

Original scientific paper
Accepted for publication on 1st June 2005

UDC 82'27:82-6MAR"1501-1516"

Marulić's Private Letters: Selection of Language as Means of Diaphasic and Diastratic Differentiation

Smiljka Malinar
Faculty of Philosophy, Zagreb

We are here dealing with certain aspects relevant in the socio-linguistic context of a rather recently discovered segment of Marulić's prose, providing an array of interesting information about the circumstances surrounding the writing of Marulić's published and unpublished, or not yet discovered, texts. At issue are seven of Marulić's private autograph letters from the period 1501-1516, which are kept in the Venetian State Archives, and were discovered and published by Miloš Milošević. Three are written in Italian, more precisely in the Venetian dialect, and are addressed to Jerolim Ćipiko from Split, canon of the St Doimus' Cathedral and a close friend of Marulić. The other four letters are written in Latin, and form part of the correspondence between Marulić and Venetian canon, notary and chancellor of the Senate of the Republic, Jacopo Grasolari, who took upon himself to care for the printing of Marulić's works. Private and family affairs, as well as considerations arising from current events, are reserved for the letters to Jerolim Ćipiko, written in Italian. Individual circumstances relating to the process of the printing of Marulić's works are the main topic of three letters sent to Jacopo Grasolari, while in one of them he discusses the traits of genuine Christian love and friendship. The author's communicational intention and his selection of topic, and partially the linguistic medium, determine the dominant formal and constructional features of two bodies of letters, or rather, of their particular segments.*

This paper will briefly address certain socio-linguistically relevant aspects of a relatively recently discovered section of Marulić's prose works, interesting primarily as material for Marulić's personal and literary biography, and as yet another contribution to a possible bibliography of this author. In extent, this is a

* The article was published in Croatian in *Colloquia Maruliana*, XIII, 2004, pp. 21-40.

modest body of work – it amounts to about 400 lines of the *Studia Romanica*; however, this is a specific sub-genre within Marulić's writings, one that to some extent belongs to a different communication situation than other texts of his previously known to us, and it seems worthwhile devoting it a certain amount of attention. This might be additionally supported by a partial citation of Badalić's commentary to the epistles addressed to Katarina Obirtića: "The very fact that this is a Marulić prose composition whets our interests... for Marulić's prose... in comparison with his ample legacy of Latin writings... is rather scanty";¹ Tomasović talks in the same vein in an article about Marulić's trilingualism.² In brief, with reference to such an important and intriguing author as Marulić, every available trace of his writing is precious.

These writings were discovered fortuitously, with the credit going however to the Montenegrin scholar Miloš Milošević, who during research in the Venetian State Archives found seven autographs of Marulić's private letters from the 1501-1516 period.³ Three are written in Italian (the designation *Italian* here is used as a conventional label for a diasystem) and are addressed to a Split man Jerolim Ćipiko, canon of the Cathedral of St Doimus and Marulić's close friend; the other four are written in Latin, and are part of correspondence between Marulić and Venetian canon, notary and chancellor of the Senate of the Republic, Jacopo Grasolari.⁴ He and Marulić were connected by a spiritual and intellectual friendship, but according to the testimony of the letters found, they did not know each other personally. Milošević published those letters in the first number of *Colloquia Maruliana* (1992), explaining them in detail in the accompanying commentary. He divided them according to "thematic units" which, from the viewpoint of the involvement of the participants of the correspondence, were classified this way: literary work, and within this, commentaries and information about his own writings (in letters to both friends) and questions related to the printing of some of his works (in letters to Grasolari); personal and family news (in letters to Ćipiko) and, forming a special thematic segment, "a prose ode to spiritual friendship"⁵ (again in a letter to Grasolari). This most recent epistolary testimony, of a private nature, contains a number of items of information that add to our knowledge of

¹ Badalić 1957: p. 31.

² Tomasović 1992: p.10.

³ Milošević 1992: p. 5-32.

⁴ Marulić 1992: 33-54.

⁵ Milošević 1992: 20.

Marulić's work in literature. They confirm information from Marulić's publisher Franciscus Lucensis and Marulić's biographer Natalis of his Latin prose work entitled *De imitatione Christi*, reinforce Natalis's note about Marulić's authorship of the Latin biography of St Jerome *Vita Beati Hyeronimi* – material confirmation followed in 1994, when Darko Novaković found a text in the London British Library⁶ – and reveal the existence of the previously unknown and unidentified Marulić paper, more precisely, a historical and philosophical treatise in Italian. Also in this language we may find some sonnets that Marulić adds to the third letter to Jeronim Ćipiko, some of which he wrote in the search for consolation and calm in perhaps the most difficult moments of his life, concerning which he writes to his friend. Through all this, as Milošević points out, “that clear and well-noted polylingualism of Marulić ... acquires new and solid proof with respect to Italian as well.”⁷ Milošević draws attention to the meaning of the terms of Marulić's metalanguage: “sermon vulgare” – Italian, and “lingua schiava” – Croatian.⁸ The phrase “lingua schiava” interests him as part of an expression in which the analogy between Dante and Marulić, which has absorbed the attention of a number of students of the Split poet, gains additional confirmation from his own pen (in the letter to Jeronim Ćipiko announcing *Judita/Judith*).⁹ As against this, the first phrase quoted, and the implications of the text that comes in the sequel, relating to the social and functional parameters of the act of communication, slipped his notice (although it could well have been used to motivate a comparison of Marulić and Dante). Marulić's explanation relates to the choice of language in his previously undiscovered historical and philosophical discourse of an equally unknown title. If we recall statements of the same order in the preface to *Judita* and take into account the genre division in Marulić's bilingual (Croatian and Latin) practice, we will be found to conclude that these private writings directly and indirectly give currency to the matter of choice of language and its correlation with given segments of the diastratic and diaphasic axis. The diastratic point of departure considers the socio-cultural components of language communication: variables are at play relating to the social identity of the participants;¹⁰ the diaphasically

⁶ Novaković 1994: 5-66.

⁷ Milošević 1992: 15.

⁸ Milošević 1992: 10-11, 22.

⁹ Milošević 1992: 36. In the same paragraph, Marulić also uses the term “lingua nostra materna”.

¹⁰ Such as class, ethnicity, gender, age. For further information, see Berutto 2000: 147-149, *passim*.

relevant components are those related to the functional and contextual, that is, to the givens of the situation. The fragments of Marulić's correspondence found by Milošević through their formal and communicational features go together with that segment of the Marulić corpus known to date that, from the standpoint of genre classification, deserve the label "the epistolary genre". Two studies published in the proceedings of the *Dani hvarskog teatra XV (Days of the Hvar Theatre XV)*¹¹ refer to this section of Marulić's writings. *Marulićeve posvete (Marulić's Dedications)*¹² is the work of the Serbian Croatian studies scholar Zlata Bojović, and the other, *Marko Marulić u epistolografiji (Marko Marulić in Epistolography)*¹³ is a contribution from the Osijek student of Croatian literature Stanislav Marijanović. Zlata Bojović deals exclusively with the epistles that are dedications accompanying Marulić's important Latin works (addressed to Jeronim Ćipiko, Augustin Mula and Domenico Grimani)¹⁴ and the dedication to *Judita*, sent to Dujam Balistrilić. The biographical foundation, and the address to a personalised addressee, against the background of a non-fictional universe and a personally accessible and undergone experience, which is in some of these writings a framework for and background to considerations of morality, doctrine, literature and poetry, is one of the basic and constitutive features of the epistolary genre, and hence common to both Marulić's private correspondence, sent only to a single interlocutor, and messages, that under the cover of a single addressee, are actually submitted to the general public. It is from this point of view that, concerning the features of the texts mentioned, Zlata Bojović says: "The importance of these dedications inheres not only in their significance for literary history, literary theory and cultural history, but also in their authenticity. They are the richest source of the writer's first-person discourse, not obscured by heroes, ideas and poetical works, the most important place for biographical recognition."¹⁵ Marijanović,

¹¹ Split 1989.

¹² Bojović 1989: 34-46.

¹³ Marijanović 1989: 237-252.

¹⁴ This concerns the epistles that go with the following texts (listed in order corresponding to the order of their addressees): *De institutione bene vivendi per exempla sanctorum*, *Dialogus de Hercule e chisticolis superato*, *Quinquaginta parabola* (the latter two texts are dedicated to Toma Niger), *In epigrammata priscorum commentarius*, *Evangelistarium*, *De humilitate et Gloria Christi*, *Davidias*. The writer does not consider two epistles accompanying the translation *Regum Dalmatiae et Croatiae gesta* or *Inscriptiones Salonitanae* and the dedication to Jeronim Papalić accompanying the translation to Petrarch's canzone *Vergine bella*, important because of the remarks concerning the nature of the translator's job.

¹⁵ Bojović 1989: 45.

quoting as being relevant both the way they belong to a certain sphere of contact (which sets up an equal communicational relation as in the previously mentioned texts – by direct authorial address to an absent interlocutor), and the “mark of biographicalness”,¹⁶ announces a surmounting of classifications and methods in the Renaissance epistolography (from which, Zlata Bojović too implicitly starts off, on the line of the tradition).¹⁷ The re-classified and re-formulated Marulićian “epistolary corpus” “is founded on 54 communicational texts”,¹⁸ covering all the products of Marulić’s pen characterised by verbal signals of a connotative function, that is, all the texts given shape from the communicational standpoint of a sender of a message orientated towards a given individual addressee, and this means furnished with morphological and syntactical signals of the first and second person, hence those that in a formal point of view – because they do not contain any opening and closing salutation and are not written in prose¹⁹ – do not comply with the definition and exemplification of the epistle that the letter-writing manuals of those times contain.²⁰ (Within this comprehensive epistolary corpus, Marjanović classifies the group dealt with by Zlata Bojović as “Marulić’s dedicatory epistles in prose”).²¹

Referring to the “generic features of the epistolary genre”, the same author states that (with some other features) “the epistles are essentially determined by the possibility of discovering the extra-literary elements of a more comprehensive

¹⁶ Marjanović 1989: 237.

¹⁷ Marjanović pays tribute to Renaissance epistolography because of its “ideological merits” (particularly on p. 239) but places above it a broad interdisciplinary approach of the kind prompted and promoted by the “modern sociology of literature” (p. 238), as the most appropriate for the need to settle issues of the historical development of Croatian literature. An assessment concerning how many of the classifications suggested by this author contribute to an objective so broadly set, remains outside the range and the research area of this paper. As against Marjanović’s extensive understanding of the epistolographic genre is the opinion of Gorana Stepanić, who in the paper *Retorika Marulićevih epistolarnih tekstova (The Rhetoric of Marulić’s Epistolary Texts)* takes into account only those texts that meet the requirements of the humanistic definition of the letter (as contained, for example, in the epistolographic manuals of Toma Nijer and Juan Luis Vives). According to these criteria, eleven private letters and about the same number of open letters (letter to Pope Adrian VI and the dedicatory epistles already mentioned) belong to Marulić’s epistolary corpus. Cf. Stepanić 2004: 41-44.

¹⁸ Marjanović 1989: 240.

¹⁹ Marjanović quotes them under the title: *Marulićevo latinsko epistolarno Pjesništvo (Marulić’s Latin Epistolary Poetry)*, 1989: 243-244.

²⁰ Cf. note 17.

²¹ 1989: 245-246.

'macrostructure' (as well as the biographical constants contained): the historical reality and the setting, ... the socio-cultural relations, external stimuli directly impinging on their creation, the individual awareness of the writer, ... the writer's psychology, ... ongoing communication ...".²² We may speculate about whether the simultaneous presence and considerably greater density of just these elements led him to pick out from the overall Marulić's epistolographic corpus that he himself defined, the group of letters with "the code of being biographical" to which he assigns four texts.²³ It is clear that for him "to be biographical" is at the same time a "constant" of the genre and a specific feature of the group of texts within the confines of the genre. In the classificatory part, Marijanović never brings together texts with such description,²⁴ while the term "biographicalness", as he uses it, without any more precise determination, can hardly serve as an indicator. Biographical interests in the sense of adducing details from one's own everyday life and experience constrained by the scope of one's own immediate knowledge and action (which can be considered the definition of "biographicalness" in the strict sense) constitutes a feature of the letters addressed to Jerolim Ćipiko and the messages sent to Jacopo Grasolari, which in form correspond to the definition of the epistle. In their communicative scope, they are restricted to a single recipient, without the background presence of a wider circle of readers, as is the case of epistles that accompany doctrinal, moralistic and literary texts. Therefore, they belong to the group of Marulić's private letters, together with the epistles to Katarina Obirtića, with which they share all the three characteristics cited.²⁵ The correspondence, though, is not complete, especially when the third characteristic is concerned. In the extant fragments of the letters to Katarina Obirtića, the private biographical circumstances reflected also in familiar and direct details, such as Marulić's concern for the health of Jeronima and Dobrica, two conventual companions of his sister Bira, are outweighed by the expansion of the biographical starting point to a much more all-embracing level of general moral and religious principles. In addition, directly addressing "the nun of the order of St Benedict" Katarina, Marulić at the same time assigns her the role of mediator and forwarder

²² Marijanović 1989: 241.

²³ Marijanović 1989: 240.

²⁴ In Marijanović's classification list, under the heading "Marulić's letters and *agitation-actualis* epistles" (1989: 246-247), four texts are selected, to which the "biographical code" is applicable, as it is to some other, in fact differently classified and characterised texts.

²⁵ Cf. the reference to the views of Gorana Stepanić given in note 17.

of his messages and lessons to the other sisters. This is made quite clear by a number of formulations in both of the letters: “A sada te molim, ako u ovom govorenju momu čutiš kogodi utišen’je nemoći tvoje, da se ni ti ne kratiš utišiti sestree tvoje ... Gospodin Bog budi utišen’je obiju njih i svih vas ... Ne dim to da bih nič posumnjio da vi sumnjite, ke u dne i u noći hvalite Isukarsta i viru njegovu,...” (“And now I plead you, if in these my words you might feel the comfort for your weakness, do not hesitate to comfort your sisters... Our Lord be the comfort to both of them and to all of you... I am not saying that I would ever doubt your faith, you who are praising Jesus Christ and his devotion day and night...”).²⁶ Hence the epistles to Katarina Obirtića are characterised by a recognisable and consistent stylisation, modelled on the archetypal representatives of the genre: the textual organisation follows the model of the epistles of St Jerome²⁷ and the sermons of St Augustine; the syntax – via the agency of sequences of successive and more directly available examples, among whom the two authors belong, as does the complex of domestic prose tradition, the lectionary offshoot of which is directly interwoven with the prose fabric of the Epistles – imitates models from the Scriptures.²⁸ The broader communicational orientation that characterises this corpus, the plural recipient “veiled” behind the immediate individual addressee,²⁹ is missing from the correspondence with Ćipiko and Grisolari, where all the elements of the messages, even those that are not personal, or even those only indirectly (auto)biographical, are subordinated to direct personal communication, restricted to the dialogue of the two interlocutors.

From the thematic point of view, letters to the two friends do not constitute a comprehensive and homogeneous discourse: private and family news, considerations moved by current events are reserved for the letters to Jerolim Ćipiko written in Italian. News about Marulić’s literary work and achievements are interwoven with his private story.³⁰ Among other things, it is precisely the

²⁶ Marulić 2001: 478-479, 485.

²⁷ The second epistle was written as a gift given in return (*antidoron*), similar to the Epistle XXXI of St Jerome to Sister Eustochia. Sveti Jeronim 1990: 65-66.

²⁸ This rather too condensed and schematic review can be supplemented by consulting the pages that relate to the analysis of the syntactical organisation of the epistles to Katarina Obirtić in: Malinar 2002: 121-141. For the relation with the Croatian prose tradition, cf. *ibid.*, pp. 138-140. Affinities between the *Naslidovan’je ...* and the *Lekcionar ...* by Bernardin of Split in the matter of scriptural citations have been investigated by Tomasović 2002: 323-331.

²⁹ According to the definition referred to by Gorana Stepanić, these letters were composed not only for private but also for public purposes. Cf. 2004: 41.

³⁰ In the most personal and most private sense this goes to the sonnets too: “Et chosi ogni chosa ho portato in patientia, chome anche ho descritto in sonetti, di qual, perchè credo haverete qualche

unconstrainedness of his communication with Ćipiko, as he himself says (“Troppo presumere me fa baldanza che ho con vui”), that liberates him from the pressure of the topos of modesty, the mask with which he shields himself in his public epistles and in the correspondence with Grasolari, and leads him to an admiring exclamation at his own work: “Conposta more poetico, venite et vedetila, direte che anchora la lingua schiava ha el suo Dante”.³¹ Some of the circumstances related to the process of the printing of Marulić’s work – the care and authority for which had been assumed by Grasolari – are the main theme of three of the four (known to date) letters addressed to this correspondent. Information about his writings, authorial dilemmas, notes about style or doctrinal acceptability, even mentions of family circumstances and close kin derive from this central thematic set. The address of all three letters to Grasolari repeats the formulation “domino” or “domino meo”, appropriate to Marulić’s position vis-à-vis the addressee. The address “...Iacobo Grasolari, uiro uirtute ac eruditione prendito, mei amantissimo mihique charissimo”³² in the one letter that does not deal with literary and business topics, rather the characteristics of true Christian love and friendship, is not just a reflection of convention or an expression of hyperbolical courtesy, but rather a confirmation of a spiritual and intellectual *sodalitium* to whom Marulić was dedicating the introductory sections of his letter,³³ in which Jerolim Ćipiko was also included. Jacopo Grasolari was after all a little more distant – he was domiciled in Venice – and had greater social reputation and status than the other two friends: and apart from anything else he had a number of important offices in the ecclesiastical and administrative structures of the Serenissima. In the letters, hence, Marulić used Latin as language that included a diatopic and diastratic difference between sender and recipient, appropriate to addressing a socially superior friend to whom at the personal level he also owes gratitude for the services he has rendered (and whom, besides, he has never actually met in person). In accord with this, their friendship comes to existence and is legitimated

piacer ve li mando, insieme con certi altri, li qual ho fatti, non sapendo altramenti aleviarmi el fastidio che patisco.” Marulić 1992: 42.

³¹ Marulić 1992: 36.

³² Marulić 1992: 46. The previously quoted addresses are on pp. 48-49 and p. 52.

³³ “Multa de me Tibi Hieronymus meus atque idem Tuus. Sed ita ille de me sentit, quantum ex Tua epistola ad me missa conicio, ut qui uehementer amat. Atque usu quidem uenit, ut talium laudatio maior uero sit. Tu me tanti esse existimas, quanti ipse sibi persuasum habet. Proinde et amare cepisti et optas redamari. Qua in re fateris profecto, qualis uir ipse sis, qui optimi cuiusque te studiosissimum ostendas.” Marulić 1992: 44.

– at Grasolari’s insistence – pursuant to spiritual and doctrinal interests, to a “common cultivation of a truthful and sincere love for God”.³⁴ Hence, in the answer to Grasolari, Marulić discusses true friendship in the framework of a theologically grounded understanding of the concept, disputing profane love, with the total exclusion (partially perhaps because of the absence of any personal contact) of any moiety of personal liking and private affinity. In accordance with this “elevated level of communication” thoughts “about today’s human depravity that has been given free rein to the extremes”³⁵ are not connected with current historical events and social conditions as they are in the letter to Čipiko, but lead to questions about the most fateful matters of doctrine, of the coming of the Anti-Christ and the Day of Judgement. The author’s communicational intentionality and the “choice of topic”, and in part the linguistic medium, define the prevailing formal and constructional features of the two corpora or rather certain segments of them. Between the two groups of letters, not even from a formal standpoint can a firm boundary be drawn – for the meditative and moralistic passages and the expressive armamentarium are parts of both one and the other, as is the focus on certain receptive and technical aspects of the activity of writing. Sections of the first type at the level of *verborum* and at the level of *sententiarum* apply a set of formal rules endorsed within the context of the Christian expressive tradition. Such rules, valorising the poetic function of language, the orientation towards the signifier – subordinated to the objective of as an effective impact on the reader’s apperceptive capacities as possible and as a result an equally successful engrafting of Christian worldview and ethical principles – activate the suggestive potentials of *repetitio* and *variatio*³⁶ via figures such as *enumeratio* and *gradatio*, *homeoteleuton*, *homoeptoton* and *anthiteton* (within the *figurae sententiae*) and the frequent isocolonic shaping of periods with an asyndetic link between parallel clauses (following the scriptural model and derivations from it).³⁷ Identically motivated is the expression of intention by the comparative adverb *nego* (*but*) of a coordinated clausal sequence, in which the clause negated comes into the position of apodosis. The “authoritative” origin of such a construction is proven by the quotation from *Job* 1, 21, which Marulić inserted into his Italian text, and

³⁴ In the original: “...communis uere, sincere, que in Deum pietatis cultus”. Marulić 1992: 44.

³⁵ Marulić 1992: 47.

³⁶ Of which a preacher as successful as St Augustine was thoroughly aware. Mohrmann 1960: 400.

³⁷ Terminology and classification based on Lausberg 1960: 310-374 and 389-398, *passim*.

which will be reproduced below.³⁸ The application of the principle of *auctoritas* constituent to a didactically oriented discourse³⁹ can be seen as a procedure of the construction of a text making use of the interpolation of quotes of the same origin, with the occasional citation from the Roman poetic tradition. “Et hoc est donum dei altissimi, al qual rendo gratie che molto menor son li soi flagelli verso noi de quel che merita li peccati nostri. Misericordiosamente ne castiga, non per farne male, ma per salvarne in eternum.” “Chosì è intravenuto, chosì è stata la volonta di dio, sit nomen domini benedictum. Lui li havea dati, lui li ha tolti, quando a lui ha piazuto.” “D’ogni cosa rendo gratie alla Maestà soa, essendo certo che tutte le adversità che ne manda, le manda a fin del ben nostro, azio chastigati se emendemo, emendati diventemo degni de quella eternal salute e beatitudine a nui preparata a constitutione mundi.”⁴⁰ “Etenim, semper amant qui sempiterna iugiter meditantur. Non carnis dilectionem nobis insinuat, sed spiritus, non corporem, sed animarum.” “Cita mors dissidium attulit ad inferna descendentibus, ubi nullus amor, sed sempiternus horror habitat.” “Non quia Filius quicquam minus sciat Patre, cum Pater et Filius unum sint, sed Pater scit, quia Filio communicat, et Filius nescit, quia nemini reuelat. Signa tamen p̄cessura Iudicium commemorantur in Euangelio, que, partim euenisse credimus, partem euentura expectamus. Bella se, uiunt, pestilentie, grassantur, fames p̄munt.” “Nobis interim expedit non plus sapere quam oportet sapere. Arcanum Dei, quod latet, latere sinamus. Iudicium autem ei semper timeamus. Nescit enim homo, utrum amore an odio dignus sit.” “Licet post multa annorum milia uenturus sit, mors tamen procul a nobis esse non potest; etiamsi ultimam inuasura est senectam, properat, currit, uolat, in ianuis est.”⁴¹

There is a visible similarity with *Od naslidovan'ja Isukarstova*⁴² ... (*The Imitation of Jesus Christ ...*), entirely written in prose, and the Epistles to Katarina Obirtića, concerning which we may note a single example of self-quotation. This

³⁸ The following sentence is at issue: “Non vult Dominus mortem peccatoris, sed ut convertatur et vivat”.

³⁹ Regardless of the specific genre, the basic origin of Marulić's texts (the assumed or the proclaimed one), is expressed by the following words from the Preface to *Evangelistarium*: “Cum enim nihil in homine laudabilius virtute sit, nihil vitio detestabilius, quid ea doctrina magis egregium magisque amplectendum videri debet, quę hominem ipsum inquit ac erudite, qua ratione et a malicia declinet et studeat probitati?” Marulić 1985: 413.

⁴⁰ Marulić 1992: 94-98.

⁴¹ Marulić 1992: 44.

⁴² In Marulić's letters to Grasolari with the latin model of this work.

refers to the last sentence from the ones just quoted “etiamsi ultimam inuasura est senectam, properat, currit, uolat, in ianuis est”⁴³– “Vrime biži, dni harlo mimohode, smart se približa, jur je na vratih, klapje i govori nam” (“The time is running, days are passing swiftly, death is coming nearer, it stands on the doorway, slapping and talking to us”),⁴⁴ which, irrespective of any immediate model Marulić might have had,⁴⁵ is a variation of one of the most characteristic motifs from the inventory of the medieval ideological complex known as *contemptus mundi*.⁴⁶

Marulić has at his command a much greater manoeuvring space when he writes about mundane themes, personal, historical or literary and “business”, which do not automatically invoke such precisely codified and systematised formal models. We might have noticed already that the meditative and moralist sections in the letters to Jerolim Ćipiko are shaped with a somewhat lesser rhetorical intensity than in the first letter to Grisolari. It is as if they were affected by the restraint and functionality of the chronicling and autobiographical sections, which are actually the occasion for their inclusion into the body of the text, and in relation to which they occur in the role of regulator and neutraliser of emotional tension – in the 2nd letter to Ćipiko, in which he reports the death of the second brother, twenty three days after he had lost the first one, they occupy as much as two thirds of the text. They are deployed as *caesura*, alternation and calming, as a counterpoise to the hyperbolic dimensions of Marulić’s personal and family drama and a dam against a possible inundation of corresponding feelings and their potential subversiveness. They are a proof of Marulić’s loyalty, his submission to the order defined by the divine intention and a kind of “topos of consolatory speaking”. At the same time, parts of the rhetorical furnishing of the fragments that are moralistic and oriented towards the transcendent may be found even outside their primary and pertinent centre, as powerful signals of the pragmatic function of the discourse, e. g. “Et quanto io indicar posso, veramente crede esser chosì, et che così serà chome in esso se contien”,⁴⁷ representing historical and moralistic work

⁴³ Marulić 1992: 46.

⁴⁴ Marulić 2001: 479.

⁴⁵ That this is a topos Marulić made use of for the occasion is confirmed by the coincidence of the phrase “in ianuis est” with *Math.* 24, 33 (“ita et vos cum videritis haec omnia scitote quia prope est in ianuis”) and the presence of the whole expression in a musical treatise *Musurghia rhythmica* by Aloysius Kircher: “Maxima dormit, longa cubat, brevis sedet, semibrevis ambulat. Minima properat, semiminima currit, chroma volat, semichroma evolat, bischroma evanescit”.

⁴⁶ In the text, this sentence is followed by the quotation from Virgil: “Breue enim et irreparabile tempus omnibus est uite”. *Aen.*, 10: 467-468.

⁴⁷ Marulić 1992: 34.

meant for secular princes or “Nihil enim in vita tam cupide cupio, quam ut quis de hoc sancto, cuius ego studiosissimus sum, aliquid scribat pro dignitate, quod me fateor nequaquam assecutum”,⁴⁸ heralding the biography of St Jerome.

The stylisation and constructional features of the letters to Ćipiko in the fragments the space of which is not entirely filled with direct reference to transcendence, reflect a level of unforced and at the same time cultivated communication. “More spontaneous” types of expression are not connected just to the conversation about family troubles, but are present in the extent to which this is enabled by the *a priori* conventional character of the contact and Marulić’s habits as an educated man who is addressing an interlocutor of a similar background. Within the framework of the prevailing hypotactic organisation, where sentences of different complexity and hierarchical extension (where on average, two to three levels of subordination prevail) alternate depending on the semantic and pragmatic factors involved, but also on Marulić’s feeling for the rhythm of the text (doubtlessly due to the influence of Latin), which inclines towards a compensatory arrangement of longer and shorter syntactic units, symmetrically constructed periods controlled in all their components such as: “Novamente qui, in le parte de Chroatia, chome za avanti havete intexo, essendo adunati cinquecento chavalli ungari et chriatti e stradioti, tutti valentissimi homini e ben armati, furono rutti e frachassati da trecento Turchi mal armati e mal a chavallo, in sula bella pianura”⁴⁹ or the simpler but equally attentively stylised: “Che s’el re non pol varentar el suo dominio, non so chome varentarà quel d’altrui”, there is also room for more “natural” forms of combining sentences, such as in: “Vedete mo in che condition me trovo” to which the exclamatory adverb “mo” gives the mark of a colloquial register, and even for this kind of syntactical hapax: “Scrissive de quella opera nostra exemplare”. Where Marulić abandons the area of syntactical exemplariness, fluency of sentence organisation and clearly marked links between the parts of the period, interrupting, skipping or inverting given links in the chain of the sentence (“Piero, anche mio fratello, sta in letto, gravemente amalato”, “Quello seguirà non so, tamen segua ciò che si voglia...”, “La qual speranza però, è vana, lezendo la opera porete cognoscer”, “Ozi divenne la nova accertata,

⁴⁸ Marulić 1992: 50.

⁴⁹ “Novamente pensando tra me la oppression di christiani per li infideli, et nela fantasia ricercando la causa, vennemi in mente sopra di ciò far un trattadello, spero non inutile a quelli voranno con mente sana legierlo, e con ragione considerar la cosa.” Marulić 1992: 34.

per quelli havean visto...”),⁵⁰ he does not overstep the boundaries of the “cursive style”, acceptable in prose written in Italian language, which is not intended for formal occasions or kinds of communication where prestige is involved. For this reason then certain phraseological elements are much more reliable indicators of the incursion of spoken habits: “S’è l’vi parerà che si possa far qualche frutto spirituale tra li christiani, lo daretì butar in stampa”, “fate che la veda se pur haverò ocio de poterla veder, tra tante occupation che in qua e in la, me destraheno al presente, ne mi lassano ripossare”, where the semi-colloquial “butar in stampa” and the colloquial “haver ocio” are placed within properly composed periods. In a text that is in any case mainly oriented towards the “subject”, that is primarily characterised by the denotative or cognitive function,⁵¹ and also by the one-way relationship of the referent-sign and the lexemic progression, asyndetic connection is occasionally applied as a means of condensation and narrative acceleration, while the paratactic polysyndeton is appropriate as mimesis of the chronological succession: “Questi giorni passati volendo scrivervi, fui impedito per la morte del mio fratello Zuane, Dio gli di pace ala anima. Al suo partir de qui fe inferno de fevre in galia, dimandassimo gratia dal retor de redurlo in la terra per medegarlo, et interim che Valerio nostro stessee al governo dela galia. Questo solo non potessimo impetrar, adoperando anchora quelli che polno apresso lui. Ha usato troppa crudelità, Dio li dia pentirse dil suo peccato et salvarsi al fine. Amen”, “... era una fevre, chome disse el medico, pestilientiale, ad intrar del quintodecimo zorno chaciolli l’anima dal corpo. A tempo fecilo confessar e comunicar, morti da bon christiano”, “Tutti altri rimedii li son fatti in vano, nullo modo per meliorar, ma continuamente le potentie vital vanno scemandò, ne anche pol masticar el

⁵⁰ This resulted in one example of anacoluthon within an otherwise impeccably composed period. “Et chosì ogni chosa ho portato in patientia, chome anche ho descritto in sonetti, di qual, perchè credo haverete qualche piacer, ve li mando insieme con certi altri, li qual ho fatti, non sapendo altramenti alleviarmi el fastidio che patisco.” The following can be added: “... un altro mio fratello, el qual insieme con mi havendo attexo a Zuanne mentre el stette inferno, credo che da lui prexe la malatia”. Incongruent abbreviation is also the result of the calquing of the Latin construction of accusative plus infinitive. “E pur anchora non se acorghemo, non esser la forza del inimico che ne preme, ma furor divino”, “Li qual, quanto penso confessar mi conviene, le preditte adversità meritatamente essermi achadute.” The loose structure of the colloquial expression is joined with the latinised construction, where the gerund, in line with the Roman use, replaces the present participle: “Et se non se pol, patientia, responderemo ali lectori d’essa, over noi atori, con parole del poeta Martiale ad Avito dicendo”. Examples are taken from Marulić’s letters to Ćipiko. Marulić 1992: 34-40.

⁵¹ We make use here of the categories of Jakobson 1960: 352-354.

cibo, tanta debolezza sente anchora in le masselle, ma con nutrimenti sorbativi sustentemogli la vita, chome meglio podemo”. Both procedures of marked narrative connotativeness are formal obstacles to digressions and interpolations, the incursion of *otiosa verba* and concessions to emotion.⁵² They can be used to obtain an objective and “reporterly” style, appropriate for the stance of spiritual strength and emotional stoicism that Marulić and his interlocutor both considered the only dignified response appropriate to a man and believer, irrespective of the drama of the circumstances in which he finds himself in. In the paragraph in which he speaks of *Judita*, a locus of swelling and positive emotions, Marulić uses juxtaposed sentences.⁵³

In the text composed in Italian, all the more complicated forms of syntactical organisation that go beyond the elementary level of oral communication (it is always approximately definable relations that are at issue here) are the result of a direct or indirect imitation of Latin, and their presence can be looked at as an achievement of acculturation and a proof of the expressive maturity and suppleness of the language concerned. Such a degree of the development of Italian is confirmed by Marulić's letters, which at the same time indicate how well educated and how much at home he is in this tongue. The genetic and status difference between Latin and Italian is manifested at the syntactical level in the letters to Jacopo Grisolari mainly as a greater proportion of complex and ramified periods, which go beyond the second level of subordination.⁵⁴ This is an expression of the “natural condition” of Latin, its immanent characteristics at an appropriate step of the diastatic scale, which is enjoined by the act of addressing such a distinguished interlocutor as Grisolari. For Marulić he occupies the same position as the addressees of the epistolary prefaces to his printed Latin works: this we would be able to conclude by the correspondence of a number of formal features of the two groups of texts,⁵⁵ even if we did not know that Grisolari's

⁵² However, invocation of its direct and extreme forms is acceptable when it is mediated by a performance procedure that follows the rules of the realisation of a recognisable literary archetype, like in the poetic epistle *Francisco Natali Marci Maruli responsio*: “Angebant, Francisce, mei me funeral fratris, / Nulla quies lachrymis nec modus ullus erat. (1-2), “Denique pressus ego tantorum mille laborum/ Optabam vitae fila suprema meae.”(19-20). Marulić 1950: 12.

⁵³ Cf. the text quoted on p. 106.

⁵⁴ We quote an example from Letter V.

⁵⁵ By emphasising just one aspect of Marulić's Latin letters, regardless of its significance, we have far from exhausted the whole spectrum of syntactic forms it contains. From sentences with Ciceronian conciseness: “Multa me de Tibi Hieronymus meus atque idem tuus”(Marulić 1992: 44), to more liberated and more colloquial looseness: “De hoc autem, quod nunc in manu

status was higher than that of Marulić. “Dignus es igitur, quem uicissim ego rogem, ne, tametsi minora in me inueneris quam audisti, ab amicicię proposito refrigescas, in qua Tibi respondere totis uiribus contendam.” “Perennes igitur perpetuique et uere amici erimus, si inuicem amando ad illum unum amandum, qui prior dilexit nos et animam suam posuit pro nobis, assiduis colloquiis crebraque litterarum uicissitudine alter alterum accenderimus.”⁵⁶ “Et quoniam eundem in isto, quod recepisti, opere proposui omnibus religionis nostrę professoribus imitandum, capessendę uirtutis gratia perennisque beatitatis consequendę, non dubito, quin multi talia a nobis ędita audius legent, postquam etiam Tibi, exacti iudicii sinceręque fidei uiro, placuisse intellexerint.”⁵⁷

Gorana Stepanić has defined a number of “commonplaces” that the letters to Grasolari share with several of Marulić’s epistles: “love of the author for the addressee although they do not know each other”, “personal modesty and humility with respect to the addressee and personal modest origins”, “his own incompetence as a writer”, and common motifs may also be found even outside of the reserves of the traditional *topoi*.⁵⁸ The letters written to Grasolari are not meant for the public, and yet all of them save the first imply it: that is, they consider the conditions and possibilities – formal, thematic and technical – that Marulić’s works are supposed to meet in order to be published and address a person who is powerful enough to be able to influence the publishing process. In the theme of books and printing, which is a kind of particular occasion Marulićian *topos*, they have most contact with the prefatory epistle to Franciscus Lucensis accompanying the *Evangelistary*. The specific motif of printing and the acceptability of the book so that it will be able to encourage the virtuous life, also appears in the epistle to Augustin Mula, prefatory to *De humilitate et Gloria Christi*.

Explaining the reasons why in writing the commentary to his philosophical and allegorical canzonas he selected Italian language, *sermon vulgare*, thus

est, ut perficere possim, Tu me preęibus Tuis adiua!” (Marulić 1992: 48), which occasionally extends to periods of more complex structure: “Ista que, nunc mitto archetya nostra, postquam impressorum typis exscripta fuerint, nobis restitue, simul etiam aliquot exemplaria Euangelistarii nostri ad me mitte meque Francisco Lucensi nostro, cui ipsum Euangelistarium impridem dono misi quique plus etiam remisit, ne ingratus uideretur, plurimum commenda!” (Marulić 1992: 48). We have presented another type of syntactic organisation on p. 122 of this paper.

⁵⁶ It would be possible to classify this period in the first part of our exemplification, on the basis of certain forms of concentration of the signifier components.

⁵⁷ Examples are taken from Marulić 1992: 48, 52.

⁵⁸ Stepanić 2003: 65-68.

deviating from his previous inveterate practice, Dante focussed on the subordinate function of the commentary, its derivative and secondary nature vis-à-vis the text commented on: “a commentary... is made in order to be a servant to the mentioned canzone, to be subordinate to each one of them, to know their needs and to be obedient to them. All of these features would be wanting were they written in Latin and not in the vernacular, since the canzoni are in the language of the people.”⁵⁹ The selection of language would not have needed defending if Dante had written in Latin, and it is self-intelligible in the case of Marulić too that the prefatory epistles he sent to well-educated clerics or officials of the Venetian Republic – the wider circle of recipients belonging to the European ecclesiastical and intellectual as well as social elite⁶⁰ – were also written in Latin. Two centuries after Dante’s *Convivio*, it was also equally explicable that Marulić wrote the address to Dujam Balistrilić in Croatian, appropriately to the linguistic medium of the main text. At the urging and with the financial support of Balistrilić, simultaneously with *Judita*, came the translation of the celebrated mystic and moralistic work of Thomas à Kempis *De Imitatione Christi*.⁶¹ We may only assume and attempt to read off from the text itself whether some kind of thinking through of language and style was connected with it⁶² – and whether the person who commissioned the text and who was the addressee of the dedication of *Judita* was in any way involved in the task. In the opinion of Julije Derossi, the translation into Croatian had a purpose to make this striking and highly valued text available to a wider circle than just senior theologians and churchmen, to the members of the conventual orders whose level of education would not have allowed them to read the original Latin.⁶³ The

⁵⁹ In the original: “... conviene questo comento, che è fatto invece di servo a le ‘nfrascritte canzoni, esser subietto a quelle in ciascuna sua (condi)zione, ed essere conoscente del bisogno del suo signore e a lui obediante. Le quali disposizioni tutte li mancavano, se latino e non volgare fosse stato, poi che le canzoni sono volgari.” Dante Alighieri 1968, I: 32.

⁶⁰ Marulić’s Latin works were to be read by St Ignatius Loyola, St Francis Xavier, Francisco Quevedo, Henry VIII and Thomas Moore. Tomasović 1999: 61-85 *passim*.

⁶¹ *De imitatione Christi – Od naslidovan’ja Isukarstova i od pogarjen’ja taščin segasvitnjih*, ed. by Milan Moguš, Split, 1989.

⁶² By formulating this utterance in the form of an indirect rhetorical question, we wish only to put forward the fact that the demiurgic linguistic undertaking of translating *De Imitatione Christi* was not followed by any auto-commentary on Marulić’s part or any explicit positioning as in the case of *Judita*. Marulić’s linguistic innovations in the *Imitation* have been discussed by Julije Derossi (1976: 187-203; 1976: 197-206; 1979: 139-144; 1980: 5-73; 1981: 23-32) and Mirko Tomasović (1975: 5-20; 1976: 83-107; 1999: 252-253).

⁶³ Derossi 1981: 24.

popularising urge of Balistrilić and Marulić might have had yet another cause. The work of à Kempis – as Tomasović points out – was related to the Dutch *devotio moderna* movement,⁶⁴ hence the intention of the Croatian translation was to win over for the movement new classes and groupings, as counterweight to the traditionalists who primarily held fast by Latin. In connection with spiritual and didactic literature, the choice of the vernacular language did not raise any new questions, because this connection was amply confirmed by Marulić's work in verse and of course by the local verse and prose tradition and practice. Similarly, when addressing the Split religious, only one possibility of choice could have been considered, as already indicated by Dante "locutio vulgaris in qua et muliercule communicant".⁶⁵ This was in accordance with the necessity for obviating all barriers to the universal intelligibility of the message; for belonging to a church structure that, at the general social level, alleviated their "naturally" conditioned position as a non-prestigious addressee, enabled the sisters much less than the monks to overcome their "natural" condition of non-acculturation, of being not at home in the complex of the institutional written culture.

Defending the use of the vernacular in the *Convivio*, Dante explained that "very few people would benefit from a commentary in Latin, but then a commentary in the vernacular will give help to many. For the goodness of spirit that awaits this benefit... exists in people of noble spirit" and they are "not only men but also women, many of whom understand the vernacular language and yet are not *literati*."⁶⁶ Marulić also believes that he is bound to explain why he wrote *Judita*, a Virgilian-Christian epic, in Croatian. He explains himself in a way similar to Dante, but more succinctly and less precisely, addressing first of all the disappointment of his literary companions, who know both languages, and who this time are not the only recipients of his poem.⁶⁷ Namely, *Judita*, through

⁶⁴ *De imitatione Christi*, according to Tomasović, is the classic work of *Devotio moderna*. Still more clearly, referring to Thomas H. Bestulo, Neven Jovanović describes it as "the key text of this movement" (1999: 163).

⁶⁵ Quote from the epistle to Cangrade della Scala, after Dante 1966: 1392.

⁶⁶ In the original: "... lo latino averebbe a pochi dato lo suo beneficio, ma lo volgare servirà veramente a molti. Ché la bontà de l'animo, la quale questo servizio attende, è in coloro che... e questi nobili sono ... non solamente maschi ma femmine, che sono molti e molte in questa lingua, volgari e non literati", Dante 1968, IX, 4-6: 57-58.

⁶⁷ "Tuj historiju čtući, ulize mi u pamet da ju stumačim našim jazikom, neka ju budu razumiti i oni ki nisu naučni knjige latinske aliti djačke". ("While reading this story, it came to my mind to translate it to our language, for it to be understandable to those who do not read Italian or Latin books"), Marulić 1988: 113.

the live historical actuality of the symbolically read biblical story, as well as through the moral and religious focusing and the propaganda charge could well have been interesting to all the classes of Split of that time (and, more generally, of Dalmatia too): to the *nobiles* and *cives* and *populares* and *habitatores*, those incomers from outside the walls without civic rights, many of whom had fled from the Turkish invasion, as well as the *districtuales*, the peasants of the environs of Split,⁶⁸ who were constantly exposed to the Turkish depredations. The work also impinged on the immediate living reality of a group that the Venetian governor in Dubrovnik called *la flor di boni homeni*,⁶⁹ and of the *muliercula*. (Two centuries earlier, Dante had shown in the *Commedia* a number of current figures and events from Italian and European history, and thus transmitted the “allegorical, or moral or anagogical” sense,⁷⁰ and because of the use of the vernacular and the great popularity of his verses in the lower classes of society, he invited the contempt of the Humanists who accused him of being a poet of the lowly commons.)⁷¹ The receptive universe of *Judita* – which was all-comprehensive in respect of its social components – was not from this point of view identical with the public Marulić had in mind – although he used the pronoun *chadauno* – when in a private letter to Jeronim Ćipiko he announced the historical/philosophical/moralistic work that was attached to the letter, inspired, as he himself says, by the consideration of “the oppression of the Christians by the infidel” and of the causes of such a state of affairs.⁷² (Marulić shared the widely disseminated view that the Turkish inroads

⁶⁸ Praga 1927: 40-41. This division was laid down in the Split Statute and in other 14th century documents and was in force in the time of Marulić.

⁶⁹ The quote is taken from the letter in which the Venetian governor or *comes* of Dubrovnik Nicholò Barbarigo reports to the Serenissima concerning the consequences of the plague that had overtaken the town. *Listine ...*1872: 270.

⁷⁰ As he says himself in the epistle to Cangrade della Scala. In the original: “... allegoricus sive moralis sive anagogicus”, Dante 1966:1388.

⁷¹ “Quamobrem, Coluci, ego istum poetam tuum a concilio litteratorum seiungam atque eum zonariis (alii: lanariis), pistoribus atque eiusmodi turbae relinquam”. Nicoli 1889: 33-34.

⁷² “Novamente pensando tra me la oppression di christiani per li infideli, et nela fantasia richercando la causa, vennemi in mente sopra di ciò far un trattadello, spero non inutile a quelli vorranno con mente sana legierlo, e con ragione considerar la chosa.” Marulić 1992: 34. But to the historical text in which he can see no exemplary meaning or possibility of having any practical effect on the present, although he considers it worthy of transmission, the so-called *Harvacka kronika* (*The Croatian Chronicle*), the Croatian version of the Ljetopis popa Dukljanina (*The Chronicle of the Priest of Duklja*), composed in “dalmatico idiomate”, he nevertheless devotes long consideration, which implicitly contains an explanation: “... quam non solum nostrae vernaculae linguae gnari, sed etiam Latini intelligent”. Marulić 1666: 303.

and their successes in the battle against the Christians were the divine punishment for human sins, for the perverted and dissolute behaviour of his contemporaries, which he succinctly indicates by the expression “publiche scelerateze”).⁷³ On this work he says: “Scritto è in sermon vulgare, acciò chadauno possa intender”.⁷⁴

Marulić had sent an epistle on the same subject of the peril of the Ottomans, including an appeal for assistance, to Pope Adrian VI, the supreme religious and moral authority and the greatest shield-bearer of Christendom, as well as the major player in political events, urging him to put an end to the discord among the Christian princes and to unite them in the battle against the Turks⁷⁵ – all, of course, in Latin. Here though he encompassed a broader and partially more directly accessible receptive circle, more clearly indicating for whom he meant his “trattadello” than in the preface to *Judita*. The pronoun *chadauno* indicates the totality, but in the text that follows, Marulić mentions only two social groups as the addressees of his writing: the church dignitaries and the secular lords, who by prohibitions and penalties should make their subjects behave with more morality.⁷⁶ In the context, the pronoun *chadauno* takes on a meaning that cancels out its primary horizontal extension, orienting it in the vertical direction of the diastatic axis. In other words, in the meaning in which it is used by Marulić, it implicitly contains the “mental rider” “of influential people”, “of rulers”, which is borne out a few lines later in the explicit expression “presidenti”.⁷⁷ When he discusses a matter that among other things impinges on the topic of governance, Marulić addresses the pertinent social segment: the political and governing class – in the immediate vicinity, too, thus in Dalmatia and Venice, and probably wider afield as well - in Italy, considering the immediacy of the Turkish menace – whose

⁷³ Milošević 1992: 34. The reason for such a consideration is the defeat of the numerically superior Christian ranks in conflict with the Turks (500 to 300) which occurred “qui, in le parte de Chroatia” during the restarted war between the Turkish forces and the Venetian Republic (1499-1503), and the same day the letter was written, arrived the news of the breach made by Skender-Pasha with 3000 horsemen who plundered “el paese de Slovigni per fino a Zagabria, senza obstaculo”. Marulić 1992: 36 .

⁷⁴ Marulić 1992: 34.

⁷⁵ “Totius ecclesiae Presidi supplicarem ne saltem reliquias ab iisdem inimicis opprimi patiatur sed apostolica autoritate reges atque Principes nostros ab armis ad concordiam revocatos ad expeditionem adversum infideles parandam compellat.” Marulić 1522.

⁷⁶ Marulić 1992: 34.

⁷⁷ They were recruited from the social class that Dante in the *Convivio* labelled as “principi, baroni, cavalieri”, addressing to them a commentary in Italian on his allegorical and moralistic canzonas. Dante 1968: 57-58.

primary language of communication and in the 16th century the language “of the profession” was Italian.⁷⁸

If we exclude two sonnets of doubtful authorship that Deanović, although with certain reserves, is inclined to attribute to Marulić,⁷⁹ it is certain that all those that he mentions in the letter to Jerolim Ćipiko were written in Italian, as it was the language appropriate to the form, which the Croatian authors also were implicitly to admit (those who regularly wrote their sonnets in Italian, with the exception of some specimens from the *Ranjinin zbornik/Anthology of Ranjina*).⁸⁰ Considering these circumstances and his very highly sophisticated use of the medium of language, if he had written them in Croatian, Marulić would have probably have highlighted the fact.

Letters written to his best friend, in the hardest hours of his life, when in less than a month he had lost two brothers and then his mother, in which he expresses concern about the situation in general and then gives himself over to outbursts of authorial self-confidence, are written in Italian. Speaking about *Judita* in the first letter to Ćipiko, Marulić equates “*lingua nostra materna*” and “*lingua schiava*” as in the foreword to the epic “our language” is the same as the “Croatian” given in the title of the work. Croatian was the mother tongue of Marulić, of his local public in the broadest sense, and both his addresses, Ćipiko and Balistrilić. His addressing Ćipiko in Italian does not affect the linguistic competence of this interlocutor of Marulić. It rather shows the lowly social and cultural position of Croatian, of the limits to its communicational scope and the powerful presence and acculturative role of Italian among the educated population of Split. Marulić and Ćipiko both faced a given situation in which Italian, or rather, the Italo-Romance *koiné* that was mainly based on the idiom of Venice, was not just the language of international communication over the whole of the Adriatic and a major part of the Mediterranean, but also, along with Latin, the language of a number of official documents of the Dalmatian communes, and after the year 1420, in Split and in Central Dalmatia the only language spoken by the those in charge of governmental matters. The “*veneziano coloniale*”,⁸¹ as it was called, was in

⁷⁸ For similar motives, Benedikt Kotruljević/Benedetto Cotrugli wrote his treatise in Italian language, “in quella lingua che fosse più commune, & piu intelligibile à mercadanti” than Latin, although he was addressing a different kind of audience. 1998: 17.

⁷⁹ Deanović 1936: 216-224.

⁸⁰ On this matter, the most complete information is still provided by Petrović 1968: 5-303 and Čale 1984: 29-52.

⁸¹ For the meaning of this term and the cognate “*lingua franca*”, and the relation to the term “*italiano*” cf. Folea 1968-1970: 331-368.

addition the vehicle of prestigious forms of culture, of achievements created in developed and innovative milieus, while it was the Tuscan idiom that dominated in the specific area of literature. The use of Italian among members of the cultivated class even in familiar correspondence is a reflection of such circumstances, the more so that the act of writing meant a move into a supra-individual sphere and a submission to the conventional and ritualised “rules of conduct”.⁸² Knowledge of the “colonial Italian”, that is, the *lingua franca*, or simply *Italiano*, by the male inhabitants, primarily of the gentry, in Zadar, Šibenik, Split, Trogir, Hvar and Dubrovnik (in all of these cities women were excluded, and in Zadar the *popolari* were expressly included), as recorded by Venetian syndic G. B. Giustiniano on his voyage along the eastern coast of the Adriatic in 1553⁸³ – the direct testimony

⁸² Marulić's Italian is essentially Venetian, which reflects a condition of advanced tuscanisation on the written level, typical of the time in which the letters were created, and typical also for the time and the lack of consistence in the use of given forms. In brief, we shall state several linguistic features of the letters to Ćipiko that are typical of the Venetian idiom: a) sonorisation of the voiceless occlusive intervocalic consonants: *medegarlo, fradello, dui fradelli, trattadello, podemo* (but also *mio fratello, dui fratelli, loco, consolato*); b) dental affricates as the result of Latin consonants K and G in front of palatal vowels and the development of the palatal semivowel (j) and clusters that in a certain phase of development are identified with it (in Tuscan dialect this gives palatal affricates): *cominzata, lezendo, piazzuto, faza, zoven, zorno, mazori, zoe, azio* (but *piacer, ciò, aciò, spacio*); c) the absence of long consonants: *asai, febbre, graveza, butar, sula, dele* (but *vendetta, chavallo, bella, peccato, quelli* and, as hypercorrect forms, *chroatti, riposso*); d) the vowel /e/ as result of the Late Latin open /i/ in front of a consonantal cluster /ng/, which in Tuscan gives /i/): *lengua* ; e) the preservation of the vowel /a/, which characterises the infinitive form of the verb also in future tense forms: *remandarà* (in Tuscan /a/ in contact with /r/ alters to /e/); f) the voiced labiodental /v/, as result of the velar semivowel /w/ (in words of German origin, which in Tuscan gives /gw/): *varentar, varentarà*; g) the non-diphthongal result of the open /o/ in the open syllable: *no se pol* (but also *non puol far, puol liberar, puol masticar*); h) the palatal affricate /ch/ from Latin KL: *havero ocio*, which phraseologically belongs to the Italian north; i) forms of the aorist, *potessimo, domandassimo* (analogical creation according to *cantassi*, widespread in northern Italian idioms). As term of comparison, we might use Marulić's will (cf. Rački 1892: 152-163, Kolendić 1924), written at that time, partially in Italian, where we may notice the same type of oscillation (but of a more restricted topic area, which reduces its suitability for comparison) or the will of Hanibal Lucić written in 1553, which shows the same linguistic situation (cf. Kasandrić 1903: 9-16). Marulić's letters have more Tuscan traits (was the closeness of the Latin influencing him or his scribe), while documents of the Split commune of the same period have more Venetian features. *Zlatna knjiga grada Splita, I. – Liber aureus comunitatis Spalati, I.*, Berket, Gligo, Rismondo, Šimunković 1996: 222-398 *passim*). However, only a close examination might offer reliable information). Naturally, this entire documentation should be studied in further details in order to form a reliable image of the state of the language within.

⁸³ Giustiniano 1877: 190-271, *passim*.

the closest to Marulić's own time⁸⁴ - was the result of both corresponding social connections and the education of the members of the upper classes, and of the bilingualism of the milieu – the presence of this idiom in everyday public oral communication, as the result of the commercial links with the other side of the Adriatic, the constant personal and professional contacts in both directions and the presence of immigrants from the Apennine peninsula among the inhabitants of Dalmatia – and, in addition, the direct political dependence on Venice.⁸⁵

Translated by Graham Mc Master

REFERENCES:

- Dante, Alighieri, 1966, *Opere* (ed. by Manfredi Porena and Mario Pazzaglia), Bologna.
- Dante, Alighieri, 1968, *Il Convivio* (ed. by Giovanni Busnelli, Giuseppe Vandelli and Antonio Enzo Quaglio), Firenze.
- Badalić, Josip, 1957, Marulićevi hrvatski autografi u Arhivu Jugoslavenske akademije, *Filologija*, I, pp. 37-57.
- Berutto, Gaetano, 2000, *Fondamenti di sociolinguistica*, Bari.
- Bojović Zlata, Marulićeve posvete, 1989, *Dani hvarskog kazališta XV*, Split, pp. 34-46.
- Cotrugli, Benedetto – Kotruljević Benedikt, 1998, *Della mercatura e del mercante perfetto – O trgovini i savršenom trgovcu* (ed. by Tomo Kratofil), Dubrovnik.
- Čale, Frano, 1984, Sonet i neki formalni aspekti hrvatskog petrarkizma, *Izvor i izvornost*, Zagreb, pp. 29-52.

⁸⁴ Marulić was born in 1450 and died in 1524.

⁸⁵ In the second half of the 16th century, a case was recorded of a semi-literate nobleman who did not understand Italian nor Latin and of young men who were keener on going to the sermons given by the Franciscans or the Dominicans, where they could hear Croatian, than to the Cathedral, where the preaching was given “in lingua italiana, da loro non ben intesa” (their educational status is not indicated in details). Jireček 1901: 100.

- Deanović, Mirko, 1936, Due sonetti inediti di Marco Marullo, *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana*, CVIII, pp. 216-224.
- Derossi, Julije, 1976, O jeziku Marulićeva prijevoda djela *De imitatione Christi*, *Umjetnost riječi*, XX/2, pp. 187-203.
- Derossi, Julije, 1976, Neke hrvatske apstraktne imenice u Marulićevu prijevodu djela *De imitatione Christi*, *Marulić*, 9, pp. 197-206.
- Derossi, Julije, 1979, Prilozi hrvatskom leksiku Marka Marulića, *Filologija*, 9, pp. 139-144.
- Derossi, Julije, 1980, Rječnik uz Marulićev prijevod djela *De imitatione Christi* – *Od naslidovanja Isukarstova*, *Kačić*, 12, pp. 5-73.
- Derossi, Julije, 1981, O jezičnim specifičnostima novootkrivene Marulićeve prijevodne čakavske proze, *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik*, 5, pp. 23-32.
- Folena, Gianfranco, 1968-1970, Introduzione al veneziano “de là da mar”, *Bolletino dell'Atlante Linguistico Mediterraneo*, 10-12, pp. 331-368.
- Giustiniano, Giovanni Battista, 1877, Itinerario (ed. by Šime Ljubić), *Commissiones et Relationes Venetae*, II, Zagreb, pp. 190-271.
- Jakobson, Roman, 1960, Linguistics and Poetics, *Style in Language* (ed. by Thomas A. Sebeok), Cambridge, Massachusetts, pp. 352-354.
- Jeronim Sveti, 1990, *Izabrane poslanice* (transl. by Ivan Marković and Mate Križman), Zagreb.
- Jireček, Constantin, 1901, Die Romanen in den Städten Dalmatiens während des Mittelalters, I. Theil, *Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie des Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosophisch-Historische Classe*, III, XLVIII, Wien.
- Jovanović, Neven, 1999, Čitanje Modruškoga Marulićem: *De consolatione* and *Evangelistarium*, *Colloquia Maruliana*, VIII, pp. 137-168.
- Kasandrić, Petar, 1903, *Testamento di Annibale Lucio*, Zara, pp. 9-16.
- Kolendić, Petar, 1924, *Marulićeva oporuka*, Split.
- Lausberg, Heinrich, 1960, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, München.
- Listine o odnošajih između južnoga Slavenstva i mletačke republike, III (ed. by Šime Ljubić), 1872, Zagreb.
- Malinar, Smiljka, 2002, Marulićeva hrvatska proza, *Od Marulića do Marina*, Zagreb, pp. 121-141.
- Marijanović, Stanislav, 1989, Marko Marulić u epistolografiji, *Dani hvarskog kazališta XV*, pp. 237-252.

- Marulić, Marko, 1522, *Epistola Domini Marci Marulli Spalatensis ad Adrianum VI. Pont. Max. ...*, Romae.
- Marulić, Marko, 1666, Regum Dalmatiae et Croatiae gesta a Marco Marulo Spalatensi Patricio Latinitate donata, in Iohannes Lucius, *De regno Dalmatiae et Croatiae libri sex*, Amstelaedami, pp. 303-309.
- Marulić, Marko, 1950, Latinske pjesme, *Zbornik u proslavu petstogodišnjice rođenja Marka Marulića: 1450-1950* (ed. By Josip Badalić and Nikola Majnarić), Zagreb, pp. 5-23.
- Marulić, Marko, 1985, *Evanđelistar – Evangelistarium* (ed. by Branimir Glavičić), Split.
- Marulić, Marko, 1988, *Judita* (ed. by Milan Moguš), Zagreb.
- Marulić, Marko, 1989, *De imitatione Christi – Od naslidovan'ja Isukarstova i od pogarjen'ja taščin segasvitnjih* (ed. by Milan Moguš), Split.
- Marulić, Marko, 1992, Sedam pisama (transl. by Miloš Milošević and Branimir Glavičić), *Colloquia Maruliana*, I, pp. 33-54.
- Marulić, Marko, 2001, *Poslanice Katarini Obirtića*, Duhom do zvijezda (ed. by Bratislav Lučin), Zagreb, pp. 478-486.
- Milošević, Miloš, 1992, Sedam nepoznatih pisama Marka Marulića, *Colloquia Maruliana*, I, p. 5-32.
- Mohrmann, Christine, 1940, Saint Augustin prédicateur, *Études sur le latin des chrétiens*, I, Roma, pp. 391-402.
- Nicoli, Niccolo, 1889, *Dialogi ad Petrum Histrum*, I (ed. by Giuseppe Kirner), Livorno, pp. 33-34.
- Novaković, Darko, 1994, Novi Marulić: *Vita divi Hieronymi* (British Library Ms. Add. 18. 029), *Colloquia Maruliana*, III, pp. 5-66.
- Petrović, Sveto, 1968, Problem soneta u starijoj hrvatskoj književnosti, *Rad JAZU*, 350, Zagreb, pp. 5-303.
- Praga, Giuseppe, 1927, Testi volgari spalatini del Trecento, *Atti e memorie della Società dalmata di storia patria*, II, Zara, pp. 36-131.
- Rački, Franjo, 1892, Oporuka Marka Marulića, *Starine*, XXV, pp. 152-163.
- Stepanić, Gorana, 2003, Marulićevi latinski paratekstovi, *Colloquia Maruliana*, XII, pp. 59-72.
- Stepanić, Gorana, 2004, Retorika Marulićevih epistolarnih tekstova, *Colloquia Maruliana XIII*, pp. 41-56.

- Tomasović, Mirko, 1975, Marulićev prijevod knjige Tome Kempisa *De imitatione Christi*, *Čakavska rič*, 2, pp. 5-20.
- Tomasović, Mirko, 1976, Komparatistički zapisi, Zagreb, pp. 83-107.
- Tomasović, Mirko, 1999, *Marko Marulić Marul*, Split.
- Tomasović, Mirko, 1996, Marulićeva trojezičnost, *Colloquia Maruliana*, V, pp. 5-11
- Tomasović, Mirko, 2002, Marko Marulić i *Lekcionar* Fra Bernardina Splićanina Drvodilića, *Colloquia Maruliana*, XI, pp. 323-331.
- Zlatna knjiga grada Splita, I. – Liber aureus comunitatis Spalati, I.* (ed. by Marin Berket, Vedran Gligo, Vladimir Rismondo and Ljerka Šimunković), 1996, Split.

MARULIĆEVA PRIVATNA PISMA: JEZIK KAO SREDSTVO DIJAFAZIJSKE I DIJASTRATIJSKE DIFERENCIJACIJE

Razmotrit ćemo neke sociolingvistički relevantne aspekte razmjerno nedavno otkrivenog segmenta Marulićeve proze, koji pruža niz zanimljivih informacija o nekim Marulićevim objavljenim i neobjavljenim, ili još nepronađenim tekstovima. Riječ je o sedam autografa Marulićevih privatnih pisama iz 1501-1516. godine, koji se čuvaju u mletačkom Državnom arhivu, a pronašao ih je i objavio Miloš Milošević. Tri su pisana talijanskim jezikom, točnije venecijanskim idiomom, a upućena su Splićaninu Jerolimu Čipiku, kanoniku katedrale sv. Duje i Marulićevu bliskome prijatelju; ostala četiri pisana su latinski i dio su dopisivanja između Marulića i mletačkog kanonoka, bilježnika i kancelara Senata Republike, Jacopa Grasolarija, koji se brinuo za tiskanje Marulićevih djela (ali ga Marulić nije osobno poznao). Privatne i obiteljske vijesti, razmatranja potaknuta aktualnim zbivanjima, rezervirana su za pisma Jerolimu Čipiku, pisana talijanskim jezikom. I vijesti o Marulićevu književnom radu i postignućima upletena su u njegovu privatnu priču. Okolnosti vezane uz tiskanje Marulićevih djela glavna su tema triju pisama Jacopu Grasolariju, dok u jednome raspravlja o odlikama prave kršćanske ljubavi i prijateljstva. U njima je Marulić upotrijebio latinski kao jezik odnosa koji uključuje dijatopijsku i dijastratijsku razliku između pošiljatelja i primatelja, primjeren obraćanju društveno nadređenom sugovorniku.

Autorova komunikacijska intencionalnost i “izbor teme” te dijelom i jezični medij određuju prevladavajuća formalna i konstrukcijska obilježja dvaju korpusa, ili, radije, pojedinih njihovih segmenata. Doktrinarni i moralistički pasusi primjenjuju, u sklopu

kršćanske izražajne tradicije potvrđen formalni repertoar koji aktivira sugestivne potencijale ponavljanja i varijacije, uz često izokolonski oblikovane periode i asindetsku vezu među rečenicama (slijedom svetopisamskih modela i njihovih izvedenica). Istodobno u pismima Grasolariju prisutna je još jedna sastavnica Marulićeva izraza, isto tako latinskog podrijetla, koja se očituje kao razmjerno veća zastupljenost složenijih i razgranatijih perioda nego u pisma Ćipiku.

U tekstu pisanom talijanskim jezikom složeniji oblici sintaktičke organizacije rezultat su latinskog utjecaja, pa njihovu prisutnost možemo promatrati kao akulturacijsko dostignuće i dokaz izražajne zrelosti i podatljivosti dotičnog jezika. Takav stupanj razvoja potvrđuju i Marulićeva pisma, a istodobno pokazuju i autorovu obrazovanost i udomaćenost u tom jeziku.

Većim manevarskim prostorom Marulić rapolaže progovarajući o ovozemaljskim temama, osobnim, povijesnim ili pak književnim i "poslovnim", koje ne prizivaju automatski tako precizno kodificirane i usustavljene formalne modele. Stilizacija i konstrukcijske odlike pisama Ćipiku, u ulomcima čiji cijeli prostor nije do kraja ispunjen izravnim referiranjem na transcendenciju, odražava razinu neprisiljene i istodobno kultivirane komunikacije. "Spontaniji" tipovi izričaja nisu ograničeni na razgovor o obiteljskim nedaćama, a prisutni su u mjeri u kojoj to omogućuje apriorno konvencionalni karakter kontakta i Marulićev habitus obrazovana čovjeka koji se obraća isto takvom sugovorniku.

Hrvatski je bio Marulićev materinski jezik – sam autor je o tome ostavio nepobitna svjedočanstva – jezik njegove lokalne publike i njegova adresata Ćipika. Obraćanje Ćipiku na talijanskome ne dotiče se pitanja hrvatske jezične kompetencije toga njegova sugovornika. Ono međutim svjedoči o slabom sociokulturnom položaju hrvatskoga, o njegovom ograničenom komunikacijskom doseg i snažnoj prisutnosti i akulturacijskoj ulozi talijanskog jezika među obrazovanim stanovnicima Splita. U svojim književnim djelima i u svojoj korespondenciji Marulić upotrebljava hrvatski samo kada se obraća intelektualno i društveno deprivilegiranim recipijentima: lokalnoj publici u najširem smislu, koja uključuje pučane i seljake (*Judita*, doktrinarni i moralistički stihovi...), manje obrazovanim redovnicima (*Od naslidovan'ja Isukarstova i od pogarjen'ja tašćin segasvitnjih*) te redovnicama (pisma Katarini Obirtića). Ta je situacija rezultat stalnih i intenzivnih dodira između dviju jadranskih obala, uz ekonomsku prevlast i snažan kulturni utjecaj talijanske komponente. Mletačka republika, mediteranska talasokracija između XIII. i XVI. stoljeća, u Dalmaciji je nakon 1420. definitivno učvrstila i svoju političku prevlast, što je imalo odraza i na kulturnom i na jezičnom planu.

Key words: Marulić, private correspondence, Latin, Italian, Croatian, diaphasic and diastratic differentiation

Ključne riječi: Marulić, privatna korespondencija, latinski, talijanski, hrvatski, dijafazijska i dijastratijska diferencijacija

Smiljka Malinar
Department of Italian Studies
Faculty of Philosophy, University of Zagreb
Ivana Lučića 3
10000 Zagreb, CROATIA
smalinar@ffzg.hr

