

Šime Starčević and the most important discussions on language published in Zadar periodicals in the 19th century

Slavica Vrsaljko

Abstrakt: Šime Starčević was a versatile person who, aside from writing newspaper articles, also took handwritten notes on how to prepare teaching classes at the initial stages of the educational system. However, in addition to all his activities, his involvement in the key Zadar periodicals (*Zora dalmatinska* and *Glasnik dalmatinski*) was particularly interesting, leaving a mark on the cultural life of Zadar and Dalmatia during the 19th century. His most significant discussions on language appeared in *Zora* and *Glasnik* as a testament to his linguistic maturity and prowess. In these periodicals, he dealt with three thematic frameworks which, apart from religious-enlightenment and language-related issues, focused on the social and political situation of Dalmatia at the time. This paper solely analyses his discussions on language published in *Zora* and *Glasnik*.

Keywords: Šime Starčević, *Zora dalmatinska*, *Glasnik dalmatinski*, language articles.

The versatility of Šime Starčević

Šime Starčević was a versatile person, a Catholic priest by profession, a linguist by cultural creativity, and a proponent of national interests who fought for the standardization of the Croatian language. He was born in Klanec near Gospić on 18 April 1784. He attended elementary and high school in Varaždin, studied philosophy in Graz and Zagreb, and theology in Senj, where he was ordained a priest in 1808. In his autobiography, he was described as being “proficient

in Illyrian and Latin, partly in German, and a little in Italian and French, being able to read all Slavic except Seraphim”¹. He knew Croatian literature well, especially linguistic works. He was the uncle and the first teacher of Ante Starčević, later the known as the Father of the Nation.

However, the most important segment of his linguistic work stands out as the *Nova ricsoslovica iliricska: vojnicsoj mladosti krajicsoj poklonjena/trudom i nastojanjem Shime Starcsevicha xupnika od Novoga u Lici*, Trieste, 1812 (reprint, Institute of Croatian Language and Linguistics, Zagreb, 2002), *Nova ricsoslovica iliricsko-francezka: na potribovanje vojnicsoe mladosti iliricsokih darxavah/ Mozin, Trieste, 1812, Homelie iliti Tumačenje svetog evengjelja za sve nedilje: od Došastja Gospodinova do poslednje nedilje po Duhovih*, Zadar, 1850, among which was the *Ričoslovnica*, grammar of the Croatian language. He was reluctant to publish because he did not accept printing on the then proposed Ljudevit Gaj’s orthography, which he strongly opposed. In 1812, “through the efforts and intentions of Šime Starčević, a parish priest from Novo”, the *Nova ričoslovica ilirička* saw the light of day.² The grammar was written in morphological orthography. Many have written about Starčević’s grammar, which along with the grammar review, was also described as: “(...) a combative cultural-political writing, strongly polemical and aiming to create a unique Croatian literary language as the basis of common spiritual creation, but focusing on the pure folk speech

¹ Cf. Fran BINIČKI, »Autobiografija popa Šime Starčevića«, *Hrvatska prosvjeta* 5, 1918, p. 95.

² *Nova ricsoslovica iliricska* (printed in Trieste in 1812) was historically extremely significant because it was the first grammar of the Croatian language written in Croatian (the previous ones were written in Latin, Italian and German). It is particularly important for the history of the Croatian language considering that it was written in Ikavian pronunciation, and it proposed the Croatian alphabet as in other Western languages, partly different from the later adopted Gaj’s alphabet with characters from the Czech language (č, ć, š, ž), which proved to be quite far-sighted in the context of the present. In the same year, Mozin also published *Nova ricsoslovica iliricsko-francezka*.

of Croatian Lika, a living, close speech, built over centuries, a speech that already tried his hand in art and scientific books in pre-Turkish times". Vladimir Anić, evaluating the linguistic work of Šime Starčević, stated that his grammar was a grammar of literary language, not a grammar of Lika speech or a linear description of a dialectal structure. For Starčević, the languages of the simple men from Primorje, Kotar, Bosnia and Slavonia were the real foundation for the general Croatian literary language, and he advocated for the Ikavian pronunciation and opposed the Ijekavian pronunciation typical for Dubrovnik. He was very adamant in noting that he wanted to preserve the continuity of the language of the Croatian Štokavian Ikavian literature.

In more recent times, Father Valentin Miklobušec, the archivist of the Society of Jesus in Zagreb, informed the public that the manuscripts of Šime Starčević were found in the estate of priest Davorin (Martin) Krmpotić in 2008³. There were more than a thousand sheets, complete manuscripts and fragments of larger units, some of which were signed by Šime Starčević. In the archive, the materials have been classified into two groups: labelled A - linguistic texts and B - religious texts. These, in addition to the manuscript⁴ that was kept in the Sacred Heritage of Senj, remain the only manuscripts of Šime Starčević found thus far.⁵

Even the titles of the texts found indicate that they were intended for school and learning. In them, he particularly discussed language learning, obviously dissatisfied with the position in teaching

³ Krmpotić, Davorin, Croatian priest (Veljun near Senj, 1867- Arizona, USA, 1931) (Opći religijski leksikon, 2002:480)

⁴ A manuscript, titled *Kratki i gladki ODGOVORI na ona, Koja se ponajviše, i naj obširnije govore suprot VIRE, I BOGOSHTOVJU*, translation from the French original.

⁵ Cf. Grahovac-Pražić, Vesna, "Udžbenički diskurs u rukopisnoj ostavštini Šime Starčevića": *Šime Starčević i hrvatska kultura u 19. stoljeću: Zbornik radova sa znanstvenoga skupa Šime Starčević i hrvatska kultura u 19. stoljeću* Gospić, 2014 137-153

and approaches to learning; he wrote that there was no real way of “planting into the soft hearts of little children” and continued by stating that he wanted to help with this booklet that he translated from a foreign language, finally writing in Latin and Cyrillic so that every “child, whether Catholic or Christian, with a little effort and a poor teacher, can not only learn in both ways and regularly defend it, and write if he/she wants to”, but receive God’s teachings. It is clear that reading and writing were taught separately, i.e., that the primary focus was to learn to read. After the preface, there is a board with Latin and Cyrillic letters, followed by six units for initials spelling, and after the students have mastered the reading technique, the most extensive chapter follows - *Uhod u Shtivenje* (eng. *Introduction to Reading*) (29 chapters + 9 in Cyrillic). *Parts of religious studies* (From God, From prayer...) and general knowledge (about the sea, water, government, man, memory, disease, land...) alternate. Thus, in the section titled *Od Razdiljenja Vladanjah*, he provides information on colleges, which were places with classrooms that served as houses or rooms where the youth could learn, after which he lists the teaching areas: worship and various sciences, such sciences especially represent the “language of their people and homelands, and languages that are not spoken... penmanship, astronomy, diplomacy, narrative writing, philosophy, religion, law and art” (cro. *Liposlovka, Zvizdoznanstvo, Kopnomirje, Dogodovshchina iliti Zgodopisanje, Mudroslovstvo, Bogoslovstvo, Zakononauk, aliti Pravdoznanstvo i Likarstvo*). This is followed by a chapter with language lessons - *Nadometak*. These include rules about sounds, syllables, dividing them into syllables, reading, punctuation, accents, pronunciation (cro. *Od promine glasa*);

for instance, the author instructs how to use the quotation marks („”) properly in Croatian.⁶

Starčević's sense for everything that was “purely Croatian” was evidenced by his desire to achieve linguistic purity. His *Riscoslovica* shows that the Croatian language was completely developed at the beginning of the 19th century, as it was possible to write a professional text without the use of loanwords. It is not enough to say that it was written in Croatian, given that the type of Croatian should also be stated - Croatian without loanwords.⁷ In addition, all previous grammars were either written in another language (Latin, Italian, German) or were bilingual. Tafra (143-145) compared Starčević's grammar with other Croatian grammars and observed that Aluzjije Torkvat Brlić (in 1854) and Antun Mažuranić (in 1859) described the Neo-Shtokavian four-tone system and stated that Starčević was the first in noting it as well.

⁶ Cf. Unosila („”) postavljaju se na početku, i na svršetku govora, koi se iz tugjih ustah, ali knjigah u svoje pismo uvodi. (Ričoslovje, 2009:10)“ postavljena na kraju svakoga redka tugjega govorenja, kako si vidio na§.16, koji se na svarhi uzbardo okrichu“, (Nova Ricoslovica iliriska, 1812:112)“.../ jesu dva poteza, koja se mechu na pocselu svakoga redka, kada se tugje govorenje na parvo izvodi, ili iz druge knjige donosi, i kad se svarshi, naopako se postavljaju./.../ (Nova ricsoslovica ilirisko-francezka, 1812:162)

⁷ Cf. Branka TAFRA, “Starčevićeva ričoslovica – 150 godina poslije”, *Jezik* 5, 2002, p. 165–175.

Zora and Glasnik – Zadar newspapers of the 19th century

More than three decades after *Kraljski Dalmatin* ceased publication, the first revivalist paper outside Zagreb, *Zora dalmatinska*, appeared. In the 1940s, the intensity of literary production in the Croatian language had certain continuity, and the beginnings of national awakening slowly but surely strengthened. The publication of *Zora*, after two years of waiting (the request for publication was submitted in August 1842), resonated strongly in Preradović's occasional poem *Zora puca* (the first issue of *Zora* was published on 1 January 1844⁸).⁹ In the 1940s Ante Kuzmanić, with his *Zora dalmatinska*, advocated for Croatian national unity and for the political and territorial unification of all Croatian countries.¹⁰ With his persistent and principled position regarding typography, Šime Starčević had a considerable influence on the typography of *Zora*, especially at the time when Kuzmanić was the editor, as they were like-minded in many important aspects of the Croatian language and orthography. Due to decisive influence by Kuzmanić and Starčević, the Slavonic-Dalmatian script always prevailed in *Zora*, while the Illyrian script was used under other editors. The two of them and *Zora's* other associates were in favour of the Croatian consensus, the only question was whether the centripetal force of Zagreb would prevail or whether the Dalmatians, along with some prominent Slavonians (Brlić,

⁸ Cf. Vjekoslav Maštrović, *Pripreme za izdanje Zore Dalmatinske u Zadru god. 1842 i 1843*. Radovi institute JAZU u Zadru, IV-V, 85-116, Zagreb, 1959.

⁹ The editors of *Zora dalmatinska* were: Ante Kuzmanić, August Ivan Kaznačić (1845), Nikola Valentić (1846) and briefly the Battara brothers. Croatian philology primarily emphasizes *Zora's* importance as the centre of the Zadar philological school.

¹⁰ Cf. Tihomil MAŠTROVIĆ, *Kroatizam Ante Kuzmanića, i Zore dalmatinske, Zora dalmatinska (1844-1849)*, Zadar, Matica hrvatska – Zadar branch, 1995, p. 62-63.

for example) would be the Croatian cultural-linguistic and political headquarters.¹¹

On the other hand, the publication of *Glasnik dalmatinski*, for the most part, coincided with the period of Bach's absolutism. The essential characteristic of the aforementioned period was the literary stagnation that affected Croatia, and was particularly strongly reflected in Dalmatia. The period of Bach's absolutism has been beautifully and metaphorically described by Vinko Kisić in his book *Osvit u Dalmaciji* (eng. Dawn in Dalmatia): In 1851, thanks to Minister Bach, absolutism was proclaimed and thus a thick snow fell on the popular rising in Dalmatia. But the seed was planted deep in the ground and germinated under the frost of Bach's dark times. The year 1848 sowed good seeds, it was the first daybreak, the dawn of the national revival of Dalmatia.¹²

The 1950s marked a very important period (admittedly, the optimism and enthusiasm in politics and literature of the 1930s and 1940s had died down, with many Croatian public and cultural professionals withdrawing from the public) because linguistic schools were being formed, which also brought openness to new possibilities for the development of language concepts. *Glasnik dalmatinski* was published for eighteen years from 1849 to 1866.¹³ The language and editorial policy of the *Glasnik dalmatinski* changed over time and it was published in the Ikavian language as well. However, during the editing period of Ante Kuzmanić from 1864 to 1866, it was

¹¹ DEROSI, Julije, "Pop Šime Stračević i Zora dalmatinska", *Zadarska smotra* 3-4, 1995.

¹² Cf. Vinko KISIĆ, *Osvit u Dalmaciji*, Zadar, Brzotisač "Narodnog lista", 1909, p. 47.

¹³ During that period, *Glasnik* had four editors. From its launch until 1855, it was edited by Ante Kuzmanić, from 1855 to 1859 by Antun Kazali, 1860 and 1861 by Jovan Sundečić, and from 1861 to 1864 by Stipan Ivičević. For the last two years of *Glasnik's* publication, Ante Kuzmanić once again took over the editorial baton.

published in the Ikavian language.¹⁴ In the first issue, Ante Kuzmanić wrote in the *Opomena* (eng. Warning) article: “Here is a new Paper for teachings and development of our Croatian arm in Dalmatia. Not only the most important events happening around the world in this time of ours will be published and described in it, but it will sometimes more or less have articles on different professions of human science, so that writers, pastors, artisans and craftsmen can derive benefit from them ”¹⁵ As evident, Kuzmanić did not give up on Ikavian even in *Glasnik*. *Glasnik* had three sections: the official part of the paper, then the unofficial part in which news from different countries were published, and finally the literary page in which articles from various social activities were published, as well as short stories, poems, proverbs, etc.¹⁶ It was published twice a week.

Looking at the period that preceded and followed the publication of *Glasnik dalmatinski*, it is more apparent why the language debates were one of the most interesting parts of *Glasnik dalmatinski*, in which Šime Starčević participated heartily. The entire 19th century in Dalmatia was marked by the desire for political unification with Banska Hrvatska. On the other hand, the generation of national-populists in the 1960s wanted to preserve the Dalmatian distinctiveness, the cultural and economic autonomy of Dalmatia within a larger national association, while the 1980s were marked by right-wingers with a very clear and decisive position on the annexation of Dalmatia to northern Croatia.

¹⁴ Cf. Vjekoslav Maštrović, *Jadertina Croatica*, JAZU, Zagreb, 1954., p. 12-14.

¹⁵ Cf. *Glasnik dalmatinski*, 1849(1), p. 2.

¹⁶ Cf. Vjekoslav MAŠTROVIĆ, *Jadertina Croatica II. dio*, Zagreb, JAZU, 1954.

Members of the Zadar cultural circle welcomed the revival movements of the 1930s in northern Croatia, although among Dalmatian intellectuals there existed the thought that it was pretentious to turn Dalmatia into Croatia, pointing out that Dalmatia had its own rich culture and literature. In the later decades, i.e., in the 40s and 50s, this same thought still clearly lived within certain members of the intellectual elites in Dalmatia, i.e., that Dalmatia could be the shaper of the modern Croatian nation¹⁷, a thought that preoccupied Šime Starčević and the members of the Zadar linguistic and cultural circle as well. It was only after Bach's absolutism that the time arrived to give up on these possibilities. Likewise, in the 1950s, there were several doubts among the Croatian public: "Should we continue to create a common literary Illyrian language for all southern Slavs; should we limit ourselves to one literary language for Serbs and Croats, or should we perhaps focus only on shaping the Croatian literary language, regardless of the Serbian language?"¹⁸

All doubts found their place on the pages of *Zora and Glasnik*. These pages were home to many heated debates with Zagreb's *Narodne novine*, clashing two positions on the literary language. The one represented by the Illyrians, which was reflected in the *Narodne novine* on the unique South Slavic language, and the one represented by Ante Kuzmanić, Šime Starčević and members of the Zadar language circle, which was based on the need to shape the Croatian literary language on the basis of the Shtokavian-Ikavian dialect, taking into account the old Croatian writers of Shtokavian-Ikavian dialect in Dalmatia, Lika, Bosnia

¹⁷ A modern nation is a more or less centrally formed state organization on a predominantly monolingual territory with a tradition of territorial-political historical unity. Cf. Tereza GANZA ARAS, "Zašto Matica dalmatinska a ne Matica hrvatska u Dalmaciji", *Zadarska smotra*, Zadar, 1994, p. 13.

¹⁸ Cf. Zlatko VINCE, *Putovima hrvatskoga književnog jezika*, Zagreb, Matica hrvatska, 2002, p. 394.

and Herzegovina and Slavonia. Even after the cessation of publication of the aforementioned newspapers in the 1950s, the Croatian public still had doubts: “(...) should we continue to create a common literary Illyrian language for all southern Slavs; should we limit ourselves to one literary language for Serbs and Croats, or should we perhaps focus only on shaping the Croatian literary language, regardless of the Serbian language”.¹⁹

Thus, in its 22nd issue, in 1850, in the article “Što je novoga?” (eng. What’s new?), he harshly attacked *Glasnik dalmatinski* that, according to him, did not justify its original goal: “So that our people become familiar with events famous in the world and in our Empire, that they learn good and useful things, and are guided to all legal order and mutual love; and shake off the herd of superstitious thoughts and feelings, which only arise from ignorance and stupidity”.²⁰

He reproached *Glasnik* for never writing about national schools, or about national education, instead of publishing articles about “religious hatred” and attacking important personalities who were responsible for the nation and literature. He expressed his fear that the Government would not tolerate this kind of editorial policy, but would leave the editorial role to someone else who would know it and want it. At the end, he stated: “The news from Zadar indicate that a group is gathering, which is going to eliminate the Zagreb orthography from our books, published in Dalmatia, and to include again the old Dalmatian! They say that the editor of *Glasnik* is in that circle of discord”.²¹

¹⁹ VINCE, Zlatko, *Putovima hrvatskoga književnog jezika*, Zagreb, Matica hrvatska, 2002, p. 394

²⁰ Cf. *Glasnik dalmatinski*, 1850(21), p. 44.

²¹ *Ibid.*

Starčević's vision of the language given in *Zora* and *Glasnik*²²

Zlatko Vince in the book *Putovima hrvatskoga književnog jezika* (eng. Paths of the Croatian Literary Language) defined two fundamental periods of the linguistic activity of Šime Starčević: the era of Napoleon's Illyria and the era of the forties and fifties, when he participated in *Zora dalmatinska* and *Glasnik dalmatinska*.²³

The linguistic articles published in both newspapers can serve as arguments for the (non)introduction of the Zagreb orthography or language-advisory character, as well as a critical review of the content of the Vienna Agreement.

He provided his clear linguistic and orthographic opinions in his first publication in *Zora* no. 32 from 1844, stating: "No Croat, no Slavs from the right side of the Danube river in their new orthography ridiculously insult the noble and graceful Latin letters, when they plant horns on their heads and stick spikes onto their brains... Thus far, Croats wrote in pure and graceful Latin, Jerome and Cyrillic script without any spikes and horns." It was his guiding principle that could be observed in *Ričoslovica* from 1812 as well. Apart from that, *Zora's* goal, as Starčević states, was to enlighten the people through thorough knowledge of the language because: "those who do not know how to protect, write, and speak properly, they do not know the proper language" (*Zora*, no. 1, year 4, 1847, p. 4). In addition to clearly

²² The paper used some examples taken from the following works: Bacalja, Robert; Ivon, Katarina; Vrsaljko, Slavica. Šime Starčević i *Glasnik dalmatinski*, *Croatica Christiana Periodica* 2013. 71.; Bacalja, Robert; Ivon, Katarina; Vrsaljko, Slavica, Šime Starčević od *Zore* do *Glasnika*. *Šime Starčević i hrvatska kultura u 19. Stoljeću: Zbornik radova sa znanstvenoga skupa* Šime Starčević i hrvatska kultura u 19. stoljeću Gospić, 2014 9-23.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 418.

expressing his stance on the enlightening role of language, it is interesting to note that Starčević's writing style was always reduced to asking argumentative questions to which he gave reasoned answers.

Therefore, he asked five questions in order to answer what the *Pravopis Zagrebački* (eng. Zagreb orthography) was, why it was called *Organički* (eng. Organic), was it *obchinski* (eng. general) and, finally, should it have been accepted or rejected? He immediately strongly opposed the appearance of the letters coming from that orthography, which gave importance to the appearance of the letters themselves, and not to the function. His opposition was clear as he stated that the Latin letters *c, e, s, z* turn into freaks and are abnormal, as they have to wear horns in the form of *ć, č, ě, š, ž*. Therefore, *Organički Pravopisn* (eng. The general orthography) disfigures letters. (Ibid) He clearly stated that Kranjci and Croats from the three river-part areas (Sutla, Sava and Drava) do not have these speech sounds. This approach, as Starčević noted, clearly caused confusion among the people, even though *Zora dalmatinska* advocated for peace and enlightenment and *should use clear Latin letters*.

He also vigorously discussed the issue of *jat*, he opposed the horned as it ignored all other possible pronunciations, e.g.: "(...) I pronounce sime, slime, vrime, dite, and the *Organički Pravopis* of this word of mine states: *sěme, slěme, vrěme, děte*". (Idem) That approach seems unclear, while according to him, the principle is much clearer: *Who speaks the i should write i, who speaks the e should write e*. It is quite clear that this approach negates the Croatian written tradition, particularly the Glagolitic script. He addressed the pronunciation of phonemic groups, commenting on their rule according to which those letters that cannot be placed at the beginning of a word cannot be placed in the middle either. However, he stated that, within the language, we have words like *skoda, skare* or words

that appear as follows in the fifth case: instead of *momče, junače* it is *momke! junake!*. Such approach certainly goes against the principles of Zora.

In the second part of the article, he answered how the Zagreb orthography came to be. The Germans took these letters from the Czechs, and the Poles took them from the Germans. And so, the Czech and later Polish letters were “brought” to Zagreb in 1835.

The third question dealt with the issue of the name; why the orthography was called *Organički*. In *Danica* they are called *Diakrički*, and elsewhere *Organički*. He talked about the name diacritic with a hint of irony because: “It could be that there was a savant Pole, whom we didn’t know about until now, whose name was Diakrič”. (Zora, no. 2, year 4, p. 10) On the other hand, the origin of the word *Organički* indicates that the Czech word is from the Latin root *organum, civnik, orgule, oruđe*, which according to him has nothing to do with orthography. What he stated again and again was the reference to the Glagolitic and Cyrillic written tradition, which was in no way related to the Czech orthography, although his knowledge of the language was commendable.

The fourth question referred to whether the Zagreb general orthography was horned. He stated that the Illyrian people could not be taken as a *general consensus*, as this proposed orthography should have been used in the Croatian Littoral, in three Counties, and in eight Districts. In the aforementioned fields and beyond them, this orthography was not well known. However, he referred to the decision of *Zora dalmatinska*, and in order to try to reach a general agreement, a question posed itself whether this orthography should even be published for the masses. However, it was clear that the people of Dalmatia strongly opposed it. It was quite clear that the orthography was applicable only in Zagreb and in its surroundings.

The last question referred to whether the Zagreb orthography should be accepted or rejected. Here, in order to argue his opposition to the acceptance of the Zagreb orthography, he talked about the Croatian written tradition from Glagolitic glossaries, Dubrovnik's written tradition in the 14th century and Jambrešić's dictionary with a fairly rich vocabulary with Latin letters. Starčević noted that the orthography solutions he offered were the only way to unite all Croatian countries. He further stated that we had the Old Glagolitic script, the Cyrillic script, and the beautiful Latin letters. These Latin letters did not carry any *horns* nor diacritical marks because they offer *purely composed consonants: ch, cs, dj, gj, lj, nj, sh*. With this, all Illyrians were able to write everything clearly and correctly in accordance with their speech. (Ibid., p.12) With compound consonants, the orthography would match that of European countries such as Germany, France and Italy. Starčević's extensive article ended with columns which showed how the people of Zagreb began to write, and how those who knew the language wrote.

Neokresano.

Organicko.

Ugladjeno.

Ded, died, d-jed, gjed

děd

did

Examples were taken from an article published in *Karlobag 21 November 1846*.

He published an article similar to the above in *Glasnik*, continuing to deal with language issues in *Glasnik* in almost the same way. He continued to strongly oppose Zagreb's orthographic solutions, which is especially evident in the extensive article *Pet slovah rogatihć, č, ě, š, ž* (eng. Five horned letters ć, č, ě, š, ž). It was important to Starčević to raise and discuss some of the fundamental questions that interested him in both newspapers. Among other things, he indicated the statement of a new Illyrian student of "Zagrebački Novarah" who said: "Why would Dalmatia care about five letters, whether they have horns or not? Do these writings behave as signs, can we use it to write words?"²⁴ His argument was that letters, like everything else, were God-given and this problem could not be approached senselessly.²⁵

Starčević already expressed his disagreement with the introduction of these five graphemes in the title as he mockingly called them horned.²⁶ He advocated using French and Italian graphemes,

²⁴ Ibid., 1850(25), p. 51.

²⁵ Ljudevit Gaj composed a script based on the Czech script. He presented his ideas in the booklet *Kratka osnova horvatsko-slavenskoga pravopisańa, poleg mudroľubneh narodneh i prigospodameh temel'ov i zrokov – Kurzer Entwurf einer kroatischen Orthographie nach philosophischen, nazionālen und ökonischen Grundsätzen*, in which he proposed the characters č, đ, ĝ, ñ, š, ž instead of digrams. He found the reasons for such language solutions in the fact that Czechs and Poles would read Croatian books in such way. In later articles, he deviated from such solutions with an excessive number of "marks" and leaves only the characters č, ž, š with a diacritical mark. Writing about Šime Starčević, his cousin dr. Mile Starčević clearly stated that: "Starčević's orthography and making the Latin alphabet more Croatian was somewhat different from what Gaj did, the Czech script, which we inherited and learned. Assuming that a Latin letter must not change its character, he wrote č as cs, ž as x, š as sh, ć as ch." Cf. Mile STARČEVIĆ, "Tragom popa Šime. Pop Šime Starčević i zagrebački knjižar Župan", *Hrvatska revija* 2:9, 1942, p. 20–26. His non-acceptance of Gaj's graphic solution is also evidenced by the extensive polemical article *Pet slovah rogatih* (eng. Five horned letters).

²⁶ In the letter that priest Šime Starčević wrote to Franje Župan, a bookseller in Zagreb, he names the letters with diacritical mark horned and *csepurasta*.

and not those that came from Czech,²⁷ Russian, Polish and Old Slavonic traditions. When it comes to language advice, there was a desire for linguistic purity. In his *Riscoslovica*, Starčević also showed that the Croatian language was completely developed at the beginning of the 19th century, because it was possible to write a professional text without loanwords. In the article *Pet slova rogatihč, ć, ě, š, ž* he was aware of the fact that Russian, Czech and Polish shared many similarities with the Croatian language, but the meanings of individual words were not aligned with Croatian language because they meant something completely different cross-linguistically. He cited several examples with which he substantiated the stated claim: “passion is a completely Russian word, in our language it means suffering, i.e., patience and suffering, and troubles, 2. it means death”. He further stated that our journalists take the word with its own meanings and then use it in their way, as Starčević says. Likewise, he did not accept words made of “small clustered words”, he didn’t like the word *strahopočitanie* (eng. veneration), because he thought that the two words that make the clustered word were composed of “holiness and wisdom; these two words are understood by every citizen and villager”.²⁸ The idea was that the meaning of those two words was easier to discover than the meaning of the compound, which was “compact”.

The last part of the article on “horned” letters was titled: *Jedna naprošnji s Pemskim, Ruskim, Poljskim, i Staroslavjanskim ričima napunjena torbica* in which he talked about the fact that everyone should know how to speak Croatian. “They speak it on the right side of the Kupa and the Sava river, in all of Croatia, in Slavonia, in Bosnia, in Herzegovina, in Albania, in the entire Dalmatia”, as evidenced

²⁷ Refers to the Czech language.

²⁸ Ibid.

by the books we remain “proud of”. Therefore, it was completely unnecessary to use “foreign words”, because in fields where we had “knowledge, we had our words”.

He especially talked about the meaning of “our own Croatian language in order to lead, perform, conduct” etc. where he cited a whole series of derivatives from the root of the word *zavod* (e.g. *voditi*, *izvoditi*, *navoditi*, *provoditi*) in the article entitled *Što je zavod?*. However, he noted that “our Rovari and Novari lead the people astray”²⁹ because for them the word *zavod* is a word which in Latin means “Institutum orpfnarum” or “orphanage” in Croatian.³⁰

In the article *Prijateljska opomena* (Zora, no. 16, year 4, p. 114), he stated that the warning was addressed to everyone, especially those who wish to destroy what was built. Of course, those who were babbling were actually those who claim that the Zagreb’s horned one was the new orthography with its true name *Ilirski Pravopis* (eng. Illyrian Orthography). In fact, he referred to the article published in *Novine Dalmatinsko-Hervatsko-Slavonske* “in the current year number 8 on page 31”. In the aforementioned article, he talked about the criticism that the author, whose name he does not mention, was addressing to him, Šime Starčević. Starčević believed that the author of the article was deluded and needed to open his eyes as his theory was not acceptable. In order to argue this, he cited the example of Iagnacijo Alojzije Brlić, who was a lover of Illyrian literature, but was forced to print his *Garmatika iliti Riçoslovje* (eng. grammar) using the horned orthography, not because he denied our linguistic tradition, but to indulge the ones who wanted it.

In the second part of the article of the same name, he specifically mentioned Vjekoslav Babukić. He also mentioned the specific

²⁹ Consult the text for an explanation of the terms rovari and novari.

³⁰ Cf. *Glasnik dalmatinski*, 1850(23), p. 48.

language preferences of the author of the article and his language suggestions, for example: *dobiti chemo učeno **drustvo** za koi dan potvrđeno od milostive vlade, na skoro* (eng. in a few days we will have learned society, confirmed by the gracious government, soon). (Ibid., p. 118) He particularly refers to the construction *za koi dan* (eng. in a few days), stating that it is not clearly specified, and it would be more precise to say *na skoro* (eng. soon) or *do malo danah* (eng. in just a few days). Therefore, he concluded it to be necessary to form a new orthography in order to be able to progress in science, among other things. And it would be more acceptable to accept the pure Dalmatian-Illyrian language, in which the Croats from the three river-part areas (Sutla, Sava and Drava) and the new Illyrians of Zagreb created the periodicals *List od Novinah* and *List od Danice*, and opened a new school to learn this pure Illyrian language, with which the Dalmatians already speak. (ibid., p. 119) He clearly stated that Dalmatia has its own long academic tradition and that it did not fall behind other regions in any way. The extensive article ends with a warning: *God forbid that the people of Dalmatia would have to learn the new Zagreb language; and God forbid that such a learned **Society** would be created, which would be confirmed in a few days.* (Ibid., p.119)

In addition to a detailed review of orthography and the possible acceptance of the Zagreb one, Starčević published an article of a linguistic and advisory nature entitled *Jezikonauk* (no. 23, year 4, 1847) in which he stated the difference between the tenses *Trajateljnim* and *Sversiteljnim*. The *Trajateljni* shows the state regardless of the beginning, and the **end** of the state. On the other hand, the *Sversiteljni* is the one stating the completed action. As an example, he cited several verbs that differ in their declension. In the article published in *Glasnik* entitled *Kako stoje novice iz Bukovice? u člankah 8* (eng. How are the novice from Bukovica?

from article 8) he complained to the Lord about the inadequate use of the verbs *sumnjiti* and *dvojiti* (eng. to doubt). Starčević noted that we doubt (*sumnjimo*) when we are afraid, that what we do not want is being done, but we have no real reason to think like that, and we use the verb *dvojiti* when we have strong reasons for and against a subject. In fact, he only explained how the Lord did not correctly write *Ne ima sumnje*, but instead should have wrote *Neima dvojnosti*.³¹ On the same note, he published an article in *Zora* bearing a linguistic and advisory nature entitled *Jezikonauk* (No. 23, year 4, 1847)

Starčević's view on the so-called Vienna Agreement³²

Previously, very similar thematic aspects from both magazines were shown. However, addressing the initial strategies for the possible standardization of the Croatian literary language were given in the so-called Vienna Agreement, which Starčević critically reviewed in *Glasnik*, even though the history of the Croatian standard went in a different direction.

In *Glasnik* in 1850, through several issues, Starčević referred to the provisions of the so-called **Literary** agreement, where he only recognized the decision that a new language could not be built by mixing dialects, “(...) it is not right to use dialects to build

³¹ Ibid, 1850(21), p.46.

³² Concluded in Vienna on 28 March 1850 (signatories: Ivan Kukuljević, Dimitrije Demetar, Ivan Mažuranić, Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, Vinko Pacel, Franjo Miklošič, Stjepan Pejaković and Đuro Daničić), first published in *Narodne novine* (no. 76, in 1850), the Ikavian version supplemented with Starčević's comments, was published in *Glasnik dalmatinski* in three issues: Š. Starčević: *Književni dogovor I.*, GD, no. 44, Zadar, 31 May 1850, p.175-176; *Književni dogovor II.*, GD, no. 46. Zadar, June 1850, p.184; *Odgovor na Književni dogovor II.*, GD, no. 48, Zadar, 14 June 1850, p. 192; *Književni dogovor III.*, *Književni dogovor IV.*, *Književni dogovor V.*, GD, no. 51, Zadar, 25 June 1850, p. 201-202. (Starčević, edited and accompanied by Ante Selak, note 34, 2009:156)

something new, which does not exist with the people; it is better to choose one of the dialects to be the literary language".³³ A question arises as to what did Starčević mean by "dialect", i.e., what did he want to express with it. Selak stated that Starčević was aware of the difficulty of introducing a single dialect for everyone, and that such a thing would only be possible if one language and with its rules was introduced into public schools and textbooks. However, this process would have taken a long time.³⁴

He harshly criticized the point where the acceptance of the Jekavian dialect is discussed, suggesting that the basis of the literary language for all Croats should be the Ikavian because "all Catholics on the right side of the Kupa and the Sava river, as well as the Turks Croats, Bosnians, people from Herzegovina and people from Dalmatia" use this dialect. Due to his eloquent efforts to affirm his linguistic solution, i.e., to prove the justification of the introduction of the Ikavian dialect, in the literature he was called an "arrogant philologist, a fanatic of the Ikavian dialect".³⁵ In addition to the fact that a large number of Croats speak Ikavian, Starčević emphasized the importance of the Croatian literary tradition written in the Ikavian version because he was deeply aware of the importance of Dubrovnik's literature for the Croatian language and culture. He knew that Dubrovnik had the most important books in which we find *ije* and *je*, but he found the reason for such writing in the fact that that same city was surrounded by neighbours who use the same script, therefore, they could not write otherwise. He partially accepted the third point of the *Agreement*, which says that the sound *h* should be written where

³³ Cf. Ante SELAK, *Šime Starčević Ričoslovje*, Zagreb, Pergamena, 2009, p. 157.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Cf. Dubravko JELČIĆ, *Preporod književnosti i književnost preporoda*, Zagreb, Matica hrvatska, 1993, p. 49.

it belongs according to etymology, but he resented the fact that Jekavian dialect was accepted as literary, which had little to none of the *h* sound.

He also opposed the fourth point of the *Agreement*, which did not accept the writing of the *h* sound in the genitive case (*vodah*, *ženah*), he believed that by writing that **sound** in the genitive case, it would be easier to distinguish the nominative singular from the genitive plural in *e*-declination nouns. He also rejected the fifth point, which demanded that the syllabic /r/ not be written with the two letters *ser* or *ar*, considering that these accompanying sounds are still heard. The issues of writing the grapheme *h* and the syllabic /r/ are problems that have been present in Croatian linguistics for many years. Starčević's insistence on purist linguistic solutions, visible in his rejection of Vuk's linguistic conception, of Old Church Slavonicism and Russism, as well as his sharp opposition to the suppression and marginalization of any language, and the direction in which the development of the Croatian standard went, resulted in a certain neglect of his linguistic activities.

Conclusion

The paper tried to raise awareness of the importance of Šime Starčević's work as a versatile person. In addition to writing newspaper articles, Father Valentin Miklobušec, the archivist of the Society of Jesus, found the manuscripts of Šime Starčević in 2008 as a part of the legacy of the priest Davorin (Martin) Krmpotić. The analysis revealed that these were handwritten texts for elementary classes. In these texts, Starčević showed his desire to create and teach by writing textbooks. However, this paper primarily explored

his creative focus during the period of his collaboration with the newspapers *Zora* and *Glasnik*, where he consistently defended and promoted his linguistic views, along with Ante Kuzmanić, and clashed with Gaj's Illyrians, both over language and over typography. Even when the Illyrian script became generally accepted in 1849, when the minutes of the Croatian Parliament were written for the first time according to the norms of the Zagreb philological school, and when *Zora dalmatinska* and its then editor Kuzmanić accepted Gaj's orthography, Starčević still refused to give in - he did not give up on Ikavian. In *Glasnik*, which continued the linguistic policy of *Zora dalmatinska*, he harshly criticized the "five horned letters". The last issue of *Zora dalmatinska* was published on 25 June 1849, and in the same year Kuzmanić launched *Glasnik dalmatinski*, an administrative-political newspaper with a literary section. Šime Starčević collaborated with *Glasnik dalmatinski* between 1849 and 1850. During that period, he wrote a series of articles on different topics. In addition to the religious-enlightenment situation, he maintained interest in the socio-political situation at that time. Although the paper exclusively dealt with his language-related work, it should be noted that these topics are not mutually exclusive but interpenetrate and complement each other, as evidenced in Starčević's work which incorporated his religious and enlightened views.

In both *Zora* and *Glasnik*, he remained consistent with his linguistic orientations, sharp-tongued both as a linguist and as a priest. From the first article published in *Zora* to the last one published in *Glasnik*, he approached language issues thoroughly and systematically without renouncing his original ideas. His persona and work remain an inexhaustible issue of the 19th century and something that has been neglected in the Croatian linguistic tradition

Bibliography

- BACALJA, Robert; IVON, Katarina; VRSALJKO, Slavica, »Šime Starčević i Glasnik dalmatinski«, *Croatica Christiana Periodica* 2013. 71.
- BACALJA, Robert; IVON, Katarina; VRSALJKO, Slavica, »Šime Starčević od Zore do Glasnika«, *Šime Starčević i hrvatska kultura u 19. stoljeću: Zbornik radova sa znanstvenoga skupa Šime Starčević i hrvatska kultura u 19. stoljeću Gospić*, 2014. 9-23.
- BINIČKI, Fran, »Autobiografija popa Šime Starčevića«, *Hrvatska prosvjeta* 5, 1918, 95–97.
- DEROSSI, Julije, »Hrvatski jezikoslovac pop Šime Starčević«, *Senjski zbornik* 24, 1997, 141–150.
- DEROSSI, Julije, »Pop Šime Stračević i Zora dalmatinska«, *Zadarska smotra* 3-4, 1995, 87-94.
- GANZA ARAS, Tereza, »Zašto Matica dalmatinska a ne Matica hrvatska u Dalmaciji«, *Zadarska smotra* XLIII 5–6, 1994, 13–23.
- GRAHOVAC-PRAŽIĆ, Vesna, »Udžbenički diskurs u rukopisnoj ostavštini Šime Starčevića«, *Šime Starčević i hrvatska kultura u 19. stoljeću: Zbornik radova sa znanstvenoga skupa Šime Starčević i hrvatska kultura u 19. stoljeću Gospić*, 2014. 137-153
- JELČIĆ, Dubravko, *Preporod književnosti i književnost preporoda*, Zagreb, Matica hrvatska, 1993, p. 153
- KISIĆ, Vinko, *Osvit u Dalmaciji*, Zadar, Brzotisak «Narodnog lista», 1909, p. 22
- MAŠTROVIĆ, Tihomil, *Nad jabukama vile hrvatice. Kroatističke studije*, Zagreb, Hrvatski studiji, 2001, p. 371
- MAŠTROVIĆ, Vjekoslav, *Jadertina Croatica. II dio. Časopisi i novine*, Zagreb, Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1954, p. 450
- MIMICA, Bože, *Dalmacija u moru svjetlosti. Povijest Dalmacije od antike do kraja XX. stoljeća. 2. dio*, Rijeka, Dušević&Kršovnik, 2004, p. 363
- SELAJ, Ante, *Šime Starčević Ričoslovje*, Zagreb, Pergamena, 2009, p. 179
- STARČEVIĆ, Mile, »Tragom popa Šime. Pop Šime Starčević i zagrebački knjižar Župan«, *Hrvatska revija* 2:9,1942, 20–26.
- STARČEVIĆ, Šime, *Nova ricsoslovica iliricka: vojnicskoj mladosti krajicnoj poklonjena / trudom i nastojanjem Shime Starcsevicha xupnika od Novoga u Lici*, Zagreb, Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje, 2002. (pretisak)

- TAFRA, Branka, »Jezikoslovac Šime Starčević«, u knj. Šime Starčević: Nova ricsoslovica iliriska (pretisak), Zagreb, Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje, 2002., 127–177.
- TAFRA, Branka, »Starčevićeva ričoslovica – 150 godina poslije«, *Jezik 5*, 2002, 165–175.
- VINCE, Zlatko, »Zadar kao sjedište raspravljanja o književnom jeziku u prvoj polovini XIX. stoljeća u Dalmaciji«, *Radovi Instituta JAZU u Zadru* 11-12, 1965, 405–460.
- VINCE, Zlatko, »Zasluge Šime Starčević za hrvatski književni jezik«, *Filologija* 7, 1973, 157–201.
- VINCE, Zlatko, *Putovima hrvatskoga književnog jezika*, Zagreb, Matica hrvatska, 2002, p. 781
- VRANDEČIĆ, Josip, *Dalmatinski autonomistički pokret u XIX. stoljeću*. Zagreb, Dom i svijet, 2002, p. 331

Sources

Zora dalmatinska, years 1844, 1847, 1848.

Glasnik dalmatinski, years 1849 and 1850.

Associate Prof. Slavica Vrsaljko
University of Zadar
Department of Teacher and Preschool Teacher Education
dr. Franje Tuđmana 24 i, HR-23000 Zadar
e-mail: slavica@unizd.hr