

BEITRÄGE

The Language of Stenographic Records of the Dalmatian Parliament in Zadar in the Second Half of the 19th Century

TANJA BREŠAN ANČIĆ, MARIJANA TOMELIĆ ĆURLIN (Split)

1. Introduction

1.1 Linguistic development in the second half of the 19th century in Croatia and Dalmatia

The second half of the 19th century in Croatia and Dalmatia was a period abounding in linguistic debates and confrontations between various philological schools of thought. For as long as twenty years, the Illyrian movement (a part of the Croatian national revival) marked the cultural, social and linguistic history in Croatia. The question of which Croatian dialect would gain primacy and become the basis for the standard Croatian language was finally resolved in the first half of the 19th century. In the age of the Croatian National Revival, the Kajkavian dialect was abandoned in favour of the Štokavian dialect which became dominant.¹ Croats were thus linguistically united in the age of this Revival. However, the language still needed to be codified due to its various versions which were dependent on geographical distribution and were also the result of centuries-long debates among Croatian grammaticists about certain linguistic issues. In the 19th century, Dalmatia was first under the Habsburg and then the Austro-Hungarian rule, and for this reason it was not politically related to the rest of Croatia. However, the aftereffect of the National Revival movement, whose aim was to unite the disparate parts of the country, was manifested in an increasing desire to achieve national, legal, cultural and linguistic unification. In spite of the fact that Croatia's legal unification was accomplished at that time, but only decades later, the attempts at linguistic unification were successful – the Štokavian dialect was selected as the basis for the standard Croatian language. However, the long-standing separation of Croatian regions, as well as different political orientations, resulted in four different philological schools of thought regarding the codification of the Croatian language. Each school of thought promoted its own linguistic concepts, and their most prominent representatives intensely debated and argued their views throughout the second half of the 19th century, making it one of the most turbulent periods in the linguistic history of Croatia.

1 There are three dialects in the Croatian language: Čakavian, Kajkavian and Štokavian. The Čakavian dialect was the most widespread dialect until the early 17th century when other dialects became favoured as the basis for the standard Croatian language. The key criteria for selecting a dialect (Kajkavian and Štokavian) as the basis for the standard language were wide geographic distribution and the number of literary works composed in the dialect.

Numerous issues regarding the language standard were resolved, but not all of them: certain grammatical, lexical, and orthographic issues still needed to be addressed.

Final linguistic solutions were sought within the four philological schools of thought which “addressed almost all of the linguistic problems ... and in resolving them general standardization processes were improved” (STOLAC 2006: 17). The first philological school was The Zagreb School of Philology, represented by Vjekoslav Babukić, Antun Mažuranić, Adolf Veber Tkalčević and Bogoslav Šulek. The Zagreb school inherited the principles of the Illyrian Movement in a cultural, ideological and linguistic sense, propagating the idea of a common Slavic language. Primarily we have in mind the Iekavian² writing of the jat reflex, or the dropping of the letter *e* with caron (*rogato e*), which is inherited etymological orthography visible in the absence of consonant assimilation by the voicing and retention of the phonemes [t] and [d] at morpheme edges as well as the *-ab* suffix in the genitive plural and the use of unsynchronized inflectional suffixes in the dative, locative and instrumental plural (for example. D pl. f. g. *-am*, L pl. *-ab*, I pl. *-ami*).

The Rijeka School of Philology, headed by Fran Kurelac, adopted different principles, advocating somewhat older solutions in the Croatian language adopted from the Old Slavonic language. Ante Kuzmanić, a representative of the Zadar School of Philology, advocated the use of the Dalmatian Ikavian dialect and fought for the restoration of the čakavian dialect’s cultural primacy, though without much success.

After the Vienna Literary Agreement in 1850, the Zagreb School of Philology, the superior of the three, gained a strong opponent in the youngest linguistic school in Croatia, known as the Croatian Vukovians. The Croatian Vukovians based their linguistic doctrine on the idea that “language has its own life and laws, regardless of the literature in which it is applied, with more or less success” (SAMARDŽIJA 2001: 205). The language was standardized according to Vuk Stefanović Karadžić’s³ ideal of the vernacular language. From a linguistic point of view, the Croatian Vukovians were proactive in propagating their idea of a standard language, which differed greatly from ideas advocated by the Zagreb School. Unlike the Zagreb School’s grammaticists, the Croatian Vukovians advocated phonological orthography, the representation of the long reflection of *jat* as *ije*, and of the short reflection as *je*; the use of *-a*

- 2 The Proto-Slavic phoneme *jat*, often represented by the letter *e* with caron (*ě*), was a separate phonological unit both in the Proto-Croatian and Old Croatian language. It was omitted from the linguistic system by the end of the 14th century, when it was absorbed into other vowels or diphthong sequences. This process is also called the *jat* reflex, and there are other related reflexes named after their result: Ekavian, Ikavian, Iekavian (Jekavian, Ijekavian) ... The process in the above-mentioned reflex is a fortition of consonants in the prefixed semivowel allophone (i) in monosyllabic reflexes (/je/ > /je/) and short *jat* reflexes, and a fortition of vowels in the prefixed allophonic semi-vowel (i) in disyllabic reflexes /ie/ > /ije/.
- 3 Vuk Stefanović Karadžić was a Serbian linguist, the most important reformer of the Serbian language and the first to set down the principles for a new Serbian standard language. Since this is not the subject of this particular paper, we will not refer to Karadžić’s reform in detail.

and *-i* suffixes in the genitive plural and the new Štokavian syncretic suffixes (*-ama* and *-ima*) in the dative, locative and instrumental plural. Thus the linguistic reality in the early 1890s was made up of two completely different linguistic doctrines of which “one [was] based on the language whose core consists of selected Štokavian (without the provincial linguistic elements), and all the proper words, forms and phrases from Čakavian and Kajkavian which cannot be found in Štokavian [were] used in the literary language” (SAMARDŽIJA 2001: 19), and another doctrine advocating literary language based on “the New Štokavian-Iekavian dialect as was recorded in Karadžić’s work and described in those by Daničić” (SAMARDŽIJA 2001: 19).

In the late 19th century linguistic dilemmas were resolved in favour of the Croatian Vukovians, with the publication of three grammars: *Croatian Orthography* by Ivan Broz in 1892, *Grammar and Stylistics of the Croatian or Serbian Language* by Tomo Maretić in 1899 and *The Dictionary of the Croatian Language* by Franjo Iveković and Ivan Broz in 1901.

The linguistic status of Dalmatia, a marginal region as far as linguistic debates were concerned, was also determined by its political status. After the establishment of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy in 1867, Dalmatia was placed under Austrian administration while Slavonia and the remaining part of Croatia were placed under Hungarian administration. For this reason the question of an official language became an issue of national interest. The Zadar School of Philology, headed by Ante Kuzmanić, exerted the most important linguistic influence in Dalmatia at the time. His views on Croatian literary language and his influence exerted through his work in Zadar’s linguistic and cultural circles and in the wider community left a significant trace in Croatian cultural life. In his attempt to protect the long cultural and literary tradition of Dalmatia, he advocated the primacy of the Štokavian-Ikavian dialect, arguing that the Dalmatian literary tradition⁴, written in the most widespread dialect of the time, was unjustly being neglected. For the question of the selection between Ikavian and Iekavian the determination of the time interval is rather important, especially for Dalmatia. Namely, the Štokavian-Ikavian dialect, after the Čakavian dialect which had long lost the battle to become part of the future standard language’s foundation, was the most widespread dialect in the mid-19th century. All of the more relevant literary works in Dalmatia were written in this dialect, which was continually being used not only by Dalmatians, but also by people in Slavonia, Lika and parts of Bosnia. It is for these reasons that the Iekavian dialect was so strongly opposed. Another crucial influence was Dubrovnik’s literary production written in the Jekavian dialect, strongly advocated by the Illyrian movement. In addition to all these reasons, we should also add a chronological one, that is, the political aspect because in the 1850s the idea of a unification with northern Croatia was still relatively weak, and the idea of Dalmatia as the cradle of Croatian culture and the future bearer of Croatia’s social and cultural life was rather strong. Twenty years of the continual infiltration of Jekavian into public speech in Dalmatia was a lot; it was enough for Ikavian to lose

4 To this linguistic literature we should also add work by Slavonian writers such as Antun Kanižlić, Matija Antun Reljković, Vid Došen and Matija Petar Katančić, who wrote in Ikavian (MOGUŠ 1995: 169).

its status in the 1870s when the National Party, whose main goal was the unification of Dalmatia with northern Croatia, won a majority in the Dalmatian Parliament. In their desire to merge with northern Croats, Dalmatians accepted Jekavian speech as the basis for the future common Croatian language standard, however unwillingly.

1.2 Language textbooks and debates on language in the second half of the 19th century in Dalmatia

One of the greatest problems of Dalmatian orthography is the lack of a strong initiative to create orthographic and grammatical textbooks that would both help writers in the use of the standard language and also to articulate Dalmatia's stance on the selected linguistic option. With the emergence of a few grammars in Dalmatia, mainly representing the linguistic positions in question, such as Danilo's *Grammatica illirica* (1855) and *Practical Grammar* (1873), as well as Parčić's *Croatian-Italian Dictionary* with a grammar (1874), this problem was even more pronounced. Of other linguistic textbooks in that period the following were also published: *Grammatika della lingua serbo-croata (illirica)* (1867) by Pietro (Pero) Budmani, Dragutin A. Parčić published *The Illyrian-Italian Dictionary* (1858), *The Italian-Croatian Dictionary* (1868) and the revised *The Slovenian-Italian Dictionary* (1874).

Besides these grammars and a dictionary by Parčić, no relevant linguistic handbooks in Dalmatia were published before Broz's orthography in 1892 and Maretić's in 1899. These two works were not written by Dalmatians and they do not follow the Croatian linguistic tradition, but together with the dictionary by Broz and Iveković they officially initiated the implementation of the New-Štokavian standard, marking the end of a long period filled with numerous debates and conflicts.

1.3 The Croatian standard language

The standard language is used to express the cultural and civil life, meaning functions and reflections of scholarly thought in the philosopho-religious, socio-political, and juridico-administrative fields (MIČANOVIĆ 2006: 559).

When discussing the standard language and the process of standardization, we must point out that there is no standard language without a norm, but the standard language "cannot be normed once and for all" because innovations contradicting the already defined norm occur frequently in a language (BIČANIĆ 2012: 14). Starting with the assumption that language when viewed as a system is subject to linguistic rules, and that language when viewed as a standard is subject to sociolinguistic rules, one must point to the fact that "recent Croatian philology" in standardization processes and language norming, has neglected a number of issues. Much more favourable political and social circumstances for the standardization of the Croatian language were found after Croatia became an independent country, and the Croatian language became the official language of the Republic of Croatia. By the end of the 20th century the Croatian language had become standardized to a great degree, but there were still some unresolved linguistic phenomena, especially in the areas of lexicon and orthography, both of which needed to be standardized. Accordingly, not all linguistic levels are equally subject to change. "The standard language – as the language of the polifunctional public communication – is explicitly normed, and is therefore not only a linguistic but also a sociolinguistic and sociopolitical fact" (BADURINA 2004: 84).

There are heterogeneous views of the standard language in a society; society has an important role in the process of linguistic standardization.

The following types of norms can be found: graphic, orthographic, prosodic, orthoepic, grammatical or morphosyntactic (includes morphological and syntactic norms), lexic or lexical-semantic (which also includes the word-formation norm) and stylistic.

The orthographic norm is taken under special consideration since it is not a linguistic norm, and it differs from other norms of a standard language by the fact that it is subject to convention and less determined by linguistic rules (KATIČIĆ 1999: 305). Besides, the orthographic norm must take into consideration each separate linguistic level (phonological, morphological, lexic, syntactic and semantic) (BADURINA 2011: 17), all of which will be discussed in greater detail in one of the following sections.

The process of norming and standardization is a complex one and it includes serious linguistic strategy and planning. Linguistic planning could best be described as an “activity.” Einar Haugen’s language planning model (consisting of four phases: norm selection, norm codification, norm implementation and norm elaboration/modernization) serves well to describe the phases of Croatian language standardization in the 19th century. These particular phases must be realized in order to define the norm of a language and to achieve all the prerequisites for its standardization. All of these phases can easily be applied to the linguistic situation in Dalmatia in the second half of the 19th century.

The example of Haugen’s first phase of language planning, in the case of Dalmatia, can be seen in the selection of the Štokavian dialect as the foundation for the standard language. On the one hand this was a spontaneous turn of events after the Turkish conquests and the ever-increasing presence and influence of Štokavian, and on the other hand it was also an “agreement” or a deliberate omission of the minor (Kajkavian) dialect. The selection of the most widespread dialect as the foundation for the standard was actually a very strategic decision by the Illyrian Revival. It is important to point out that the selection of the Štokavian dialect had a strictly extralinguistic character, and was based on the “geographical, social and political” context (MIČANOVIĆ 2006: 573). The consequence of such a selection was an even greater similarity between the Croatian and Serbian languages which would turn out to be problematic in the 1990s.

Codification of the norm was problematic due to various linguistic schools of thought with their own grammars and orthographic handbooks. The inconsistency and irregularity of the Croatian language in the 19th century was the result of heterogeneous views of certain grammatical and orthographic problems.

The main subject of this paper is the implementation of the language norm, and the degree to which the language of the stenographic records, which we assume to have been edited according to certain linguistic rules, adheres to norms prescribed in the above-mentioned language handbooks. The existence of different norms in the standardization of the Croatian language can result in very inconsistent solutions. The authors of this paper are interested in finding out whether the grammatical and orthographic solutions are actually inconsistent and whether the causes of this inconsistency can be found within the historical-linguistic framework.

An example of the norm's elaboration can be seen in the development of functional styles as well as persistent and continuous work on the systematization of terminology in various fields (education, science⁵, etc.). Croatian linguist and prominent lexicographer Bogoslav Šulek developed thorough terminology in his dictionaries⁶, the majority of which is still used today.

2. Purpose and hypotheses of the research paper

The goal of this paper is to reconstruct certain elements of the Croatian language that was used for official purposes in Dalmatia in the second half of the 19th century. Since the subject of research is language used in the stenographic records, the authors' assumption is that it must have undergone editorial corrections. The authors are interested in showing whether the Dalmatian Ikavian dialect, as the basis of the Zadar School of Philology and as the idiom spoken in that region, influenced the language of the stenographic records.

The analysis includes only some linguistic issues which caused the debates: the jat reflex, and the selection between the etymological and phonological orthography manifested in the question of assimilation and the plural suffixes in the genitive, dative, locative and instrumental plural. It is therefore important to see which linguistic concept dominates in every single decade of the analyzed period, and which one gains primacy in the end.

The starting hypothesis is that the language of the analyzed corpus will display different linguistic solutions over different time periods due to the vibrancy and frequency of changes occurring with each decade in the second half of the 19th century. The period up until the 1870s can be considered "the real age of the philological schools" when "the Illyrian tradition" is continued by the Zagreb School of Philology which was the most dominant of the three schools⁷; the Zadar School of Philology propagated the use of the Ikavian jat reflex and its advocates, as "strict phoneticians," suggested graphic and orthographic reforms different from those argued for by the proponents of the Zagreb School. The diminishing influence of these schools was followed by the emergence of the fourth school of thought, whose proponents adhered to the linguistic principles established by Vuk Karadžić after whom they were named the Croatian Vukovians. By the end of the century the Croatian Vukovians became the most dominant school of thought (BROZOVIĆ 2008: 90–108).

The authors' assumption is that in the 1870s and 1880s the linguistic concepts of the Croatian Vukovians and the Zagreb School of Philology, the heirs of the ideological and linguistic premises of the Illyrian movement, will be equally represented,

5 With the aim of achieving the necessary degree of polifunctionality of the Croatian language, the second half of the 19th century saw efforts to create Croatian scientific terminology.

6 We refer to a couple of his dictionaries: *Deutsch-kroatisches Wörterbuch – Němačko-hrvatski rěčnik*, I–II (1860); *Hrvatsko-njemačko-talijanski rječnik znanstvenog nazivlja*, I–II (1874–1875); *Jugoslavenski imenik bilja* (1879).

7 The Rijeka School of Philology will not be elaborated on in much detail, since its linguistic concepts were not influential, and are not relevant for the subject matter of this paper.

while towards the end of the 19th century the dominant linguistic concept will become that advocated by the Croatian Vukovians.

For easy reference to linguistic sources, all of the examples will be shown in tables.

The assumption is that the analysis of the selected corpus will reveal the directions of linguistic development in a specific area and within possible timeframes; in other words: When and with how much resistance were certain changes initiated?

The content analysis method was used in this research because it is most relevant for the research of a language's historical character: its goal is to take "a verbal, non-quantitative document and transform it into quantitative data" (COHEN 2007: 164). In addition, content analysis is focused on a document's linguistic aspect, that is, it provides a linguistic overview, as it does not deal with the historical, cultural or social content of a document. Other methods used are descriptive and contrastive approaches which serve to identify those linguistic elements that could be related to the standard used at the time.

3. Definition of the corpus and the time-frame

The *Hitropisna/Brzopisna izvješća*⁸ stenographic records make up the corpus of this research. These are records of Dalmatian Parliamentary sessions in the town of Zadar, which can serve as indicators of the linguistic situation in the second half of the 19th century.⁹ Zadar was the center of the Kingdom of Dalmatia at the time, and the language of such a corpus is particularly challenging and relevant for this research because it was officially recorded and edited. Official texts are therefore an ideal subject matter for the research of language standardization.

This period has been selected because it represents the culmination of the process of Croatian standard language codification. The timeframe was defined by the publication dates of two grammar textbooks, Budmani's *Grammatica della lingua serbo-croata (illirica)* (1867) and Maretić's *Grammar and Stylistics of the Croatian or Serbian Language* (1899), based on Vukovian principles.

The *Grammatica della lingua serbo-croata (illirica)* by Pietro (Pero) Budmani was published in 1867. In spite of being perceived as a Vukovian-type of grammar by the public because of its title (Serbo-Croatian), and because it was written in phonetic orthography and prescribed the New Štokavian suffix inflections, it should not be viewed only in this context. Since grammars more often describe than prescribe, Budmani necessarily had to depict the language actually in use in addition to the New-Štokavian innovations. In addition, his grammar was published in the 1860s when the influence of the Croatian Vukovians was not widespread as of yet, and the

8 The title of this corpus has changed over the years: *Hitropisna izvješća ... skupštine dalmatinskog pokrajinskog sabora* (1864–1868), *Izvješća hitropisna i razglozna ... zasjedanja dalmatinskoga pokrajinskog sabora* (1869), *Izvješća brzopisna i analitična ... zasjedanja zemaljskoga sabora dalmatinskoga* (1870–1877), *Brzopisna izvješća ... zasjedanja zemaljskoga sabora dalmatinskoga* (1880–1912). For clarity's sake, in this paper we will only use the title *Hitropisna/Brzopisna izvješća*.

9 For easy reference in the listing of the linguistic sources, the second half of the 19th century was divided into the 60s, 70s, 80s and the 90s.

development of the Croatian language could have always taken a different course. It is therefore not surprising that Budmani also called his grammar Illyrian since the term was so frequently used in Dalmatia (TAFRA 1995: 163). He identifies noun declensions by the genitive singular inflectional suffix, keeps the double suffixes in the dative, locative and plural instrumental, and retains the differentiation between the declension of definite and indefinite adjectives. Along with these morphological categories, Budmani also keeps the digrams *dj* and *gj* for [ǰ] and *tj* for [č], as well as the Iekavian jat reflex and the retention of the phonemes [t] and [d] during assimilations.¹⁰

Upon its publication in 1899, Maretić's *Grammar and Stylistics of the Croatian or Serbian Language* became highly acclaimed, "marking a final act of codification of the new type of standard language, different from those which had been codified by the Illyrian grammars ('slovnice') for the Croatian linguistic community sixty years before" (PETI 2008: 314). In his grammar Maretić selects and grammatically describes and standardizes the Iekavian linguistic type, also advocated by Vuk Stefanović Karadžić as the proper standard in his reformations of the Serbian language in the first half of the 19th century.

Even though this grammar represents the best of the young linguistic concepts in this region, its shortcomings, with regard to the linguo-political reality of the times, are to be found in its exclusive reliance on folk tradition and examples from Karadžić's and Daničić's work, as well as its unswerving adherence to their linguistic postulates.¹¹

Due to the broad timeframe being described, our focus will be on only some of the important issues regarding standardization in the said period, these being the jat reflex, the selection between the etymological and phonological orthographies and the plural noun inflectional suffixes in the genitive, dative, locative and instrumental.

4. Results of the analysis

4.1 The jat reflex

In the attempts to codify the Croatian language, vehement debates were spurred by the question of the jat reflex on the phonological level.¹² As early as 1836¹³, the

10 For comparative analysis of Budmani's grammar with the Illyrian and New-Štokavian standards see: TAFRA 1995.

11 V. Jagić, as an expert in the history of Croatian standard language, wrote a severe criticism of Maretić's *Grammar* pointing out that "Croatia used the Štokavian type of language as the standard even before Vuk Karadžić, under various other names (Croatian, Illyrian, Bosnian, Dalmatian, Slavonian), therefore it has much deeper roots; so the argument that Croats stole the Serbian language, which some have been proposing lately (even some rational people), is quite invalid" (quoted in PETI 2008: 315).

12 The jat reflex is analyzed on the phonological level, but the jat reflex is also known to alternate and many of these alternations occur on the morphological level. The jat reflex can therefore also be analyzed on the morphological level. Besides, various jat reflexes create difficulties in writing, making it problematic on the orthographic level as well.

13 Before Babukić's proposition, I. Brlić suggested the letter *γ* for the jat reflex (STOLAC 2006: 18).

proponent of the Illyrian movement, V. Babukić, suggested a letter from the Czech alphabet *-ě* later named a *rogato e* (the letter e with a caron), arguing that it can be pronounced as *je, ie, e, i* in “formal and vernacular speech,” but that it would be good to pronounce it as *je* “at least when reading.” Thus, even though the Illyrians provided a choice, Yekavian Štokavian was preferred (STOLAC 2006: 18). The Zagreb School of Philology inherited the Illyrian postulates, which is why the first philologists used the letter *e* with a caron (*ě*) for a while, and afterwards switched to the use of *je* and *ie* in writing (STOLAC 2006: 18). In this regard, the School board meetings which took place in 1877 and 1879 reveal how debates over the jat reflex were still ongoing, and the following conclusion was made: “If the syllable is long, write *ie*, and if it is short, write *je*” (M[RAZOVIĆ] 1877: 218); they also noted the necessity of publishing a smaller dictionary that would list words with long and short syllables. In addition to these official declarations, which were not implemented with consistency, there was a long tradition of the usage of the jat reflex in Dalmatia which included, as already mentioned, the Zadar School of Philology, headed by Ante Kuzmanić, who firmly believed that the tradition of Dalmatian and Slavonian literature in Štokavian Ikavian should not be neglected.

Croatian Vukovians prescribed the Iekavian-Jekavian jat reflex (BUDMANI 1867: 14). Contradictions in the decisions of certain philological schools as well as the absence of a unique orthography resulted in unstandardized solutions in the selection of the jat reflex in the analyzed corpus. The linguistic situation of the analyzed corpus (the jat reflex) can be seen in Table 1 and Table 2.¹⁴

Table 1: The jat reflex

	ikavian		ekavian		iekavian
	long	short	long	short	
60s	<i>naprid</i>	<i>čovik</i>	<i>mnenje predlog</i>	/	/
70s	<i>posli</i>	/	<i>predlozi</i>	<i>Starešina</i>	/
80s	/	/	<i>mnenje predlog upotrebit</i>	/	<i>slijedeći</i>
90s	/	/	<i>predlog tekom (lanjskog zasjedanja) izvestit</i>	/	<i>uslijed poslije dijela udijelila</i>

14 Due to the volume of the corpus, results were divided into two tables. Table 1 contains examples of Ikavian, Ekavian and Iekavian jat reflexes, and Table 2 Iekavian and Jekavian.

Table 2: The jat reflex

	iekavian		jekavian	
	long	short	long	short
60s	<i>mnienje</i> <i>rieč</i> <i>siečanj</i> <i>sprieda</i> <i>vrieme</i>	<i>obielodanjen</i> <i>splietske</i>	<i>lječenje</i>	<i>namjesništvo</i> <i>savjetnik</i> <i>Spljetsko</i>
70s	<i>rieč</i> <i>vrieme</i>	<i>zavietovat</i>	<i>izvjestit</i>	<i>umjesto</i> <i>vidjet</i>
80s	<i>rieč</i>	<i>riešenje</i> <i>dielo</i>	/	<i>mjesec</i> <i>povjerenici</i> <i>sjednica</i>
90s	<i>sliedi</i>	/	/	<i>izvješće zamjenik</i> <i>gdje</i>

In spite of the strong influence of Dalmatian-Ikavian and the linguistic solutions advocated by the Zadar School of Philology, there are only a few examples of the Ikavian reflex in the analyzed corpus and they only appear during the 1860s and 1870s. On the other hand, the Ekavian reflex occurs with greater frequency, especially during the 1880s and 1890s. The Iekavian reflex is present in the analyzed corpus in all timeframes, but unlike the 1860s when it was dominant, it was less used in the 1880s and 1890s. This is the precise indicator of how Illyrian postulates, under the influence of changes that took place in linguistic circles, were steadily being abandoned in favour of a stronger feeling of Croatian linguistic unity.

The Iekavian reflex emerged in the 1880s, and a stable standardization in the form of the Iekavian reflex in long syllables and the Jekavian reflex in short syllables started to take place in the 1890s. Considering the fact that the linguistic doctrine of the Croatian Vukovians became dominant in the 1890s, which is evidenced by the publication of both Maretić's grammar, Broz's orthography and Broz and Iveković's dictionary (which solidified the New Štokavian standard), the frequent use of the Iekavian reflex is quite surprising. This confirms that the Zagreb School of Philology still had a strong influence in Dalmatia, the cause of which could also be the political separation of Dalmatia from the rest of Croatia and a strong aspiration for the unification of its separate parts.

The jat reflex in the toponym of Split occurring in the Yekavian form of the syntagm is something the authors' have particularly analyzed: *Spljetsko okružje* (1865), *okružje Spljetsko* (1866) and in Iekavian as well: *obnovljenje Splietske bolnice* (1866). In spite of there not being a written record of its Iekavian form in later periods, we can assume that this form was used all throughout the analyzed period because the "iekavization" of toponyms was in use until 1921 when D. Boranić prescribes a rule that "local names and surnames in ekavian and ikavian areas preserve *e* and *i*" (ŠIMUNOVIĆ 2008: 11). Still, if this were a printed medium, meaning a newspaper or

official paper published at the time, an iekavian form would be expected with regard to the linguistic tendencies of the period. In this case, since these are records of the speech of Dalmatian parliamentary members who strongly opposed such disfigurement of the linguistic tradition we can only conclude that these records underwent revision or were composed by someone who favoured the Vukovian linguistic concept.

4.2 Consonant assimilation by voicing

Of all the issues in the linguistic debates in the second half of the 19th century, the question of consonant assimilation by voicing or the dichotomy between etymological¹⁵ and phonological orthographies¹⁶ represented the most important elements in the codification of what is today the standard Croatian language. The etymological principle was propounded by the members of the Zagreb School of Philology with the following motto “Write in such a way so that everyone can easily understand you, or at least the majority of those for whom you write” (MAŽURANIĆ 1859: 26), which meant that in practice the word was written etymologically as long as it did not affect understanding. The Croatian Vukovians, on the other hand, were proponents of phonological orthography, which implied the use of consonant assimilation by voicing. In Dalmatia, as early as 1848, the question of the use of phonological orthography was, in a more extreme version, promoted by Đuro Augustinović (VINCE 2002: 373) and Ivan Danilo in the second of their two grammars¹⁷ (DANILO 1873: 9). The linguistic situation of the analyzed corpus (implementation or the lack of consonant assimilation by voicing) is shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Consonant assimilation by voicing

	non-implemented	implemented
60s	<i>društvo, opazka, razprava, teškoća, uobće</i>	<i>društvenog, društvima, društvo</i>
70s	<i>društven, občina, razprava, sbog, sdušno</i>	<i>uskratiti</i>
80s	<i>občina, opterećen, podpora, razprava</i>	<i>općinski</i>
90s	<i>iztraga, občina, teške</i>	<i>društvo, srpski</i>

15 Orthography based on the root of a word or etymon is called etymological orthography or root orthography. Etymological orthography writes: *glasba, srčba, uredništvo, vasma ...* (BABIĆ/FINKA/MOGUŠ 1996: X).

16 Orthography based on the phoneme is called phonological orthography, the phonological principle being the most important. In this orthography phonemes are written as they are spoken, which means that the same phoneme is written with the same letter, for example *kazališni* (< kazalište), *retka* (< redak), *stambeni* (< stan), *vrapca* (< vrbac). Phonological orthography takes allophones into consideration (BABIĆ 2005: 64).

17 This is the *Slovnica za srednja učilišta nižega reda* from 1873.

As can be seen in the table, in the language of the stenographic records both principles are adhered to and assimilation by voicing was implemented in some words and not in others: for example, in the 1860s there are the written forms *družtvo* as well as *društvo*; similarly in the 1890s there were: *občina* and *općinski*. A somewhat surprising fact is that etymological writing is more represented than phonological throughout the analyzed period, especially in the 1890s after the systematization of the New Štokavian standard and the publishing of Broz's orthography. The preservation of this principle during the 1860s and 1870s is also justified by Budmani's grammar in which the author suggests double solutions since Croats and Serbs have different views on some linguistic issues; so in spite of the Vukovian character of its grammar, Budmani allowed the etymological view as well (BUDMANI 1967: 9).

4.3 The genitive plural of nouns in all three genders

On the morphological level the genitive plural morpheme was the subject of numerous debates between philological schools. A great number of various inflectional suffixes for the genitive plural of nouns in all three genders¹⁸ were a consequence of the impossibility of the linguistic concepts of the time to affirm the length of the last syllable with a grapheme or letter. The Zagreb School of Philology and the linguists Babukić and Mažuranić, following the example of Slavonian orthography (TAFRA 1993: 84), signified inflectional suffix length¹⁹ with the phoneme /x/ (*-ah* and *-ih* in the suffix) while Budmani's grammar, for example, favoured the *-â* suffix, that is *-ã*²⁰ (BUDMANI 1867: 22). Other Vukovians – Maretić and Daničić – also standardized the inflectional suffix *-â* in their grammars (MARETIĆ 1899: 133; DANIČIĆ 1869: 3).

The phoneme /x/, which was written in the inflectional suffix for the genitive plural in Dalmatia, was of a different origin; it emerged from adjective declension and the syllable length was marked differently, with the inflectional suffixes *-ah*, *-aa*, or even *-aaa*: in *kripost Viraa*, in *čuvanju pasaaa* (VINCE 1971: 296). The double or even triple *a* in the inflectional suffix was not recorded in the analyzed corpus and in this case it cannot be considered as having been a part of standard usage in Dalmatia, or at least this is the case with the analyzed records. However, Vince says that such forms were only recorded in the early 19th century. The linguistic situation of the analyzed corpus (genitive plural of nouns in all three genders) is shown in Table 4.

18 All suffixes of this case can be seen in Table 4.

19 The reason for such a written form of the genitive plural (with the phoneme /h/) is given by proponents of the Zagreb School of Philology as allowing an easier differentiation of the genitive singular from the genitive plural (G sg. *junaka* : G pl. *junakah*) (STOLAC 2006: 20).

20 Budmani records this suffix in a paradigm (BUDMANI 1867: 22).

Table 4: Genitive plural of nouns in all three genders

	<i>-ab</i>	<i>-ib</i>	<i>-a</i>	<i>-â</i>	<i>-a'</i>	<i>-i</i>
60s	<i>poučenje takovih spisah, prvih točakah, občinskih naznakah</i>	<i>u 10½ satih</i>	<i>svojih proračunskih prihoda, zbog nesreća, razprostranjenju pučkih učiona</i>	/	<i>zbog potrebitog odpušta poreza', privremenitog utočišta bolnika', zbog pripoznatih mana'</i>	<i>do svojih najneznatnijih podrobnosti</i>
70s	/	/	<i>zastupnika vanjskih općina, nekoliko besjeda, od rečenih struka</i>	<i>mnoštvo činovnikâ, naredbom Popečiteljâ, bez preinaka, 40 godina</i>	/	<i>kod sudbenih Vlasti, u izvršivanju dužnosti</i>
80s	/	/	<i>u smislu naredaba, po riešenju molba</i>	<i>3550 fiorinâ, pomagati obiteljima spremnikâ</i>	/	<i>od 300 forinti</i>
90s	/	/	<i>službenih obzira, umirovljenje činovnika, o ustanovljenju zadruga</i>	<i>ugled škole i učiteljâ</i>	/	/

The analysis revealed that the most frequently occurring inflectional suffix is *-a*, which appears in all the stenographic records during the second half of the 19th century. The usage of the inflectional suffix *-ab* is frequently noted in the 1860s, but it was quickly succeeded by the inflectional suffixes *-a* and *-â*. This is found in masculine and neuter nouns and in nouns of the *e*-type of declension. Nouns of the *i*-type of declension consistently use the inflectional suffix *-i* while the inflectional suffix *-ib* occurs only with the noun *sat* (Eng. Hour).

The absence of phoneme /x/ in the inflectional genitive suffix is compensated for by the apostrophe in phrases such as *zbog potrebitog odpušta poreza'*, which is inherited from Mažuranić's grammar in which it is stated.

4.4 Dative plural of nouns in all three genders

4.4.1 Dative plural of masculine and neuter nouns

As was the case with the genitive plural, inflectional suffixes for the dative and later the locative and instrumental plural represented one of the key subjects of standardization debates in the second half of the 19th century. The Illyrian movement favoured a complex declension system, which was later also advocated by the Zagreb School of Philology, which is the reason why different inflectional suffixes can be found in the dative, locative and instrumental plural. In the dative this inflectional suffix, with stems ending in nonpalatal consonants, was *-om*, and in those ending with a palatal consonant the inflectional suffix was *-em*. Such inflectional suffixes are not recorded in the 1860s due to the rare use of the dative plural, however, they are very frequent in the 1870s and 1880s.

Besides the cultural and ideological reasons it is important to point out that Illyrians connected the inflectional suffix *-ima* to the dual (TAFRA 1993: 86) which was one other reason why they opposed the introduction of the syncretized case for plural forms. It needs to be pointed out that the Vukovian language concept argued for the syncretism of the nouns and noun words in the dative, locative and instrumental plural and it is not surprising that the inflectional suffix *-ima* in masculine and neuter nouns was dominant for 40 years.

The inflectional suffix *-im* was also found in the analyzed corpus; however, it appeared exceptionally rarely. Even though it was not a part of any linguistic concept, the aforementioned suffix randomly appeared as a remnant of either an older linguistic tradition, as claimed by Maretić (MARETIĆ 1915: 215), or it was considered a provincialism as was argued by the Zagreb School of Philology (BABUKIĆ 1854: 183). The linguistic situation of the analyzed corpus (dative plural of masculine and neuter nouns) is shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Dative plural of masculine and neuter nouns

	<i>-om/-em</i>	<i>-im</i>	<i>-ima</i>
60s	/	/	<i>koliko je veći prostor pojedinim miestima ostavljen</i>
70s	<i>ovim redovitim odborom sve naprititi, tim učiteljem treba dati plaću</i>	/	<i>naprama tajnicima, školskim viećima</i>
80s	<i>dopušteni manjini Talijancem, budi slobodno Hrvatom zvati svoj jezik</i>	<i>odgovara običajim</i>	<i>priobćene svim obćinskim Upraviteljstvima</i>
90s	/	/	<i>kopa oči dušmanima, nisu učiteljima ono što bi trebali biti</i>

4.4.2 Dative plural of feminine nouns

The analysis reveals that in feminine nouns the older form of the inflectional suffix *-am*, or *-im* for *i*-type nouns, remained longer in use than the older form of the inflectional suffix *-om/-em* in masculine and neuter nouns. Namely, the inflectional suffix *-am* was used throughout the analyzed period. It has already been pointed out that the Vukovian linguistic concept advocated the syncretism of the dative, locative and instrumental plural in nouns and noun words so, while the corpus analysis revealed the use of the inflectional suffix *-ima* in masculine and neuter nouns throughout the analyzed 40-year period, the inflectional suffix *-ama* in feminine nouns appeared only in the 1890s. The linguistic situation of the analyzed corpus (dative plural of feminine nouns) is shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Dative plural of feminine nouns

	<i>-am</i>	<i>-im</i>	<i>-ima</i>
60s	<i>ostavljeno predrasudam, suprotno nekim osobam</i>	/	/
70s	<i>zadovoljiti umjerenim željam</i>	<i>pa su i dotičnim Vlastim bolje na srcu</i>	/
80s	<i>oduzevši oružje pojedinim osobam</i>	<i>upravljenih svim kotarskim vlastim, na pripomoć obiteljim</i>	/
90s	<i>pripadajuća učiteljskim osobam, nameće zemlji i občinam</i>	/	<i>pripadaju občinama</i>

4.5 Locative plural of nouns in all three genders

4.5.1 Locative plural of masculine and neuter nouns

The syncretized inflectional suffix *-ima* was increasingly used in the locative plural of masculine and neuter nouns since the 1860s. The inflectional suffix *-ih*, standardized in the declension system of the Zagreb School, occurs very rarely in the analyzed corpus. The older inflectional suffix *-im* occurs more frequently in its place. The linguistic situation of the analyzed corpus (locative plural of masculine and neuter nouns) is shown in Table 7.

Table 7: Locative plural of masculine and neuter nouns

	<i>-ih</i>	<i>-im</i>	<i>-ima</i>
60s	/	/	<i>u ostalim odpravničkim poslima</i>
70s	<i>o predlozih</i>	<i>u gradovima, po selim</i>	<i>u upitima, po selima, u svim javnim učilištima</i>
80s	/	<i>po onim nadzornicim</i>	<i>o javnim zborovima</i>
90s	/	<i>u svim saborim, prema našim jadnim učiteljim</i>	<i>u svim pitanjima</i>

4.5.2 Locative plural of feminine nouns

In the locative plural of feminine nouns the most frequently occurring inflectional suffix is *-am* (even though the corpus analysis revealed no records of it in the 1860s) while the older suffix *-ab* appears in the early 1860s. In addition to these, there is also the inflectional suffix *-ami*, which was added to the locative most probably through its analogy with an instrumental suffix, and it was sometimes used by older Croatian writers (MARETIĆ 1915: 223). The inflectional suffix *-ama* is a syncretized case inflectional suffix recorded only in the 1890s. The linguistic situation of the analyzed corpus (locative plural of feminine nouns) is shown in Table 8.

Table 8: Locative plural of feminine nouns

	<i>-ab</i>	<i>-am</i>	<i>-ami</i>	<i>-ama</i>
60s	<i>u predjašnjih mjerah</i>	/	/	/
70s	/	<i>na ceduljam, u srednjim učionam, prama osobam</i>	<i>u godinami</i>	/
80s	/	<i>po sljedećim činjenicam, na galerijam</i>	/	/
90s	/	<i>u sjednicam, o školskim knjigam</i>	/	<i>u našim školama, u drugim zemljama</i>

4.6 Instrumental plural of nouns in all three genders

4.6.1 Instrumental plural of masculine and neuter nouns

Unlike the feminine gender, the locative plural of masculine and neuter nouns does not have a large number of various inflectional suffixes. The analysis of the corpus revealed only the inflectional suffix *-ima*, which had been used since the 1870s. The linguistic situation of the analyzed corpus (instrumental plural of masculine and neuter nouns) is shown in Table 9.

Table 9: Instrumental plural of masculine and neuter nouns

	<i>-ima</i>
60s	/
70s	<i>s mojim i častnimi drugovima, nad zastupnicima, dotignuti vinskih društva</i>
80s	<i>sa propisanim dokazima, s talijanašima</i>
90s	<i>obkoljena je brdima, boriti svim nastavnim sredstvima</i>

4.6.2 Instrumental plural of feminine nouns

Unlike the masculine and neuter nouns, in the feminine gender of *e*- and *i*-types of declension, there are additional inflectional suffixes occurring in the instrumental plural. In nouns of the *e*-type of declension, *-am* and *-ama* there are very frequently occurring inflectional suffixes. The older form of the inflectional suffix *-ami* is used very rarely, only in the 1870s. In nouns of the *i*-type declension the inflectional suffixes *-mi* and *-ima* were found to occur in the 1870s and 1880s. The linguistic situation of the analyzed corpus (instrumental plural of feminine nouns) is shown in Table 10.

Table 10: Instrumental plural of feminine nouns

	<i>-am</i>	<i>-ami</i>	<i>-mi</i>	<i>-ima</i>	<i>-ama</i>
60s	/	/	/	/	<i>postojećim naredbama</i>
70s	<i>ogledana biše gradjevinam i drugim podporam</i>	<i>opremaju se tiskanicami</i>	<i>među svimi vlastmi, nad riečmi</i>	<i>s prazniem riečima</i>	/
80s	<i>nazivali poglavicam</i>	/	<i>s riečmi</i>	<i>s ovim tekstualnim riječima</i>	<i>s ovim naredbama</i>
90s	<i>neprijeti se više težkim globam</i>	/	/	/	<i>nositi se s ovim odlukama</i>

5. Conclusion

The analysis of the stenographic records (*Hitropisna/Brzopisna izvješća*) of the Dalmatian Parliament has revealed that the linguistic situation in Dalmatia was similar to that of the rest of Croatia, which was politically, culturally and linguistically separate. It is clear how the efforts to unite the separate parts of the country also resulted in an effort to achieve linguistic unity; however, in some places it was impossible to ignore the centuries-long written tradition rooted in these areas.

Analysis of the jat reflex has led us to conclude that three separate timeframes could be defined. The first timeframe encompasses the 1860s and the 1870s and is marked by the dominance of the Iekavian reflex in long syllables and the Yekavian in short syllables. There was also an occasional influence of Dalmatian Ikavian in words such as *čovik* and *naprid* whose usage became obsolete in later years. The second timeframe refers to the 1880s when various jat reflexes were used throughout the decade; the Iekavian jat reflex is also used in long syllables in addition to the Iekavian, while the Jekavian jat reflex is more frequent than the Iekavian in short syllables. Ikavian was slowly becoming obsolete, and eventually was succeeded by Ekavian which started to emerge in this period. Even though it was expected that the 1890s would bring the stabilization of the standard, analysis revealed how alongside the Iekavian and Jekavian reflexes, the Iekavian reflex also frequently occurred as a

remnant of a different linguistic tradition inherited from the Zagreb School of Philology. As far as assimilation by voicing, the analysis has revealed that it is still an exception and that assimilated examples occurred less frequently than unassimilated.

This research paper is especially focused on the plural cases, some of which (genitive, dative, locative and instrumental) were a major subject of debates among numerous schools. Inflectional suffixes in other singular and plural cases have remained almost unchanged from the first Croatian grammar until modern-day standard Croatian. Differences could be found in a number of cases (their order and so forth), but the morphological characteristics have always remained stable, which is not the case with the four cases mentioned above. The genitive inflectional suffix represented a clear conceptual orientation in Dalmatia. The importance of the genitive inflectional suffix selection is confirmed by the fact that it was only in this case that Budmani did not allow the use of the inflectional suffix *-ab*, only the New Štokavian *-â* or *-ā*.

The dominance of the New Štokavian inflectional suffixes *-a* and *-â* is noticeable in Dalmatia since early times, at least as far as the stenographic records are concerned. The influence of the Zagreb School of Philology is noticeable only in the emergence of the inflectional suffixes *-ab* and *-a'* during the 1860s, but that influence soon wore off.

The research has shown that the inflectional suffixes prescribed by the grammars of the Zagreb School of Philology most frequently occur in the dative in all genders and in the instrumental feminine throughout the selected period. The syncretized inflectional suffix *-ima/-ama* is used throughout the 1860s, in the early 1870s, and is present until the end of the analyzed period. We can therefore conclude that in spite of the efforts of some linguists of the day, at least as far as morphology is concerned, the influence of the Vukovian language doctrine was present starting in the 1860s, but only gained primacy in the 1890s.

Based on the analyzed corpus we can conclude that the language used in Dalmatia in the second half of the 19th century was conceptually a deeply unstable and incoherent system which became more stable by the end of the century. The non-homogeneity of the political arena resulted in the non-homogeneity of the linguistic system, so the final break from the Dalmatian tradition, the influence of the Illyrian movement and the Zagreb School of Philology did not take place before the 20th century, when the language was finally standardized. This standardization process is still to be researched.

The victory of the Croatian Vukovians in Dalmatia was not achieved only due to linguistic reasons, but was to a large extent a result of political influences. Numerous members of the Croatian Vukovians were highly positioned politicians, which enabled the easier implementation of language norms in the public. Also, the Štokavian dialect, which was the basis of the standard Croatian language, was also the basis of the Serbian language. This has caused a number of debates about the origin of the Štokavian dialect and its speakers' ethnic identity. The problems here described and the process of defining Dalmatia's linguistic identity are especially relevant today, due to the fact that the modern-day Croatian language has not changed much since it was standardized in the 19th century. The selection of Štokavian as the basis for the standard resulted in the great similarity between Croatian and Serbian, which still evokes conflicts on linguistic as well as political levels.

6. Works Cited

- BABIĆ, Stjepan; FINKA, Božidar; MOGUŠ, Milan (1996): *Hrvatski pravopis*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- BABIĆ, Stjepan (2005): *Temelji Hrvatskomu pravopisu*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- BABUKIĆ, Vjekoslav (1854): *Ilirska slovnica*. Zagreb: Tiskovnica Dra. Ljudevita Gaja.
- BADURINA, Lada (2004): „Novije promjene u hrvatskome standardnom jeziku“. *Croatian Studies Review* 3–4. 83–93.
- BADURINA, Lada (2011): „Jezik i pravopis: teorijsko-metodološki pristup pravopisnom normiranju“. *Croatica et Slavica Iadertina* 7 (1). 17–31.
- BREŠAN, Tanja (2012): *Jezik službeno-upravnih novina za Kraljevinu Dalmaciju u razdoblju od 1867. do 1903* (= Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of Zagreb).
- BIĆANIĆ, Ante (2012): „Pravopisna norma i standardizacija hrvatskoga jezika devedesetih godina. 20. stoljeća i početkom 21. stoljeća“. In: Senahid Halilović et al. (eds): *Bosanskohercegovački slavistički kongres* 1. 13–23.
- BROZOVIĆ, Dalibor (2008): *Povijest hrvatskoga književnog i standardnoga jezika*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- BUDMANI, Pero (1867): *Grammatica della lingua serbo-croata (illirica)*. Vienna.
- BULAT, Gajo (1900): *Jezično pitanje u Kraljevini Dalmaciji: bilježke i izprave*. Split: Brzotisaak “Narodna Tiskara”.
- COHEN, Louis (2007): *Metode istraživanja u obrazovanju*. Jastrebarsko: Naklada Slap.
- DANIČIĆ, Đuro (1869): *Oblici srpskoga ili hrvatskoga jezika*. Zagreb: Štamparija Dragutina Albrehta.
- DANILO, Ivan (1873): *Slovnica za srednja učilišta nižega reda. Uređena prema Budmanijevoj*. Zadar: Tisak Narodnog lista.
- HAUGEN, Einar (1987): *Blessing of Babel*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- KATIČIĆ, Radoslav (1999): „Načela standardnosti hrvatskoga jezika“. In: Marko Samardžija (ed.): *Norme i normiranje hrvatskoga standardnoga jezika*. Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska. 295–307.
- MARETIĆ, Tomo (1899): *Gramatika i stilistika hrvatskoga ili srpskoga književnog jezika*. Zagreb: Štampa i naklada knjižare L. Hartmana (Kugli i Deutch).
- MARETIĆ, Tomo (1915): „Jezik dalmatinskih pisaca XVIII. vijeka. Drugi prilog istoričkoj gramatici našega jezika“. *Rad JAZU* 209. 177–240.
- MAŽURANIĆ, Antun (1859): *Slovnica Hèrvatska. Za gimnazije i realne škole. Dio I. Rěčoslovje*. Zagreb.
- MIČANOVIĆ, Krešimir (2006): „Mjesto standardologije u jezikoslovnoj kroatistici“. In: Marko Samardžija, Ivo Pranjković (eds.): *Hrvatski jezik u XX. stoljeću*. Zagreb. 559–585.
- MOGUŠ, Milan (1995): *Povijest hrvatskoga književnoga jezika*. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Globus.
- M[RAZOVIĆ], L[adislav] (1877): „Ob ustanovi hrvatskog pravopisa“. *Vienac* 9 (11). 176–179, (13). 210–211, (14). 217–221.
- PETI, Mirko (2008): „Jagić o Maretiću“. In: *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 34. 305–321.
- SAMARDŽIJA, Marko (2001): *Franjo Iveković, Ivan Broz, Tomo Maretić, Vatroslav Rožić, Milan Rešetar, Antun Radić, Dragutin Boranić: Jezikoslovne rasprave i članci*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- STOLAC, Diana (2006): *Riječki filološki portreti*. Rijeka: Fluminensia.
- ŠIMUNOVIĆ, Petar (2008): „Ranosrednjovjekovna toponimija splitskog poluotoka.“ *Archaeologica Adriatica* 2. 587–599.
- TAFRA, Branka (1993): *Gramatika u Hrvata i Vjekoslav Babukić*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.

- VASILJEVA, Ljudmila (2001): „Sociolingvistička konstelacija unutar štokavskoga sustava s osobitim obzirom na crnogorski standardni jezik (jedan od suvremenih pristupa)“. In: *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 27. 333–345.
- VINCE, Zlatko (1971): „Gramatike zadarsko-dalmatinskog jezičnog kruga“. *Zadarska revija* 20. 285–300.
- VINCE, Zlatko (2002): *Putovima hrvatskoga književnog jezika. Lingvističko-kulturnopovijesni prikaz filoloških škola i njihovih izvora*. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske.