

## IGNJAT DJURDJEVIĆ (IGNATIO GIORGI) 18<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY SCHOLAR FROM DUBROVNIK

The development of scientific Indo-European comparative linguistics, which can be divided into three main periods,<sup>1</sup> from F. Bopp, R. Rask and J. Grimm up to the present day,<sup>2</sup> represents a long course of a hundred and fifty years of studying the problems of language, that primary manifestation of human spirit, the most important means in the development of society. This long development of scientific thought concerning language was preceded by an incomparably longer period of hard approaching and finding the way through the dim notions about man in general, until some vague and uncertain first conjectures of the truth about language have been reached. An explicit testimony of this are the interests of Greek philosophers and language theoreticians, from the "analogists" (Protagoras, Pythagoras) the "anomalists" (Hermogenes), Heraclitus, Democritus, Plato, Socrates, the founder of classical European grammar Aristotle, up to the philological studies of the Alexandrian school (Dionysius Thrax, Apollonius Dyscole, Herodianus) and the very precise examination of the structure of languages of the Indian school (Panini, Patanjali, Bhartrhari).<sup>3</sup>

The achievements of Greek and Hellenistic culture (and, when we speak about linguistics and philology we mean particularly, the achievements of the Alexandrian school), were taken over by the Romans, who through the grammar of Latin (Varro), which was the language of the greatest empire of the world, laid down the foundations for all language studies. Even before the terms language and nation became equivalent, there had been a long period of fighting over the privileged, primary, sacred language from the biblical story about the tower of Babylon, the Deluge, the constantly vindicated prerogatives of the sacred languages of Sanskrit, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Ara-

---

1. V. Georgiev, *Issledovanija po sravnitelno-istoričeskomu jazikoznaniu*. Moscow, 1958, pp. 7-27.

2. Franz Bopp, *Über das conjugationssystem der Sanskritsprache, in Vergleichung mit jenen der griechischen, lateinischen und germanischen Sprache*. Frankfurt 1816; R. Rask, *Undersøgelse om det gamle Nordiske eller Islandske Sprogs Oprindelse*. Köbenhavn 1818; J. Grimm, *Deutsche Grammatik*, I, first edition. Göttingen 1819.

3. Literature about this see in M. Ivić, *Directions in Linguistics*. Ljubljana 1963, pp. 9-22.

bic up to the long lasting fight and victories won for the equality of languages of the new "barbarian" peoples.

From the period of pre-scientific linguistics the following authors are well-known for their works, Guilielmus Postellus Barentonius (1510-1551),<sup>4</sup> Theodorus Bibliander-Buchmann (1504-1569),<sup>5</sup> Conrad(us) Gesner(us) (1516-1563),<sup>6</sup> J. J. Scaliger (1540-1609),<sup>7</sup> Mathias Miechovitus (Maciej z Miechow) (1457-1525),<sup>8</sup> Hieronymus Megiserus (1550-1616),<sup>9</sup> Angelo Roccha,<sup>10</sup> Sigismundus Gelenius (Zikmund Hruby z Jeleni † 1554),<sup>11</sup> Faustus Verantius (Vrančić) (1551-1617),<sup>12</sup> Joannes Aquensis,<sup>13</sup> Gabriel Pannonius Pesthinus (Gabor Mészér)<sup>14</sup> and many others<sup>15</sup>.

In addition to these and many other pioneers of pre-scientific linguistics, who are known to us by their published works, there was a great number of unknown predecessors of this science whose works have not come to light, so that their often important contributions to the general progress of this science remained unknown and unestimated. To these belongs the well-known poet from Dubrovnik Ignjat Djurdjević, who was considered by his contemporaries to be one of the greatest scholars of his time.

Ignjat Djurdjević (Ignazio Giorgi) (1675-1737)<sup>16</sup> completed his education in lower sciences (*studia inferiora*: humanitas, grammatica, rhetorica) at the Collegium Ragusinum. His teachers were the well-known Rafo Tu-

4. *Linguarum duodecim characteribus differentium alphabetum*. Paris 1538.

5. *De ratione communi omnium linguarum et literarum commentarius*. Zürich 1548.

6. *Mithridates, De Differentiis linguarum observationes*. Zürich 1555.

7. *Europaeorum linguae*, published in 1599 in Paulus Merula, *Cosmographia generalis*, pars I, lib. I, cap. VIII, pp. 271-272; again (postumously) in *Opuscula varia antehac inedita*. Paris 1610, under the title of: *Diatriba de Europaeorum linguis*, pp. 119-122.

8. *Tractatus de duabus Sarmatiis, Asiana et Europiana et de Contentis in eis*. Krakov 1517, Augsburg 1518.

9. *Specimen quinquaginta diversarum atque inter se differentium linguarum et dialectorum*. Frankfurt 1593, 1603; *Thesaurus polyglottus, vel Dictionarium multilinguae, ex quadringentis circiter...linguis...consans*. Frankfurt 1603.

10. *Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana*. Roma 1591 in "Appendix de dialectis, hoc est de linguis diversis ordine alphabetico dispositis", pp. 305-376.

11. *Lexicon Symphonum*. Basel 1537.

12. *Dictionarium quinque nobilissimarum Europae linguarum*. Venetiis 1595.

13. *Lexicon*, 1511.

14. *Nomenclatura sex linguarum*. Vienna 1568.

15. See W. K. Matthews, *Knowledge of Slavonic in XVIth-Century Western Europe*. Napoli 1958, *Annali* (Sezione Slava) pp. 1-16.

16. See the detailed biography in M. Rešetar, *The Works of Ignacio Giorgi* (Ignat Djurdjević) *Old Croatian writers*. Book XXV (2), p. XXIII-CLII, III Life and Work of Ignacio Giorgi (Djurdjević), Zagreb 1926.

dišević (Tudisi) and the lexicographer Andello Della Bella. While in this school Djurdjević, in addition to the regular study of Latin, devoted his time particularly and more than was demanded by the school to the study of Greek. His younger contemporary Saro Crijević pointed that out in “*Bibliotheca Ragusina*” (214, 11): “quo tempore Grecis etiam litteris egregiam dedit operam”.<sup>17</sup> It is certain that Djurdjević, even after graduating from Collegium Ragusinum and especially in theology, continued with the study of Greek. His treatises are full of quotations from Greek and Byzantine works. I could ascertain that Djurdjević gave each Greek text in Latin translation. It is not at all unusual, when we know that it was regular procedure in all the works of that time, written in Latin, Italian or any other language; the Greek text was translated into Latin or into the language used. It is to be noted, however, that Djurdjević never translated the Greek text himself, but gave it in the Latin translation of other authors. In addition to this, while the Latin or Italian text in the autographs was written fluently, in skilful and clear handwriting, the Greek text was written with less skill, with frequent mistakes, particularly in omitting the accents.

When he was 16, he completed the study of lower sciences, became member of the Great Council, engaged himself in politics, state affairs and poetry up to the age of 23 (1698), when he entered the Society of Jesus in Rome. According to the propositions of the society he started reading, in 1700, for a three year course in philosophy, which he never really liked. He had, however, completed this course too with best marks. He did not continue with the study of theology, but was the Master in Collegium Illyricum at Loreto in 1702, at Ascoli in 1703, at Prato in 1704. At Ascoli he had a good pupil, Domenico Meriani, who praised Djurdjević as a good commentator and an expert on old writers (Marciale, Salustio). Meriani stated that as a person Djurdjević was kind, but of a very sensitive nature... “che il P(adre) Nivolo M(aria) Giorgi era di tale erudizione, che... non aveva nella Comp(agnia) eguale. Era egli nello spiegare singolare, mentre notava ogni senso, et in un’ ode d’Orazio vi averebbe speso un’ ora, la altra in venti righe di Salustio, Marziale si faceva aprire a caso, e notava talm(ent)e li sensi, e le parole, con dire fin l’occasione, e perche l’autore burlava l’amico...”<sup>18</sup> Meriani also pointed out Djurdjević’s extensive knowledge of Roman history: “Aveva tal suppellettile d’istorie, che a me diceva, quando in stanza era con esso fino alle due della notte, che gli avessi nominato qvalunque nobile di Roma antica, che n’averebbe detto l’origine, le fortune, le disgrazie fino all’estinzione, e mi leggeva le sue compo-

17. See M. Rešetar, *o.c.*, p. XLIII, com. 1.

18. See M. Rešetar, *o.c.*, p. CLL (Appendix 9).

sizioni delle molte, che fatte ne avea prima dell'ingresso nella Comp(agni)a in versi..." (Mat. II, 76).<sup>19</sup>

S. Crijević says that in the course of seven years Djurdjević spent in studying philosophy and was the master; he studied, among other things, the history of ancient peoples, particularly the history of Christianity and also mastered the basic knowledge of Hebrew: "nonnisi leviter tinctus est", by no means as well as Latin, Greek, Illyrian, Italian and French<sup>20</sup>. From Djurdjević's treatises it can be seen that he was using French. This is, on the other hand, confirmed by Meriani when he says that he wrote in Greek, Latin "and I believe in French as well".<sup>21</sup> Djurdjević's knowledge of Hebrew can not be seen in his treatises; he only wrote a few words here and there and mentioned several sounds and letters in the glossaries. That fact makes one point in his essay on Hieronymus' "Dalmatian" translation of Holy Scripture even less clear: "Disquisitio 3a De Hieronymi Dalmatica Sacrarum Scripturarum Versione" (Transcript DA XXXVI Antiquitates Illyricae, p. 726) where he says that after Greek he also learned Hebrew "penitissime" and that he published many works in that language.<sup>22</sup> It may be that Djurdjević has in mind his Saltijer Slovinski (1729), in which he gives explanations of Hebraisms, and in which there is a separate chapter: "Aliquot idiotismi hebraici" (s. III, IV, V).<sup>23</sup>

While he was in the Society of Jesus, Djurdjević occupied himself with poetry and science, but he apparently had very little time left for it, so it may be the main reason why he left the Society in 1705: "totum plane Heliconem dedidici, nec mihi cultiores libri uspiam prae manibus, male sit Philosophiae quae mihi me abstulit" (Mat. II, 55-56).<sup>24</sup> Straight after his return to Dubrovnik (1705) his pyrrhic songs appeared and in 1706 he entered the Benedictine order, where in the monastery of St. Jacob near Dubrovnik, he will spend the

19. See M. Rešetar, *o.e.*, p. CLII (Appendix 9).

20. See M. Rešetar, *o.c.*, p. CXXXI (Appendix 1: Crijevic's Biography of I. Djurdjevic) "in hebraicae, linguae, studium incubuit qua tamen, nonnisi leuiter tinctus est, neque enim in ea addiscenda, sicut in Latina, Greca, Illyrica, Etrusca, et Gallica fecerat, omnem operam locauit".

21. See M. Rešetar, *o.c.*, p. CLII Appendix 9: The Letter of Djurdjević while a teacher at Ascoli: "Componева in varie lingue, in greco, in poesia latina, e volgare con sapore in ogn' una e credo anche in francese".

22. "At ego uir Dalmata, qui(ue) post Graecam, atq(ue) Hebraicam penitissime studui, qua etiam edidi complura Opera, a uiris cultioris linguae, gnaris Illyricae, utique non improbata, cum toto Illyrico aio, multo sapientius de uocis huius significatione (Pagani) duos alienigenos cripsisse, quam Bandurium".

23. See M. Rešetar, *The Works Of Inacio Gorgi (Ignat Djurdjević) JAZU*, Old Croatian Writers, Book XXV (1), pp. 25-28.

24. See M. Rešetar, *o.c.*, p. XCVI.

most fruitful years of his life. In the period between 1710-1712 Djurdjević was in Italy. During that time he was in Rome again, travelled through southern Italy, was "lector eloquentiae" in Naples. In 1712 he was in Dubrovnik again to commence his fruitful work in the Academy of Idlers (*Accademia degli oziosi*). Following the example of many Academies of that kind in Italy, this Academy of Idlers in Dubrovnik had as its chief aim the compiling of a Latin-Italian-Illyrian dictionary and grammar. Djurdjević was the Principal of this Academy for several years. The work of the Academy, however, did not quite go on as it should and Djurdjević who considered establishing a new Academy for Illyrian language (*un'altra Accademia Privata sopra la lingua Illirica*), did not succeed in doing so and left the Academy of Idlers in 1719.

Between 1728-1731 he used to go to Italy more often (Padua, Venice), but after 1713 until his death he did not leave Dubrovnik any more. In the monastery of St. Jacob he had a rich library, as well as the libraries of Dubrovnik nearby. How much such quiet life in which he could devote himself to undisturbed work meant to him, is illustrated by the fact that he declined the offer of bishopric at Trebinje.

Why Djurdjević writes and what he wants to show in his numerous treatises, he himself says in the Preface to Book I of *Sighs*: "...moje književno nastojanje, zasve o družijeh naucijeh zabavljeno, uzdržalo svedj osobitu ljubav svom rodnom jeziku i svojoj adrijanskoslovenskoj pokrajini... koju držim srčano i dobrohoćno svedj prid očima, i sve što pišem, činim da nju gleda, da nju utišti, da nju hvali i uzumnoža u plemenitoj sejeni i svijetlu imenovanju prid svijetom" (v.I., 467).<sup>25</sup>

Djurdjević's first interests for the History of Illyria, conceived in the spirit of that time on the basis of evidences of old authors and conclusions, etymologizings, date from the time of his attending the lower course at Collegium Ragusinum, encouraged by his teacher, the lexicographer A. Della Bella. That interest and work should further be traced in his activity at the Academy of Idlers, which had, as we have seen, as its main aim the compiling of the Illyrian dictionary and grammar. It can be taken that Djurdjević started with his scientific work as early as while he was in Rome; there he worked on collecting material for his treatises, which was very extensive and which he could not collect only during his last permanent stay in Dubrovnik (from 1731 up to his death in 1737).

The first news about the work on the History of Illyria is from 1716, when N. Alečić writes that Djurdjević is working hard on his History (Ma. I, 156) and that he had three books of the first part in his hands, giving some comments

25. See M. Rešetar, *o.c.*, p. LXVIII.

on them as well<sup>26</sup>. After his definite return from Italy (1731) in the drafts of his letters to friends and acquaintances in Italy, Djurdjević mentions on several occasions that he will continue with his work on *Antichità Illiriche*<sup>27</sup> as soon as he recovers. In his letter to Fontanini (1735) he stresses that the work he is engaged with at the moment is not “l’Illirico sacro”, but “l’Illirico profano”, and that it will take him quite some time to complete it.<sup>28</sup>

In Djurdjević’s preserved autographs there is also some direct evidence about the time in which he wrote those treatises. In the autograph B DA 3, p. 329 (Transcript B DA D XXXVII, p. 808): he states: “Ad minus mille et centum anni ad hunc annum 1732, cum haec scribo elapsi sunt”. In the autograph “Computatio temporum” he says: “Anno 1730 quo hec scribo”, and further in the same autograph he counts: “Neomeniam 1730 mensis Octobris”. In the Transcript DA XXXVI, *Antiquitates Illyricae*, p. 73, *Disquisitio 3<sup>a</sup> De Hieronymi Dalmatica Sacrarum Scripturarum Versione: Quidam Jo. Petrus Kohlius Historiae Ecclesiasticae professor in Petroburgensi Accademia edidit anno ni fallor 1717. Introductionem in Historiam Slavorum...*, meaning that this treatise was written after this year. He also states further the year 1729, the month of November, when “Acta Lipsienses” came out.

In his letter to Fontanini of April 6th 1735, as a reply to Fontanini’s letter of July 18th 1734, Djurdjević also gives the plan of his work on the History of Illyria. He says that “L’Antichità Illiriche dal Diluvio Universale fin all’anno primo Dionisiano precedenti” will be divided “in due Tomi in foglio”. The first part will include the Illyrian antiquities of the Smal Illyric (dell’Illirico Minore) and of Dalmatia, a history written in full, not in separate treatises. The second part will deal with the Great Illyric (Illirico il Grande) in more that two hundred separate treatises “in piu di duecento Trattati sopra sogetti, e cose piu notabili coll’aggiunta di molte Dissertazioni Etimologiche, e Proleptiche”.<sup>29</sup>

S. Crijević says that “*Antiquitates Illyricae*” consist of two parts, that the first part remained “nearly finished” after the death of its author, and that the second one was not completed.<sup>30</sup> Ristić too, in his biography of I. Djurdje-

26. See M. Rešetar, *o.c.*, p. CXV.

27. See here R 3893 (SKZ), II part, p.

28. See M. Rešetar, *o.c.*, p. CXVI.

29. See M. Rešetar, *o.c.*, p. CXXXIV - Appendix 1: Crijević’s Biography of I. Djurdjevic, VI, In. 2.

30. See M. Rešetar, *o.c.*, p. CXXXIV (Appendix 1 VI, In 2 „Opus) duobus Tomis semissibus foliis continetur. Primum feré absolutum, et prelo maturum reliquit ita inscriptum: “*Antiquitatum Illyricarum Tomus Primus, siue de Illyrici Minoris, atque Dalmatiae, rebus*

vić, speaks about the sudden death which took away so great a writer, and that the world, had he lived a bit longer, would admire the works he intended to publish in Latin "in praise of our Slavonic language."<sup>31</sup> M. Zlatarić in his biography states only the following: "5. Historia Illirici tom. 2. Spovidanje od slovinskoga sadržanja dijela dva."<sup>32</sup>

According to the description preserved at N. Aletić (Mat. 1, 186-192),<sup>33</sup> that part of the manuscript which N. Aletić had seen and described is to be found today in KMB: "D. Ignatii Georgii Abbatis Melitensis Rerum Illyricarum sive Rhacusanae Historiae Pars I. qua de vetri Illyrico, vel de Urbis Rhacusae progenitoribus agitur Libris VIII quorum argumenta aversa pagina dabit". Kaznačić was of the opinion (p. 77 of the Catalogue) that this manuscript was an autograph. This manuscript has been described in detail by V. Makušev.<sup>34</sup> The description of V. Makušev corresponds in full to the contents and titles reported to Matijašević by N. Aletić.<sup>35</sup> The first thing that can be taken as certain is the fact that Djurdjević worked on this paper while he was actively taking part in the work of the Academy of Idlers.<sup>36</sup> For this manuscript K. Vojnović says that it is not an autograph, but a transcript "učinjen pod nadzorom auktora, koji ga je pregledao te ispravio, dapače popravio u više mjesta tekst i uvrstio svojom rukom umetaka."<sup>37</sup> Although, in fact, this manuscript does not seem at first sight to be Djurdjević's autograph, by a better, and more thorough analysis of the paper itself it can be seen that it was written by the same Djurdjević's hand. In great many places in Excerptorium and in the treatises there are extracts which are, as far as letters are concerned, identical with the letters in this manuscript, being always so when Djurdjević wrote in calligraphy. It is true that Djurdjević, later, made same changes, corrections and amendments in this text. This is, however, his definite transcript. It is also shown by the fact that this autograph, as compared to the other parts of the autograph and transcript, is rewritten and divided into chapters. All the

---

Disquisitiones, et Annales a Diluio Noachico ad Tiberii Caesaris Principatum prolati. Alterum cum scriberet in fata concessit nec absolutum, nec emendatum reliquit."

31. See M. Rešetar, *o.c.*, p. CXLV Appendix 2: Rastić's Biography of I. Djurdjević: "Sudden and premature death had taken from this earth so great a writer, who, had he lived longer, would seem even greater to the world with his works he was to publish in Latin, and in praise of our Slavonic language."

32. See M. Rešetar, *o.c.*, p. CXLVI, Appendix 3: Zlatarić's biography of I. Djurdjević.

33. See M. Rešetar, *o.c.*, p. CXV.

34. V. Makušev, *Izledovanija ob istoričeskih pamjatnikah i bytopisateljah Dubrovnika*, pp. 129-134.

35. See M. Rešetar, *o.c.*, p. CXVI.

36. K. Vojnović, *Antiquitates XXVII*, 213,

37. K. Vojnović, *o.c.*, pp. 121, 122, 231; see also M. Rešetar, *o.c.*, p. CXVII.

transcripts of Djurdjević's treatises which have been copied by somebody else's hands are so true to the original, that they are actually literal transcripts, even with obvious author's mistakes and spaces for the quotations left by the author to be completed later. This manuscript is, however, the author's reshaping, the final editing of the treatises which are to be found as drafts in B DA2, B DA4, B DA7, as it is shown by comparing the autograph and the transcript.<sup>38</sup>

The Academy of Idlers (*Accademia degli oziosi*) in Dubrovnik was founded (in 1699) under the immediate influence of the Roman Arcadia (1690). I. Djurdjević had been the Principal of the Academy for a number of years. As far as the influence of the Roman Arcadia on the Academy of Idlers is concerned, we should bear in mind that one of the conditions for admittance into its membership was that the member should devote himself to the history and study of his mother tongue. The influence of the Italian academies of this time spread into Germany as well, where numerous language societies were founded. All these numerous institutions in Italy, France, Spain and elsewhere, which were often weak in the structure of their organization, and founded as voluntary associations, had as their primary aim a concern for the language. This concern was usually evident in the struggle against foreign influences in speech and writing. The founding of these numerous societies and academies falls into the period when the term *nation* became identified with the term *community of the same language*.

For the work of the Academy of Idlers as well as of some individual authors in the Slavic lands, apart from the above mentioned influence of the Italian academies, the idea of Pan-slavism was of exceptional importance. In this idea, regardless the various phases it went through,<sup>39</sup> one of the basic components was always present. It was the feeling of community of Slavic peoples based on the same language which remains unchanged from the earliest times. This component not only was always present in the idea of Pan-slavism; in fact the complex idea of Pan-slavism originated in it. In the course of time this idea was acquiring definite forms and substance, depending on the time of development of some Slavonic peoples, their geographic and political position, their degree of culture, political and social currents and, above all, depending on settling the question of, and withstanding the influences of other peoples and cultures.<sup>40</sup>

38. See p. 76.

39. Extensive literature about that see in A. Schmaus, *Vincentius Priboevius, ein Völaufer des Panslavismus, Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, N.F. 1953, Bd 1, Heft 3, pp. 243-254, ditto: *Sigismundus Gelenius und sein Lexicon symphonum (1537)*, Festschrift M. Vasmer).

40. A. Schmaus, *Vincentius Priboevius...*, pp. 243/44... "am wenigsten zu übersehen



Although the idea of Pan-slavism passed through the confessionist phase during the time of the Reformation and counter-Reformation, the strongest national impulse came to the fore in the older humanistic phase.<sup>41</sup> In that stage of ideological Pan-slavism,<sup>42</sup> which in our country coincides with the beginning of classicism, the basic aspiration was to oppose the humanistic picture of the history of Italy by an equal picture of the history of Slavism.

The founder and the first typical representative of this idea was Vinko Pribojević,<sup>43</sup> who had a decisive influence on the work of Mavro Orbini<sup>44</sup> and on the whole of later Yugoslav historiography. Orbini's History is an apology of the Slavs in the form of historical and scientific bringing back to life the past in a true baroque style.<sup>45</sup> The name *Slavus* was being put as a counter-balance to the name *Romanus*. The historical picture of Italy, coming only as far as the time of the invasion of the Goths, was opposed by the equally unique picture of the Slavs up to the Middle Ages. According to that picture on the territory of the Slavs there do not appear various nations, but only various names of the same nation. Hence the names Sarmatae, Illyrii, Slavi, Dalmatae and the insisting on their origin being from one of Noah's descendants. The old unity of language, which does not change, should point out to the unity of peoples. It should be taken that there has always been a continuity of peoples of the same language on the territory of the Slavic peoples; there is only a succession of various names. It does not matter, accordingly, that the earlier name of the Sarmatians is changed into that of the Goths, or the Geths, the Illyrians or the Slavs. Even the Roman emperors were "Illyrian" rulers. That aim was well served by the Illyrian queen Teuta, Dimitrius of Hvar; all the popes are of Slavic origin. The well-known and popular translator of the Holy Scripture St. Jeronim (Dalmata) was certainly only a Dalmatian, a Slav; his translations are only Slavic, both Slavic orthographies are his work. The western and southern Slavs are connected by the thesis about the Balkan autochthony, by the story about the migration of the brothers Czechs, the Lehs (and the Russians) from the Balkans and the founding of Poland, Czecho-

---

durch die von Raum und Geschichte aufgezwungenen Auseinandersetzungen mit anderen Völkern und Kulturen, die das Antlitz der einzelnen Sprachen formen."

41. See A. Schmaus, *o.c.*, p. 245.

42. S.J. Ježić, *Croatian Literature*, p. 15.

43. Vincentius Priboevius, *De origine successibusque Slavorum*. Venetiis 1532. Grga Novak, Vinko Pribojević, *About the origin and history of the Slavs*, Zagreb 1951/JAZU, Croatian Latinists, Book I, see also A. Schmaus, *o.c.*

44. Mauro Orbini, *Il regno degli Slavi*, 1601.

45. W. Giusti, *Il panslavismo*. Milano 1941, A. Cronia, Italiens Anteil am geistigen Leben der Slaven (= *Blick nach Osten*, 1,3/4 Heft 1948) p. 17.

Slovakia and Russia.<sup>46</sup> There comes out the fight between the Nordan thesis about the origin of the Slavs, supported mainly by the Western authors, and the thesis about the Balkan autochthony supported by the Slavic authors. The history of Dalmatia, Croatia, Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Russia, Prussia, Slezia Bosnia, Serbia, Mezia, Bulgaria ("Quae olim Macedonia dicebatur") in one word of all the Roman provinces in which the Slavs settled later, flows into one history of Illyria. Russia, because of its political position, remains in the background. The Italian-Polish relations make it possible to look at Russia through the eyes of Poland. The confessionist and other differences are not pointed out. There is no mention anywhere about the negative features and characteristics of the Slavic peoples, all with the aim to preserve the unity of the Slavs. Poland is praised and emphasized most of all for being "antemurale Christianitatis" in its fight against the Turks.

At the time of forming an alliance between Poland and Venice against Hungary, it is made possible for Venice to step with a firm foot upon the territory of Dalmatia. While Venice on the one hand and the Roman curia on the other organize their fight against Turkey, Poland is always on their side.<sup>47</sup>

A great role in the spreading of the idea of Pan-slavism was played by the counter-Reformation which brought back to life the idea of the common destiny of all the Slavs and led the struggle against the Turks in an organized way.

After the success of the German humanists to secure to the German language the place of the third main language, the chief founders of the idea of Pan-slavic unity, the Dalmatian Vinko Pribojević, the Pole Maciej z Miechowa and the Czech Sigmund z Jeleni secure to the Slavonic language, as the second barbarian language, the place of the fourth main language: "duae (linguae) barbarici soli, Germanicae et Slavinicae, nunc solae omnem Europam longe lateque occupantes."

It was K. Gesner already who had put in his *Mithridates* all the peoples who had apparently spoken or now speak the Slavonic language under the common name of the Illyrians.

The great period of Slavic lexicography falls just into the time between the 16th and the 18th centuries.<sup>48</sup> S. Gelenius devoted all his attention to "etymology" with the help of which he endeavoured to put the Slavonic language among the main European languages. In his *Lexicon symphonum* he displays the "concordia consonantiae" of the four European languages (Latin, Greek, German, Slavonic). He finds a great number of words which are by their pronunciation or meaning similar or same: "vocabula, apud diversas

46. A. Schmaus, *o.c.*, p. 250.

47. A. Cronia, *o.c.*, p. 14.

48. Joh. Blahoslav, Bohorić, Vrančić, Megiser and others.

gentes eadem idemque significantia, prolatione tantummodo variante.” About the similarity or equality of forms, these authors conclude in a very easy way, by simple, chance interchange or insertion of letters, instead of the sound changes. The chief obstacle for this primitive etymology, in not being able to develop into a scientific discipline, was the static conception of language, the process of language development being unknown to it. Phonetics and semantics were only guessed to some extent. The development of forms had completely been neglected. The lexical aspect was always playing the most important part. Foreign words in a language have not, however, been taken separately, nor had the differences in the history of the language, or between the languages or dialects been taken into account. All the words had been compared synchronously and without taking into consideration whether foreign words in a language or indigenous elements are in question. The main criterion was the similarity of forms, consonance. The laws in the forming of words had not been noticed; single words had not been distinguished from the compounds. Suffixes had been treated in the same way as basic words.

The proof of the relationship between languages, and in the further treatment of the original identity, makes a great number of parallels possible. It is enough if there is only a certain similarity in the meaning of words, to be satisfied with only a foreshadowed sound similarity. This procedure remained in fact on the level of popular etymology.<sup>49</sup>

The supremacy of interpretation on the part of one author over that of the other author, the proof of his greater learning, was based nearly exclusively on calling upon the authority of old authors and giving as many proofs from their works as possible. The older the author, the more valuable the proof. There is an absolute, nearly blind confidence in the unsystematic data of classical writers, and combinations not based on history are being taken as some already proved truths.

It was Mavro Orbini<sup>50</sup> already who had worked out the conception of the empire of the Slavs which was similar to the historical conceptions of other peoples of that time, particularly of those in Italy. Some towns and states in Italy were getting their own histories. “Their past was glorified within the scope of description of the glorious past of the whole of Italy.”<sup>51</sup> That national spirit of Dalmatian towns could be kept up and preserved only by their constant linking with the background, with the Slavism on the whole and its ancient, glorious history. The glorious part of the Slavs is put alongside the past

49. A. Schmaus, *Sigismundus Gelenius*, p. 438 and the like.

50. N. Radojčić, *Serbian History* by Mavro Orbini. SAN Separate edition Book CLII, Social sciences n.s. Book 2. Belgrade 1950.

51. N. Radojčić, *o.c.*, p. 12 and the like.

of Italy, the glorification of Slavic towns and states alongside the glorification of Italian towns and states. The fundamental proof is the ancient unchanged unity of the language: "che è solito...che dal antica unità del parlare si vuol prouar largamente l'unità della natione."

The panslavistic idea of Vinko Pribojević was worked out by Mavro Orbini with a sincere patriotic desire to make a contribution to the glory of his people. I. Djurdjević who had far surpassed M. Orbini by his learning, also driven by true patriotism, endeavoured in his *History of Illyria* to bring forth as many evidences and proofs from the works of classical authors as possible, which would show that the Slavs are not only equal to other peoples in everything, but also surpass them in many respects. His treatises which have not been published, and which have been used by many authors, most of all by M.A. Apendidi, to publish sometimes whole chapters as their own, are a testimony of his outstanding learning and above all of his excellent knowledge of contemporary literature. He spent great many years on this work of his. He considered it the work of his life-time, with one and only aim to make his Dubrovnik famous, finding its glorious past in the glorious past of the Slavs, and so proving that the Illyrians — the Slavs are in everything equal to other nations, if not above them.

The treatises of Djurdjević are the result of many, long and conscientious preparations, the collecting of enormous amount of material and with a plan worked out in advance. He used to do the same treatise several times over, copy it, make amendments, alter it, until he would come to a definite text.

The justifiable wish of his biographer S. Crijević has not been fulfilled: "Opus immensi profecto laboris, et exquisite ac non vulgaris eruditionis utinam longior vita eruditissimo auctori contigisset, ut illud omnibus absolutum numeris in lucem publicam, hominumque aspectum vulgare potuisset". (Crijević's biography of I. Djurdjevic, II, 224), just as was the case with the suggestion of Dj. Körbler:<sup>52</sup> "it is high time to publish those treatises as soon as possible, because apart from Djurdjevic's autographs we have not a single transcript of his work, and the autograph is so dilapidated, that it might vanish soon." If only Djurdjević's work "*Rerum Illyricarum*" had been published during his life-time, or at least immediately after his death, he would have been the pioneer of many later theories accepted in the scientific world. "*Rerum Illyricarum*" on the whole, with its autographs and transcripts, deals with all the fields of science. It is a first-rate encyclopaedia of 18th century.

Belgrade

IVAN PUDIĆ

---

52. Dj. Körbler, Ignjat Djurdjević, Wolf's predecessor on the question of Homer. *JAZU*, Rad 186 (1911), pp. 1-34.