives*, 2023(23), Article 2813. https://doi.org/10.11649/cs.2813.

Kolibaba, L., & Romanyuk, S. (2023). «Vil'nyy narode nezlamnoyi krayiny!», abo pro hramatychni formy zvertan' v ukrayins'komu politychnomu dyskursi KhKhI st. In N. Yasakova (Ed.). *Sotsial'ne u movi ta mova v sotsiumi* (pp. 313–354). Kyyiv. https://ekmair.ukma.edu.ua/items/9ba206fa-02cb-43e5-a3eb-2b27e94c7fd1. [Колібаба, Л., & Романюк, С. (2023). «Віл'нии народе незламної країни!», або про граматичні форми звертан' в українс'кому політичному дискурсі КгКгI ст. In Н. Ясакова (Ed.). *Сотсіал'не у мові та мова в сотсіумі* (pp. 313–354). Київ. https://ekmair.ukma.edu.ua/items/9ba206fa-02cb-43e5-a3eb-2b27e94c7fd1].

Levinson, S. C. (2008). Pragmatics. Cambridge.

Peti-Stantić, A. (2009). Restandardizacija (hrvatskoga) standardnoga jezika. In: L. Badurina, I. Pranjković, & J. Silič (Eds.). *Jezični varijeteti i nacionalni identiteti: prilozi proučavanju standardnih jezika utemeljenih na štokavštini* (pp. 71–82). Zagreb.

Plachynda, H. (2018). *Slovnychok feminityviv dlya pres-ofitseriv ta pres-ofitserok terytorial'nykh upravlin' derzhavnoyi sluzhby Ukrayiny z nadzvychaynykh sytuatsiy*. Kyyiv. [Плачинда, Г. (2018). *Словничок фемінітивів для прес-офіт-серів та прес-офітсерок територіал'никг управлін' державної служби України з надзвичаиникг ситуатсіи*. Київ].

Schaden, G. (2010). Vocatives: A Note on Addressee-Management. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics*, 16(1), Article 20. https://repository.upenn.edu/pwpl/vol16/iss1/20.

Selihey, P. O. (2023). *Ukrayins'ka mova u 2222 rotsi: Vstup do linhvofuturolohiyi*. Kyyiv. [Селігеи, П. О. (2023). *Українська мова у 2222 році: Вступ до лінгвофутурології*. Київ].

Sherekh, Yu. (1951). *Narys suchasnoyi ukrayins'koyi literaturnoyi movy*. Myunkhen. [Шерекг, Ю. (1951). *Нарис сучасної українс'кої літературної мови*. Мюнкген].

Silverstein, M. (1979). Language structure and linguistic ideology. In R. Clyne, W. Hanks. & C. Hofbauer (Eds.). *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels* (pp. 193–247). Chicago.

Skab, M. (2003). *Prahmatyka apelyatsiyi v ukrayins'kiy movi*. Chernivtsi. [Скаб, М. (2003). *Прагматика апелятсії в українськіи мові*. Чернівці].

Skab, M. S. (2007). Vokatyvni formy v suchasnomu ukrayins'komu movlenni: yakisna ta kil'kisna kharakterystyky. *Naukovi zapysky Ternopil's'koho natsional'noho pedahohichnoho universytetu. Seriya: Movoznavstvo*, 1(16), 291–302. [Скаб, М. С. (2007). Вокативні форми в сучасному українському мовленні: якісна та кіл'кісна кгарактеристики. *Наукові записки Тернопільського натсіонал'ного педагогічного університету. Серія: Мовознавство*, 1(16), 291–302].

Synchak, O. (2022). *Vebslovnyk zhinochykh nazv ukrainskoi movy*. https://r2u.org.ua/ html/femin_details.html. [Синчак, О. (2022). *Вебсловник жіночикг назв українскоі мови*. https://r2u.org.ua/html/femin_details.html].

Slovnyk feminityviv (2021). https://gendergid.org.ua/a/. [*Словник фемінітивів* (2021). https://gendergid.org.ua/a/].

Tkachenko, O. B. (Ed.). (2008). *Istorychna typolohiya slov'yans'kykh mov*. Part 2. Kyyiv. [Ткаченко, О. Б. (Ed.). (2008). *Історична типологія слов'янс'кикг мов*. Ч. 2. Київ].

Ukrayins'kyy pravopys. (2019). Kyyiv. [*Українськии правопис*. (2019). Київ].

Vykhovanets', I. R. (1987). *Systema vidminkiv ukraïns'koï movy*. Kyyiv. [Вихованец', І. Р. (1987). *Система відмінків українс'кої мови*. Київ].

Yasakova, N. Yu., Kobchenko, N. V., & Ozhohan, V. M. (2022). Ukrayins'kyy vokatyv: Zmina pohlyadiv na funktsiyi morfolohiynoyi formy na tli suspil'nykh transformatsiy. *Studia z Filologii Polskiej i Słowiańskiej*, 57, Article 2673. https:// doi.org/10.11649/sfps.2673. [Ясакова, Н. Ю., Кобченко, Н. В., & Ожоган, В. М. (2022). Українськии вокатив: Зміна поглядів на функтсії морфологіиної форми на тлі суспільникг трансформатсіи. *Studia z Filologii Polskiej i Słowiańskiej*, 57, Article 2673. https://doi.org/10.11649/sfps.2673].