

**THE CONTINUITY BETWEEN THE ENLIGHTENMENT AND NATIONALISM:
POLITICS AND HISTORICAL NARRATIVES OF THE CROATIAN NATIONAL
REVIVAL**

By
Vilim Pavlovic

Submitted to
Central European University
History Department

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Supervisor: Professor László Kontler
Second Reader: Professor Balázs Trencsényi

Budapest, Hungary
2014

Statement of Copyright

Copyright in the text of this thesis rests with the Author. Copies by any process, either in full or part, may be made only in accordance with the instructions given by the Author and lodged in the Central European Library. Details may be obtained from the librarian. This page must form a part of any such copies made. Further copies made in accordance with such instructions may not be made without the written permission of the Author.

Abstract

This thesis provides a look the fundamental programmatic articles of the Croatian National Revival. It attempts to first contextualize the Croatian national movement within the context of the Habsburg Monarchy, and especially in regards to the relationship of Croatia and Hungary. Secondly, the thesis attempts to explore the possible continuity between the ideology of the Croatian National Revival and the Enlightenment. This is done using some of the fundamental documents of the national movement. Looking at the political program of the national movement, I attempt to identify the influences of the Enlightenment in both explicit and implicit level. Furthermore, as this thesis is on a fundamental level concerned with nationalism, I will explore the interaction between the political programs of the national movement and historical narratives as both are often found in the same text. Finally, I will attempt to contextualize my findings in the context of the Enlightenment and any other ideology preceding nationalism that might reveal itself.

The result of this thesis is that we can now establish that on a fundamental level, the politicians and authors of political programs of the Croatian National Revival were to a degree influenced by the thought of the Enlightenment. Be that is it may, the political necessities directed the politics of the movement towards the defense of the municipal rights. The second part of the thesis is concerned precisely with that issue. From it, we can establish that even in historical narratives we can recognized the influence of previous ideologies, mainly ancient constitutionalism.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Theory.....	3
Methodology.....	8
1. Historical context of the Croatian National Revival.....	14
1.2. Hungary and nationalism.....	17
1.3. The Croatian National Revival.....	30
2. Enlightenment and the Croatian National Revival.....	41
2.1. Language and politics intertwine.....	41
2.2. The <i>Dissertation</i> of Janko Drašković.....	46
2.3. The political program of the <i>Dissertation</i>	48
2.4. Ivan Derkos' The Spirit of the Homeland.....	61
2.5. Conclusion.....	70
3. Historical narratives of the Croatian National Revival.....	76
3.1. The municipal rights and the constitution.....	76
3.2. Collecting the municipal rights.....	79
3.3. Drašković's historical narrative.....	101
3.4. Conclusion.....	106
Conclusion.....	108
Bibliography.....	111

Introduction

It is the aim of this thesis to explore the possible continuity and transfer of ideas from the Enlightenment to the early period of the Croatian national movement. Due to the significant role history played in the political activity of the Croatian National Revival in the 1830s and 1840s, I intend to limit my exploration to those documents which were politically fundamental to the development of the movement and at the same time contained historical arguments for the movement's agenda. This should allow us to see what the fundamental ideological and political tendencies of the movement were and how the political tendencies interacted with historiography. Furthermore, I will attempt to show how the political project of the national movement directed the approach to history and historical research. Finally, the goal of this thesis is to show how these two elements, politics and history, and their interaction within the historical context, directed the development of the Croatian national movement.

I will thus begin by contextualizing the Croatian National Revival in a broader context of the Habsburg Monarchy and the Kingdom of Hungary, and continue with an explanation of the ideological foundations of the national revival. The second chapter of this thesis will attempt to outline the political foundations of the movement and show how the political situation encouraged the interaction of politics and historiography. The third chapter will concentrate on the historical narratives themselves, showing how history was approached by the Croatian national movement.

The early period of the Croatian National Revival has mostly been written about within the national historiography. Already the historians that were part of the second generation of the national revival in the second half of the 19th century wrote history books about the founders of the movement. This tendency within the national historiography led to the works of

such historians as Tadija Smičiklas, Ferdo Šišić and Jaroslav Šidak. Being that they wrote within the national historiography, the value of such work in scholarly research is highly questionable and subject to the effects of later historiographical traditions. In addition, their treatment of the revival in the 1820s and 1830s was only superficial. They only used it as an introduction for the extensive writing on the revival in the 1840s when it was already a strong and established movement. Only Nikša Stančić, a contemporary historian and a current member of the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, significantly discussed the early, formative years of the national revival, but again only to better understand what happened in the years and centuries after it. In general, it seems that most historians that worked on this topic were more concerned with what the national revival led to, rather than what led to it. In addition, previous research of this period did not to a large extent deal with the continuity between the national movement and earlier ideologies nor with the direction possible continuity took within the political context of the period.

It is true that the Croatian National Revival was a much stronger and directed movement in the 1840s than it was in the previous decade. It was during the 1840s and until the introduction of the so-called Bach's absolutism after the 1848/1849 revolutions that the Croatian revival was at its strongest. That is the period when the cultural activity of the revival, as well as the political conflict with Hungary within the Croatian Diet was at its highest. When it comes to the understanding of what the foundations of the revival were in regards to how they were manifested in the following years, the existing research is relatively comprehensive. However, the research concerning the origins of the fundamental political thought of the national movement, its contextual manifestation and consequently the interaction with

historical narratives, has not been done. This represent the narrow research gap within which I intend to place this thesis.

Theory

When approaching the Enlightenment, it is important to mention some of the contemporary debates revolving around the issue of a singular “the Enlightenment” as opposed to the duality and multiplicity of enlightenments that heavily depend on contextual influences. Conventionally, the Enlightenment is seen as a strictly French invention where the circle mostly gathered around the *Encyclopedia* is perceived to have created the enlightened norm to which all other developments of the same type are to be compared. This norm is generally based on the idea of progress, where the overall progress of humanity is based on reason and knowledge. The guiding line and main trait of all enlightened thought is based on the premise that cognitive reasoning can and will ultimately lead to the advancement of human kind. However, some authors have argued that, while this is the basis of enlightened thought, it is neither a strictly French invention nor should the French model be considered a norm. Authors like László Kontler¹ and Teodora Shek Brnardić² have suggested a perception where “the Enlightenment is more keenly studied as a multi-centered and multi-layered movement in which similar sets of questions about man and the universe were answered in different ways, depending on a fair diversity of contextual elements”³.

What comes out of these views is the ideas that fundamentally the Enlightenment (in a wider, non French-centered sense) had an overarching theme but was manifested in relation to the local social, political or intellectual context. We could say that it showed a large dose of

¹ László Kontler, “What is the (Historians') Enlightenment Today?,” *European Review of History* 13 (2006), 357-371.

² Teodora Shek Brnardić, *The Enlightenment in Eastern Europe: Between Regional Typology and Particular Micro-history*, *European Review of History* 13 (2006), 411-435.

³ Kontler, *What is the (Historians') Enlightenment*, 360.

adaptability visible in its evolutionary path of development, one that was highly influenced by its environment. It is exactly this sort of a local manifestation of a general Enlightenment tendency that I will be looking to find in this thesis. Nonetheless, I intend to compare any possible findings to a more general ideological tendencies of the Enlightenment rather than attempting to trace the genealogical origin of these tendencies in the Croatian National Revival. This is due to the fact that a genealogical approach would most probably move the focus of this thesis from Croatian nationalism itself and the study of the interaction between politics and history, to a more general discussion of intellectual history which is not the aim of my work.

When speaking about the theory of nationalism we cannot bypass the work of Ernest Gellner. In his *Nations and nationalism*⁴ Gellner establishes nationalism as “primarily a political principle”⁵. He defines nationalism as following:

“nationalism is a theory of political legitimacy, which requires that ethnic boundaries should not cut across political ones, and, in particular, that ethnic boundaries within a given state ... should not separate the power-holders from the rest”⁶.

This type of approach however, does not seem completely applicable to the case of the Croatian National Revival which functioned within a multi-ethnic environment of the Habsburg Monarchy. Gellner’s theory seems to be quite reliant on the “one nation, one state” principle in which the ethnic nation is equal to the ruling nation. Within an empire ruled by a monarch this condition is not met and an ethnic boundary obviously separated “the power-holders from the rest”⁷. Gellner does acknowledge the significance of culture in nationalism, stating that “two

⁴ Ernest Gellner, *Nations and nationalism*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983.

⁵ Ibid. 1.

⁶ Ibid.1.

⁷ Ibid. 1.

men are of the same nation if any only if they share the same culture”⁸, and adds that “two men are of the same nation if and only if they recognize each other as belonging to the same nation”⁹. Nonetheless, Gellner’s theory is contingent on the existence of a state and an uninterrupted ethnic nation within that state. This is partially applicable to the Croatian but more in its later, more mature period in the second half of the 19th century. It also fails to fully express the adaptability of the nationalism to contextual differences, especially in non-industrial, agrarian societies.

Similar issues can be found in Benedict Anderson’s famous work, *The Imagined Community*¹⁰. Anderson’s concept of nationalism is reliant on the idea that the “imagining” of a national community was only possible when and where certain conditions were met. These included the development of the vernacular language after Latin as a script language started losing its position. This is also connected to the development of the printing press where the printing of vernacular books helped develop a capitalist economy, making nationalism a capitalist endeavor.¹¹ More importantly for us however, one of the preconditions of nationalism was the lessening of the divine legitimacy of monarchical rule.¹² This allowed the legitimacy of rule to be transferred from the monarch to the people. Nonetheless, Anderson’s theory is still unsatisfactory for the purpose of this thesis due to its connection of nationalism and capitalism, leading to a similar problem as with Gellner and industrial communities.

⁸ Ibid. 7.

⁹ Ibid. 7.

¹⁰ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London and New York: Verso, 2006).

¹¹ Ibid. 46.

¹² Ibid. 36.

This is why we turn to Miroslav Hroch and his book *Social precondition of national revival in Europe*¹³ which specifically deals with the national movements of smaller European nations. Hroch acknowledges the existence of a wide array of “distinguishing features”¹⁴ preventing the formulation of a comprehensive definition of a nation. He thus offers a working theory, stating: “We thus consider the nation to be a large social group characterized by a combination of several kinds of relation (economic, territorial, political, religious, cultural, linguistic and so on)...”¹⁵. This theory seems to be fitting for the purpose of this thesis as it allows for the consideration and adaptation to distinguishing features present in different national movements. As Hroch himself discusses, any comprehensive definition of nationalism soon becomes the victim of these distinguishing features can disprove it. That is why in the attempt to lay the theoretical foundation for the Croatian National Revival I will concentrate less on the elusive definition and turn to Hroch’s three phase model of national development.

In Hroch’s view, the first, phase A, is the “marked by a passionate concern on the part of a group of individuals, usually intellectuals, for the study of the language, the culture, the history of the oppressed nationality”¹⁶ without “attempt[in] to mount a patriotic agitation”¹⁷. In the sense of the Croatian National Revival, this corresponds to the period prior to 1830 and the official beginning of the movement when individuals like Maksimilijan Vrhovac was promoting the Croatian language and culture. Phase B is the one driven by “a group of patriots who were already dissatisfied with the limitation of interest to the antiquities of the land, the language and the culture, and saw their mission as the spreading of national consciousness

¹³ Miroslav Hroch, *Social precondition of national revival in Europe: A comparative analysis of the social composition of patriotic groups among the smaller European nations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

¹⁴ Ibid. 3.

¹⁵ Ibid. 4-5.

¹⁶ Ibid. 22.

¹⁷ Ibid. 23.

among the people”¹⁸. Hroch labels this as the era of “patriotic agitation”¹⁹ whose success “was made possible by the establishment of objective relations of economic, political and other types”²⁰. It is this phase of national development that the Croatian National Revival exhibits in the period studied here. In addition, as Hroch further shows, phase B is most crucial in the development of European small nations, and the Croatian example is no exception.²¹

As we see, Hroch’s theory is based on different kinds of objective relations of which political, cultural, linguistic and territorial are most applicable to the Croatian National Revival. They played the most significant role as “integrating factors”²² of Croatian nationalism. This adaptability of the base theory and the direct applicability of Hroch’s three phase model to the Croatian example is the reason why I chose to write this thesis under this theoretical arch.

To conclude, this thesis is in a broader sense concerned with the issues of nationalism and the interaction of history and politics. Possible enlightened tendencies will thus be contextualized within the issue of nationalism, with a special focus how contextual elements directed, promoted or limited the use of Enlightenment thought for national purposes. This is why I intend to introduce further theoretical framework (especially on the Enlightenment which is only shortly discussed here) when and if it becomes necessary.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Phase C of Hroch’s three phase model is the one of a mass national movement. Such a phase was not reached by the Croatian nation before the end of the 19th century or even by the end of the First World War and will thus not be discussed here further.

²² Hroch, 23.

Methodology

The primary sources for this thesis are the essential written documents from the early period of the Croatian National Revival. Writing and publishing were the main means by which such movements propagated their agenda. Consequently, the quantity of documents created in the period is immense. The very selection of documents for the purpose of this thesis required adequate and well-developed criterion that would allow the study to concentrate on the truly relevant documents. At the same time, the criterion had to be wide enough to encompass all the relevant documents but also narrow enough as to not bring into question the feasibility of the study.

As is evident from the above stated, this thesis is positioned at the point of interaction between historiography and politics. This choice to use political documents containing historical elements was made to highlight the obscured distinction between the two areas in the early period of the national movement. History played an important role in the process of political legitimization of nations in the Habsburg Monarchy. In such a situation, history was extensively used for political purposes, playing a significant role and interacting with the political agendas of different groups. Consequently, it was exactly in the political sphere that historiographical work was conducted. That is why the criterion of selection of sources was base on documents that contained historical narratives while at the same time containing either explicit or implicit political connotations.

Another factor in this criterion was the significance and influence the document had at the time of publishing. We might be able to find more ambiguous documents that were historical but were not well known, widely read or influential. In this thesis, I wanted to concentrate on the documents that had a significant role in the forming of both the Croatian

National Revival as a political movement, as well as in the formation of Croatian historiography. Simply put, the selected documents had to at the same time contain the interplay of politics and history and be influential in both fields.

Because of these criteria, the emphasis in the selection fell on documents that were essential in the founding and activity of the Croatian National Revival. This approach should allow us to concentrate on the truly important and influential sources that accurately reflect the major tendencies in politics and history writing.

The two main documents that meet these criteria are Josip Kušević's work *On the municipal rights and statutes of the kingdoms of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia*²³ published in 1830 and Janko Drašković's *Dissertation, or Treatise, given to the honorable lawful deputies and future legislators of our Kingdoms, delegated to the future Hungarian Diet, by an old patriot of these Kingdoms*²⁴ published in 1832.

Both of these works were central in the political activity of the Croatian National Revival. Kušević's work was commissioned by the Croatian Diet in an attempt to use historical documents in proving the Croatian political distinctiveness from Hungary. Drašković's *Dissertation* on the other hand was primarily a political document written for the Croatian deputies in the Hungarian Diet as a program containing Croatian political demands. These demands were substantiated by historical arguments through which Drašković attempted to legitimate the political activity of the national movement. The *Dissertation* became the basis

²³ Josip Kušević, *De municipalibus iuribus et statutis regnorum Dalmatiae, Croatiae et Slavoniae* [On the municipal rights and statutes of the kingdoms of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia], trans. Franjo Pretočki (Zagreb: Knjigotiskarski i litografski zavod C. Albrechta, 1883).

²⁴ Janko Drašković, *Disertacija iliti razgovor, darovan gospodi poklisarom zakonskim i budućem zakonotvorcem kraljevinah naših, za buduću dietu ungarsku odaslanem, držan po jednom starom domorodcu kraljevinah ovih* [Dissertation, or Treatise, given to the honorable lawful deputies and future legislators of our Kingdoms, delegated to the future Hungarian Diet, by an old patriot of these Kingdoms] in: Miroslav Šicel, ed., *Programski spisi Hrvatskog narodnog preporoda* [Programmatic writings of the Croatian National Revival], (Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1997).

for all political activity aimed at Croatian sovereignty already at the time of publication but also in the next decades and even centuries. As such, it is the central and essential document of the Croatian nation, influencing the future politicians as well as historians. In addition, its historical elements provided a foundation for the development of the Croatian historiography.

I will exclusively concentrate on these two documents. In talking about the Croatian National Revival, it is impossible to bypass the works of Ljudevit Gaj as the founder of the movement. His *Brief Basics of the Croatian-Slavonic Orthography*²⁵ is an unavoidable document in discussing the national movement considering it set the foundation for the standardization of the Croatian language. In addition, to narrow down the relevant writings, a source collection entitled *Programmatic writings of the Croatian National Revival*²⁶ will be useful. This collection contains the most influential and important documents of the movement, including more works of Gaj, Ivan Derkos, Dragutin Rakovac and Ljudevit Vukotinović, all of whom will be discussed below.

In regards to some of these documents and especially Kušević's work, it is important to note that I will be using mostly reprinted documents. In Kušević's case specifically I will be using a 1883 Croatian translation of an originally Latin text. However, I have been able to compare the Latin original with the translation and found no significant differences. Some inconsistencies can be found and they will be discussed when presenting the document. I was able to compare sources which are found in the *Programmatic writings of the Croatian National Revival* with their originals and determined that they are accurate and minutely prepared reprints, mindful of linguistic differences which existed at the time of original

²⁵ Ljudevit Gaj, *Kratka osnova horvatsko-slavenskoga pravopisana* [Brief Basics of the Croatian-Slavonic Orthography], (Buda: Kraljevsko Vseučilište, 1830).

²⁶ Miroslav Šicel, ed., *Programski spisi Hrvatskog narodnog preporoda* [Programmatic writings of the Croatian National Revival], (Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1997).

publishing of individual documents. I thus do not perceive that using reprints of originals poses an issue to this thesis considering I intend to use them to extrapolate underlying tendencies and meanings rather than the used discourse itself.

This leads us to the issue of methodology and approach. The basic point of approach to this thesis would be to analyze in detail the mentioned documents. This will firstly lead to a descriptive presentation of the findings. Such a presentation and an in-depth reading of the documents should allow us to identify the main tendencies present in the works and activity of the Croatian National Revival. These extrapolations presented in a descriptive manner would then be approached analytically with a strong focus on their contextual significance and meaning. Finally, the analytical approach and the result of such an approach should allow us to establish the causal relationship between the political foundations of the movement and its use of historical narratives within the framework of the historical circumstances and reality within which the Croatian National Revival functioned.

It is important to note that it is the intent of this thesis to be heavily source-based, meaning that it will be the content of the studied documents itself that will dictate the direction of the thesis. It is anticipated that an analytical approach will lead to some comparative needs, especially in regards to the understanding of history within national movements in Central and Eastern Europe. The comparative sphere will thus be interjected with the flow of the thesis as it is necessary, relaying exclusively on secondary sources.

The main secondary literature for this thesis are the works of Croatian historians such as Nikša Stančić and Jaroslav Šidak. Šidak's *Croatian National Revival: Illyrian movement*²⁷ is still the basic and most informative work on the period of the early Croatian national movement. It undoubtedly has to be approached carefully considering its time of writing and the fact it comes from the national historiography however, it still stands as the most extensive, detailed and comprehensive account of the national revival in Croatia. More contemporary works on the subject are most notably the writings of Nikša Stančić, a Croatian historian whose book *Croatian nation and nationalism in the 19th and 20th century*²⁸ is the most comprehensive overview of Croatian nationalism available. It offers both detailed narratives as well as a sound theoretical framework. Stančić will also be used for a more extensive analysis of the sources, especially Drašković's *Dissertation* which he discussed in his article *Dissertation of Count Janko Drašković from 1832: independence and wholeness of Croatia, language and identity, cultural standardization and conservative modernization*²⁹. For Kušević on the other hand, a recent book by Zvezdana Sikirić Assouline entitled *In defense of Croatian municipal rights and the Latin language* will be used to compliment the already mentioned document as it deals with some of the discussions of the subject of municipal rights in the studied period.

²⁷ Jaroslav Šidak, *Hrvatski narodni preporod: ilirski pokret* [Croatian National Revival: Illyrian movement] (Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1990).

²⁸ Nikša Stančić, *Hrvatska nacija i nacionalizam u 19. i 20 stoljeću* [Croatian nation and nationalism in the 19th and 20th century] (Zagreb: Barbat, 2002).

²⁹ Nikša Stančić, "Disertacija grofa Janka Draškovića iz 1832. godine: samostalnost i cjelovitost Hrvatske, jezik i identitet, kulturna standardizacija i konzervativna modernizacija [Dissertation of Count Janko Drašković from 1832: independence and wholeness of Croatia, language and identity, cultural standardization and conservative modernization]," Kolo 3 (2007): accessed October 19, 2013, <http://www.matica.hr/kolo/306/Disertacija%20grofa%20Janka%20Dra%C5%A1kovi%C4%87a%20iz%201832.%20godine%3A%20samostalnost%20i%20cjelovitost%20Hrvatske,%20jezik%20i%20identitet,%20kulturna%20standardizacija%20i%20konzervativna%20modernizacija/>.

I will now proceed to the discussion of the historical situation in the Habsburg Monarchy, Kingdom of Hungary and finally the Croatian National Revival itself. I will attempt to outline the main tendencies of all three elements, concentrating especially on the ideological concepts behind the Croatian National Revival.

1. Historical context of the Croatian National Revival

1.1. The Habsburg Monarchy

Between the formation of the Austrian Empire in 1804 and the Revolution of 1848, two members of the House of Habsburg – Francis I³⁰ and Ferdinand V³¹ - ruled the Habsburg Monarchy. Francis I, whose reign started in 1792 in a Monarchy still under influence of enlightened absolutism of Joseph II and the withdrawal of his reforms by Leopold II, did little to reform the state. While he seems to have been a “cultivated, virtuous, and reasonably intelligent man”³² his reign was marked by the wish to maintain the *status quo*. “One of the most influential mediocrities of modern times”³³, as Robin Okey describes Francis, he was only 24 years of age when he succeeded to the throne of the Holy Roman Empire and the Habsburg Monarchy, subsequently disbanding the former and transforming the latter into an empire. Immediately after succession he found himself and his lands under threat of the French Revolution and soon after of Napoleon and his armies marching to the east. “Battered in his youth by his uncle Joseph and in manhood by his son-in-law Napoleon”³⁴ ... his only quality was a stubbornness in resisting foreign enemies and domestic change”.³⁵ His heir, Ferdinand, changed little in this regard and even lessened the influence the emperor himself on the everyday functioning of the empire. The state was in reality governed by the Regency Council

³⁰ Also known as Francis II as Holy Roman Emperor from 1792-1806; known as Francis I as the emperor of the Austrian Empire from 1804-1835. I will refer to him as Francis I due to the fact that the period studied here mostly corresponds with his reign as Francis I and the Austrian Empire.

³¹ Known as Ferdinand V as the king of Kingdom of Hungary and Kingdom of Bohemia from 1835-1848; known as Ferdinand I as the emperor of the Austrian Empire. I will refer to him as Ferdinand V due to the fact that this study deals predominantly with the Kingdom of Hungary and the Croatian lands associated with it.

³² Charles Ingrao, *The Habsburg Monarchy, 1618-1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 222.

³³ Robin Okey, *The Habsburg Monarchy: From Enlightenment to Eclipse* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001), 76.

³⁴ Francis' daughter, Marie Louise of Austria was the wife of Napoleon Bonaparte and thus the Empress consort of the French from 1810 until Napoleon's exile to Elbe.

³⁵ A.J.P. Taylor, *The Habsburg Monarchy, 1809-1918* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1966), 38.

or the State Conference (*Staatskonferenz*)³⁶ which was presided by Archduke Louis of Austria, the younger brother of Francis I. Under a decree signed by Francis on his deathbed, Ferdinand was “not to alter anything in the bases of the state, [he was] to consult Archduke [Louis] ... in all internal affairs, and, above all, to rely on Metternich”³⁷. Ever since the fall of Napoleon and the Congress of Vienna in 1815, it was not the emperor who directed the politics of Austria. Rather, it was the Foreign Minister (1809-1848) and State Chancellor of the Austrian Empire (1821-1848) - Prince Klemens Wenzel von Metternich.

Not accidentally and without deep foundations has the period from 1815 until the Revolution of 1848 been labeled The Metternich System. It is a period in which, in foreign affairs, Metternich controlled or attempted to control the so called Concert of Europe – an international system created as a response to the Napoleonic Wars which attempted to restore and preserve the European balance of power as it was before the French Revolution. An important element in this was the German Confederation created in 1815 to counter the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire by bringing German lands into a weak association. The head of the Confederation was the Austrian emperor. However, a conflict soon began between Austria and Prussia over the domination over the Confederation, leading to Austria’s exclusion from the *Zollverein* – a customs union of the German lands headed by Prussia.

The real ambition of Metternich’s system was to counter all revolutionary movements and maintain the monarchical balance in Europe. While this system is significant for the comprehension of European international relations throughout the 19th century and until the outbreak of the First World War, we are here more interested in the internal policy of Metternich.

³⁶ Okey, xvi.

³⁷ Taylor, 46.

A major mark of the Metternich System in the Habsburg Monarchy was its police organization, leading some authors to label the empire in this period as a police state.³⁸ The time of Metternich was also marked by a conflict between him and Count Franz Anton Kolowrat who opposed the police system under Count Joseph Sedlnitzky. The police organization was constructed under the approval and control of Metternich, leading (in combination with other reasons³⁹) to a constant dissent between him and the Minister of the Interior and Finance – Kolowrat.⁴⁰ Metternich himself took the task of “monitoring intellectual trends and managing the Monarchy’s ideological stance”⁴¹, all in the interest of preserving the “dynastic legitimacy” in the Austrian Empire.⁴² After 1815, the police in the Habsburg Monarchy had the “task [to] check the spread of even faintly liberal ideas, [in other words], potentially revolutionary ideas”⁴³. To this end, censorship was especially strong, prohibiting the publishing of books and newspapers to the point where “things were assumed to be forbidden unless expressly permitted”⁴⁴.

Overall, Metternich understood the fundamental problems facing the Monarchy – the “lack of coordination and the confusion between policy-making and its implementation”⁴⁵. He envisioned a system of ministers and a monarch’s council. In this organization, the ministers would be responsible for the functioning and implementation of regulations “on the ground”,

³⁸ Robert Kann, *A History of the Habsburg Empire, 1526-1918* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980), 283.

³⁹ The constant disagreements between Metternich and Kolowrat were caused by much more than just disagreement about the police system, even though they were rooted around the same problem. Metternich’s state system of control and repulsion of any liberal or revolutionary movements required him to maintain a strong and reliable police and military force. On the contrary to this imagined tendency, the military expenditure of the Austrian Empire went from almost 50% of the state income in 1817 to just 20% by 1848. If we know that Kolowrat was the Minister of Finance, we can clearly identify the root of dissent between the two men. Okey, 73.

⁴⁰ Kann, 283.

⁴¹ Okey, 74.

⁴² Ibid. 73.

⁴³ Kann, 283.

⁴⁴ Okey, 78.

⁴⁵ Ibid. 74.

“while a small elite body advised the monarch on general policy for the state as a whole”⁴⁶. The need for administrative reform was in the end mostly hindered by Emperor Francis - a diligent man accustomed to dealing directly with even the smallest issues. He thus successfully managed to hinder Metternich’s reforms in most respects.

In the time of Emperor Ferdinand, Metternich had more freedom to achieve at least some of his goals. He attempted to improve the economy by removing the tariff system between Austria and Hungary after Austria was not allowed to join the *Zollverein*. Railways were built to connect different parts of the Monarchy, giving dominance to the German speaking elites. However, even in the economy we can see signs of the most dominant trend which marked the Habsburg Monarchy until its collapse – nationalism. The Bohemian’s objected to joining the German *Zollverein* to avoid competition and the Hungarians objected to the customs union with Austria in an attempt to protect their special position. While Metternich did have more control over the government after 1835 and did not have to directly answer to the emperor, his “conservative government which had abandoned Josephinism’s dynamic social policy had no powerful vision with which to override the objections of interest groups, whether economic or national”⁴⁷. In both of these aspects, Hungary had a special position within the Habsburg Monarchy.

1.2. Hungary and nationalism

The fundamental characteristic of the government system in the Habsburg Monarchy, other than the royal authority itself, were the estates. The estates represented the interests of the ruling classes of society. This narrow group was comprised of “prelates (ecclesiastic or spiritual

⁴⁶ Ibid. 74.

⁴⁷ Ibid. 95.

lords) ... secular lords ... knights (lower nobility), and lastly princely towns and markets”.⁴⁸ A rare exception to this was that in certain regions the free peasants comprised the fourth curia in which case the noble lords and the lower nobility were joined together. Overall, the commoners or the general population was only represented in government in towns and markets. This form of representation, as Robert Kann points out, was not a democratic one but rather stood “for some kind of representative government based on narrow group interests”.⁴⁹

In general, the estates would receive certain rights and privileges, such as taxation, quotas of soldiers for recruitment in the time of war and “flexible control of the princely budget” in their lands.⁵⁰ They also possessed the right of petitioning the prince or governor of a land for changes in regulations. The success of this system differed depending on the land, where the Bohemian estates had more power than the estates of the Habsburg hereditary lands (before the battle of the White Mountain) and were sometimes bypassed in the decision-making leading to “princely absolutism”.⁵¹ While the estates held the right to hold their own assemblies or diets, the authority of calling a diet into session remained the prerogative of the king meaning the estates could be simply ignored if their decisions differed from those of the king or the prince.

The estates system reached its peak in the 16th century and by the time of Maria Theresa⁵² the “basically still feudal estates institutions” were being replaced by a centralized government.⁵³ Their removal was not complete however, meaning that the power of the estates

⁴⁸ Kann, 125-126.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Ibid. 126.

⁵¹ Ibid. 126-127.

⁵² Maria Theresa, Holy Roman Empress consort from 1745 until 1765, Queen of Hungary and Croatia from 1740 to 1780; co-regent with Joseph II from 1765 until her death in 1780.

⁵³ Kann, 174.

was transferred to the royal authority, but the institutional structure of the estates remained intact in the interest of maintaining the integrity of the Habsburg Monarchy.⁵⁴

The two main reasons for the centralization and suppression of the estates were defense and taxation. The mentioned quota system in military mobilization meant that only a particular number of troops could be mobilized and that the whole process depended on the estates themselves. With Maria Theresa's reforms, the military quotas were raised. The second reason the estates lost power was taxation. Taxes were introduced for the nobility and the Church to compensate for the taxation of the lower classes that "yielded lesser results" and to finance the centralized state and defense needs.⁵⁵ The structure of the estates remained largely unchanged in the time of Francis I with the exception of Hungary. In fact, the estates system, its functioning and reform barely touched the Hungarian estates whose foundation and power laid on different ground than Bohemia and the Habsburg Hereditary lands.⁵⁶

Hungary's special position within the Habsburg Monarchy was based on the "privileges of the estates, firmly entrenched in Hungary's corporate constitution"⁵⁷. The Hungarian constitutional tradition could be traced "back to the Bulla Aurea of 1222"⁵⁸ with the general rights of the estates being the exemption from taxation and authority over military within Hungary. The military aspect of their rights was especially significant. Due to the Ottoman threat, Hungary had been on the front of the defense of the entire Habsburg Monarchy. This meant that the Habsburg themselves were reluctant to interfere with the rights of the estates as long as they were serving their role as protectors of the Monarchy. The Ottoman wars thus

⁵⁴ Ibid. 174.

⁵⁵ Ibid. 176.

⁵⁶ Ibid. 126-127, 237.

⁵⁷ László Kontler, *A history of Hungary* (Budapest: Atlantisz, 2009), 213.

⁵⁸ Kann, 127.

partially ensured that Hungary retain its privileges and escaped the reforms and centralization from Vienna.

Essentially, Hungary was considered an autonomous kingdom associated with the Habsburgs through the person of the king rather than through a deeper legal or historical connection. Hungary managed to preserve its “balance between the crown and corporate structures. That is, the political influence and social privileges ... of the magnates”⁵⁹. These were preserved and confirmed by monarchs in coronation charters. As an autonomous kingdom, Hungary retained the right to elect its own king in the event that the Habsburg male line should become extinct. This is why the Hungarian acknowledgment of the Pragmatic sanction granting the Habsburg succession in the female line was an important step, guaranteeing the indivisibility and inseparability of Hungary and the Habsburg hereditary lands.⁶⁰ It comes as a bit of a historical irony that the Pragmatic sanction was soon invoked with Maria Theresa (1740) who in turn attempted to limit the privileges of the Hungarian estates that ratified the sanction.

Maria Theresa attempted to repair the budget of the Monarchy by raising the question of taxation of the nobility in Hungary. This was partially done through the attempted increase of the army subsidy Hungary was to pay. The Hungarian estates naturally objected to the removal of their constitutional rights but were in response faced with the Urbarial Patent of 1767. In the patent promulgated by Maria Theresa as “a reaction to the conduct of the Hungarian nobility”⁶¹, the “manorial impositions” were regulated in an attempt to improve the position of

⁵⁹ Kontler, *A history of Hungary*, 206.

⁶⁰ Kontler, 208.

⁶¹ Éva H. Balázs, *Hungary and the Habsburgs, 1765-1800 : an experiment in enlightened absolutism* (Budapest: CEU Press, 1997), 14.

“the defenseless against the interest of the feudal ruling class”⁶². The peasants were now obligated to contribute a prescribed amount of produce from their land and received a standardization of the *robot* – the work obligation towards the state or feudal lord – “to one day per week with, or two days per week without the use of animals”⁶³.

While the reforms of Maria Theresa definitely angered the estates and the nobility, it was the radical reforms of her son, Joseph II⁶⁴, which almost caused a feudal revolt in Hungary. In 1785 Joseph abolished “perpetual servitudes [in Hungary] and guaranteed the peasants freedom of movement and choice of career”⁶⁵. However, Eva Balázs argues that the serfs did not want the freedom of movement as they stayed with their land and work because it provided security. Balázs thus considers that the patent only effected about a quarter of the population of Hungary and attributes its significance more to the moral aspects as it educated “the landowning nobility”⁶⁶ in better treatment of serfs.⁶⁷ Also in relation to the social structure of Hungary, it needs to be noted that a large portion of the society was the land-owning nobility. This meant that “some 700,000 landowners, mostly in the middle-income brackets were tax exempt”⁶⁸, explaining to an extent the wish of some monarchs to impose taxes on the nobility and thus help the filling of the state budget.

Joseph II traveled throughout Europe and the Habsburg Monarchy in preparation to his ascent to the throne. The travels and education molded him into a representative of enlightened absolutism which he had every intention of implementing into his domains after he became sole ruler in 1780. He envisioned “a *Gesamtstaat*, a unitary state not made up of heterogeneous

⁶² Ibid. 151-152.

⁶³ Kontler, *A history of Hungary*, 220.

⁶⁴ Joseph II, Holy Roman Emperor from 1765 until 1790, co-regent of Hungary, Croatia and Bohemia with Maria Theresa from 1765 until 1780, sole ruler from 1780 until 1790.

⁶⁵ Balázs, 223.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Kann, 287.

parts, but established on the clear principles of reason, ruled by one ruler, ... a centralized bureaucracy and army”⁶⁹. This centralization and strong imperial government were obviously unacceptable for the estates in general, but especially for the constitutionally autonomous Hungary. To avoid having to obey the Hungarian constitution Joseph “avoided being crowned King of Hungary”⁷⁰.

Joseph attempted to reshape the Monarchy as a whole, reforming the military and administration, attempting to expand taxation and emancipating the serfs. His most famous and lasting measure was the Patent of Toleration issued in 1781, allowing religious activity of the non-Catholic religions. This freedom was extended to the Jewish population the next year. Still, taxation drew most resistance and by 1789, Joseph proclaimed equal taxation of all landed properties at a rate of 12.25%.⁷¹ The Hungarians were revolted by the breaking of their rights and privileges, and even considered electing a new king. Disillusioned about the possibility of creating his *Gesamtstaat*, Joseph II revoked most of his edicts a few weeks before he died in 1790. His heir whose reign lasted only two years, Leopold II, agreed to restore the constitutional prerogatives in Hungary, returning the situation to pre-Josephinist position.

Hungary thus defended its constitutionalism, rights and privileges that were the basis of its autonomy within the Habsburg Monarchy. However, as a consequence of Josephinism new trends were beginning to emerge in Hungary.

On April 26, 1784 Joseph signed into action the German-Language Edict. The logic behind it was that Latin, which was still used as the main language of administration and education in Hungary, was a dead language in which “civilized nations no longer conducted

⁶⁹ Kontler, *A history of Hungary*, 222.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Ibid. 228.

their affairs in”⁷². It also signified a wish for civility and proved that Hungarian was either not know or not adequate for conducting public affairs. That is why Joseph proclaimed German the official administrative language in Hungary also furthering his wish for a unitary state by introducing a common *lingua franca* in the whole Habsburg Monarchy.⁷³ Unlike elsewhere, where national languages were “emancipated” in previous centuries in an organic, evolutionary process, Hungarian rose as the official and literary language through a reactionary process.⁷⁴ The Language Edict started a conscious effort to improve and modernize Hungarian. Hungarian officials educated in Vienna who became familiar with the development of German in Goethe’s work started the same process with Hungarian, elevating it to a qualitatively and quantitatively rich literary language. This also initiated the impulse for the organization of linguistic and cultural institutions. “The linguistic and literary revival”⁷⁵, forced into action by the impulse of Germanization, “began to overflow into a general cultivation of native traditions”⁷⁶. In other words, “Hungary arrived at the threshold of national awakening”⁷⁷.

R.J.W. Evans recognizes in his book *Austria, Hungary, and Habsburgs – Central Europe c.1683-1867*⁷⁸ three elements that supported the development of national sentiment in Central Europe. The first is the above mentioned Germanization and in a wider sense the absolutist centralization of Joseph II. In Evans’ view, “the pursuit of uniform sovereignty, accompanied by the introduction of German where previously Latin had held sway for official

⁷² Balázs, 206.

⁷³ Ibid. 205-206.

⁷⁴ Ibid. 206-207.

⁷⁵ Kontler, *A history of Hungary*, 226.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ R.J.W. Evans, *Austria, Hungary, and Habsburgs – Central Europe c.1683-1867*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

purposes, engendered a series of patriotic reactions”⁷⁹. The second element in the development of nationalism was the economic impulse where the still infantile industrialization of the region caused “social restructuring”⁸⁰ and urbanization, invoking “the ideal of nationhood ... inseparable from the material need for a national market”⁸¹. The third element is the ideological one, where nationalism emerged under the influence of the intellectual development of the ideas of fraternity and citizenship stemming from the French Revolution, and the “individual *Volk* and the diversity of *Völker* as inspired by Herder”⁸².

The first element incited in Hungary the collecting and writing of songs, poem, pamphlets and all kinds of literary works. While the artistic value of these works might have been low, they were enthusiastically welcomed as celebrations of the nation. Such was for instance the case with the work of a young playwright “Károly Kisfaludy, entitled *A tatárok Magyarországon* (The Mongols in Hungary)”⁸³. Theater became an integral part of cultural nationalism, contributing to it with “their variety, content, the emotional and at times passionate connection between these plays and their audiences”⁸⁴. Connected with this was the development of music, the so-called *verbunkos*, which was composed from old Hungarian, Slavic, German, and Viennese-Italian influences but “came to be regarded as ancient Hungarian music of Asian origin”⁸⁵. The original and main aim of cultural nationalism was, in addition to theater, the advancement “of the Hungarian language and literature”⁸⁶.

⁷⁹ Ibid. 102.

⁸⁰ Ibid. 103.

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ Gabor Vermes, *Hungarian culture and politics in the Habsburg monarchy, 1711-1848*, Budapest, CEU University Press, 2014, 2013.

⁸⁴ Ibid. 214.

⁸⁵ Ibid. 220-221.

⁸⁶ Ibid. 222.

The revival, improvement and embellishment of language became the main focus of the linguistically focused cultural nationalist. At the same time, the themes they chose to deal with were strongly historical. One such example is the national epic poem of Mihály Vörösmarty, *Zalán's Flight*, which in a romanticized way deals with the conquest of the Hungarian medieval “founding father” – Árpád. Romanticism in general contributed to the linguistic development “with its insistence on the local, the particular, or even the peculiar”⁸⁷. Gabor Vermes establishes the characteristics of romanticism to be “emotionalism, passion, imagination, fantasy, spontaneity...”⁸⁸, some or all of which can be read in the works of Hungarian (and other) cultural nationalists. In Vermes’ view, romanticism “provided the poetic passion that fuelled the enthusiastic inspiration” of Vörösmarty and his compatriots. However, romanticism lacked the political tension and was rather a way of perceiving the world,⁸⁹ which led some cultural nationalist to realize that an exclusively culturally based national policy was insufficient. The reconvening of the Hungarian Diet helped the move of the national activity from the cultural to the political arena. This however, meant that now language was being discussed as a political issue, something that will from the perspective of the non-Hungarian peoples of the kingdom become known as Magyarization.

Under the rule of Francis I, most of Hungary’s constitutional rights were restored. However, the king retained the right to call the Diet into session, a right he exercised to his advantage, not summoning it for thirteen years in an attempt to subdue the constitutionally minded Hungarian estates. It was only in 1825, under the urging of his brother Joseph, Palatine of Hungary, and Chancellor Metternich, that Francis agreed to call the Diet into session. Thus

⁸⁷ Ibid. 223.

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

began the period known as the Hungarian Reform Era, starting in 1825 and ending with the Hungarian Revolution of 1848.

The major trait of the period is the duality of conservative and liberal tendencies. On the conservative side, the nobility was, as previously, intent on retaining their rights and exemption from taxation as the “only thing that distinguished them from the peasantry”⁹⁰. The other, liberal side of the political spectrum stood for “equality before the law, civil liberties, representative and responsible government”⁹¹. Importantly however, as time went on and as 1848 approached, the two tendencies started interacting more and more.

The main representative of this interaction was Count István Széchenyi. A member of the nobility, Széchenyi nonetheless supported liberal reforms. He helped the agenda of cultural nationalism by contributing his yearly income for the establishment of an institution that would work on the development and promotion of the Hungarian language. Other members of the diet joined and by 1830 the Academy of Sciences was opened and became the foundation of the national movement in Hungary and of Magyarization. His contribution also lies in the promotion of a reformed political in social system, one which would break the constitutionally entrenched rights of the nobility, moving towards a government more representative of all the classes or in other words – the nation. Széchenyi’s policy became more defined by the 1830s and after he published his works *Credit* (1830), *Light* (1831) and *Stages* (1833). He argued against the system of monopolies and guilds that in his view obstructed the functioning and progress of the economy, especially industry, in a heavily agricultural Hungary. Széchenyi strongly spoke against the burdens imposed on the serfs, seeking the abolishment of labor services. “He ... pointed out the moral injustice suffered by the underprivileged, who he

⁹⁰ Kontler, *A history of Hungary*, 239.

⁹¹ Ibid.

proposed to be elevated ‘within the bulwark of the constitution’”.⁹² At the same time, Széchenyi was against a revolutionary turnaround of the country, promoting a peaceful, evolutionary and gradual transformation. Such a change was not completely unconceivable to the other great *Magyar* of the age – Lajos Kossuth.

Kossuth was of non-noble descent but part of the intelligentsia. He thus reached his position in the Diet as a representative of an absent magnate, a common practice and position that allowed many non-nobleman like Kossuth to participate in the assemblies and promote “ideas of democracy based on popular representation”⁹³. Kossuth’s political prominence came about in part as a consequence of his other endeavors, primarily journalism, which allowed him to spread his political agenda. He wished to rely on the middle nobility as the carrier of the reforms that were built around the emancipation of the serfs through a state funded compensation to the landlords for the lost labor. This also meant that the nobility would have to give up its tax privileges, which were something they were still clinging to on old constitutional grounds. Unable to convince the privilege holders to do so, Kossuth turned his policy towards the expansion of the constitution to all members of the nation, based on liberal principles of representation.⁹⁴

Another important element in the policy of the national liberals was a protectionist approach to the country’s economy. In his previously mentioned works, Széchenyi argued for the removal of the economically restrictive and harmful tariff system. Kossuth argued within his protectionist policy that economic independence is “a precondition of political

⁹² Ibid. 243.

⁹³ Ibid. 246.

⁹⁴ Ibid. 249.

independence”⁹⁵ – a stance which indicated the coming of the March Laws and the Hungarian Revolution of 1848.

In the field of cultural nationalism, Kossuth supported Magyarization “even though he warned against the violent propagation of the Hungarian language”⁹⁶. Széchenyi was also aware of the dangers of Magyarization if it was applied forcefully. He was “afraid that it would break up the Empire, to Hungary’s detriment”⁹⁷. These cautious approaches were not fully acknowledged, leading sometimes to forcible implementation of Hungarian among the non-Hungarian speaking population of the multilingual Kingdom of Hungary.⁹⁸ Two main lines of action dominated the implementation of the Hungarian language. The first was the attempted implementation of Hungarian into the state, making it the first and if possible the only language of public life. The second line of action followed the same idea of making “Hungarian the country’s official language”⁹⁹ and propagated the spread and teaching of Hungarian to non-Hungarians in the interest of them being able to communicate to each other.¹⁰⁰

Attempts at Magyarization of public life began far before the Reform Era. Such requests were already presented at the Diet of 1790-1791, expanding with time. They began by requests the sole use of Hungarian in the Diet, abandoning the still used Latin which was seen as obsolete and as a dead language. As we get closed to 1848 the ideas of spread of Hungarian in all spheres of life continued and expanded to state administration. By the 1830s, Magyarization was more frequently promoted in the educational system. The major problem of Magyarization

⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ Janos Varga, *A Hungarian Quo Vadis – Political Trends and Theories of the early 1840s* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1993), 268.

⁹⁸ Ibid. 50.

⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

was that the Kingdom of Hungary was inhabited by a number of different linguistic and through that, national groups. The Slovaks, Serbs, Croats, Germans and others, refused the Hungarian language as their own, based on the same logic on which the Hungarians were not willing to continue using Latin or accept German. Language was equated with identity, culture, history and the nation itself. Abandoning and replacing one's own language with another was thus inherently connected to the demise of the nation itself and was just as unacceptable to the Slavs and Germans as it was to the Hungarians. To justify the abandonment of other national languages and assimilation of Hungarian by all the people of the Kingdom, Hungarians closely connected Magyarization with the project of liberal reforms.

Politically, the Hungarians fought for the liberation of the mass population through the intended extension of civil rights and liberties to all classes. This was to be done base on constitutional grounds, making all equal before law, with equal rights in all regards. Here however, lied the contradiction of the Hungarian national liberalism.¹⁰¹ Extending all liberal rights to the entire population of the indivisible Kingdom of Hungary, meant extending national rights to the entire population, majority of which was not Hungarian. The expectation of the Hungarians was thus that only Hungarian nation would be recognized "as a nation with collective rights"¹⁰². This meant that no other nationality would be recognized (with the exception of Croats but only within the Kingdom of Croatia). They imagined that if everyone was given civil liberties it would "give them an interest in loyalty to the [Hungarian] nation"¹⁰³, thus making them willing to renounce their own ethnic and national identity. This overestimate of the possibilities of Hungarian nationalism is well summarized by Janos Varga. He states:

¹⁰¹ Ibid. 43.

¹⁰² Ibid. 44.

¹⁰³ Ibid. 45.

“In fact, their reaction to the idea of “constitutional” Magyarization and to attempts to spread the use of the Hungarian language left no doubt that the proposed “liberties” were hardly attractive enough for them to subscribe to the “one nation” principle. As Károly Nagy aptly noted, equal rights would not engender jubilant ethnic groups rushing to assimilate to the Hungarians”.¹⁰⁴

The assimilation process varied depending on the national group within the Kingdom of Hungary and the Croats were at least a partial exception in the Hungarian view.

1.3. The Croatian National Revival

The Croatian National Revival officially began in 1835, even though its beginnings as an actual movement could easily be placed in 1830. Whichever date we chose, it remains undisputable that in the sense of an organized Croatian national movement everything starts with one man – Ljudevit Gaj. Born in Krapina near Zagreb in 1809 to a middle class family, Gaj managed to attend some of the better schools in Croatia before continuing his education in philosophy in Vienna and Graz. In 1829, he moved to Pest where he studied law and where his revivalist career began when in 1830 when he published his short but fundamental book - *Brief Basics of the Croatian-Slavonic Orthography*. In it he attempted to reform and standardize the Croatian orthography, primarily in regards to the diacritical characters. He primarily wanted to clean out the Croatian language of foreign influences, primarily of Italian, German and Hungarian, in the interest of positioning it as a standard by which Croatian could follow other Slavs, like Czechs and Russians, in their linguistic endeavors.¹⁰⁵ Interestingly enough, while Gaj was attempting to consolidate the orthography, he was doing so in the Kajkavian dialect which was native to his birthplace, Krapina. However, Croatian was spoken in two other

¹⁰⁴ Ibid. 46-47.

¹⁰⁵ Gaj, *Kratka osnova*, 2.

dialectic forms – Chakavian and Shtokavian – the latter of which was to become the standard of the Croatian language. It was again Gaj who pushed for this standardization and supported it through the publishing of the *Croatian newspaper*¹⁰⁶.

Started in 1835, the *Croatian newspaper* were the main herald of the Croatian National Revival. Gaj served as their editor, publishing news from all parts of the Habsburg Monarchy, Europe and sometimes the world. The type of articles found in this newspaper was rarely ideological, with the exception of Gaj's own programmatic proclamations which he published from time to time. Interestingly however, even though Gaj is considered the main person in the promotion of the Shtokavian dialect as a linguistic standard for the Croats and/or the Illyrians, his newspaper was actually published in the Kajkavian dialect during its first year. The newspaper was also followed by the so called *Croatian, Slavonian and Dalmatian Morning Star*¹⁰⁷, a literary addition published once a week (the *Croatian Newspaper* were published twice a week), carrying literary contents, songs, stories, collected oral traditions, etc.

It was in the *Danica* that most of the linguistic activity of the national revival took place. Gaj himself published in it the song *Još Hrvatska ni propala*¹⁰⁸ which became the anthem of the Illyrian movement. Antun Mihanović published in the same publication his song *Horvatska domovina*¹⁰⁹, which is more commonly known as *Our beautiful homeland*¹¹⁰ and is the contemporary anthem of the Republic of Croatia. While these were newly composed literary products, the *Danica* also attempted to collect the existing, traditional writings and publish them. This however, was not a new initiative. Several decades earlier, Maksimilijan

¹⁰⁶ *Novine horvatzke.*

¹⁰⁷ *Danicza Horvatzka, Slavonzka y Dalmatinzka.*

¹⁰⁸ *Croatia has not yet fallen.*

¹⁰⁹ *Croatian homeland.*

¹¹⁰ *Lijepa naša domovino.*

Vrhovac, a bishop of Zagreb attempted to use the Catholic Church's extensive network to collect old writings in what is now considered a proto-nationalist move.

As the bishop of Zagreb, Vrhovac sat in the Croatian Diet and was also one of its representatives in the Hungarian Diet. This gave him a prominent political position when it came to the introduction of Hungarian into Croatia. He strongly argued against it, especially in 1805 when the Hungarians attempted to introduce Hungarian into the judicial system and some branches of administration. On that occasion, Vrhovac proclaimed that Croats would, as Hungarians did previously, introduce their own Illyrian language into administration, which meant the Shtokavian dialect, which was called Illyrian at the time.¹¹¹ Vrhovac continued working on the development of the Croatian or Illyrian language for a number of years and finally in 1813 sent to the clergy of Croatia a written invitation for them to collect and thus improve the Illyrian language.

In it Vrhovac speaks of all those who contributed to the development of the Illyrian language and lists the major works which contributed to it and enriched it. However, he notes that there are many words that are still not found in books and grammars. He thus invites and begs the clergy to send him all the Croatian and Slavonian words, proverbs and national songs that they so far collected. He also encourages them to collect these writings further for the sake of developing the language.¹¹² Ljudevit Gaj was following in the footsteps of Vrhovac when he started the *Danica*, which had the same goal of collecting and publishing Croatian literary texts, except the language Gaj was promoting was not called Croatian at the time. In 1836, Gaj even

¹¹¹ Jaroslav Šidak, *Hrvatske zemlje u razdoblju nastajanja preporodnog pokreta* [Croatian lands in the period of formation of the revival movement], *Historijski zbornik* 33-34 (1980-1981), 69.

¹¹² Maksimilijan Vrhovac, *Poziv na sve duhovne pastire svoje biskupije* [Invitation for all the spiritual pastors of my bishopric], 1813. Translated and published as: *Poziv pokojnoga episkopa Maximiliana Verhovca Rakitovackoga na sve duhovne pastire svoje episkopie* [Invitation of the deceased bishop Maximilian Verhovac Rakitovacki for all the spiritual pastors of his bishopric] in: *Danica Ilirska* 24 [Illyrian Morning Star], ed. Ljudevit Gaj, Zagreb, 1837, 93-96.

changed the name of his newspaper to reflect this fact, naming it the *Illyrian People's Newspaper*¹¹³ while the *Croatian, Slavonian and Dalmatian Morning Star* became the *Illyrian Morning Star*¹¹⁴. At the same time, Gaj substituted the Kajkavian for the Shtokavian dialect. This was due to the fact that the Croatian National Revival was actually from its beginning until the banning of the Illyrian name in 1843, just that – the Illyrian national revival.

Illyrism was the idea that all South Slavs constituted one nation based on the shared language. While it is true that only within the Croatian lands there were three dialects (Shtokavian, Kajkavian, Chakavian), Shtokavian was the most widely used one, common in large part to all the South Slavs. It was based on this idea that Gaj claimed and promoted the Illyrian ideology as a cultural movement of the South Slavs and not just the Croats. Illyrism as such however, was not Gaj's invention. The idea could be traced back to the 15th century when “just as the Italian humanists rediscovered ancient Rome, and the German humanists Tacitus' *Germania* the Croats and other South Slav writers discovered ‘Illyria’”¹¹⁵.

Illyrism can be traced back to Juraj Šižgorić who in 1487 published a work on the historical and geographical concept of Illyria. He perceives it as the area between Hungary, Friuli, the Black Sea and Macedonia. As Zrinka Blažević points out, this concept and territorial extent seems to reflect a “utopian annulment of the real political situation”,¹¹⁶ considering that most of Šižgorić's Illyria is at the time under the Ottoman Empire. Ivo Banac also contributes to the emergence of the Illyrian idea to the Ottoman treat, saying that due to the lack of support

¹¹³ *Ilirske narodne novine*.

¹¹⁴ *Danica Ilirska*.

¹¹⁵ Wayne S. Vucinich, *Croatian Illyrism: Its background and genesis*, in: *Intellectual and social developments in the Habsburg Empire from Maria Theresa to World War I*, Stanley B. Winters and Robert A. Kann (Boulder: Columbia University Press, 1975), 55.

¹¹⁶ Zrinka Blažević, *Ilirizam prije Ilirizma* [Illyrism before Illyrism] (Zagreb: Golden Marketing; Tehnička Knjiga, 2008), 125.

from the West, the Slavs started to experience sentiments of unity based on mutual peril.¹¹⁷ Vinko Pribojević's wrote the second work fundamental to the establishment of Illyrism in 1525. Entitled *On the origin and glory of the Slavs*¹¹⁸, this work goes a step further than Šižgorić and establishes Illyrians as Slavs, making them the direct ancestors of the contemporary South Slavs.¹¹⁹

A key figure for the concept of Illyrism as will be promoted by Gaj in the 19th century is Pavao Ritter Vitezović who in 1700 published his most famous work *Croatia Rediviva*¹²⁰. In it, and in some previous writings, Vitezović stated that the Slavic name is not referring only to Croatia between the Drava River (boarder with Hungary) and the Adriatic Sea, but rather that it includes all those lands which the Greeks and Romans called Illyria. He thus "extended the ancient Illyrian name, which the Renaissance writers applied mainly to the Croats, to all the Slavic people"¹²¹. Vitezović's claim "was based on linguistic communality"¹²². He considered that the Slavs and Illyrians spoke the same language, prompting him to claim the validity of application of the Illyrian name to all the Slavs.¹²³ Vitezović continued his work and attempted to chronicle Croatian history from old sources, encouraging his readers to send him historical sources. The result of this was the work *Croatia rediviva* (actually only a preparation for a larger but unfinished work on Croatian history) in which "Vitezović effectively claimed all of the Western and Eastern Slavs for the Croats"¹²⁴. It was roughly in this condition that Ljudevit Gaj "inherited" Illyrism from his predecessors and started developing it as a national identity in the linguistic and cultural sense of the 19th century.

¹¹⁷ Ivo Banac, *The Redivided Croatia of Pavao Ritter Vitezović*, *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 10 (1986), 493.

¹¹⁸ *O podrijetlu i zgodama Slavena*.

¹¹⁹ Blažević, 125-126.

¹²⁰ *Oživljena Hrvatska*.

¹²¹ Banac, 495.

¹²² Ibid.

¹²³ Ibid.

¹²⁴ Ibid. 502.

In the *Proclamation*¹²⁵ published as a leaflet in 1835 and reprinted in the *Danica* in 1836¹²⁶, Gaj compared Illyria to a lyre that is out of tune. The parts or strings of this lyre were in his view Carinthia, Gorizia, Istria, Carniola, Styria, Croatia, Slavonia, Dalmatia, Dubrovnik, Bosnia, Montenegro, Serbia, Bulgaria and lower Hungary.¹²⁷ Continuing with the lyre analogy Gaj wished that all the string of the lyre would once again be brought into tune, in other words, that all the South Slavic lands are brought together in a linguistic sense. He himself saw this as problematic due to the fact that each mentioned region is “in tune” with a different entity (meaning the Habsburg Monarchy or the Ottoman Empire) and is adapt to a different language. To achieve this renewed tune of the lyre that is Illyria, Gaj sees a return to the old books, emphasizing the importance of literature and through that the language which is common to all Illyrians.¹²⁸ We can see that Gaj thus continues the thought of previous Illyrian ideologists, connecting the territorial extent of Illyria with the vernacular. To spread the appeal of the Illyrian movement among all South Slavs Gaj decided to carry out the already mentioned change of language used in his *Croatian newspaper* and *Danica* to the Shtokavian dialect, also losing the Croatian and introducing the Illyrian name to the title. In his argument for a single language in all of Illyria, Gaj argues that Germans and Italians also gathered their many dialects into one language. Gaj thus based his entire argument of South Slavs or Illyrians as one nation, on the fact they all speak the same or at least a similar language with only dialectal differences.¹²⁹ To gather all the Illyrians to his cause, the members of the Illyrian movement led

¹²⁵ *Proglas*.

¹²⁶ Ljudevit Gaj, *II. Proglas* [Second Proclamation], in: *Danica ilirska*, Zagreb: 1836. Taken from Programski spisi Hrvatskog narodnog preporoda [Programmatic writings of the Croatian National Revival], Miroslav Šicel, ed. Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1997, 113-116.

¹²⁷ “...Koruška, Gorica, Istria, Krainska, Štajerska, Horvatska, Slavonia, Dalmacia, Dubrovnik, Bosna, Crna Gora, Srbia, Bulgaria I dolnja Ugarska.”, Gaj, *II. Proglas*, 113.

¹²⁸ *Ibid*.

¹²⁹ *Ibid*. 114-116.

by Gaj started a wide array of activities, with Dragutin Rakovac¹³⁰ concisely defining the immediate as well as wider goals of the movement.

In his *Small catechism for great men*¹³¹, Dragutin Rakovac deals with a range of issues facing the Croatian national movement in a form of questions and answers. Addressing the fundamental issue of why the Croats chose to start their national movement under the Illyrian rather than the Croatian name, Rakovac argues that they wished to have a strong literature which has to extend beyond the Kingdom of Croatia and include all the speakers of the South Slavic language. This could not be achieved under the limitations of the Croatian name because every South Slavic nation (Croat, Slavonian, Dalmatian, Serb, etc.) would have the right to demand that the language and literature be created under its name. Thus, a single name is needed; one which would do no harm to all and under which the South Slavs are known under to the English, French and Italians and has not disappeared since before the birth of Jesus Christ.¹³² Rakovac argues for the use of the Illyrian name on the basis that there is no other name under which the South Slavs can be united and that the Northern Slavs have united under the name of Rus. This is also the basis for his rejection of the use of just the Slavic name for the South Slavs. In his view, it is a common name which encompasses the Illyrians, the Czechs, Russians and Poles and is thus unsuitable for the South Slavs. He also argues against any possible new name that could be created for this purpose, saying that names of nations and languages cannot be just made up.¹³³

¹³⁰ Dragutin Rakovac was one of the closest associates of Ljudevit Gaj. He was the promoter of the Illyrian cultural nationalism and worked both on Gaj's newspaper and the second most important newspaper of the movement, the *Kolo*, a literary magazine started by Stanko Vraz, another prominent member of the Illyrian movement.

¹³¹ Dragutin Rakovac, *Mali katekizam za velike ljude* [*Small catechism for great men*], 1842, in: *Programski spisi Hrvatskog narodnog preporoda* [Programmatic writings of the Croatian National Revival], Miroslav Šicel, ed. (Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1997), 125-138.

¹³² Ibid. 131.

¹³³ Ibid. 132.

In a political sense, Rakovac argues for the use of the Illyrian name when it is necessary to refer to the whole Triune Kingdom of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia. He also finds the support of his argument in old document, primarily the *Corpus Juris Hungarici* where the Illyrian name is used for Croatia, Dalmatia and Slavonia. In addition, he cites the geographer Magjar Bel and his *Compendium Hungariae Geographicum* published in 1779 in Bratislava and Košice, specifically referring to the chapter entitled *Regnorum Slavoniae, Croatiae et Dalmatiae Geographicum*. In it is stated that Illyria is today divided on Hungarian, Venetian and Ottoman Illyria. According to Rakovac, when Bal says Hungarian Illyria he means the Kingdom of Slavonia, Croatia and Dalmatia thus proving the applicability of the Illyrian name.¹³⁴

In the end, Rakovac shortly summarizes the goals of the Illyrians. First, he wishes for the Illyrians to have their own language because without a language the nation dies. Second, to have “our” national literate because without it the language itself dies. Third, to educate the people of the nation in their own language because foreign languages are capable to educate only the literate. Fourth, to maintain “our” municipal rights for they are the foundation of our political being. Fifth, to be and remain brothers with the Hungarians under the Hungarian constitution.¹³⁵

Already here we see the interaction of politics, through the issue of municipal rights, with the Illyrian language. It becomes apparent that the Illyrian movement was in practice not exclusively oriented towards cultural nationalism but employed and had political aspirations and connotations. We could even conclude that the central issue, which connects Rakovac’s five points, is Magyarization.

¹³⁴ Ibid. 133.

¹³⁵ Ibid. 137.

The first part of his *Small catechism* is dedicated to the pro-Hungarian Croats who he labels “pseudomagyar”¹³⁶ because they support the Hungarian cause (the introduction of Hungarian in Croatia and by that the violation of Croatian municipal rights, in other words Magyarization) but are not Hungarian by birth, blood or language.¹³⁷ Rakovac again lists five reasons why the Croats do not want Hungarian as the official language in their lands. First, they have for 700 years conducted their affairs in Latin in which all their diplomas and documents are written. Second, because they do not want to step away from a single one of their municipal rights because if they did so the Hungarians would with time break them all. Third, if Hungarian was to be introduced in the Croatian lands as the official language for public affairs it would soon spread to other areas of life and extinguish the Croatian or Illyrian language. Forth, the introduction of Hungarian would be a deadly blow to the development of “our” literature while Latin as a dead language poses no threat to Croatian. Fifth, if Croats were to give up their right to use Latin then they would rather introduce their own Illyrian language which all can understand.¹³⁸

What comes out of Rakovac’s text is the evident duality and interchangeability of the Croatian and Illyrian name. In fact, the Illyrian national movement is often synonymous with the Croatian National Revival. However, the members of the movement were aware of this duality and Ljudevit Vukotinović shortly summarized the differences in 1842.¹³⁹

In his discussion simply entitled *Illyrism and Croatism*, Vukotinović establishes that Illyrism in a political sense does not mean anything. He sees it only as a genealogical term

¹³⁶ “...preudomagjarske...”, Ibid. 125.

¹³⁷ Ibid. 125-126.

¹³⁸ Ibid. 130.

¹³⁹ Ljudevit Vukotinović, *Ilirizam i kroatizam* [Illyrism and Croatism], 1842, in: Programski spisi Hrvatskog narodnog preporoda [Programmatic writings of the Croatian National Revival], Miroslav Šicel, ed. (Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1997), 139-146.

designating the Illyrians as part of the Slavic people. In this sense, he connects it with reading and thinking. He proclaims that a nation can achieve real and lasting happiness only when knowledge of self is awakened within a person that was educated within the patriotic sentiment.¹⁴⁰ He justifies the use of the Illyrian name with historical reasons, citing some of the same sources as Rakovac. However, he does not go further into the historical argument about the existence of the Illyrians and their name but rather continues to the literary side of it – “literary Illyrism is our spiritual life”¹⁴¹. Like Rakovac, Vukotinović argues for the use of the Illyrian name so that no South Slavic nation would object that their own name is being excluded or suppressed in this Illyrian literary and cultural revival.

On the other hand, Croatism is the political life of the national movement. In this sense, Vukotinović sees the Croatian designation as a political and constitutional category. He compares it with Saxony and Württemberg, saying that in a constitutional sense they are just that, Saxony and Württemberg. However, in a genealogical sense they are all Germans. Just like them, the Croats are Croats in a constitutional and political sense while they are Illyrian in the genealogical and cultural sense, together with Bosnians, Serbs, etc.¹⁴² This in no way leads Vukotinović to proclaim the necessity of a political unification of the Slavs. He says that the Illyrians need to be “strong in spirit and independent under the Hungarian constitution, as they were up until now”¹⁴³. He feels that Austrian rule never denationalized anyone and it will not do so to the Illyrians either. Vukotinović finally promotes obedience to the king and emperor, which should grant the Croats the right to retain their constitution and even improve it.¹⁴⁴

¹⁴⁰ Ibid. 139-140.

¹⁴¹ “*Ilirisam slovnički je život naš duševni.*”, Ibid. 142.

¹⁴² Ibid. 140.

¹⁴³ “...mi valja da budemo dugom jaki I samostalni pod konštituciom ugraskom, kao što I dosad biasmo.”, Ibid. 141.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid. 141.

The Illyrians, acting on the grounds of cultural nationalism, promoted the use and expansion of the Illyrian language based on the commonly used Shtokavian dialect. For this purpose they organized national institutions such as *Matica ilirska*¹⁴⁵ that published books in the vernacular. Those could then be read in a wide net of reading rooms that served as meeting places for the revivalists. Other South Slavs, primarily the Slovenians and the Serbs nonetheless rejected the Illyrian national movement. As did the Czechs, Russians and Poles, other South Slavs had their own national movements developing at the time and did not wish to abandon their own national names. Serbs were the most advanced in the linguistic development of their vernacular thanks to Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, a linguist who like Gaj worked on the standardization of the Serbian Shtokavian language through the collecting of folk stories and songs. The objection of other South Slavs against Illyrism was based on the fact that they saw it as threatening to their own name and language. Gaj defended his stance, arguing in his *Third Proclamation* for brotherly Illyrism in which all that belongs to one Illyrian nation, meaning name, tradition and culture should be maintained within a broader Illyrian brotherhood.¹⁴⁶ Regardless of Gaj's efforts, other South Slavs rejected Illyrism which thus remained localized within the Croatian lands and especially in Zagreb. As such, it had a far greater incentive to more thoroughly deal with the Magyarization, inevitably connecting the cultural Illyrian and political Croatian national movement. As Gaj himself states, those Illyrians most veraciously fought and defended the Croatian and Slavonian municipal rights and privileges.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁵ *Matica* is a common name and for of a cultural institution in Slavic national movements. Its goal was the publishing and promotion of literature on the vernacular.

¹⁴⁶ Ljudevit Gaj, *III. Proglas* [Third Proclamation], in: *Danica ilirska*, Zagreb: 1843. Taken from: Programski spisi Hrvatskog narodnog preporoda [Programmatic writings of the Croatian National Revival], Miroslav Šicel, ed. (Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1997), 119-120.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid.

2. Enlightenment and the Croatian National Revival

2.1. Language and politics intertwine

As we saw in the Hungarian case, the development of the Hungarian language was a reaction to the attempted Germanization under Joseph II. The Hungarians emphasized that one of their constitutional rights was to use their own language in their affairs. With that, the issue of linguistic nationalism became connected with the political issue of defending constitutional prerogatives. Even the nationalist who first promoted only a cultural and linguistic revival soon came to the realization that only cultural activity was not enough to achieve the goals of the national movement. Thus, cultural nationalism became intertwined with politics. The development of this national politics led to the promotion of the Magyarization of all lands under the Crown of St. Stephen. This meant the introduction of Hungarian in public affairs and schools, something the other nationalities of the Kingdom of Hungary could not take lightly as it conflicted with their own national sentiments.

This attempt at Magyarization was especially problematic when it comes to Croatia. Croatia as we refer to it here actually include three separate kingdoms – Kingdom of Croatia, Kingdom of Dalmatia and Kingdom of Slavonia – which together in the minds of Croatian nationalist constitute a single, three-part political body called the Triune Kingdom.¹⁴⁸ In an even wider sense, the Triune Kingdom was part of Illyria. As we saw above, the Illyrians had

¹⁴⁸ Kingdom of Croatia and Kingdom of Slavonia were part of the Kingdom of Hungary. Because they were functioning within the same surrounding their politics intertwined to a large extent. The fact that they were both represented in the Croatian Diet connected the two in the approach the Croatian National Revival had towards them. The political side of the revival will thus often argue for the common political goals of the tow kingdoms which were actually joined into a single Kingdom of Croatia-Slavonia after the 1868 Croatian-Hungarian Settlement. On the other hand, the Kingdom of Dalmatia was not part of the Kingdom of Hungary, but was under the jurisdiction of Vienna. This political circumstances, as well as some difference of opinion between Dalmatians and the members of the Croatian National Revival, meant that the unification of Dalmatia with Slavonia and Croatia was requested only on a nominal level, with the bulk of political activity concentration on the Croatian lands within the Kingdom of Hungary.

their view of what constituted this Illyria in its fullest territorial extent. It was an that encompassed all those territories in which linguistic Illyrians lived. The unification of these territories was one of the major political demands of the Croatian National Revival, as we will see in Drašković's work.

First, it is important to understand what the position of the Kingdom of Croatia was within the Kingdom of Hungary. The two kingdoms were joined in 1102 by the so-called *pacta conventa*, a personal union by which the Hungarian king became the king of the Kingdom of Croatia. The Croats saw this union as a voluntarily joining with Hungary in which they retained their right to decide upon their own affairs. It also meant that the Kingdom of Hungary had no jurisdiction over Croatia since it was an independent and autonomous kingdom connected to Hungary only through the person of the king. On the other hand, Hungary saw Croatia as its subordinate over which it had complete jurisdiction within the constitutional prerogatives of the Hungarian constitution. They were willing to acknowledge to the Kingdom of Croatia a degree of independence and constitutional rights because Croatia was seen as a historical and constitutional entity. This acknowledgement of its individuality as a historical and political body is what differentiated the Kingdom of Croatia from other territories of the Kingdom of Hungary and gave it a slightly better position in regards to the Magyarization process.

The acknowledgement of such a status meant that the Croatian Diet “was competent to bring decisions binding throughout Croatia in matters to which no existing law or county regulation applied”¹⁴⁹. This on the other hand meant that the Hungarian Diet had nominal jurisdiction over Croatia, but the Croatian Diet had legislative authority in non-common affairs. The executive power within Croatia was in the hands of the *ban*, the viceroy of Croatia appointed by the king. This organization also meant that when the Hungarian Diet attempted to

¹⁴⁹ Varga, 90.

implement the Hungarian language in educational, judicial or administrative institutions such a decision should be applied to its entire jurisdiction, including Croatia. This was the source of the struggle over Croatia's municipal rights because in the view of the Croats, its own diet, the so-called *Sabor*, had jurisdiction in the matter based on the Croatian municipal or constitutional rights¹⁵⁰. This situation was further worsened with the political maturing of the Croatian national movement.

The concept of the Illyrian territorial extent as formulated by Vitezović and Gaj meant that the jurisdiction of Hungary over those territories came into question in the same manner as with the Kingdom of Croatia. Slavonia was an especially complex issue. The Požega, Virovitica and Syrmia counties, which constituted the Kingdom of Slavonia, were represented in both the Hungarian and the Croatian Diet. As such, Slavonia constituted a part of Hungary proper, but also held seats in the Croatian Diet making it in the minds of Croatian nationalists an integral part of the Croatian lands to which the Croatian municipal rights clearly extended. Consequently, Slavonia was to be part of the Magyarization process as part of Hungary proper but was also claimed for the Croatian side. The position on Slavonia varied in Hungary as well, especially when in 1842 it was granted the right to communicate with Hungarian counties in Latin instead of the obligatory Hungarian. The Hungarians saw this as granting Slavonia the same status as Croatia, to a strong discontent of the Hungarian counties but also the Croats who saw it as a push to further legislate the process of Magyarization.¹⁵¹

What becomes obvious from this situation is that the activity of the Croatian national movement was expanding its reach beyond the Kingdom of Croatia, to all the Croatian or Illyrian lands it could reasonably include. More importantly, it shows us that the linguistic

¹⁵⁰ When talking about the constitution we refer to the body of law. In this sense, a constitution is perceived as a collection of all laws. This issue will be discussed further below.

¹⁵¹ Varga, 99.

concept of the Illyrian movement was interacting with the political struggle of the Croatian National Revival.

Just like the Hungarians responded to Germanization with developing their own language, the Croats responded to Magyarization by developing the Croatian or, in a wider sense, the Illyrian language. The Magyarization then brought into question the Croatian political position, the jurisdiction of the Croatian Diet and the Croatian municipal rights. Again, just as Hungary defended its own constitutional rights against the Habsburgs, part of which was the autonomy over the language used in public affairs, so did Croatia. When the Hungarians attempted to introduce Hungarian into public affairs within Croatia, the Croats saw it as a violation of their autonomy and municipal rights. The Croats thought that the violation of one municipal right regarding language would ultimately lead to the violation of them all, as we saw from Rakovac. Continuing the reactionary tendencies, just as the Hungarians realized that only cultural activity void of any political engagement was not productive, so did the Croats. Thus the initial push for the development of the Illyrian language, through the issue of the municipal right to use Latin within Croatian lands, began the introduction of Croatian cultural nationalism into politics. The founding figure in this political and linguistic interaction was Count Janko Drašković.

Count Drašković was a member of one of the oldest noble families in Croatia whose origins can be traced back to the Middle Ages. As such, his family was also one of the richest, with extensive possessions including the largest Croatian castle – Trakošćan, near Zagreb. This wealth allowed Drašković to receive extensive education making him fluent in several languages, including Latin, German and the Illyrian vernacular. He studied in Vienna and Paris,

was interested in literature and wrote poetry, but he also pursued a military career, which was cut short because of illness. He nonetheless actively participated in the Napoleonic Wars and was a member of the Croatian and Hungarian Diets.

The fact that he was of noble descent, educated and a member of the Diets, made him especially important and prominent in the Croatian national movement. Firstly, he was significantly older than most of the members of the national movement. Most of the other initial members of the movement were in their twenties. Gaj for instance was only 21 when he published the *Brief Basics of the Croatian-Slavonic Orthography* in 1830. While Gaj's age was not necessarily a drawback, it undoubtedly meant a lack of experience in politics. This was definitely not an issue for Drašković who had first participated in the Croatian Diet in the 1790s, in his early twenties and forty years before the beginning of the Croatian National Revival. This experience inevitably earned Drašković significant respect from the mostly young, middle class, members of the Croatian national movement.

Second important fact for Drašković's position within the revival was his noble descent. In the initial stages of the revival, he was the only nobleman who was interested and willing, at least publically and actively, to join the Croatian National Revival. He could thus more credibly voice the stance of the nobility in the national movement and of the national movement among the nobility. As we shall see, his aristocratic background had a significant impact on the content of his *Dissertation* as the political program of the movement. His noble title ultimately meant that a nobleman and a member of the feudal estates formulated the political program of a predominantly middle class national movement.

After publishing the *Dissertation*, Drašković became one of the most prominent members of the Croatian National Revival and one of the leaders of the Illyrian party¹⁵² in the Croatian Diet. He also helped organize revivalist national institutions like the Illyrian reading room, *Matica hrvatska*, the National Museum and National Theater. In 1848, when more liberal political course was emerging in Croatia, Drašković refused an offer to become the Croatian *ban* and withdrew from the leadership of the People's Party.

2.2. The *Dissertation* of Janko Drašković

The *Dissertation* was originally published anonymously in Karlovac, but as Nikša Stančić shows¹⁵³ Drašković's authorship was never questionable for the members of the national revival or later historians. Aleksandar Šuljok¹⁵⁴ wrote to Gaj about Drašković as the author of the *Dissertation* already in November 1832¹⁵⁵, and the certainty of his authorship was further reinforced by the fact that the work was published in Karlovac, a city near one of the Drašković family estates where the Count resided. The work was reprinted, also anonymously, in Leipzig in German already two years later with the purpose of familiarizing "the Habsburg and European public with Croatian-Hungarian relations and generally with the Croatian question in the Monarchy"¹⁵⁶. This also shows that the significance of the *Dissertation* was

¹⁵² The Illyrian Party was the political party of an otherwise culturally based Croatian National Revival. It was organized in 1841 as an opposition of the Croatian-Hungarian Party which was advocating a closer relationship with Hungary and the introduction of Hungarian as an official language in Croatia. The Illyrian Party functioned under that name only until 1843 when the Illyrian name was banned by the imperial government in Vienna, leading to the renaming of the party to People's Party.

¹⁵³ Nikša Stančić. "*Disertacija grofa Janka Draškovića.*"

¹⁵⁴ Aleksandar Šuljok was a little known member of the Croatian National Revival. In fact, the name is mentioned only in Šidak's article in the above context. I was not able to find any more information about him in any source. It seems reasonable to conclude that he was thus not an important figure about whom more should be written in this thesis. Ibid.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid.

recognized from the time of publishing, as it was within Croatian historiography in the following centuries.¹⁵⁷

As was mentioned above, the *Dissertation* was primarily a political program. This is evident even if we consider just the title of the work, which roughly translates into *Dissertation, or Conversation, given to the honorable lawful deputies and future legislators of our Kingdoms, delegated to the future Hungarian Diet, by an old patriot of these Kingdoms*. As we can see, Drašković intended his publication for the Croatian representative in the Hungarian Diet. In addition, we can notice that the main political demand of the *Dissertation* and the Croatian National Revival - the unification of the perceived Croatian lands around the historically based but currently disintegrated Triune Kingdom of Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia - is present already in the title of the work with the use of the plural form, kingdoms.

Drašković discusses language already in the preface of his work. He wrote his work in the Shtokavian dialect of the Croatian language, which he considers the dialect of old books and “most appropriate for the Slav-Croats, as the nation (*narod*) of our kingdoms”¹⁵⁸. His main motivation for using this dialect and the Croatian language as such was to prove that “we have our national language in which we can say everything our heart and mind desires”¹⁵⁹. He also notes that he arranged his own orthography for this publication because of the influences of Hungarian in Zagreb and Italian in Dalmatia. That is why, as Drašković notes, some of his readers might not be familiar with some of the words, but that they can all be found in old

¹⁵⁷ Ibid.

¹⁵⁸ Narod is the term which designates the people of the nation in an ethnic sense. It is based primarily on the ethnic concept of a nation, as a large social group with a shared culture, language, etc. It should be differentiated from the term *nacije*, which is the nation in a political sense. There does not seem to be an adequate translation of these words into English. I will thus use the Croatian word *narod* whenever it is relevant to point out the difference between the nation and the people of the nation. Drašković, 55.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid.

dictionaries. He concludes by saying that this proves that the Croatian language was richer in previous ages.¹⁶⁰

Drašković contradicts himself slightly because at various points of his text he also promotes the development of the language which would suggest that it was not as developed as he implies in his introduction. The stance that promotes development is more in line with other members of the Croatian national movement who were promoting the development of language, such as Vrhovac or Gaj. Nonetheless, Drašković's *Dissertation* is not so relevant because of its propagation of language, but rather because of the political guidelines for the national movement that it outlined.

2.3. The political program of the *Dissertation*

Drašković's *Dissertation* covers a wide range of topics concerning the relationship of Hungary and Croatia, with his political demands ranging from the political and administrative division of the Croatian lands, language used in administration and everyday life, education, social reform and economy.

He first touches upon the question of political and administrative integration and unity of the Croatian lands. His whole argument is based on the idea that Croatia was joined with Hungary by her own free will and is thus in no way its subordinate. He rather sees Croatia as a willing companion of Hungary, equal to it in every regard, and even goes so far to describe the relationship as a "conditional brotherhood"¹⁶¹, the condition being that Croatia retains its autonomy that it enjoyed before the signing of the *Pacta conventa* in 1102.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid.

¹⁶¹ Ibid. 65.

Croatia in this context is not meant to refer to only the historical Kingdom of Croatia, but also the Slavonian and Dalmatian Kingdom, constituting the territory of the Triune Kingdom. This view of one kingdom constructed of three separate entities was, in the view of the revivalists, based on historical connections and was supposed to serve as a nucleus for the unification of all Croatian lands – thus serving the role comparable to Piedmont's role in the Italian or Prussia in the German national unification.

The Triune center was only the basis for further territorial pretensions of the Croatian National Revival. Drašković thus first talks about the unification of Dalmatia with Croatia and Slavonia, which in his view, would create a single *narod* of two million people. While he uses the ethnic designation, *narod*, Drašković obviously means a political nation as well, considering he is demanding a political unification. After this is achieved, the author considers that maybe even Bosnia “where so many of our people lived”¹⁶² could eventually be joined with the Croatian lands. Drašković requests the same for what he refers to as “our land which is now called Illyria and speaks our language”¹⁶³. He goes on in the same paragraph to say that “this new Illyrian Kingdom” would then number three and a half million “souls”.¹⁶⁴

Here the author uses the Illyrian name in two different contexts. First, he refers to Illyrian lands. According to Stančić, by saying “our land now called Illyria”¹⁶⁵ Drašković is referring to the provinces of Istria, Carinthia and Carniola which had a significant Slavic population.¹⁶⁶ The use of this term is connected to the Illyrian provinces created in 1809 by Napoleon as an administrative division of his domains. This province included most of the Eastern Adriatic and the three mentioned provinces, together with the city of Rijeka, Dalmatia

¹⁶² Ibid. 60.

¹⁶³ Ibid. 61.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶⁶ Nikša Stančić. “*Disertacija grofa Janka Draškovića*”.

and the Military Frontier. These three lands and their unification with the Triune Kingdom is also a political goal set in the Dissertation but are separately discussed by Drašković, which leads Stančić to correctly extrapolate the meaning of Drašković's concept of the land now called Illyria. The Illyrian Kingdom on the other hand is connected to the Illyrian ideology of the Croatian National Revival where this political entity would encompass the entire territory inhabited by the speakers of the perceived Illyrian language.

This demand for the unification of Croatian lands is in the *Dissertation* interconnected with the program of reforms in the political relationship of Hungary and Croatia. One of his major demands is the organization of a Croatian government, which would be headed by the Croatian *ban*, thus creating a governmental body similar to the one existing in Hungary. This represented another step towards the political equalization of Croatia to Hungary. Drašković was not against the Hungarian Diet being the common one if the Croatian Diet appointed the Croatian representatives to it. This was in opposition to the Hungarian request that the Croatian representatives be sent to their Diet directly by the counties rather than by delegation of the Croatian Diet.¹⁶⁷ Drašković also notes that the Croatian delegates only represent the nobility and are in an uneven position with the counties of Hungary proper. In his view, the current number of representatives did not properly reflect the number of counties in Croatia or the size of the population because if it were so Croats would constitute one fifth of the entire Hungarian Diet.¹⁶⁸

Drašković returns to the issue of language once more now connected to the issue jurisdiction of the Hungarian Diet, in the overall context of equalizing Croatian-Hungarian relations, Drašković considers that the Hungarian Diet should use Latin in common affairs. His

¹⁶⁷ Drašković, 62.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid.

argument for this is based on the fact that Latin was well known to all. In addition, it was a neutral language, which was equally relevant for both countries.¹⁶⁹ In non-common affairs he promoted the use of the vernacular even though he notes, creating the mentioned contradiction, that Croatian was not yet standardized and should be developed to fit the needs of the government.¹⁷⁰ This is the point in the *Dissertation* when Drašković begins talking about the defense of the Croatian municipal rights, as one of those rights was the right to their own language. The proposition of Latin is thus a compromise between the Hungarian and Croatian vernacular considering Croatian was not acceptable for the Hungarians and vice versa.

Another municipal rights and charters in question was the one from the time of counter-reformation when it was prohibited for any non-Catholic to settle in Croatia. Drašković advises the Croatian representatives in the Hungarian Diet to maintain this right, not for the sake of religious limitations themselves, but rather as a response to the Hungarian treatment of Croatia as its subordinated land. Drašković uses this to invoke again the issue of jurisdiction, claiming that if Croatia decided to give up this charter it would do so only in the Croatian Diet.¹⁷¹ The same issue and remedy is imagined for the issue of taxation. The Hungarians “attacked” the issue of taxation as the Croatian and Slavonian counties paid only half as much taxes as the Hungarian counties and were not ready to revoke that right as one of their municipal privileges.¹⁷²

Drašković does suggest a solution to the whole situation between Hungary and Croatia. He states that it has now been proven that different lands and nations (*narodi*), especially the ones that speak different languages, can be joined and maintained under a single crown only by

¹⁶⁹ Ibid.

¹⁷⁰ Nikša Stančić. “*Disertacija grofa Janka Draškovića*”.

¹⁷¹ Drašković, 65.

¹⁷² Ibid.

fair conditions. He goes on to explain that this would mean creating the same set of laws for the entire state while at the same time allowing each state to have its own laws based on specific conditions in that state. This would represent a federal organization of the country, even though Drašković himself does not use that term. This might seem to contradict Drašković himself because later (as we will see below) he argues against the changing of existing laws. It might not be a contradiction however, because Croatia already perceived itself as a separate kingdom. This federalization would thus confirm that status and could be conducted under the existing Croatian municipal prerogatives. Drašković seems to confirm this by finding a historical model for this proposed federalization in the Hungarian constitution. He considers that “Transylvania, Galicia, Bosnia and our kingdoms were united with Hungary”¹⁷³ in this way. Drašković appeals to the emotions of the deputies by exclaiming that “our” nation deserves this sort of constitutional organization due to its “long-lived virtue, loyalty and courage. Even though it is poor, it has a big heart, is of good state of soul and body, and has always been of heroic determination.”¹⁷⁴ This emphasis of the heroic past of the nation is a major part of Drašković’s text and serves as an overarching theme throughout the interconnected historical narrative and the political program of the *Dissertation*.

Drašković’s overarching thought for the Croatian representatives in the Hungarian Diet is that they will be the ones who will have the power over the old charters of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia. He demands from them that they represent the entire “narod” regardless of its religion or kin. In addition, they should “love their homeland and be faithful to the constitution of their ancestors”¹⁷⁵. We will return to this concept of a constitution later in the thesis.

¹⁷³ Ibid. 68.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid. 56.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid. 57.

In a wider sense, Drašković's political program is heavily monarchist. He states early and often that the primary duty of every patriot is loyalty to the king and the homeland.¹⁷⁶ This loyalty is further emphasized when talking about the unification of the Croatian lands. In Drašković's view, this goal can be achieved by the mercy of the king, creating another reason why the loyalty to the monarch is necessary. In this respect, he also speaks against changing the existing laws, using the examples of England and France to prove his point. Drašković calls the English the "first among the enlightened nations"¹⁷⁷ because they uphold their laws and constitution. He acknowledges that the needs of a country change, thus demanding the changing of the laws, but still praises the English for their insistence on their existing legislation, which provides stability. He contrasts to this the case of the French who never maintained their old laws and have changed many constitutions in recent times and with that fell into one complication after another.¹⁷⁸

He thus proposes that the king, all the "chieftains" and legislators should maintain the laws that are already in place and have not already been abandoned. In Drašković's view, to not do so would lead to collapse whereas maintaining these laws, as seems to be implied by Drašković, would provide stability in a hard time for the monarchy. He is not completely against changing laws which are not good, but such reforms need to be conducted slowly and carefully.

This monarchist stance of Drašković, which also propagates the maintenance of social order as it is, seems to be quite conservative if we consider that at the same time Hungarian politics are becoming more liberal with the promotion of civic rights and liberties. We do need to remember in Hungary, just like in Croatia, a part of the nobility (and Drašković was a

¹⁷⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷⁷ "...prvi med razsvietlenih narodov...", Ibid. 69.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid.

nobleman) rejected liberalism for the sake of maintaining their won rights and privileges. Even with this conservative stance, Drašković did promote some more progressive policies that are especially visible in the issue of social relations.

As part of the nobility, Drašković himself possessed certain rights and privileges granted to his family by the king. Some of these were the exemption from taxation and the employment of serfs who were tied to the land they cultivated without the possibility to move.

In regards to changing this overall position of the serfs, Drašković is still quite conservative. He is in no way for the abolishment of serfdom, but rather promotes a reform of the current feudal relations so they would be easier on the lower classes. He considered that the serfs could no longer be contained by force. Rather, the land-owning nobility should see itself as the serf's father and protector. They should be raised by their lords and if possible turned into friends. Drašković points out that the nobility is dependent on the serfs who are far more numerous than it and that without them the nobility cannot feed itself or live. Drašković thus seems to promote a far more humane approach and treatment of the serfs. Stančić concisely summarizes Drašković's argument in this matter:

“Drašković wanted to maintain the feudal relations in agriculture by diffusing the social tensions. This would be achieved by establishing some sort of a patriarchal relationship between the serfs and nobility ... in which the serfs would accept their patronage and their own serf status”¹⁷⁹.

Drašković's monarchism, its stability and the maintenance of the position of the nobility, but also the simultaneous improvement of the position of the serfs and at least a slight equalization of the two social classes, is somewhat reminiscent of certain political theories of monarchism put forth in the time of the Enlightenment, especially Montesquieu.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid.

Montesquieu, a man who held the noble title of baron, is one of the most famous representatives of the French Enlightenment. He was one of the most important and influential political philosophers of the age. His writings dealt with the issues of government for which he created a classification which interests us here the most. In his *The Spirit of the Laws*, Montesquieu attempted to deal with and “explain human laws and social institutions”¹⁸⁰. In trying to understand these inherently man-created entities, Montesquieu approaches his study with the premise that human laws and social institutions need to be considered and understood in relation to a number of factors. These include the people for whom they are written, their different occupations, different types of government, and even different climate and soil conditions. The understanding of this is important to prevent “misguided attempts at reform”¹⁸¹. As Hilary Bok states: “[Montesquieu] believes that to live under a stable, non-despotic government that leaves its law-abiding citizens more or less free to live their lives is a great good, and that no such government should be lightly tampered with”. In a monarchy for instance, Montesquieu argues against the weakening of the nobility on the basis that this increases the power of the monarch but lessens the power of those institutions which keep the monarch’s power in check, thus raising the threat of despotism which is unwanted due to its instability. This threat of instability and despotism led Montesquieu himself to be a monarchist “in terms of his political hopes for France and the rest of Europe”¹⁸². As Michael Mosher recognizes, “Montesquieu identified enlightenment not only with French society but with the monarchy, whose intermediary powers, even when they lack enlightenment, serve to resist the

¹⁸⁰ Hilary Bok, *Baron de Montesquieu, Charles-Louis de Secondat*, The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, accessed April 22, 2014. <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/montesquieu/>.

¹⁸¹ Bok.

¹⁸² Mark Bevir, ed. *Encyclopedia of Political Theory* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2010), 906.

ever-present potential for administrative despotism”¹⁸³. To understand the functioning of this monarchism we must consider the overall “typology of regimes”¹⁸⁴ which Montesquieu presented in *The Spirit of the Laws*.

Montesquieu differentiates between republican, monarchical and despotic government of which the republican can be either democratic or aristocratic. Accompanying the description of each of these types is also an overview of what can disrupt them and lead to their decline.¹⁸⁵

In a democratic republic the sovereign are the people who have the right to elect their own representatives – ministers or senators. “The principle of democracy is political virtue”¹⁸⁶ under which, according to Bok, Montesquieu means the love of laws and country in which is included the democratic constitution of such a country. This is not achieved naturally and “a democracy must educate its citizens to identify their interests with the interests of their country”¹⁸⁷.

The second form of a republican government is the aristocratic republic in which a group of people rules over the entire population. To this government Montesquieu attributes moderation which is necessary “to restrain [the aristocracy] both from oppressing the people and from trying to acquire excessive power over one another”¹⁸⁸. The moderation is intended to insure that the nobility does not abuse the population, “[fostering] a responsible ... administration”¹⁸⁹. It is also meant to “disguise as much as possible the difference between the

¹⁸³ Michael Mosher, Free trade, free speech, and free love: Monarchy from the liberal prospect in eighteenth century France, in H. Blom, J. Laursen, & L. Simonutti, eds. *Monarchisms in the age of Enlightenment: Liberty, patriotism, and the common good* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press), 108.

¹⁸⁴ Bevir, 907.

¹⁸⁵ Bok.

¹⁸⁶ Bok.

¹⁸⁷ Bok.

¹⁸⁸ Bok.

¹⁸⁹ Bok.

nobility and the people, so that the people feel their lack of power as little as possible”¹⁹⁰. This should be achieved through “modest and simple manners”¹⁹¹.

A condition for a republic is that its territory is small in order to help the identification of citizens with it.¹⁹² Size of the territory is an important element of Montesquieu’s theory, where a republic is of the smallest territorial extent while despotism is the largest. Despotism is also the most unstable one. Where in a republic or in a monarchy the government functions within the legal framework and defined hierarchy, despotism is governed strictly by the will and whim of a single person, unchecked by law or institution. Just as virtue and love of the country and law were the governing principles of a republic, fear is the ruling principle of a despotic country.

In the middle, between the republic and despotism, we find the monarchy. In a monarchy, one person who rules holds the power, but unlike despotism, the rule is conducted within the framework of laws. Like the republic, the monarchy possesses a hierarchy. A monarch thus rules through intermediaries or institutions such “as the nobility and an independent judiciary; and the laws of the monarchy should therefore be designed to preserve their power”¹⁹³. Unlike democratic virtue and despotic fear, a monarchy is ruled under the principle of honor. Honor designates “an ideal ... worth aspiring to”¹⁹⁴ and is essentially a system of maintenance of the monarchy as it “in the case of an overruled intermediary power, honorable judges will be expected to continue to resist”¹⁹⁵ such loss of power regardless of the laws, thus preventing the corruption of the monarchy. To conclude:

¹⁹⁰ Bok.

¹⁹¹ Bok.

¹⁹² Bok.

¹⁹³ Bok.

¹⁹⁴ Bok.

¹⁹⁵ Mosher, 106.

“the chief task of the laws in a monarchy is to protect the subordinate institutions that distinguish monarchy from despotism. To this end, they should make it easy to preserve large estates undivided, protect the rights and privileges of the nobility, and promote the rule of law”¹⁹⁶.

Montesquieu’s views on the monarchy extends to more humane agendas, as he believed “that the laws of many countries can be made more liberal and more humane ... with less scope for the unpredictable and oppressive use of state power”¹⁹⁷. In this regard, he also advocated the abolishment of “religious persecution and slavery”. Generally concerned with stability of a government system Montesquieu supported these changes, as they “would generally strengthen the monarchical government, since they enhanced the freedom and dignity of citizens”¹⁹⁸. With that, let us return to Drašković’s political program.

We can see that Drašković follows Montesquieu in regards to stability. Just as the French philosopher, Drašković sees the changing of the laws as harmful to the stability of the country. With this stability Drašković also argues against the lowering of the power of the nobility, though not in Montesquieu’s sense where such a reduction of power would lead to too much power of the monarch and consequently to despotism.

Drašković also seems to follow certain elements of the aristocratic republic in regards to the nobility. The principle of moderation in this form of government designates that the nobility should not abuse the population, something Drašković supports when claiming that the population can no longer be controlled by force. In addition, Drašković follows Montesquieu’s thought on disguising the “differences between the nobility and the population”¹⁹⁹. While he

¹⁹⁶ Bok.

¹⁹⁷ Bok.

¹⁹⁸ Bok.

¹⁹⁹ Bok.

does not talk about it in those terms, we could argue that turning the subordinates of the nobility into friends as Drašković suggests would achieve just that. Making someone a friend seems to be a way of disguising the differences where the social relationship has not actually changed but is perceived as such, making the friend “feel [his] lack of power as little as possible”²⁰⁰.

Drašković follows the idea that the monarch rules a monarchy under the framework of the laws and he acknowledges the intermediacy of the nobility and institutions, especially when talking about the Croatian Diet and the honor of the *ban*. Rule of law is especially important to both authors and both argue against “misguided attempts at reform”²⁰¹. It is interesting that Drašković’s writing follows, almost word for word what Bok identifies as Montesquieu’s “task of the laws in the monarchy”²⁰². Following that theory, Drašković advocates the maintenance of large estates. He also at no point suggests the extension of the rights and privileges of the nobility to the population which was something that was discussed in the liberal nationalism of Hungary. In his view, the rights and privileges of the nobility are to remain in the possession of that class. He does promote a humane agenda with the lessening of the burden on the serfs which could be considered as something that would improve the “dignity of citizens”²⁰³.

Montesquieu’s monarchism and the direction it might take with a more humane approach to the population is present in Drašković. In addition, some general processes visible in Montesquieu’s theory of monarchism are obviously also present. The fact remains that in a time when Drašković is writing the *Dissertation*, monarchical power was already being challenged by ideas of popular sovereignty, republicanism, civil rights, etc. Most scholars thus

²⁰⁰ Bok.

²⁰¹ Bok.

²⁰² Bok.

²⁰³ Bok.

justifiably see Drašković's political program as a conservative program that was not in line with the relatively common liberal tendencies of national movements. We cannot determine a genealogical connection between the two described works, even though Drašković did spend time in Vienna and Paris where he could have contacted Montesquieu's writings. As a Croatian dignitary to the Hungarian Diet, Drašković spent time in Hungary as well. As we know and as Eva Balázs discusses in detail, *The Spirit of the Laws* could be found in Hungary already in 1751 in Latin and in Vienna in German.²⁰⁴ The Hungarians also extensively read it as it talked about Hungary. It is thus completely conceivable that Drašković was well aware of it and had in fact read it.

Even without being able to determine a direct connection and Drašković's familiarity with Montesquieu, I am at this point inclined to say that on a very basic, underlying, fundamental level, we can recognize a degree of influence of the Enlightenment on the Croatian National Revival. We should here recall what was said in the beginning of the thesis about the adaptability of the Enlightenment and its diversity stemming from contextual differences.²⁰⁵ Drašković's monarchism is not a carbon copy of Montesquieu theory however, the similarities of the two can be recognized in several places. It does need to be kept in mind that Drašković's variant is ideologically founded on the contextual needs of Croatia.

Monarchism was not necessarily an ideology that was naturally characteristic for Drašković. As I attempted to show, the Croatian National Revival was a reactionary movement. It defended its municipal rights against the Hungarian attempts to deny them and it developed the language in resistance to the Magyarization. It follows from this that it might have accepted monarchism as a reaction to the more liberal reform attempts from Hungary by looking for an

²⁰⁴ Balázs, 134.

²⁰⁵ Kontler, *What is the (Historians') Enlightenment Today?*, 360.

ally in the monarchy, which had the authority to maintain the existing laws in the interest of stability.

To conclude, it seems that the monarchism promoted by Drašković, based on Montesquieu or not, was a reaction to the perceived threat of Magyarization. The issue of language was connected to the political issue of municipal rights. The maintenance of the municipal rights was in other words an attempt at preserving the rule of a particular set of laws. This reactionary train of thought meant that when threatened with new, liberal reforms that were influencing what Croatia perceived as its national interests, the Croatian National Revival as a reaction invoked the monarchical stability and the rule of law as its political program. Before we reach the final conclusion on the issue of continuity between the Enlightenment and nationalism, let us consider one more important work of the Croatian national movement.

2.4. Ivan Derkos' *The Spirit of the Homeland*

While to find the Enlightenment influences in Drašković we had to go quite deep, Ivan Derkos leaves us little doubt about the authors he is engaging with. He begins his entire work, *The Spirit of the Homeland over its sons who are sleeping* (1832)²⁰⁶, by quoting Hugo Grotius and exclaiming “O patria salve lingua”²⁰⁷. While the main discussion of the text is language, the first part of it is more important to us. In it, Derkos discusses what is a homeland and what is patriotism.²⁰⁸

He begins by saying that he in no way wishes to build on the words of Jean-Jacques Rousseau who proposes that both terms, homeland and citizen, should be erased from new

²⁰⁶ Ivan Derkos, Duh domovina nad sinovima svojim, koji spavaju, in Miroslav Šicel, ed., *Programski spisi Hrvatskog narodnog preporoda* [Programmatic writings of the Croatian National Revival], (Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1997).

²⁰⁷ Ibid. 83.

²⁰⁸ Ibid. 84.

languages. Rather, Derkos wishes to systematize and explain the meanings of those words.²⁰⁹ In his view, there are two common perceptions of the homeland as the land where we are born and raised, and the perception that residence in the land is the most important aspect that creates what we consider our homeland. Derkos himself considers different meaning of the homeland. First is the common meaning and the other are what he calls legal-natural, legal-positive and the genealogical meaning of the homeland. The common understanding is the one where our homeland is that land in which we reside for a few years without the intention to move. Just being born in a land but not living in it cannot be a base on which we perceive any land as our homeland.

The legal-natural criterion in Derkos' view implies that a homeland is based on "fundamental contracts on which, in a legal sense, states could be and were founded"²¹⁰. Under the first type of that contract, a person agrees to enter a civil alliance with others who have the [equal] right to decide. Under the second and third contract of legal-natural criterion, a person sides with the holder of the power, the supreme ruler or the autocrat²¹¹. This is a person's homeland of which he or she is a citizen of through spoken or unspoken agreement.

This concept of the homeland is thus quite reminiscent of the theories of natural law and social contract that were discussed in the time of the Enlightenment by thinkers like Hugo Grotius, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Thomas Hobbs, Samuel von Pufendorf, etc. Natural law was the idea that human being are all subject to an universal natural laws. It was based on that natural law that they created political communities based on a social contract. Hugo Grotius, who Derkos mentions, was one of the important figures for the beginning of this discussion.

²⁰⁹ Ibid. 83.

²¹⁰ "...temeljnim ugovorima, po kojima su se u pravnome smislu države mogle, a I sada se mogu osnivati...", Ibid. 84.

²¹¹ "...samodržca...", Ibid. 84.

Rousseau, with whom Derkos already engaged with, developed the idea of a social contract further, establishing that “sovereignty resides in the people as a whole and was to be expressed by the general will, which was determined by a collective decision of all members of the commonwealth”²¹². In his mind, these equal rights of all citizens to decide meant that “each citizen was to vote in accordance with what they felt to be the general interest”. This type of social contract corresponds with what Derkos supposes to be the first base of the homeland. The second and third concepts are closer to the ideas of Thomas Hobbs. In his view, the state of nature is a war of all over all, which then for the purposes of security leads the people to “sign a social contract that will establish a leviathan, an absolute sovereign authority”²¹³. This seems to represent the siding with the holder of power as a fundamental contract on which the homeland is based. Derkos’ argument could also be connected to Montesquieu as the three contracts on which a homeland is based seem to correspond to republic, monarchical and despotic types of government.

Derkos adds to the typology of the homeland with the third understanding in which the homeland is understood in the legal-positive sense in which it is based on positive laws. The only difference between this criterion and the legal-natural criterion is that in the legal-positive case the positive laws determine the conditions of acceptance into the state, as well as the conditions of residence after birth.²¹⁴ In other words, the homeland is not based on a social contract which was in turn based on natural law, but rather on the human-made laws.

Finally, in a genealogical sense the homeland is that nation or land from which a person descended from and has origin from. Under this criterion, Derkos calls a Pole his countryman. The genealogical approach seems to carry significant weight for the national purposes,

²¹² Bevir, 1290.

²¹³ Bevir, 1281.

²¹⁴ Derkos, 85.

prompting Derkos to proclaim: "... you cannot think that every natural connection is broken with a single migration".²¹⁵ The author also acknowledges that this criterion of the homeland will have many opponents due to the fact that a person who left his birthplace and tied himself with another land is prohibited to express any interest towards his birthplace at the expense and contrary to the interests of his "adoptive" land.²¹⁶

Derkos continues with a discussion of patriotism, quoting Mihaly Szibeleiszt and his work on natural law (volume 2, section 187) where the author proclaims patriotism to be the "feeling of delight that we feel for the progress of the homeland"²¹⁷. For Derkos this means that a patriot needs to invest all his power for the good of the homeland out of which he receives delight and comfort. A person that delights in the prosperity of his homeland but does nothing to help it, is no patriot. Patriotism is thus a voluntary legal and ethical duty towards the homeland and the joy over its prosperity.²¹⁸

Returning to Rousseau, patriotism was an important part of this political theory. "In many different places he speaks of the importance of the social spirit, the bond of union, of patriotism and love of one's country and compatriots..."²¹⁹. Rousseau's patriotism is connected to the feeling of love the citizens feel towards each other, stemming from "a desire to ensure that the well being of our fellow citizens comes to be vivid and precious to [the patriot]"²²⁰, even if "our own narrow private interests have to be circumscribed"²²¹. Derkos' patriotism seems to follow the same line of thought, where patriotism is seen as the paramount duty of a citizen as a feeling and activity that achieves the good of the homeland.

²¹⁵ "...a ne možeš misliti, da se svaki vez prirodni raskida jednim jedincatim selenjem.", Ibid.

²¹⁶ Ibid.

²¹⁷ "...naslade, što je osjećamo zbog napredka domovine...", Ibid. 86.

²¹⁸ Ibid.

²¹⁹ Nicholas Dent, Rousseau (London and New York: Routledge, 2005), 139.

²²⁰ Ibid. 76.

²²¹ Ibid.

Derkos uses all this as an introduction to the contextualization of patriotism and homeland to the Austrian Empire. He claims that the Triune Kingdom of Croatia, Dalmatia and Slavonia has a triple homeland and a triple patriotism. Derkos studies the Pragmatic sanction of the Emperor Charles VI²²², the pragmatic law from 1804 and the pragmatic constitution from 1806 issued by Francis I, concluding from them that all the lands which are governed by the Habsburg scepter are one homeland. In this sense, all are obligate to contribute to the prosperity of the state. The monarchy that is assembled from many parts shares the same future and the prosperity of the whole is the result of the prosperity of individual parts and vice-versa. In that sense, claims Derkos, we all have one homeland and thus one, as the author refers to it, general patriotism.²²³

Except this general patriotism there are within the Austrian Empire individual patriotisms. This is especially true of Hungary and its associated parts. The three mentioned (pragmatic) laws are for him nothing else than contracts of unity and subordination by natural law and are common to all. However, the fundamental, constitutional law of Hungary expressed primarily in the Golden Bull of Andrew II, contracts signed in Linz and Vienna, and confirmed by the fundamental prerogatives of the nobility and the inaugural diploma, is different, exceptional and specific for Hungary. This individuality and constitution dictates different means of achieving common good. Thus, under the Hungarian constitution Hungary has to be allowed its own partial patriotism in addition the general one.

This constitutional foundation based on natural law that grants Hungary the right to its own process in the achievement of prosperity and progress serves Derkos as an introduction to the same right of the Triune Kingdom. In his view, the relationship Hungary has to the Austrian

²²² Derkos, 85-86.

²²³ Ibid. 86-87.

Empire, based on which it should be allowed its own patriotism and right to decide on its own laws, is the same as the relationship the Triune Kingdom has to the Kingdom of Hungary.

To summarize, what Derkos is saying is that within the Habsburg Monarchy there are three levels of the homeland. First is the Habsburg Monarchy itself, second is the Kingdom of Hungary and third is the Kingdom of Croatia. Croats are thus considered by origin the citizens of Croatia, which is part of the Kingdom of Hungary, which is then again part of the Habsburg Monarchy. This in Derkos' view means that they possess a three part homeland. Since patriotism is defined by him as a "feeling of delight that we feel for the progress of the homeland"²²⁴, and since the Croats have three homelands, they obviously also have three levels of patriotism.

The entire theoretical discussion of patriotism and homeland thus serves to show that the Kingdoms of Croatia, Dalmatia and Slavonia have the right to their own constitution, patriotism, homeland and legal individuality. To prove this relation and Croatian rights based on natural and positive law, Derkos reaches into history.²²⁵

Using old documents the author concludes that in the time of Coloman when Croatia was joined with Hungary, it (Croatia) encompassed most of today's Kingdom of Slavonia which was a name of both kingdoms at the time. Those parts of Slavonia which were not originally part of it, became parts of it under municipal rights given to the Kingdom. The author thus proceeds to present the union of Croatia with Hungary to prove the applicability of the third type of patriotism, legal-positive, which is based on positive laws which in this case seem to be the municipal rights and privileges Croatia received from the king.²²⁶

²²⁴ "...naslade, što je osjećamo zbog napredka domovine...", Ibid. 86.

²²⁵ Ibid. 87-88.

²²⁶ Ibid. 88.

In Derkos' version of the story, the union of the two kingdoms was based on the basic principles on which Hungary relied upon at the time²²⁷ (1102). He adds the contract (*Pacta conventa*) stipulated that Croatia and Hungary are to hold their own lands peacefully in mutual peace. The author quotes Procopius in saying that Slavs have lived from the oldest times in common freedom and all issues, good or bad, were brought before a common council. Derkos claims that the existence of this institution among the Croats is proven by the privilege of Ban Trpimir from 838. The continued existence of this constitution, as Derkos refers to it, is proven by the privilege of Zvonimir from the year 1078 when he created a council with Grgur, the bishop of Croatia, his *tepčija*²²⁸, deputies and nobles.²²⁹ The right to the council was confirmed by Coloman in 1111 when he confirmed the right of the bishopric on the island of Rab to its perishes. In it is mentioned the "diet of both kingdoms"²³⁰ (Croatia and Dalmatia). The author thus concludes that the Croats preserved their constitution on which rest all the rights the Croats enjoyed until the union with Hungary and municipal right granted to them after it. They should thus be granted the right to their own interests under this constitution. This includes patriotism that should be intact for the Triune Kingdom.

Derkos further discusses the association of Dalmatia with the Kingdom of Croatia. He claims there is no doubt that Croatia has been under Croatian kings since the time of Petar Krešimir IV and undoubtedly after 1052. The authors feels that this is confirmed by the mentioned charter of Zvonimir and confirmed with Coloman who pledged not to disturb Dalmatia's old privileges. Dalmatia retained its constitution based on the fact they were under

²²⁷ Derkos does not go further into what those principles were.

²²⁸ Title or position corresponding with the title of a palatine.

²²⁹ Derkos, 88.

²³⁰ "...sveukupnim saborom obiju kraljevina...", Ibid.

the same king as Croatia and possessed the same constitution as Croatia.²³¹ Derkos finishes this section by talking directly to the reader and encouraging him not to give up this heritage, to cherish it and consider it sacred, never rejecting and forsaking it.

The author invokes the comparison with Lycurgus of Sparta whose laws supposedly had the ultimate goal to promote the love of the homeland. Everything that surrounded a Spartan boy was the nation, the state and the homeland. Derkos states that when a Spartan woman was informed her son had died she stated that that is why she gave birth to him, to die for the homeland, with the author adding “for homeland!”²³² Patriotism was also the fuel on the fire of Demosthenes’ speech when Philip of Macedonia attacked Athens.²³³

The second part of Derkos’ work is dedicated to the connection of language and patriotism and in response to the same tendencies from the Hungarians. It is argued that Hungarian is not adequate for the prosperity of the whole state. Fundamentally, Derkos is using the historical and patriotic argument presented above to prove that Croats have the right to the development of their own language just as they do to their own patriotism. The right of Croats to their own language or at least Latin in which all the old charters are written is based on the fact that they did not agree at any point to adopt a language the Hungarians consider adequate for themselves and the Croats. The right to use Latin was prescribed under statute from 1715, article 120 which was confirmed by the king at the time and reinforced in February 1806. The right to use the language of the homeland was confirmed to the Kingdoms of Croatia, Dalmatia and Slavonia by article 58 from the year 1791. The right of the estates to use the local vernacular in municipal affairs was then again confirmed by the institutions of the Kingdom of

²³¹ Ibid..

²³² Ibid. 90.

²³³ Ibid. 90-91.

Slavonia in 1492 and 1538.²³⁴ This however, does not speak of the language itself and its development that was a mayor issue of the Croatian National Revival, but rather only about the historically and legally confirmed rights of the Triune Kingdom to decide on their own the language of their own affairs.²³⁵

Derkos goes on to talk about the correlations between the development of language and national prosperity. He sees in the English, the French and the Czechs that their language has developed significantly once they organized their academies and began writing literature in the vernacular. If Croats are not to follow these tendencies and develop their language, they are to be left behind by other European lands. He thus proposes the unification of the three Croatian dialects, or more simply stated the standardization of the Croatian language into a literary language in which the educated would write science and art.²³⁶ To achieve this linguistic standardization Derkos proposes the territorial unification of the Croatian lands which would benefit the linguistic situation and through that evidently the cultural standard of the Croats.

We can see that unlike Drašković who uses elements of the Enlightenment more scarcely and at a very fundamental level, Derkos does not hesitate to directly engage with major Enlightenment thinkers. He directly comments and disagrees with certain elements of Rousseau while at the same time promoting his theories. In addition, he uses the Enlightenment debates on natural law and social contract quite explicitly in his work. We can thus easily conclude that there is a base of the Enlightenment thought in Derkos' text. We can say with absolute certainty that Derkos was familiar with the works of at least two major Enlightenment thinkers, Grotius and Rousseau. However, the fact he mentions a Hungarian thinker Szibeleiszt

²³⁴ Ibid.

²³⁵ Ibid. 92-93.

²³⁶ Ibid. 102-103.

might lead us to suspect that he could have familiarized himself with the Enlightenment indirectly, through the writings of some Central European authors. Be that as it may, Derkos' mentioning of these authors suggests that he was quite familiar with political philosophy and theory. It is also obvious that he uses elements of this Enlightenment thought his argument for the Croatian National Revival.

He uses the concepts of natural law, social contract and positive law to prove that the Croats have the right to their own homeland and patriotism, and through that to their nation and nationalism. He uses these concepts to prove that Croatia had its own foundations which prove its right to individuality. This is how Derkos connects his theory to the issue of municipal rights that were central to the political direction of the Croatian national movement. To prove those municipal rights he turns to the study of history as will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter.

2.5. Conclusion

As we have already established, the Croatian National Revival was a reactionary movement whose political and linguistic direction was dictated by their reaction to external influences. This led both Drašković and Derkos to use their knowledge of political theory to argument against the breaking of what they perceived as Croatian rights. It seems safe to conclude that while fundamentally the Croatian National Revival evidently employed the Enlightenment ideologies to a degree, it was the context of their position in the political struggle with Hungary that dictated how these ideologies were applied to the political situation. As a reaction to the Hungarian political agendas, the Croatian National Revival with the help of some enlightened thought, directed its focus towards municipal rights.

It seems that the defense of the Croatian municipal rights was in fact the central political agenda of the national movement. We could even go so far as to say that it was the only truly universal political programmatic goal of the movement.

When discussing Croatian political life of the period, Šidak perceives it as a two-sided affair. He perceives the Croatian national movement as one standing for the “democratization of social relations”²³⁷. On the other side stood the nobility whose opposition to the movement was nominally based on linguistic arguments and loss of their Croatian identity based on language. In reality and in Šidak’s view however, their opposition to the national movement was based on fear of losing their class privileges and material prosperity. Both sides thus defended the municipal rights of Croatia, the nobility out of a conservative wish for self-preservation, the nationalist out of the wish to preserve what they perceived as the national constitutional foundation that extended to the entire nation and not just the nobility. In addition, by basing their political actions on traditional and feudal charters, rights and privileges the nationalist avoided, as Šidak points out, the oppression of the court.²³⁸ The fact that the defense of municipal rights was the agenda of both the nationalists and their opponents means it was essentially a universal political program characteristic of the Croats in the period. Let us however, briefly consider other programmatic elements of the national revival.

While the political party of the national movement was organized in 1841, its only existing political program was the *Dissertation* Drašković. That program is problematic however, as it is quite conservative in that it promoted a monarchical agenda. That is not to say that the younger members of the movement were necessarily against the monarchy. However, Drašković promoted a status quo that would maintain the social relations intact, something that

²³⁷ Šidak, *Hrvatski narodni preporod* 134.

²³⁸ Ibid.

was at least in principle unacceptable to the non-noble members of the movement. Something the young and the old member of the movement did agree on was the issue of maintaining the municipal rights as the constitutional basis of all their activity.

The Illyrians relied on the simple principle formulated by Vukotinović and published by Gaj: “May God let live the Hungarian constitution, Kingdom of Croatia and Illyrian nationality!”²³⁹ In “translation”, this meant that the Croats supported the position Hungary had within the Habsburg Monarchy and its constitutional foundations. At the same time, they promoted the maintenance of municipal rights as the constitutional foundation of the Kingdom of Croatia based on their historical individuality from the Kingdom of Hungary. The last part of the Illyrian motto was a more culturally based one, promoting the development of cultural and literary movement. This motto, as Šidak points out, presented and summarized the political agendas of the national movement.²⁴⁰

The lack of a concise program that would satisfy the middle class intelligentsia however, led several authors to try and define it. The results were Rakovac’s *Small catechism for great men* and Vukotinović’s *Croatism and Illyrism*.²⁴¹ Nonetheless, these documents still dealt more with the issue of literary Illyrism than the political program of the revival. We saw that Rakovac pointed to the municipal rights connected to language as one of the aims of the revival. In reality, his document was not so different from Drašković’s. That is why the *Dissertation* is still considered to be the actual political program of the movement, even if it did not completely reflect the goals of the revival as a whole. In 1846, the Vukotinović attempted again to outline the main liberal programmatic tendencies and requests of the Croatian national movement.

²³⁹ “*Da Bog živi konstituciju ugarsku, kraljevinu hrvatsku I narodnost ilirsku!*”, Ibid. 136.

²⁴⁰ Ibid.

²⁴¹ Ibid. 140-141.

In that unpublished document, Vukotinović proclaims that their tendencies summarized under the term nation are not just literary and patriotic but are also based on the idea of “prosperity of the nation as a whole”.²⁴² This is again to be done through the constitutional means which at this time are not just oriented towards Croatia but promoted the reforms in Hungary as well. In other words, Vukotinović promotes the reform of the diet based on “representational principles”²⁴³. That would mean a reform of both diets from feudal institutions of the estates into a general representative body.²⁴⁴ While the program does not touch upon the issue of an electoral system that would stem from this general representation, it moves towards the envisioned social equality through the issue of taxation. It promotes equality of taxation for “all sons of the homeland”²⁴⁵, meaning that the nobility would also be subject to taxation. Abolishment of serfdom is not mentioned in those words but is implied through the tax reforms. The rights of the people are also promoted by the requested education of all social classes.²⁴⁶

Vukotinović’s program is concluded with a statement claiming that the goal is not to strip anyone of their possessions, but only to grant rights to those without them and thus equate the standing of all social classes for the mutual benefit of all.²⁴⁷ This program draft was according to its author accepted in a meeting of the “patriots” who agreed on it, but was never formally accepted by the party due to changing political circumstances. During 1847, political negotiations were held with moderate opponents of the party in an attempt to join forces in opposition to the Hungarians. That meant that the liberal character of Vukotinović’s program

²⁴² Ibid.158.

²⁴³ Ibid. 159.

²⁴⁴ Ibid.158-159.

²⁴⁵ Ibid.159.

²⁴⁶ Ibid.

²⁴⁷ Ibid.

had to be scaled down to appeal to a wider base. By 1848, the political situation changed fundamentally with the revolution in Hungary, prompting new directions and structures of the National party which started promoting a fully liberal agenda.²⁴⁸

What is evident from this is that the different currents of the national movement collided in their views on the political agendas of the movement. The younger, middle class members were quite liberal and requested for social changes at various times and with varying intensity. The other side of the movement was a more conservative one. Like Drašković, it promoted the monarchy but under a stronger rule of law. The interest of both groups were the municipal rights. Seen as the political and national foundations of Croatia, all sides promoted their defense. This defense was invoked as a reaction to the pressures coming from Hungary in the form of Magyarization on both political and cultural fields. As such, even when the members of the Croatian National Revival used the Enlightenment, they did so in defense of their municipal rights.

In an article entitled *Development of ideas on the organization of power and civil rights in Croatia, 1832-1849*, Dalibor Čepulo attempts to overview the modernization of Croatian politics in regards to the promotion of liberal, progressive agendas by the Croatian National Revival. Čepulo overviews the development of the political ideology of the national revival and reaches the conclusion about its main characteristic. He considers that the introduction “of modern ideas about the organization of government and civil freedoms and rights” was obstructed by the fact that “the struggle for Croatian autonomy was led” by the idea of “defending the *iure municipalia*”²⁴⁹. This political emphasis thus obstructed all other political

²⁴⁸ Ibid. 158-159.

²⁴⁹ Dalibor Čepulo, *Razvoj ideja o ustroju vlasti i građanskim pravima u Hrvatskoj 1832.-1849* [*Development of ideas on the organization of power and civil rights in Croatia*], *Pravni vjesnik* 16,(2000), 33-53.

tendencies, allowing for monarchism to be the strongest programmatic goal of an otherwise liberal national movement.

We can see that the main and the only universal trait of Croatian politics in the time of the early national revival was the defense of municipal rights. These municipal rights represented the legal foundations of the Croatian independence and autonomy. If the entire national movement was to be based on them, the Croats needed to know exactly what these municipal rights were. This is what led them to the study of history. All the rights and privileges as well as the confirmation of the historical existence and tradition of the Croatian nation was perceived to be written in the old documents. That is how the Croats started to study history to argument their political demands. As we will see in the next chapter, the search for a political and national history will lead the Croats to a particular approach to it, one that was at the same time characteristic for national but also other traditions in historiography.

3. Historical narratives of the Croatian National Revival

3.1. The municipal rights and the constitution

The issue of municipal rights was so strongly emphasized by the Croats, by both the members of the national movement and its opponents, because those rights were the basis of the Croatian political life. They contained all the prerogatives which made Croatia a separate entity from Hungary. The Croats advocated them so strongly because without them they would have become an integral part of Hungary, something that for them meant losing their national identity.²⁵⁰ These municipal rights were equated with the existence of the nation in both the political and the national sense. In the early modern terms, the Croatian nation was perceived as the *natio croatica*, a nation of the nobility of Croatia. With the coming of romanticism, the nation became perceived more and more as a linguistic and cultural community. After the initial stage of only linguistic nationalism, the Croatian nationalist slowly started expanding to the political field as well, with the perceived extension of the noble nation, with all its municipal rights and privileges, to the entire linguistic and cultural nation.²⁵¹ This is how the nationalist became the protectors of the municipal rights of the nobility. These rights were in fact not only seen as a set of documents or regulations but as a constitution of the nation.

In general, constitutionalism “presupposes the existence of a constitution, which is typically, but not necessarily, contained in a constitutional law”²⁵². More concretely, constitutionalism is characterized by three elements:

“First, the constitutions not only constitute but also limit government power, for instance, by separating the organs of state. Second, constitutions expressly protect individual rights against the state. Third, constitutions claim to be higher-order law

²⁵⁰ For a detailed analysis of the debates on municipal rights in the Croatian Diet, see: Zvezdana Sikirić Assouline, *U obranu hrvatskih municipalnih prava I latinskog jezika* [In the defense of Croatian municipal rights and the Latin language] (Zagreb: Srednja Europa, 2006).

²⁵¹ For more on the development of Croatian nationalism, see: Nikša Stančić, *Hrvatska nacija I nacionalizam*.

²⁵² Bevir, 288.

in the sense that the constitutional norms enshrined in the written document take precedence over ordinary laws in the case of conflict.”²⁵³

In a contemporary sense, constitution is a codified, fundamental law which regulates the functioning of the state and represents the foundation of all other laws of the state. Such constitutions are most famously the Constitution of the United States (1788) and the French Constitution of 1791. These were intentionally written, codified constitutional laws that regulated the fundamental organization of the state. On the other hand, there are uncoded constitutions and common law, most famous of which is the constitution of England.²⁵⁴ The uncoded constitution is envisioned as the body of law, the collection of all laws of the state that together make the constitution of the state. It is exactly this type of constitution and the term ancient constitution that we are interested in here.

“Ancient constitutions, as imagined or constructed by early modern ancient constitutionalists, were not the unified written documents with clear status as fundamental law that we now associate with the word constitution. [They] were complex mixtures of written charters and codes of public law ..., customs, evolved institutions, feudal oaths, and political compromises newly described as fundamental law. The key intellectual move of an ancient constitutionalist argument was usually to identify some exercise of central or royal power as novel and innovative and disruptive of some long-established rule, custom, law, or practice and as therefore illegal or illegitimate.”²⁵⁵

This is how the Croats envisioned their constitutionalism based on their municipal rights. Drašković was reminding the Croatian representatives in the Hungarian Diet that they will have authority over the charter of the Triune Kingdom. He continued by advising the representatives to protect and uphold the constitution of their ancestors. The constitution Drašković was talking about was exactly this ancient constitution, assembled of customs,

²⁵³ Bevir, 288.

²⁵⁴ For more on ancient constitutionalism and especially the English case, see: J.G.A. Pocock, *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

²⁵⁵ Bevir, 44.

institutions, oaths and other diverse legal documents which as a whole constituted a constitution in a pre-modern sense. The problem with the defense of the Croatian constitution was that it was not collected and united to serve as a single collection to which the nobility and the nationalist could turn to in the defense of their constitutional rights. This was about to change after 1827.

During a session of the Hungarian Diet, Josip Kušević, the prothonotary of the Kingdom of Croatia held a speech in which he claimed that the Hungarian Diet had no jurisdiction to decide the language of public life in Croatia. He at the same time recognize the benefits of learning Hungarian. Consistent with his stance on the jurisdiction of the Hungarian Diet, he proclaimed that the Croatian Diet will decide on this matter. They did so on September 10, 1827, when by decision of the Croatian Diet, Hungarian was introduced into Croatian schools as a mandatory language. This decision was a slight concession to the Hungarians that Šidak sees as a result of a selfish nobility who forgot their own language and was only concerned with retaining their rights and privileges. The decision to introduce Hungarian into Croatian schools was countered by the members of the Croatian Diet themselves. They decided to create a commission that would collect all the municipal rights of the Kingdom of Croatia (the final collection will extend beyond just the Kingdom of Croatia, as we shall see). As Šidak concludes, the Croatian Diet thus initiated the first ever systematic study of Croatian municipal rights and the study of Croatian history overall.²⁵⁶

²⁵⁶ Šidak, *Hrvatske zemlje*, 90.

3.2. Collecting the municipal rights

We have talked extensively about the defense of the Croatian municipal rights and Drašković even discussed some of them. However, the study commissioned by the Diet was to be a comprehensive collection of all the municipal rights in one place. I will thus dedicate this chapter to presenting a large body of the municipal rights so we could understand what they actually entailed.

The result of the commissioning ordered by the Croatian Diet was the publication entitled *On the municipal rights and statutes of the kingdoms of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia*. It was published in 1830 and signed by Kušević who himself was not a member of the national movement. As such, his work is not considered a product of the national revival. Rather it is seen as a pre-revival work that supports the same cause and was used by the nationalist in their activity. The work was well known among the members of the national movement and influenced their writings.

Interestingly, it does not seem that Kušević conducted the collecting of the documents himself, but rather it was an effort of an archivist. Before we turn to the work itself and overview the municipal rights the Croatian nobility and nationalist defended, we need to note that the copy of the document I will be working with here is actually a translation from 1883. This allows us to learn more about the work from the introduction to the translation, as otherwise Kušević's work has been written about quite scarcely.

According to Franjo Žigrović Pretočki²⁵⁷, the translator of the work, it was actually Valentin Kirinić²⁵⁸, a “diligent son of the homeland and the keeper of the glorious and eternal

²⁵⁷ Franjo Žigrović Pretočki was a member of the Croatian National Revival from its early period. He published in the *Danica* and already in 1846 wrote on the relationship of Croatia and Hungary. He continued this work throughout his life and career.

²⁵⁸ Referred to as Valentin noble Kirinić, *Valentin plemeniti Kirinić*. Kušević, 4.

records”²⁵⁹, who researched and assembled the work. Kirinić was an archivist who was entrusted with the main national documents. As Pretočki almost poetically states, Kirinić did not want to be just a “mechanic” keeper of the records. Instead, he devoted his entire life to familiarize himself with the “treasure entrusted to him”²⁶⁰ and to report on it to the public. He thus wrote under the supervision of Kušević the work *On the municipal rights and statutes of the kingdoms of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia*.²⁶¹

The original introduction to the work speaks about how it has long been proven that the Slavs have not reached the “both Pannonias”²⁶² only in the 6th century as some authors have speculated. Rather, in Kušević’s view, they ruled Dalmatia, Dacia and the Pannonian lands far before and even fought for their freedom with the Romans, as has been proven by learned men.²⁶³ Kušević does not specify when exactly the Slavs reached the mentioned lands. His view however, might be influenced by the Illyrian concepts described in the introduction. In fact, many of the sources Kušević uses are the same ones used by Vitezović in his work more than a century earlier. Previous ideologists of Illyrism have considered the ancient Illyrians to be Slavs. This would explain how the Slavs fought the Romans before the 6th century. In addition, Vitezović’s works were quite well known among the nationalist of the 19th century

²⁵⁹ “*Vriedni sin domovina, dične i viečne uspomene arhivar...*”, Ibid. 4.

²⁶⁰ Ibid. 3.

²⁶¹ As the work was published and is treated in historiography as the work of Kušević, I will also refer to it here under his name. We do need to remember that the work was actually done by Kirinić.

²⁶² The two Pannonias seem to be referring to the two Roman provinces of Pannonia Superior and Pannonia Inferior, established in 103 CE. The term could also be referring to later Frankish influenced territories in the about the same geographical area however, the context of Kušević’s writing and the further mention of the Romans seems to indicate that Kušević is actually referring to the Roman rather than Medieval division of Pannonia. Ibid. 6.

²⁶³ The “learned men” which Kušević speaks of are Adam Franjo Kollar (Adam František Kollár), Petar Katančić (Matija Petar Katančić), Ivan Christ, Jordan and August Ljudevit Šlecer (August Ludwig von Schlözer). Kušević uses other sources for his work, as we shall see throughout this chapter. Also, in regards to nomenclature, I intend to stay true to the forms present in the source itself. When necessary I will explain who the author might be referring to. Ibid.

and it is conceivable that Kušević's work on the Croatian municipal rights rests precisely on the works of Vitezović, even though he is not one of the people Kušević explicitly mentions.

The first article²⁶⁴ of the *On the municipal rights and statutes* talks about the coming of the Slavs to Pannonia, Dalmatia, Pannonia between the Drava and Sava rivers (stated separately from Pannonia) and later Serbia (still without the dates of those arrivals). Kušević relies on the writings of Konstantin Porfizogenit²⁶⁵ based on whose work *De Administrando Imperio* he claims that the Slavs fought off the Avars and acquired the mentioned lands. With the weakening of the Eastern Roman Empire and after successfully repelling the influence of the Franks, the Slavs established the four kingdoms – Dalmatia, Croatia, Slavonia and Serbia.²⁶⁶

According to the same source, Kušević writes in the second article that Croats and Serbs, having populated these lands, lived in them in mutual freedom. These people had no princes²⁶⁷ but only their elders as authority, like other Slavic people. Croatia, which was already understood as a single name for Croatia, Dalmatia and Slavonia, was at first divided in eleven prefectures and ruled by the prefects and later by its own kings. This is in Kušević's view confirmed to be true by domestic and foreign writers as well as the acquired charters.²⁶⁸

The third article speaks about the Hungarians who were at the same time when the Croats were settling the Croatian lands, leaving the lands between Tanais and the Maeotian

²⁶⁴ The work is divided into 36 articles.

²⁶⁵ Konstantin Porfizogenit, as Kušević refers to him, is Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos, notable in Croatian historiography for his records on the Croatian lands in the work *De Administrando Imperio*. Kušević cites particularly chapters XXX and XXXI as being his sources for this article of his work. I will further use the Porfizogenit form of the name to remain true to the source. Ibid.

²⁶⁶ Ibid.

²⁶⁷ The original term Kušević uses is *knez*.

²⁶⁸ Ibid. 7.

Lake defeating the Slavs in the “inner Pannonia” in the year 889. Stjepan²⁶⁹ later changed the name of this land and accepted Christianity, creating the Kingdom of Hungary.²⁷⁰

After the death of the King Zvonimir²⁷¹ the Croatian royal dynasty was extinct. This led to the disintegration of the kingdom through the divisions and intrigues of the nobles by which the kingdom fell into anarchy. Consequently, a foreigner began to rule the Croatian lands. Ladislav²⁷² of Hungary entered Croatia in 1091 with an army and took the Croatian lands south of the Drava River and up to the Alps. He did not at this time occupy the coastal regions because he had to return to Hungary to protect its borders from “some people”.²⁷³

Ladislav whom Kušević now calls Saint, was succeeded by Koloman²⁷⁴ who decided to take all of Croatia lands to the Dalmatian sea. He thus gathered an army and marched it to the Drava River. The Croats hearing of this gathered their army and prepared for battle. Koloman sent messengers in an attempt to reach an agreement. In response, the Croats sent 12 nobles from as many tribes to the King and reached an agreement in the year 1102. Under this agreement (the famous *Pacta conventa*²⁷⁵) all (Hungary and Croatia) were to hold their own lands in peace. Only in war were the Croats obligated to send to the king ten armed horseman

²⁶⁹ Stephen I of Hungary, ruled Hungary from 997 as Grand Prince, and as king from 1000-1038.

²⁷⁰ Kušević, 7.

²⁷¹ Kušević does not write a year of his death, which is 1089.

²⁷² Ladislaus I of Hungary, ruled 1077-1095.

²⁷³ “...*niekog naroda*...”. Kušević literally says “some people”, not naming or maybe not knowing who they were. Kušević, 7-8.

²⁷⁴ Coloman of Hungary, ruled 1095-1116. Article 5 is based on the writings of “...*Tomo archidiacon špljetski*...” (Thomas the Archdeacon of Split) who is quoted by the historian Ivan Juraj Švandtner. Ibid. 8.

²⁷⁵ *Pacta conventa* or *Qualiter* is the name for the agreement between the Hungarian King Coloman and the Croatian nobility under which the union of the two kingdoms was created. The originality of the document now preserved in the Hungarian National Museum in Budapest has been widely questioned with the dating of it ranging from the year 1102 until the 14th century. Regardless of the authenticity of its dating, it has been a central document in the political situation of the early Croatian National Revival and was used to construct historical narratives of the period thus making it a relevant document for this thesis. While this subsequent use and different perceptions of it in the contemporary political situation stemming make it relevant for the thesis the accuracy of its dating seems less relevant as it does not in a meaningful way affect the content of historical narratives of the early Croatian national movement.

per family but at their expense only to the Drava River, after which they would be provided for under the expense of the king.²⁷⁶

This article really speaks of the first municipal right of Croatia, referring to the *Pacta conventa* by which the union of the Kingdom of Hungary and the Kingdom of Croatia was created. The military contribution of Croatia will be discussed at various points in Kušević's work. Further articles go more into details of the agreement.

Articles six and seven talk about the sources from which we know the conditions of the 1102 agreement. The main sources for it are the writings of Tomo Archidiakon of Split and a Hungarian Ivan Juraj Švandtner²⁷⁷, together with the official and unnamed scribe of the King Bela IV.²⁷⁸ In article 8 however, Kušević decides to consider Archidiakon as the relevant source, saying that no matter what some think, the conditions of the *Pacta conventa* have been recorded by Archidiakon according to the document itself which was lost. More relevant than the historical authenticity of the document is the perception on the conditions presented by Kušević, which seem to be strongly influenced by the political situation in the time of writing of the *On municipal rights and statuses*. Kušević presents the two perceptions of the *Pacta conventa* where the ruler sees it as an agreement of subjugation of Croatia, while in the “perception of the people of Hungary”²⁷⁹ it is an agreement of alliance, under which the Croats and the Dalmatians committed themselves to a joint defense in the case of attack on the king's

²⁷⁶ Kušević, 8.

²⁷⁷ Johann Georg Schwandtner was a curator of the imperial library in Vienna who published a collection of sources entitled *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum veteres ac genuini* (1746–48).

²⁷⁸ Kušević, 8-9.

²⁷⁹ “...u pogledu naroda ugarskoga...”. Kušević here uses a confusing formulation, saying that the people of Hungary, rather than the people of Croatia perceive the agreement in a particular way. In the context it seems that the use of “the people of Hungary” should not be seen as the national population in the 19th century sense, but rather as a way of distinguishing the royal and noble elite of Hungary from the wide and heterogeneous population of Hungarian-ruled lands. In short, the label Hungarian people in this context would seem to denote all subordinates of the king as opposed to the king himself.

lands, but are not subjugated to the Hungarian king.²⁸⁰ This statement seem to reflect the claim of the 19th century Croatian estates. It is an attempt of the nobility to curb the authority of the king over them by claiming that the nature of the union between the two kingdoms was an alliance rather than subjugation. This is further discussed in the next article.

In it, Kušević explicitly claims that it is unquestionable that the *pacta conventa* resulted in an alliance rather than subjugation. He bases this stance on the facet, as he sees it, that Croats remained in control over all the lands they previously governed and that by the agreement all previous possessions as well as special (municipal) rights were guaranteed.²⁸¹

Article 10 begins with the list of cities and numbers of military units in Croatia, based on the writings of Konstantin Porfizogenit. More interestingly, the second part of the article presents the customs of the Slavs based on the same source. According to it, an individual did not rule Slavic people. Rather, they lived in “the ancient plebeian and common freedom”²⁸². Here Kušević shows the Slavs as an egalitarian society, living in a community of their own without leaders or rulers. More important issues and decisions were in this type of community brought before a council, while others were decided under the communities own customs.²⁸³

This idea of national ancestors who lived in harmony and freedom is a common theme in national historiography, as shown by Monica Baar in her book entitled *Historians and nationalism* in which she covered six national historians, outlining their tendencies. In the book, we can see that this view of national ancestors was characterized by the idea of “the noble savage ... who was portrayed as simple, generous, hospitable, frugal and highly

²⁸⁰ Kušević, 9.

²⁸¹ Ibid. 10.

²⁸² “...starodavnoj pučkoj i zajedničkoj slobodi...”, Kušević, 10. Kušević uses the term *puk* or *pučkoj* for the people of the community. The most accurate translation for this is *plebs* or *plebeian* and designates the non-noble commoners.

²⁸³ Kušević, 10.

virtuous”²⁸⁴. The idealized, peaceful life of the historical ancestor is in national historiographies interrupted by an incoming foreign force that introduced restrictive hierarchies and feudal organization. This idea is reflected in Kušević’s work as well. In it, the old Croats lived in peace and harmony until the Hungarians came and introduced their social structure that is in this case seen as negative and restrictive of a harmonious natural state.

Moving on, in article 11, Kušević continues to argue against the idea that Croatia is subordinated to Hungary. He states that the Croats were known as great warriors and raised to arms when Koloman came to the Drava River and they also fought the Romans. Thus the author concludes that who could believe that those same Croats laid down their arms and subordinated themselves to Koloman without a fight if in fact their rights were not guaranteed. In the authors view, the Croats agreed to obey Koloman without a fight only because they were allowed to retain their existing privileges.²⁸⁵

Article 12 refers to the writing of Charlemagne’s scribe, Eginhard²⁸⁶. In his works on Charlemagne, Eginhard mentions the division of the Croatian lands at the time. He notes that in the time of the fall of the Roman Empire Dalmatia was subordinated to the emperor in Constantinople while the western parts of the “Croatian lands” were possessed by the Croats and thus named Croatia. The Franks ruled the coastal parts and Slavonia.²⁸⁷

Article 13 talks about the organization of the Croatian lands after they were “liberated” from the Romans and Franks. The article is also heavily referenced to the works which Kušević uses for his proof of Croatian individuality, citing the already mentioned Švdndtner who in turn

²⁸⁴ Monika Baar, *Historians and nationalism: East-Central Europe in the Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.) 168.

²⁸⁵ Kušević, 10-11.

²⁸⁶ Einhard, lived 775-840.

²⁸⁷ Kušević, 11.

cites Toma Achidiakon Špljetski and Lucije from Porfirogenit, whose sources are again different unnamed authors and documents.

According to this, the Duchy of Croatia was divided into two major provinces²⁸⁸ - Dalmatia and Croatia. Under the Croatian dukes and kings they each had their own governments with separate *bans*²⁸⁹, county heads (chiefs) and their subordinates. Dukes and kings invited the *bans*, county heads and nobles into their council for more important issues and through them ruled the state. The legal system in these duchies and kingdoms was based partly on the old Roman law, on the introduced Frankish law and partly on the customary law of the Slavs.²⁹⁰

In article 14, Kušević discusses the administration in the Croatian Kingdom. According to this, the Croatian King Svetopelek XI²⁹¹ named for each province (Dalmatia and Croatia) a *ban* from the ranks of his brothers. Then he named the county heads or chiefs who were after King Krešimir named *komeše*²⁹², which is what they were known as under the Hungarian kings. Each *ban* had 700 subordinates from the ranks of the nobility who were in charge of the judiciary and the collecting of taxes. These taxes were to be given to the *ban* who had to give half of it to the king and keep half for the needs of his province. The same was the case with individual counties within the two *ban*-ruled provinces, except they were obligated to give two-thirds of their income to the king. This article ends with the acknowledgement of the “King” Svetopelek who enacted many laws and good customs.²⁹³

²⁸⁸ “Županije, to jest Varmedjije...”, Ibid. 11.

²⁸⁹ *Ban* used as the title of the viceroy in a given land.

²⁹⁰ Kušević, 11-12.

²⁹¹ Kušević bases this claim on the *Chronicles of “Misnik Dioklej”* (more commonly known in Croatian as Pop Dukljanin or Priest of Duklja), a 14th or 15th century chronicler. From that source, he attributes to Svetopelek XI the title of king. However, Svetopelek as he is known in the mentioned work is later known as Budimir and was in fact a duke and not the king of the Duchy of Croatia in the mid-8th century.

²⁹² Kušević, 12.

²⁹³ Ibid.

Article 15 introduces several royal charters issued by Croatian kings, regarding the giving of land to monasteries. The first charter is from the registry of charters of the Split archbishopric. In this charter dated to the year 838 and issued in Bihać, Trpimir²⁹⁴ declares that with the council of his chiefs he has decided to establish a monastery in the church of Salona²⁹⁵. That church which stretches to the Danube and almost through the whole of Croatia is to be given the specified king's lands and one-tenth of the income of the counties.²⁹⁶

The next charter in the same article comes from the registry of the St. Chrysogonus Monastery (presumably in Zadar) and is dated to the year 1069. In it, King Krešimir²⁹⁷ donates to the mentioned monastery the Adriatic island Manni. The charter was signed by the Adriatic Bishop, Stjepan; Boleslav, the court chief; Petar, the judge of the royal court; Šandor, the court's brewer and several county chiefs, as well as Leo, the "...*protospatarij*..."²⁹⁸ and captain of Dalmatia.²⁹⁹ Another charter from the same king, dated to the year 1059 gives to the monastery of Saint John the Apostle and Evangelist³⁰⁰ the island of Zuri with the special privilege by which it is free of taxation.³⁰¹

Article 16 adds to this by saying that the charters of Croatian kings granting Dalmatian cities certain rights are also mentioned in the charters of the Hungarian kings given to the same cities. Only the Charter of King Zvonimir to the city of Trogir is specifically mentioned, but it is further explained that it is visible from Toma Archidiakon's history of the church in Salona that Dalmatian cities had the right to choose their own bishops and chiefs. The charter of King Coloman to the city of Trogir from the year 1108 is specifically quoted. It states: "I, Koloman,

²⁹⁴ Duke of Croatia in mid-9th century.

²⁹⁵ Salona is the ancient Roman settlement close to today's Split.

²⁹⁶ Kušević, 13.

²⁹⁷ Petar Krešimir IV, ruled 1059-1074/75.

²⁹⁸ Protospatharios, a court dignitary. Kušević, 13.

²⁹⁹ Ibid.

³⁰⁰ "...Manastiru sv. Ivana apoštola I Evangeliste...", Ibid. 13-14.

³⁰¹ Ibid.

the King of Hungary, Croatia and Dalmatia, promise by the holy cross to you my faithful citizens of Trogir a lasting peace, and that you are not obligated to give offerings to my son or my heir. I [Koloman] will confirm bishops and chiefs which the clergy and the people select and will leave you [the city of Trogir] to the enjoyment of your old laws ... and will not allow for any Hungarian or foreigner to reside in your city if you do not allow it yourself...”³⁰². These right were confirmed by Koloman’s son and heir Stjepan, in 1124.

Article 17 present another charter issued by Koloman in 1109 by which he confirms the parishes of the Croatian and Dalmatian church and grants the clergy the right to enjoy all rights enjoyed by the clergy of Hungary (not specified what they are). They are not to be limited by any government but only by the authority of their own bishops, archbishops, the canon law, and are also granted one-tenth of the state’s income.³⁰³

Article 18 serves as a sort of conclusion to the previously written articles. In it, Kušević states that all this (previously written) was not written to chronicle the historical development and beginnings of the Kingdoms of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia. It is rather here to show that the Croats were met by the European nations centuries before the Hungarians and that there can be no doubt that they (the Croats) were a free people (*narod*) governed under its own laws and customs. After the extinction of the royal dynasty, Dalmatia and Croatia were not subordinated to Koloman but joined Hungary through an agreement. Again speaking about the voluntary union with Hungary, the author states that the Croats did not defeat the Romans, Franks and Avars just to subjugate themselves to the Hungarians. The promise that Croats will

³⁰² “... ja Koloman kralj Ungarije, Hrvatske i Dalmacije, tako mi svetog Križa, prisižem Vam Trožiranom, mojim viernim gradjanom stalni mir, I da niste dužni meni, niti sinu mojemu, ili nasljednikom mojim daće podavati, da ću biskupa, ili komeša, kog bi svećenstvo I narod izabrao, naimenovati, I pustiti Vas u uživanju vajkada stvorenih zakona ... I neću dopustiti, da ikoj Ugrin, ili tudjinac u gradu Vašem prebiva, izim ako sami to dozvolite...”, Ibid. 14-15.

³⁰³ “...povelja slobode...”, Ibid. 15-16.

remain the rulers of their own land is, in Kušević's view, the basis of the alliance under which Croatia, Dalmatia and Slavonia joined Hungary and the Hungarian Crown.³⁰⁴

This summary also reflects the political situation of the 19th century. The argument of the 19th century defenders of municipal rights was that they were able to retain their status of kingdoms (Croatia, Dalmatia, Slavonia) and their charters, rights, freedoms and customs which were confirmed by diplomas and laws of the Hungarian kings.³⁰⁵ It was on this idea that Croatia voluntarily joined Hungary and thus retained its previous rights, that the Croats were basing the defense of their municipal rights.

Article 19 continues by the author stating that in this work he will not consider the laws and privileges of the Triune Kingdom that are mutual with Hungary. He will only discuss the exceptional and independents municipal rights and statutes of the Kingdoms of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia. Kušević intends to base his argument for the maintenance of the Croatian rights and statutes on the "ancestral constitution of the kingdom by which the fundamental laws ... and diplomas are insured"³⁰⁶. As we see in this statement, Kušević perceives the collection of medieval documents as a *de facto* constitution of Croatia.

The following articles seem to go into more detail about the concrete documents on which Kušević bases his arguments, rather than just reiterating the works of older historians. Here we will see that Kušević often just names the number of the article within a law and a

³⁰⁴ Ibid. 16-17.

³⁰⁵ Kušević here specifically names the second decree of Matthias Corvinus which in article 13 speaks of Slavonia. He also specifically names the following: article one of the laws brought in 1492 and the eight decree of the same year; article one from the year 1600; article 27 from the year 1649, article 33 from the year 1681; article 66 from the year 1715; article 120 from the year 1723; article three and eight from the year 1741 brought forth at the occasion of the enactment of the pragmatic sanction and the diplomas from the same year, 1790 and 1792. Ibid. 17.

³⁰⁶ "...u diedovnom kraljevine ustavu temeljnimi kraljevine zakoni I krunitbenimi kraljevine diploma zajednički osigurane...", Ibid. 17.

year in which it was published. It becomes clear only later that he is in fact talking about the *corpus juris* or body of law. *Corpus juris* is a common legal term for the collection of all laws of the particular land, state or country. It is from this body of law that Kušević seems to extrapolate all of his rights and privileges of the Kingdoms of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia.

Historically, sessions of the diet were not held on regular basis or several times a year. Diets would only convene at times and rarely more often than once a year. At the end of a session the decisions that were made would be collected in a single legal code. When Kušević is referring to an article from a particular year, he is actually referring to the article within a legal code proclaimed in that year by the diet. Otherwise, he is just referring to a specific charter issued by the king.

Article 20 begins with a statement that all dukes who ruled Hungary after the death of St. Ladislav used the title King of Dalmatia and Croatia. Vladislav³⁰⁷ started using the title King of Slavonia which was retained by the later kings of Hungary and Croatia, as is testified by royal diplomas and laws. The same king issued in 1496 a seal for red wax to the nobility of Slavonia, by which old records of royal assemblies and *ban*'s orders were sealed.

The same article is continued by saying that the estates of the Triune Kingdom had by the oldest customs, the right to discuss their municipal affairs in assemblies. This right was confirmed by the decisions of the Kingdom of Slavonia in 1492 and 1538, by many documents from previous periods and by documents issued by the royal house. This right was further confirmed in article 58 of the legal code issued in 1791, with the change that these assemblies are allowed to take place only with the permission of the king.³⁰⁸

³⁰⁷ Vladislaus II of Hungary, ruled 1490-1516.

³⁰⁸ As Pretočki notes in a footnote to this article, the name used for this assembly of the estates in Croatia was *Congregatio Regni* as opposed to *Diaeta Regni*. This was done to create a differentiation between the assembly of

In article 21, Kušević speaks about the honor of the *ban*. *Ban* is the highest honor in the Kingdoms of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia, second only to the king. This honor stems from the earliest period of the Croatian people, as is written in numerous diplomas and historical documents proving the legitimacy of the *ban*'s power from the Adriatic Sea to the Drava River. Kušević acknowledges that the honor of the *ban* does not have today the privilege that it once had. Nonetheless, its authority and privilege is still great.³⁰⁹

Under the documents Kušević studies, the *ban* also possesses judicial power equal to that of judges in Hungary. Judicial mandates are issued by the *ban* and under his seal, making all documents verified by it credible and legal. Under the charter of King Ljudevit I³¹⁰, issued in 1359, the nobility of Slavonia was not obligated to put themselves before any judge over the Drava River (meaning in Hungary) but only before the *ban* and his deputies with the right of appeal to the royal court itself. This decision was transumpt³¹¹ by the same king in 1377 and confirmed by King Sigismund³¹² in 1395 (transumpt in 1402).³¹³

Among the same charters is the one of King Karlo I³¹⁴ who in 1325 decreed that previous exemptions from the judicial authority of the *ban* in Slavonia are from that point on void. The *ban* was also the head of the "octaval court"³¹⁵ which had the authority to decide on the loss of office of a state official and decided on the appeals cases.³¹⁶

the nobility of the Kingdoms of Croatia, Dalmatia and Slavonia and the royal diet of all the lands of the Hungarian king. Ibid. 18-19.

³⁰⁹ Ibid. 19.

³¹⁰ Louis I, ruled 1342-1382.

³¹¹ Transumpt, a copy of a writing or legal document. Merriam-Webster dictionary, accessed May 8, 2014, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/transumpt>; According to the translator, "...transumptum..." signifies "... a transfer of a charter or any other written document into a different charter or document under [the supervision] of an authorized person; word by word and confirmed by a seal... [Such a document] is thus equal to the original". Kušević, 20.

³¹² Sigismund of Luxemburg, Holy Roman Emperor and King of Hungary and Croatia from 1387-1437.

³¹³ Kušević, 20.

³¹⁴ Charles I, also known as Charles Robert, ruled 1312-1342.

³¹⁵ "...oktavalnog suda...". Octaval court or latin *iudicium octavale*, was the ban's court which came into session for 40 days two times a year and was called to session eight days (thus octaval) after a significant holiday such as

Article 23 presents the jurisdiction of the *ban* over the Croatian Military Frontier³¹⁷. It states that the *ban* of the Kingdom of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia is the primary captain of the Croatian Military Frontier between the Una and Kupa rivers. The right to name the captain belongs to the estates of the kingdoms which was confirmed by Maria Terezia³¹⁸ in a diploma issued in 1750. It was hoped that the estates would always award the captaincy to the *ban* and in turn, that the *ban* would name the commander of the army in the Military Frontier. The same document adds that all military officers in the Croatian Military Frontier should be selected for the ranks of able men from Croatia by the *ban* and will be confirmed by the king.³¹⁹

All this did not mean that the Military Frontier was completely subordinated to the *ban* as it was a territory under special conditions as a defensive, military belt against the Ottomans. In 1609, it was requested by the estates that the *ban* be accepted as the viceroy of the Frontier. Under the rule of Ljudevit II³²⁰ the rule of the Frontier, as Kušević states, was entrusted to the *ban*. After the loss of lower Slavonia, the authority of the *ban* in the Frontier began to shrink to the areas around the Una and Kupa rivers, and only to the insurrectional forces. The right was again somewhat reinforced in the time when the Archduke Karl³²¹ was the steward for military affairs in the name of the King and Emperor Rudolf³²². With Karl's position in the Frontier came a decision in 1578 that he should cooperate with the *ban* so that nothing could happen which is contrary to the freedoms of the Kingdom of Croatia. Another decision from 1609

Easter. From the end of the 16th century it functioned as a first and second degree court. The sessions were headed by the ban himself, with the participation of his replacement, scribe of the kingdoms, representatives of the clergy and the nobility. Ibid. 21; Croatian Encyclopedia (Hrvatska Enciklopedija), *Oktavalni sud*, accessed May 8, 2014. <http://www.enciklopedija.hr/Natuknica.aspx?ID=44956>.

³¹⁶ Kušević, 20-21.

³¹⁷ Croatian Military Frontier or Ban's Frontier; "...*banska Krajina*...", Ibid. 21-23.

³¹⁸ Maria Theresa, ruled 1740-1780.

³¹⁹ Kušević, 21-23.

³²⁰ Louis II, ruled 1516-1526.

³²¹ Charles II, Archduke of Austria, reigned 1564-1590.

³²² Rudolph II, Holy Roman Emperor and ruler of the Kingdoms of Hungary and Croatia from 1572-1608.

stipulates that the command of the Military Frontier should be conducted under the authority of the *ban* and the laws of the homeland.³²³

Article 24 continues³²⁴ on the authority of the *ban*, determining that the diets³²⁵ of the three Croatian kingdoms are called to session by the *ban* who also presides over every session. In the case of the absence of the *ban*, his deputy can preside over them. An important privilege and right of the *ban* was to, as one of the four barons of the Kingdom of Hungary, perform two honors at the same time. Under a decision issued in 1687 the *ban* has the right to attend the session of the Hungarian Diet. In addition, if he so chooses, he is allowed to join the session of the Hungarian government where he is entitled to a seat and a vote.³²⁶

Under law and custom, in a case of an attack the nobility with their subordinates is obligated to rise to defense. The way of fulfillment of this duty is prescribed by the following decisions introduced into the legal code of the Kingdom of Slavonia: article 4 from 1538, article 85 from 1659, article 66 from 1681, article 59 from 1741 and article 5 from 1808. These stipulate that in the case of an attack, the nobility is obligated to raise on the command of the *ban* with a fifth of their peasants or if the situation demands it, with a full force. This duty was fulfilled in 1809 when in the time of Napoleonic Wars the estates of the Kingdom of Slavonia raised an army of 17 000 people. A full mobilization was decided upon in the assembly in 1813 when a full force (unspecified how many soldiers that is) was raised to take back from Napoleon the Kingdom of Croatia. This region was, according to Kušević, the witnesses of the virtue and courage of the sons who harbored from their ancestors the loyalty to their lawful king.

³²³ Kušević, 21-23.

³²⁴ Article 24 is missing from the translated text however, only as a separate section. The text itself is included as a continuation of the article 23 and does contain all the text present in the original.

³²⁵ *Sabor*.

³²⁶ Kušević, 21-23.

Article 26 discusses the taxation of the Croatian lands, stating that the tax in the Kingdoms of Croatia and Slavonia was always half that of Hungary. The tax was given voluntarily by the oldest traditions and secured by the laws of the kingdoms. It was used to maintain the Croatian Frontier. Kušević supports this claim by referring to article two written into the legal code of Slavonia in 1492.³²⁷ In it is stated that the system of voluntary taxation was maintained in the past and in present time. This system was maintained until 1791 when new laws were created.³²⁸ Under article 59 of that year all the taxes from the three upper counties of Slavonia and the Kingdom of Croatia are to be discussed at the Hungarian Diet but separately from the taxation in the Kingdom of Hungary. They can also never be increased without the authorization of the Hungarian Diet. This law was used by the representatives of the three counties in 1802 when they claimed that their taxes cannot be raised and that they cannot be considered in the same category as the Hungarian counties.³²⁹

The next article discusses the jurisdiction of the Hungarian Diet over taxation in the Croatian lands. Under the records of the Diet from the years 1715, 1723, 1751 and 1764/5, in the Croatian view, the taxes were only prescribed for the counties of the Hungarian Kingdom while the taxes in Slavonia and the Kingdom of Croatia were and could only be discussed in their own assemblies. According to the author, it was concluded in the session of the Croatian Diet in 1802 that their obligation to maintain the military in the Croatian Frontier with their own taxes, has ended due to new circumstances. This means that previously mentioned laws

³²⁷ Ibid. 25.

³²⁸ The taxation system is regulated under the following articles of the *corpus juris*: article 9 from 1596, article 14 from 1608, article 62 from 1609, article 9 from 1613, article 36 from 1618, article 32 from 1622, article 8 from 1625, article 1 from 1635, article 7 from 1638, article 34 from 1647, article 4 from 1649, article 86 from 1659, articles 66 and 75 from 1681, article 115 from 1715, article 54 from 1741. Ibid.

³²⁹ Ibid. 25-26.

should be corrected and that the amount of taxes paid by the Kingdom of Croatia should be newly prescribed by its own Diet.³³⁰

The question of lower taxes for Slavonia and Croatian remained unresolved even after the Diet of 1802 when a tax of 20 000 forints was prescribed for those lands. It is further mentioned that according to article 8 from the year 1715, Croatia and Slavonia were obligated to pay taxes for the maintenance of the standing military in Hungary, which they did not do. In the same document however, article 115, it is prescribed that the estates of the Kingdoms of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia are to maintain the Military Frontier from their own tax income and as was already prescribed by article 75 from 1681, and by sheer tradition. That is why, in Kušević's view, just as the Croats cannot ask the Hungarians to contribute to the maintenance of the units in the Frontier, the Hungarians cannot justly ask the Croats to pay for the maintenance of the troops in Hungary. Even if Croatia and Slavonia contributed in exceptional times to the funding of military purely out of their sense of obligation to the king and the homeland, no future obligations can stem from such voluntary acts.³³¹

Article 29 continues this discussion, repeating that the nobles have the obligation to gather personally and with one-fifth of the peasantry in case of war. This amounts to 4 000 soldiers. This number is far exceeded by the number of soldiers in the Military Frontier. They tally 64 000 soldiers in 11 regiments (8 in upper Slavonia and 3 in the lower) that are ready to fight at all times and are thus equal to the standing army in Hungary. The author concludes by asking did the Kingdoms of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia not fulfill their duty in the defense of the kingdom by supporting such a large army. Can they not, Kušević asks, after fulfilling

³³⁰ Ibid. 26-27.

³³¹ Ibid. 27-29.

their duty for eight centuries, request that the taxes, their rights and statutes remain the same as they were for the ancestor?³³²

Kingdoms of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia have by the decision of the king the right (under title 2, part 3 of the *Tripartitum*³³³) to create their own laws in their own affairs, which are binding for all residents of the Kingdoms. This right cannot be denied to the plebs and counties of the Kingdoms which lived under their own laws and customs even before the arrival of the Hungarians to Europe. The right to decide on their own affairs was entered into the legal code of Slavonia in 1492 and 1538 and has ever since been enjoyed by that Kingdom. Kušević compares the rights of Slavonia to the rights of Erdelj, which in his view enjoyed similar rights within the Kingdom of Hungary. Under the same title and part of the *Tripartitum*, the Kingdoms of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia cannot reach any decision that would be contrary to the general regulations and rules of the Kingdom of Hungary (prescribed and collected in the same document) and its judicial decisions. According to Kušević, the *Tripartitum* establishes the rights, charters, rules, articles and customs of the Kingdoms of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia and regulates the common affairs. The right of the Kingdoms to create their own laws is especially confirmed under article 120 from the year 1715. The article has four sections. The first establishes that the validity of the municipal rights of the Kingdoms confirmed by the king can no longer be attacked and questioned. Under section two, all decisions prescribed under article 66 from the year 1681 are to be upheld. Article three creates an exception to that, prescribing that the continuation or abolishment of such rights and

³³² Ibid. 30-31.

³³³ *Tripartitum opus iuris consuetudinarii incltyti regni Hungariae* or *The Customary Law of the Renowned Kingdom of Hungary in Three Parts* issued in 1514.

privileges can be brought before the king and emperor once a year. The same is true for any new regulation that would conflict with royal and judicial authority.³³⁴

Article 31 of Kušević's work discusses the religious laws and rights. It is stipulated that only the members of Roman-Catholic religion and under article 27 from 1790/1 the members of the Greek Orthodox religion, can acquire and possess estates and perform civic and private duties within the Kingdoms of Croatia and Slavonia.³³⁵

Going further, Kušević establishes that the legislative power in the Kingdom of Hungary and its associated lands belongs, under article 12 from the year 1790/1, to the legally crowned king and the estates gathered in the Hungarian Diet. When a session of the Diet is called by the king, the estates of the three Croatian kingdoms dispatch from their own diet three representatives under article 61 from 1652. Based on this decision, the Kingdoms of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia have the right to defend their municipal right to be represented in both houses of the assembly.³³⁶

Article 33 and partially 32, describe the jurisdiction and rights of the prothonotary of the Kingdoms. Interestingly, Kušević himself was a prothonotary of the Croatian Kingdom and as such had the right to a place and a vote in the Hungarian Diet. In addition, as is established under article 52 from 1662, he has the right to the minutes of the Diet's session. The prothonotary was to be elected in the assembly of the estates from a list of candidates put forth by the *ban*. This right of the estates is recorded in the charter of the *Ban* of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia, Matija Talovac, from the year 1429. In it is stated that the nobles of Slavonia have always enjoyed the right to select their prothonotary, who is also the keeper of the official seal. Talovac only re-confirmed this right which was never actually abandoned and was

³³⁴ Ibid. 31-33.

³³⁵ Ibid. 33-34.

³³⁶ Ibid. 34-35.

confirmed by Matthias Corvinus in 1465. It was also stipulated that non-nobles could not be candidates or elected to the prothonotary position.³³⁷

Article 34 is the only one discussing the issue of language. Kušević establishes at the start that public life in the Triune Kingdom can be conducted only in Latin and no other language. He considers it an oldest custom, which started when the Romans established settlements in Dalmatia and Slavonia. It is thus even older than the union between Dalmatia and Croatia with Hungary.³³⁸

Kušević arguments for the continued use of Latin by saying that throughout the ages, all business was discussed and conducted in Latin and all public records, family letters, documents and laws are in this language. All the prominent writers from Hungary and the associated lands were written in Latin and in later times in German. With time, Latin also became the language of education for all possible services.³³⁹

As Kušević writes, Hungarian has been introduced in public affairs of the Kingdom of Hungary and its counties, as well as in parts of the Croatian lands that are less familiar with that language. Kušević continues by explaining further why Hungarian should not be introduced into Croatian lands. He states that the estates of Croatia, Dalmatia and Slavonia agreed to voluntarily join Hungary under the condition that they maintain their language. They did not do so just so Hungarian could be introduced later. For the purpose of retaining Latin, the estates of Croatia created a statute in their assembly on November 28, 1805 which proclaimed that public affairs in their area can be conducted in and only in Latin. This decision was submitted, as dictated under article 120 from the year 1715, to the king who approved it on February 8, 1806. On September 10, 1827, however, the same assembly decided that Hungarian should be taught

³³⁷ Ibid. 35-36.

³³⁸ Ibid. 36.

³³⁹ Ibid. 36-37.

in schools to prepare the youth for public service in the common areas and affairs with the Kingdom of Hungary. This was the same session of the Croatian Diet in which the work of Kušević on the municipal rights was commissioned.³⁴⁰

Article 35 names several others minor rights and privileges of the Triune Kingdom and finally concludes that with this article the thoughts on the municipal rights and statutes of the Kingdoms of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia are exhausted.³⁴¹

The last article (36) concludes the work. It overviews in short lines the creation of the Triune Kingdoms and their preserved by the strength of faith, loyalty to God and love of the homeland. The rights, freedoms and privileges acquired by the virtues of the ancestors have thus been transferred to “us”. In the end Kušević wishes that by the grace of God, the virtue of the ancestors should be found in their grandchildren through good upbringing and education. The work is concluded with a patriotic song glorifying Slavs and Croatian ancestors.³⁴²

As we saw earlier, the political context and necessity directed the political direction of the Croatian National Revival towards the defense of municipal rights. Kušević contributed immensely to this as he was the first one to collect and present in a concise manner all those municipal rights on which Croatian political life was based on. To achieve this he had to study centuries of Croatian history. We can thus see that it was political necessity that forced and gave incentive to the Croats to study history. It was again political necessity that dictated how this history will be studied. The political need dictated that the Croats should search for their constitution. Considering they did not possess a modern constitution, their political rights could only be based on old laws, customs, charters and privileges, thus dictating that the research of

³⁴⁰ Ibid. 36-38.

³⁴¹ Ibid. 38-39.

³⁴² Ibid. 39-40.

history should be approached under the idea of an ancient constitution. Ancient constitutionalism as such was neither a nationalist nor an enlightened tendency. It can be traced to the Renaissance and was most prominent in 17th and 18th centuries, especially in England. While it is not the tendency of the Enlightenment, it is an ideology that precedes nationalism. We can thus see here as well that the Croatian National Revival used previous ideologies in its activity. We can also see that political necessity, a need for a constitution that is the foundation of political life, dictated the start of historical studies in the Croatian national case.

It is true that Kušević himself was not a member of the Croatian National Revival, but he was nonetheless the defender of the Croatian municipal rights. In addition, his work presents certain elements of national historiography. This is especially evident in the presentation of Croatian ancestors as virtuous, courageous and free before the union with Hungary that destroyed their primordial freedom.

Kušević's work represented a study of national history even if it is not completely written in a nationalist manner. The study of history was something that was crucial to nationalist everywhere. Thus, when Kušević published his work it provided the nationalists with a strong foundation on which to build their historical narratives, something many of them did. All the previously mentioned authors, Derkos, Rakovac, Vukotinović, Gaj, etc. referred to history and told the historical story of the Croatian people. Drašković did the same in his *Dissertation*, complimenting his political program with stories of national heroisms and martyrdoms. Let us thus return to Drašković for a brief moment.

3.3. Drašković's historical narrative

Anthony D. Smith offers in this case a very relevant definition of a nation. He defines a nation as following:

“a named and self-defining human community whose members cultivate shared memories, symbols, myths, traditions and values, inhabit and are attached to historic territories or “homelands”, create and disseminate a distinctive public culture, and observe shared customs and standardized laws”.³⁴³

Smith's theory promotes the idea that the self-fashioning of a national community and its identity is based on the “focus on the significance of national history”³⁴⁴. When faced with a crisis, the nationalist return to the “earlier ‘golden’ ages of national history. That is typically when grand narratives of the national history are formulated, its exemplary or golden ages are defined, and its heroes and saints selected”³⁴⁵. In Smith's view, but also in the view of other scholars of nationalism, nationalist tended to mythologize their histories. The heroisms and martyrdoms as part of ethno-symbolism served as a tool in the creation of the national identity and community. This tendency in the case of the early Croatian national movement is most obvious precisely in Drašković's *Dissertation*.

Drašković states early in his text that before he can present and get into the reasons for this “conversation”³⁴⁶ he has to introduce the reader to the history of “our nations”³⁴⁷. He explains that it is necessary to remember and know previous events to be able to make a smart decision in the future. This is because knowing the history of one's nation can guide a person in future decisions.

³⁴³ Anthony D. Smith, *Ethno-Symbolism and Nationalism: A cultural Approach*, (London and New York: Routledge, 2009), 29.

³⁴⁴ Smith, 35.

³⁴⁵ Smith, 36.

³⁴⁶ Ibid.

³⁴⁷ Drašković uses the term “*narodov naših*” which roughly translates into “our nations”. However, it needs to be noted that he uses the word “*narod*” instead of “*nacija*” or nation, thus giving it an ethnic sense. Ibid.

Drašković begins the story of Croatian history by talking about the Hungarians and their expansionism. At first, the Hungarians settled down and arranged their own laws for themselves. However, with time they realized that they would gladly conquer the “kingdoms of the Greek Empire” – Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia. They wanted to reach the sea, which would benefit their trade, and wanted the great rivers flowing through those lands.³⁴⁸

It was exactly in this moment that Croatia and Slavonia were under two different but equally weak rulers. However, Hungarians did not attack directly and immediately. They saw that “to conquer and retain these lands they would face a large obstacle in the heroic temper”³⁴⁹ of the local people and that they will not be able to rule them without a great sacrifice of their own. They thus made an “artificial agreement with the chieftains” of these kingdoms and joined them to Hungary in a conditional way.³⁵⁰ The “chieftains” gladly accepted this arrangement because they wanted peace and to create a “conditional companion” out of their enemy. They were also promised that they would retain their customary law and that they will be able to select their own *ban* as a viceroy in their lands. This is why they so willingly accepted a foreign king as their ruler.

The heirs of Koloman and Ladislav later confirmed these rights with charters. They eventually also included Dalmatia which joined Hungary through time, piece by piece. Continuing, Drašković claims that written in these charters are all the merits of these lands and all the good they did for the Hungarian crown. Showing the Croatian lands such kindness was not in vain for the Hungarians and this relationship was blessed by blood in mutual battles against Italians, Greeks, Tatars and Turks. That is why the Hungarians, recognizing the value of these lands and people, wanted to create an even closer alliance with the Croatian lands. They

³⁴⁸ Ibid. 57-58.

³⁴⁹ Ibid. 58.

³⁵⁰ Ibid.

thus resettled “our kin” to their lands, “giving to them wives, honors and wealth”. The same they did with their own people, moving them to Croatian lands. Many Hungarians came and brought with them their own language. This quickly led to the introduction of the Hungarian language in Croatia by the giving of Hungarian names to churches and cities, which could now be done legally and justly because of the migration. The new inhabitants also brought their own songs and dance, and the Hungarian king had Croats, Slavonians and Dalmatians at his court.³⁵¹

The point of this part of Drašković’s text can be simply summarized as assimilation. The Hungarians were bringing their own people to Croatian lands and at the same time moving the Croats to Hungary by giving them wealth and riches. Incoming Hungarians brought their own language and culture that was quickly introduced in the Croatian lands thus causing the Croats to become Hungarian. As Drašković stipulates, had this continued for another century the Croatian national name and language would have disappeared without any resistance.³⁵²

Continuing the historical narrative, Drašković says that the House of Austria eventually inherited the crown of Hungary and found it more useful for the state to stop the integration and assimilation of Croats. That is why they allowed the local vernaculars and gave new charters to the Croatian kingdoms after already confirming the previously existing ones. Thus, the House of Austria destroyed what Hungarians envisioned. “This dissipation of nations belonging to the Hungarian crown was suffered until Emperor Karol”³⁵³. Drašković is here obviously referring to Holy Roman Emperor Charles VI because he further talks about his heir on the throne, Maria Theresa. She by “mercy and piety and in the end Joseph³⁵⁴ by force”³⁵⁵, put a stop to this

³⁵¹ Ibid.

³⁵² Ibid. 58-59.

³⁵³ Ibid. 59.

³⁵⁴ Joseph II.

individuality of nations and toleration of the vernaculars by introducing “the German language and German customs in all houses”³⁵⁶ without honoring “our own” laws and charter. Because of this external threat, the Croats and Hungarians abandoned the disagreements that existed among them.

Drašković creates the undertone of martyrdom in his text by saying it is sad that not only did Hungarians not remember “our” long service and sacrifice during this political transformation, but they also forgot our rights and privileges expressed in the charters and are not allowing Croats administrative and clerical positions for which they are equally capable.³⁵⁷ They are in fact now again trying to assimilate “our” lands both politically and linguistically. He concludes this continuous historical overview by saying that we “must establish principles that will guide us” in our struggle against this.³⁵⁸ This is where Drašković introduces his political program as described in the previous chapter.

Drašković further emphasizes the heroism and martyrdoms of the Croatian people. While he discusses it at various points, it is especially prominent when it comes to telling the historical story of the resistance of Croatia to the Ottoman attacks. Drašković states that Croatia was defending Hungary from the Turks, thus using the concept of *antemurale christianitatis* as an element of national mythology. The author considers that the Croats and Slavonians always suffered the first blow from the Turks. For ages now, everyone who could carry a weapon would rise and gather in military units at the first word of another Turkish attack. The Turks, having no “state order or police”³⁵⁹ thought of Christians as unbelievers and had no problem

³⁵⁵ Drašković, 59.

³⁵⁶ Ibid.

³⁵⁷ Ibid. 59-60.

³⁵⁸ Ibid.

³⁵⁹ Ibid. 66.

enslaving them. It often happened that even in a time of peace Turkish bandits³⁶⁰ gathered and attacked borderline territories, “enslaved the population, burned the villages and if they could, took with them the young of both sexes”³⁶¹. Croats always fought those troops and prevented them from reaching Hungary. Both in war and peace the Croats and Slavonians insured that the Hungarian lands could enjoy peace and prosperity while they live under constant unrest and exposed themselves to death.³⁶²

Drašković speaks about the Ottoman attacks when talking about the Military Frontier which is in his view also one of the Croatian lands and contains eleven military regiments of “our people“ who are the treasure and defenders of the crown. These troops were comprised of old Croats, Bosnians, Dalmatians and some Greeks who kept running from the Turks after “the collapse of the western empire”³⁶³. These people are now first in service but also in sacrifice. Among them, there are old nobles who wish nothing more than to avenge their ancestors who were cut down and enslaved by the Turks. And when the old died the young forgot where they came from and what they did before and they took up arms now already for the sixth generation. With time, they became poor, lost their cattle and riches, and now require care or they will die out. Drašković states that even Napoleon praised the soldiers from the Croatian Military Frontier because in them he found greater courage, “persistence, obedience and unanimity”³⁶⁴ than in his own soldiers.³⁶⁵ Because of this suffering and courage, Drašković instructs the Croatian deputies in the Hungarian Diet to request for the Military Frontier to be joined with the Triune Kingdom once again.

³⁶⁰ *Hajduci*.

³⁶¹ Drašković, 66.

³⁶² *Ibid.*

³⁶³ *Ibid.* 74.

³⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

As we can see, there are two important historiographical elements in Janko Drašković's *Dissertation*. The emphasis on the municipal rights, privileges and old charters of the Triune Kingdom, and the view of Croats as a heroic nation, which had to endure centuries of suffering.

Drašković adds to the struggle for municipal rights the element on national martyrdom as an attempt to build a national identity based on historical kinship of all the Croatian lands. He develops a historical narrative filled with elements of heroics and suffering of the Croatian nation in which we can clearly see nationalistic and romanticist tendencies as well as an attempt at creating a national mythology. All this is at the same time combined with the political agenda of the national movement, suggesting that the historical suffering of Croats is the same as the contemporary crisis in which they find themselves.

Returning to Smith, he shortly summarizes in his theoretical considerations exactly what Drašković is doing in his presentation of Croatian history. Smith states: "we should interpret these narratives not as inventions or fabrications, but as selective political understandings of aspects of ethnic past that may be supported by documentary or other evidence"³⁶⁶. This seems to be exactly what Drašković is doing. He is attempting to create the ethno-symbolism and national mythology based on the historical documents which he interprets in a particular, and nationally beneficial way.

3.4. Conclusion

What I have attempted to show in this chapter is that the political agenda of the Croatian National Revival dictated the direction the movement took towards the study of history. As the main political agenda of the movement was the defense of the municipal rights of the Croatian

³⁶⁶ Smith, 36.

lands, the study of history at the time strived to accommodate those political demands. Thus with the struggle over a constitutional foundation of the Croatian nation, historical research turned to the principles of ancient constitutionalism, collecting all those documents which were seen as constituting the body of law of the Croatian lands. Not only was the study of history serving the purposes of the cultural national revival and the building of national identity, it was directly influenced and influential on the political development of the Croatian nation.

However, this history based on ancient constitutionalism transcended a pure listing of laws and charters and became the platform for the creation of national myths, national symbolism and a romanticized version of a nation's history. Kušević himself, who was not a member of the national movement, already presented certain elements of national mythology by presenting the old Croats as noble. Drašković took this a step further. He used the political base and the defense of the municipal rights as a foundation to build his historical myths of glory, heroism, suffering and martyrdom.

This is how the politics of the 1820s, 1830s and 1840s directly initiated the study of Croatian history and the writing of a national and nationalized history. Other authors, like Ivan Kukuljević Sakcinski, contributed to this study of history. However, their contributions came later. It was Kušević and Drašković who set the foundations, in both politics and history.

Conclusion

In this thesis I have first attempted to show that on a comparative level, the relationship of Croatia and Hungary was similar or not the same as the relationship of Hungary and the Habsburg Monarchy. With Germanization and the denial of Hungary's constitutional rights by the Habsburg Monarchy, the Hungarians reacted by developing their language and fighting for their constitutional rights to remain as they were. With the emergence of nationalism and with its development in a political direction the initially reactionary impulse of Hungarian nationalism transformed into the Magyarization. Thus, when Hungary attempted to introduce Hungarian into Croatia, the Croats reacted and started developing their own language. The right to their own language was part of the feudal municipal rights which with the development of linguistic nationalism became a national right of the Croatian nation. Thus, politics and nationalism became intertwined in Croatia.

The primary aim of this thesis was to research possible influences of the Enlightenment in primarily the political programs of the Croatian National Revival. As we have seen, Janko Drašković presented a particularly conservative political program that was in the end not accepted by the more liberal members of the movement. Nonetheless, we seem to be able to conclude that a degree of influence of the Enlightenment is present in Drašković's *Dissertation*. The monarchist position of Drašković seems to be quite reminiscent of Montesquieu. However, that is not the only document where we can establish such a connection. As I have shown, the work of Ivan Derkos shows Enlightenment influences on obvious level, with the author engaging directly with some of the major debates of the that age.

However, the influences of the Enlightenment are present on a fundamental level. They were adapted to the context of the Croatian National Revival, serving the role of promoting the

particular agenda the revivalist saw fit for it. In the widest sense, the Enlightenment was thus used to advocate the Croatian municipal rights as the main political aim of the Croatian national revival. These municipal rights and the political situation surrounding them meant that the Croats became interested in exploring their constitutionalism. They did so in the sense of an ancient constitution, collecting the legal codes, charters and other rights and privileges given to the nobility, in an attempt to prove their autonomy from Hungary that was attacking their rights.

This meant that the political situation in Croatia directly started the study of history, which soon became transformed into a national history. Drašković combined his entire political program with the national history in which he created national myths, heroes and martyrs.

This thesis for the most part achieved its goals. I was able to establish a degree of continuity between the Enlightenment and nationalism. Also, I was able to show how the main political goals of the national movement fueled the study of history and how the two intertwined. However, there is significant room for further research, especially in regards to the influences of the Enlightenment on the Croatian national movement. First, a more thorough and much deeper analysis should be conducted to establish the full extent of continuity and transfer between the two period. I have here concentrated on only the most prominent and significant documents. However, as a primarily literary movement, there is a huge body of sources to work with when we talk about the Croatian National Revival. An expansion of the research to the economic policy might be especially significant considering there are several source collections already published on the works of Nikola Škrlec Lomnički, a Croatian cameralist.

On the other side, we can probably never exhaust the issue of national historiography. I have here attempted to show on a few examples how politics dictated the beginning of writing the national history in the Croatian case. A comparative approach would be especially interesting to see whether we can recognize the same tendency in Hungary or other Central European nations.

Overall, this thesis did achieve its main goals of establishing the transfer between the Enlightenment. Nonetheless, it represents only a foundation on which future studies should develop, that makes this conclusion a beginning and not the end.

Bibliography

Primary sources

- Derkos, Ivan. *Duh domovina nad sinovima svojim, koji spavaju* [The spirit of the homeland over its sons who are sleeping] In: Miroslav Šicel, ed., *Programski spisi Hrvatskog narodnog preporoda* [Programmatic writings of the Croatian National Revival]. Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1997.
- Drašković, Janko. *Disertacija iliti razgovor, darovan gospodi poklisarom zakonskim i budućem zakonotvorcem kraljevinah naših, za buduću dietu ugarsku odaslanem, držan po jednom starom domorodcu kraljevinah ovih* [Dissertation, or Treatise, given to the honorable lawful deputies and future legislators of our Kingdoms, delegated to the future Hungarian Diet, by an old patriot of these Kingdoms]. In Miroslav Šicel, ed., *Programski spisi Hrvatskog narodnog preporoda* [Programmatic writings of the Croatian National Revival], (Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1997).
- Gaj, Ljudevit. *II. Proglas* [Second Proclamation], in: *Danica ilirska*, Zagreb: 1836. In: *Programski spisi Hrvatskog narodnog preporoda* [Programmatic writings of the Croatian National Revival], Miroslav Šicel, ed. Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1997.
- Gaj, Ljudevit. *Kratka osnova horvatsko-slavenskoga pravopisana* [Brief Basics of the Croatian-Slavonic Orthography]. Buda: Kraljevsko Vseučilište, 1830.
- Kušević, Josip. *De municipalibus iuribus et statutis regnorum Dalmatiae, Croatiae et Slavoniae* [On the municipal rights and statutes of the kingdoms of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia], trans. Franjo Pretočki. Zagreb: Knjigotiskarski i litografski zavod C. Albrechta, 1883.
- Rakovac, Dragutin. *Mali katekizam za velike ljude* [Small catechism for great men], 1842. In: *Programski spisi Hrvatskog narodnog preporoda* [Programmatic writings of the Croatian National Revival], Miroslav Šicel, ed. Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1997.
- Vukotinović, Ljudevit. *Ilirizam i kroatizam* [Illyrism and Croatism], 1842. In: *Programski spisi Hrvatskog narodnog preporoda* [Programmatic writings of the Croatian National Revival], Miroslav Šicel, ed. Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1997.
- Poziv pokojnoga episkopa Maximiliana Verhovca Rakitovackoga na sve duhovne pastire svoje episkopie* [Invitation of the deceased bishop Maximilian Verhovac Rakitovacki for all the spiritual pastors of his bishopric]. In: *Danica Ilirska* 24 [Illyrian Morning Star], ed. Ljudevit Gaj. Zagreb, 1837.
- Gaj, Ljudevit. *III. Proglas* [Third Proclamation]. In: *Danica ilirska*, Zagreb: 1843. Taken from: *Programski spisi Hrvatskog narodnog preporoda* [Programmatic writings of the Croatian National Revival], Miroslav Šicel, ed. Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1997.

Secondary sources

- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London and New York: Verso, 2006.

- Baar, Monika. *Historians and nationalism: East-Central Europe in the Nineteenth Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Balázs, Éva H. *Hungary and the Habsburgs, 1765-1800: an experiment in enlightened absolutism*. Budapest: CEU Press, 1997.
- Banac, Ivo. *The Redivived Croatia of Pavao Ritter Vitezović*, Harvard Ukrainian Studies 10. 1986.
- Bevir, Mark, ed. *Encyclopedia of Political Theory*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2010.
- Blažević, Zrinka, *Ilirizam prije Ilirizma* [Illyrism before Illyrism]. Zagreb: Golden Marketing; Tehnička Knjiga, 2008.
- Bok, Hilary. *Baron de Montesquieu, Charles-Louis de Secondat*. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Accessed April 22, 2014. <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/montesquieu/>.
- Čepulo, Dalibor. *Razvoj ideja o ustroju vlasti I građanskim pravima u Hrvatskoj 1832.-1849* [Development of ideas on the organization of power and civil rights in Croatia], Pravni vjesnik 16. 2000.
- Dent, Nicholas. *Rousseau*. London and New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Evans, R.J.W. *Austria, Hungary, and Habsburgs – Central Europe c.1683-1860*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and nationalism*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983.
- Hroch, Miroslav. *Social precondition of national revival in Europe: A comparative analysis of the social composition of patriotic groups among the smaller European nations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Ingrao, Charles. *The Habsburg Monarchy, 1618-1815*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Kann, Robert. *A History of the Habsburg Empire, 1526-1918*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980.
- Kontler, László. *A history of Hungary*. Budapest: Atlantisz, 2009.
- Kontler, László. "What is the (Historians') Enlightenment Today?," European Review of History 13. 2006.
- Okey, Robin. *The Habsburg Monarchy: From Enlightenment to Eclipse*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001.
- Pocock, J.G.A. *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Shek Brnardić, Teodora. *The Enlightenment in Eastern Europe: Between Regional Typology and Particular Micro-history*, European Review of History 13, 2006.
- Sikirić Assouline, Zvezdana, *U obranu hrvatskih municipalnih prava i latinskog jezika* [In the defense of Croatian municipal rights and the Latin language]. Zagreb: Srednja Europa, 2006.

- Stančić, Nikša. *Hrvatska nacija i nacionalizam u 19. i 20 stoljeću* [Croatian nation and nationalism in the 19th and 20th century] . Zagreb: Barbat, 2002.
- Stančić, Nikša. "Disertacija grofa Janka Draškovića iz 1832. godine: samostalnost i cjelovitost Hrvatske, jezik i identitet, kulturna standardizacija i konzervativna modernizacija [Dissertation of Count Janko Drašković from 1832: independence and wholeness of Croatia, language and identity, cultural standardization and conservative modernization]," Kolo 3. 2007. Accessed October 19, 2013, <http://www.matica.hr/kolo/306/Disertacija%20grofa%20Janka%20Dra%C5%A1kovi%C4%87a%20iz%201832.%20godine%3A%20samostalnost%20i%20cjelovitost%20Hrvatske,%20jezik%20i%20identitet,%20kulturna%20standardizacija%20i%20konzervativna%20modernizacija/>.
- Šicel, Miroslav, ed., *Programski spisi Hrvatskog narodnog preporoda* [Programmatic writings of the Croatian National Revival]. Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1997.
- Šidak, Jaroslav. *Hrvatske zemlje u razdoblju nastajanja preporodnog pokreta* [Croatian lands in the period of formation of the revival movement], Historijski zbornik 33-34. 1980-1981. Šidak, Jaroslav. *Hrvatski narodni preporod: ilirski pokret* [Croatian National Revival: Illyrian movement]. Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1990.
- Taylor, A.J.P. *The Habsburg Monarchy, 1809-1918*. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1966.
- Varga, Janos. *A Hungarian Quo Vadis – Political Trends and Theories of the early 1840s*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1993.
- Vermes, Gabor. *Hungarian culture and politics in the Habsburg monarchy, 1711-1848*, Budapest, CEU University Press, 2014.
- Vucinich, Wayne S. *Croatian Illyrism: Its background and genesis*, in: *Intellectual and social developments in the Habsburg Empire from Maria Theresa to World War I*, Stanley B. Winters and Robert A. Kann. Boulder: Columbia University Press, 1975.
- Oktavalni sud*, Hrvatska Enciklopedija [Croatian Encyclopedia], accessed May 8, 2014. <http://www.enciklopedija.hr/Natuknica.aspx?ID=44956>.
- Smith. Anthony D. *Ethno-Symbolism and Nationalism: A cultural Approach*. London and New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Transumpt*. Merriam-Webster dictionary, accessed May 8, 2014, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/transumpt>