

ILLYRIAN HUMANIST IDEAS IN THE WORKS OF
THE SOUTH SLAVIC PROTESTANT PUBLISHERS
IN URACH

Olga Nedeljković

The presence of humanist ideas in the works of both South Slavic Protestant and Counter-Reformation writers has been discussed many times in Slavic philology.¹ Most of these discussions treat Slavic humanist-reformist ideas as belonging to a specific ideology of the Baroque, hence to so-called Baroque Slavism.² However, recent studies have attempted to correct this erroneous designation of Slavic humanist ideas of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and trace their development all the way back to their origins.³ Though humanist ideas themselves have attracted much attention, their appearance in the works of the South Slavic Protestants (both Slovene and Croatian) has not yet been satisfactorily accounted for. I shall try to cast more light on the whole problem, particularly concerning the relations between Croatian and Slovene Protestant publishers and their collaborative efforts, which were conditioned by the reciprocal influences of their divergent humanist ideas.

The chief publishers, printers, and distributors of Protestant publications throughout the Balkans were inhabitants of Istria, of Rijeka, and of the Croatian Littoral, Illyrians (*i.e.*, Croats) and Italians who wrote or translated for the Croatian Protestant publishing enterprise during a very brief period. These Illyrian humanists became acquainted with the new Protestant ideology emanating from the northern Italian cities, especially from Venice. As an international mercantile center, the most prominent Mediterranean port where people of all nationalities converged, Venice became something of a cross-fertilized breeding ground for the new "heretical" ideas. In particular, a common system of business, which included a great German mercantile colony within the city itself, helped to make Venice such a crossroads. This German colony possessed a type of extraterritoriality.⁴ Through this colony, as well as through diplomatic conventions with Europe, Venice, like some other northern Italian cities, became a Protestant center. Thus, in Istria there were at the same time three bishops: the Bishop of Trieste, the Bishop of Pula, and the Bishop of Capodistria, all of whom joined the Reformation. The Bishop of Trieste, Peter Bonomo, who studied at the University of Bologna, was a highly visible figure in the Italian humanist movement of

that time. In his school, Primož Trubar, the future founder of Slovene literature, became acquainted with classical writers, the intellectual currents of that time, and with the father of the Northern European humanist Reforms, Erasmus of Rotterdam, whose ideas were overwhelmingly popular among humanists throughout Europe. In Bonomo's circle in Trieste, Trubar also studied the ideas of the Swiss reformers, particularly Calvin's *Institutiones religionis christianae*.⁵

The Bishop of Koper, Pier Paolo Vergerio, the younger Paulus Peter Vergerius (1498-1565), was papal envoy to a diplomatic meeting with Luther on November 6, 1553,⁶ after which he joined the Reformation. On his arrival in Germany, he endeavored to spread the Reformation among the Croats, and later among the Southern Slavs, including those under Turkish domination. According to Croatian literary criticism, he was also the author of the first Croatian Protestant book *Razgovaranje meju papistu i jednim luteran* (in 1555).⁷ In the same year (1555), Vergerio enlisted Trubar's support for the creation of a single literary center for Croatian Protestant books. On the basis of Bučar's description of the collaboration between Vergerio and Trubar, it is clear that Vergerio initiated and supported the preparation of the Slovene publications of Trubar's works.

Vergerio was concerned not only with the organization of people, but also with the promotion of his idea of a Slovene-Croatian publishing house; at the same time he became involved with financial organizations.⁸ Together with Vergerio, Trubar reissued the *Abecedarium* and the *Catechism*, but this time, following Vergerio's advice, he printed them in latin rather than in gothic letters (as in 1555). Vergerio explained to Trubar the superiority of the latin alphabet over the gothic, since the latin alphabet was used by Croats and other peoples. Actually the Slovenes are indebted to the Italian-humanist component in Trubar's education, and especially to Vergerio's influence upon Trubar, for their use of the latin *antiqua* in their publications beginning in 1555. Only two very early editions of Trubar were printed in gothic letters. Although the Slovenes date their literary foundation from the Protestant period, they differed in their latin writings from their contemporaries, the Lusatian Serbs, who retained "Schwabacher Lettern" (*i.e.*, gothic letters) until well into the nineteenth century.

In his plans to organize a joint Croatian-Slovene Protestant publishing enterprise, Vergerio chose not to limit the use of the other alphabets, the glagolitic and cyrillic, widely used among the Croats. Glagolitic writings were especially popular in his former bishopric in Istria, where they had been traditional for centuries. This accounts for Vergerio's great concern with providing a glagolitic type-face for Croatian publications.⁹ His decision to print Protestant books in all three alphabets (*i.e.*, latin, glagolitic, and cyrillic) was intended to make future Protestant edi-

tions accessible to all the South Slavic peoples of the Balkans, most notably for the Dalmatians who used all three alphabets.

The alphabets raised the question of the language for Protestant publications. In which language should Protestant books be printed? As an Italian Renaissance humanist, Vergerio was duly concerned with the current Italian *questione della lingua*. In sixteenth-century Italy the language question was raised to crucial importance by the publication of Bembo's *Prose della volgar linqua* (1525). Its appearance encouraged members of the rising generation to cultivate their mother tongue. Bembo made an impression on Vergerio who, still living in the Republic of Venice, became actively involved in the language question. Vergerio even delivered a stirring speech about the necessity of improving Italian.¹⁰ Vergerio was also well acquainted with the Illyrian language (*i.e.*, the Croatian vernacular) which was patterned after Latin-Italian developmental models.

The idea of the unifying Illyrian language which would embrace all the Slavic nations of the former Illyricum (*i.e.*, all the Southern Slavs—Pribojević, Šišgorić, Korjenić-Neorić, Vrančić, Orbini, Gundulić, and others) originated from the fifteenth century Italian historiographers Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini and Flavio Biondo. Later the same idea developed into a broader linguistic concept of a common pan-Slavic language which would eventually unify all the Slavic nations (Levaković, Tarlecki, Križanić, and others). Illyrian humanists embraced this vision and promoted its realization in subsequent generations. It was spread and propagated in the other Slavic countries.

The development and the final results of these humanist ideas of Italian historiography exceed the scope of this paper. Here, we are primarily interested in tracing the expression of Illyrian humanist ideas in the works of a few South Slavic Protestant publishers in Urach. In their humanist-reformist enthusiasm and endeavors the South Slavic Protestant publishers and printers assimilated and skillfully expanded this vital concept of Italian humanistic historiography, including it in the prefaces of their publications.

Vergerio's South Slavic Protestant literary program insisted on translating Protestant books into the most popular vernacular in the Balkans—Illyrian. He knew that the Illyrian language would be easily understood and accepted by the other South Slavic regions. The same idea was corroborated by the other Illyrian Protestants, Croatian collaborators in the Protestant publishing enterprise in Urach. Their all-embracing humanistic idea was the publishing of Protestant editions in one generally understandable language, in "*sadanji općeni i razumni hrvatski jezik*,"¹¹ for all of the Balkans, that would be printed in latin, glagolitic, and cyrillic letters so that all of Illyria could read it. Trying to introduce a common language for both Croatian and Slovene Protestant

writings gave rise to the famous quarrels between Trubar and his Croatian collaborators, translators and printers. Eventually the quarrels resulted in the application of separate languages in their publications.

Croatian and Slovene Protestant literature emerged in the middle of the sixteenth century. A print shop in Urach, which was established by Baron Ungnad and protected by Count Christoph of Württemberg became a center of Croatian and Slovene Reformation publishing.¹² The chief object of interest among the Reformers was the Bible in the vernacular. The leading Slovene humanist-reformer, Primož Trubar, espoused this Protestant goal and focused his activity on a Slovene translation of the Bible. Although the critics of Croatian and Slovene literature often quote Trubar's own admission of linguistic ignorance, it is important to recall that Vergerio was an indispensable help in the early phases of Trubar's work. Trubar explicitly stated that he knew no Croatian, and that he could neither read nor write glagolitic. Therefore, he needed at least two Croatian assistants to produce his Croatian translations and to print them in cyrillic and glagolitic type. Furthermore, he was not confident of his Slovene translation, for he knew neither Greek nor Hebrew, and his Slovene was lexically poor. Thus he searched for two men from the areas of Carniola and Styria who knew Slovene, Latin, and German well.¹³

Vergerio assisted Trubar in the translation and collation of the parallel edition of the Greek and Latin Bible. Later, Vergerio, along with Trubar, signed the forward to Trubar's translation of the Gospel according to Matthew (in 1555). In a second edition of Trubar's Matthew, Vergerio's signature appeared above Trubar's. Because of this question of authorship their later collaborative efforts were marred by scholarly rivalry, and, finally, they ceased to work together. In 1557 Trubar reissued *Ta pervi deil tiga Noviga Testamenta* under his own name.¹⁴ It is likely that Trubar's streak of quarrelsomeness is responsible for the well-known disagreements between him and the Croatian translators Stipan Konzul and Antun Dalmatin. To be certain, it would be necessary to reexamine their relationships and eventually correct existing interpretations of the clashes as far as the sources permit us. Although these quarrels may have been of a private nature, still one cannot ignore the possibility that they rose out of crucial differences between the Slovene Trubar and the Italian and Illyrian humanists. These quarrels probably resulted from the fact that these men operated with different ideas, different formulations of the basic intellectual codes of Humanism.

Dalmatia, the Croatian Littoral, and Istria, at the head of which was the Republic of Dubrovnik, formed an integral part of Italian Renaissance Humanism with all of its characteristics. Participating actively in its cultural union with Italy, the Eastern Adriatic coast adopted the humanistic name of ancient *Illyricum* and its inhabitants became known

as *natio illyrica*.¹⁵ Illyrian poets and writers took part in the creation of the basic principles of Renaissance literary theory and elaborated on these principles. Illyrians in Dalmatia, in the Croatian Littoral, and in Istria adopted and propagated vital concepts of humanistic universalism and Renaissance ideals among the Southern and Northern Slavs. As we noted earlier, future generations of Illyrians inherited and transmitted a pan-Slavic patriotism which gradually evolved into a very potent South Slavic, and later omni-Slavic, Slavophilism.

Italian and Illyrian Humanism was never confined to narrow national boundaries. It was a movement of international dimensions. The cultural-historical and linguistic framework of the Illyrian humanist reformers and Protestants paralleled that of Italy. Their common humanist aspirations were universal, pan-European. Belonging to a humanistic Republic of Letters (*Respublica literarum*), Renaissance humanists in Italy and Illyricum worked together to spread their universal ideals among diverse nations, near and far. Thus, one of the most important scholars of the Protestant era and one of the most prominent humanists among the South Slavic Protestants, the Croatian Flacius Illyricus, corresponded with people from Europe, Africa, Turkey, Mongolia, and other countries. He strove to spread his new reformist spirit and humanist cultural not only in Europe, but on other continents as well.¹⁶ During the entire period of the Renaissance and Reformation, Illyrian Humanism remained an international cultural movement, universal in its character and inspirations.

In contrast to Croatian Renaissance Humanism, the Slovenes accepted and adopted without any great changes North European Humanism, a distinctly German, that is Lutheran, brand of reform. In northern European countries genuine Italian Humanism was dispersed and altered by an infusion of indigenous elements. This resulted in a gradual desintegration of Italian Humanism. It became confused with divergent elements in the transalpine countries of the North, where most humanists accepted a predominately Christian, still medieval, tradition and were less disposed to allow any real synthesis between Christianity and classical thought. The leading humanist of the North, Erasmus of Rotterdam, dedicated his scholarly life, like many other northern scholars, to improving theology and Christian life by means of humanistic studies.

The consolidation of Slovene Humanism depended exclusively on Protestant impulses. Slovene Humanism developed without the direct influence of Italian Renaissance Humanism. As we noted earlier, Erasmusian influence is especially remarkable in the earliest period of Trubar's formation and study in Venice. Erasmus stressed the necessity for the Bible in the vernacular, for the application of philology to the Scriptures, in particular form its Greek and Hebrew originals. Štefan Barbarič aptly

depicts how the writings of Primož Trubar reflect these Erasmian concerns. Barbarič demonstrates how Trubar relied on Erasmus's editions of the Church Fathers, whom Trubar mentions in the prefaces to his editions.¹⁷ In the period from 1555 to 1562 Luther also became one of Trubar's chief authorities, but Barbarič correctly points out that in his prefaces to his editions of the New Testament, Trubar selects quotations from Erasmus' and Luther's works and makes them appear identical.¹⁸

In contrast to the above-mentioned salient features of Italian-Illyrian Humanism, on Slovene soil there emerged a literature of an overwhelmingly moral-didactic and religious character (Biblical and liturgical texts, didactic catechisms and primers, prayer- and hymn-books). The Slovene language evolved along different lines, lines diametrically opposed to the Renaissance-humanistic concept of the Illyrian language. The concept of language development among the Slovene is clearly expressed in Trubar's works. In full accordance with the ideological motifs of the German Reformation (*vox populi, vox Dei*) Trubar depicts the linguistic situation in Slovenia as follows: ". . . Kedar ta slovenski jezik se povsod glih inu v eni viži ne govori—drigači govore z dostimi besedami Krajnci, drigači Korošci, drigači Štajerji inu Dolenci ter Bezjaki, drigači Krašovci inu Istrijani, drigači Krovati—, obtu smo mi le-tu naše delu v ta krajnski jezik hoteli postavati. . . ." ¹⁹ Specialists in the history of the Slovene literary language regularly quote this fragment from Trubar's introduction to *Ta Evangeli Svetiga Matevža* (1555), as an example of an asyndetic figure.²⁰ But this asyndetic binding is also an explicit expression of the Protestant language concept (*Omnis lingua confitebitur Deo*, Romans 1:14). In the same Reformation spirit Adam Bohorič, the author of the first Slovene grammar (*Arcticae horulae*), assigns to the language as its major function its use in the liturgy. Bohorič in the Preface to his grammar maintains that history has proven that believers have prayed to God in their mother tongues not having any signs of writing at all: "*Deo grata officia et laudes, linguarum, (vocali verbo) subsidio, excitavit. . . . Quod etiam unicum et perspicuum genus dicendi, in Ecclesia Dei prioribus et multis seculis, et sine literis, sineq; certa literaturea, usurpatum et ita conservatu fuisse consentaneum est.*" In his opinion, the priests' task is to master the ordinary people's language if the priests want to announce God's will: ". . . . gnarum esse linguae eius gentis, que cum agendum cuiquam est, id, me tacente, quivis facile intelligit." ²¹ The apology of every individual speech and utterance, actively applied and used in praying to God, became the basis for the linguistic development of Slovene literary expression. This Protestant linguistic concept is reiterated in the works of all the Slovene Protestants.

Trubar's disputes with Stipan Konzul and Antun Dalmatin arose primarily from this difference in attitudes concerning linguistic development, attitudes rooted in different theological and ecclesiastical spheres.

Once this crucial difference between the Illyrian (*i.e.*, Croatian) linguistic program and the Slovene tendency towards linguistic pluralism is understood, Trubar's disagreements with his Croatian collaborators, translators, and printers in Urach may be considered in a new light. Their opposite perceptions of language usage, with Illyrians insisting on a unified linguistic synthesis and Slovenes insisting on preserving and catering to dialectal diversity, underlie all their discussions and quarrels over the readiest way to promote Humanism and reforms through printed books.

Half a century ago one of the greatest scholars of South Slavic Protestantism and the Counter-Reformation, Matija Murko, correctly noted:

The Slovene influence has still not been thoroughly investigated, but one should neither overestimate, nor overlook it. The Germans who only had access to Trubar's German prefaces, assigned Trubar a major role in the publication of Serbo-Croatian Protestant books. In particular, Th. Elze was unjust to Konzul and Dalmatin, because he elaborated upon his sources and he put together some of his works from others' books; in addition to that he was the founder of a completely new literary language. But Dalmatin and Konzul at least knew how to write their own prefaces; their language is certainly more polished and precise than Trubar's.²²

It is logical to assume that Dalmatin's and Konzul's language must have been more creative, independent, and certainly more elaborate than Trubar's emerging Slovene. Konzul and Dalmatin were hampered by their dependence on Trubar and on the mechanical transmission of his works. As Murko also notes, Konzul and Dalmatin did not slavishly translate from Trubar's editions.²³ Frequently they did not like Trubar's translations and turned to the Latin versions in order to check Trubar's translations. Often they tried to correct Trubar and to adapt his texts to their own understanding and interpretation. In the titles of their works, Konzul and Dalmatin underscored their sources: "Now again (the text is) faithfully translated from the Latin, German, and Carniolan language into the Croatian."²⁴ Their independent tendencies and resistance to Trubar's constant interference and control is evident in Konzul's and Dalmatin's numerous (yet infrequently noted) prefaces as well as in their various commentaries.²⁵

The language of Konzul's and Dalmatin's publications is based on a centuries-long tradition of the Croatian vernacular. In the preface to the New Testament, written in glagolitic letters, they refer directly to this tradition: "*Mi esmo světom dosta razumnih' i učenih', latinskim' i hrvatskim' jazikom' hrvatskih' pisac tere njih prija pisañem', gledajuć' na onu staru hrvacku štampu u Brevijalih i Misalih', ova slova od dobrih' umetlivih' němških meštar činili izdlesti, izseči ter izliti.*"²⁶ It is

understandable that the Croatian Protestant publishers relied on the previous glagolitic tradition of writing, both ecclesiastical and secular. After their definitive break with Trubar, when Trubar proclaimed that he did not wish to have anything more to do with Croatian publications (November 22, 1562),²⁷ the language of Konzul's and Dalmatin's later editions improved. In addition to their separation from Trubar, another event contributed to advancing the quality of their language. In the period after 1562, the Croatian translators and printers did not translate biblical texts. For the translation of biblical texts they used the existing ecclesiastical books and strictly followed the Church's version of the Illyrian language (cf. for instance, their use of the ending *-t* in the 3 p. sg. and pl. in liturgical texts).²⁸ In other translations and publications the Croatian Protestants wrote in the common, cultivated, current Illyrian language, which they described as "*sadašnjim, pitomim, obćenim jezikom*" (The preface to the cyrillic *Razumni Nauci*). Franjo Fancev characterizes the language of Konzul and Dalmatin as "*primorski i istarski govor čakavskoga narječja.*"²⁹ Actually, Konzul and Dalmatin used the common Croatian vernacular, known familiarly as the Illyrian language, with prominent Čakavian-Ikavian elements. One must keep in mind that in the period from the fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries, Čakavian-Ikavian characteristics continued to appear in the works of Dubrovnik's writers and poets. Čakavian elements were legitimate components of the common Illyrian.

The Croatian Protestant publications in Urach could have absolutely no impact upon the further development of religious-propaganda literature. This "Protestant episode" (Kombol) was peripheral and short-lived in Croatian lands, where the Counter-Reformation triumphed shortly thereafter. It is impossible to credit the new Croatian Protestant movement with the introduction of novel religious thought into an already richly religious Dalmatian-Dubrovnik literary tradition. The religious strain in Croatian literature was never eliminated during the Renaissance. Croatian Protestant literature also could not lay the foundation for Croatian Kajkavian literature, because the first Kajkavian text appeared some time earlier (1560) than Croatian Protestant publications in Urach, which relied on the previous Dalmatian-Dubrovnik literary tradition. In spite of some limited peripheral Kajkavian literary expressions,³⁰ Croatian Kajkavian literature followed a different trend of language development from that which was followed in Slovenia. Kajkavian literature was gradually included into the sphere of the Illyrian language.³¹

As noted above, Croatian Protestant translator—publishers in Urach relied mostly on the earlier humanistic and glagolitic literary tradition. Humanistic-Renaissance principles in their works were never questioned or exposed to any kind of transformations or changes. In spite of the narrow framework of their theological writings, some

humanistic ideas were preserved. The Illyrian humanists succeeded in inserting these ideas into the prefaces to their Protestant publications.

Within their program of printing and spreading Protestant books, the Illyrian Protestants wanted to encompass the broadest territory in the interior of the Balkans, including all the South Slavs, both those free and those occupied by the Turks. For example, in the preface to the New Testament, written in glagolitic letters, in 1562-1563, Konzul and Dalmatin declared: "*Predragi dobri krstijani Hrvatje znajte da jesmo s tim našim tumačenjem vsim slovenskoga jezika ludem služiti hoteli, najprvo vam, Hrvatom i Dalmatinom, potom takajše Bošnjakom, Bezjakom, Srblanom i Bulgarom.*"³² In the dedication to the *Artikuli*, written in cyrillic, Konzul and Dalmatin emphasized that they had translated and published these books for the Slovenes, the Croatians, and also for the Turks in order to bring all of them into one Christian Church: "*Slovinom, Hrvatom, ja i Turkom ednu Krstjansku crkav savkupiti.*"

Future studies of these prefaces to Croatian Protestant publications may reveal some ideas of a pan-Slavic character. On the basis of material available to me, I can conclude that the Illyrian Protestants expressed clearly South Slavic Slavophilism, or more precisely South Slavic Illyrism. For instance, in the preface to the *Kratki razumni nauci*, Konzul and Dalmatin explicitly stressed that with their translation they did not want to serve either "*Rusom' ili Rusijanom, i Polakom i Čehom, i Moškovićem' . . . ž njihovim jezikom,*" which is foreign and unintelligible to us. Actually, the translators wanted to serve "*vam Hrvatom, Dalmatinom, Istrijanom i Bošnjakom, srblanom, bulgarom i vsim onim koji s ovim jezikom' ovih imenovanih zemal govore.*"³³ Therefore, the Illyrian Protestant translators and printers aimed at making their language maximally intelligible and acceptable for all "*krstijanom v Dalmaciji, v Hrvatih, Srvije, Bosne, Srimске zemle*" (The cyrillic *Artikuli*). In order to assure widespread reading of their books, they took special care to choose for printing the alphabet which was mostly frequently used in the given area.

Generally unfavorable conditions did not allow them to realize the entire Croatian Protestant program. However, Konzul and Dalmatin, as well as the other Croatian associates (Juraj Cvečić, Juraj Juričić) were aware of the significance of their mission and of the importance of the kind of language they used in their translations to the eventual success of Protestant publications in the Balkans. Croatian Protestant translations were intended to serve all the South Slavs, both educated and illiterate people. Therefore, Konzul and Dalmatin often emphasized that they wrote in ordinary—people's language. These ideas are clearly expressed, for example, in the following fragment of the preface to the glagolitic version of the New Testament (1562-1563): "*znamo . . . da dužni esmo svim ljudem, Grkom zajedno i Barbarom i tako učenim kako*

neučenim. Toga radi esmo va ovo naše flmačeňe ove PRIPROSTE, NAVADNE RAZUMNE, OBĆENE, VSAGDAÑE, SADAŠNEGA VRĚ(I)MENA BESEDE, koie Hřrvatě, Dalmatini i drugi Slově(i)nci, i Kraňci najveće va ñih govorenju govore, hotěli postavti."³⁴ As this quotation demonstrates, Konzul and Dalmatin tended to introduce a single, common language for both the Croats and the Slovenes, especially for printing their Protestant books. In the dedication to King Maximilian of the same New Testament, under the obvious influence of Croatian Protestants, Primož Trubar tried to write in the same all-embracing humanistic spirit. However, he could not avoid mentioning some differences between the Croatian Kajkavian and Slovene on the one side, and Bosnian and Serbian dialects on the other. Thus, he says:

Not only priests and scholars could read and understand them [our translations], but also children and laymen in all Croatia, Dalmatia, Bosnia, Serbia, and Bulgaria, though some words and letters will not be to everyone's liking, since the Croats and Dalmatians say some words differently than Bosnians and Serbs, and in cyrillic all the letters are not written in the same way, just as we in Latin and German script differ.³⁵

This interpretation of South Slavic humanist ideas as exclusively Illyrian, (*i.e.*, Croatian) like other data about the cultural status of the South Slavs in that area, their kin relationship, and ties to the other Slavs as well as the phenomenon of publishing Croatian Protestant books in Slovene, Illyrian, German, Latin, and Italian, which requires three alphabets: glagolitic, cyrillic, and latin — all of this unequivocally came from the pens of Illyrian Protestant humanists.

Among the Slovene Protestant humanists three Illyrian ideas were most strongly expressed by Sebastjan Krelj, the pupil of Flacius Illyricus.³⁶ Clear traces of Flacius' influence can be found in the *Otrozhia biblia*, in which the *Catechism* is published in five languages (Slovene, Croatian, German, Latin, and Italian). Among other things, in the *Otrozhia biblia* is found *Alfabetum slavonicorum* with its *nomine literarum* (as, buki, vedi . . . etc.). The use of different languages in this Bible indicates a more thorough elaboration of omni-Slavic and South Slavic Illyrism, which would find its full expression in the works of the Counter-Reformation missionaries. Therefore, Mirković correctly concludes that the *Otrozhia biblia* can be attributed to Flacius, for he alone could have had such a broad outlook.³⁷ Most probably Krelj, when he was working on the *Otrozhia biblia*, simply followed the ideas of his teacher. Due to constant persecution and to his exile immediately after his departure from Jena, Flacius did not dare to publicly appear in print, with the result that his ideas formed the basis of this book. Therefore, his pupil Krelj appeared as its author.³⁸

After Krelj these humanistic ideas for the unification, first of all, of the South Slavs, and then all of the Slavs, were accepted by Bohorič and some aspects of them were analyzed in the preface to his Grammar, in 1584.³⁹ As a very close friend of Krelj, Bohorič was influenced by some of Krelj's ideas. Thus, Bohorič introduced at the beginning of his Grammar both the cyrillic and glagolitic alphabets, the texts of "Our Father" (*Oče naš*) in six or, when one wants, in eight idioms (*sex, si vis octo idiomatum*),⁴⁰ as well as some other ideas about the interrelatedness of the Slavs and their common Slavic ethnicity.⁴¹ Although most of these humanistic ideas did not figure prominently in his German preface to the Bible, Jurij Dalmatin inserted some of these ideas most likely under Bohorič's influence.⁴² These Slavic feelings and the awareness of existence of Slavic kinship in Bohorič's Grammar and Dalmatin's Bible have been noted many times. However, it is peculiar that the following fact has eluded the attention of scholars — the Slavophilism apparently inserted into some prefaces of Slovene Protestant writers contradicts the major themes of the original Protestant essays. The majority of their ideas are written in the Reformation spirit, clear and full reflections of Protestant ideology. Some of these ideas were discussed earlier in this paper.

At this point, it is impossible to resist quoting Murko once more. As the leading expert in the field, Murko long ago maintained that "It is curious that among the Slovene Protestants, who had deep ties with Southern Germany, there was a profound understanding of their linguistic membership in the community of Southern Slavs including the Bulgarians. Moreover, they extolled their common Slavic feelings."⁴³ Since Murko, this obvious contradiction between isolated and limited humanist ideas, inserted in some prefaces of Slovene publications on the one hand, and overwhelmingly Protestant ideology typical of the prefaces of Slovene Protestant works on the other, has never been questioned. Even more remarkable, no one has tried to explain these contradictory insertions in a satisfactory way. This statement is not meant to deny the existence of separate interpretations of both Renaissance-humanist and Reformation-humanist ideas in these prefaces. On the contrary, Slovene scholars have correctly described the expressions of homeland, the idea of the Slovene language, as well as historical consciousness present in the prefaces to Bohorič's Grammar. The intense Slovene ethnocentricity characteristic of all the Slovene Protestant writers is also properly stressed. An analysis of Slovene cultural nationalism, a rather narrow, local patriotism, would exceed the scope of this paper.

The further development of Protestantism among the Slovenes demonstrates most clearly that the ideas of the Illyrian humanists were never truly accepted in Slovenia. If they had been accepted in the sixteenth century, during the period of the Reformation, the Slovenes

would have shared a common language with the Croats. They would have accepted the current "Illyrian" idiom which attempted to unite all the peoples of the Balkans and the Turks as far as Constantinople. In this light it becomes clearer why Vergerio was trying to convince Trubar to accept this common Illyrian language which was being used throughout all of the Slavic South. He wanted Trubar to break with his own Slovene language which was used only along the border of the Balkans, in Carinthia, Carniola, and Styria. Not only Trubar, but also later generations of Slovenes did not understand Vergerio's plan to unite, by means of the Illyrian language, all the Slavic Balkans, and eventually all of the Slavic East (Križanić). Indeed, it was not a sense of realism on Trubar's part that led him to reject Vergerio's "fantastic" plan about the introduction of a Slavic, "artificial" idiom, which would have been understood by all the Slavs.⁴⁴

As our analysis has shown, in accepting the essential characteristics of Northern European Humanism directly from Luther's Germany, the Slovenes developed a different concept of language from the Croatian Illyrian. They strongly expressed local patriotism. Thus, it should not be misunderstood, if one concludes that the Slovenes were ill-prepared for a different developmental trend from the one they accepted. Already in the initial phase, there were divergences, unbridgeable differences between the ideas and trends of the Slovene Protestant Reformers and the Renaissance Humanist Illyrian Reformers. These differences could not be overcome even by the leaders of the Counter-Reformation which succeeded Protestantism in Slovenia. Nor could they be resolved in the nineteenth century, when these vital Illyrian ideas of South Slavic and omni-Slavic unity fully matured and were transformed into the so-called Illyrian Revival (Awakening), headed by the Zagreb Illyrians. Few Slovenes (Vraz is a notable exception) joined this movement. The reason for this, it seems to me, must be sought exclusively in the Protestant foundations of the modern Slovene nation.

University of Illinois, Chicago

REFERENCES

1. Matija Murko, *Die Bedeutung der Reformation und Gegenreformation für das geistige Leben der Südslawen* (Prague and Heidelberg: 1927); M. Kombol, *Poviest hrvatske književnosti do Narodnog Preporoda* (Zagreb: 1945); K. Georgijević, *Hrvatska književnost od 16. do 18. stoljeća u sjevernoj Hrvatskoj i Bosni* (Zagreb: 1969); Z. Vince, *Putovima hrvatskoga književnog jezika: Lingvističko-kulturnopovijesni prikaz filoloških škola i njihovih izvora* (Zagreb:

- 1978); A. Kadić, "The Croatian Renaissance" and "Križanić's Formative Years," in *From Croatian Renaissance to Yugoslav Socialism* (The Hague-Paris: 1969), 9-36; 41-73; and his "Križanić and His Predecessors—The Slavic Idea among the Croatian Baroque Writers," in *Jurij Križanić (1618-1683) Russophile and Ecumenic Visionary*, eds. Th. Eekman & A. Kadić (The Hague-Paris: 1976). Cf. also Slovene work on that subject: F. Kidrič, *Zgodovina slovenskega slovstva* (Ljubljana: 1929-1938), 20-103; M. Rupel, *Slovenski protestantski pisci* (Ljubljana: 1934); his, *Reformacija, Protivreformacija in Barok*, in *Zgodovina slovenskega slovstva*, I (Ljubljana: 1956); A. Slodnjak, *Geschichte der slowenischen Literatur* (Berlin: 1958), 49-66; J. Pogačnik, *Zgodovina slovenskega slovstva* I (Maribor: 1968), 95-168; S. Barbarič, "Stik Primoža Trubarja s mislijo Erazma Rotterdamskega," in *Zbornik za slavistiku* (Novi Sad: 1972), 87-98; his "A szlovén protestáns irodalom az európai humanizmus áramlatában, with the summary "L'empreinte de l'humanisme dans la littérature slovène protestante," in *Helikon*, 3-4 (1971), 344-52; his "Ideje humanizma v delih slovenskih protestantov," in *Slavistična revija*, 24 (1976), 409-420; his "Les aspects humanistes de la littérature protestante slovène," in *Actes du VIII^e Congrès de l'Association Internationale de Littérature*, 201-207; his "Die Beziehungen der slowenischen Protestanten zu Ungarn," in *Studia Slavica Hungarica*, 25 (1979), 37-43.
2. R. Brtáň, *Barokový Slavizmus, Porovnávací štúdiá z dejín slovanskej slovesnosti* (Lipt. sv. Mkoláš: 1939); F. Wollman, *Slovanství v jazykové literárním obrození u Slovanů* (Praha: 1958) (*Spisy filosofické fakulty v Brně*, vol. 52).
 3. O. Halecki, "The Renaissance Origin of Pan-Slavism," *The Polish Review*, 3 (1958); his *From Florence to Brest* (Rome: 1958) 253-67; J. Matl, "Die slawische Idee in der Praefatio der Arcticae Horulae des Adam Bohorič," in B. Berčić, ed., *Adam Bohorič, Arcticae Horulae, Die erste Grammatik der slowenischen Sprache, II. Teil: Untersuchungen* (Munich: 1971), 2-28; his, *Der Panlawismus als politische Idee im Südosteuropa im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, in *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft Südosteuropa* (Munich: 1961), 296-320; M. Živančević, "Slavenska ideja od humanizma do ilirizma," *Zbornik Zagrebačke slavističke škole*, 1 (1973), 137-46; O. Nedeljković, "New Perspectives on the Collaboration Between Maksimilijan Vrhovac and Jernej Kopitar," in R. L. Lencek and H. R. Cooper, eds., *Papers in Slavic Philology*, 2, (Ann Arbor: 1982), 123-149, esp. 123-128.
 4. J. Burckhardt, *Die Kultur der Renaissance in Italien* (Basel: 1860); W. J. Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense of Republican Liberty*,

- Renaissance Values in the Age of the Counter Reformation* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1968), 95-161.
5. Kidrič, *Zgodovina slovenskega slovstva*, op. cit., 22-27; Pogačnik, *Zgodovina slovenskega slovstva*, op. cit., 117, 147; F. Orazem, *Dogmatični nazori Primoža Trubarja in njegova odvisnost od početnikov reformacije* (Inavguralna disertacija) (Ljubljana: 1964); Rupel, *Slovenski protestantski pisci*, op. cit., I-XLV, esp. XI-XII.
 6. A. Jacobson Schutte, *Pier Paolo Vergerio - The Making of an Italian Reformer*, in *Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance*, 160 (1977), 94-95. Unluckily this monograph follows Vergerio's development up to 1549, when he left Italy and the Roman communion. His relationship with the South Slavic Protestants, both Slovenes and Croats, began after 1549.
 7. Mirković is of the opinion that this book was written by Flacius Illyricus. Cf. his work *Matija Vlačić Ilirik* (Djela JAZU, knj. 50) (Zagreb: 1960), 138-149. This, however, seems extremely doubtful, since Flacius did not directly collaborate in the publication of all these Protestant books. See J. Šidak, "The Reformation" in the *Enciklopedija Jugoslavije* (Zagreb: 1960), 57.
 8. F. Bučar, *Povijest hrvatske protestantske književnosti za reformacije* (Zagreb: 1910), 39, where the author says: "On the 1st of April, 1555, he (Vergerio) wrote to *Voivoda* Krištof about this very matter, and informed him that some Roman cardinal wanted to give them monetary support. . . . Following Vergerio's advice, the *Voivoda* supported the establishment of a Slovene-Croatian publishing house with an annual subsidy of 300 florints."
 9. Kidrič, *Zgodovina slovenskega slovstva*, op. cit., 34.
 10. Schutte, *Pier Paolo Vergerio*, op. cit., 38-39.
 11. It has to be underscored that in the Reformation period one still deals with one single Illyrian language. Although Flacius Illyricus fought against an exclusive use of Latin in the liturgy, as a leading theoretician of the Reformation in Germany, he never spoke of or mentioned in any way a special kind of *lingua illyrica vel slavonica*. For Flacius the Illyrian language was one of the four major languages of that time, in addition to Greek, Latin, and German. (Mirković, op. cit., 443). All the Illyrian Protestants perceived the Illyrian language as one single language. Even during the entire period of the Council in Trent (1545-1563) the *lingua illyrica* was not officially different from the *illyrica vulgaris*. The idea of introducing some sort of "artificial" common ecclesiastical language among the Southern Slavs and later among all the Slavs could have been created by Vergerio or by any other Renaissance humanist; but in practice it was elaborated only by the Counter-Reformers, i.e., by the missionaries of the Catholic Revival. They began the process of russification of glagolitic texts in the seventeenth century.

12. See note 1.
13. Bučar, *Povijest hrvatske protestantske književnosti*, op. cit., 39; Rupel, op., cit., *Slovenski protestantski pisci*, 20-25.
14. Bučar, op. cit., 40-43; Kidrič, op. cit., 34-36.
15. V. Novak, *Antologija jugoslovenske misli i narodnog jedinstva* (Belgrade: 1930), XVIII.
16. Mirković, op. cit., 460.
17. Barbarič, "Stik Primoža Trubarja s mislijo Erazma Rotterdamskega," op. cit., 92-94; his, "Ideje humanizma v delih slovenskih protestantov," op. cit., 413-414; his, "Les aspects humanistes de la littérature protestante slovène," op. cit., 203.
18. Barbarič, "Ideje humanizma v delih slovenskih protestantov," op. cit., 414.
19. Rupel, *Slovenski protestantski pisci*, op. cit., 13.
20. J. Toporišič, *Slovenski knjižni jezik 2* (Maribor: 1966), 19-23; Pogačnik, *Zgodovina slovenskega slovstva*, op. cit., 153.
21. J. Pogačnik, "Bohoričevi nazori o jeziku in slogu," *Zbornik za slavistiku*, 1 (1970), 74.
22. M. Murko, "Nekoliko reči o jeziku srpsko-hrvatskih protestantskih knjiga," *Daničićev zbornik* (Belgrade-Ljubljana: 1925), 75.
23. Ibid., 90.
24. "Sada vnovе is Latinskoga, Nimškoga i Krainskoga jazika va Harvacki verno stlmačeni." Quoted from Z. Bartolič, "Književni rad Stipana Konzula i krug hrvatskih protestantskih pisaca," *Forum* 12 (1977), 1101-1121, esp. 10.
25. Ibid.
26. M. Rešetar was the first scholar who pointed out that Croatian Protestant translations were dependent on the earlier glagolitic Missal tradition (cf. *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, 13 (), 184).
27. T. Elze, *Primus Trubers Briefe* (Tubingen, 1897), 255. (Quoted from Murko, "Nekoliko reči o jeziku srpsko-hrvatskih, op. cit., 90).
28. F. Fancev, "Jezik hrvatskih protestantskih pisaca 16. vijeka," in *Rad JAZU* 214 (1916), 1-191, esp. 37.
29. Ibid., *Rad JAZU* 212 (1916), 148-159.
30. Bučar, *Povijest hrvatske protestantske književnosti za reformacije*, op. cit.; and his *Povijest reformacije i protureformacije u Medjumurju i susjednoj Hratskoj* (Varaždin, 1913).
31. Nedeljković, op. cit., 139.
32. Quoted from Georgijević, op. cit., 26.
33. Ibid.
34. Quoted from Murko, "Nekoliko reči o jeziku srpsko-hrvatskih . . .," op. cit., 73.
35. Rupel, *Slovenski protestantski pisci*, op. cit., 66.
36. Josip Bratulić, "Die Glagolitische und die kyrillische Schrift in der Bohorič'schen Grammatik," in *Adam Bohorič: Arcticae horulae, II.*

- Teil: Untersuchungen*, op. cit., 109-121; Pogačnik, *Zgodovina slovenskega slovstva*, op. cit., 155-156; Kidrič, op. cit., 50-51.
37. Mirković, op. cit., 452-455; see also Kidrič's comments in *Časopis za slovenski jezik, književnost in zgodovinu* 4 (1924), 121-125.
38. Z. Bartolić, "Hrvatsko-slovenske veze u doba protestantizma," *Zbornik Štefana Küzmiča* (Murska Sobota: 1974), 87-122, esp. 102-104.
39. Bratulić, op. cit., 110, footnote 5.
40. Ibid., 111-112.
41. Murko, *Die Bedeutung der Reformation und Gegenreformation*, op. cit., 8-9; Pogačnik, *Zgodovina slovenskega slovstva*, op. cit., 158-160; Matl, "Die slawische Idee in der Praefatio der Arcticae Horulae des Adam Bohorič," op. cit., 22-28.
42. Kidrič, op. cit., 54-56; Pogačnik, *Zgodovina*, op. cit., 157-159.
43. Murko, *Die Bedeutung der Reformation und Gegenreformation*, op. cit., 6.
44. Kidrič, op. cit., 33-34; A. Slodnjak, "Nov pogled na vznik slovenske in hrvatske reformacijske književnosti 16. stoletja," *Slavistična revija*, 5-7 (1954), 109-120, esp. 114-115; J. Pogačnik, *Zgodovina*, op. cit., 121; R. L. Lencek, *The Structure and History of the Slovene Language* (Columbus, OH: Slavica, 1982), 236: "Trubar was too much of a realist and practical-minded missionary to accept this offer" See also I. Prijatelj, *Borda za individualnost slovenskega književnega jezika v letih 1848-1857* (Ljubljana: Slavistično društvo, 1937), 30-60.