

ROBERT AUTY

THE LINGUISTIC WORK OF IGNJAT
ALOJZIJE BRLIĆ (1795-1855)

In the history of the Croatian national and linguistic revival in the first half of the nineteenth century I. A. Brlić, merchant of Brod in Slavonia, plays a minor and in some ways eccentric part. His views on linguistic questions, individual and forthright though they often were, played no direct part in the fashioning of the new literary language: this was rather the work of the Illyrian group in Zagreb with whom Brlić usually did not see eye to eye. Yet in his time this gifted amateur philologist and sincere patriot was a figure to be reckoned with. He was on familiar terms not only with Gaj and the intellectuals of Zagreb, but with Vuk and Kopitar in Vienna, and through them with a wide range of Slavonic patriots. His grammar of his native language must have been well thought of by his contemporaries, for it went through three editions; and he took an active part in the linguistic polemics of the time, notably in contributions to *Danica ilirska* and *Zora dalmatinska*, as well as in private correspondence. The purpose of the present article is to survey Brlić's activities as a linguistic theoretician against the general background of his time and to characterize his role and importance in the Croatian linguistic revival¹. No attempt will be made here to analyse in detail

¹ The principal sources for the present study are: the three editions of Brlić's grammar: 1. *Grammatik der Illyrischen Sprache wie solche in Boßnien, Dalmazien, Slawonien, Serbien, Ragusa &c. dann von den Illyriern in Banat und Ungarn gesprochen wird*. Für Teutsche verfaßt und herausgegeben von Ignatz Al. Berlich bürgerl. Handelsmanne, und Magistratsrathe der k. k. freien militär. Kommunität Brood in Slawonien. Ofen, 1833. 2. *Grammatik der illirischen Sprache wie solche in Dalmatien, Kroatien, Slawonien, Bosnien, Serbien, und von den Illiriern in Ungarn gesprochen wird*. Für Deutsche verfaßt und herausgegeben von Ignaz Al. Berlic. Zweite durchgesehene und verbesserte Auflage. Agram, 1842. 3. *Grammatik der illirischen Sprache, wie solche in den südslawischen Ländern Serbien, Bosnien, Slawonien, Dalmatien, Kroatien und von den Illiriern und Serben in Ungarn und der Vojvodina gesprochen wird*. Für Deutsche verfaßt und herausgegeben von Ignaz Al. Berlic. Dritte Auflage. Agram, 1850; the contemporary journals *Danica Horvatzka*, *Slavonzka*

the linguistic practice of Brlić as it emerges from his grammar and his other writings: it goes without saying however that such a study would be a highly desirable contribution to the history of the Serbo-Croat literary language.

The Brlić family had originally come to Slavonia from Herzegovina; but they had been established in Slavonia for several generations, since 1724 in Brod on the Sava. Ignjat Alojzije was born in 1795, the son of a merchant and destined himself to carry on the family business until his death in 1855.² Nevertheless he received a good education at the Franciscan monastery in Brod and the grammar school (*gymnasium*) at Požega. He was an able pupil and became acquainted with the notable Slavonian tradition of vernacular literature that had grown up in the eighteenth century – with the work of such men as Kanižlić, Relković and Došen.³ In 1813 he took over his father's business: in addition to the purely commercial side of his work he had also to perform the functions of 'syndicus and procurator' of the Bosnian province of the Franciscan order, acting as intermediary between the Franciscans of Turkish Bosnia and the Western world. The widespread contacts that naturally resulted from Brlić's professional activities must be borne in mind when we consider his broad and liberal views on linguistic questions.

It cannot, I think, be precisely ascertained when Brlić first conceived the idea of writing a grammar of his native tongue. In the Preface to the first edition he tells us⁴ that he began to while away his spare time in annotating the 'Slavonian' grammar of Relković.⁵ As the annotations became more and more voluminous he decided to rewrite the whole work. This task he took in hand with a commendable thoroughness. He procured all the available grammars of his native tongue in order to find material to supplement Relković. In the first instance, he tells us, he examined the works of della Bella

y Dalmatinzka, Zagreb 1835 ff. (*Danica ilirska*, 1836–1843) and *Zora Dalmatinska*, Zadar 1844–1848; Brlić's correspondence, printed in *Vukova prepiska*, ed. Lj. Stojanović, 7 vols., Belgrade 1907–1913 (especially vol. V), I. A. Brlić, *Pisma sinu Andriji Torkvatu* 1836–1855, 2 vols., Zagreb 1942–3, and *Pisma Ljudevitu Gaju* (ed. J. Horvath and J. Ravlić) (= *Grada za povijest književnosti hrvatske*, knj. 26), Zagreb 1956; and manuscripts by Brlić which are preserved in the Brlić family archive at Brod on the Sava. I am particularly grateful to Mme Zdenka Benčević-Brlić for permitting me to consult these manuscripts, for providing me with photographic copies of some of them, and for generous advice and assistance. I should like also to express my gratitude to my friend Professor Rudolf Filipović for help and advice of many kinds.

² A short biographical sketch may be found in the introduction to *Pisma sinu Andriji Torkvatu* (cf. note 1), which will be referred to hereafter as PS.

³ Cf PS, p. 10.

⁴ *Grammatik*², p. V. References to Brlić's grammar will in general be to the second edition, the only one available to me in Cambridge.

⁵ M. A. Relković, *Nova slavonska i nimacska Grammatika*, Zagreb 1767, second ed. Vienna 1774, third ed. Vienna 1789.

(1728), Relković (1767, 1774 and 1789), Lanosović (1778, 1789 and 1795), Voltić (Voltipigi) (1803), Appendini (1808), Šime Starčević (1812) and the anonymous *Illyricae linguae praecepta* (1807).⁶ To his astonishment he found that della Bella's grammar was the common source of all the later works⁷ and that none of them was really adequate to his purpose. He therefore obtained several grammars of other Slavonic languages, including Dobrovský's masterly grammars of Czech and Old Church Slavonic⁸. He had by this time decided to compose an entirely new grammar of his own: this he began to write in September 1822.⁹

At this time Brlić had not yet seen Vuk Karadžić's Serbian grammar which had appeared in 1814 and in a second edition as an appendage to his Serbian-German-Latin dictionary of 1818¹⁰. He had indeed heard of the existence of the work and had been advised by friends to consult it: but he could not bring himself to look at a grammar labelled 'Serbian', thinking that it would be yet another example of the hybrid Russo-Serbian Church Slavonic that had hitherto served as the literary language of the Serbs¹¹. In 1824 or 1825 however he had the opportunity of reading Jakob Grimm's German translation of Vuk's grammar in which he found, as he puts it, more than he could ever have expected: 'eine neugeregelte und mit äusserst nöthigen Buchstaben bereicherte Orthographie mit cirillischen Lettern, welche für die illirische Sprache nichts zu wünschen übrig lässt, eine kräftige, schöne Nationalsprache wie sie im Munde des Volkes lebt, die grammatischen Eintheilungen wie sie seyn sollen, alle übrigen mir bekannten illirischen weit zurücklassend'¹². Had he known this work earlier, he says, it might have dissuaded him from his project of writing a new grammar of his own. As he had already progressed so far he decided, however, to continue with it, but with the valuable help afforded by Vuk's work.

It was not long before he was brought into personal contact with the Serbian scholar. From his friend Popović he learnt that Vuk was proposing to visit Brod in the matter of a law-suit in which he was in-

⁶ Cf. *Grammatik*², p. V-VI.

⁷ In fact della Bella himself had been greatly in the debt of B. Kašić, *Institutionum Linguae illyricae Libri duo*, Rome 1604. Cf. St. Bosanac, 'Ocjena Dellabelline gramatike (Prilog za istoriju hrvatske gramatike)', *Nastavni vjesnik* IX (1901), 529-561, and A. Cronia, 'Contributo alla grammatologia serbo-croata (Cassio-Della Bella-Appendini)', *Ricerche slavistiche* I (1952), 22-37.

⁸ *Grammatik*², p. VI-VII.

⁹ In the manuscript of the grammar preserved in the Brlić Archive the main text (after the *Vorrede*) is headed 'In Nomine Sanctissimae Triadis P. f. - S. S. Brodii die 23-tia Septembris 1822'.

¹⁰ Писменица сербскога иезика, по говору простога народа написана, Vienna 1814; Српски рјечник, истолкован њемачким и латинским рјечима, *ibid.* 1818.

¹¹ '... weil ich einen Eckel von (*sic*) allen serbisch sein sollenden Werken hatte, indem sie eigentlich in gar keinem slawischen, sondern in einem heterogenen Gemisch von serbisch-russisch- und cirillischem Dialekt geschrieben sind.' *Grammatik*², p. VII.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. VII f.

volved. The news gave Brlić the opportunity of writing to Vuk to introduce himself and express the hope that they might meet and discuss philological matters. In this letter (of 8 March 1825¹³) he expresses with due modesty his debt to Vuk in grammatical matters and implies that he is a mere dilettante in these pursuits: '... jerbo se i já s' tim poslòm veche vishe od 3 Godine, kad 'sam besposten, zabavljam, zabavljam velim, jerbo mi nije od zanáta tò ráđiti i s' takvima se stvárma baviti, Pántlikár bo 'sam.'¹⁴ A further passage in this letter is of considerable significance for Brlić's whole approach to the problems of the literary language. He looks forward to discussions with Vuk, he says 'káno s' jedínim razumnim filologom nashkiem', and continues:

'... Istina, da 'ste Ví narodu serbskòmu písali, a já Slavóncem píshe, áli mislim, da se i pák razumiemo, i da na sverhi o jednoj i istoj stvári bavimo se, i jedan jèzik obradjujemo, s' tòm rázlikom, da Ví u Vashemu Národu prvi bili jeste, koji 'ste se usúđili, – (shto pravo i jest) s' csistim materinskim jezikom písati i pokázati, da prosti serbski jezik tolikè lypote u sebi uzderxáje, da, ako u sladkosti izgovora cerkveni jezik nenadvishujè, istinito da mu se i podloxiti usiljen nije, jerbo shto je taliánski jezik prema latin-skomu, zaista da je i nash prosti pram cerkvenomu, koji sverhu toga i pák *nash* stari nije.'

In these lines we find the expression of two principles that were paramount in all Brlić's linguistic work: the conception of the unity of the Serbo-Croat language and the acceptance of the language of the people as the foundation of the literary language. In another letter (of 28 March 1825) he asks for Vuk's opinion on his orthography, and in particular on his use of the 'Latin or rather Greek' *ÿ* for the Cyrillic ѣ. Here another important feature of Brlić's linguistic views is adumbrated – his predilection for the Cyrillic alphabet: 'Já znam da chete rechi: пиши Брате као ја што пишем, бити ће најбоље, али имадем ја осим оних од Г-пдина Копитара у његовој Граматици најављених узроках још више, који ми ово чинити недопушћају – морам дакле и ја колико је могуће, латинска керпати, да нашки писати могу –'

The two men met in Brod in April 1825¹⁵ and from that time on they remained in regular correspondence until 1834. Vuk kept Brlić informed of new ideas and publications in the field of Slavonic philology:

¹³ *Vukova prepiska* (cf. note 1; this work will hereafter be referred to as VP), V, p. 79–81.

¹⁴ This letter is still in the Slavonian orthography; but in the course of a letter of 28 February 1825 he changes to Cyrillic and thereafter writes regularly to Vuk in that alphabet.

¹⁵ Cf. Vuk's letter to Kopitar of 29 April 1825, VP I, p. 265.

on 6/18 October 1825 he informs him of Kopitar's proposals for the introduction of certain new letters into the Latin alphabet¹⁶; a few months later he recommends to him Šafařík's *Geschichte der slawischen Sprache und Litteratur nach allen Mundarten*. But above all Vuk continually urged his Slavonian friend to forge ahead as quickly as possible with the completion of his grammar. Apart from the general desirability of advancing the literary use of the popular language there was another more specific reason for Vuk's insistence. Already in April 1826 he informed Brlić that he himself would like to write a more extensive grammar and that for this task he would like to make use of Brlić's syntactical material¹⁷. (Vuk's *Pismenica* had contained no section on syntax.) Nevertheless Brlić's progress was slow: he complains of the difficulty of working in the winter¹⁸ and of his business preoccupations¹⁹. It would appear that the book may have been completed by the end of 1827 in the form in which we know it²⁰: originally Brlić still hoped to include sections on etymology and prosody but decided in the end to omit them. By the end of 1830 the manuscript had been passed by the censor in Buda²¹ and after complicated negotiations about the printing the grammar appeared in May 1833²².

At the time when Brlić wrote his grammar the stirrings of a linguistic revival among the southern Slavs were apparent in several quarters, but of the various tendencies towards the codification of modern literary languages none had yet become authoritative. The work of Vuk was far from being generally accepted or even approved; Gaj was still writing in the kajkavic dialect; discussion and polemics were in progress among the Slovenes as to the proper literary form of their language. In Brod Brlić was somewhat isolated from the main centres of linguistic discussion; and he often complained to Vuk that

¹⁶ *ibid.*, V, p. 93, f.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 116.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 110.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 117.

²⁰ Он 18 Септембер 1827 he writes to Vuk: 'Ове би зиме рада да се почне штампати, али ће бити много краћа, него што сам наурио, немам Брате времена сада се много о тому бавити, Синтаксис је мислим доста обширно и добро израђен, Етимологија ће бити доста неподпуна, а Просодија ће савим изостат. Може бити, ако се други пута кадгод почне штампат, да ће бити подпунија, а сад за сад нека овако на свѣт иде.' VP V, 129. In fact the etymology and prosody never appeared; we may assume that that part of the Brod MS headed *Fünfter Theil. Von der Bildung der Wörter* represents, at any rate in part, the etymology. It is dated '26 Julia 827'; 'Julia' is struck through and replaced by 'Ibra'.

²¹ Cf. Brlić's letter to Vuk of 22 November 1830, VP V, p. 139.

²² From a manuscript in the Brlić Archive we learn that the book appeared in an edition of 500 copies together with two extra ones on special paper, and that he sent out 66 complimentary copies. Among the recipients were the Slovak writer Jur Pavlovič, Vuk, Kopitar, Šafařík, F. M. Appendini, as well as the Russian scholar A. S. Šiškov, the Pole Bandtke, and Jakob Grimm. The bill for the printing, presented by Conrad Adolph Hartlebens Buchhandlung in Pest, amounted to fl. 442. 58.

he had no-one with whom he could discuss the linguistic problems that preoccupied him. To a large extent he must have worked out the principles underlying his grammatical codification with no other aid than the older grammatical literature which he consulted and his own keen intelligence. All the more noteworthy is it, therefore, that his book represented a significant contribution to the linguistic debate that was then in progress.

His book finally appeared as a grammar of the 'Illyrian' language, as spoken in Bosnia, Dalmatia, Slavonia, Serbia, Ragusa etc., as well as by the Illyrians of the Banat and Hungary. The concept of a unitary literary language for all Serbs and Croats is thus fundamental to his work. The name Illyrian was not his own choice. The manuscript of his grammar preserved in the Brlić Archive at Brod bears the title *Slavonische Sprachlehre*. The decision to change this to 'Illyrian' was not taken till after the work was completed, perhaps as late as 1832: for on 23 May of that year he writes to Vuk (who was, he hoped, to read a proof²³): 'У својој Граматици гдѣ стоји *südslawisch* или *slawonisch* говорећ о Граматици или Језику у обћину, онди поправите и метните *illyrisch* то ме је наговорио Г. Копитар – а видити ћете и у предговору'. In the preface he devotes some attention to this question. It is clear that he regarded the term 'illyrisch' as a mere *pis aller*. The arguments in favour of it, he says, are, first, the fact that the Bosnians, Dalmatians and Ragusans still use it to describe their language, and, second, 'dass einst in diesem, jetzt mit so vielen Namen bezeichneten Lande, die alten Illirier ihre Sitze gehabt haben.'²⁴ Nevertheless, he continues, this term will soon have to be abandoned, for the 'Kingdom of Illyria' established by the French during the Napoleonic wars has caused different territorial associations to be attached to this name. To choose a substitute, however, is not so easy. Brlić rejects in turn the terms Slavonian, Serbian, Croatian, South Slavonic and 'Raitzisch' as all are open to objection on historical or practical grounds. His somewhat surprising conclusion is to use the familiar term that is in use in all the provinces concerned: *naški*. 'Also werden wir wohl im Deutschen *na s c h k i* sprechen müssen, so wie wir *našinci* zu Hause *naški* reden.'²⁵ In fact, as will be seen later, this eccentric proposal was never taken up, even by Brlić himself. For subsequent developments reinforced, at any rate for a time, the use of 'Illyrian'.²⁶

²³ It does not arise clearly from the correspondence whether Vuk in fact did so; but the absence of a corresponding acknowledgement in the preface makes it unlikely that he did.

²⁴ *Grammatik*², p. IV. Brlić shows commendable caution in refusing to commit himself on the question of whether the ancient Illyrians were the ancestors of the Slavs.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. V.

²⁶ Brlić's term is used by Dimitrije Frušić, writing to Vuk from Trieste on 21 December 1833; 'Jesteli čitali Bārlića (*sic*) predsluviје na Gramatiku našku.' VP I. p. 684.

The second fundamental concept of Brlić's grammar is that the grammarian should be guided by popular usage, not by abstract principles. 'Ich glaube, keine Regel aufgeschrieben zu haben', he says, 'die sich im Munde des Volkes nicht bewähren könnte.'²⁷ In this he was in full agreement not only with Vuk (v. supra p. 7), but also with the views which Kopitar was eagerly propagating at this time²⁸; indeed he supports his position by quoting the well-known dictum of the Slovene scholar: 'Der Grammatiker ist nur ein Referent der Sprache, er darf sie nicht in die Regeln zwingen, sondern die Regeln der Sprache, so wie sie ist, anpassen.'²⁹ These two concepts, the unity of the Serbo-Croat language (whatever its name) and the primacy of popular usage, are central to the whole of Brlić's linguistic work.

As in all the linguistic discussions among the Slavs of Austria at this time, questions of orthography are of the first importance for Brlić. A special foreword, headed *An meine Landsleute*, is devoted to this problem. For want of anything better he has, he tells us, used the traditional Slavonian orthography of Kanžlić and Relković, or rather a combination of the slightly divergent systems employed by these two writers. He does not attempt to defend this orthography, whose defects he explicitly recognizes – in particular the etymological principle which caused the same sound to be written in different ways according to its origin.³⁰ 'Das angemessenste wäre: schreibe wie du sprichst, und lese wie es geschrieben steht.'³¹ This is, of course, Vuk's principle; but Brlić had not attempted to apply it in the Latin alphabet.

The adoption of a traditionally Slavonian orthography had no doubt a certain appropriateness in a work originally entitled *Slavonische Grammatik*. Nevertheless Brlić was aiming at a wider audience; and in one respect he modified the Slavonian system in order to minimize its local character. The Slavonian authors, ikavic speakers writing for an ikavic public, had naturally used *i* for words with etymological /ě/. In view of the numerous variations in the realization of this phoneme in the dialects of his native language (even within the boundaries of Slavonia) Brlić proposed to express it orthographically by the neutral, though unusual *y*.³² This usage had no support in tradition; but it marks a further modest attempt on Brlić's part to encourage linguistic unity among his compatriots. This aim also inspires the remainder

²⁷ *Grammatik*², p. VIII.

²⁸ Kopitar was led by his attachment to the popular language to propagate the right of every dialect to its own literary language – a very different conception from that of Brlić. Cf. Kopitar's correspondance with I. Kristijanović in *Arhiv za povjestnicu jugoslavensku* XII (1875).

²⁹ *Grammatik*², p. VIII.

³⁰ *ć* is represented by *ch*, *tj*; *đ* by *gj*, *d* ; *nj* by *ny*, *nj*; *lj* by *ly*, *lj*.

³¹ *Grammatik*², p. 10

³² This usage is, strangely, not referred to in the foreword *An meine Landsleute*, but only at the appropriate point in the text of the grammar. Cf. *Grammatik*², p. 13 n.

of his orthographic foreword, which is a strong plea for the acceptance of the Cyrillic alphabet in Vuk's revised form. This alphabet, he argues, is in itself a good one; and it has been used in the past on occasion by Catholics; moreover the majority of the 5,000,000 'Illyrian' speakers are members of the orthodox church and it is therefore reasonable that the minority should adopt Cyrillic for the sake of unity. He would modify Vuk's alphabet only in one respect – by the restoration of Ѣ. The desire for unity also underlies his final plea that Catholics and Orthodox should read each other's books, so that the merits of the 'Catholic' language, with its long tradition of independent growth, and of the Church Slavonic of the Serbs, with its ancient lexical treasures, may mutually fructify one another.

Of the success of Brlić's grammar we can only judge by the fact that a new edition was called for nine years later. The first edition was of 502 copies, and if, as we may not unreasonably assume, the first edition had been sold out before the appearance of the second his book must have sold remarkably well for a work of its kind.³³ Nevertheless it seems to have received little public notice. A letter from Brlić to Vuk of 1 October 1833 seems to imply that even those eminent philologists to whom he had sent the book had failed to react:

„О мојој Граматици, као да је проклета, нигда ни слова – бар да ме наши попови чешљају – ал баш и они шуте, и чудо когагод упитам од мојих пријатељах био поп ил' фратар, сваки вели да право имам, што м'есто латинских сербска слова припоручујем, а кажу ми баш да и велики попови ништа протива мени неговоре!"³⁴

In the meantime the national revival was proceeding, and interest in the written form of the vernacular was soon to become a central issue among Croatian intellectuals. Gaj returned to Zagreb in 1832, full of plans and ideas for the future of his nation and its language. In January 1835 the first issue of *Danica horvatska, slavonska i dalmatinska* appeared in Zagreb. From the first questions of the written language and especially of its orthography loomed large in the columns of Gaj's journal. It was not long before Brlić joined in the debate. On 8 August 1835 *Danica* published a letter from him on the subject of orthography.³⁵ Earlier in that year Gaj had expounded at length his proposals for a diacritic orthography.³⁶ Brlić here expresses himself in favour of this system, but only on condition that the Serbs also accept it. Failing such acceptance he reiterates his opinion that the Croats should accept Cyrillic. A reply from Vjekoslav Babukić in the

³³ Cf. note 22.

³⁴ VP V, p. 152.

³⁵ *Danica* . . . , теџај I, no. 31, 8 August 1835.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, nos 10, 11 and 12.

same issue of *Danica* argues that it is more reasonable for the Serbs to learn the new diacritic orthography than for all those who use the Latin alphabet to go over to Cyrillic. His article is couched in the idealistic terms of Gaj's and Kollár's conceptions of Slavonic brotherhood. Unity demands that Gaj's orthography should be employed by all 'Illyrians'; brotherhood will cause the Catholic Southern Slavs to learn Cyrillic. This idealistic approach is very different from Brlić's practical common sense: events were to show that neither gauged the possibilities of the situation with complete accuracy. In any case it is no surprise that during the following decade, vital in the history of the Serbo-Croat literary language, Brlić no longer figures among the contributors to *Danica ilirska*. The strength of his opposition to the Illyrian trends and of his support for the reformed Cyrillic alphabet clearly emerge from a characteristically temperamental letter to Vuk of 21 September 1837: 'Какогод сам у Граматици мојој казао – при цириличкој азбуци Вашег реда остајем а што они сањају није ме страх – али ми је жао што се од доброг пута оддаљујемо. Мене су додуше лани сплели да сам њихове мисли – али су лагали – међутим знам да јих се не треба бојат – Бог би дао да се уздрже, какви су такви су – наши су!'³⁷

In 1842 Brlić published a second edition of his grammar. In January of that year he complains in a letter to his son of delays in the printing. The book had been taken over by the publisher F. Župan (Suppan) of Zagreb, and in the arrangements for the printing Brlić was helped by his friend Bogoslav Šulek. The preface to the new edition, dated 20 August 1842, gives credit to Gaj for having awakened the 'Illyrian spirit' and the national consciousness; and it announces that Brlić has now adopted the new orthography (with a single divergence). That his motive was the desire for unity rather than any change of views on the intrinsic merits of the diacritic system is immediately apparent:

'Dass ich mich nun in würdiger Anerkennung dessen (*scil.* of Gaj's achievements) entschlossen habe – um allen Spaltungen in der durch den Dr. Gaj neuerweckten illirischen Literatur vorzubeugen – die von ihm eingeführte, sogenannte organische Orthographie bei dieser Auflage zu gebrauchen, – wird mir wohl kein wahrer Patriot verübeln, und das um so weniger, als dies für jetzt das einzige Bindungsmittel ist, wodurch wir gewissermassen beisammen bleiben können. – Warum ich jedoch das gehörnte *ě* ausgelassen, und dafür ein *je*, welches aber ebenfalls dem Zwecke nicht entspricht, angenommen, habe ich bereits in dem Werke selbst erklärt.

'Ich will mich hier in die Kritik dieser Orthographie nicht einlassen, aber bekennen muss ich es, dass sie weder mir, noch vielen Andern gefällt; – doch bedient man sich derselben der Einigkeit

³⁷ VP V, p. 161.

wegen, und zu wünschen wäre es, dass man sich derselben so lange bedienen möchte, bis nicht allen Illiriern die wahre Danica aufgeht, und man sich in einem Alphabetarion, und einer Schreibart vereinigt haben wird.³⁸

There follows an emphatic plea for the acceptance by Croats and Serbs alike of Vuk's reformed Cyrillic alphabet. In addition to the argument of unity Brlić now adduces a philological argument. Dobrovský had divided the Slavonic languages into two *ordines*: to the first he ascribed Russian, Old Slavonic, 'Illyrian or Serbian', Croatian and 'Slovene or Wendish', and to the second Slovak Czech, Upper and Lower Lusatian and Polish. The languages of the first order, Brlić suggests, should all adopt Cyrillic 'nachdem schon fünfzehn Sechszehntel davon wirklich nur cirillisch schreiben.' Such a step would, he concludes, be fully in the spirit of Kollár's *Wechselseitigkeit*.

The reason for the substitution of *je* for Gaj's *ě* was primarily a practical one. Brlić's grammar presented the words in accentuated form, and to add a second diacritic to the letter *ě* was typographically impossible. Brlić would have preferred his original *y*, but no-one had followed him in this usage; he preferred *je* to the Ragusan *ie* as it was phonetically clearer³⁹.

The increasing strength of the Illyrian linguistic reforms throughout the 1840's made it less and less likely that Brlić's hopes for a general acceptance of Cyrillic would be realised. He probably understood this well enough; for while in his letters and articles he more than once praises Vuk's alphabet and language he threw his main energies into an attempt to correct what he regarded as the worst excesses of the Zagreb school particularly in the fields of orthography and morphology. In his letters to his son Andrija Torkvat Brlić⁴⁰ his views on the Illyrians were expressed with uncompromising frankness. The principal targets for his attacks were Šulek and Babukić. Šulek (whose help in linguistic matters he had acknowledged so recently!) is scornfully described as a Slovak who, it is implied, cannot speak with authority on a language that is not his own. Babukić is criticized, more in sorrow than in anger, as a fellow-Slavonian who has allowed the artificial intellectualism of Zagreb to override his native idiom. His bitterness was increased by the fact that his son inclined to accept the views of the Illyrians. On 29 March 1845 he writes:

'Ponudenu Šafarikovu misao o zagrebačkom vrstopisu ne trebam. Svaki ciganin svoju kobilu hvali. – Ti da si tvoga oca gramatiku pomljiivo i dobro prošio može biti da bi našao razboritije

³⁸ *Grammatik*² p. XVII.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 13 n.

⁴⁰ Cf. notes 1 and 2.

uzroke protiva latinskoj abecedi, nego po zraku hvatajuć, tudjinska lukava mnenja!!!! – ele mlad si lud si, ja ti opraštam, a ti ćeš vidjeti!—⁴¹

By December 1846 he was using even more intemperate language:

‘Šuleku ništa ne odgovaraj – nije bo toga dostojan, dosta zlo što su si Zagrebci gluhog Šlovaka za svoga Diktatora u Ilirizmu uzeli; čudim se Požežcu Babukiću.’⁴²

Babukić is described as ‘...fantasta regius, destructor iliricae lingvae...’ (15 September 1847)⁴³. The appearance of Vuk’s translation of the New Testament reminds him, by contrast, of the defects of the language of the Zagreb school:

‘Vukov Novi zavit primio sam iz Osika i svaki se dan s’ jednim poglavljem nasladujem. Est vere classicissimus Ilirus. Od njega nek Zagrebci uče, a nebudale po kekavečki, totski i kranjski!!!!’ (10 January 1848).⁴⁴

His indignation with the Illyrians was the deciding factor in causing him to undertake the preparation of a third edition of his grammar:

‘...Ja se nebi bio pozivu Supanovom, za izdavanje moje Gramatike i treći puta, odazvao, da mi naš krasni i slavni jezik na serdcu neleži, koga Zagrebci samohotno kvare, pak još nepostidno viču, s v i u s l o g u! Sloga jim je u ustima, al oni samo ono za slogu drže, tko njih u svemu slipo nasliđuje, sve ostale – za nesložne proglašujuć, koji se usuđe njihove magarečine rešetati; vele bo: tko nije s nama, onaj je protiva nama. Ako to nije tako, jer Kekavac Gaj, Kranjac Vraz, Slovak Šulek, polutalijani Mažuranići, fantasta Babukić nisu takva lumina mundi, da jih čovik slipo nasliđovati mora, a Bog me i to ti svesredno kažem, da ja starih Dubrovčanih i Dalmatinah za nikakve Auctoritaete nedržim, nego samo i jedino živo naričje štujem, pak neogaziv ovo – po njemu Gramatiku gradio sam – i gradim. Meni je dosad, a i sada još – Vuk najsvetiji i najveći Auctoritaet u deklinaciji i conjugaciji – u tomu se njega držim, a ostalo sjedinjujem za svu Iliriu koliko i kad mogu, i neobazirajuć se na gorirečeno.—’ (15 March 1848)⁴⁵.

⁴¹ PS I, p. 90 .

⁴² Ibid. p. 123.

⁴³ Ibid., p. 146.

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 156. Here the Carniolan (Kranjac) Vraz is pilloried along with the Kajkavac Gaj and the Slovak Šulek.

⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 164.

In this passage some of Brlić's main linguistic principles are clearly expressed: respect above all for the living spoken language and a deep distrust for purely literary authorities. During this same period (1844–1848) he expounded the practical implications of these principles in a number of weighty and well thought out articles. As publication of his views in *Danica* hardly came into question he made use of the opportunities offered by the appearance from 1844 onwards of a new journal – *Zora dalmatinska*. It is true that his first impressions of this journal, with its provincial outlook and conservative Dalmatian orthography,⁴⁶ were not favourable:

‘Dalmatinsku zoru štijem, al bi joj do sad bolje ime bilo: polun o ć je.’ (Letter to A. T. Brlić of 17 February 1844)⁴⁷ Nevertheless it was not long before he availed himself of the possibility of free discussion which was offered by Ante Kuzmanić, the editor of *Zora* in its first year of existence. His first contribution was a letter discussing various detailed points of orthography and morphology.⁴⁸ His comments concerned principally the spelling to be adopted for vocalic /r/, /h/ and the reflexes of /ě/. The first of these sounds should, Brlić firmly held, be written *er. ar* (at that time favoured by the Illyrians ‘iz robske poniznosti prama Dubrovčanom’) has nothing in its favour, for it is not used by other Slavs, is not universal even in the older Ragusan and Dalmatian literature, and gives rise to inconvenient homographies such as *Marko* (= *Marko/mrko*) and *marva* (= *marva/mrva*). *h* should be written where pronounced.⁴⁹ For *ě* Brlić still seems to prefer his own suggested *y* which has, however, found no approval; he is firmly against *ie*, the latest Illyrian usage. At the beginning and end of his letter Brlić raises a more general subject on which he felt strongly: the language of *Zora*, he says reminds him of Italian; it is essential that the Dalmatians should learn to think in their mother-tongue, not merely to write in it.

In another contribution⁵⁰ Brlić raised a further point which often recurs in his linguistic writings: the forms of the 3. pers. pl. pres. ind. in *-du*, to which he violently objects as being unjustified localisms which should have no place in the literary language⁵¹. He also became

⁴⁶ Cf. R. Anty, ‘Dalmatia and the Illyrian Linguistic Reforms’, *Annali dell’ Istituto Universitario Orientale* (Naples). Sezione slava II (1959), 49–60.

⁴⁷ PS I, p. 74.

⁴⁸ *Zora dalmatinska* (hereafter referred to as ZD) I (1844), no. 20, p. 155 f.

⁴⁹ Brlić also advocates writing *h* in the endings of the instrumental and locative plural: *S našima konjih, u inostranima gradovih*. This is no doubt due to an erroneous analysis of the Slavonian instr. and loc. forms in *-i*. Cf. P. Ivić, *Dijalektologija srpskohrvatskog jezika*, Novi Sad 1956, p. 201.

⁵⁰ ZD I (1844), p. 274 ff.

⁵¹ In *Grammatik*² he had written: ‘Das hoëdu der Agramer Literaten ist ein übel angebrachter Bačko-Banater Idiotismus, oder ein Serbismus, der durch keine Analogie genügend gerechtfertigt werden kann, und darum eben so, wie das idedu, vidjedu, glededu, znadedu u. dgl., ganz zu meiden ist’ (p. 99 n). At the Brlić Archive there is a manuscript poem by Brlić, making fun of these verbal forms.

involved in the fundamental issue of diacritic orthography, to which he was increasingly opposed. The opponents of the diacritics referred to them as 'horns' (*rogovi*) or 'spikes' (*šiljki*); and Brlić found scriptural support for his views in Psalm 21, 22 'Salva...a cornibus unicornium humilitatem meam'. This thrust was smartly countered by St. Ivičević of Makarska, who quoted Psalm 17, 3: 'Cornu salutis meae.'

All this was of the nature of preliminary skirmishing. Brlić's considered and reasoned views on the literary language are contained in two important articles which appeared in *Zora dalmatinska* in 1846 and 1847. The first was entitled *Knjiženstvo. Několiko rěčih, o najnoviima proměnama u ilirskom organičkom vërstopisu*.⁵² After renewed attacks on the Zagreb orthography in its current form, especially on *ar* and *ie* Brlić gives his *pia desideria* which may be summarized as follows: 1. Writers should keep to Gaj's 'organic' orthography in its original form as given in *Danica ilirska* in 1836. 2. *ar* should not be used for *er/r*. 3. For /ě/ 'budi ě ili y, samo nek je jedno...' 4. In books intended to have only local circulation other spellings for /ě/ might be permitted, but books intended to be read over all 'Illyria' should have ě or y. 5. When older works are republished it would be admissible to retain the author's original spelling. 6. New poets should retain the spirit of Ragusan poetry but not its language. They should take greater note of the *narodne pjesme* and of such authors as Kačić, Došen and Relković. These proposals were warmly welcomed by the editor (now Nikola Valentić), in particular the suggestions about /ě/. They represented Brlić's closest approach to unity with the Zagreb school; but the response was negative. An article in *Danica*, signed —k (perhaps the work of Šulek?) defended the Illyrian positions and was temperamentally attacked by Brlić in *Zora*⁵³. He no longer concealed his preference for Cyrillic:

'A ja opet velikim glasom vapijem: Nejma nam spasenija, ako naše knjiženstvo u ćirilici nesjedinimo.'

His conclusion, again in defence of *er*, recalls the tone of his letters to his son:

'Mi dakle, razboritija bratjo! ostanimo pri preprostomu e, i pišimo po razlogu: *kerst*, *perst*, *tern*, makar nas baš i kekavcima imenovali, a pustimo Zagrebačke Ilire, nek oni ilirišu dok nedoili-rišu, to Vas moli, i to vam preporučuje

Stari Berlić.'

Brlić's second important general article in *Zora* appeared in May 1847⁵⁴ under the title *O izobraženju i knjiženstvu*. It takes the form

⁵² ZD III (1846), p. 82-87 and 90-91.

⁵³ Ibid., p. 242.

⁵⁴ Ibid., IV (1847), p. 121-123, 125-127 and 129-130.

of advice to poets on the language they should use. The theme is familiar: the natural spoken language should be used, as opposed to the artificial literary language now in vogue:

‘Da svaki piše kako ga je majka naučila, berzo bi se ova gruba pomanjkanja, o kojima sam naumio govorit, razperšila; al ovako se sve dublje i dublje u kaljuxinu propada.’⁷

These arguments are reinforced by reference to Kopitar:

‘Ama ljudi bratjo: uzmite na um Kopitarove riči: *Onaj koji Gramatiku piše, ništa drugo nije, nego predavaoc od jezika – kakvi je jezik u sam sebi; za to ga on nesmil u uprave stiskivati; – nego uprave onako jeziku prikrajati, kakvi je jezik u sam sebi.*’

Of detailed points of usage Brlić on this occasion deals only with the plural case-endings of the masculine nominal declensions. After rejecting the Zagreb usage of dat. *-om*, *-em*, instr. *-i*, loc. *-ah*, *-ih* and discussing the alternatives he now proposes dat. *-im*, instr. *-mi*, loc. *-ma*.

This article was Brlić’s last important linguistic contribution to *Zora dalmatinska*. The final volume of that journal did, it is true, contain a favourable review of Vuk’s translation of the New Testament, on which Brlić’s views have already been noted; and on 15 May 1848 there appeared an article by him on the revolutionary events in Vienna, supporting the rising against the Metternich regime and of no relevance in the present context.

Brlić’s letters to his son contain references to another article which he had sent to *Zora* at the same time as that just discussed, but which Kuzmanić had refused to publish:

‘Tandem evo izlazi u Zori moje razloženje o izobraženosti i knjiženstvu, drago bi mi bilo, da i u Jahrbücher dojde. – Al bi onda i na Zoru upravljeno pismo o verstopisim Ilirskima, koje G. Kuzmanić neće da primi, dodati želio, i to bi isto moralo pred ovim razloženjem u Zori uštampano biti. Al denique neće Dalmatini da Zagrebački vrstopis prime, pak možebit neće ni Starčevića⁵⁵ da uvrde, te tako moje razloženje o verstopisim izostade; ovo je razloženje uzdržavalo ponukovanje, da se odfrknutog Zagrebačkog verstopisa primimo, da ga, gdi po svisti i dužnosti, sudimo, pravljamo – al da S. Augustina riči vavike na očima imamo: in necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus charitas.’ (13 May 1847.)⁵⁶

⁵⁵ Šime Starčević, parish priest of Karlobag, a violent opponent of the Zagreb orthography and author of a grammar praised by Brlić in *Grammatik*², p. XVI.

⁵⁶ PS I, p. 136.

The same article is referred to in another letter, of 31 May 1847⁵⁷. Although the article never appeared in *Zora dalmatinska* or, so far as I have been able to ascertain, in any other journal, the manuscript is preserved at the Brlić Archive in Brod⁵⁸. The MS of the article is accompanied by a draft letter to Ante Kuzmanić, urging him to accept the Zagreb orthography which has now been given official recognition by the Austrian government. In the light of this fact Brlić declares his readiness – though he is no friend of the Zagreb party – to accept their orthography ‘... dok Bog nedáde da se u ćirilici sjedinimo, a to će biti kad bude.’ The article itself is entitled *Poslydnje moje misli o našim verstopisim*. It begins, like the accompanying letter, with the recognition that the Zagreb orthography has now achieved official status and should therefore be accepted. Nevertheless, Brlić envisages the possibility of minor modifications. He accepts the ‘ražnji i roгови’ on consonants, but rejects them on vowels. That is to say he disapproves of ě, ěr and àr. Monosyllabic *ie* is also attacked once again. After speaking briefly of these details he proceeds to enlarge on the text from St Augustine which he quoted in his letter of 13 May 1847. *In necessariis unitas*: Unity is the greatest need; and he recognizes that this can now only be reached on the basis of the Zagreb orthography. *In dubiis libertas*: the only doubt is that concerning the representation of ě. Brlić proposes that *y, i, e* and *je* should all be allowed, but not *ie*. *In omnibus charitas*: the article ends with a plea for mutual love, the greatest of the cardinal virtues, and for the avoidance of disunity. The manuscript is dated St Georges Day (‘na s. Gergusa’) 1847.⁵⁹

In 1850 Župan brought out the third edition of Brlić’s grammar. The printing seems to have been delayed by the political events of 1849. The work included a long, new preface (p. III–XV), summarizing the history of the original composition of the grammar, as well as Brlić’s considered views on the literary language. These bring little that is new and parts of the preface repeat more or less *verbatim* passages from earlier prefaces or articles. Reference is made to the new national situation: the cultivation of the language has a new and responsible part to play in the development of the nation:

‘Jetzt handelt es sich um die Selbständigkeit der Nationen und Nationalitäten, und diese sind blos an ihrer Sprache kennbar. – Wir sind auch zu dieser Selbsterkenntnis geweckt und vorbereitet, und nun ist es unsere heiligste Pflicht dem Heiligthume unserer Nation und Nationalität – unserer Sprache aufzuhelfen, und sie zu

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 138.

⁵⁸ I hope to publish the text of this article, together with that of the poem referred to in note 51 and certain other of Brlić’s linguistic miscellanea on another occasion.

⁵⁹ The year is struck through, together with the last few words of the manuscript; but 1847 is confirmed as the year in which the article was composed by the references in PS.

jenen Ehren zu bringen, wie diess die gebildeten Nationen mit ihren Sprachen gethan; in der Schule, Kirche und im Amte soll nur die Nationalsprache Platz haben, mit Entfernung alles Fremden, das uns nur an die erlittenen Unbilden erinnern könnte.'

He has no new solution to offer in the matter of the name of his language. 'Illyrian' is still no more than a *pis aller* and he repeats his earlier eccentric suggestion:

'Es scheint, dass wir doch am Ende, um unter einem genetischen Namen zu leben, das Wort Našinska für das Land, Našinci für das Volk, und naški für die Sprache anzunehmen und genötigt sehen werden, warum? – wird sich ein jeder Südslave leicht an den Fingern abzählen können.'

The Cyrillic alphabet, in Vuk's version, still appears to him a more sensible solution to the orthographic problem than any other, though he realises that the trend of events is against him here. His criticism of the Zagreb writers, expressed in judicious but firm language, is largely on the grounds that they are widening the gap between 'Serbian' and 'Illyrian':

'Es scheint aber auch ihre Tendenz der letzten Zeit zu sein, die illirische von der serbischen Sprache ganz zu trennen, um dann desto leichter sich ein eigenes Sprachgewäch nach selbst erfundenen Regeln zu schmieden, und somit in den südslawischen Ländern, in allem Ernste, aus einem – zwei Idiome, nämlich den serbischen und illirischen, wie auch wirklich die beiden Namen da stehen, zu machen, wozu ihnen der Gebrauch der lateinischen Lettern treffliche Dienste leistet.'

The preface ends with a vision of true unity between all speakers of 'naški', whatever their religion. It is characteristic that he conceives this unity as being achieved by the general acceptance of Vuk's alphabet (regarded as a compromise between the Latin and the Church Slavonic alphabets) and that he cannot resist a final blow at the Illyrians:

'Dies [the introduction of Vuk's alphabet] wäre der einzige Weg zu unserem Heil, dann, nur dann erst würde uns, unserer Literatur und unserer Bildung und Aufklärung die helle Sonne aufgehen, dann würden wir – ohne nach dem Glauben und Ritus zu fragen – wahre Brüder von einem Stamme, einer Sprache und einer Literatur werden, dann könnten wir insgesamt die Söhne der südlichen Slava heissen, denn dann wird unsere Nationalität, Sprache und Literatur blühen, sonst aber nie und nimmermehr, wenn gleich sich die Agramer beim Bestande des status quo wer weiss welchen sanguinischen Hoffnungen hingeben.'

In the event the sanguine hopes of the men of Zagreb have been realised, rather than those of Brlić; and yet the linguistic disunity which he feared has not come about. Brlić stood on the periphery of events and did not fully appreciate the way in which the idealistic fervour of Gaj and his friends met the needs of their generation and thus decisively influenced the history of their people. To Brlić it was ridiculous that Gaj, Šulek, Vraz and the brothers Mažuranić, none of them native speakers of štokavic, should be the arbiters of the new štokavic literary language; and Babukić appeared as a foolish dupe, denying his native speech. Yet we now see – and many at the time also saw – that the desire for linguistic unity was in itself admirable and that both the acceptance of štokavic by speakers of other dialects and the conscious forging of links with the older literary language of Dubrovnik were factors that aided the stability and unity of the revived vernacular. Brlić's principle that all should follow the language of the people was indeed a good one, but like many slogans it was not easy to apply to the facts. Here the policy of the Illyrians was perhaps after all more practical than that of the shrewd merchant of Brod.

Nevertheless Brlić undoubtedly played a positive and fruitful part in the complex process of linguistic evolution that was proceeding in his country in the mid-nineteenth century. The discussions that he stimulated, his emphasis on the values of the popular language and above all his efforts for unity, culminating in his acceptance of the distasteful *šiljki i roгови* – for all this he deserves to be remembered in the history of the Serbo-Croat literary language.

S a d r Ź a j

LINGVISTIČKI RAD IGNJATA ALOJZIJA BRLIĆA

(1795-1855)

Autor opisuje i vrednuje ulogu Ignjata Alojzija Brlića u hrvatskom lingvističkom preporodu prve polovine 19. stoljeća. Svoju je gramatiku (*Grammatik der illirischen Sprache*, Buda 1833) Brlić započeo pisati na vlastitu inicijativu, ali ohrabren Vukom Karadžićem i Kopitarom.

U predgovoru izražava principe na kojima je zasnovao svoje djelo: 1. vjeru u *jedinstven* književni jezik za Srbe i Hrvate; 2. želju da taj književni jezik odražava jezik kojim narod govori; 3. prioritet Vukovu ćirilskom alfabetu nad bilo kojom varijantom latiničke abecede. Bio je protiv Gaja i iliraca u pitanju ortografije, izražavajući svoje poglede vrlo otvoreno u pismima svome sinu A. T. Brliću, a mnogo diskretnije u časopisu *Zora dalmatinska*. U isto je vrijeme uočio važnost da se po-

stigne jedinstvo različitih lingvističkih pogleda kod Srba i Hrvata u to vrijeme. Iako je bio više sklon ćirilici, on je sâm prihvatio Gajevu ortografiju kao svoj prilog tom jedinstvu. Premda nije bio centralna ličnost u jezičnom pokretu svoga vremena, Brlić je ipak u njemu odigrao pozitivnu i korisnu ulogu.