

Croatian Latin Script Throughout the Centuries

Loretana Farkaš
University of Osijek

Abstract

It is little known among the general public that the Croatian Latin alphabet has not always possessed all the letters that we use today. This paper presents a general overview of all significant attempts to reform the Croatian Latin script in works written in the Croatian language and the Latin script. The influence of other Latin writings on the formation of the Croatian Latin script and the path of development from the first Croatian Latin writings to the present day are considered. The most important accounts of the development of Croatian Latin writing and the scholarly debate that they have generated are discussed.

Key words: Latin alphabet, Croatian language

The history of the Croatian Latin-based script covers the medieval period and the modern era. The use of the Croatian Latin script in the modern era refers to the non-standardised script before the Croatian National Revival and to the standardized script after the Revival.¹

The appearance of the Latin script in Croatian lands was quite expected, despite the use of the two Slavic scripts, which were suppressed and eventually supplanted by the Croatian Latin alphabet. Croatian words (personal names and place names in particular) were recorded in the Latin script in Latin and Greek documents ever since the beginnings of Croatian words in the Balkans. Over time, the Glagolitic script was confined to religious services in the Church Slavonic language, the Cyrillic script retreated from the coast inland, and the Latin script became predominant. Although the recording of Croatian expressions in

¹ For instance, the following is valid for the Latin and Italian script: a single grapheme (depending on its position) can represent several phonemes: e.g. *c* – /c/, /k/ and /č/; *g* – /ġ/ and /g/; a single phoneme can be represented by a group of graphemes, e.g. *ch* – /h/, /k/; *gl* – /l/; *gn* – /ñ/; functionality of gemination of graphemes between vowels: e.g. the grapheme *s* was used to mark the phoneme /z/, a the digraph *ss* marked the phoneme /s/.

the Latin script on foreign language monuments was primarily the work of foreigners, there was also a search for independent solutions.

Firstly, a tendency towards monographemic solutions can be noticed in most of them, that is, the tendency to establish the equation one letter = one phoneme, although this one letter was not the same in all of them, thus the clutter of letters creates a somewhat different impression. Due to the monographemic tendency inherent in the Glagolitic script, firstly, no geminates are used, and secondly, special letters are introduced, the stylization of which seems to be a diacritical mark, such as the stylization of the Greek letter zeta (ζ), which was understood as adding a subscript mark to the grapheme ζ (to use the graphemes c and ç to distinguish between the phonemes /c/ and /ç/). (Moguš, 2009: 31)

Although the first recorders of Croatian texts in the Latin script were facing great dilemmas, efforts, and aspirations to sort out the Croatian Latin script were evident from the very beginnings of Croatian Latin literacy.

In designing the script, the Croats followed the Southern models (Latin and Italian), and in the 16th century the Latin script came into use in the Northern region as well, using the Hungarian alphabet as the model. Particular difficulties were encountered in recording the palatals that did not exist in Latin, and the Italian and Hungarian scripts marked the phonemes /c/ and /s/ differently.

Phoneme	/c/	/č/	/ć/	/j/	/ń/	/r/	/s/	/š/	/ž/
South	c, z	c, ci	ch	gl	gn	ar	s, ì	sc, ìc	x
North	cz	cs, cì	ch, ty	ly	ny	er	sz, ìz	s, ì, ss	s (i)

The models provided the Croatian Latin alphabet with a limited number of graphemes, which were insufficient for marking all of the Croatian phonemes.²

² For instance, the following is valid for the Latin and Italian script: a single grapheme (depending on its position) can represent several phonemes: e.g. *c* – /c/, /k/ and /č/; *g* – /ġ/ and /g/; a single phoneme can be represented by a group of graphemes, e.g. *ch* – /h/, /k/; *gl* – /j/; *gn* – /ń/; functionality of gemination of graphemes between vowels: e.g. the grapheme *s* was used to mark the phoneme /z/, a the digraph *ss* marked the phoneme /s/.

The historical accounts of the development of the Croatian Latin alphabet are evident in the overviews written by Maretić (1889), Diels (1951), and Moguš & Vončina (1969).

In *Historija hrvatskoga pravopisa latinskijem slovima* of 1889, Tomo Maretić presents the overview of the Croatian Latin script, noting that there is a variety of solutions in the recordings. The best example, according to Maretić, is the inconsistency in representing the palatals, e.g.: /č/ – 18, /ć/ – 22, /ġ/ – 15, /j/ – 10, /lj/ – 9, /š/ – 22, /ž/ – 18. He lists the following graphemic solutions for the phoneme /ž/ alone: *ç, g, s, sc, sci, sh, ò, òc, òci, òcj, òg, ògi, ògj, òh, òs, z, x, and xi*. If we evaluate the script from today's point of view, it may at first glance seem inconsistent. Moreover, Maretić's overview might lead to the wrong conclusion that the writers were inconsistent in the script they used. For instance, they recorded /j/ in two different ways: as *gl* and as *li* (*cragl, priategli, veòelie*). Maretić failed to notice that such a representation indicates first-class data on annotating the difference in the representation of the unique phoneme /j/ with grapheme *gl*, and of the set /l+j/ with the digraph *li*, which indicates the functionality of the Croatian Latin-based writing system.

Approaches in which the combinations of two or more graphemes for a single phoneme are rejected *a priori*, and the principle of one phoneme = one grapheme is highlighted as the only valid solution are also one-sided. Sometimes, in the old texts, groups of graphemes are good solutions, for example: *cs /č/, ch /ć/, /k/, cz /c/*.

In his treatise covering the period from 1495 to 1833, Maretić does not include any of the significant Croatian writers (Marin Držić, Gundulić, Grabovac, Brezovački), leaves out the printed dictionaries (Habelić, Belostenac, Sušnik-Jambrešić, Della Bella, Stulli, Voltić), and does not mention any Croatian grammars written before the Revival period (Kašić, Della Bella, Tadijanović, Reljković, Lanosović, Appendini, Starčević, Brlić ...), and presents only the beginning of Vitezović's *Kronika* from among the basic interventions in the Croatian Latin alphabet. Maretić's studies unfavourably evaluated the previous attempts to arrange the Croatian Latin script. He portrayed them as unsystematic and messy. The graphemic solutions may seem inconsistent since Maretić neglected the phonemic side of the language. One should therefore be cautious in claiming that the old writers were inconsistent as functionality was often a motivation. The following statements made by Maretić should be taken with caution:

The reader will see from my book that we had no orthographic tradition before Gaj's times, that every writer wrote differently, often contradicting the most sensible and simple demands of good script. An etymological tradition only emerges after 1835 in the Zagreb Circle, which continues to this day. (Maretić, 1889: ix).

Paul Diels' work *Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Schrift bei den Südslaven* gives an account of the history of the Latin script used by the South Slavic peoples; nevertheless, it mostly presents the Latin script practices of Croats in the modern era.

In their work *Latinica u Hrvata*, Milan Moguš and Josip Vončina critique Maretić's one-sidedness in depicting the development of the Croatian Latin script. The authors also emphasize the permeation of the three Croatian scripts and present an overview of the centuries-old use of the Latin script by the Croats and the more significant attempts at reform before Ljudevit Gaj's orthographic reform.

Moguš and Vončina reject Maretić's categorical statements that the one phoneme-one grapheme principle is explicitly valid. The authors point out that, in some works by the old Croatian writers, examples can be found that clearly show that groups of graphemes can be good solutions – if the phonemes that each character marked were not materialized side by side, that is, if they were not possible in a spoken sequence. The true value of the graphemic solutions can be fully established only when in all the Latin texts – for which there is no direct testimony to which vocal sequences were used to convey the messages– the connection between the sound system and its graphemic image has been uncovered.

Although the Croats have been using Latin script to record the words of their language sporadically ever since the 11th century, either in Latin or in Glagolitic texts, the first known Croatian-language document written in the Latin script is considered to be *Red i zakon sestara dominikanki*³ of 1345. It is a list of rules and regulations intended for the Dominican nuns residing in a convent in Zadar. *Šibenik Prayer* and a fragment of the *Korčula lectionary* (the name Korčula refers to the place of its

³ The Croatian recordings in the Latin script: *Cantilena pro sabatho* (Passion hymn in Croatian), the unfinished Croatian theological interpretation of the *Ten Commandments*, the *Prayer to St. Margarita*, and *Sudac hoće gnjivan priti* also date back to the second half of the 14th century. There are also the records of Georgius de Sclavonia, dating from the end of the 14th century.

discovery, but its originates from Zadar) also date back to the 14th century. The first dated Latin script incunabula was printed in Venice on 12 March 1495, and it is referred to as *Bernardinov lekcionar* or *Lekcionar Bernardina Splicićanina*.

We can discuss the standardization of Croatian orthography already in the works of Marko Marulić (1521), and especially Petar Hektorović (1568), who show a clear tendency to reject double graphemes: /c/ – c, /č/ – č, /ć/ – ch, *chi*, /j/ – y, /k/ – k, /l/ – gl, *gli*, /ń/ – gn, *gni*, /s/ – ô, s, /š/ – ôc, *sc*, /u/ – u, /v/ – u, /z/ – z, /ž/ – x.

Some researchers studying the development of the Croatian Latin script point out that the first attempt to simplify and systematize the Croatian Latin script through the use of diacritical marks is reflected in the work of Šime Budinić. In *Summa nauka krstjanskoga* (Rome, 1583), Budinić makes the following suggestions: ç /c/, c /č/, ʒ /ž/. If we consider the diacritical marks only as superscript, then Budinić was the first to introduce diacritical marks into the Croatian Latin script. However, if we understand the diacritical marks as any (superscript or subscript) addition to the grapheme that gives it a new value, diacritical marks had been known in Croatia even before Budinić (e.g. ç for /č/ in the *Šibenik Prayer* and Petar Hektorović's work). The new solutions were c, ʒ, and he took over the grapheme ç from the Croatian Latin alphabet tradition.

Faust Vrančić also presented his graphemic solutions in 1595 dictionary, which reflects the orthographic tendencies of the Southern and Northern scripts. The following suggestions belong to the Southern solutions: /č/ – ch, /r̄/ – ar, /ž/ – x, and /c/ – cz, /ć/ – cs, /đ/ – dy, /l/ – ly, /ń/ – ny to the Northern solutions.

Intensive and organized efforts to create a unique language and script for printing liturgical and non-liturgical books for the needs of the Croats began with the founding of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in 1622. Efforts to sort out Croatian linguistic and orthographic issues had been made before this, however. At the end of 1599, the Jesuit General Aquaviva ordered a Croatian grammar from Bartul Kašić (it would be published in 1604). The script instantly emerged as one of the most important issues. The Congregation Secretary Francesco Ingoli raised the issue of the language and the script to be used to print the books. The Archbishop of Zadar and the bishops of Krk and Nin favoured the Glagolitic script, while the Archbishop Sforza Ponzoni of Split advocated the Cyrillic alphabet. In Rome, the Bosnian Franciscans proposed that it should be the Bosnian (Western) Cyrillic, because the

Bosnian Franciscans and other priests from the Ottoman empire used to address the Congregation mostly in the Bosnian (Western) Cyrillic alphabet. The use of the Latin script was advocated by the Croatian priests who were living in Rome in those years: Franjo Glavinić and Rafael Levaković. It therefore should not be surprising that Bartol Kašić talks about the Croatian Latin script in the introductory part of the first Croatian grammar (1604), in Chapter *De litteris*. Kašić tried to build a writing system based on the one grapheme – one phoneme rule, which he confirmed in *Ritual rimski* in 1640. He resolved the issue of the bivalence *u* /u/, *v* /v/, and abolished the bivalence *ch* - /k/, /č/ by introducing the distinction between *k* /k/ and *cch* /č/.

Rafael Levaković, in *Azbukividnjak slovinskij iže općenim načinom Psalterić nazivaet se* (1629), used the Glagolitic alphabet to issue printed theoretical guidelines for the Church language. Traces of the Russification of his language are evident in the script as well – he started adding diacritic marks to the Glagolitic and Cyrillic graphemes. A Latin equivalent was added to the Cyrillic and Glagolitic list of graphemes (“*moć ili vrednost*”). These lists are a solid argument against Maretić’s claim that old Croatian writers paid no attention to the Glagolitic or Cyrillic script. Levaković, among others, proposes the following: /č/ – ç, /ć/ – ć, /ļ/ – ł, /ń/ – ń, /š/ – ß, /ž/ – ź. Although Levaković digressed with his thesis that the Russian recension of the Old Slavonic language was the basis for all Slavic languages, it is a pity that his solutions for the reform of the Latin script had no significant influence.

In the foreword to *Nauk za dobro pisati latinskijem slovima riječi jezika slovinskoga* (1639), Rajmund Đamanjić emphasizes that it is very difficult to adopt Latin graphemes from other Latin-based scripts and use them to write our own words. He wants to simplify and minimize the writing of two or more graphemes for a single phoneme: /c/ – z, /č/ – c, /ć/ – ch, /dz/ – ž, /ġ/ – ġh, /j/ – y, /ļ/ – gl, /ń/ – gn, /š/ – ôc, /z/ – ô. In order to clear up the ambiguities, Đamanjić proposes that the phonemic sequences /g+l/ and /g+n/ be marked by using the graphemic combinations *g'l* and *g'n*. Jakov Mikalja also writes about orthographic issues in his afterword (*Od ortographie jezika slovinskoga*) to the dictionary *Blago jezika slovinskoga* (1649).

There are also numerous activities in the Kajkavian regions aimed at standardizing the old Croatian writing system. Nikola Krajačević Sartorius proposes c [, cs /č/, gy /ġ/, ly /ļ/, ny /ń/ in *Molitvene knysicze* (1640), and Petar Petretić takes the Hungarian script as the model in the

preface to Krajačević's *Szveti Evangeliomi* (1651). Andrija Jambrešić, in his treatise *Manuductio ad croaticam orthographiam* (1732), proposes a reform of the Kajkavian writing system based on diacritic marks.

One of the most significant visionaries in sorting out the Croatian Latin script, Pavao Ritter Vitezović, did not implement his orthographic reform at once but built it gradually. His approach was by far the most systematic to date. In *Kronika* (1696), Vitezović proposes marking the graphemes *ly* and *ny* / *lj* and *nj*. The combination *l*, *n+y* denotes the primary set /l̥/, /ń/, and the combination *l*, *n+j* the secondary set (*lj* < *l̥bj*, *nj* < *n̥bj*). Vitezović's treatise *Orthographia Illyricana* (1697) has not been preserved, but we know of it from the preface to the book *Plorantis Croatiae sacula duo* (1703), in which Vitezović makes the following Latin script proposals: /č/ – ç, /ć/ – ć, /l̥/ – l̥, /ń/ – ñ, /ž/ – z. Vitezović notes that there are too few Latin graphemes to always use only one grapheme for each single phoneme. In the comprehensive Latin to Croatian manuscript dictionary, *Lexicon latino-illyricum*, written between 1698 and 1708, he introduces /ǧ/ – ġ i /đ/ – đ, in addition to the graphemes already mentioned. In Vitezović's work, the graphemes have one mark for the 'soft' phonemes (apostrophe or tilde), and a different mark (a check mark under the letter) for the 'hard' phonemes. Vitezović remains faithful to the one phoneme – one grapheme principle to the end, and the only exception is the use of the digraph *yr* for /r̥/. Although Vitezović's proposals are a unique and good attempt at sorting out the Croatian Latin script, his case clearly shows that an individual's efforts cannot be fruitful until they have received public acclaim, since the issue of the script and its adoption in a particular social environment is an issue of general interest.

In the 18th century, the Slavonian script occupied a central place. At that time, the state government in Vienna became interested in settling the linguistic and orthographic issues with both Croats and Serbs. In the spirit of the Enlightenment, which sought to make books as accessible as possible to all of society, but also driven by the political tendency to break the cultural ties of Serbs with Russia, the Viennese government in the final decades of the eighteenth century sought to enforce that all books intended for Serbs, except for ecclesiastical ones, be printed in Latin and in the vernacular of the Shtokavian and Ikavian dialects, which were used in schools and literature by Croats in Slavonia. This attempt by the government failed in the face of Serbian resistance, most notably from Mojsije Putnik and Stefan Stratimirović, successive Serbian Orthodox Metropolitans of Srijemski Karlovci. At the same time, the

Viennese government tried to resolve the Croatian orthography issue. In 1782, Stulli came to Vienna to ask Emperor Joseph II to fund the printing of his dictionary. The Emperor appointed a special committee to regulate the issue of Croatian orthography using the Latin script. Zagreb canon Anto Mandić from Požega was appointed the Chairman of the Committee, and the members were the poet Joso Krmpotić and two Franciscan Friars: grammarian Marijan Lanosović, and lexicographer Joakim Stulli. The battle was fought over whether to adopt the Dubrovnik-Dalmatian style of writing or the Slavonian one.

Krmpotić (from the Lika region) and the Slavonians Mandić and Lanosović advocated the Slavonian orthography, while Stulli (from Dubrovnik) defended the orthographic traditions of his homeland (Matić, 1945: 135–136). Matić's observations point to the value and significance of the Slavonian writing system and the significant problem it posed for the publication of Stulli's dictionary. In 1783, the joint Czech and Austrian Office asked the censor of Serbian and Romanian books Atanasi Sekereš whether the proper Illyrian language or only one of its dialects was treated in Stulli's dictionary, how the dictionary was compiled, whether there were other similar works, and whether the dictionary was worth printing. Censor Sekereš pointed out that only one dialect – the most widespread one – was addressed in the dictionary. Objection was primarily taken with the type of Latin script that was used in compiling Stulli's dictionary. This was a special kind of writing system from Dubrovnik that few people were familiar with. Based on the censor's opinion, it was decided that the script used in the dictionary should be revised. In 1783 Emperor Joseph II appointed a committee to resolve the above dilemmas. The Committee comprised Antun Mandić and Marijan Lanosović from Slavonia, Josip Krmpotić from Lika and Joakim Stulli from Dubrovnik.

Although this committee is referred to in literature as the Orthographic Committee, its primary task was to edit the Croatian script. The Slavonian representatives in the Committee advocated the Slavonian graphemic solutions, while Stulli vehemently defended the Dubrovnik writing system. The biggest opponent of Stulli's writing system was Joso Krmpotić Ličanin, who repeatedly tried to persuade him to revise the dictionary according to the Slavonian script. In his letter to Kopitar, Dobrovsky testifies to the ferocity of the conflict between Krmpotić and Stulli. Based on Krmpotić's criticism, the Office invited canon Antun Mandić, who as the inspector of public schools had compiled an orthographic manual for Croatian and Slavonian schools and asked him

to express his opinion on the dispute. In his writings of 26 September 1785, Mandić carefully formulated his views: he defended Stulli to a certain extent, and nothing would have been disputable if Stulli had consistently followed the Dubrovnik type of script. However, the problem was that Stulli did not fully embrace the Dubrovnik tradition, but rather moved away from the Dubrovnik script, which could have created additional difficulties for the readers. Mandić therefore drew Stulli's attention to specific shortcomings and inconsistencies. He recommended that Stulli revise the dictionary according to the Slavonian writing system. The office forwarded Mandić's proposals to Stulli, and he accepted them.

The Slavonian script was quite stable and consistent. The following solutions had settled:

Phoneme	/c/	/č/	/ć/	/ǧ/	/ǧ̇/	/j/	/l̥/	/ń/	/r̥/	/s/	/š/	/z/	/ž/
Grapheme	c	cs	ch	cx	gj	j	lj	nj	er	s	sh	z	x

There were also problems in the Croatian South. In order to put an end to the differences between the Dubrovnik and Dalmatian scripts, under the chairmanship of Franjo Maria Appendini, an orthographic committee comprising Mihajlo Bobrowski, Benedikt Mihaljević, Nikola (Dominik) Budrović and Pavle Klement Miošić was convened in Zadar in 1820. The Committee proposed the following graphemic solutions: /c/ – č, /č/ – ċ, /ć/ – ch, /h/ – h, /l̥/ – lj, /ń/ – nj, /s/ – s, /š/ – ŝ, /ž/ – x. Although these proposals were not accepted by Dubrovnik and Kotor, most of Dalmatia did accept them. The conclusions of the Committee became compulsory in the schools and public life of Dalmatia, which indicates that Northern and Central Dalmatia had a standardized orthography ten years before Ljudevit Gaj, since that writing system was used in Dalmatia for 26 years. These graphemic solutions thus become a powerful tool against Gaj's orthographic reforms.

On the eve of the appearance of Ljudevit Gaj, Josip Završnik from Rijeka stands out with his orthographic reform. Using the Polish writing system as a model, he mostly opts for subscript characters that were used in the Croatian Latin script since its beginnings, and only a few graphemic solutions with superscript diacritics. Some fifteen years before Gaj, Završnik showed that the Latin script could be adapted to Croatian needs with the help of additional diacritic marks. Završnik's ideas would remain

in his manuscripts, however, and were almost unknown until recent decades.

In *Kratka osnova horvatsko-slavenskog pravopisa* (1830), Ljudevit Gaj introduced the Czech way of writing with a diacritic mark above the grapheme. Although such usage was not new in the Croatian Latin alphabet, Gaj showed remarkable systematicity and consistency in his construction of a solid writing system: /č/ – č̣, /ǧ/ – ǧ̣, /ǰ/ – ǰ̣, /ḷ/ – ḷ̣, /ń/ – ṇ́, /š/ – ṣ̌, /ž/ – ẓ̌. Introducing a checkmark above the graph as a marker of palatals, Gaj tried to show that the links with *j*, *y* were not good (*y* is not known in the Croatian script, and *dj* exists as a sequence as well). Gaj did not have a separate grapheme for /č/ because, being a Kajkavian, he was not familiar with it. The article *Pravopisz* of 1835 is written in the old unreformed Kajkavian script. Gaj retains a single grapheme only for č, ž, š, and for the other palatals he uses digraphs *tj* /č/, *dj*, *gj* /ǧ/, *lj* /ḷ/, *nj* /ń/, i.e., he adds *j* with an accent instead of a dot to the graphemes *t*, *d*, *g*, *l*, *n*. Such an unusual *j* (with the accent) lingered only for two years, and as of 1838, *j* appears with a dot.

Davorin Trstenjak and Stanko Vraz started introducing Gaj's script in Slovenia, where it was named *Gajica* (Gaj's Latin Alphabet), in 1848. *Gajica* was adopted by Bleiweis' *Novice* as well, and in 1848 it was officially introduced in Slovenian schools and has been used by the Slovenes ever since. Guy's orthographic reform did not fully implement the one phoneme – one grapheme principle (digraphs *dj*, *gj*, *lj*, *nj*), and this departure from the monographemic system soon proved to be the weaker side of the reformed script (*djevojka*, *rodjen*). The claims that the Croatian National Revival introduced the contemporary Croatian Latin script are pretentious, since Gaj obviously introduced only three graphemes that we still use today (č, ž, š). At the end of the 19th century, Đuro Daničić, a Croatian follower of Vuk Karadžić, suggested the graphemes *đ* /ǧ/, *ǧ* /ǧ̣/, *ḷ* /ḷ/, *ń* /ṇ́/. His intention was to highlight the differences in the examples *rođen*, *svjedoǧba*, *ľubav*, *ńegov*, in which the corresponding phonemes are /ǧ̣/, /ǧ/, /ḷ/ and /ṇ́/, and the examples *podjarmiti*, *nadživjeti*, *bilje*, *kamenje*, in which we find the phonemic sequences /d+j/, /d+ž/, /l+j/ i /n+j/. The third editor of the Academy's Dictionary, Pero Budmani, introduced the grapheme *z* /dz/ (*spenẓa*, *zora*). Daničić's and Budmani's reform was not fully adopted, and only the grapheme *đ* was accepted from among Daničić's proposals, because it was adopted by the first official orthography in Croatia – *Hrvatski pravopis* by Ivan Broz in 1892.

When citing some of the most significant reforms in the development of the Croatian Latin script, one gets the impression that writers were making conscious efforts to contribute to a more adequate reading of texts by reforming the script. There had evidently been centuries-long attempts to systematize and standardize the Croatian Latin script even before the orthographic reform of Ljudevit Gaj. There were obviously several small-scale ‘revivals’ aimed at reforming the writing system, and the Croatian National Revival itself is not bigger nor more important in terms of linguistic and orthographic results so much as in the terms of its national cultural, social and political significance. The writing systems used in the various periods before the Croatian National Revival were better than they are presented by old philological historiography like that of Maretić. Something should also be said about the theses that exaggerate the perfection of the monographemic system. Such a system was first devised in Croatia by Pavao Vitezović, but the implementation of this system remained in his manuscripts.

Vitezović’s solutions were taken over by Ljudevit Gaj in 1830. The principle that a single phoneme is used for a single grapheme is good and economical, but the principle alone cannot be considered ideal. Theoretically, it does not matter whether we use a grapheme with a superscript or subscript diacritic mark, or whether we add another grapheme that cannot be realized in the speech sequence to the existing grapheme. The diacritic mark has the same function as an added letter. Our old writers and linguists pursued the possibilities of unambiguous writing, and their efforts were aimed precisely at achieving as much uniformity in conscious normative interventions as is necessary to avoid any ambiguity. Superficial research may assume that their graphemic suggestions contain different recordings of the same phonemes, but it is necessary to repeatedly re-read the works of our old writers and linguists and use detailed analyses to point to the uninterrupted flow in the development of the Croatian Latin script.

There are also some objective obstacles in implementing script reforms that should not be overlooked, such as the territorial fragmentation and the printing of books abroad. Printing abroad also implied the impossibility of casting moulds for new graphemes (let us remember the failure of Budinić’s and Vitezović’s reforms), and one should also not disregard the technical limitations of foreign printing houses, which prevented the use of graphemes better suited to the phonological system of the Croatian language.

Bibliography

- Badurina, L. (1990). Hrvatska (orto)grafija prije pojave prvoga pravopisa. *Dometi*, 10(23): 657–665.
- Brozović. (1972). O nekim načelnim pitanjima pravopisne i ortoepske norme. *Jezik: časopis za kulturu hrvatskoga književnog jezika* 20(1), 12–19.
- Brozović, D. (1976). O općim jezičnim i izvanjezičnim uvjetovanostima standardnonovoštokavske pravopisne problematike sa stanovišta njezina historijata i suvrenoga stanja, *Jezik: časopis za kulturu hrvatskoga književnog jezika* 24(3–4), 66–74.
- Hadrovics, L. (1944). Zur Geschichte der kroatischen Rechtschreibung im XVIII. Jh. *Archivum Europae Centro-Orientalis* 9-10, 325-374.
- Hadrovics, L. (1966). Pokušaj reforme latiničkog pravopisa 1785. godine. *Anali Filološkog fakulteta u Beogradu* 5, 268–272.
- Ivšić, S. (1938). Etimologija i fonetika u našem pravopisu. *Hrvatski jezik* 1, 3–13.
- Kapetanović, A. (2005). Hrvatska srednjovjekovna latinica. *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 31, 463–471.
- Kostić, M. (1937). Pokušaj bečke vlade oko uvođenja narodnog jezika i pravopisa u srpske, hrvatske i slovenačke škole krajem 18. veka. *Prilog za književnost, jezik, istoriju i folklor* 17(2), 253–267.
- Krstić, K. (1962). Latinica kod Hrvata. *Enciklopedija Jugoslavije* 5. Leksikografski zavod.
- Maretić, T. (1889). *Istorija hrvatskoga pravopisa latinskijem slovima*. JAZU.
- Matić, T. (1945). *Prosvjetni i književni rad u Slavoniji prije preporoda*. HAZU.
- Moguš, M. & Vončina, J. (1969). Latinica u Hrvata. *Radovi Zavoda za slavensku filologiju* 11, 61–81.
- Moguš, M. (1971). *Fonološki razvoj hrvatskog jezika*. Matica hrvatska.
- Moguš, M. (2009). *Povijest hrvatskoga književnoga jezika* (3rd ed). Nakladni zavod Globus.
- Moguš, M. (2010). *Povijesna fonologija hrvatskoga jezika*. Školska knjiga.
- Pranjković, I. (2000). *Hrvatski jezik i franjevci Bosne Srebrene*. Matica hrvatska.
- Pranjković, I. (2007). Slovoapis i pravopis fra Jeronima Lipovčića. *Studia Slavica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 52, 357–362.
- Pranjković, I. (2008). Latinička grafija budimskoga franjevačkog kruga i Kujundžić-Marijanovićevo ‘lipopisanje’. *Zbornik radova sa znanstvenog skupa*

- Tristota obljetnica stradanja samostana i crkve u Olovu (1704–2004)*. Franjevačka teologija u Sarajevu, 281–298.
- Putanec, V. (1985). Prijedlozi Jakova Mikalje za reformu grafije u hrvatskoj latinici. *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 7, 199–212.
- Sekulić, A. (1982). Stariji hrvatski podunavski pisci o svome jeziku i pravopisu. *Filologija* 11, 99–148.
- Šojat, A. (1970). Pravopis stare kajkavske književnosti. *Filologija* 6, 265–282.
- Šoltić, J. (1967). Lovro Bračuljević (1685.–1737.) – prvi začetnik našeg fonetskog pravopisa (1730. godine). *Kolo* 5(6), 588–592.
- Vince, Z. (1960). Rad pravopisne komisije u Zadru 1820. *Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta u Zadru* 1, 66–81.
- Vince, Z. (1970). Grafijsko-pravopisna pitanja pretpreporodnog i preporodnog doba u Slavoniji. In *Zbornik radova I. znanstvenog sabora Slavonije i Baranje*. JAZU, 773–810.
- Vince, Z. (1991). Razmišljanja uz Reljkovićevu slavonsku grafiju. In *Vrijeme i djelo Matije Antuna Reljkovića*. JAZU, 47–51.
- Vončina, J. (1988). *Jezična baština*. Književni krug.
- Vončina, J. (1990). Čevapovićeve zamisli o reformi hrvatske latinice. In *Zbornik radova o fra Grguru Čevapoviću*. JAZU, 155–173.
- Vončina, J. (2002). Latinicom pisani hrvatski tekstovi od Marulića do Gaja. *Forum: mjesečnik Razreda za književnost Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 41, 286–321.
- Vončina, J. (2006). *Tekstološka načela za pisanu baštinu hrvatskoga jezičnog izraza: Posebni prilog Stoljećima hrvatske književnosti* (2nd ed). Matica hrvatska.

Sažetak

Široj je javnosti malo poznato kako hrvatsko latiničko pismo kojim danas pišemo nije oduvijek sadržavalo slova koja koristimo u suvremenoj hrvatskoj latinici. Rad prikazuje opći pregled svih značajnijih pokušaja reformi i intervencija u hrvatsku latiničku grafiju na primjeru djela pisanih hrvatskim jezikom i hrvatskim tipom latinice. Prikazani su utjecaji drugih latiničkih grafija na oblikovanje hrvatske latinice, kao i razvojni put od prvih hrvatskih latiničkih tekstova pisanih hrvatskim jezikom do današnjice. Također, raspravlja se i o najvažnijim prikazima razvojnog tijeka hrvatske latiničke grafije te o prijedlozima koje su ti prikazi izazivali.