

Vladislav B. Sotirović
University of Vilnius, Lithuania

THE CROATIAN NATIONAL REVIVAL MOVEMENT (THE "ILLYRIAN MOVEMENT") AND THE QUESTION OF LANGUAGE IN THE PHASE FROM 1830 TO 1841

INTRODUCTION

The article investigates how language influenced ethnonational group identity of Croatian national leadership during the first period (1830–1841) of Croatian national revival movement that was formally named as the *Illyrian Movement*. This work is an attempt to reconstruct the main stream of linguistic policy by the leaders of the movement (in the first phase of it) and their outlines how to solve the South Slavic question within a part of Central and South East Europe.

Previous research into the problem basically failed to investigate the role of language in the ideological structure of the *Illyrian Movement* as a model of the definition of Croatian, respectively Serbian, nationality and as well as a model of the creation of a ethnolinguistically-defined national states of Croats and Serbs. The findings of the previous research largely misinterpreted the linguistic side of the political ideology of the Movement, mainly suggesting that Croatian political leadership fought for pan-South Slavic cultural and even political unification. However, my research-results are indicating that most probably an ultimate goal of the Movement was to establish a Greater Croatia and as such to politically reshape a map of the Balkan Peninsula and the South East Europe.

In other words, the main attention in the former investigations has been to analyze the political structure of the ideological framework of the Movement, while the structure and the importance of the linguistic model of the national determination and the creation of a united national state has been largely disregarded. The subject need to be further investigated for at least two reasons: 1) the previous research in the field was incomplete; it still remains unclear whether or not language played an important role within the ideological framework of the Movement, and 2) the results of the previous research are controversial: (a) within one approach, the ultimate political aim of the Movement was to establish an

united South Slavic, basically Croato-Serbian, national state, whereas (b) within the other approach, the leaders of the Movement struggled for an independent Triune Kingdom of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia.

Method of comparison and *method of text analysis* are used in the investigation of Croatian and Serbian linguistic nationalism during the first period of the *Illyrian Movement*. Both methods are used for the purpose of sociolinguistic examination of the role and function of language in the process of national determination and national-ideology creation, internal national cohesion and distinction from the others by the Croats and Serbs at the time of the Movement.

The majority of published works on the topic in Yugoslav historiography after both the WWI and WWII deal with the manifestation of extreme pan-South Slavic unity in cultural-linguistic point of view. The ideology of the Movement became (mis)used for the practical-political purpose of Serbo-Croat and Yugoslav brotherhood and unity within Yugoslavia(s).

THE ORIGINS OF THE MOVEMENT

The Croatian national revival movement (officially as the *Illyrian Movement*) emerged with the name of Croatian national worker and politician of German origin¹, Ljudevit Gaj in 1830 when he published in Budim a brochure in two languages (Croatian-*kajkavian* and German) *Kratka osnova horvatsko-slavenskoga pravopisanja/Die Kleine Kroatische-Slavischen Orthographie* (*Short Foundation of Croatian-Slavonic Orthography*). This publication marked the beginning of the Croatian national revival movement, which is considered in Croatian historiography as the period of Croatian national renaissance. From this period starts a modern Croatian history, but also and modern Croatian nationalism and history of political thoughts. The brochure *Kratka osnova horvatsko-slavenskog pravopisanja* became the foundation for the further development of the policy of standardization of literal-public language of the Croats and as well a reform of orthography among the Croats. Incontestably, Lj. Gaj in 1830 reformed the Croatian orthography and stressed a literal unity of the Croats with the other South Slavs, particularly with the Serbs who were speaking (only) *štokavian* dialect. Gaj's ortographic modification of Croatian writings was done fundamentally according to the pattern

1 His father, Johan Gay, was a German physician who came to live in northern Croatia (in Krapina) in 1786. Gaj's ancestors from the father side were from Burgundy and Slovakia. Gaj's mother was Juliana Schmidt. Gaj's mother tongue was German (I. Perić. *Povijest Hrvata*. – Zagreb, 1997, 151).

of the Czech orthography. This new Croatian orthography, which was accepted by the neighbouring kajkavian Slovenes as well, became known as *gajica*.²

In the same year (1830) a *protonotar* (secretary) of Triune Kingdom, Josip Kušević, published in Latin language one of the most important political works in Croatian modern history: *Iura municipalia*... The book was dealing with the special political rights and constitution of the Kingdom of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia. The author in point of fact tried to refute Hungarian claims that after the year of 1102 (when Kingdom of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia joined the Kingdom of Hungary by personal union in the personality of the Hungarian King Coloman (“the Book-Lover”) 1095–1116), Croatia, Dalmatia and Slavonia (three historical provinces of Croats claimed by Croatian historiography) became the ordinary province within a greater historical Hungary without any special political status, rights or autonomy. In other words, Hungarian politicians claimed that after the year of 1102 Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia lost any state or *municipal* rights and that historical lands of Croats became *partes subjectae* (“subdued parts”) to Hungary. It means, furthermore, that Hungarian language has to be the only mandatory public-official medium of communication within the whole Hungary including and the Triune Kingdom. However, contrary to such Hungarian claims, Kušević argued that historical Croatian lands made a political union with Hungary and that after 1102 Hungary and Croatia were *regna socia* (“united kingdoms”) with equal political rights. This Kušević’s program became the first formulation of Croatian historical rights, which later in the 19th century became the foundation of the programs of several Croatian political parties. Among them the most important has *Croatian Party of Rights* been, established in 1861.³

The next step in development of Croatian national revival made Ivan Derkos when he published in 1832 in the Latin language in Zagreb/Zágráb *Genius patriae super dormientibus suis filiis* (*The genius of the motherland above its sleeping sons*). Derkos with this book tried to wake up the love toward motherland among the Croats, but in addition to promote an idea of the one single Croatian literal language that has to be composed by a combination of the three South Slavic dialects: *kajkavian* (spoken by the Croats in north-western Croatia and Slovenes in Slove-

2 D. Pavličević. *Povijest Hrvatske. Drugo, izmijenjeno i prošireno izdanje*. – Zagreb, 2000, 244.

3 A. Starčević. *Izabrani politički spisi*. – Zagreb, 1999; D. Pavličević. *Povijest Hrvatske. Drugo, izmijenjeno i prošireno izdanje*. – Zagreb, 2000, 245; M. Gross. *Povijest pravaške ideologije*. – Zagreb, 1973.

nia), *čakavian* (spoken by the Croats in northern Dalmatia, Istria and Dalmatian islands) and *štokavian* (spoken by all Serbs and very small number of those who accepted the ethnic name of Croats at that time).⁴ However, Derkos was in opinion that all of these three South Slavic dialects were spoken solely by the Croats, i.e. that Croatian language consists *kajkavian*, *čakavian* and *štokavian* dialects. This Derkos' claim became from the mid-19th century the key backbone within a framework of Croatian linguistic nationalism. It provoked in due course a Serbian reaction and finally alienated Serbs from the Croatian *Illyrian* ideology of Yugoslavism.

In the same year, Croatian count Janko Drašković published in Karlovac *Disertacija iliti razgovor... (Disertation or Talk...)* which was the first political book written in Croatian language. This work was actually the political program of both the Croatian national revival movement and the Croatian nation in which the author required political, economic, linguistic and cultural union of all "Croatian" lands into one single national state of ethnolinguistic Croats. At such a way united Croatia was named by Drašković as a *Greater Illyria*. The lands which should be incorporated into united Croatia were: Croatia, Slavonia, Rijeka/Fiume, the Military Border, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Montenegro, Dalmatia and Slovenien provinces. According to him, an united Greater Croatia would stay in political union with Hungary, but both Hungary and united Croatia would remain as the parts of the Habsburg Monarchy. In united Croatia the official language would be *Illyrian*, i.e. "Croatian" language of *štokavian* dialect, while the supreme authority would be in the hands of the *Ban* (the Governor or *prorex*). Also, he required a modification of the Croatian feudal system and development of the Croatian trade and economy.

Undeniably, the mentioned writers have to be considered as the founders of the so-called *Illyrian Movement*, which lasted until 1847 when the national language of Croats achieved a final victory over Germanization and Magyarization in Croatia and Slavonia and when the *Illyrian* name (as the common name for all South Slavs) was replaced with the national name of the Croats. Basically, the time of *Illyrian Movement* is the most important period of the Croatian renaissance. In the larger sense of periodization, the whole Croatian national revival movement can be subdivided into: 1) the period of the preparatory time from the end of the 18th century to 1829; 2) the first (early) period from 1830 to 1834; 3) the developed period from 1835 to 1842; 4) the period of the prohibition of

4 П. Милосављевић. *Срби и њихов језик*. – Приштина, 1997, 13–50.

the *Illyrian* name (1843–1845); and 5) the period of a replacement of the *Illyrian* name by the national name of the Croats (1846–1874).⁵



Territorial distribution of Serbs and Croats after their migration to the Balkans, according to Constantinus VII Porfirogenetus

THE ILLYRIAN MOVEMENT UNTIL THE CREATION OF POLITICAL PARTIES (1841)

Certainly, the publishing of Gaj's *Kratka osnova horvatsko-slaven-skoga pravopisanja/Die Kleine Kroatische-Slavischen Orthographie* in 1830 marked the beginning of the Croatian national revival movement and made Ljudevit Gaj to be a leading figure of it. The essential value of the book was that Gaj proposed a creation of one literal language for all Croats. It was a revolutionary act at that time, which was done, according to Gaj and other leaders of the movement, for the ultimate political-national purpose to unify Croatian population and Croatian lands. At such a way, the Croats and their lands would be united on the language-literal base that was a crucial precondition for Croatian political unification in the future.

5 J. Šidak and co-authors. *Hrvatski narodni preporod*, t. I. – Zagreb, 1965, 7.

Lj. Gaj and his followers required that Croatian national language has to be accepted as an official-bureaucratic medium of correspondence in the Triune Kingdom. At that time the official language in Croatia and Slavonia (under Hungarian administration) was Latin. However, at the same time Hungarian magnates required that Hungarian language should be only official language in Croatia and Slavonia, but not Croatian one.⁶ Ivan Kukuljević Sakcinski was the first Croatian politician who openly required (on May 2nd, 1843) Croatian language to become an official in Croatian feudal assembly (the *Sabor*). Nevertheless, Hungarian authorities rejected this requirement and at the same time prohibited the practice of Latin language of Croatian representatives in Hungarian feudal parliament (the *Dieta*), requiring the usage of only Hungarian. Hungarian *Dieta* issued in the same year a parliamentary decision that in ten years only Hungarian language would be the official language within the whole territory of the “Lands of the Crown of St. István” (i.e. historical Hungary from the Carpathian Mountains to the Adriatic Sea) including and Croatia and Slavonia (these two provinces were parts of Hungary, while Dalmatia has been a part of Austria). This struggle over the language issue in Croatia and Slavonia became the initial bit of fire in Croatia’s society which very soon became politically bipolarized into two opposite political parties: *narodnjaci* (supporters of Croatian national revival movement and Croatia’s independence in relation to Hungary) and *mađaroni* (pro-Hungarians who required closer links between Croatia and Hungary, i.e. Croatia’s total incorporation into Hungary).

The year of 1832 was one of the most important in history of Croatian national revival movement. Among other things, in this year Ljudevit Gaj asked the Habsburg authorities for permission to print Croatian national newspaper (*hrvatske novine*) and wrote in the same year a song “*Horvatov sloga zjedinjenje*”, which in the following years became Croatian anthem. This anthem became popular under the name which was derived from the very beginning of it: “*Još Hrvatska ni propala, dok mi živimo*.” In the same year, as well, the Croatian assembly (the *Sabor*) elected Franjo Vlašić for Croatian Governor (the *Ban*) for the period from 1832 to 1840. He chose General Juraj Rukavina for the vice-captain of the Croatian-Slavonian kingdom. On this occasion Rukavina gave a speech in the *Sabor*, but unusually not in the Latin but rather in Croatian-*kajkavian* language. It was the first speech in national language in Croatian *Sabor*.

As it is mentioned above, in 1832 Ivan Derkos printed one of the most influential books of the movement – *Genij domovine nad svojim*

6 B. Šulek. *Hrvatski ustav*. – Zagreb, 1883, 80.

sinovima koji spavaju (*Genius patriae...*), which was the first cultural and national program of the *Illyrian Movement* with the final idea to create a single literal language of the Croats, whose literature up to that time was mainly written in *čakavian* and *kajkavian* dialects (or languages). Josip Kundek promoted the same idea in his work *Rec jezika narodnoga* in 1832 where he emphasised the old national glory of the Croats.⁷ However, mature-developed political program of the movement was framed by the work of count Janko Drašković in the same year of 1832 when he published *Disertatia iliti razgovor, darovan gospodi poklisarom zakon-skim i buducem zakonotvorcem kraljevinah nasih...* This manuscript was written in *štokavian* dialect, regardless on the fact that Drašković was *kajkavian* speaker (likewise Ljudevit Gaj too) and the work was printed in the city of Karlovac where *kajkavian* dialect was spoken, but not *štokavian* one.

For the matter of better understanding the research-issue, it should be said that the so-called *Serbo-Croatian language* (an official name for the common language of Serbs and Croats in the time of both former Yugoslavias) is divided into three basic dialects according to the form of the interrogative pronoun *what*: *kajkavian* (what = kaj), *čakavian* (what = ča), and *štokavian* (what = što). At the time of *Illyrian Movement*, *kajkavian* dialect was spoken in north-western parts of Croatia proper (around Zagreb and Karlovac), *čakavian* in the northern coast area and the islands of eastern Adriatic shore (Istrian Peninsula, area around Zadar, Rijeka, Split) and *štokavian* within the area from Austrian Military Border/*Vojna Krajina* (present-day in Croatia) in the north-west to the Šara Mountain (on the border between Kosovo and Macedonia) in the south-east. The *štokavian* dialect (spoken in Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia, Herzegovina and biggest part of present-day Croatia) is divided into three sub-dialects (*ekavian*, *ijekavian*, *ikavian*) according to the pronunciation of the original Slavic vowel represented by the letter *jat*.⁸

J. Drašković's manuscript, anyway, became not only an extensive program of the *Illyrian Movement*, but also and a political program of the Croatian people.⁹ His proposal upon creation of the *Greater Illyria* (i.e. a Greater or united "Croatia" composed by Croatia proper, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Austrian Military Border, Dalmatian city of Rijeka, Dalmatia, Slavonia, Montenegro and Slovenia) on the bases of Croataian state rights (*iura municipalia*) became an official program of the *Illyrian Move-*

7 D. Pavličević. *Povijest Hrvatske. Drugo, izmijenjeno i prošireno izdanje*. – Zagreb, 2000, 247.

8 V. Dedijer. *History of Yugoslavia*. – New York, 1975, p. 103; B. Jelavich. *History of the Balkans: Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*. – Cambridge, 1983, 304–308.

9 J. Šidak and co-authors. *Hrvatski narodni preporod – Ilirski pokret*. – Zagreb, 1990, 210.

ment. Simultaneously, Drašković supported I. Derkos' idea of creation of the common literal language of the Croats, but differently from Derkos count Drašković proposed only *štokavian* dialect (spoken at that time by all Serbs and only minority of Croats)¹⁰ as the standardized language of Croatian literature. This language he called as *Illyrian* and accepted at the same time the so-called "Illyrian theory" upon Croatian ethnolinguistic origin according to the old Croatian tradition especially from Dalmatian shore.

This theory traced back among the Croats to the humanist from Dalmatian city of Šibenik, Juraj Šižgorić, who wrote a short history of his native city around 1477 (*De situ Illyriae et civitate Sibenici*). In this work the author undoubtedly stressed that ancient Balkan *Illyrians* (ab-origines of western and central regions of the peninsula) have been a real ancestors of the modern Croats. According to his (wrong) opinion, St. Jerome, a native from Dalmatia, was a Croat who invented the first Slavic alphabet – *Glagolitic* one. A half a century later this Šižgorić's idea of Illyrian origin of Croats and all Slavs (Southern, Eastern and Western) was further developed by Dominican friar from Dalmatian island of Hvar – Vinko Pribojević in his public lecture *De origine successibusque Slavorum* given in the city of Hvar in 1525 and published in Venice in 1532. For him, Greek philosopher Aristotel, Macedonian King Alexander the Great, Roman Emperors Diocletian and Constantine the Great, St. Jerome, SS. Constantine (Cyril) and Methodius were Illyrians, i.e. Slavs. Also Pribojević was the first to claim that three brothers, Czech, Lech, and Rus, were expelled from the Balkans and consequently became the founders of Bohemia and Czechs, Poland and Poles and Russia and Russians (in fact *Rus'*). Likewise Pribojević, Mauro Orbini, a Benedictine abbot from Dubrovnik who wrote an extensive history of Serbia (and in the lesser extend of Croatia and Bulgaria) under the title *Il regno degli Slavi* (published in Pesaro in 1601), saw the Slavs everywhere¹¹ and the Illyrians as "the noble Slavic race". For him, the soldiers of Alexander the Great were Slavs who spoke "the same language which is today spoken by the inhabitants of Macedonia" (the *Muscovite Annals* expressly state that the Rus' are of the same race as were the ancient Macedonians). Finally, Orbini advocated the idea that the first Slavic alphabet, popularly called *Bukvica*, i.e. *Glagolitic* script (for him second Slavic script – *Cyrillic* was invented by the saintly brothers from Salonika – Cyril and Methodius), was invented by St. Jerome, who was a Slav, "since he was

10 Б. Брборић. *О језичком расколу. Социолингвистички огледи I*. – Београд, 2000, 324; Б. Брборић. *С језика на језик. Социолингвистички огледи II*. – Београд, 2001, 321–326.

11 А. Schmaus. "Vincentius Priboevius", *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*. – 1953, 254.

born in Dalmatia”.¹² M. Orbini repeated the old Dalmatian theory that the three Balkan Slavic tribes, led by the brothers Czech, Lech and Rus’, moved northward and established the three new Slavic states – Bohemia (first ruled by Czech), Poland (first ruled by Lech) and Russia (first ruled by Rus’). For Orbini, modern Czechs, Poles and Russians likewise all South Slavs originated in the Balkan Illyrians. However, a century later, Croat Pavao Ritter Vitezović (of German origin) went one step further: he claimed in 1700 and 1701 that all Slavs had a common progenitors in ancient Illyrians who were in fact the ethnolinguistic Croats.¹³ Vitezović’s main programmatic idea upon unification of “all Croatia” (*totius Croatia*) became a century later an official political program of the leaders of Croatian *Illyrian Movement*.¹⁴

It is important to notice that St. Jerome (Hieronymus) from Dalmatia was as well appropriated as a Slav and later on exclusively as a Croat. Consequently, the Latin-language Bible, which was written by St. Jerome and used by all Catholic Slavs in Europe was recognized by Dalmatian Catholics as achievement of the Slavic Croat. Moreover, St. Jerome was unjustifiably proclaimed as an inventor of the oldest Slavic alphabet – the *Glagolitic* one, named as “Jerome’s script” and subsequently this font became appropriated by Croats as their own original and national characters that became used and by other Slavonic peoples.

Thus, this first written Slavic language (named by the scholars as *Old Church Slavonic*), and devised in fact by Constantine (Cyril) and Methodius in the middle of the 9th century¹⁵, became appropriated by Croats in the Middle Ages and later on as a Croatian national and indigenous literal language. This belief founded an ideological doctrine in the later centuries for the claiming that all people (i.e. Slavs,) who used this language virtually belonged to Croatian ethnic community. In the late medieval period following a popular tradition about him, St. Jerome has been assumed as a spiritual progenitor of Croatian people who translated Hebrew and Greek holy writings (*sacre scripture*) to

12 M. Orbini. *Kraljevstvo Slovena*. – Beograd, 1968, CXLII–CXLIX.

13 Eq. Pavlus Ritter [Pavao Ritter Vitezović]. *Croatia rediviva; regnante Leopoldo Magno Caesare*. – Zagreb, 1700. About historical development of Slavic idea among the Croatian Baroque writers see: J. Šidak. „Počeci političke misli u Hrvata – J. Križanić i P. Ritter Vitezović”, *Naše teme*, № 16. – 1972; T. Eekman, A. Kadić (eds.). *Juraj Križanić (1618–1683): Russophile and Ecumenic Visionary*. – The Hague, 1976.

14 Lj. Gaj. „Horvatov Szloga y Zjedinenje”, *Danicza Horvatska, Slavonska y Dalmatinzka*. – January 7th, 1835.

15 J. Fine. *The Early Medieval Balkans. A Critical Survey from the Sixth to the Late Twelfth Century*. – Ann Arbor, 1994, 302.

both Latin and Slavonic languages.¹⁶ Even and Roman Catholic Church accepted this popular opinion that St. Jerome was a founder of Slavonic literacy.¹⁷

I. Derkos and J. Drašković promoted *štokavian* dialect of Renaissance and Baroque literature of Republic of Dubrovnik (Ragusium/Ragusa) as Croatian one—an act which created among the Croats a national conscience upon Ragusan cultural heritage as solely a Croatian one. However, Serbian philologist Branislav Brborić (and many others) is in opinion that *štokavian* literature of Dubrovnik belongs to Serbian cultural heritage as this dialect is national Serbian language, but not Croatian one. According to his research, there are many Latin-language documents in the *Archives of Dubrovnik* in which the language of the people of Dubrovnik (*štokavian* dialect of *ijekavian* speech) is named as *lingua serviana*, but there is no one document in which this language is named as *lingua croata*.¹⁸ B. Brborić claims further that for centuries citizens of Dubrovnik had “some” Serbian national consciousness and perception that their spoken language is Serbian. Among Ragusan inhabitants there was no Croatian ethnolinguistic consciousness before the *Illyrian Movement* and before Dubrovnik became included into Catho-

16 V. Štefanić. „Tisuću i sto godina od moravske misije”, *Slovo*, № XIII. – 1963, 34–36.

17 However, many of ancient and early mediaeval historical sources are using the term *Illyrians* as a synonym for modern ethnic-name of the *Serbs* and claiming at the same time St. Jerome from Dalmatia was in fact of a Serb origin. There is a visible tendency, based on the sources and tradition, among contemporary Serbian historians and ethnologists to claim that Serbs are the oldest Balkan, i.e. indigenous, people, and even more that the original name for all Slavs has been – the *Serbli*. See for instance: О. Луковић-Пјановић. *Срби...народ најстарији*. I-III. – Београд, 1994; Б. Влајић-Земљанички. *Срби староседеоци Балкана и Паноније у војним и цивилним догађајима са Римљанима и Хеленима од I до X века*. – Београд, 1999; Д. Јевђевић. *Од Индије до Србије. Прастари почеци српске историје. Хиљаде година сеобе српског народа кроз Азију и Европу према списима и цитатима највећих светских историчара*. – Београд, 2000 (reprint from 1961, Rome); М. Јовић. *Срби пре Срба*. – Краљево, 2002; Ј. Бајић. *Блажени Јероним, Солинска црква и Србо-Далмати*. – Шабац, 2003.

18 Yugoslav linguist Ranko Bugarski is in opinion that in sociolinguistic sense the dialects are not a separate languages, but in linguistic sense they are. According to him, a “dialect” is a “language” which lost political battle, while “language” is a “dialect” which won political battle. In the other words, it is only political decision if one “dialect” will be proclaimed as a “language”. For him, in fact the most important criteria which makes a difference between the “language” and the “dialect” is a *comprehensibility* (R. Bugarski. *Uvod u opštu lingvistiku*. – Beograd, 1996, 238–239). Serbian philologist and academic Ljubomir Stojanović (1860–1929) was in opinion that around 20% of South Slavic population can not be exactly classified to one linguistic-national group according to their spoken language because they are speaking “mixture dialects” of two languages. Thus, there are “transitional zones” between South Slavic languages (Љ. Стојановић. *Приступна академска беседа*. – Београд, 11-I-1896).

lic Habsburg Monarchy (from 1815).¹⁹ In other words, from the time of *Illyrian Movement* the process of Croatization of Dubrovnik, backed by the Habsburg authority, started. Consequently, all Catholic Serbs from Dubrovnik became national Croats whose language was proclaimed by the leaders of the *Illyrian Movement* as *Croatian language* of *štokavian dialect* and *ijekavian* speech.²⁰ Therefore, after 1830 Croatian national workers considered the people from Dubrovnik exclusively as Croats and Ragusan history and culture as Croat ones. Consequently, an anthology of *Stari pisci hrvatski (Old Croatian Writers)* where many Ragusan writers were published among others was printed in Zagreb from 1869 onwards. The edition of this collection was criticized by the Serbs as Croatian attempt to appropriate Serbian cultural heritage of Dubrovnik with the final political aim to include the territory of Dubrovnik, which never was a part of Croatia, into united greater Croatia.

Before Dubrovnik with Southern Dalmatia was included into Croatia for the first time in history due to Communist rearrangement of the inner-territorial structure of Yugoslavia by her federalisation two of the most fervent defenders of Serbian character of Dubrovnik against the claims of the leaders of the *Illyrian Movement* that this city-state belongs to the Croatian history and cultural heritage were Catholic Serb and famous philologist from Dubrovnik–Milan Rešetar (1860–1942) and Serbian Orthodox priest–Dimitrije Ruvarac (1842–1931).

M. Rešetar concluded, after the extensive research in the *Archives of Dubrovnik* and as a person who very well knew Ragusan literature, that: a) the people from Dubrovnik were and are the ethnic Serbs; b) their spoken and literal language is Serbian because they were speaking and mainly writing in *štokavian* dialect;²¹ c) the Dubrovnik citizens, however, did not feel themselves as the Serbs since for them the ethnic name *Serbian* was relating only to those who lived in Serbian state: as Dubrovnik never was included into Serbia for that reason Ragusan people did not call

19 Б. Брборић. *С језика на језик. Социолингвистички огледи II*. – Београд, 2001, 43–44, 68.

20 П. Милосављевић. *Срби и њихов језик*. – Приштина, 1997, 13–41, 412–426, 466–476.

21 The spoken language of the people from Dubrovnik was always *štokavian* dialect, but their literature was written in four languages: *Latin, Italian, čakavian* dialect, and *štokavian* dialect. The last two were “domestic languages”. *Čakavian* dialect was used till mid-15th century as the most fashionable literal language in the whole Dalmatia besides the Italian and Latin. However, from the mid-15th century the writers from Dubrovnik mainly wrote in *štokavian* dialect that became the language in which the most glorious Ragusan literature (the period of Baroque) was written. According to the most critics of the Slavic literature, probably, the *štokavian* Baroque literature of Dubrovnik gave the best examples of the Slavic Baroque literature.

themselves as Serbians; d) they, however, did not call themselves as Croats too; e) usually Ragusan people understood themselves as *Dubrovčani*, i.e. as the citizens of the Republic of Dubrovnik (citizenship-identity); f) the Serbs and Croats do not speak the same (*Serbo-Croatian/Croatian or Serbian*) language; g) Serbs and Croats are two different peoples.²²

D. Ruvarac claimed that after Slavic migrations to the Balkans at the end of the 6th century the Latin municipality (city) of *Ragusium* became Serbianized and as a consequence of this process the city changed its name into Slavic-Serbian–*Dubrovnik* (Slavic *dubrava*=oak-forest). He refuted as well Croatian claims advocated by the leaders of the *Illyrian Movement* that all inhabitants of Croatia, Dalmatia, Dubrovnik and Slavonia can be only ethnolinguistic Croats regardless on their religion. However, Ruvarac was in opinion that *štokavian* dialect is only Serbian national language which was spoken in Serbia, Dubrovnik, Slavonia, Dalmatia, Montenegro and part of Croatia (the Military Border) by Orthodox, Catholic and Muslim believers. Especially he disproved Croatian idea that Slavonia (the region between the rivers of Sava and Drava, today included into Republic of Croatia) is a part of Croatia because historically it was all the time a separate province with separate provincial name whose inhabitants were speaking *Slavonian* language, as it is recorded in many historical documents. However, according to Ruvarac, the leaders of *Illyrian Movement* proclaimed that *Croatian* people and language (i.e. *kajkavian* dialect, which was spoken in north-western Croatia only by the Catholics) and *Slavonian* people and language (i.e. *štokavian* dialect, which was spoken in Slavonia by both the Orthodox and Catholics) as one *Croato-Slavonian* people and language, which was very soon started to be called by Croatian philologists as only *Croatian* people and language. Thus, *Slavonians* became *Croats* and *Slavonian* language became *Croatian* language. For Ruvarac, the same philologi-

22 М. Решетар. *Антологија дубровачке лирике*. – Београд, 1894; М. Решетар. „Најстарији дубровачки говор”, *Годишњак Српске краљевске академије*, № 50. – Београд, 1940; М. Rešetar. “Die Ragusanischen Urkunden des XIII–XV. Jahrhunderts”, *Archiv für slawische Philologie*, XVI Jahrgang. – Wien, 1891; М. Rešetar. “Die Čakavština un deren einstige und jetzige Grenzen”, *Archiv für slawische Philologie*, XVI Jahrgang. – Wien, 1891. However, during the time of Kingdom of Yugoslavia (1918–1941) Rešetar corrected his stand upon Serbs and Croats and their languages. Namely, under the strong influence of the official policy of “the integral Yugoslavism” Rešetar became an advocate of the idea that Serbs and Croats were and are speaking the same language, and therefore they belong to the same people who just has two names (see: В. Новак. *Антологија југословенске мисли и народног јединства*. – Београд, 1930). Nevertheless, Rešetar two years before died returned to his original idea that Serbs and Croats are two different peoples who spoke two different languages and that Ragusan literal heritage is definitely Serbian, but not Croatian.

cal strategy was implied by the Croatian *Illyrians* in the case of *Ragusan* people and their *our* or *Slavic* language (how did they usually call their language). The final consequences of such politics by the leaders of *Illyrian Movement* was Croatization of Slavonia and Southern Dalmatia with Dubrovnik. D. Ruvarac's stands can be summarized into three points: a) Serbs are all South Slavs whose mother tongue is *štokavian* dialect regardless on their religion; b) **Serbian and Croatian languages**, regardless on the fact that they are similar, are two separate languages; 3) Croats are speaking *kajkavian* and *čakavian* "languages" (i.e. dialects), but not *štokavian* one.²³

According to the leading Slavic philologists from the end of the 18th century and the 19th century (Serb Dositej Obradović 1738–1811; Czech Pavel Josef Šafařík 1795–1861; Czech Josef Dobrovský 1753–1829; Slovene Jernej Kopitar 1780–1844; and Slovene Franc Miklošič 1813–1891), genuine Croatian national language was only *čakavian*, while *kajkavian* was originally only Slovenian national language, but in the course of time kajkavian speakers who lived in Croatia accepted Croatian national feeling.²⁴ All opponents of political ideology and national program of the *Illyrian Movement* (Serbs and Slovenes), concluded that the thesis of the *Illyrian Movement* that Croats are speaking three "languages" (i.e. *kajkavian*, *čakavian* and *štokavian*) should be refuted as wrong one because the leading principle in the whole Europe from the end of the 18th century onwards was that one nation can speak only one language, but not several of them.²⁵

Undoubtedly, I. Derkos' and J. Drašković's works and patriotism framed the basic idea of political requirement by the leaders of the *Illyrian Movement*—political, linguistic and cultural unification of all "Croatian" lands. However, this idea was inspired by the work of Croatian nobleman and professional writer of German origin, Pavao Ritter Vitezović (1652–1713) who was the first among the Croats who advocated the con-

23 Д. Руvaraц. *Ево, шта сте нам криви!* – Земун, 1895. This book is important because the author is dealing with ethnolinguistic division between the Serbs and Croats.

24 Д. Обрадовић. „Писмо Харалампију”, *Живот и прикљученија*. – Нови Сад, 1783; P. J. Šafařík. *Slowansky narodopis*. – Praha, 1842; P. J. Šafařík. *Serbische Lesekörner*. – Pest, 1833; P. J. Šafařík. *Geschichte der slawischen Sprache und Literatur nach allen Mundarten*. – Buda, 1826; J. Dobrovský. *Geschichte der böhmische Sprache und Literatur*. – Wien, 1792/1818; J. Kopitar. *Serbica*. – Beograd, 1984 (reprinted selected works); J. Kopitar. „Patriotske fantazije jednog Slovena”, *Vaterländische Blätter*. – 1810; F. Miklošič. „Serbisch und chorvatisch”, *Vergleichende Gramatik der slawischen Sprachen*. – Wien, 1852/1879.

25 For instance: А. Петровић. „Шта смо ми, шта ћемо бити, како ћемо се звати?”, *Српски народни лист*, № 24, 25, 26. – 1839; Ђ. Николајевић. *Српски споменици*. – Београд, 1840.

cept of political unification of historical and ethnolinguistic *Croatia* and promoted the idea that ancient Balkan people–*Illyrians*, who lived in the Central and Western parts of the Peninsula at the time of ancient Greeks and Romans, were the real ancestors of modern Croats and all Slavs. In the other words, he championed the idea that Croats are descendents of ancient Balkan *Illyrians* and that all Slavs originated in Croats. His formula was: Illyrian = Croat = Slav.

P. R. Vitezović divided the whole world into six ethnolinguistic, historical, cultural and geographical areas, civilizations and cultures: I) **Germania**, which embraced the whole German-speaking world: 1. Holy Roman Empire of German Nation, headed by Austria, 2. Kingdom of Sweden (Sweden, Norway, Finland), 3. Denmark, 4. East Prussia, 5. Curonian Isthmus (Kurdiř neria) with Curonian Bay or Courish Lagoon (Kurdiř Marios), 6. Memel (Klaipėda), and 7. *Angliae regnum* (Scotland, England, Wales, and Ireland). II) **Italia cum parte Graeciae** (Italy with the part of Greece) referred to the 1. Apenninian Peninsula, 2. Corsica, 3. Sardinia, 4. Sicily, 5. Attica, 6. Peloponnesus (Morea), 7. the main number of Aegean and Ionian islands, 8. Malta, and 9. Crete. III) **Illyricum**, that was 1. almost the whole Balkans (except Attica and Peloponnesus with the adjoining islands), 2. Wallachia (Dacia and Cumania), 3. Transylvania, and 4. Hungary. IV) **Hispania**, which was composed by 1. Spain and Portugal, 2. their European possessions, and 3. their overseas colonies in Africa, Asia, Latin America with Florida and California. V) **Sarmatia**, that was 1. the territory of Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (the Republic of Two Nations), 2. Moldavia, and 3. Muscovy (i.e. the Russian Empire). Finally, VI) **Gallia**, that was France.²⁶

The real ideological source for such a division of the whole world was the popular Slavic idea that decisively influenced Vitezović, who recognized that all Slavs belonged to a single ethnolinguistic community (having the same ethnolinguistic origin). Nevertheless, traditional idea of Pan-Slavism was metamorphosed by him eleven years later into the idea of Pan-Croatianism and a Greater Croatia. In fact, Vitezović claimed that all Slavs are Illyrians who were autochthonous inhabitants of Illyricum. For him it was clear that ancient Illyrians have been modern Croats and ancestors of all Slavs. This ideology of Croatian-Slavic ethnogenesis Vitezović developed in his work *Croatia rediviva...* (in 1700) that was an outline of more ambitious general history of the Croats and Croatia, i.e. entire Slavic population. In this work Vitezović divided a total territory

26 P. E. Ritter. *Anagrammaton, sive Laurus auxiliatoribus Ungariae liber secundus*. – Vienna, 1689, 69–117.

of, according to his opinion, ethnic-historical-linguistic Croatia into two parts: I) **Croatia Septemtrionalis** (*Northern Croatia*), and II) **Croatia Meridionalis** (*Southern Croatia*). The boundary between them was Danube River. Northern Croatia encompassed the entire territories of 1. Bohemia, 2. Moravia, 3. Lusatia (Łužica or Łużyca in Eastern Saxony and Southern Brandenburg), 4. Hungary, 5. Transylvania, 6. Wallachia, 7. Muscovy, and 8. Poland with Lithuania.²⁷ The people who were living in Northern Croatia were divided into two groups: 1. Northwestern Croats, called as Venedicos (*Wends*), and 2. Northeastern Croats, named as Sarmaticos (*Sarmatians*). The *Wends* consisted of Czechs, Moravians, and Sorbs (Sorabi who lived in Lusatia), whereas the *Sarmatians* were living in Muscovy, Lithuania and Poland,²⁸ i.e., were Rus', Lithuanians and Poles.

Vitezović found that ancestors of all Northern Croats – *Wends* and *Sarmatians* – have been the **White Croats** (*Belohrobatoi* from the Byzantine historical sources) who lived in the early Middle Ages around the upper Dnester River and upper Vistula River, i.e., Galicia and Little Poland. Traditional name from the sources for White Croatia was a *Greater Croatia* or an *Ancient Croatia*. In the time of Vitezović's writing of *Croatia rediviva*...this territory was integral part of the Republic of Two Nations (**Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth**).

Vitezović's Southern Croatia, or Illyricum (the Balkans), was subdivided into two parts: *Croatia Alba* (White Croatia), and *Croatia Rubea* (Red Croatia). **Croatia Alba** was composed by *Croatia Maritima* (central and maritime Montenegro, Dalmatia and Eastern Istria), *Croatia Mediterranea* (Croatia proper and Bosnia-Herzegovina), *Crotia Alpensis* (Slovenia and Western Istria) and *Croatia Interamnina* (Slavonia with part of Pannonia). **Croatia Rubea** consisted of 1. Serbia, 2. north-eastern Montenegro, 3. Bulgaria, 4. Macedonia, 5. Epirus, 6. Albania, 7. Thessaly, and 8. *Odrysia* (Thrace).²⁹ There have been Vitezović's frontiers of "*limites totius Croatiae*" ("all Croatia") settled by ethnolinguistic Croats.³⁰ However, Vitezović recognized that his **Greater Croatia and Pan-Croatian** national identity was not unified in whole. In the other words, he acknowledged differences in borders, names, emblems, and customs: "*cum*

27 P. Ritter. *Croatia rediviva: Regnante Leopoldo Magno Caesare*. – Zagreb, 1700, 10.

28 P. Ritter. *Croatia rediviva: Regnante Leopoldo Magno Caesare*. – Zagreb, 1700, 10.

29 P. Ritter. *Croatia rediviva: Regnante Leopoldo Magno Caesare*. – Zagreb, 1700, 32.

30 P. R. Vitezović. *Mappa Generalis Regni Croatiae Totius. Limitibus suis Antiquis, videlicet, a Ludovici, Regis Hungariae, Diplomatus, comprobatis, determinati*, 1:550 000 (drawing in color), 69,4 x 46,4 cm. – Croatian State Archives, Cartographic Collection, D I. – Zagreb, 1699.

propriis tamen singularum limitibus etymo, Insignibus, rebusque ac magis memorabilibus populi moribus”³¹ After all, he believed that these distinctions were of less importance than the common Croatian nationhood of all of these peoples and lands. His apotheosis of the common Croat name especially for all South Slavs (Illyrians) with regional and historic differences was expressed in Vitezović’s heraldic manual *Stemmatographia...* where he presented all Croatian historical and ethnolinguistic lands in the South East Europe, like Serbia, Bulgaria, Romania, etc.³²

31 P. Ritter. *Croatia rediviva: Regnante Leopoldo Magno Caesare*. – Zagreb, 1700, 32; P. Ritter. *Stemmatographia, sive Armorum Illyricorum delineatio, descriptio et restitutio*. – Vienna, 1701.

32 P. Ritter. *Croatia rediviva: Regnante Leopoldo Magno Caesare*. – Zagreb, 1700, 32; P. Ritter. *Stemmatographia, sive Armorum Illyricorum delineatio, descriptio et restitutio*. – Vienna, 1701; I. Banac. “The Insignia of Identity: Heraldry and the Growth of National Ideologies Among the South Slavs”, *Ethnic Studies*, vol. 10. – 1993, 223–227.