

Borana Morić-Mohorovičić  
Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Rijeci

*review scientific paper*

## **The morphology of pronouns, adjectives and numbers in the *Oblici književne hrvastine* (1865) grammar book by Vinko Pacel**

### **Summary**

This work analyses the grammatical description of pronouns, adjectives and numbers in the grammar book *Oblici književne hrvastine* (1865) written by Vinko Pacel, member of the Rijeka Philological School. When it comes to grammatical categories of variable parts of speech, Pacel distinguishes gender (masculine, feminine and neutrum), numbers (singular, dual and plural) and case (nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, vocative, instrumental, locative). Pacel didn't define pronouns, adjectives and number (just like other parts of speech). Pacel categorizes pronouns into three classes based on declension patterns, and into six classes based on meaning. This paper analyses both divisions and the author's considerations are put in the context of his time. The author distinguishes definite and indefinite adjectives. He claims that definite and indefinite adjectives are distinguished based on declension, meaning and accentuation. He pays special attention to the prosodic difference between examples of definite and indefinite adjectives. This work presents nominal and pronominal-adjective declension. Special attention is paid to the analysis of specificities in declension patterns. The author also briefly explains adjective comparison. Numbers are categorized into nine classes. The author pays attention to the declension of numbers, allowing the declension of numbers following four. Pacel's grammatical solutions are put in the context of grammatical solutions of the Zagreb Philological School.

Keywords: Vinko Pacel, 19th century, *Oblici književne hrvastine*, pronouns, adjectives, numbers, Rijeka Philological School, Zagreb Philological School

Vinko Pacel supported the Rijeka Philological School, the "relatively narrow linguistic movement" (Vince 1978: 405), gathered around Franjo Kurelac.<sup>1</sup> As a high school

---

<sup>1</sup> Croatian language historians point out that in his mature years, Vinko Pacel moved away from Kurelac's linguistic concept. However, up to this date, there haven't been any systemic analyses which would show when Pacel

teacher from Rijeka, he fulfilled an important mission and wrote two grammar books for his students.<sup>2</sup>

*Slovnica jezika hrvatskoga ili srpskoga, I diel. Nauka o prieslovu*<sup>3</sup> (Zagreb, 1860), the first grammar book whose title used the dual name of the language – hrvatski and srbski (Croatian and Serbian Language), is, “actually, the first historical grammar book (more precisely, phonology) of the Croatian language created within the framework of the Zagreb Philological School” (Pranjko 2013: 85). The author conceived it as the first part of a comprehensive and complete grammar book of the Croatian language, which he never finished, so it (only) covered the phonetics and phonology of the Croatian language.

*Oblici književne hrvaštine*<sup>4</sup> (Karlovac, 1865) is a short, 52-page grammar book of the Croatian language, which Pacel refers to *slovnica* in the preface. From the preface, we learn that the grammar was completed in Varaždin in 1864<sup>5</sup> and that it includes “the rules of Croatian language for first class high school or real school”<sup>6</sup> (Pacel 1865: I). Pacel’s grammar, divided into eleven chapters,<sup>7</sup> is primarily a depiction of Croatian phonology in a form shorter than in *Slovnica*, as well as an overview of the Croatian declension and conjugation system. Morphology takes the central place in Pacel’s grammar description (page 4–52). The author describes five types of words: ime samostavno (noun), zaimenica (pronoun), pridjev (adjective), broj (number), glagol (verb). From the list above, it can be concluded that the author gives (and interprets) only variable parts of speech.

When it comes to grammatical categories of variable nominal parts of speech, Pacel distinguishes gender (masculine, feminine, neutral), number (singular, dual, plural) and case. When it comes to gender, the author writes that “all declinable words are of either masculine, feminine or neutral gender”<sup>8</sup> (Pacel 1865: 4).

---

left the Rijeka Philological School. Compare, for example, Vince 1978; Mogoš 1995; Ham 2005; Stolac 2006.

2 In addition to the two grammar books, Pacel wrote three linguistic texts: *Nješto o našem glagolu* (Rijeka, 1862), followed by an additional text under the title *Još nješto o našem glagolu: Kako rabe vremena, načini, prislovi i pričešća* (Zagreb, 1863), as well as *Naglas u rieči hrvatskoga jezika* (Zagreb, 1864).

3 Hereinafter: *Slovnica*.

4 Hereinafter: *Oblici*.

5 At the end of a half-page preface, Pacel says: *In Varaždin 1964*.

6 „pravila književne Hrvaštine za prve razrede na gimnaziji ili na realci“ (Pacel 1865: I).

7 The grammar book consists of the following chapters: I. Slova, pismena; II. Naglas (*accentus*); III. Oblici (*formae*); IV. Muški sklon samostavnih (*substantivum*); V. Ženski sklon samostavnih; VI. Srednji sklon samostavnih; VII. Dvojina prava (*dualis absolutus*); VIII. Zaimenice (*pronomina*); IX. Pridjev (*adjectivum*); X. Broj (*numerales*); XII. Glagol (*verbum*). Therefore, the 11th chapter is missing. Given that the page numeration confirms that no pages are missing, it can be assumed that it is either Pacel’s or typographical error.

8 „sve su sklonjive rieči ili mužkoga, ili ženskoga, ili srednjega spola“ (Pacel 1865: 4). Pacel uses the word *spol* (sex) to describe the grammatical category of gender. That name was used by the Zagreb Philological School grammarians. Compare Morić-Mohorovičić 2016; Morić-Mohorovičić – Vlastelić 2018. That name also belongs to the Croatian Kajkavian grammar book traditions. Compare Lewis – Štebih – Vajs 2006; Brlobaš Vajs 2007.

Modelled by the Zagreb Philological School grammarians, Pacel distinguishes singular, plural and dual.<sup>9</sup> Like in the Zagreb Philological School, dual is prescribed for all declensions, but not in verbs. However, Pacel goes a step further, distinguishing three types of duals<sup>10</sup> – *dvojina brojna* with numbers *dva (dvie), tri, četiri, oba (obje), obadva (obadvie, objedvie), dvojina neprava* with forms of nouns which denote a couple and “are declensed with the number *jedni, jedne, jedna*“ (Pacel 1865: 16), e.g. *jedne čarape, jedne čizme, jedne dokoljenke, jedne rukavice, jedne gaće* as well as *dvojina prava*, which denotes words which aren’t declensed with numbers and whose inflections for locative and instrumental plural aren’t syncretized, e.g. *boka, noge, ruke, grudi, oči, uši, prsi, njedri, vrati*. Therefore, the last category also includes the pluralia tantum nouns. The noun *vrata* (door) also belongs to this category, for which Pacel “warns in a completely peculiar and self-conscious way” (Ham 2005: 41): “remember this: if *vrata* (door) means *jedna vrata* (one door), the declension is in dual; if it means multiple doors, the declension is in plural”<sup>11</sup> (Pacel 1895: 16). Even though grammatical descriptions of *dvojina neprava* and *dvojina prava* “constitute a methodological failure, the examples are correct – the forms are live and confirmed, but inaccurately described“ (Ham 2005: 42).

There are seven cases, the definition of the case is missing, and Pacel gives only case names and questions:

1. padež (nominativ) tko? što? (1st case (nominative) who? what?)
2. padež (genitiv) koga? šta? čega? česa? (2nd case (genitive) of whom? of what?)
3. padež (dativ) komu? čemu? (3rd case (dative) to whom? to what?)
4. padež (akuzativ) koga? šta? što? (4th case (accusative) who? what?)
5. padež (vokativ) o! oj! (5th case (vocative) o! oj!)
6. padež (sociativ, instrumental) kim? čim? (6th case (sociative, instrumental) with whom? with what?)
7. padež (lokal) kom? čem? (7th case (local) to whom? to what?)

It is evident that the author doesn’t mention Croatian names for cases and that he is aware of the dual function of the instrumental case (means and company), which he further explains in the following note: “one must distinguish the sixth case, whether

9 „From Bartol Kašić to the Illirian movement in the 19<sup>th</sup> century there is no dual in the Croatian grammar books” (Tafra 1993: 87). This morphological archaism was introduced in the Croatian grammar books by Vjekoslav Babukić in his *Osnova slovnice slavjanske narčja ilirskoga* (1836), and it was adopted by all grammarians from the Zagreb Philological School.

10 Sanda Ham (2005: 41) states that Pacel distinguishes two types of dual: *dvojina brojna* and *dvojina neprava*. The examples and explanations of *dvojina prava* are depicted as *dvojina neprava*.

11 „pamti pak ovo: ako *vrata* znači *jedna vrata* to se sklanja u dvojnini, ako li znači njih više, to se sklanja u množini“ (Pacel 1895: 16).

it is čist or društven, i.e. is it instrumental or sociative. For example, *došao sam tvojimi konji* means “I was riding your horses”, while *došao sam s tvojimi konji* means that I was walking or running along the horses, meaning that I wasn’t riding the horses”<sup>12</sup> (Pacel 1865: 5). The name of the locative is related to its spatial meaning. Pacel is aware that this case is also referred to as prepozicional,<sup>13</sup> which denotes that it is followed exclusively by prepositions, but he considers that prepozicional can mean “any oblique case before which there is a preposition (praepositio)”<sup>14</sup> (Pacel 1865: 5). The replaced positions of the locative and instrumental cases in relation to contemporary grammar books were not new in Croatian grammar books.<sup>15</sup>

Pacel dedicated 13 pages to pronouns, adjectives and numbers, even though he doesn’t define them (nor other parts of speech)<sup>16</sup> (pronouns, pages 16–20; adjectives pages 20–24, numbers pages 25–29). Even though Pacel’s contemporaries confirmed that they are aware of grammatical relation between an adjective and a noun because the description of an adjective was followed by the description of the noun,<sup>17</sup> Pacel did not. The description of the nouns is followed by the description of pronouns and adjectives.<sup>18</sup>

The main attention was paid to declension patterns, according to which Pacel divides pronouns into three groups. There is no definition of each class.

The first group consists of pronouns with “special inflections, without reflecting the base, out of which only one or none consonants remain, and without reflecting the inflections”<sup>19</sup> (Pacel 1865: 16). It refers to personal pronouns *ja, ti, mi, vi* (I, you, we) and a reflexive pronoun *sebe/se* (oneself). Pacel writes declension patterns of those pronouns and omits comments and explanations of declension patterns. The instrumental case of

12 „razlikuj 6- p. da li je čist ili društven t. j. instrumental ili socijativ jer n. p. *došao sam tvojimi konji* znači: tvoji konji su me dovezli; a. *došao sam s tvojimi konji* znači, da sam ja išao ili trčao uz konje ili s konji, a ne da su me oni vozili“ (Pacel 1865: 5).

13 Word *Prepozicional* can be found in Vjekoslav Babukić and Adolfo Veber’s grammar books. For this topic, compare Morić-Mohorovičić 2016; Morić-Mohorovičić – Vlastelić 2018.

14 „svaki kosi padež, pred kojim je priedlog (praepositio)“ (Pacel 1865: 5).

15 Although the literature states that locative is the seventh case and instrumental the sixth one per the Vukovian model (compare e.g. Ham 2005; Ham 2006), instrumental precedes locative in, for example, plural cases in Bartol Kašić, Ardelio Della Bella and Marijan Lanosović’s works.

Branka Tafra and Petra Košutar (2012) conclude that the order of the cases is by no means a linguistic norm feature, but “a matter of the description method” (Tafra – Košutar 2012: 196).

16 The reason was a lack of space or, more likely, of a didactic nature: considering that he intended his grammar for students in the first grade of high school, the author probably omits theoretical considerations that he believes the students learned in lower grades.

17 Compare, for example, Vjekoslav Babukić’s grammar books *Osnova slovnice slavjanske narčja ilirskoga* (1936) and *Ilirska slovnica* (1854) and Antun Mažuranić’s *Slovnica Hèrvatska za gimnazije i realne škole* (1859).

18 Six years later, in his grammar book *Slovnica hèrvatska za srednja učilišta*, Veber defines pronouns after nouns and before adjectives (compare Veber 1871).

19 „posebnimi nastavci, bez ogleđa na osnov, od kojega ostane ili samo po jedan suglas, ili niti jedan, i bez ogleđa na nastavke“ (Pacel 1865: 16).

pronoun *ja* has two forms: *mnôm*, as well as a dialectal form *mènôm*. Dialectisms aren't present in the instrumental case of pronoun *ti* (*tòbôm*) and *sebe* / *se* (*sòbôm*).

Genitive and locative of pronouns *mi* and *vi* has been syncretized – *nas*, *vas*.<sup>20</sup> When it comes to other pronouns (written in the remaining two groups), genitive is equal to locative, which is why *h* is added in the inflection: *ovakvih*, *kakvih*, *ovih*, etc. The declension of personal pronouns *mi*, *vi* includes an additional, more conservative form: the instrumental *nami*, *vami*.<sup>21</sup> Such norm of using older forms is in accordance with the linguistic concept of the Zagreb Philological School. Of course, neither Pacel nor the grammarians of the Zagreb Philological School could introduce the Novoštokavian forms *nama*, *vama* because for them, those are dual forms for the dative and instrumental cases. Furthermore, the author writes the vocative case of pronouns *ja*, *ti*, *mi*, *vi* (*jâ*, *tî*, *mî*, *vî*).

The other group consists of “pronouns with an inflection”<sup>22</sup> (Pacel 1865: 17). That group includes all pronouns, except those with “a special inflection”<sup>23</sup> (Pacel 1865: 17) from the first group and pronouns *òn*, *òna*, *òno* (he, she, it), which belong to the third group. Pronoun *sâm*, as well as pronouns “*kakav*, *takav*, *ovakav* and the pronouns comprising them”<sup>24</sup> (Pacel 1865: 17) are inflected “using a noun inflection /.../ which, nevertheless, isn't always correct”<sup>25</sup> (Pacel 1865: 17). Therefore, the author notes that certain pronouns can have nominal and pronominal-adjective declension. He didn't write the declension pattern of the given pronouns assuming that the reader knows nominal inflections from the previous chapter about nouns. Pacel wrote declension patterns for the pronominal-adjective declension. More accurately, he wrote the inflections for the pronominal-adjective declension. It must be noted that he didn't write the inflections for nominative singular for masculine, feminine and neutral gender.

---

20 The locative case *nas*, *vas* was present in Croatian grammar books by the end of the 19th century, and in some Slavic languages (e.g. Russian and Czech), it hasn't changed.

21 Form *nama* appeared at the end of 14th century, but an older record was kept in the Chakavian, Kajkavian and Old Štokavian language. Compare, for example, Mihaljević 2009.

22 „zaimenice s nastavkom“ (Pacel 1865: 17).

23 “posebnoga nastavka” (Pacel 1865: 17).

24 „*kakav*, *takav*, *ovakav* i složene od ovih“ (Pacel 1865: 17).

25 „nastavkom samostava /.../ što ipak ne valja svigdje i svagda“ (Pacel 1865: 17).

**Annex 1. Declension pattern of the pronominal-adjective declension of *zaimenica s nastavkom***  
(“pronouns with an inflection”)

	<i>Singular</i>			<i>Plural</i>		
	Masculine	Feminine	Neutral	Masculine	Feminine	Neutral
N				-i	-e	-i
G	-ga	-a	-ga	-ih (or -ieh)		
D	-mu	-oj	-mu	-im (-iem)		
A	=N/A	-u	-o	-e	-a	-e
V	=N			=N		
I	-im (-iem)	-om	-im (-iem)	-imi (or -iemi)		
L	-m	-oj	-m	-ih (or -ieh)		
	<i>Dual</i>					
NAV	-a	-e	-a			
DI	-ima (iema)					
GL	-iju					

The author mentions the declension (only) for pronouns *òv(i, -aj)*, *òva*, *òvo*; *mòj*, *mòja*, *mòje*; *tko*, *što*. In genitive, dative, locative and instrumental plural, he allows forms with a longer reflex of the old jat: *-ieh*; *-iem*; *-ieh*; *-iemi*<sup>26</sup>, but he prioritizes the shorter forms. He also allows the use of older forms in demonstrative pronouns, e.g.. *òv(i, -aj)*; *on(i, -aj)*, *taj (ti)*. Pacel divided demonstrative pronouns into base and inflection, showing no recognition of a null morpheme. Furthermore, he wrote that those pronouns “end with a hard consonant”<sup>27</sup> (Pacel 1865: 18). Just like in adjectives, in accusative singular, Pacel recognized the relationship of the pronoun given the animate / inanimate difference, confirming that he is aware of the relation between a pronoun and the noun in which the noun determines the form of the pronoun in the accusative masculine singular.

The list of pronouns includes dialectisms *čigov*, *kakov*, *nikakov*, *svakakov*, *njekakov*, *onojzi*, *što*, *kojano*. In addition to *što* (what) in nominative and *čèga* (of what) in genitive, Pacel also allows dialectisms *šta* i *česa*. The following remark proves that Pacel is well acquainted with language history: “In the word *onomade* (or, shortened, *onomad*), an old seventh case singular is visible: *onom dne*, so it transformed from *onomъ* (jer) into *a*, like in *onime* into *e*”<sup>28</sup> (Pacel 1865: 19).

26 He wrote a note that in locative, inflection -iemi “is rare” („riedko”) (Pacel 1861: 17).

27 „svršuju na tvrdi suglas“ (Pacel 1865: 18).

28 „U riječi *onomade* (ili skraćeno *onomad*) očit je jošte stari 7 p. jedn. *onom dne*, pa se iz *onomъ* (jer) preslovio u *a* kano i u *onime* u *e*“ (Pacel 1865: 19).

As stated above, the third group includes pronoun *òn, òna, òno* (he, she, it). Pacel decided to separate it because “it is different from all others; apart from the first case singular, plural and dual, it has no other cases, but takes the form of Old Church Slavonic Language, in which this pronoun is called *i, ja, je* (instead of ours *on, ona, ono*)”<sup>29</sup> (Pacel 1865: 19). Therefore, with older forms, the author wishes to explain forms in oblique cases. Modelled by the Zagreb Philological School grammarians, Pacel distinguishes the dative and locative cases singular of *on* and *ono*: *njemu, mu / njem*; the enclitic form of pronoun *ona* in the accusative singular is *ju*; the accusative plural of *on, ona, ono* is *nje, jě*.

At the end of a short discussion on pronouns, the author divides pronouns into six classes according to meaning: *osobne samostavne* (personal): “I, you and the reflexive pronoun itself”<sup>30</sup> (Pacel 1865: 20); *osobne pridjevne* (possessive), e.g. *moj, tvoj, svoj, njegov, njezin, naš, vaš, pokazno osobne* (reflexive), e.g. *ov (ovi, ovaj), taj, on(i)*; interrogative, e.g. *tko, što, čij; odnosne* (respective), e.g. *koj (koja, koje), što; neodredjene* (indefinite), e.g. *njetko, nešto, itko, isto, gdje, gdje, svatko, neki*. This division could have been taken from the Zagreb Philological School grammarians. Since *Ilirska slovnica* (1854) by Vjekoslav Babukić, grammarians from the Zagreb Philological School used almost identical division of pronouns.<sup>31</sup> Furthermore, both Vjekoslav Babukić and Antun Mažuranić think that “for the third person, there is no personal pronoun; instead, demonstrative pronouns *ona, ona, ono* are used”<sup>32</sup> (Mažuranić 2008: 83). Vinko Pacel agrees, categorizing pronoun *on (he)* into demonstrative pronouns.<sup>33</sup>

Although Pacel paid a lot of attention to prosodic notes in nouns, he did not write

29 „razlikuje od svih ostalih tim, što joj osim 1. padeža u jednini, množini i dvojini nije nijednoga padeža, nego se dovode svi od stare Slovjestine, u kojoj se ova zaimenica zove *i, ja, je* (umjesto našega *on, ona, ono*)“ (Pacel 1865: 19).

30 „ja, ti i povratna se“ (Pacel 1865: 20).

31 In *Ilirska slovnica* (1854) Babukić introduced a division of pronouns based on meaning into *osobne, povratne, posjedovne* (posvojne), *pokazne, odnosne, upitne, neopredeljene* (neodredene) zamjenice (personal, reflexive, possessive, demonstrative, respective, interrogative and indefinite pronouns). In *Slovnica Hèrvatska za gimnazije i realne škole* (1859), Antun Mažuranić distinguishes pronouns based on meaning: *osobne* (*samostavne: osobne* (personal) and *povratne* (reflexive)), as well as *pridavne: posjedovne* (posvojne) (possessive) and *povratno posjedovne* (povratno-posvojne) (reflexive possessive), *pokazne, upitne, odnosne* i *neopredeljene* zamjenice (*demonstrative, interrogative, respective and indefinite pronouns*).

32 „za tretju osobu neima samostavnoga zaimena, nego męsto njega služi pokazno: *ona, ona, ono*“ (Mažuranić 2008: 83).

33 Categorizing personal pronoun *on (he)* as demonstrative wasn't a novelty. Modelled by Latin grammar, such classification was first used by Bartol Kašić (*Institutionum linguae Illyricae libri duo*, 1604), and numerous grammarians followed it, such as: Ardelio Della Bella (*Instruzioni grammaticali della Lingua Illirica*, 1728), Josip Jurin (*Grammatica Illyricae iuventuti Latino, Italoquae sermone instruendae accomodata – Slavkigna slavnoj slovinskoj mladosti diackim, illirickim i talianskim izgovorom napravljena*, 1793), Francesco Maria Appendini (*Grammatica della lingua Illirica*, 1808).

In *Slovnica hèrvatska za srednja učilišta* (1871), Adolfo Veber categorized *on, ona, ono* as personal pronouns.

anything about the accent of pronouns.

Prosodic notes form a part of adjective description. Pacel distinguishes *kratke* and *cielo*, i.e. definite and indefinite adjectives.<sup>34</sup> An adjective is “short in form”<sup>35</sup> if in nominative masculine singular, it “ends in a consonant”<sup>36</sup>, and in nominative feminine and neutrum, it “has an unstressed inflection”<sup>37</sup> (Pacel 1865: 20). An adjective is “long in form”<sup>38</sup> if, in nominative masculine singular, it “ends in *i* /.../, which is why its inflection in all three genders is stressed”<sup>39</sup> (Pacel 1865: 20). Pacel makes a good conclusion that definite and indefinite adjectives differ not only in form, but also in declension, meaning<sup>40</sup> and stress<sup>41</sup>. Indefinite adjectives are declined according to nominal declension, while definite adjectives are declined according to pronominal-adjective declension. In his note, Pacel wrote that “if there are two, three, etc. adjectives next to the noun, either in front of it or following it, and they are declined with the noun, all adjectives must be either short or long; therefore, it is incorrect to write *od tvoga dobra staroga otca*, or *dobroga stara*, but *od tvoga dobroga staroga*, etc.”<sup>42</sup> (Pacel 1865: 22). Therefore, Pacel makes a good conclusion that the two adjectives which are next to each other must both be either definite or indefinite. He pays special attention to the prosodic difference between examples of definite and indefinite adjectives, e.g.: “One should bear in mind that the short one doesn’t become acutus because, when pronounced, it is based on pronouncing each syllable, not on the way the word is added. /.../ If the short adjective in masculine gender is made of a single syllable, it changes when pronounced as described, i.e. in the long adjective, the short stress remains short, the long stress becomes long falling (there is no acute; long falling in the diphthong *ie* and in a single syllable adjective in feminine and neutrum genders and in declensions, it has a long accent). /.../ If, in a short adjective

34 In his note, Pacel writes that “the short adjective is called *neodredjen* or *neopredieljen*, and the long adjective is called *odredjen* or *opredieljen*“ („kratki pridjev zove i *neodredjen* ili *neopredieljen*, a cieli *odredjen* ili *opredieljen*“) (Pacel 1865: 20), but that “none of those terms is correct“ („nijedan od ovih naziva nije točan“) (Pacel 1865: 20) it is better to call them “based on their form, rather than on the position in the syntax“ („prema obliku, a ne kojim mu je valjalost istom u skladnji (sintaksi)“) (Pacel 1865: 20).

35 „kratak po obliku“ (Pacel 1865: 20).

36 „svršuje na suglas“ (Pacel 1865: 20).

37 „ako je nastavak bez naglasa“ (Pacel 1865: 20).

38 „ciel po obliku“ (Pacel 1865: 20).

39 „svršuje na *i* /.../ te mu je radi toga nastavak u sva tri spola naglašen“ (Pacel 1865: 20).

40 “Short adjectives answer the question *kakov* (*kakova*, *kakovo*), and long adjective answer the questions *tko* and *kakov*, *kakova*, or *što* and *kakovo*“ („Kratki pridjev rabi na pitanje *kakov* (*kakova*, *kakovo*), a cieli na pitanje *tko* i *kakov*, *kakova*, ili *što* i *kakovo*“) (Pacel 1865: 20).

41 “Ona *cĕnā* i *vĕlikā* brda luĕe naš i vaš kotar: *cĕnā*, *vĕlikā* are long adjectives; Ona brda što luĕe naš i vaš kotar jesu *cĕrna* i *vĕlika* ili *velika*; *cĕrna*, *vĕlika* are short adjectives“ („Ona *cĕnā* i *vĕlikā* brda luĕe naš i vaš kotar: *cĕnā*, *vĕlikā* pridjevi su cieli; Ona brda što luĕe naš i vaš kotar jesu *cĕrna* i *vĕlika* ili *velika*; *cĕrna*, *vĕlika* pridjevi su kratki“) (Pacel 1865: 20).

42 „ako su dva, tri itd. pridjeva uz samostav, bilo pred njim, bilo za njim, te se skladaju s njim, to moraju biti svi ili kratki ili cieli; ne valja daklje; *od tvoga dobra staroga otca*, ili *dobroga stara*, nego: *od tvoga dobroga staroga* itd.“ (Pacel 1865: 22).



in all three genders with two syllables (in the last one, a movable *a*), the short one remains short, the long one becomes long falling; the short one before two consonants remains short, except if it is a diphthong. /.../ If a short adjective masculine has two syllables, and in feminine and neutrum three syllables, and if only the first syllable in the masculine adjective is stressed (usually just the short one): in feminine and neutrum gender, in pronunciation, it is moved to the second syllable; in long adjectives, the stress remains on the first syllable in all three genders<sup>43</sup> (Pacel 1865: 21).

### Annex 2. Indefinite adjective declension

	<i>Singular</i>			<i>Plural</i>		
	Masculine	Feminine	Neutral	Masculine	Feminine	Neutral
N	žût	Žúta	žúto	žúti	žúte	žúta
G	žúta	Žúte	žúta	žútih		
D	žútu	Žútoj	žútu	žútím		
A	žút(a)	Žútu	žúto	žúte	žúte	žúta
V	žût	Žúta	žúto	žúte	žúte	žúta
I	žútím	Žútom	žútím	žútími		
L	žútu	Žútoj	žútu	žútih		
<i>Dual</i>						
NAV	žúta	žúte	žúta			
G	žútiju					
DIL	žútíma					

43 „Valja pamtiti, da kratki pred dva suglasa ne postane oštar jer se naglas osniva na izgovoru pojedine slovke, a ne na tom kako se tvorka dodaje. /.../ Ako je kratki pridjev u mužkom spolu od jedne slovke, naglas se mienja kao što je rečeno, t. j. u celoga pridjeva kratki ostane kratkim, dugi postane oblim (oštroga nejma, obli u dvoglasu ie i u pridjevu od jedne slovke u ženskom i srednjem spolu i u sklonih postane dugoga naglasa. /.../ Ako se u pridjevu kratkom u sva tri spola po dvie slovke (u zadnjoj pomični *a*), to kratka u osnovu ostaje kratkom, duga postaje oblom; kratka pred dva suglasa ostane kratkom izim ako je dvoglas. /.../ Ako su pridjevu kratkomu u mužkom spolu dvie, a u ženskom i srednjem tri slovke, te ako je u mužkom spolu samo na prvoj slovcu naglas (obično samo kratki): to preskoči u ženskom i u srednjem spolu naglas na drugu slovku; u celoga pako pridjeva ostane u sva tri spola na prvoj slovcu“ (Pacel 1865: 21).

### Annex 3. Definite adjective declension

#### a) Base ends in non-palatal consonant

	<i>Singular</i>			<i>Plural</i>		
	Masculine	Feminine	Neutral	Masculine	Feminine	Neutral
N	žûti	žûtā	žûto	žûti	žûtē	žûtā
G	žûtōga	žûtē	žûtōga	žûtiḥ		
D	žûtōmu	žûtōj	žûtōmu	Žûtim		
A	žût(ī)(ōga)	žûtū	žûto	žûtē	žûtē	žûtā
V	žûti	žûtā	žûto	žûti	žûtē	žûtā
I	žûtim	žûtōm	žûtim	žûtimi		
L	žûtōm	žûtōj	žûtōm	žûtiḥ		
<i>Dual</i>						
NAV	žûtā	žûtē	Žûtā			
G	žûtiju					
DIL	žûtima					

#### b) base ends in palatal consonant

	<i>Singular</i>			<i>Plural</i>		
	Masculine	Feminine	Neutral	Masculine	Feminine	Neutral
N	smêdjī	smêdjā	smêdjē	smêdjī	smêdjē	smêdjā
G	smêdjēga	smêdjē	smêdjēga	smêdjīḥ		
D	smêdjēmu	smêdjōj	smêdjēmu	smêdjīm		
A	smêdj(ī)(ēga)	smêdjū	smêdjē	smêdjē	smêdjē	smêdjā
V	smêdjī	smêdjā	smêdjē	smêdjē	smêdjē	smêdjā
I	smêdjīm	smêdjōm	smêdjīm	smêdjīmi		
L	smêdjēm	smêdjōj	smêdjēm	smêdjīḥ		
“Dual just like the example in a)” <sup>44</sup> (Pacel 1865: 23)						

From the Annex 2 and Annex 3, it is evident that the author writes examples *žuti* and *smedji* in the declension patterns of certain adjectives in order to show the difference in the declension of adjectives whose base ends in a palatal and adjectives whose base ends in a non-palatal.

He specifically highlights the rule on morphological congruence of accusative masculine singular of definite and indefinite adjectives given the difference between animate and inanimate nouns, confirming that he is aware of the relationship between

44 „Dvojina kano i primjer pod a“ (Pacel 1865: 23).

an adjective and a noun, whereby the noun determines the form of the adjective in accusative masculine singular. Just like the Zagreb Philological School grammarians, Pacel documents vocative for definite and indefinite forms of adjectives.<sup>45</sup> Dative, locative and instrumental plural don't have syncretized inflections neither in the nominal declension nor in the pronominal-adjective declension. Old inflections of the pronominal-adjective declension keep dative masculine and neutrum singular *-ōmu* or *-ēmu* and locative singular *-ōm* or *-ēm*. Pacel continues the tradition of the Zagreb Philological School. Locative plural is equal to genitive plural (*žútih; smédjih*), which is another example of the Zagreb Philological School tradition.

Pacel didn't write the comments on declension patterns. His only comment is the following: in indefinite adjectives, if the base ends in a palatal, "in jekavština, the cases ending in *im, ih, ima*, are pronounced as *iem, ieh, iema*"<sup>46</sup> (Pacel 1865: 22). In this way, in indefinite adjectives in genitive, dative and locative plural, he allows forms with longer reflexes of the old jat.

In adjective comparison, Pacel didn't write inflections for *II. Stupanj* ("the second degree"), that is, comparative. From his examples, we can see that the inflections are as follows: *-iji, -ji, -ši*. He highlighted the examples in which there is a sound change in the comparative. There are numerous examples with iotated base: *ljući, gušći, krući, ljući, čvršći, češći*. There are several adjectives with a guttural base, which have an epenthetic *l* before the inflection in the comparative: *duglji* (apart from *duži*), *laglji* (apart from *lakši*), *žutji* (apart from *žući*). In this way, the author puts in an equal position dialectisms,<sup>47</sup> which he probably heard on the field or found in books, and (Novo) Štokavian examples. He specifically highlights the examples with irregular comparative (*dobar, zao, velik, mao – bolji, gori, veći, manji*). Adjectives ending in *-ak, -ik, -ok* "reject the entire syllable"<sup>48</sup> (Pacel 1865: 24), so the comparative is *gladak – gladji, sladak – sladji, žestok – žešći, težak – teži, plitak – plići*. Adjectives *bližnji, donji, gornji, krajnji, posljednji, zadnji, prvi* don't have a comparative, and when it comes to *bližnji*, the superlative is *najbližnji*. This comment could have been found in the Zagreb Philological School grammarians.<sup>49</sup>

45 Vuk Karadžić claimed that vocative isn't possible in indefinite adjectives, and his numerous followers, such as Đuro Daničić, Ignjat Alojzije Brlić and Blaž Jurišić agreed.

46 „u jekavštini obično se padeži, što svršuju na *im, ih, ima*, ovo izgovara *iem, ieh, iema*“ (Pacel 1865: 22).

47 Given that this text was written in the 19th century, when the standardization process was not completed, it should be emphasized that the term dialectism differs from the current scope of meaning. Josip Vončina also warned that when analyzing older texts, one should move away from the current scope of the term dialectism, stating that the "time gap" and "evolutionary changes" (Vončina 1979: 9) which have occurred since the creation of old records until today should be taken into account.

In Pacel, we include in dialectisms those achievements that the author does not label as literary language and almost as a rule writes them down in parentheses or in notes along with the examples he gave priority to.

48 „odbacuju cijelu slovu“ (Pacel 1865: 24).

49 Adjectives *bližnji, donji, gornji, pèrvi, posljednji, zadnji* are determined as adjectives without the comparative

Pacel extended that list, adding six categories of adjectives which don't have a comparative: "1) adjectives from nouns: Petrov, Hrvatski, etc.; 2) from family members: bratov, sestrin, etc.; 3) from materials: drven, gvozden, staklen, zemljen, zlatan, etc.; 4) complex: predobar, vrlo učen, veoma slab, vele zgodan, svemoguć, svakojak, etc. 5) adverbs and participles: čitajući, pišući, spali, umrli etc. but učeniji, najučeniji; 6) finally: desnilievi, zimni ili zimski, ljetni..."<sup>50</sup> (Pacel 1865: 24).

Besides *prispodobni treći stupanj*, which is created using the comparative and a particle *naj-* (*najbolji*), the author distinguishes *neovisni treći stupanj*, which is the result of the positive and a particle *pre-*, e.g. *predobar*, as well as the *opisni treći stupanj*, which is the result of the positive and adverbs *vele*, *vrlo*, *veoma*, *jako*, *sila*, (*zdravo*), *najveće najvećma*, *najviše*, *najjače*, *najmanje*, e.g. *vrlo bogat*, *veoma uljudan*, *jako nagao*, *sila bogat*, (*zdravo bolestan*), *najveće najvećma najviše pijan*, *najjače kriv*, *najmanje zdrav*.

As stated above, Pacel didn't define the numbers. He also omitted notes regarding accentuation. He paid attention to the division of numbers. Pacel distinguishes nine types of numbers: *glavni broj* ("answering the question: *how many?*"<sup>51</sup> (Pacel 1865: 25)), *poredni broj* ("answering the question: *which in order?*"<sup>52</sup> (Pacel 1865: 26)), *dielni broj* ("answering the question: *how many each time? (svaki krat, na svaki diel)? Po što?*"<sup>53</sup> (Pacel 1865: 27)), *množni broj* ("answering and saying: *how many times was something taken?*"<sup>54</sup> (Pacel 1865: 27)), *brojevi kakvoće* ("answering the question: *of how many types or of how many ways?*"<sup>55</sup> (Pacel 1865: 27)), *broj samostav* ("answering the question *how many men or animals of the same gender?*"<sup>56</sup> (Pacel 1865: 28)), *broj prislovni* ("answering the question: *how many times?*"<sup>57</sup> (Pacel 1865: 28)), *društveni broj* ("answering the question: *how many of them is with me, with you, with him, with her, etc.?*"<sup>58</sup> (Pacel 1865: 28)), *broj za lomke* ("answering the question: *how many parts of a whole?*"<sup>59</sup> (Pacel 1865: 28)). Six years later, Veber presented the same categorization.<sup>60</sup>

by Veber (for bližnji, the superlative is *najbližnji*). Compare Veber 1871: 50.

50 „1) pridjevi od imena: Petrov, Hrvatski itd.; 2) od roda: bratov, sestrin itd.; 3) od tvari: drven, gvozden, staklen, zemljen, zlatan itd.; 4) složeni: predobar, vrlo učen, veoma slab, vele zgodan, svemoguć, svakojak itd. 5) prilozi i pričešća tvornoga lica: čitajući, pišući, spali, umrli itd. ali učeniji, najučeniji; 6) napokon: desnilievi, zimni ili zimski, ljetni..." (Pacel 1865: 24).

51 „odgovara na pitanje *koliko?* (Pacel 1865: 25).

52 „odgovara na pitanje *koj po redu (u redu, redom)?*" (Pacel 1865: 26).

53 „odgovara na pitanje *po koliko svaki put? (svaki krat, na svaki diel)? Po što?*" (Pacel 1865: 27).

54 „odgovara i kaže, *koliko putij je što uzeto?*" (Pacel 1865: 27)..

55 „Odgovaraju na pitanje, *od koliko vrstij (kolikovrst, a, o) ili od koliko načina?*" (Pacel 1865: 27).

56 „odgovara na pitanje *koliko ljudi ili životinja istoga spola?*" (Pacel 1865: 28).

57 „odgovara dvojako na pitanje *koliko krat ili koliko putij?*" (Pacel 1865: 28).

58 „odgovara na pitanje *koliko ih je sa mnom, s tobom, s njim, s njom itd?*" (Pacel 1865: 28).

59 „odgovara na pitanje: *koja čest cielka? Ili koliko dielova ili čestij cielka?*" (Pacel 1865: 28).

60 When categorizing numbers, Veber looked up to Mažuranić's classification. Mažuranić distinguishes eight types of numbers: *glavne, redne, dělne* (answering the question: *how many per each time or part* („po koliko dolazi na svakokrat ili svaki dio") (Mažuranić 2008: 75); *po jedna, po dva*), *množne* (answering the question: *how many times was something taken* („koliko putah-je što uzeto") (Mažuranić 2008: 75); *jednostuk, jednogub*), *kakvoće* (answering the question: *how many types or ways* („od koliko raznih vèrstah ili načinah-je što") (Mažuranić 2008: 75); *jedin, jednovèstan*), *samostavničke* (two men, three men), *prislovne* (answering the question: *how many times?, /.../ when?* („odgovaraju na pitanje koliko krat? ili koliko putah?, /.../ kada?") (Mažuranić 2008: 75); *jednom, jedankrat, pèrvu*,

*Glavni brojevi, množni brojevi, brojevi kakvoće, brojevi samostavni and brojevi društveni* are declined “like nouns or like adjectives, or in their own dedicated way”<sup>61</sup> (Pacel 1865: 25). Number *one* (*jedan, jedna; jedno*) is declined based on the pronominal-adjective declension, *two* (*dva, dvie, dva*) is declined based on the same pattern like *both* (*oba, obie or obje, oba*), and *three* is declined as *four*. Thus, the author does not fall into the trap of classifying the number two in the same declination pattern as three and four. Nevertheless, he does so in order to decline number two based on a dual paradigm (NAV *dva*, G *dvaju*, DI *dvama* L *dvaju*; NAV *dvie*, G *dviju*, DI *dvima, dvjema*, L *dviju*), but not including the category of gender. In numbers, genitive plural of *jedan, tri* and *četiri* is equal to locative plural: *jednih, triju, četiriju*. In the declension, the archaism is present in the instrumental plural inflection as well: *jednimi*. Just like in adjectives, Pacel distinguishes inflections for accusative singular based on the difference between animate / inanimate: *jedan / jednoga*. It should also be noted that Pacel declined cardinal numbers following four, according to the pronominal-adjective declension, in plural.

#### Annex 4. *The declension of cardinal numbers following four*

N	pet knjiga
G	petih knjiga
D	petim knjigam
A	pet knjiga
V	pet knjiga
I	petimi knjigami
L	petih knjigah

Nevertheless, the author states that the declension of cardinal numbers following four is not common. He further claims that “following a preposition, the number isn’t declined: *s dva vola*”<sup>62</sup> (Pacel 1865: 26).

Pacel gives numerous examples of all nine categories of numbers, which must have drugo. In the explanation of the mentioned types, the author adds an eighth type of numbers and calls them *društvenima* (answering the question: *how many of them are there with you or with him* („odgovaraju na pitanje: koliko-jih-je s tobom ili s njim”) (Mažuranić 2008: 75); *sam, samodrug*). Mažuranić’s complex division was further expanded by Veber, describing the following categories of numbers: *glavni, redni, dělni* (answering the question: *how many each time*; e.g. *po jedan, po dva*), *kakvoće* (answering the question: *how many and which type*; e.g. *jednovèstan, troj*), *množne* (answering the question: *how many fold*; *onefold*), *društvene* (answering the question: *how many in the company*; *sam, samotret*), *prislovne* (answering the question: *how many times*: *dvaput, dvakrat*), *razne* (for cards: *dvojka*; for domestic animals: *dvizac*), *ulomne* (1/3). Compare Veber 1871: 50-54.

61 „ili kano samostavi ili kano pridjevi ili posebnim svojim načinom“ (Pacel 1865: 25).

62 „se obično iza priedloga broj ne sklanja: *s dva vola*“ (Pacel 1865: 26).

been very useful for his students when learning language.

Finally, let's conclude. In the 19th century, there weren't many grammarians who published more than one Croatian language grammar book. Until the 1860s, together with Šime Starčević, the grammarians of the Zagreb Philological School stand out in this group. The conducted analysis confirms that Vinko Pacel was acquainted with their grammatical titles. Furthermore, he accepted and continued them as well. This is, for example, visible in dual, which is mandatory for all declensions, but not for verbs; in writing vocative forms in adjectives; in non-syncretized inflections for dative, locative and instrumental plural in nominal and pronominal-adjective declension; in dative and locative singular inflections of the pronominal-adjective declension. Although Pacel's morphological nomenclature is still to be analyzed, we can briefly mention that it is partially in accordance with the nomenclature of the Zagreb Philological School (*spol, ime samostavno, zaimenica*). Although a comprehensive analysis of Pacel's grammatical work has yet to be done, the conducted research shows that Pacel, who is in the literature regularly (but unjustifiably) often included as a member of the Rijeka Philological School, is close to the Zagreb Philological School in his grammatical science. Pacel's grammar was intended for his students, and he relied upon their knowledge which had been acquired in earlier education. We believe that this is the reason why many definitions and additional explanations were missing. Therefore, we believe that the grammar was the result of his experience as a teacher, i.e. that he wrote the materials which were difficult to master.

### Sources:

- Vjekoslav Babukić (2013) Osnova slovnice slavjanske narječja ilirskoga, Zagreb, 1936. (pretisak Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje, Zagreb).
- Vjekoslav Babukić (1854) Ilirska slovnica, Bèrztisak nar. tiskarnice Dra. Ljudevita Gaja, Zagreb.
- Antun Mažuranić (2008) Slovnica Hèrvatska za gimnazije i realne škole, Zagreb 1859. (pretisak: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje, Zagreb).
- Vinko Pacel (1860) Slovnica jezika hrvatskoga ili srpskoga, I diel. Nauka o prieslovu, Brzotiskom pečatnje Karla Albrechta, Zagreb.
- Vinko Pacel (1965) Oblici književne hrvaštine, Tiskara A. Lukšića u Karlovcu pod odgovornom upravom D. Kostinčera, Karlovac.
- Adolfo Veber (1871) Slovnica hèrvatska za srednja učilišta, Zagreb.

## References:

- Babić, Stjepan (ur.) (1991) *Tisućljetni jezik naš hrvatski*, Spiridon Brusina, Zagreb.
- Barić, Eugeniya i sur. (1997) *Hrvatska gramatika*, Školska knjiga, Zagreb.
- Bičanić, Ante i sur., *Pregled povijesti, gramatike i pravopisa hrvatskoga jezika*, Croatica, Zagreb, 2013.
- Brlobaš, Željka (2001) „Teorijska promišljanja o vrstama riječi”, *Suvremena lingvistika*, 51-52, 1-2, Zagreb, 267–279.
- Brlobaš, Željka (2015) „Hrvatske gramatike u 19. stoljeću“, *Povijest hrvatskoga jezika, 4. knjiga: 19. stoljeće*, Croatica, Zagreb, 431–467.
- Brlobaš, Željka, Nada Vajs (2007) „Hrvatsko kajkavsko gramatičko nazivlje u gramatici latinskoga jezika Antuna Rožića”, *Filologija*, 49, 1–36.
- Brozović, Dalibor (1985/86) „Jezična i pravopisna previranja u Hrvatskoj na prijelazu iz 19. u 20. stoljeće”, *Jezik*, 33, 1, Zagreb, 1–15.
- Brozović, Dalibor (2005) „O početku hrvatskoga jezičnog standarda”, *Jezik*, 52, 5, Zagreb, 186–192.
- Brozović, D. (2006) *Neka bitna pitanja hrvatskoga jezičnog standarda*, Školska knjiga, Zagreb.
- *Fran Kurelac, Bogoslav Šulek, Vinko Pacel, Adolfo Veber Tkalčević: Jezikoslovne rasprave i članci. Stoljeća hrvatske književnosti* (1999). Matica hrvatska, Zagreb. Priredio Ivo Pranjković.
- Gabrić-Bagarić, Darija (2003) „Jezik u gramatikama južnih hrvatskih prostora 17. i 18. stoljeća”, *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje*, 29, br. 1, Zagreb, str. 65–86.
- Ham, Sanda (1998) *Jezik zagrebačke filološke škole*, Matica hrvatska, Osijek.
- Ham, Sanda (2005) „Slovnice Vinka Pacela“, *Književna revija*, 3-4, str. 35–47.
- Ham, Sanda (2006) *Povijest hrvatskih gramatika*, Nakladni zavod Globus, Zagreb.
- Jagić, Vatroslav (1864) „Naš pravopis”, *Književnik, časopis za jezik o poviest hrvatsku i srbsku i prirodne znanosti*, str. 1–34.
- Jonke, Ljudevit (1971) *Hrvatski književni jezik 19. i 20. stoljeća*, Matica hrvatska, Zagreb.
- Katičić, Radoslav (1988) „Ilirci i ilirski jezik”, *Forum*, 27, 12, Zagreb, 678–688.
- Lewis, Kristian, Barbara Štebih, Nada Vajs (2006) „Gramatičko nazivlje u hrvatskome kajkavskome književnom jeziku”, *Filologija*, 46–47, 183–201.
- Moguš, Milan (1995) *Povijest hrvatskoga književnog jezika*, Nakladni zavod Globus, Zagreb.
- Morić-Mohorovičić, Borana (2016) „Parčičevo morfološko nazivlje u kontekstu morfološkoga nazivlja zagrebačke filološke škole“, *Fluminensia*, 28, 69–82.

- Morić-Mohorovičić, Borana; Vlastelić, Anastazija (2018) „Morfološko nazivlje u gramatikama i rječnicima Dragutina Antuna Parčića“, u: *Od fonologije do leksikologije: Zbornik u čast Mariji Turk*, Izdavački centar Rijeka, Rijeka, 229–243.
- Kristijan Novak (2012) *Višejezičnost i kolektivni identiteti iliraca: jezične biografije Dragojle Jarnević, Ljudevita Gaja i Ivana Kukuljevića Sakcinskoga*, Srednja Europa – Filozofski fakultet, Zagreb – Rijeka.
- Pranjković, Ivo (2010) „Hrvatski jezik u 19. stoljeću“, *Zbornik radova 38. seminara Zagrebačke slavističke škole*, FF Press, Zagreb, 49–68.
- Pranjković, Ivo (2013) „Gramatike hrvatskoga jezika šezdesetih i sedamdesetih godina 19. stoljeća s posebnim obzirom na Veberovu *Slovnícu hěrvatsku*“, u: *150. obljetnica uvođenja hrvatskoga jezika u službenu uporabu, 2011., I. Stoljeća hrvatskoga jezika*, Riječ – SN Privlačica, Vinkovci, 84–91.
- Samardžija, Marko (2004) *Iz triju stoljeća hrvatskoga standardnog jezika*, Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, Zagreb.
- Stolac, Diana (1997) „Riječki profesor Vinko Pacel“, *Sveti Vid*, Rijeka, str. 189–198.
- Stolac, Diana (2019) „Riječka filološka škola“, *Hrvatska revija*, 2, Zagreb, str. 60–64.
- Stolac, Diana (2006) *Riječki filološki portreti*, Filozofski fakultet u Rijeci, Sveučilište u Rijeci, Biblioteka časopisa Fluminensia, knjiga 2, Rijeka.
- Tafra, Branka (1991) „Jesu li ahavci izgovarali h?“, *Kolo*, 5-6, str. 47-64
- Tafra, Branka (1993) *Gramatika u Hrvata i Vjekoslav Babukić*, Matica hrvatska, Zagreb.
- Tafra, Branka (1995) „Obilježja hrvatske gramatičke norme do kraja 19. stoljeća“, *Filologija*, 24-25, Zagreb, str. 345–354.
- Tafra, Branka (1998) „Veberov i Babukićev gramatički model“, *Riječki filološki dani 2*. Zbornik radova s Međunarodnoga znanstvenog skupa Riječki filološki dani održanoga u Rijeci od 5. do 7. prosinca 1996., Filozofski fakultet, Rijeka, str. 67–80.
- Tafra, Branka (2002) „Jezikoslovac Šime Starčević“, u: Šime Starčević, *Nova ricsoslovica iliricska*, Trst 1812. pretisak: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje, Zagreb, str. 127–177.
- Tafra, Branka – Košutar, Petra (2012) „Andrija Torkvat Brlić između dviju književnojezičnih koncepcija, *Prinosi povijesti hrvatskoga jezikoslovlja*, Hrvatski studiji Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, Zagreb, str. 184–201.
- Vince, Zlatko (1978) *Putovima hrvatskoga književnog jezika*, Sveučilišna naklada Liber, Zagreb.
- Vince, Zlatko (1982) „Norma u hrvatskom književnom jeziku potkraj 19. stoljeća“, *Jezik*, god. 30, br. 2, Zagreb, str. 51–57.
- Vončina, Josip (1979) *Jezičnopovijesne rasprave*, Liber, Zagreb.
- Vončina, Josip (1993) *Preporodni jezični temelji*, Matica hrvatska, Zagreb.



## Morfologija zamjenica, pridjeva i brojeva u gramatici *Oblici književne hrvastine (1865) Vinka Pacela*

*U radu se analizira gramatički opis zamjenica, pridjeva i brojeva u gramatici Oblici književne hrvastine (1865) Vinka Pacela, pripadnika riječke filološke škole. Od gramatičkih kategorija promjenjivih vrsta riječi autor razlikuje rod (muški, ženski, srednji), broj (jednina, dvojima i množina) i padež (N, G, D, A, V, I, L). Zamjenice, pridjeve i brojeve (kao ni ostale vrste riječi) Pacel ne definira. Zamjenice Pacel prema deklinacijskim obrascima dijeli u tri, a prema značenju u šest razreda. U radu se analiziraju obje podjele te se autorovo razmatranje stavlja u kontekst njegova vremena. Pridjeve autor dijeli na određene i neodređene. Drži da je razlika između određenih i neodređenih pridjeva u deklinaciji, značenju i naglasku. Posebna je pažnja usmjerena razlici u prozodiji između primjera određenoga i neodređenoga pridjeva. U radu se donosi prikaz sklonidbe imeničke i zamjeničko-pridjevske sklonidbe. Posebna se pažnja pridaje analizi osobitosti u deklinacijskim obrascima. Recimo i da autor u kratkom razmatranju objašnjava komparaciju pridjeva. Brojeve Pacel dijeli u devet razreda. Naglasak je na deklinaciji brojeva, a dopušta i deklinaciju glavnih brojeva nakon četiri. Pacelova se gramatička rješenja stavljaju u kontekst gramatičkih rješenja zagrebačke filološke škole.*

### Adresa autorice:

Borana Morić-Mohorovičić

Filozofski fakultet

Sveučilište u Rijeci

[bmoric@uniri.hr](mailto:bmoric@uniri.hr)