THE TWO DIVERGENT IDEOLOGICAL CONCEPTS UNDERLYING THE LANGUAGE CONCEPTS OF CROATIAN AND SLOVENE PROTESTANT WRITERS

OlgaNedeljković

INTRODUCTION

Culture and its most important constituent, language, are shaped by ideology, the intricate and far-reaching network of relations that unite a groups's social life and its ideals, values and spiritual beliefs. Our concern here is the manner in which ideologies exerted a creative and transforming influence on Protestant writings in Croatian and Slovenia. Throughout the Middle Ages Croatia and Slovene had both lain under the unifying aegis of the Holy Roman Empire, but the ideologies of late medieval Roman Christianity on the one hand and Reformation Europe on the other directed the languages of Croatian and Slovene Protestants into divergent paths. The Croatian Protestant writers, most notably Flacius Illyricus, followed the Roman humanistic ideal of a single uniform and unifying language in developing the Croatian literary language, as that ideal had been realized by Christian Latin, and as it was applied to the native language by Dante and other Italian Humanist writers. The Slovene Protestants such as Primož Trubar, Adam Bohorič and Jurij Dalmatin followed the North European humanists in encouraging a standardized pluralism based on the primacy of the spoken word.

The idea of a Roman Empire embracing the whole Mediterranean world was transformed (*translatio imperii*) into a Holy Roman Empire during the entire period of the Middle Ages. Even later, the idea of *imperium romanum* did not vanish. Through the Church the Empire became Christendom, unifying all human powers. The leaders of the Church carried teaching to the whole world:

> "The universality of Christianity is inherent in its very nature as an exclusive religion: the unity of God and the brotherhood of men must allow no social or political barriers to block the way. All the local Gods must give place, all the pretensions of castes or nations must vanish . . . The idea of a single empire embracing all Christendom was an attempt to associate the universality of the Church with the like universality claimed by the political power."[1]

Thus, the Roman universalistic aspirations were transformed into a new social form of an ethical and mystical character, with a re-ordering of values. Christianity was assimilating Roman culture with its distinctly classical and pagan characteristics and its pronounced tendency to humanize social institutions and all spheres of life, making a new Roman-Christian synthesis. The major universalistic principles of Roman Christian doctrines were embodied into the universal Roman Catholic Church, the common Latin language, and the idea of the Holy Roman Empire. Roman Christianity kept expanding its specific forms of Humanism to the world in general and to humanity as a whole.

The Roman Church looked back to the civilized past and preserved the tradition of Latin culture and of the Roman order. Thus, when the Roman Church leaders had decided to extend their faith to the barbarian tribes, their inherited Latin became a 'missionary' language, and then a universal language. Unequivocally the most

important task of the pioneers, missionaries, clergy and monks was to create a common vehicle that was more suitable to the practical use of the various barbarian peoples than was complicated Classical Latin. Thus, the Roman Church deliberately debased the language in an effort to make literature an instrument of edification for the people. Classical Latin became a learned language, written only for churchmen. Thus so-called Vulgar Latin came into being.

Christian Latin played a decisive role in the development of the Romance languages and indeed in the development of all the languages of Catholic Europe, by offering them its dynamic, synthetic model of development, inspired with a creative principle which was always able to produce new syntheses. Christian Latin harmoniously absorbed the old and the new, the native and the medieval, the classical and the barbarian. Change was the essence of any given linguistic development: it always adjusted in a creative manner, either to the existing level of development or to the newly arisen one, without causing major perturbations, and without endangering the basic communicative function of language. In Catholic Europe, this linguistic development went in two directions: horizontally, it assimilated elements from all dialects and sub-dialects; vertically, it adapted the assimilated elements to the variability of the well-developed categories of Latin. This is Dante's well-known vision of linguistic development in Italy, which has a great variety of dialects. In the cultivation of a common literary language, Dante urged the poets of various regions, especially those of Bologna, to be open to deliberate enrichment: both horizontally, "adopting elements from either side", by "combining what I have called opposites," i.e., the characteristic features of neighboring dialects; and vertically, drawing on the highly-developed grammatical system of Latin. Let there be no restrictions, Dante said, on borrowing words and usages and techniques of verse from any source, ancient or contemporary, Italian or foreign; let there be full encouragement of the imitation of excellence wherever excellence was to be found; but, in the end, let the arresting achievement of literary genius in the finished work of art be decisive.[2]

This process was one continuous creative act, extending through many centuries, constantly creating new languages and new literatures which differed qualitatively, primarily in their popular Christian inspiration, from Classical Latin. The popular languages of Christianity in the West, as well as other cultural media, needed to be cultivated, refined, and freed from their purely local idiosyncrasies; but they had nevertheless to retain the natural character of their native tongue. Again, Christian Latin, the so-called "latino romano," is best described in Dante's *De Vulgari Eloquentia* as a synthesis of both a "vulgaris locutio" and a "gramatica" (a language system with established grammatical norms.) This is Dante's well-known "vulgare illustre" which tended to achieve fixed literary norms by means of grammatical codification. Thus it would become an elaborated means of poetical expression and would be even more noble than the two other idioms taken together (i.e., the "vulgaris locutio" and the "gramatica"). Dante further explained that this latter feature, viz., the standardized language's noble character, would appear because at the same time, while refined and standardized, it would retain its natural characteristcs as a mother tongue (Book I, Chapter 12). Dante made a plea for the cultivation and universalization of a common Italian literary language which would serve the whole peninsula, unifying Italy in the way that centralized royal courts did for the people (I, 18-19).

In this way, already in the fourteenth century Dante instituted the major guidelines for the development and codification of the neo-Latin languages, of their supra-dialectal literary forms. The traditional Latin of the Church, Christian Latin, re-

mained available for transregional and international use. Dante had no objection to its continued use in that capacity. Therefore, all the standard-language codifications which closely imitated Latin in the formative process of their development assumed the same unitary and unifying, universalistic character of Roman-Christian Humanism, which actually served as the ideological pattern underlying their linguistic formation. Emulating Latin, the new literary languages strove to reach the same linguistic status and high level of Latin expression and literary sophistication. Among the Slavic languages, Croatian followed the same evolutive course, assimilating the same Roman-Christian ideological pattern as the basis for its literary formation. It adapted this ideological model to its specific political circumstances and cultural needs, first of all in Dalmatia and the Croatian Littoral and gradually extending it to other Croatian provinces, to the whole of the Balkan peninsula, and eventually even further to Western and Eastern Slavs.

CROATIAN: THE IDEAL OF A UNIVERSAL LANGUAGE

From its first beginnings on the Adriatic Coast, the Roman-Slavic symbiosis, which very early found its identity in the name "Croatian" in the Baška inscription, possessed two linguistic expressions (Christian Latin and Old Church Slavic in its Croatian recension), and utilized three alphabets (Latin, Glagolitic and Cyrillic). Though Croatian Church Slavic played an important role in the formation of Croatian Glagolitic literature, Christian Latin undoubtedly had an incomparably greater, more universal character which it transmitted further to the earliest Croatian written forms which emerged from the beginning of the thirteenth century. Medieval Croatian preserved Old Church Slavic elements in various degrees depending on the content of the various Glagolitic texts. It was however patterned after Christian Latin, the basic model and direct source not only for the creation of Croatian literature in the folk language, but also for the establishment of the entirety of *latinitas* which became the dominant factor in literature and culture in Dalmatia and the Croatian Littoral throughout the whole period from the late Middle Ages and Renaissance through the Croatian National Awakening in the nineteenth century.[3]

Thanks to its unrivaled model, "latino romano", literary Croatian became an 'ordinary person's language' from the very outset. Imitating both the form and spirit of Christian Latin, it attained simplicity, practicality, clarity, and sophistication, retaining at the same time its natural characteristics as a mother tongue. Even more important, it followed Christian Latin as a universalizing, 'missionary' vehicle. In spite of the political disunity in the Croatian provinces, the regional dialects (Čakavian, Kajkavian and Štokavian) were themselves developing organically towards a common, higher, supradialectal language. All levels of language diffusion and diversification were already far advanced in Medieval Croatian. Croatian unequivocally developed on the Latin-Italian model, as outlined by Dante: it enlarged its vertical dimension by opening itself up to Medieval Latin, upon which it drew heavily for syntax, grammar and vocabulary, enriching its means of expression with the words and phrases necessary for translating from Latin Christian literature. The Croatian literary form assumed both characteristics of Dante's *volgare*: it became an 'illustrious' medium, capable of 'spreading its light,' illuminating others. It became an elaborated vehicle for spiritual and artistic intercourse. In a relatively short time, by emulating Christian Latin and its creative genius, the Croatian literary language (the Čakavian dialect) rose to the status of a common language, capable of making new syntheses and serving new dialectal territories.[4]

Following Dante's envisioned cultivation of a common Italian literary language, Croatian was open not only vertically but also horizontally, assimilating and adopting from dialects on all sides, making elements from each available to be used by all. Specialists in Old Croatian literature have stressed the widespread phenomenon of interdialectal interference, first of all the mixing of Čakavian forms with Old Church Slavic literary elements, and later also the fusing of Čakavian, Kajkavian and common Church Slavic elements in Glagolitic liturgical and also non-liturgical, semi-secular texts.[5] The synthetic character of the Croatian literary language, which was designed to function as a unifying medium, is very clearly demonstrated by the varying degrees and varying frequency of this interdialectal interference and the dialects' combination with Church Slavic elements; these latter, though limited in usage and scope, were yet retained in Glagolitic literature by literary tradition and were often employed in stylistic functions. Likewise, the presence of interdialectal interference in Glagolitic texts is a remarkable testimony of the application of the unitary Christian Latin creative principle capable of producing ever-new linguistic and literary syntheses.

Interdialectal interference has become the constant principle of the Croatian literary language, a principle easily traceable from Croatians' earliest literary expressions straight down through the centuries to our own times.[6] Probably the most intriguing interference, one which resulted in diverse controversies and for a long time puzzled investigators, concerns the numerous Čakavian elements in the literary works of Dubrovnik writers. All attempts to localize or explain these Čakavian elements by an alleged Čakavian substratum in Dubrovnik, or by some Čakavian dialects that may have penetrated to Dubrovnik, have been futile, and remain unproven, except in the sphere of the literary language.[7] Čakavian elements in Dubrovnik literature were adopted directly from preceding Čakavian matrices and were legitimate components of the literary language in that city in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Developing in the same climate and the same humanistic Renaissance cosmopolitanism, Dubrovnik literature (as also Dalmatian literary expression which, in fact, fused with it) was integrally connected with Latin and Italian models and prototypes which constantly inspired it in both form and content, and served as an inexhaustible source for it.

Therefore the existence of Čakavian elements in the works of Dubrovnik writers and their organic interrelationship with Čakavian literary circles is completely understandable. It is clear that Čakavian elements represented a variable part of the norm of the literary language in Renaissance Dubrovnik. Its writers maintained however the prerogatives of the literary language to such an extent that even towards the end of the eighteenth century Štokavian Dubrovnik more or less served all poetic creation with its koine, in which Čakavian dialectal elements were present to a significant degree.[8]

Bearing in mind earlier analogous discussions that had flourished in Italy, Dalmatians of the sixteenth century began to search for a single dialect of the Croatian literary language which would, like Tuscan, be distinguished from the other dialects by its beauty, its richness, and its comprehensibility. It is hardly necessary to prove that the Dubrovnik literary language very quickly became the Croatian Tuscan, to a great extent surpassing the other dialects of Dalmatia.

Owing to its political independence, the Republic of Dubrovnik experienced its 'Golden Age' and became the center of Dalmatian literature in the period of Humanism and the Renaissance. The literary circles of Hvar, Split, and Zadar considered Dubrovnik a model and recognized its leadership. As an integral part of the same cultural community as Italy, the literature of Dubrovnik accepted and elaborated the basic principles of Renaissance literary theory, thereby attaining a level of achievement unsurpassed in the history of Slavic literature.

Literary and linguistic historians until the most recent times have overlooked this fact and treated Croatian Renaissance literature as regional, that is, dialectal, without noticing the clearly monodialectal tendency in the development of literary expression in Dubrovnik. Actually, the literary language of Dubrovnik had already been functioning for some two centuries as the basic literary idiom, gradually assuming that function for regional literatures beyond the boundaries of Dalmatia and Dubrovnik and, in the course of time, absorbing some characteristics of other dialects. The entire evolutive trend of the Croatian vernacular, i.e., the literary idiom of Dubrovnik, was consonant with Dante's linguistic model of the development of a common Italian *volgare*. Thus the literary language of Dubrovnik strictly followed Dante's projection for the further evolution of Tuscan and its centuries-long role of unifying politically-fragmented regions continuously through Italian unification and independence in the 1860s and 1870s. In the same way, the Dubrovnik literary idiom, as a living cultural force across many centuries, played an identical role in the process of unifying Croatian dialects into one single literary language. As a result, on the eve of the Croatian National Awakening of ca. 1835-1848, a definite Dubrovnik-Štokavian-Ijekavian language orientation had finally prevailed among the aspirations of Zagreb Illyrians who strove for the linguistic and political unification of all the South Slavs.

As our introductory remarks have shown, there were no essential differences in the ideological concepts of Medieval Croatian (the Čakavian literary language) and Humanistic Croatian (the language of Dubrovnik). Both were inspired by the same humanistic universalistic motives, both were intended from their very outset to function supradialectally as uniform and unifying media. Both were formed within the same framework of the continuity of Roman-Christian civilization. The only innovation came to be the name of the Humanistic Croatian language: in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries it became 'Illyrian'; its speakers were called 'Illyrians'; and the country they inhabited was assigned the ancient name of 'Illyricum'. These names are part of the humanistic legacy of Humanistic-Renaissance Italian historiography,[9] a legacy which was embraced both by humanist reformers and Protestants, and also later by the Catholic Counter-Reformers. Since we here deal only with the ideological concept underlying the language codification of Croatian Protestant writers, it is appropriate to limit ourselves to the treatment of that problem in the writings of Illyrian Protestants.

The most striking personality among the South Slavic Protestant Humanists was Matija Vlačić (Matthias Flacius Illyricus, 1520-1575) from Istria. He was an historian, a theologian, and a scholar of Greek and Hebrew, who throughout his life was an active participant in the religio-political movement of Luther's Reformation. In the words of leading Catholic theologians (I. Döllinger, A. Herte) he became "The greatest Lutheran theologian of his time." Wilhelm Dilthey assigned him the role of "the founder of Protestant hermeneutics and its greatest theoretician." Like other Illyrian humanist-reformers in Dubrovnik and the Croatian Littoral, Flacius belonged to the same intellectual community as the Italian reformers, with whom he shared a common ideological model. His adherence to a universal humanist Latin community can be seen from the fact that he published some 300 books and articles, which made him the most prolific Croatian Latinist.

As a leading theoretician of the Reformation in Germany, however, Flacius not only fought against the exclusive use of Latin in the liturgy, but also elaborated extensively on the Protestant language question in his well-known work *De voce et re fidei* (printed in 1549 with the title *De vocabulo fidei* and republished in 1554 and 1561). In it

linguistic problems and language as such are completely subject to religion and, as an auxiliary, they fully support his theological ideas. The attempt to ground Protestant Christian thought on the basis of Hebrew and in particular on Greek philosophic-linguistic categories, and to make a whole system of Protestant hermeneutics and its *litterae sacrae*, found its best-elaborated and most sophisticated expression in his enormous opus *Clavis scripturae sacrae, seu de sermone sacrarum litterarum*. It consists of 1749 large folia, and was published twice in Basel (1567) and Jena (1674). Recently scholars have brought to our attention some theoretical aspects of his thoughts on linguistics,[10] the thorough analysis of which would require at least a whole volume. Even a cursory representation of the theoretical deliberations expounded in these two works by Flacius lies outside the scope of this paper; here we are primarily interested in his views on the Illyrian (Croatian) language. This he knew but practically never used in his theoretical writings, almost all of which were written in the Latin of the Humanists (a few were published in German).

Following in the footsteps of the father of Italian humanist historiography, Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, and later Flavius Biondo and others, Flacius referred to his own Slavic homeland as 'Illyria', where 'Illyrians' lived who spoke 'Illyrian' (hence his calling himself 'Illyricus'). The central aim of Italian historiography was to reconcile the problems of the classical world, of the Middle Ages, and of contemporary events. Historiographers based their ideas on linguistic, ethnic and toponymic data as well as on peoples' customs. In his *Centuriae* Flacius stated: "the Croatians, Dalmatians and inhabitants of Istria settled in these lands since about A.D. 600, and at that time they spoke the same, common language." He considered this as proof that they had the same origin. If however the Illyrians were identical with the Croatians, then they were identical with the Serbs. In *Centuria* XI, Flacius maintained that the Croatians and Serbs were alike: he referred to "Croatians who are also called Serbs." In the eleventh century these Croatians who were called Serbs invaded Bulgarian lands that were some distance from actual Croatian territory.[11] Flacius' Illyria was quite extensive and generally did not have firm boundaries. On the Adriatic coast it extended from Istria to the area south of Dubrovnik; in the North-East, according to indirect indications in his works, it would have included Lower Pannonia; towards the East there were no fixed boundaries, but one may conclude, in Mirković's words, that they included the South Slavic lands where Methodius worked.[12]

During his work in the German Protestant centers, Flacius also adapted the concept of the Illyrian language to the specific circumstances of his time. This concept, as already noted, had been shaped according to the Italian "questione della lingua." Indeed, he only partly modified the humanistic Renaissance concept of trilingualism (Latin/Italian/Illyrian), which Croatian followed in its linguistic development. The literary language of the Croatians received its final shape and elaboration during the Renaissance era, when instead of Christian Latin it paralleled and imitated Classical Latin and Italian models. Since the territories where Glagolitic was used, which included Istria and the Kvarneri islands, were ruled by Venice, they were most heavily influenced by the Protestant Reformation. And, since the priests in these areas suffered from shortages of books printed in Glagolitic, Flacius adapted the basic concept of the Italian "questione della lingua" to the situation in these territories. Thus he stated that, based on its historical and cultural importance, "the Illyrian language was one of the four main languages of that time, in addition to Greek, Latin and German."[13] Illyrian had been equal to Greek and Latin in the past, he wrote. Like these languages, it had its own (Glagolitic) alphabet, in which religious books were first

written, then printed. He added that, formerly, no other language had had as many religious books as Illyrian. With the advent of typography the language was revived. As a result it became more widely used not only in the churches but also in secular correspondence, in business, in chancellery books and in feudal accounts. Indeed, during the Reformation this language and its alphabet again came to the fore: when Flacius wrote the above, it was second to German in the number of its printed religious books.[14]

For Flacius, as for all Renaissance humanists, both Italian and Illyrian, the 'Illyri' designated the South Slavic peoples as a whole, and 'Illyrian' designated their common folk language. Flacius' ideological concept of the Illyrian language was widely accepted among Illyrian Protestant Reformers. In their practice they tried to introduce a single common everyday language for the Croatians and the Slovenes, especially for printing their Protestant books. Within their program of printing and spreading Protestant publications, the Illyrian Protestants wanted to encompass the broadest territory in the interior of the Balkans, including all the South Slavs, both those free of the Turkish yoke and those under it. They emphasized that their aim was to make their language maximally intelligible and acceptable for all the Christians in Dalmatia, Croatia, Serbia, Bosnia, and the Srem region; in fact, to embrace the whole of the Balkans. Their works reveal that, during the Renaissance and the Reformation, the concept of the common Illyrian language grew into a very strong South Slavic Illyrian movement, which was aimed at achieving cultural unity among the South Slavs.[15]

SLOVENE: VERNACULAR PLURALISM

The ideological pattern of the Slovene language was adopted from the best tradition of Protestant and German humanist philology. The Protestant humanists stressed the necessity of studying Greek and Hebrew sources for exegetical studies and for homiletical and expository communication. "Sine Graecis literis caeca est omnis eruditio," said Erasmus, who strove, together with Melanchthon and many other contemporary humanists, broadly to spread a first-hand knowledge of Greek through education, the professions, and the Church. As Melanchthon pointed out in his essay *On Improving the Studies of Youth*:

> "Greek letters should be added to Latin, so that reading philosophers, historians, theologians, orators, poets, wherever you turn, you may gain the very substance, not the shadow of things . . . Here, above all, the erudition of the Greeks, which comprises the universal knowledge of nature, is necessary so that you can discuss behavior fitly and fully. . . ."[16]

Melanchthon was a pivotal figure in Luther's educational system and in Protestant culture in Germany; his thinking strongly affected the Protestant humanists and reformers surrounding him. "All the students in Wittenberg are clamoring to learn Greek," wrote Luther. For the German humanist-reformers, all sound education involved a thorough knowledge of Greek learning and literature, the cultivation of the whole humanist curriculum including, above all, rhetoric. "Ex institutio omnis fere rerum scientia e Graecis oratoribus petenda est," wrote Erasmus. Luther enthusiastically studied rhetoric and poetry and was trained in other humanistic disciplines. Both his treatises *Von der Freiheit eines Christenmenschen* and *Predigt, dass man Kinder zur Schulen halten solle*, as well as his other works, reveal his mastery of

rhetorical principles, his knowledge of classics and his intensive involvement in the entire humanist education of the time. There was therefore a marked tendency among Luther's contemporaries to compare him to Cicero.[17]

For northern humanists, as for Italian ones, antiquity was not a subject of liberal study for its own sake, but was a reforming force of the first rank for improving the existing social order and achieving better conditions of human life, chief among which was the reform of the Christian faith. As a major cultural force northern humanists not only conditioned and supported but brought about the Reformation and determined the destiny of Luther's Reform. And vice versa: the influence of Luther, whose personality dominated Wittenberg's scholarship, brought about the definitive shift in orientation from Roman ideological models towards primary Greek and Hebrew sources. The return to original Christian sources in Greek and Hebrew via study of the Bible and the writings of the Church Fathers was of utmost importance for the general development of northern humanist scholarship. Humanism was inherent in the Reformation movement from its very outset to the final triumph of Wittenberg's theology. It is difficult, if not impossible, to assume that Luther's work could ever have been achieved without Reuchlin's Hebrew Grammar, or Erasmus' Greek New Testament. All this enabled Luther to say: "So lieb nu alls uns das Euangelion ist, so hart last uns uber den sprachen hallten."[18] Humanists in the North were the driving force of Luther's Reformation.[19]

In Slovenia as in Northern Europe Protestantism grew from Humanism. Primož Trubar, the founder of Slovene literature, owed his original ideological inspiration to Erasmus, whose overpowering influence upon the real course of the Reformation was carried all over Europe by the biblical humanists. Nevertheless, between 1555 and 1562 Trubar's most frequently-cited authority was Luther. Štefan Barbarič stresses the fact that in Trubar's prefaces to his editions of the New Testament the quotations from Erasmus and from Luther make them appear identical, for "this is the ideological sphere of inspiration where it is rather difficult to delineate Erasmus' ideas from Luther's, or from anybody else's; all the relevant ideas are fused into one."[20] Thus, in his Preface to *Artikuli oli deili, te prave stare vere kerszhanske* of 1562 Trubar speaks extensively about Luther's merits for the new reformist Christian Church, crediting him in particular for his translation of the Bible and other Church writings:

> "Through his writings he influenced many people so that they began to understand the Holy Writ and these ancient books. And they found in them what Luther told them and wrote to them. In this way, through Luther's writings, God opened inner spiritual eyes to many people . . . so that due to this Holy Writ they perceived the true, ancient Christian faith, understood it wholeheartedly, and embraced it joyously..."[21]

Luther's translation of the Bible and his other Church writings became the starting-point and guiding principles for the whole literary output of Slovene Protestants. The language of Luther's Bible became their standard. The fact that all these Protestant works were translations and not original works in no way detracts from their significance. Slovene Protestant writings equalled in importance the whole corpus of Dalmatia-Dubrovnik Renaissance literature which paved the way for modern Croatian. Trubar's appearance is thus an event of unparalleled consequence in the history of Slovene language and literature. His translation of the Bible occupies such an important place in the history of the Slovene literary language that it can be equalled

only by that of Dante's *Divine Comedy* in the development of Italian. It is true that Trubar had the least systematic humanist education among Slovene Protestants. Nevertheless, he was a humanist *par excellence* of the Northern European type;[22] and he resolutely laid the foundation for the New Protestant Learning in an uncultivated language, his own dialect of Raščica (spoken south of Ljubljana): for this was, like all other Slovene idioms hitherto, a non-codified means of literary expression.

In the course of time systematic humanist education was instituted among Slovene Protestants. Thus the new generation of Slovene Protestant humanists yielded better literary results than were Trubar's first works; according to Jože Rajhman, "Jurij Dalmatin's Bible is a highpoint of Slovene literature. [It] is truly a translation of Luther's original text, as Luther himself supervised it in 1545-46."[23] On the basis of Dalmatin's Bible, Bohorič's Grammar was created as a true monument of Protestant humanist philology, which in turn enabled the appearance of Megiser's Glossary, by introducing a relatively systematic means of collecting vocabulary.

At the very beginning of his *Praefatiuncula* to *Arcticae Horulae*, Bohorič proclaims that "the language is the index to the soul":

> "Plures novisse linguas et iucundum est, et utile, addo et pernecessarium esse, in confesso est. Nam quid magis liberale ingenium delectare potest, quam vel suum vel alterius, sive loquentis sive scribentis animum, *decenti sermone (qui index est animi)* et commodo orationis genere, vel explicare vel explicatum, quasi coram contueri?" [my emphasis, ON][24]

In these first lines, Bohorič expresses an idea important in both the Classical Greek and the Protestant traditions: the idea can be traced back to the Aristotelian doctrine that "speech sounds are symbols for states of the soul,"[25] yet this classical Greek notion also occupied a central place in Luther's considerations of language.

The revival of Greek studies, looking to Greek models and sources for the ideal of man and his learning and education, became one of the major constituents in the process of shaping Northen European New Learning. Thus, the New Learning in the North depended on the Reformation ideological stimuli. Protestant humanists, both reformers and educators, redirected themselves spiritually and theologically towards Greek Church sources, and educationally and ideologically towards Greek learning models. They fostered Greek studies for religious reasons. Due to Protestant ideologians and humanist-educators, Greek linguistic, literary and grammatical models played an important role in the codification of vernacular systems in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in Western Europe.[26] Protestant reformers favored and fostered the development of mother-tongue literature. This was in full conformity with their evangelical aim of preaching the Gospel in the voice of the people (*vox populi, vox Dei*). To understand this transmuted view of the language concept, which dominated Protestantism and religious reform, it is best to turn to Luther's own views on language and literature. The most important criterion for any literary writing is, in Luther's opinion, the spoken word, the spoken language: "Ita non scripturam dei, sed eloquia dei potissimum casta vocat. Non enim tantum nocet aut prodest scriptura quantum eloquium, *cum vox sit anima verbi*" (WA 5: 379) [my emphasis, ON]. The same idea arose often in Luther's writings: "Die buchstaben sind todte woerter, die mundliche rede sind lebendige woerter, die geben sich nicht so eigentlich und gut in die schrifft, als sie der Geist oder Seele des Menschen durch den Mund gibt" (WA 54: 74).[27] The doctrine that 'the voice is the soul of the word' was for Luther the essential point, the

real issue, from which all other considerations about language had to be derived. The voice, the sound, the spoken word became the basic principle of all his deliberations on and elaborations of the religious language that was his prime concern. In his *Second Lecture on the Psalms* (1518, printed 1519) Luther stressed his linguistic maxim as follows:

> "The second secret is that in the Church it is not enough to read and write books, but it is necessary to speak and to listen. Thus Christ has written nothing but said everything, the apostles have written little but said a great deal. Thus Psalm 19, although it might have said, 'Their book is gone out through all the earth,' prefers to say, 'Their line is gone out through all the earth', that is the living voice, and 'their words', not their writing, 'to the end of the world.' Likewise, 'there is no speech nor language, where their voice is not heard.' Mark, 'their voice' is not 'heard': it does not say 'their books' are not 'read.' For the service of the New Testament has not degenerated into writing on dead tablets of stone, but has been conferred upon the living voice . . ."[28]

The Gospel is in reality, Luther says, not what is to be found in printed books, but a spoken sermon and a living word, a voice resounding into the whole world and publicly shouted aloud so that all can hear it (WA 12: 259). A 'spoken', living speech as the voice of the soul became the basic principle and law not only of Luther's whole work, but an essential constituent of the Protestants' linguistic views of the evangelical word.

Thus, in the same spirit Adam Bohorič, in his Preface, maintains that history has proved that believers have prayed to God in their mother tongues, without any writing at all: "Deo gratia officia et laudes, linguarum (vocali verbo) subsidio, excitavit . . . Quod etiam unicum et perspicum genus dicendi, in Ecclesia Dei prioribus et multis seculis, et sine literis, sineque certa literaturae, usurpatum et ita conservatu fuisse consentaneum est." In the footsteps of Luther's linguistic reform, which aimed at improving the language of religion and making it suitable for the common, uneducated people, Bohorič intended to improve both the spoken Carniolan dialect, used in every-day speech (*usitatum idioma*), and its written, codified forms (*ad rectius et loquendum et scribendum Carniolanum sermonem, aliquid adiumenti attulisse*). His major goal was to facilitate the learning of Slovene (grammatical) elements so that in a short period of time the simple, ordinary people of Carniola, Styria and Carinthia could easily read and understand the Gospel in their own language: "Verum plebei etiam homines vestri, brevi tempore, in percipiendis Elementis Slavicis, in sumpto, in tantum sint profecturi, ut, expeditius, sua lingua, sacra Biblia et legere et intelligere facile queant. . ." Bohorič maintains that the most profitable use of a language is found when one is able to correctly understand either oral discourses about God, law, and nature, or writings about the same matters: "Quid vero fructuosius est, quam de Deo, de iure, deque natura rerum vel differentes vel conscripta, de illis rebus monumenta intelligere . . ."

In his Preface, Bohorič expounds ideas which clearly reflect Luther's influence. Thus, for example, in Bohorič's opinion, the priests' task is to master the ordinary people's language if they want to announce God's will: ". . . gnarum esse linguae eius gentis, que cum agendum cuiqam est, id, me tacente, quivis facile intelligit;" compare Luther's ultimate goal: "Und diss ist mein letzte und beste kunst: Tradere scripturam simplici sensu, denn literalis sensus, der thuts. . ." (WA TR 5, no. 5285). In the same way as Luther wanted above all to "preach and write German for the uneducated

laymen" (WA 6: 203) in a simple language that everyone could understand, Trubar aimed at creating suitable expressions for the common people and at writing in a most simple and popular way: "And we have not sought in this translation after fine, smooth, elevated, artistic, new or unknown words, but rather common, simple Carniolan words (*gmajnske, krajnske preproste besede*) which every simple Slovene . . . is able to understand."[29] Luther's principle of translating into the most simple language of ordinary people also became the maxim of Trubar's literary conception, which he stresses again:

> "In translating, I tried to use words and a style that every Slovene, whether a from Carniola, Lower Styria, Carinthia, the Karst, Istria, Dolenjsko or Bezjak regions, would be able to understand easily. Therefore I have simply stayed with the peasant Slovene speech spoken in Raščica, where I was born. I have not wished either to add uncommon or Croatian words" (here, Trubar refers only to Kajkavian Croatian) "or to invent new ones."[30]

A search for the simplest forms of popular language became a general tendency of all Slovene Protestant writers. All of them followed Luther's ideas about the religious language, which must be spoken in the simplest form with uneducated people. Also, they all had an unquestioning admiration for his doctrine.[31]

In contrast, therefore, to the general tendency described above to develop one single, national (Croatian) language, based on the unifying linguistic concept of 'Illyrian', and modeled on the universalistic idea of Roman Christian Humanism, there prevailed on Slovene territory a narrow, regional, dialectal and pluralistic concept of language development, that may be called 'vernacular-literary pluralism.' As already noted, the formation of the first Slovene literary codifications was based on the ideological motifs of the Reformation. Protestant reformers followed the *Greek dialects model* and adopted the classical Greek doctrine "cum vox sit anima verbi" which constituted Luther's fundamental linguistic concept. In this evangelical atmosphere Protestant reformers looked for the voice of the people in preaching, and for the direct spoken word of the Gospel. Their linguistic concept about the equality of languages, "Quando nimirum futura est confessio Dei in omnibus linguis" (as it was expressed in Bohorič's *Praefatiuncula*), was founded on St. Paul's dictum, "Omnis lingua confitebitur Deo." (Romans 1, 14). The cultivation of every individual utterance, actively 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.

Thus Trubar wrote his works in an idiom based on his native Lower Carniolan dialect of Raščica. Krelj used his own native dialect, that of Vipava in Western Slovenia. Dalmatin in 1584 translated the Bible into the Lower Carniolan dialect; and this codification was supported by Bohorič, who described this same dialect in his *Arcticae Horulae* of the same year. This tendency lasted throughout the whole period from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries. During this time, among other regional idioms, there appeared new vernacular codifications. Along the northern border, on the basis of the Pannonian dialects, there developed three literary traditions: 'prekmurski', 'prleško-slovenjegoriški', and Croatian Kajkavian. Thus Štefan Küzmič wrote his translation of the New Testament in his own 'srednje-prekmurski' dialect.[32] 'Vernacular-literary pluralism' became a widely-accepted concept in the formations of supradialectal literary forms, based on the dialects of practically all the Slovene administrative regions. The adoption of this pluralistic vernacular model of language

development was of crucial importance for the further evolution of Slovene grammatical thought, as well as for the creation and final consolidation of Slovene literature.

The *Register* to Dalmatin's Bible perhaps best manifests this tendency. As its title, which has been frequently cited and analyzed,[33] Dalmatin wrote: "REGISTER Nekatérih beséd, katére, Crajnski, Coroshki, Slovénski ali Bezjazhki, Hervazki, Dalmatinski, Istrianski, ali Crashki, se drugázhi govoré": his *Register* could *de facto* be interpreted as his wish to provide the different Slovene dialects their appropriate but diverse expressions and words for one and the same idea. Dalmatin did not intend to unite these dialects by using a unifying language, i.e., the same expressions, for all of them. The *Register*[34] contains 775 word-units with their parallel equivalents in various Slovene and Croatian dialects. As such, it represents the first Slovene and Slovene-Croatian dictionary. The same tendency is apparent in Dalmatin's 1578 translation of the Pentateuch, at the end of which one finds three pages of parallel columns listing biblical synonyms under the title: "REGISTER. Vkaterim so nekotere Krainske bessede, sa Haruatou inu drugih Slouenzou volo, vnih iesik stolmazhene, de bodo lete inu druge nashe Buque bule sastopili."

By introducing synonyms (or, more precisely, glosses) in their texts for unusual dialectal expressions and less familiar words, Slovene Protestant writers were strictly following the example of German Protestants. As Murko pointed out, they all aimed at making their publications accessible to as many diverse linguistic regions as possible.[35] Thus it is important to remember that they explicitly tried to develop and establish narrow, dialectal literary forms. A pluralistic attitude towards the development of written codes dominates the entire period from the adoption of Protestantism, which laid the foundation for the Slovene literary language, literature and culture as a whole, well into the nineteenth century. The Slovene pluralistic concept of standard-language development was in complete contrast to the uniform and unifying Illyrian linguistic program and its general development.

Based upon the evidence cited, it is apparent that two divergent, if not opposite, concepts underlie the linguistic development of the Croatian and the Slovene Protestant writers. These two concepts of language development had far-reaching consequences in the spheres of both nations' culture and history. The Croatian literary language developed within the framework of Roman Christian Humanism, where classical Roman traditions and new medieval Christian ones met in constant, fruitful intercourse, creating a new Roman Christian synthesis. This very synthesis laid the medieval foundations of Renaissance Humanism. Roman Christian universalistic principles and their uniform, unifying forms became the leading models in the development of Croatian literature and Croatian culture in its entirety. Croatian was established as a national language, whose function was to serve a secular literature and secular learning as a cultural medium of communication.

In contrast to the Croatian Protestants, who adopted their own language and adapted it to the new political and cultural circumstances of their own time, the Slovene Protestants aimed at developing a common religious language, exclusively designed to serve the preaching of God's Word, i.e., religious literature.[36] Without any previous literary tradition, they wholeheartedly adopted the Protestant idea of the native language as the medium of communication in the Church; this not only laid the foundation for Slovene literature and culture, but also persisted much longer on Slovene soil than in other Protestant nations which had participated in the Reformation.

University of Illinois at Chicago

REFERENCES

1. Luigi Sturzo, *Church and State* (Notre Dame: U of Notre Dame P, 1962) 22.

2. The references here and in subsequent citations of Dante's *On Eloquence in the Vernacular* are to Robert S. Haller, ed., *Literary Criticism of Dante Alighieri* (Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1973) 3-70, esp. 25-26. The Latin text of Pier Vincenzo Mengaldo, ed., *De Vulgari Eloquentia* (Padua: Editrice Antenore, 1968) has also been consulted.

3. The function of Latin as the language of administration, theology, science, and international communication was not challenged among Croatians during the entire Medieval, Renaissance or Post-Renaissance periods. It was the Croatian official language until 1847, which means that Latin was used longer here than in any other European country; cf. Zlatko Posavac, "Estetika humanizma hrvatskih latinističkih pjesnika 15. i 16. stoljeća," *Forum* 6 (1977): 972-984, esp. 972.

4. Specialists in Old Croatian literature have aptly observed, for example, "Interferiranje čakavštine i kajkavštine (uz prisutnost crkvenoslavenskih elemenata) što ga je u cijelom spisu (s različitim intenzitetom) proveo pisac *Petrisova zbornika* kao da nagoviještava—davno prije djela naših protestantskih pisaca—misao o potrebi stvaranja jednog takvog književnog jezika koji će na neki način prevladati dijalektalna ograničenja i tako postati razumljiv i prihvatljiv na širim prostorima. U tom smislu možda bi valjalo revidirati i nadopuniti Kombolovu tvrdnju da je u naših reformatora najvažnije upravo to što oni bili 'prvi hrvatski književnici' . . . koji su 'iz praktičnih razloga opće razumljivosti' željeli književni jezik stapanjem dijalekata 'izdići iznad lokalnih narječja' (sve isp. M. Kombol, *Povijest hrvatske književnosti do preporoda* (Zagreb, 1945) 196)," Eduard Hercigonja, *Nad iskonom hrvatske knjige. Rasprave o hrvatskoglagoljskom srednjovjekovlju* (Zagreb, 1983) 166-167. The same idea is supported by Julije Derossi, who correctly stresses the fact that the Medieval Čakavian literary language in glagolitic played the role of a *nationally functional and communicative* means of expression ("O normiranosti hrvatskoga književnog jezika u srednjem vijeku," *Filologija* 8 (1978) 81-87). As such, the Croatian language unequivocally must have established its own codified norms, primarily based on Christian Latin literary models. See also a slightly different interpretation of the norms of the Čakavian literary language in Peter Rehder, "The concept of the norm and the literary language among the Glagoljaši." Gerald Stone and Dean Worth, eds., *The Formation of the Slavonic Literary Languages* [= *UCLA Slavic Studies* 11], 1985: 183-191, esp. 191.

5. Eduard Hercigonja. "Kajkavski elementi u jeziku glagoljske književnosti 15. i 16. stoljeća. (Prilog istraživanja kontinuiteta hrvatskog književnog jezika)," *Croatica* 5 (1974): 169-245.

6. Dragica Malić, "Počeci hrvatskog književnog jezika." *VII Medjunarodni Kongres slavista - Warszawa*. (Zagreb: Hrvatsko filološko društvo, 1973) 83-87.

7. C.A. van den Berk, *Y a-t-il un subtrat čakavien dans le dialecte de Dubrovnik? Contribution à l'histoire de la langue serbo-croate* (The Hague: Mouton, 1959), with relevant literature.

8. It should however be stressed that already in the 16th cent. there appeared literary prose with predominantly Dubrovnik features. Yet from the 17th cent. the

literature of Dubrovnik became more expressly Štokavian-Ijekavian. Gradually, between the 15th and the 18th cents., the number of Čakavian-Ikavian features in the literary language of Dubrovnik decreased. This was an entirely regular process of linguistic development. There is thus no reason to see this as a removal of the Štokavian dialect from Čakavian; it was simply a consequence of the prestige of Dubrovnik Renaissance literature, which definitively discarded Čakavian elements and imposed the Štokavian-Ijekavian dialect as the most nearly perfect model of the literary language.

9. Olga Nedeljković, "Illyrian humanist ideas in the works of the South Slavic publishers in Urach," *Slovene Studies* 6 (1984): 127-142, esp. 130-131.

10. Vladimir Filipović, "Matija Vlačić kao začetnik suvremene hermeneutike i strukturalizma," *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 1.1-2 (1975): 21-36; Mate Križman, "O nekim izvorima Vlačićeve jezikoslovne naobrazbe," *Istra* 14.6-7 (1976): 16-34; Josip Matešić, "Jezikoslovni pogledi Matije Vlačića Ilirika," *Istra* 14.3-4 (1976): 56-62.

11. "Crabati qui et Servii dicuntur," *Centuriae Magdeburgenses, Centurio XI* (1559-1574): 719. Cf. Mijo Mirković, *Matija Vlačić Ilirik* [= Djela JAZU, knj. 50] (Zagreb: JAZU, 1960) 443 and fn. 44.

12. Mirković 443.

13. "Quattuor principalium nunc linguarum: Graecae, Latinae, Germanicae et Illyricae," (*Clavis* II: 690), is the version cited in Mirković 443.

14. Mirković 444.

15. Nedeljković 130-131.

16. Philipp Melanchthon, "De corrigendis adolescentiae studiis." Robert Stupperich, ed., *Melanchthons Werke in Auswahl. III. Humanistische Schriften* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1961) 29-42. The translated quotation is from Lewis W. Spitz, "Humanism and the Reformation." Robert M. Kingdon, ed., *Transition and Revolution. Problems and Issues of European Renaissance and Reformation History* (Minneapolis: Burgess, 1974) 169.

17. Birgit Stolt, *Studien zu Luthers Freiheitstraktat mit besonderer Rücksicht auf das Verhältnis der lateinischen und der deutschen Fassung zueinander und die Stilmittel der Rhetorik* [= *Stockholmer Germanistische Forschungen* 6], 1969; Birgit Stolt, "*Docere, delectare* und *movere* bei Luther. Analysiert anhand der 'Predigt, dass man Kinder zur Schulen halten solle'," *Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift* 44 (1970): 433-474; Ulrich Nembach, *Predigt des Evangeliums. Luther als Prediger, Pädagoge und Rhetor* (Neukirchen: Vluyn, 1972); Heinz Otto Burger, "Luther as an event in literary history," *Martin Luther—450th Anniversary of the Reformation* (Bad Godesberg: Inter Nationes, 1967) 119-134.

18. *D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe* (Weimar: Bohlau, 1883-1885) 15: 37. Hereafter cited as WA [= Weimarer Ausgabe]; TR = *Tischreden*, in the same series.

19. Spitz 153-167.

20. Štefan Barbarič, "Ideje humanizma v delih slovenskih protestantov," *Slavistična revija* 24 (1976): 409-420, esp. 414.

21. Mirko Rupel, *Slovenski protestantski pisci* [First ed., 1934], 2nd ed. (Ljubljana, 1966) 144.

22. During the past decade specialists in Old Slovene literature have become more inclined than the previous generation of scholars to identify Humanism with

Reformation in Slovenia, and try to define Trubar's due place among the 16th century Northern European humanists; cf. Barbarič; also Jože Javoršek, *Primož Trubar* (Ljubljana: Partizanska knjiga, 1977) 17-25, esp. 22; Primož Simoniti, "K vprašanju razmerja med humanizmom in reformacijo." *Protestantismus bei den Slowenen - Protestantizem pri Slovencih. Beiträge zur 3. Slawistentagung der Universitäten Klagenfurt und Ljubljana, Klagenfurt, 26-28. Mai 1983* [= Wiener Slawistischer Almanach, Sonderband 13], (1984) 89-103; and Henry R. Cooper, Jr., "Primož Trubar and Slovene literature of the sixteenth century," *Slovene Studies* 7 (1985): 35-50, esp. 40-41.

23. Jože Rajhman, "Jurij Dalmatin and his Bible in the light of literary history and theology," *Slovene Studies* 6 (1984): 113-125, esp. 113, 121.

24. Adam Bohorič, *Arcticae horulae* (Wittenberg, 1584). The references here are to Branko Berčič's edition (Munich: Trofenik, 1969).

25. L. Lersch, *Sprachphilosophie der Alten* (Bonn, 1838-1841) 2: 128-129. The same idea can be traced even further back, to the Sophists in the person of Gorgias, the first theorist of the art of writing prose, who wrote: "The word is mighty in its power; its body is small and indivisible but the deeds it performs are divine. It can *end fear*, remove pain, bring joy, *increase pity*. . . The power of *the word is to the soul as medicines are to the body*." Quoted from G.M.A. Grube, *The Greek and Roman Critics* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965) 18-19.

26. Olga Nedeljković, "Two humanistic traditions in the grammatical system of the Croatians and the Slovenes," forthcoming.

27. In his excellent survey of Luther's views on language and literature, and on Luther's forceful influence on the contemporary and later generations of German literati, Burger 123-124 stresses: "For [Luther], German is really a language—something spoken, not written, something heard, not read, resounding and reverberant . . . For Luther language is indeed sonorous. . ; his feeling for language, as revealed primarily in his translation of the Bible, brings him closer to the source and true essence of humanism than the German humanists themselves were."

28. Quoted from *Martin Luther—450th Anniversary* 36.

29. From the translation by Cooper in his "Primož Trubar" 42.

30. In Rupel's modern Slovene version (*Slovenski protestantski pisci*, 2nd. ed.: 80): "Pri tem prevajanju sem se potrudil glede besed in sloga, da bi ga utegnil z lahkoto razumeti vsak Slovenec, bodisi Kranjec, Spodnještajerec, Korošec, Kraševec, Istran, Dolenjec ali Bezjak. Zaradi tega sem ostal kar pri kmeckem slovenskem jeziku, kakor se govori na Raščici, kjer sem se rodil. Nenavadnih in hrvatskih besed nisem hotel primešavati niti si novih izmišljati."

31. For example, in his dedication to *Biblija, tu je, vse svetu pismu* (1584) Dalmatin writes (in Rupel's modern Slovene translation): "In v teh poslednjih časih, ko je temà antikristovstva bila najgostejša, nam je Bog prav kakor nekoč spet naklonil svojo milost in usmiljenje ter je po dragem, razsvetljenem božjem možu, pokojnem drju Martinu Luthru, razodel svojo besedo barbarskim narodom (kakor so jih ponosni in ošabni Grki in Latinci vedno in povsod zaničljivo imenovali) v nemškem, preprostemu človeku razumljivem jeziku, in sicer tako, da se ni razmahnil samo nemški jezik obenem s čisto božjo besedo, ampak tudi božja beseda z jezikom in zlasti z dobro ponemčeno biblijo: Luthrov prevod sam na sebi imajo vsi bogoslovci in juristi za komentar, ker tako točno in imenitno soglaša s hebrejskim in grškim tekstom, da ga morajo celó učeni Judje hoté ali nehoté potrditi in priznati. . ."

32. Cf. Rado L. Lencek, *The Structure and History of the Slovene Language* (Columbus, OH: Slavica, 1982) 268: "Thus, up to the mid-eighteenth century, a paradoxical situation existed. Instead of one, the Carniolan, at least four additional written traditions existed: a Carinthian . . . , a Lower Styrian . . . , an East Styrian . . . , and the beginning of a written Prekmurje tradition . . . ," and cf. 253-254. See also J. Rigler, *Začetki slovenskega knjižnega jezika* (Ljubljana, 1968) 232-240.

33. J. Rigler, "Register v Dalmatnovi Bibliji," *Jezik in slovstvo* 12 (1967): 104-106; M. Murko, "Nekoliko reči o jeziku srpsko-hrvatskih protestantskih knjig," *Daničićev zbornik*, (Beograd/Ljubljana, 1925) 84; Jože Toporišič, *Slovenski knjižni jezik II* (Maribor, 1966) 28-29; Jože Pogačnik, "Bohoričevi nazori o jeziku in slogu," *Zbornik za slavistiku* (Novi Sad: Matica srpska) 1 (1970): 74; Lencek 267.

34. Recent investigations have revealed that the actual author of this *Register* was Bohorič; see Rigler, "Register" 104-106; Pogačnik 74.

35. Murko 84-86.

36. ". . . for a time-span of more than three hundred years Dalmatin's Bible dominated the religious use of the language and was the only form of a functional-stylistic specialization of its written expression, open, understandable and accessible to literate and illiterate speakers of their parish communities. At this level of Slovene cultural development—before Prešeren—the language of the Bible, of the gospels and of ritual, the language of the pulpit and the confessional, was the most important formative factor in the evolution of a common psychic system underlying the concept of Slovene nationality," Rado L. Lencek, "A paradigm of Slavic national evolution: Bible—Grammar—Poet," *Slovene Studies* 6 (1984): 57-71, esp. 63.

POVZETEK

Razprava je posvečena primerjavi razvoja hrvatskega in slovenskega knjižnega jezika. Znano je, ugotavlja avtor, da se je hrvatska knjižna tradicija na neki stopnji svojega razvoja naslonila na model knjižnega jezika, kot ga je nudila srednjeveška cerkvena latinščina. Ob tem modelu je hrvatski pismeni jezik, porajajoč se iz dokaj raznolikega sistema regionalnih dialektov, že ob koncu srednjega veka simbolično zedinjeval razkosane dežele hrvatskega jezika. Kasneje je domača Renesansa, ob tesni naslonitvi na Danteja (De Vulgari Eloquentia, samo še poglobila to dediščino. Iz te same dediščine je končno rastel koncept 'ilirskega' (to je hrvatskega) jezika, kot so ga razvijali hrvatski protestanti. Na drugi strani pa se je slovenski knjižni jezik razvijal ob tesni naslonitvi na nemško-protestantsko humanistično filologijo. Slovenski protestantski pisci, ki so ustvarili knjižni jezik, so sledili Martinu Lutru v prevajanju svetega pisma. Kot Luter v nemških deželah, so upoštevali raznoličnost slovenskih deželnih narečij. Tako se je že ob samem začetku slovenskega knjižnega jezika razvil nekakšen 'pokrajinski književni pluralizem', rastoč iz narečij praktično vseh slovenskih administrativnih področij. Ta pluralistična tendenca je dominirala vse do srede 19. stoletja.