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In this article reference will be made to the contribution of Italian natural historian, journalist and travel writer Alberto Fortis (1741-1802) to the understanding of linguistic conditions in the area of the Kvarner (Quarnero).1 At least at the beginning of his research, Fortis was primarily interested in natural science, particularly in mineralogy and palaeontology. But because he was a true man of the Enlightenment period, his attention was also caught by the anthropological characteristics of the regions through which he travelled. In addition, he took with him an interest in archaeology and philology as part of the intellectual background and cultural heritage of the milieu in which he was formed, while the eastern part of the Adriatic provided an abundance of material and numerous opportunities for new knowledge and discoveries in both of these fields. Fortis the philologist was interested in the places that he visited in languages unknown to him; he embarked on etymological ‘reconstructions’, partially under the influence of local intellectuals. A good many of his linguistic considerations have no basis in the real circumstances, and are simply a reflection of the pre-scientific fallacies of his time.2 However, his field observations and notations of local names are much more reliable. Among other things, they were intended to provide a realistic and credible backing for the reports of his travelogues. Fortis’ field reports are not particularly numerous, nor are they characterised by system. Still, Romance philology does own to him some important information about two extinct languages – Krk-Romance and Krk-Romanian, although his informants, and so he too, incorrectly identified them.3 Some parts of Fortis’ records from Kvarner refer also to socio-ethnic aspects of linguistic practice in the area, although mostly indirectly and fragmentarily. We believe that the topic deserves more minute examination, irrespective of our not having at our disposal an ideal corpus.

Alberto Fortis was the first to discover the Kvarner for science: first of all the islands of Cres and Lošinj, or Osor (as Lošinj was called in his time),4 with a few

1 Kvarner and Dalmatia did not in Fortis’ time have a uniformly defined border. Cf. Muljačić, 1996: 69, 147, 154 and 1976a: 98-100. In this article we shall adhere to the divisions that derive from Fortis.
4 Osor/Osero was long used for Lošinj, because most of the cultivable land on that island belonged to people from Osor. Cf. Muljačić, 1996: 45.
surrounding islets, and then Krk, Rab and Pag, as well as a part of the mainland zone. He first set out to Cres and Lošinj in May 1770, spending a fortnight there, briefly landing on Cres in September 1771, on the return from his first tour of Dalmatia; he visited both islands twice more, in 1773 and 1774, when he both went around Krk, Rab and Pag\(^5\) and spent time on the mainland facing onto these islands. The first tour of the Kvarner islands was taken at the prompting and with the resources of a Scottish patron, lover of the natural sciences and archaeology, as well as an impassioned botanist and fervent supporter of Ossian, and collector of natural, historical and artistic objects,\(^6\) the Earl of Bute, John Stuart. Prevented from undertaking the journey by illness, Bute provided Fortis with some fellow travellers: Domenico Cirilli, physician and professor of botany at Naples University, and John Symonds, a lawyer, who was interested in the study of farming in Italy. Fortis went on his first journey around Dalmatia as the cicerone of Anglican bishop Frederick Augustus Hervey and his son. Hervey was most interested in the geological characteristics of the area, and less (than Bute and Symonds) by the archaeological finds. Journeys during which he visited not only Cres and Lošinj but also Krk, Pag and Rab, as well as the Croatian Littoral, were approved by the Senate of La Serenissima, at the recommendation of three members of the Extraordinary Deputation for the regulation of trades\(^7\) (close to Fortis in their Enlightenment viewpoints), in the context of planned economic reforms and in particular for the advancement of the fishery.\(^8\) Fortis described his visit to Cres and Lošinj in the book Saggio d’osservazioni sopra l’isola di Cherso ed Osero\(^9\) (Observations on the Island of Cherso and Osero) published in Venice in 1771, while his stay on the “island of Rab in the Bay of Quarnaro” was first published in the letter to Lazzaro Spallanzani that concludes the Viaggio in Dalmazia,\(^10\) and once again, together with the report from Krk, Pag and the Croatian Littoral was included in the Appendix printed in the English edition of Fortis, called Travels into Dalmatia.\(^11\)

\(^5\) For reports about these travels cf. ibid.: 17-92, passim.

\(^6\) Ibid.: 22. For information about Fortis’ British patrons, fellow travellers and acquaintances, cf. ibid.: 22-41 passim.

\(^7\) Original and full name: Deputazione straordinaria per la regolazione delle arti della Dominante.

\(^8\) Cf. Muljačić, 1996: 43, 67-68, 84-85 and 1976a: 99. Between his first journey around Dalmatia and his research for the Serenissima, Fortis had a quarrel with two of the three rich and distinguished Venetians who were ready to finance one more tour to Dalmatia. Because of illness, he got no further than Rab (where he spent the summer of 1772), and then returned to the lagoons. Cf. Muljačić: 1996: 60, 83-84 and 1976a: 98.

\(^9\) Below: Saggio. (For the English title of the Saggio see n.11.) Fortis speaks of Cres and Osor as of a single island since the strait dividing them is so narrow “that it can scarcely be reckoned any separation at all”. The “uniformity of soil, products and inhabitants” also tends to support treating them as one. Cf. Fortis 1778: 389-390 (Saggio: 34-35).


\(^11\) Full title runs: Travels into Dalmatia containing general observations of the Natural History of that Country and the Neighbouring Islands; the Natural Productions, Arts, Manners and Customs of the Inhabitants: in a Series of Letters from Abbé Alberto Fortis to the Earl of Bute,
Fortis adduced as the primary reason for his journey the search for fossil bones, and research into the composition of the soil, following up reports of a large number of such formations on the eastern shore of the Adriatic. Indeed, in the Saggio, four chapters of a total of 12 were devoted to this phenomenon, as well as a series of observations in other parts of the book. But Fortis and Bute, and Fortis’ travelling companions were also interested in other themes, and Bute, as an enthusiast for Scottish things, was particularly interested in the folk or popular poetry, qua possible support for the authenticity of Ossian. The Saggio, then, was not conceived as an exclusively scientific report of the journey, although the naturalist component is actually dominant. Apart from observations from the journey, Fortis also put into his account later information about the area, drawing on the experience acquired during his first sojourn in Dalmatia. He did not just observe and record the natural phenomena and natural characteristics of the islands, but was also interested in archaeology and history, social and economic circumstances as well as the demographic, ethnographic and linguistic factors. Collecting information for the Senate about fishery on his later journeys, he went on exploring topics that interested him and that he had handled in Saggio and Viaggio. The chapter in which he noted information about the existence of two non-Veneto Romance idioms on Krk bears a characteristic title „Of the city of Veglia, its Antiquities, Customs, and Language“.
Introducing “the City of Cherso”, Fortis mentions, as “among the chief families of the island” “i signori Colombis, Bocchina, Moise, De Petris, Zambelli”,\textsuperscript{21} praising their hospitality and kindness. He invokes at the same time the virtues of the ancient Illyrians of 2000 years earlier. He says that Cres people wear dark clothing, and that this custom, like the mentioned social virtues, was inherited from their forefathers. Almost all the Illyrians wore dark garments, adopting them from their ancient Scythian forefathers.\textsuperscript{22} Fortis does not mention Illyrians expressly as ancestors of the current Cres people, but the context would tend to suggest such a connection. At the same time he uses the term „lingua Illirica“ as synonym for „lingua Slava“ to denote the idiom that the “Sclavonian inhabitants of Cherso” and other eastern Adriatic areas ruled by Venice speak.\textsuperscript{23} It is not clear whether Fortis understood the ultimate implications of such similarities and correspondences, but the influence of the pseudo-scientific propositions of the time on his ethno-genetic constructions is clear. In the city of Rab the leading families were De Dominis, “from which sprung the famous Archbishop of Spalatro, Marc Antonio”,\textsuperscript{24} Galzigna, Nemira, Spalatini and Zudenighi. Many families were notable for their nobility, and paltry in terms of their property.\textsuperscript{25} In Pag city the Cassich (Kašić), Jadrulei, Portada and Grasso families stood out. From the surname we can assume that the first was of “Illyrian” origin.\textsuperscript{26} Because the town was so isolated, the patricians of Pag were not in their conduct and manners to be distinguished from the wild and uncivilised commoners, although with external emblems and haughtiness they tried to show the opposite.\textsuperscript{27}

There is no doubt that Fortis conversed with the inhabitants of the local elite in Italian, that is, Venetian, and for all of them Venetian (colonial Venetian),\textsuperscript{28} was probably their native language. He was guided around Cres and Osor by “Signor Dottor Artico” (who was not born in the island),\textsuperscript{29} and an anonymous but

\textsuperscript{21} Cf. Fortis 1778: 396; Saggio: 43.
\textsuperscript{22} Ibid.: 42-43.
\textsuperscript{23} Cf. Saggio: 44-55 (n., passim); Fortis 1778: 467. In the Saggio in the n. 22 on p. 16 he says “Illirico”, also mentioning some other neighbouring and Slavic languages. „Illirico, Albanese, Serviano, Polacco“. From the same text on p. 55 it would seem that he links “Russo” and “Serviano” on the basis of Cyrillic script.
\textsuperscript{24} Fortis 1778: 348. It is significant that Fortis spoke positively about this heretic, who ended by being incarcerated by the Inquisition and whose corpse was burned; he kept quiet about his dissidence.
\textsuperscript{25} Ibid.; Viaggio: 192. Poverty and pride were mentioned as characteristics of the Dalmatian nobility by the venetian sindico G. B. Giustiniano in a report of 1553. Cf. Ljubić 1877: 222 and 247.
\textsuperscript{26} Surname is not always a reliable indication, but it is reasonable to assume it as such if, in the situation of the coexistence of a prestige and less prestigious ethnicity, we regard it as characteristic of the less admired.
\textsuperscript{27} Cf. Fortis 1778: 507.
\textsuperscript{29} Cf. Saggio: 44.
“cortese gentiluomo”, whom on the basis of further writing we can recognise as the “courteous gentleman Jacopo Colombis”.30 He made particular friends with Matej Sović, archdeacon of Osor and a Glagolite, with whom he kept in touch until his death in 1774, and who helped him on a number of occasions. He taught him the “ancient Illyrian”, i.e. Old Slavonic, obtained him the remains of Roman period inscriptions, and helped him to compose the chapter Iscrizioni antiche in the Saggio. He also participated in the editing of Hasanaginica – not knowing the word “labutovi” (swans) nor understanding the Turkish “pentžere” (windows)31, sent many items of information to Fortis about fishing for his official reports, and was asked by the latter to collect Croatian fish names.32 They corresponded in Italian, i.e. in Tuscan,33 but very likely spoke together in Venetian, the lingua franca of the lands of the Serenissima, particularly at first encounter, when Fortis did not yet know sufficient Croatian.34 Sović, judging also by his name,35 belonged to the ethnic group that, touring Cres, Fortis described as “a meager and stupid flock, of ugly, poor, and lazy people”.36 Similar to them were the denizens of Susak, “poor and miserable beyond description”, who lived in dwellings more like dens than cottages.37 On Rab he noted “a way of life differing little from that of the Hottentots” of the rural folk, whom he also described as “stupid and lazy”.38 If we ignore Fortis’ aesthetic criteria, was this kind of negative description entirely truthful, or did he perhaps heighten it a bit in order to point up his thesis of the harmful role of the over-numerous and parasitic clergy and lay stress on the need

30 Ibid.: 80 and 84; Fortis 1778: 435. Fortis had previously mentioned Jacopo Colombis as “a hospitable gentleman, and a promoter of good cultivation”. Ibid.: 417 (Saggio: 64).
31 Cf. Muljačić, 1966: 89, n. 14., where Sović’s comment about the “labutovi” is mentioned. “Per verità non so cosa sia. Suppongo certi uccelli.”
33 This is clear from the text in n. 27 and other examples given by Muljačić. The written language of educated venetophones at that time was Tuscan.
34 For Fortis’ command of Croatian, see Muljačić 1996: 20, 30, 85-87, 89 and Malinar 1986-1987: 194, including n. 6.
35 See n. 26.
36 Saggio: 40: «una greggia magra e stupidadi di brutta, povera e infingarda gente». Fortis’ observations about several Cres „povere villette, o miserabili Casali“ are similar (mentioning “Neresine, Orlez, Urana, Cacichi, Bellely, Ustrine”). Ibid.: 35.
37 I. e. „poveri e sudicj oltre ogni credere“. Saggio: 121. He was no more favourably impressed by the people of Mali Lošinj, where filth was accompanied by traces of smallpox. Cf. ibid.: 39. This remark probably does not refer to all the inhabitants of Mali Lošinj, but perhaps only to the lower classes. (For the class, ethnic and linguistic affiliation of the inhabitants of the place we will look in vain in the Saggio.)
38 Fortis 1778: 347 and 350; „vivono quasi alla maniera degli Otentoti“, Viaggio: 192; „popolo ... stupido e infingardo“. Ibid.: 194.
for reform and education, to which he wanted to encourage the representatives of the government\(^{39}\) (accusing them indirectly of being responsible for the misery of the island’s inhabitants)? As for their language, he observes: “The Slavii, or Sclavonian language,... is commonly used by the people, and the peasants of the island, and they speak it in a manner non inelegant”.\(^{40}\) He annotates some local terms, mostly toponyms: „dell’aspro, e sassoso monte detto ancora Verch od mela, il colle della sabbia”,\(^{41}\) „forced ... me to take shelter in a port called Mala-lucca”; “at a place called Gos”, “they call it Lughe, or lakes”, “a permanent lake called Panighe”, „by the name of Rudarnizza, which signifies „the country of mines“.”\(^{42}\) Great and little Stracane is the term used for Canidole by the “abitanti Slavoni di Cherso”.\(^{43}\) In the Saggio Chapter 12 is named Lago detto di Jezero\(^{44}\) and it might be thought that he uses the noun jezero/lake as a hydronym. Of common nouns, he mentions „rakia or brandy”, produced on Pag,\(^{45}\) and a phytonym, verb, explaining that the toponym Vrbnik “derived from the willows that grow in plenty on the fides of the brooks, and are called in Illyric Verb”.\(^{46}\) The Veneto form tonere is used by the islanders,\(^{47}\) probably in both languages, as well as the technical term mandolato, used by stone carvers, recorded by Fortis on Krk.\(^{48}\)

On Pag, on May 1, Fortis watched the parade of Green George, calling it a “odd custom”, and recording the phrase uttered by the women when they threw water on it: “May day vodé i. e. May give water”.\(^{49}\) The area of Novalja\(^{50}\) was the scene of rites to drive out the evil spirits, vukodlaci (werewolves) and witches,

---

\(^{39}\) This is suggested by the partially quoted sentence in which he represents Rab: „L’isola d’Arbe avrebbe tutto il necessario alla sussistenza della sua piccola popolazione, se l’Agricoltura vi fosse esercitata da un popolo meno stupido e infingardo”. Viaggio: 194.

\(^{40}\) Fortis 1778: 399. «La lingua Slavica, ... usasi comunemente dal popolo, e da’ contadini dell’isola, e vi si parla con una sorta di dialetto non inelegante». Saggio: 44. We have missed out the relative sentence “ch’è la più estesa di tutte l’altre lingue Europee”, that reflects the inaccurate beliefs of Fortis’ age and is the cause of a long note from the area of “comparative linguistics”, where we can consider only a few expressions taken from the spoken language as being credible (daite mi malo pit, mys, alli, siromah, smiete).

\(^{41}\) Viaggio: 198.

\(^{42}\) Fortis 1778: 524, 535, 537, 538. Fortis wrote about Lika, which he had not visited, and quoted two local toponyms: „whereof a diramation, called Sridyna gora, separates it from the Corbavia. ... On the north ... it ... is separated from the sea by the Bebian Alps, called Velebich, by the people of the country”. Ibid.: 523.

\(^{43}\) Saggio: 120.

\(^{44}\) Ibid.: 79.

\(^{45}\) Fortis 1778: 528. He recorded several characteristic words used in Lika: bumbreci (“wild cardi”), Ozimnicza, Jarieza (“kinds of wheat”), „the culture of potatoes, by them called krumpir”. Ibid.: 526.

\(^{46}\) Ibid.: 538.

\(^{47}\) Saggio: 76: “posti ... pella pesca del Tonno, detti dagl’Isolani Tonnera”.

\(^{48}\) The form in –o is obviously Italianised (as well as -nn- in “Tonnera”).

\(^{49}\) Fortis gives a detailed description of the rite, the purpose of which was to ensure water enough for sowing. Fortis 1778: 530

\(^{50}\) Ibid.: 529. Fortis mentions the toponyms Novaglia vecchia and Novaglia nuova, and thinks “the names ... indicate a Latin Origin”.

which were done at the request of the superstitious village folk by “Illyrian Glagolite priests”, of whose learning and ability to perform their office he was extremely sceptical. He does not omit mentioning that the Glagolitic language (i.e. the ancient devotional Illyrian) “is now but little understood”. In Vrbnik he met a priest who could read Glagolitic, but probably did not understand it. He reckoned Glagolitic books dead antiquarian objects, for even where they were used in divine service, no one could understand their meaning. It seems that the participation of the clergy in “silly customs” and superstition inspired enlightened and anti-clerical Fortis to comical descriptions and ironic remarks. On Cres, and Osor, too, the superstition that aroused his anger was widespread in the lower classes, among the city commons and the peasants on the island and nearby islands, in the group, then, that mainly spoke “the Slavic language”. Fortis states and explains a few specific terms: morà, mrkodlaci, krsniki, bilfi. The last word (a synonym for vampires) is of German origin, but might have come into the local Chakavian via the Veneto idiom. He adds to it the derivation imbilinxo, more likely to have been used by speakers of Veneto than of Chakavian. Mentioning that similar superstitions existed in out-of-the-way Veneto hamlets – where the pesariol corresponds to the appellative morà – and even in the capital itself, he returns to Cres and Osor, mentioning once again that “we find these prejudices only among the most benighted of the commons and in the countryside”. But he was put in a good mood by the pisme (poems) of the same stupid and superstitious islanders, which they transmitted from generation to generation, like the scottish Gaels. Probably meeting Bute’s expectations as specimen of folk poetry, however, he does not cite any local product, rather, Kačić’s Poem about Miloš Kobilić and Vuk Branković in a translation of his own without mentioning the source. In it, in his own words, it is possible to find “both knowledge of man, and the expression of the national spirit and, most valuable, the most accurate historical truth.” Fortis might have got to know Kačić’s Razgovor igradnji naroda slovinskoga (Pleasant Conversation of the Slavic People) via one of his Dalmatian informant.

In his report from Krk, Fortis gives details about particular linguistic conditions on the island and records a sentence composed in a “particular dialect of their own, somewhat resembling that of Friuli”: „La Isla de Vicla circonduta da torno dall’jague de mur zuraja circa miglia chiant; ce facile all’approdar de
burche de runqua grandezza nei zu puarich”. 60 This dialect that he did not know probably reminded him of Friulian because of the important presence of diphthongs. 61 But the sentence written down belongs to Vegliot or Krk-Romance, a local variety of Dalmatian, the indigenous Romance language of the eastern coast of the Adriatic. Fortis says that citizens of Krk city spoke this dialect until the beginning of the century, when it was supplanted by Venetian, and that it was still spoken in some villages on the island. The sentence that he quotes does show a high degree of Venetianisation.

Fortis describes another non-Veneto and non-Slavic Krk idiom spoken by the inhabitants of some villages, particularly in Poljica 62 as “a mixture of Carinthen-Slavic, Latin and Italian”. This impressionist description, according to Muljačić, shows that he had some slight knowledge of the little Krk-Romanian enclave. 63 To Muljačić we owe the discovery that Fortis possessed a notation of the Krk-Romanian version of the Pater Noster, and a list of 36 Krk-Romanian words with a Latin translation, probably provided for him by Sović. 64 These are the oldest available written confirmations of Krk-Romanian.

Passing over to the area of the “Littoral Croazia”, 65 which belonged to the Habsburg Empire – in which it had a different political status than the Kvarner islands as part of the Venetian Republic – Fortis adjusted the ethnic identity and language identity names. He mentions “devout Croats” together with “Istrians and neighbouring islanders”, as well as “Croats”, who persisted in the pious legend of Trsat, although even the official church had abandoned it, and used the same ethnonym while describing Baška (“the Brenta of the Croats”). 66 In the report on Fiume (Rijeka), which impressed him with the wealth and civilisation of the inhabitants, he used the glossonym “Croatian”. 67 The second part of the sentence tells however of social-cultural and linguistic conditions identical to those on the Venetian Kvarner islands (except that not belonging politically to

---

60 Fortis 1778: 534: “The island of Veglia surrounded by the water of the sea, is about hundred miles round, it is of easy access for barks of any size in its ports”.

61 So supposes Muljačić. Cf. 1976: 52. G. B. Giustiniano also remarked that the inhabitants of Krk spoke “some language of their own”, but he identified it as a kind of “lingua schiava”, a kind of slang. („ch’assomiglia al calmone”). Cf. Ljubić 1877: 200.

62 “... they speak a mixt jargon of Carnian Slavonic, Latin and Italian, particularly in one village called Pagliza.” Fortis 1778: 534.


65 Fortis 1778: 509. The country name Croatia was used by Fortis a few times more: „there is a streight passage to the city of Fiume in Croatia”, ibid.: 537; „... a part of Mediterranian Croatia”, ibid.: 522; “the coast of Liburnia, or low Austrian Croatia”, ibid.: 509. Littoral Croatia covered the area from Brseč to Lukovo Šugarje.

66 „... devout Croats, Istrians and neighbouring islanders”; „but the Croats are two hundred years behind us in these matters”. Ibid.: 511, 512 and 540

67 „The natural language of the country is the Croatian; but al the genteel people of both sexes speak good Italian and imitate the Tuscan manner ...“. Ibid: 510.
Venice tended to support Tuscan claims.\textsuperscript{68} This enabled reciprocal tight links in the key, prestige, field of education.\textsuperscript{69}

Of the nobility of the area, Fortis only mentions that of Senj which, although they derived from the Uskoks, “who were actually pirates”, set much store by patrician formalities.\textsuperscript{70} He met “the Signori Streglianazich”, an old and noble Uskok family, whose hearty hospitality and courtesy he praised.\textsuperscript{71} He recorded that “the church of Segna is officiated partly in Glagolitic Illyrian, and partly in Latin”, and that there had been there, in the 16\textsuperscript{th} century, a Glagolitic printing works. It was ruined when the Venetians ravaged the city. Not a single book printed in it had been preserved, and none of the contemporary Senj people knew of it. In Senj too Fortis was bitter about the clergy, who abused the credibility of the folk and used their influence to forestall “the flourishing of learning”, but refrained from an assessment of their (lack of) knowledge.

Alberto Fortis was the first researcher to give data about the socio-linguistic situation in the northern part of the Adriatic. His work is thus indispensable, though scholars after him, linguists in the true sense of the word, such as Bartoli and Pellis, collected much richer material and provided more thorough and systematic information. But Fortis is the only connection with a part of our past, and the only source for some information, confirmations and data. The greatest authority for Vegliot, Matteo Giulio Bartoli, for example, did not know the sentence recorded by Fortis, meaning that the \textit{Travels into Dalmatia} had clearly not reached him. Fortis’ reports are characterised by an additional and special characteristic: their literary and travelogue form, the author’s talent for observation and his skill as a writer, as well as his personal, committed viewpoint with respect to regions that he visited and the people he met, giving them a charm and vivacity that later papers were not to possess, even if they were more scientific and accurate.

\textit{Translated by Graham Mc Master.}

\textsuperscript{68} It would seem that on the contrary among the subjects of Venice the imitation of Tuscan was a source of derision.

\textsuperscript{69} “... the inhabitants of the venetian islands who chuse to give their children good education send them in the publick schools erected and maintained by the munificence of the Sovereign”. Fortis 1778: 510.

\textsuperscript{70} “Though the principal families of Segna are descended from the Uscocchi, who were actually pirates, yet they stand much on the punctilio of nobility.” \textit{Ibid.}: 517-518. He in general ascribed courteous behaviour to the Senj people, but held against them their superstition and nonsensical customs.

\textsuperscript{71} \textit{Ibid.}: 520: „the Signori Streglianazich, an ancient and noble family of the Uscocchi who, having lost the old warlike fierceness, preserves the sentiments of cordial hospitality”.

\textsuperscript{72} \textit{Ibid.}: 518
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JEZIK I GOVORNICI KVARNERSKOGA PODRUČJA U ISTRAŽIVANJIMA ALBERTA FORTISA

U radu smo prikazali doprinos talijanskog prirodoslovca, publicista i putopisca Alberta Fortisa (1741.-1803.) poznavanju jezičnih prilika na kvarnerskom području. Fortisa su, barem na početku njegovih istraživanja, u prvom redu zanimale prirodne znanosti, osobito mineralologija i paleontologija. Ali kao pravi pripadnik prosvjetiteljskog doba svoju je pozornost usmjerio i na antropološke karakteristike krajeva kojima je putovao. Interes za arheologiju i filologiju ponio je uz to kao intelektualni habitus i kulturnu popudbinu iz sredine u kojoj se formirao a istočni dio Jadran pružao je obilje građe i brojne prilike za nove spoznaje i otkrića na oba ta polja. Fortisa filologa zanimali su njemu nepoznati jezici u mjestima koja je posjetio a upuštao se i u etimološke „rekonstrukcije“, dijelom i pod utjecajem lokalnih intelektualaca. Dobar dio njegovih jezikoslovnih razmatranja nema uporište u stvarnim prilikama i odraz je predznansvenih zabluda svojstvenih njegovu vremenu. Pouzdaniji su, međutim, njegova terenska zapažanja i zabilježbe mjesnih naziva, koji su, uz ostalo, trebali potkrijepiti „realističnost“ i vjerodostojnost njegovih putopisnih izvješća. Fortisovi terenski prilozi nisu osobito brojni i ne odlikuju se sustavnošću. Ipak, romanska filologija duguje mu važne podatke o dva izumrla jezika, krčkoromanskome i krčkorumunjskom, premda su ih njegovi informatori, pa stoga i on, pogrešno identificirali. Neki dijelovi Fortisovih zapisa s Kvarnera upućuju i na socioetničke aspekte jezične prakse na tom području, premda većinom neizravno i fragmentarno. Kao angažirani prosvjetitelj osobito ističe siromaštvo i zapuštenost kroatofonih stanovnika kvarnerskih otoka. Fortis je bio prvi i zato je nezaobilazan, premda su znanstvenici nakon njega, jezikoslovci u pravom smislu riječi, kao što su Bartoli i Pellis, prikupili mnogo bogatiju građu i pružili temeljne i sustavnije informacije. Ali Fortis je jedina spona s jednim dijelom naše prošlosti i jedini je izvor za neke potvrdne i podatke. Najvećem autoritetu za veljotski, Matteu Giuliju Bartoliju, nije, primjerice, bila poznata rečenica koju je zabilježio Fortis, jer do njega očito nisu doprli Travels into Dalmatia. Fortisova izvješća odlikuje još jedno, posebno, svojstvo: literarni, putopisni oblik, autorov dar zapažanja i spisateljska vještina, kao i osobni, angažirani stav prema krajevima koje je posjetio i ljudima koje je susreo. To im daje živost i šarm koje neće posjedovati kasniji, stručniji radovi.
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