

Croatian Shtokavian grammar books: overview of the history of grammar books on the Croatian Shtokavian literary language with an outline of their periodization and classification

Sanda Ham 

University of Osijek, School of Social Sciences and Humanities, Osijek, Croatia

Correspondence to:

Sanda Ham
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences,
Jagerova 9, Osijek
sanda.ham@gmail.com

Cite as:

Ham, S. Croatian Shtokavian grammar books: overview of the history of grammar books on the Croatian Shtokavian literary language with an outline of their periodization and classification. ST-OPEN. 2020; 1: e2020.2019.24.

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.48188/so.1.10>

This paper describes the criteria for the systematic periodization of Croatian grammar books. These criteria are exclusively linguistic and take into account the phonological and morphological structure described in these grammar books; where the grammar books contain a dictionary, the lexical organization has been taken into consideration as well. Based on these criteria, all Croatian grammar books may be systematized into four periods: I. 1604 – 1836 (old Croatian grammars), II. 1836 – 1899 (Croatian grammars from the Illyrian Movement to the end of the 19th century, with two parallel subgroups: grammars by the Zagreb School and Croatian Vukovians), III. 1899 – 1986 (with three successive subgroups: Croatian grammars from the beginning of the 20th century to 1940, Croatian grammars from 1940 to 1945, Croatian grammars from 1945 to the 1970s), IV. contemporary Croatian grammars. All these grammars clearly reveal the continuity of the Croatian literary language. This language is recognizable and comprehensible in all grammars, primarily owing to its Shtokavian stylization – and not to any kind of “organic basis”.

Introduction

This paper deals with the way Croatian Shtokavian grammar books were classified and grouped based on their synchronicity, which was determined on account of their common linguistic and/or normative features.

Croatian linguistic heritage in the shadow of politics

Comprehensive lists of Croatian grammar books (hereinafter referred to as “CGBs”) are a modern occurrence (Tafra, 1993, 1994, 1995; Ham, 2006, 2008; Marković, 2011). The earli-

est CGBs date back to the early 17th century, and Croatian grammarians have always been exceptionally active and prolific, so it is only reasonable to wonder why the affirmation of Croatian grammar books took as many as three hundred years. The reason for the lagging pace of modern Croatian linguistics is not in the negligence of the Croatian linguistic heritage; it lies in the unfavorable political climate that had faced Croats as well as Croatian linguistics until the establishment of the Republic of Croatia (Ham, 2020). We have records on Croatian linguists and their work from the periods when Croats were able to write freely about their language and literary heritage, allowing for a better understanding of the history of our language. For example, the Croatian historian Šime Ljubić (1869) wrote freely, without political pressure, and his works represent an accurate record of the Croatian literary tradition. Back in 1869, he listed and commented on the Croatian normative literature, from its beginning to the early 19th century, or the Illyrian Movement period. Ljubić compiled an exhaustive list of grammar books, dictionaries, and orthography books, including Džamanjić's orthography book – and today, a whole century and a half after Ljubić, this text is the first known Croatian orthography book, titled: *Nauk za pisati dobro latinskim slovima rieči jezika slovinskoga kojim se Dubrovčani i sva Dalamcija kako vlastitim svojim jezikom služe* (1639, reprinted in 1991 in Bamberg), almost like a modern discovery. For centuries, the Croatian written heritage has been virtually unknown in Croatia.

The unitarian Yugoslavia – of which Croatia was a part – denied the distinctiveness of the Croatian language. The Croatian language was disclaimed and only the politically constructed Serbo-Croatian language was accepted. Its role was to drown the Croatian language in Serbian, weakening thus the Croatian national consciousness. This unitarian language policy and the denial of distinctive Croatian features (not only the linguistic kind but also the broader, national kind) gained momentum in the middle of the 19th century. It expanded and grew, culminating in the former state of Yugoslavia (Auburger, 2009). The Yugoslav authorities denied the Croatian linguistic tradition and did not encourage its research and evaluation. The reason lies in the fact that the Croatian tradition transparently shows that Croatian developed independently, so there can be no talk of any Serbo-Croatian language (Brozović, 1977). This is also supported by numerous Croatian grammar books written before the politically-motivated creation of the artificial Serbo-Croatian language, and this paper aims to demonstrate this fact.

“The organic basis” – the pivot of polycentric linguistic unitarism

Unitarian pressures have entrenched the centuries-old bad habit of describing the Croatian language in terms of its “organic basis” – while disregarding its grammatical standard. This “organic basis” was, of course, supposed to be the Shtokavian dialect. There was a quest for the underlying dialect of all Shtokavian languages, in the intention to prove their kinship and push it to the point of uniformity. The traces of this reasoning still remain today, in the post-Yugoslav language cesspool which spawned the 2016 *Declaration on the Common Language* (<https://jezicinacionalizmi.com/deklaracija>). Based on the Shtokavian elements in Croatian, Serbian, Bosnian, and Montenegrin, this Declaration calls for the common, anational Yugoslav-type language.

Croatian and Serbian are Shtokavian languages, but the perennial search for an “organic basis” in the foundation of the Croatian literary language is the quest for a non-existent common polycentric language of not only Croats and Serbs but Bosnians and Montenegrins as well.

Serbs are still known to claim the Shtokavian dialect as exclusively their own. They consider all older works written in Shtokavian as belonging to the Serbs, including the acclaimed Croatian literature centered around Dubrovnik (Bojović, 2014). In this regard, I note that I read an abridged version of this paper at the International Slavic Congress in Ohrid, on 10 – 16 September 2008 (Ham, 2008). Beyond my wildest imagination, the entire Serbian delegation led by the Serbian linguist Miloš Kovačević assembled to hear my presentation. They pulled no punches in their attack on my speech – because it came to light that Croatia’s Shtokavian grammars were at least two and a half centuries older than the alleged time of appearance of the Croatian language, proposed by the Serbian theory. By their very existence, these Croatian Shtokavian grammars negate any theory of Shtokavian as the common language of Croats and Serbs (Bosniaks and Montenegrins) as well as the common and shared beginnings of these standard languages. I assume that it was this guiding idea of mine that provoked the Serbian delegation to the point of professing that all the entries on my list of Croatian Shtokavian and Kajkavian grammars (which was on that occasion presented to the audience) were, in fact, not grammar books at all. I described this discussion in detail in my paper entitled *Kroatistikom uzvodno – rasprava o autorstvu* (“The Croatian Studies against the Current – A Discussion on Authorship”) (Ham, 2015).

Contrary to the “organic basis” theory, the grammatical norm presupposes the development of a literary language, and in that sense rejects the importance of the “organic basis”, if not the “organic basis” itself. European Neogrammarians rejected this fact, distorting the perspectives on the Croatian language by their excessive regard for the “organic basis”. The renowned Croatian linguist Radoslav Katičić (2008) often wrote on this issue and his view of the Croatian literary language as a language lacking an “organic basis”, but boasting a dialectal stylization.

The linguistic interrelations between CGBs have been noted in recent times (Brozović, 1977, 1985; Katičić, 1978; Vince, 1988, 1990; Tafra, 1995a; Gabrić-Bagarić, 2003; Kolenić, 2003; Stolac, 2005, 2006), as well as the relations to dialects and literary works. It is certainly worth mentioning the monographs that were built on the correlation of the literary text and its corresponding norm, i.e. grammar books (Vončina, 1975; Kalenić, 1965; Ham, 1994). In this sense, we have only just scratched the surface of the history of CGBs.

In this paper, I wish to touch on the possibility of describing the history of the Croatian literary language based on Croatian grammar books and propose a classification of Croatian grammars founded on their shared features. The links that make up the history of Croatian grammars also make up the history of the Croatian literary norm.

Old Croatian Shtokavian grammars

The old Shtokavian CGBs are CGBs written between 1604 and 1836: Kašić 1604, Della Bella 1728, Tadijanović 1761, Lanosović 1778, Relković 1767, Jurinov 1793, Voltić 1803, Appendini 1808, Starčević 1812, and I. A. Brlić 1833. This is a span of two centuries, from the first CGB by B. Kašić to the first Illyrian grammar by V. Babukić (Bibliographic data on these grammars are given in the **Box 1** – Chronological list of Croatian Shtokavian Grammars).

Križanić's Pan-Slavic grammar

A special mention should be made of this solitary literary and linguistic attempt – a grammar of the language of the Ozalj circle, the three-dialect Chakavian-Kajkavian-Shtokavian stylization nurtured by the men of letters, writers and lexicographers of the 17th century on the Zrinski and Frankopan estates centered around Ozalj – hence the name, the Ozalj literary-linguistic circle (Vončina, 1968). The idiosyncrasies of this language were described by Juraj Križanić in his Pan-Slavic grammar *Gramatično izkazanje ob ruskom jeziku*, published in Tobolsk in 1665. This grammar was written after Kašić's Croatian grammar (1604) and Mikalja's Italian grammar (1649) and is consequently the second grammar of Croatian. However, the Croatian language in Križanić's grammar needs to be approached indirectly; Križanić wrote a Pan-Slavic grammar with examples from all Slavic languages and commented on Croatian only where it deviated from his Pan-Slavic system.

Comments of this nature abound: *A gdi Hervāti izrikájut..., Hervāti velét..., po Hervâtsku... Hervāti vezdí ráži izrikájut...;* if we isolate all that is *po hervatsku* (in Croatian), we may try to describe the Croatian language of Križanić's time.

“When we sum this up and look for Croatian texts written in the language that, to the greatest extent, meets Križanić's description, there is no doubt that this is the language that was nurtured on the Zrinski and Frankopan estates... Now we may declare that the Ozalj literary and linguistic circle comprised not only its own writers but also Juraj Križanić, a grammarian of its own... now we may declare that Croats in the 17th century had two grammars, as the language of the Croatian literary complex of the southeast and northwest gained a grammatical description” (Moguš, 1993, p. 87).

The grammatical description of the Croatian south (southeast) and the Shtokavian-Chakavian literary and linguistic stylization we owe to B. Kašić. Within the framework of his Pan-Slavic grammar, Kašić gave a grammatical description of the Chakavian-Kajkavian-Shtokavian literary and linguistic stylization as a distinctive language of the Ozalj circle. The legacy of the first Croatian grammarian, Bartul Kašić, has been kept alive by many grammarians, and it still survives in grammar books today. Križanić's legacy, on the other hand, has not been kept alive by anyone, as his grammar was inaccessible and unknown for two centuries. It was published in Moscow two centuries after Križanić had written it, in 1848 and 1859, and in Frankfurt in 1976 and 1978. J. Hamm transcribed it into the Latin script (Hamm, 1984). The Croatian of Križanić's grammar was reconstructed by Milan Moguš (1984).

Old Croatian Latin and Italian grammars

More than a century had passed between the first printed CGB by Kašić in 1604, and the second grammar by Della Bellina, written in 1728; however, it was by no means a dead century in grammatical, and especially in linguistic terms. This is the era of grammars of foreign languages written by Croats – Mikalja, Babić, and Ljubušak.

The grammar books by Mikalja, Babić, and Ljubušak are not grammars of the Croatian language, but they were written in Croatian. In 1649, in Loreto, Jakov Mikalja published his Italian grammar, *Grammatika talianska u kratho ili kratak nauk za naucciti latinski jezik*, as apart of the dictionary titled *Blago jezika slovinskoga*. This is important for the history of the study of Croatian grammar not only due to the fact that the first Italian grammar was written in Croatian but also because various lexicographers and grammarians built on Mikalja's work. It should be noted that Mikalja was a professor at the Jesuit grammar school in Dubrovnik; consequently, his grammar was written in the Jekavian-Ikavian Shtokavian stylization of Croatian with some Chakavian elements. When it comes to Shtokavian with Chakavian elements, Mikalja followed in the footsteps of Kašić and his literary and linguistic Shtokavian stylization. The closer we get to the 18th century, the fewer Chakavian elements we encounter in this Shtokavian stylization.

Other grammars in the vein of Mikalja's were written and published in the early 18th century. These were Latin grammars written in the Ikavian-Jekavian Shtokavian stylization of Croatian: by Tome Babić (1712, ²1745) (Numbers in superscript next to the year indicate the edition of the document) and Lovro Šitović Ljubušak 1713, ²1742, ³1781. Although these were Latin grammars, they were written in Croatian, so they may serve as a basis for the study of the contemporary Croatian language of the area where they were written. In this sense, they should most certainly be mentioned among the old Croatian grammars, especially as they meet the literary and linguistic guidelines of their time and had an influence on their contemporaries (Kolenić, 1998).

Franciscan grammar manuscripts

We know today that three additional trilingual Latin-Italian-Croatian grammars were handwritten in the Shtokavian stylization. All three were authored by Franciscans.

Gašpar Vinjalić was the author of the oldest of the three. His grammar spans 273 pages, in 12 small volumes. It is kept in the Sinj monastery archives. We do not know the exact time of its creation, but it is assumed to be sometime between 1766 and 1770. It was discovered only in the late 19th century. It is a reworking of Álvares' (1572) Latin grammar, but Vinjalić also followed in the footsteps of both Babić and Šitović. It is considered to be the first complete trilingual grammar in Croatia.

Mijo Bilušić, the author of the second grammar, had begun writing it in 1781, but passed away in 1797 before finishing it. The manuscript is kept in the archives of the monastery on Visovac.

The title, author, and time of writing of the third manuscript, an incomplete grammar by Andrija Bujas, were determined indirectly, as the grammar does not give this information. The author's name and title on the cover were a later addition by Fr. Petar Bačić; Bujas' au-

thorship was established by comparing handwritten letters (reliably known to have been written by Andrija Bujas) and the grammar manuscript. The exact time of writing cannot be established, but based on the grammatical model and language; we may conclude that it is part of the Franciscan manuscript trio from the late 18th century. The grammar has 284 small pages and is a rewriting of Álvares' (1572) grammar. Its content is divided into three columns – one for Latin, Croatian and Italian respectively. The manuscript is kept in the Visovac monastery archives. Pezo (1984) and Bezina (1993, 1994) wrote at length on the three Franciscan manuscript grammars, Kovačić (2018) described Vinjalić's trilingual grammar, while Kramarić (2020) described the Croatian language of Vinjalić's grammar based on the digital scans of Vinjalić's manuscript made in 2013. Unfortunately, these scans, as well as the manuscripts of all three grammars, are unavailable to the public. As they were not printed (or completed), they were not in use and could not have influenced the development of the linguistic norm. Nevertheless, these manuscripts also bear witness to an older version of Croatian as well as the burgeoning work of the Croatian Franciscan grammarians.

Common linguistic features of old Croatian Shtokavian grammars

This series of CGBs in the Shtokavian stylization may be segregated into two smaller circles: the first being the grammars of the Croatian southern circle (Kašić, Mikalja, Della Bella, Jurin, Voltić, Appendini) and the second, the grammars of the Bosnian-Slavonian circle (Babić, Ljubušak, Tadijanović, Relković, Lanosović, Starčević, Brlić). Naturally, any such division is conditional, as there are no significant linguistic differences between the CGBs of these two circles. There is, therefore, no need for any such divisions; they share the same supradialectal stylization and literary language, described based on virtually the same grammatical model, using practically the same script.

Supradialectal Shtokavian stylization

The above CGBs all share the same supradialectal Shtokavian stylization, which borrowed lexically from three dialects; due to the fact that most CGBs contain examples of spoken language as well as dictionaries, this supradialectal permeation of lexis is clearly evident. The Štokavian stylization is either Ikavian and/or Jekavian, though not consistently so, in keeping with its supradialectal nature.

Tree accents

All old CGBs describe three accents: acute, gravis, and circumflex. The exception is Starčević's grammar, which records a four-accent system.

Spelling

Depending on the author, the grammar books use either the Jesuit or Franciscan spelling; in any case, they reflect an old spelling with no superscript diacritics. Only one grammarian employs a subscript diacritic: Jurin uses the letter *ç*, for /č/.

All CGBs use this spelling, drawing a clear dividing line between the old CGBs and the CGBs of the following period, which use a uniform spelling as well as superscript diacritics.

However, it should be noted that old CGBs in no way demonstrate spelling anarchy, and instead strive toward a common spelling system; the closer we draw to the 19th century and the Illyrian era, the greater this enterprise, and more uniform the spelling (Moguš & Vončina, 1969).

What unifies the spelling in both periods is the spelling of the syllabic *r* with its accompanying vocal, as either *ar* or *er*. The choice between the *ar* and *er* spelling is usually seen as the distinguishing feature separating the southern and Bosnian-Slavonian circles. However, the very recording of the accompanying vocal with the syllabic *r* may be seen as a shared feature. This spelling was finally abandoned only in the second half of the 19th century, in the third edition of Weber's grammar *Slovnica hrvatska*.

Word morphology and declension

All old CGBs honor the Latin model of classifying nouns according to their genitive plural suffix (established by B. Kašić). A feature of the old CGBs is the unequal number of cases in the singular and plural, resulting from the omission of the locative case in the singular (as its suffix corresponded to the dative suffix in the singular). Kašić's legacy is also evident in the fact that the old CGBs have the ablative case (except for Starčević and Brlić), which Kašić borrowed from Latin grammar and which in the old CGBs corresponded to the Croatian genitive case preceded by the preposition *od*. The first CGB to describe the same number of cases as our modern grammars is the last of the old CGBs, written by Brlić. The case system described in the old CGBs shares another significant common feature: the suffixes in plural cases are not syncretized. However, most grammarians recorded the new suffixes alongside the old instrumental plural suffixes, placing these new suffixes at the very forefront of the Croatian standardization processes.

It should also be noted that the old CGBs did not describe and morphologically distinguish between definite and indefinite adjectival forms. Syntactically, however, they do make this distinction, echoing Kašić, who described the use of adjectives in nominal predicates, noting that adjectival predicates may not end in *-i*, i.e. that definite adjectives may function as predicate nominatives. Only the last of the old CGBs, written by Brlić, described the declension of the definite and indefinite adjectival forms.

Verb morphology

The verb system of the old CGBs also closely mimicked Kašić and the Latin grammar – by normalizing the conjunctive and optative (or, at best, merging these two moods into one) and going as far as normalizing the potential mood. The CGBs of the second period, from the Illyrian Movement to the end of the 19th century, will be the first to escape this model.

Dual

Old CGBs do not describe the dual form; the dual was, as a standard form, introduced into the Croatian literary language only in the first half of the 19th century by Babukić, and then kept by the grammarians of the Zagreb School.

Metalanguage and the grammatical model

The old CGBs were written in either Latin or Italian or German. They were often bilingual; the first monolingual, Croatian-only grammar was written by Starčević. The CGBs of the second period, from the Illyrian Movement to the end of the 19th century, were mostly written in Croatian; only a few Croatian linguists or grammarians still wrote in German or Italian.

Another significant feature of the old CGBs had gradually faded away during the 19th century, only to completely disappear in the 20th century – the CGBs from B. Kašić to I. A. Brlić were conceived as exhaustive linguistic manuals containing (besides the chapters on spelling, phonology, morphology, and syntax) obligatory examples from oral or written communication (conversations and letters), and often dictionaries as well – conceptual, not alphabetical. Kašić's grammar did not contain samples of conversations and letters, and neither did it come with a dictionary; it was titled *Osnove* ("The Basics") for that very reason – it was incomplete. Although it was conceived and written as a complete work, the whole book could not be printed, so only its *basic* part saw the light of day (Horvat, 1999).

This awareness of a grammar book as an exhaustive language manual had not completely vanished in the 19th century, but grammars containing conversational snippets and dictionaries – let alone conceptual dictionaries – were a rare find during the second period in the history of grammar-writing. This is an exclusive and required feature of the first-period grammars, and the first CGB to eschew this system – doing away with conversational snippets and dictionaries – was Babukić's *Osnova slovnice*.

Croatian grammars from the Illyrian era to the end of the 19th century

Philologically, the period starting with the Illyrian Movement and lasting until the end of the 19th century has habitually been divided into three parts – the Illyrian period (from the 1830s to the middle of the 19th century), the period of philological schools (from the mid-1800s to the 1890s), and the period of triumph of the Croatian Vukovians (last decade of the 19th century).

If we look at these three periods only from the perspective of the CGB linguistic features, the boundaries between them merge into one – normative linguistics. On the one side we have the grammars of the Zagreb Philological School, and on the other, the grammars of Croatian Vukovians. The Rijeka and Zadar schools produced no grammars; authors from Zadar did compose grammar books, but their grammars in no way differed from those of the Zagreb School (Vince, 1998).

Grammars of the Zagreb Philological School

In principle, the Zagreb grammars cultivated and kept the same normative solutions during the Illyrian Movement period and through the second half of the 19th century, so from that perspective, there is no point in dividing them into two groups; the solutions advocated by the Vukovian CGBs clashed with those of the Zagreb School in the exact same manner from the 1830s until the turn of the century. Therefore, we here view the

period from the Illyrian Movement to the end of the 19th century as a uniform period in the history of CGBs. Grammars compiled in the Illyrian Movement period and through the end of the 19th century are hence divided into two parallel subgroups – the grammars of the Zagreb Philological School and Vukovian CGBs. The decisive – and only criterion – for such a division is the literary and linguistic norm evident in these grammars, as opposed to their time or place of origin. In principle, these two groups explicitly subscribed to distinctive normative solutions, which clearly set them apart.

The Zagreb School followed in the footsteps of the bustling work of Shtokavian grammarians of the 18th and the first half of the 19th century. This meant two things: their supradialectal stylization of the literary language is Shtokavian; and they made no break with the tradition and so heralded no new era in the development of the literary language. What was novel was the conscious Pan-Croatian effort to achieve a unified literary language in all parts of Croatia (*svih stranah hervatskih*); in contrast to the guiding principles of the Zagreb School, the older CGBs were not a result of conscious Pan-Croatian strivings, with clear and concrete normative solutions based on philological principles. Today, we know that Kašić wrote his grammar when prompted to do so by his order – but methodologically and normatively, it had no set framework (Horvat, 1999; Katičić, 1999).

The Zagreb School followed along the normative path mapped out since Kašić's time, but still modernized the Shtokavian stylization. For example, the Jekavian Shtokavian had already been stylized in the first Zagreb grammar book, as evident in the recommendation that, although the reflexes of the Old Slavic yat (diphthong) – written as *ě* – may be read in the Jekavian, Ikavian, or Ekavian variant (and even Ijekavian, for metric purposes), they should preferably be pronounced as *je*, as prescribed by Babukić in his grammar *Osnova slovnice slavjanske*. The various pronunciations of yat therefore gradually waned from one grammar to the next, eventually leaving only the Jekavian pronunciation. Thus, the predominant Ikavian Shtokavian language standardized in the Shtokavian CGBs during the late 18th and early 19th centuries gradually and seamlessly shifted into the Jekavian style. Another example is the accents – the old Shtokavian three-accent system was only abandoned in the middle of the 19th century, and not immediately, in the first Zagreb grammar. This was a decisive step towards the newer Shtokavian characters.

The old case suffixes are a distinctive feature of the Zagreb School and a sharp dividing line between them and Croatian Vukovians. From the Illyrian Movement to the end of the 19th century, by choosing the older forms of the inherited Shtokavian supradialectal stylization, the Zagreb School grammarians gradually, step by step, moved towards the Neo-Shtokavian stylization. The language of the Zagreb Philological School did not start as a Neo-Stokavian stylization with old features; rather, it was an Old Stokavian stylization that gradually took on novel features (Tafra, 1995; Ham, 1998). Every new grammar featured some Neo-Stokavian stylizations, but the literary language, in principle, remained the same, and easily recognizable. On the intelligibility and distinctness of the Croatian literary language as the common language to all Croats, regardless of time and space, see Katičić, 2008.

The fundamental difference between the Zagreb and Vukovian grammar books was the fact that the Zagreb grammarians standardized the literary language while being perfectly

aware that it stood above local vernaculars and dialects, and so not to be sought there (this problematized the importance and survival of the *organic basis*, see: Katičić, 2008). Their principle was: “Write as skillful writers write” (*Piši kao što dobri pisci pišu*), as their standardization efforts drew from the written Croatian Shtokavian tradition. Of course, these are modern definitions of the 19th century principles (Skok, 1952; Jonke, 1965). Croatian Vukovians standardized their literary language by relying on the living vernacular and their principle was: “Speak as skillful Shtokavians speak” (*Govori kao što dobri štokavci govore*), as their standardization efforts drew from the spoken Shtokavian language.

The most important and most influential Zagreb grammarians were V. Babukić, A. Mažuranić, and A. Veber; however, there were many other authors whose grammars were not crucial or decisive in the normative sense, but they did direct the standardization of the Croatian literary language towards the Zagreb mother tongue: L. Fröhlich Veselić, Lj. Rukavina Ljubački, L. Fürholzer, A. Stazić, J. Šutina, F. Volarić, V. Pacel, I. Danilo, M. Divković, (at first, I. Danilo and M. Divković subscribed to the Zagreb norm, but later sided with the Croatian Vukovians), Paul Pierre, J. Vitanović, D. Parčić, J. Margitaj. The grammars by most authors had at least two editions.

Grammars by the Croatian Vukovians

A grammar book by the Croatian Vukovians is any CGB prominently featuring the literary and linguistic features standardized by V. S. Karadžić and Đ. Daničić; by Croatian Vukovians, we mean the Croatian supporters of Karadžić and Daničić. The Philological School of Croatian Vukovians was at the time known as the Daničić School.

Croatian Vukovians strove towards creating a common language of Croats and Serbs, and their grammars were linguistic products of the Yugoslav idea that saw an upsurge among Croatian intelligentsia, including some linguists and writers, during the 19th century. To put it shortly and succinctly, and without going into a detailed analysis of complex political and national relations, the Vukovians started from a contemporary scientific idea advanced by European Neogrammarians: that the genetic relationship among languages dictated the kinship of their peoples. As both Croats and Serbs were Shtokavians, they were considered to be one people. As there had never been such linguistic unity – neither before the time of the Croatian Vukovians nor during their time – the common language was modeled on the language that V. S. Karadžić recorded lexically in his Serbian dictionary (*Srpski rječnik*) in 1818, and systematized grammatically in his short grammar volume attached to it, and which was finally described by Đ. Daničić phonologically, phonetically, and morphologically in his grammar books *Mala srpska gramatika* in 1850 and *Oblici srpskog jezika* in 1864, and syntactically, in his *Srpska sintaksa* in 1858.

The dialectal bases for the common language of Croats and Serbs were to be the Neo-Stokavian Ijekavian dialects and vernaculars; the Vukovians strove to promote these vernaculars to the literary language level and keep them purely Shtokavian. For Serbs, this was an acceptable option, as they had only started to look for a literary and linguistic dialectal basis (not a stylization – a basis!) on which to model their literary language; for Croats, however, this was generally unacceptable, because they settled on the Shtokavian dialectal basis back in the time of B. Kašić, based on the existing Croatian literature –

therefore, the literary and linguistic Shtokavian language of the Croats is older than the first CGB. By the time of V. S. Karadžić, this Shtokavian language had already been refined, abundantly expanded, cultivated, and adapted to the Croatian three-dialectal linguistic reality, as well as directed towards the Neo-Shtokavian development (Katičić, 1987).

Compared to Zagreb grammarians, Croatian Vukovians were few and far between: A. T. Brlić, P. Budmani, I. Danilo, M. Divković, F. Vuletić, Rudolf Strohal, and Tomo Maretić. The apparent scarcity of Croatian Vukovians is only amplified by the fact that I. Danilo and M. Divković emerged as Zagreb grammarians; that F. Vuletić wrote his Vukovian grammar for the Croats in Bosnia and Hercegovina; and that Budmani's work was a comparative grammar of the Croatian and Serbian language.

Table 1. The most pronounced differences between the grammars of the Zagreb School and Croatian Vukovians

Grammatical features	The Zagreb Philological School norm	The Croatian Vukovians norm
Grammatical model	Noun declensions are categorized according to the genitive singular suffix; locative is the sixth case, instrumental the seventh.	Noun declensions are categorized according to gender; locative is the seventh case, instrumental the sixth.
Terminology	<i>slovnica, samostavnik, pridavnik, brojnik, zaima, spol, osobno zaima, glagolj, glagoljna osoba, prošlo vrijeme, predlog, veznik, uzključnik or umetak, prislov (prilog)...</i>	<i>gramatika, imenica, pridjev, broj, zamjenica, rod, lična zamjenica, glagol, glagolsko lice, pređašnje vrijeme, predlog, savez, usklik, prilog...</i>
Spelling	<i>tj, ć = č, dj, gj = đ</i> ; before 1876, the yat was written as <i>ě</i> ; syllabic <i>r</i> as <i>ěr</i> ; from 1876 the yat was written as <i>ie, je</i> ; syllabic <i>r</i> as <i>r</i> .	Introduced the letters <i>đ</i> and <i>dž</i> ; no <i>tj</i> , only <i>ć</i> ; the long reflex of the yat is written as <i>ije</i> , the short reflex as <i>je</i> ; the syllabic <i>r</i> is written without the accompanying <i>e</i> .
Orthography	Morphology-based: Write for the eyes, speak for the ears.	Phonology-based: Write as you speak.
Phonology and phonetics	The yat reflex is a phoneme, a monosyllabic diphthong; the four-accent system (only Babukić advocates for three accents); the long rising accent: <i>^</i> , the long falling accent: <i>/</i> . The diphthong is only long: <i>ie, iê</i> .	The long reflex of the yat is not a diphthong phoneme, but a trophoneme sequence <i>i+j+e</i> with a disyllabic pronunciation and short accents: <i>ijê, ije</i> ; the four-accent system; the long rising accent: <i>/</i> , the long falling accent: <i>^</i> .
Morphology	Genitive plural nouns have the <i>h</i> suffix: <i>jelen-ah, konj-ah, sel-ah, žen-ah, stvar-ih</i> ; in dative, locative and instrumental plural, the nonsyncretic suffixes are: D pl. <i>jelen-om, konj-em, sel-om, žen-am, stvar-im</i> ; L pl. <i>jelen-ih, konj-ih, sel-ih, žen-ah, stvar-ih</i> ; I pl. <i>jelen-i, konj-i, sel-i, žen-ami, stvar-mi</i> . In the dative and instrumental dual, all nouns have the suffixes <i>-ima, -ama</i> : <i>jelen-ima, konj-ima, sel-ima, žen-ama, stvar-ima</i> . The pronoun <i>ona</i> in the post-accentual accusative singular is <i>ju</i> . A regular arrangement of suffixes in the declension of pronouns and adjectives (there is no <i>e</i> suffix within the system): G sg. <i>žut-oga</i> , D sg. <i>žut-omu</i> , L sg. <i>žut-om</i> , I sg. <i>žut-im</i> . Recommend the declension of the numbers <i>dva, oba tri, četiri</i> ; for numbers <i>dva</i> and <i>oba</i> , the gender varies: <i>dvaju</i> and <i>dviju, dvama</i> and <i>dvjema</i> . Present and past verbal adjectives are a special declension of participles: <i>prikazujuća slika, prikazujuće slike...</i> The exact future: besides the form <i>budem kopao</i> , the form <i>bit ću kopao</i> is also standard.	Genitive plural nouns do not have the <i>h</i> suffix: <i>jelena-a, konj-a, sel-a, žen-a, stvar-i</i> ; the dative, locative and instrumental plural syncretic suffixes: <i>jelen-ima, konj-ima, sel-ima, žena-ama stvar-ima</i> . No dual. The pronoun <i>ona</i> in the post-accentual accusative singular is <i>je</i> . An irregular arrangement of suffixes in the declension of pronouns and adjectives (the <i>e</i> suffix is preferred): G sg. <i>žut-oga</i> and <i>žut-og</i> , D sg. <i>žut-omu</i> and <i>žut-om</i> and <i>žut-ome</i> , L sg. <i>žut-om</i> and <i>žut-ome</i> , I sg. <i>žut-im</i> . Do not recommend the declension of the numbers <i>dva, oba tri, četiri</i> ; for numbers <i>dva</i> and <i>oba</i> , <i>dvije</i> and <i>obje</i> , both genders share the same dative, locative and instrumental forms, based on the feminine forms: <i>dvjema, objema</i> . No present and past verbal adjectives as a special declension of participles. No exact future: <i>bit ću kopao</i> .
Case syntax	<i>Prema</i> and <i>protiv</i> are dative propositions; <i>mimo</i> is an accusative preposition.	<i>Prema</i> and <i>protiv</i> are locative propositions; <i>mimo</i> is a genitive preposition.

The most important distinguishing features between the two opposing norms – the Croatian Shtokavian stylization and the Vukovian Neo-Shtokavian “organic” basis – are shown in [Table 1](#).

The normative features of the Vukovian CGBs are not as complete as those of their very idols, V. S. Karadžić and Gj. Daničić – they are usually somewhere in between the Vukovian and Zagreb norm and their CGBs commonly mix linguistic features. The only purely Croatian Vukovian grammar is that by Maretić. Croatian Vukovians before Maretić followed the *Karadžić-Daničić canon* only to the extent that would not deny the unique features of the Croatian language and rudely interrupt its tradition. For that reason, their grammars often give double solutions, both upholding the Croatian tradition, as well as accepting innovations. All Vukovian grammars before Maretić also feature enough traditional, Zagreb-esque solutions to uphold their undisputed affiliation with the Croatian tradition ([Tafra, 1995](#)).

New Croatian grammars – Croatian grammars in the 20th century

What separates the 20th century grammars from the previous generation of grammar books is the general uniformity of their normative solutions, as the 20th century had no opposing philological schools; therefore, no CGBs advanced fundamentally conflicting normative solutions, as the standardization in the 19th century ended in a (political) victory of the Croatian Vukovians.

The normative solutions of the 20th century CGBs are generally modeled on the new Shtokavian forms, as standardized by Maretić in his grammar; it is, therefore, justified to speak of Maretić’s norm, which took root in Croatia at the beginning of the 20th century. Maretić’s solutions were generally modernized and largely Croatianized. However, no 20th century CGB diverged significantly from the new Shtokavian forms, making the differences between these CGBs individual, and not principal in nature. This is certainly due to the strict unitarian linguistic policy of the time.

Croatian grammars from the beginning of the 20th century to 1940

The most important aspect of this period is the consolidation of Maretić’s norm, which also ushered the era of Neo-Shtokavian purism – the “exclusivity” of the Neo-Shtokavian stylization. Maretić’s grammar was the normative archetype, and the language use and rules were modeled accordingly.

From Maretić’s grammar in 1899 to the end of this period in 1940, Croatian authors produced four new CGBs: Florschütz in 1905, Rešetar in 1916, Dujmušić in 1933, and Benešić in 1937. The Hungarian Slavist Munkácsy also wrote one in 1920.

Three new CGBs – by Florschütz, Rešetar, and Benešić – mimicked the new Shtokavian forms prescribed by Maretić, but their normative solutions differed. Florschütz took Maretić’s norm and made it more Croatian in those aspects where that norm deviated from the language spoken in Croatia to the extent that the Croats would never accept is as their literary and linguistic expression. Here is just one example – although a major

one – of Florschütz’s deviation: his examples come mostly from Croatian writers, and not, as was canonized at the time, from folklore birthed by Vuk. Rešetar recognized several linguistic differences between Croatian and Serbian. His grammar mostly follows Maretić (as opposed to the totality of scientific work), even when this is not acceptable in terms of the Croatian tradition and use. Benešić, on the other hand, heralded a new period in the CGB history – an era of nurturing Croatian linguistic idiosyncrasies and going back to what was traditionally Croatian. Benešić merely breached this approach – in his notes on the Croatian Jekavian pronunciation of the long yat or the comparative Croatian-Serbian dictionary appended to his grammar.

Also worthy of notice are Musulin’s grammar textbooks, as they replaced Maretić’s school grammars in 1928, and were in use in schools until the proclamation of the Banovina of Croatia. These textbooks were fully in the hands of the unitarian language policy – they went as far as promoting the Ekavian speech, making them unacceptable to Croats. They were short-lived.

Croatian grammars from 1940 to 1945

During the Banovina of Croatia, the political wind turned in favor of the Croatian language. Guberina and Krstić took the first step towards de-Croatization in their 1940 work, *Razlike između hrvatskoga i srpskoga jezika* (this work was primarily a comparative dictionary, but may, broadly speaking, also be seen as a comparative grammar of Croatian and Serbian). The somewhat revised Banovina edition of Florschütz’s grammar followed the same year. The work was retitled as *Hrvatska slovnica* (“Croatian Grammar”) during the time of the Independent State of Croatia and gained its final Croatianized form based on the so-called “root” orthography in 1943. The last published grammar from this period was that by Jurišić in 1944; his 1948 manuscript on noun formation was printed only in 1992. Jurišić’s grammar was surprisingly akin to the works written during the preceding subperiod – likely due to the speed with which it was written. Under the Ministry of Public Education Circular and the legal provision on reducing the college coursework for soldiers, Jurišić had to write specialized books in 1944. He reached for what he already had written for higher educational needs, as there was no time to write anything else; what he had written, he had written in the spirit of his time, laden with unitarism and distorted views of the Croatian language history.

Croatian grammars from 1945 to the 1970s

The year 1945 was in no way a turning point for the study of Croatian grammar, and should therefore not mark the beginning of a new era in the study of grammar – no new CGBs were printed that year. However, this is the year of establishment of Tito’s Yugoslavia, which launched the period of new unitarian bans for the Croatian language and linguistics. In any case, the year that marks the end of one period necessarily marks the beginning of the next one – the period of the Yugoslav CGBs.

The CGBs of this era were written by Brabec-Hraste-Živković in 1952, Jonke in 1964, Hamm in 1967, and the 1971 grammar book that was part of the linguistic guidebook *Jezični savjetnik s gramatikom*. According to its year of publication, the Težak-Babić grammar (1966)

also belongs to this period; however, the 15th edition of this grammar (2005) is still in use today, making this grammar, in principle, a modern CGB.

In addition to the above CGBs, Maretić's grammar was still in use. It saw its last and final edition during this period, in 1963. Ostensibly, this grammar was still the normative model; however, it was already sorely outdated, both in terms of methodology and normative solutions. The pressure of the Yugoslav unitarism – which especially intensified in the wake of the Novi Sad Agreement, which sided with Maretić's ideology – notwithstanding, the CGBs of this period took a methodological and normative detour from Maretić, as far as this was possible. Unfortunately, there was very little leeway within the Yugoslav stranglehold, so even the smallest victories were to be celebrated. Here are some linguistic tidbits from each of these grammars (the list is not exhaustive): the Brabec-Hraste-Živković grammar prescribed the spelling of *d* before *š*, *c*, *č*, *ć*, based on the 9th edition of Boranić's orthography – a feature always perceived as distinctly Croatian; Jonke noted that Croats say *zà mene*, and Serbs, *za mène*; Hamm's grammar forwent the Vienna Agreement (which was at the time revered as the main argument for the policy of linguistic unity – linguistic unitarism) and every official linguistic canon in place at the time when he spoke of the Croatian *Jekavian* speech (instead of *Ijekavian*); Pavešić denounced the spelling of *jedamput*, which was prescribed by the Novi Sad orthography, and advocated for *jedanput* instead – denying its full authority over the Croatian language. These were linguistic tidbits, but still a sign of resistance to the unitarian pressure. Furthermore, Hamm in his grammar deals with the phoneme, and his phonology was structuralist – these are the first signs of the modern methodology that will prevail in the CGBs of the following period.

Contemporary Croatian grammars

The ranks of modern Croatian grammars include the grammars in use today: these grammars were written twenty, thirty or even forty years ago, but have been updated with every new edition, in keeping with the modern linguistic thought and changes. They are fully applicable today, and we may rightly call them modern grammars. There are three such important grammars: by Težak-Babić, the Institute, and the Great Grammar (*Velika gramatika*) by the Academy. In addition to normative deviations from previous periods (and more significant deviations from the unified, unitarian norm), these grammars are in step with modern theoretical linguistic knowledge. This is especially evident in the Great Grammar: Katičić's syntax, Babić's word formation, Brozović's phonology, and especially Škarić's phonetics – the search for modern methodology could only start when the pressing questions of the survival of the Croatian language were finally resolved.

Of all the above CGBs, the Great Grammar holds a special place (not only in the scientific but also in the normative sense). Its latest edition (especially its manual on accents and phonetics) advocates for systematic normative changes. The final assessment of the place of contemporary CGBs in the history of CGBs and their impact on the development of the literary language cannot be given from today's point of view – this should be left for the future.

Conclusion

More than 400 years have passed since the first Croatian grammar. So far, we have found about sixty of them, but we are still in the process of rediscovering old Croatian grammars. We have described most of these grammars. Due to the unfavorable political conditions that have faced the Croatian people for centuries, our linguistic heritage has remained hidden; we are belatedly discovering and appreciating it.

All these CGBs clearly reveal the continuity of the Croatian literary language. This language is recognizable and comprehensible in all CGBs, from the oldest to the newest, primarily owing to its Shtokavian *stylization* – and not to any kind of *organic basis*. Croatian grammars also confirm the fact we know from Croatian literature – there have been no interruptions or breaks in the development of the Croatian literary/standard language. It is important to stress that no break occurred even with the appearance of Croatian Vukovians in the late 19th century, since Croatian had already been stylized in the Shtokavian style in the 17th century. This Shtokavian stylization has only been modernized with the introduction of novel forms. Croatian grammar has permeated the Croatian literature, and vice versa, since the beginning of Croatian grammar studies.

The mutual differences between CGBs and the language they describe arise from the extent of this stylization in a certain time and/or space. Owing to the different extents of the same stylization, CGBs may be divided into four groups:

- I. old Croatian grammars (1604 – 1836);
- II. Croatian grammars from the Illyrian Movement to the end of the 19th century (1836 – 1899), with two parallel subgroups: grammars by the Zagreb School and Croatian Vukovians;
- III. new Croatian grammars (1899 – 1970s) with three successive subgroups: Croatian grammars from the beginning of the 20th century to 1940, Croatian grammars from 1940 to 1945, Croatian grammars from 1945 to the 1970s;
- IV. contemporary Croatian grammars.

Box 1. Chronological list of Croatian Shtokavian grammar

The list also includes Croatian Latin/Italian grammars written. Bibliographical entries for the grammar books follow the common Croatian tradition.

Bartol Kašić, *Institutiones linguae Illyricae libri duo.*, Rome, 1604 (Reprints: *Slavistische Forschungen* herausgegeben von Reinhold Olesch, Band 21, Böhlau Verlag, Köln, Wien, 1977; *Most/The Bridge*, Zagreb, 1990; *Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje/Institute of Croatian Language and Linguistics*, Zagreb, 2002; *Naklada Tusculum*, Zagreb – Mostar, 2005).

Jakov Mikalja, *Grammatika talianska u kratko ili kratak nauk za nauciti latinski jezik*, Loreto, 1649 (Reprint: 2008, Zagreb: *Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje/Institute of Croatian Language and Linguistics*).

Juraj Križanić, *Gramatično izkazanje ob ruskom jeziku, Tobolsk, 1665* (Transliterated into Latin script and published in: *Sabrana djela Jurja Križanića, knjiga 2, Juraj Križanić Gramatično izkazanje ob ruskom jeziku, JAZU, Zagreb, 1894*).

Toma Babić, *Prima grammaticae institutio pro tyronibus Illiricis accomodata, Venice, 1712, ²1745*.

Lovro Šitović Ljubušak, *Grammatica latini-illyrica, Venice, 1713, ²1742, ³1781* (Reprint: 2005, Zagreb: MLADE udruga za istraživanje i proučavanje kulturno-povijesne građe i Synopsis, Zagreb – MH, Ljubuški – Synopsis).

Ardelio Della Bella, *Instruzioni grammaticali della lingua illirica, Venice, 1728, Dubrovnik, ²1785* (Both editions are part of the dictionary: *Dizionario italiano, latino, ilirico.*); *Principi elemetari della grammatica illirica, Dubrovnik, 1873*.

Gašpar Vinjalić, *Principi della grammatica ad suo de Slavi che desiderano esser Religiosi con quali apprederano nell' i stesso tempo la lingua Latina et Italiana, servira anco angli Italiani per apprendere la lingua Slava/Grammatica prima in lingua Slava, Italiana et Latina, manuscript, Sinj, 1766 (1770)*.

Mijo Bilušić, *Grammatica triplici idiomate latino videlicet illirico et italico idiomate conscripta multum necessaria iis qui ad Deo servitum dicati sunt et in duas partes divisa, quorum prima octo partium orationes quantum satis est constructionem, secunda vero eorum quae in prima evitandi confusionis causa omissa desiderantur continet, manuscript, Visovac, 1781 – 1797*.

Andrija Bujas, *Gramatika latinsko-hrvatsko-talijanska, late 18th century, manuscript, Visovac*.

Blaž Tadijanović, *Svaschta po mallo illiti kratko sloxenyje immenah, i ricsih u illyrski, i nyemacski jezik, Koje sloxio Blax Thaddianovich, Magdenburg, 1761, Tropava, ²1766*.

Matija Antun Relković, *Nova slavonska, i nimacska grammatika. Neue Slavonische und Deutsche Grammatik, Zagreb, 1767, Vienna, ²1774, ³1789*.

Marijan Lanosović, *Neue Einleitung zur Slavonischen Sprache mit einem nützlichen Wörter-und Gesprächsbuche, auch einem Anhang verschiedener deutscher und slavonischer Briefe und einem kleinen Titularbuche versehen, Osijek, 1778, ²1789*; *Anleitung zur slavonischen Sprachlehre, sammt einem nützlichen Anhang mit verschiedenen Gesprächen, deutsch-slavonisch- und hungarischen Wörterbuche; Briefe, Benennung der vornehmsten geist- und weltlichen Würden, dann vorzüglichsten Festtage und anderern Personen versehen, Ofen, 1795*.

Josip Jurin (Josephi Giurini), *Grammatica Illyricae juventuti latino-Italoque sermone instruendae accomodata, Venice, 1793 – Slovkniga slavnoj slovinskoj mladosti diackim illirickim i talianskim izgovorom napravljena, Mletczy, 1793*.

Josip Voltić, *Grammatica illirica, Vienna, 1803* (In the dictionary: *Ricoslovník (Vocabolario, Wörterbuch) illirickoga, italianskoga i nimacskoga jezika s'jednom pridpostavlienomm grammatikom ili pismenstvom: sve ovo sabrano i sloxeno od Jose Voltiggi Istranina*).

Franjo Marija Appendini (Francesco Maria Appendini), *Grammatica della lingua Illirica compilata dal padre Francesco Maria Apendini delle scuole pie professore di eloquenza nel collegio di Ragusa, Dubrovnik, 1808, ²1828, ³1848, ⁴1850*.

Šime Starčević, *Nova ricoslovnica iliricka vojnickoj mladosti krajicsnoj poklonjena trudom i nastojanjem Shime Starscevicha xupnika od Novog u Lici, Trieste, 1812* (Reprint: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje/Institute of Croatian Language and Linguistics, Zagreb, 2002).

Ignjat Alojzije Brlić, Grammatik der illyrischen Sprache, wie solche in Bosnien, Dalmatien, Slavonien, Serbien, Ragusa & c. dann von den Illyriern in Banat und Ungarn gesprochen wird. Für Teutsche verfasst und herausgegeben von Ignatz Al. Berlich, Ofen, 1833; Grammatik der illyrischen Sprache wie solche in Dalmatien, Kroatien, Slawonien, Bosnien, Serbien, und von den Illiriern in Ungarn gesprochen wird. Für Deutsche verfasst und herausgegeben von Ignaz Al. Berlić. Zweite durchgesehene und verbesserte Auflage, Agram, 1842; Grammatik der illirischen Sprache, wie solche in den südslawischen Ländern Serbien, Bosnien, Slavonien, Dalmatien, Kroatien und von den Illiriern und Serben in Ungarn und der Vojvodina gesprochen wird. Für Deutsche verfasst und herausgegeben von Ignaz Al. Berlić. Dritte Auflage. Agram, 1850.

Vjekoslav Babukić, Osnova slovnice slavjanske narječja ilirskoga uredjena Věkoslavom Babukićem. Danica ilirska, II, 1836, vol. 10, pp. 37-40; vol. 11, pp. 41-44; vol. 12, pp. 45-48; vol. 13, pp. 49-52; vol. 14, pp. 53-56; vol. 15, pp. 57-60; reprinted with the same title in Zagreb in the same year; German translation by Rudolf Fröhlich: Grundzüge der Illirischen Grammatik, durchaus mit der neuen Orthographie, Wien 1839; Italian translation by Ivan Kaznačić.: Elementi della grammatica illirica secondo la nouova ortografia di Viekoslavo Babukić con una prefazione filologica di Rodolfo Fröhlich, Zara, 1846 ²1851, ³1865; Grundzüge der Ilirischen Sprachlehre, Italian translation by Vladislava Vežića: Fondamenti della grammatica illirica – u Ilirsko-němačko-talianskom malom rěčniku Josipa Drobnića, 1846 – 1849; Ilirska slovnica, Zagreb, 1854.

Antun Mažuranić, Temelji ilirskoga i latinskoga jezika za početnike, Zagreb 1839, ²1842; Slovnica Hèrvatska za gimnazije i realne škole, Dio I: Rěčoslovje, Zagreb 1859, ²1861, ³1866, ⁴1869.

Rudolf Fröhlich Veselić, Der kleine Illirier, Beč 1840; Anleitung zur Erlernung der vier slavischen Hauptsprachen, Vienna. 1847; Theoretische-praktische Taschen-Grammatik der illirischen Sprache, Vienna, 1850, Grammatik der illirischen Sprache, wie solche in dalmatien, Kroatien, Slawonien, Bosnien, Serbien, im südlichen Ungarn und einem Theile der Militärgrenze gesprochen wird, ³1861, ⁴1865.

Ilija Rukavina Ljubački, Abänderungs = und Abwandlungs = Formen nebst den Regeln der Aussprache und Rechtshreibung, Ein Leitfaden für Lehrer und Lernende im Königreiche Kroatien, Slavonien, und Dalmatien, so wie in den angränedzen Provinzen: Istrien, Serbien und Bosnien grammatikalisch verfasst, Trieste, 1843.

Lavoslav Fürholzer, Horvatsko-slavonska slovnica za početnike, Varaždin, 1847.

Andrija Stazić, Grammatica della lingua illirica ad uso degli amatori nazionali e stranieri che bramano d'impararla, Zadar, 1850; Grammatica illirica pratica secondo il metodo di Ahn e di Ollendorf, Split, 1855, ²1861.

Jerolim Šutina, Principi di grammatica illirica u rječniku Vocaboli di prima necessita, Zadar 1850, ²1855, ³1879.

Fran Volarić, Ilirska slovnica za početne učionice, Terst, 1854.

Andrija Torkvat Brlić, Grammatik der illyrischen sprache wie solche im Munde und Schrift der Serben und Kroaten gebräuchlich ist, Wien, 1854.

Ivan Danilo, Grammatica illirica, Zadar, 1855, Slovnica za srednja učilišta nižega reda. Uredio po Budmanijevoj. Zadar, 1873.

Adolfo Veber Tkalčević, *Skladnja ilirskoga jezika za srednja učilišta*, Vienna, 1859, ²1862.

Slovnica hèrvatska za srednja učilišta, Zagreb, 1871, ²1873; *Slovnica hrvatska za srednja učilišta*, Zagreb, ³1876.

Vinko Pacel, *Slovnica jezika Hrvatskoga ili Srbskoga*, I. diel. *Nauka o prieslovu*. Zagreb, 1860; *Oblici književne hrvaštine*, Karlovac, 1865.

Pero Budmani, *Grammatica della lingua serbo-croata (illirica)*, Vienna, 1867.

Paul Pierre, *Abrégé de grammaire française-croate et de dictionnaire français-croate*, Agram, 1868.

Josip Vitanović, *Slovnica hèrvatskoga jezika za nižu realku*, Osěk, 1872; *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika za škole i samouke*, Osiek, 1880, ²1882, ³1888, ⁴1891.

Dragutin Parčić, *Grammatica della lingua slava (illirica)*, Zadar, 1873, ²1878, French translation: *Grammaire de la langue Serbo-Croate*, Paris 1877, ²1904.

Mirko Divković, *Hrvatske gramatike I. dio. Oblici*, Zagreb 1879; *Oblici hrvatskoga jezika za srednje škole*, Zagreb, ²1887, ³1890, ⁴1894, ⁵1895; *Hrvatske gramatike II. dio. Sintaksa za školu.*, Zagreb, 1881; *Hrvatska sintaksa za školu*, Zagreb, ²1889, ³1893, ⁴1896; *Nauka o izreci za školu*, Zagreb, 1880, ²1881, ³1885, ⁴1888, ⁵1892; *Rečenica za školu*, Zagreb, ⁶1895, ⁷1898, ⁸1899, ⁹1901, ¹⁰1907, ¹¹1911, ¹²1914, ¹³1917; *Oblici i sintaksa hrvatskoga jezika za srednje škole*, Zagreb, ⁶1897, ⁷1898, ⁸1899, ⁹1900, ¹⁰1903, ¹¹1908, ¹²1917.

József Margitai, *Horvát Nyelvtan*, Nagy-Kanizsa, 1884.

Rudolf Strohal, *Hrvatska slovnica za srednje i nalike im škole*, Bjelovar, 1893.

Frane Vuletić, *Gramatika bosanskoga jezika za srednje škole*, *Nauka o glasovima i oblicima*, Sarajevo, 1890.

Tomo Maretić, *Gramatika i stilistika hrvatskoga ili srpskoga književnog jezika*, Zagreb, 1899, ²1931; *Gramatika hrvatskoga ili srpskoga književnog jezika*, Zagreb, ³1963.

Josip Florschütz, *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika za ženski licej, preparandije i više pučke škole*, Zagreb 1905, ²1907, ³1916 ⁷2002 (the 2002 edition is the reprint of the 1916 edition); *Gramatika hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika za srednje i slične škole*, Zagreb, ⁴1940; *Hrvatska slovnica*, Zagreb, ⁵1941, ⁶1943.

Milan Rešetar, *Elementar-Grammatik der kroatischen (serbischen) Sprache*, Zagreb, 1916, ²1922.

Jozo Dujmušić, *Repetitorij hrvatske slovnice*, Zagreb, 1933.

Julije Benešić, *Gramatyka języka chorwackiego czyli serbskiego*, Warszawa, 1937, Instytut Wydawniczy "Biblioteka Polska" (The author's name on the covers spelled as: Juljusz Benešić).

Petar Guberina i Kruno Krstić, *Razlike između hrvatskoga i srpskoga književnog jezika*, Zagreb, 1940; *Liber Croaticus Verlag*, Mainz, ²1977; Part 1. published in *Jezik*, year 44, vol. 5, 1977, pp. 162-191.

Blaž Jurišić, *Nacrt hrvatske slovice*, I. *Glasovi i oblici u poviestnom razvoju*, Zagreb, 1944, ²1992; The manuscript of *Nacrt hrvatske slovnice*, *Tvorba imenica u povijesnom razvoju* was finalized in 1948, and printed in Zagrebu in 1992.

Ivan Brabec, Mate Hraste, Sreten Živković, *Gramatika hrvatskoga ili srpskog jezika*, Zagreb, 1952, ²1954, ³1966, ⁴1970.

Stjepko Težak – Stjepan Babić, Pregled gramatike hrvatskosrpskog jezika za osnovne i druge škole, Školska knjiga, Zagreb, 1966, ²1969, ³1970, ⁴1971, ⁵1972; Pregled gramatike hrvatskoga književnog jezika, Školska knjiga, Zagreb, ⁶1973 (In 1974, a phototype reprint was published by Nova Hrvatska in London; another reprint of the London edition was made, with no publisher details, year and place of publication); Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika – Priručnik za osnovno jezično obrazovanje, Školska knjiga, Zagreb, ⁷1992, ⁸1992, ⁹1994, ¹⁰1995, ¹¹1996, ¹²2000, ¹³2003, ¹⁴2004.

Josip Hamm, Kratka gramatika hrvatskosrpskog književnog jezika za strance, Zagreb, 1967.

Slavko Pavešić i Zlatko Vince, Gramatika; Jezični savjetnik s gramatikom, Zagreb, 1971.

Eugenija Barić, Mijo Lončarić, Dragica Malić, Slavko Pavešić, Mirko Peti, Vesna Zečević, Marija Znika, Priručna gramatika hrvatskoga književnog jezika, Zagreb, 1979; Gramatika hrvatskoga književnog jezika, ²1990; Hrvatska gramatika, ³1995, ⁴2003.

Stjepan Babić, Tvorba riječi u hrvatskom književnom jeziku, Zagreb, 1986, ²1991, ³2002.

Radoslav Katičić, Sintaksa hrvatskoga književnog jezika, Zagreb, 1986, ²1991, ³2002.

Stjepan Babić, Dalibor Brozović, Milan Moguš, Slavko Pavešić, Ivo Škarić, Stjepko Težak, Povijesni pregled, glasovi i oblici hrvatskoga književnog jezika, Zagreb, 1991.

Dragutin Raguž, Praktična hrvatska gramatika, Zagreb, 1997.

Sanda Ham, Školska gramatika hrvatskoga jezika, Zagreb, 2002.

Josip Silić – Ivo Pranjković, Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika za gimnazije i visoka učilišta, Zagreb, 2005.

Stjepan Vukušić, Ivan Zoričić, Marija Grasselli-Vukušić, Naglasak u hrvatskome književnom jeziku, Zagreb, 2007.

Stjepan Babić, Dalibor Brozović, Ivo Škarić, Stjepko Težak, Glasovi i oblici hrvatskoga književnog jezika, Zagreb, 2007.

Provenance: Submitted. This is an extended version of a conference paper by Sanda Ham (2008), deposited in the DABAR repository (<https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:142:254660>).

Peer review: Externally peer reviewed.

Received: 6 June 2020 / **Accepted:** 7 December 2020 / **Published online:** 17 December 2020.

Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Authorship declaration: SH is the sole author of the study.

Competing interests: The author completed the ICMJE Unified Competing Interest form (available upon request from the corresponding author), and declares no conflicts of interest.

ORCID

Sanda Ham  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8236-5892>

References

- Álvares, M. (1527). *De Institutione Grammatica Libri Tres*. Lisbon, Portugal.
- Auburger, L. (2009). *Hrvatski jezik i serbokroatizam*. Rijeka, Croatia: Maveda, Croatian Philological Society.
- Bezina, P. (1993). *Rukopisna baština franjevača Provincije presvetoga Otkupitelja*. Zagreb, Croatia: Kršćanska sadašnjost.
- Bezina, P. (1994). *Kulturni djelatnici Franjevačke provincije presvetoga Otkupitelja*. Zagreb, Croatia: Kršćanska sadašnjost.
- Bojović, Z. (2014). *Istorija dubrovačke književnosti*. Belgrade, Serbia: Serbian Literary Cooperative.
- Brozović, D. (1977). O suvremenoj morfološkoj normi jezičnog standarda i o morfološkim značajkama standardne štokavštine uopće. *Jezik*, (24)1, 1-13; 24(2) 41-50.
- Brozović, D. (1985). Jezična i pravopisna previranja u Hrvatskoj na prijelazu iz 19. u 20. stoljeće. *Jezik*, (33)1, 1-15.
- Gabrić-Bagarić, D. (2003). Jezik u gramatikama južnih hrvatskih prostora 17. i 18. st. *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje*, 29(1), 65–86.
- Ham, S. (1994). *Jezik Josipa Kozarca*. Manuscript doctoral thesis, Zagreb, Croatia: Zagreb Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences.
- Ham, S. (1998). *Jezik zagrebačke filološke škole*. Osijek, Croatia: MH.
- Ham, S. (2006). *Povijest hrvatskih gramatika*. Zagreb, Croatia: Globus.
- Ham, S. (2008). Hrvatske gramatike. Bernardina Petrović i Marko Samardžija (ed.), *Vidjeti Ohrid, Referati hrvatskih sudionika i sudionica za XI. međunarodni slavistički kongres* (pp. 187-202). Zagreb, Croatia: HFD.
- Ham, S. (2015). Kroatistikom uzvodno – rasprava o autorstvu. *Kolo*, 2015(3), 172-200.
- Ham, S. (2020). Croatian language. In M. Marušić (Ed.), *Croatia: Past, present and future perspectives*. (pp. 79-134). New York, New York, USA: Nova Publishers.
- Hamm, J. (1984). *Juraj Križanić, Gramatično izkazanje ob ruskom jeziku, Sabrana djela Jurja Križanića*. Zagreb, Croatia: JAZU, volume 2.
- Horvat, V. (1999). *Bartol Kašić - otac hrvatskog jezikoslovlja*. Zagreb, Croatia: Faculty of Croatian Studies.
- Jonke, Lj. (1965). *Književni jezik u teoriji i praksi*. Zagreb, Croatia: Znanje.
- Kalenić, V. (1965). *Jezik i umjetnički izraz Augusta Šenoa*. Manuscript doctoral thesis. Ljubljana, Slovenia: Ljubljana Faculty of Arts.
- Katičić, R. (1978). O početku novoštokavskoga hrvatskoga jezičnog standarda, o njegovu položaju u povijesti hrvatskoga književnog jezika i u cjelini standardne novoštokavštine. *Filologija*, 1978(8), 165-180.
- Katičić, R. (1987). Vuk Stefanović Karadžić i književni jezik u Hrvata. *Jezik*, 35(2), 38-48.
- Katičić, R. (1999). *Na kroatističkim raskrižjima*. Zagreb, Croatia: Faculty of Croatian Studies.
- Katičić, R. (2008). Deklaracija i jezikoslovlje. *Jezik*, 55(1), 1-11.
- Kolenić, Lj. (1998). *Riječ o riječima*. Osijek, Croatia: Osijek Faculty of Education.
- Kolenić, Lj. (2003). *Pogled u strukturu hrvatske gramatike*. Osijek, Croatia: Osijek Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences.
- Kovačić, V. (2018). Trojezična gramatika fra Gašpara Vinjalića: struktura i usporedba. N. Lanović, Lj. Maslina, M. Musulin, P. Radosavljević, S. Šoštarčić (Eds.), *Poglavlja iz romanske filologije: u čast akademiku Augustu Kovačecu o njegovu 80. rođendanu* (pp. 303–317). Zagreb, Croatia: FF press.
- Kramarić, M. (2020). Prilog istraživanju hrvatske sastavnice rukopisne gramatike Principi della grammatica [...] grammatica prima in lingua slava, italiana et latina Gašpara Vinjalića. *Filologija*, 2020(74), 17-48.
- Ljubić, Š. (1869). *Ogledalo književne poviesti jugoslavjanske na podučavanje mladeži, Knjiga II*. Rijeka, Croatia.
- Marković, I. (2011). *Hrvatske gramatike*. Retrieved from <http://www.hrvatskiplus.org>.

- Moguš, M. (1984). Križanićeva hrvatska gramatika. *Radovi Zavoda za slavensku filologiju*, 19, 1-96.
- Moguš, M., Vončina, J. (1969). Latinica u Hrvata. *Radovi Zavoda za slavensku filologiju*, 11, 61-81,
- Moguš, M. (1993). *Povijest hrvatskoga književnoga jezika*. Zagreb, Croatia: Globus.
- Moguš, M. (2003). Hrvatske gramatike XVII. i XVIII. stoljeća. Ivan Golub (Ed.), *Hrvatska i Europa 3* (pp. 473-483). Zagreb, Croatia: HAZU, Školska knjiga.
- Pezo, B. (1984). Franjevci Provincije presvetoga Otkupitelja pisci latinskih gramatika u XVIII. st. *Kačić*, 16, 59-81.
- Skok, P. (1952). O jezičnoj kulturi. *Jezik*, (1)1, 3-10.
- Stolac, D. (2005). Sintaksa u hrvatskim gramatikama u 20. st. *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovje*, 31(1), 249-276.
- Stolac, D. (2006). Hrvatska gramatikologija u 20. stoljeću. M. Samardžija & I. Pranjković (Eds.), *Hrvatski jezik u XX. stoljeću* (pp. 297-320). Zagreb, Croatia: MH.
- Tafra, B. (1993). *Gramatika u Hrvata i Vjekoslav Babukić*. Zagreb, Croatia: MH.
- Tafra, B. (1994). O hrvatskim vukovcima iz drugoga kuta. *Rasprave zavoda za hrvatski jezik*, 19(1), 363-378.
- Tafra, B. (1995). *Jezikoslovna razdvojba*. Zagreb, Croatia: MH.
- Tafra, B. (1995a). Obilježja hrvatske gramatičke norme do kraja 19. st. *Filologija*, 1995(24-25), 349-354.
- Vince, Z. (1988). Pregled hrvatskih gramatika u drugoj polovici 19. stoljeća. *Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku XXXI/2*, Novi Sad, Serbia: MS.
- Vince, Z. (1990). *Putovima hrvatskoga književnog jezika*. Zagreb, Croatia: MH.
- Vince, Z. (1998). *Ikavica u hrvatskoj jezičnoj povijesti: sudbina ikavice u hrvatskoj pisanoj riječi – Zadarsko-dalmatinski jezično-kulturni krug*. Zagreb, Croatia: MH.
- Vončina, J. (1968). Ozaljski jezično-književni krug. *Radovi zavoda za slavensku filologiju*, 10, 195-205.
- Vončina, J. (1975). Jezik Antuna Kanižlića. *Rad JAZU 368*. Zagreb, Croatia: JAZU.