

Whose Love of Which Country?

Studies in the History of Political Thought

Edited by

Terence Ball, Arizona State University
Jörn Leonhard, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg
Wyger Velema, University of Amsterdam

Advisory Board

Janet Coleman, London School of Economics
and Political Science, UK
Vittor Ivo Comparato, University of Perugia, Italy
Jacques Guilhaumou, CNRS, France
John Marshall, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA
Markku Peltonen, University of Helsinki, Finland

VOLUME 3

Whose Love of Which Country?

Composite States, National Histories and Patriotic
Discourses in Early Modern East Central Europe

Edited by

Balázs Trencsényi
Márton Zászkaliczky



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2010

On the cover: "The Allegory of Regnum Marianum with the coats of arms of Hungary and Transylvania". Courtesy of the Hungarian National Gallery Budapest, No. 86.15M.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Trencsényi, Balázs, 1973–

Whose love of which country? : composite states, national histories and patriotic discourses in early modern East Central Europe / by Balazs Trencsenyi, Marton Zaszkaliczky.

p. cm. — (Studies in the history of political thought)

Includes index.

ISBN 978-90-04-18262-2 (hardback : alk. paper) 1. Nationalism—Europe, Eastern—Historiography. 2. Nationalism—Europe, Eastern—History. 3. Patriotism—Europe, Eastern—Historiography. 4. Patriotism—Europe, Eastern—History. 5. Nationalism—Europe, Central—Historiography. 6. Nationalism—Europe, Central—History. 7. Patriotism—Europe, Central—Historiography. 8. Patriotism—Europe, Central—History. 9. Europe, Eastern—Historiography. 10. Europe, Central—Historiography. I. Zászkaliczky, Márton. II. Title. III. Series.

DJK32.T74 2010

943.7'0232—dc22

2009053520

ISSN 1873-6548

ISBN 978 9004 18262 2

Copyright 2010 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishing,
IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Brill has made all reasonable efforts to trace all right holders to any copyrighted material used in this work. In cases where these efforts have not been successful the publisher welcomes communications from copyright holders, so that the appropriate acknowledgements can be made in future editions, and to settle other permission matters.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Towards an intellectual history of patriotism in East Central Europe in the early modern period	1
<i>Balázs Trencsényi and Márton Zászkaliczky</i>	

PART I

HUMANIST VISIONS OF THE PATRIA

Chapter One The reception of Erasmianism in Hungary and the contexts of the Erasmian program: The “cultural patriotism” of Benedek Komjáti	75
<i>Pál Ács</i>	
Chapter Two Constructing the Wallach “other” in the late Renaissance	91
<i>Gábor Almási</i>	
Chapter Three Humanist ethics and urban patriotism in Upper Hungary in the early sixteenth century (Valentin Eck’s <i>De reipublicae administratione</i>)	131
<i>Farkas Gábor Kiss</i>	
Chapter Four Civic and ethnic discourses of identity in a city-state context: The case of Renaissance Ragusa	149
<i>Lovro Kunčević</i>	
Chapter Five Strategies of distinction in the work of Vinko Pribojević	177
<i>Domagoj Madunić</i>	
Chapter Six Indetermi-Nation: Narrative identity and symbolic politics in early modern Illyrism	203
<i>Zrinka Blažević</i>	
Chapter Seven Nation, patria and the aesthetics of existence: Late humanist national discourse and its rewriting by the modern Czech nationalist movement	225
<i>Lucie Storchová</i>	

Chapter Eight Citizen, fatherland and patriotism in the political discourse of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth	255
<i>Anna Grzeskowiak-Krwawicz</i>	

PART II

THE POLITICS OF THE ESTATES AND THE LOVE OF FATHERLAND

Chapter Nine Political humanism and the corporate theory of state: Nation, patria and virtue in Hungarian political thought of the sixteenth century	285
<i>Benedek Varga</i>	
Chapter Ten The Hungarian roots of a Bohemian humanist: Johann Jessenius a Jessen and early modern national identity	315
<i>Kees Teszelszky</i>	
Chapter Eleven Piety and Industry: Variations on patriotism in seventeenth-century Hungarian political thought	333
<i>Hanna Orsolya Vincze</i>	
Chapter Twelve Illyria or what you will: Luigi Ferdinando Marsigli's and Pavao Ritter Vitezović's "mapping" of the borderlands recaptured from the Ottomans	351
<i>Sándor Bene</i>	
Chapter Thirteen <i>Patres Patriae</i> or <i>Proditores Patriae</i> ? Legitimizing and de-legitimizing the authority of the provincial estates in seventeenth-century Bohemia	405
<i>Petr Maťa</i>	
Chapter Fourteen Forms of patriotism in the early modern Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth	443
<i>Stanisław Roszak</i>	
Chapter Fifteen Two patriotisms? Opinions of townsmen and soldiers on duty to the fatherland in seventeenth-century Poland	461
<i>Urszula Augustyniak</i>	

PART III

POLITICAL THEOLOGY AND DISCOURSES OF IDENTITY

- Chapter Sixteen Patriotism and elect nationhood in early modern Hungarian political discourse 499
Balázs Trencsényi
- Chapter Seventeen The homiletics of political discourse: Martyrology as a (re)invented tradition in the paradigm of early modern Hungarian patriotism 545
Zsombor Tóth
- Chapter Eighteen Defending the Catholic enterprise: National sentiment, ethnic tensions, and the Jesuit mission in seventeenth-century Hungary 569
Regina Pörtner
- Chapter Nineteen Patria Lost and Chosen People: The case of the seventeenth-century Bohemian Protestant exiles 587
Vladimír Urbánek
- Chapter Twenty Patriotic and “proto-national” motives in late medieval and early modern Bulgarian literature: The contexts of Paisij Hilendarski 611
Alexandar Nikolov

PART IV

ENLIGHTENMENT MODALITIES OF PATRIOTISM

- Chapter Twenty-One Modalities of enlightened monarchical patriotism in the mid-eighteenth century Habsburg Monarchy 631
Teodora Shek Brnardić
- Chapter Twenty-Two Patriotic scholarship: The adaptation of state sciences in late eighteenth-century Transylvania 663
Borbála Zsuzsanna Török
- Chapter Twenty-Three Reflections on patriotism in Polish literature in the second half of the eighteenth century 689
Teresa Kostkiewiczowa

Chapter Twenty-Four	Republican and monarchical patriotism in Polish political thought during the Enlightenment	711
	<i>Arkadiusz Michał Stasiak</i>	
Chapter Twenty-Five	Das landespatriotische Programm der galizischen Stände um 1790: Von der polnischen Tradition zur Etablierung eines neuen Landespatriotismus	735
	<i>Miloš Řezník</i>	
Afterword		759
	<i>R.J.W. Evans</i>	
List of Contributors		769
Index		779

TOWARDS AN INTELLECTUAL HISTORY OF PATRIOTISM IN EAST CENTRAL EUROPE IN THE EARLY MODERN PERIOD

Balázs Trencsényi and Márton Zászkaliczky

The present volume seeks to reconsider the heritage of early modern discourses of patriotism and national allegiance in East Central Europe. In the last thirty years, the question of early modern collective identities has become a crucial topic of research in the history of political ideas, breaking through the conflict between “primordialists” and “social constructivists” and leading to more text- and context-sensitive approaches.¹ While the classical interpretations of nationalism usually started from the presumption that it was only meaningful to talk about this phenomenon from the late-eighteenth or early-nineteenth century,² an increasing number of authors tried to adapt the basic categories of “Nationalism Studies” to the pre-modern context and interpreted patriotic discourses as in some sense national ideologies.³ With some remarkable exceptions,

¹ The pioneering volume is Orest Ranum, ed., *National Consciousness, History and Political Culture in Early Modern Europe* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975). For various strategies of interpretation, see John A. Armstrong, *Nations before Nationalism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982); Colette Beaune, *Naissance de la nation France* (Paris: Gallimard, 1985); Otto Dann, ed., *Nationalismus in vorindustrieller Zeit* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1986); Claus Björn, Alexander Grant and Keith J. Stringer, eds., *Nations, Nationalism and Patriotism in the European Past* (Copenhagen: Academic Press, 1994); Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging a Nation (1707–1837)* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992); David Avrom Bell, “Recent Works on Early Modern French National Identity,” *Journal of Modern History* 58 (1996) 1: 84–113; David J. Baker, *Between Nations* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997); Herfried Münkler, Hans Grünberger and Kathrin Mayer, *Nationenbildung. Die Nationalisierung Europas im Diskurs humanistischer Intellektueller. Italien und Deutschland* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1998); Philip S. Gorski, “The Mosaic Moment: An Early Modernist Critique of Modernist Theories of Nationalism,” *American Journal of Sociology* (2000) 5:1428–68; Caspar Hirschi, *Wettkampf der Nationen: Konstruktionen einer deutschen Ehrgemeinschaft an der Wende vom Mittelalter zur Neuzeit* (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2005).

² See, for instance, Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983); Eric Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

³ Reinhard Stauber, “Nationalismus vor dem Nationalismus? Eine Bestandsaufnahme der Forschung zu ‘Nation’ und ‘Nationalismus’ in der Frühen Neuzeit,” *Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht* 47 (1996): 139–65; Adrian Hastings, *The*

such as David A. Bell⁴ and Colin Kidd,⁵ however, they tended to draw a sharp line in a normative sense between the early modern and the modern phenomena, opposing “good” patriotism to “bad” nationalism.⁶ This counter-position organizes Maurizio Viroli’s argument about the shift from Renaissance patriotism to modern nationalism, triggered by the expansion of territorial (and usually monarchic) statehood at the expense of republican city-states.⁷ We also encounter this line of argument in the literature concerning the “British” framework of political and intellectual history that emerged simultaneously with the destabilization of the British institutional and symbolic-emotional framework.⁸ As the Scottish historian Arthur Williamson argued, patriotism in the early modern period was “reformist,” “dissentient,” and had “internationalist implications,” which made it “largely alien to nineteenth and twentieth century traditionalism and utterly alien to nineteenth and twentieth century nationalisms.”⁹

In attempting to go beyond these normative counter-positions and to make sense of texts from the early modern period which appealed to a “national” focus of loyalty, one has to devise an interpretative framework that is sensitive not only to the structural and discursive continuities with the modern phenomena but also to the breaches of continuity.

Construction of Nationhood: Ethnicity, Religion and Nationalism (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Caspar Hirschi, “Das humanistische Nationskonstrukt vor dem Hintergrund modernistischer Nationalismustheorien,” *Historische Jahrbuch* 122 (2002): 355–96. See also the first part of the volume edited by Linas Eriksonas and Leos Müller, *Statehood Before and Beyond Ethnicity: Minor States in Northern and Eastern Europe, 1600–2000* (Brussels: P.I.E.-Peter Lang, 2005) dealing with early modern nationalism and patriotism.

⁴ David Avrom Bell, *The Cult of the Nation in France: Inventing Nationalism, 1680–1800* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001).

⁵ Colin Kidd, *British Identities Before Nationalism: Ethnicity and Nationhood in the Atlantic World, 1600–1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

⁶ See, for instance, Klaus Garber’s *Imperiled heritage: Tradition, History, and Utopia in Early Modern German Literature* (Studies in European Cultural Transition 5) (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000).

⁷ Maurizio Viroli, *For Love of Country: An Essay on Patriotism and Nationalism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995).

⁸ For this literature see Alexander Grant and Keith J. Stringer, eds., *Uniting the Kingdom? The making of British History* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995); Brendan Bradshaw and John Morrill, eds., *The British Problem, c. 1534–1707: State formation in the Atlantic Archipelago* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1996); Brendan Bradshaw and Peter Roberts, eds., *British Consciousness and Identity: The Making of Britain, 1533–1707* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

⁹ Arthur Williamson, “Patterns of British Identity: ‘Britain’ and its Rivals in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries,” in Glenn Burgess, ed., *The New British History: Founding a Modern State, 1603–1715* (London: I. B. Tauris, 1999), 138–173.

A plausible strategy is to study early modern national ideologies from the perspective of “political languages,” which contain a distinct vocabulary and are marked by certain semantic and syntactical characteristics. However, the relative persistence of the vocabulary should not prevent us from registering the profound changes in the use and interaction of conceptual tools. What is more, excluding references to the “objective” existence of nations does not entail the exclusion of references to “realities” external to the “political language” of nationhood. On the contrary, one of the basic tasks is the contextual reconstruction of discourses referring to national identity. Thus, one has to analyze from a contextual perspective events of political interaction where references to political and ethno-cultural layers of identity are made. What is more, one has to describe and interpret the relationship (conflict, exclusion, and incorporation) of the “patriotic discourse” with other political languages, competing in the public sphere.

While political languages were triggered by their immediate social and political contexts, they very often capitalized on a cross-national circulation of ideas and were formulated as a response to paradigmatic situations of intercultural communication. In contrast, most of the national historiographies retrospectively constructed the “national discourse” of the respective nation as autarchic, or at best reactive to some external aggression. This “monadic” perception can be effectively challenged by introducing alternative models based on comparative research.

The international research project, “The Intellectual History of Patriotism and the Legacy of Composite States in East Central Europe,” brought together scholars from the region to discuss the problem of patriotism in the light of the multiplicity of levels of ethnic, cultural and political allegiances characterizing East Central Europe in early modern times. The aim of our project was to critically reconsider some of the common presumptions concerning patriotism and proto-nationalism and analyze the complex process of the formation, reception and transmission of early modern discourses of collective identity in a regional context. Here we might note that a major project which recently tackled the emergence of patriotism in the Western European context¹⁰ made a conscious but regrettable choice of leaving out

¹⁰ Robert von Friedeburg, ed., *“Patria” und “Patrioten” vor dem Patriotismus. Pflichten, Rechte, Glauben und die Rekonfigurierung europäischer Gemeinwesen im 17. Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag, 2005).

Eastern Europe as a whole, presuming that because they were lacking a sufficient texture of legal and political institutionalization, the political cultures of these peoples did not leave any space for a patriotic modality of the political discourse. Our volume is meant to challenge this reductionist image and draw attention to various intellectual configurations stemming from European research. In keeping with this aim the present volume has a twofold agenda. On the one hand, it seeks to correct the absence of reliable East Central European case studies and in doing so, reconfigure the geographical focus of scholarship on this topic. On the other hand, it introduces themes and methods stemming from Western European academic contexts into the research on collective identities and political discourses in East Central Europe, a field which is still lagging behind in appropriating the more recent interpretative strategies of intellectual history.

*Discourses of collective identity in early modern Europe:
the chief ideological components*

One can discern a number of interrelated intellectual developments of early modern Europe, which all contributed to the reshaping of the discourse of collective identity. In dealing with the modalities of early modern patriotism and “national discourse,” we face the problem of the emergence of the limited this-worldly political community as the ultimate focus of loyalty. The intellectual history of this theme goes back to the Aristotelian conceptualization of the problem at the beginning of his *Politics*. While he was living on the eve of the formation of a world empire, his formulation focused on *polis* as the natural framework of human existence: “a complete association composed of many villages is a state, an association which (a) has reached the limit of every self-sufficiency, so to speak (b) was formed for the sake of living, but (c) exists for the sake of living well.”¹¹

When Augustine attempted the total subversion of the Roman civic culture in view of the Christian community, he conspicuously retained the same conceptual framework—hence his crucial term *civitas dei*, for example. The early-medieval Christian culture used some of the crucial

¹¹ Aristotle, *Politics*, ed. Hippocrates G. Apostle and Lloyd P. Gerson (Grinnell, Iowa: Peripatetic Press, 1986), 18.

terms of the Graeco-Roman civic culture for designating the universal Christian community: *patria* equaled Christendom, while *patria aeterna* referred to the Heaven. The most interesting consequence of the Christian redescription of this civic terminology was obviously the potential of returning to the original connotations. What is more, exactly the new sacral references created an extremely fruitful ambiguity in the usage of these concepts, for these theological overtones persisted even when the original meanings were slowly unearthed. Thus the *topos* of *pro patria mori* ceased to be a matter of the pagan culture and retained a heavy load of Christian symbolism (in the context of martyrdom).

Nevertheless, the medieval conceptualization of community negated the possibility of political/cultural communities as ultimate frameworks of loyalty. The contrast between *civitas dei* and *civitas terrena* placed human beings between the eternity of the invisible and the contingency of the visible. It is quite legitimate then to see the crucial shift in the emergence of a third temporal modality which was neither *tempus* nor *aeternitas*. The emergence of *aevum*, analyzed by Ernst Kantorowicz, made place for the speculation on constitutional mutations (quest for stability in the sublunar world) and ultimately, created the framework for the “rebirth” of antiquity.¹²

i. *Humanist patriotism: translatio studii, chorography, vernacularism and the political community*

Humanist patriotism was a combination of the ancient Graeco-Roman perception of normative political community with certain elements of medieval political theology. It is a process of the recovery of the classical emotional connotations of *patria*, while retaining certain elements from the Christian conception of the sacred sphere. Thus, *caritas* (which is modeled on the love of God) became the legitimizing construction of “just war,” and the *corpus mysticum* (originally referring to the Eucharist, expanded to mean the Church-community) merged with the notion of *persona ficta* taken from the Roman legal tradition.

As *populus* eventually became the *corpus mysticum*, dying *pro patria* became a sacred act. In the case of almost all of the crucial categories

¹² Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies. A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957), 279.

of humanist political speculation, we can trace the same interaction of theological and classical conceptual frameworks, mediated by Aristotelism. In the writing of the mid-fifteenth century Florentine political writer, Matteo Palmieri, for example, we find the identification of *vivere civile* with *vivere beatamente* (i.e. the theological notion of *beatitudo*).¹³ Likewise, his catalogue of virtues (*Prudentia*, *Fortezza*, *Temperantia* and *Iustitia*) is displayed in an ascending order of spiritualization (where *Prudentia* is overwhelmingly secular, but *Iustitia* is essentially divine).

As Myron Gilmore pointed out, the provenience of the humanist notion of *Prudentia* is preponderantly Ciceronian.¹⁴ It means the ability to draw relevant conclusions from the past and to make relevant predictions concerning the future. This temporalized existence is identified as one of the crucial features of humankind. For Palmieri, this is the crucial difference between animals and humans:

*molte certo ne sono che ne sensi, appetiti, & potentie corporee avanzano gli huomini, ma solo in tanto quanto il senso gli tira alle cose presenti, poco, o, nulla sentendo il passato, o, che debba venire. L'huomo ha seco la ragione, con la quale repetendo le cose passate, examina, & iudica le presenti, & le venture prevede.*¹⁵

Man is a social and a “temporal” animal at the same time. *Prudentia* binds these two spheres together while the *res publica* is constituted by collective discussion (*ragunata moltitudine*). This ability of perceiving the past and the future (*ne gli animi nostri essere fermo un desiderio quasi pronosticativo de futuri secoli*)¹⁶ also causes human dissension (as we are prone to pose a normative picture of past or future against the present state of affairs), but we also have the remedy for our conflicts in our capacity of legislating on the basis of our collective experience and discussion.

As much as the root of discord, humanist political theory reinterpreted the chief virtue of human solidarity, *caritas*, in terms of the

¹³ Matteo Palmieri, *Libro della vita civile da Matteo Palmieri Cittadino Fiorentino* (Firenze: Per li heredi di Philippo Giunta, 1529).

¹⁴ See Myron P. Gilmore, “The Renaissance Conception of the Lessons of History,” in *idem*, *Humanists and Jurists. Six studies in the Renaissance* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963), 1–38.

¹⁵ Palmieri, *Libro della vita civile*, 38v.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 62.

temporality of human condition. Thus, Coluccio Salutati described patriotism in terms of a trans-generational solidarity:

*omnibus Florentinis vitam, immo supra vitam, opibus ferroque defendere, nostrisque posteris hanc hereditatem optimam, quam a maioribus nostris accepimus, relinquere, Deo favente, solidam et immaculatam.*¹⁷

This does not mean that the discursive framework of patriotic allegiance was set once and for all in the late-fourteenth century. Although Hans Baron's famous "thesis" has been contested, it is undeniable that the intellectual orientation of the Florentine humanist circle underwent a profound change at the turn of the fifteenth century.¹⁸ While Salutati, the key figure of the older generation, still defended the *libertas* of his city by referring it to a medieval cognitive framework (connecting it with an external locus of loyalty, the *parte guelfa*), in his general convictions he shared some of the ideals he fought against as a defender of Florentine liberty. Thus he deemed monarchy to be the best-theoretical-option of constitutions, and defended *vita contemplativa* against the participatory ethos of classical republicanism.

Leonardo Bruni attempted a revision of this canon and envisioned the city as an autarchic subject of narration and focus of loyalty. He was a native of Arezzo, and chose Florence as his *patria*, thus he was less restrained by the local communal traditions and more prone to speculative constructions of identity. As Hans Baron showed, Bruni turned to the classical description of Athens by Aelius Aristides in order to construct the symbolic geography of Florence. Following his model, Bruni described the city in terms of concentric circles, ranging from the innermost core to the agricultural outskirts and the mountains crowning the basin. The "ontological" message is clear: Florence was an autarchic world, its circular form symbolizes perfection and it contains everything needed for a virtuous human existence.

Baron's interpretation, culminating in the idea of "civic humanism," was subsequently criticized for exaggerating the radicalism of this ideological transformation. Jerrold Seigel, for instance, claimed that the praise of the city by Salutati and Bruni was determined by the

¹⁷ Coluccio Salutati, "Invectiva in Antonium Luschum Vicentinum," in Eugenio Garin, ed., *Prosatori latini del Quattrocento* (Milano-Napoli: Ricciardi, 1952), 14.

¹⁸ See Hans Baron, *Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance: Civic Humanism and Republican Liberty in an Age of Classicism and Tyranny* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1966).

generic conventions of panegyric, rather than by some kind of identification of the city-state as an ultimate moral value. Since humanist culture was mediated by rhetoric, warned Seigel, we should not take these assertions of the desirability of the city-state seriously: “For the humanists, eloquent affirmations of the virtue of a city-state and its citizens were not primarily expressions of personal feelings; they were the performance of a professional task.”¹⁹

Nevertheless, the implications of this discourse were far-reaching, and even if it might be problematic to relate it directly, as Baron did, to the propaganda struggle between Milan and Florence at the turn of the fifteenth century, it still meant a radical transformation in terms of the focus of loyalty. According to James Hankins:

Civic humanism was in origin a discourse that changed the self-understanding of Florentine elites by helping them see their polity, not as congeries of self-ruling juridical corporations set within the larger medieval juridical order, but as a sovereign secular state led by an aristocracy of virtue.²⁰

Taken from a different perspective, one can analyze humanist discourses of patriotism in terms of their use of historical references. As Peter Burke observed, the medieval perception of history was characterized by a duality of explanatory models: one was integrated into the unfolding of the plan of Salvation, while the other was too minutious, characterizing the temporality of concrete communities (the annalistic historiography—commemorating famines, the election of new abbots, memorable eclipses, etc.).²¹ When these communities became the subject of constitutional speculation, entering the dimension of sublunar temporal existence, one can identify the third kind of explanatory model (the middle-range one in Burke’s model), i.e. the birth of the “Renaissance sense of history.”

¹⁹ Jerrold C. Seigel, *Rhetoric and Philosophy in Renaissance Humanism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968), 253. The ‘Baron-thesis’ has been the object of heated debates. Among the most important contributions, see Jerrold C. Seigel, “‘Civic Humanism’ or Ciceronian Rhetoric?” *Past and Present* 34 (1966): 3–48; Alison Brown, *The Medici in Florence: The exercise and language of power* (Florence: Olschki, 1992), especially 334–337. For a recent reconsideration, see James Hankins, *Renaissance civic humanism: reappraisals and reflections* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

²⁰ James Hankins, *Renaissance civic humanism*, 12.

²¹ Peter Burke, *The Renaissance Sense of the Past* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1969), ch. IV.

The humanist concern with the past altered the referential basis of political prudence: history became *exemplum*, our understanding of the present being conditioned by our relationship to the past. Thus, the vocabulary of temporal (secular) existence (*Fortuna*, longevity, necessity, corruption) furnished a compact vocabulary of historical analysis. This obviously contributed to the particularization of historiography, since it irretrievably shifted the focus from supra-political collectivities to secular communities—subject to temporal-constitutional change. The attempt at integrating “national” histories into the archetypal Roman context broke through the lines of the origin-myths of the Middle Ages: instead of tracing the ruling dynasties back to some mythical figure, now the peoples themselves “were put on the map” of classical geography. While medieval historiography was characterized by the spatialization of time, the humanist discourse turned to temporalizing space. The “Barbarian” became localized in a previous “age” of humankind. Consequently, the ideal ruler is praised for bringing his people out of barbarity to civilization, and the duality of “then and now” (*olim/nunc*) becomes the crucial modality of collective existence. A paradigmatic usage of this strategy can be discerned in Aenea Silvio Piccolomini’s use of Tacitus, turning the description of Germania (i.e. the vision of barbarian simplicity) against those German polemicists who blamed the papacy for the destruction of German cultural and material excellence.²²

This contrast of past and present could be turned upside down—underlying not only the story of civilization but also that of corruption. This rhetoric option led to conceptual dualism, arranged around the poles of “programmatically past” and “deplorable present.” The most frequent reproach, and the alleged cause of “corruption,” was “discord,” and the humanist analysis of history could contribute to the proliferation of the “unitary” vision in the midst of political-religious disintegration. The humanist perception of history was particularist enough to prefer the secular *patria* as a legitimate focus of identity over supra-national entities while remaining universalistic enough to be turned against smaller units—like counties, regions, or communities based on religious denomination. Of course, more often than not, the very framework of the *patria* remained a matter of contention, but the discourse identifying

²² See Herfried Münkler and Hans Grünberger, “Nationale Identität im Diskurs der Deutschen Humanisten,” in Helmut Berding, ed., *Nationales Bewußtsein und kollektive Identität. Studien zur Entwicklung des kollektiven Bewußtsein in der Neuzeit 2* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1994), 221–248.

particularism (entities organized on the basis of *de facto* divergent political loyalties) with “corruption,” and appealing to “national” allegiance to overcome current divisions, became a general feature of humanist patriotism.

If we turn to the political texts of the sixteenth century all over Europe, we often encounter such *topoi* as “for our sweet patria and for the liberties of our nation.” Although it is misleading to speak about a specific ideology of “patriotic humanism,”²³ we can definitely identify a number of elements supporting some form of political and cultural particularism in the humanist pool of ideas. We can discern at least four important factors contributing to the “particularization” of the humanist perspective, exported from Italy from the fifteenth century onwards. First, from the late-fourteenth century, *patria* was emphatically identified with the focus of political allegiance in the world of Italian city-states while always retaining a reference to a common culture and a shared set of customs as well. Second, the key feature of the humanist analysis of action, virtue, was held to be conditioned by the context of its exercise. “Civic virtue” must have been aimed at an existing community. Third, the emergence of philology and the customary humanist pride derived from the eloquent praise of one’s provenience created a scholarly interest in vernacular languages. Finally, the key elements of humanist time-perception, and consequently, humanist historiography (circularity, the alternation of state-forms as the “superstructure” of history, the role of *Fortuna*, and the analysis of necessity) exposed two important themes: the concern with the process of corruption and its respective rhetoric (like the binary oppositions of unity/dissension, *concordia/discordia*), and the suggested measure of regeneration, the reduction to *original principles*. All this led to the re-evaluation of “national” traditions, and fed the discourse of historical normativity.

This does not mean, however, that the temporal-political framework of *patria*, emerging from this fusion was unambiguous. The “middle-level” narrative of historicity turned the emphasis from the unitary vision of Christendom and the sub-political community of a monastery or a guild to something in-between, but it was not quite clear what qualified as the subject of this novel narration of history. Is it the *regnum* or the city-state? In Western Europe, in most of the cases the kingdom turned

²³ For the term, see the characteristic interpretation of the ‘nationalistic’ roots of the Reformation by Arthur Geoffrey Dickens, *The German Nation and Martin Luther* (New York: Harper and Row, 1974), Chapters I–II.

out to be the ideal subject of narration, even though Italy, carrying the double (republican/imperial) heritage of Roman history, created a fruitful ambiguity.

Whereas the key figures of the *Trecento* opted for an “Italian” focus of the cultural and political rebirth of classical antiquity, the Florentine humanists defended their polity by extolling the city-state. In contrast, the humanist idiom spoken by the partisans of Milan used exactly this “Italian” discourse to fight the particularism of the city-states, deeming the republican structures (rooted in the medieval communal movements) anarchistic, and pleading for the well-ordered polity, ruled by a generous and talented individual who sponsors arts and warrants peace. In turn, the Florentine authors argued for the participatory allegiance to the *patria*, warranting the citizens’ civil liberty.

One could say that ultimately these two discursive options, the vision of civil peace and *concordia* and that of participation, make up the framework of humanist patriotism. From this perspective we can grasp the radicalism of Machiavelli in taking to the extremes both of these options: his *Prince* secures peace (potentially even in Italian dimensions) by destroying participation, while the *Discorsi* champions an expansive and internally and externally militant participatory community, identifying peace with corruption. But, in most of the cases, the two canons co-existed in the same rhetorical framework, since the conceptual framework they used was usually containing both options. It was exactly this vocabulary (the *topoi* of *vera nobilitas*, exemplarity, *fortuna*, *virtus*, *concordia*, *vita activa/contemplativa*) that became the core of humanist political thought and historiography all over Europe. Significantly, the “traveling” humanism of the first wave was closer to the “discourse of peace,” since the employers of humanist historians were mostly kings.

Thus, the Italian canon of “civic” humanism entered into a complex relationship with the ideological exigencies of the European courts, opening up the possibility of incorporating broader frameworks by using the same *topoi* of self-description. While using the rhetorical strategies of the city-praise (as stipulated in Quintilian III, 7, 26), Flavio Biondo’s writings suggested a vision of the cartographic and geographic unity of Italy.²⁴ The fusion of Ciceronian rhetoric of common good was

²⁴ Ottavio Clavuot, “Flavio Biondos «Italia illustrata»,” in Johannes Helmtrath, Ulrich Muhlack and Gerrit Walther, eds., *Diffusion des Humanismus. Studien zur nationalen Geschichtsschreibung europäischer Humanisten* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2002), 55–76.

coupled with a sharp counter-position of Italians and aliens (Germans). For Biondo, the focus of this “Italian” framework of identity was the Pope, perceived as the agent of unification. Consequently, Biondo also stressed that Italy was flourishing in the time of indigenous militias and after the return of the Pope from Avignon. The historical and political description thus became linked to a territorial entity, which was not possible to equate with a participatory republic. This is the reason that Biondo, rather than Salutati or Bruni, provided a blueprint for further “national histories.”²⁵

In the process of cultural transfer, the new contexts activated new discourses and contributed to the formation of a novel rhetoric of patriotism and a specific normative vision of political community. If one studies the discourse produced by the humanists in England or France, one realizes that the notions of common good, unity, unanimity, and hierarchy became closely interrelated in a new construction, using humanist elements but not exclusively them. This indicates that the question of early-modern European national identities is closely connected to the reception of humanism. One might even claim that “nation” eventually emerged as the most important object of humanist historiography. Along these lines, it is possible to try to answer the classical historiographical riddle: to what extent the frameworks of identity characterizing this historical moment could be considered autochthonous, or were based on imported materials? As a matter of fact, in the first half of the twentieth century, most of the national historiographies were preoccupied with proving that humanism had autochthonous roots in their respective national culture.²⁶ In turn, the more recent scholarly ventures sought exactly to map the mechanisms of transmission and the complex dialogue of local traditions and imported ideological structures. How did the cultural vision of *migratio artium* become a collective identity discourse, how did humanist historiography become a tool of self-description, underpinning

²⁵ Ulrich Muhlack, “Die humanistische Historiographie. Umgang, Bedeutung, Probleme,” in Franz Brendle, Dieter Mertens, Anton Schindling and Walter Ziegler, eds., *Deutsche Landesgeschichtsschreibung im Zeichen des Humanismus* (Contubernium, 56) (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner 2001), 3–18.

²⁶ Helmrath, “Diffusion des Humanismus. Zur Einführung” in Helmrath, Muhlack and Walther, eds., *Diffusion des Humanismus*, 9–29; see also Henry Hornik, “Three Interpretations of the French Renaissance,” in Werner L. Gundersheimer, ed., *French humanism, 1470–1600* (London: Macmillan, 1969), 19–50.

both monarchic legitimacy and the corporate/participatory vision of politics?

The central question is thus aiming at the modalities of this dialogue. Thus, the Italian ideological developments can be read as catalysts of modern collective identities, not only with reference to Italian historiographers, who were “nationalizing other nations”, but also by posing a challenge of *barbaries*, which the local historiographers had to explain away when trying to relate their community to the civilizational achievements.²⁷ While there might be considerable divergences between the conceptions stressing more the continuity of local structures or the “challenge of Italian humanists,” most scholars tend to agree by now that the study of early modern thematizations of collective identity should be based on a flexible model of the interplay of local and imported elements. This is what Johannes Helmrath sought to encapsulate in the concept of “diffusion,” trying to avoid the one-sided implications of “transfer” and “reception.”²⁸

Obviously, in different local contexts very different traditions of humanist patriotism came to emerge, triggered by the different ideological and institutional settings. To set the stage for our analyses of East Central European discourses, the French case was chosen to illustrate the main lines of the development of discourses of collective identity in Western Europe. Interpreters of French humanist patriotism²⁹ usually concentrate on two partially divergent but still interrelated aspects, the ideological developments around the dynastic focus of the monarchy and the broader community of “Frenchness.” Connecting these two aspects, Joachim Ehlers stressed the role of historiography as a central instance of national consciousness. According to him, in

²⁷ Gerrit Walther, “Nation also Exportgut. Mögliche Antworten auf die Frage: Was heißt «Diffusion des Humanismus?»” in Helmrath, Muhlack and Walther, eds., *Diffusion des Humanismus*, 438.

²⁸ Helmrath, “Diffusion des Humanismus,” 19.

²⁹ For the classical interpretations, see Marie-Madeleine Martin, *The Making of France: The Origins and Development of the Idea of National Unity*, translated by Barbara and Robert North (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1951); Miriam Yardeni, *La conscience nationale en France pendant les Guerres de Religion* (Louvain, Paris: Nauwelaerts, 1971). For more recent developments, see Colette Beaune, *Naissance de la nation France* (Paris: Gallimard, 1985); Pierre Fougeyrollas, *La Nation: essor et déclin des sociétés modernes* (Paris: Fayard, 1987); Bell, *The Cult of the Nation in France*; Timothy Hampton, *Literature and Nation in the Sixteenth Century: Inventing Renaissance France* (Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press, 2001); Alain Tallon, *Conscience nationale et sentiment religieux en France au XVI^e siècle* (Paris: P.U.F., 2002).

the eleventh century, the Trojan myth, which until then focused on the dynasty, was gradually extended to the nobility as well, opening up the historical narrative of identity to the entire “community of the realm.”³⁰ In the fourteenth century, all this became coupled with an assertion of national freedom—on the one hand, in ecclesiastical terms against the papal court, on the other hand, in the course of the military conflict with England. The crisis of heredity, which was exemplified by the choice between Philippe Valois and Edward III, son of Isabella of France, and the connection of the alien ruler to the female inheritance, triggered the use of Salic law as the chief marker of the French monarchy. This also contributed to the formation of a new discourse of historical continuity, which in turn catalyzed the politicization of the Trojan legend, creating a normative past linked to “national space” in order to support the hereditary territorial claims. These ideological struggles led to the historicization of liberties, stressing that France was free of oppression from time immemorial (*a tempore ex quo non exstat memoria*), and thus Frenchness, at least symbolically, could be extended to the whole territorial grasp of the monarch.³¹

The input of the Renaissance was to merge the two (dynastic and corporate/territorial) focal points into an even more complex synchronic and diachronic construction. Philippe Desan went so far as to assert that “French Renaissance thinkers created ideas of a French nation; ideas that would outlive the monarchy that had supported them in this period.”³² History remained the central framework of identity-building, being instrumentalized to create a national space and gather the French people around the figures of ancient heroes, fusing a number of myths and legends of medieval provenience—Salic law, Trojan legend, the Gauls, and the Gallic Hercules—into a new construction of identity.³³

The fifteenth century visions of Frenchness were marked by the symbolic struggle with two significant others: a political clash with England and the cultural rivalry with Italy.³⁴ The traditional interpre-

³⁰ Joachim Ehlers, “Kontinuität und Tradition als Grundlage mittelalterlicher Nationsbildung in Frankreich,” in idem, *Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, ed. M. Kintzinger and B. Schneidmüller (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot 1996), 311.

³¹ Martin, *The Making of France*, 100ff.

³² Philippe Desan, “Nationalism and history in France,” *Rinascimento* XXIV, (1984): 262.

³³ Philippe Desan, *Penser l'histoire à la Renaissance* (Caen: Paradigme, 1993), 36ff.

³⁴ Desan, *Penser l'histoire à la Renaissance*, 54.

tations usually tried to link the origins of French humanist patriotism to the challenge of Petrarca as the catalyst of French patriotic resentment. In his classic interpretation, Franco Simone also stressed Petrarca's overall importance in introducing "nationalism" to literature. His assertion of an Italian rebirth of classical antiquity implied the lack of culture in other nations. The famous sentence, "*Oratores et poetae extra Italiam non quaerantur*," implied the negation of the late medieval framework of *translatio studii*.³⁵ The challenge and the ensuing reactions (first by Nicolas de Clamanges), interiorizing Petrarca's argumentation, even though rejecting its implications, devised a new—and genuinely Renaissance—framework of French identity.

More recently, the anti-English struggle has been linked to a certain movement of French pre-humanism, fusing the duty of patriotism with an assertion of French cultural specificity. One can argue, however, that these influences were rather complementary than mutually exclusive. Italian influence was also formative for Jean de Montreuil, one of the earliest champions of the humanist construction of collective identity, both in terms of the way he sought to grasp Frenchness and the way he rejected the Italian claims to superiority.³⁶ Although he used late medieval chronicles as his main source of historical narrative, his construction featured a number of references to Cicero, Sallust, and Orosius, praising the ancient Gauls, and thus the modern French, in the typically humanist way. Montreuil created a kind of "alternative antiquity" ("*prouesse et valliance de voz predecesseurs*," "*valliance des anciens*"), identifying the *Françoiz* with the *Gauloiz*. This vision of the past supported a counter-identification in opposition to the English: "*puis cent ans en ça, iceulx Angloiz aient tué et fait mourir plus de crestiens, que a (toutes) autres nacions n'ont fait*."³⁷

The complex dialogue with Italian constructions of identity can be observed in the works of Jean Lemaire de Belges (1473–c. 1525).³⁸ In

³⁵ Franco Simone, *Il rinascimento francese. Studi e ricerche* (Torino: Società Editrice Internazionale, 1963), 47.

³⁶ Heribert Müller, "Der französische Frühhumanismus um 1400," in Helmrath, Muhlack, and Walther, eds., *Diffusion des Humanismus*, 319–376.

³⁷ Jean de Montreuil, *A toute la Chevalerie* in de Montreuil, *Opera*, 105.

³⁸ Jehan le maire de Belges, *Les illustrations de Gaule et singularitez de Troye* (Lyon: Etienne Baland pour Geoffroy de Marnef à Paris, 1512). For Lemaire's importance, see Walter Stephens, *Giants in Those Days: Folklore, Ancient History and Nationalism* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989); R. E. Asher, *National myths in Renaissance France: Francus, Samothés, and the Druids* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University

some ways, Lemaire also responded to Petrarca's challenge, which identified Latin and Italian in a circular vision, thus leaving no place for other nations to claim a direct relationship with classical antiquity. To avoid this trap, Lemaire sought to rewrite the legend of Troy with the help of the humanist historiographical toolkit, reinserting France into the framework of classical antiquity. He turned to the contemporary historical bestseller, and arguably the most influential hoax of the Renaissance, "edited" by Annus da Viterbo, which established a concordance between the Biblical and Middle-Eastern chronologies and the temporal framework of classical antiquity.

In order to turn the implications of Annus' work into a legitimation of French cultural and political aims, Lemaire had to make important changes. Annus' agenda was outspokenly pro-Italian and pro-papalist, so much so that the first French editions tended to omit his—"genuine"—commentaries, and reprinted only the spurious world chronicle by the imaginary Babylonian and Egyptian high-priests. Nevertheless, there were some ambiguities built into the ideological framework of the text, which made it possible for Lemaire to turn it into a direction not entirely corresponding to the original intentions of its Italian author. Writing with an aim of glorifying his native Viterbo, Annus asserted that his beloved city's origins reached back before the Roman colonization. While he did not mention the origins of Western Catholic monarchies, he displayed an obvious bias towards the Etruscans at the expense of the Roman Empire, describing Noah as the original colonizer of Italy and attributing the rise of Roman civilization to "Hamic corruption." This framework, however, made it possible to re-narrate the *translatio imperii* scheme, turning to Noah's Golden Age (identified with the Saturnine age), while undermining the prestige of the Augustan Golden Age, the traditional legitimation of the Roman Empire.

The cyclical view of history undermined the Italo-centric construction of the renaissance of antiquity—opening up the symbolic space for the rebirth of "alternative antiquities." Interestingly, the "ontological" superiority of the Gauls championed by Lemaire did not imply an unproblematic identification with the actual political framework of France. Serving for some time also in the Burgundian-Habsburg court,

Press, 1993); see also Suzanne Trocmé Sweany, *Estienne Pasquier (1529–1615) et nationalisme littéraire* (Paris: Champion, 1985), 35–38.

he created a possibility of French cultural emancipation from Italian *tutelage*, without transferring wholesale the imperial narrative to the French monarch.

Nevertheless, the followers of Lemaire turned this construction to support the French “state-building” project, fusing the assertion of a more archaic antiquity than the Roman one with the vision of the institutional and cultural peculiarity of the French monarchy, connecting cultural prestige to political power. In debate with Jerome of Pavia, Symphorien Champier extolled the French past as more prestigious than the Italian one, while Gilles Corrozet wrote an *elogium* of Paris based on pseudo-Berosian information. Somewhat later, Guillaume du Bellay’s *Epitomé de l’Antiquité* formulated a program of mapping the peculiarly French historical itinerary, while in the works of Guillaume Postel this turned into the direction of a veritable “national Messianism.”

Alongside with the assertion of a peculiar Franco-Gallic antiquity, the French monarchy became re-narrated in a humanist key, turning the “nation” into a symbolic fusion of cultural, political, and institutional aspects in the works of Claude de Seyssel. Typical for a “transitional” situation, Seyssel’s writings feature a number of highly ambiguous assertions. On the one hand, he started from the question of recovering antiquity, admitting that Latin culture was the reservoir of antique civilization. On the other hand, he stressed the aspect of *mutatio*: once the Italians labeled the French as barbarians, later, however, the French language and customs expanded to Italy, which means that the traditional hierarchy of cultures could be challenged.³⁹

Seyssel connected the “national” framework to the moral and political spheres as the reference to Frenchness became a tool of creating a constitutionalist narrative of the monarchy, built on the distinction of “*monarchie*” and “*Tyrannie*.”⁴⁰ This is the core of his famous *La Monarchie de France* from 1515.⁴¹ In the preface, he emphasized his dual “*affection et devoir*” to the crown and to the “*nation de France*.” The “national pride” in this work is derived from the institutional excellence

³⁹ Claude de Seyssel, “Exorde en la Translation de l’Histoire de Justin” (1510) in idem, *La monarchie de France et deux autres fragments politiques*, ed. Jacques Poujol (Paris: Librairie d’Argences, 1961), 66.

⁴⁰ See also his *Prohème en la translation de l’Histoire d’Appien* (1510) in Seyssel, *La monarchie de France et deux autres fragments politiques*.

⁴¹ “La Monarchie de France” (1515) in Seyssel, *La monarchie de France et deux autres fragments politiques*.

of the kingdom: being “mieux réglée que nulle autre.”⁴² This implies the significant limitations put on the king by the corporate framework, re-narrated in the language of “national” customs and institutions. The three reins of the authority are “Religion, Justice, Police,” and especially the last one entails customs and “instructions”—e.g., that the king cannot alienate his inherited territories. From this perspective, the Salic law, regulating the principles of heredity irrespective of the personal preference of the actual ruler, becomes a “fundamental law”—creating a trans-generational normative continuity at the core of the French monarchy.

In sum, Seyssel’s argumentation witnessed an important shift in the use of patriotic rhetoric. He did not turn to the discourse of patriotic allegiance to boost the dynastic aims of the monarchic power-center, but expressed the willingness of bringing together the two focal points of allegiance (*amour au Prince et à la nation*), while the very duality of the formulation suggested if not an actuality, at least a potentiality of conflict between the monarch and the Estates. Following this track, in the sixteenth century, the “body of the kings” could be fused with that of the nation, and nation became a normative community, which eventually overwrote the duality of dynastic and geographical categories. Thus, stepping out of the framework of the two bodies of the king, nation became a self-standing entity, which was gradually acquiring its own corporeality, moved by its own spiritual drive—creating a national “body and soul.”⁴³

This came to fore in the increasing politicization of cultural and institutional “us” and “them” and the critique of internal alienation, i.e. following the manners of other nations. By the mid-sixteenth century, the consciousness of “national” development, the vision of a competition with other “national” projects, and the claim for cultural autarchy became commonplaces of French humanism. Guillaume Budé was repeatedly stressing that *externorum admiratio* blocked cultural development,⁴⁴ while Henri Estienne turned this into a tentative critique of civilization, contrasting Italian *sumptuosité* to French *frugalité*, in danger of being lost. Joachim Du Bellay deplored the cus-

⁴² Seyssel, “La Monarchie de France”, 112.

⁴³ Philippe Desan stresses the thematization of “esprit français” and the psychological basis of the national discourse in sixteenth-century France. Desan, *Penser l’histoire à la Renaissance*, 55ff.

⁴⁴ Quoted by Simone, *Il rinascimento francese*, 52.

tom of *louer des etrangers, les François mespriser*, blaming the Grand Tours for depriving the French noble youth of its ancestral virtues in exchange for dubious Italian luxury-products. This was the emotional basis of the general political and religious anti-Italianism, manifested in the critique of Rome, the attack on Italian courtiers coming to France, and the ideological trend of anti-Machiavellism. The influx of foreigners came to be perceived as a threat that the French were eventually becoming “foreigners in their own land.”⁴⁵ Typical for this rhetoric, anti-Italianism was based on a conceptual framework which was direct import from the intellectual centers of Italian humanism, such as in the case of Estienne who frequently used Italianisms to condemn Italy.⁴⁶

The cultural assertion of Frenchness in the sixteenth century had two crucial, often overlapping, modalities: the criticism of Italian influence and the *topoi* of Roman “ruins,” i.e. the assertion that there is nothing to imitate there, as its antiquity is dead, and the rebirth of antiquity could be expected from France rather than in Italy. The *mutatio*-theory imported from the Italian humanists became a crucial narrative of French cultural prestige, thus reintegrating the *translatio studiorum* into the humanist self-legitimation. The Erasmian counterposition of rhetoric and truth became a tool of contrasting the idealized image of Rome to its actuality, leading to the claim of *Roma Roma non est*.⁴⁷ This position could be radicalized even further, culminating in an attack of ancient Rome as well, following on the path of Lemaire, contrasting “virtuous Gaule” and “corrupted Rome,” although the mainstream of French humanism in the sixteenth century remained content with the idea of *mutatio*.

One of the central modalities of humanist patriotism in the European context was the codification of national languages. *Patria* emerged as a temporal community where the dead and the yet-to-be-born were having their word as well. The structural link between the rhetorical and the historical frameworks became reinforced by the crucial trait

⁴⁵ Lionello Sozzi, *Rome n'est plus Rome: la polémique anti-italienne et autres essais sur la Renaissance* (Paris: Champion, 2002).

⁴⁶ Lionello Sozzi, “La polémique anti-italienne dans l'oeuvre narrative d'Henri Estienne,” in Sozzi, *Rome n'est plus Rome*, 125.

⁴⁷ Erasmus was actually questioning the racial continuity between the inhabitants of Rome and the Romans of antiquity as well. Of course, all this went back to Italian cultural references, such as Dante's famous “non donna di province, ma bordello.” Sozzi, *Rome n'est plus Rome*, 57.

of the rhetorical praxis—*decorum*, i.e. the claim of accommodating the speech “to the dignity of time, place, and person.” The sensitivity of the humanist political discourse to cultural and political individuality was encoded in this “historicist” conviction of the rhetorical roots: every age has a pattern of its own. It is along these lines that Leonardo Bruni claimed: “every language has its own perception, its own sound, its own refinement and *parlare scientifico*”.⁴⁸

As it is well-known, the issue of *volgare* emerged as one of the most important questions of Italian humanism. The theme went back to Dante, who, in his *Il Convivio* and *De vulgari eloquentia*, re-evaluated the vernacular, but also asserted that only Latin had a proper grammar.⁴⁹ Already in the thirteenth century, however, a number of Provençal grammars were written and, in the fourteenth-fifteenth centuries, the canonization of *volgare* became a theoretical as well as a practical problem. The main issue of contention was about deciding which dialect was to be taken as normative. Eventually, Bembo’s suggestion, that the Florentine dialect as used in the works of the first generation of humanist authors should be taken as model, won the day.⁵⁰ At the same time, the circle around Lorenzo de Medici projected the creation of a Florentine language comparable to the Latin into the future. Significantly, the latter case was linked to an identity-building project for Florence (formulated in terms of a *fiorentino imperio*), abandoning the broader Italian national framework.⁵¹ This also means that national and linguistic frameworks could develop simultaneously, especially in the context of the balance of powers in *Quattrocento* Italy, where the Florentine patriotic discourse focused on language (contrasting *lingua latina* to *lingua fiorentina*) and attempted to create a local literary canon, based on the “re-florentinization” of Dante and Petrarca (in Landino’s *Proclusioni Petrarchesche*). According to Chris-

⁴⁸ Quoted in Hans Baron, *Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance*, 338.

⁴⁹ János Balázs, *Sylvester János és kora* [János Sylvester and his age] (Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó, 1958); and Klaus Garber, ed., *Nation und Literatur im Europa der Frühen Neuzeit* (Akten des I. Internationalen Osnabrücker Kongresses zur Kulturgeschichte der Frühen Neuzeit) (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1989).

⁵⁰ It was formulated in his *Prose delle Volgar Lingua* (1502). On the different conceptions, see Jennifer Lorch, “Aspiring to a National Language. The Case of Fifteenth Century Florentine,” in Marie-Thérèse Jones-Davies, ed., *Langues et nations au temps de la Renaissance* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1991), 153–167.

⁵¹ Christiane Maass, «*La lingua nostra patria*». *Die Rolle der florentinischen Sprache für die Konstitution einer florentinischen WIR-Gemeinschaft im Kreis um Lorenzo de’ Medici* (Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 2002).

tiane Maass, all this led to a re-thematization of patriotism in terms of linguistic allegiance, “*lingua nostra patria*,” going as far as equating writing in *volgare* even with *pro paria mori*.

As the other modalities of humanist patriotism, the French defense of the vernacular were also results of an intensive dialogue with Italian theories. Especially Sperone Speroni’s influence was considerable, although the reception of his ideas was tailored to the local context.⁵² While, in the Italian case, the “significant other” of the *volgare* was the Latin, the French theorists had to locate their vernacular in a more complex normative framework, where cultural patriotism was also a counter-reaction to the Italian influence.⁵³ We can find plaidoyers for the French tongue already in the works of Seyssel (in *La Monarchie de France*, and his *Exorde* to the translation of Justinian). The conceptualization of the problem of French language in relation to the Italian debates is witnessed by the very title of Jacques de Beaune’s treatise from 1548: *Discours comme une langue vulgaire peut se perpetuer*. By the mid-sixteenth century, in the works of Lefevre d’Etaples, Geoffroy Tory, and Peletier du Mans (the translator of Horace’s *Ars Poetica*, 1555), the entire program of *litterature en francoys* was formulated.

Du Bellay’s *Deffence et illustration* from 1549 is the most famous elaboration of French linguistic patriotism.⁵⁴ He explicitly connected the care for language with the commemoration of the French glory, and thus described his linguistic studies as patriotic activity (*au profit de la patrie; affection naturelle envers ma patrie*).⁵⁵ Languages are tools of communication (their aim is: “*signifier entre nous les conceptions et intelligences de l’esprit*”),⁵⁶ which means that there is no natural hierarchy among them, just different levels of refinement, and their difference is due to the “*seul artifice et industrie des hommes*.”

⁵² Eva Kushner, “Deffence et illustration; perspectives européennes,” in Yvonne Bellenger, ed., *Du Bellay devant la critique de 1550 à nos jours* (Oeuvres et Critiques Vol. 20 No. 1) (Tübingen: Günter Narr Verlag, 1995), 13–24.

⁵³ Sweany, *Estienne Pasquier*, 20ff.

⁵⁴ Joachim Du Bellay, *La Deffence et illustration de la langue Francoyse* (Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1969).

⁵⁵ “Dedication to Cardinal Guillaume du Bellay,” Du Bellay, *Deffence et illustration*, 35. As a matter of fact, *Patrie* itself was a contested concept. Quintil Horatien (Barthélémy Aneau) contended that du Bellay should have said *pays*, as *patrie* was neologism. According to the editor of the text, Henri Chamard, this is not true, as in the 1530–40s the word was already in use. See also Hampton, *Literature and Nation in the Sixteenth Century*, Ch. V.

⁵⁶ Du Bellay, *Deffence et illustration*, 48.

Therefore, those who reject the use of “*notre vulgaire*” on the basis of its vulgarity (“*deprisent et rejettent d’un sourcil plus que stoïque toutes choses écrites en François*”) are themselves responsible for its relative backwardness.⁵⁷

At the same time, Du Bellay repudiated the label of barbarism, calling it an *arrogance greque* to despise other peoples without any basis (*n’avoit loy ny privilege de legitimer ainsi sa nation et batardir les autres*). The prestige of the Romans was due not so much to their intrinsic moral superiority over the others rather to their texts (*multitude d’écrivains*). Although the ancestors of the French were equally virtuous (*nous ne sommes rien moins qu’eux*), they were less concerned with commemorating their virtue than with the virtuous deeds themselves (*en plus grande recommandation le bien faire que le bien dire*).⁵⁸ There was a veritable conspiracy against them to diminish their fame (*ilz ont receu plus de honte et dommaige que les autres; conjuration conspirait contre nous*) so that eventually they almost completely lost any memory whatsoever (*avons quasi perdu non seulement la gloire, mais la memoire*).⁵⁹

In terms of the model of history, Du Bellay opted for a cyclical vision (*ne durer perpetuellement, mais passer sans fin d’un etat en l’autre*), which served as a guarantee of French cultural flourishing. Knowledge also circulates, there is no fixed hierarchy, and every cultural upsurge stems from vernacularized knowledge (*à chacun sa langue puyse competement communiquer toute doctrine*).⁶⁰ It is impossible to recover the classical antiquity if there is no living reality around it—the ancients used a language they appropriated with their nurse’s milk, while the moderns learn these languages with immense difficulties. The study of ancient languages takes a lot of intellectual energy away, while it would be much better to employ the brightest minds on sciences, rather than on philology. The classical examples should be used mainly for creating the *vulgaire*. The Latin self-defense against Greek cultural impact is a case in point. If the French savants invested as much energy into polishing their language as the Romans into theirs,⁶¹ it would be a perfect tool of communication. This also implies the imperative of

⁵⁷ Ibid., 50–51.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 67.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 61.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 129.

⁶¹ Ibid., 160.

the cultivation of “national canon.” This is the meaning of *illustratio* for Du Bellay: commemorating the *virii illustris*, exploring the literary antiquity (*anciens poètes françois*) and registering the history of this self-thematization (the author even names Le Maire des Belges as the first one to “illustrate” *les Gaules et la langue françoise*).⁶²

The program of *Illustratio*, originating with the Italian *Quattrocento* writers, and originally describing the cultural geography and local history of a given territorial unit, becomes here a basis of a normative discourse of the national-linguistic community. For Du Bellay, the praise of the natural resources of France remains a secondary register, being fused with a general praise—piety, integrity of manners, magnanimity, and antiquity (Hercule Gallique, Marseille)—of the nation. All this channels into a program of cultural and political emancipation.⁶³ France is “*serve maintenant et mercenaire de ceux aux quelz elle souloit commander*.”⁶⁴ In this sense, poetry indeed becomes a crucial sphere of patriotism, linking “*honneur de la France, et grande illustration de nostre langue*,” as the very moral commitment of patriotic action entails the cultivation of national language: “*le mesme loy naturelle, qui commande à chacun defendre le lieu de sa naissance, nous oblige aussi de garder la dignité de notre langue*.”⁶⁵

In his *La précellence du langue françois*, written three decades later, Henri Estienne blurred the linguistic and patriotic arguments even further.⁶⁶ One can say that for Estienne language functioned as a synecdoche of France, opening up the way to the definition of Frenchness in terms of an interaction of language and territory.⁶⁷ He also started his treatise with the profession of his patriotism (*ardante affection de honorer ma patrie*⁶⁸ and *devoir d'un personnage vrayement amateur de*

⁶² Ibid., 174ff.

⁶³ On the broader context of French humanist historiography, see the classic works by Julian H. Franklin, *Jean Bodin and the Sixteenth-Century Revolution in the Methodology of Law and History* (New York/London: Columbia University Press, 1963) and Donald R. Kelley, *Foundations of Modern Historical Scholarship. Language, Law, and History in the French Renaissance* (New York/London: Columbia University Press, 1970).

⁶⁴ Du Bellay, *Deffence et illustration*, 322.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 319; see also David Hartley, *Patriotism in the Work of Joachim Du Bellay. A Study of the Relationship between the Poet and France* (Lampeter: Mellen Press, 1993).

⁶⁶ Henri Estienne, *La précellence du langue françois*, ed. Edmond Huguet (Paris: Armand Colin, 1896).

⁶⁷ Hampton, *Literature and Nation in the Sixteenth Century*, 6.

⁶⁸ Estienne, *La précellence du langue françois*, 2.

sa patrie).⁶⁹ In contrast to Du Bellay, who considered a certain amount of import necessary to develop the French language, Estienne put forward a much more autarchic vision. The French language is not yet fully corrupted by import, and it has to be protected from *mots étrangers*. Its “precellence” is due to its purity and archaism. Thus, he does not question the primacy of ancients—instead, he tries to prove that the French has even greater familiarity with the Latin than it seems. What is more, being very close to the Greek, French takes the first place among the moderns.⁷⁰ Following this logic, Estienne is not formulating a vision of regeneration, as Du Bellay, rather a program of cultural self-defense. This implies, apart from the effort to maintain the language in its original form, the fight against external cultural expansion (especially against the proliferating Italians in the court—*maintenant on y voit une petite Italie*) and the internal “agents” of this cultural influence. Thus, in his *Deux dialogues* from 1578, Estienne criticizes the *indiscret desir de nouveauté*⁷¹ and even refers to the concept of *desnationalizez*.

Another venue of counter-identification was actualized by the religious differentiation, as the motif of “aliens” became saturated with religious connotations. The Huguenot treatises attacked the “Italian wisdom,” and anti-Italianism in the form of anti-Romanism became a master-narrative of the Protestant and Gallican versions as well, deploring their “*fanatisme et impiété*.” By the end of the century, in competition with the definition of Frenchness in terms of religious orthodoxy, the interaction of the ideological framework of the Renaissance with the religious narratives triggered a crystallization of French “national discourse” around the themes of “national” territory, legitimate authority, continuity of rightful obedience, and providential community. It would be, however, a mistake to presume that there was a high road leading from these to the democratic-republican conception of nationhood crystallizing during the French Revolution. As Lucien Febvre observed, by the seventeenth century, *patrie* lost much of its compelling force. Instead, it became a commonplace that the population of France incorporated different races (*schisme de la France en deux*

⁶⁹ Estienne, *La précellence du langage françois*, 11.

⁷⁰ This idea was put forward by Estienne already in his *Conformité du langage françois avec le Grec* (1565).

⁷¹ Henri Estienne, *Deux dialogues du nouveau langage françois italianizé* (Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1970), 22.

rares), and statehood came to identified less with the nation, but with the monarch.⁷² As it is well-known, Abbé Sieyès subverted exactly this perspective when he identified the third estate with the nation.

ii. *The “Chosen nation” as a focus of allegiance*

While the discourse of humanist patriotism had a certain tendency to try to suppress religious conflicts in the name of common good, the emergence of religious plurality also led to various competing narratives of the national community in terms of a community in God’s particular care. As in the case of the other components, the history of the providentialist discourse also links the medieval, early modern and modern contexts. The self-perception of the religious community as God’s elect has very deep roots, and the connection of this discourse with political legitimacy also goes back to medieval antecedents. An important instance in this respect is the decretal *Per Venerabilem*, from 1202, stating that the French king was *imperator in regno suo*, linking the idea of “God’s direct and special favour” to the rejection of external authority.⁷³ France was described as a heavenly kingdom, while the king of France became the “most Christian king,” and also a type of Christ. The combination of sacred king and holy country became crucial for what Joseph Strayer described as the Capetians inventing “the France which they claimed to rule.”⁷⁴ Apart from the cult of “national saints” and “national relics,” this was reflected by the use of such commonplaces as Christ turning his face towards France on the cross, or the prestige of Paris as spiritual capital of Christianity.⁷⁵

In the fight against Pope Boniface VIII in the early-fourteenth century, the propaganda campaign of Phillip the Fair, orchestrated by the legists, Pierre Dubois and Guillaume de Nogaret, developed a new conception of patriotism connected to Christian duties, and this also

⁷² Lucien Febvre, *Honneur et patrie*, ed. Thérèse Charmasson and Brigitte Mazon (Paris: Perrin, 1996), 146.

⁷³ John W. McKenna, “How God Became an Englishman,” in Delloyd J. Guth and John W. McKenna, eds., *Tudor Rule and Revolution: Essays for G. R. Elton from his American friends* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 25–43.

⁷⁴ Joseph Strayer, “France, the Holy Land, the Chosen People and the Most Christian King,” in Theodore Rabb and Jerrold Seigel, eds., *Action and Conviction in Early Modern Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969), 5.

⁷⁵ On the medieval antecedents, see Beaune, *Naissance de la nation France* (Paris: Gallimard, 1985).

went together with the assertion of divine election—“*Deus... sibi peculiare regnum eleget*” (Nogaret).⁷⁶ The Decree, *Rex Glorie* by the first Avignon-pope, Clement V, applied this language, establishing a direct link between the ancient Jews and the French:

*divisorum populorum regimina secundum divisiones linguarum et gentium stabilivit, inter quos sicut israeliticus populus... sic regnum Francie in peculiarem populum electus a Domino in executione mandatorum celestium specialis honoris et gratie titulis insignitur.*⁷⁷

In the fourteenth-fifteenth centuries, the motif of divine punishment also became an important register of collective identification. Following the example of Jeremiah and Lucian, the personification of the *patria* as a female became a popular genre all over Europe.⁷⁸ In the French case the paradigmatic example is the *Quadrilogue investif* (1422) by Alain Chartier (1385–1433), followed by a number of other writings.⁷⁹

Although the breakthrough of this eschatological pattern of a “particular” community came with the Reformation, the theocratic-apocalyptic discourse and the republican vision of citizenship could fuse before the sixteenth century, engendering a specific conception of a sacral but not universal community. For example, Savonarola spoke about *Christo re di Firenze*, and about the Florentine community as *popolo di Dio*.⁸⁰ The most important feature of Savonarola’s construction of “divine election” was exactly the constant interplay between the humanist-patriotic and eschatological modalities. Nevertheless, initially, he spoke about “divine punishment” in general, and only during the final French attack on Florence did he devise a fully apocalyptic re-interpretation of patriotism. When legitimating the *popolare* government of the city, he did not use eschatological arguments, but remained in the purely secular and fairly Aristotelian framework of interpretation, claiming that *antica consuetudine*

⁷⁶ Kantorowicz, *The King’s Two Bodies*, 249.

⁷⁷ Strayer, *France, the Holy Land*, 15.

⁷⁸ László Szörényi, “«A szent hazának képe». Östörténet és epika Zrínyiitől Krúdyig” [«The image of the holy fatherland». Prehistory and epic from Zrínyi to Krúdy] in idem, *Múltaddal valamit kezdeni. Tanulmányok* [To do something with your past. Studies] (Budapest: Magvető, 1989), 208–231.

⁷⁹ See also Hans Kohn, *The Idea of Nationalism. A Study in Its Origins and Background* (New York: Collier Books, 1969), 113–4.

⁸⁰ Quoted by Rudolf von Albertini, *Das Florentinische Staatsbewusstsein im Übergang von der Republik zum Prinzipat* (Bern: Francke Verlag, 1955), 24.

and *natura* (in the sense of climatic determination) qualify the city for a democratic regime.

The conceptual fusion can be grasped first in his ambivalent speculation about the “mission” of Florence. When he speaks about *pace universale*, he means the overruling of the traditional communal conflicts in view of the *unanimitas* of the common good (*tutti insieme uniti siano una medesima cosa*),⁸¹ but this construction of unity is warranted by an eschatological construction when he starts to speak about the *città riformata*, fusing the civic recovery with a spiritual one. While in the humanist canon the ancient examples are taken to be the key to regeneration, here the recovery of the *patria* is grasped in terms of returning to the Biblical pattern of community.

It was mainly the post-Savonarolan republican discourse, which succeeded in integrating patriotism fully into an eschatological framework.⁸² As Donald Weinstein observed, there was a rise in the production of patriotic-eschatologic oracles and poems at the end of the fifteenth century. The identification of Florence with New Jerusalem appears in the poem of Girolamo Benivieni, for example:

Arise, O New Jerusalem and see
your Queen and her beloved son.
In you, city of God, who row, sit and weep
such joy and splendour will yet be born
as to decorate both you and all the world.⁸³

The emergence of a Florentine “Imperium” was considered to initiate the process of universal regeneration, bringing over the *novum illud saeculum*, the new golden age. The eschatological vision of mission was integrated into the already existing construction of the Florentine continuation of the Roman Republic, so now the new republicans could blur the symbols of Rome and Jerusalem, claiming that the exemplary republic would be the instrument of Providence in conquering and reforming first Italy, and then the entire world.

⁸¹ Roberto de Mattei, “Istanze politiche e sociali nel Savonarola,” in *Aspetti di storia del pensiero politico* (Roma: Giuffrè, 1980), vol. I, 299.

⁸² Lorenzo Polizzotto, *The Elect Nation: the Savonarolan Movement in Florence, 1494–1545* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).

⁸³ Donald Weinstein, “The Myth of Florence,” in Nicolai Rubinstein, ed., *Florentine Studies, Politics and Society in Renaissance Florence* (London: Faber and Faber, 1968), 18.

During the sixteenth century, the conception of elect nationhood, a vision of the political community described as an exegetical subject, became prominent throughout Europe. While “civic humanism” sought to envision virtue in terms of overcoming human contingency, many communities had to face a situation when Fortuna, the capricious Goddess of humanist speculation, became uncontrollable and the process of corruption seemed to be beyond any constitutional remedy. The problem of the meaning of what was happening could be solved by pointing out the complete contingency of human existence, but there was another option, offering more coherence: turning to a vision of divine providence as an interpretative model of the seemingly disconnected events. The recurrent theme of “elect nationhood” sought to trace the manifestations of divine providence behind the seemingly contingent and lamentable history of the community, and contributed to the formation of a collective identity of compassion and responsibility.

As it is evident from the example of Savonarola, the formation of this vision is not exclusively due to the Reformation—it is well known that Protestantism was reinforcing tendencies already present in late-fifteenth century popular preaching (such as the theory of divine punishment and collective expiation). Likewise, in the seventeenth century, the Counter-Reformation creatively adopted many of the claims of the Protestant eschatological discourse.⁸⁴ The impact of Protestantism on the conception of “elect nationhood” was nevertheless considerable: the presence of the Protestant apocalyptic had a propensity to feature “the imagination of the exegetical subject as a location for governmental authority.”⁸⁵ We can observe the same “osmotic” relationship between secular and theological conceptual frameworks as before, but now the Biblical pattern became the primary framework of speculation. This pattern of nationhood served with a characteristically different formulation of community than either the traditional rhetoric of political *nationes*, or the “purely” humanist *patria*. The transgression

⁸⁴ “The essence of a new *patria*, which had emerged in both Catholic Ireland and Presbyterian Scotland by the 1630s, was the notion of the nation as a new Israel.” Michael Lynch, “National Identity in Ireland and Scotland, 1500–1640,” in Björn, Grant, and Stringer, eds., *Nations, Nationalism and Patriotism in the European Past*, 117.

⁸⁵ Claire McEachern, *The Poetics of English Nationhood, 1590–1612* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 11.

of actual political boundaries and a unitary vision disregarding social stratification was encoded in the possible identification with Israel.

The most important element of this identification with the Biblical nation was obviously that this vision broke through the participatory notion of citizenship crucial to “humanist patriotism.” The causal model of interpreting history abandoned the individualist concern with the virtue of the few and described the collective morality of the community as the root of historical events. Of course, this does not mean that the crucial ideas of the humanist analysis of corruption were totally abandoned. Particularism, contrasted to the common weal, remained the greatest sin, just its focus was altered: while in the “civic humanist” discourse the commonwealth is represented by the participatory citizenship, now it becomes more abstract—the moral well-being of the people, regardless of political rights.

There was an imminent danger: if eschatology took over completely, it could destroy the entire sphere of agency open to humanist political speculation. The total reliance on God’s providence could deem any action illusory and could result in complete passivity. As a matter of fact, the purely eschatological vision of elect nationhood carried a rather simplistic message: whenever the king and the people turned to idolatry, God punished them; whenever they expiated their sins, God gave them victory even if they faced much larger armies. This moralization of politics could reach an extreme, where rational action failed to hold completely and only the definition of true belief and idolatry occupied the minds.

Nevertheless, the discourse of “elect nationhood” was usually characterized by a fusion of the humanist-patriotic and apocalyptic ideas. The itinerary of the providentialist narrative as an identity-discourse in the French context was also extremely complicated. It featured prominently in the Huguenot political discourse, but it also had considerable echo in the different reformulations of the Catholic position, ranging from the *politique* to the *Ligueur* camps. As mentioned above, by the coming of the Reformation, the theme of chosenness already had a long history in the French context. Religious virtues were for long considered to be constitutive of Frenchness in the discourse of “humanist patriotism” as well. Gradually, the discourse of the *roy très chrétien* moved towards the glorification of the realm in the sense of *royaume très chrétien*. Seyssel spoke of the *peuple élu*, while Du Bellay described the French as a *peuple dévot et religieux* and in his *Deffence* he listed *piété, religion et mœurs* as the basic character-traits of his nation.

In 1560, the *politique* Michel L'Hospital defined religion, in contrast to language, as being constitutive of national allegiance: "*La division des langues ne fait la separation des royaumes, mais celle de la religion et des loix, qui d'un royaume en fait deux.*"⁸⁶ All this went back to the Gallican connection of "nation" and religion, developed by the Conciliarist movement and thus pre-existing the Reformation with at least a century. Consequently, the liberties of the Church could be narrated as being rooted in an "ancient constitution" from times immemorial, and the projection of piety back to pre-Christian times could be turned into a politics of normative past, supporting the conciliarist ideology against Rome.

The idiosyncratic construction of identity forged by Guillaume Postel fused exactly this Gallican-conciliarist narrative of Frenchness (for instance, defining the Parisian faculty of theology as a proxy-council), with an antiquarian narrative based on Annius da Viterbo's falsification (describing the Gauls as the most ancient people in Europe, named after the Hebrew *Gallim*, "saved from the waters"), creating a vision of the French role in the Salvation story. The outcome was a "nationalization" of the Apocalypse, asserting that the second coming of Christ, "within the reborn Cain," was linked to the rise of the kingdom of France, as the "secular arm" within the eternal monarchy (*le second bras du monde à ladite province Gomerique ou Gallique*).⁸⁷ France thus emerged as the final destination of *translatio imperii*, the last monarchy, chosen to become a *monarchie universelle*.⁸⁸

The picture became even more variegated with the radicalization of religious conflicts. While Calvin originally took a considerable distance from the "patriotic" narrative, the religious division was gradually transferred into the sphere of "national" symbolism. The Huguenots tried to undermine the Catholics by appealing to the anti-Italian and later the anti-Spanish sentiments; and the other way round, the Catholics were also trying to "exclude" the Huguenots from the national community, claiming that their faith was "alien." The emergence of the *Ligueur* discourse was posing a challenge to this fusion, separating once again the religious and national identities, going against the

⁸⁶ Tallon, *Conscience nationale et sentiment religieux en France*, 5.

⁸⁷ Guillaume Postel, "La nouvelle Eve," in *Apologies et rétractations* (Nieuwkoop: B. De Graaf, 1972), 46.

⁸⁸ Guillaume Postel, *Le Thresor des Propheties de l'Univers* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1969).

“national” discourse of the *politique* moderates. In the famous *Dialogue d’entre le maheustre et le manant*, we can find an exclusivist statement of the Catholic allegiance as opposed to national-political solidarity: “*nous n’affections la nation, mais la religion*”, “*hors ma Religion je ne desire plus y habiter*.”⁸⁹ Nevertheless, as Alain Tallon observed, even the ideas of the radical *ligeurs* had a powerful Gallican aspect, usually not giving the pope sovereignty over the king. In turn, the reaction of the *politique* camp to the denominational polarization was exactly to reassert the “national” framework. Thus, in the *Satire Menippée*, one of the key *politique* pamphlets of the civil war, we can also find a host of appeals to the national allegiance.

The historical works of Etienne Pasquier (1529–1615) retained some elements of the providentialist scheme, considering it the mystery of God (*mystère de Dieu*) that the French monarchy was able to survive.⁹⁰ On the whole, however, he described the course of French history as a “moral dynamism,” without eschatological references.⁹¹ Nevertheless, the emerging new glorification of monarchy did not mean the disappearance, rather the reconfiguration of the theme of divine election. As Peter Burke and Tallon also pointed out, while the cult of St. Louis was interrupted for some time in the sixteenth century, after the conversion of Henry IV the imperial theme was re-launched in search of integrating symbols and rituals—such as royal penitence—for resacralizing the monarchy.⁹² By the mid-seventeenth century, a new fusion of the religious and political frameworks was reached. So much so that in the works of Bishop Bossuet, patriotism could be described as a duty sanctioned by divine will, describing Christ also as a “good patriot.”⁹³

iii. *Reason of state and the language of nationhood*

The *reintegration* of politics into morality, solving the riddle of the divergence of particularity and universality, the problems of limitation

⁸⁹ Tallon, *Conscience nationale et sentiment religieux en France*, 63.

⁹⁰ Robert Büttler, *Nationales und universales Denken im Werke Étienne Pasquiers* (Basel: Helbing and Lichtenhahn, 1948), 34ff.

⁹¹ Tallon, *Conscience nationale et sentiment religieux en France*, 69.

⁹² Peter Burke, *The fabrication of Louis XIV* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992).

⁹³ Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet, *Politics drawn from the very words of Holy Scripture*, ed. Patrick Riley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), “On the Love of Country,” 27–37.

of princely power and the efficiency of rulership—these were the crucial problems of the “post-Machiavellian” political scene. The different genres of political thought proliferating in the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries can be encapsulated under the heading of “reason of state.” These discourses (neostoicism, neo-Tacitism, arcanism etc.) were all contributing to the emergence of the early modern “political science.”⁹⁴

Ratio status already existed in the Middle Ages, but implied considerably less than the novel term rooted in Italian political speculation. *Status* in this sense meant a dominantly personal relationship while the early modern *stato* underwent a gradual semantic expansion, towards more abstract and impersonal connotations. In Machiavelli *stato* still had a strong personal connotation: *mantenere gli stati* had a dual meaning (*stato* can be both princely authority and object of dominion) but in both senses it referred to the interaction with the person of the ruler. In the Renaissance *civitas* and *res publica* stood for an impersonal (or rather supra-personal) notion of political institutions but these cannot be directly rendered as “state” either, because our modern notion of statehood was formed by exactly the fusion of the ascending and descending conceptions of power. It was a strange mixture of the personal dominion of the king, the form of government, the territoriality of the dominion, and the institutional system of the polity. The crucial step in the reason of state discourses was towards abstraction, thus attempting to solve the problems of the divergence of the ruler’s particular interests from the collectivity, with reference to a supra-personal conception of virtue (identified not as excellence, but in terms of service).

As Michel Sénellart pointed out, the writers of reason of state revised the Machiavellian political doctrine in three ways: they reactivated the humanist canon of pacifism, developed a theory of balance of forces in external politics, and turned their attention to the economic aspect of statecraft. This revision, along with their endorsement of the middle-

⁹⁴ See Roman Schnur, ed., *Staaträson. Studien zur Geschichte eines politischen Begriffes* (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1975); Gerhard Oestreich, *Neostoicism and the Early Modern State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982); Herfried Münkler, *Im Namen des Staates* (Frankfurt a. M.: S. Fischer, 1987); Michael Stolleis, *Staat und Staatsräson in der frühen Neuzeit. Studien zur Geschichte des öffentlichen Rechts* (Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp, 1990); Enzo Baldini, ed., *Botero e la 'ragion di stato'* (Firenze: Olschi, 1992); Enzo Baldini, ed., *Aristotelismo politico e ragion di stato* (Firenze: Olschi, 1995); Ulrich Muhlack, “Der Tacitism—ein Späthumanistisches Phänomen?,” in Notker Hammerstein and Gerrit Walther, eds., *Späthumanismus. Studien über das Ende einer kulturhistorischen Epoche* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2000), 160–183.

sized polity as an ideal entity (not over-expansive, but not too small either) strengthened the tendency towards a secular-territorial form of political community, smaller than the Empire, but more encompassing than a city-state.⁹⁵

The core of the post-humanist theories of political prudence is a fairly compact conceptual framework. Most of these terms were rooted in humanist political speculation, and there is a strong intellectual continuity between the *Quattrocento* and early *Cinquecento* political theories and the neostoic, Lipsian, neo-Tacitist, etc. discourses proliferating throughout the late-sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries. The emergence of this modality of a supra-personal political entity, perceived in terms of a community of needs and interests and possessing an autonomous normative sphere, was ultimately rooted in the humanist norm of the adjustment to the nature of times. As Guicciardini puts it, “*chi potessi variare la natura secondo la condizione de’ tempi, il che è difficillimo e forse impossibile, sarebbe tanto manco dominato dalla fortuna.*”⁹⁶ The “post-humanist” political discourse was formulated in terms of this duality between *prudence* (rational adjustment to the nature of times by relying on our experience and capacity of prediction) and *necessity* (something which is out of our reach). Likewise, the ultimate normative legitimation of extarordinary action (the essential modality of the reason of state) is another key term of the “civic humanist” discourse, i.e. the *common good*.

Looking at the French context, the emergence of a discourse of state interests overwriting the particular perceptions of common good was the result of the traumatic experience of the Wars of Religion.⁹⁷ Patriotic symbolism was a crucial discursive asset for all the sides involved. The Huguenot defense of resistance was based on a patriotic discourse of liberties, and not on religious declarations. The attempt of capturing the king in Amboise was described as a move against the Italianate courtiers, “*delivrer son roy, de la main des estrangers*”. When St. Bartholomew’s Night made it clear that the person of the king was out of reach for the

⁹⁵ Michel Sémellart, *Machiavélisme et raison d’État, XII^e–XVIII^e siècle* (1989).

⁹⁶ Francesco Guicciardini, *Ricordi* (Firenze: Sansoni, 1951), 36. That is why Tacitus becomes a crucial reference for Guicciardini: “*Insegna molto bene Cornelio Tacito a chi vive sotto a’ tiranni...*”, *ibid.*, 22.

⁹⁷ Étienne Thuau, *Raison d’état et pensée politique a l’époque de Richelieu*, (Paris: Armand Colin, 1966); Nannerl O. Keohane, *Philosophy and the State in France. The Renaissance to Enlightenment* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1980); John H. M. Salmon, *Society in crisis: France in the sixteenth century* (London: E. Benn, 1975).

Protestant cause, the Huguenot pamphleteers reframed their patriotism to be able to exclude the king himself from their ideal vision of Frenchness. Now they counterposed the personal *roy* with his suprapersonal *royaume*, or the *personne du Roy* with the *majesté du Roy*.⁹⁸ Gentillet abandoned the counterposition of the “two bodies of the King” altogether, and claimed that ultimately the Estates were equaling the realm, and therefore the loyalty to the nation overruled the loyalty to the king (who acted against the laws and customs of his country).⁹⁹

Similarly, when the League turned against Henry III, they even experimented with the modality of “elect nationhood,” and even the pro-Spanish (“anti-national”) discourse was integrated into a patriotic symbolic framework.¹⁰⁰ They claimed that exactly this Spanish orientation served the real national interest, since the threatening closeness of this empire could only be neutralized by an active political cooperation. Furthermore, they attempted to redefine the notion of Frenchness in an exclusivist way: the heretic is the *vray étranger*, while the Spanish orientation served the *patria*, so it was fully “national.”

The success of the *Politique*-discourse was also due to its skillful use of “national symbolism,” turning the patriotic canon against the “extremists” of both sides. They appealed to a trans-denominational symbolic framework as the focus of loyalty, contrasting unity, peace, and toleration with factionalism, Leagues, and discord (ultimately exploiting the binary opposition of *common good vs. particularity*). The expediency of toleration was also debated in terms of the “national discourse.” L’Hospital sought to legitimize it by claiming that it was “necessary for the sake of the common wealth.” The key analytical move of this attempt was expressed in terms of the nationality discourse as well: he attempted to separate denominational identity from citizenship with a reference to necessity. As another pamphleteer argued on behalf of tolerance: it was astonishing to see “*Chrestiens guerroyer les uns contre les autres, mais encores qui est plus detestable, les François contre les François mesmes.*”¹⁰¹ Of course, this was an answer to another claim in national garments, i.e. the exclusivism of the Catholic identification of *Frenchness* (being the subject of the “most Christian king”) with *Catholicism*. This led to the conceptual construction of a supra-personal *état*, subordinating religious

⁹⁸ Ibid., 153.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 155.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 202ff.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 110. n. 33.

identity to itself, although obviously not separating political and religious identities completely. The symbolic unity of the realm was based on a construction of normative collective past, a compelling vision of ancient national *gloire*.

At the same time, this was connected to the strengthening of a skeptical mode, refusing the utopian models and paying more attention to the actual power-relations. While humanist patriotism was occasionally used to legitimize the different denominational projects, the theoreticians of the emerging *raison d'état* sought to renarrate the patriotic allegiance in terms of the identification with a fixed order, concentrating on the ruler, separating patriotism from participation. We can find an early example of this tendency in Hurault's political writings, pervaded by a profound anthropologic pessimism, describing the monarchy as *moindre mal*. He tried to integrate monarchism with patriotism, connecting the *amour et charité de la patrie* to "grandeur," asserting that republicanism would undermine exactly this grandeur.¹⁰²

The emergence of this new version of patriotism, rooted in political prudence and centered around the figure of a monarch and the welfare of the population, played a central role in the political and historical writings of Etienne Pasquier as well. His conception of national specificity was rooted in legal humanism, developed under Gallican auspices, contrasting *mos gallicus* to Roman law.¹⁰³ In his *Advis au Roy* (1588), he fused conceptually the service of the king with the service of the republic and the *patria*,¹⁰⁴ stressing the concept of "grandeur," not only in terms of the size of the kingdom, but also in terms of the population (*un grand peuple*). Thus, while he repudiated the resistance theory, he argued that it was in the ruler's interest to cultivate the well-being of his subjects as the good of the ruler equaled that of the kingdom, while the poverty of the king entailed the poverty of the ruler. These ideas were coming very close to the *ragion di stato* formulated by his contemporaries, but at least in one point he distanced himself from this tradition, categorically rejecting dissimulation as a possible instrument of rule.

¹⁰² Miriam Yardeni, "La pensée politique et sociale de Michel Hurault," in idem, *Repenser l'histoire: Aspects de l'historiographie huguenote des Guerres de Religion à la Révolution Française* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2000), 51–72.

¹⁰³ Etienne Pasquier, *Pourparler des Princes* (1559), ed. Béatrice Sayhi-Périgot (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1995).

¹⁰⁴ Etienne Pasquier, "Advis au Roy," in idem, *Ecrits politiques*, ed. D. Thickett (Genève: Droz, 1966), 102.

Trying to give political guidance in a period of crisis, Pasquier sought to reshape the intellectual framework of humanist patriotism. In his *Remonstrance aux François* (1589), he referred to the universal reputation of the French nation (i.e. that all the peoples of Asia and Africa call the Europeans “Franks”) to convince his compatriots to emulate this ancient glory (*si vous estes François*). This made the concept of Frenchness normative, conferring legitimacy on the king. The king commanded allegiance on the basis of being French, while abandoning religious exclusivism: “O François, que je vous appelle encores un coup tous ensemble ainsi, reconnoissez que ce zele de Religion n’est qu’un masque.”¹⁰⁵

Pasquier’s “national” discourse thus tried to extol the common good and create a trans-denominational solidarity with reference to the external threat. In his *Exhortation*, he depicted the foreigners as conspirators, aspiring to see the Frenchmen turning their arms against each other.¹⁰⁶ In the treatise, *L’Antimartyr*, he tried to mobilize the normative frameworks of statheood and nationhood to keep the polity together. Nationhood in this scheme is the affective counterpart of statheood (*la miserable France; O vrais François*), rooted in a counter-identification:

*Ne voiez vous pas les ennemis anciens de cest Estat accourir de toutes parts pour le desmembrer? L’Espagnol, le Savoiant, et le Lorrain (...) faisant chacun son profit de noz malheureuses divisions?*¹⁰⁷

All this channeled into a historical construction of identity in Pasquier’s life-long project, the *Recherches*, fusing the *politique* discourse with humanist antiquarianism and seeking to devise a framework of identification: “*escrivant icy pour ma France, et non pour moy.*”¹⁰⁸

He reiterated all the common patriotic *topoi* of humanist historiography, legitimizing his use of the vernacular with a reference to those who did not understand Latin. He also deplored the failure of

¹⁰⁵ Pasquier, *Advis au Roy*, 176.

¹⁰⁶ Etienne Pasquier, “Exhortation aux princes et seigneurs,” in *Ecrits politiques*, 89.

¹⁰⁷ Etienne Pasquier, “L’Antimartyr,” in *Ecrits politiques*, 242. In his later *Histoire prodigeuse* (1614), he sought to separate religious and national identity along these lines—“L’Espagnol nostre ennemy naturel; a vous vrais François (...) auquelz je veux adresser ma parole”, “Mes amis, vivons et mourons Catholics Romains, mais aussi nous faut il vivre et mourir François, puis que Dieu nous à fait ceste grace de n’estre nez ny Marranes, ny Espaignols.” 266.

¹⁰⁸ Etienne Pasquier, *Les Recherches de la France*, vols. I–III. (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1996), 252.

the Gauls to transmit their virtue (*de bien faire et de ne rien écrire*).¹⁰⁹ The *politique* tone is recognizable in his qualification that this failure was due to the envy of the Druids, who did not want to transmit the great enterprises of the nobles. In contrast to the earlier interpretation of Druids as bearers of *prisca theologia*, they posed a considerable challenge to Pasquier: on the one hand, he considered them as the makers of ancient laws, on the other hand, he also mentioned the factionalism of the Gallic ancestors. The theoretical solution was to describe the ancient heritage not in terms of a fixed constitutional order, but as a dynamic model of judicial and legal continuity, embodied in representative institutions, and fitting well into the *politique* discourse:

*justice toutesfois avoit cours, et qu'ils avoient gens choisis, sous la puissance desquels nonobstant les débats de leurs primautez, ils soubmettoient les negoces des particuliers.*¹¹⁰

When describing the origins of Parlement, he used a conceptual framework, which became crucial for *raison d'état*: asserting that after Hugues Capet, the rulers started to “*entretenir leur grandeur*” instead of expanding, seeking to reach an “*équilibre des pouvoirs*.”¹¹¹

Fusing the reference to Fortune and divine mystery, he asserted that the continuity of the French monarchy was a veritable miracle. He read the history of Jeanne la Pucelle along these lines (*miracle tres expres de Dieu*). This contrast between common good and the “*formalitez de Justice*” opened up an interpretation of “providentially sanctioned” necessity breaking the customary patterns rather than that any sort of national eschatology.¹¹² Providence is reflected in the continuity of the French state (*l'Etat de nos Princes s'est perpetué jusques à nous*)¹¹³—Pasquier uses here a transitional concept of “*Estat*,” referring to the monarch, but the context also refers to the population)—contrasted to Italy, which became corrupted by the wandering of peoples. Although the Italians considered themselves the only inheritors of classical antiquity (*se pensent avantager grandement en reputation envers toutes autres contrées*),¹¹⁴ Pasquier referred to Caesar to assert that the Gauls were not at all barbarians, as opposed to the rude and “*mal façonnez*”

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 256.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 261.

¹¹¹ Ibid., 321.

¹¹² Ibid., 1343.

¹¹³ Ibid., 265.

¹¹⁴ Ibid., 258.

Germans. The “modern” Italians, who lack the *commune civilité*, are using the label of barbarism only to compensate their deficit of virtue—“*seulement pour penser venger par leurs escrits et traicts de plume, nos braves traicts d’armes et prouesses.*”¹¹⁵ But their arrogance has no basis whatsoever: “*nous ne sommes à luy inferieurs, ny en police et bonnes moeurs, ny en bonne conduite de guerre.*”¹¹⁶

While he also mentions the Trojan myth and refers to Hercules Gallicus, his stance is ambiguous (*je n’ose ny bonnement contrevenir à cette opinion, ny (...) y consentir librement*),¹¹⁷ due to his overall skepticism in view of the theories of ethnogenesis: “*disputer de la vieille origine des nations, c’est chose fort chatouilleuse.*” At the moment of their birth, the nations are too small to be recorded, and the tools of historical reconstruction are imperfect; for instance, the etimologies are not always proper, except for royal foundations. Pasquier was thus inclined to repudiate the Trojan myth, considering it a matter of distortion of history to connect the country’s past to one of the most ancient histories (*nous voulons faire des nations comme des familles, esquelles l’on fonde le principal degré de noblesse sur l’ancienneté des maisons*).¹¹⁸ What is more, he argued, the link with the defeated Trojans was not at all a reason for self-congratulation (*ce n’est pas grand honneur d’attribuer son premier estre à un vaincu Troyen, et eust esté de meilleure grace le prendre d’un victorieux Gregeois*).¹¹⁹

Pasquier put his stake rather on the Gauls, suggesting that they were autochthonous. He repudiated the claim that the Francs subjected them (*ils se vantent que les François issus de la Germanie, ont pour quelquefois reduit sous leur obeissance les Gaules*).¹²⁰ All this is integrated into a cyclical perspective of history, where the great are eventually becoming small and the other way round. This is however not the product of blind fortune, but sanctioned by the divine will, conferring a moral aspect on historical events. The basic rule of this historical morality is that of mutuality—you will be treated the way you treat your neighbor. This is the clue for Pasquier’s reinterpretation of the theme of *mutatio*

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 266.

¹¹⁶ Ibid., 266.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 316.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 317.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 317.

¹²⁰ Ibid., 283.

in view of the territory of Gaul: first the Gauls were usurping part of German territory, then the other way round.

Similar to Pasquier, the adherents of *raison d'état* in the early-seventeenth century sought to reinstate some sort of "order" in the political life. At the same time, they put much more emphasis on the theme of irregular action legitimized by the common good. These authors inherited some elements of the *politique* discourse, thematizing patriotism against foreign interference, aiming at peace and cultivating the idea of a strong king suppressing the factional fight.¹²¹ We can see this in one of the most striking treatises of the French *raison d'état*-tradition, Gabriel Naudé's book on *coups d'état*.¹²² For Naudé, extraordinary and absolute necessity legitimates the abandonment of formal judicial precepts, but only if the action can be referred to the common good embodied by the prince. It is from this perspective that the reason of state tradition stressed the problem of internal discord (another crucial term of the humanist canon) as the main reason for the collapse of a realm.

The propaganda of Henry IV was fully exploiting the patriotic discursive option; what is more, his public figure was turned to represent a fusion of humanist and Biblical patterns of community. His ascendance was legitimized in terms of the "*ripigliare lo stato*" (i.e. the humanist construction of constitutional renewal) and divine providence, bringing peace and harmony to the torn and divided nation. But this vision, no matter how much centered on the king, was far from the personal radiation of sacrality of medieval kingship. From merely *vertical* loyalty, the French discourse of political community shifted to a partly *horizontal* pattern of solidarity. The king regained his position as a unitary synechdochic representation of this partly horizontally, partly vertically constructed community (the state implying more the vertical, nation more the horizontal direction).

Reason of state also developed a specific discourse on peace and war: while the humanist tradition was split between the canons of expansion and of small inward-looking communities, the new statecraft blurred

¹²¹ Miriam Yardeni, "French Calvinist Political Thought, 1534–1715," in Gregor Vogt-Spira and Bettina Rommel, eds., *Rezeption und Identität. Die kulturelle Auseinandersetzung Roms mit Griechenland als europäisches Paradigma* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1999), 315–337.

¹²² Gabriel Naudé, *Political Considerations upon Refin'd Politicks and the Master-Strokes of State* (Translated into English by William King) (London: Printed for H. Clements, 1711).

these two frameworks in a peculiar way. The influential political thinker of the beginning of the seventeenth century, Prince de Rohan, in his *Parfait Capitaine*, stressed the importance of military virtue and tried to integrate it into an otherwise hierarchical vision of politics.¹²³ In Rohan's writings we find the conflation of the "war" and the "peace" canons: if we want peace we have to prepare for war; "disarmed peace is fragile," military security is the basis of "industry, growth of inhabitants, and flourishing commerce." The theoretical construction of "statehood" thus goes together with the emergence of "*oeconomie*" as "*la base des vertus*": common good is perceived in terms of "welfare," the appearance of "*oikos*" in the political space means the "privatization" of the public sphere by a new brood of men—the political "experts", who are qualified by "nature, estude, & experience" to administer the commonwealth—hidden from the commonalty.

While in the French case, reason of state eventually came to underline a centralizing "national monarchy", the very same discursive elements had markedly different reception in the German context, marked by a plurality of potential state-centers, and a much more complex vertical scale of potential frameworks of allegiance. What is more, while in the French case all this led to the reassertion of a religious uniformity, the German context was characterized by a permanent tension between the drive of confessionalization and the assertion of an autonomous political sphere, overwriting the religious differences. Nevertheless, some of the developments were converging. As in France, the end of the sixteenth century witnessed the rise of a new discourse, trying to redescribe the confessional questions as national ones, in the Empire as well. While the beginning of the Thirty Years' War was characterized by an emphatically denominational propaganda, the complex intertwining of national, denominational and state-centered discourses was a crucial aspect of political communication. In a sense, the confessional civil war was destroying and reconstructing "national" identity at the same time.

¹²³ Henri de Rohan, *Le parfait capitaine, autrement l'abrege des guerres de Gaule des commentaires de Cesar* (Paris: Augustin Courbé, 1638).

iv. *Enlightened patriotism and the modalities of national allegiance*

While the “modernist” trend, seeking to undermine the perennialist claim of the existence of national consciousness from times immemorial, appended the birth of nationalism to the French Revolution, the last decades saw a variety of research results documenting the existence of strong collective identity discourses throughout the 18th century and thus balancing the picture previously dominated by two mutually exclusive and dogmatic positions.¹²⁴ Thus, in his comprehensive study David Avrom Bell analyzed the French political languages in the “long eighteenth century,” seeking to refocus the attention from the Revolution to the Europe of “absolute monarchies.”¹²⁵ While the author admitted that there was an important conceptual shift, as the nation gradually turned from a “fact of nature” into an “act of political will,” he questioned the linkage of the social-technological change—stressed by authors like Gellner—and the transformation of consciousness and thus described the emergence of national ideology in the context of a complex web of political and cultural events and tendencies.¹²⁶ Along these lines he asserted that nationhood was a discursive construct, which was at the same time a catalyst and a product of the emerging modern “public sphere.”

On the whole, the 18th century was characterized by powerful tensions between various socio-cultural entities all operating with their own notion of nation and fatherland. Therefore, it is important to discern the main actors projecting a national community and formulating rival claims as to the contents of patriotic loyalty. The two most visible trends were crystallizing around the figure of the monarch and the community of nobles, producing an ambiguity which Bernard Cottret described as the tension of hierarchical and egalitarian aspects. In the last decades, the second option, which was entangled with the

¹²⁴ On French patriotism and national ideology during the Enlightenment, see Jean Lestocquoy, *Histoire du patriotisme en France des origines à nos jours* (Paris: A. Michel, 1968), 81–95; Bernard Cottret, ed., *Du patriotisme aux nationalismes, 1700–1848: France, Grande-Bretagne, Amérique du Nord* (Paris: Creaphis, 2002); Raymonde Monnier, *Républicanisme, Patriotisme et Révolution Française* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 2006); Edmond Dziembowski, *Un nouveau patriotisme français, 1750–1770: la France face à la puissance anglaise à l'époque de la guerre de Sept Ans* (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 1998); Sylvie Lelievre-Botton, *Droit du sol, droit du sang: patriotisme et sentiment national chez Rousseau* (Paris: Ellipses, 1996).

¹²⁵ Bell, *The Cult of the Nation in France*.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 32.

discourse of republicanism, received more attention as it influenced the discussions of the *Philosophes* on the *patria* and thus became integrated into the mainstream of French democratic ideological tradition. Thus, the assertion of noble privileges in terms of a national constitutional tradition in the writings of Boulainvilliers can be connected to Montesquieu's claim (Book IV. 5 in his *Esprit des lois*) that patriotism is most of all a republican virtue linked to the democratic form of government.

This construction, also inspired by La Bruyère's famous dictum in his *Caractères* asserting that there is no *patria* in a country ruled by despotic government, gained a strong critical edge in the essay by Abbé Coyer, *Dissertation sur le vieux mot de patrie* (1755). Coyer contrasted patriotic feeling to the attachment to one's birthplace (*pays*) and observed the disappearance of the use of the notion of *patrie* as well as the concomitant patriotic feeling in French society subjected to an absolutist government. Coyer's ideas were subsequently echoed in the entry on *Patrie* in the *Encyclopédie*, authored by Louis de Jaucourt, who stressed that there is no fatherland under the yoke of despotism. This position was radicalized in the writings of Rousseau. Significantly, in his *Du contrat social* the philosopher from Geneva turned the republican connotations into a more explicitly democratic direction. Similarly, Marat, in his *The Chains of Slavery*, elaborated on the *topos* of the contrast between the affection towards the native land and love of freedom, stressing that "Turks have no *patria*." This ideological trend was to become an important component of the early revolutionary political manifestos, separating the loyalty to the king from that to the fatherland.

A potential direction of development was represented by Rousseau's later writings especially his *Considérations sur le gouvernement de Pologne* which linked patriotic loyalty not so much to individual liberty but collective independence and a specific "physionomie nationale" to be preserved.¹²⁷ In this sense, the imperative of the preservation of national institutions could overwrite the demand for individual liberties and even the preservation of irrational and obscure national customs and traditions could become crucial from the perspective of

¹²⁷ Bronisław Baczko links this text to the tradition of utopianism: see *Utopian lights: the evolution of the idea of social progress* (New York: Paragon House, 1989), 62–70.

national self-defense. In general, national character became one of the key notions of Enlightenment political analysis—comparing the influence of nature (mostly climatic determination) and culture (the impact of institutions)—developing a political anthropology linking personality types to the question of the possibility of free government.

This trend of thought was clashing with Voltaire's interpretation of patriotism, linking it neither to some sort of republican institutional tradition, nor to national peculiarity, but to the welfare of citizens. In his *Dictionnaire philosophique* Voltaire reiterated that one has a fatherland only under a good king. The implications of this claim for Voltaire were opening the way for a cosmopolitan interpretation of human allegiance, rejecting the normativity of country of birth not from a republican perspective, but from the perspective of universal moral norms and stressing the irrationality of treating humans in different way on the basis of their place of origins.

As mentioned above, the monarchic center also made considerable efforts to instrumentalize the patriotic symbolism, seeking to mobilize popular support for the political and military moves of the ruler. As Edmond Dziembowski convincingly showed, while Abbé Coyer decried the disappearance of patriotic allegiance from French society in the 1750s, in reality the period, influenced by the atmosphere of the Seven Years War, actually witnessed an outburst of patriotic (anti-English) propaganda and the war became featured not so much as a conflict of monarchs but that of nations.

All this once again confirms that contrasting patriotism as an institutional loyalty and nationalism as an affective-cultural identification is extremely problematic. Instead, one can talk about different combinations of institutional and cultural elements. Also, in different contexts the national cultural references could be more or less powerful—a case in point is the patriotic invective of the Austrian Sonnenfels whose projected framework of identification lacks almost completely any reference to cultural markers. At the same time, as we will see, reactions to this color-blind Austrian imperial patriotism stemming from the Hungarian, Bohemian, etc. estates of the Empire actually fused some elements of the discourse of enlightened patriotism with a strong emphasis on national tradition and peculiarity.

East Central Europe—transnational, regional and national patterns

Naturally, as every historical region, East Central Europe is also a heuristic projection to interpret historical phenomena in a comparative setting.¹²⁸ This means that from different perspectives and different research topics very different regional units could have been drawn as a relevant framework. For a project on early modern discourses of national and patriotic allegiance focusing mostly on the four medieval *regna* (Poland, Bohemia, Hungary and Croatia)—formed at the confines of the Latin-German imperial framework, penetrated by Latin Christianity but retaining certain specificities linked to their spatial and temporal birth conditions—seemed to be such a relevant comparative setting.¹²⁹ While naturally there are infinite possible comparative operations, the “original characteristics” (using the vocabulary of Marc Bloch) of the region can be grasped also in terms of a rather similar evolution of the relationship of king, estates and the peasantry, producing among others a sizeable nobility by the eve of the early modern period (in Poland around 7–8 percent compared to the average 1 percent in Western Europe). Thus, far from seeking to essentialize the region as such, the East Central European patterns could be used to show a specific dynamism which is markedly different from the Western European developments but also can be clearly distinguished from, for instance, the evolution of Russian political discourse in the same period.

¹²⁸ For the historiography of the concept of *Mitteleuropa*, Central Europe and East Central Europe see Jacques Droz, *L'Europe centrale: Evolution historique de l'idée de 'Mitteleuropa'* (Paris: Payot, 1960); Peter Stirk, ed., *Mitteleuropa. History and Prospects* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1994); Richard-Georg Plaschka, Horst Haselsteiner et al., eds., *Mitteleuropa-Konzeptionen in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts*, (Wien: Verlag des Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaft, 1995); the thematic issue on Central Europe of the *European Review of History* in Spring 1999; Maciej Janowski, Constantin Iordachi, and Balázs Trencsényi, “Why Bother About Historical Regions? Debates Over Central Europe in Hungary, Poland and Romania,” in *East Central Europe*, (2005), 1–2:5–58; and, most recently, the special issue on Central Europe in *European Journal of Social Theory* 11(2).

¹²⁹ For various perspectives on these specificities see Oskar Halecki, *Borderlands of Western Civilization: A History of East Central Europe* (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1952); Jenő Szűcs, “The three historical regions of Europe: an outline,” *Acta Historica Academiae Scientiarum Hungariae*, 29 (1983), 131–184; Piotr S. Wandycz, *The Price of Freedom: A History of East Central Europe from the Middle Ages to the Present* (London: Routledge, 1992).

On the whole, the development of the conceptions of fatherland and nationhood in this region in the early modern period followed the Western European pattern described above. The identity discourses of the Estates were rooted in the common European tradition of corporate representation, such as the organic metaphors and the ideology of the *communitas regni*. Likewise, the humanist conception of *patria* was received already in the 15th century, most often by direct contact with Italian humanist circles. The impact of the Reformation and religious pluralism generated similar attempts to bring together an eschatological modality and the national discourse. While the evolution of statehood as such was rather problematic in this region, the doctrine of reason of state found its followers in the first half of the 17th century, projecting a new vision of territorial state and governmentality. Finally, enlightened conceptions of patriotism were also eagerly adopted to the East Central European contexts, due to the vivid cultural interaction with France and Britain and also to the local demand of social and political reforms increasingly felt necessary by certain segments of the elite.

Nevertheless, one can discern a set of key factors that made the discourses of patriotic and national allegiance regionally specific. One such aspect is the fundamental role played by cultural transfer in shaping the local discourses of identity. As we could see in the French case, humanist patriotism was everywhere to a large extent a “reactive” ideology, triggered and shaped by the compelling Italian model linking classical antiquity to the present. In East Central Europe the mechanism of transfer was to some extent similar but there were some additional complications leading to the development of certain specific local factors. One such factor is the lack of roots of the medieval and early modern polities in classical antiquity and the equally important absence of the mediation of classical symbols and ideological patterns by the Carolingian Empire. In addition, we can speak also of a permanent exposure to various European centers creating an interference between the French, Italian and German influences which led to fusion of spatial, temporal and ideological horizons rarely seen in Western European contexts (a typical example is the fusion of *ragion di stato*, the ethnogenetic discourse of nobility, and the genre of humanist *Türkenliteratur* in the work of Miklós Zrínyi).

A key factor of lasting importance in the region is the divergence of ethno-cultural and political borders. Significantly, most of the

state-formations in the region were multiple monarchies with various levels of self-government and also encompassing various ethnic groups with divergent political and cultural traditions and symbols. While the roots of these complexities were often present already in the 11–12th centuries, all this got increasingly complicated with the disappearance of the “native” (Piast, Árpád, Przemyslid, Trpimirović) dynasties and the rise of transnational dynastic frameworks (Anjou, Luxemburg, Jagiellonian, and finally Habsburg) that came to dominate a significant part of the region. This multiple state structure evolved simultaneously with the development of vernacular cultural sensitivities, reaching its climax in the second half of the 16th century under the joint impact of humanist philology and Protestantism. At the same time, one cannot speak of the complete separation of political and cultural frameworks of identification either, a process which has often been pointed out in the German context evolving towards a German linguistic-cultural sensitivity increasingly disentangled from institutional-political allegiance. What is peculiar, although definitely not unique, in East Central Europe is the plurality of such allegiances operating in the same political space—conceived of the loyalty to the *regnum* (often symbolized by the crown) in terms of cultivating a normative past of national glory, in a dynamic relationship (in times more tense, sometimes more harmonious) to the allegiance to the imperial center.

A good example for the interplay of different and interwoven layers of loyalty is provided by the Croatian case in the 16–17th centuries. In theory, Croatia was a *regnum* bound in the Middle Ages by an eventually asymmetric, personal union to the Kingdom of Hungary, which in its turn became attached to the Habsburg Monarchy as the Habsburg ruler became crowned as Hungarian king. At the same time, certain Dalmatian territories once under the Croatian kingdom were more or less controlled by Venice, while the city state of Ragusa (Dubrovnik) rose to considerable independence, although paying tribute to the Ottoman Empire. In this complex texture one can discern a pro-Habsburg imperial orientation contrasted to the Hungarian symbolic claims, while another camp stressed the common estates-based constitutional privileges enjoyed as being part of the Hungarian nobility (a discourse with an increasing anti-Habsburg edge). This implied that the symbolic focus of loyalty for the Croatian estates was a partly by then fictitious Hungarian realm, while at the same time the normative memory of a separate Croatian kingdom was also alive. All this was further blurred by the religious divisions, pitting the preponder-

antly Catholic Croatian estates against the Hungarian Protestants (but uniting them in the common cause of Counter-Reformation with the Hungarian Catholics). At the same time, while in the 16th century some of the Dalmatian humanists influenced by Italian cultural references entered the Hungarian *republica litteraria*, developing a specific supra-ethnic *Hungarus* identity, in the 17th century they tended to gravitate towards framing their own Illyrian ethnogenetic myths, which otherwise were first articulated in the 15th century. In the urban contexts of Dalmatia this could further be twisted by the republican identification with the urban community, sometimes coupled with a Slavic cultural-linguistic layer of identity which transgressed the political borders but had little political consequence. From this example one can clearly see that in the case of East Central Europe, perhaps more than anywhere else, the overlapping of different types and layers of cultural and political identifications created a complexity which could hardly be resolved by the rise of modern bureaucratic states in the 18th century and thus led to conflicting claims of national loyalty and territorial imaginary characterizing the emergence of modern nationalism in this region.

On the whole, a fundamental factor of the evolution of discourses of collective identity in the region was the presence of multiple state structures. Hence, one of the conceptual starting points of the project was the notion of “composite monarchy,” brought to the center of attention by G. Koenigsberger and J. H. Elliott and turned recently into one of the key problems of European comparative history.¹³⁰

¹³⁰ John H. Elliott, “A Europe of Composite Monarchies,” *Past and Present* 137 (1992): 48–71. Helmut Georg Koenigsberger: “Dominium regale or dominium politicum et regale. Monarchies and parliaments in Early Modern Europe,” in idem, ed. *Politicians and Virtuosi. Essays in Early Modern History* (London: Hambledon Press, 1986), 1–25; idem, “Composite States, Representative Institutions and the American Revolution.” *Historical Research* 62 (1989) 148: 135–153; For the Central European context see R. J. W. Evans, *The Making of the Habsburg Monarchy, 1550–1700. An Interpretation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979); Márta Fata, *Ungarn—das Reich der Stephanskronen im Zeitalter der Reformation und Konfessionalisierung. Multiethnizität, Land und Konfession 1500–1700* (Münster: Aschendorff, 2000). For the recent literature on the composite monarchies as background for the emergence of multiple identities see: Thomas Winkelbauer, *Ständefreiheit und Fürstenmacht. Länder und Untertanen des Hauses Habsburg im konfessionellen Zeitalter* (Österreichische Geschichte 1522–1699), ed. Herwig Wolfram, (Vienna: Ueberreuter, 2003); Petr Mat’ a and Thomas Winkelbauer, “Einleitung: Das Absolutismuskonzept, die Neubewertung der frühneuzeitlichen Monarchie und der zusammengesetzte Staat der österreichischen Habsburger im 17. und frühen 18. Jahrhundert,” in Petr Mat’ a and Thomas Winkelbauer, eds.,

Drawing on their insights, different historical configurations could be compared from the perspective of their participation in composite state-structures and their respective discourses of identity, paying due respect to the contextual peculiarities of the individual cases, but also seeking to devise a more encompassing vision of the functioning of early modern and modern states and the modalities of cultural-political identification in these multi-national frameworks.

Taking composite states as a starting point means the reconstruction of the “offers” of identity stemming from various entities existing within them. This implies a duality, as the loyalties connected closely to the state frameworks could differ from those tied to regional political entities existing within the framework of composite states. While some of the patriotic discourses were linked to the imperial structure, others were formulated in a dialogue with, or often in a direct opposition to these centres, or embracing both a regional-national allegiance and a supra-national loyalty towards the centralizing court at the same time.¹³¹ In general, this perspective also provides us with a framework of discussion, taking into account not only the ideological developments, but also the “infrastructure” of politics, i.e., the working of institutions producing these discourses and the socio-cultural contexts of these ideological offers.

All this is mediated by the specific role the politics of the estates played in East Central Europe. As mentioned above, the early modern period witnessed a peculiarly strong presence of nobility in the region—segmented in social terms but often extremely keen on retaining its legal coherence—which led to a specific style of politics focused on asserting corporate privileges both upwards (in face of the ruler) and downwards (in face of the peasantry). Identifying the *communitas regni* and the *populus* with the nobility implied the salience of specific legitimating discourses using the national framework. An important

Die Habsburgermonarchie 1620 bis 1740. Leistungen und Grenzen des Absolutismusparadigmas (Forschungen zur Geschichte und Kultur des östlichen Mitteleuropa 24), (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2006) 7–42; on Hungary, most recently: Géza Pálffy, *Szent István birodalma a Habsburgok közép-európai államában—A magyar királyság és a Habsburg monarchia a 16. században* [St. Stephen’s Empire within the Central European state of the Habsburgs—The Hungarian Kingdom and the Habsburg Monarchy in the 16th century], Academic doctoral dissertation (2008).

¹³¹ See various articles in Sándor Bene and Gábor Hausner, eds., *A Zrínyiek a magyar és a horvát történetében* [The Zrínyi family in Hungarian and Croatian history] (Budapest: Zrínyi kiadó, 2007).

element in this is the use of ethnogenetic myths for underpinning the privileges and also for conferring a collective prestige on the realm in view of the European “theater” of nations.

The preponderance of noble corporatism went together with the relative weakness of the urban layer of the society in terms of political representation. In contrast to the English parliament based on the boroughs, for instance in Hungary the urban strata were only represented in a very irregular way. The mainstream discourse, based on the nobility, was rather inimical to the cities, often perceived as ethnic and sometimes also as religious “others.” This, however, does not mean the total absence of the modality of urban patriotism so fundamental in humanist political culture all over Europe. Different East Central European urban elites developed their own narratives of urban liberty and civic allegiance ranging from the relatively “soft” claims of royal cities in Poland or Hungary to the territorialized urban corporatism of Transylvanian Saxons, or to the discourse of city-statehood in Dalmatia most emphatically present in the case of Ragusa.

The denominational factor also contributed to the multiplication of possible loci of allegiance. Confessionalization in the region was in general linked to the Estates (thus at some point almost the entire Hungarian, Polish and Czech nobility was Protestant, the Transylvanian Saxons were *en bloc* becoming Lutheran, etc.) but sometimes alternative streams were developing linked to specific communities and historical conditions. The result was the presence of competing religious cultures in the same place such as in the case of Transylvania marked by the co-existence of Catholic, Lutheran, Calvinist, Unitarian, and Orthodox communities. While the borders of some of these communities could overlap with ethnic divisions, in other cases various denominational groups could assert competing visions of the nation providentially chosen by God.

All this blurring and overlapping had a result which makes the abstract distinction between “political” patriotism and ethno-culturally oriented proto-nationalism impossible to employ in the case of East Central Europe. Instead, one has to trace the complex configurations and the competing and sometimes right-away contradictory claims to allegiance on the part of various political, symbolic, historical, cultural, linguistic, religious and social communities. These actors are far from being specific for the region, but their entanglement and persistence definitely shaped this part of Europe in a very specific way, contributing to what is traditionally described as a “belated” nation

formation. However, rather than subscribing to a one-directional temporal axis and hierarchy, one might well look at these phenomena in terms of a matrix of sometimes even precociously developed national discourses, which permanently clashed with each other and with lots of other concentric circles of loyalty and thus prevented the gradual merger of territorial, ethno-cultural and institutional frameworks of identification which was the key feature of modern Western European nation formation.

In order to put East Central European developments on the European “map,” and assess both the intra- and trans-regional similarities and differences, the Project brought together leading experts in intellectual history from these countries. Creating such a multi-national space of academic dialogue we sought to identify common traits but also leave space for the specific dynamism of individual national contexts. Seeking to critically reassess the ways early modern “national” identities have been conceptualized by different canons of interpretation, we have opted for an approach which focused on the “discursive negotiation” of nationhood in various contexts rather than imposing on the different cases a meta-theory of the “essence” or the “origins” of patriotism and/or nationalism. We are also aware that the canons of conceptualist and contextualist history have been developed in different historiographical traditions and from the perspective of different historical processes. In any case, the socio-cultural context of political discourse and the conflicts around the definition and use of keywords were considered to be central by all authors dealing with some form of conceptual-contextual history. At the same time, a crucial factor of divergence can be found in their differing interpretations of modernity: the birth of modern politics is equated with the transition from a purported absolutism to a parliamentary monarchy in England in the late-17th century, with the dissolution of the medieval state-system and the advent of the *age of ideologies* as a result of the Napoleonic wars in Germany, and, obviously, with the *Grande Revolution* and the ensuing institutional-cultural change in France.

In order to adapt some of these methodological precepts to other national or regional contexts, we realized that the respective advantages of the different “offers” needed to be taken into account in order to devise a new combination of elements which is tailored to the context in question. Standing outside of the formative “Western” traditions, studying more than one national case and envisioning a relatively long-term transformation, the methodological framework of this project fused the

results of the “English” contextualist approach, the “German” *Begriffsgeschichte* and also some elements of “French” post-structuralist historical scholarship with the “local” traditions of intellectual history, while at the same time remaining aware of the complications that such eclecticism entails.

Needless to say, the methodological premises of a project drawing on these diverse traditions are not so firmly established in our region, where the study of early modern intellectual history usually falls under the heading of “literary studies” or else remains subordinated to a more factographically oriented political history which usually treats ideas as epiphenomena. In order to develop such a common methodological framework it proved extremely constructive to engage in intensive discussion with scholars studying the intellectual history of patriotism outside the region. Furthermore, the project had to become inter-disciplinary for the very reason of the existence of a significant branch of intellectual history located within the disciplinary borders of literary studies in our region. Our hope is that the present volume will also facilitate the dialogue between historians and literary historians, whose agendas might prove to be compatible even if the institutional taxonomy often sets them apart.

The unity of the research agenda was guaranteed by some basic factors. We sought to reach a minimum of consensus concerning methodology and the analytical tools to be used during this research. As a result of the joint workshops and research interaction we formulated a basic set of questions which reflected the “loci” and structure of political discourse in these countries. These questions concerned the origins of patriotic discourse, the ways of its adjustment, the mechanisms of conceptual transfer, the institutionalization of these discourses and their socio-cultural context and, finally, the comparability of patterns within the region, as well as the relationship of various Central European and Western political languages. On the whole, the project fits into the tradition of “history of ideas,” but instead of subscribing to the vision of a “great chain” of meanings it concentrates on historically more manageable “thick descriptions,” i.e., analyzing the modification of concepts, interaction of “languages,” shifts in connotations, actions and reactions, texts and contexts, without projecting a mystical journey of “high-flying” ideas from one political situation to another. At the same time, we had to draw a disciplinary border and agreed that rather than posing the question of what early modern historical actors and communities believed about their identity (which would be

a question more for historical anthropologists) we would concentrate on how certain offers of identification were formulated and negotiated in the cultural and political sphere.

In all of the countries in question, the early modern texts referring to nationhood and fatherland forming the core of our project have received considerable attention since the emerging “national canons” of the nineteenth century often evoked this literature as their precursors. This, however, means that more often than not they were studied from the linear perspective of the “formation” of modern nationhood. Our task was therefore to recontextualize these texts from a comparative perspective and explore their common European cultural references, ideological functions and conceptual framework. It was of special interest for us to examine to what extent the patriotic discourse was adjusted to the different ethno-cultural and confessional structures characterizing these countries—i.e. what was the mutual relationship of the different layers of collective identity in the early modern period (corporate, territorial, linguistic, dynastic, etc.) which eventually came to be fused in the national romantic construct of nationhood?

While the heuristic value of the concept of identity has been recently challenged, it seems to be useful, nevertheless, to consider the discourses of collective identity, i.e., the ways different actors described their allegiance to their state framework. Combining the tools of conceptual history and contextual analysis,¹³² we sought to discern the various political attitudes, ideas and loyalties that came to play a role in patriotic discourse.¹³³ Along these lines, we also “mapped” their ref-

¹³² For a recent overview of the Western European developments from the perspective of conceptual history, see Iain Hampsher-Monk, Karin Tilmans, and Frank van Vree, eds., *History of concepts: Comparative perspectives* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1998).

¹³³ There is to date no encompassing comparative examination of the history of patriotism in Europe. There are, however, a number of important case studies. See, for instance, Adam Wandruszka, *Reichspatriotismus und Reichspolitik zur Zeit des Prager Friedens von 1635* (Graz and Cologne: Böhlau, 1955); Jean Lestocquoy, *Histoire du patriotisme en France des origines à nos jours* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1968); Christoph Prignitz, *Vaterlandsliebe und Freiheit: deutscher Patriotismus von 1750 bis 1850* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1981); Hartley, *Patriotism in the Work of Joachim Du Bellay*; Steven C. Pincus, *Protestantism and Patriotism: Ideologies and The Making of English Foreign Policy, 1650–1668* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Dziembowski, *Un nouveau patriotisme français*; Robert von Friedeburg, “In Defense of Patria: Resisting Magistrates and the Duties of Patriots in the Empire from the 1530s to the 1640s,” *Sixteenth Century Journal XXXII* (2001) 2: 357–82 and von Friedeburg, “Patria” und “Patrioten” vor dem Patriotismus.

erences, such as the concrete or abstract *patria*, the patriotic rhetoric of denominational identity-discourses, the clash of regional and state loyalties, the symbolic place of the crown in evoking patriotic allegiance and the cultivation of language as a patriotic duty.

The territorial range of the project concentrated on four countries in East Central Europe—Poland, Hungary, Bohemia and Croatia—which shared a comparable historical experience, being exposed to a similar dynamism of state-formation, but which nevertheless displayed considerable divergence that necessitated a complex “negotiation” of approaches. While the first aim of the project was to bring together case studies on these countries, the working process stimulated an interaction and opened up the way for comparative perspectives going beyond individual national contexts. Obviously, the polities in this region were multi-level composite states—thus rather than limiting ourselves to four “discourses of identity” we had to extend our attention to such focuses of identification as Lithuania, Ruthenia, “Royal” Prussia, Moravia, Transylvania, Dalmatia and the city-state of Ragusa. In addition, we extended our discussions to certain contexts beyond the conventionally understood East Central European space such as Bulgaria, Moldavia, Wallachia, Serbia and Bosnia, which could offer a further basis of comparison.

As for its time-frame, the volume focuses on the understanding of “*patria*” in the early modern period, comparing the Central European cases to each other but also implicitly comparing our regional setting to contemporaneous Italian, German, British and French examples. It also seeks to offer a conceptual and historical apparatus to tackle different discourses of collective self-narration from the period of the rise of humanism until the late-seventeenth century.¹³⁴ By doing so, a number of crucial modalities were identified (humanist patriotism, “elect nationhood,” “Estates patriotism,” and reason of state) which shaped the cultural/political/social aspects of the “discourse of nationhood” in all these contexts from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century. As there is a close conceptual continuity between the seventeenth and eighteenth century formulations (Bolingbroke’s works

¹³⁴ For various aspects of the humanist notion of *patria*, see “L’idée de nation en Europe au XVII^e siècle,” *XVII^e siècle*, 176. (Juillet–Sept. 1992); Christiane Maass, “*La lingua nostra patria*”.

provide a good example),¹³⁵ we also aimed at the reconstruction of Enlightenment modalities of patriotism in relationship to the previous discourses. During our discussions we sought to reassess the impact on our region of ideas stemming from a Swiss/German/Austrian context (Iselin, Moser, Abbt, Sonnenfels)¹³⁶ and paid special attention to the ambiguous impact of Enlightened Absolutism on the political discourses of identity inherited from the previous period, which catalyzed a state-patriotism, but also a new version of ethno-cultural allegiance. While we stopped our systematic research at the period of the emergence of Romantic nationalism, we could not avoid referring to the later processes of canonization and selective appropriation that some of these early modern authors and discursive traditions underwent. On the long run, it is hoped that our project will generate further research going beyond the early modern period and encompassing the history of the impact of the earlier patterns of collective identity-discourse in the 19–20th centuries.¹³⁷ This would make it possible to reassess in a comparative setting the debates on the “national content” of the “fights for independence in the early modern period” (which in the Hungarian context came to the fore in the so-called “Erik Molnár-debate”) formative for all East Central European historiographies in the mid-twentieth century.

In our work, drawing on the academic literature dealing with the discourses of early modern patriotism and national identification in Western Europe, we identified four key contexts shaping the discourse of patriotism: a, humanist constructions of the normative past and their relationship with the vision of active citizenship, the problem of vernacularism and cultural patriotism; b, the politics of the Estates and their patriotic discourses, the emergence of reason of state and its impact on the emerging normativity of territorial statehood; c, the impact of denominational plurality and the reshaping of patriotism in the light of the thrust of confessionalization, political theology and the discourses of “elect nationhood”; and d, the influence of Enlightenment cultural sensitivities on the conception of Fatherland and the

¹³⁵ Henry Villiers Viscount Bolingbroke, *Political writings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

¹³⁶ For an overview of these debates, see Hans-Martin Blitz, *Aus Liebe zum Vaterland. Die deutsche Nation im 18. Jahrhundert* (Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 2000).

¹³⁷ A similar venture on Dutch patriotism, encompassing both the early modern and modern periods, is Niek van Sas, ed., *Vaderland: een geschiedenis van de vijftiende eeuw tot 1940* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1999).

relationship between monarchical, civic/constitutional and cultural forms of patriotism in the second half of the eighteenth century.

i. *The multifarious impact of humanist models*

In the Hungarian case,¹³⁸ the question of humanist patriotism has been traditionally discussed in the light of the works of such protagonists of humanism as János Vitéz or Miklós Oláh. In both cases the attempt to put Hungary on the map of the *Respublica Litteraria* went together with an attempt to formulate the non-Western cultural specificity of the Hungarians and the reassertion of the corporate identity of the nobility based on a construction of the normative past. Of course, in both cases the very fact that the authors were actually ethnically non-Hungarians makes their position all the more intriguing, and their references to the multi-ethnic character of “Hungaria” requires a more thorough treatment. A crucial issue in this context is the relationship between humanism and the building of a national culture through vernacularism. On this issue **Pál Ács** has contributed with a study on the reception of Erasmianism in Hungary, based on the example of Benedek Komjáti’s translation of the Epistles of St. Paul, the first Hungarian printed book. While the humanist cultural program is usually associated with a self-fashioning in terms of erudition and cultural sophistication, **Gábor Almási**, analyzing the image of the Wallach (Romanian) “other” in Hungarian humanist texts, points out the considerable conflicting potentials of the humanist discourse and the prevalence of ethnic stereotyping. Finally, humanist patriotism in the Italian and German context is often linked to a particular urban space and the existence of city-states, and while early modern Hungary did not develop an institutional framework of strong urban self-government, urban patriotism nevertheless appeared as one of the

¹³⁸ On the problem of early modern Hungarian identity in general, see Jenő Szűcs, *Nemzet és történelem* [Nation and history] (Budapest: Gondolat, 1974). See also Tibor Klaniczay, ed., *Antike Rezeption und Nationale Identität in der Renaissance in besondere in Deutschland und in Ungarn* (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1993); Katalin Péter, “A haza és a nemzet az ország három részre szakadt állapotá idején” [Fatherland and nation in the time of tripartite Hungary], in *Papok és nemesek* [Priests and noblemen] (Budapest: Ráday Gyűjtemény, 1995), 211–33; For a recent overview of Hungarian political thought in the early modern period, see László Kontler and Balázs Trencsényi, “Hungary,” in Glenn Burgess, Howell Lloyd, and Simon Hodson, eds., *Religion, Law and Philosophy: European Political Thought, 1450–1700* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 176–207.

modalities of political discourse. **Farkas Gábor Kiss** studies the text of an urban magistrate of German origins, Valentin Eck, from this perspective, analyzing the socio-cultural and ideological contexts of the emergence of civic humanist precepts in Hungary.

The Croatian story is in many ways complementary to the Hungarian one. The political elite of the late medieval Hungarian monarchy exhibited colorful variation ethnically and linguistically, and the emerging humanist movement was also marked by the mixture of different nationalities. The most powerful such presence was doubtless that of Croats. Some of them shared the so-called “Hungarus” consciousness, identifying themselves on the basis of the common privileges of the nobility with the institutional framework of Hungary, symbolically represented by Saint Stephen’s Crown. Yet parallel to this Hungarian focus of identification many of them also devised a specific Croatian cultural patriotism. The nation-state centered historiographical traditions of the nineteenth-twentieth centuries often eliminated such cross-cultural references and constructed their narratives of early modern Hungarian and Croatian identities as a linear progression leading to the modern national movements, without taking into account the multiplicity of loyalties characterizing the early modern composite state-structures.¹³⁹

¹³⁹ There are some exceptions, however: the humanist intellectual atmosphere of the Hungarian-Croatian shared cultural space is explored by Marianna D. Birnbaum, *Humanists in a shattered world: Croatian and Hungarian Latinity in the Sixteenth Century* (Los Angeles: UCLA Slavic Studies, 1986); while the alternative options of Croatian self-identification, wavering between Illyrism and a “Hungarus”-consciousness, have been described by Sándor Bene, *Egy kanonok három királysága. Ráttkay György horvát históriája* [Three kingdoms of one prebend: The Croatian History of György Ráttkay] (Budapest: Argumentum, 2000). For a general overview of Croatian political history of the early modern period with an eye on the formation of national identity, see Stanko Guldescu, *The Croatian-Slavonian Kingdom, 1526–1792* (The Hague: Mouton, 1970), which is, however, strongly nationalistic. For Croatian humanist historiography, see Ante Kadić, “Croatian Renaissance,” *Studies in the Renaissance* 6 (1959): 28–35; Michael B. Petrovich, ‘Dalmatian historiography in the age of humanism,’ *Medievalia et humanistica* 12 (1958): 84–103; idem, “Croatian Humanists and the Writing of History in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries,” *Slavic Review* 37 (1978) 4: 624–39. On the intellectual history of Illyrism, see Zrinka Blazević, “Performing National Identity: The Case of Pavao Ritter Vitezovic (1652–1713),” *National Identities* 5 (2003) 3: 251–68; and most recently her *Ilirizam prije ilirizma* [Illyrism before Illyrism] (Zagreb: Golden Marketing & Technicka Knjiga, 2008). For the relationship of confessionalization and collective identities, see Joachim Bahlcke, “Außenpolitik, Konfession und kollektive Identitätsbildung: Kroatien und Innerösterreich im historischen Vergleich,” in Joachim Bahlcke and Arno Strohmeyer, eds., *Konfessionalisierung in Ostmitteleuropa. Wirkungen des religiösen Wandels im*

In the context of humanism certain manifestations of Croatian patriotic rhetoric can be related to the Hungarian context, such as the anti-Turkish invectives of Tranquillus Andreis (Andronicus Andrijević), *Ad Deum contra Thurcas Oratio carmine heroico* (1518) and *Oratio...contra Thurcas ad Germanos habita* (1518). However, along with this version of patriotism there was always an alternative stream, mostly stemming from Dalmatia, a border-zone contested by Venice and Hungary. In addition, there were a number of cities (most importantly Ragusa/Dubrovnik) which were marked by a strong sense of urban patriotism and which were shaped by specific cultural influences (mainly mediated by Venice). Focusing on the case of Renaissance Ragusa **Lovro Kunčević** analyzes the relationship of civic and ethnic discourses of identity, pointing out the divergence of functions and referential groups inherent to these two discourses.

In the sixteenth century Dalmatian humanists writing on the origins of Slavs came to champion “Illyrism” and an identification grounded in the common “Illyrian” (i.e. South-Slavonic) language. The most important representative of this trend, studied by **Domagoj Madunić** , is the Dominican monk from Hvar, Vinko Pribojević,¹⁴⁰ who developed a specific humanist historical narrative which was then critically revised in the seventeenth century in the context of the Counter-Reformation (Ivan Lučić, *De regno Dalmatiae et Croatiae*, 1666). All this became the basis of the central *ideologeme* of early modern Croatian identity, which had an enormous impact on the formation of modern Croatian nationalism in the nineteenth century. The evolution of Illyrism is placed in a *longue durée* perspective by **Zrinka Blažević** , who concentrates mainly on the persistence of rhetorical *topoi* and strategies for creating a symbolic framework of identification in the context of overlapping state-building projects and multi-level composite structures (Habsburg, Hungarian, Croatian, Dalmatian, and Venetian).

16. und 17. Jahrhundert in Staat, Gesellschaft und Kultur (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1999), 193–209. On the Counter-Reformation political culture of the Ragusan (Dubrovnik) city-state, see Zdenko Zlatar, *Our Kingdom Come: The Counter-Reformation, the Republic of Dubrovnik, and the Liberation of the Balkan Slavs* (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1992); Zdenko Zlatar, *Between the Double Eagle and the Crescent: The Republic of Dubrovnik and the Origins of the Eastern Question* (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1992).

¹⁴⁰ *De origine successibusque Slavorum* (1532); Croatian translation: Vinko Pribojević, *O podrijetlu i zgodama slavena* (modern ed.: Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1951).

The early modern Bohemian context represents yet another intriguing case of the interplay of different visions of collective identity.¹⁴¹ While the claim of finding the roots of modern nationalism in Hussitism is obviously farfetched, the vernacularist ideology developed by Jan Hus and his followers requires both theoretical and empirical attention.¹⁴² The sixteenth-century chronicle-literature, the most important being the “Czech chronicle” of Václav Hájek z Libočan,¹⁴³ can be compared to the other Central European constructions of normative past underpinning the corporate paradigm of the Estates. At the same time, the ideas of the legal humanist Viktorín Kornel ze Všehrd or the Erasmian philosopher and translator Řehoř Hrubý z Jelení (Gelenius) are good examples of the humanist fusion of the participation in the European *Respublica Litteraria* with the normativity of love of the fatherland. Choosing the case of the humanist printer and writer Daniel Adam z Veleslavína as her starting point, **Lucie Storchová** reassesses the impact of the late humanist doctrines of political prudence

¹⁴¹ For general literature on Bohemian identity and politics in the early modern period, see Josef Macek, “The monarchy of estates,” and Josef Petrůň and Lydia Petrůňová, “The White Mountain as a symbol in modern Czech history,” both in Mikuláš Teich, ed., *Bohemia in History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 98–116 and 143–163; Winfried Eberhard, “The Political System and the Intellectual Traditions of the Bohemian Ständestaat from the Thirteenth to the Sixteenth Century,” in Robert J. W. Evans and T. V. Thomas, eds., *Crown, Church and Estates: Central European Politics in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1991), 23–47; František Kavka, “Bohemia,” in Bob Scribner, Roy Porter, and Mikuláš Teich, eds., *The Reformation in national context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 131–54; Hugh LeCaine Agnew, *Origins of the Czech national renaissance* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1993), 19–50. František Kutnar, *Obrozenecké vlastenectví a nacionalismus. Příspěvek k národnímu a společenskému obsahu češství doby obrozené* [Enlightened patriotism and nationalism. Contribution to the national and social contents of Czechness in the revival period] (written in 1939, published in Prague: Karolinum, 2003); Joachim Bahlcke, *Regionalismus und Staatsintegration im Widerstreit. Die Länder der böhmischen Krone im ersten Jahrhundert der Habsburgerherrschaft (1526–1619)* (München: Oldenbourg, 1994); Josef Válka, “Die «Politiques». Konfessionelle Orientierung und politische Landesinteresse in Böhmen und Mähren (bis 1630),” in Joachim Bahlcke, Hans-Jürgen Bömelburg, and Norbert Kersken, eds., *Ständefreiheit und Staatsgestaltung in Ostmitteleuropa. Übernationale Gemeinsamkeiten in der politischen Kultur vom 16.–18. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig: Universitätsverlag, 1996), 229–241.

¹⁴² The most authoritative studies are František Šmahel, “The idea of the ‘nation’ in Hussite Bohemia,” *Historica* 16 (1969): 143–347, and *Historica* 17 (1969), 93–197; and more recently František Šmahel, *Die Hussitische Revolution* (Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 2002). See also Reginald R. Betts, “National and Heretical Religious Movements from the End of the Fourteenth to the Middle of the Fifteenth Century,” in *Essays in Czech History* (London: Athlone, 1969), 107–31.

¹⁴³ Václav Hájek z Libočan, *Kronika česká* (1534–39).

and social morality from the perspective of a vernacularist program of cultural identity-building and also ponders on the selective appropriation of this tradition by the nineteenth-century Czech nationalist movement in search of predecessors.

Given the extent of the secondary literature, the Polish case must be regarded to a certain extent as an exception in the East Central European context, as the gap between the collective identities of the Polish Commonwealth and the modern Polish national project has for obvious reasons been reflected upon by a number of scholars throughout the twentieth century.¹⁴⁴ At the same time, the experience of the *Rzeczpospolita* has been often raised as a precursor of modern political values, such as tolerance and democracy. It is therefore an interesting challenge to revisit the early modern forms of Polish patriotic discourse, especially in comparison with the other Central European cases. As in the other cases, the first step is to reassess the interplay of the late medieval corporate paradigm with the emerging humanist vision of history in the light of the construction of a new discourse of collective identity. This can be traced in the transformation of chronicle literature from Jan Długosz¹⁴⁵ to Marcin Bielski,¹⁴⁶ the latter being already profoundly influenced by humanism. Humanist political discourse reached a sophistication unparalleled in the region in the works of Andrzej Frycz-Modrzewski,¹⁴⁷ where the issue of *amor patriae* is

¹⁴⁴ On collective identities in the Polish Commonwealth, see Stanisław Kot, "Świadomość narodowa w Polsce w XV–XVII w.," [National consciousness in Poland in the 15th–17th centuries] *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 52 (1938): 15–33; idem, "Recherches sur le conscience nationale en Pologne," *Acta Polonica historica* XIV (1966): 5–22; idem, "Polish National Consciousness in the sixteenth to the eighteenth Century," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* X (1986) 3–4: 316–35; Tadeusz Łepkowski, *Polska—Narodziny nowoczesnego narodu 1764–1870* [Poland—Birth of a modern nation] (Poznań: Poznańskie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk, 1967¹, 2003); Andrzej Walicki, *Poland Between East and West: The Controversies over Self-Definition and Modernization in Partitioned Poland* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1994); Andrzej Walicki, *The Enlightenment and the Birth of Modern Nationhood: Polish Political Thought from Noble Republicanism to Tadeusz Kosciuszko* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989); Konstantin Symmons-Symonolewicz, *National Consciousness in Poland: Origin and Development* (Meadville: Maplewood Press, 1983). Lajos Hopp and Jan Ślaski, *A magyar-lengyel múltszemlélet előzményei* [The prehistory of the Hungarian-Polish vision of the past] (Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó, 1992); Tomasz Kizwalter, *O nowoczesności narodu. Przypadek Polski* [On the modernity of the nation: The Polish case] (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Semper, 1999).

¹⁴⁵ A modern edition is Joannes Długossius, *Annales seu Cronicae incliti regni Poloniae* (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1964–1985).

¹⁴⁶ Marcin Bielski, *Kronika Polska* [Polish Chronicle] (Cracow, 1564).

¹⁴⁷ Andrzej Frycz-Modrzewski, *Commentariorum de Republica emendanda* (1554): modern edition: 1953.

also crucial. The “civic humanist” tradition received a specific twist in the work of the Ruthenian Stanislaus Orzechowski,¹⁴⁸ whose construction of Polish noble Republicanism brought together a myth of common origins and the consciousness of ethnic differences. The Polish ideology of Sarmatism is probably the most powerful example of how the identity constructions of the political nation (of noblemen) sought to incorporate the ethnic diversity of the composite states in question. The symbolic incorporation of the Ruthenian and Lithuanian nobility should also be studied from the “other side” as well, i.e. what were the discursive practices developed by these local nobilities to “write themselves into” the symbolic structure of the Commonwealth and what were the alternative streams, developing parallel or counter-myths.¹⁴⁹ In general, however, even though some new elements of political philosophy, such as reason of state, were becoming influential in Poland as well in the seventeenth century, the “noble republican” ideological constructs of the previous century remained dominant.¹⁵⁰ Along these lines, **Anna Grześkowiak-Krwawicz** offers a broad overview of the notions of citizenship and fatherland in the political discourse of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, focusing on the *longue durée* persistence of republican patterns of thought which stemmed from civic humanism but whose influence extended as far as the political thought of the Enlightenment.

On the whole, one can state that the various discursive modalities of humanist patriotism were received in East Central Europe during the 15–16th centuries and decisively contributed to the formation of local political languages. A key element in this was the impact of humanism

¹⁴⁸ Stanisław Orzechowski, *Quincunx, to jest wzór Korony Polskiej* [Quincunx, or a design for the Polish Crown] (Cracow, 1564).

¹⁴⁹ See, for example, the epic poem *Roxolania* by Sebastian Fabian Klenovych, and for the seventeenth century Frank E Sysyn, “Ukrainian-Polish Relations in the Seventeenth Century: The Role of National Consciousness and National Conflict in the Khmelnytsky Movement,” in Peter J. Potichnyj, ed., *Poland and Ukraine: Past and Present* (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1980), 58–82. See also Józef Andrzej Gierowski, *The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the XVIIIth century: From Anarchy to Well-Organised State* (Cracow: Nakładem Polskiej Akademii Umiejętności, 1996), 105–45.

¹⁵⁰ See, for instance, Szymon Starowolski, *Lament utrapionej Matki Korony Polskiej już konającej na syny wyrodne, złośliwe i niedbajace na rodzicielkę swoją* [The Lament of the despairing Mother of the Polish Crown complaining about her malignant son disregarding his parent] (1655). See also A. M. Fredro’s “Defense of the *Liberum Veto*” (1660), English translation in M. B. Biskupski and James S. Pula, eds., *Polish Democratic Thought from the Renaissance to the Great Emigration: Essays and Documents* (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1990), 157–62.

on the historical narratives of the region, and also on the cultural and political topology of self- and hetero-stereotyping. While the first wave of reception was often based on the shared Latinity of Western Christianity, the philological drive of humanism which also had an impact on the emergence of vernacular cultures in general played a crucial role in formatting a vernacular humanist political terminology centered exactly on the moral duties of man towards his community. As the community in question could be very different (city state, republic, monarchy, empire) the humanist political culture in East Central Europe can hardly be described in terms of a coherent model of “civic humanism”—what we see instead is a complex web of significations shaping the patterns of collective self-identification.

ii. *The politics of the estates and the discourses of collective identity*

In all the cases studied in the framework of our project, the politics of the estates in the context of conflicting claims of loyalty generated by the emergence of modern territorial statehood played a crucial role in sustaining the patriotic discourse, often in opposition to the state project. In his contribution **Benedek Varga** looks at the impact of medieval and humanist political and historiographical constructs on the corporate theory of state, identifying those ideological components which came to shape the opposition discourse of the Hungarian estates in the early-seventeenth century in their clash with Vienna. Looking at the same phenomenon from a different perspective, **Kees Teszelszky** reassesses the complex frameworks of identification devised by Johann Jessenius a Jessen. This Bohemian late humanist reshaped the Hungarian identity discourse by modernizing the corporate paradigm of the body of the crown in the light of new organicist and “arcanist” concepts of politics rooted in the neo-Stoicism fashionable at the turn of the seventeenth century. He thus symbolically reinforced the compromise between the estates and the Habsburg Court personified by the rise of Matthias II to the Hungarian throne.

Along these lines, theories of reason of state, although emerging in a context where statehood itself was still a rather problematic aspect of political life, had a formative intellectual impact on the political culture of Hungary. The discourse of reason of state had antecedents in the reception of Lipsian political prudence at the beginning of the seventeenth century, and the process of its reception is interesting from the perspective of the history of patriotism since the Hungarian neo-Stoic

writers rejected the Lipsian advice of getting rid of the “irrational” passion of *amor patriae* to reach the stoic virtue of “passionlessness” (*ataraxia*).¹⁵¹ This context is studied by **Hanna Orsolya Vincze**, who points out the complex relationship of the patriotic discourse with the Lipsian program in the first half of the seventeenth century. This tradition reached its climax in the works of Miklós Zrínyi, who, drawing mostly on Italian and French reason of state literature, employed a Machiavellian notion of politics as the science of opportunities, combining this with ideas of elect nationhood. In praising (military) virtue and calling for a national army marked by the exemplary role of a reformed and public spirited nobility Zrínyi came close to the vision of a centralized national monarchy. Once again, the neo-Stoic catalogue of virtues incorporates patriotic allegiance and becomes the normative framework of a Hungarian “reason of state”—where the normative memory of the nation occupies the position of the actual territorial state.¹⁵² An alternative focus of patriotism, which was in many ways parallel to this development, emerged with the formation of a Transylvanian reason of state discourse, which, curiously enough, reached its climax exactly in the moment when the Principality lost its political weight completely.¹⁵³

Although the impact of the Counter-Reformation had a certain homogenizing effect on the new political discourses, this multiplicity of loyalties was perpetuated in the seventeenth-century Croatian context. While the work of Juraj Rattkay¹⁵⁴ asserted the interests of the

¹⁵¹ János Laskai, *Válogatott művei. Magyar Iustus Lipsius* [Selected works: The Hungarian Justus Lipsius] (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1970); János Rimay, *Összes művei* [Collected works], ed. Sándor Eckhardt (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1955).

¹⁵² Miklós Zrínyi, *Prózai munkái* [Prose works], ed. Árpád Markó (Budapest: Magyar Szemle Társaság, 1939). The best analysis to date of Zrínyi’s political ideas is written by Tibor Klaniczay, “Korszerű politikai gondolkodás és nemzetközi látóköri Zrínyi műveiben,” [Progressive political thought and international perspective in Zrínyi’s works] in Béla Varjas, ed., *Irodalom és ideológia a 16–17. században* [Literature and ideology in the 16–17th centuries] (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1987), 337–400. From the perspective of reason of state theories, see also Balázs Trencsényi, “Conceptualizations of Statehood and Nationhood: The Hungarian Reception of Reason of State and the Political Languages of National Identity in the Early Modern Period,” *East Central Europe* 29 (Autumn 2002) 1–2: 1–26.

¹⁵³ See, for example, János Szalárdi’s *Siralmas magyar krónikája* [Sorrowful Hungarian chronicle] (modern ed.: Budapest: Magyar Helikon, 1980).

¹⁵⁴ *Memoria regnum et banorum, regnorum Dalmatie, Croatiae & Sclavoniae* (1652). Facsimile and Croatian translation: Juraj Rattkay, *Spomen na kraljeve i banove Kraljevstava Hrvatske, Slavonije i Dalmacije* [Memory of Kings and Bans of the

Croatian Estates in cooperation with the Hungarians and rejecting the Habsburg “reason of state,” Pavao Ritter Vitezović (*Croatia rediviva regnante Leopoldo Magno cesare*, 1700; *Plorantis Croatiae saecula duo*, 1703) developed a “greater-Croatian” discourse, envisioning a national revival in the framework of the Habsburg Empire. Finally, the ideas of Juraj Križanić which transcended the Croatian identity discourse altogether and which were instrumental in bringing the idea of common Slavic identity to Russia, were also the outgrowth of the Croatian patriotic discourse. Studying the historiographical and symbolic geographical negotiation over Illyria in the work of Ferdinando Marsigli and Pavao Ritter Vitezović, **Sándor Bene** analyzes the discursive mechanisms of this new type of “expert” patriotism based on a spatial and a historical projection. By doing so, the author exposes the connections between the search for individual and collective identity and thus challenges the common historiographical picture of the political re-orientation of Illyrian discourse at the end of the seventeenth century.

What makes the Czech case unique is the collapse of the paradigm of Estates-centered patriotism with the fall of the Bohemian Revolt in the 1620s. Thus, Pavel Stránský’s *Respublica Bojema*,¹⁵⁵ a presentation of the political culture of Bohemia to a European audience cloaked in the fashionable theories of political prudence and “reason of state,” becomes a nostalgic image of a non-existing formation rather than the depiction of the actual state of affairs. The ensuing century and a half came to be dominated by a Counter-Reformation political and literary culture which sought to suppress the cultural memory of the anti-Habsburg patriotism of the (Protestant) estates. Nevertheless, one cannot describe this period as lacking in patriotic discourses. We find both on the level of vernacular chronicle-writing¹⁵⁶ and in Church apologetics numerous patriotic statements, so much so that one of the major debates of modern Czech historiography and philosophy of history was precisely the issue whether it was the tradition of the Husites and Czech Brethren or the Counter-Reformation (the so-called

Kingdom of Dalmatia, Croatia, and Slavonia] (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2001).

¹⁵⁵ Modern Czech edition: Pavel Stránský, *O státě českém* [On the Czech state] (modern ed. in Czech: Prague: Sfinx, 1946). See also Pavel Skála ze Zhoře, *Historie česká* [Czech history] (Prague: Svoboda, 1984).

¹⁵⁶ *Země dobrá, to jest země česká* [The good land, that is, the Czech land] (1754) (modern ed.: Brno: Atlantis, 1998).

Baroque Patriotism)¹⁵⁷ that can be considered the precursor of modern Czech national consciousness. The crucial figure in this respect is usually taken to be Bohuslav Balbín,¹⁵⁸ who combined a rigorous Counter-Reformation spirituality with an acute sense of “national sacrality” (the cult of specifically Bohemian saints) and a competition of Czechs and Germans. **Petr Maťa** studies the complex relationship of different representations of the Fatherland in this context, following the instrumentalization of patriotic references in the power struggle of ecclesiastical and noble groups, thus challenging the common idea of the suppression of national references after the triumph of Counter-Reformation and contextualizing the emergence of patriotic claims in the context of the competing estates and networks of patronage.

In the Polish context the swing of the pendulum of denominational identity back to Catholicism was much less dramatic as it was not connected to the collapse of the traditional estates politics but on the contrary brought about its reinforcement. In his essay **Stanisław Roszak** points out the main intellectual sources of the patriotic discourse and analyzes how references to the love of the fatherland were used by the estates, especially the nobility, to legitimize their political projects. Arguing against the usual image of the patriotic discourse monopolized by the nobility, **Urszula Augustyniak** comparatively analyzes the ideas of two social groups, townsmen and soldiers, who were excluded from high politics but nevertheless in different discursive situations expressed their complex identification with their fatherland (understood on different levels ranging from their immediate locality to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth as such).

To sum up, in comparison with the Western European frameworks, one can stress the persistence of the “corporate paradigm” of political self-representation in East Central Europe. The noble estate, identified with the “*communitas regni*” emerged as a focal point of the political ideology in the region in the late Middle Ages and remained there well into the 19th century. This created a strong link between the specific narratives of self-legitimization on the part of the nobility (ethnogenetic myths, etc.) and the national imagery. This does not mean that

¹⁵⁷ The classic statement of this position is Josef Pekař, *O smyslu českých dějin* [On the meaning of Czech history] (1929) (modern ed.: Prague: Rozmluvy, 1990).

¹⁵⁸ Bohuslav Balbín, *Miscellanea historica regni Bohemiae* (Prague, 1679–87); *Dissertatio apologetica pro lingua Slavonica praecipue Bohemica* (ca. 1672, first published in 1775).

those who were excluded from noble privileges were completely without a voice in shaping the national discourse and conversely, in certain crisis situations the symbolic extension of the national framework to the non-nobles also became part of the political discourse. On the whole, however, the deep connection of the national rhetoric to the nobility remained a constitutive feature of political cultures in East Central Europe shaping—sometimes subconsciously—even the modern historiographical constructions.

iii. *Denominational plurality and the discourses of “elect nationhood”*

As for the third question concerning the role of political theology in shaping the patriotic discourse, the complex use of the *topos* of “elect nationhood” by both Protestants and Catholics in the religious-political conflicts of the period is obviously the most important issue to be addressed.¹⁵⁹ Apart from the obvious choice of contemporary sermon-literature and moral-theological poetry, the pamphlet-literature yields us ample material for study. A classic example is the clash between István Magyari¹⁶⁰ and Péter Pázmány.¹⁶¹ The fusion of denominational and patriotic argument has been studied in the works of Péter Alvinczi,¹⁶² who was the most important pamphleteer of the Protestant camp and who also developed a certain “local patriotic” modality concentrating on the multinational city of Kassa (Košice, Kaschau).

Balázs Trencsényi follows the transformation of the discourse of Hungarian elect nationhood from the mid-sixteenth to the early-eighteenth century, pointing out the common European trends but also the local specificities stemming from the fragmented nature of the political and religious community which made it impossible to

¹⁵⁹ See Sándor Óze, “Bűneiért bünteti Isten a magyar népet”. *Egy bibliai párhuzam vizsgálata a XVI. századi nyomtatott egyházi irodalom alapján* [“God is punishing the Hungarians for their sins”: Analysis of a Biblical parallel on the basis of sixteenth-century printed Church literature] (Budapest: Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum, 1991).

¹⁶⁰ Modern ed.: István Magyari, *Az országokban való sok romlásoknak okairól* [On the causes of the many corruptions in Hungary] (Budapest: Magyar Helikon, 1979).

¹⁶¹ Modern ed.: Péter Pázmány, *Felelet az Magiari István sarvari praedicatornak, az orzag romlása okairul, irt koeniure* [Answer to István Magyari, preacher of Sárvár, concerning his book on the causes of the corruption of the country], ed. Emil Hargittay (Budapest: Universitas, 2000).

¹⁶² Péter Alvinczi, *Magyarország panaszainak megoltalmazása és válogatás prédikációiból, leveleiből* [The defense of the *Complaints of Hungary* and a selection of his sermons and letters] (Budapest: Európa, 1989).

identify the community of the elect with the nation as such. While in Western Europe the eschatological paradigm had a decreasing impact on the political discourse in the second half of the 17th century, the Hungarian Protestant context shows an interesting counter-example. Along these lines, looking at the martyrological discourses of Transylvanian and Upper Hungarian Protestants who became targets of persecution in the 1670–80s, **Zsombor Tóth** analyzes the reactivation of the Foxean paradigm of the persecuted Church and its interplay with the patriotic *ideologeme*.

While this discourse is usually connected to the Protestants, the Counter-Reformation also provided certain incentives for reframing a national discourse. The famous “Sermons preached before the Diet” by the late-sixteenth century Polish Catholic priest and writer Piotr Skarga which centered on the issue of love of the Fatherland are a striking example of the intertwining of this corporate discourse and the ideology of the Counter-Reformation which subsequently gave birth to an emotionally even more captivating rhetoric of patriotic allegiance.¹⁶³ Providing a case study to shed light on the way nationhood became an issue in this context, **Regina Pörtner** analyzes the references by the Jesuit mission in seventeenth-century Hungary to the national framework and points to the roots of the later development at the turn of the eighteenth century when disaffected Jesuits and Piarists actually turned out to be principal actors in shaping a discourse of national antiquity.

In the Bohemian context the post-White Mountain Protestant exile community found its main and also internationally renowned ideologue in the person of Jan Amos Komenský (Comenius),¹⁶⁴ who combined a universalist theological and philosophical vision of the improvement of human knowledge, religion and politics with a Czech cultural-linguistic patriotism. **Vladimír Urbánek** follows the evolution of the ideas of this Protestant exile community as it tried to defy oblivion and cultivate the memory of the Czech Protestant estates through an eschatological narrative of elect nationhood structurally

¹⁶³ Piotr Skarga, *Kazania Sejmowe* [Preachings at the Diet], 1597 (Modern edition: Wrocław and Warsaw: Ossolineum—De Agostini Polska, 2003).

¹⁶⁴ See his major work *De rerum humanarum emendatione consultatio catholica* (about 1645–1670, full modern ed.: Prague: Academia 1966); and his *Opera omnia* series (Prague: Academia, 1969–). The most authoritative biography remains Milada Blekastad, *Comenius: Versuch eines Umrisses von Leben, Werk und Schicksal* (Oslo-Prague: Universitetsforlaget-Academia, 1969).

comparable to the Hungarian discourses but assuming rather different functions.

An intriguing case study supplementing the research on the core countries of our project is offered by **Alexandar Nikolov**, who places the emergence of the 18th century ecclesiastical narrative of Bulgarian identity formulated by the monk Paisij Hilendarski into a complex Central and Southeast European framework. Paisij was not a conscious nation-builder, but rather, rooted in a competition of ecclesiastical factions, mediated a series of historiographical *topoi* devised by the Dalmatian Catholic humanist historiography regarding the Slavs, which eventually became appropriated by the completely new cognitive framework of modern Bulgarian nation-building.

On the whole, the discourse of elect nationhood had a powerful resonance in East Central European political culture. To a large extent, it was prepared by the late medieval constructions of identity, such as the *antemurale Christianitatis*, conferring a special mission on the national community. While the ideologeme of “chosen nation” gained special currency with the rise of Protestantism, East Central Europe also provides interesting examples of the trans-denominational symbolic negotiation. Responding to the Protestant political theology integrating national history to the salvation story, Catholic pamphleteers also turned to this framework and sought to depict the ruin of the nation exactly as the result of the rise of religious heterodoxy. In this sense, while both camps were operating in a translational framework of alliances, they developed a strong national narrative with a special focus on national past which could be turned subsequently into a resource of modern national ideology.

iv. *The influence of Enlightenment cultural sensitivities on the conception of Fatherland*

Finally, the reception of the multifarious doctrines of Enlightenment patriotism stemming from England, France and the German lands had a formative impact on the way the duty of serving the fatherland was understood in East Central Europe. Offering a broadly-conceived overview, **Teodora Shek Brnardić** notes the apparent ambiguity of republican and monarchical understandings of the fatherland and points out the way enlightened political thinkers in various parts of the Habsburg Monarchy sought to harmonize all this in terms of a new understanding of the political community.

In Hungary the transformation of collective identity discourses in the eighteenth century was triggered as well by the dramatic reconfiguration of the political situation. The post-1711 establishment following the Rákóczi uprising promised metropolitan careers to the select few (especially the more substantive landed aristocracy) while securing uncontested local power-positions for the country gentry (in exchange for the abandonment of their more daring aspirations to be allowed a say in decisions regarding more general issues). As a result of the consolidation the “language of nationhood” lost its place of eminence in the discursive space of politics. The re-emergence of the “political language of nationhood” was the result of the perceived danger to the framework of compromise posed by Josephist reforms, especially when the Enlightened Absolutist concern with administrative efficiency began to undermine the positions of the country gentry. Nevertheless, one can establish a number of levels of continuity with the patriotic rhetoric of the seventeenth century. One such level is the trajectory of the ethno-genetic discourse,¹⁶⁵ while another one is the use of cultural-linguistic references, which, although in a different institutional context, had a strong impact on the later developments. This can be studied in the county-patriotism of Mátyás (Matej) Bél in the first half of the eighteenth century,¹⁶⁶ and of course the cultural-political discourse of the so-called “national revival,” starting in the 1770s, must also be contextualized from this perspective. Another important but often overlooked modality focused on the supra-national framework of patriotic identification. This was typically an option of those urban elites who did not identify completely with the emerging Hungarian cultural nation-building although they often considered themselves to be part of the Hungarian nation in the pre-modern estates-based sense. From this perspective, **Zsuzsanna Borbála Török**’s study looks at the trans-national contexts of the emerging new understanding of patriotic scholarship in the context of the multi-ethnic principality of Transylvania, which was the venue of three entangled but also fiercely competing projects of national identification (Hungarian, Romanian and Saxon).

¹⁶⁵ László Szörényi, *Memoria Hungarorum* (Budapest: Balassi, 1996).

¹⁶⁶ Mátyás Bél, *Hungáriából Magyarország felé* [From Hungaria towards Hungary], ed. Andor Tarnai (Budapest: Szépirodalmi, 1984).

In the context of the Croatian Enlightenment, the entanglement of the Croatian Estates with the Hungarian project once again makes the patriotic discourse extremely complex. We can study this in the works of Janko Drašković (1770–1856), who put forward a number of projects of Croatian-Hungarian constitutionalism, while the peculiarly Enlightenment-style considerations of national economy and *Staatswissenschaft*, once again in a dual Hungarian-Croatian framework, are at the center in the works of Miklós Skerlecz (*Descriptio physico-politicae situationis Regni Hungariae relata ad Commercium...; Proiectum legum motivatum in objecto oeconomiae publicae et commercii perferendarum*). Similarly, the Bohemian Enlightenment is characterized by a duality present in most of the other members of Central European composite states: the emergence of an Enlightened “constitutional patriotism” disentangled from the ethno-cultural and genealogical narratives, such as presented by František Josef Kinský,¹⁶⁷ and the formation of a language and culture-centered patriotic narrative, which indeed can be read as a precursor of “national awakening” type of discourse.¹⁶⁸ For the second, a good example is František Martin Pelcl, the first professor of Czech language and literature at Prague University, who was instrumental in the recovery of the cultural heritage of Balbín. Similarly, the publishing activities of Václav Matěj Kramerius made the concept of patria (*vlast*) a key term of conceptual mediation between the project of Czech national revival and the Habsburg authorities.¹⁶⁹

The Enlightenment forms of patriotic discourse in Poland are very much connected to the debates and identity options of the previous centuries. As for the mainstream, while the protagonists of the reformist tradition, such as Michał Wielhorski and A. W. Rzewuski,¹⁷⁰ tried

¹⁶⁷ Teodora Shek Brnardić, *The Enlightened Officer at Work: The Educational Projects of the Bohemian Count Franz Joseph Kinsky (1739–1805)* (Ph.D. Dissertation, CEU: 2004).

¹⁶⁸ Hugh Lecaine Agnew, *Origins of the Czech National Renaissance* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1993).

¹⁶⁹ See especially František Kutnar, *Obrozenecké vlastenectví a nacionalismus*; Josef Johanides, *František Martin Pelcl* (Prague: Melantrich, 1981); and Miroslav Hroch, *Na prahu národní existence* [On the threshold of national existence] (Prague: Mladá Fronta, 1999).

¹⁷⁰ Michał Wielhorski, *O przywróceniu dawnego rządu według pierwiastkowych Rzeczypospolitej ustaw* [On reestablishing the ancient order according to the primordial laws of the Commonwealth] (Paris, 1775); Adam W. Rzewuski, *O formie rządu republikańskiego myśli* [Thoughts on republican government] (Warsaw, 1790).

to renegotiate the heritage of noble republicanism, the radical Enlightenment patriotism of Stanisław Staszic and Hugo Kołłątaj contained an explicit critique of Sarmatism and sought to reshape the social imaginary while blaming the gentry for the misery of the Fatherland. Studying the competing discursive frameworks, **Teresa Kostkiewiczowa** offers an overview of the motif of patriotic allegiance in Polish political and literary works, tracing the transformation of the conceptual framework of patriotism culminating in the formation of a program of social emancipation. In turn **Arkadiusz Michał Stasiak**, returning to the issues raised by Teodora Shek Brnardić in the Habsburg context, looks at the alternative formulations of patriotism in the context of the clash between republican and monarchist political projects to save Poland in a period of apparent decline.

In the context of the Polish Partitions, the multiethnic aspects and legacies are once again crucial to understanding the long-term development of Polish patriotism. A case in point is the East-Prussian context previously studied by **Miloš Řezník**,¹⁷¹ where Polish intellectuals like Godofredus Lengnich developed a parallel discourse of Polish linguistic patriotism and Prussian state patriotism. In the present volume Řezník offers a case study on the ambiguities of patriotism displayed by the Galician Polish elite in the context of the loss of Polish statehood and the new referential system of the Habsburg Monarchy, in which he examines the possibility of multiple patriotisms in the period which can be considered the threshold between early modern forms of identification and modern nationalism.

Summing up, as it is the case with other European cultural transfers studied in this volume, the Enlightenment also profoundly reshaped the discourses of collective identity in the region. As in the French case, the duality of monarcho-centric and republican constructions can be observed in this region as well. It is important to stress, however, that in most of the cases we can find the mixture of these two options. For instance, Hungarian Josephists or Polish radical reformers start out as supporters of enlightened absolutism but shift to an ideological position that seeks to activate the democratic potentials

See further Andrzej Walicki, "The Idea of Nation in the Main Currents of Political Thought of the Enlightenment," in Samuel Fiszman, ed., *Constitution and reform in eighteenth century Poland* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997), 155–74.

¹⁷¹ Miloš Řezník, *Pomoří mezi Polskem a Pruskem. Patriotismus a identity v Královských Prusech v době dělení Polska* [Pomerania between Poland and Prussia: Patriotism and identity in Royal Prussia in the time of the Polish partitions] (Prague: Karolinum 2001).

inherent to the anti-absolutist “national” resistance movement of the Estates, seeking to extend the political community of noble republicanism to the non-nobles as well. This also meant that the Enlightenment conceptions of patria and nation are often direct precursors of the national revival movements of the 19th century, although the epistemological frameworks sustaining the interest in national culture were rather different. While the enlightened scholars (such as Kopitar, Dobrovský or Schwartner) usually studied their fatherland as part of a trans-national (or even supra-national) scholarly community, the romantic nation-builders became increasingly focused on national self-fashioning aimed at political mobilization.

On the whole, while East Central European conceptions of *patria* and nation were clearly rooted in a common European circulation of ideas, the local social and political conditions significantly modified the interplay of different ideological components. Beyond presenting the polyphony of national cases, a crucial result of our venture was documenting that, besides the cultural transfer from Western Europe, the intra-regional circulation of ideas and discourses was also considerable. Suffice it to recall the Illyrian project of the Croatian Pribojević which was rooted in Polish ethnogenetic discourses, the Hungarian-Bohemian ideological confluence in the *oeuvre* of Jessenius, the influence of Comenius on Hungarian/Transylvanian radical Protestant ideology, or the impact of the Czech Baroque cult of “national saints” on Croatian Catholicism. In this sense we hope that, while avoiding the “essentialization” of the region, we have managed to prove the validity of posing questions of early modern intellectual history in an East Central European framework.

*

During the four years of our work we received a great deal of institutional and personal help, without which it would have been impossible to complete our project. In some ways, our venture served as a follow-up to the Leverhulme Trust project, *Religion, Law and Philosophy: European Political Thought 1450–1700* (2002–2004), directed by Howell Lloyd, Glenn Burgess and Simon Hodson.¹⁷² One of the aims of that venture was to reshape the intellectual map of Europe, transgressing the common borders of historical narration and involving researchers dealing with Poland, Muscovy, Hungary or the Ottoman Empire in

¹⁷² The outcome of the project is Glenn Burgess, Howell Lloyd, and Simon Hodson, eds., *Religion, Law and Philosophy: European Political Thought, 1450–1700* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008).

“re-negotiating” the history of political ideas in view of the complex interplay of the “multiple” centers with the “multiple peripheries.” Our project drew on the experience of this venture and profited from discussions with its members.

We would like to thank the Research Board and Pasts, Inc., Center for Historical Studies at the Central European University for having generously provided funding for the project meetings and the editing work. The staff of the History Department and the Open Society Archives at CEU kindly hosted our workshops and provided us with an ideal working environment. During our workshops Paul Gradwohl (University of Nancy), Jon Arrieta (Basque University Bilbao) and Hans Blom (Erasmus University Rotterdam) shared with us their insights on the French, Spanish and Dutch cases and also gave a broader geographical perspective to our discussions. Mikhail Dmitriev (Moscow State University—and visiting lecturer at CEU), who has been running a similar project on Eastern European national consciousness in the early modern period was also an important partner of dialogue in shaping our project. Although he could not participate in our workshops, Dubravko Lovrenović (University of Sarajevo) sent us some of his insights on the South-Slavic context. While circumstances prevented him from contributing to the volume, László Kontler’s intellectual presence was very important, particularly for those authors working on the Enlightenment contexts. Our special thanks are due to Professor Robert Evans, a honorary compatriot of all Central Europeans, who contributed a very thoughtful afterword to our volume. We are also especially grateful to Anna Grześkowiak-Krwawicz, who, besides contributing to the volume, was kind enough to help recruiting the other Polish participants. Maciej Janowski generously helped the editors clarifying some of the linguistic and interpretative questions in the Polish context. Florence Walker was kind enough to double check the present introduction from a linguistic perspective. Last but not least, Frank Schaer made a heroic effort of polishing our manuscripts linguistically, making our texts intelligible but also preserving some Central European *couleur locale*, when the historical experience of these cultures—rather divergent from that of Great Britain, not to speak about the United States—necessitated non-conventional conceptual solutions.

PART I

HUMANIST VISIONS OF THE PATRIA

CHAPTER ONE

THE RECEPTION OF ERASMIANISM IN HUNGARY AND THE CONTEXTS OF THE ERASMIAN PROGRAM: THE “CULTURAL PATRIOTISM” OF BENEDEK KOMJÁTI

Pál Ács

“Take into your hands Paul, who is not Jewish any more, nor is he Greek, but he is Hungarian.” This sentence appears in the preface of *Az Zenth Paal leueley magyar nyeluen* (Epistles of Saint Paul in the Hungarian language), the first book to be printed in Hungarian in its entirety.¹ The translation of Benedek Komjáti, published in 1533, is a work of symbolic significance in the history of Hungarian culture.² It is distinctive in that it sets higher rhetoric ambitions on Hungarian literature and commands the interest of a wider readership. Yet while the book’s cultural and related “national” values have understandably made a mark in cultural memory, less research has been done on its distinctiveness in the areas of intellectual history and religion.

The public literary perception crystallized in this way around Komjáti’s translation of St. Paul because his work was seen as the first manifestation of a “national humanism” in the Hungarian language. The translator, while also consulting the *Vulgata*, used Erasmus’ bilingual (Greek-Latin) edition of the Bible (*Novum instrumentum*, 1516) as well as his paraphrases written to accompany Paul’s epistles (*Paraphrases in omnes epistolas Pauli*, 1521).³ On the basis of these two texts

¹ “Accipite itaque manibus obviis Paulum non iam Hebraeum aut Graecum, sed Hungarum”. Benedek Komjáti, *Epistolae Pauli lingua hungarica donatae. Az Zenth Paal leueley magyar nyeluen* [The Epistles of Saint Paul in Hungarian] (Cracov: Vietor, 1533); facsimile edition and commentaries by Áron Szilády (Budapest, Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1883).

² János Horváth, *A reformáció jegyében* [In the name of the Reformation] (Budapest: Gondolat, 1957), 26–30; Rabán Gerézdi, “Az erasmista Komjáti Benedek” [Benedek Komjáti the Erasmian], in idem *Janus Pannoniustól Balassi Bálintig. Tanulmányok* [From Janus Pannonius to Bálint Balassi: Studies], (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1968), 331–46.

³ A copy of Erasmus’s Bible translation was in Sopron (Ödenburg) in Hungary two years after its first publication. Cf. Árpád Mikó and Mária Verő, eds., *Mátyás*

of Erasmus he created his own Hungarian edition, to which he added Erasmus' introductions to the epistles.

Erasmus and the Epistles of St. Paul

The choice of work to translate was already an Erasmian gesture, as the epistles of St. Paul essentially determined Erasmus' Gospel-centric theology.⁴ It can be argued that this representative piece of early Renaissance Hungarian literature derives from an up-to-date state-of-the-art European work that is also of symbolic value in its original context within Erasmus' oeuvre. There was a special reason that Quentin Metsys' portrait showed the master occupied in the composition of his paraphrase of the *Epistle to the Romans*; and there was also a reason that the text of the St. Paul paraphrase was eventually erased from the painting, which was kept in Rome.⁵ There was a time when in the eyes of the Vatican St. Paul counted as a "Protestant saint." Thus, when researching the "national implications" of the Hungarian translation of St. Paul, we have to consider the intellectual movements in the field of force in which this kind of cultural patriotism was formed.

It is well known that the philological, theological and philosophical writings of Erasmus were already in the libraries of Hungarian humanists previous to the battle of Mohács (1526)—a dividing line in terms of history and literary history as well.⁶ By the time the most influential

király öröksége. Késő reneszánsz művészet Magyarországon. 16–17. század század [The Heritage of King Matthias Corvinus. Late Renaissance Art in Hungary, 16th–17th Century] Exhibition Catalogue 28. 3. 2008–27. 7. 2008 (Budapest: Hungarian National Gallery, 2008), N° III–2.

⁴ Albert Rabil, Jr., *Erasmus and the New Testament: The Mind of a Christian Humanist* (Lanham, University Press of America, 1993), 128–39; Jean-Claude Margolin, "The Epistle to the Romans (Chapter 11) According to the Versions and/or Commentaries of Valla, Colet, Lefèvre, and Erasmus," in David C. Steinmetz, ed., *The Bible in the Sixteenth Century* (Durham, North Carolina, Duke University Press, 1990), 136–66.

⁵ Letter from Thomas More to Pieter Gilles, Calais, 6–7 October 1517 in *The Correspondence of Erasmus: Letters 594 to 841; 1517 to 1518*, trs. R. A. B. Mynors and D. F. S. Thomson, annotated by Peter G. Bietenholz, *Collected Works of Erasmus*, 5 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979), 149–51 (letter N° 684). See also Peter G. Bietenholz, ed., *Contemporaries of Erasmus: A Biographical Register of the Renaissance and the Reformation* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985), 2: 438–39; Rachel Giese, "Erasmus and the Fine Arts," *The Journal of Modern History* 7 (1935): 257–79; Margolin, "The Epistle to the Romans," 138.

⁶ Rabán Gerézdi, "Erasmus et la Hongrie," in *Littérature hongroise, littérature européenne, études de littérature comparée* (Budapest: Académie des Sciences, 1964),

works of Erasmus were published, humanism in Hungary was already past its peak: the poetry of Janus Pannonius, the historic works of Antonius Bonfini and the establishment of the world famous Bibliotheca Corvina, all belonged to the humanism of the 15th century, to the history of the Renaissance court of Matthias Corvinus of Hungary. No wonder that the master of Rotterdam working at the workshop of Aldus Manutius in Venice considered Hungary as a place where important and good quality manuscripts essential for philological studies could be purchased for reasonable price. Over the ensuing decades Erasmus “conversed” with his Hungarian friends who were familiar with the newest trends in humanism through personal contacts and especially via the correspondence that connected and bound together the great family of humanists. And of course it was the humanism of the age of Matthias and the Jagiellons that created a well-prepared base for the Hungarian reception of Erasmian intellectuality.⁷

The consecutive phases of Hungarian Erasmianism are usually grouped around three topics especially characteristic of the individual periods. In this scheme the early period is concerned with humanist philology, in the second phase theology and ethics gained pre-eminence, while the third or late phase was mainly characterized by an interest in “*philosophia sacra*.” If we concentrate in particular on Erasmian writings in Hungarian, we can see that these topics are present from the beginning in Komjáti’s literary program and create a coherent logical unit.⁸

One cannot find any deliberate attempt at improving the *lingua vulgaris* in Hungary before the publication of Komjáti’s translation of St. Paul in 1533. It is well known that literature (literacy) in the Hungarian language had existed previously, mainly in monasteries where religious texts considered important were translated for the monks and nuns who did not read Latin. However, Komjáti made the first real attempt to develop a Hungarian literary language capable of rendering

129–54; Ágnes Ritoók-Szalay, “Erasmus und die ungarischen Intellektuellen des 16. Jahrhunderts,” in August Buck, ed., *Erasmus und Europa*, Wolfenbütteler Abhandlungen zur Renaissanceforschung, 7 (Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz, 1988), 111–28.

⁷ Rabán Gerézdi, “Aldus Manutius magyar barátai” [The Hungarian friends of Aldus Manutius], in *Janus Pannoniustól Balassi Bálintig*, 204–65.

⁸ Pál Ács, “Hungarian Friends of Erasmus in the Sixteenth Century and Today,” in Arnoud Visser, ed., *In Search of the Republic of Letters: Intellectual Relations between Hungary and The Netherlands 1500–1800* (Wassenaar: Study Centre on the Republic of Letters in the Early Modern Period, NIAS, 1999), 21–28.

the Bible. Erasmus' works stimulated Komjáti to lay the grammatical, rhetorical and theological foundations of a Hungarian vernacular literary language (*vulgaris illustris*). In this sense the Hungarian translation of St. Paul brought about a shift in the process of the development of cultural patriotism.⁹

First of all, we have to trace the itinerary of Erasmus to St. Paul, which might allow us to understand better the path of his modest Hungarian "disciple," Benedek Komjáti, to the master of Rotterdam. Reading and interpreting the epistles of St. Paul had in fact caused a kind of *volte-face* in Erasmus' own intellectual development. Until 1499 he had mostly been concerned with the literature of classical antiquity, but the impressions he received during his stay in England completely transformed his interests.¹⁰ John Colet's enthusiastic lectures in Oxford on the interpretation of St. Paul's epistles inspired the scholar from Rotterdam to dedicate his humanist education and his mental powers to the study of the Bible.¹¹ Colet was not a scholar of Greek, so he interpreted St. Paul according to the *Vulgata*; however, Erasmus made his own translation and paraphrase based on his knowledge of the original sources.¹² In doing so, Erasmus contributed greatly to enlightening the Christian world about the text and theology of the Apostle's letters. At the same time he distilled those basic thoughts from St. Paul that were to pervade his later works. Indeed, it can be said that that Erasmus built up his own philosophy based on the epistles of St. Paul, which he called the "philosophy of Christ."¹³

Erasmus placed a special interpretation on the fact that Paul was "the apostle of pagans." The Paulian mission, in this interpretation,

⁹ Pál Ács, "A magyar irodalmi nyelv két elmélete: az erasmista és a Balassi-követő" [Two theories of the Hungarian literary language: The Erasmian and that of the followers of Balassi], in "Az idő ósága." *Történetiség és történetiszemlélet a régi magyar irodalomban* ["The Antiquity of Time": Historical aspects of old Hungarian literature] (Budapest: Osiris, 2001), 13–31.

¹⁰ Johan Huizinga, *Erasmus and the Age of Reformation: With a selection from the letters of Erasmus* (London: Phoenix, 2002, c. 1924), 29–34; Cornelis Augustijn, *Erasmus: His Life, Works and Influence*, trs. J. C. Grayson (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995), 31–33.

¹¹ Bietenholz, *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, 1: 323–28; Rabil, *Erasmus and the New Testament*, 38–46; Margolin, "The Epistle to the Romans," 151–57.

¹² Germain Marc'hadour, "Erasmé et John Colet," *Colloquia erasmiana turonensia, 12e Stage international d'études humanistes, II, Tours, 1969*, ed. Jean-Claude Margolin (Paris: J. Vrin, 1972), 761–769.

¹³ James D. Tracy, *Erasmus of the Low Countries* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), 104–115.

extended to the intellectual culture of paganism. For him, the conversion of pagans meant the consecration of the entirety of antiquity. He was convinced that God did not proclaim himself only for the Jews, but sowed the seeds of the Gospel in the earth of paganism, and thus the germs of the more valuable Christian philosophy were contained in Classical culture.¹⁴ It is not accidental that in his letters written at the turn of the 15th and 16th centuries he often refers to the deepening knowledge of *bonae litterae*, the literature of the Antiquity, as “salvation.”¹⁵ Thus Erasmian Christian humanism is not merely the application of the liberal arts in Biblical studies, but a two-way consecration serving universal redemption. Erasmus’ world view, it should be noted, was greatly influenced by the exaggerated eschatological expectations of his age.¹⁶

Erasmus’ tenets of redemption were based on the New Testament, the Gospel addressed to the whole of humanity. The New Testament, according to Paul’s teaching, is sharply set against the Old Testament, the Law proclaimed to the Jews—a view, of course, shared by Erasmus. “For this reason above all he [Christ] was born and died, to teach us not to act like Jews, but to love,” wrote Erasmus.¹⁷ The parallel and contrasted Old and New Testaments—the Law and the Gospel, and the two different, chosen communities that accepted the proclamation—are opposing pairs born at the same time with Christianity. Following in St. Paul’s footsteps, Erasmus also contrasts “the body of Israel” (that is, Judaism) with spiritual Israel, that is, Christianity, and the Law with the Gospel.¹⁸ However, when we talk about Erasmus’ anti-Judaism, we have to interpret it in the original context of his times. The verbal

¹⁴ Augustijn, *Erasmus*, 84.

¹⁵ Huizinga, *Erasmus*, 203; Tracy, *Erasmus of the Low Countries*, 152.

¹⁶ Peter G. Bietenholz, “Millenarismo ed età dell’oro nell’opera di Celio Secondo Curione,” in Luisa Cecchi Tarugi, ed., *Millenarismo ed età dell’oro nel Rinascimento. Atti del XIII Convegno internazionale Chianciano-Montepulciano-Pienza (16–17 luglio 2001)* (Florence: Franco Cesati Editore, 2003), 51–64.

¹⁷ Desiderius Erasmus, “Enchiridion,” in *Collected Works of Erasmus (CWE), Spiritualia: Enchiridion / De contemptu mundi / De vidua christiana*, Volume 66, ed. John W. O’Malley (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988), 79; *Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami Opera Omnia* (LB), ed. Jean Leclerc (Leiden, 1703–1706) V 35E.

¹⁸ Rom. 2,29; cf. Marcel Bataillon, *Erasme et l’Espagne. Recherches sur l’histoire spirituelle du XVI^e siècle* (Genève: Droz, 1998), 638–39.

context of late humanism, while not “better” in a moral sense, is essentially different from that of modern anti-Semitism.¹⁹

In his eyes—as in the eyes of St. Paul—Judaism mainly meant the Pharisees’ strict obedience of the law, and in a figurative sense, the Pharisee mentality present in Christian circles. Erasmus wrote:

There are also some relevant passages in the Gospel where Christ attacks the Pharisees and scribes and teachers of the Law while giving his unflinching protection to the ignorant multitude. What else can ‘Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees’ mean but ‘Woe unto you who are wise’? But Christ seems to have taken special delight in little children, women, and fishermen...²⁰

Erasmus well knew this kind of religiousness, for he had been raised in it.²¹ As Paul had been struggling to cast off his own Pharisee past, so Erasmus was trying to shake off the bonds of monasticism. His anti-Judaism thus was mainly antinomianism.²² He was not confronting the Jews, he was rather condemning those forms of religious life that he deemed to be of a Jewish character, characterizing not the Jews but rabid Christians, Erasmus’ opponents. As he writes in one of his letters:

Nowadays...on the slightest pretext at once they are all crying, ‘Heresy, heresy’. In the old days a heretic was one who dissented from the Gospels...Anything they do not like, anything they do not understand is heresy. To know Greek is heresy; to speak like an educated man is heresy. Anything they do not do themselves is heresy. It is, I admit, a serious crime to violate the faith; but not everything should be forced into a question of faith.²³

Erasmus was intent on narrowing the number of the “questions of faith”—in this he was in harmony with Paul’s intentions. “The Lord is

¹⁹ Simon Peretsovich Markish, *Erasmus and the Jews* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986); Zoltán Csepregi, *Zsidómisszió, vérvád, hebraisztika* [Mission to the Jews, blood libel, Hebrew studies] (Budapest: Luther Kiadó, 2004), 30–31.

²⁰ Erasmus, *Moriæ encomium*, LB IV 497A.; Praise of Folly, CWE 27, 148.

²¹ Rabil, *Erasmus and the New Testament*, 2–6.

²² Desiderius Erasmus, “Commentarius in psalmum 2,” CWE 63, 65–153; Allan K. Jenkins, “Erasmus’ Commentary on Psalm 2,” *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 3 (2000–2001): Article 3 (http://www.arts.ualberta.ca/JHS/Articles/article_15.pdf). Accessed on 31st May 2008.

²³ Letter to Albert of Brandenburg, Louvain, 19 October 1519. *The Correspondence of Erasmus. Letters 993 to 1121; 1519 to 1520*, trs. R. A. B. Mynors, annotated by Peter G. Bietenholz, *Collected Works of Erasmus*, 7 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987), 115 (Letter N^o 1033).

spirit. Where the spirit is, there is liberty,” he writes in the *Enchiridion*.²⁴ However, he always paired the basic tenet of *sola fides* with active love. He could only imagine the unity of the Christian world based on faith in Christ. This Gospel-based human community was the only social formation whose right to existence he acknowledged: as Christ is the source of life, there must be no human life outside of Christ. Those who belong to this community reach the state of chosenness through God’s mercy and Christ’s expiatory sacrifice.²⁵ In Erasmus’ interpretation, it is not only in God’s, but also in mankind’s power to make a choice: human beings can choose which world they want to belong to.²⁶ Nevertheless there are only two worlds: one is visible, the other is invisible; one is transient, the other is eternal. There are two ways, there is no third one. As he says, “Do not try to divide yourself between the world and Christ. You cannot serve two masters.”²⁷

According to both St. Paul and Erasmus, the basis of the evangelical community is not Moses’ Law but Abraham’s faith. Abraham did not owe his true state to circumcision—the symbol of the contract made with God—as he had proven his true nature before he ever received the sign. Abraham believed in God above all else, and he was even willing to sacrifice his only son, the token of the promise. His faith was active devotion, free realization and voluntary choice. According to Erasmus’ paraphrases of St. Paul, Paul’s Abraham was the model to follow for the reborn Christian community. His sacrifice created harmony between God’s eternal mercy and mankind’s unlimited possibilities. As Albert Rabil says regarding Erasmus’ religious consciousness, “Faith here has the double meaning of something received from God [*fides qua creditur*] and a human response [*fides quae creditur*]. . . . Sometimes Erasmus speaks as if trust [*fiducia*] is the human response to the faith [*fides*] given by God. [. . .] Obedience to faith means simple and tacit obedience, not that of Jews who demand signs—they should be confronted with the example of Abraham, or of Christians who are more addicted to their ceremonialism than the Jews ever were. [. . .] Trusting God in one’s heart is spiritual worship;

²⁴ Erasmus, *Enchiridion*, 78; LB V35A.

²⁵ Rabil, *Erasmus and the New Testament*, 52–58; Augustijn, *Erasmus*, 43–55.

²⁶ John B. Payne, “Erasmus on Romans 9:6–24,” in *The Bible in the Sixteenth Century*, 119–35.

²⁷ Erasmus, *Enchiridion*, 57; LB V22D.

demanding from him a sign is carnal worship. These two forms of religion are mutually exclusive.”²⁸

*The achievement of Benedek Komjáti:
Vernacular translation as “patriotic mission”*

Benedek Komjáti, the first Erasmist writing in Hungarian, studied at the University in Vienna where he enrolled in the first half of 1527. Erasmus’ influence prevailed at the university, marked now by a stark rejection of the reform of faith after the doyen of Rotterdam openly turned against Luther from 1525. It was during Komjáti’s stay in Vienna, in 1528, that the bishop of Vienna invited Erasmus to the imperial city in the name of Ferdinand of Habsburg—an invitation Erasmus politely declined.²⁹ From “the Turk beasts” laying siege to Vienna in 1529 Komjáti fled to Huszt in north-east Hungary. The owner of neighboring Nyalábvár, Katalin Frangepán, noticed him and entrusted him with the education of her son. Katalin Frangepán was among the active supporters of Hungarian erudition. On the commission of his patroness, who never mastered Latin and indeed was probably illiterate, Komjáti undertook the Hungarian translation of St. Paul’s letters.³⁰

Komjáti’s Erasmian humanism is founded on an appropriate choice of sources and a critical treatment of these texts. In his preface to the work, the author tells that there was an earlier Hungarian interpretation of St. Paul available; however, he did not like it, as it was not only difficult to interpret but difficult even to read:

Although Your Ladyship has the epistles of St. Paul translated at Your place, yet You urged and commanded me to see whether they were all, and if in a good way and manner, translated from Latin into the Hungarian. After having seen the translation, it did not seem to me that it was translated well, as not only its meaning but even its reading seemed difficult.³¹

²⁸ Rabil, *Erasmus and the New Testament*, 143–44.

²⁹ Gerézdi, “Az erasmista Komjáti Benedek,” 336.

³⁰ Ács, Pál, “Komjáti Benedek” [Benedek Komjáti], in *Magyar Művelődéstörténeti Lexikon* [Encyclopaedia of Hungarian Cultural History], ed. Péter Kőszeghy and Zsuzsa Tamás (Budapest: Balassi Kiadó, 2006), 6: 30–32.

³¹ Komjáti, *Epistolae Pauli*, 8.

Thus Komjáti rejected this earlier Hungarianized version of St. Paul—probably intended for use in monasteries—on linguistic and philological arguments. However, this rejection on principle did not prevail in practice: in effect, Komjáti's work is a compilation, for he also used a medieval manuscript he found in Nyalábvár.³² Just as Erasmus studied the original Greek text instead of the Vulgate, so the Hungarian translator neglected the medieval versions of St. Paul and started work by rendering Erasmus' Latin paraphrases. The first Hungarian printed book is an erudite philological work that utilized, via Erasmus, the interpretations of Origen and St. Jerome as well.³³ In order to fulfil his aim, Komjáti had to speak in a Hungarian language that was worthy to convey the Biblical message; however, the Hungarian language of the time was inadequate to express delicate textuality and rhetorical sophistication.³⁴ Erasmus himself had made serious attempts to widen the parabolic possibilities of the Latin language—his world-famous *Adagia*, a collection of proverbs and idioms, was a result of this effort.³⁵ Komjáti was the modest but determined disciple of Erasmus in exploring the possibilities of synonyms and figurative speech. A considerable part of the text is interrupted by *parentheses*, or additions in brackets. In his Preface—a classical dedication building on humanist *topoi*—Komjáti gives a longer explanation for this practice, which was an attempt to unite translation and Bible commentary,³⁶ whereby he raised the practice of medieval glossators—of putting the synonyms of given words above or below the lines—to the level of Erasmian

³² This medieval source of Komjáti is lost. It might have been very similar to the pericopes surviving in the so-called *Codex Döbrentei*. See *Döbrentei-kódex*, ed. Csilla Abaffy and Csilla T. Szabó, Régi magyar kódexek 19. (Old Hungarian Codices 19) (Budapest: Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság-Argumentum, 1995).

³³ On the Origenism of Erasmus see André Godin, *Erasmus, lecteur d'Origen* (Genève: Droz, 1982) (Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance, 190); Rabil, *Erasmus and the New Testament*, 46–52; Payne, “Erasmus on Romans 9:6–24,” 123.

³⁴ József Turóczy-Trostler, “A magyar nyelv felfedezése. Két tanulmány az európai s a magyar humanizmus kapcsolatáról” [The discovery of the Hungarian language: Two studies on the relationship of European and Hungarian humanism], in *Magyar irodalom—világirodalom. Tanulmányok* [Hungarian Literature—World Literature. Studies] (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1961), 1: 17–72.

³⁵ On the reception of Erasmus' *Adagia* see Adam Fox, *Oral and Literate Culture in England 1500–1700* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2000), 112–72; Vilmos Voigt, “Paremiology in Europe 400 Years Ago,” in Gábor Barna, Ágnes Stremmler and Vilmos Voigt, eds., *Igniculi sapientiae. János-Baranyai-Decsi Festschrift*, (Budapest: OSZK–Osiris, 2004), 12–30.

³⁶ Komjáti, *Epistolae Pauli*, 15–16.

philology.³⁷ Through these efforts he fulfilled a goal of Erasmus, who often expressed his desire to make the Gospel available to simple, ordinary people through translations to their mother tongue, and the process of the consecration of languages could be extended beyond the boundaries of the three holy languages (Hebrew, Greek and Latin). The Master of Rotterdam never really took the time for this kind of work, but his Latin commentaries were written in such a fluent and clear style that it was easy for translators to convey their meaning in other languages.³⁸

The Hungarian translation of St. Paul also conveyed Erasmus' theological message. Komjáti's book is an interpretation of Erasmus that closely follows word, text and subject. Still, there were times when the emphases moved from their original places in the new context of the Hungarian vernacular language, and the Erasmian teaching was broadened and modified to a certain extent. It is this transformation that we shall try to elucidate next.

Translation has an evangelical mission: passing redemption to the cultures of national languages.³⁹ The fact that the Apostle speaks Hungarian instead of Hebrew, Greek or Latin has a deeper meaning. The Gospel, of course, speaks to the whole body of chosen Christians, but in this case it addresses a special, separate group which has its own language and history and which is waiting for salvation in both a cultural and spiritual sense. This message is not for the Gentiles, but in a linguistic-cultural sense reaches Hungarians who are about to step on the road to salvation. It strengthens their sense of belonging together

³⁷ Simon Markis, *Rotterdam Erasmus* [Erasmus of Rotterdam] (Budapest: Gondolat, 1976), 221.

³⁸ For example, Erasmus' paraphrases of St. Paul were translated into German by Leo Jud, Zwingly's faithful colleague. Bietenholz, ed., *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, 2: 248–50.

³⁹ Luther made a similar effort in the preface to his edition (1518) of the famous German mystical treatise called *Theologia Deutsch*: "Where books in the Latin, Greek and Hebrew tongues have failed to lead the German people to God, a book in the German tongue has succeeded." Steven E. Ozment, *Mysticism and Dissent: Religious Ideology and Social Protest in the Sixteenth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973), 20. See also André Séguenny, "Le spiritualisme de Sebastian Franck: ses rapports avec la mystique, le luthéranisme et l'Humanisme," in Jan-Dirk Müller, ed., *Sebastian Franck (1499–1542)* (Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz, 1993) (Wolfenbütteler Forschungen, 56), 87–102; Julie K. Tanaka, "Historical Writing and German Identity. Jacob Wimpheling and Sebastian Franck," in Christopher Ocker et al., eds., *Politics and Reformations. Histories and Reformations. Essays in Honor of Thomas A. Brady, Jr* (Leiden: Brill, 2007) (Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions, 127), 155–176.

and lays a foundation for their sense of chosenness.⁴⁰ As for Erasmus Christianity becomes the “second Israel,” likewise the Hungarians can become God’s newly chosen people: “Such a hard thing it was to make a Christian out of a Jew. [...] In addition, as the nation of the Jews is so hated, much more than all other nations in this world, [...] they too were cursing [...] everyone as [...] idolaters.”⁴¹

The old counterparts of Synagogue and Ecclesia are now filled with national content. Ecclesia, interpreted as the “real Israel,” symbolizes not only Christianity as it acts in the eternal present, but also the eschatological community living to see the end of time. The symbol of Ecclesia represented the community’s existential aim, its mystical walk of life and history of salvation.⁴² Although Komjáti does not openly identify the “new Israel” of the Paulian letters with the Hungarians, he does so in a covert form.

The book was published in Cracow at Katalin Frangepán’s expense in the printing house of Hieronymus Vietor, fittingly designed and richly illustrated with figured initials and wood-cut engravings.⁴³ For some time Vietor considered using German-style Schwabachian or Antiqua characters for the typesetting; there was a pilot-printing of at least a part of the *Epistle to the Romans* in Gothic type, specimens of which were later found in the binding of certain books printed in Cracow;⁴⁴ but finally the printer opted for classic type. The edition is one of the most richly illustrated books of the period. In the Latin pre-ambule and epilogue the printer boasts that the first Hungarian printing (*prima foetura*)⁴⁵ was produced in his workshop, giving the epistles

⁴⁰ Balázs Trencsényi, “Conceptualizing statehood and nationhood: The Hungarian reception of «Reason of State» and the political language of national identity in the early modern period,” *East Central Europe* 29 (2002): 1–26; Pál Ács, “Historischer Skeptizismus und Frömmigkeit. Die Revision protestantischer Geschichtsvorstellungen in den Predigten des ungarischen Jesuiten Péter Pázmány,” in Anna Ohlidal and Stefan Samerski, eds., *Jesuitische Frömmigkeitskulturen. Konfessionelle Interaktion in Ostmitteleuropa 1570–1700*, Forschungen zur Geschichte und Kultur des östlichen Mitteleuropa, 28 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag), 279–94.

⁴¹ Komjáti, *Epistolae Pauli*, 25–26.

⁴² Hannelore Sachs, Ernst Badstübner and Helga Neumann, *Christliche Ikonographie in Stichworten* (Leipzig: Koehler und Amelang, 1988), 110–11.

⁴³ Gedeon Borsa, Ferenc Hervay, Béla Holl et al., eds., *Régi Magyarországi Nyomtatványok I. 1473–1600* [Repertory of Early Hungarian Printed Books, vol. I, 1473–1600] (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1971), N^o 13. (The work is commonly abbreviated: RMNy).

⁴⁴ RMNy I N^o 12.

⁴⁵ Komjáti, *Epistolae Pauli*, 471.

of St. Paul in Hungarian to the Hungarians. In this he was following Erasmus' instructions, who had urged "every woman to read the Gospel, to read Paul's epistles."⁴⁶

The title page of the book is illustrated by a strikingly large Hungarian crest bearing the stripes and the cross—symbolizing the power of the Kingdom of Hungary by the inclusion of the coats of arms of Dalmatia and Bohemia. As Vietor always sought to satisfy the taste of his customers, the wood trunk of the over-sized coat of arms is likely to have been designed specifically for this book—a gesture embracing the ideas of both the author and the commissioner. This woodcut coat of arms reoccurred in Hungarian printings produced in Cracow in the following years.⁴⁷ It has been long established that the start of Hungarian translations was furthered by the booming "national" tendencies. The Hungarian coat of arms cut in Cracow very probably sought to propagate the "national" ideas of the Erasmist Benedek Komjáti—in this context, the expression of a desire for peace and tranquility in a politically divided country ravaged by the Ottomans. As he says in his preface "If the Mighty Lord is postponing my death, and in this crippled (miserable) country there will be peacefulness, I intend more and more to serve in such matters."⁴⁸

This kind of overemphasis of the Hungarian sense of mission is obviously a compensation to counterbalance the country's passed glory, its ruptured political unity and a Turkish military advance that seemed impossible to contain. We know that Komjáti himself was driven from his homeland by the "pagan Turks." The more limited the possibilities offered by his country seemed, the more he wanted to enlarge it in his imagination. In the words of a later Hungarian Erasmian János Baranyai Decsi, the translator of Erasmus' *Adagia*: "If—like the Greeks—we have lost control over most of the territory of our country [...], we should at least dedicate our language, history and literature to immortality."⁴⁹

⁴⁶ Markis, *Rotterdam Erasmus*, 221, 339.

⁴⁷ Judit Ecsedy V., *A könyvnyomtatás Magyarországon a kézisajtó korában 1473–1800* [Book printing in Hungary in the age of hand-operated printing machines 1473–1800] (Budapest: Balassi Kiadó, 1999), 33.

⁴⁸ Komjáti, *Epistolae Pauli*, 14.

⁴⁹ Letter to János Telegdi, 5 March 1598. in *Janus Pannonius—magyarországi humanisták* [Janus Pannonius—Hungarian Humanists], ed. Tibor Klaniczay (Budapest: Szépirodalmi Kiadó, 1982), 809.

The program of spreading the Gospel in Hungarian fits into the main spiritual movements of the age, which fundamentally influenced Erasmus himself too. The reason that the Latin prologue of the book emphasizes that not only Cicero but also St. Paul must be read by the Hungarians is that Komjádi regarded as especially significant that God speaks in Hungarian to the Hungarians here: “If M. Tullius, who was equally excellent as philosopher and rhetorician, was right that cultivating erudition makes advantageous things bright and gives asylum in disadvantage, how much more should we hold the same about these letters, which are from Him, whom we profess as our God, and also call him Paracletus, that is consoling”—as Vietor put it in the prologue.⁵⁰ Paracletus refers of course to the Holy Spirit. It is a notion—a favorite of Erasmus—which in this context only occurs in the Gospel of St. John, and is also kept in Greek in St. Jerome. In itself it is a telling evidence that the Cracow printer considered the publishing of the Hungarian translation of St. Paul in line with the program of Erasmian spiritualism. It was this thought that inspired Komjádi to write in a purified and refined Hungarian language capable of transmitting the message of the Bible. A similar spiritually-motivated desire to improve the vernacular languages was expressed in other countries of Europe as well, for example by David Joris for the Dutch language,⁵¹ or a decade later, if certain limitations are applied, by Sebastian Franck in his paraphrase to the abovementioned *Theologia Deutsch*.⁵² As Alastair Hamilton puts it:

It was proof that God spoke wherever He chose, whenever he chose and in whatever language he chose. Indeed Franck went as far as to suggest that the Almighty spoke with particular effectiveness in German to the Germans, certainly just as well as He had ever spoken to “any theologian from the ranks of the Hebrews, Latins or Greeks.”⁵³

Besides speaking in tongues (glossolalia), another sign of divine election was the undertaking of martyrdom, of self-sacrifice.⁵⁴ Following the

⁵⁰ Komjádi, *Epistolae Pauli*, 3.

⁵¹ Gary K. Waite, “The Holy Spirit Speaks Dutch: David Joris and the Promotion of the Dutch Language, 1538–1545,” *Church History* 61 (1992): 47–59.

⁵² Sebastian Franck’s Latin paraphrase to the German Theology was written in 1541–1542.; Ozment, *Mysticism and Dissent*, 32.

⁵³ Alastair Hamilton, *The Family of Love* (Cambridge: Clarke, 1981), 9.

⁵⁴ Pál Ács, “The Names of the Holy Maccabees: Erasmus and the Origin of the Hungarian Protestant Martirology,” in Marcell Sebök, ed., *Republic of Letters, Humanism, Humanities: Selected Papers of the Workshop held at the Collegium Budapest in*

example of Erasmus, Komjáti's longest commentaries are attached to the *Epistle to the Romans*. He interprets in detail the notion of the "two Israels," stressing that Paul talks about two Jewries, two circumcisions, two sons of Abraham, two laws (of soul and body), two Baptisms, two deaths and two resurrections—the old and the new.⁵⁵ The freshly chosen are more advanced than the old not only in time, but also in a moral sense. Paul's teaching that the original status of chosenness applies by the will of God to other peoples as well, and that the newly chosen are more important than the old, is strongly emphasized here. This is an argument that was to stay at the very centre of Hungarian national consciousness.

The poignant contrast of limited space of action and growing desire of glory can be justified by religious arguments. The example of Abraham provides arguments for the Hungarian sense of mission. In harmony with Erasmus, Komjáti pinpoints that those can be viewed as Abraham's real sons who profess Abraham's faith as their own according to its essence. In Erasmus' interpretation, Abraham's example presents a special form of Christian behavior. This also includes the theology of "redemption through faith," as faith is the basic momentum of Christian existence. And Abraham believed in God above all. Many—especially those who followed Luther's commentaries on St. Paul—stopped at this point. According to Erasmus' interpretation, though, Abraham not only believed in God but he also acted according to his faith and conviction. He forsook the only one in whom he could hope, and he was even willing to tie up, kill and sacrifice his own son in order to be able to stand as a true man in front of God. According to Erasmus, faith is necessary but not sufficient: man has to follow Christ consciously, from his own will. In this sense, voluntary self-sacrifice becomes the pattern that most verifies the existence of the evangelical community. Christ's people have to follow the steps of their leader: they have to take up the cross and carry it voluntarily.⁵⁶

It is well known that the idea of *propugnaculum Christianitatis*, "the bulwark of Christianity," was one of the basic symbols of Hungarian patriotism. This national symbol of course cannot be considered originally Hungarian: the *topos* was employed by the humanists mostly in

Cooperation with NIAS between November 25 and 28, 1999, Workshop Series, 15 (Budapest: Collegium Budapest, 2005), 45–62.

⁵⁵ Komjáti, *Epistolae Pauli*, 32–33.

⁵⁶ Rabil, *Erasmus and the New Testament*, 143–46.

relation to Byzantium, later on it was widely used by the Hungarians, the Poles and the Croats.⁵⁷ This thought had long preceded the Reformation, but it became widely known during that epoch, as this was also the period when parts of Hungary became subject to Ottoman rule. The Protestant interpretation of the *Epistle to the Romans* still limited the human possibilities hidden in Paul's parable of Abraham. According to Luther and his followers, it is only God who is active, whereas humans are passive: man cannot do more than stand in front of God. In contrast, Erasmus represented a position which gave a balanced role to faith and to action, to grace and to free will. Komjáti warns his reader to take note of this. He emphasizes that the *Letter to the Romans* is about human merits, divine grace and the free will of man.⁵⁸ With this, the Hungarian Erasmian movement sought to build a Hungarian national resurrection on pre-Counter-Reformation Catholic theology. Komjáti, who attended university in Vienna, became acquainted with the Catholic version of Erasmianism,⁵⁹ and this was what he represented later in his translation.⁶⁰ For all that, it can be said that Erasmian Catholicism is a superficial phenomenon as it appears in his work. The essential inspiration of Komjáti's translation is neither "Catholic" nor "Protestant," but rather spiritual.⁶¹ Its author was not driven by apologetic intentions. As Vietor's preface suggests: "Non iam Haebreum aut Graecum, sed Hungarum"—or, with other words, "The wind bloweth where it listeth" (John 3:8).

⁵⁷ Lajos Hopp, "Les principes de l'«antemurale» et de la «conformitas» dans la tradition hungaro-polonaise avant Báthory," *Acta Litteraria Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 31 (1989): 125–40.

⁵⁸ Komjáti, *Epistolae Pauli*, 31.

⁵⁹ On the relationship of Erasmus and the Catholic Reformation see John C. Olin, *The Catholic Reformation. Savonarola to Ignatius Loyola. Reform in the Church, 1495–1540* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1992), 65–89; Michael A. Mullett, *The Catholic Reformation* (London: Routledge, 1999), 1–28.

⁶⁰ Ulrike Denk, *Das Collegium trilingue des Bischofs Johann Fabri. Ein Konzept zur katholischen Reform an der Wiener Universität* (Diplomarbeit, Univ. Wien—Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, 1998).

⁶¹ André Séguenny, "Pourquoi Bucer détestait les spirituels? Quelques réflexions après la lecture des dialogues de Bucer de 1535," in Christian Krieger and Marc Lienhard, eds., *Martin Bucer and 16th Century Europe. Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg 28–31 août 1991*, vol. 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1993), 627–634.

Conclusions

Komjáti finished the translation of the Epistles of St. Paul in 1532, in the midst of an intensification of European religious conflicts. It is very unlikely that he intended to contribute to the inflaming of dogmatic debates, and he carefully refrained from any utterance that could cause scandal on either side. He does not even so much as mention Erasmus, although his entire work depended on the edition of the “master of Rotterdam”. As we have seen, he contrasted the desire for national peace with the Turkish menace and the internal division. Similarly, he fought against religious division and pointed to the possibility of a Christian unity. In this way, too, he was mediating Erasmus’ goals. We know that in the same year (i.e. 1532) Erasmus prepared for publication a revised version of the paraphrase of the *Letter to the Romans*, from which he left out those references that would have sharpened the tensions between Protestants and Catholics. Moreover, Christian unity, the “*sanctorum communio*,” cannot be separated from ideas of commitment, self-sacrifice and martyrdom. This attitude was also expressed in Komjáti’s Erasmist patriotism.

The Erasmian principle of Christian self-sacrifice originates in the Pauline interpretation of Abraham’s sacrifice and Isaac’s self-sacrifice. This theology urges not the adoption of a passive, accepting, yielding attitude, but the discovery of an active, personal self-awareness. This is what was later forced into the background by Protestant fatalism, and what was cut out of the argumentation system of post-Tridentine Catholic theology. It is not an accident that in the long run Erasmus could offer valid patterns of behavior to individualist intellectuals alone and not to a nation. Nor is it surprising that neither Protestants nor Catholics availed themselves of the Hungarian Bible translation in the Erasmian spirit.

CHAPTER TWO

CONSTRUCTING THE WALLACH "OTHER" IN THE LATE RENAISSANCE

Gábor Almási

In the Renaissance, representations of the Wallach "other" were largely determined by the cultural code of humanism. In other words, the concepts and ideas used for describing Wallachs were an intrinsic part of a culture that is generally little remembered for patriotic sentiments or ethnic prejudices. Humanism is usually perceived as a supranational and religiously indifferent culture, where scientific pursuits joined people together. The prime example for this cosmopolitanism has been the paradigmatic figure of Erasmus, whose character has set the horizons of historical discourse on humanism to date. As a consequence, we are likely to forget that patriotism and cultural pride had a significant role in both Italian and Northern humanism and that the Renaissance meant also a rebirth of the Classical semantics of discrimination and xenophobia.¹

The often negative image of the inhabitants of today's Romania (historically called Wallachs or Moldavians),² as reflected in the works

¹ There are a few notable exceptions though, most importantly a monograph by Herfried Münkler, Hans Grünberger and Kathrin Mayer, *Nationenbildung: Die Nationalisierung Europas im Diskurs humanistischer Intellektueller: Italien und Deutschland* (Berlin: Akademie, 1998), where the following claim is made: "... today humanism is treated as an intellectual movement with a cosmopolitan orientation and as a source of European identity. As a matter of fact, the Italian humanists decidedly contributed to a cognitive-cultural nationalization of Europe through the initiation of the (re)discovery of Greek and Roman historiography and ethnography" (page 75—my translation). See also Denys Hay, "Italy and Barbarian Europe," in Ernest Fraser Jacob, ed., *Italian Renaissance Studies: A Tribute to the Late Cecilia M. Ady* (London: Faber and Faber, 1960), 48–68; and W. R. Jones, "The Image of the Barbarian in Medieval Europe," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 13 (1971) 4: 376–407. Also very relevant is Reinhart Koselleck, "The Historical-Political Semantics of Asymmetrical Counterconcepts," in idem, *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1985), 159–97.

² Since Latin sources mention them either as *Valachi* or occasionally as *Moldavi* (though the people in Moldavia, too, could be called *Valachi*) the term "Wallach" appears to be the least anachronistic. Therefore, in the following I will mostly use

of more or less literate authors of the sixteenth-century, shows many similarities to other patriotic, discriminating discourses of earlier times. Although the principal authors mentioned in this paper did not all have a thorough humanist education, they imitated Classical and Renaissance patriotic traditions either as compilers or more often as inheritors of an idiom, the Classical-Renaissance discourse of cultural superiority.³ In view of this, a brief detour through antiquity and the early Renaissance will supply the background necessary to interpret the various sources on the origins and alleged backwardness of the Wallachs.

The “barbarian” in antiquity and the Renaissance

One of the key concepts of Roman cultural superiority was “barbarian”—a term passed to Western civilization from the Greeks.⁴ While in its origins the word implied a non-Greek person, a stranger, at the

this term and not “Romanian”, which is problematic, even if not entirely anachronistic. In this paper I will not consider the pastoral groups of the Balkans commonly known as Vlachs (apart from a mention in a diploma of 1538), although they were regarded as being of the same ethnic group as those living in Wallachia (also called *Valachia inferior* or *Transalpina*), Moldavia (sometimes called *Vallachia superior*) and Transylvania. While the “barbarian” image of the “Vlachs” in the Balkans might have contributed to the image of the “Wallachs” living in the three principalities of Wallachia, Moldavia and Transylvania there is no need to treat them separately, since these pastoral groups commonly inhabited all three regions.

³ Antonio Bonfini’s famous history of Hungary of c. 1492 is a superb example of a Renaissance compilation. Antonio Bonfini, *Rerum Ungaricarum Decades*, ed. István Főgel, Béla Iványi and László Juhász (Leipzig: Teubner, 1936). See Péter Kulcsár, *Bonfini magyar történetének forrásai és keletkezése* [The sources and the making of Bonfini’s Hungarian history] (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1973).

⁴ According to Aristotle—overtly hostile to all barbarians—the word arose from the Greek mimicry of an unfamiliar language, i.e. ‘bar-bar’. The most comprehensive summary is given by Rolf Michael Schneider, “Barbar,” in Theodor Klauser, ed., *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum. Supplement 1, 2* (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1985), 813–962. Also see Thomas E. J. Wiedemann, “Barbarian,” in Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth, eds., *The Oxford Companion to Classical Civilisation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 112–13; V. Losemann, “Barbaren,” in Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider, eds., *Der neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike* (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1997), 2:439–43; and Derek Williams, *Romans and Barbarians: Four Views From the Empire’s Edge, 1st Century AD* (London: Constable, 1998), 10. For the Greek uses of the word, see Edith Hall, *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1991), and Julius Jüthner, *Hellenen und Barbaren: Aus der Geschichte des Nationalbewusstseins* (Leipzig: Dieterich, 1923).

same time it meant what it does today: the opposite of civilized.⁵ The Romans embraced the concept with enthusiasm and launched it on its long career in European history. While barbarian peoples continued to mean races living outside the Roman Empire (significantly, mostly the non-Roman peoples of Europe and not those of the Near and Middle East), it came to stand for everything that was contrary to Roman civility. Most frequent attributes of a barbarian were *immanis, ferus, crudelis, rudis, asper, indoctus*, that is, inhuman, savage, cruel, wild, rude and unlearned.⁶ The barbarian wore "wasteful and effeminate clothing," drank milk,⁷ and was marked by a "lack of control regarding sex, food and cruelty."⁸ Very often he was depicted as an instinctive, bestial human being, with no interest in (agri)culture but often taking pleasure in killing and robbing. Law had no force among barbarians, and power alone mattered. According to Aristotle barbarians lacked moral responsibility, were slavish by nature and tolerant of despotic rule.⁹

Although the history of Rome involved continuous clashes and interaction with races outside the changing frontiers of the empire, this curiously did not lead to much modification in the concept of the barbarian "other": it continued to be used principally in a negative way. Neither did the figure of the "noble savage" imply a deeper interest in the other, but rather a critique of the "unmanly", "slothful" elite of Roman society. The public knowledge of non-Romans remained limited. The whole structure of the empire existed to provide peace to

⁵ It is important to note that neutral, non-pejorative uses also existed in antiquity, while some authors revealed a critical stance towards the stereotypes related to barbarians. Although Strabo was not uninfluenced by them (see his dispute with Eratosthenes, who heavily criticized this way of thinking in dichotomies already in the 3rd century BC, as recorded at the end of the first book of Strabo's *Geographika*, and also the ambiguities in book 7.3.7–9), still he consciously relied on the dichotomy of "barbarian—us." See Eran Almagor, "Who is a barbarian? The barbarians in the ethnological and cultural taxonomies of Strabo," in Daniela Dueck, Hugh Lindsay and Sarah Pothecary, eds., *Strabo's Cultural Geography—The Making of a Kolossourgia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 42–55.

⁶ Livy, *Ab urbe condita*, 29,2,14; Caesar, *Commentarii belli Gallici* 1,31,5; Sallust, *Bellum Iugurthinum*, 18; Cicero, *Pro Q. Ligario*, 11; idem, *Pro Fonteio*, 31; idem, *De domo sua*, 140; idem, *Tusculanae disputationes*, 2,22,52 and 2,27,65; idem, *In M. Antonium orationes Philippicae* 11,2; idem, *In C. Verrem* 2,22,52; Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, 2,17,6; Suetonius, *Claudius*, 25,5.

⁷ See, for example, Herodotus on the Scythians, 4,1.

⁸ Wiedemann, "Barbarian," 113.

⁹ Aristotle, *Politica*, 1252b, 1285a.

Italy and especially to Rome, where a barbarian was seen either on a monument or as a captive. Literary tradition remained Rome-centered and also blinkered, looking more to the East, which was “the prestigious theater, where Roman statesmanship had achieved memorable results”, than to the North.¹⁰ Meanwhile, Rome paid higher and higher prices for keeping her northern barbarian neighbors submissive. “The sense of being surrounded by the paid-to-be-peaceful was a permanent obstacle to Rome’s acceptance of the barbarians to be as equals, ensuring that cross-frontier relationships would seldom be based on mutual respect.”¹¹ On the other hand, maintaining a moral barrier between Romans and barbarians served well Roman military, political and intellectual objectives.

Ovid—who even wrote poetry in the language of the Getae, the people inhabiting Tomis (today Constanța) where he had been exiled—was no exception. His two volumes of poetry written in exile (*Epistulae ex Ponto* and *Tristia*) expressed the usual superiority Romans felt when encountering non-Latin cultures. His perception of the people surrounding him was subordinated to his principal goal, which was to have Roman patricians arrange for his rehabilitation and return to Rome:¹²

Are you interested to know what the people round Tomis / are like, and the customs of those I live among? / Though there’s a mix of Greeks and Getae on this coast, / it’s characterized more by the barely civilized Getae. / Great hordes of Sarmatians and Getae pass / to and fro, along the trails, on horseback. / There’s not one among them who doesn’t carry / bow, quiver, and arrows pale yellow with viper’s gall: / Harsh voices, grim faces, the true image of Mars, / neither beard or hair trimmed, hands not slow / to deal wounds with the ever-present knife / that every barbarian carries, strapped to his side. / Alas, dear friend, your poet is living among them...¹³

Barbarian features and habits were often interchangeable and replaceable: seen from Rome, Getae and Sarmatians, Gauls and Germans were not easy to distinguish. Pomponius Mela’s “Description of the World” (AD 44) was one of those stockrooms of cosmographical common-

¹⁰ Williams, *Romans and Barbarians*, 23.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 26.

¹² *Ibid.*, 38–48.

¹³ Ovid, *Tristia*, 5.7.9–21. trs. A. S. Kline. ([Http://www.tkline.freereserve.co.uk/Ovidexilehome.htm](http://www.tkline.freereserve.co.uk/Ovidexilehome.htm)) Accessed on 15 December 2007.

places that were to enjoy long acceptance during the Renaissance.¹⁴ According to Mela, the peoples in the Gaul are "crude, superstitious, and sometimes even so monstrous that they used to believe that to the gods the best and most pleasing sacrificial victim was a human being."¹⁵ The peoples of Germany are no better.¹⁶ They are "enormous in courage as in physique" and "thanks to their natural ferocity"¹⁷ they prodigiously exercise "their minds by making war, their bodies by habitual hard work but above all by habitual exposure to the cold." They live naked before they reach puberty—Mela claims—while grown-up men dress "in woollen clothing or the bark of trees even during the harsh winter." They do not cultivate in earnest even what is in their possession,¹⁸ and they consider that "right lies in might."¹⁹ They are "so crude and uncivilized (*asperi incultique*) in their way of life that they even eat raw or fresh-killed meat." Regarding the Sarmatians Mela comments that "the rougher the climate, the cruder their disposition."²⁰ Borrowing from Herodotus (who was in fact referring to the Asian Sarmatians) Mela declares that "they are warlike, free, unconquered, and so savage and cruel that women also go to war side by side with men."²¹ The mythical paradise-like state is reserved alone for the even more remote Scythians, who live "longer and happier than any mortals," and know no wars or disputes.²²

By the time of late antiquity, Christianity came to be viewed as another attribute of Latin civilization, and for a while the concept

¹⁴ Pomponius Mela, *Description of the World*, ed. and tr. Frank E. Romer (Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press, 1998). On Mela's Renaissance fortune in Italy, see Nathalie Bouloux, *Culture et savoirs géographiques en Italie au XIV^e siècle* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002), 159–67.

¹⁵ Mela, *Description*, 107. The following comments are borrowed from Piergiorgio Parroni's critical, richly commented edition: Pomponius Mela, *De Chorographia libri tres* (Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1984).

¹⁶ Mela, *Description*, 109.

¹⁷ In Latin: "Qui habitant immanes sunt animis atque corporibus et ad insitam feritatem vaste utraque exercent..." (Mela, *De Chorographia*, 159.) Compare Caesar, *Commentarii belli Gallici*, 1,39: "ingenti magnitudine corporum Germanos". For the expression "ad insitam feritatem" compare Tacitus, *Germania*, 43,4.

¹⁸ Compare Caesar, *Commentarii belli Gallici*, 6,22: "Agricoltura non student."

¹⁹ Compare Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res Gestae*, 17,12,18; Sallustius, *Historiae*, 1,33.

²⁰ Mela, *Description*, 110.

²¹ Herodotus, *Historion logoi*, 4,110–17.

²² Mela, *Description*, 111.

of the barbarian (non-Roman) corresponded to the non-Christian.²³ However, the conversion of the northern peoples gradually made this double meaning anachronistic: from the 8th century “barbarian” came to signify chiefly “non-Christian” (pagan), maintaining though its negative, “uncivilized” connotations. It was first in the thirteenth-century among the rivaling Italian city-states that Roman patriotic discourses were put to new uses.²⁴ Here should be mentioned not only Florence with Dante and Giovanni Villani but also Padua with her proto-humanists who used the Classical heritage in order to construct a new identity for themselves and for their community.²⁵ While Petrarch lacked local patriotic feelings, he was a patriot on an Italian level and shared a sense of cultural superiority towards all barbarians, including the French. It was first of all him and his followers—headed by Coluccio Salutati—who adopted the rhetoric of barbarism for the uses of Italian humanism.

The contest between Avignon and Rome for the seat of the papacy gave Petrarch’s rhetoric of patriotism full political significance. While French delegates in Avignon argued for French cultural supremacy, Petrarch made sure their claims were fiercely rejected:

But lest I continually accuse the Gauls, I won’t deny that they may be excused if their learning is but modest. To strive against nature is always a bootless effort; and by nature the Gauls are unteachable. Now my barbarian is angry. But let him direct his anger not to me, but at his own Hilary, who was the first to say this....²⁶

²³ “The primitive cosmopolitanism of Christianity had been drained away by its political success [...] and the ideals of Christianity were narrowed sharply to coincide with Roman ethnocentrism.” Jones, “The Image of the Barbarian,” 381.

²⁴ See Jones, “The Image of the Barbarian,” 381–92. “(Italian) humanists—claims Jones (401)—contrasted Romanitas with barbarism and used this distinction as a means for expressing a fierce cultural pride and patriotism.” In 1286, Giovanni Balbi defined the barbarian as *crudelis, incultus, austerus, stolidus* (quoted by Hay, “Italy and Barbarian Europe,” 56.)

²⁵ On Dante and Villani see Münkler et al., *Nationenbildung*, 82–92. The humanist project of reconstructing Livy’s *Ab urbe condita* and digging up the tomb of the classical author went hand in hand in Padua. Lovato Lovati of Padua celebrated Livy as a hero of his home town. See Giuseppe Billanovich, *La tradizione del testo di Livio e le origini dell’umanesimo* (Padua: Antenore, 1981) 1/1, 5–12; Roberto Weiss, “Lovato dei Lovati (1241–1309),” *Italian Studies* 6 (1951) 1, 3–28; Sarah Blake McHam, “Renaissance monuments to favourite sons,” *Renaissance Studies* 19 (2005) 4, 458–86.

²⁶ Francesco Petrarca, “Against a detractor of Italy,” in idem, *Invectives*, ed. and trans. David Marsh (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 2003), 441. See also his letters to Pope Urban V (Petrarca, *Epistole rerum senilium* 7,1; 9,1; 11,1) and Salutati’s reaction to the first one of these: Coluccio Salutati, *Epistolario*, ed. Francesco Novati (Roma: Forzani, 1891), 1:72–76.

In the series of letters and poems that Petrarch dedicated to the praise of Italy—a country with extraordinary natural potential protected from the *furor barbaricus* by the Alps²⁷—he put special emphasis on the Classical legacy and the emerging humanist culture of his people. In his letters to Pope Urban Petrarch asserted that the difference between Italy and France was so great that no one who had a little knowledge of history doubted it. If there was any fortunate attempt made in the liberal arts by a foreigner, it was either because the person was an imitator of the Italians or was educated in Italy.²⁸ Aquinas, Bonaventure, Petrus Lombardus were all Italians, Petrarch insisted.²⁹

Following in the footsteps of Cicero, humanists emphasized those features of the *barbarus* which were contrary to their own value system as men of learning.³⁰ According to the new humanist rhetoric, principally those individuals and nations were condemned as barbarians who neglected the *studia humanitatis*. The concept of the barbarian became a key term for the program of the Renaissance, and the awareness of a cultural renewal became thoroughly linked to the awareness of being non-barbarian.³¹ The more "Romanitas" a person, a city or a country could boast of, the more civilized it was considered. Calling the rest of the world simply *ultramontani barbari* became a common practice in Italy that survived until the late sixteenth century, although with increasing self-reflection and ambiguity.³²

²⁷ Petrarca, *Epistole rerum senilium*, 7,1. Also see *Epistole rerum senilium* 9,1, and his famous poem *Italia mia* (cited by Machiavelli at the end of *The Prince*: "Virtue will take arms against fury, and the battle will be brief; for the ancient valor in Italian hearts is not yet dead").

²⁸ Petrarca, *Epistole rerum senilium*, 9,1.

²⁹ Petrarca, *Contra eum*, 49. As if arguing with Petrarch, Denys Hay states that "it is hard to see how Aquinas, or Bonaventure, or Marsilio of Padua, could have displayed their talents in their homeland as well as they did in Paris." Hay, "Italy and Barbarian Europe," 53. The nature of French anti-Italianism in the sixteenth century was rather different than fifteenth-century Italian humanists' anti-French xenophobia. See Henry Heller, *Anti-Italianism in sixteenth-century France* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003).

³⁰ Marcus Tullius Cicero, *De Natura Deorum* [On the Nature of the Gods], trans. Francis Brooks (London: Methuen, 1896), 2.59.

³¹ See Luca d'Ascia, "Coscienza della Rinascita e coscienza antibarbara. Appunti sulla visione storica del Rinascimento nei secoli XV e XVI," in Renzo Raggianti and Alessandro Savorelli, eds., *Rinascimento: mito e concetto* (Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2005), 1–37.

³² See Massimo Donattini, "Il giardino e la muraglia. Le Alpi nella letteratura geografica del Rinascimento," in Rosanna Gorris Camos, ed., *Les montagnes de l'esprit. Imaginaire et histoire de la montagne à la Renaissance* (Quart: Musumeci, 2005), 183–208.

As Renaissance humanism spread to the north, northern intellectuals started tackling the problem of their own cultural origins in much similar terms as the Italians were doing. At the same time they set out to respond to the challenge of the peninsula's claimed cultural superiority.³³ Although humanism became truly international by the sixteenth-century, this did not mean that canonical figures (for instance the German Conrad Celtis, the French Guillaume Postel, the Scottish George Buchanan or the Danish Tycho Brahe, etc.) were not motivated by patriotic feelings in realizing their different cultural projects. No doubt the Classical language of "othering" survived, however, members of the Republic of Letters generally avoided using it against each other. In adopting it in the case of the Wallachs they revealed much less self-reflection.

The "Wallach problem" in the sixteenth century

The story of the sixteenth-century debate over Dacia's Roman heritage fits well into the general European context where appropriating the classical past was an inherent part of humanist projects. The negation (or affirmation) of the Roman legacy of the Wallach people generally aimed to confirm one's own cultural superiority and to justify actual privileges over the other. Men of learning were liable to use the dichotomies of civilized-uncivilized, erudite-ignorant according to the agenda of their writings. Their problem with the Wallachs was not only the real (but usually distorted) cultural and social differences between them and the neighboring ethnic groups, but also their both-

³³ On the humanist construction of the German past, see Münkler et al., *Nationenbildung*. For the French case, see Ron E. Asher, *National myths in Renaissance France: Francus, Samothès and the Druids* (Edinburgh: University Press, 1993). In the spread of humanism to the North, patriotic and nationalistic motives have been emphasized by Charles G. Nauert, Jr., *Humanism and the Culture of Renaissance Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 95–123. Also see Caspar Hirschi, "Vorwärts in neue Vergangenheiten. Funktionen des humanistischen Nationalismus in Deutschland," in Thomas Maissen and Gerrit Walther, eds., *Funktionen des Humanismus: Studien zum Nutzen des Neuen in der humanistischen Kultur* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2006), 362–95. A short look at Conrad Celtis' famous Ingolstadt oration will convince anyone that these motives really mattered. Conrad Celtis, "Oration Delivered Publicly in the University in Ingolstadt," in Kenneth R. Bartlett and Margaret McGlynn, eds., *Humanism and the Northern Renaissance* (Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press, 2000), 74–86.

ering claim to be the heirs of the Roman conquerors of Dacia. Whether this claim stemmed from a kind of medieval "Romanian" patriotism or went back to an ancient tradition is irrelevant. What matters is that their Neo-Latin language was a very strong argument supporting their claims for Roman origins. For many humanists, for whom "civilized" meant the possession of a Latin humanist culture, this was a puzzling fact, difficult to refute or to explain away. What added to the complexity of the "Wallach problem" was their mixed social status. First of all, they were the people inhabiting the two principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia; secondly, they were a minority scattered across Transylvania; and thirdly, several Vlach groups were spread around the Balkans. The question of Roman legacy was all the more debated since Roman rule in the area of ancient Dacia had left its evident marks in written sources and in the landscape.³⁴ However, there were three ethnicities who could claim a share in this heritage, at least in the northern part of Dacia, that is, in Transylvania: Magyars, Saxons and Wallachs.

In the following we will mostly deal with the Wallach 'other' in the context of Transylvania's history. In the political vacuum that followed the Battle of Mohács (1526) Transylvania, the former eastern region of Hungary, gradually became an internationally-recognized more or less independent principality (though paying tax to the Ottomans). Ottoman military and political pressure was the order of the day, while Habsburg-Hungarian plans to reunite the country were kept alive. Hungary, torn into three parts, ceased to be the power it used to be, and it soon became obvious that *Pannonia*, which had become a competing denomination for *Hungaria* since the mid-fifteenth century, was an anachronistic term when applied to Transylvania. Hungarian students from Transylvania when abroad used more and more often the denomination *Ungarus*, while Saxon students opted mostly for the attributives *Transilvanus*, or rarely *Saxo-Transilvanus*.³⁵ The new

³⁴ Inscriptions and coins coming from Dacia were first collected and published by the prolific imperial historian, Wolfgang Lazius, and were seldom left unmentioned by humanists who described this country. Wolfgang Lazius, *Commentariorum veterum numismatum maximi operis*. . . (Vienna: Zimmermann, 1558). Lazius had quite a number of sixteenth-century professional followers, but learned travelers of all sorts felt it their duty to take notes of inscriptions.

³⁵ Tibor Klaniczay, "Die Benennungen 'Hungaria' und 'Pannonia' als Mittel der Identitätssuche der Ungarn," in Tibor Klaniczay et al., eds., *Antike Rezeption und nationale Identität in der Renaissance insbesondere in Deutschland und in Ungarn* (Budapest: Balassi, 1993), 83–100.

political situation created new loyalties and enhanced the importance of national identity. The spread of the Reformation only intensified this process: Saxons became exclusively Lutherans, and consequently more dependent on German cultural influx than earlier;³⁶ Hungarians in Transylvania either chose Calvinism or Unitarianism (which acquired almost as much national significance as Lutheranism among Saxons) or remained Catholics (like the Szeklers); while Orthodox Wallachs resisted reforming or missionary attempts.³⁷ Paradoxically, political disintegration brought to the fore a growing awareness of national identity among Hungarians, which was most importantly viewed in language and history.

Although Transylvania was sometimes described in humanist writings as the northern part of the Roman province Dacia, to which also Moldavia and Wallachia (or Dacia Transalpina) belonged, no student from Transylvania ever called himself a *Dacus*: this term was associated either with the Romanian principalities or with the Wallach people. Transylvania's distinctness in Dacia was reaffirmed by almost everyone. For example, Georg Wernher of Silesian origins in his famous description of the baths in Hungary called Transylvania the *pars cultissima* of Dacia. Very often, however, the term Dacia was either not used in texts describing Transylvania or not emphasized. What was usually underlined was the multinational character of this land. Authors followed normally two paths. Those who had personal contacts with the region frequently followed Hungarian-Saxon political-legal thinking and affirmed that the three politically organized peoples—the Saxons, the Szeklers and the Hungarians—were the three nations inhabiting the land.³⁸ Although in this case *natio* meant a legal-political entity

³⁶ See Louis J. Elteto, "Reformation Literature and the National Consciousness of Transylvanian Hungarians, Saxons, and Rumanians," in John F. Cadzow, Andrew Ludanyi and Louis J. Elteto, eds., *Transylvania: The Roots of Ethnic Conflict* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1983), 67 (available on the Internet).

³⁷ See Ana Dumitran, *Religie ortodoxă—Religie reformată. Ipostaze ale identității profesionale a românilor din Transilvania în secolele XVI–XVII* [Orthodox religion—reformed religion: The expression of confessional identity of Transylvanian Romanians in the 16th and 17th centuries] (Cluj-Napoca: Nereamia Napocae, 2004); Radu Mârza, "Die Orthodoxe Kirche der Rumänen aus Siebenbürgen: Konfession und Politik im 16. Jahrhundert," in Volker Leppin and Ulrich A. Wien, eds., *Konfessionsbildung und Konfessionskultur in Siebenbürgen in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2005), 179–90.

³⁸ The Magyar *natio* was often identified with the nobility of the land. See one of Verantius' letters to Queen Isabella: "Ad haec his tribus nationibus: Seculis, *Nobilibus* et Saxonibus in dicto conventu...." Antal Verancsics [Antonius Verantius], *Opera*,

(e.g. one of the three legal bodies of the Transylvanian diet), the word also implied an ethnic community; therefore, mentioning the ethnically Magyar Szeklers as a separate *natio* was often felt confusing and was commented upon, while the presence of Wallachs (who were not considered a political *natio* since they were not represented at the diet) was also frequently mentioned in brackets.³⁹ Another group of authors—mostly Italians—less influenced by the Hungarian-Saxon legal approach and political system, listed in the place of the Szeklers the Wallachs as the third nationality of the land.⁴⁰ The learned diplomat Antonius Verantius, of Dalmatian origins, in his chorography of Transylvania, Moldavia and Wallachia, that is, of ancient Dacia (ca. 1540), listed the peoples of Transylvania in a typical way: "Transylvania is inhabited by three nations: Szeklers, Hungarians, Saxons; nevertheless I would also add the Wallachs..."⁴¹

The Saxons were liable to aggrandize their presence, as were the Hungarians, who continued to consider Transylvania as a part of their *patria*, though this was now rather a mental configuration than a political reality. The Saxons comprehended the historical significance of Mohács much sooner. Already in 1532, the Saxon arch-humanist and reformer Johannes Honterus published a map of Transylvania in Basle (*Chorographia Transylvaniae Sybembürgen*). The names and

ed. Ladislaus Szalay and Gusztáv Wenzel (Monumenta Hungariae Historica [MHH], Scriptorum, 9), 6:1538–49 (Pest: Eggenberger, 1860), 95.

³⁹ On the concept of *natio*, see Krista Zach, *Konfessionelle Pluralität, Stände und Nation. Ausgewählte Abhandlungen zur südosteuropäischen Religions- und Gesellschaftsgeschichte*, ed. Joachim Bahlcke and Konrad Gündisch (Münster: Lit, 2004), 3–36; idem, "Nation und Konfession in Reformationszeitalter," in Georg and Renate Weber, eds., *Luther und Siebenbürgen. Ausstrahlungen von Reformation und Humanismus nach Südosteuropa* (Cologne: Böhlau, 1985), 156–211.

⁴⁰ For example, Pietro Busto in 1595; see Giacomo Bascapè, *Le relazioni fra l'Italia e la Transilvania nel secolo XVI. Note e documenti* (Rome: Anonima Romana, 1931), 169; Giovanandrea Gromo, "Compendio di tutto il Regno posseduto dal Re Giovanni Transilvano et di tutte le cose notabili d'esso Regno (1564/67)," ed. Aurel Decei, *Apulum* 2 (1943–45): 165–66.

⁴¹ "Natio eam triplex incolit: Siculi, Hungari, Saxones, adiungam tamen et Valachos..." Antonius Wrancius Sibiensis Dalmata [Antonius Verantius], *Expeditionis Solymani in Moldaviam et Transsylvaniam libri duo. De situ Transsylvanicae, Moldaviae et Transalpiniae liber tertius*, ed. Kálmán Eperjessy (Budapest: Egyetemi, 1944), 42 (136). For other similar examples see Georg Wernher, "De admirandis Hungariae aquis hypomnematation," in Sigmund Herberstein, *Rerum Moscoviticarum commentarii*... (Basle: Oporinus, 1556), 178–94; Ciro Spontone, *Historia della Transilvania* (Venice: Sarzina, 1638), 4; Georg Reicherstorffer, "Chorographia Transylvaniae," in idem, *Erdély és Moldva leírása* [The Description of Transylvania and Moldavia], ed. István Szabadi (Debrecen: Kossuth L. Tudományegyetem, 1994), 22–24.

orientation of the map implies a region populated by Germans—a fact which did not remain unnoticed by contemporaries—while a German poem printed on the map hints at the German origins of the Transylvanian Saxons.⁴² However, sixteenth-century Saxons did not unequivocally share Honterus' opinion on this question. A noteworthy example of an alternate origin story was given by the superintendent of the Saxon nation, Albertus Hutterus, in a talk addressed to the prince of Transylvania and his counselors in 1591.⁴³ In this oration Hutterus affirmed that the first nation of Transylvania was the bellicose Saxon who (“according to Herodotus”) originated from the Goths and the Dacians. Hutterus also affirmed that a second wave of Saxons had arrived on the invitation of King Géza II to sustain the Hungarian ruler as warriors.⁴⁴ It was therefore not right to call Saxons *hospites* and *peregrine*, that is, not citizens but foreigners, as people often did.⁴⁵

However, the Dacian-Saxon origin theory was not Hutterus' own creation. One of his named sources, Caspar Peucer—probably not uninfluenced by the numerous Transylvanian Saxon students in Wittenberg—declared in his widely read elaboration of the *Chronicon Carionis* that the arrival of the Saxons in Transylvania in the times of Charlemagne was no more than a tale and that the Saxons in fact arrived in the land much earlier. Peucer claimed that Transylvanian

⁴² “Vom Rein vnd Sachsen ich gemein / Bin aufgewachsen in grossem Schein...” See Bernhard Capesius, *Deutsche Humanisten in Siebenbürgen* (Bucharest: Kriterion, 1974), 84–85. On Honterus' map see Gerhard Engelmann, *Johannes Honter als Geograph* (Cologne: Böhlau, 1982), 1–50. For a criticism of the map, see Verantius, *Opera*, 6:332, warning the Saxon humanist Christian Pomarius who was taking notes for a history of Saxon towns not to rely on Honterus, since the map-maker misrepresented reality, exaggerating the size of the Saxon area of settlement and miseladngly depicting the course of the rivers. On Pomarius see R. Schuller, “Christian Pomarius. Ein Humanist und Reformator im Siebenbürger Sachsenlande,” *Archiv des Vereins für siebenbürgische Landeskunde* 39 (1913): 185–246.

⁴³ Albertus Hutterus (Huet), “Oratio Domini Alberti Hutteri Judicis Civitatis Cibiniensis,” in Joseph Trausch, ed., *Chronicon Fuchsio-Lupino-Oltardinum: sive Annales Hungarici et Transsilvanici* (Corona [Braşov]: Johannes Gött, 1848), 2:288–300. For an analysis, see Edit Szegeci, *Geschichtsbewusstsein und Gruppenidentität: Die Historiographie der Siebenbürger Sachsen zwischen Barock und Aufklärung* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2002), 133–37.

⁴⁴ Hutterus, *Oratio*, 291–92.

⁴⁵ Hutterus, *Oratio*, 294. The Dacian-Saxon origin theory was further developed in the seventeenth century by Lorenz Töppel (Laurentius Toppeltinus), David Hermann and Johann Tröster. See Adolf Armbruster, “Die Romanität der Rumänen im Spiegel der sächsischen Geschichtsschreibung (16.–18. Jh.),” *Südostdeutsches Archiv* 14 (1971): 85–90.

Germans were the remnants of the Dacians and the Goths (and the Getae, Mysians and Goths spoke all German).⁴⁶ Even among those Saxons who still embraced a *Hungarus*-identity one can often detect a distinctive Transylvanian-Saxon undertone.⁴⁷ The Saxon Leonhardus Uncius, for example, started his poetic history of Hungary with Attila and continued with "the seven leaders of Transylvania" (*septem duces Transylvaniae*), who were actually mythological heroes of the Hungarians.⁴⁸ These appropriations are only the tip of an iceberg reflecting the apparently massive patriotism of sixteenth-century Transylvanian Saxons. These authors not only played up the importance of the Saxons in Transylvania but as a rule they also asserted their superiority to other nations. In a poetic chronicle of a little Saxon town the learned Lutheran preacher Johannes Lebelius—following the historical decades of the celebrated Italian humanist Antonio Bonfini—memorialized the Hungarians in the following way: "In these times [when the Saxons were called into Transylvania to go to war at the side of Duke Géza, the father of King Saint Stephen] the Hungarians were commonly called Magyars. It is dreadful how incredibly cruel they were. They had barbarian habits, hard necks and were audacious. This was the inborn nature of these people of an untameable race."⁴⁹

⁴⁶ Caspar Peucer, *Chronicon Carionis. Tertia Pars Chronici Carionis, A Carolo Magno [...] usque ad Fridericum Secundum* (Wittenberg: Haeredes Georgii Rhau, 1563), 52a; also see 21a–26b.

⁴⁷ Examples for the survival of a *Hungarus*-identity among Saxons are Christian Schesaeus, Thomas Bomel, and the completely Magyarized Gáspár Heltai (Kaspar Helth). A strong *Hungarus*-identity with a concomitant Saxon patriotism was not unusual in the more tranquil political situation of the 1570s. See István Bitskey, "História és politika. Leonhardus Uncius verseskötete a magyar történelemről" [History and politics: The poetic volume of Leonhardus Uncius on Hungarian history], in Sándor Bene, ed., *A politika műfajai a régi magyar irodalomban* [The genres of politics in Hungarian literature] (Konferencia, Gyula, 2005. május 25–28.) (At <http://www.iti.mta.hu/Gyula/TANULMANYOK>). For Heltai's curious identity, see Szegeci, *Geschichtsbewusstsein*, 175–86.

⁴⁸ Leonhard Uncius, *Poematum libri septem de rebus Ungaricis* (Cracow: Lazarus, 1579). A similarly "Magyarized" Saxon historical view can be found in Thomas Bomeilius, *Chronologia Rerum Ungaricarum, A Primo Unnorum In Pannoniam aduentu, ad millesimum quingentesimum quinquagesimum sextum à nato Christo annum* (Corona [Braşov]: Wagner, 1556).

⁴⁹ "Tum temporis Hungari *Magyari* sunt vulgo vocati, / Horrendi quod fuerint mirisque modis crudeles, / Imbuti barbaricis moribus, durae cervicis, austeri; / Genuinum id habent ac indomabile genus." Joannes Lebelius, *De Oppido Thalmus: Carmen historicum*, ed. Joannes Seivert (Cibinii: Joan. & Petri Barth, 1779), 15. Compare Bonfini: "Scythicos mores mitiores effecit [i.e. King Matthias], immanem superbiam repressit

Foreign observers also fed the feeling of Saxon cultural superiority.⁵⁰ A characteristic example is the history of Transylvania prepared by the Italian historian and politician of Bologna, Ciro Spontone, at the end of the century. In the introduction of his work he gives a brief description of the three nations of the land (Saxons, Szeklers and Hungarians). Naturally, in this German-friendly opus dedicated to the archbishop of Salzburg, Spontone uses only superlatives when speaking about the Saxons. They are the “glorious descendants of that honorable German race [...] the most dedicated to agriculture and to all other sciences pertaining to *humana eleganza*.” According to him, the Szeklers are wild people who despise all danger, desire war and military victory, but at least keep to their promises and are loyal to their lords. The Hungarians are worse. They are “curious of anything new, changing their religious faith” and are “rebellious and disloyal to their lords more than any other nations; in short, they are as much stubborn in doing evil as in their noble actions cowardly, contemptible and completely vile.” Spontone puts the Wallachs in the usual brackets: “The third nation is the Hungarian, to which one could easily add some people of the most different customs and laws, named the Wallachs, who partly live in some good villages, partly in the loneliness of deserted places, abusing the skills of other nations in order to conserve their natural ferocity.”⁵¹ Another example is a letter by the émigré historian of Italy Giovanni Michele Bruto addressing the imperial doctor Johannes Crato of Krafftheim. Bruto affirms that Germans even in their colonies—like the Saxons in Transylvania—excel in their humanity, discipline, civil law, industry and in their knowledge of the liberal arts. In all these areas of life the Saxons are superior to the other peoples of the same land. This superiority is even more to be admired when we consider “for how many centuries the Saxons have preserved their nature uncorrupted, surrounded by so many barbarian nations, Getae and Moldavians, living among the dirty mob of barbarians.”⁵²

et post Attilam primus ad obsequium diligens durae cervicis Ungarum redegit.” Bonfini, *Rerum Ungaricarum Decades*, 4.8.259.

⁵⁰ An example can be Verantius, *Expeditionis Solymani*, 44–45.

⁵¹ Spontone, *Historia della Transylvania*, 4.

⁵² Joannes Michael Brutus, *Selectarum epistolarum libri quinque* (Cracow: Andrzej Piotrkowczyk, 1583), 126r (letter from Cracow, November 23rd, 1577).

Constructing one's own cultural identity and the "otherness" of neighboring peoples is a parallel process.⁵³ In this process sixteenth-century Saxons made exceeding use of the classical repertoire of "othering." As a rule, when describing the Wallach people of *Transylvania* as backward, rational explanations were seldom offered. This was slightly different in the case of the principalities, Wallachia and Moldavia, where the main cause of alleged backwardness was said to have laid in the continuous internal fights and despotic princely rule. "There is so much ambition for glory even among barbarian peoples"—exclaimed Verantius, who saw the roots of political discord in the uncertain rules of princely succession, a result of the quasi-polygamic life of the rulers.⁵⁴

The ill-reputed agent of Emperor Ferdinand, the Saxon Georg Reicherstorffer, used much harsher words in his chorographies of *Transylvania* and *Moldavia* than did his contemporary Verantius. He gave a long description of the brutality of the Moldavians and asserted that the Wallachs in general were a tough people who lived off shepherding and stealing animals. They were spread all around *Transylvania*, occupying deserted manors and houses. They wore unfinished hairy goat-skins and followed no human law at all.⁵⁵ The Hungarian historian of *Transylvania*, István Szamosközy, used virtually the same stereotypes: "Since these *Transylvanian* Wallachs have meager and paltry properties because of their inborn indolence, many of them help themselves in their misery by all kinds of stealing, robbing and plundering."⁵⁶ Szamosközy, however, made an exception of the Wallachs of *Karánsebes* (*Caransebeș*), who lived in a privileged state, since many of them were nobles: "Although these people are Wallachs, as regards honor, culture and commerce they are superior, and have more taste than the people of other parts."⁵⁷ The Italian observer Giovanandrea Gromo was not

⁵³ "A political or social agency is first constituted through concepts by means of which it circumscribes itself and hence excludes others; and therefore, by means of which it defines itself." Koselleck, "The Historical-Political Semantics," 160.

⁵⁴ "Tanta gloriae cupiditas insit etiam genti barbarae." Verantius, *Expeditionis Solymani*, 41 (also see previous pages).

⁵⁵ Reicherstorffer, "Chorographia Transilvaniae," 21. For the brutality of the Moldavians see "Chorographia Moldaviae," in *Erdély és Moldva leírása*, 80–84.

⁵⁶ István Szamosközy, *Történeti maradványai (Pentas)* [Historical writings (*Pentas*)], ed. Sándor Szilágyi (MHH Scriptorum XXVIII) (Budapest: Akadémia, 1876), 2:343.

⁵⁷ István Szamosközy, *Történeti maradványai (Hebdomades)* [Historical writings (*Hebdomades*)], ed. Sándor Szilágyi (MHH Scriptorum XXIX) (Budapest: Akadémia, 1877), 3:10. A similar exception was made by Verantius regarding the Wallachs of

less biased towards Wallachs: they work in agriculture, live dirtily, use self-made goat-hair clothes; they are very strong but ruthless, and “there are great thieves among them and killers on the road.”⁵⁸

However, it was the historian and politician Ferenc Forgách, of a prosperous Hungarian noble family, in whom racially prejudiced language appears at its most extreme. Once again, the knack of this description lay in identifying all the Wallachs with “barbarian,” nomadic shepherds. His description of the Wallachs comes at the end of his important book on the history of contemporary Hungary. We learn first that “there is so much cruelty in these barbarians that lords kill their subjects and subjects their lords for the most trivial reasons.” It follows that no ruler can have a stable rule and there are no illustrious families. Like the Gauls of Pomponius Mela, the Wallachs are very religious but their religion is more like a superstition than a proper faith, since their priests are almost uneducated and hardly know even the Illyrian (i.e. Cyrillic) letters, which are the only ones in use. Regarding their strange eating habits Forgách comments that there is no greater crime than eating meat on feast days and that they hardly eat bread in the summer but live off their sheep. It is common to get divorced and remarry and no crime to kill someone of a different religion. Although they occupy a third of the Transylvanian lands (because of the nearness of the Romanian principalities), no good example, no law can force them to become more civilized. Their houses qualify as a nobleman’s stall; in the summer they live up in the mountains wearing self-made dresses of hair. They are white but smelly, and abhor all kinds of work. Almost everyone lives of stealing. As is observable in all barbarians, Forgách concludes, they consider

Hátszeg (Hațeg), where the people had gained collective nobility because of the support they gave to Johannes Hunyadi.

⁵⁸ “[La nazione Valaccha] per l’ordinario tutta attende all’Agricoltura si per se, come nel coltivare a modo di Lavoratori i terreni degl’Ungheri et Sassoni. [...] La vita loro per l’ordinario alle rurali operationi data et però simiglianti all’esercitio. Vi sono di gran ladri fra loro et assassini di strada; la veste loro lorde all’Ungheresca, ma pochi di panni vestiti, ma di lana grossa et di pelle di capra da loro tessuti; sporchi e delle persone et in casa... Sono per natura fortissimi, atti a sostenere ogni disagio, ma non hanno ordine di milizia, non conoscono pericolo e sono crudelissimi...” Gromo, “Compendio di tutto il Regno,” 165–66. Also see Gromo’s letter in Endre Veress, *Documente privitioare la istoria Ardealului, Moldovei, și Țării-Românești* (Bucharest: Cartea Românească, 1929), 1:253: “Vivono sporcamente, et sono gente brutta, si huomini come donne di costoro. [...] La lingua loro si chiama Romanza o romanescha, et è quasi un Latino macconesco. Si tengono discesi da colonie Romane.”

indolence the greatest good, and shun deliberation, discipline and all kinds of order. In their idleness and carnality they accept good and bad fortune with the same indifference.⁵⁹

The debate on the origin of the Wallachs

The first Renaissance humanist to refer to the survival of Trajan's Roman colonists in the Balkans was Poggio Bracciolini in the mid-fifteenth century.⁶⁰ Two years later Flavio Biondo affirmed that "the Dacians or Wallachs claim to have Roman origins and think it a distinction. Once when they were paying an annual visit to Rome and the seat of the Apostles, in the manner of Catholics, I was delighted to listen to them speaking and hear that when they were speaking in the common and ordinary manner of their people it was redolent of a rustic and ungrammatical Latin."⁶¹ However, Bracciolini and Biondo were not the first ones to report on surviving descendents of the Romans in that region. The Byzantine historian Joannes Kinnamos noted already in the 12th century that the Wallachs were claimed as the heirs of former colonists coming from Italy,⁶² and the existence of an autochthonous Roman origin-theory (presumably concerning

⁵⁹ Ferenc Forgách, *Ghymesí Forgách Ferencz nagyváradí püspök Magyar históriája, 1540–1572* [The Hungarian history of the bishop of Nagyvárad, Ferencz Ghymesí Forgách], ed. Fidél Majer (MHH Scriptorés XVI) (Pest: Eggenberger, 1866), 516–18. This repellent image of the Wallachs much influenced Giovanni Michele Bruto. See Joannes M. Brutus, *Brutus János Mihály magyar históriája* [The Hungarian history of Giovanni Bruto], ed. Ferenc Toldy (MHH Scriptorés XIV vol. 3) (Pest: Eggenberger, 1876), 17–27.

⁶⁰ "Apud superiores Sarmatas colonia est ab Traiano, ut aiunt, derelicta, quae nunc etiam inter tantam barbariem multa retinet latina vocabula ab Italis qui eo profecti sunt notata." Poggio Bracciolini, "Utrum priscis romanis latina lingua omnibus communis fuerit..." in Mirko Tavoni, ed., *Latino, grammatica, volgare: storia di una questione umanistica* (Padua: Antenore, 1984), 242. For a prehistory of the Daco-Roman-Romanian theory, see Adolf Armbruster, *Der Donau-Karpatenraum in den Mittel- und Westeuropäischen Quellen des 10–16. Jahrhunderts* (Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau, 1990), 23–211; idem, *Romanitatea Românilor. Istoria unei idei* (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 1993), 31–156 (also available in French). Also see Gábor Vékony, *Dacians-Romans-Romanians* (Toronto and Buffalo: Matthias Corvinus Publishing, 2000), 23–54 (available on the Internet).

⁶¹ Flavio Biondo, "Ad Alphonsum Aragonensem serenissimum regem de expeditione in Turchos Blondus Flavius Forliviensis," in Flavio Biondo, *Scritti inediti e rari* (Roma: Ti Poliglotta Vaticana, 1927), 44–45.

⁶² Joannes Cinnamus, *Epitome rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio Comnenis gestarum*, ed. August Meineke (Bonn: Weber, 1836), 260.

Macedo-Romanians) was confirmed not much later.⁶³ Around 1400 a Dominican traveler, Johannes archbishop of Sultanyeh already put down a draft of the theory of the Wallachs' mixed origins: the Roman colonists intermarried with the locals and thereby formed a new group of people in Macedonia who still spoke a language very close to Latin.⁶⁴

However, the most influential humanist authority on the question of the Roman origins of the Wallachs was Enea Silvio Piccolomini (Pope Pius II). In his hugely popular *De Europa* (written in 1458) Piccolomini noted that "the region of Transylvania lies over the Danube. It was once inhabited by the Dacians, those wild people famous for the many calamities they inflicted on the Romans. In our age three nations live there: Teutons, Szeklers, and Wallachs (*Valachi*)."⁶⁵ The author affirmed that the Wallachs were a *genus Italicum* (although their language was hardly intelligible to an Italian). He was the first to claim that their name *Valachus* originated from Flaccus, the name of the commander of the Roman army who seized the land from the Dacians. A few years later, in his biographical work entitled *Commentaries* (1464), Piccolomini's objective voice turned malicious. Here, he asserted the paradox (which became a commonplace) that these descendants of the Roman legionaries became more barbaric than the barbarians. This claim was presumably fueled by the shocking news of the incredible cruelty of Vlad Țepeș, the historical Dracula, which Piccolomini was keen to present in the most garish details. One needs to comment that the spread of the gruesome tales regarding Dracula was in a great part the work of the Transylvanian Saxons and the Hungarian chancellery.⁶⁶

⁶³ See the letters of Pope Innocent III cited by Armbruster, *Romanitatea Românilor*, 32–33.

⁶⁴ "Ipsi habent linguam propriam et quasi latinam et, ut fertur, ipsi exiverunt de Romanis, quia cum quidem imperator Romanus obtinisset illas terras, scilicet Macedoniam, quaedam societas Romanorum videntes bonam patriam recipientes uxores, remanserunt ibidem." Armbruster, *Der Donau-Karpatenraum*, 117, note 31.

⁶⁵ Enea Silvio Piccolomini, *De Europa*, ed. and commentary by Adrianus Van Heck (Vatican: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 2001), 54. Piccolomini's *Europa* was first published in 1485 in Memmingen. It was later incorporated in Hartman Schedel's famous Nuremberg chronicle, the *Liber Chronicarum* (Nuremberg: A. Koberger, 1493–94).

⁶⁶ Pius II, *Commentarii*, 11,13. The historical figure of Vlad Țepeș has been the subject of several recent monographs (by Radu Florescu and Raymond T. McNally, Kurt W. Treptow, Matei Cazacu etc.). An essential historiographical introduction to the subject is given by Ambrus Miskolczy, "A karó mint metafora. Tallózás a Drakula-

The first humanist accounts by and large coincided with an apparently living tradition of a Roman-Romanian (Roman-Wallach) origin theory. The existence of this tradition (still a sensitive point of debate concerning the Daco-Roman-Romanian theory) is reconfirmed by a growing number of sources in the sixteenth century.⁶⁷ One of them is the letter of privilege of 1538 given by Emperor Ferdinand to the Wallachs of Obrovac in Dalmatia, who were, according to the diploma, called "ancient Romans" by the Croats and Serbians, and were therefore addressed as such by Ferdinand himself.⁶⁸ Around the same time, Francesco della Valle, who was the Italian secretary of Luigi Gritti, the governor of Transylvania, commented that the Wallachs claimed to be Romans despite the corruption of their Roman name, habits and language.⁶⁹ However, in the repeated presentation of the Roman-Romanian origin theory Piccolomini remained throughout the century the greatest authority, even if there were significant modifications to his

irodalomban I–II." [The stake as metaphor: A review of Dracula literature], *BUKSZ* 5 (1992): 4, 470–77 and 6 (1993): 1, 54–60. Although an account of the "othering" of Dracula would be pertinent to our topic, this paper cannot deal with this enormous and also hotly debated theme.

⁶⁷ For more sources on the existence of a Roman-Romanian origin theory among historical Romanians see Alessandro Cortesi, "De Mathiae Corvini regis Ungariae laudibus bellicis carmen," in the Basle edition of Bonfini, *Rerum Ungaricarum Decades* (Basle: Oporinus, 1568), 878; Gromo, "Compendio di tutto il Regno," 166; and the same author in Veress, *Documente*, 253; Verantius, *Expeditionis Solymani*, 33 (36), 35 (63); Giovanni Francesco Baviera, "Ragguaglio di Transilvania (1594)," ed. Alessandro Baviera, *Corvina* 3 (1942): 692; Stephanus Zamosius [István Szamosközy], *Analecta lapidum vetustorum et nonnullarum in Dacia antiquitatum* (Padua: Laurentius Pasquatus, 1593), 12a (reprinted by Mihály Balázs and István Monok, Szeged, 1992). The young French traveler Pierre Lescalopier's diary is also relevant, see Pierre Lescalopier, *Utazása Erdélybe* [His travel to Transylvania], eds. Kálmán Benda and Lajos Tardy (Budapest: Helikon, 1982), 62–63; as well as the partial French-Romanian edition of the work: Pierre Lescalopier, "Voyage fait par moy, Pierre Lescalopier l'an 1574 de Venise a Constantinople," ed. Paul Cernovodeanu, *Studii și materiale de istorie medie* IV (1960), 434–463.

⁶⁸ Veress, *Documente*, 16–17. The diploma adds that vulgarly the Wallachs were called *Zitschy*.

⁶⁹ Francesco della Valle, "Breve narrazione della grandezza, virtu, valore, et della infelice morte dell' Illmo Sigr Conte Alouise Gritti..." ed. István Nagy, *Történelmi Társ* (1857), 23. Della Valle states that Wallachs who wanted to communicate with foreigners would ask, "Do you speak Roman?" (22). The same is asserted by Verantius, *Expeditionis Solymani*, 38 (87).

version.⁷⁰ The aforementioned Saxon Johannes Lebelius presented the story the following way:

Hereafter, following much massacre and Decebalus' defeat Trajan led the *Vlachi* along with Italian people into the kingdom, spread them all around the Dacian kingdom, the offspring of whom still survive and can be seen in Wallachia today. These people after so many severe fights which they have survived, remained in Dacia, and are now farmers of the land. From Vlachs they became Wallachs, Roman-like Italians (*Romanenses Italiani*), whose remnants speak a Roman-like language. They once inhabited boundless and agreeable woody areas and streams of fountains, to which spacious fields belong. They still occupy the same, and live protected in the kingdom; but they are shepherds and live on the food that comes from the sheep. They represent the Romans only in their name and not in substance, therefore they are vulgarly called *Romuini*.⁷¹

Although the Roman origins of the Wallachs were frequently presented in pejorative terms, there were also some exceptions. When in 1574 the Hungarian Jesuit István Szántó argued for sending a Catholic mission to Wallachia, he claimed that Italians would be highly welcomed in the country, where they could easily understand the language: "no wonder! these people are the offspring of an ancient colony of the Romans which used to be once in Transylvania."⁷² Later, Szántó affirmed again that the corrupted Italian language that people spoke in "Lower Wallachia," that is, in "*Romandiola* or *Romaniola*," would be intelligible to "real Italians."⁷³

⁷⁰ For more sources, see Alexandru Marcu, "Riflessi di storia rumena in opere italiane dei secoli XIV e XV," *Ephemeris dacoromana: Annuario della Scuola romana di Roma* 1 (1923): 338–86; Claudio Isopescu, "Notizie intorno ai romeni nella letteratura geografica italiana del Cinquecento," *Bulletin de la Section Historique, Académie Roumaine* 16 (1929): 1–90; idem, *Documenti inediti della fine del Cinquecento* (Bucharest: Cultura națională, 1929); Armbruster, *Romanitatea Românilor*, 57–156; idem, *Der Donau-Karpatenraum*, 23–211; Karl Kaser, *Südosteuropäische Geschichte und Geschichtsschreibung* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2002), 60–69.

⁷¹ Lebelius, *De Oppido Thalmus*, 11–12.

⁷² László Lukács, ed., *Monumenta Antiquae Hungariae*, Vol. I, 1550–1579 (Rome: Institutum historicum, 1969), 474. The letter was written before Szántó had yet arrived in Transylvania. In 1600, Szántó uses another tone regarding Transylvanian Wallachs: "Valachi olim fuerint coloniae romanorum, et loquuntur corrupta italica lingua. Sunt rudes et sylvestres homines. Sunt pastores ovium, incolunt montes et sylvas et nobilium ungarorum sunt coloni." László Lukács, ed., *Monumenta Antiquae Hungariae*, Vol. IV, 1593–1600 (Rome: Institutum historicum, 1987), 578.

⁷³ Lukács, *Monumenta*, I. 755.

It was most of all the paradox of the "barbarian Romans" which particularly fascinated humanists and literati. The prolific itinerant humanist from Italy, Tranquillus Andronicus, reproduced Piccolomini's description of the Wallachs with a noteworthy difference. According to him, the legionaries of Flaccus and the people of the province intermarried and thus created a new ethnic group; however, there was nothing Roman in this mixed nation apart from their language, and this in any case was profoundly corrupted and full of barbarian idioms. Andronicus ironically added that civil discord and tyranny in the principalities might similarly be a Roman heritage.⁷⁴

The humanist chancellor of Transylvania, Farkas Kovacsóczy (a former client of Ferenc Forgách), likewise reacted ironically to the paradox of "barbarian Romans." At the end of his political dialog on the right form of government, the two participants, Eubulus ("he who gives good advice") and Philodacus ("he who loves the people of Dacia"), contemplate a bucolic setting and realize how conspicuously the landscape holds the memory of the old Romans. Philodacus raises the question whether "their Wallachs", who still generally pretend to be Romans, are indeed the heirs of the colonists, as their language would suggest. Eubulos responds that their customs run against this claim, remarking that the Romans would be certainly much disgusted by these dull beasts. Philodacus suggests the reason for this change is to be sought in their nature. He offers the comparison of rotten bread: although bread is the healthiest food, when it goes bad it is the most harmful. Similarly, the most excellent nation, the Roman, had over the course of the centuries become a people of good-for-nothings and rascals.⁷⁵

Although the language of the Wallachs appeared an unshakable argument, there were already quite a number of sixteenth-century humanists who questioned the Roman-Romanian theory in one way or another. Since racial prejudices are often semantically encoded, one can surmise that the very names that were most frequently used in

⁷⁴ Tranquillus Andronicus, "De rebus in Hungariae gestis ab illustrissimo et magnifico Ludovico Gritti deque eius obitu epistola (ad Joannem comitem in Tarnow, 1534)," in Henrik Kretschmayr, ed., *Történelmi Tár* (1903), 203.

⁷⁵ Farkas Kovacsóczy, "De administratione Transylvaniae dialogus," in Pál Ács, József Jankovics and Péter Kőszeghy, eds., *Régi magyar irodalmi szöveggyűjtemény. I. Humanizmus* (Budapest: Balassi, 1998), 650–87.

reference to Wallachs (e.g. Dacians, Getae, Thracians, Triballi, Moesi) could often allude to an opposition to the Roman origin theory.

Stephanus Taurinus of Olomouc/Olmütz, an early sixteenth-century humanist of German origin who spent his life in Hungary and finally in Transylvania, lists a number of Roman inscriptions from Dacia in the appendix to his epic on the peasant war of Dózsa. When he finally mentions the Roman-Romanian origin theory, as a kind of aside, he modifies Piccolomini's version in a curious manner: "The Wallachs (*Vlacci*) (as is recorded by Enea Silvio) started to be called this way because of their leader Vlaccus(!), who was the first to lead them into Moesia from the *mountains* of Italy (*ex Italicis montibus*)."⁷⁶ Taurinus is here implicitly claiming that the Wallachs represented an Italian subgroup who were mountain-dwellers already in their home country.

In describing the Roman period of Dacia in his chorography Antonius Verantius applied to his sources the critical sense of a mature and well-versed humanist.⁷⁷ One of the objectives of his work was to offer a valid refutation of Piccolomini's Roman-Romanian origin theory, and for a long while his riposte remained the longest and most elaborate consideration of the question. Verantius' main point was that Piccolomini's Flaccus-*Valachus* etymology was simply untenable, since ancient sources made absolutely no mention of any such Flaccus.⁷⁸ Even more curious, he argued, was the silence in the sources about any nation called Wallach named after a Roman soldier.⁷⁹ Verantius asserted instead that the name of the Wallachs had Slavic origins, for among the Slavs the Italians were called "Wlah" or "Wlaz".⁸⁰ These

⁷⁶ Stephanus Taurinus Olomucensis, *Stauromachia id est Cruciatorum servile bellum (Servilis belli Pannonici libri V)*, ed. László Juhász (Budapest: K. M. Egyetemi Ny., 1944), 66.

⁷⁷ Regarding the varying views on the Roman-Romanian theory he claimed: "De quo, quoniam multi ambigunt et diversi modo traditur a scriptoribus, afferam paulo prolixius etiam meam hac de re sententiam." Verantius, *Expeditionis Solymani*, 35–36 (63.) Already Piccolomini had affirmed the difficulty in interpreting the contradicting sources. Piccolomini, *De Europa*, 58 (Part 17).

⁷⁸ Probably independently it is confirmed by Martin Cromer, *De origine et rebus gestis Polonorum libri XXX* (Basle: Oporinus, 1555), 313; and probably following him, by Peucer, *Chronicon Carionis*, 237b.

⁷⁹ Verantius, *Expeditionis Solymani*, 36–37. Verantius lists in these pages a remarkable number of sources he consulted.

⁸⁰ According to Verantius, the Wallachs were associated with the Italians—the Wlahi/Wlazi—because they had been slaves of the Italians. Later, invading Hungarians started calling them "Olazak", which the Wallachs transformed into "Valacchi".

people of Roman-Dacian origins once used to serve as shepherds for the local Lombard and Italic groups.⁸¹ When the Huns pushed these groups back as far as the Adriatic Sea, the descendants of the Wallachs took the name of their former lords and came to be called "Olaz" and later "Valach".⁸² Verantius also claimed that Romans were later completely expelled from the entire region. This argument has become a hotly debated point in the discussion over the Roman-Dacian origin theory.⁸³

Ten years later, the aforementioned agent of Ferdinand, Georg Reicherstorffer in his own chorography of Transylvania and Moldavia reasserted the Italian origins of the Wallachs and the Flaccus-*Valachus* etymology.⁸⁴ Nevertheless, he noted a different opinion held by some contemporaries: they considered the Wallachs to be the heirs of the Moesi, and thus descendants of the Dacians.⁸⁵ To be sure, the Wallachs themselves could hardly be the successors to the glory of the Romans. At the ending of his work he reveals that the true heirs of the Romans were effectively none other than the Saxons:⁸⁶

Transylvania is [...] the same as ancient Dacia, or at least its most flourishing and important part, which was once formed into a province [...] by Emperor Trajan, who moved colonists here and established

Verantius, *Expeditionis Solymani*, 38. This etymology became an important pillar of the Roman-Romanian theory, but it seems it had this function already in the sixteenth century. According to Martin Cromer, "Polonorum quidem atque adeo Slavorum omnium lingua, non modo hi populi, verumetiam omnes Italicis generis Vulassi & Volussi dicuntur: Quod ipsum etiam argumento est Italicam hanc gentem esse." Cromer, *De origine*, 313.

⁸¹ This claim comes from Simon de Keza, "Gesta Hungarorum," in István Szentpétery, ed., *Scriptores Rerum Hungaricarum* (Budapest: Akadémia, 1937), 1:269; László Veszprémy and Frank Schaer, ed.-tr., *Simon de Keza Gesta Hungarorum/Simon of Keza: The Deeds of the Hungarians* (Budapest: CEU Press, 1999), 54–55.

⁸² Verantius, *Expeditionis Solymani*, 38.

⁸³ "...iam Romani dudum per Gothos, Vandalos et alias diversas peregrinas nationes, postremo per Hunnos Hungarorum progenitores non a Getarum et Dacorum tantummodo solo, sed etiam ex Pannoniis exacti erant..." Verantius, *Expeditionis Solymani*, 38.

⁸⁴ Reicherstorffer, "Chorographia Moldaviae," 72; Idem, "Chorographia Transilvaniae," 24. Georg Reicherstorffer extensively used Verantius as his source. The protest against plagiarism which appears in one of Verantius' elegies presumably refers to the work of Reicherstorffer. István Szabadi, "Georg Reicherstorffer és a magyarországi humanista földrajzírás" [Georg Reicherstorffer and the humanist geography in Hungary] in Reicherstorffer, *Erdély és Moldva leírása*, 125–27.

⁸⁵ Reicherstorffer, "Chorographia Transilvaniae," 24.

⁸⁶ Reicherstorffer presented here two independent origin theories. Ibid., 24–26.

cities... [This region] passed first into the possession of the Teutons who came either from Saxony or from the area of the Rhine, and remained theirs for some centuries...⁸⁷

This was confirmed—Reicherstorffer added—by the age-old Chronicle of the Hungarians, where the Saxons were described as an indigenous group of the Carpathian Basin.

In 1555, the Polish humanist bishop Martin Cromer, who also asserted the Slavic origin of the name of the Wallachs, presented a developed version of the mixed origin theory. According to Cromer, the Roman province of Dacia, where great numbers of Roman colonists had been moved after the wars, was a little later conquered by the barbarian Goths. The Wallachs were born from the exchange and intermarriage of Goths and Romans, which explained their barbarism and the impurity of their Roman language. Although at the beginning Russian and another Slavic language was also in use among them, these languages were later “subjugated” to the surviving Roman-Goth language, probably because of the commercial relations that they maintained (e.g. with the Romans).⁸⁸ By the end of the century, the Flaccus-*Valachus* thesis had become generally discredited, but the paradox of the “barbarian Romans” remained a vexing problem.

Heroes and villains of Wallach origins

Learned sixteenth-century contemporaries liked to parade their Classical learning when discriminating against the Wallachs. Following the ancient clichés of a dichotomic thinking, and classical geographical representations of a culturally hierarchized Europe they affirmed that Wallachs were everything but civilized: they were ruled by despots, plagued by civil wars and internal fights, were superstitious, illiterate, smelly and dirty, they kept no legal order, stole, and lived with animals.⁸⁹ By constructing the otherness of the Wallachs, the self-

⁸⁷ Ibid., 50.

⁸⁸ Cromer, *De origine*, 313.

⁸⁹ Compare the note of Giovanni Lorenzo D’Anania in which he asserts that the Szeklers and Wallachs live off agriculture and animals, while the Saxons live in a civilized way: “Have questo paese tre sorti di abitanti, oltre gli Ungheri, che sono i principali, e che signeroggiano, Cecoli, Valacchi, et Sassoni; le due attendono all’agricoltura, et al bestame, gli ultimi vivono civilmente.” Cited in Isopescu, *Documenti inediti*, 49.

identity of the authors was reaffirmed. But there was more to it than reaffirming humanist identity and cultural superiority, or redrawing the frontiers of Latin civilization. Since the Wallachs were scattered across Transylvania they could only sporadically organize themselves into privileged legal bodies—as the Saxons had done—that could represent their interests. In Transylvania the Wallachs fitted into a political and economic system from which the Hungarian nobility and the Saxon communities largely profited. On the other hand, the prejudices against them were common enough to harm (at very least psychologically) those people of Wallach origins who strove to win a better place in that society. A noteworthy example is the case of the humanist Nicolaus Olahus (1493–1568), chancellor of Hungary, head of the Catholic Church, and one of the most influential politicians of the century.

In 1567, half a year before Nicolaus Olahus' death, some Latin mock-epitaphs and an invective directed against him were secretly circulated during the session of the Hungarian diet. The authors were certain younger humanists, either identical with, or belonging to the group of Ferenc Forgách and Farkas Kovacsóczy, two names we have already encountered. Like most of Olahus' enemies, Forgách felt the archbishop was a serious obstacle to him in realizing his career objectives at the imperial court.⁹⁰ This was not the first time Olahus was attacked in literary works. A few years before, he had been caricatured under the guise of a corrupt and fraudulent inquisitor in a Hungarian drama on the conspiracy of the powerful magnate Menyhárt Balassa.⁹¹ The tone of the drama was nevertheless distinctly mild when compared with the newer compositions. It was already offensive enough that mock-epitaphs should be written of someone who was still alive. But the poems had no literary value: their sole objective was to present a list of Olahus' alleged vices, while their outspoken and at times

⁹⁰ For more details, see Gábor Almási, "Variációk az értelmiségi útkeresés témájára a 16. században: Forgách Ferenc és társai" [Variations on the theme of intellectual careers in the sixteenth century: Ferenc Forgách and his associates], *Századok* 140 (2006): 6, 1405–1440. See also Benedek Varga's article in this volume.

⁹¹ [Author unknown], *Comoedia Balassi Menyhárt arultatarol, meliel elszakada az magyarországi masodic valasztot Ianos kiraltul* [Comedy on the treason committed by Menyhárt Balassi abandoning the second elected king John of Hungary] (Abrudbánya: Karádi Pál, 1569).

coarse language was supposed to entertain the reader.⁹² A surprising feature of these writings (especially of the invective) is their anti-Wallach nature. It was the Wallach, hence low origins of the archbishop-chancellor that the poems singled out as making him most despicable. As the invective puts it, it is not surprising that Olahus' character is so rough (*asper*) and brutal as he comes from the mountain-dwelling Olahs (or Wallachs), who live in caves and have no dealings with other men and no firm idea of God.⁹³ The oration then goes on to describe Olahus' rise to power as mired by sexual liaisons and chiefly based on luck.

Referring to the archbishop-chancellor as "the Wallach" had various negative connotations. First and foremost, it suggested that he was considered a stranger. What is worse, the word Wallach had strong religious (orthodox) and social (lowborn) connotations. Not only Forgách's circle but also other intellectuals like Georg Purkircher and allegedly even King Maximilian had disparaged the archbishop in this way.⁹⁴ Andreas Dudith, the Croatian-Italian humanist of Hungary, was similarly prejudiced towards his former patron and for the very same reason as Forgách (both of them had vainly aspired to the office of

⁹² See, for example, the beginning of the poem entitled *In tumulum Nicolai Olahi, Archiepi(scopi) Strigonien(sis)*: "Hic iacet invisum caput et mortalibus & Dijs, / Barbarus, immitis, fere populi valachi. / Quem non sancta fides, probitas, constantia, virtus, / Aut genus, aut sanctae religionis amor: / Extulit indignum, celsaque in sede locavit, / é qua nunc Parcae praecipitem eijciunt. / Sed sors, & nobis iratum numen, ut esset, / Qui magis atque magis Pannonios premeret." Österreichische Nationalbibliothek [ÖNB], Codex S.N. 1912, f. 55v.

⁹³ "Quanquam autem de natalibus tuis humillimis scilicet ac sordidissimis dicere non est in animo, quo celerius ad vitam tuam veniam omnibus sceleribus ac flagitiis coopertam, illud tamen silentio non praeteribo. Mirandum non esse te tam asperis atque adeo nimi[s] acribus moribus esse, cum tu olahus sis, id est ex eorum populorum genere unus, quos propter sylvestrem ac firmam vitam Valachos alii vocant, qui sunt homines in montibus Transsylvaniae ad Valachiam in specubus et antris more belluarum d[e]gentes, luorum ac pecudum usu vitam tolerantantes, nulla praeterea cum ceteris hominibus commerciorum societate coniuncti, nulla firma dei cognitione imbuti." ÖNB Codex S.N. 1912, f. 60r-v. Several Classical sources of these stereotypes could be cited here; e.g. for the last charge, compare Cicero, *De Natura Deorum*, 23: "For in the first place how do you know that nations do hold that belief [the existence of gods]? I think myself that there are many races so barbarously savage as to be without any conception of such beings."

⁹⁴ "Infensus patriam premit Balahus / ac verbi exilio gravat ministros." Georg Purkircher, *Opera quae supersunt omnia*, ed. Miloslav Okál (Budapest: Akadémia, 1988), 114. The Germans of Upper Hungary claimed that King Maximilian had reacted to Olahus' acts the following way: "...es wirt dem wolochen nicht allzeit nach seinem willen fortgehenn." Vilmos Fraknói, ed., *Magyar Országgyűlési Emlékek* (Budapest: Akadémia, 1876), 4:170, note 2.

vice-chancellor). In a letter to Maximilian he put it bluntly: "Or do you think that this barbarian person who comes from the vilest dregs of the Getae, and who has attained the standing that he has, and from where he despises God and men, because of the most obscure reasons or because of Fortune's whim, but certainly not for his own merit—do you think he would have found peace unless he had destroyed me as completely as was in his power?"⁹⁵

Although these people principally accused Olahus of having low and mean origins, their attacks can be easily interpreted as stemming from a more general, racially colored prejudice against all Wallachs. If they focused on Olahus' Wallach origins it was not because it profoundly offended them, but rather because they wanted to hurt the archbishop in a point where it was easy and safe and where they could expect to win the readers' sympathy. In fact, this was a problematic element in Olahus' identity.⁹⁶

Nicolaus Olahus came from a rich family in Sibiu (Hermannstadt, Nagyszeben), the most important town of the Transylvanian Saxons. His father, a refugee from the principality of Wallachia, had come from a princely family. He managed to marry into an affluent Hungarian family with connections to the Hungarian nobility; meanwhile he apparently maintained commercial relations with the principality.⁹⁷ Despite Saxon protests he became *praefectus salinarum*, an office

⁹⁵ Andreas Dudithius, *Epistolae*, Vol. I, 1554–1567, eds. Tibor Szepessy and Lech Szczucki (Budapest: Argumentum, 1992), 452.

⁹⁶ Hungarian and Romanian scholars have been intensely interested in appropriating Olahus. On his origins see János Karácsonyi, "Az oláhországi (havaselyi) vajdák családfája" [The genealogy of the rulers of Wallachia], *Századok* 44 (1910): 187–92; Ion Lupaș, "Doi umaniști români în secolul al XVI-lea" [Two Romanian humanists in the sixteenth century], *Anuarul Institutului de istorie națională* 4 (1926–1927): 337–53; Ștefan Bezdechi, "Familia lui Nicolaus Olahus" [The family of Nicolaus Olahus], *Anuarul Institutului de istorie națională* 5 (1928–1930): 63–85; A. Sacerdoțeanu, "Stema lui Dan al II-lea în legătură cu familiile Huniade și Olah" [The relationship between the stemma of Dan II and the families of Huniade and Olah], *Revista muzeelor* 5 (1968): 5–16; Alexander Tonk (Sándor Tonk), "Diplomele de înnobilitare ale lui Nicolaus Olahus. Unele probleme privind genealogia familiei Olahus" [The diploma of nobility of Nicolaus Olahus: Some problems concerning the genealogy of the Olahus Family], *Revista Arhivelor* 46 (1969): 13–31; István Fodor, *Oláh Miklós Hungariája: egy eddig ismeretlen kézirat és a magyar nyelvi adatok tanulságai* [The Hungaria of Nicolaus Olahus in the light of an unknown manuscript and its Hungarian language usage] (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1990), 7–8, 29–32.

⁹⁷ See Tonk, "Diplomele de înnobilitare," and Olahus' letter to Cornelius Schepper of March 2nd, 1533. Miklós Oláh [Nicolaus Olahus], *Codex epistolaris: MDXXVI–MDXXXVIII*, ed. Arnold Ipolyi (MHH Diplomataria XXV) (Budapest: Akadémia, 1876), 307–15. Although the Hungarian nationality of his mother has been questioned

which Olahus' brother later inherited. One of Nicolaus' uncles, Prince Mihnea (from the Dracula family), was also forced to flee from Wallachia and was later killed in Sibiu.⁹⁸ In spite of the kinship with the Dracula family, Olahus later, in his celebrated work, the *Hungaria* (but nowhere else) preferred to describe not the Draculas but the Dans (who were the two alternative princely families of Wallachia) as the forerunners of his family. The reason that he opted for the Dans may well be the evil reputation of Vlad Țepeș (e.g. "the Dracula").⁹⁹

Olahus' major endeavor to represent to the greater public his "Hungarus" identity was through his opus *Hungaria-Athila*. This work was written when he was still in the Low Countries around the time of the death of Erasmus, with whom he had corresponded for several years. At the time, he was only one among the erudite secretaries of Mary of Hungary waiting for the right opportunity to return into his *patria* and obtain a more substantial political-ecclesiastical office.¹⁰⁰ The two connected writings, the *Hungaria* and the *Athila* were the products of this relative *otium*, and were probably intended as the first chapters of a major historical work on Hungary that never saw completion.¹⁰¹ The reason for this may be the fact that Olahus did soon receive a prestigious post in Hungary. On the other hand, he had very probably already achieved his major intellectual goals once he had written *Hungaria-Athila*.

Olahus described Hungary as a multi-ethnic country repeatedly calling attention to her national diversity. This is affirmed most emphatically at the end of the work: "Nowadays, the entirety of Hun-

by Romanian historians, these objections have been convincingly refuted by Karácsonyi and Tonk.

⁹⁸ Their kinship is also proven by Mihnea's golden ring that came into the possession of the young Olahus. Karácsonyi, *Az oláhországi (havaselyi) vajdák*, 190.

⁹⁹ Nicolaus Olahus, *Hungaria—Athila*, ed. Károly Eperjessy and László Juhász (Budapest: K. M. Egyetemi Nyomda, 1938), 21–22.

¹⁰⁰ For Olahus' early career see Fazekas István, "Miklós Oláh, Secretary to Queen Mary of Hungary, 1526–1539," in Orsolya Réthelyi et al., eds., *Mary of Hungary, The Queen and Her Court 1521–1531* (Budapest: BTM, 2005), 41–43; István Sugár, *Az egri püspökök története* [History of the bishops of Eger] (Budapest: Szt. István Társ., 1984), 241–53.

¹⁰¹ On their connectedness see Tibor Kardos, *A magyarországi humanizmus kora* (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1955), 314; Fodor, *Oláh Miklós Hungariája*, 9; Christina Neagu, *Servant of the Renaissance: The Poetry and Prose of Nicolaus Olahus* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2003), 220–46. Still in 1560, Andreas Dudith seems to refer to a possible continuation of the work in a dedicatory letter addressed to Olahus; see Dudithius, *Epistolae*, I. 81.

gary comprises diverse nations: Hungarians, Germans, Bohemians, Slavs, Croats, Saxons, Szeklers, Wallachs, Serbians, Cumans, Yazygs, Ruthenes and finally already also Turks, all of whom speak different languages."¹⁰² The author also told of a village where the population was called *Eburons* and spoke French, while in the very end of the work he brought up another extreme example, the self-maiming gypsies of the village of Simánd, who lived by begging and used a local dialect unintelligible to people outside their community.

At the time of writing, civil war-ridden Hungary had suffered the trauma of the battle of Mohács but was still not entirely occupied by the Turks. Yet the country described in Olahus' chorography resembled more an imagined peaceful and powerful monarchy alongside the Danube than reality. It was a virtual-historical representation of Hungary drawn with noticeable nostalgia.¹⁰³ According to Olahus, Hungary consisted of four parts: Western Hungary, Upper Hungary, the part south of the Drava (which in reality belonged only in title to the king), and finally the whole of ancient Dacia, including the two Romanian principalities (which were independent territories). The importance of the fourth, south-eastern region of the country is signaled by the structure of the work: out of the thirteen descriptive chapters six are dedicated to it.

In discussing the history of Wallachia the author presents the Flacus etymology, and also mentions the civil wars that forced his family into exile. As for Transylvania, we learn that it consists of not the usually mentioned three nations (the Hungarians, the Szeklers, the Saxons) but of four (*quatuor diverso genere nationes*), by implication the Wallachs as well. This represented a mixture of the Hungarian legal-political tradition and of ethnic reality. Following Piccolomini, Olahus affirmed that the language of the Wallachs and the Roman coins found in the ground testified to their Roman origins. Commenting on their religion, his tone is remarkably Erasmian: "The Wallachs are Christians, the only difference is that they follow the Greeks as regards the procession of the Holy Spirit, and differ from our Church in certain other less significant articles."¹⁰⁴ Olahus uses this moderate, rational

¹⁰² Olahus, *Hungaria*, 33–34.

¹⁰³ This was, however, not alien to contemporary chorographic tradition. See for example Johannes Bohemus, *Omnium gentium mores, leges, et ritus ex multis clarissimis rerum scriptoribus* (Lugduni: F. Iustum, 1536).

¹⁰⁴ Olahus, *Hungaria*, 22.

voice all through the work and does not refrain from communicating the darker sides of Wallachian history—not surprisingly, seeing as he and his family had been so personally affected. He gives a long and detailed account of the suffering his ancestors, his “close relative” Mihnea and his still living cousin. He makes clear that these were caused by the continuous fighting and bloody vendettas between the two leading families of Wallachia, which had been often manipulated by the Turkish sultan and the Hungarian king.¹⁰⁵

In the chapter on Wallachia Olahus tells the story of his own origins. Not only do we learn that he had princely ancestors in Wallachia from the Dan family but also that his grandmother was the sister of János Hunyadi, the famous hero and father of King Matthias Corvinus. Although still often repeated, this is a false genealogy, chronologically and historically untenable, that the humanist bishop had neither mentioned earlier nor allowed to be included in his diploma of nobility.¹⁰⁶ The reason why he needed in the *Hungaria-Athila* an admired and unquestionably acknowledged ancestor of Wallach origins is, however, quite clear. It served to dignify his Wallachian origins, which was also one of the goals of the aforementioned diploma. This document affirmed in the name of Emperor Ferdinand that the Wallachs had come (in part at least) from the city of Rome, whence their language is now called “Roman.” It also declared that the heroes this nation had given to history—such as János Hunyadi, King Matthias and Olahus’ own ancestors in Wallachia—all testified to her uniqueness. As for Olahus’ coat of arms, whose principal symbol was a rhinoceros, the diploma affirmed that it stood both for the original harshness and generosity of his race—such as is typical of all laudable nations, among whom the Wallachs are in no way the least—and for his own gallantry.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁵ Olahus, *Hungaria*, 21–22.

¹⁰⁶ Although the invention of this genealogy has been convincingly proven by Karácsonyi (“Az oláhországi (havaselyi) vajdák”) and Tonk (“Diplomele de innobiliare”), it is still taken much too seriously by Romanian authors. See for example the appendix of Olahus’ genealogy in Neagu, *Servant of the Renaissance*, which cites the work of Tonk in the bibliography.

¹⁰⁷ “Asperrimam ferarum, sed eandem generosissimam monocerotem esse aiunt, sic vero sunt omnes propemodum laudatissimarum gentium origine(s), inter quas Valachi gentiles tui minime postremas habent, ut quos ab ipsa rerum domina urbe Roma oriundos et in veteris illius Daciae opulentissima parte, cui nunc nomen est Transalpinæ, ad arcendos hostium finitimorum in provincias Romanas incurSIONES collocatos esse constat, unde nunc quoque sua lingua Romani vocantur. Generis itaque tui nobilitatem refert monoceros simul et ingenium, nam que in fera asperitas

The illustrious family origins must have been both an enormous source of pride for the later archbishop and at the same time a burden that could give him headaches every once in a while. In fact, he was not the only one so to suffer: Wallach origins apparently presented a problem even to King Matthias, who adopted the name Corvinus and used professional historians to create a myth of his Roman origins.

It was a common knowledge at the time that the most celebrated hero fighting the Turks, János Hunyadi (Matthias' father), who made a political and military career in the service of the Hungarian king and Holy Roman Emperor Sigismund and ultimately became governor of Hungary, had Wallach origins. Piccolomini, sensitive to the question of nationality, underlined that Hunyadi added to the glory not so much of the Hungarians as of the Wallachs, from whom he took his origins.¹⁰⁸ In 1475, the Florentine humanist Ludovico Carbo still did not understand how to capitalize on the origins of the Hunyadis, "We cannot deny the modest origins of our János from the town of Hunyad"—claimed one of the interlocutors of his dialog written in the praise of János' son King Matthias. "During the time he lived in the court of one of the barons (as we call them), and was educated among boys, he proved to be so very warlike (*ferox*) and spirited that he used to divide the army of boys into two parts, clash as if in battle lines and fight most fiercely."¹⁰⁹ Needless to say, Carbo applied in vain for a position at the royal court in Buda. It was only at the end of Matthias' rule that two Italian historians Pietro Ransano and Antonio Bonfini made full advantage of the king's Wallach origins.¹¹⁰ In fact, Bonfini's appointment as a court historian appears to be related to the

est, ea in homine fortitudo vocatur. Qua tua ista gens semper prepollens fuit, multorum prestantissimorum ducum genetrix, inter quos et Joannes Huniades, incliti regis Mathiae pater, et illius aetate proximi maiores tui potissimum enituisse feruntur." Tonk, "Diplomele de innobilare," 24.

¹⁰⁸ "Ioannes Huniades, cuius nomen ceteros obnubilat, non tam Hungaris quam Valachis, ex quibus natus erat, gloriam auxit." Piccolomini, *De Europa*, 56 (Part 15).

¹⁰⁹ Ludovico Carbo, "Dialogus de laudibus rebusque gestis R. Mathiae," in Ferenc Toldy, ed., *Annalecta monumentorum Hungariae historicorum literariorum maximum inedita* (Pesthini: Acad. Hung., 1862), 174–75. (Reprinted 1986; also available on the internet: <http://carbo.mtak.hu/hu/09.htm>). See also Péter Kulcsár, "A Corvinus-legenda" [The Corvinus Legend], in Gábor Barta, ed., *Mátyás király 1458–1490* (Budapest: Akadémia, 1990), 17–40.

¹¹⁰ Petrus Ransanus, *Epithoma Rerum Hungararum*, ed. Péter Kulcsár (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1977); Bonfini, *Rerum Ungaricarum Decades*. Although Bonfini often relied on Piccolomini, unlike Ransano, he did not share the Flaccus-Valachus etymology. (See Bonfini, *Rerum Ungaricarum Decades* 2.7.155.)

new Corvinus-legend, which he offered to the king in a booklet upon his arrival. Later, in his history of Hungary he described the origins of Matthias' father, the military hero the following way:

[János Hunyadi] was born from a Wallach father and a Greek mother, and embellished his ancestry with his industry and virtue more than anyone would believe. As they say, his parents did not have modest origins at all. His father is said to have had very much power among the Wallachs, who inhabit the place of Getae and Dacians, and are reasonably believed to be the survivors of Roman colonies, as the similitude of their language proves. [...] Being born in the village of Corvinum he traced his descent from the Roman Corvinus family, while his mother of Greek origins was believed to have had antique and imperial blood. [...] He was the kind of man in whom one could recognize the great virtue of the Corvini, likewise the Roman magnanimity, wisdom and courage.¹¹¹

Whereas Hunyadi's Greek mother with her imperial ancestors—who calls to mind Olahus' own fictional grandmother, a sister of Hunyadi himself—remained only a suggestion without further elaboration, Bonfini, following most probably Ransano, took great pains to create a long, complicated (and rather fabulous) genealogy of the Corvinus family, to bolster the claim that King Matthias had Roman patrician blood.¹¹² Both Italian authors Bonfini and Ransano served the interests of the *par excellence* Renaissance ruler, King Matthias. There were a number of reasons why the king needed an elegant origin myth: to support his imperial ambitions, to ease the way for a prestigious marriage for his illegitimate son János Corvin and to take the edge off the

¹¹¹ Bonfini, *Rerum Ungaricarum Decades*, 3.4.254–264. Although the Roman-Romanian origin theory is affirmed here, Bonfini (but also Ransano) remained confused whether to make the Wallachs purely Roman or also claim for them Dacian origins. Compare *ibid.*, 3.9.285. and 2.7.155. Also note the contradictions in Ransanus, *Epithoma Rerum Hungararum*, 33.42 and 33.44. See Ágnes Ritoók-Szalay, “La leggenda corviniana e i monumenti archeologici,” in Sante Graciotti and Amadeo Di Francesco, eds., *L'eredità classica in Italia e Ungheria fra tardo Medioevo e primo Rinascimento* (Roma: Il Calamo, 2001), 283–291.

¹¹² Bonfini, *Rerum Ungaricarum Decades*, 3.9.230–85; Ransanus, *Epithoma Rerum Hungararum*, 33–36. Although the text referring to Johannes Hunyadi (which remained unpublished until recently) is claimed by the editor to go back to a version made before 1453, I find it difficult not to see in it the signs of later elaboration. Alternatively, we should suppose that the Flaccus-Valachus theory presented by Ransano was his own creation and Piccolomini used his manuscript as a source; and should also accept that the Corvinus-myth mattered already before the rule of Matthias.

general criticism regarding his origins.¹¹³ Bonfini ended the presentation of the Corvinus genealogy the following way:

The blood of the Corvinus family had then been hiding here for a long time and eventually it sprang forth in the village of Corvinus. [...] You may think that recalling this story we made a detour further than the subject matter would seem to demand—many dislike loquacious writers—but we did not go far from the point, since Matthias, who knew well how ancient his origins were, did not seem to support anything so badly as to be attacked by envious people because of his “low origins” (*obscuritatem gentis*). He similarly disliked those who would strive to be ahead of others by vamping about their barbarian nobility instead of revealing their own merits and virtues. He was aware that his enemies condemned his “base origins” (*ignobilitas sui generis*); that people say all around that his family comes from the Wallachs; that some people considered him a hybrid, who was born of parents of two different languages. First of all the barons of Western Hungary would say that the little king of the Wallachs is not to be tolerated. Emperor Frederick could also hardly suffer that this up-to-now opulent kingdom was ruled by an adolescent and nearly foreign king...¹¹⁴

Bonfini and Ransano had the same reason for creating Matthias' origin myth as Olahus in creating his own origin story with the Hunyadi grandmother: it was to turn their Wallach origins to their own advantage. However, neither Bonfini nor Olahus convinced contemporaries.¹¹⁵ The Ragusan historian Ludovico Tubero for example presumed that the “Geta” Matthias called himself Corvinus either because his father used in war a banner with a raven (*corvinus*) on it or because he fell into the usual royal mistake of believing flatterers who claimed he had originated from the former colonists of Roman citizens “who, in the major part, still inhabit the Getic land.”¹¹⁶ In the Hungarian adaptation of Bonfini's history prepared by the learned typographer Gáspár Heltai, Hunyadi's origins became the subject of a fable. In the version of Heltai, János Hunyadi originated from an extramarital

¹¹³ Armbruster, *Romanitatea Românilor*, 67–68; Kulcsár, “A Corvinus-legenda.”

¹¹⁴ Bonfini, *Rerum Ungaricarum Decades*, 3.9.286–293.

¹¹⁵ Olahus' noble ancestry was emphasized only in a few panegyrics, like the one written by the Hungarian historian Nicolaus Istvánffy, who tellingly ignores the Wallachian princely heirs and mentions only the Hunyadi grandmother. Nicolaus Istvánffy, *Carmina*, ed. József Holub and László Juhász (Leipzig: Teubner, 1885), 2–3.

¹¹⁶ “Geticum agrum” Ludovico Tubero, “Commentariorum de rebus quae temporibus suis in illa Europae parte, quam Pannonii et Turcae eorumque finitimi incolunt, gestae sunt libri XI,” in Johann Georg Schwandtner, ed., *Scriptores Rerum Hungaricarum* (Vienna: J. Kraus, 1747), 2:113.

relationship between Emperor Sigismund (in whose service Hunyadi made a career later) and the beautiful daughter of a Wallachian boyar living in Transylvanian exile.¹¹⁷ Another curious invention of Heltai's was the birthplace of King Matthias: Hungary's most famous ruler was born in the residence of a Saxon citizen in Heltai's own home town, Cluj (Kolozsvár/Klausenberg), and this was the place where the king was supposed to have received his elementary education, too.¹¹⁸

Conclusion

The Wallach origin of Olahus and the Hunyadis was an Achilles' heel that rivals eagerly exploited. Since both made an extraordinary career they necessarily faced a great number of rivals and sparked jealousy in numerous others. In the context of these rivalries, ethnic prejudices could be used for one's own advantage. Nevertheless, we should never forget that these prejudices were on the whole not strong and widespread enough to hinder the election of János Hunyadi as governor or Matthias as king of Hungary, or to stop Olahus rising to the highest ecclesiastical and political office of the country. Unlike Olahus, the two Hunyadis were always beloved and admired figures, and their ethnic origins became a more widely recognized subject only in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.¹¹⁹ Unlike in Matthias' case in the fifteenth century, the people who ridiculed Olahus' origins were mostly humanists of humble birth (except for Forgách), who made a political career relying on their erudition and talents just as Olahus had done. These people had differing national backgrounds: like Verantius, the Transylvanian chancellor Farkas Kovacsóczy had Dalmatian origins, Andreas Dudith was born in Buda of an Italian mother and a Croatian father, while Georg Purkircher was an ethnic German from Pozsony (present-day Bratislava). Politically, they all represented

¹¹⁷ Heltai made a tale of the story but it was certainly not solely his own creation. On the historiography of János Hunyadi and the various presentations of his origins see the excellent article by Radu Lupescu, "Hunyadi János alakja a magyar és a román történetírásban" [The figure of János Hunyadi in Hungarian and Romanian historiography], *Századok* 139 (2005) 2, 385–420.

¹¹⁸ Gáspár Heltai, *Krónika az magyaroknak dolgairól* [Chronicle on the deeds of the Hungarians], ed. Margit Kulcsár (Budapest: Magyar Helikon, 1981), 197–204 and 203.

¹¹⁹ See Lupescu, "Hunyadi János alakja."

a *Hungarus*-identity and enjoyed full membership in the body politic. Unlike these people, Nicolaus Olahus took pains to grapple with his origins probably since the beginning of his life. His father, coming from the princely family of the Draculas from Wallachia, was forced to flee because of the power contest that made the political system so unstable. Nicolaus, of mixed Wallach-Hungarian origins, had to realize that the memory of princely ancestors of Wallachia was a valuable intellectual heredity but one that had little significance in the country of his birth. Mythologizing the past of the family and at the same time emphasizing his *Hungarus*-identity through the writing of *Hungaria-Athila* was an answer to this paradox.

Unlike the Saxons, whose privileged community was fully integrated into the political system, the politically, religiously and economically largely marginalized and socially divided Wallachs did not have easy access to a political career in Hungary-Transylvania. It goes without saying that the construction of the "otherness" of a nation had always had significant political-economic reasons. The origins of anti-Wallach sentiments expressed by the humanists should be placed in this context. Postulating the "otherness" of Wallachs appealed to mostly those people who profited from their subordinated state: principally the rich Saxon burghers and the Hungarian noblemen. Economic and cultural interests coincided most conspicuously in the Saxon case, which developed out of the classical medieval urban configuration, where privileged town-dwellers competed with the unprivileged inhabitants of the country. The difference is that in Transylvania this well-known pattern acquired a curious ethnic coloring: while town-dwellers were almost exclusively Saxons (an important exception was Cluj/Kolozsvár), in the surrounding countryside Wallach and Hungarian peasants were mostly in the majority. Since Saxon political-economic privileges were deeply connected to the ethnic organization of the community, the preservation of ethnic homogeneity, cultural identity and legal-economic advantages were closely interrelated. The discourse on Saxon cultural superiority served to reinforce their identity (like their common adherence to Lutheranism), while reinforcing ethnic identity was a political and legal-economic interest of the community.

The use of the classical language of "othering" against Wallachs was facilitated by a number of other factors. First, the adoption of a discriminating phraseology to Wallachs was enhanced by their different religion. No doubt, orthodoxy was the most important element in their otherness. From a Western point of view an orthodox believer was not

very far from a pagan, which in medieval semantics would equate with “barbarian.”¹²⁰ The widening of horizons in the sixteenth-century did not significantly change the image of the orthodox other. Indeed, in the epoch of Luther and Erasmus the more ritualized religious practice of orthodox people were viewed with little tolerance. Second, as has been argued above, the new uses of the “discourse of the barbarian” was very much a product of Renaissance humanism. By the sixteenth century, the culture of humanism became truly international and provided a new and common identity to people of different social, religious and national backgrounds. The fact that the inhabitants of Wallachia and Moldavia did not contribute to this Latin culture made them increasingly open to attack by members of the Republic of Letters. Finally, it ought to be admitted that a part of the Wallachs were indeed nomadic shepherds, and, as we know, the classical repertoire of “othering” had been directed in great part against the nomadic neighbors of ancient Greece and Rome. This partly explains why Wallachs were mostly represented as shepherds in discriminating discourses. When the aforementioned Albertus Hutterus, who asserted that Saxons were the descendants of Dacians and Goths, gave an erudite talk to the prince of Transylvania and his counselors (among them Farkas Kovacsóczy), his main goal was to get Saxon privileges reconfirmed by the prince. As he said, “these privileges are not only derided but are also trampled under foot. [Our] possessions are not only being diminished but also exhausted: not only by the servants of the nobility but also by the Wallachs themselves, who show great wantonness in the canton and want to sustain themselves for free.”¹²¹ Tom Winniffrith’s comments regarding the general unpopularity of Macedo-Romanians in the Balkan have some bearing also on our case: “the word blachos in Greek can mean merely a shepherd, and this has resulted in confusion between Vlachs and other nomads [...] and a reluctance to admit that Vlachs could be anything other than nomadic shepherds, when in fact they have risen to positions of wealth and distinction as merchants

¹²⁰ As an example, see the letter of Pope Boniface IX (written only a few decades before the famous Council of Florence, in 1399) that concerned Brassó (Braşov/Corona/Kronstadt), where there lived *tam Grecorum, Walachorum, Bulgarorum, Armenorum, quam aliorum infidelium multitudo*. Imre Lukinich, Antal Nagy Fekete, László Makkai, eds., *Documenta historiam Valachorum in Hungaria illustrantia usque ad annum 1400 Christum* (Budapest: [Egyetem], 1941), 526.

¹²¹ Hutterus, “Oratio,” 297.

and craftsman."¹²² It is similarly true that in Transylvania only a segment of the Wallach population was of nomadic shepherds, and since the fifteenth century a growing proportion of them received nobility (and mostly assimilated).

A changing perception of the Wallachs can be detected only at the end of the sixteenth century with the coming of the missionary Jesuits, who had no grounds to represent their orthodoxy and otherness along similar lines. Among the numerous negatively biased descriptions of sixteenth-century Wallachs the report of the Jesuit Ferrante Capeci of Naples shines out with its positive attitude. Capeci, wanting to extend the Jesuit mission towards the Wallachs, had no intention to acknowledge their "otherness":

Transylvania is populated by three kinds of peoples, and all have a different language. [First] by the Wallachs, who are the most antique inhabitants and who descend from Italians and Lombards. This is why they have a language similar to modern Italian, so much so, that their language could be easily learned in a few months, just as they also learn Italian easily. Moreover, they call themselves Romanian [*romanesco*] and many assert that they had been sent here as persons condemned to mine metals, of which there is abundant quantity in this kingdom. The other inhabitants are Hungarians and come from the Huns and the Scythians. This is why a part of Transylvania is called *Scitulia*, which is called today *Siculia*, since a letter has been corrupted, as some people claim. The third group of inhabitants are German Saxons, who came here during the times of Charlemagne, and still have the Saxon language, even if in a very corrupted form. They also speak Hungarian.

Among these people the Wallachs do not have important towns, and there are not many nobles among them either, but for the most part they live among the mountains and are shepherds. And I am speaking about the Wallachs who live in Transylvania, because among those who are in Wallachia and Moldavia (and in these countries only Wallachs live) there are numerous nobles and lords and good towns. As for their religion, the Wallachs follow the Greeks and could not be contaminated by heresy at any price. They are in accord with Catholics a great deal. [...] As for their way of living, Wallachs have a bad reputation here, as if all of them were thieves, so much so, that [they think that] if a person crosses their place and is not killed or robbed, then he will surely fix a plaque onto the wall of a church. With these people, my Father, one

¹²² Tom J. Winnifrith, *The Vlachs: The History of a Balkan People* (London: Duckworth, 1987). However, *vlach* (particularly "oláh" in Hungarian) did not necessarily need to denote *originally* a shepherd for being generally used in that sense.

could achieve a lot, I would have this province with pleasure if I had no other obligations.

The Hungarians are the lords of the country and are the most valued, in such a great degree that the person who kills a Hungarian will pay a lot more than the amount he should pay if he killed a Wallach. But not so much more: at the death of Wallach you pay 18 florins, while you pay 30 for a Hungarian.¹²³

Capeci had the keen eye of an anthropologist. His observations on prejudices against the Wallachs, on the legal discrimination they suffered and on the differences between the Wallachs of Transylvania and those of Wallachia and Moldavia are fresh and rather unique. We cannot however claim that Capeci's writing was absolutely disinterested. Wallachs appeared to him easy and promising subjects of missionary fieldwork, a challenge that in the end he could not address because of other obligations and his premature death.

In conclusion, it needs to be restated once more that ethnic prejudices and patriotic feelings were already deeply embedded in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. When foreign observers described Wallachs in pejorative terms they often discussed them as an ethnic group (a "nation" as they called it), basing their arguments on reflections about their language, religion, political situation and customs. The emphasis on the backwardness of the Wallachs, expressed through a classical-Renaissance semantics, was mostly to reaffirm the erudite identity of the authors. However, the function of ethnic preju-

¹²³ Ladislaus Lukács, ed., *Monumenta Antiquae Hungariae*, vol. II, 1580–1586 (Rome: Institutum Historicum, 1976), 672. This letter to Claudio Aquaviva (February 27th, 1584) was written at the beginning of Capeci's Transylvanian stay, where he died of plague two years later. I have not found the relevant law regarding the above-mentioned penalties paid for killing, but there seems to be no reason to doubt Capeci's words. In any case, it applied to ignoble people, and might have also reflected the social distinction between farmers and shepherds. Nevertheless, the fact remains that it could have had an ethnic reading the way Capeci indeed interpreted it. According to the resolution of the Diet of Marosvásárhely (Târgu-Mureş/Neumarkt) in 1554, Wallachs did not enjoy equality before the law. This law declared that a Hungarian peasant could be condemned only on the testimony of seven witnesses, whereas for the condemnation of a Romanian (peasant) three witnesses were sufficient. Sándor Szilágyi, ed., *Monumenta comitalia regni Transylvaniae*, Vol. 1, 1540–56 (Budapest: Akadémia, 1876), 520.

dices, that is, the function of the semantics of "othering," was also to rationalize social-historical inequalities and validate claims of superiority both individual and communal. In the more learned contexts to which our sources refer, a typical case of voicing and exploiting these prejudices for promoting personal goals was that of Nicolaus Olahus.

CHAPTER THREE

HUMANIST ETHICS AND URBAN PATRIOTISM IN UPPER
HUNGARY IN THE EARLY SIXTEENTH CENTURY
(VALENTIN ECK'S *DE REIPUBLICAE ADMINISTRATONE*)

Farkas Gábor Kiss

Si tibi sit virtus, si sit respublica cordi
In terso studium sit Cicerone tuum.¹
(Jakob Wimpfeling)

Hungary was one of the first countries over the Alps to imbibe the ideas of Renaissance humanism, and the humanistic notion of *patria* had gained wide acceptance in Hungary already in the 15th century. But whereas Italian civic patriotism praised the city in the terms of the panegyric *topoi* of Cicero (*patria mihi vita mea carior est*, “the fatherland is dearer to me than my life”) and expressed love for the fatherland with the classical notions of *amor patriae* and virtuous *heros*, the first wave of Hungarian humanism was strongly influenced by the *topos* of regional opposition between the *humanitas* in Italy and the barbarity over the Alps, which included Hungary as well. Faced with this dichotomy, humanist poetic works tended to express their opinion about the *patria* with a rhetorical argument *in utramque partem*: either praising the fatherland for its cultural and civic merits despite the barbaric inheritance, or scolding the country for a lack of culture. Janus Pannonius (1434–1472), bishop of Pécs and student of Guarino of Verona, as well as the first humanist poet in Hungary, praises his fatherland in terms of true nobility (*vera nobilitas*) in his epigram, *Praise of Pannonia*, when he utters the often quoted line: *nobilis ingenio patria facta meo*, i.e. my country became noble (only) because of my genius. Thus the true nobility of his country is attributed to his own humanist culture, not to inherited titles or noble ancestors.

¹ “If you appreciate virtue and republic, you should study the terse writings of Cicero.” Jakob Wimpfeling, *Briefwechsel. Kritische Ausgabe mit Einleitung und Kommentar*, ed. Otto Herding and Dieter Mertens (Munich: Fink, 1990), 1: 15. (= Jacobi Wimpfelingi opera selecta III, 1.2).

Conversely, he often chided his land for lacking a civilization worthy to be compared to Italy.² Reprimanding the cultural backwardness of the country remained a constant element in the writings of the second generation of humanists as well, and Iacobus Piso (d. 1527), the most talented poet of the first two decades of the 16th century and a friend of Erasmus, subverted even the classical ideals when he openly expressed his contempt for the uncaring, graceless, ungrateful country. Playing with the etymology of the word, Hungary is no longer a father-land (*patria*) but a stepmother (*noverca*), offering nothing to the humanist poet, and thus not entitled to receive anything in return.³

However, the purpose of resurrecting the poetic language of ancient patriotism was not to offer new political or ethical insights into the functioning of the various communities of the country, either on a national or on a local level. It was rather a rhetorical tool that played a role in the language of international diplomacy in East Central Europe around 1440–1450, which can be at least partly attributed to the activity of Enea Silvio Piccolomini, the chancellor of Emperor Frederick III and later Pope Pius II.⁴ Humanistic ideas, such as the *respublica Christiana*, i.e. Europe, our common fatherland, the only place where *libertas Christiana* repels tyranny and can be defended from the Turks; the descent of the Turks from the Asian race of Trojans (Teuceri); and the notion of a common Christian *patria*, reappear in the diplomatic epistolary of János (Johannes) Vitéz, bishop of Várad (Grosswardein,

² “We foreigners are the barbarian mob” (*externi barbara turba sumus*). Janus Pannonius, *Ad Gasparum Tribrahum*, in Janus Pannonius, *Összes munkái* [Collected works], ed. Sándor V. Kovács (Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó, 1987), 223. This theme occurs in several epigrams (e.g. *Ad Galeotum Narnensem*, *De amygdalo in Pannonio nata*, *ibid.*, 224–27, 248–49).

³ “Non est patria, quae mihi noverca est / Nil largita mihi, nihil reposcat” (To Caspar Ursinus Velius). See also “Pauca debemus patriae” (‘we owe little to the fatherland’) in his poem written to *Ladislao Zalcano* (László Szalkai). Iacobus Piso, *Schedia*, ed. Georg Wernher (Wien: Zimmerman, 1554); I have used the copy of the Jagellonian Library, Cracow, Cim. 5317. The play on words might be retraced to a saying of Publius Scipio Africanus Aemilianus cited in Vell. Pat. (2,4,4): “qui possum vestro [terrore] moveri, quorum noverca est Italia?”

⁴ Dieter Mertens, “Europa, id est patria, domus propria, sedes nostra... Zu Funktionen und Überlieferung lateinischer Türkenreden im 15. Jahrhundert,” in Rainer Erkens, ed., *Europa und die osmanische Expansion im ausgehenden Mittelalter. Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot 1997), 39–57. Johannes Helmrath, “Pius II. und die Türken,” in Bodo Guthmüller and Wilhelm Kühlmann, eds., *Europa und die Türken in der Renaissance* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2000), 79–137.

now Oradea in Romania), and later archbishop of Esztergom.⁵ But such humanistic political theory did not achieve wide circulation in Hungary. Two works, one dedicated to a Hungarian ruler (*De virtutibus regiis*, by Andreas Pannonius, written between 1467–1471 and dedicated to King Matthias Corvinus)⁶ and another that compared the political system of the country to Florence (*De comparatione regni et reipublicae*, by Aurelio Lippo Brandolini, ca. 1490)⁷ survived only in manuscript copies and were not published until a later time. In the first decade of the 16th century two speeches of Isocrates (*To Nicocles* and *Symmachicos*), favorite practice pieces as Greek language exercises in the Renaissance, were translated into Latin and dedicated to King Wladislas II by Michael Chesserius (Kesserű), later bishop of Bosnia.⁸ Chesserius, who was at that time a student of Filippo Beroaldo the Elder in Bologna and published the translation before his return to Hungary, claimed in his dedication that the book could prove to be useful both to the King, who will see his own excellent personality in this book as if in a mirror, and to the newborn Louis, the heir of the throne, who will follow the guidance given by Isocrates. However, this work cannot be regarded as more than a linguistic-rhetorical—and one has to admit, quite unsuccessful—exercise of translating an easy Greek text into Latin.⁹

Until around 1520, humanism in Hungary was an ideal for the elect few, as the expensive Italian schools and universities were available only to the aristocracy, the higher clergy and their offspring. The idea of Christian liberty, the love of the fatherland and Ciceronian style began to spread slowly in the cities only after the program of

⁵ Iohannes Vitéz de Zredna, *Opera quae supersunt*, ed. Iván Boronkai (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1980).

⁶ Sándor Bene, “Középkor és reneszánsz határán. 1467–1471: Megszületnek Andreas Pannonius királytükrei” [On the threshold of the Renaissance. 1467–1471: Mirrors of princes penned by Andreas Pannonius], in László Jankovits and Mihály Szegedy-Maszák, eds., *A magyar irodalom története* [Histories of Hungarian literature] (Budapest: Gondolat, 2007), 118–32.

⁷ Jenő Ábel, ed., *Olaszországi XV. századbeli íróknak Mátyás királyt dicsőítő művei* [Works written by 15th century Italian humanists praising King Matthias], *Irodalomtörténeti Emlékek 2* (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1890); and Aurelio Lippo Brandolini, *Republics and Kingdoms Compared*, ed. and transl. James Hankins, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 2009.

⁸ *Isocratis orationes duae e Graeco in Latinum verse quarum prima reges altera subditos docet*, trs. Michael Chesserius (Bologna: De Benedictis, ca. 1507–1510).

⁹ The Latin of Chesserius’ translation is poor and hardly understandable. Compare the almost contemporary translation of the same speech (*Ad Nicoclem*) by Martinus Phileticus, dedicated to Emperor Maximilian I (Vienna: Singrenius, 1514).

Renaissance humanism was accepted in the curricula of the universities (Vienna and Cracow) that the Hungarian middle clergy and the sons of richer burghers could afford to attend. Humanist rhetoric could easily accommodate itself to the ideology of the local aristocracies of these mostly German-inhabited cities in Hungary, and the commonplaces through which civic humanism could be introduced among these virtuous citizens, proud of their royal privileges, law-books (the *Sachsenspiegel*) and autonomous jurisdiction, had already been formulated by the humanists of the Italian city states. As Battista Guarino, the son of the famous Guarino of Verona, said in his inauguration speech in Bologna in 1455:

[Rhetoric] is the only art by which humans, who originally wandered in the woods and meadows and spent their life collecting herbs and roots of trees and fell prey to huge beasts, started to gather into one, and founded those communities that are called cities. [...] It is the art by which we can induce people to do or not to do something, as we want, with which we can change people's movements, the convictions of judges, the gravity of the senate, with which we can defend our friends, comfort the miserable, help the pleading; and, what is certainly its greatest achievement, sometimes we can change the will of God with an oration. [...] Rhetoric is the art which blossomed among every free people, and especially in peaceful and quiet cities, and always dominated them.¹⁰

Humanist rhetoric, which promised power and served the interest of citizens, could easily be absorbed into the ideology of these free cities.

Humanist political theory and Valentin Eck's career

The first original work of humanist political theory published in the kingdom of Hungary was the *De administratione reipublicae dialogus* (Dialogue about the administration of the republic), a booklet written by Valentin Eck on the subject of government, the role of the prince, the duties of the citizens and the administration of the state, and published for the first time in 1520.¹¹ Valentin Eck (Valentinus Ecchius, 1494–ca. 1545) is not among the best known humanists of the period,

¹⁰ Battista Guarini, *Opuscula*, ed. Luigi Piacente (Bari: Adriatica, 1995), 98.

¹¹ Valentinus Ecchius, *De reipublicae administratione dialogus* (Cracow: Vietor, 1520). Copies survive in Cracow, Budapest, Vienna, Munich and Stuttgart. Recently, a Latin-Slovak bilingual edition of Eck's text was published: *De reipublicae administratione dialogus*, ed. Daniel Škoviera, (Trnava: Universitas, 2006).

although he played an important role in the civic life of the cities of Upper Hungary in the first decades of the 16th century. He was born in Lindau, an important free city on the shore of the Bodensee in South Bavaria.¹² In 1508 he was studying in Leipzig, together with his friend and teacher Rudolf Agricola Jr., whose steps he followed later when he moved to the university of Cracow in 1511. In the same year his first publication appeared there, attached to Agrippa's edition of the *Modus epistolandi* of Filippo Beroaldo the Elder: a collection of choice phrases from the *Elegantiae minores* of Jakob Wimpfeling. In 1514, having received a bachelor's degree, he wrote an entertaining panegyric poem to Augustinus Moravus, canon of Olomouc (Olmütz), describing among other things his patron's palace and library. Augustinus was one of the most learned men in the circle of Wladislas II; in his youth, he studied in Italy and afterwards wrote a dialogue in praise of poetry, published in Venice (1494), so he might be expected to have received the poem of Eck with pleasure. In the winter semester of the same year, Eck was able to take up a position teaching metric composition (*ars versificatoria*) at the university of Cracow, after Agricola moved to Vienna and then to Esztergom, to the court of Archbishop Tamás Bakócz. Eck published a small textbook to accompany his course (*De arte versificatoria*, 1515), based on a similar work written by Heinrich Bebel. In the following year he was teaching the Roman historical compendium of Florus, and in the meantime he composed a panegyric celebrating the victory of the Polish king Sigismund I over the Russian Tsar. But his position as a teacher of poetry at the Cracow University was taken over by another German humanist with better qualifications, Johann Hadeke,¹³ so Eck was forced to look for a new post, which he found in Bartfeld, a German city of Upper Hungary (Hun. Bártfa, Slo. Bardejov, in present-day Slovakia). He was

¹² On his life see Gustav Bauch, "Valentin Eck und Georg Werner, Zwei Lebensbilder aus der Zeit der Besitzergreifung Ungarns durch die Habsburger," *Ungarische Revue* 14 (1894): 40, and Aladár Klenner, *Eck Bálint, Thurzó Elek humanista pártfogoltja* [Valentin Eck, a humanist protégé of Alexius Thurzó] (Pestszenterzsébet, 1939). I could not use in this study Jacqueline Glomski's book, *Patronage and Humanist literature in the age of the Jagiellons, Court and Career in the writings of Rudolf Agricola Junior, Valentin Eck and Leonard Cox* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007).

¹³ Hermann Wiegand, "Johannes Hadeke-Hadelius ein niedersächsischer Wanderhumanist in Rostock, Krakau und Wien," in Thomas Haye, ed., *Humanismus im Norden: Frühneuzeitliche Rezeption antiker Kultur und Literatur an Nord- und Ostsee* (Amsterdam: Atlanta, 2000), 105–33, and Gustav Bauch, "Johannes Hadus-Hadelius. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Humanismus an der Ostsee," *Vierteljahrsschrift zur Kultur und Litteratur der Renaissance* 1 (1886): 206–28.

contracted before the day of St. Stanislas in 1518, at the unusually high salary of 24 forints.¹⁴

To understand why he decided to compose a work “on the administration of the republic” in a foreign city so soon after his arrival, it is worth considering the careers of other contemporary teachers. Bartholomaeus Frankfordinus of Buda, after having studied in Vienna and having taught in a school in Buda, where he staged a Plautine comedy, became the notary of the small mining town of Schemnitz (Slo. Banská Štiavnica; Hun. Selmecebánya, in present-day Slovakia), where he represented the interests of the local elites so loyally against the mass of miners that during the miners’ revolt of 1525–26 the workers especially asked for his head.¹⁵ Georg Wernher, also of German origin, was born in Paczków (Patschkau) in Silesia; after his studies in Wittenberg and Cracow, he came to Preschau (Slo. Prešov; Hun. Eperjes, in present-day Slovakia), one of the most important trading cities on the wine-road leading to Poland. After some years of teaching, he became the judge of the city, and he ended his life as the president of the Zips (Spiš/Szepes) Chamber, one of the most important financial posts in early modern Hungary.¹⁶

The careers of these two contemporaries of Eck show distinctive parallels to his own. Coming from a more urban environment in Germany to the eastern part of Central Europe (as so many German intellectuals did in these years), he tried to secure a solid and substantial living for himself by attaching himself to the local authorities. In attain-

¹⁴ Remig Békefi, *A népoktatás története Magyarországon 1540-ig* [The history of mass education in Hungary] (Budapest: MTA, 1906), 302. A teacher in the neighboring town of Prešov (Eperjes) received only 11 forints a year in 1517, another teacher earned 6 forints in 1518. See Béla Iványi, *Eperjes sz. kir. város iskoláügye a középkorban* [Schooling in Prešov in the Middle Ages] (Budapest: Stephaneum, 1911), 3–4.

¹⁵ Gustav Hammann, “Bartholomaeus Frankfordinus Pannonius—Simon Grynäus in Ungarn,” *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung* 14 (1965): 228–42, and Farkas Gábor Kiss, “Dramen am Wiener und Ofener Hof: Benedictus Chelidoniumus und Bartholomaeus Frankfordinus Pannonius,” in Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi, eds., *Maria von Ungarn (1505–1558)* (Münster: Aschendorff, 2007), 293–312.

¹⁶ Elfriede Rensing, “Georg Wernher, (1490?–1556). Präsident der Zipser Kammer,” *Jahrbuch des Graf Klebelsberg Kuno Instituts für Ungarische Geschichtsforschung in Wien* 3 (1933): 31–58; Tünde Katona, “Georg Wernher—ein oberschlesischer Humanist,” in Gerhard Kosellek, ed., *Oberschlesische Dichter und Gelehrte vom Humanismus bis zum Barock* (Bielefeld: Aisthesis, 2000), 267–79; Zoltán Csepregi, “Bújócskázó életrajz: Wernher György (1490?–1556) hányattatott ifjúsága” [A biographical hide-and-seek: The troubled youth of Georg Wernher], *Acta historiae litterarum Hungaricarum (Szeged)*, 29 (2006): 41–46.

ing the position in Bartfeld he probably had the support of Alexius Thurzó, one of the richest men of Hungary, as he became the teacher of his daughter, at least according to a tradition in Polish historiography.¹⁷ Although we do not have any information on how his career as a wandering humanist took this turn, an application letter for the position of notary of Kaschau (Hun. Kassa, Slo. Košice, in present-day Slovakia) in 1506 shows how much a new employee of the city had to abide by the requirements set by the local authorities and adapt himself to the local patrons: “I promise that I will do everything for you, and to anybody to whom I will have to obey I will be compliant. Furthermore, I will not forget or delay to show gratitude if you consent to my wishes (as I hardly doubt you will), and you will find in me someone who always honors your name.”¹⁸

Eck’s striving for acceptance was obvious from the beginning: in the year of his arrival, he composed poems praising Andreas Reuber, his main local patron and judge of the city. (At the same time, we know from archival sources that he was establishing order in the school as well, as he threw out some older students who kept a dog there that disturbed him by its barking).¹⁹ Afterwards, still in 1517, he wrote a treatise on “whether a prudent man should marry” (*Utrum prudenti viro sit ducenda uxor*), a very common rhetorical topic in these years, one upon which Erasmus also had tried his argumentative capabilities, arguing both *pro* and *contra*.²⁰ In 1519 he published a dialogue on contempt for the world and the necessity of embracing Virtue. These treatises had a double purpose: primarily, they could be read for their moral lessons, but at the same time, they could be analyzed in the course of teaching in the school of Bartfeld.²¹

¹⁷ Another possibility is that he came to Bardejov with the aid of Emanuel Reuber, who befriended him in Cracow and to whom he later dedicated one of his works. Emanuel may have been a relative (the son?) of the judge Andreas Reuber. See Klenner, *Eck*, 27, 70.

¹⁸ Cited by Jenő Ábel, “Műtörténeti adalékok a XV. és XVI. századból” [Art historical data from the 15th and 16th century], *Történelmi Tár* (1884): 540–41.

¹⁹ Békefi, *A népoktatás*, 399.

²⁰ *Utrum prudenti viro sit ducenda uxor* (Cracow: Vietor, 1524), f. A3r. See Jacqueline Glomski, “The German Role in the Reception of Italian Neo-Latin Literary Currents at Cracow (1510–1525),” in Bodo Guthmüller, ed., *Deutschland und Italien in ihren wechselseitigen Beziehungen während der Renaissance*, Wolfenbütteler Abhandlungen zur Renaissanceforschung, Bd. 19 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2000), 31–44.

²¹ See Daniel Škoviera, “Der Dialog de Reipublicae Administratione von dem Humanisten Valentinus Ecchius,” *Graecolatina et Orientalia* 23–24 (1991–92): 73–84.

The use of these works in school teaching is shown by a few surviving copies which contain annotations, most probably from Eck's pupils. Eck had a distinctive teaching strategy of commenting on his own works: while most schoolbooks from this period bear marks of finding synonyms, writing keywords on the margin of books, or summarizing chapters in entire sentences, on the basis of the surviving copies we can presume that Eck as a teacher lectured on his own works. While editing and printing a classical work for a university class was a fairly common practice at the universities of Vienna and Cracow at the beginning of the 16th century,²² one rarely finds a printed edition with the pre-prepared notes of the teacher for the class.²³ Generally, course material was commented upon during classes, and the dictated words of the teacher appear in many booklets from these years. But Eck's practice went even further, as he commented not on the classics, but upon his own works, which is proven by the fact that he often dictated the actual source of his sentences.²⁴ Where the poem describes how marriage causes troubles to man (it seduces youth, carries off men, and causes bitter death to the old), the notes quote the source, the Epistle 106 of Enea Silvio Piccolomini.²⁵ It is difficult to imagine how anybody could or would identify these so successfully unless we sup-

²² The output of the Singrenius printing house, the main printing press of Vienna in the 1510s–1520s, is dominated by the edition of readers for university courses (*Vorlesungsmitschriften*). See Michael Denis, *Wiens Buchdruckgeschichte bis 1560* (Vienna: Wapler, 1782), 90–120. On the practice of using “Vorlesungsmitschriften” at northern (mostly German) universities, see Jürgen Leonhardt, “Eine Leipziger Vorlesung über Ciceros De legibus aus dem Jahre 1514,” *Wolfenbütteler Renaissance-Mitteilungen* 26 (2002) 1: 26–40, and idem, “Gedruckte humanistische Kolleghefte als Quelle für Buch- und Bildungsgeschichte,” *Wolfenbütteler Notizen zur Buchgeschichte* 29 (2004): 21–34.

²³ Instances are e.g. the commentaries of Joannes Camers (Giovanni da Camerino) on Florus (Vienna, Singrenius, 1511) and Solinus (Vienna: Singrenius, 1520) and Ulrich Fabri's printed commentary appended to his edition of Maffeo Vegio's *Philalethes* (Vienna: Singrenius, 1517).

²⁴ My hypothesis is strengthened by the fact that a missing—and very important—line on b4v is supplied to the text by a hand different from the writer of the notes, possibly by Eck himself before distributing his work to the students. Such an annotated copy of the poem “Whether a prudent man should marry” survives in the Library of the Hungarian Academy, and a similarly annotated copy of his treatise on contempt for the world can be found in the Calvinist College of Debrecen. Budapest, Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Ráth 1575; Debrecen, Library of the College of the Reformed Church, RMK 1235.

²⁵ “Seductrix iuuenum, fortisque rapina uirorum, / Et longaeuorum mors peramara senum.” Printed note: “Ex 106. Epist. Ene. Sylvij.” Manuscript note: “vbi sic ait: Mulier est iuuentutis expilatrix, uirorum rapina etc.”

pose that Eck himself dictated the sources of his treatise to his pupils. A similarly annotated copy of the treatise about the administration of the republic has survived in the Library of the Hungarian Academy, and there is a manuscript copy of this treatise in Prague from the year 1531, with notes which offer insights to the modern investigator.²⁶ For example, to the sentence, where Philomathes asks if governing a republic is such an arduous matter (“Estne reipublicae administratio res tam ardua?”), the notes give us a clue from which classical author the word “arduous” came from.²⁷

Virtues and laws

According to the *Summa huius dialogi* (Summary of this dialogue), which Eck dictated to his students and which was annexed to the volume, “That is most salutary to the administration, and it is conserved best then, when the magistrate behaves as a public personality, and completely sets aside his private person; he does what he has to, and he does not do what should be omitted, and moreover keeps equity, and embraces justice.” Eck’s work is a dialogue between Etnearches and Philomathes. As it was the vogue in literary dialogues of the 16th century these names have meaning: Etnearches is “the leader of the people,” Philomathes, “he who desires to learn.”²⁸ It was a general practice, based on Plautine dramas and allegorical plays of the Middle Ages, to give allegorical names to the fictive characters in dialogues, and Eck might have known this custom from the genre of *apologus*, a more or less short dialogized tale, popularized by Leonbattista Alberti,

²⁶ The copies are: Library of the Hungarian Academy RM. IV. 117/a (R), and Strahovska knihovna Ms. D. D. IV. 6 (S, containing also the *Comedia Poliscena* of Leonardo della Serrata; it was owned by Sebastian Chojnaczyk and copied in 1531, probably at the University of Cracow). The notes differ slightly, those of R being less extensive, and thus probably earlier. Furthermore, two surviving copies of the dialogue contain the manuscript commentary (Wroclaw, Ossolin. XVI Qu. 3587–88 and XVI. Qu. 1839) and a handwritten note in one of them states explicitly that the owner of the volume studied under Eck, and heard him lecturing on his own book (in Ossol. XVI. Qu. 3587: “Eckio sub audiui hoc quod compilatum per eundem constat 1520”).

²⁷ *De administratione...*, f. a4v: “Cicero officiorum primo res publicas et vehementer arduas plenasque laborum” i.e. Cicero, *De officiis* 1, 66; both in R and S). In R we find a further parallel, from Ovid: “Ardua prima via est.”

²⁸ As indeed the notes in both copies explain: “Philomathes: discendi cupidus. Etnearches: gentis princeps”.

Pandolfo Collenuccio and later Eobanus Hessus. The genre of dialogue had been used already for political writings in Northern humanism by several German authors, but they mostly treated current political issues. The closest parallel would be the six dialogues of Jakob Wimpfeling, written in Heidelberg in 1498, that deal with princely virtues (prudence, wisdom, bravery); however, these focus not on the virtuous citizenry but on the ruler.²⁹

Eck's dialogue sets off with the Ciceronian-Stoic and ultimately Platonic claim that eloquence and virtue are not separable, and thus only educated people are able to lead the government, which is, of course, best personified in this case by his patron, Alexius Thurzó. A virtuous man has to pay attention to his private behavior on the one hand and to have an ear for the needs of the public on the other. Etnearches explains the moral rules governing the public sphere, which we may note contrasts with Eck's previous work, the *De mundi contemptu*, which can be regarded as a work concerning private morality. The division between private and public morality is very strongly marked in the *De officiis* of Cicero, whose influence on the dialogue is palpable from the beginning.³⁰ As Robert von Friedeburg remarked in his study on civic humanism and republican citizenship in early modern Germany: "From the 1460s, Cicero's *De officiis* became a prime source to describe the nature and duties of government in general. The office of magistrates was thus described not least in terms of the virtues of Cicero's citizens."³¹ As we shall see, this statement applies to the work of the Upper Hungarian humanist as well, although with interesting modifications.

After introducing the main subject of the treatise, the prince or leader (called either *princeps*, *populi praefectus* or *rector*) of the city (*respublica*—although one could argue in favor of a more general application) is compared to the sun, and a few sentences later the citizen is warned that he should avoid getting sunburnt if the prince is

²⁹ Mertens, Dieter, "Zum politischen Dialog bei den oberdeutschen Humanisten," in Bodo Guthmüller and Wolfgang G. Müller, eds., *Dialog und Gesprächskultur in der Renaissance*, Wolfenbütteler Abhandlungen zur Renaissanceforschung, 22 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2004), 293–317; here 297.

³⁰ Of course it is also present in law: Iust. Inst. 1, 11.

³¹ Robert von Friedeburg, "Civic Humanism and Republican Citizenship in Early Modern Germany," in *Republicanism: A Shared European Heritage*, vol. I, Republicanism and Constitutionalism in Early Modern Europe, ed. Martin van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 127.

evil, as anybody following bad rules becomes “contaminated.”³² In the introductory part, Eck states that the stability of a republic is based on its laws: “The leader has to keep an eye on the laws themselves (which are the nerves of the city) and the precepts of law (*praecepta iuris*), which are made by the *rector*, following the rules of the law.” Eck stresses this point in two ways: first, he quotes several lines from a panegyric of Claudianus (*Ad quartum consulatum Honorii*, 294–302) which enjoin impartiality on the *consul* and which are often cited in mirrors of princes; for example, exactly the same lines appear in Filippo Beroaldo the Elder’s treatise *Libellus de optimo statu* (Booklet about the best state), which was published in 1497 in Bologna.³³ The preliminary remarks end up by stating that the best moral doctrine is to follow the precepts of law, which derive from natural law.

From here onwards, the text of the treatise seems to meander. One of the earlier critics, Aladár Klenner, even went so far as to claim that it had no structure at all, and the order of different virtues wanders without any directions: “Eck forgets about the aim of his book, and he starts to treat not the duties, but the virtues of the prince.”³⁴ If one ignores the sources of these precepts one could well get this feeling; however, we have to pay attention to the origins of these rules, which Eck does not reveal directly. The main precepts of law are 1. to live honestly, 2. not to hurt the other, 3. to give everyone his share (1. *honeste vivere*, 2. *alterum non laedere* 3. *suum cuique tribuere*).³⁵ Thus he defines the proper behavior of a leader in the most conventional way, simply quoting the commandments of Ulpian (Dig. 1, 1, 3). The assertion that law is founded on these three precepts was traditional in municipal law collections: the *Sächsisches Weichbildrecht*

³² The “sunburn” simile of knowledge, originally from Cicero’s *De Oratore* 2, 14, 60, is a popular commonplace in 16th c. literature. See G. W. Pigman, “Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 33 (1980): 13.

³³ Filippo Beroaldo the Elder, *Orationes, praelectiones et praefationes et quaedam mythicae Historiae Philippi Beroaldi* (Paris: Jean Petit, 1505), fol. Bb6r. During his lectures, Eck added further classical and Christian parallels about impartiality, quoting John Chrysostom, Aristotle, Pope Leo the Great and Seneca.

³⁴ Klenner, *Eck*, 53.

³⁵ A thorough investigation of the sources was undertaken by Daniel Škoviera, “Antike Autoren als Quellen der Argumentation in dem Dialog de Reipublicae Administratione (1520) von Valentin Ecchius,” *Graecolatina et Orientalia* 25–26 (1993–94): 141–157, and idem, “Die Bibel und die Corpora Iuris als Quellen der Argumentation De reipublicae administratione (1520) von Valentinus Ecchius,” *Graecolatina et Orientalia* 27–28 (2001): 55–70.

begins with the same three commandments,³⁶ and the late medieval lawbook of Brünn (Cz. Brno) in Moravia contains the same passage in its very first article.³⁷

The first half of the treatise amplifies this material. Eck starts by expanding with Erasmian copiousness upon the injunction to “honest living”. He divides the rules into four sub-categories (prohibition, precepts, punishment, permission), which are explained as Erasmus taught in his *De duplici copia rerum ac verborum*—here using the topical (and not linguistic) copiousness (*copia rerum*), and quoting among other examples drinking and blasphemy. However, we never arrive at “not hurting anybody”, the second precept of Ulpian, since Eck introduces a new categorization which he takes directly from the *De officiis* of Cicero:

All that is honorable emerges from one or other of four sources. It is found in the perception and intelligent awareness of what is true (*prudentia*); or in safeguarding the community by assigning each individual his due, and by keeping faith with compacts made (*iustitia*); or in the greatness and strength of a lofty and unconquered spirit (*fortitudo*); or in the order and due measure by which all words and deeds reflect an underlying moderation and self-control (*temperantia*).³⁸

It is not immediately clear exactly how the virtues of Stoic ethics—invented by Plato, transplanted into Stoicism by Panaetius and transmitted by Cicero, then popularized as the cardinal virtues in Christian literature (from St. Ambrose on)³⁹—actually fit in the framework of the three precepts of law. But Eck says: “If you examine carefully how

³⁶ *Rechtsdenkmäler des deutschen Mittelalters, Saechsisches Weichbildrecht*, ed. A. von Daniels, Fr. von Gruben and Ferd. Jul. Kuehns (Berlin: Mylius, 1857); *Jus Municipale Saxonum, Bd. I., Weltchronik und Weichbildrecht in XXXVI Artikeln mit der Glosse* (Berlin: Mylius, 1858), col. 184. As Gregory IX quoted these precepts in the introduction of the *Decretales*, every medieval student of law naturally encountered them. Although Eck did not study law, he might have read these famous lines during his studies of the liberal arts. The notes in the copy S actually quote the *Decretals* at this point: “Gracianus in sui decreti principio humanum inquit genus duobus regitur naturali videlicet iure et legibus. Ius naturale est quod in lege et ewangelio continetur quo quisque iubetur alii facere quod sibi vlt fieri. Et prohibetur inferre quod sibi nolit fieri. Vnde dominus Mathei vii. dixit omnia quecumque volas ut faciant vobis homines et vos eadem facite illis.”

³⁷ Emil Franz Rössler, *Die Stadtrechte von Brünn aus dem XIII. und XIV. Jahrhundert*, Deutsche Rechtsdenkmäler aus Böhmen und Mähren, 2 (Prague: Calve, 1852), 2.

³⁸ Cicero, *On Obligations*, tr. G. Walsh (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 7–8.

³⁹ A. Michel, “Vertu,” in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1950), 15/2: 2743–47.

these things [the cardinal virtues] flow down from the fountain of unique Virtue with similar pace, you will see that the precepts of law are actually contained in them. And so that you see it clearly, I will explain shortly each of them.”⁴⁰ Thus he substitutes for the four cardinal virtues of Cicero the three precepts of natural law, which explains why there is no word about the second and the third precept later. The idea of looking at similarities between legal precepts and Stoic-Christian ethical teaching is most probably Eck’s own, as it appears unparalleled. However, the categories and commandments of the two systems are not too closely correlated, and this parallelism could not be entirely extended. While the precept “*ius suum cuique*” can easily be equated to the Ciceronian description of justice, and “honest living” might be understood as prudence, the third precept, “not hurting others,” is quite remote from both fortitude and temperance.⁴¹ This may explain why Eck describes only the first two cardinal virtues, prudence and justice, and afterwards breaks off his line of thought by claiming that obedience (which is a necessary component of justice) is worthless without Charity. Obviously, Charity (*Caritas*), a theological virtue, has been dragged in from outside simply to supply a suitable equivalent of “not hurting others”. Then to effect the awkward transition back to fortitude he makes use of the notion of *concordia* by quoting several ancient examples where concord among the leaders of the city contributed to the valiant defense of liberty, or to the contrary, discord resulted in the decay of a republic.⁴²

⁴⁰ Eck, *De reipublicae administratione*, B2r–v. The notes here quote passages of Horace (Epist. 1, 1, 41) and Plautus (Amphitryo, 650–654), both stressing the role of virtue in safeguarding freedom, life, property, parents, fatherland and relatives (*libertas salus vita res parentes, patria et cognati*).

⁴¹ It is obvious from Eck’s description that he was not familiar with the Platonic order of cardinal virtues, where Justice appears not juxtaposed to Prudence, Fortitude and Temperance but emerging over the other three as a “fundamental power of the soul which assigns to each of them their particular function.” Edgar Wind, “Platonic Justice, designed by Raphael,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 1 (1937): 70.

⁴² Eck, *De reipublicae administratione*, C1v–C2r. Some examples (Aristides and Cn. Pompeius) derive from book 7 ch. 3 of the *Exempla* of Marcus Antonius Sabellicus according to the notes. Cf. Marcus Antonius Sabellicus, *Exemplorum libri decem* (Leipzig: Stöckel, 1512), fol. 72v–73r. Historically, the Renaissance notion of *amor patriae* is related to Christian *caritas*: “the secularized Christian notions of *martyr* and *caritas* henceforth were sided by the classical notions of *heros* and *amor patriae*.” Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *The King’s Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957), 248. Thus Eck unwittingly returns to the medieval origins of his otherwise classically influenced notion of “*patria*”, when he deduces concord from *caritas*.

Even though Cicero in the *De officiis* (2, 78) calls concord one of the bases of the republic, we may surmise that the real reason this virtue appears here is partly because of its popularity in humanist literature (notably in anti-Turkish treatises) and partly because of the importance Erasmus gave to this concept. As is well-known from the books of Reinhart Koselleck and Denys Hay,⁴³ the image of the Barbarian was constructed with the help of the Aristotelian theory of climates, according to which people living in the torrid region are intelligent but obedient to authority, and thus they lose their freedom and live in serfdom. Whereas people in the north prefer liberty to serfdom, and their discord is implicated in their desire for freedom. Hence the concord of Christian princes became a central notion of anti-Turkish rhetoric from the 15th century already, and Erasmus in his *Education of the Christian prince*, a textbook written for the future Charles V, sets it as the main goal of Christian rulers in Europe, although he objects to an anti-Turkish war there. The Erasmian inspiration to concord in the present work can also be felt in a poem of Eck's on *Amicitia et Concordantia* (Friendship and Concordance), written in 1518 in praise of Peter Czipser and Andreas Reuber, who as parish priest and judge of Bartfeld were the ecclesiastic and the secular leaders of the community. In this poem of 83 lines, Eck devotes a dozen lines to a comparison of human and animal behavior: while animals of one species never fight each other—neither wolves, nor bears or lions—man constantly fights with his own kind.⁴⁴ This commonplace, taken up by Erasmus in the *Querela pacis* (The Complaint of Peace) in 1517, became very popular in the following years, appearing for example in the works of Ulrich von Hutten.⁴⁵ Eck also quoted examples in his "About the administration of the republic" from another work of Erasmus, the *Adagia*, which he used again for pedagogical purposes: the meaning of such uncommon phrases as *Lesbia regula*, *Bolitus* or *Bocchiris*, which were only explained and annotated by the students during class.

⁴³ Denys Hay, *Europe: The emergence of an idea* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1968), and Reinhart Koselleck, "Zur historisch-politischen Semantik asymmetrischer Gegenbegriffe," in idem, *Vergangene Zukunft: Zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1979), 65–104.

⁴⁴ Eck, D2v–D3r. The poem has already been published in Eck's *De mundi contemptu et virtute amplectenda* (Cracow: Vietor, 1519), E2v–E4r., with some textual variants.

⁴⁵ Ulrich von Hutten, *Ad proceres Germaniae*, 1518.

Conclusion

To sum up, the *De reipublicae administratione* is an interesting amalgam of legal precepts and of the cardinal virtues taken from Cicero, which can be considered as perhaps the first representative of the political literature of civic humanism in the kingdom of Hungary. Eck's work can no longer be categorized as purely rhetorical in purpose, as it contains positive statements concerning issues to which the community could respond with interest. The most important of these was probably the question of resistance to the unjust ruler. Eck still echoes the medieval theories of complete obedience to the ruler who received his power to govern from God, according to St. Paul: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation." (Rom. 13, 1–2) As it is well-known, this passage was traditionally interpreted to induce subjects to obey the will of the ruler, be it good or evil, because human government has been created as a divine remedy after the Fall; thus the ruler is ordained to his position by God, and no man might change this, even if the ruler went against the moral precepts of Christian ethics.⁴⁶ But here an interesting shift appears in the interpretation of this quotation. Eck first applies it not to a king or the Emperor, but to the power of a local magistrate, the judge—and in this case, his patron, as well—who is "qualiscunque dei imago" (some kind of image of God), and only later mentions the prince. Resistance to an evil prince is not allowed, as he is ordained by God as a trial and punishment for our sins, although in his answer to the following question of Philomathes Etnarches seems to suggest that resistance is still allowed if the ruler's will is against God. But how can we decide when a prince is acting against God and when as a scourge of God? This paradoxical reasoning shows that Eck has not arrived historically at the stage when local

⁴⁶ Generally quoted together with "Admone illos principibus et potestatibus subditos esse" (Titus 3), "per me reges regnant" (Prov. 8, 16) and "princeps legibus solutus est" (Digest 1, 3, 31). See further Karl F. Morrison, "Rome and the City of God: An Essay on the Constitutional Relationships of Empire and Church in the 4th c.," *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 54 (1961): 1, 43, and generally, Philippe Buc, "The Book of Kings: Nicholas of Lyra's Mirror of Princes," in Philip D. W. Krey and Lesley Smith, eds., *Nicholas of Lyra: The Senses of Scripture* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 83–110.

magistrates accepted it as their duty to defend the *leges patriae* even against the prince himself; thus the virtue of the citizens could not yet be transformed into the duty of patriots, as happened a hundred years later in the cities of Germany.⁴⁷ Friedeburg neatly summarizes this development:

In particular, leading urban patricians and local members of the territorial magistracy participated in a culture of urban Protestant humanism that cherished civic values and classical rhetoric and praised fellow-magistrates in such terms. They focused, however, on the magistracy as virtuous citizenry, not on urban dwellers as such. Civic humanism therefore offered an ethical model for rulers like noblemen, patricians and inferior magistrates alike on the many levels of government of the Empire, not a counter-model of self-rule meant to oppose monarchical order in fundamental terms.⁴⁸

The case of Eck and the city of Bartfeld fits in this picture from another point of view as well. In 1510–1511, just a few years before Eck's arrival, the city council had a Final Judgment depicted on the Western wall of the Council Hall, a symbol—as was popular among the self-legitimizing magistrates of Germany at that time—of the judicial power of the city in early modern urban culture.⁴⁹ The local career of Valentin Eck, who started out instructing the children of the burghers to civic values and ended up as the mayor of the city, is a symbolic feat of the self-legitimizing ideology of Upper Hungarian towns. Eck's assumption into the local elite succeeded to the extent that he was able to marry the daughter of Theophil Stenczel, the local artist who painted the image of the Final Judgment in the Council Hall. In 1528 Stenczel, who was embroiled in personal difficulties, had to ask for help from his son-in-law, who had become a prominent citizen by that time.⁵⁰

In conclusion, I would like to call attention to the uniqueness of this treatise. Contemporary mirrors of princes naturally targeted a different audience, the prince himself, as do two of the most significant outputs of this humanist genre, the *Philippica* and the *Agatharchia* of

⁴⁷ Ibid., 130.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 128.

⁴⁹ On the typical iconography of the Last Judgment in city councils, see Ulrich Meier, "Vom Mythos der Republik, Formen und Funktionen spätmittelalterlicher Rathausikonographie in Deutschland und Italien," in Andrea Löther, Ulrich Meier, Norbert Schnitzler et al., eds., *Mundus in imagine. Bildersprache und Lebenswelten im Mittelalter. Festgabe für Klaus Schreiner* (Munich: Fink, 1996), 345–87.

⁵⁰ See Jenő Abel, "Műtörténeti adalékok a XV. és XVI. századból," 533–34.

Jakob Wimpfeling from 1498. Therefore, it is not surprising that they differ in structure or content: while Wimpfeling also uses Cicero's *De officiis* as a major source, he does not include the fourfold scheme of virtues, and bases his system of virtues on Aegidius Romanus and Seneca.⁵¹ The most important expression of the humanist ideals of Christian government, the *Institutio principis Christiani* of Erasmus (1515), is dedicated to Prince Charles, the future Emperor,⁵² and, as far as we know, was not used for the formation of civic identity, as its purpose, the education of a faultless, ideal Christian ruler—who is thus omnipotent by his virtuosity—sharply contradicts the interests of the citizenry.

On the other hand, a work targeted at a civic audience like the *Norimberga*, or praise of Nuremberg, by Conrad Celtis (1502) was rather aiming at an imaginary reconstruction of the social structure of the Roman republic, bestowing rights upon the patricians and plebeians of Nuremberg as if it had been Rome: senators and praetors leading the city, while the plebs is strictly divided from them.⁵³ The political discourse of early civic humanism in the North seems to have neglected the question of the legal foundations of their communities and the legal representation of citizenry. One often finds scattered references to basic civic ideals and virtues (as *libertas*, *aequalitas*, *participatio*) in city chronicles,⁵⁴ and the introductions to local *Rechtsbücher* contain general remarks about such notions as legal independence, justice and impartiality. But Eck's dialogue is closer in form and genre to works like the *De solitudine dialogus* of Jacobus Canter,⁵⁵ where civic consciousness appears in a confrontation between *vita activa* and *vita contemplativa*, although the discussion of Canter's characters still lacks any references to the legal foundations of civic morality. This contrast also demonstrates a characteristic feature of Eck's work: while

⁵¹ Bruno Singer, *Die Fürstenspiegel in Deutschland im Zeitalter des Humanismus und der Reformation* (Munich: Fink, 1981), 187–89.

⁵² See the introduction by Lisa Jardine in her edition of Erasmus, *Institution of a Christian prince* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

⁵³ Friedeburg, "Civic Humanism," 131.

⁵⁴ Ulman Weiss, "Respublica Erfordiana, Zum Politikverständnis einer deutschen Stadt in der Zeit der Konfessionalisierung," in Peter Johaneck, ed., *Städtische Geschichtsschreibung im Spätmittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2000), 301–18.

⁵⁵ Karl E. Ehenkel, ed., *Kulturoptimismus und Kulturpessimismus in der Renaissance: Studie zu Jacobus Canters Dyalogus de solitudine mit kritischer Textausgabe und deutscher Übersetzung*, Frühneuzeit-Studien 3 (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1997).

the ancient historical parables and examples (quoted from Erasmus' *Adagia*, his *Complaint of Peace*, Sabellicus or Valerius Maximus) are not unique in any sense, the argument of the treatise with its basic twofold structure—the precepts from the *Digesta* and the Ciceronian list of virtues—creates a matrix, that—filled up with this historical material—can successfully express the medieval traditions of the legal independence of a free city within a humanistic vocabulary of virtues.

CHAPTER FOUR

CIVIC AND ETHNIC DISCOURSES OF IDENTITY IN A CITY-STATE CONTEXT: THE CASE OF RENAISSANCE RAGUSA

Lovro Kunčević

It is a commonplace that in early modern societies a multitude of different “offers of identity”—based on confessional, legal, ethnic and similar factors—co-existed, involved in complex relationships which oscillated from complementarity to direct conflict. Renaissance Ragusa also suffered from this characteristic “surplus” of identity. In various instances in which Ragusans spoke about themselves, one encounters claims of belonging to very different types of “imagined communities” which ranged from the most general, such as Christendom (*Christianitas, Respublica Christiana*), all the way to narrowly local *universitates* of the Ragusan district. In other words, one encounters in Ragusan documents a number of discourses of identity, that is, traditions of self-narration which established various types of imagined communities and frequently implied normative allegiances towards them.

However, not all of those traditions of speaking about oneself were equally important. They differed seriously when it came to crucial issues such as the power of their appeal, the frequency of their appearance or the types of political sponsorship they enjoyed. But one among these strategies of self-narration seems to have been especially powerful and elaborate, permeating the most diverse types of sources—the discourse of identity, for which I suggest the term “civic.”

By civic discourse I denote a series of attempts to define and characterize the Ragusan political community (*Natione Ragusea*) by references to important motifs such as the foundation of the city, its independent statehood, its Catholic religion, its republican constitution, its patron-saint and so on. Simply put, civic discourse was the self-portrait of the Ragusan city-state. By far the most politically relevant among the identity-discourses of Renaissance Ragusa, civic discourse served a myriad of purposes, from the external representation of the Republic in diplomacy to the legitimization of aristocratic rule in domestic politics. It was both the result and the catalyst of a specific type of

solidarity and loyalty: civic patriotism. This discourse was a characteristic mixture of politics and culture: largely created and controlled by the ruling elite for its own ideological purposes, yet also encompassing less instrumental, “genuine” expressions of patriotism which did not serve any immediate political interest. Generally speaking, Ragusan civic discourse is an example of a well-known phenomenon belonging to that wide category of self-representations of Late Medieval and Renaissance republics, two of the most famous of which are the so-called “myth of Venice” and the Florentine “civic humanism.”¹

The goal of this article is to investigate the relationship of this civic discourse with one of the less salient and yet important “secondary” offers of identity in Ragusan Renaissance culture, a discourse which—for the lack of a better name—I propose to call “ethnic.” By ethnic discourse of identity I mean references to imagined communities (e.g. Slavs, Illyrians or Dalmatians) which were defined by contemporaries through a combination of factors such as mythic common origin and history, common language, religion, customs, territorial vicinity and so on. In territorial scope these ethnic communities were conceived as extending far beyond the borders of the small Ragusan city state; at the same time they were not generally connected to any particular political structure but rather cut through several of them (the Habsburg and Ottoman Empires, the Venetian Republic). However, as ethnic discourse lacked the sort of systematic sponsorship by the Ragusan elite that civic discourse enjoyed, ethnic communities were much less clearly defined than the civic community itself and references to them seem not to have carried much political weight. While there were undeniably moments when it engendered a certain sense of solidarity, ethnic discourse does not seem to have figured as a guideline in

¹ The literature on both is immense. An excellent introduction to the contemporary state of the art on “civic humanism” is James Hankins, ed., *Renaissance Civic Humanism: Reappraisals and Reflections* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000). The fundamental work still remains Hans Baron, *Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance: Civic Humanism and Republican Liberty in an Age of Classicism and Tyranny* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966). The classical work on the “myth of Venice” remains Edward Muir, *Civic Ritual in Renaissance Venice* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), while more recently David Rosand has provided important insights into political messages in Venetian visual arts: see *The Myths of Venice: The Figuration of the State* (Chapel Hill & London: University of North Carolina Press, 2001). An interesting reflection on the posthumous working of Venetian ideology is to be found in James S. Grubb, “When myths lose power: Four decades of Venetian historiography,” *Journal of Modern History* 58 (1986): 43–94.

the foreign policy of the Ragusan republic, and even less as a basis for some possible future political organization in the way in which modern national(istic) discourses frequently do. Although sometimes, quite pragmatically, used by the Ragusan government, ethnic discourse was a phenomenon pertaining mostly to the sphere of culture and largely a topic of poets, humanist rhetoricians and historians. Again, as in the case of its civic counterpart, ethnic discourse can also be considered a variant of a more widespread phenomenon: one of those intriguing but methodologically challenging (proto)national discourses of identity present in early modern Europe.²

In essence, my point in this study is very simple: in Renaissance Ragusa it was a very different thing to be a “Ragusan” (*Raguseus*, *Raguseo*) than to be a “Slav,” “Dalmatian” or “Illyrian” (*Sclavus*, *Schiavone*, *Illyricus*, *Dalmata*, etc.). The first aim of this article is to shed light on the ways in which Ragusans themselves distinguished between those two types of imagined community by focusing on three important points used in differentiation: the criteria of membership, the modalities of their narrative representation, and their political implications. The second aim of this article is to try to reconstruct the ways in which their relationship was understood and to investigate whether in the eyes of the contemporaries those two identity offers contradicted, competed with or complemented each other.

One thing should be made clear at the very beginning: differentiation between civic and ethnic belonging, as well as a clear characterization of their relationship, was never an important topic of Ragusan political culture. This problem was not systematically reflected upon

² The first major publication dealing with the issue was Orest Ranum, ed., *National Consciousness, History, and Culture in Early Modern Europe* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975). Since then the reductive “modernist” paradigm—the claim that nation and national ideology are phenomena emerging only after the French Revolution—has been increasingly brought into question. It is gradually being replaced by a far more plausible position which indeed admits that during the late 18th and 19th century dramatic changes took place in the ways in which national identity was conceptualized, but at the same time insists that the communities of the pre-modern period were able to develop complex, persistent and socially penetrating collective identities and solidarities which at moments could even strikingly resemble modern nations. Two more recent exemplary publications in this vein are: Herfried Münkler, Hans Grünberger and Kathrin Mayer, eds., *Nationenbildung. Die Nationalisierung Europas im Diskurs humanistischer Intellektueller. Italien und Deutschland* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1998); Colin Kidd, *British Identities before Nationalism: Ethnicity and Nationhood in the Atlantic World, 1600–1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

for very simple reasons. There was no need for it, as it was not a serious ideological issue of the epoch. Yet, as a series of examples mentioned below are meant to show, a distinction between the two types of identity and a certain widely-shared understanding concerning their relationship undeniably existed. The reconstruction of such an implicit but persistent set of assumptions about collective identity is the goal of this study.³

Finally, an important caveat needs to be made. I am aware that to insist on a difference between the civic and ethnic discourses of identity in pre-modern context means to tread on a methodologically slippery ground. Therefore some preliminary clarifications are in order. In the first place, I am far from making too general a claim here, such as trying to extend this distinction to the history of early modern political thought in general, as has been recently attempted by Maurizio Viroli in his nevertheless inspiring essay.⁴ My point is simply that the specific historical situation of the Ragusan city-state—with the profound discrepancy between the small political community and far bigger linguistic, cultural and confessional communities to which Ragusans felt that they belonged—made the conceptualization of civic and ethnic communities as fully separate more accessible than it was in most other early modern political cultures. If any generalizations are to be made at all, I would dare to go only as far as to claim that similar distinctiveness was probably prone to appear in other historical constel-

³ For a good overview of the relationship between Dalmatian urban and (proto)national identities in a *longue durée* perspective, see Josip Vrandečić, *Dalmatinski autonomistički pokret u XIX. stoljeću* [The Dalmatian autonomist movement in the 19th century] (Zagreb: Dom & Svijet, 2002) and also his “Dalmatinski gradovi između regionalizma (*ius soli*) i hrvatskoj nacionalizma (*ius sanguinis*). Teritorij kao čimbenik samoidentifikacije u dalmatinskim protonacionalnim ideologijama” [Dalmatian cities between regionalism (*ius soli*) and Croatian nationalism (*ius sanguinis*): Territory as a factor of self-identification in Dalmatian proto-national ideologies], *Glasje* 5/9 (1998): 52–79.

⁴ Maurizio Viroli, *For Love of Country: An Essay on Patriotism and Nationalism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995). Another claim of Viroli’s—which I do not accept—is the normative distinction between the “good and evil twin,” according to which civic (patriotic) discourse is the tolerant, inclusive and rational while ethnic (nationalistic) discourse is the intolerant, exclusive and irrational language of identity. I do not find such *dramatis personae* convincing primarily because civic (patriotic) discourse was frequently used for quite non-noble purposes, such as the legitimization of the rule of the few over the many or as a justification for an aggressive imperial policy abroad. For the inherent tendency of scholars of republicanism to idealize this intellectual tradition see James Hankins, “Introduction,” in Hankins, ed., *Renaissance Civic Humanism*, especially 12–13.

lations comparable to that of Ragusa, the most obvious example being the Renaissance Italian city-states.⁵

Let me be even more precise: what made this conceptual distinctiveness more readily available in Ragusa was not simply any discrepancy between the political and cultural borders. That was a commonplace of Renaissance Europe. What seems to have been crucial was that the political or state community was *significantly smaller* than the confessional, linguistic and cultural communities to which its inhabitants claimed that they belonged; that the state community was, to coin an ugly anachronism, strongly “sub-national.” It is much harder to find such a clearly conceptualized difference between state and ethnic belonging in the territorially large multi-ethnic polities of early modern Europe, although they were also characterized by major discrepancies between political and cultural borders. The main reason lies in the fact that such states encompassed within their borders sizeable (if not complete) groups of population sharing common cultural traits, and this imbued the ethnic vocabulary with serious ideological potential. It made it possible for the ideology of the state to use the elements of ethnic discourse, usually attempting to construct a separate origin and “ethnicity” for the elite while enabling the voices of oppositional, peripheral elites to be supported by claims of a separate origin, past and culture as well. Simply put, ethnic discourse was frequently mixed with constitutional, confessional or regional discourses, and used to (de)legitimize the relationships of power, the result being that parts of the state structure or even the whole state community were defined in ethnic terms as well. On the other hand, in the culturally homogeneous and extremely small Renaissance Ragusa, surrounded by culturally similar populations, ethnic vocabulary was not readily available for such purposes. Normally it was not used to enforce internal divisions of power, express opposition to the patrician elite or even less to define the community as a whole. Quite to the contrary, ethnic vocabulary usually had exactly the opposite effect, integrating the inhabitants of the city-state with each other and with the populations outside of its borders. If lines had to be drawn between the city-state and Others, as well as between the different social groups of Ragusan society, other vocabularies were used, primarily those of medieval legal and republican

⁵ For some remarks along these lines, see Herfried Münkler, “Einleitung,” in Münkler, Grünberger and Mayer, eds., *Nationenbildung*, 16–17.

thought. The consequence of such specific ideological setting is what this article is about: the clear distinction between the imagined civic and ethnic communities and the specific, non-conflictual and asymmetrical way in which their relationship was understood.⁶

Differentiation between civic and ethnic communities in Ragusan political culture: Criteria of membership

The first major way in which civic and ethnic communities were differentiated in Ragusan political culture involves the criteria that defined belonging to them: that is, the specific political, cultural or social factors which were used to identify somebody as their member. Simply put, for the sixteenth-century Ragusans different things made somebody a “Ragusan” and other things made him a “Dalmatian” or a “Slav.” Consequently, those two communities were understood as encompassing different populations (which did overlap to a certain extent) and as having different requirements for becoming or ceasing to be a member.

⁶ The only notable Renaissance Ragusan exception to the usage of the ethnic vocabulary sketched above is the *oeuvre* of the humanist Elias L. Cerva in which the civic community, especially the city’s patriciate, was defined partially through ethnic references, in terms of specific common descent, language and culture. Cerva insisted on the “Roman blood” of the founders of Ragusa, claiming that it still flowed through the veins of the Ragusan patricians. Furthermore, he referred to the extinct Romance Dalmatian language of Ragusa as the unique and characteristic *lingua ragusea*, lamented the Slavicization of the city and called for the restoration of its antique Roman culture. However, even Cerva himself admitted that Slavic is his native language and that contemporary Ragusa was a Slavic city and he repeatedly included the Ragusans among the Slavs (mostly using the archaizing “Illyrian” name). Thus it appears that his concern was less about establishing the “factual” ethnic difference and far more about the cultural rebirth of a lost classical heritage in general accordance with the typical humanist obsession with antiquity. The vast majority of Ragusan patrician authors had absolutely no problem setting forth their Slavic identity, and it was precisely due to their cultural efforts—good examples are J. Gondola or J. Palmota—that Ragusa was one of the birthplaces of early modern Panslavism. For the Ragusan aristocracy’s claims to Roman origins and the Slavicization of Ragusa, see Irmgard Manken, *Dubrovački patricijat u XIV veku* [The Ragusan Patriciate in the 14th century] (Belgrade: SANU, 1960), 53–83; Bariša Krekić, “On the Latino-Slavic cultural symbiosis in late medieval and Renaissance Dalmatia and Dubrovnik,” in Bariša Krekić, *Dubrovnik: a Mediterranean Urban Society, 1300–1600* (Vermont: Variorum, 1997), XVIII, 321–32; Zdenka Janeković-Römer, *Okvir slobode* [The frame of freedom] (Zagreb and Dubrovnik: Zavod za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Dubrovniku, 1999), 41–48.

Albeit the word *Raguseus/Raguseo* appears constantly in the most diverse sources, there is not a single statement which could be taken as an explicit and universally valid definition of what made somebody a “Ragusan.” Coming closest to explicating the criteria of belonging to the *natione Ragusea* are the official sources in which this question was connected to very concrete things such as taxes or trading privileges. Especially revealing are those moments when the Ragusan government had to prove to foreign powers that certain individuals are Ragusans and therefore entitled to different privileges and the legal protection granted to the *natione Ragusea* abroad. Such arguments—whether set out in charters issued directly to individuals or in letters written to foreign authorities—were far from unambiguous and consistent, yet certain general tendencies did exist.

One set of criteria sometimes used to prove that somebody was a Ragusan might be loosely labelled as “social”. This was applied mostly in cases of immigrants to the city, newcomers whose integration within the urban community had to be accentuated. Thus, the authorities of the city-state would seek to prove that an individual of foreign origin is a *Raguseo* by mentioning that he had lived in the city for a longer period, had brought his family there, had married into the family of Ragusan citizens, had bought immobile possessions and, generally, “called himself a Ragusan.”

A more important and far more frequent type of argumentation was jurisdictional. It appears in almost all cases, regardless of whether the individual in question was a newcomer or not. The jurisdictional essence of belonging to the *natione Ragusea* is revealed from the start by the fact that in most of such confirmations the terms *Raguseo* and “subject” (*soddito*) appeared as interchangeable. Even more clearly, the government in many instances explicitly stated that somebody is a *Raguseo* since he obeys their commands, lives “under our jurisdiction” (*sotto la Nostra obediencia*), was born in the place under that jurisdiction and/or of parents who were *sodditi* of the Republic.⁷

⁷ A clear combination of social and jurisdictional criteria is to be found in one letter of the Ragusan government from the mid-fifteenth century which sought to prove that two brothers, Zohane and Marinze Gabro, whose goods a neighboring duke had seized considering them to be Venetians, are in fact “Ragusans.” The essence of the argument ran as follows: “stagando... lo detto Zohane in Ragusa nella qual se a maridado in una fiola d’uno lor zittadin de Ragusa et apresso a comprato chase et possessione. Et l’altro zoe Marinze stagando et conversando nelle parte de Schiavonia... el qual sempre se a acpitado et chiamato per Raguseo nostro et sempre a obedito chome

However, the most frequently used formulation was even more precise. It designated as a “Ragusan” not simply any “subject” of the Ragusan *signoria* but persons who enjoyed a specific legal status. Typically, Ragusans were those who “in the past lived and in present live under our jurisdiction, enjoying all the concessions, benefices and privileges which are enjoyed by our other subjects, and fulfilling all those duties which are fulfilled by everybody else of our nation.”⁸ In other words, in most cases somebody’s Ragusan identity was proved by the fact that he fulfilled a set of obligations (*pesi, pagamenti*) towards the government and in return enjoyed a set of privileges (*concesioni, benefizij, privilegij*).

Importantly, such a formulation is strongly reminiscent of the traditional obligations and privileges of the Ragusan citizen, *civis Ragusii*, that had existed since the Middle Ages. Ragusan *cives* were entitled to legal protection as well as trading privileges in the city and abroad while being obliged to pay their taxes and fulfil a number of obligations demanded by the government (e.g. guard-duty in the city). In defining a *Raguseo* by means of such legal criteria the government simply continued an old medieval tradition which frequently equated

Raguseo et sodito della Signoria de Ragusa a diti li comandanti et facione dela Signoria de Ragusa. Et nichil piu mexi sono che se a maridado in Ragusa in una fiola d’uno lor zittadin.” (State Archives of Dubrovnik (SAD), *Lettere di Levante* 13, f. 119v). In another document concerning the same case, the senate argued in a more narrowly legalistic way that one of those two brothers “siando vegnuto qua a Ragusa he stato incarcerato et condannato chome Raguseo et sobdito della signoria de Ragusa et luy e buono subdito e Raguseo he stato obediente, et a consendo ad ogni voluntade et comandamento dela signoria de Ragusa.” (SAD, *Lettere di Levante* 13, f. 123r). One clear example of jurisdictional argumentation comes from 1570: “Noi Rettore, et consiglieri di Ragusa, à tutti et singoli magnifici et clarissimi signori... significamo, et facciamo certa, et indubitata fede, qualmente Michele di Rado... è nostro Raugeo, et nato de Raugei, suditi nostri, et per tale, et da noi, et da tutta la citta nostra, massime tra mercanti è sempre stato tenuto conosciuto, et reputato, et nominato per Raguseo, et etiam per tale in tutti li atti publici, et priuati è stato trattato...” (SAD, *Isprave i akti* (ASMM) 16, 466 no. 34). A similar example of jurisdictional argumentation is to be found in 1629: “Il Rettore, et i Consilieri della Republica di Ragusa à tutti et singoli facciamo fede, e testifichiamo, qualmente ci consta di vera cognitione, e scienza che Biagio di Luca... è Raguseo nativo sudito Nostro descendente da padre e madre similmente nostri sudditi, oriundi dalla Villa, ò sia contrada di Canosa alias Tarsteno soggetta alla nostra giurisdittione...” (SAD, *Fides et attestata* 1 f. 47 v). For Venetian analogies see Matteo Casini, “La cittadinanza originaria a Venezia tra i secoli XV e XVI. Una linea interpretativa,” in Gino Benzoni, ed., *Studi veneti offerti a Gaetano Cozzi* (Venezia: Il Cardo, 1992), 136.

⁸ This representative statement is from the confirmation issued to a certain Biagio di Luca on 30th of June 1629 (SAD, *Fides et attestata* 1, f. 47 v).

civis Ragusii and *Raguseus*. Perhaps the best examples are the numerous fourteenth-century citizenship grants in which the expressions *factus fuit civis Ragusii* and *factus fuit Raguseus* appear as fully interchangeable. This traditionally close connection between citizen status and Ragusan identity is also confirmed by some seemingly curious formulations from the documents. Thus, in 1235 when forbidding its subjects from engaging in piracy, the Ragusan government stated that the main punishment for anyone who disobeys is to “let him nevermore be a Ragusan” (*numquam sit Raguseus*). What they obviously meant to say is that he will lose his citizenship privileges; so again, *civis Ragusii* is equivalent to *Raguseus*.⁹

The reason why one does not find this revealing medieval equation between *civis* and *Raguseus* in the sources from the 16th and 17th centuries is that the notion of *civis* or *cittadino* had by then changed its meaning. With time it became more of a social category which designated exclusively the members of the non-patrician secondary elite organized in its confraternities and therefore did not encompass all of those who legally enjoyed the status of a citizen.¹⁰ Despite such

⁹ For the 1235 law see Ante Šoljić, Zdravko Šundrica and Ivo Veselić, eds., *Statut grada Dubrovnika sastavljen godine 1272* [The statute of the city of Ragusa from the year 1272] (Dubrovnik: Državni arhiv u Dubrovniku, 2002), L. VI, c. 58. For an intriguing fourteenth-century debate concerning whether a certain merchant was a *Raguseus* or not, conducted completely along the same lines of duties and privileges, see Mihailo J. Dinić, *Za istoriju rudarstva u srednjevekovnoj Srbiji i Bosni* [Concerning the history of mining in medieval Serbia and Bosnia] (Belgrade: Srpska akademija nauka, 1955), I: 11, note 50. On Ragusan citizenship in the Middle Ages see Jovanka Mijušković, “Dodeljivanje dubrovačkog građanstva u srednjem veku” [Granting Ragusan citizenship in the Middle Ages], *Glas SANU* 246 (1961): 89–127; Zrinka Pešorda, *Dubrovački Antunini u kasnom Srednjem vijeku* [Ragusan Antunins in the Late Middle Ages], (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Zagreb, 2006), especially the chapter “Antunini kao dubrovačko građanstvo”; Zdenka Janeković, “Stranac u srednjovekovnom Dubrovniku: između prihvaćenosti i odbačenosti” [The foreigner in medieval Ragusa: Between acceptance and rejection], *Historijski zbornik* 26 (1993): 27–38; Zdenka Janeković-Römer, *Okvir slobode, 227–233*; Zdenka Janeković, “Građani, stanovnici, podanici, stranci, inovjerci u srednjovekovnom Dubrovniku” [Citizens, inhabitants, subjects, foreigners, infidels in medieval Ragusa], in Neven Budak, ed., *Raukarov zbornik* (Zagreb: FF Press, 2005), 318–20. On medieval citizenship in general see Peter Riesenbergh, *Citizenship in the Western Tradition* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1992), 87–199. For a number of intriguing reflections on citizenship in Western Europe since the Middle Ages, see Quentin Skinner and Bo Stråth, eds., *States & Citizens: History, Theory, Prospects* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

¹⁰ For the new, exclusive and social meaning of the term that appears in the fifteenth century, see Pešorda, *Antunini*, 122–23. Something similar happened in Venice as well. The word itself started to have two meanings—social and legal—which

confusion in terminology, the criteria of being a Ragusan—at least *stricto sensu* and in the official sources—remained connected to the status of a citizen in the older sense of the word. Accordingly, the notion kept its old, slightly elitist and legal connotations, designating only the upper, privileged layers of society and not all the inhabitants of the city-state. Simple *habitatores* and *districtuales*—the urban labour force or the peasants from the surrounding area—seem to have been excluded from Ragusan identity as understood in this way.¹¹

Naturally, this definition of a Raguseo is influenced by the specific perspective of legal and official sources and therefore should not be (over)generalized. For example, in the official documents there is no mention of one important criteria of belonging to the civic community, not explicitly stated probably because self-evident: namely, that in order to be considered a Ragusan a person had to be Catholic. Not only was the status of *civis* open only to Catholics, but the city-state government applied a rigid and exclusively pro-Catholic policy to its dominion and all of its subjects.¹² Besides such confessional criteria, the abovementioned “social” ones—marriage, possessions and habitation in the city—also probably played a more serious role than is apparent from the official sources and might in fact point towards a more down-to-earth understanding of what made somebody a Ragusan.¹³

coexisted and caused some confusion. See Anna Bellavitis, “Per cittadini metterete:’ La stratificazione della società veneziana cinquecentesca tra norma giuridica e riconoscimento sociale,” *Quaderni storici* 89 (1995): 372.

¹¹ A similar understanding is to be found in Venice. In 1455, answering a question of Borso d’Este concerning exactly which “Veneti” or “homines Venetiarum” enjoyed extensive trading privileges in his state, the Venetian *Signoria* specified that it meant those enjoying different grades of Venetian citizenship: *cives originarii*, *cives de intus et extra*, and *cives de intus*. As in the Ragusan case, only a specific legally defined group of citizens, encompassing higher and middle social layers of the city’s population, was to be understood as *stricto sensu* “Venetians.” See Gaetano Cozzi and Michael Knapton, *La Repubblica di Venezia nell’età moderna: Dalla guerra di Chioggia al 1517* (Torino: UTET, 1986), I: 133.

¹² There were some exceptions in respect of Catholicism as a necessary requirement for attaining the status of citizen. On certain rare occasions the government would grant Ragusan citizenship and even nobility to powerful political figures of the hinterland who were Orthodox or Bosnian “heretics” (there is even one case in which they contemplated offering citizenship to a “Turk”). However, this was a relatively rare and exceptional practice. See Mijušković, “Dodeljivanje,” 105–106, 114–15; Janeković, “Građani, stanovnici, podanici,” 330–37.

¹³ Yet it is important to note that many of these “social” elements were part of the traditional medieval requirements for obtaining the status of *civis Ragusii* and thus had legal connotations as well. Besides swearing fidelity to the *communitas* and obliging themselves to pay all the dues and fulfill all the obligations imposed by the city-state government, candidates usually had to oblige themselves to buy immovable

This is confirmed by the fact that in sources such as historiography, literature or diplomacy the notion of *Raguseo* had much vaguer meaning than in the official documents. At times it could have a narrower territorial connotation, designating the inhabitants of the city proper as opposed to the inhabitants of the district and the surrounding isles; on other occasions the word simply designated all the inhabitants of the city-state, regardless of their legal status or place of residence. Sometimes even the official sources abandoned the narrower conception of Ragusan identity, speaking of *nullus Raguseus cuiuscumque conditionis* or, even more clearly, of *Ragusei sia de che stato, grado et condicion se voglia*.¹⁴ Yet even when conceived so broadly, the notion kept its jurisdictional and territorial essence, since it designated the subjects of one state who were living on its territory.

To sum up, one can state that in early modern Ragusa there was no unambiguous and universal definition of what made somebody a Ragusan. Belonging to the civic community (*natione Ragusea*) was determined by a combination of jurisdictional, legal, social, confessional and territorial factors, the relative importance of which depended on who spoke and with what aim in mind. However, it seems that the most direct and unambiguous way to be considered a Ragusan was the traditional one: the possession of citizenship.

On the other hand, belonging to an ethnic community was determined by a very different set of criteria. The following revealing sentence was written in 1446 in a letter of the Ragusan government to the authorities of Barcelona: "it is clear to the nations of the whole world...that Ragusans are not Italians...quite to the contrary, that both judging by their language and by the criteria of place, they are Dalmatians."¹⁵ Here the political community of Ragusans is included in the wider community of Dalmatians which is defined through its

property in Ragusa and move in the city together with their families. See Mijušković, "Dodeljivanje," 118–21.

¹⁴ Branislav M. Nedeljković, ed., *Liber Viridis*, Zbornik za istoriju, jezik i književnost srpskog naroda, vol. 23 (Belgrade: Srpska Akademija Nauka i Umetnosti, 1984), 28.

¹⁵ Cited from Jovan Radonić, ed., *Dubrovačka akta i povelje* [Ragusan decrees and charters], Zbornik za istoriju, jezik i književnost Srpskog naroda, vol. I, tome 1 (Belgrade: Srpska Kraljevska Akademija, 1934), 492–93. Regarding Ragusan ethnic discourse, it is notable that among the ethnic names that appear in Ragusan sources, albeit rarely, are also the terms "Croatian" and "Serbian." As only a very general outline of the Ragusan ethnic discourse is necessary for the purposes of this article, I do not intend to address the delicate question of the usage of Croatian and Serbian names and their precise connotations in Ragusan sources.

common language (*ex suo idiomate*) and common territorial context (*ex situs ratione*). Ragusan historians of the Renaissance seem to have understood the distinguishing characteristics of ethnic communities in a similar way. When speaking of Slavs, Illyrians or Dalmatians, they usually elaborate upon all the typical rhetorical *topoi* such as the mythic common origin, the shared history and customs, physical/psychological traits, faithfulness to Catholicism and the illustrious men of that “nation”. However, the stronger accent undeniably lies upon the two concrete criteria which reappear constantly: an insistence on the shared language and a comprehensive description of the “province(s)” which that “nation” inhabits.¹⁶

The single most important factor usually was language. Thus, for the immensely influential sixteenth-century historian Mauro Orbini, what constituted the *unità di nazione* was simply and solely *unità di lingua*. For another important Renaissance historian, L. C. Tubero, language also seems to have been the single most distinctive feature of a *gens* or *natio*. In his description of the sixteenth-century Hungarian Kingdom Tubero is almost as explicit as Orbini, stating that it is inhabited by numerous “nations who differ from each other through language.”¹⁷ The “linguistic” element of ethnicity seemingly was so powerful that it bore greater weight even than the otherwise very important confessional one. Certainly, the most self-evident ethnic frame of reference for Ragusan historians was provided by the Catholic populations of neighboring Dalmatian cities. However, the majority of them also insisted on the wider, linguistically founded, ethnic community of “Slavs” or “Illyrians” which included Orthodox and even Muslim populations from the city’s hinterland.¹⁸ Importantly, such an understanding was

¹⁶ Two good sixteenth-century examples are Serafino Razzi, *La Storia di Raugia* (Lucca: Per Vicentio Busdraghi, 1595), 5; Giacomo Luccari, *Copioso ristretto degli annali di Rausa* (Venice: Ad instantia di Antonio Leonardi, 1605), 7–9.

¹⁷ “Itaque Regiones Hungarico imperio subiectas multae incolunt nationes, quae inter se linguis diferrunt...” *Lvdovici Tvberonis Dalmatae Abbatis, &c. Commentariorvm de rebvs quae temporibvs eivs in illa Evropaie parte quam Pannonii & Turcae eorumq; finitimi incolunt, gestae sunt, libri undecim* (Frankfurt: Impensis Claudij Mar-nij, & haeredum, 1603), 10. In Tubero’s history, immensely rich in ethno-cultural references, there are many similar examples. One of the more intriguing even points out a way in which a certain people could become (sic!) “Slavs.” Namely, while describing the Slavic migrations to the Balkans Tubero remarks that many of the defeated peoples took over the Slavic language of the victors and thus “bona pars eorum in nomen Sclauenorum abiit” (*Ibidem*, 12).

¹⁸ Thus, for example, the Ragusan historian Luccari proudly narrates that the “*Rei Ottomanii tengono in tanta veneratione la virtù de Dalmatini*” and give them the

far from confined to historiography. A certain sense of closeness, even solidarity with other speakers of (South-)Slavic vernaculars regardless of their religion was quite wide-spread in Ragusa. Perhaps the most striking examples are to be found in the letters of Ragusan diplomats from the Ottoman Empire who frequently mention that certain dignitaries of the Porte, obviously Muslim, are “of our (Slavic) language” or simply “ours.”¹⁹

Such predominance of territorial and especially linguistic criteria was not specific for Renaissance Ragusa, but was also typical for the self-understanding of other Dalmatian cities. The concrete, widely-shared criteria used to determine whether somebody belonged to a particular ethnic community can be clearly seen in the case of one interesting institution, the “national” confraternity of “Slavs” or “Illyrians” in Rome, *Confraternità di San Girolamo degli Schiavoni*.²⁰ The confraternity of *San Girolamo*—in which Ragusans played a considerable role—is a revealing example since it was probably the only institution where the question whether a certain person was a *Schiavone* or *Illyricus* was an official issue, as it entitled that person to different services, privileges and membership in the confraternity. The criteria were quite similar to those in the aforementioned letter of Ragusan government from 1446: language and place of birth. Those applying for membership or simply wishing to use the guesthouse usually had to demonstrate that they are Slavs/Illyrians by proving with a baptismal certificate that they were born on the territory of “Illyricum”

highest offices at their court, pointing out that at that very time the Ottoman grand visier is a “Dalmatian” from Čajnik (in today’s Bosnia). Luccari, *Copioso ristretto*, 8. Naturally, all of those “Dalmatini” at the Ottoman court were Muslims.

¹⁹ The usual expression was “*del nostro idioma*.” For examples, see Jorjo Tadić, “Dubrovnik za vreme Djiva Gundulića” [Ragusa in the age of Djivo Gundulić], *Srpski književni glasnik* 56 (1939): 279–80; Jorjo Tadić, “Narodnost starih dubrovčana” [The nationhood of the ancient Ragusans], *Politika* 5 January (1928): 1–2.

²⁰ On this confraternity see Luka Jelić, *L’Istituto Croato à Roma* (Zadar: Hrvatska knjižarnica, 1902); Josip Burić, *Iz prošlosti hrvatske kolonije u Rimu* [From the history of the Croatian colony in Rome] (Rome: Knjižnica Novog života, 1966); Ivan Črnčić, “Imena Slovjenin i Ilir u našem gostinju u Rimu poslije 1453. godine” [The terms Slav and Illyrian in our guesthouse in Rome after 1453], *Rad JAZU* 79 (1886): 1–70; Radosav Katičić, “Ustanove sv. Jeronima u Rimu i povijest hrvatske kulture i narodnosti” [The institutions of St. Jerome in Rome and the history of Croatian culture and nationhood], in Radosav Katičić, *Na kroatističkim raskrižjima* [On the Crossroads of Croaticistics] (Zagreb: Hrvatski studiji-Studia Croatica, 1999). For a further bibliography on this institution see Iva Mandušić, “Bibliografija radova o bratovštini sv. Jeronima u Rimu” [Bibliography of works concerning the Confraternity of St. Jerome in Rome], *Croatica Christiana Periodica* 57 (2006): 197–203.

(roughly Dalmatia and its hinterland) and that they could speak its vernacular language. Needless to say, an implicit but necessary third condition was that the given person was a Catholic.²¹

Those examples should suffice to illustrate several important differences concerning the criteria of membership in civic and ethnic communities. Although it is hard to establish firm differences due to shifting criteria—depending on who was citing them—several general conclusions can be drawn. The most salient element of belonging to an ethnic community was language, yet this was of absolutely no importance when it came to defining membership in the civic community. Most of the inhabitants of the city-state in fact spoke Slavic as their mother tongue, but knowledge of that language was never a factor when it came to determining somebody's Ragusan identity. Numerous foreigners, especially Italians, many of whom surely did not speak Slavic, were Ragusan *cives* and thus considered to be "Ragusan" during the Late Middle Ages and the Renaissance. The situation was similar to another equally important element of ethnic belonging, the place of birth. While it is almost always mentioned in references to ethnic communities, it seems to have played a secondary role as a factor of belonging to the civic community. As we have seen, sometimes the fact that an individual was born in the place under the jurisdiction of Ragusan government might have been an argument for his Ragusan identity, nevertheless one should remember that many Ragusan *cives*, fully integrated into the urban community, were born abroad. As far as the confessional criterion is concerned, namely the Catholic confession of the individual, it seems to have played a far more important role regarding membership in the civic community. While the ethnic community to which Ragusans claimed that they belonged was frequently taken to include the Orthodox and Muslim populations—although its core were the Catholic populations of Dalmatia—being a "Ragusan" necessarily meant being a Catholic. Finally, the jurisdictional element, apparently crucial for membership in the civic community, is absolutely missing from the criteria of belonging to the ethnic community.

²¹ Jelić, *L'Instituto Croato*, 29; Burić, *Iz prošlosti*, 8–9. Similar but slightly more vague criteria were applied in determining the eligibility of persons for the office of canons of the church of St. Jerome in Rome. For this see Josip Burić, *Kanonici kaptola sv. Jeronima* [Canons of the Chapter of St. Jerome] (Rome: Hrvatski povijesni institut, 1971), 94; Katičić, "Ustanove sv. Jeronima u Rimu," 183–85; Črnčić, "Imena Slovjenin i Ilir," 39.

The fact that the populations which were considered Illyrian or Slavic were under the rule of several foreign states never brought into question their “national” belonging.

Summing up, one could say that since belonging to these two communities depended on different factors, it is clear that it was possible to be a member of one without being a member of the other. Thus it was possible to be a Ragusan and, at the same time, not to be a Slav or Dalmatian and *vice versa*. Furthermore, the very nature of the border mechanisms of those two communities was not the same: one of them was open, the other closed. While it was possible for a person of means to eventually become a *Raguseo*, it was much harder, and perhaps not possible at all, for one to become a Slav or Illyrian. Regardless of his ethnic background a person who fulfilled the necessary conditions could become a Ragusan citizen, integrating himself fully into the urban community, and thus also becoming a *Raguseo*. Even more important, it seems that one could choose literally to not be a “Ragusan” by rejecting the status of a citizen.²² On the other hand, it does not seem likely that, say, a Florentine merchant could “become” a Slav or Dalmatian. Such a person most probably could not have gained admittance into the above-mentioned national confraternity of St. Jerome. Even if he learned the Slavic language and acculturated totally, the fact of his foreign birth and origin would remain an obstacle.

Representations in narrative sources

That Renaissance Ragusans conceptualized civic and ethnic communities as clearly distinct is also visible from the ways in which these were represented in the narrative sources. Some of the major points of difference between them in Ragusan historiography and literature were as follows: firstly, each of those two communities had its own distinguishable and independent myth of origins; secondly, each was characterized through its own specific set of common-places or *topoi*;

²² A curious mid-fourteenth century example is to be found in Josip Gelcich, ed., *Monumenta Ragusina, Libri Reformationum. Monumenta Ragusina II* (Zagreb: JAZU, 1882), 130: “Jacomellus...speciarius, constitutus in minori consilio...et interrogatus, si ipse est civis Ragusinus, dixit et respondit dicto d. Comiti et suo minori consilio ibidem statim, quod ipse non est civis Ragusinus nec Raguseus (sic!) esse intendit, nec vult se Raguseum esse...”

thirdly, each possessed its own specific symbolic geography. This distinction is also confirmed by *Begriffsgeschichte*. Although Ragusan authors were far less sensitive to terminological issues than the modern historian would have liked, the traditional usage of some important notions such as *gens*, *natio* or *patria* does seem to confirm the differentiation between the civic and ethnic belonging.

Although in Renaissance historical texts one sometimes finds origin myths of Slavs or Illyrians standing besides the very foundation myth of the Ragusan city-state, those were clearly two different stories. Not only could they appear independently and self-sufficiently, but occasionally they could even get into embarrassing discrepancy. Many Renaissance authors were aware that the origin of the Slavic people who inhabited Ragusa in their time was profoundly different from the alleged origin of the supposed founders of the city. According to an old medieval tradition, Ragusa was founded by “Romans”—by the uniting of refugees from Rome coming in ships and refugees from the neighboring Roman colony Epidaurum. Yet it was obvious that the contemporary city was inhabited by Slavs. In order to harmonize those two facts, most of the later medieval and Renaissance authors modified the old story, claiming that the founders were in fact half-Roman and half-Slavic. However, there were also instances in which the difference between the supposed origin of the city’s founders and the origins of most of its present inhabitants was ideologically exploited. Legendary “Roman” origins of the city’s founders could have been used to separate Ragusa, especially its aristocracy, from the Slavic peoples in the surrounding area and even from the lower classes in the city itself. The most famous example was the humanist orator and poet Elias L. Cerva who, on the basis of the supposed Roman foundation of Ragusa, claimed that all the nobles in “this province... grew out of the Roman seed” and, while acknowledging the contemporary Slavic culture of Ragusa, lamented it as a tragic loss of Roman origins.²³ Discrepancies between the history of the city-state and the history of the Slavic “nation” to which Ragusans claimed that they belonged did not end here. For example, another embarrassing fact which had to be some-

²³ “...ut caeteri plures omnes fere patritiorum huic provinciae... Romano germine sobolescit.” Darinka Nevenić-Grabovac, “Oratio funebris humaniste Ilije Crijevića dubrovačkom pesniku Ivanu (Dživu) Gunduliću” [The Oratio Funebris of the humanist Ilija Crijević for the Ragusan poet Ivan (Dživo) Gundulić], *Živa antika* 24 (1974), 1–2. Similar thoughts are to be found in Cerva’s other public speeches.

how negotiated was the—historically correct—claim that Slavs were the very ones who destroyed the revered predecessor of Ragusa, the ancient city of Epidaurum from which came the refugees who supposedly founded the medieval city. In the historiography of the city-state this uncomfortable truth was sometimes acknowledged, but more frequently circumvented by ascribing this terrible deed to either Saracens or Goths.

Furthermore, not only the ancient past but also the present of these two imagined communities was conceptualized in quite different terms. Besides separate origin myths and histories which sometimes did not fit together smoothly, each of them had a specific set of rhetorical common-places—codified through generations of authors—through which it was characterized. Typical elements of civic self-narration were, for example, the wise republican constitution of Ragusa, its cherished ancient liberty (*libertas, libertà*), its virtuous patriciate and social harmony, its millennial faithfulness to the Church of Rome, its fabled beauty, its riches and its cultural importance. Most of those motifs were modified common-places of the Mediterranean republican tradition, in particular the famous “myth of Venice.” On the other hand, Ragusan (and Dalmatian) historiography and literature developed a set of different common-places connected to ethnic communities. Illyrians or Slavs were characterized in terms of their battle prowess and courage, faithfulness to their (foreign) lords, their great territorial extent (*gens amplissima*), the beauty of their Slavic vernacular or their role as the defenders of Christian faith against the Ottoman infidel. The intellectual origins of this set of *topoi* were quite heterogeneous, combining as they did such very different traditions as the Biblical ethno-genetic theories, humanist concepts of nationhood, the idea of a “cultural nation” of Italian origin and the myths of the Christian frontier similar to those of the Hungarian and Polish Kingdoms.²⁴

²⁴ Although this intellectual genealogy is mine, invaluable contributions concerning the Illyrian and Slavic ethnic discourse are to be found in the works of Zrinka Blažević, such as her “Performing National Identity: The Case of Pavao Ritter Vitezovic (1652–1713),” *National Identities* 5/3 (2003): 251–67, and “Rethinking Balkanism: The Interpretative Challenge of the Early Modern Illyrism,” *Etudes Balkaniques* 1 (2007): 87–106, as well as in her recent book *Ilirizam prije ilirizma* [Illyrism before Illyrism] (Zagreb: Golden marketing—Tehnička knjiga, 2008). Besides the above-mentioned works of J. Vrandečić (see n. 3), other relevant studies of the Illyrian and Slavic discourse are Reinhard Lauer, “Genese und Funktion des illyrischen Ideologems in den südslawische Literaturen (16. bis Anfang des 19. Jahrhunderts),” in Klaus-Detlev Grothusen, ed., *Ethnogenese und Staatsbildung in Südosteuropa* (Göttingen:

Besides their imagined origins and the ways in which their present was described, those two communities also differed when it came to conceptualizing their spatial dimensions, the territories and populations which they were considered to encompass. The first and obvious difference was that the ethnic community was much larger than the small civic community. Whereas the Ragusan Republic consisted of a tiny strip of territory on the Eastern shore of the Adriatic, Slavs were said to inhabit vast regions, usually described with phrases such as “from the cold northern seas down to the Adriatic.” It was not only a matter of size, however: those two communities also differed when it came to the clarity of their territorial scope. While it was clear which populations and territories should be called Ragusan, there were endless differences, even open debates regarding which populations and lands should be considered Illyrian, Slavic or Dalmatian. In the mid-seventeenth century, after a fierce debate the question of which territories were to be considered parts of Illyria had to be resolved by no less than the papal court.²⁵ The territorial scope of the ethnic community was being constantly redefined or manipulated according to the education, affinities and goals of the individual authors. For example, at its most minimal extent Illyria could be understood as comprising merely Dalmatia and its immediate hinterland, while at other times it could be stretched to include literally all the lands inhabited by Slavic speakers.

Finally, the differentiation between these two types of community is also visible in the usage of some important notions through which identity was traditionally conceptualized. The least revealing of such

Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1974), 116–43; Ivo Banac, “The Revived Croatia of Pavao Ritter Vitezovic,” in Ivo Banac and F. E. Sysyn, eds., *Concepts of Nationhood in Early Modern Eastern Europe* (Cambridge, Ma.: Ukrainian Research Institute, Harvard University, 1986), 492–507; Jaroslav Šidak, “Počeci političke misli u Hrvata—J. Križanić i Ritter Vitezović” [The beginnings of political thought among the Croats—J. Križanić and Ritter Vitezović], *Naše teme* 16/7 (1972): 1132–44.

²⁵ The core of the dilemma was whether persons from roughly the territory of present day Slovenia were to be considered Illyrian and thus entitled to the services of the Illyrian Confraternity of St. Jerome in Rome. After a prolonged debate the issue was finally resolved by the papal court which decreed that “Illyricum” consisted only of Croatia, Dalmatia, Slavonia and Bosnia. A similar problem, though less fiercely debated, appeared in the late 16th century when the question was raised whether the inhabitants of Bar in present day Montenegro were Illyrians; see Ivan Golub, “J. Križanić i pitanje prava Slovenaca na svetojeronimske ustanove” [Juraj Križanić and the right of Slovenes to the Institutions of St. Jerome], *Historijski zbornik* 21–22 (1968/9): 213–258; Burić, *Iz prošlosti*, 10.

notions is that of *natio* or *nazione*. In Ragusan documents it is used to designate both the community of the city-state as well as ethno-cultural communities. The word *gens* is already more telling, as it was, to the best of my knowledge, never used to designate Ragusans, but exclusively ethnic communities. However, the clearest differentiation between two types of identity appears in connection with the most important notion—that of *patria*. In Ragusan documents *patria* always designated Ragusa only and exclusively, and never “Dalmatia”, “Slavonia” or “Illyricum.” Such a linguistic usage was similar to the Italian context where, as Federico Chabod warned, *patria* normally designated a concrete city-state such as Florence or Venice and only exceptionally Italy which was usually designated as “province.” Even when referred to as *patria*, Italy was usually called *patria commune*, obviously in order to distinguish it from the true *patria*—one’s city or city-state. This terminological differentiation between civic and ethno-cultural belonging—between *patria* and *gens*—typical of Italian city-states but also shared by Ragusa, is nicely summarized in the famous dictum of Coluccio Salutati: “Sum denique *gente italicus, patria florentinus*.”²⁶

Different political relevance

Besides having different criteria of membership and distinct modes of representation in the narrative sources, civic and ethnic communities also differed with regard to their political implications. The first and most obvious difference concerned the normative allegiances which membership in them involved. Simply put, the practical consequences

²⁶ For Salutati’s statement and the meaning of *patria* in Renaissance Italy, see Alberto Tenenti, “Profilo e limiti delle realtà nazionali in Italia fra Quattro e Seicento,” in Vittore Branca and Sante Gracioti, eds., *Cultura e nazione in Italia e Polonia dal Rinascimento all’Illuminismo* (Florence: Olschki, 1986), 266, passim; Federico Chabod, “Alcune questioni di terminologia: Stato, nazione, patria nel linguaggio del Cinquecento,” in Chabod, *Scritti sul rinascimento* (Turin: Einaudi, 1967), 657–59. A telling example of how in 1792 one Italian count concluded, “Now the whole of Italy has become a *patria*”, is to be found in Adrian Lyttelton, “Between piccola patria and grande patria: National Identity and Nation-Building in Nineteenth Century Italy,” in Ulrike von Hirschhausen and Jörn Leonard, eds., *Nationalismen in Europa. West- und Osteuropa im Vergleich* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2001), 155. For the meaning of *patria* in a wider European context, see Thomas Eichenberger, *Patria. Studien zur Bedeutung des Wortes im Mittelalter* (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke 1991).

of being a Ragusan were very different from the practical consequences of being a Slav, Dalmatian or Illyrian.

At least in theory, being a Ragusan implied a classical set of duties of the “good citizen” (*buon cittadino*). On the bottom line, it meant to be ready to give one’s own property and even one’s life for the sake of Ragusa understood as *patria*. Despite the fact that the most important and salient criteria of belonging to the civic community were legal and jurisdictional, this community was far from being perceived as an instrumentalist corporation founded exclusively on rational interest. It was true that the acquisition of citizenship, the clearest road to Ragusan identity, was largely a business deal which brought trading opportunities and privileges. However, it was a business deal with serious moral consequences. In all cases the applicant had to swear on the Scriptures to be loyal (*fidelis*) to the *communitas*, frequently “for eternity” (*perpetualiter*), and to fulfil all of his new duties for the “honor” and “conservation” (*honor, conservatio*, etc.) of the city-state. Moreover, the language used to illustrate the mutual relationships of the members of the civic community was far from evoking the image of a rational business corporation. Quite to the contrary, the metaphor frequently was exactly the opposite—that of a family. A family, in which, naturally, the paternal role was played by the patrician government whose subject “sons” (*figli, buoni figli*) owed their love, loyalty and obedience to their “fathers” or “natural masters” (*signori naturali*). Along the same lines, *patria* frequently acquired maternal connotations, as in the endlessly repeated phrase, *figlio di questa patria*, often used by the government when asking for extraordinary favors from its subjects. This familial language constantly applied to illustrate the relationships between subject, patrician government and *patria*, reinforced one crucial point: the *patria* and its patrician rulers were supposed to be loved to the point of self-sacrifice.²⁷

While Ragusan documents endlessly rehearse the extreme sacrifices expected from a “good citizen”, things were very different when it came to the duties of a “good” Illyrian or Slav. True, there are numerous

²⁷ Some of the numerous examples of such familial language are to be found in SAD, *Litterae et commissiones levantis* 22, fol 20r–20v; 22, f. 205r; 23, f. 49r; 23, f. 224v; 31 f. 7r; 31, f. 168 v, f. 201v. For a similar understanding of the obligations of the individual towards the “state” and a similar language used to conceptualize them in the Venetian case, see Alberto Tenenti, “Il senso dello stato,” in Alberto Tenenti and Ugo Tucci, eds., *Storia di Venezia dalle origini alla caduta della Serenissima* (Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1996), IV: 326–33.

vague references to a general solidarity expected from others “of our idiom” (*del nostro idioma*).²⁸ However, the only more or less concrete obligations of somebody as member of an ethnic community seem to have been the cultivation of its vernacular language through literature and general efforts to promote the reputation or “glory” of that nation among other European “nations,” primarily through history-writing.²⁹ More than that would have seemed strange even to the most passionately proto-nationalistic sixteenth-century Ragusan. Formulating this difference in normative allegiances very dramatically, one could say that to die for Ragusan *patria* was seen as an unquestionable duty and a glorified act; while to die for “Slavdom” or Dalmatia does not seem to have been a very plausible choice.

The same difference in practical consequences visible on the level of individual duties is noticeable on the level of general political relevance of the two communities. More precisely, it appears clearly when one investigates the relationship of these two communities to the claims of self-rule and statehood. The right of the civic community to self-rule or at least considerable autonomy was well established since Ragusa had a strong reception of the medieval and renaissance

²⁸ This vague solidarity felt among members of the ethnic community is nicely summarized in one sentence from “Dundo Maroje,” a famous Renaissance comedy by the Ragusan writer Marin Držić. One character, a maid in Rome, after encountering several Dalmatians, asks her mistress to let her talk with them since “sangue tira” (Marin Držić, *Djela* [Works], ed. Frano Čale (Zagreb: Liber, 1979), 405). Similarly, one Ragusan diplomat, writing to his government in 1548 from the Viennese court, mentions that he met a certain gentleman who was the King’s councillor and “quale per essere di nostro legnagio, ha contratato con meco una intrinsecissima amiciera”. SAD, *Isprave i akti s pečatom* (ASMM) 16, 466 no. 24/I.

²⁹ This was most explicitly mentioned in the forewords of historical works whose authors repeatedly claimed that they were “rescuing” the glorious history of the Slavs/Illyrians from darkness or oblivion. A typical example is the foreword written by the sixteenth-century Ragusan historian Mauro Orbini in his *Il Regno de gli Slavi hogi corrottamente detti Schiavoni. Historia di don Mavro Orbini Ravseo abate melitense* (Pesaro: Apresso Girolamo Concordia, 1601), foreword without pagination. For typical glorifying *topoi* on the Slavic vernacular see the remarks of the Ragusan poet, Dinko Ragnina, *Pjesni razlike* [Various Poems] Stari Pisci Hrvatski, vol. 19, (Zagreb: JAZU, 1891), 5. For some illuminating remarks on the relationship between literature, public sphere and nation in the sixteenth century, see “Introduction: The nation and public literature in the sixteenth century,” in Andrew Hadfield, *Literature, Politics and National Identity: Reformation to Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 1–22. For numerous case studies of the relationship between early modern nationhood and literature, see Klaus Garber, ed., *Nation und Literatur im Europa der Frühen Neuzeit. Akten des I. Internationalen Osnabrücker Kongresses zur Kulturgeschichte der Frühen Neuzeit* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1989).

Italian republicanism whose main ideological concern was precisely the notion of urban *libertas*. Already the opening lines of the Ragusan statute, codified in 1272, clearly postulate the urban *populus* as a legitimate source of political authority, stating that “the people” established all the laws and customs of the city in order to ensure justice and virtuous life. With the full formation of the aristocratic republic in the 15th and 16th centuries, Ragusan *libertà* was conceptualized as originating directly from God and as being vigilantly guarded by the divine will, especially through the city’s patron, St. Blaise (Vlaho), “divine protector of Ragusa and guardian of its liberty and peace.”³⁰

While Ragusan statehood was one of the most important political values, to be defended at any cost, ethno-cultural communities did not seem to possess anything even close to such political relevance or implications. The existence of an ethnic community did not seem to legitimize the establishment of its national state as it does in the modern world. Indeed, Ragusan authors frequently lamented the “servitude” of other Dalmatian cities and Slavic areas subjected to “foreigners”—Venice or the Ottomans. Yet when it came to imagining what might happen after the “reconquest” of their lost *libertas* they became quite vague. One thing is clear: they did not propose the establishment of some Illyrian or Slavic ethnic or “national” state. When a sixteenth century Ragusan diplomat Aluigi Giurasio stated that “everyone of our language should desire that the rest of Dalmatia be free at least inasmuch as Ragusa is,” he seemed to imply that the ideal arrangement was the establishment not of some Dalmatian nation-state but of a series of (semi)independent Dalmatian city-states.³¹

³⁰ St. Blaise is so described by a Ragusan humanist, Philippus de Diversis, in the mid-fifteenth century: *Cum Racusii protector divinus et libertatis as suae pacis custos post Dei clementiam sit gloriosus episcopus et martir Sanctus Blasius...* (Filip de Diversis, *Opis slavnoga grada Dubrovnika* [Description of the glorious city of Ragusa], trs. Zdenka Janeković-Römer (Zagreb: Dom i svijet, 2004), 50, 147). On the notion of *libertas/libertà* in Late Medieval Ragusa, see Lovro Kunčević, “O dubrovačkoj *libertas* u kasnom Srednjem vijeku” [On Ragusan *libertas* in the Late Middle Ages], *Anali Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Dubrovniku* 46 (2008), 9–64.

³¹ The same thought seems to be prominent in one inscription which appeared in Zadar in 1597 and scandalized its Venetian *provveditore* B. Moro, who reproduced it in his letter to the Doge: *Non se possibil che tosa Radichio. / Varda Ragusa, che minchiona tutti, / E non se zente qua co dirave mi, / Che facesse come Ragusa a fato. / Che no gle se comanda nessuna zente, / Ma sula patrona, / E nui ne minchiona / E ne cugiuna, disendo: / O zenta manzona, / Orbesca, cugiuna* (quoted from Šime Ljubić, “Odnosaji medju republikom mletačkom i dubrovačkom od početka XVI. st do njihove propasti” [Relations between the Venetian and Ragusan republics from the

Similarly, when in the early seventeenth century the Ragusan government interrogated two patricians who participated in a conspiracy aiming at the liberation of Balkan Slavs from the Ottomans, they justified themselves by invoking general Christian solidarity on the one hand and on the other hand by claiming that such a change of the political constellation could only benefit their Ragusan *patria*. In all the documents concerning the case there are no traces of the idea that Ragusa should have been included into a hypothetical “Kingdom of the Slavs” which was to be established after the expulsion of the Ottomans. If the conspirators’ vision of the future is to be reconstructed from their vague references, it was that of a Balkan Christian state under the auspices of the Spanish Habsburgs, which was to be simply a benevolent neighbour to the Ragusan city-state, and a far more pleasant protector than the Ottoman Empire.³² Not even the greatest Slavic or Dalmatian enthusiasts of Renaissance and Baroque Ragusa considered bringing into question its independent statehood in the cause of an ethnic ideology. The idea that all (Southern) Slavs should live in one state appeared in Ragusa only much later and in quite a symptomatic period—the late eighteenth century. The earliest example known to me appears in the work of Tomo Bassegli (Basiljević) who under the influence of French revolutionary ideals imagined a “Republic of Illyria” consisting roughly of the lands of later Yugoslavia. Yet even here his patriotism crept in. The capital of the new state was to be—of course—Ragusa.³³

beginning of the 16th century until their fall], *Rad JAZU* 53 (1880): 17). This much-desired (semi-) independence of the Dalmatian communes was frequently envisaged by the Dalmatian elites as something to be realized through the return of the province under the rule of the Austrian Habsburgs; see Ivan Pederin, *Mletačka uprava, privreda i politika u Dalmaciji (1409–1797)* [Venetian administration, economy and politics in Dalmatia (1409–1797)] (Dubrovnik: Časopis Dubrovnik, 1990), 7–14. For several clear examples of the idea in the Dalmatian literature of the period that a people and its ruler should be of the same “nation”, see John V. A. Fine, *When Ethnicity did not Matter in the Balkans* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2006), 184–88. Albeit as tendentious and methodologically outdated as the nationalistic interpretations of the Croatian historians it seeks to oppose, Fine’s book contains much useful information.

³² For the extracts from the interrogation documents, see Zdenko Zlatar, *Our Kingdom Come. The Counter-Reformation, the Republic of Dubrovnik, and the Liberation of the Balkan Slavs* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992), 304–5, 327. Zlatar’s book provides a good insight into the broader context of this conspiracy.

³³ Žarko Muljačić, “Tomo Basiljević,” *Dubrovnik. Časopis za književnost, umjetnost, znanost i društvena pitanja*, 4 (1970): 139; idem, *Tomo Basiljević-Baselji. Predstavnik prosvjedenja u Dubrovniku* [Tomo Basiljević-Baselji: A representative of the

Conclusion: Relationship between civic and ethnic discourses

When it comes to determining the relationship between the two discourses, it is revealing to look at the ways in which civic and ethnic references appear in the sources. The first way in which they could appear was separately and independently of each other. However, while it is relatively easy to find a “pure” civic discourse—many of the praises of the city insist on typical *topoi* of civic self-representation without referring to the communities such as Slavs or Dalmatians—it is much harder to find “pure” and self-sufficient ethnic discourse. Although there are few such cases, especially in the notably proto-nationalistic vernacular poetry, ethnic discourse rarely appeared independently. It is mostly to be found connected to the more salient and important civic discourse. In other words, the images of ethnic communities usually appeared as closely connected to the image of the Ragusan city-state.

One characteristic example, intertwining typical civic motifs with references to ethnic communities, comes from the historian Mauro Orbini, who in the early 17th century wrote:

In that province (Dalmatia) is situated the city of Rausa, of Slavic name and of Slavic language, the only free and the most glorious (among all the cities) not only of Dalmatia, but also of the whole of Illyricum, as much because of its antiquity as due to the great deeds accomplished by its citizens in the past times...³⁴

Enlightenment in Ragusa] (Belgrade: SAN, Posebna izdanja, knjiga CCXCIX, Odeljenja literature i jezika, knjiga 8, 1958), 55–56, 89, 90, 93. See also Teodora Šek Brnardić's comments on Basiljević in Balázs Trencsényi and Michal Kopeček, eds., *Discourses of Collective Identity in Central and Southeast Europe (1770–1945): Texts and Commentaries*, Volume 1: Late Enlightenment Emergence of the Modern “National Idea” (Budapest: CEU Press, 2006), 312–318. The whole discourse bears certain similarities with the contemporary discourse on *libertà d'Italia* which might have influenced the Dalmatian/Ragusan authors. As in the Dalmatian case, for most Italian writers the desirable outcome was the expulsion of foreigners, but what political arrangement should follow afterwards was again quite vaguely formulated (if at all). On the Italian case see Vittorio Di Tocco, *Ideali d'indipendenza in Italia durante la preponderanza Spagnuola* (Messina: G. Principato, 1926), passim, especially 34–42; Rodolfo De Mattei, “L'idea dell'unità e indipendenza d'Italia,” in Rodolfo De Mattei, *Il pensiero politico italiano nell'età della controriforma* (Milano-Napoli: Riccardo Riccardi, 1984), 2:313–331; Giuseppe Rua, *Per la libertà d'Italia* (Torino: Paravia, 1905); Münkler, Grünberger and Mayer, *Nationenbildung*, 75–161. For a recent and quite idiosyncratic interpretation of Machiavelli's idea of united Italy, see William J. Landon, *Politics, Patriotism and Language: Niccolò Machiavelli's “Secular Patria” and the Creation of an Italian National Identity* (New York: Peter Lang, 2005).

³⁴ Orbini, *Il Regno de gli Slavi*, 180.

Orbini's example is telling since it combines in one single sentence such commonplaces of civic discourse as republican *libertà*, antique foundation and the virtue of the citizens with references to the wider communities of Dalmatians and Illyrians. Similar examples can be found in many other *topoi* of Ragusan literature and historiography. Thus, Ragusa was frequently represented as a wisely governed republic with virtuous patricians, therefore deserving the title of "crown of the Croatian cities," or as a city which due to its ancient origins, cultural importance and riches is the "capital of Illyria (*caput Illyrici*)," while Ragusans were represented as the only ones among the (South-)Slavs who preserved their liberty and were still ruled by "the lords of our own language."³⁵

Most such identity statements follow the same pattern. Elements of the separate civic identity of Ragusa are bound together, integrated within the wider ethnic setting which appears as a self-explanatory framework for the image of the city-state. It is important to notice that the majority of such identity-statements contain one specific figure of thought: that of comparison or even contrast between Ragusa and its less illustrious neighbours. Slavic, Dalmatian, Illyrian populations in many cases served only as a "dark background" against which the self-glorifying image of the Ragusan civic community could appear more brightly. Ethnic identities were simply the frame for the picture of Ragusa. Therefore, one could say that in many instances ethnic discourse in Ragusan sources had a certain local-patriotic tendency; more precisely, it was pointedly "Ragusa-centric."

The fact that the ethnic discourse had a strong "Ragusa-centric" note reveals a lot about the relationship of these two discourses. I believe that it was quite similar to what C. Kidd found when he tried to determine the "ideological status" of pre-modern ethnic discourse in the British case. In a nutshell, Kidd claims that discourses of ethnic identity undeniably were present in the pre-modern world, but that "the form they took rendered them vulnerable to colonization by other ideological types, the most common parasites being arguments for the

³⁵ For these examples see Vatroslav Jagić and Gjuro Daničić, eds., *Pjesme Nikole Dmitrovića i Nikole Nalješkovića* [The poems of Nikola Dmitrović and Nikola Nalješković], *Stari pisci hrvatski*, (Zagreb: JAZU, 1873), 5:352; Darinka Nevenić-Grabovac, "Crijević Ilija, Posmrtni govor svom ujaku Juniju Sorkočeviću" [C.I, A funeral oration for his uncle Junije Sorkočević], *Živa antika* 27/1 (1977): 199; Jakša Ravlić, ed., *Zbornik proze XVI. i XVII. stoljeća* [A collection of prose of the 16th and 17th centuries] (Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1972), 150.

prescriptive legitimacy of institutions.”³⁶ This was precisely the case in Ragusa: the ethnic discourse rarely appeared self-sufficiently, but mostly figured together with a civic discourse whose primary function was to affirm the legitimacy of Ragusan political institutions. Therefore, if one had to characterize the relationship of these two discourses in general terms, it could be said that in the Ragusan context they coexisted quite peacefully, complementing each other. More precisely, Ragusan authors used ethnic references primarily in order to enrich and support the claims of civic self-representation.³⁷

What were the reasons for such a peaceful coexistence between the civic and ethnic discourses? What were the reasons for the lack of conflict or competition between these two means of self-narration? One important reason is that the ethnic discourse in the Ragusan context had no serious political implications. As mentioned above, it did not seem to have implied or legitimized the establishment of some “ethnic” Illyrian or Slavic state, since the conceptual connection between ethnicity—or nationhood—and statehood was not self-evident as it is today. Thus, focusing on “cultural” factors alone, the ethnic discourse was never understood as a threat to the cherished independent statehood of Ragusa—the very focus of the civic discourse.

On the other hand, and more importantly, Ragusan civic discourse was a very specific state ideology. It not only enjoyed far more pow-

³⁶ Kidd, *British Identities*, 288.

³⁷ Alternatively, the ethno-linguistic discourse could also appear in texts imbued with the spirit of the Counter-Reformation, such as different liturgical books or reports to Rome concerning the state of Slavic Christians under Ottoman rule. Whether written as propaganda pieces for Balkan Christians themselves or in order to inform the government of the Church of their situation, those texts frequently speak about the significant Slavic population under the Turk, sketching their history before the advent of the “Infidel,” pointing out their common language and the need for its standardization and describing the members of this community through “national” stereotypes (for some examples, see Matija Murko, “Die Bedeutung der Reformation und Gegenreformation für das geistige Leben der Südslaven,” *Slavia* 5 (1926–7): 65–99, 277–302, 500–534; Zlatar, *Our Kingdom*, 228–235.) However, even when it appeared in such texts, the ethnic discourse still was not an end in itself, or the main self-sufficient topic. In general, its status remained “collateral”: it mostly appeared as a secondary issue connected to the more important ideological concerns of sixteenth-century Ragusans, namely republican legitimacy and Catholic propaganda. The only genre in which it achieved a degree of self-sufficiency in the 16th century was the rising vernacular literature, where it was connected with the conventional glorifications of the Slavic vernacular and its literary capacities. However, in Renaissance Dalmatian literature the question of language (and even less that of ethnicity) did not receive systematic theoretical elaboration, simply appearing as a number of scattered reflections, mostly to be found in the forewords of books of vernacular poetry.

erful political sponsorship than the ethnic discourse, being actively propagated by the city's elite and thus obviously having a stronger emotional appeal. An equally important reason for its predominance lies in the fact that it was not seeking to invoke loyalties to an abstract political commonwealth, a structure of power very distant from the everyday experience of the majority of the population, as was frequently the case with state ideologies of the early modern "composite monarchies." Unlike the ideologies of most contemporary European states, Ragusan civic discourse did not need to mediate between a surplus of diverse historical, regional, confessional and ethnic identities in an attempt to create a unifying ideological framework to integrate them all. Quite to the contrary, it was grounded in the very concrete local and even parochial loyalties and traditions of a small and culturally homogeneous population which lacked serious peripheral elites capable of formulating a proper particularist discourse. On the bottom line, Ragusan state ideology was built around the powerful notion of *patria*, conceived in unusually concrete terms. In the spatial sense it consisted of a territory that could be travelled through in one day and comprised one middle-sized city and its surroundings. In terms other than spatial, this *patria* could be conceptualized in an extremely intimate way:

We Ragusans have nothing but that city which upholds us in liberty and lordship. Our sons, our blood, the bones of our ancestors, the place of our birth, our houses and properties, the very subsistence of our lives are all there. We should cherish it more than the pupil of our eye...³⁸

These are the words of one Ragusan diplomat in the early seventeenth century. Whether his statement is tendentious or not is irrelevant. The point is: this emotionally laden rhetoric is pure civic discourse—the ideology of a state.

³⁸ Quoted from Radovan Samardžić, *Veliki vek Dubrovnika* [The great century of Ragusa] (Belgrade: Prosveta, 1962), 86.

CHAPTER FIVE

STRATEGIES OF DISTINCTION IN THE WORK OF VINKO PRIBOJEVIĆ

Domagoj Madunić

The people who once over the soil crawled, now
over the stars tread
Under your guidance, o fluent language of a learned
man¹

In the year 1525 on the island of Hvar, in front of a selected audience who represented the social and intellectual elite of this prosperous Adriatic community, the learned Dominican monk Vinko (or Vicko) Pribojević² (Vincentius Priboevius) delivered an oration, “On the origin and the glory of the Slavs” (*Oratio de origine successibusque Slavorum*). Only a few years later, in 1532, embellished with praises

¹ “Quaeque prius repebat humi, gens sydera calcat / Vindice te, o docti lingua diserta uiri...”. From the poem of Dominic of Rab dedicated to Vinko Pribojević and published in the closing pages of the 1532 edition of the *Oratio*. See Vinko Pribojević, *O podrijetlu i slavi Slavena* [Concerning the origin and the glory of the Slavs] (Zagreb: Golden Marketing, 1997), 104.

² In spite of the fact that there is an extensive body of literature on the work of Vinko Pribojević, the figure of this Dalmatian scholar remains even today surrounded by a veil of mystery. What we know about him is mainly based on what he himself has told us. Our knowledge about him can be summarized as follows. Pribojević was born on the island of Hvar around 1480. In 1511, we find him in Florence where he was appointed as *magister studentium* in the Dominican covenant of *Sanctae Mariae Novellae*. In the *Oratio* Pribojević styles himself *magister* of theology, but it is not known where he earned his academic title. The last piece of information known concerning his life is that prior to 1525 he made a prolonged visit to Cracow in Poland, where he familiarized himself with the works of Polish humanists. For more on Vinko Pribojević and his work, see Grga Novak, “Dalmacija i Hvar u pribojevićevo doba” [Dalmatia and Hvar in the time of Vinko Pribojević], in Grga Novak, ed., *O podrijetlu i zgodama Slavena* [Concerning the origin and histories of the Slavs] (Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1951), 1–21; Joško Kovač, “O podrijetlu Vicka Pribojevića” [Concerning the origin of Vicko Pribojević], *Croatica Christiana Periodica* 45 (2000): 207–11; Miroslav Kurelac, “Vinko Pribojević i njegovo djelo” [Vinko Pribojević and his work], in Vinko Pribojević, *O podrijetlu i slavi Slavena* (Zagreb: Golden Marketing, 1997), 9–32; Alois Schmaus, “Vincentius Priboevius, ein Vorläufer des Panslavismus,” *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, 3 (1953): 243–254.

and poems by other Dalmatian humanists, Pribojević's oration was published for the first time. As such, the *Oratio* was among the earliest of its kind in Dalmatian/Croatian historiography. It abandoned the use of medieval forms of the chronicle or annals, and was instead inspired by the revival of antiquity and the art of rhetoric. Furthermore, it encompassed both a time-span and a territorial scope previously unknown in Dalmatian historiography.

But most important of all, Pribojević's *Oratio* promoted a new model of Dalmatian patriotism, one that was consciously built on the Slavic character of sixteenth century Dalmatia. In the opening part of his speech Pribojević stated: "But, because I have, as a Dalmatian, and therefore as an Illyrian and finally as a Slav, decided to give a speech about the destiny of the Slavs in front of Slavs, I shall speak in the first place of the origin and the glory of the Slavs (*Slauonici generis*) and their name, and then about the history of Dalmatia, which is an important part of Slavdom..."³ This simple sentence concisely sums up the new way in which this Dalmatian humanist perceived himself and his community. Differently to the medieval Dalmatian historiographical tradition that associated Slavs with Goths, and promoted the Latin-Roman character of Dalmatian towns, Pribojević strongly emphasized Dalmatian distinctiveness through their Slavic identity.⁴

³ Pribojević, *O podrijetlu i slavi Slavena*, 56.

⁴ Two influential works of medieval Dalmatian historiography that made this association between Goths and Slavs were Thomas the Archdeacon's thirteenth-century *Historia Salonitana*, and an immensely problematic text known in Croatian historiography as the "Chronicle of the Dioclean priest." This misunderstanding is a product of a fusion of two historical events, the Gothic invasion of the fifth century and the Slavic migration of the sixth and seventh centuries. Indeed, this tradition was not without its advocates among Dalmatian humanists even in Pribojević's time, as the case of Ragusan humanist Ludovik Crijević Tuberon (Ludovicus de Cierva, Tubero, 1459–1527) shows. Tuberon in his "Comments on my Epoch" (*Comentaria suorum temporum*), which was a history of contemporary events in the Hungarian-Croatian kingdom covering the period from 1490 until 1522, decided to follow this Roman-Latin historiographical tradition and associated the Slavs with the Goths, claiming a Dalmatian-Latin (Roman) heritage both for his home town of Ragusa and for Dalmatia in general. For more on this subject, see Ferdo Šišić, *Letopis popa Dukljanina* [Chronicle of the Dioclean priest] (Belgrade: Srpska Kraljevska Akademija, 1928); Toma Arhiđakon, *Kronika: Splitski rukopis* [Chronicle: Split manuscript], trans. Vladimir Rismondo (Split: Čakavski Sabor, 1977), English translation: Thomae archidiaconi Spalatensis.../Archdeacon Thomas of Split, *History of the Bishops of Salona and Split*, ed. Damir Karbić et al., CEMT, 4 (Budapest: CEU Press, 2006); and Eduard Peričić, *Sclavorum regnum Grgura Barskog* [The *Sclavorum regnum* of Grgur of Bar] (Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost, 1991). A short summary of the problems concerning the Chronicle in English can be found in Zdenko Zlatar, *Our Kingdom Come*:

Pribojević began from the same starting point as other Dalmatian scholars before him, but as we have seen, the conclusions he reached were quite different. Unlike his fifteenth and early sixteenth century predecessors who called the people of the territory between the Danube and Adriatic Illyrians⁵ in the humanistic fashion of the time without necessarily claiming that they were actual descendants of the ancient Illyrians,⁶ Pribojević's main premise was that the ancient Illyrians and the Slavs inhabiting the Balkan peninsula in his time were one and the same people.

Based on this false premise of the autochthonism of the Slavs in the Balkan peninsula Pribojević constructed his version of the history of the Slavs, covering the period from times immemorial to the present day and incorporating in it not only the history of the Illyrians but also that of other ancient ethnic groups, such as the Thracians, Macedonians, Sarmatians, Vandals, Gepids, Goths, Getae and even Amazons—all of whom he declared to be members of the glorious Slavic *natio*. In this way there emerged in front of his audience a glorious history of Slavdom rescued from oblivion. It was the Slavs who conquered Persia, Africa and Spain, sacked Rome and gave to the world such learned men as Aristotle and St. Jerome, or powerful monarchs like Alexander the Great and the emperor Diocletian. Let us allow Pribojević himself to deliver the closing words in this short summary of his narrative:

The Counter-Reformation, the Republic of Dubrovnik, and the Liberation of the Balkan Slavs (Boulder/New York: East European Monographs, 1992), 361–74. Concerning Tubero see Marin Franičević, *Povijest hrvatske renesansne književnosti* [History of Croatian Renaissance literature] (Zagreb: Nakladni Zavod Matice Hrvatske, 1986), 386–92; and the “Introductory study” to the recent edition of Tubero’s work, Vlado Rezar, “Uvodna studija: Latinitet Ludovika Crijevića Tuberona” [Introductory study: The latinity of Ludovik Crijević Tuberon], in Ludovik Crijević Tuberon, *Komentari o mojem vrmenu* [Comments on my epoch], ed. Mirko Valentić (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2001), VII–LXXXVII.

⁵ The oldest known case of the use of the name “Illyrian” for the Slavic inhabitants of the fifteenth century Balkan peninsula dates from 1441. A document written in Italian and preserved in the archives of Trogir contains an interesting note that it is a translation of an original written in *sermone et alphabeto Illiracho seu Sclavonico*; see Radoslav Katičić, “Ilirci i ilirski jezik” [The Illyrians and the Illyrian language], *Forum* 56 (1988): 677.

⁶ For a very good introduction to Dalmatian historiography of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries and the revival of the Illyrian name, see Bruna Kuntić-Makvić, “Tradicija o našim krajevima u antičkom razdoblju kod dalmatinskih pisaca XVI i XVII stoljeća” [The tradition of our regions in antiquity in the works of Dalmatian writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries], *Živa antika* 34 (1984): 155–64.

Who can bestow high enough praise on the Slavs to reflect their glory? With their bravery they humbled the arrogant Persians, weakened the mighty Assyrians and Medes, overthrew the famed Egyptians, defeated the brave Greeks, conquered the indomitable Scythians, overcame the numerous Indians, overpowered the strong Germans, defeated the dexterous Hispanians, tamed the savage Gauls, humbled the proud Romans, and annihilated the sly Carthaginians!⁷ So much I have done according to my abilities, but not enough by far as the dignity of the Slavs demands.⁸

By doing so, Pribojević created a completely new historical tradition, one in which the Slavs not only played a role in, but actually came to dominate the most crucial epoch for the humanists, namely antiquity, and in which, not surprisingly, his homeland, Dalmatia, held the most illustrious position. In the case of such an *invented tradition*, as Pribojević's history of the Slavs is, one can easily note the obvious connection between the claim to a glorious history and the author's ability to identify a particular historical person or entire ethnic groups as valid members of a communal past. The main question of this study then becomes how all those ancient peoples in Pribojević's story of the past have become Slavs. However, before turning to this question, it will be useful to provide a short sketch of the intellectual context from which Pribojević's work came forth.

Pribojević's oration in the context of contemporary discursive practices

The seeds of early Italian Renaissance historiography, which "fused enthusiasm for ancient models with pride in the contemporary *patria*, the city-state,"⁹ very quickly spread over the Adriatic Sea and found fertile soil among Dalmatian humanists. With the newly awakened love and interest for antiquity came also the Illyrian name, recently resurrected by Italian humanists. This ancient name was quickly adopted by Croatian and Dalmatian humanists because it provided a solution to the problem of discontinuity brought about by the Slavic invasion

⁷ Adapted from the English translation in Zdenko Zlatar, *The Double Eagle and the Crescent* (Boulder/New York: East European Monographs, 1992), 58–59.

⁸ Pribojević, *O podrijetlu i slavi Slavena*, 75.

⁹ Ernest Breisach, *Historiography Ancient, Medieval and Modern* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 154.

of the Balkan peninsula in the sixth and seventh centuries, and also supported their claim to the cultural heritage of ancient Dalmatia and Illyria.

Among the early Dalmatian humanists, the short work of Juraj Šižgorić of Šibenik (Georgius Sisgoreus Sibenicensis, ca. 1420–1509), “Concerning the location of Illyria and the town of Šibenik” (*De situ Illyriae et civitate Sibenici*), is especially worth noting because of its relevance to the promotion of the Illyrian name and the adoption of this in Croatian intellectual tradition.¹⁰ Written in 1487, *De situ Illyriae* was the first literary praise of the *patria* among Dalmatian humanists, but more importantly, also the first scholarly work in which Dalmatians were identified with the ancient Illyrians. Šižgorić formulated a multi-layered model of identity: communal (in this case, Šibenik), regional (Dalmatian) and national (Illyrian), which was to become a distinctive mark of Dalmatian humanist historiography.

Although never mentioned by Pribojević, Šižgorić’s short treatise served as a role model and template for his more elaborate work, albeit with one notable addition, namely the identification of the ancient Illyrians with the contemporary Slavs.¹¹ This digression from the canon established by Šižgorić was the product of general trends in Renaissance historiography. The “local-patriotism” of fifteenth-century Italian humanists such as Bruni, Guiccardini and Sabellico¹² was in the works of their French, German, English and other non-Italian counterparts successfully widened to a national plane. Moreover,

¹⁰ For more on Šižgorić, see Franičević, *Povijest hrvatske renesansne književnosti*, 361–66, and Juraj Šižgorić, *O smještaju Ilirije i o gradu Šibeniku* [Concerning the location of the Illyria and the town of Šibenik] (Šibenik: Muzej grada, 1981).

¹¹ In his study, Veljko Gortan noted that the structure of Pribojević’s text closely follows the structure of Šižgorić’s earlier *De situ Illyriae*. Although the latter was not published until 1899 and Pribojević never mentions Šižgorić’s work as a source for any information found in his work, Gortan argues, on the basis of the use of the same references to ancient authors, namely Strabo, Pliny, Cicero and Vergil, and the structural similarities of both works, that Pribojević was not only familiar with Šižgorić’s text but that he even used it as a template for his oration. This thesis was further expanded by Giovanna Brogi-Bercoff, who pointed out further similarities in content between the two, such as the question of the ethnic origins of St. Jerome and the identification as Dalmatians of a number of Roman emperors and popes born in Dalmatia. For more see Veljko Gortan, “Juraj Šižgorić i Vinko Pribojević” [Juraj Šižgorić and Vinko Pribojević], *Filologija*, 2 (1960): 149–52; Giovanna Brogi-Bercoff, “Il Priboevo et il ‘Regno degli Slavi’ di Mauro Orbini,” *Ricerche slavistiche* 22–23 (1975–76): 145–46.

¹² Eric Cochrane, *Historians and Historiography in the Italian Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 3–9.

with the rediscovery and publication of Tacitus' *Germania* in the early sixteenth century, European Renaissance historiography experienced an even more radical and qualitative change, the so-called "barbarian turn," or the emergence of the barbarian—the non-Roman and non-Greek—*nationes*, such as Gauls, Vandals or Sarmatians, as legitimate forefathers of the communal past.¹³ What separated Vinko Pribojević from his Dalmatian predecessors and enabled his expansion of the equation formulated in the 1480's by Šižgorić—Dalmatians=Illyrians—to its full complex form with the introduction of Slavs—Dalmatians=Illyrians=Slavs—were these fifty years in the development of Renaissance historiography.

Here, because of its influence on Pribojević's discourse, one historiographical tradition in particular deserves special attention. In 1525, the same year that Pribojević entertained his audience on the Island of Hvar, an important event took place in the north in the Polish-Lithuanian state. The centuries-old struggle between the Teutonic order and Polish kingdom came to an end. The final phase of the conflict (1520–1525) was ceremoniously concluded on April 15, 1525, in the market square of Cracow, when the last of the Grand Masters of the Teutonic order, Albert of Hohenzollern, paid homage to the Polish king. This event was preceded by his conversion to the Lutheran faith in 1520, and the secularization of the lands of the Teutonic order. Albert dissolved what remained of the once powerful Order, turned the country into a secular duchy and, with Polish support, declared himself Duke of Prussia and vassal of the Polish crown.

Is there a connection between these two events: the abolition of the state of a German knightly order and the patriotic speech of a Dalmatian Dominican enriched with pan-Slavic ornament? If one takes into consideration that armed conflict was not the only aspect of the struggle between the Polish King and the duke of Prussia, and that the conquest of new territories was often supported by historical or some other legal claims, the link that connects the Adriatic and the Baltic begins to become clearer.

¹³ On the use of Tacitus in German Renaissance political thought, see Kenneth C. Schellhase, *Tacitus in Renaissance Political Thought* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1976), 31–66; for the use of Tacitus as a source of information on German antiquity, see Frank Borhardt, *German Antiquity in Renaissance Myths* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1971), 177–81.

Parallel to armed warfare, Polish historiography of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century waged its own intellectual struggle in support of Jagiellonian political claims. History became one of the central issues for contemporary political debates, and the past was consciously used as an instrument for the expression of current political needs. An example of such practices is the famous *Oratio* of 1492 given at the gymnasium of Ingolstadt by the German arch-humanist Konrad Celtis (who, apart from many other things, played a significant role in the development of humanism in Central Europe and was actually one of the founders of Polish humanism),¹⁴ in which he called for the revival of humanist practices among the Germans. But Celtis' *Oratio* also possessed serious political connotations. It supported an imperial policy, spoke against the abuses of papal and episcopal authority for worldly ends, and finally issued a warning:

O free and powerful people, O noble and valiant race, plainly worthy of the Roman Empire, our famous harbor is held by the *Sarmatian*, and the gateway to our ocean by the *Dacian*! While in the east powerful peoples live in slavery, the *Marcomani*, the *Quadi*, the *Bastranae*, and the *Peucini*, who all live as it were separated from the body of our Germany.¹⁵

As Kenneth Schellhase revealed, under these ancient names are skillfully hidden the Poles, Danes, Bohemians, Prussians, Silesians and so on. What we see here is actually a call to put under the imperial rule all "German tribes" of the East, at present separated from the main German body and living in slavery.¹⁶ Thus Celtis declared the Bohemians, Prussians, Silesians and others to be Germans, and so effectively put history in the service of politics.

The attacks from the opposing side, backed by the authority of the works of Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini,¹⁷ who was not too favorably inclined towards the Slavs, had to be countered with equally effective arguments by Polish humanists. Thus, the questions concerning the origin of the Slavs, the etymology of their name, their autochthonous

¹⁴ For the influence of Konrad Celtis on the development of Polish humanism, see Harold B. Segel, *Renaissance Culture in Poland: The Rise of Humanism 1470-1543* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1989), 83-106.

¹⁵ Cited from Schellhase, *Tacitus*, 35.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 35.

¹⁷ For the influence of Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini on German Renaissance historiography, with special emphasis on the development of so-called myth of the *Imperium*, see Borchardt, *German Antiquity*, 53-56.

origins in their lands and thus their historical and natural rights, became weapons in the political debates of the time. But, to complete the link, one more aspect needs clarification, namely the contacts between Polish and Croatian humanists.

The Jagiellonian University of Cracow, founded by Casimir the Great in 1364, established itself as a first class European humanistic center by the end of the fifteenth century. Throughout the sixteenth century, many Croatian humanists, either as visitors, students, or diplomatic envoys of the Hungarian kings, resided in Cracow.¹⁸ One of those visitors from the south was Vinko Pribojević, who, as he states in his oration, spent three years among the Poles.¹⁹ During his stay, Pribojević was the guest of another Dalmatian who found a new home in Poland, Bernardin Galla from Zara (Zadar), a high official in the Cracow church hierarchy and also an active participant in contemporary historiographical and political debates. It was most probably during these three years that Pribojević became familiar with recent developments in Polish historiography, especially with the works of Maciej z Miechowita (1457–1523), who served as a professor at the Jagiellonian University from 1501–1519 and published his famous work, *Tractatus de duabus Sarmatiis, Asiatica et Europea* (Treatise on the two Sarmatias, Asian and European), in 1517.²⁰ The fact that some of the historical problems of interest to Polish humanists, namely the etymology of the Slav name from the word *slava* “glory” instead of from “*sclavus*” and the question of the Slavs’ autochthony and their origins, constitute the ideological foundations of Pribojević’s oration, shows the profound influence of this historiographical tradition on the Dominican from Hvar.²¹

¹⁸ For more on Croatian-Polish contacts in the fifteenth and sixteenth century, see Joanna Rapacka, “O nekim problemima iz povijesti odnosa hrvatskih humanista s Poljskom i Poljacima” [Concerning some problems in the history of the relations of Croatian humanists with Poland and the Poles], *Dani hvarskog kazališta* 16 (1990): 168–75.

¹⁹ Pribojević, *O podrijetlu i Slavi Slavena*, 70.

²⁰ That Pribojević was familiar with Polish historiography is also visible from his work. Among his sources he lists *Annales Polonorum*—by which name he refers to Jan Długosz’ famous *Historia Polonica* (1480)—and he extensively quotes the already mentioned *De Duabus Sarmatiis* of Maciej z Miechowita, which serves as a main source for his description of contemporary Eastern Europe.

²¹ During the preparations for the Lateran Council (1512–1517), Jan Łaski, *primas* of the Polish kingdom, contacted Bernardin Galla and requested his historical expertise concerning some of the above-mentioned questions. A letter sent by Łaski to Galla also raises some pan-Slavic questions besides the Polish issues: for instance,

As we have seen, the premise of the autochthony of the Slavs on the Balkan peninsula proved to be a powerful tool in the hands of the learned humanist. The final result was impressive, not only because Pribojević managed to include all the peoples of antiquity (and their histories) who had lived in the lands presently inhabited by the Slavs (plus a few more, like the wandering Goths and Vandals), but he also managed to support his narrative with a consistent theory. Moreover, since almost all humanist historians used the same limited set of texts by ancient authors and early Church Fathers as their sources, and since the majority of ancient peoples and great heroes whom Pribojević incorporated into the new national canon were already claimed by other Renaissance authors for their own national traditions, a consistent theory was an absolute necessity.

What tools or, if we are to borrow the terminology proposed by Walter Pohl and the Vienna school of historical ethnography, “strategies of distinction,”²² did the Dominican from Hvar apply in order to accomplish his goal? The criteria proposed by Pribojević to identify someone as a Slav were neither social nor religious. For him, the 20,000 Thracians, Macedonians and Illyrians in the service of the Grand Turk were still Slavs, no matter what religion they professed:

So there is no reason for anyone to be puzzled because the Ottoman Sultan esteems so much the people of Slavic origin that almost all of his commanders are appointed from their ranks, and he maintains a corps, almost 20,000 strong, for his personal guard composed of Thracians, Macedonians and Illyrians.²³

the etymology of the Slav name from the word “glory, *slava*, instead of “*sclavus*,” in confirmation of which theory he lists names of Slavic rulers ending in “-slaus,” such as “Stanislaus, Vinceslaus, Ladislaus, Ceslaus, Bogoslaus, Marislaus...”. On the evidence of this list of names and the citing of the same etymology for the name Slav, all of which appears in Pribojević’s narrative word-for-word, Joanna Rapacka argues that Pribojević was familiar with the content of the letter. Pribojević, *O podrijetlu i Slavi Slavena*, 66. For more, see Joanna Rapacka, *O nekim problemima*, 171–75.

²² The term “strategies of distinction” was coined by Walter Pohl, who used it as a conceptual framework for dealing with early medieval ethnicity. For Pohl, early medieval ethnicity had a double function of integration and distinction, and since this closely matches the approach taken by Pribojević, who integrated into his narrative various groups from the past, I have chosen to appropriate this term in the present study. For more, see Walter Pohl, *Strategies of Distinction: The Construction of the Ethnic Communities, 300–800* (Leiden-Boston-Cologne: Brill, 1998), 1–15.

²³ Here Pribojević refers to the Janissary corps, at that time filled by *devşirme* or the “blood tribute” recruited mainly from the Slavic population of the Balkan peninsula.

Experience has shown, especially in these unfortunate times of ours, that Osman's heirs, by the use of Slavic troops, have overcome kingdoms, obtained empires, taken over strongly fortified cities and with all forces press to ruin the Roman Empire, and if the hand of the God Almighty does not assist us, they will utterly destroy the true faith.²⁴

Neither was Slavdom a social category, since for Pribojević it embraced both the many Roman emperors of Illyrian origin as well as contemporary peasants from Hvar. So what, in his eyes, determines whether someone belongs to the *populus slavus*? Like other Renaissance authors, Pribojević approached his sources armed with the same "weapons" that had been used by scholars since the early Middle Ages for asserting someone's ethnicity, namely descent, language and customs.

What follows is an attempt to demonstrate his practical application of these criteria, through the descriptive analysis of the three examples of his argument in favor of the Slavic identity of various ethnic groups from antiquity. As it will be shown, each of these criteria had its own role and significance in the overall discourse.

Strategies of distinction

Now these are the generations of the sons of Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japheth: and unto them were sons born after the flood.

The sons of Japheth; Gomer, and Magog, and Madai, and Javan, and Tubal, and Meshech, and Tiras.²⁵

The first case leads us back to the dawn of mankind, as that is where Pribojević's history of the Slavs begins. The first question that Pribojević addressed was that of the origins of the Slavs. Following the fashion of his time he constructed a myth of origins which provided the Slavs with a noble lineage.

For Pribojević, a Dominican and a *magister* of theology, there was no question as to how his narrative had to begin. It started with the

²⁴ Pribojević, *O podrijetlu i Slavi Slavena*, 73.

²⁵ Genesis, 10:1. *The Holy Bible, New International Version: Containing the Old Testament and the New Testament* (Colorado Springs: International Bible Society, 1984), 25.

Biblical flood: "Let me, honorable gentlemen, commence this investigation of the greatness and nobility of the race which today is called by its new name, the Slavic nation, by tracing it back to the well-known flood in the times of Noah..."²⁶ By doing so, Pribojević joined a long line of medieval and renaissance scholars who chose the re-population of the earth by the sons of Noah as the point of departure in their construction of a national past. At the core of this tradition was a vision of humanity divided into various *gentes* and *nationes*, each one of them the offspring of Noah and his three sons Ham, Shem and Japheth.²⁷

²⁶ Pribojević, *O podrijetlu i Slavi Slavena*, 57.

²⁷ For more on the origin and the development of this concept in the early centuries of the Middle Ages see the study by Patrick Geary, *The Myth of Nations* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002) 41–62. Further to this theme, Susan Reynolds in her article "Medieval *origines gentium* and the community of the realm," in John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, eds., *Nationalism: Critical Concepts in Political Science* (London: Routledge, 2000), 2: 538–57, offers a classification of the medieval myths of origins. The first group is made of those myths which evolved from the so-called "Frankish table," in which genealogical connections between various groups of people are shown, the basis of which being their common descent from *Manus* or, as his name was later changed to, *Alemanus*. The second major theme identified by Reynolds is what she calls myths of classical origin, based on the alleged connection of a particular people through their descent from the Trojans or some other prominent people of antiquity. Finally, a third tradition was the already-mentioned Biblical one. The source of this tradition was Isidore of Seville, who in his famous *Etymologiae* provided genealogical connections for various contemporary and ancient peoples with the sons of Japheth. Nevertheless, the crucial moment for the development of this tradition and its incorporation in Renaissance historiography occurred in the year 1498 with the publication of the *Antiquitatum variarum volumina* by Giovanni Nanni, also known as Annus da Viterbo. This widely read and influential work included among other forgeries the alleged translation of the lost five books of the Chaldean priest Berosus from the 3rd century BC. In his work, Nanni merged data from various classical authors with information from these fictional books of Berosus and, based on the Biblical model, produced a genealogical tree which included almost all European nations, assigning one of the sons of Noah as a forefather to each—a model which was soon widely adopted and copied by numerous Renaissance historians. As Anthony Grafton argued, the influence of these Annian forgeries was such that, before Nanni's work was widely exposed as a forgery by Joseph Scaliger in the 1560s, almost every study of national origins rested in whole or in part on *Annian* materials. For more on *Pseudo-Berosus*, as Nanni's forgery became known in historiography, and its influence on Renaissance historiography, see Anthony T. Grafton, "Joseph Scaliger and Historical Chronology: The Rise and Fall of a Discipline," *History and Theory* 14 (1975) 2: 156–85; Borchardt, *German Antiquity*, 89–91; Antony T. Grafton, "Invention of Traditions and Traditions of Invention in Renaissance Europe: The Strange Case of Annus da Viterbo," in Anthony T. Grafton and Ann Blair, eds., *The Transmission of Culture in Early Modern Europe* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990), 8–38; Eric Cochrane, *Historians and Historiography*, 432–33.

By the time of Vinko Pribojević it was a widely accepted view that Japheth was the forefather of all European nations.²⁸ But which of the sons of Japheth was the forefather of the Slavs? The problem Pribojević faced was that there was no mention of the Slavs either in the Book of Genesis or in the works that elaborated more precisely on the genealogy of the nations, such as those of Josephus Flavius, St. Jerome and Isidore of Seville. The only way to solve this problem was either to incorporate the Slavs into the genealogy of some other ancient people, or to invent a completely new offspring of Noah and attribute to him fatherhood of the *natio*, as was the usual practice of other Renaissance historians who encountered a similar problem.

In his study of German Renaissance myths of origins, Frank Borchardt accurately described the situation with the analogy of the kaleidoscope. The common set of ideas and beliefs contained in the limited corpus of available texts written by the Church Fathers and ancient pagan authors served the Renaissance writers as a collection of building blocks. Similar to a kaleidoscope, each author rearranged the elements according to his own needs and understanding, and “suddenly the picture presented was one quite familiar but at the same time new and unrecognizable.”²⁹ Pribojević was no exception in applying this methodology.

The genealogical schema adopted by Pribojević was a simple one. There were to be no parallel branches of descent, nor several forefathers for various Slavic branches. The entire Slavic tree sprang forth from one root alone, and only one of the descendants of Noah was to be the forefather of all of the Slavs. In this approach, Pribojević was greatly influenced by the two earlier Polish historians previously mentioned, Jan Długosz and Maciej z Miechowita.³⁰ Jan Długosz in his *Historia Polonica* (1480) constructed an elaborate genealogy of the European nations in which he designated Negno, the third son

²⁸ A good overview of the transformation of the more complex genealogical schemas of Noah's patrimony recorded by Josephus and Isidore to a more simplified conventional three-sons, three-continents view can be found in Benjamin Braude, “The Sons of Noah and the Construction of Ethnic and Geographical Identities in the Medieval and Early Modern Periods,” *The William and Mary Quarterly* 54 (1997): 111–20.

²⁹ Borchardt, *German Antiquity*, 177–78.

³⁰ Both authors are mentioned by Pribojević in his work. Pribojević, *O podrijetlu i Slavi Slavena*, 64.

of Alanus, descendant of Japheth by a somewhat suspicious line of descent, as the *omnium Slavorum parens*.³¹

Unlike Długosz, Maciej z Miechowita opted for a more traditional approach and selected one of the sons of Japheth whose existence could be confirmed by Scripture and authorities: Isidorus, Jordanes and so on. He chose Javan, the fourth son of Japheth—who was usually held to be forefather of the Greeks—as the root of the Slavic branch. Pribojević decided to follow the path taken by Miechowita and appropriated one of the “reliable” descendants of Noah from the first generation of his sons as a forefather of the Slavs, but instead of Javan, his final choice fell on Thyras, the youngest of the sons of Japheth:³² “But Thyras, the seventh son of Japheth, (as it is obvious from what I have said) was the forefather of the Thracians, and from him stemmed that people which is nowadays known under the name of Slavs.”³³

Traditionally, Thyras was held to be the forefather of the Thracians, a long forgotten people who lived in the regions later to be settled by Slavs. At a first glance this choice does not seem to be the most promising one, but a closer investigation of Pribojević’s final results reveals not only his creativity in combining various ancient authors, but also the fruitfulness of this choice.

³¹ In his account of the beginnings of mankind, Długosz started with the traditional narrative found in the tenth book of Genesis and Josephus, but then provided his own supplementary genealogy for the European nations. See Ioannis Dlugossii, *Annales seu cronicae incliti regni Poloniae* (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1964), I: 67–70.

³² Of the seven sons of Japheth, Pribojević was easily able to rule out four, either because of their links to nations geographically too far away to have any connection to the Slavs, such as the Iberians (Thobel), the Cappadocians (Meshech) and the Medes (Madai), or otherwise unable to be related to the Slavs, as in the case of the Gomer-Gaul combination. The fifth possible choice, Magog, who was usually held to be the forefather of the Germans, but also of the Goths (a connection not without roots in Dalmatian medieval historiographical tradition, see footnote 4 above) was also unacceptable to Pribojević. Although he did want to count the Goths among the Slavs, he did not wish them to be the root from which the entire Slavic tree sprang forth, but rather to be merely one branch of it. This in the end narrowed down his choice to just two remaining brothers: Thyras and Javan. Pribojević’s decision not to follow the choice of Maciej Miechowita (i.e. Javan) was, as Alois Schmaus argues, a purely pragmatic one. It did not fit into Pribojević’s overall scheme, especially concerning the Macedonian question—of which more will be said in the following sections. For details, see Schmaus, *Vincentius Priboevius*, 243–54; Maciej z Miechowita, *Tractatus de duabus Sarmatis Asiana et Europiana* [Treatise about the two Sarmatias, Asian and European] (Moscow: Izdatel’stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1936), 152–53.

³³ Pribojević, *O podrijetlu i Slavi Slavena*, 58.

Obviously, the first step which Pribojević needed to take was to establish a connection between the Thracians and the ancient Illyrians and thus the contemporary Slavs. This he accomplished through a highly subjective and uncritical compilation of statements by various classical authors and Church Fathers. Since the argumentation provides a very good illustration of Pribojević's methodology, it will be outlined in more detail in the following paragraphs.

Pribojević first declared, relying on Strabo, that the Thracians used the same language as the Mysians. Secondly, he claimed that this was the reason for the Romans who, according to Appian of Alexandria, considered the Mysians to be Illyrians, to hold the Thracian and Illyrian languages to be one and the same. Furthermore, continues Pribojević, the "Getae, who are later called Goths" (according to Isidore of Seville, St. Antoninus and others) also used the same language as the Dacians and Mysians, as is confirmed by Strabo. From here Pribojević draws the obvious conclusion: the Mysians, Illyrians, Dacians and Getae were all descendants of the Thracians, and thus of Thyras, son of Japheth, son of Noah.³⁴

Nonetheless, even after establishing such a linguistic unity among the alleged descendants of Thyras, Pribojević was not yet on safe ground. He still needed to refute the identification of the Thracians with the Greeks, as found in the writings of many ancient and medieval authors. This he did by introducing the argument of the different descent of the Thracians and the Greeks. Since, Pribojević argues, the Thracians descended from Thyras, while the forefather of the Greeks, as "everyone knows," was Javan, they (the Thracians) cannot be Greeks.³⁵ In order to explain why Isidore, St. Antoninus, Philip of Bergamo and others associated the Thracians with the Greeks, Pribojević stated that they were "probably deceived by the proximity of those lands."³⁶ Finally, as the last nail in the coffin, this line of argumentation closed with claims of differences in (1) customs, (2) style of armaments and (3) interests between the Thracians and Greeks, all supported by quotes from Lucius Florus and Appian of Alexandria.

Thus, as can be seen even from this first example, the roles and weight of particular criteria in Pribojević's argumentation varied sig-

³⁴ Pribojević, *O podrijetlu i Slavi Slavena*, 57–58

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 58.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 58.

nificantly. However, it is already noticeable that the main axis of argumentation rested on the criterion of language. Indeed, language was an unavoidable element in almost all of Pribojević's argumentation. Not only did it represent the main link which connected Illyrians and thus contemporary Slavs to their biblical ancestors, the Thracians, it was also the main argument around which the defense of the Slavic identity of two other important ethnic groups of antiquity could be built, namely, the Macedonians and Istrians.

The choice of these two lines of argument as my last case study is not arbitrary. For no other ethnic group from antiquity is Pribojević's argument for Slavic identity as extensive nor as elaborate as it is in the cases of the Macedonians and Istrians. This is not at all surprising if one considers the "historiographical capital" invested in these two groups, which provided Pribojević with the opportunity to count among the Slavs such famous historical personalities as Alexander the Great, Aristotle and St. Jerome.

In order to confirm the Slavic identity of the Macedonians, Pribojević's first step was to prove that their language is not same as Greek. To achieve this, he used an anecdote found in the "History of Alexander the Great" by Quintus Curtius Rufus. According to the story told by Rufus (and retold by Pribojević), when Philotas, the son of Parmenio, was put on trial in front of the Macedonian army (a large part of which was Greek), Alexander asked him, "Philotas, the Macedonians are going to judge you, state whether you will use your mother-tongue in front of them." Philotas answered that he will not, because not everyone will be able to understand him, which provoked Alexander to respond that Philotas hates his mother-tongue.³⁷

The conclusion Pribojević draws from this anecdote is that Philotas decided not to speak his native language (Macedonian) in front of the army because it was a different one from the common language of the rest of the army: Greek. Therefore, Pribojević argues that we should not consider Macedonians and Greeks as the same people because: "...it has become the custom of old that unity of descent is proved by unity of speech, and thus we consider as the members of the same kin only those who have in tender age, together with their mother's milk, also received the mother-tongue."³⁸ From here the argumentation goes

³⁷ Ibid., 60–61.

³⁸ Ibid., 61.

as follows. First, Pribojević reminds his audience that in the division of languages following the destruction of the Tower of Babel, the Macedonians did not acquire a distinct language of their own, and as he has shown, the Macedonians have never spoken the Greek language either: thus, concludes Pribojević, this proves that “the Macedonians have always, as today, spoken only the Slavic language.”³⁹

Having finally proven that Macedonians were always Slavic-speaking, following the pattern of argumentation already established in the case of the Thracians, Pribojević introduced as a supportive argument the criterion of customs, claiming that the inborn difference in the nature and the ways of life (*... moribus et convictu diversitas*) between the Macedonians and the Greeks is such that they could not be considered to be of the same kin.⁴⁰ All in all, he repeats almost the same line of argument as in the case of the Thracians: the Slavic identity of the Macedonians was proven by their use of the Slavic language and their difference in customs from the Greeks.

The last case that remains to be addressed here is that of the Istrians. The line of argument in favor of the Slavic identity of the ancient Istrians is neither as clear nor as convincing as those used in the cases of the Macedonians and the Thracians. Nevertheless, it is still extremely important as it clearly demonstrates the limits of Pribojević’s conceptualization of identity on the basis of ethno-linguistic discourse.

The case of the Istrians posed an unexpected problem. Unlike the inhabitants of Macedonia in Pribojević’s time, who did speak a Slavic language, the contemporary Istrians were bilingual, speaking both Slavic and Italian. The Gordian knot was resolved by Pribojević’s laconic declaration that “some Istrians especially those living on the coast, like the Dalmatians, do speak Italian when they wish to.”⁴¹ This statement he further strengthened by arguments that the inhabitants of Gorizia and Trieste—the parts bordering Istria to the north-west, which were indeed settled mainly by a Slavic speaking population—“like all other Istrians(!),” use only the Slavic language for their internal communication.⁴²

Interestingly enough, what this *magister* of theology is not ready to allow in the question of descent, namely, multiple lines of descent for

³⁹ Ibid., 61.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 62.

⁴¹ Ibid., 62.

⁴² Ibid., 62.

various *gentes*, he is ready to concede in the case of language, allowing bilingualism for the Dalmatians and Istrians. In other words, although a *gens* is defined mainly through language, it is possible for the members of one *gens* to use two or even more languages, without bringing their distinctiveness and identity into question.

This main line of argument is supported with quotes from Appian's *De bello Illyrico*, which recorded numerous battles involving the *Histros, Illyriorum nationem* (meaning Slavs, not the Italians).⁴³ In short, we encounter again the same methodology Pribojević already had applied in the Macedonian case, albeit with a different content. Unfortunately, in this case Pribojević lacked a suitable anecdote from classical authors to strengthen his claims and provide further edification for his audience.

But the question of Istrian membership among the *nationes Illirici* for Dalmatian humanists also had another dimension that deserves to be noted here. The argumentation in favor of the Slavic rather than Italian character of Istria was directly connected with the claim on the person and authority of St. Jerome:⁴⁴

I cannot stop being amazed at how, competing with us, Biondo of Forli, Philip of Bergamo and some others, so that they could take away from us and number among themselves St. Jerome, claim that Istria is an Italian land, although it is by its location, by its customs and by its language separated from Italy [...]⁴⁵

For Dalmatian/Croatian humanists, a claim on St. Jerome was more than the claim on just another saint or one more figure to be counted among the ranks of venerable ancestors. The first reason for this is obviously based on the esteem that St. Jerome, author of the standard Latin translation of the Bible and "most learned among the Saints", enjoyed among the humanists; therefore, even if the list of the learned and famous Dalmatians was not a long one, at least it started with St. Jerome.

⁴³ Ibid., 63.

⁴⁴ In this, Pribojević joined an ongoing dispute between Dalmatian and Italian Humanists concerning the "ownership" of St. Jerome. The first Dalmatian humanist to write on this question was the previously mentioned Juraj Šižgorić in his *De situ*, later followed by Marko Marulić in his *Animadversio in eos qui beatum Hieronymum Italum esse contendunt*, which Pribojević also refers to, although the work remained in manuscript until 1666.

⁴⁵ Pribojević, *O podrijetlu i Slavi Slavena*, 62.

The second, more important reason, also mentioned by Pribojević, concerns the common belief of Dalmatian scholars that St. Jerome was both the author of the so-called glagolitic letters—also known as “*scriptura hieronymitana*,” or Croatian letters—and the translator into Slavic of the church liturgical books used in parts of Istria, Kvarner and the hinterland of the northwestern coast, where a specific Slavic liturgy based on the Latin rite and the use of glagolitic letters had existed since the Middle Ages. This tradition, at the same time Slavic and Catholic, as opposed to the Slavic-Orthodox tradition, and always on the verge of being declared schismatic or even heretical,⁴⁶ was by its advocates defended by the authority of St. Jerome:

In order to glorify his mother tongue, he has (as testified by Sabellico) invented new letters, which are in our days in use in neighboring regions both in sacral as in secular affairs. Moreover, he also (as recorded by Biondo and Philip of Bergamo) translated the divine office used by Catholic Christians into this new idiom, which was approved by Pope Eugenius IV.⁴⁷

Thus, not only have the Slavs caused their name to be celebrated in numerous military deeds and conquests, but just like the Romans and the Greeks, they possess their own alphabet and their own church liturgy thanks to St. Jerome. Consequently, this legitimization of the Slavic language by St. Jerome put it, in the eyes of humanists, on the same footing with Latin and Greek.

That is why Pribojević, the Dominican, does not allow St. Jerome to be “taken away from us and numbered among theirs.”⁴⁸ For him, there is no doubt that “St. Jerome, who was born in the town of *Stridon* on the border of Dalmatia and Pannonia, was not an Italian but rather a

⁴⁶ In the thirteenth century, after almost three centuries of struggle, the papacy reluctantly acknowledged the *status quo* and allowed the usage of the Slavic rite and the glagolitic alphabet in liturgy, but limited it spatially to the above-mentioned areas. Another important center of glagolitic literature was Prague, where since the fourteenth century a mission of glagolitic Benedictines was active in the monastery “*Na Slovanech*” founded by Charles IV of Luxemburg. For more on glagolitic vernacular literature in medieval Dalmatia and Croatia and its influence on the birth of the Croatian Renaissance vernacular literature, see Franičević, *Povijest hrvatske renesansne književnosti*, 62–88, and also a very detailed overview in Eduard Hercigonja, *Tropismena i trojezična kultura hrvatskog srednjovjekovlja* [The trialphabetic and trilingual culture of the Croatian Middle Ages] (Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1994) 49–86.

⁴⁷ Pribojević, *O podrijetlu i Slavi Slavena*, 80–81.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 62, 80.

Slav.”⁴⁹ Moreover, in the light of all the above it is not unreasonable to assume that in the eyes of Pribojević (and probably other Dalmatian humanists), it was the person of St. Jerome that placed Istria into the Slavic world, and not the other way round. Supporting this argument is the fact that the space he dedicates to arguing for the Slavic character of St. Jerome is almost the double of what he devotes to defending of the Slavic character of Istria.

Analysis of Pribojević's ethno-genetic arguments

As it can be seen from the examples presented above, the role of language in Pribojević's argument was twofold. It is used both as a linking tool, as in the case of Thracians, who were linked to contemporary Slavs on the basis of their linguistic unity with the Mysians and thus Illyrians. However, language also serves as a differentiating criterion, as in the case of Macedonians, whom Pribojević distinguished from the Greeks with reference to linguistic difference. On the other hand, the criterion of the similarities in customs represents a secondary or supportive argument under which many things could be placed, ranging from armament to dress and hair styles. Unlike language, this argument is mainly used as a differentiating tool, as was shown in the cases of the Macedonians and Thracians.

Finally, the criterion of descent, although rarely used as a decisive argument by the author, was of utmost importance, and one so far mostly neglected by historians who have studied Pribojević. Pribojević was the first among the South Slavs to construct and publish a full genealogy of the Slavs. His construction falls into the category of myth-making tradition, based on the claims of chroniclers and poets and on the genealogical links of their community with a noble hero, founder or a deity—in this case, the lineage of all Slavs from Thyras, son of Japheth, seventh son of Noah.

Apart from being a splendid humanistic construction, Pribojević's myth of Slavic origins well and truly struck the cord with his fellow-countrymen. The purpose of such myths is to provide a community with an answer to the question of who we are on the basis of who we were or where we come from. This represents the first step

⁴⁹ Ibid., 63.

in positioning the community in reference to others, and serves as a solid basis for the development of its sense of difference and uniqueness. Herein lies the true strength of the argument of descent, and one of the main reasons for the reappearance of Pribojević's Noachian genealogy of the Slavic peoples in later Dalmatian histories such as Mauro Orbini's *Il Regno degli Slavi* (1603) or Serafino Razzi's *Storia di Ragusa* (1595).⁵⁰

Moreover, not only did the myth of origin provide a conceptual framework that shaped the entire narrative, but it also set fixed limits. In Pribojević's world-view, the offspring of the sons of Noah were strictly divided, and no deriving of one contemporary *natio* from several forefathers was permitted or possible. Therefore, as shown previously, the criteria of a single line of descent for each particular *gens* was the foundation on which his entire construction rested. Interestingly enough, Pribojević further expanded this biblical narrative of *origo gentis* with the incorporation of several classical and contemporary traditions. Here, one must mention in the first place the famous Appian of Alexandria and his genealogy of the Illyrians from their forefather Illyrius, son of the mythical Cyclops Polyphemus, then the identification by various authors of antiquity of the Goths with the Getae, and finally the contemporary Polish tradition that connected the Poles to the Sarmatians and the Vandals.⁵¹

Nevertheless, the weightiest argument, the one which formed the basis of Pribojević's concept of collective identity, was that of linguistic unity. As Pribojević himself clearly formulated it: "unity of descent is proved by unity of speech."⁵²

The origins of Pribojević's understanding of collective identity can be located in several traditions. His concept of ethnic identity as mainly based on linguistic community leads back to the Bible with its

⁵⁰ While the Dominican Serafino Razzi in his history of Ragusa, *La storia di Ragusa*, repeats almost in full Pribojević's myth of the biblical origins of the Slavs, Orbini is more cautious. On the one hand, he accepted the wide-spread idea of Scandinavia as the homeland of the Slavs who migrated to the Balkan peninsula in the 6th and 7th centuries; but he merged this account with Pribojević's myth by claiming the existence of a separate Slavic branch of the Thracians and Illyrians—descendants of Thyras—who already inhabited these lands at the time of the Slavic migration. See Serafino Razzi, *La storia di Ragusa: scritta nuovamente in tre libri* (Dubrovnik: Editrice Tipografia Serbo-Ragusea A. Pasarić, 1903), 8–10; Mauro Orbini, *Kraljevstvo Slavena* [The kingdom of the Slavs] (Zagreb, Golden Marketing, 1999), 231, 238.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 57, 59.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 61.

myth of the common descent of the European nations from Japheth and the story of the Tower of Babel where the various languages came into existence and mankind was accordingly divided. For the majority of medieval ecclesiastics and scholars, this was the first step in the formation of races or peoples.⁵³ Their belief was backed by St. Isidore's claim that "peoples have originated from languages, not languages from peoples."⁵⁴ Although, as Walter Pohl argues, it was hardly possible that St. Isidore considered language as a practical differentiating criterion,⁵⁵ it still entered medieval tradition.

Moreover, references to such an ethno-linguistic concept of identity can also be located much closer, in Pribojević's immediate surrounding. Already in the late Middle Ages the identification of language with *natio* was common among almost all Slavic nations. The Croats, whose vernacular literature contains numerous examples of such associations, were no exception to this. The most famous of such examples is probably that of Pop Martinac (Martinac the Priest), who recorded the catastrophic defeat of the Croat army at Krbava in 1493, noting that the Turks afterwards "pressed hard on the Croatian language".⁵⁶

⁵³ Robert Bartlett, "Language and Ethnicity in Medieval Europe," in John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, eds., *Ethnicity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 128.

⁵⁴ "... *ex linguis gentes, non ex gentibus linguae exortae sunt.*" Taken from Walter Pohl, "Telling the Difference: Signs of ethnic identity," in *Strategies of Distinction* (Leiden-Boston-Cologne: Brill, 1998), 17–18.

⁵⁵ Pohl based the arguments for this claim on the fact that in the Roman Empire, which Isidore considered not as a single Roman *gens*, but rather as a collection of *gentes* and *nationes*, Latin and Greek as shared languages enabled unrestricted communication. Furthermore, as Pohl argues, the choice of language as a criterion for ethnicity could look like a logical choice to St. Isidore only in the case of barbaric *gentes*, where the variety of languages did impede communication. Walter Pohl, "Telling the Difference," 24–25.

⁵⁶ Another notable example of the identification of *natio* with language can be found in the Croatian redaction of the already mentioned "Chronicle of the Dioclean priest." The Croatian edition—used and quoted by Pribojević—contains the story, which was not part of the original chronicle, about the death of King Zvonimir, the last king of the independent early medieval Croatian kingdom. The story claims that when the king in front of the general assembly of the kingdom issued a call for the Croats to join the First Crusade, the untrustworthy Croats killed him. But before he died, the king pronounced a curse on them, stating that "they shall never again have a lord of their own language." The chronicler later continues, and compares the damned Croats to the Jews, who have also killed their lord, and since then "they serve others, and never have a lord of their own language." For more see Šišić, *Letopis*, 416; and Franičević, *Povijest hrvatske renesansne književnosti*, 36–37.

Therefore, we can conclude that although Pribojević's *Oratio* was indeed a true child of Renaissance historiography both in its form and content, the ways in which it conceived collective identity had its roots in the conceptual framework of the Middle Ages. Like other similar Renaissance concepts it was born from the medieval legacy but operated in completely new circumstances and assumed a quite new function.

The last riddle that remains to be solved is why Pribojević felt the need for this ethno-linguistic construction of identity at all. To answer this question we must take into account the specific political and cultural circumstances of Renaissance Dalmatia.

Conclusion

In his famous essay "Pater Juraj Križanić," the Croatian writer Miroslav Krleža suggested that the long and rich history of Croatian supranational integrative ideologies (*Slovinstvo*, Illyrism, Yugoslavism) originated from centuries of weakness, of constant struggle for survival from, so to speak, the traumas of a history on the verge of ceasing to exist.⁵⁷ In the 1520s, as he was writing his *Oratio*, Pribojević was living in one of the most paradoxical periods of Croatian history. While the Dalmatian communes under the protection and rule of St. Mark still enjoyed some level of peace and prosperity, the medieval Kingdom of Croatia was disintegrating under the constant pressure of Ottoman attacks. Yet the Ottoman devastation of the immediate surroundings of Dalmatian towns presented a stark contrast to their rich and flourishing cultural life. The words of Mihovil Kombat, author of the canonic history of Croatian literature, sum up this paradox poetically but accurately: "cultural flourishing on the coast, blood and tears in the hinterland—that is the Croatian sixteenth century."⁵⁸

Meanwhile, throughout the fifteenth century, a number of Venetian historians, Bernardo Guistiniani, Marino Sanudo and Marc' Antonio Coccio, better known as Sabellico, had laid down the foundations of the official Venetian historiographical discourse, one with serious political

⁵⁷ Miroslav Krleža, *Eseji* [Essays] (Zagreb: Zora, 1963), 45–70.

⁵⁸ Mihovil Kombat, *Povijest hrvatske književnosti do preporoda* [The History of Croatian literature before the national revival] (Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1961), 62.

implications since it promoted the right and duty of Venice to rule over people who were deemed to be incapable of ruling themselves, namely the Paduans, the Greeks and the Dalmatians. Pribojević's discourse, usually labeled Illyrism, corresponds closely with other similar early modern ideological constructs such as Polish Sarmatianism, French Franco-Gallism, German Teutonism and Venetian so-called Henetism. Whether Pribojević's work can be openly labeled as anti-Venetian or not is open to debate, but what can be claimed with certainty is that the content of *Oratio* was not without strong political connotations.

First, Pribojević attempted to reinterpret a crucial historical moment for Venice-Hvar relations, namely, the Venetian subjugation of the island in the year 1000. He did this by blurring the story with the introduction of an alleged peace treaty concluded between Venice and the island, by which Hvar was confirmed in its privileges and liberties. Second, the language he used when referring to his commune and its institutions is also not free of symbolic political meanings: Pribojević styles the semi-autonomous commune of Hvar as a *respublica* and its council of nobles, a political organ deprived by Venice of any real power, as a *senate*, thus at least in name placing this feeble institution on the same level with one of the central organs of the Venetian state.⁵⁹

And finally, what he could not openly advocate for Hvar or other Dalmatian communes, all subjects of St. Mark, he could freely express when speaking of Dubrovnik, the last remaining independent part of Dalmatia. His carefully worded praise for the contemporary Ragusan state leaves no doubt about his feelings, as when he emphasizes that Ragusans are subject to no one: "a city famous because of its wealth, ships and liberty(!), guarded by the Ragusans with skillful devotion and alertness."⁶⁰ Although the semi-autonomous commune was still the main source of political identity for Pribojević, his *laudatio* provided a model that was easily adoptable and highly acceptable to other Dalmatian humanists.

But not only did the *Oratio* remind Pribojević's compatriots of their glorious past, civic virtues and traditions, it also broadened their horizons and diverted their gazes to the north, to the prosperous, powerful

⁵⁹ Pribojević, *O podrijetlu i Slavi Slavena*, 99.

⁶⁰ Pribojević, *O podrijetlu i Slavi Slavena*, 85.

and self-governing kingdoms of their northern Slavic brothers. In spite of all the glory and esteem that Pribojević attributes to Dalmatia, the fact that it was located on the European periphery and basically a Venetian maritime colony could not be ignored. To compensate for this, and in order it might stand comparison with other countries, Dalmatia had to be made part of a larger entity.

Vinko Pribojević found this entity in the vast Slavic world, a territory that stretched from the Adriatic to the Baltic and from the Odra River to the Ural mountains. Most importantly, the place of Dalmatia in that huge Slavic world was quite unique. Apart from being the alleged cradle of all Slavdom—the birthplace of the three brothers Czech, Lech and Rus, founders of northern Slavic kingdoms—its ancient heritage was one unmatched anywhere in the Slavic world: among its sons could be counted a number of popes, saints and Roman emperors. Its cultural achievements, both contemporary and ancient, were also extraordinary, as well as its long tradition of urban life, with towns truly founded by the ancient Greeks or by Roman emperors. All of this, in the age of humanism, made Dalmatia in the eyes of Vinko Pribojević and other members of the Dalmatian republic of letters the most noble part of that world.

Pribojević's ethno-linguistic model of identity, combined with the myth of the Dalmatian origin of Czech, Lech and Rus, served as a sort of bridge rising over the sorrowful state of the contemporary Dalmatian communes and the lack of Dalmatian state traditions and symbolically connecting the rich and glorious pre-Roman Dalmatian past with the vast northern Slavic kingdoms of Poland and Bohemia. His intention in so doing was to remind his countrymen that they were not facing the Ottoman threat alone, to give them some hope and pride in the expectation that this sad state of affairs would someday end and the glory of the past would return. Thus Pribojević's discourse, operating at three distinct levels, communal (Hvar), regional (Dalmatian/Illyrian) and universal (Slav), suited well both the cultural and political needs of the Dalmatian humanists, caught as they were between Venetian hegemony on one side and the seemingly unstoppable Ottoman expansion on the other.

Although Pribojević's "patriotism" was far from being a political program in a modern sense and targeted only a very narrow circle of the Dalmatian intellectual elite, his narrative was written with the intention to mobilize and inspire. Pribojević leaves no doubt about this, as he himself states that he spoke "for homeland, friends and

common utility” about history, which in general is a powerful thing, because it “awakens virtue” in men and makes them ready to “risk their lives for their homeland...”⁶¹ And in this his oration succeeded. By awakening passions it provoked a response and became an integral part of the Dalmatian historiographical tradition. As a result of its positive initial reception among Dalmatian humanists, the oration, embellished with praises and poems dedicated to its author by various other members of the Dalmatian humanist circle, was published twice during the sixteenth century, both times in Venice. The first edition of the book appeared in 1532, and the second in 1595, this time translated to Italian. In the years to come, not all components of his narrative would hold the same interest for its later readers. His praise of Dalmatia and Hvar, which actually constituted two-thirds of the work, brought him much less fame than his newly invented image of the Slavs and their past. It was this set of core ideas, the concept of the autochthony of the Slavs on the Balkan peninsula, their identification with the ancient Illyrians and finally, the sense of belonging to a wider Slavic community based on linguistic unity that proved to be the most persistent parts of Pribojević’s narration.

In spite of the fact that later authors very rarely quoted Pribojević as their source of information, many of his ideas found their way into the works of the next generations of Croatian writers through the mediation of Mauro Orbini,⁶² who included large parts of Pribojević’s text in his famous *Il Regno degli Slavi*. In the following centuries, his ideas went through a series of transformations and were incorporated into various ideological frameworks—first into seventeenth century Croatian Baroque Pan-Slavism,⁶³ then into Pavao Ritter Vitezović’s early eighteenth-century Pan-Croatism,⁶⁴ until they finally found a place

⁶¹ Pribojević, *O podrijetlu i Slavi Slavena*, 128.

⁶² For the influence of Vinko Pribojević on Mauro Orbini and his more famous work *Il Regno de gli Slavi*, see Giovanna Brogi-Bercoff, “Il Priboevo et il ‘Regno degli Slavi’ di Mauro Orbini,” *Ricerche slavistiche* 22–23 (1975–1976): 137–54 .

⁶³ For more about seventeenth-century pan-Slavism in Croatian literature, see Rafo Bogišić, “Hrvatski barokni slavizam” [Croatian Baroque Slavism], in *Zrcalo duhovno, književne studije* [The spiritual mirror: literary studies] (Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, 1997), 133–64; Katičić, *Ilirci i ilirski jezik*, 675–88; Zlatar, *Our Kingdom Come*, 425–54.

⁶⁴ For a good overview of Pavao Ritter Vitezović and his works see Zrinka Blažević, *Vitezovićeva hrvatska između stvarnosti i utopije* [Vitezović’s Croatia, between reality and utopia] (Zagreb: Barbat, 2002). See also the contributions by Zrinka Blažević and Sándor Bene in this volume.

in Ljudevit Gaj's Illyrism, which so profoundly marked the emerging modern Croatian political and intellectual discourse in the nineteenth century. Because of this, Pribojević's work is usually referred to the genre known as "Illyrian literature." Indeed, his *Oratio* might well be considered the founding text of that genre.

CHAPTER SIX

INDETERMINATION: NARRATIVE IDENTITY AND SYMBOLIC POLITICS IN EARLY MODERN ILLYRISM

Zrinka Blažević

Through rediscovering and discursively reactivating the opulent cultural and symbolic capital of classical antiquity, the late Renaissance brought to the fore the issue of ethnic and political community. In an ideological sense, it is a merit of civic humanism and its main postulate that the supreme ethical purpose of the human being conceptualized as *homo politicus* could be realized only within a community.

This perfectly met the needs of various political factors engaged in the dubious struggle for universal power. The first factor was the nascent early modern state, eagerly searching for the most appropriate ideological tools to obtain and affirm its own legitimacy and to provide efficient means for political integration usually conceptualized in terms of *monarchia universalis*. Without going into details of the complex historical genesis of the early modern imperial ideology, suffice it to say that it was a kind of synthesis of the Greco-Roman legal and political tradition and Christian doctrine which, laconically said, starts from the ontological presumption that the *genus humanum* can realize its moral purpose only in a temporally, spatially and politically homogenous universe. For that reason the concept of *imperium*, which was often interchangeable with the term *monarchia*, either denoting independent and “perfect” rule and territory encompassing more than one political community or absolute sovereignty, was one of the key regulatory principles of early modern political practice.¹

This tendency reached its peak in the framework of the universalistic imperial ideology of the Habsburgs who, according to the

¹ For a more detailed account, see Franz Bosbach, *Monarchia universalis. Storia di un concetto cardine della politica europea (secoli XVI–XVIII)* (Milano: Vita e pensiero, 1998), and Anthony Pagden, *Lords of All the World: Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain and France c. 1500–c. 1800* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995), 11–28.

interpretation of the contemporary political theoreticians and publicists, had legitimate right to fill the imperial function as the sublime source of all justice and authority thanks to their personal ability and divine grace. Accordingly, they were entrusted with the highest duty to maintain the worldly and spiritual well-being of the whole *res publica Christiana*.²

Equally ambitious counterparts and simultaneously main rivals and allies to the secular political powers were the confessional Churches (Protestant, Catholic and Orthodox). Although Protestantism initially intended to restrict itself purely to ecclesiastic and theological reform, it soon obtained an explicit political character, which would considerably determine its ideological structure. Consequently, by equating the confessional, ethnical and linguistic community, Protestantism inaugurated a kind of confessional patriotism based on the formula *amor Dei = amor Patriae*. Thanks to this strategy, it became an appropriate instrument for political emancipation and mobilization in the struggle which the Estates led against the central power (e.g., the Estates of Carinthia, Styria and Carniola against Archduke Charles II of Habsburg during the 1570s and 1580s).³

Having consolidated its dogmatic and institutional foundations after the Council of Trent (1545–1563), the Roman Catholic Church at the beginning of the 17th century became a worthy partner/rival of the early modern absolutist state regarding its own universalistic political pretensions. Moreover, under the motto “*extra ecclesiam non est salus*” it tried to carry out its two main challenges—the Christianization of “infidels” and the conversion of “schismatics.”

Notwithstanding the occasional conflicts between the Catholic Church and the early modern state, they were naturally oriented towards one another with the aim to realize their own universalistic and hegemonist claims.⁴ In Southeast Europe these tendencies manifested themselves in the form of two key political issues: the anti-Ottoman war and confessional unification. The profit on both sides was indisputable: by expelling the Ottomans, the Catholic Church would spread

² See Marie Tanner, *The Last Descendant of Aeneas: The Hapsburgs and the Mythic Image of the Emperor* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993).

³ See Peter Štih and Vasko Simoniti, *Slovenska povijest do prosvjetiteljstva* [Slovenian history until the Enlightenment] (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2004), 261–65.

⁴ See Wolfgang Reinhard, “Reformation, Counter-Reformation and the Early Modern State: A Reassessment,” in David M. Luebke, ed., *The Counter-Reformation: The Essential Readings* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), 105–29.

its spiritual, and the Catholic monarchy its political jurisdiction over the newly liberated territories, while the ecclesiastic unity, imagined as the return of the schismatics to the bosom of the Church and conversion of the Muslim infidels, would serve as an additional cohesive and integrative factor, as well as a guarantee of political stability.

Besides, the anti-Ottoman war was an issue of vital political importance for the third confessional party, the Orthodox one, which, from the second half of the sixteenth century, entered into numerous coalitions not only with the Spanish and later the Austrian Habsburgs, gambling on the institutional tradition of the Serbian medieval empire, but also with the Catholic Church, promising that in the case of a successful war of liberation it would even embrace church union.

Another factor was the impact of different internal social, confessional and political groups (e.g. the Croatian Estates, the political and ecclesiastic representatives of the Orthodox Serbian community etc.) trying to disturb the fragile balance of power in their own interest. Their main goal was to “renew” their extensive national state, which was legitimized by their “historical” right and powerful national institutions in the territory liberated from the Ottomans. Therefore, through the complex interference of all these factors an ideological field was created in which early modern Illyrism was bred.

Early modern Illyrism might be described as a discursive product of the South Slavic branch of the *res publica litteraria* which was intensively engaged in the symbolic construction of distinctive national identities ever since the rise of Humanism.⁵ Referring to Kristeva’s and Jameson’s concept of “ideologeme” as the intra/inter/extratextual function of a text,⁶ and the Foucauldian comprehension of discourse as a practice,⁷ Illyrism could also be conceptualized as a national

⁵ For the genesis, structural modifications and instrumentalist uses of early modern Illyrism on the basis of a selected corpus of early modern historiographical works see Zrinka Blažević, *Ilirizam prije ilirizma* [Illyrism before Illyrism] (Zagreb: Golden marketing—Tehnička knjiga, 2008).

⁶ See Julia Kristeva, *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, trs. Thomas Gora et al. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980), 36–63; Fredric Jameson, *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act* (Ithaca and New York: Cornell University Press, 1981), 101–3.

⁷ At the end of the third chapter of “Archaeology of Knowledge” Foucault explicitly defines discourses “as practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak.” Michel Foucault, *Archeology of Knowledge*, trs. A. M. Sheridan Smith, London & New York: Routledge, 2002), 54. The very concept of discourse as a form of socio-cultural practice or as a specific communicational event which is at the same time socio-historically constitutive and constituted, has become a main presumption of both Critical and Historical Discourse Analysis. The main advocate of Historical

ideologeme, a phenomenon located at the intersection of language, culture and history, the nature of which is at once uniquely contingent and repetitive. Thanks to its inherent polysemy, the Illyrian ideologeme had a great performative potential.⁸ It could “intervene” in various socio-historical and cultural contexts and foist its “signified” on the referent, eliciting strong emotional, psychological as well as political effect.⁹

The performative dimension of the Illyrian ideologeme is of utmost importance not only for the (re)production and transmission of collective, national identity, but also for the accumulation of symbolic and cultural capital in processes of the early modern cultural production. Thanks to persuasive and, even more importantly, trans-temporal discursive production of the utopian political models marked by (trans)national features, Illyrism was able to perform all of its ideological functions at the very beginning of its discursive life, although it would gather momentum during the modern period when adequate infrastructural and institutional prerequisites for the more successful horizontal and vertical realization of its creative potential would be developed.

Discourse Analysis in Anglo-American historiography is Gabrielle Spiegel, while the main representatives of the German school of Historical Discourse Analysis are Dietrich Busse, Wolfgang Teubert and Philipp Sarasin. For a systematic overview of the main theoretical assumptions and methodological procedures of Critical Discourse Analysis see Norman Fairclough, *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language* (London and New York: Longman, 1995); Stefan Titcher et al., *Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis* (London: Sage, 2000). For Historical Discourse Analysis, see Achim Landwehr, *Geschichte des Sagbaren. Einführung in der Historische Diskursanalyse* (Tübingen: Diskord, 2001).

⁸ The term “performative” was launched by a British philosopher, J. L. Austin, in the book *How to do Things with Words* in the 1950s. Austin suggests that to say something does not mean only to utter “true or false” statements but also includes performing an action and consequently producing particular effects. See John L. Austin, *How to do Things with Words* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962), 6–7. Besides, French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu considers performativity as the political pre-vision, or pre-diction which simultaneously creates the collective representation and will which contribute to its production. See Pierre Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1999), 128–129. For the possibilities of implementing the concept of performativity and performativity in the historical sciences see Jürgen Martschukat and Steffen Patzold, “Geschichtswissenschaft und ‘performative turn’: Eine Einführung in Fragestellungen, Konzepte und Literatur,” in Jürgen Martschukat and Steffen Patzold, eds., *Geschichtswissenschaft und ‘performative turn’. Ritual, Inszenierung und Performanz vom Mittelalter bis zur Neuzeit* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2003), 1–33.

⁹ See Klaus Garber, “Zur Konstitution der europäischen Nationalliteratur. Implikationen und Perspektiven,” in Klaus Garber, ed., *Nation und Literatur im Europa der Frühen Neuzeit* (Tübingen: Niemeyer Verlag, 1989), 1.

For this purpose the Illyrian ideogeme used all available representational instruments, so that its various articulations might be found in numerous genres and media, from humanist histories in Latin to vernacular epics, from Renaissance heraldry to Romantic poetry and operas. The performative efficacy of the Illyrian ideogeme is the main cause of its (re)productional longevity as well, for it can be traced for almost four centuries, from the rise of Humanism up until the nineteenth century.

From the polysemy and discursive productivity of Illyrism stems also its multi-functionality, manifesting itself both in the wide scope of its uses (e.g. ideological mobilization, political integration, de/legitimation of various real or virtual political models and practices, identity construction, accumulation of personal and collective symbolic capital etc.), as well as in possibilities for its flexible adaptation and insertion into numerous, even disparate ideological and political paradigms (e.g. Counter-Reformation proselytism, Spanish imperialism, Habsburg absolutism, the emancipatory politics of the Estates etc.). Illyrism could thus be likened to a complex ideological code which in the concatenated processes of overcoding always acquires new meanings and permanently oscillates between ideological legitimation and subversion.

In this essay, the main emphasis will be placed upon the two historically formative aspects of the Illyrian ideology. First, it will be analyzed as a narrative configuration of collective identity (both of particular national, religious and political identities—Croatian, Slovenian and Serbian—as well as of transnational Pan/South/Slavic identity). Secondly, it will be examined as a constitutive segment of the symbolic field of politics, since it functioned as an effective medium of political reflection, mobilization and propaganda.¹⁰

Illyrism as narrative identity

The term “narrative identity,” which was introduced by Paul Ricoeur in the book *Soi-même comme un autre*,¹¹ denotes narrative configuration

¹⁰ For the theoretical presumptions of the political semiotics see e.g. Andreas Dörner, *Politische Mythos und symbolische Politik. Der Hermann-Mythos: zur Entstehung des Nationalbewußtseins der Deutschen* (Opladen: Rowohlt, 1996), 7–39.

¹¹ See the English translation: Paul Ricoeur, *Oneself as Another* (Chicago and London: Chicago University Press, 1992), 140–63.

or a specific model of linking events in a story, which enables the dialectic integration of contradictions within the identity domain: differences, variabilities, discontinuity and instability. Besides, narrative identity is a bond between past and future facilitating the integration of manifold, different and partly contradictory circumstances and experiences in a coherent temporal structure to make them functional for the future. Referring to Clifford Geertz, Ricoeur holds that identity configurations are responsible for the integrative function of ideology defined as “an aspect of the symbolic activity aimed at the identity creation both of an individual and a collectivity.”¹² According to Ricoeur, the most significant integrative effects of ideology are not only the spatial, but also the temporal homogenization of a group by protecting and mediating collective symbolic memory. This points to the dominant role of language, which is “a medium in which the expressive power of the social symbols is articulated.” As a result, ideology is not regarded as a distortion of communication but on the contrary, as a “rhetoric of the basic communication.”¹³ This theoretical framework could thus be regarded as more than appropriate for the elaboration of the Illyrian/Slavic identity problem, not because an extremely complex, heterogeneous and contradictory ideological phenomenon is at stake, but merely because Illyrism, as a highly contextualized discursive construction fashioned in the multifarious processes of cultural (re)production, always strives to break the textual borders and achieve its referential existence.

An ideal discursive medium for the representation and transmission of the various (trans)national secular and confessional models of political identification, legitimation and integration was historiography. Early modern historiography inherited this ability from the imperial and chiliastic traditions of ancient Rome (Vergil, Livy), which owed their regenerational potential to the fact that they successfully resolved the duality of universal and national, turning them into complementary principles and, even more importantly, essential premises for the establishment of the desired “Golden Age.”

Moreover, early modern historiography was permeated by the Biblical prophetic and eschatological tradition (e.g. the prophecy of

¹² See Paul Ricoeur, *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), 254–66.

¹³ See Ricoeur, *Lectures*, 258–61.

Daniel) and inherited the identificational and legitimational models of the medieval chronicles as well. Their main function was to affirm the socio-political identity of a collectivity, usually by virtue of genealogical narratives. In addition to this, in medieval chronicles some basic topical models were outlined which would later be transplanted into the humanist histories, such as the *topos* of common origins (e.g. the Trojan origins of Romans, Franks and Germans), narratives about seizing a particular territory, national characterologies and cults of national heroes and saints.¹⁴

The organizational principle of the linguistic representations in historiography, as well as in other early modern literary genres, was topics. Topics were a constitutive segment of the historiographical “fact,” an element endowing historiography not only with practical and utilitarian cognition, but also with performative potential for producing models of desirable political practice. Moreover, topics functioned as a catalyst of inter-discursive circulation all over the European *res publica litteraria*.¹⁵

In historical discourse analysis of narrative configurations of national identities, the Illyrian ideologeme could be for heuristic reasons decomposed into various *topoi*, i.e. functional micro-narratives which both referred to and discursively produced the common origin, linguistic unity, territorial magnitude and exceptional qualities of the Illyrian/Slavic “nation,” which were “materialized” in the “national” geography, institutions, heroes and saints.¹⁶

¹⁴ See František Graus, *Lebendige Vergangenheit. Überlieferung im Mittelalter und in den Vorstellungen vom Mittelalter* (Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau, 1975), and František Graus, “Nationale Denkmuster der Vergangenheit in spätmittelalterlichen Chroniken,” in Otto Dann, ed., *Nationalismus in vorindustrieller Zeit* (Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 1986), 35–53.

¹⁵ On topics as the main organizational principle of reception and reproduction of early modern texts and as a formative aspect of early modern intertextuality, see Barbara Bauer, “Intertextualität und der rhetorischen System der frühen Neuzeit,” in Wilhelm Kühlmann and Wolfgang Neuber, eds., *Intertextualität in der frühen Neuzeit* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1994), 31–63.

¹⁶ On the poetical realisations and political usages of the Illyrian ideologeme in the *longue durée*, see Reinhard Lauer, “Genese und Funktion des illyrischen Ideologems in den südslawische Literaturen (16. bis Anfang des 19. Jahrhunderts),” in Klaus-Detlev Grothusen, ed., *Ethnogenese und Staatsbildung in Südosteuropa. Beiträge des Südosteuropa-Arbeitskreises der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft zum III. Internationalen Südosteuropa-Kongreß der Association Internationale d’Études du Sud-Est Européen, Bukarest, 4–10. 9. 1974* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974), 116–43.

On the other hand, some formative elements of German Teutonism (e.g. national prosopography, the topos of *translatio imperii*) and the Panslavic identificational pattern of Polish Sarmatism, based primarily on the idea of Slavic genetic and linguistic unity, were integrated into the ideological and discursive structure of the Illyrian ideogeme as well, thanks to which it successfully doubled not only its legitimizing power, but also its ideological potency.¹⁷ In that way, the exclusivist national narrative which pretends to define unique temporal, spatial and “psychological” features of the nation once and for all, paradoxically discloses itself as a discursive hybrid, a product of various inter-textual and interdiscursive mixings and overlappings.

As has been already stated, early modern Illyrism became, thanks to its “appellative scheme,” a complex ideological paradigm suitable for various political usages. One of its most important functions was patriotic mobilization aimed at fostering a sense of belonging to the glorious “Illyrian nation” and loyalty to the real or virtual “Illyrian state.” Consequently, as an ideological product of political thinking inspired by the concept of *monarchia universalis*, early modern Illyrism can be interpreted as a utopian political platform aimed at constituting a supra-regional state, culturally, ethnically and confessionally unified and homogenous. It was modeled on and legitimized by the political tradition of the ancient *Imperium Romanum*, the perfect model of *dominium mundi* in both spiritual (in Protestant, Orthodox and Catholic versions) and secular (Spanish and Austrian Habsburg) interpretations of universal political power. In order to express that link both semantically and symbolically, as well as to designate the potential territorial scope of the new Empire which would rise from the ruins of the Ottoman one, the ancient Roman administrative term “Illyricum” was reactivated. At the time of its greatest magnitude, the Roman province of Illyricum encompassed seventeen smaller provinces, i.e. a whole range of territories from today’s Slovenia to the

¹⁷ On the early modern German national discourse, see e.g. Herfried Münkler, Hans Grünberger and Kathrin Mayer, *Nationenbildung. Die Nationalisierung Europas im Diskurs humanistischer Intellektueller. Italien und Deutschland* (Berlin: Akademie, 1998). On Sarmatism see Stanisław Cynarski, “The Shape of Sarmatian Ideology in Poland,” *Acta Poloniae Historica* 19 (1968): 5–17; Konstantin Symmons-Symonolewicz, *National Consciousness in Poland: Origin and Evolution* (Meadville, Pa.: Maplewood Press, 1983), 23–40.

Aegean islands.¹⁸ In that way, thanks to both its rich ideological inventory and transnational character, early modern Illyrism was able to appeal to the contemporary secular and church powers in a desperate and mostly unsuccessful effort to ensure its pragmatic realization.

In order to illustrate the performative mechanism of early modern Illyrism, I will analyze the topological structure of the Illyrian ideogeme with a short description of the discursive modalities and ideological functions of each topos. Symbolically the most distinguished status within the Illyrian topological scheme is attributed to the topos of common origin. There are two distinct versions of this topos, both aimed at establishing a nation as a primordial ontological category. According to the so-called “biblical theory,” Illyrians-equated-with-Slavs are the descendants of Noah’s son Japheth. His son Gomer led a new nation from the Scandinavian *vagina gentium* to European Sarmatia, from where Slavs spread “to the largest part of Europe and a major part of Asia.” Another version, intertextually transferred from Appian of Alexandria’s writings on the Illyrian wars, derives the origins of the Illyrians from Illyrius, son of the Cyclops Polyphemus and his wife, the nymph Galatea.¹⁹ These two versions were often mixed to ensure a logical link between the Slavic and non-Slavic ethnical strata and to double the symbolic legitimation of the *origo et vetustas* of the Illyrian nation, anchoring it in the two privileged sources of tradition: the sacral biblical and the classical one.

The topos of territorial magnitude is a logical extension of the previous genetic one which presupposes procreation and thus the physical spreading of the nation in search of its “*Lebensraum*.” There are many different definitions of the territorial extension of the Illyrians who were equated with various barbaric tribes (Thracians, Scythians, Sarmatians, Goths, Vandals, etc.), almost as many as there are Illyrian works. The most extensive one situates the Illyrian/Slavic “nation” between the Baltic and the Black Sea, in a few works extending it even to Asia Minor and North Africa. A means of legitimization of this Illyrian/Slavic “hereditary right” is a fictive privilege of Alexander

¹⁸ Before the final division of the Roman Empire (in 395 A.D.), *Illyricum* comprised the following provinces: *Noricum Ripense*, *Noricum Mediterraneum*, *Pannonia Prima*, *Pannonia Secunda*, *Pannonia Savia*, *Pannonia Valeria*, *Dalmatia*, *Praevalitana*, *Moesia Superior*, *Moesia Inferior*, *Dacia Ripensis*, *Dacia Mediterranea*, *Macedonia*, *Thesalia*, *Achaia*, *Epirus* and *Creta*.

¹⁹ See Viereck and A. G. Roos, eds., *Appiani Historia Romana* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1962), Ch. 2:3–4

the Great, who allegedly donated them the mentioned tract of land *in perpetuum*.²⁰ A myriad of other narrower definitions mostly correspond to the cultural and political fields of their production or, more precisely, to the concrete ideological and political programs of their authors. In other words, all these discursive Illyricums can be regarded as virtual projections of particular political utopias, but with an evident performative dimension. This means that all these works directed their appellative power to persuade their main addressees—spiritual and/or secular rulers (Popes, Italian princes, Habsburgs)—to “re-establish” the Illyrian Empire within those borders which more or less corresponded to the contemporary political ambitions of the respective rulers.

The topos of linguistic unity is complementary to the aforementioned one. This means that a relation of two-way causality is established between the nation and its language, making, of course, the whole argumentation circular. The topos of linguistic unity often includes the legend of St. Jerome the Slav, the author of the Slavic script who translated the Bible into his own mother tongue. On the one hand, St. Jerome confers on the *lingua Illyrica* a sacral legitimacy, which is of utmost importance in the period of “confessionalization,” while, on the other hand, it makes the sacral Illyrian *koiné* a perfect medium for religious and political integration.²¹

The Slavic national character was etymologically derived from the word “glory” (*slava*). It mainly refers to the military glory achieved by the Slavs in the course of their heroic history, but also to their intellectual excellence. Other important elements of the catalogue of national virtues were piety and loyalty, the function of which was to make the Illyrian ideogeme acceptable to the representatives of superimposed imperial ideologies. In this way an idealized psychological portrait of the nation was created, making the constructed nation a desirable model of identification for its potential members. A fact

²⁰ On the privilege of Alexander the Great in early modern Polish and Bohemian historiography, see Otakar Odložilík, “The privilege of Alexander the Great for the Slavs,” *Folia diplomatica* 1 (1970): 239–351.

²¹ On the uses and functions of the “Illyrian language,” especially as a linguistic tool for the proselytizing mission of the Roman Catholic Church in the Balkans, see Micaela S. Iovine, “The Illyrian Language and the Language Question among the Southern Slavs in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries,” in Riccardo Picchio and Harvey Goldblatt, eds., *Aspects of the Slavic Language Question*, vol. 1, (New Haven: Yale Concilium on International and Area Studies; Columbus, Ohio: Distributed by Slavica Publishers, 1984), 101–56.

of equal importance is that the nation presents itself as a natural and necessary protagonist of a unique historical mission.

Illyrian national geography, poetically represented as a *locus amoenus*, has the function of a sacred “ethnoscape,” the ideal nation’s natural homeland imbued with high emotional content.²² At the same time, this idealized portrait of an opulent Illyricum served as a powerful discursive instrument of mobilization. It was supposed to stimulate compatriots, and additionally interested political powers, to establish an Illyrian “paradise on Earth,” potentially the source of considerable economic profit as well.

National saints and national heroes are objects of horizontal and vertical emulation and their discursive role is to ensure the ethical and intellectual renovation of the nation. On the most general level national saints serve as a means of sacralization of the national and nationalization of the sacred.²³ Namely, in the early modern period a respectable national canon could be an important criterion for obtaining the needed legitimacy to a “nation under construction.” A distinctive feature of the Illyrian topos of national saints is the presence of “inter-confessional” saints, i.e. saints who simultaneously belong to the Catholic and Orthodox canons.²⁴ They were supposed to be effective stimulators of the confessional integration of the “Illyrian” nation, which was the vital precondition for national unity as well as for a successful anti-Ottoman liberation.

National heroes as supreme incorporations of national virtues were in most cases equated with the last Illyrian topos, that of national rulers. The fictive institutional tradition of the “Illyrian Empire” begins with the so-called Illyrian Emperors who once ruled the Roman and Byzantine Empires and originated from the “Illyrian soil.”²⁵ The Illyrian

²² For the concept of “ethnoscape,” see Anthony D. Smith, *Myths and Memories of the Nation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 149–59.

²³ In later Illyrian works the *topos* of national saints underwent a generic emancipation in the form of “national hagiography”. The most elaborated Illyrian hagiographies in Latin are “The Abundance of Illyrian Royal Sanctity” (*Regiae sanctitatis Illyricanae foecunditas*, Rome, 1630) by Ivan Tomko Mrnavić, which contains the *vitae* of 22 “Illyrian” saints of royal blood, and the manuscript “Illyrian Natives” (*Indigetes Illyricani*) by Pavao Ritter Vitezović, which in the form of calendar of the church year commemorated as much as 152 Illyrian saints.

²⁴ The most frequent interconfessional saints are St. Sava, St. Constantine the Great, St. Helena, SS. Cyril and Methodius, St. Metrophanes, St. Marcian and St. Placidia.

²⁵ The number of “Illyrian Emperors” oscillates between 25 and 59, the latter number is given by Ivan Tomko Mrnavić in his manuscript, “Seven Books of dialogues on

Emperors are followed by legendary “Gothic kings” transplanted from the Annals of the anonymous priest of Dioclia (Duklja), which served as a link to the medieval “national dynasties.” Among them the most prominent symbolic status is enjoyed by the Bosnian kings and Serbian and Bulgarian Emperors. Besides endowing the national collectivity with political dignity, the main function of this discursively constructed *translatio imperii* is to attract contemporary political powers (e.g. Italian princes and Habsburg rulers) to liberate the people “who groan under the Turkish yoke” and, as “legitimate successors of the Illyrian rulers,” to revive the “once potent and glorious” *Imperium Illyricum*.

The humanist histories written in the towns of Dalmatia during the 16th century are traditionally regarded as the first articulations of the Illyrian ideologeme in general. Their main feature is the inherent dualism of the particular and universal model of political identification which was realized as a complementary triad of the communal (civic), regional (Dalmatian) and national (Illyrian). Two main representatives of humanist Illyrism are Juraj Šižgorić/Georgius Sigoreus (ca. 1444–1509), a poet and historiographer from Šibenik, and Vinko Pribojević/Vincentius Priboevius (end of the 15th century–after 1532), a learned Dominican from the island of Hvar. Taking as his model Italian communal historiography, Šižgorić wrote a historico-geographical treatise, “On the location of Illyria and the city of Šibenik” (*De situ Illyriae et civitate Sibenici*), in which he fashioned a complete topological inventory of the Illyrian ideologeme.²⁶ Šižgorić constructed the borders of Illyria by juxtaposing various territorial definitions of the ancient geographers, finally setting them between Hungary, Furlania, the Black Sea and Macedonia. Apart from that, he composed the first catalogue of thirty “Illyrian” tribes. The ethnonyms he took from the classical authors denoted contemporary Slavic nations who lived on a territory ranging from Bohemia to the Adriatic and the Black Sea. This reflects a paradox of Šižgorić’s model which depends on the idea of a Slavic linguistic unity, but explicitly rejects the identification of

Illyricum and the Illyrian Emperors” (*De Illyrico Caesaribusque Illyricis dialogorum libri VII*). The most popular are certainly Diocletian, Justinian and Constantine the Great. Đorđe Branković, for example, makes the latter a forefather of the Serbian Nemanjić dynasty. On the other hand, Mrnavić deduces the genealogy of the Kings and Despots of Serbia and the Princes of Herzegovina as well as of the entire Habsburg dynasty from Emperor Constantine.

²⁶ Juraj Šižgorić, *O smještaju Ilirije i grada Šibenika*, ed. Veljko Gortan [On the location of Illyria and the city of Šibenik] (Šibenik: Muzej grada Šibenika, 1981).

the Illyrians with the Slavs due to the pejorative connotation of this ethnonym (*Sclavi*=slaves).

Compared with Šižgorić, the principal novelty of Pribojević's Illyrism is the "slavification" of the Illyrian ideologeme, realized by inserting a Slavic factor into the identity equation. In his oration, "On the origin and the glory of the Slavs" (*De origine successibusque Slavorum*), Pribojević developed the topological structure of the Illyrian ideologeme even further, establishing intertextual links with contemporary Polish Sarmatism.²⁷ Slavic history is portrayed as the expression of the dominant national virtues (exceptional military glory and intellectual abilities) and interpreted within the eschatological context of their historical mission of "ruling the whole world." A comprehensively elaborated ethno-characterology of the Dalmatians combined with a natural and cultural geography of Dalmatia and the commune of Hvar (depicted in the second and the third part of Pribojević's work), represent a small-scale replica of the ethic and aesthetic ideals of Slavdom.

Following a period of ideological formation and narrative configuration within the Humanist episteme, where it was primarily directed at creating a distinctive communal identity and anti-Ottoman mobilization, the end of the 16th century marked the beginning of "confessionalization" of the Illyrian ideologeme.

First of all, it became a discursive ingredient of the religious and political program of the Slovenian Protestants, serving as an ideological axis for the creation of a desired confessional community, which was, according to the famous postulate *cuius regio eius religio*, equated with the ethnic and political ones. A kind of ideological manifesto of Slovenian Protestant Illyrism is represented by a foreword to the Slovenian grammar, "Winter spare hours" (*Arcticae horulae succisivae*) by Adam Bohorič (ca. 1520–1600). Slovenian Protestant Illyrism was intertextually and ideologically linked both with the Protestant version of German Teutonism and Italian Henetism.²⁸ Additionally, it highlighted the importance of the *lingua Slavica*, which was regarded as

²⁷ Original edition: Venice 1532. See Vinko Pribojević, *O podrijetlu i slavi Slavena* [On the origin and glory of the Slavs] (Zagreb: Golden Marketing, 1997). On Pribojević, see also the study by Domagoj Madunić in this volume.

²⁸ But in contrast to German Teutonism, which identified Henetes, Venetes, Wends and Vandals as Germans, Bohorič ascribed all these peoples to the Slavic nation. Having borrowed the *origo*-theory from the Italian Henetism, he then claimed that Henetes-Slavs had fought in the Trojan war, after which, according to Bohorič, they came to Europe under the leadership of Antenor and founded Padua and Venice.

a key factor in the process of the discursive production of a desirable ethno-confessional identity.²⁹

Soon Illyrism was incorporated into the ideological platform of Post-Tridentine Counter-Reformation Catholicism as it oriented itself towards institutional and dogmatic consolidation as well as proselytizing expansion. During the seventeenth century Counter-Reformation Illyrism was discursively articulated with reference to two main institutions: the Collegium Illyricum, established in 1580 in Loreto by Pope Gregory XIII, and the Illyrian Congregation of St. Jerome in Rome, founded in 1453 by Pope Nicholas V as a *hospitium* for “Illyrian” pilgrims.³⁰ In order to impose itself as a privileged medium for spreading the Catholic faith, Counter-Reformation Illyrism absorbed and made use of modified elements of the Orthodox—above all the Serbian—historical tradition, thus losing its ideological “purity.” Another important feature of Counter-Reformation Illyrism is its anti-Ottoman dimension which, together with confessional unification, was a common platform for the organic, although always conflict-ridden cooperation between the Catholic Church and the nascent Habsburg absolutist state.

Varieties of Counter-Reformation Illyrism

Regarding its discursive modalities and pragmatic functions, Counter-Reformation Illyrism can be classified into four distinct subcategories: Interconfessional, Franciscan, Curial-Habsburg and Dalmatian Illyrism. A heraldic work, “The Book of Saints and Coats of Arms of the Kingdoms and Families of the Illyrian Empire,” commissioned by Petar Ohmučević,³¹ a Spanish admiral of Ragusan origin, and finished

²⁹ For a more detailed account see Zrinka Blažević, “Ilirizem kot heterotopija” [Illyrism as heterotopia], in Miran Hladnik, ed., *Preseganje meje* [Transgression of borders], (Ljubljana: Slavistično društvo Slovenije, 2006), 139–150.

³⁰ See Josip Jurić, “Ilirski kolegij u Loretu (1580–1860)” [The Illyrian College in Loreto], *Vrela i prilozi* 13 (1982): 23–60; Ivan Kukuljević-Sakcinski, “Ilirski zavod i crkva sv. Jerolima u Rimu” [The Illyrian Congregation and Church of St. Jerome in Rome], *Arkiv za povestnicu jugoslavensku* 1 (1851): 102–120.

³¹ See “*Libellus sanctorum patronum et publicarum insigniarum Regnorum et familiarum illustrium Illyrici Imperii etc. / Rodoslovie navišćenih i svetih otaca i vlastitih bilegovi zemalja i svitlih tih plemena cesarstva Ilirskoga (...) vlastela i plemića svih zemalja Ilirskih,*” in Ivo Banac, *Grbovi, biljezi identiteta* [Coats of arms, symbols of identity] (Zagreb: Grafički zavod Hrvatske, 1991), 135–316.

around 1595, belongs to the first category, as does the famous “The Kingdom of the Slavs” (*Il Regno de gli Slavi*), by Mavro (or Mauro) Orbini (ca. 1550–1611), a Benedictine monk from Dubrovnik.³²

“The Book of Saints and Coats of Arms of Kingdoms and Families of the Illyrian Empire” represents the first “national” heraldic catalogue which iconographically displays a fictitious political construction of the *Imperium Illyricum*, encompassing nine “Illyrian” provinces: Macedonia, Bosnia, Dalmatia, Croatia, Slavonia, Bulgaria, Serbia, Rascia and Hulmia. This imaginary empire corresponds to the space of the contemporary Spanish imperial interests in the Balkans, as well as to the political interests of the Balkan peoples under the Ottoman rule and, naturally, of don Pedro himself.³³

Orbini’s “The Kingdom of the Slavs” can be regarded without doubt as the most elaborated and the most complex narrative articulation of early modern Illyrism. It synthesized the tradition of Dalmatian humanist historiography with discursive patterns from contemporary European learned history. Orbini uses linguistic criteria to construct an impressive catalogue of the Slavic people and lands, encompassing territories from England on the west, North Africa on the south, India on the east and toward the Baltic Sea on the north and including in all no less than 41 Slavic tribes. The last part of Orbini’s work in which he presents the histories of medieval Serbia, Bosnia, Hulmia, Bulgaria and to a smaller degree Croatia, is narratively structured in the form of the *res gestae* of their ruling dynasties. In Orbini’s political vision these very regions make the core of the “Kingdom of Slavs” in a narrower sense. Its symbolic epicenter is the Republic of Dubrovnik which is represented not only as the most important historical agent but also as a normative political, cultural, as well as civilizational model. Moreover, it seems that Orbini’s history had an explicit political purpose, since at the beginning of the 17th century, a part of the Ragusan nobility declared their fervent support for the idea that the Republic of Dubrovnik should take part in a planned military expedition under

³² Original edition: Pesaro 1601. See Mauro Orbini, *Il Regno degli Slavi hoggi corrottamento detti Schiavoni* (Munich: Otto Sagner, 1986), and in Croatian translation, Mavro Orbini, *Kraljevstvo Slavena* [tr. Snježana Husić] (Zagreb: Golden Marketing, 1999).

³³ See Peter Bartl, *Der Westbalkan zwischen Spanischer Monarchie und Osmanischem Reich. Zur Türkenkriegsproblematik an der Wende vom 16. zum 17. Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1974).

Spanish leadership to liberate the Balkan peninsula from the Ottomans and in so doing revive the once glorious Kingdom of Slavs.³⁴

The “second generation” of Interconfessional Illyrism is represented by the chronicle, “The glorious, sacred and virtuous Republic,” by the Catholic archbishop of Bar, Andrija Zmajević (1628–1694).³⁵ Composed according to the model established by St. Augustine and later adapted by Cesare Baronio, it provides a conceptual framework for representing exemplary “Slavic” history as embodied in national rulers and saints who belonged to the Catholic as well as to the Orthodox canons. The main function of Zmajević’s chronicle is thus simultaneously to affirm the particular “Slavic” element within the universal history of salvation and to appropriate ideological elements from the Orthodox tradition which would make the desired confessional unification of the Catholic and Orthodox Churches possible.

The most important articulations of Franciscan Illyrism are the foreword of the hagiographical work, “The Flower of Saints” (*Czvit szvetih*) written in the “Slavic language” by a Franciscan guardian, Franjo Glavinić (1585–1652),³⁶ and a Latin poem, “A short account of the glorious nation of the whole Illyrian tongue” (*Breve compendium nationis gloriosae totius linguae Illyricae*), composed by a Franciscan monk Martin Rusić (Martinus Rosa, d. 1660).³⁷ The main characteristics of Franciscan Illyrism are its conceptual and symbolic delimitation by the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the two Franciscan Provinces (Bosna Croatia and Bosna Argentina), together with a strong insistence upon renewed Catholic ethics and a pragmatic orientation towards the secular political powers. Glavinić’s ideological construction is founded upon the symbolic equation of the Franciscan Province of Bosna Croatia and the Kingdom of Croatia; in this way Glavinić constructs a utopian political oasis which emanates ancient national glory and where Catholic orthodoxy flourishes. Similar to Glavinić, Rusić constructs

³⁴ Zdenko Zlatar, *Our Kingdom Come: The Counter-Reformation, the Republic of Dubrovnik, and the Liberation of the Balkan Slavs* (New York: Boulder, 1992).

³⁵ *Darxava sveta slavna i kreposna carkovnoga lietopisa trudom Andrie Zmaievichia (...) narodu slovinskomu otvorena a S. Skupstini od rasplodegnia viere poklognena, god. 1675.* (manuscript [no. 69], Archaeological museum in Split). Modern edition: Andrija Zmajević, *Ljetopis crkovni* [Ecclesiastical Annals], ed. Mato Pižurica, 2 vols. (Cetinje: Obod, 1996).

³⁶ Original ed.: Venice, 1628. See Vatroslav Frkin, Eduard Hercigonja and Milan Mogaš, eds., *Zbornik radova o Franji Glaviniću* [Studies on Franjo Glavinić] (Zagreb: Croatian Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1989).

³⁷ *Breve compendium nationis gloriosae totius linguae Illyricae* (Madrid, 1628).

a kind of a virtual Illyrian state but locates it within the borders of the Franciscan Province of Bosna Argentina. Since its main part was at that time under Ottoman jurisdiction, Glavinić called on the then Spanish king, Philip IV, who laid claim to be ruler of the universal Christian monarchy, to become as well the liberator and potential renovator of the *Imperium Illyricum*.

Curial-Habsburg Illyrism, articulated in the works on “Illyrian saints” and “Illyrian Emperors” by Ivan Tomko Mrnavić (Ioannes Tomcus Marnavitius, 1580–1637), is a discursive mixture of two ideological and political paradigms, the proselytizing ideology of the Papal Curia and the Habsburg imperial ideology, which converged during the 1620s. In the two works mentioned, “Dialogue on Illyricum and the Illyrian Emperors” (*Dialogus de Illyrico Caesaribusque Illyricis*, in manuscript) and “The Abundance of Illyrian Royal Sanctity” (*Regiae sanctitatis Illyricanae foecunditas*),³⁸ Mrnavić combined the ideological elements not only of Counter-Reformation universalism and Habsburg imperialism, but also of Orthodox sacral and dynastical traditions, adapted, naturally, to the Catholic ideological framework. Mrnavić in fact discursively constructed a utopian state, a kind of *Illyricum sacrum*, which was equated with the former Byzantine Empire. The role of its ruler is credited to Ferdinand III Habsburg (1637–1657), son of the then Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand II (1619–1637), who represented a symbolic incarnation of the “new Constantine” with a mission to realize the political and confessional unification of Illyricum.

The last version of Counter-Reformation Illyrism is the Dalmatian one, which was created around the Illyrian Congregation of St. Jerome in Rome during the 1660s. Its main proponent was Jeronim Paštrić (1615–1708), a professor of apologetics at the Roman College and the author of the manuscript, “Description of Dalmatia and Illyricum with their provinces” (*Descriptio Dalmatiae et Hillyrii cum suis provinciis*, around 1650). Here Paštrić constructs a “double Illyricum”—a universal and a particular one. The universal Illyricum comprised 17 provinces and extended from the Danube to the Black Sea. The second, which he identified with Dalmatia, lies within the borders of Macedonia, Pannonia, Istria and the Adriatic Sea. Its legitimate ruler is, according to Paštrić, the actual banus or *prorex* of the Kingdom of

³⁸ *Dialogus de Illyrico Caesaribusque Illyricis* (in manuscript) and *Regiae sanctitatis Illyricanae foecunditas* (Rome, 1630).

Croatia, Nikola Zrinski (in Hungarian Miklós Zrínyi, 1620–1664) who during the Candian war (1645–1669) planned to liberate his “dominium” from the Ottomans.

Here is an obvious proof that around the second half of the 17th century the sacral component of Illyrism was gradually weakening in favor of a profane one, so that its appellative interests became more and more orientated towards the secular centers of power. This process reached its culmination in the so-called Illyrism of the Croatian Estates, which was the ideological foundation of the conspiracy of the Croatian and Hungarian magnates in 1671. The Illyrism of the Croatian Estates, discursively formulated in the Latin history “Memory of the kings and bans of the kingdoms of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia” by a canon from Zagreb, Juraj Rattkay (1612–1666),³⁹ focused upon the “national” institutions of king and ban, as well as the national saints and heroes in order to create a respectable historical representation of the “national” kingdom and to legitimize the political aspirations of the Croatian Estates which at that time were cooperating with the Hungarian Estates in the anti-Habsburg struggle.

Conclusion: The Impact of Illyrism on Croatian and Serbian national ideology

The emergence of two (proto-)national Illyrisms—the Croatian and the Serbian one—represented the final stage of the process of the “nationalization” of the Illyrian ideogeme at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Although both Croatian and Serbian Illyrisms seem to be distinctive, even incommensurable ideologies, both ethnonymous Illyrisms were not only conditioned by similar textual, intertextual and contextual determinants, but were also interdependent. The best illustration for this argument is the fact that Pavao Ritter Vitezović (1652–1713), creator of the exclusivist Croatian ideogeme, was the author of the

³⁹ Original edition: *Memoria Regum et Banorum Regnorum Dalmatiae, Croatiae et Sclavoniae inchoata ab origine sua et usque ad praesentem annum MDCLII deducta. Auctore Georgio Rattkay de Nagy Thabor. Viennae Austriae: Ex officina typographica Matthaei Cosmerovii, 1652.* Facsimile and Croatian translation: Juraj Rattkay, *Spomen na kraljeve i banove Kraljevstava Hrvatske, Slavonije i Dalmacije* [Memory of kings and bans of the kingdoms of Dalmatia, Croatia, and Slavonia] (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2001).

first history of the Serbs.⁴⁰ Besides, these (proto-)national Illyrisms did not appeal primarily to those institutions which were supranational (Habsburg rulers, Papacy) but to the national ones (Croatian and Serbian), which made them effective emancipative political platforms.

Beyond doubt, Vitezović's Illyrian opus represents the culmination of seventeenth-century Illyrism both in the structural and the functional sense. He simultaneously summarized and finalized the whole previous Illyrian tradition, clearing the path for the development of secular national Illyrisms, which would build their legitimizing potential upon the (real or fictive) historical and legal tradition.⁴¹

On the other hand, in both of his historiographical works, "Romanian Chronicle" (1688) and "Slavo-Serbian Chronicles" (beginning of the eighteenth century), Count Đorđe Branković (1665–1711)⁴² fused the indigenous Serbian Orthodox historical tradition with analogous Western models in order to make his national narrative transculturally legible. In this way he managed to create an emancipative ideological platform for the Serbian Orthodox population which came into the Habsburg dominium in Southern Hungary in 1690, as well as to introduce Illyrian terminology into the official Habsburg political discourse.

During the eighteenth century Illyrism experienced some important structural and functional modifications under the influence of the ideological and cultural paradigm of the Enlightenment. The most important novelty was doubtlessly its vertical "descent" from an elite discourse to various popular vernacular genres—e.g., the epic work, *Razgovor ugodni naroda Slovinskoga* (Pleasant Conversation of the Slavic people, 1756), written by the Franciscan monk, Andrija Kačić Miošić—which caused considerable modifications of its discursive forms and instrumental usages. For example, Kačić's immediate discursive and ideological models were the inter-confessional Illyrism of Petar Ohmučević and Mavro Orbini as well as Croatian Illyrism of Pavao Ritter Vitezović. The epicenter of his discursive "Slavic" state was Herzegovina, Dalmatia and Bosnia, but in contrast to his predecessors

⁴⁰ Entitled *Serbiae illustratae libri octo* [Eight books of Illustrated Serbia], it remains in manuscript.

⁴¹ For a more detailed account see Zrinka Blažević, "Performing National Identity: The Case of Pavao Ritter Vitezović (1652–1713)," *National Identities* 5 (2003) 3: 251–69. See also Sándor Bene's contribution to the present volume.

⁴² See Jovan Radonić, *Đurađ II Branković, "despot Ilirika"* [Djuradj Branković, Despot of Illyricum] (Cetinje: Obod, 1955).

who had projected the role of the continuators of the Illyrian “political” continuity onto actual secular or ecclesiastic rulers, Kačić assigned this to the “Dukes and Princes of the Slavic nation” (i.e. the chieftains of the Morlach population in the Dalmatian hinterland), who represented the structural analogy of, and, in a way, a functional substitute to the national institutions swept away by the Ottoman conquests.⁴³

Apart from this, the Illyrian ideologeme during this period permeated Serbian ethno-confessional ideologies (e.g. Hristofor Žefarović, Jovan Rajić), which, again, caused great changes in its discursive structure and political functions. Finally, it continued its discursive life within normative and institutionalized historiographical genres, the production of great Illyrian *summae* being characteristic of the whole period of the eighteenth century (Ignjat Đurđević, Josip Bedeković, Andrija Blašković). Discursively perpetuating its own rich ideological heritage, eighteenth-century Illyrism was also permeated by contemporary elite political languages and ideological configurations such as the reason of state and enlightened philosophy imbued with the theory of natural and/or historical law.

Thanks to its flexible, polysemic and transgressive nature, Illyrism had not only developed a complex discursive structure, but also accumulated enormous ideological potential during the early modern period, which enabled its “prolonged performance” in the nineteenth century when it was additionally enriched with the symbolic political capital of the Napoleonic Illyrian provinces and Romantic ethno-linguistic national conceptions.⁴⁴ Thanks to that very ideological content, nineteenth-century Illyrism simultaneously made possible both vertical political mobilization (Austroslavism) on ethnogenetic premises, and horizontal national integration (the Triune Kingdom) which was founded upon the historical and legal tradition of the Croatian Estates. Nevertheless, having been divided into two incompatible variants, a supranational (the Yugoslavism of J. J. Strossmayer) and a national exclusivist one (promoted by the Party of Right of A. Starčević) in the second half of the nineteenth century, the Illyrian ideologeme gradually started losing the features of a transnational ideologeme

⁴³ See Zrinka Blažević, “Ilirski ideologem u djelima Andrije Kačića Miošića” [The Illyrian ideologeme in the works of Andrija Kačić Miošić], *Ljetopis Srpskog kulturnog društva Prosvjeta* 10 (2005): 140–50.

⁴⁴ See “Ilirizam,” in Joanna Rapacka, *Leksikon hrvatskih tradicija* [Lexicon of Croatian traditions] (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2006), 78–84.

capable of performing distinctive, even incompatible ideological and political functions.

In contrast to its modern successor which sought to obtain discursive stability and ideological homogeneity, early modern Illyrism could be described as a national, supranational and transnational ideologeme, a symbolic field of politics which always offered itself to various practices and interpretations as a boundless space of (utopian) alternatives. Moreover, it could be read as a kind of discursive heterotopia, an “impossible space” of the coexistence of the opposite, the distinctive and the incommensurable.⁴⁵

⁴⁵ See Michel Foucault, “Of Other Spaces,” *Diacritics* 2 (1986): 22–27.

CHAPTER SEVEN

NATION, PATRIA AND THE AESTHETICS OF EXISTENCE: LATE HUMANIST NATIONAL DISCOURSE AND ITS REWRITING BY THE MODERN CZECH NATIONALIST MOVEMENT

Lucie Storchová

According to many scholars, research on early modern national discourses is constrained in the “iron cage” of modernism and it is rarely analyzed in adequate depth.¹ However, recent texts on the topic suggest a quite different situation. Instead of understanding national discourses of the period as a mass phenomenon, they are more often analyzed as a set of constructions defining the self and the other and offering to individuals multiple frames for (self)identification. My research focuses, to paraphrase Aleida Assmann, mostly on three main topological patterns common to various historical national discourses—the topos of unity (nation as a collective identity based rather on the common project and experience than on ethnicity), the topos of origin (nation as a set of values and aims based on the shared interpretation of history) and the topos of liberation (nation as an integrating definition in face of the image of the other).² Recent research on Central European early modern discourses of nationhood (including also the “German” and “Italian” texts of the period) concentrates on the problem of *origo gentis*, on the mythology of *translatio imperii*, on transformations of classical narratives or on constructions of hetero- and auto-stereotypes seen as peculiar forms of knowledge sustaining

¹ For a summary of modernist concepts and an overview of early modern forms of nationalism see Philip S. Gorski, “The Mosaic Moment: An Early Modernist Critique of Modernist Theories of Nationalism,” *American Journal of Sociology*, 105 (2000) 5: 1428–1468.

² Aleida Assmann, “Erinnerung und Erwählung. Zwei Modelle von Nationbildung im England des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts,” in U. Ch. Sander and Paul Fritz, eds., *Muster und Funktionen kultureller Selbst- und Fremdwahrnehmung. Beiträge zur internationalen Geschichte der sprachlichen und literarischen Emanzipation* (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2000), 319–34.

collective identities (e.g. the humanist discourses of *excellencia* and *libertas*, *antibarbaries*, *antiromanitas*, etc.).³ As Caspar Hirschi has recently demonstrated in his excellent monograph, most of these discourses referred to the idea of an exclusive national honor bound to the singular qualities of the respective nation and territory that led to an “international contest” for reputation and sanctioned, at the same time, the social positions of humanists.⁴

Before turning to these approaches it is necessary to explain my choice of discourses proceeding from a very particular group of Bohemian writers of the late Renaissance—the so-called Veleslavín’s circle. This circle consisted of collaborators of the Prague typographer Daniel Adam of Veleslavín (1546–1599) and arose in connection with activities of his printing house from the late 1570s till 1599 when he died. The circle of authors and translators cooperating with Veleslavín could be considered one of the most productive Bohemian centers of intellectual communication and literacy of the period (both in Latin and Czech). Veleslavín wrote, translated, re-worked and published almost 140 volumes until his death, including a typical humanist corpus of casual poetry as well as numerous treatises on medicine, marital con-

³ See Henfried Münkler and Hans Grünberger, “Nationale Identität im Diskurs der Deutschen Humanisten,” in Helmut Berding, ed., *Nationales Bewusstsein und kollektive Identität* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1994), 211–48; Henfried Münkler, Hans Grünberger and Kathrin Mayer, *Nationenbildung. Die Nationalisierung Europas im Diskurs humanistischer Intellektueller. Italien und Deutschland* (Berlin: Akademischer Verlag, 1998); Herbert Jaumann, “Das dreistellige Translatio-Schema und einige Schwierigkeiten mit der Renaissance in Deutschland, Konrad Celtis’ *Ode ad Apollinem* (1486),” in Georg Vogt-Spira and Bettina Romme, eds., *Rezeption und Identität. Die kulturelle Auseinandersetzung Roms mit Griechenland als europäisches Paradigma* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1999), 335–49; Johannes Helmuth, Ulrich Muhlack and Gerrit Walther, eds., *Diffusion des Humanismus. Studien zur nationalen Geschichtsschreibung europäischer Humanisten* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2002), especially Ottavio Clavuot, “Flavio Biondos Italia illustrata. Porträt und historisch-geographische Legitimation der humanistischcn Elite Italiens,” 55–76; Ulrich Muhlack “Das Projekt der *Germania illustrata*. Ein Paradigma der Diffusion des Humanismus?,” 142–58; Thomas Maissen, “Weshalb die Eidgenossen Helvetier wurden. Die humanistische Definition einer Natio,” 210–49; and Gerrit Walther, “Nation als Exportgut. Mögliche Antworten auf die Frage: Was heisst Diffusion des Humanismus?” 436–46. All these interpretations of national discourses differ markedly from researches on European “patriotism,” if it is seen as a complex of optional duties toward the *patria* performed by *cives boni*. See the volume edited by Robert von Friedeburg, “*Patria*” und “*Patrioten*” vor dem *Patriotismus. Pflichten, Rechte, Glauben und die Rekonfigurierung europäischer Gemeinwesen im 17. Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag, 2005).

⁴ Caspar Hirschi, *Wettkampf der Nationen. Konstruktion einer deutschen Ehrgemeinschaft an der Wende vom Mittelalter zur Neuzeit* (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2005).

cord and household governance. However, my choice was also influenced by the modern nationalist interpretation of Czech history. The theorists of historical tropology and narrativism draw our attention to the fact that each historical narrative or set of events should dispose of clear initial and final points if they are to be understood as a meaningful story. In the story of great “fathers” (founders, defenders and restorers) of the Czech nation that was shaped and retold since the beginning of the nineteenth century, the *Architypographus Pragensis* represents the zenith of the unspoiled “golden age” of Czech literature and language before its decline after the “fatal” Battle of White Mountain in 1620 and eventual revival by the Czech nationalist movement, an inevitable victory completing the elliptic logic of the story.⁵

Let us disregard the fact that Daniel Adam could without doubt be considered as one of the “intertextual fathers” of the modern Czech idiom, because his lexicographical works (including four huge dictionaries) served as a basis for the revivalist intellectuals in the construction of modern Czech vocabulary and grammar.⁶ The story mentioned above, or at least its main reasoning, survives even in recent scholarly works. For instance, Milan Kopecký, the author of the most recent synthetic work about Renaissance humanism in Bohemia, regards the so-called “potential to laicization” as a specific feature of Czech humanism.⁷ It originates in the proto-humanist period under the rule of Charles IV and in Hussitism and becomes evident at the beginning of the sixteenth century, after the separation of humanism into two independent branches—Latin humanism (of no importance for the future) and “national humanism,” centered on the Utraquist bourgeoisie and

⁵ For the most important literature concerning this master-narrative and its revisionist interpretations as well (mostly referring to the concept of continuity) see Vladimír Urbánek, “The Idea of State and Nation in the Writings of Bohemian Exiles after 1620,” in Linas Eriksonas and Leos Müller, eds., *Statehood Before and Beyond Ethnicity: Minor States in Northern and Eastern Europe, 1600–2000* (Frankfurt am Main: Lang 2005), 67–68, footnotes 1–3.

⁶ In his “History of Czech Literature,” Josef Jungmann, author of the voluminous early nineteenth-century Czech-German dictionary, explicitly acknowledges that Veleslavín’s lexicons served him as an excellent base for the “entire national dictionary” (*wýborný základ k auplnému národnjmu slowáři*). See footnote 77, here 162.

⁷ Milan Kopecký, *Český humanismus* [Czech Humanism] (Prague: Melantrich, 1988). The same author also wrote the only modern biography of Daniel Adam of Veleslavín that contains some nationalist statements too. Milan Kopecký, *Daniel Adam z Veleslavína* (Prague: Svobodné Slovo, 1962); see explicitly 34: “*Veleslavín není pouze hrdým vlastencem, je také přesvědčeným zastáncem sounděžitosti slovanských národů.*”

social topics. The development of the second branch allegedly culminates in the works of Veleslavín's circle that found a wide reception in the public. After Veleslavín's death "national humanism" entered a period of crisis that eventually led to the Czech national revival.⁸ Besides an over-simplifying "Marxist" overtone—regarding which it is difficult to say whether it was compulsory or simply subconscious in the late 1980s—the clear meta-narrative elements (progress towards a modern Czech national state) can be found in the background of this interpretation.⁹

The main aim of my approach is to avoid the category of "continuity" that constructs the representatives of early modern national discourse as forerunners of the modern national state. Therefore, I will seek to analyze the role played by the national discourse in the late humanist "ethics of the self" and examine how this particular discourse was re-written by the modern Czech national movement since the 1780s.

Discourses of nationhood and late humanist "aesthetics of existence"

The first part of the analysis refers to the concept of the "aesthetics of existence" elaborated by Michel Foucault in the last two volumes of his *History of Sexuality*.¹⁰ Before turning to this conceptual framework,

⁸ The term "national humanism" is mostly used uncritically in contemporary Czech historiography. Kopecký himself does not address the German-speaking background of this term. Even the most recent German historiography often considers the "idea of the German nation" (*deutsche Nationalgedanke*) to be the very heart of the German humanism (*Kern des deutschen Humanismus*). See Muhlack, "Das Projekt der *Germania illustrata*," 148. As for the basic literature to the German humanist discourse of nationhood (from Paul Joachimsen to Gernot Michael Müller), see Caspar Hirschi, "Vorwärts in neue Vergangenheiten. Funktionen des humanistischen Nationalismus in Deutschland," in Thomas Maissen and Gerrit Walther, eds., *Funktionen des Humanismus. Studien zum Nutzen des Neuen in der humanistischen Kultur* (Göttingen: Wallstein 2006), 362.

⁹ The dichotomy of "vernacular" and "Latin" branches as well as an explicit nationalist analysis of Veleslavín's texts is still current in main-stream Czech historiography and can be found even in quite recent works, see Alena Wildová, "Amor di patria e conoscenza del mondo nella prefazione di Daniel Adam z Veleslavína all' *Itinerarium Sacrae Scripturae* di H. Büting," in Sante Graciotti, ed., *Italia e Boemia nella cornice del rinascimento europeo* (Firenze: Leo S. Olschki, 1999), 298.

¹⁰ My interpretation refers to the last two published volumes of the "History of Sexuality" (*L'Usage de plaisirs* and *Le Souci de soi*), as well as to the late Foucault's essays and interviews that also partly anticipate the fourth unfinished volume (*Les Aveux de*

let me point out briefly its relationship to an analysis of early modern discourses of nation, their arguments and figurative speech. As the following paragraphs illustrate, Veleslavín and his collaborators produced a particular discourse of subjectivity and ethical preoccupation, probably the most comprehensive that can be found in Bohemian late humanist literature. Contrary to conventional historiographical reading, it does not only refer to Christian hermeneutics of the self but also to ancient political and medical theories and subtexts. This aesthetics of existence implies a particular interpretation of the social whole and the role played by each individual in the set of imagined communities, such as the *patria* and the “nation”. Forms of “ethical work” as well as social participation were performed in this discourse with specific metaphors (mostly corporeal or civic). Above all, on the level of figurative speech “organicist aspects” of this humanist political anthropology could appear.

The practices of the self we could find in texts published by Veleslavín and his collaborators imply, beside direct ethical work on oneself (e.g. practice of diet, medical regime, religious self-reflection), also relations with others and can not be separated from the social whole. This subjectivization is related to the ways in which one is to occupy one’s rightful social role, however it is positioned in a set of imagined communities like *patria*, civic community, church and so on, or in interpersonal, above all marital relations, without necessarily resulting in individualism of the modern kind.¹¹ By using this conceptual frame I will try to show how a specific early modern discourse of nation could work in relationship to the other categories of personal and social cultivation and to the ways in which they are figured. At this point a difference

la chair). See also Michel Foucault, *L’Herméneutique du Sujet: Cours au Collège du France (1981–1982)*, ed. Frédérique Gros (Paris: Gallimard, 2001) and the following articles contained in the volume Michel Foucault, *Dits et écrits IV (1980–1988)*, ed. Daniel Defert and François Ewald (Paris: Gallimard, 1994): “Sexualité et solitude” (No. 295), “Subjectivité et vérité” (No. 304), “Le combat de la chasteté” (No. 312), “L’écriture de soi” (No. 329), “À propos de la généalogie de l’éthique: un aperçu du travail en cours” (No. 344), “L’éthique du souci de soi comme pratique de la liberté” (No. 356), “Une esthétique de l’existence” (No. 357). See also Michel Foucault, “Technologies of the Self,” in Luther H. Martin, Huck Gutman and Patrick H. Hutton, eds., *Technologies of the Self: A seminar with Michel Foucault* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1988), 16–49.

¹¹ About the social implications of Foucault’s late concepts, see among others Margaret A. McLaren, *Feminism, Foucault and Embodied Subjectivity* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002), 68–73.

between my approach and the analysis of early modern patriotism mentioned in the introduction seems to be evident. If we understand subjectivity as one of the ways we are led to think about ourselves, then being a subject means on the most basic level inventing a relationship to oneself, to discourse, to power and to knowledge.¹² In contrast to the position taken in the earlier works by Foucault (e.g. the analysis of panopticism or bio-power and their functions to individualize, to normalize and to hierarchize human beings), individuals constitute themselves, they cannot be seen just as an inscribed material or the effects of power. In doing so, the Foucauldian “aesthetics of existence” goes beyond Burckhardt’s thesis about the Renaissance autonomous individual (*geistiges Individuum*) and approaches the claims of New Historicism, above all those of Stephen Greenblatt and his famous book on Renaissance self-fashioning, which in recent English-speaking historiography is considered *the* referential text on the history of subjectivity.¹³

Although declaring the subject a fragmented cultural artifact, Greenblatt’s text refers not to the ways in which subjects fashioned themselves but rather to the primacy of social, economic and political forces (the so-called centers of authority) over the articulation of the self.¹⁴ In contrast, Foucault sees the ethics of the self (the aesthetics or stylistics of existence) as a positive operation, a sum of technologies on how to create, observe, examine and govern oneself and how to make the self a subject of ethical experience and conduct. The subject is not considered an *a priori* given substance or a universal form that could be found in any human society, but a form constituted by a specific set of practices producing one’s own life as a work of art. The ethical preoccupation shows itself in discourse as a problematization and includes all forms of relationship to one’s self and of ways to consider one’s own conduct, duties, feelings etc.

¹² See the basic introductory compendium to the problem, Nick Mansfield, *Subjectivity: Theories of the Self from Freud to Haraway* (N.Y.: New York University Press, 2000).

¹³ See Roy Porter, ed., *Rewriting the Self: Histories from the Renaissance to Present* (London, N.Y.: Routledge, 1997).

¹⁴ Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1980). Jürgen Pieters uses term “near-absence of theoretical reflexion” with reference to the contribution by Koenraad Geldof in Jürgen Pieters, ed., *Critical Self-Fashioning: Stephen Greenblatt and the New Historicism* (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1999), 17. See also John Jeffries Martin, *Myths of Renaissance Individualism* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).

Technologies and forms of an active relationship to one's self create also the social intelligibility of the subject and they enable its social integration and involvement. Above all, the social dimension is important to the analysis of early modern subjectivation processes that are not related exclusively to religious discourses as in the case of texts published by Veleslavín's circle. Historians working with the late Foucauldian concepts prefer to concentrate on technologies of the self linked with the traditional Christian hermeneutics of the self, typical for the monasticism of late antiquity and the Middle Ages (self-abnegation as a paradoxical form of the care for oneself, ascetic exercises of self-mastery, penitential ritual forms of self-renunciation, forms of contemplation, practices for avoiding temptation etc.). Foucault himself considered the main area of ethical preoccupation in the sixteenth century to be the practice of self-examination in the context of the contemporary religious crisis and during the early modern revival of Stoic philosophy. The discourse we are dealing with concentrates only partly on Christian hermeneutical topics, as it also retrieves ancient subtexts, commonplaces and even ancient political or medical theories, for instance, humoral pathology, or the typical pre-Stoic emphasis on man's fitness to rule and master others, whether as a head of his household or as governor of a city. By stressing the differences between the early Christian hermeneutics of the self and the late humanist aesthetics of existence, the interdependence of ethical preoccupations, social participation and discourses of nation, patria and other imagined communities becomes visible.

The early Christian hermeneutics of the self can be compared to this form of subjectivation while analyzing four aspects, defined by Foucault in the introductory chapter to the *History of Sexuality*, Vol. 2. The ethical substance (*la substance éthique*, a "material" that should be cultivated through ethical work) referred in the early Christian period to the idea of sexuality being in the very center of human peccability—in our textual corpus it concentrates on the human proclivity to violate the good measure and good order of Christian society. In both cases the mode of subjection (*le mode d'assujettissement*, the way in which individuals should be concerned about their moral obligations) is an obedience to the divine law, which in the later discourses is substantiated as a "natural order" embodied by social institutions (matrimony etc.). The ethical work itself (*les formes de l'élaboration*, forms of work that one performs on oneself, ascetics in the widest sense of the word) differs strongly from all sophisticated forms of self-reflection.

Self-renunciation in the early Christian hermeneutical and ascetical practices is the only thing requested in the latter discourse, namely the introspection of the divine part of the human heart as well as an examination of God's order in the world, so that the divine order can be observed in each individual life. The *telos* (the aim of the ethical work) is salvation in both cases, but the purity of soul as such is not guaranteed by sexual abstinence, incrimination of sexual intercourse or a state of virginity. The parallel second *telos* in the latter discourses is the natural/divine order itself.

All these contrasts indicate how subjectivity and various levels of social life blend together in texts written by Veleslavín's circle. Before proceeding to discourses of nation, patria and other imagined communities, it seems to be necessary to treat briefly the general levels of the problematization and ethical preoccupation. The main sources of ethical preoccupation are Veleslavín's eschatology and his eschatological interpretation of Bohemian history. Veleslavín and his collaborators recurred in their texts again and again to the coming Judgment Day as a crucial impulse for an individual to hold communion with himself. Veleslavín adapted to the topic the editorial politics of his printing house in order to depict the ways God's wrath and impatience were manifested in the past and present. He even applied Melanchthon's concept of fatal periods (*fatales periodi*, predictable regular changes in governments) to Bohemian history and interpreted some of his historical editions (Josephus Flavius, Eusebius, Cassiodorus) as practical Christian manuals of conduct in the age of the coming Last Judgment.¹⁵ The eschatological source of moral preoccupation is not

¹⁵ See Lucie Storchová, "Der eschatologische Ton in den Vorworten der Drucke Veleslavíns. Zur Position der Eschatologie als Quelle der Ethik im späthumanistischen Diskurs," *Acta Comeniana* 18 (2004): 7–41. As to the eschatological historical narratives at the beginning of the Thirty Years' War, see Vladimír Urbánek, "Prorocství, astrologie a chronologie v dílech exulantů" [Prophecy, astrology and chronology in the writings of Bohemian exiles], in Michaela Hrubá, ed., *Víra nebo vlast? Exil v českých dějinách raného novověku* [Faith or Fatherland? The exile in the history of early modern Bohemia] (Ústí nad Labem: Albis international, 2001), 166–173; Urbánek, "The Idea of State and Nation," 67–83. See also older articles about prefaces to Veleslavín's historical editions that do not deal with the eschatological level: Zdeněk Beneš, "Kroniky dvě o založení země české a jejich místo v dějinách české historiografie" ["Two Chronicles on the Origin of Bohemia" and its Place in the History of the Czech Historiography], *Acta Universitatis Carolinae—Philosophica et historica* 1984, *Studia historica* XXIX, *Problémy dějin historiografie* III, 41–67; idem, *Historický text a historická skutečnost. Studie o principech českého humanistického dějepisectví* [Historical text and historical reality. On the principles of Bohemian humanist historiography]

so clean-cut confessionalized—which is analogous to his conception of the elect nation, as will be shown hereafter.

The first crucial point is the very problematization of the self and the frequency of appeals to recognize and govern oneself. All of them refer to the Christian ethical substance: to become a “king over yourself” (*sám nad sebau Králem*) implies an introspective attitude, to see “as in the mirror” one’s own peccability and to try to find a solution in sincere submission and obedience to God and his Law.¹⁶ An important role is played there by the category of *timor Dei* and of “consciousness,” understood as a “divine spark” in the human heart. A person can rely only on his divine part, because it is firmly anchored in God and already known to Him. The ethical work subsequently does not lie in generating or cultivating one’s own consciousness, but in introspecting one’s own heart and seeking the already given.¹⁷ The category of “Christian inwardness” stays in the very heart of Veleslavín’s ethical substance; it presents a special form of the relationship to oneself and includes specific forms of moral attention. The early Christian ethical substance, according to Michel Foucault, was defined by the sphere of anxiety hidden deep in the heart and determined by the inherited sin that each individual should fight by means of contemplation, penitence and prayer. In contrast to the early Christian ethical

(Prague: Karolinum, 1993), 89ff.; Hans Rothe, “Die Vorworte in den Drucken des Daniel Adam von Veleslavín,” in Hans Bernd Harder and Hans Rothe, eds., *Studien zum Humanismus in den böhmischen Ländern IV. Später Humanismus in der Krone Böhmen 1570–1620* (Dresden: Dresden University Press, 1998), 224–41.

¹⁶ Georg Lauterbeck, *Politia Historica. O Wrchnostech a Sprawcých Swětských. Knihy Patery*. [Politia Historica. Five books on suzerains and secular regents] (Prague, 1584) /KNM: 29 B 1/, 127; *Sskola aneb Cwičenj Křestianské a wěrné dusse pobožného Człowěka* [School or exercises for the Christian soul of a pious man] (Prague, 1589) /NKP: 54 F 215/, 31.

¹⁷ See this argument in another book edited and commented on by Veleslavín: Juan Luis Vives, *Ioannis Lodovici Vivis Valentini ad veram sapientiam Introductio* (Prague, 1586) / NKP: 54 G 224/, 94a (about the category of consciousness on 109f.). See also Jan Brtvín z Ploskovic and Mikuláš Černobyl, *Hospodář. Knižka welmi užitečná, zawijragijc v sobě, předně nawedenij žiwota Křestianského, yakby ti, kteříž w swětě nad ginými panugij, sami sebe y sobě poddanné sprawowati měli* [Householder: A very useful booklet containing rules of Christian life for all suzerains, how to govern themselves and their subjects] (Prague, 1587) /NKP: 54 K 11.682/, 69; *Čelednj wůdce čili upřjmná a spasitedlná rada všem we službě stogjcjm aneb do služba se chystagjcjm. Třetj uprawnénj wydání* [Guide for servants or sincere and saving advice for all servants and servants-to-be. The third edition] (Prague, 1843). The original version is: Peter Glaser, *Czelednij Diábel. Krátký spis o wsseligakých neřádijch, newěře a neposlussnosti* [Devil of servants. A short treatise on disorder, infidelity and disobedience] (Prague, 1586), Preface.

hermeneutical model, these practices are neither strictly defined nor elaborated. The aesthetic of existence of a late humanist *athleta Christi* refers neither to monastic asceticism nor bodily mortification, rather it stresses explicitly that God likes much more a sincere and industrious work on the prescribed social position than “the afflicted life of nuns and monks.”¹⁸

The second point is an ambivalence between an active and passive relationship to one’s self—all forms of inwardness and introspection are anyway conditioned by divine grace that favors only active individuals. On the one hand, no human being should usurp the role of God in caring for him/herself. On the other hand, a certain activity is necessary, at least to introspect one’s own heart and to distinguish good from evil.¹⁹ One of the tracts translated and published by Veleslavín even comprises the large set of techniques on how to actively distinguish the truth in the time of religious disagreements and how to look for the divine spark of truth hidden in the human heart.²⁰ Other tracts emphasize the model of activity coming up to the order created by God, also the necessity of a master that is described on an abstract level as “reason” (leading the soul and led by God according to Vives, whose texts were also translated by Veleslavín’s circle) or, more often, as a punishing father, shepherd or school-master, who, as taking God’s place, must be followed without resistance, in the terrestrial hierarchy.²¹

Finally, the third point is a submission to paternal and pastoral authority, to the so-called “natural order” (“natural Law”) as well as to the social and professional occupations ordained by God. All levels of social as well as individual practice are regulated by this pattern of fatherly authority. While the Lord chastises as Father and Shepherd all his loving children, His authority is transmitted to suzerains, husbands, governors, teachers, and indeed all human beings in relation-

¹⁸ *Čelednj wůdce*, the 5th declamation.

¹⁹ *Čelednj wůdce*, the 5th declamation.

²⁰ *Štjt wjry prawé, Katholické a Křestianské* [Shield of the true, Catholic and Christian faith] (Prague, 1591) /NKP: 54 B 49/, 25f.

²¹ *Tabule sedmi zlých a sedmi dobrých věcí Čžlowěka* [List of seven good and seven bad human characters] (Prague, 1588) /NKM: 62 L 32/, 254–259, 267–268. As to the model teacher-disciple see *Isocratis ad Daemonicum Paranesis de Officijs* (Prague, 1586) /NKP: 54 E 224, adl. 2/, 11a; *Introductio* (1586), 30–31. About the necessity of a pastoral leadership see *Rozgijmánij aneb výklad Pobožný a Křestianský na Žalm S. Davida XXXII* [Contemplation or a pious and Christian comment on Psalm 32] (Prague, 1589) /NKP: 54 F 215, adl. 1/, 239.

ship to their bodies and lives. Divine order is seen as the *conditio sine qua non* of human society defining the social and working position of each individual. Society functions as a body and as such needs the head ruling in the name of the Father who must be explicitly obeyed in place of God. The father-like model is then transposed to all levels of society (civic community, sovereign, household, Church) and entails mutual obligations, in which “subordinate” members too are provided with full ethical subjectivity.²² The model of paternal authority rejected asceticism and emphasized “natural hierarchy” and “natural reciprocity” of all social institutions. To secede from the divine order means to commit a sin, to show ingratitude and to forgo the God. The necessity to comply with the “natural bond” of human society as well as with the human obligation to oneself and to *patria* are mentioned in numerous texts, for instance the tracts about proper Christian conduct at the time of the plague epidemic.²³

The categories of concord (*swornost*, distinguished in the external and the more important internal concord) and peace (*pokog*) are the most crucial for the functioning of the natural order on all social as well as individual levels.²⁴ These categories are based on the idea of

²² The category of a “natural order” or a “good order” and the way it works on all social levels is discussed in many texts published by Veleslavin and his collaborators, see e.g. *Ecclesiasticus sive sapientia Iesu filii Sirachi* (Prague, 1586) /NKP: 54 K 5868/, 60f. and passim; Henrik von Rantzau, *Regiment zdrawij* [Book on health] (Prague, 1587) /NKP: 54 G 23/, 13–14; *Čelednj wůdce* (ed. 1834), the first declamation and passim; *Hospodář* (1587), the preface, 2b, in the text 31f.; *Prawidlo křestianského žiwota. Wedlé kteréhož powinen g(es)t se každý Křestianský člověk w swém žiwotě a stawu řijditi a chowati* [The rule of Christian life, according to which every Christian should behave and govern himself] (Prague, 1587) /NKP: 54 F 198/, passim; Jean L’Espine, *Providentia Dei. O řjzenj a opatrowánj Božském* [Providentia Dei. On divine government and care] (Prague, 1592) /NKP: 54 F 318/, 6f., 608 and passim; Andreas Hyperius, *Traktát O opatrowánj Chudých kterakby ti w městech a obcech chowáni a opatrowáni býti měli a mohli* (Prague, 1592) [Treatise on the care of the poor, how they should be looked after and nourished in towns] /MK 29 E 3/, 37f.; *Introductio* (1586), 24a; Christof Fischer, *Postylla Djtek* [Sermons for children] (Prague, 1589) /NKP: 54 B 104/, the preface, 1.; Jan Rosacius, *O Swornosti Manželské* [On marital concord] (Prague, 1583) /NKP: 54 G 669/, 50., 222–23, and passim; *Politia historica* (1587), passim. The concept of the divine order is best evident in the literature on house management and in the *querelles des femmes*. See *Hospodář* (1587), 5f.; *O swornosti* (1583), passim; Jan Kocýn, *Abeceda pobožné Manželky a rozssaffné Hospodyně* [Abecedarium for the pious spouse and a good housewife] (Prague, 1585) /NKP 54 C 132/, passim; *Cžest a Newina pohlawj Ženského* [Virtue and Innocence of the female sex] (Prague, 1584) /NKP: 54 C 132/, passim, 329.

²³ Jan Kocýn, *Rozmaluwánj o Moru* [Discourse on the Black Death] (Prague, 1582) /NKP: 54 D 193/, 5 and 80f.

²⁴ *O swornosti* (1583), 7f.; and *Politia historica* (1587), 514f.

the pathology of excess and the pathology of change. This becomes evident in texts about medicine, dietetics, humoral pathology and astrology. They present the human body as a harmonious assembly of limbs, a “very fragile machine” (*welmi subtylný strog*) endangered by changes of any form, by so-called corporeal fatal periods (*anni climacterici* coming in cycles of seven or nine years), affects and all disturbing acts of any kind. The concrete practices (concerning eating, etc.) are interpreted as means to restore the former balance, e.g. according to the humor (in interdependence on season, temperament, daytime etc.).²⁵ Not only prescriptive discourses about the governance over the self and one’s own body but also over various social institutions (seen usually also as a body) refer to the image of balance, good time and good measure.²⁶

Key concepts of collective identity

For the analysis of Veleslavín’s national discourse it is important to describe the relationship of the concept of nation to the whole set of “imagined communities” discussed in texts of Veleslavín’s circle.²⁷ In light of the traditional Czech nationalist interpretation it would be necessary to focus on categories of “národ” (nation), “patria” (understood in a geographical way as a homeland) and “slovanství” (Slavism), because in their very name the whole discourse was rewritten in the early nineteenth century. By contrast, the categories of an “elect nation”, “elect church” determined by the eschatological thought of the period or of *patria* (defined as a civic, city-like community) were not accepted in the new discursive constellation at all.

I begin with the most problematical of all categories—the category of the nation itself. The category functions in the texts on several levels, but only two of them seem to stay in the center of discursive activ-

²⁵ See *Ecclesiasticus* (1586), 112f.; *Introductio* (1586), 20f.; and above all the whole book on dietetics in *Regiment zdravij* (1587).

²⁶ The texts published by Veleslavín’s circle stressed above all the danger of historical and social change, see *Čelednj wůdce* (ed. 1843), the 6th declamation. As to the danger of historical changes see Storchová, “Der eschatologische Ton,” 20f.

²⁷ The way I use the term “imagined communities” refers to the famous work by Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983), but also to its later interpretations which expanded it towards a discursive theory that Anderson most probably does not share.

ity. Firstly, the term is used to promote Veleslavín himself and his achievement as translator and publisher, while evoking the contemporary degradation of the nation and an absence of writers engaged in its correction. In these passages by Veleslavín one can find one of the sentences most quoted in the nineteenth century: “soon it would be more probable to see on the Prague bridge a deer with a golden antler than a true Czech.” The laments for the decline of the Czech language function in the same way. Both strategies could be found mostly in the closing passage of his prefaces underlining the generosity of the patron (as the only one to understand and appreciate the congeniality of the Czech language etc.) without any explicit reference to the whole ethical preoccupation mentioned above.²⁸ Secondly, the category of nation transfers some points of the ethics of the self on two communities, on the so-called “old Bohemians” (*staršíj Čechowé*), arguing that they also obeyed the Order and Law, and on contemporary Bohemians (*Čechowé*).²⁹ By using the term “other nations” (*cizij národowé, okolnij národowé*) Veleslavín depicts the other as a source of moral contamination; in the same prefaces he tells the story of the “golden age” many years ago and calls for the restoration of “ancient” customs (equanimity, temperance, concord, order and rights etc.).³⁰ This comparative approach, usually called in scholarly literature the *olim-nunc* schema, was of crucial importance for discourses at the beginning of the nineteenth century, because it enabled one to define the cultural autonomy and national virtues of the “golden age” by using its own “authentic” idiom and authority.

The passage about “Slavism” was rewritten to the same degree, and recited later as an appeal for Slavonic brotherly solidarity. On the one hand, Veleslavín wrote in his preface to the edition of the travel books by Herberstein and Guagnini about the common origins of all

²⁸ Heinrich Buenting, *Itinerarium Sacrae Scripturae: To gest: Putowánj Swatých Na wssecku Swatau Biblj obogjho Zákona* [Itinerarium sanctae scripturae, i.e. travels of saints in the Old and New Testament] (Prague, 1592) /NKP: 54 D 7046/, 6af. See also the only modern edition of Veleslavín's prefaces: Mirjam Bohatcová, *Obečné dobré podle Melantricha a Veleslavínů* [The common good according to Melantrich and the Veleslavíns] (Prague: Nakladatelství Karolinum, 2005), 320ff.

²⁹ *Kronyky dvě O založenij Země České a prwnijch Obywatelijch gegich* [Two chronicles on the foundation of Bohemian lands and their first inhabitants] (Prague, 1585) /NKP: 54 G 11520/, A4a (see also Bohatcová, *Obečné dobré*, 229), A4b (230), B1a (231), B2b; B3b (233), B4a (233); *Kalendář Hystorycký* [Historical calendar] (Prague, 1578) /NKP: 54 C 29/, 2b.

³⁰ *Kroniky dvě* (1585), A2b, A4a etc.; *Kalendář hystorycký* (1578), 3a.

Slavonic nations and languages and their spread on both continents; on the other hand, the existence of the Muscovite state is interpreted as an eschatological example of God's punishment and as a defense of the current Christian political establishment in Bohemia that protects justice, order and right against "Turks, Muscovites and Tartars."³¹

A key category that does not appear in the nineteenth-century nationalist discourses is that of the elect nation and the elect church. In the broader context of the European (or Euro-Atlantic) Reformation the discourses of "especial grace," "chosenness", "New Israel," "New Jerusalem" etc. based on biblical (mostly Old Testament) narratives constitute an integral part of its apocalyptic semantics to such an extent that Philip S. Gorski speaks about a "*Mosaic moment* in the history of North Atlantic nationalism" or even the "pandemic character of Hebraic imaginary during the early seventeenth century" referring to the experience of popular revolutions.³²

The very motive of election in texts written by Veleslavín and his collaborators corresponds neither to the traditional concept of "elect nation" in the apocalyptic Protestant discourses of the seventeenth century nor to the model of New Israel analyzed by William Haller in the late 1960s.³³ According to Haller, John Foxe based the election of the English nation on the analogy to the New Israel, a development that became evident in his *Acts and Monuments*, known also as the *Book of Martyrs*. But Veleslavín's use of the concept of elect nation confirms rather the recent research of Ronald G. Asch, who shows that Foxe did not link the motive of "election" to any particular place or people, but to the true faith. This way of election is not to be related to the nation as a whole and should not be defined in contrast to other nations.³⁴ While referring to the true faith, the concept of "elect

³¹ Alessandro Guagnini, *Kronyka Mozkewská. Wypśánij přednjch zemj, Kragin, Náródůw, Knjžetstwj, Měst, Zámkůw, Ržek a Gezer, Welikému Knjžeti Mozkewskému poddáných* [Muscovite Chronicle: description of the most important lands, nations, principates, towns, castles, rivers and lakes subjected to the Muscovite Prince] (Prague, 1590) /NKP: 54 F 55/, preface, 15. See also Bohatcová, *Obecné dobré*, 311.

³² Gorski, "The Mosaic Moment," 1444 and 1455. On apocalyptic semantics see Matthias Pohl, "Konfessionskulturelle Deutungsmuster internationaler Konflikte um 1600—Kreuzzug, Antichrist, Tausendjähriges Reich," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 93 (2002): 278–316.

³³ William Haller, *The Elect Nations: The Meaning and Relevance of Foxe's "Book of Martyrs"* (New York: Harper and Row, 1963).

³⁴ Ronald G. Asch, "«An Elect Nation?» Protestantismus, nationales Selbstbewusstsein und nationale Feindbilder in England und Irland von zirka 1560 bis 1660," in

nation” can represent at most only a very small and exclusive group of people (never a “nation” in the modern sense of the word). Still, the implicit question remains whether the very high degree of exclusivity should not be seen as a basic characteristic of most early modern discourses of nation.

An elect Church is interpreted as a community of holy people comprising also the past and future generations, whose head is Jesus alone, something that can be recognized by the fact that it survives even the hardest persecution. The historical examples of conduct in the time of persecution Veleslavín regards as particularly up-to-date because of the coming Judgement Day. Only a marginal group of persons can be elected, these being called simply the elect church “by divine grace assembled in our nation,” a suffering “small flock” or “holy seed.” This election means no special grace in the fight against the Antichrist (as in confessional discourses), but a grace not to be punished excessively. The specificity of Bohemia (Prague) lies in a fact that the true religion distinguished by the right form of preaching and communion persisted here. This singular gift Veleslavín relates not to the whole country, but explicitly only to Prague and its citizens.³⁵ That leads us to a civic-like model of the church that is—besides the organic one—the main source of metaphors and images of church structure and institutions. Understood like patria as a civic community, the church is represented as a body whose limbs must collaborate in harmony. All limbs are for the whole of the same importance, so brethren should cherish each other as the limbs of the same body. A civic community functions as the second pattern of signification: analogous to the civic model of *patria*, the church is described on the abstract level as a “Holy City” endowed with all civic institutions, administration and laws (the Holy Spirit being considered as its governor etc.).³⁶ Even

Alois Mosser, ed., “*Gottes auserwählte Völker*”—*Erwähnungsvorstellungen und kollektive Selbstfindung in der Geschichte* (Frankfurt am Main, etc: Lang, 2001), 121–22.

³⁵ As to the elect church and its history in Bohemia and Prague, see *Štít wjry prawé* (1591), 11; Eusebius Pamphili, *Historia Cýrkewnj* [Ecclesiastic history] (Prague, 1594) /NKP: 54 B 4/, A6b; *Kalendář Hystorycský* (1578), 3b; Josephus Flavius, *Hystoria Židovská* [History of Jews] (Prague, 1592) /KNM: 30 B 2/, 3f.; Flavius Magnus Casiodorus, *Historia Cýrkewnj* [Ecclesiastic history] (Prague, 1594) /NKP: 54 B 4, adl. 2/, 9; *Providentia Dei* (1592), 348ff. For body metaphors see in the *Tabule sedmi zlych* (1588), 318ff.; *Sskola aneb Cwičenj* (1589), 254; *Rozgjmánij* (1589), 85. On the mothering of the Church see *Sskola aneb Cwičenj* (1589), 489.

³⁶ On the church and its comparison with the civic polity see *Providentia Dei* (1592), 351ff. and 512ff. Also *Prawidlo křestianského žiwota* (1587), 9ff.

Paradise is constructed according to this civic model when Veleslavín and his collaborators write about the “celestial *patria*” (mostly about a return to it) or the “celestial citizens.”³⁷ Veleslavín himself defined *patria* in his great dictionary from 1598 simply as a place we come from or we are living in. All true Christians originate from Paradise, which was lost in consequence of hereditary sin and regained by the sacrifice of Jesus. Death is interpreted as a transition from the terrestrial “city” to the “celestial” one. Last but not least, the civic model of the church makes it possible to criticize disagreement on confession by underlining the “holy” unanimity and concord of all celestial and terrestrial citizens.³⁸

At this point it becomes evident that not the category of nation, but *patria* in the sense of civic community must be considered as a basic axis of Veleslavín’s discourse, based on figurative speech as well as argumentation about concord, law and order.³⁹ Most passages about *patria* were also rewritten at the beginning of the nineteenth century in the context of nationalist appeals and definitions of nationalist duties, where *patria* was identified with the “Czech fatherland.”

In one of his dictionaries Veleslavín enumerates the following synonyms to the word *patria*: “Homeland; Home; Place, where someone is at home, where he was born, where he grew up, where he has a wife, children and profession; Fatherland; Mother.”⁴⁰ In other texts the

³⁷ Martin Moller, *Soliloquia de Passione D. N. Iesu Christi. Kterak gedenkaždý Křestian Zmučenj a Smrt Pána nasseho Gezukrysta w srdcy swém k naučenj potřebnému y potěšitedlnému rozgijmati... má* [Soliloquia de Passione D. N. Iesu Christi, or how every Christian should contemplate in his heart the passion and death of Our Lord Jesus] (Prague, 1593) /NKP 54 F 50/, 589; *Wýklad pobožný na žalm dewadesátý prwnij S. Dawida* [Pious comment on the Psalm 91] (Prague, 1599) /NM 36 G 16/, 11; *Introductio* (1586), 73a; *Tabule sedmi zlých* (1588), 399; *Sskola aneb Cwičenj* (1589), 48; and also a broad comparison of the terrestrial prison and celestial “*patria*” (ibid., 130f.).

³⁸ *Kroniky dvě* (1585), C1a. See also Bohatcová, *Obecné dobré*, 235.

³⁹ On the semantics of “*patria*” in Veleslavín’s texts, see Zdeněk Beneš, “Pojmy národ a vlast v díle Daniela Adama z Veleslavína” [Conceptions of Nation and Fatherland in the Writings of Daniel Adam of Veleslavín], *Acta Universitatis Carolinae—Philosophica et historica*, 1988. *Studia historica XXII. Problémy dějin historiografie IV*, 61–74.

⁴⁰ Helfricus Emmelius, *Sylva Qvadrilingvis Vocabvlorvm Et Phrasivm Bohemicae, Latinae, Graecae et Germanicae lingvae ...* (Prague, 1598) /MK 26 B 2/, 1756: “Wlast/ dům/ kdež někdo doma gest, kdež gest narozen a odchowán, kdež maželku, djtky a žiwnůstku swau má/ země Otcowska/ Matka”. Veleslavín also used the term *patria* in writing about Prague; see Hadrian Junius, *Nomenclator quadrilinguis Boemico-latino-graeco-germanus* (Prague, 1598) /KNM: 26 B2, adl. 1/, 2a: “*naturalis et vera patria mea.*”

semantic field of the term denotes almost exclusively the civic community or city or even Prague—so, for instance, the inhabitants of the *patria* are not called “patriots” (*vlastenci*), a term used in Czech nationalist discourses to perform the national collective identity, but “*patria*-loving citizens” or even “citizens of the *patria*” (*měšťěijnowé milownijci vlasti, měšťěijnowé vlasti*).⁴¹ According to Veleslavín, in accordance to the aesthetic of existence sketched above, duties towards one’s *patria* entail that it should be loved more than one’s own parents. In Veleslavín’s vision, *patria* determines both individual and social ways of living in agreement with Divine Order, and it functions as a guarantee for all main aspects of moral preoccupation. This set of duties was recontextualized in nineteenth-century nationalist discourse in order to defend the Nation as a sacralized abstract entity and to construct the other as enemy.

If we read the original late Renaissance discourse in light of the ethics of the self, *patria* is there to protect the very ethical substance (concord of members, order, authority) against dangers such as the “pathology of abundance.” The city is presented as a body: its diseases rise from violation of balance, exactly in the same way as in humoral pathology.⁴² A governor analogous to a doctor is there to restore equilibrium. The civic community functions as a body, namely on four levels: God (the highest Lord, head of humankind) installs *pastores populi* (kings, suzerains, aldermen or anyone else), these heads govern over all limbs according to divine order, and these “limbs” acting as “head” (“kings in miniature”, as they are explicitly called) govern over their own bodies, wives and households, who in turn control their own bodies.⁴³

At this point I cannot desist from the critical parallel to the famous concept of civic humanism as it was developed by Hans Baron and

⁴¹ *Kalendář hystorycký* (1578), 2a. See also Bohatcová, *Obecné dobré*, 209–10, here 209: “Poněvadž ne na tom dosti jest, abychom živi byli, ale abychom dobře a chvalitebně podle řádu a práva živi byli, k tomu jsme se zrodili”; *Kalendář hystorycký* (1590), 2b. See also Bohatcová, *Obecné dobré*, 307; *Politia historica* (1584), 5–6.

⁴² See the figures of a city/body and magistrate/physician (taking care of the body) or a soul (leading the body) referring to the concept of humoral pathology and pathology of excess in *Politia historica* (1584), Preface, 2; *Traktát o opatrowánj chudých* (1592), 289.

⁴³ See the term “kings in miniature” (*kdo panuge nad málem*) in *Politia historica* (1584), 276: “Nebo dosti gest/ když nad přátely/ nad manželkau/ nad dijkami spráwu a wrchnost má: aneb třebas když sám nad sebau panuge.”

later by the Cambridge school of history of political thought.⁴⁴ Hans Baron interpreted civic humanism firstly as a form of secular polity, secondly, and more crucially, he saw it as the reborn ideology of ancient republican liberty and its civic ideals, which was disseminated by humanists (the ideologists of the Italian city states) in the age of incoming absolutism. Civic humanism must be then seen as an ideology of defense against tyranny based on inherited civic obligations. The new conception of freedom and active citizenship arose out of the fundamental changes in consciousness and values, identified by Baron on the basis of a new attitude toward Cicero and on a “new historical outlook” which saw Florence as a modern counterpart of Rome and consecrated its “mission to carry on the civic liberty of ancient Etruria and to continue the fight of the Roman republicans against tyranny.”⁴⁵ The community-oriented ethic of the citizen was shaped, according to Baron, in this sense in opposition to Stoic philosophy.

Let us disregard the implicit meta-narrative level of the concept that was later expressed by John Pocock—this new conception of freedom and active citizenship subsumes some essential aspects of modern political life (constitutionalism, participation etc.) to become the second step on the way of progress to contemporary western democracies. Pocock himself defined civic humanism as an expression of “positive liberty” and as a continuous tradition of modern political thinking marked by a distinct republican language that was translated from Aristotle over humanist Florence and Venice to Cromwell and

⁴⁴ My summary refers to the following texts: Hans Baron, *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance: Civic Humanism and Republican Liberty in an Age of Classicism and Tyranny* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1955); idem, *In Search of Florentine Humanism: Essays on the Transition from Medieval to Modern Thought*, Vol. I (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1980), above all the articles, “New Historical and Psychological Ways of Thinking: From Petrarch to Bruni and Machiavelli,” 24–42, “The Changed Perspective of the Past in Bruni’s Histories of the Florentine People,” 43–67, “Bruni’s Histories as an Expression of Modern Thought,” 68–93, “The Memory of Cicero’s Roman Civic Spirit in the Medieval Centuries and the Florentine Renaissance,” 94–133, “The Florentine Revival of the Philosophy of the Active Political Life,” 134–157; and in Vol. II (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1988), the article “The Humanistic revaluation of the Vita activa in Italy and North of the Alps,” 55–71. The articulation of Renaissance civic discourses was discussed in the following classical work: Arthur B. Ferguson, *The Articulate Citizen and the English Renaissance* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press 1965). See also the excellent recent volume on civic humanism: James Hankins, ed., *Renaissance Civic Humanism: Reappraisals and Reflections* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

⁴⁵ Hans Baron, *The Crisis*, 59.

finally to republican ideologists of the nascent United States.⁴⁶ In the early-1980s this interpretation was challenged by Quentin Skinner, who denied the existence of a “neo-Roman” republicanism as a distinct tradition and coherent ideology and defined active citizenship as an intellectual concept supporting, with reference to Isaiah Berlin’s essay on two liberties, “negative liberty.”⁴⁷ Skinner’s recent books concentrate on the way the neo-Roman element in English republican discourses of the seventeenth century differs essentially from the Roman and Italian Renaissance political thought in that it employs the language of god-given (“natural”) rights and individual freedom.⁴⁸ The very category of freedom or liberty (whether negative, positive or perfect and individual) is hardly compatible with the complex of moral preoccupations I have tried to point out. The only freedom given to the individual is the freedom to sin and that must be overwhelmed by the everyday practice of introspection and submission to paternal and pastoral authority. The works I have analyzed do not refer to active citizenship, but to a divine order and concord expressed in corporeal metaphors (*concordia membrorum*).

The very fact that these metaphors refer in Velešlavin’s discourses to a “non-civic” organicist imagery without even mentioning the problem of liberty does not mean of course that they could not work differently in other early modern discourses on political anthropology. A crucial question is how the civic humanist discourses employed this kind of figurative speech. For instance, Quentin Skinner pointed to an entirely different use of body metaphors in English neo-Roman republicanism, in defining active citizenship and “examining the sense in which natural and political bodies are alike capable of possessing and forfeiting their liberty.”⁴⁹ The body imaginary with reference to Plato was employed when writing about communities as “bodies” of people, nations or states and their capacity of self-government and acting at will based on the consent of all members establishing their equal

⁴⁶ John Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1975).

⁴⁷ Quentin Skinner, “The Idea of Negative Liberty: Philosophical and Historical Perspectives,” in Richard Rorty, J. B. Schneewind and Quentin Skinner, eds., *Philosophy in History* (Cambridge, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 193–221.

⁴⁸ Quentin Skinner, *Liberty before Liberalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

⁴⁹ Skinner, *Liberty before Liberalism*, 25ff.

rights in the political participation as well as the possibility to defend themselves against slavery.

The thesis about the “family-like republic” presents another aspect of Veleslavin’s discursive practices. In polemics against the Baronian interpretation John M. Najemy emphasized the fact that the ideal of *vita activa civilis* was at its core an ethic of passive consensus and obedience.⁵⁰ The category of “natural leadership” obvious in the Renaissance cities is judged by the standards of paternal discipline and presupposes a model of citizen who was prepared to assume his place and suppress his own political ambition. To quote Najemy, the family seems to figure as an ideal metaphor for a republic “that assumed the natural and benevolent leadership of experienced fathers, tolerated no opposition from its citizen/children, and conceived of citizenship in terms of training, education and socialization into the virtues of the whole community as represented by its revered elders.”⁵¹ The model of ethics of the self mentioned above shows the other more complicated roots of this figurative speech and argumentation, which cannot be understood without taking into account a particular set of ethical preoccupations related to the social position of each individual in the “natural order” depicted by Veleslavin and his collaborators.

This attitude could be defined as “civic” in so far as the very idea of human society (including institutions like the church) is presented on the level of figurative speech, beside the corporeal metaphors, as a civic community. But the system refers to the model of subjectivity and recognition of the Law and paternal and pastoral authority over the self, over own’s household, subjects, over the city etc. If we return to Baron’s argument, it seems clear that the aesthetics of existence and its elaboration in the form of social order neither refers to the secular state nor to republicanism. The modus of divine order and hierarchy works in the same way in every form of Aristotelian polity as it was modified in the end of sixteenth century, even in a “tyranny”, and could hardly be connected to the ideology of republicanism. The very heart of the model does not correspond to the idea of a secular state, because it is based on paternal and pastoral authority and on keeping a Christian concord on all social as well as individual levels. The

⁵⁰ John M. Najemy, “Civic Humanism and Florentine Politics,” in Hankins, ed., *Renaissance Civic Humanism*, 75–104.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 101.

very category of concord (*harmonia membrorum*), seen as part and at the same time as an effect of the particular aesthetics of existence, implies civic activity and public service. The government cannot be interpreted as a popular one, not to speak of a civic equality in a hierarchical vision of social life.

The next point of controversy is the supposed negative attitude of civic humanism toward the philosophy of Stoicism. Although Veleslavín's arguments cannot be seen as a direct reception of neo-Stoicism (neither of the tract *De Constantia*, that was probably accessible in Bohemia since the late 1580s, nor of Lipsius' later works like *Manuductio ad veram philosophiam*, which is characterized by a much more elaborated system of ethical preoccupation related to the self), some of the neo-Stoic arguments seem to have played an important role in numerous other discourses of the period, including the writings of Veleslavín's circle. Above all, the very concepts of *constantia*, *patientia* and *firmitas* were seen as a spiritual force enabling a person to hold a balance between extremities and subsequently as a key to *recte vivere et agere*.⁵²

Rewriting by the modern Czech nationalist movement

The last section of my analysis concentrates on the rewriting of Veleslavín's discourses by the modern Czech nationalist movement since the late eighteenth century. The last two decades of the eighteenth century can be considered a break in the discussion about Veleslavín and the literature of his age. While the erudite discourses

⁵² See Günter Abel, *Stoizismus und Frühe Neuzeit. Zur Entstehungsgeschichte modernen Denkens im Felde vom Ethik und Politik* (Berlin, N.Y.: De Gruyter, 1978), 63ff; Karl Beuth, *Weisheit und Geistestärke. Eine philosophiegeschichtliche Untersuchung zur "Constantia" des Justus Lipsius* (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1990); Toon Van Houdt and Jan Papy, "Modestia, constantia, fama: Towards a literary and philosophical interpretation of Lipsius' *De calumnia oratio*," in G. Tournoy, J. de Landtsheer and J. Papy, eds., *Iustus Lipsius: Europae lumen et columen: Proceedings of the International Colloquium Leuven 17–nineteenth September 1997* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999), 186–220. As to the problem of an indifferent reception of Lipsius' works in Bohemia before 1610 see also M. E. H. Nicolette Mout, "Die politische Theorie in der Bildung der Eliten: Die Lipsius-Rezeption in Böhmen und in Ungarn," in Joachim Bahlcke, Hans-Jürgen Bömelburg and Norbert Kersken, eds., *Ständefreiheit und Staatsgestaltung in Ostmitteleuropa. Übernationale Gemeinsamkeit in der politischen Kultur vom 16.–18. Jahrhundert*, (Leipzig: Universitäts-Verlag, 1996), 243–64.

of the period in German and Latin admired the authors of Veleslavín's circle and applauded their methods of work, their diligence and even their skills in cultivating the vernacular, the Czech-speaking medium created an idealized biography and produced a set of quotations featuring as an invitation to restore the "Attic" Czech and the "golden age". Symptomatic of the change is also the very name of the scholar—*Daniel Adam* becomes *Veleslavín* (marginalizing the Latinized form *Weleslawina* which was used only for a short while), the predicate conferred on him after his shift from being a scholar at the Charles University to dedicating himself to the "patriotic service of the public."⁵³ The new name was interpreted in this context as an acceptance of the new national mission. As early as 1806 the name *Veleslavín* is represented as "usual" or "normal."⁵⁴ The break cannot be reduced just to the shift of generations, as the case of František Faustín Procházka shows, and some authors were able to write at once in both discourses, following different rules.⁵⁵

The most important problem here is the "migration" of early modern utterances as well as the ways and rules of quoting in the modernist discourses. The process of rewriting comprises both the intentional (let's say, strategic) as well as unintentional (intertextual) levels. The rules according to which the early modern utterances were reformulated depend generally on each concrete discursive modus, which must be seen as an open and auto-referential form. However, the revivalists of the nineteenth century developed their own strategies on this discursive territory. Needless to say, the very concept of rewriting (subsuming both intentional and involuntary discursive components) postulates different discursive structures and a logic that selects only some utterances, rereads them, and performs them in a new manner. Therefore it should be considered a radical discontinuity.⁵⁶ To admit this means to stop postulating the early modern discourse of nation

⁵³ The post-revivalist name (*Veleslavín*) is nowadays normalized to such an extent that an author cannot use the older version without making a text unintelligible for the Czech-speaking audience.

⁵⁴ "Žiwot Danyele Adama of Weleslawjna od J.[ana] N.[ejedlého]" [Life of Daniel Adam of Veleslavín by Jan Nejedlý], *Hlasatel český* 1 (1806) 2, 161.

⁵⁵ See all his editions analysed below and the work *Faustini Prochaska Ordinis minorum S. Francisci de Paula... De saecularibus liberalium artium in bohemia et moravia fatis Commentarius* (Prague, 1782).

⁵⁶ It would be methodologically naive to argue that these discourses (in any case discontinual because based on different intertexts and working according to other discursive rules) do not interact on the level of (e.g. my own) reading and interpretation.

as the initial point of a “development toward the modern nation-state.”⁵⁷

My reading of the texts originating in the early nineteenth century draws in this sense on the constructivistic theories (Eric Hobsbawm, John Breuilly, Benedict Anderson etc.) that see modern nationalism as a political movement constructing the historical legitimization of its political pretensions. The new discourses of the early nationalist movements were “permeable” just to a certain extent that determined the reappearance and rewriting of some utterances. Only a few passages were selected from the original huge *corpus* of texts and repeatedly recited in various contexts as a legitimization of nationalist or Panslavist appeals. It is easy to “localize” all future nationalist subtexts in Veleslavín’s forewords and prefaces. This textual body includes a eulogy of the Czech language and its lexical and stylistic adequacy in relation to ancient languages which appears in the foreword to an edition of the “Ecclesiastical History” of Eusebius (1594) and in Bueting’s *Itinerarium Sacrae Scripturae* (1592); a comparison of the “Fatherland” (*vlast*) to ancient Athens (in the preface to *Kalendář hystorycký*, 1578 and 1590); the defense of the Czech lands against foreigners (in the preface to *Kroniky dvě*, 1585); and a passage about the currency of the Slavonic languages in Europe (in the foreword to *Kronyka Mozkewská*, 1590).⁵⁸

As late as in the 1880s these shared commonplaces shifted from the scholarly discourses to the popular one, where they could be found at least till the mid-twentieth century.⁵⁹ Other *topoi* had almost the same

⁵⁷ Claus Uhlig, “National Historiography and Cultural Identity: The Example of the English Renaissance,” in Herbert Grabes, ed., *Writing the Early Modern English Nation: The Transformation of National Identity in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England* (Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi, 2001), 89.

⁵⁸ See the latest edition of Veleslavín’s prefaces: Bohatcová, *Obecné dobré*, 208–213, 227–262, 305–308, 308–315, 315–321, 328–330.

⁵⁹ From twentieth-century works see the national discourse imitating Veleslavín after WWII and several texts published on the occasion of the 400th anniversary of his birth in 1947 that stressed among other things also the idea of a postwar progress to a just society: *Kalendář historický národa českého* [Historical calendar of the Czech nation] (Prague, 1940); Otto Müller, *Česká kniha v XV. a XVI. století* [Czech book in the 15th and 16th century] (Prague, 1946); *Dialogus slavného architypografa Mistra Daniela Adam z Veleslavína s typografem dvacátého století* [Dialogue of the famous typographer Daniel Adam with a typographer from the 20th century] (Přerov, 1947); František Jílek, *M. Daniel Adam z Veleslavína* (Přerov, 1947); *Dar nejvzácnější* [The most uncommon gift] (Přerov, 1947).

persistence, for instance, Veleslavín's fictive last words⁶⁰ or the often repeated passage where Veleslavín declares his resolve to sacrifice all his property, rather than to stop working for the good of his fatherland. Also some interpretations turned during the nineteenth century to commonplaces, e.g. the juxtaposition of Veleslavín to Cotta and Brockhaus (probably the most frequent one). After the mid-nineteenth century also the excerpts from Jungmann⁶¹ and the Czech translation of the encomiastic sentence "*ad linguae bohemicae cultum, et elegantiam, quae Rudolphi II. tempore ad summum pervenerat, plurimum contulit ejus industria*" written by Bohuslav Balbín, the seventeenth-century Jesuit historian and author of the work *Bohemia docta* (not published until 1778), who was interpreted as another of the legitimizing "great fathers" of the Czech nation, functioned in similar ways.⁶²

The process of rewriting was determined, besides the unintentional discursive rules, by the strategies of editing practice. The first modern editions reveal that many important elements of late humanist texts were intentionally excluded, while others were emphasized. The most important editor of the late eighteenth century, František Faustin Procházka, defended his search for the "hard core" (or "golden," as he writes) of the text with metaphors of expurgation. In clearing out the "dung, scrap-iron and rotten old shoes," he skips all passages on eschatology or astrology, by doing which he completely reinterpreted the early modern medical argument based on the microcosmos-macrocosmos model. For the main reading axis of the new text he chose "everyone's duty to take care of one's own health" (probably in relation to the social body, reminding the reader of Foucault's concepts of bio-power and governmentality).⁶³ Procházka also omitted long narratives about the cruelty and despotism of Ivan the Terrible

⁶⁰ See Josef Jireček, *Rukověť k dějinám literatury české* [Handbook of the history of Czech literature] (Prague, 1876), 2:313.

⁶¹ F. L. Rieger, ed., *Slovník naučný* [Scientific dictionary] (Prague, 1872), 9:960; *Ottův slovník naučný* [Otto's scientific dictionary] (Prague: Argo, Paseka, 2002), 26:510. It is significant that this passage ("zrna pravdy bez plev lichoty, zlato mravů počestných") does not originate from any of Jungmann's scientific texts but from the most famous "nether land" dialogue analysed below. See note 80, here 46.

⁶² *Bohuslav Balbini Bohemia docta* (Prague, 1778), 2:52. See Rieger, ed., *Slovník naučný*, 9:960, or the paraphrase in *Ottův slovník naučný*, 26:510.

⁶³ *Wyetah z regimentu Zdrawj od Henrycha Rantzowia* [Extracts from the regulations of health by Henrych Rantzow] (Prague, 1786), 1 and 26.

because they “hurt the human heart, which should rest in quietude and benignancy.”⁶⁴

Since the late 1780s two parallel arguments occurred in editor’s forewords. The early modern discourses (including Veleslavín’s circle) are interpreted firstly as a source of ethical examples for the correct ways of living (prudence and piety above all)⁶⁵ and at the same time as a source of language examples for the correct ways of speaking. However, besides omitting some editors admitted also substantial linguistic corrections. In the revivalist forewords the main attention is paid to the ways how to “remain Czech” (*zůstati Čechem*), not to vitiate, to rape (*przniti*) one’s own nation—in this context gendered as female—but to glorify her increasingly.⁶⁶ The editions of the period also performed the image of the German enemy—elaborate strategies can be found in the edition of *Kronyka Boleslawská* (the so-called Dalimil’s chronicle, written in Czech, originating from the first half of the fourteenth century), where Procházka explicitly rejected the anti-German interpretation and political radicalism of Pavel Ješín of Bezděží, the early modern editor of this work, but in a paradoxical way quoted his apologetic preface from 1620 as a whole.⁶⁷ The first metaphors of perpetuation and patriotic involvement in the form of literary editions occur as early as in the second decade of the nineteenth century.⁶⁸

The main plot of the early nationalist discourses reflecting humanism was the story of the “golden age”. The first quotations from early modern texts that made it possible to tell the story and established its main participants and authorities can be found already in scholarly discourses written in German at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Although the history of the Bohemian language and literature by Josef Dobrovský reached only to the “fourth period” of literary and linguistic development, ending in 1526, he based his interpretation

⁶⁴ *Weytah z Kronyky Mozkewské* [Extracts from the Moscow Chronicle] (Prague, 1786), 8–9.

⁶⁵ *Knjžka Swatého Augustýna, kterauž nazwal Manuale* [The booklet of St. Augustine which he called Manual] (Prague, 1786).

⁶⁶ F. F. Procházka, ed., *Život Cýsaře Karla čtvrtého, a krále českého toho gména prwnjho* [Life of Emperor Charles IV, first of this name as Czech king] (Prague, 1791), 1.

⁶⁷ F.F. Procházka, ed., *Kronyka Boleslawská o Poslaupnosti Knjžat a Králů Českých, a slawných národu Českého činech* [Boleslav Chronicle on the succession of Czech princes and kings, and the deeds of the glorious Czech nation] (Prague, 1786), the preface, 1–15.

⁶⁸ “Isokratesa Řeckého řečníka napomenutj psané k Demonymowi, z řeckého přeložené od Wáclava Píseckého,” *Hlasatel český* 4 (1818) 4, 273–294, here 274.

on extracts of humanist apologies of translations to Czech that later became the basic subtexts and referential points of the story of golden age.⁶⁹ The scientific discourses were rewritten in popular patriotic literature, where the motive of synchronous “vitality” and exemplary “classicism” of early modern Czech literature can be found for the first time. The popular genre was criticized by the next generation of Czech nationalist writers as too mannerist, formalist and depleted on the level of content, its undefiled form being recognized in the literature of the pre-Hussite and Hussite period (Tomáš Štítný of Štítné, Jan Hus etc.).⁷⁰ The interdependent concepts of “classicism” and “vitality” appear in texts dealing with sixteenth-century Bohemian literature, and consequently also Veleslavín and his “patriotic mission.” On the one hand, the Czech language should be seen as “vital” only because it is also classic, on the other hand, the idea of an excessive classicism that has already reached its climax makes it impossible to surpass the mythological golden age and construct a new mythology of the modern Czech nation.

As the texts show, the relationship between these concepts changed about 1810, when the competitive rhetoric intensified. In 1806 an older thesis that Czech literature culminated by Veleslavín’s works and has persisted in this ideal state that should be followed to the present without being improved or even developed, could still be found.⁷¹ On the contrary, this very “linguistic vitality” should encourage, according to Jan Nejedlý in 1818 (on the pages of the same journal), a “natural” national love, it should engage the present generation to emu-

⁶⁹ *Geschichte der böhmischen Sprache und Literatur von Joseph Dobrovský* (Prague: G. Haase, 1818), 200f. and especially on 349f. The fact the text explicitly professed scientific neutrality and was also interpreted in this way does not mean however that we could not find here arguments and forms of figurative speech, which could be reassumed by a nationalist reader. For instance, Dobrovský also wrote about the patriotism of Bohemian humanists, see 211: “Dieser patriotische Entschluss, alles in böhmischer Sprache zu schreiben und diese nachdrückliche Empfehlung der Muttersprache blieben auch bei andern nicht ohne Wirkung.”

⁷⁰ See Jaroslav Vlček, *Dějiny české literatury* [History of Czech Literature] (Prague: Státní Nakladatelství Krásné Literatury, Hubdy a Umění, 1960), 1: 382f. (The first volumes of this classical work of Czech literary history were published in 1885); Rieger, ed., *Slovník naučný*, Vol. IX, 960; Čeněk Zíbrt, “K třístému výročí smrti Daniela Adama z Veleslavína” [On the tercentenary anniversary of the death of Daniel Adam of Veleslavín], *Světovzor* 33 (1899), 559–560 and 579–583; here 559.

⁷¹ “Život Danyele Adama,” 162–163: “Gazyk český nynj geho přičiněnjm nad mjru vynikl, se brausyl, welebil a takowé dokonalosti nabył, že žádného wyšssjho stupně dosáhnaui gemu nezbywalo, a od toho času žádné proměny a žádného wzdełánj w stroj swém potřebj nemá.”

late the “golden age,” to “finish” the violently interrupted work of the grandfathers, to compete not only with the Slavonic brothers but also with other “non-fraternal” nations and to call contemporary German-speaking renegades back to the “bosom of the Czech Mother.”⁷² His story of a golden age when the Czech language achieved the highest degree of perfection and was massively used across all social strata (here we can see an explicit reference to Jungmann, whose interpretation will be introduced below),⁷³ functions as a historical base of the contemporary “holy duty” (*swatá powinnost*) for its heirs.⁷⁴

Josef Jungmann subsequently resumed the older interpretations, placed them into a broad narrative context and shielded them by the scholarly form of his influential work on the history of Czech literature. His interpretation, in any case uncritical to the language of the period, emphasizes the brave fight of “patriots” against “Latinists”, the mass expansion of the Czech language on all social levels, as well as the abundance of translations and original works in the “fifth period” of Czech literary history (1526–1620, and above all under the rule of Rudolf II).⁷⁵ The narrative level of this history required indeed the older stories to be rewritten without reducing its potential to agitate—to define the “dark ages” and decline of the language in recent centuries. In doing so, Jungmann constructed a system of periodization which had an impact even on the historiography of the late 20th century (and maybe still has) and offered to later revivalist authors also a seemingly objective, scientific framework, whereof they did not have to represent their texts as a continuation, but rather as an “awakening after three centuries of deep sleep.”

The story of the “golden age” is closely linked also to the construction of Veleslavín’s idealized biography, shaping him as an exemplary patriot. For long years (from the 1780s till the 1870s at least) Veleslavín was considered the greatest and the most hardworking Czech writer. Besides the autochthonous sources of his education and his well-advised and unselfish project of national work, the nationalist proclamations also emphasized his “warm love” towards the Czech nation. Jan Nejedlý, the first professor of Czech language at the Charles University and the author of Veleslavín’s reference biography,

⁷² See the introduction by Jan Nejedlý in the 4th volume of *Hlasatel český* 4 (1818) 4, 7 and 16.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 15.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 15–16.

⁷⁵ Josef Jungmann, *Historie literatury* (Prague 1825). See 153, 155 and 161.

called this same feeling and its traces in early modern texts “patriotic spirit” (*duch vlastenský*). He interprets it as a main source and feeding of the “patriotic flame” in the reader’s heart that will bring the new golden age to the Czech lands. The patriotic spirit can be, however, experienced only by the act of reading, as a textual product. That is why Nejedlý promises in the conclusion to the biography to publish Veleslavín’s work.⁷⁶ In later biographies, besides the motif of national involvement, other accents can also be found, and Veleslavín is often presented as a self-made man, a tender husband and father, a practical businessman or a man of liberal opinions.⁷⁷

The last part of the article will concentrate on the discourses of othering, or more precisely on the relationship of the story of the “golden age” to the “staging” of Veleslavín in the so-called dialogues from the “nether world”. The most famous of these dialogues, dating from 1806, was rewritten by Josef Jungmann, under the title “About the Czech language” (*O gazyku českém*). It features the meeting of an early modern scholar and an exemplary patriot with a contemporary Prague “Bohemian,” accompanied by Minos, the Stygian judge.⁷⁸ The plot starts with the surprise of Veleslavín, turning soon into dramatic grief and shame, when he runs into someone who on the one hand has spent his whole life in Prague, studied there and defined himself explicitly as a German-speaking Bohemian/Czech—symptomatically, there is no distinction between these terms in modern Czech—but cannot read in Czech, and what is more, even when he lived there refused to speak the language for reasons of social status.⁷⁹ Behind this argument we could read also an implicit argument in the controversy about the regional or linguistic origins of the nation itself. According to Jungmann, any nation entirely coincides with its language. This is

⁷⁶ “Žiwot Danyele Adama,” 163.

⁷⁷ See also other biographies of Veleslavín from the late-nineteenth century: František Čupr, “Život M. Daniele Adama of Veleslavín” [The life of Daniel Adam of Veleslavín], in *M. Daniele Adama z Veleslavína práce původní* [Basic works of Daniel Adam of Veleslavín] (Prague, 1853), 1:I–XLVIII; “Daniel Adam of Veleslavín,” *Libuša* 1 (1863) 3, 83–84; Rieger, ed., *Slovník naučný*, 9:959; *Ottův slovník naučný*, 26:509; Zíbrt, “K třístému výročí”; *Památník Danieli Adamovi z Veleslavína* [Commemoration of Daniel Adam of Veleslavín] (Prague, 1899), above all the article by Josef M. Hovorka, “Daniela Adam of Veleslavín a jeho doba,” 7–22.

⁷⁸ Josef Jungmann, “O gazyku českém. Rozmlouvánj prwnj” [On the Czech language. First dialogue], *Hlasatel český* 1 (1806) 2: 43–48.

⁷⁹ See 43, 44, 45.

shown by the second dialogue of the “nether world” between Slawomil and Protiwa, an idealized revivalist and a “cosmopolitan.”⁸⁰

But let us come back to Hades. The sophisticated parody of legal language spoiled by plenty of Germanisms on the level of grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation not only performs the image of the other/enemy—Germans who have, despite their “barking and grunting” language, already reached the new golden age—but also patriotic duties and trespasses against them. Jungmann shapes in the dialogue the official “succession” of great “fathers” in accordance with his scholarly texts, including even Comenius (!) and of course Veleslavín himself.⁸¹ The dialogue culminates in the promise of Minos, who identified in the ghost of the scholar an ideal “Old-Czech” man,⁸² that the Czech national glory will flourish again thanks to the coming generation and through Veleslavín’s subsequent appeals for national unity. This hope refers again to the linguistic concept of nation—the Czech nation has not died yet, because its language is still alive, of which the present text also bears testimony.⁸³

Another dialogue staged according to the same model takes place between Žižka, the Hussite leader, and F. Pelcl, an early revivalist author still alive in the year when the volume was published. The comparative *olim-nunc* schema performs in the texts “Old-Czech” frankness and faithfulness (in matrimony too) as well as true masculinity steeled in patriotic fight, in order to lampoon the current weaklings.⁸⁴ In spite of his initial contempt for the indifferent relationship to the fatherland displayed by the modern Czechs, Žižka finally prophesizes the future glory of the Czech nation.⁸⁵

⁸⁰ Josef Jungmann, “O gazyku českém. Rozmlauwánj druhé,” *Hlasatel český* 1 (1806) 3, 321ff.

⁸¹ See 45–46.

⁸² See 47.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 48: “Nermuť se Danyeli! Nenj gesstě posawad po wssem weta. Žiw gest národ ten, gehožto gazyk zcela nepossel.”

⁸⁴ *Hlasatel český* 4 (1818) 2, 295–302. For the construction of “Old-Czech” masculinity, see 297: “Tak milý bratře! Byli nassi časowé plni urkutnosti, zmatenice, ale y mužnosti lidské. Prawda mezy námi panowala, a muž cýtil swého ramena [...]”; and Pelcl’s following criticism towards the current masculinity on the same page: “Nemotorné stwůry ge těssj, duchowé, zaklené zámky a čaroděgnice gim bryndagj mozky, a zamilowaná žwatlánj k sobě ge wábj, že čitedlné dussinky po horách blaudjce w slzy rozplynau. Gsaut práwě gako děti, gen cukr a med chtějg gjsti, a chleba ani widěti nemohau.”

⁸⁵ See 302.

All the cases sketched above present probably just a fragmentary insight into the ways humanist texts were rewritten and the story of the golden age retold. Neither the argumentation based on particular late humanist “aesthetics of existence” (including the direct ethical work on oneself as well as its implications for social participation) nor the organicist figurative speech was used in the revivalist texts at the beginning of the nineteenth century. However, the importance of a humanist intertextual impetus for the construction of the modern Czech nationalism seems to be beyond any dispute. This very fact, illustrated by the Bohemian and Czech discourses of nationhood, could contribute also to further analyses of the ways humanist subtexts influenced other European national movements.

CHAPTER EIGHT

CITIZEN, FATHERLAND AND PATRIOTISM IN THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE OF THE POLISH-LITHUANIAN COMMONWEALTH

Anna Grześkowiak-Krwawicz

To assert that the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth had an incredibly diverse ethnic structure is a banality. Contemporaries were themselves aware of this diversity, noting that the Commonwealth was comprised “of Poles, Lithuanians, Ruthenians, Prussians, Livonians and Samogitians,”¹ a list that could be extended further to include Germans, Jews, Armenians and Tatars. It therefore might seem quite a risky endeavor to contemplate the contemporary notion of patriotism towards the Commonwealth as a whole, or especially to treat it as a homogenous phenomenon. After all, the very name of the polity mentioned not one, but two composite nations (being known in Polish as the “Republic of the Two Nations”). Moreover, there was undoubtedly a clear and stable awareness of distinct non-Polish identities, especially Lithuanian. The Lithuanian nobility, despite its rapid adoption of the Polish language and the common privileges it shared with the nobility of the Crown, retained a profound sense of its own “Lithuanianness,” manifested repeatedly and in various ways—such as in the notion of “we, Lithuania” juxtaposed against such notions as the “Polish lords.”² Yet on the other hand, historical research to date has shown that it is indeed entirely justified to speak of patriotism during the era, a sense of sharing a common fatherland—at least as far as the

¹ Piotr Skarga, quoted from Stanisław Obirek, “Koncepcja państwa w kazaniach Piotra Skargi SJ” [The conception of state in the sermons of Piotr Skarga], in Ludwik Grzebień and S. Obirek, eds., *Jezuici a kultura polska* [Jesuits and Polish culture] (Cracow: WAM 1993), 212.

² Henryk Wisner, *Rzeczpospolita Wazów. Czasy Zygmunta III i Władysława IV* (The Commonwealth of the Vasa dynasty. The times of Sigismund III and Wladislas IV) (Warsaw: Neriton, IH PAN, 2002), 50.

noble society was concerned.³ It was nearly exclusively the nobility that participated in political life from the sixteenth century nearly until the end of the eighteenth century; it was the nobility that constituted the political nation (quite sizeable, representing some 8% of the overall population); and by waging disputes at *Sejm* and *Sejmik* gatherings and publishing both topical pamphlets and serious treatises, it was the nobility that produced the political discourse that is the subject of our analysis here.

While the words “patriotism” or “patriot” appeared in this discourse only at the outset of the eighteenth century (becoming more frequent in its latter half), the problem of what attitudes and duties individuals (citizens) possessed towards their fatherland had constituted one of the more important elements of political writings from as far back as the sixteenth century. The terminology used before then, through the end of the seventeenth century, chiefly referred to love for one’s fatherland or lovers of the fatherland or citizens faithful to their fatherland, or the Latin prototypes *amor patriae* and *bonus civis patriae*, alongside which a host of Latin and Polish terms were in use—for example we can note the word combinations “*charitas patriae*,”⁴ “*pietas in patriam*,”⁵ “courtesy [uprzejmość] to the fatherland,” and descriptions of people who professed such love as being “useful sons of the fatherland” or “citizens wishing the fatherland well.”⁶ Significantly, although the word “fatherland” was also sometimes construed in a narrower sense (as in “our Lithuanian fatherland”), references to love for the fatherland nearly without exception referred to the common fatherland of the “noble nation”—i.e. the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. One author during the Zebrzydowski rebellion (or *rokosz*) in 1606 summed this up

³ See chiefly the work of Andrzej Walicki, Edward Opaliński, Ewa Bem-Wiśniewska, as well as other historians, especially specialists in sixteenth and seventeenth century history (whose works are cited below).

⁴ Łukasz Opaliński, “Rozmowa plebana z ziemianiem” [1641], [The conversation of the priest and the country gentleman] in idem, *Pisma polskie*, ed. Ludwik Kamykowski (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Kasy im. Mianowskiego, 1938), 43.

⁵ *Egzorbitancyja powszechna, która Rzeczpospolitą królestwa polskiego niszczy, zgubą grożąc* [The general abuse which destroys the Republic of the Polish Crown, threatening it with ruin] (Warsaw, 1628), modern ed. Kazimierz J. Turowski (Cracow: Biblioteka Polska, 1858), 28.

⁶ All these quotations come from the sixteenth century, quoted from Ewa Bem, “Termin ‘ojczyzna’ w literaturze XVI i XVII wieku. Refleksje o języku” [The term “fatherland” in the literature of the 16–17th centuries. Reflections on the language], *Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce* 34 (1989): 131–57.

nicely, urging that “a level-headed faith in the Commonwealth” should prevail in the country. Edward Opaliński, referring to the sixteenth century and first half of the seventeenth, wrote that “love of the fatherland was a value that, like brotherhood, drew the diverse noble society together ideologically, ensuring the unity of the Commonwealth state.”⁷ One historian of old Polish political terminology, in turn, has found that “when the terms *fatherland* or *state* appeared in old Polish texts (...) their referent was most frequently the Commonwealth, as a Polish and Lithuanian state,” concluding that “with all certainty, the notion of the Commonwealth was one of the key political notions of the old Polish epoch.”⁸ Fatherland is undoubtedly a crucial term for understanding the Polish patriotism—or “noble patriotism”—of the “First Republic.”

That is why investigating what this Commonwealth-fatherland meant for its noble citizens must serve as our point of departure for such inquiry. Nonetheless, this issue proves to be quite complex. For its citizens, the Commonwealth was undoubtedly a state that guaranteed their rights and privileges, that ensured their peace and security and the ability to use their property. As the author of one *rokosz* pamphlet wrote in 1606: “There are three jewels which the good Commonwealth gives *suis civibus* (...) peace with justice, liberty and nobility.”⁹ Significantly, this state was not something external to its noble citizens. In contrast to the Western theoretical developments, in Polish political discourse there was never any talk of some abstract state existing above and beyond its citizens. In Poland, the state was always discussed and written about as a community of its citizens. The Polish-Lithuanian nobility took the term *res publica*, or “common, public thing,” very literally. Attention was also drawn to something unusual on a Europe-wide scale: “citizens fully identifying with the state that they not only built in the past, but also form and constitute

⁷ Edward Opaliński, *Kultura polityczna szlachty polskiej w latach 1587–1652* [The political culture of the Polish nobility between 1587–1652] (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 1995), 92.

⁸ Ewa Bem-Wiśniewska, *Funkcjonowanie nazwy Polska w języku czasów nowożytnych* [The functioning of the notion of Poland in the language of modern times] (Warsaw: DiG, 1998), 168, 170 n.

⁹ [Anonymous], *Libera respublica—absolutum dominium—rokosz* [Libera respublica—absolutum dominium—revolt], in Jan Czubek, ed., *Pisma polityczne z czasów rokoszu Zebrzydowskiego 1606–1608* [Political writings from the period of the Zebrzydowski Rebellion, 1606–1608] (Cracow: Akademia Umiejętności, 1918), 2: 409.

at present.”¹⁰ “Who comprises the republic, if not we ourselves?” wrote Andrzej Zamoyski in the mid-eighteenth century,¹¹ and his question was wholly rhetorical—essentially asserting a pride-instilling fact, already considered obvious since the sixteenth century. We can say that the Polish understanding of the state, all the way until the end of the eighteenth century, remained more *civitas* than *l'état*. Noble citizens could say “we are the state,” and indeed they did say and think so. Historians point out “the disappearance of a distinction between the notions of state and society, their mutual permeation.”¹² Therefore, the imperative to be concerned for the good of the fatherland referred to the state as a polity, to a specific territorial domain, as well as to the nation, understood as the community constituting that polity and inhabiting that domain.

In passing we can note that the concept of nation had a distinctly political connotation starting in the sixteenth century—the noble nation was a community of people bound together by political rather than ethnic affiliation, by their acceptance of the same political ideals and of a certain political system enshrining the pursuit of those ideals.¹³ Beginning in the sixteenth century, members of the nobility—of various ethnic origins and faiths, and fully aware of these differences—considered themselves to be representatives of a single nation. The nobility undoubtedly shared the privileges of their noble estate, yet their shared political rights, the fact that they were all citizens of a single Commonwealth, was more important. Perhaps the complexity of the Polish construal of patriotism is best expressed by a late statement, written in 1794, explaining what the insurgents of the Kościuszko Uprising were fighting for: “for their rights, liberties and

¹⁰ Edward Opaliński, *Sejm srebrnego wieku* [The Diet of the Silver Age] (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 2001), 193; also compare Claude Backvis, *Szkice o kulturze staropolskiej* [Sketches on ancient Polish culture] (Warsaw: PIW, 1975), 475, 492.

¹¹ Andrzej Zamoyski, *Mowa na sejmie convocationis dnia 16 maja 1764 roku w Warszawie miana* [Speech at the Diet convoked on 16 May 1764 held in Warsaw], (n.p., 1764).

¹² Henryk Wisner, *Najjaśniejsza Rzeczpospolita. Szkice z dziejów Polski szlacheckiej XVI–XVII wieku* [The most serene republic: Sketches on the history of noble Poland of the 16th–17th century] (Warsaw: PIW, 1978), 225.

¹³ Andrzej Walicki, *Idea narodu w polskiej myśli oświeceniowej* [The idea of nation in Polish Enlightenment thought] (Warsaw: PAN, IFiS, 2000), 21.

freedoms (...), for the fatherland, nation, integrity of borders, independence of government, for their own laws common to all.”¹⁴

Fatherland and liberty: The republican ideological framework of Polish patriotism

We have already several times used the term “citizen”—this may seem misplaced when referring only to a single estate, the *szlachta* or nobility. Yet without this term there is no way to analyze the political discourse of the sixteenth-eighteenth centuries, or to grasp what the noble patriotism of the era entailed. Especially since starting back in the sixteenth century, representatives of the “noble nation” indeed described themselves as citizens and saw themselves as having much more in common with the citizens of the free republics—i.e. Venice, later Holland, also Switzerland in the eighteenth century, and even the United States to a certain extent—than with the nobility inhabiting absolute monarchies, whom they described as “subjects” (the same term used to describe Polish peasants). Starting in the sixteenth century, dating back at least to the introduction of free elections, or perhaps even earlier to Stanisław Orzechowski’s writings (about 1560), a conviction became ever more widespread among the noble society that its fatherland was a free country, a *libera respublica* as it was frequently called to distinguish it from a monarchy, in times when the term “republic” was often simply used to denote a state. Although such clear expressions were initially not very common, indirect confirmation of this conviction that Poland was a kind of republic can be found in various comparisons and references to other republics. Already at the end of the sixteenth century the Commonwealth was felt to be the direct continuator of republican Rome, and a similarity to Venice was likewise seen: “Such is the form of the republics which we call free and (...) of which there have been but three in the world: the Roman one,

¹⁴ Michał Franciszek Karpowicz, *Kazanie na żałobnym obchodzie pamiątki tych obywateli, którzy w dniu powstania narodu w Wilnie i w następnym gonieniu nieprzyjaciół życie swe mężnie za wolność i ojczyznę położyli, w kościele S. Jana miane w Wilnie dnia 20 maja 1794, a z rozkazu RNL do druku podane* [Sermon at the mourning-ceremony for the memory of those citizens who heroically lost their life for fatherland and freedom in the uprising in Wilno and the ensuing persecutions, delivered in St. John’s Church in Wilno, on the 20th of May 1794, published on the order of Lithuanian Supreme Council] (Wilno [Vilnius], 1794), 16.

(...) after which it shifted to Venetia and lasts to this very day. Our ancestors, *ad normam* the Venetian [republic], instituted their own, third one..." wrote the author of one rebellion-era pamphlet.¹⁵

Under such a construal, discourse among noble politicians proceeded not in terms of their estate privileges, but in terms of civil rights, as enshrined by the liberty-based polity of their state. Paradoxically, this was further aided by the nobility's view that they themselves constituted the nation and by their practical exclusion of the other estates from political discourse, aspects that would only come under criticism from political writers in the late eighteenth century. Using the terminology proposed by J. G. A. Pocock, we can say that this was a "republican discourse."¹⁶ The authors of more theoretical writings, including participants in ongoing political discussions, stressed that their country's government, which they described in the sixteenth–seventeenth centuries as a *monarchia mixta*, but later more frequently as a free government or republican government, guaranteed that the nation (in their case, the nobility) had the right to participate in political life, to have a hand in making decisions affecting the state, their fellow citizens and themselves.¹⁷ From the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries Poles stressed with pride that they were dependent upon their own will, not upon that of their ruler. In 1573, one anonymous politician wrote: "Great is the common freedom, that I am not ruled by any lord as he wishes and desires, or any other light-minded individual, but by my brother (...), and it is more pleasant for me as a free man to bear what I myself and my brother, enthroned by me, allow."¹⁸ At the end of the eighteenth century, one of the defenders of the old liberty wrote: "It is better to be self-determinate than a subject, to limit oneself than to be limited, (...) to have one's own existence by and for oneself, which means being one's own proprietor, than by and for

¹⁵ [Anon.], *Libera respublica*, 407.

¹⁶ J. G. A. Pocock, *The Machiavellian moment: Florentine political thought and the Atlantic republican tradition* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1975); on the republican language of patriotism, see also Maurizio Viroli, *For Love of Country: An Essay on Patriotism and Nationalism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 24 and passim.

¹⁷ Zbigniew Ogonowski, *Filozofia polityczna w Polsce XVII wieku i tradycje demokracji europejskiej* [Political philosophy in Poland in the 17th century and the European democratic traditions] (Warsaw: PAN, IFiS, 1992), 78 n.

¹⁸ *Naprawa Rzeczypospolitej do elekcyi nowego króla* [Reform of the Republic until the election of a new king] (1573), d. K. J. Turowski (Cracow: Biblioteka Polska, 1859), 18.

someone else, which means being disgracefully owned.”¹⁹ It is indicative how frequently the pronoun “self” appeared in Polish political discourse. As early as in 1606 an anonymous *rokosz* rebel explained that the law governing the republic was called “common law” because “everyone voluntarily imposes it upon *himself*, *ratione* that the law is not burdensome for him who imposes it upon *himself*”²⁰ “I *myself* impose upon me and *myself* pay, I *myself* deliberate my own condition and decide about *myself*”²¹—this notion would be repeatedly expressed until the end of the existence of the “Republic of the Two Nations.” It is no wonder that noble citizens identified with their state, and that the distinction between the fatherland as a political construct and as a community of individuals (essentially embracing only the noble citizens) was very fluid, insofar as it existed at all.

Love for the fatherland thus interpreted was portrayed as the fundamental duty of its citizen, who owed his country “more than his wife, more than his daughter, more than himself.”²² Reminders of this duty were reiterated (very frequently in vain) throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Characteristically, love for the fatherland was in the Polish interpretation frequently treated more as a rational duty, in a certain sense a kind of *quid-pro-quo* transaction, than as an automatic, unthinking reflex learned in the cradle.²³ One of the *rokosz* pamphlets of 1606 very tellingly portrayed the Commonwealth itself as appealing to one of its citizens: “Remember that having given birth to you in this Crown, I bequeathed you (...) freedom, I gave you love, I raised you and strengthened you for defending me and my health; [remember] that I took the bread from my own mouth and gave it to you; do not now let me perish disgracefully and miserably.”²⁴

¹⁹ *Uwagi przeciw elekcyi i sukcesyi tronu w Polsce* [Observations on the election and succession to the throne in Poland] (n.p., 1791), 8 n.

²⁰ [Anon.], *Libera respublica*, 403.

²¹ *Uwagi pod rokiem 1790* [Observations in the year 1790] (n.p., [1790]), 40.

²² *Obrońca ojczyzny przez jednego z synów jej miłujących bratu swemu zaleconą RP 1650* [The defense of fatherland recommended by one of her loving sons to his brother AD 1650], in Stefania Ochmann-Staniszevska, ed., *Pisma polityczne z czasów panowania Jana Kazimierza* [Political writings from the period of the rule of John Casimir] (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1989), 1:61

²³ For older antecedents of this attitude, see M. Viroli, *For Love of Country*, 25.

²⁴ [Anon.] “Żaloszna mowa Rzpltej polskiej pod Koprzywnicą do zgromadzonego rycerstwa” [The Complaint of the Polish Commonwealth at Koprzywnicą to the gathered nobility] (1606) in Czubek, *Pisma polityczne z czasów rokoszu*, 2:97.

A classic explanation of such mutual duty was expressed by an anonymous work from 1628, complaining of the “exorbitances” in the Commonwealth:

what an incentive against the enemy it is to love and cherishingly enjoy what he wants to take away, which is freedom, justice, peace; but where there is bondage, unbearable wrongs and unrest among countrymen this incentive weakens, as many may think: who knows whether a foreigner, having conquered us, might give us what we cannot attain by ourselves?²⁵

These were theoretical considerations, since Poles had no doubt that what their own fatherland offered them was so attractive as to be worth the greatest sacrifice: “I now rest in the shade of law and liberty, equal to all and not subject to any; were I not to strive to save my rights I could moan under the yoke of bondage and disgrace. What virtue, what valor, could such a strong interest, mutual to all, not inspire?”—an anonymous author from the mid-eighteenth century asked rhetorically,²⁶ reiterating an opinion then nearly 200 years old. Love for the fatherland entailed a gratefulness for all the goods it bestowed upon its sons: “The fatherland (...), through sweet liberty ensuring happiness and safety to all, virtually itself instills love in its own citizens.”²⁷ Such love was also the only rational behavior, since only it could ensure such benefits, both material and spiritual. “Remember, gentlemen and landlords,” one *rokosz* participant of 1606 appealed to his countrymen, “that after God, whatever you have you have from your fatherland; it raises you, it feeds you, it gives you all abundances; let it also be so dear to you because if it perishes, we all must perish with it.”²⁸ As one of the outstanding Polish political thinkers of the eighteenth century put it concisely: “No one can be fortunate in an unfortunate fatherland, no one can be safe in an unsafe, weak Commonwealth.”²⁹ Being a patriot imposed a well-understood civil interest.

²⁵ *Egzorbitancja*, 8.

²⁶ [Jan Nepomucen Poniński], *Projekt uszczęśliwienia ojczyzny* [Project for making the fatherland happy], Czartoryski Library manuscript 2619, 198.

²⁷ Michał Franciszek Karpowicz, *Kazanie o miłości ojczyzny* [Sermon on the love of fatherland], (n.p., 1781).

²⁸ *Pismo szlachcica jednego, w którym o rozprawie znać daje do braciej* [The letter of a country gentleman, in which he informs his brothers about a skirmish], in Czubek, *Pisma polityczne z czasów rokoszu*, 3:367.

²⁹ Stanisław Konarski, *O skutecznym rad sposobie* [On the efficient way of councils] (Warsaw, 1760), 1:184.

The passages cited above have already several times employed the term “liberty”—the first and highest benefit guaranteed by the fatherland. We should once again point out here that nearly until the end of the eighteenth century, political discourse in the Commonwealth was republican, like the political ideology of the *szlachta*. It was extremely typical in Polish writings that the sort of liberty nowadays perceived as negative, i.e. the freedom to pursue private aims, was linked to or even made contingent upon citizens’ possession of positive liberty, i.e. the right to participate in enacting the law and determining state affairs.³⁰ This notion of liberty could only come to fruition in a free state—the Commonwealth. In the opinion of its noble citizens, the situation present in absolute monarchies, where the law and subjects’ individual freedoms were contingent upon the ruler’s arbitrary will, was tantamount to total bondage. As an anonymous author wrote in the sixteenth century, citing Jan Herburt: “Although they have greater abundances there, these are not possessed by their owners. Moreover, when the superior ruler so orders you must appear in person and be judged as he likes, and give as much as ordered whenever so ordered, even without necessity—should you wish to avoid trouble, mount your horse!”³¹ In the mid-seventeenth century Andrzej Maksymilian Fredro expressed this even more emphatically: “Many people fare well under absolute rule, especially if they happen to have a good ruler. But I could call this a kind of liberty by consent rather than true liberty, because the people there are constantly on the verge of bondage, and their blood and life are endangered under a ruler who, when struck with fury, has the right to go into frenzy freely and with impunity.”³² This being the case, protecting the state was the only way to protect the liberty of its citizens. As Stanisław Leszczyński wrote in 1743,

in statu monarchico the particularist stands not to lose much from war, since although his fatherland may come under a new ruler if there is an

³⁰ “Only by having political rights—the right to participate in some way in the determination of what the laws were to be—could civil liberty be protected. Thus republican liberty was essential to all freedom.” Maurice Goldsmith, *Liberty, Virtue and the Rule of Law, 1689–1770*, in David Wootton, ed., *Republicanism, Liberty, and Commercial Society, 1649–1776* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994), 200.

³¹ *Krótkie rzeczy potrzebnych...*, 11.

³² Andrzej Maksymilian Fredro, *O wyższości rzeczypospolitej nad monarchią* (1668), [On the superiority of the republic over the monarchy], cited from the Polish translation by T. Włodarczyk, in *Filozofia i myśl społeczna XVII wieku*, ed. Zbigniew Ogonowski (Warsaw: PWN, 1979), 335.

ill-favourable outcome, he will still remain a subject as before. In our country *non item*, because if through insufficient forces we are unable to avoid *cladem* in wars, we face an inevitable loss of not only our fatherland, but also our freedoms and liberties.³³

The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was considered an oasis of liberty. This conviction was already being expressed in the sixteenth century: “Liberty and freedom, the greatest good of all, which is so great and decent that the liberties of other nations are nothing more than unbearable bondage in comparison” wrote one anonymous author in 1587.³⁴ “There is no nation under the sun as free as Poland”³⁵—this view would be reiterated for nearly 200 years. It is telling to note how strongly the notion of liberty was linked in Polish writings with the Commonwealth, and only with it. This link was already perceived at the end of the sixteenth century, and it grew ever stronger over time. Liberty was not just the most precious gift the fatherland bestowed upon its citizens, but also a certain inherent trait. “*Fundamentum nostrae Reipublicae libertas est*” Jan Zamoyski said in 1605.³⁶ In a pamphlet from 1697 the Commonwealth itself is portrayed as follows: “My freedom is my life.” Liberty was seen as the Commonwealth’s sister, the “heart of the fatherland,” the apple of its eye, its most precious jewel and adornment. This is best illustrated by a Latin verse popular in the eighteenth century: *Poloniae orbis annulus, annulique hujus gemma libertas/ [...] Poloniae orbis hortus hortique hujus laurale libertas, Poloniae orbis paradisus paradisque hujus delitia libertas/ Poloniae orbis coelum coelique hujus data libertas.*³⁷ The fatherland-liberty connection seems to be the most commonly linked pair in Polish political discourse.

³³ Stanisław Leszczyński, *Głos wolny wolność ubezpieczający* [The free voice guaranteeing freedom] (written circa 1740), ed. Stanisław Rembowski, in *Biblioteka Ordynacji Krasieńskich*. Muzeum Konstantego Świdzińskiego, vol. 19. (Warsaw: Świdzińscy i Ord. Krasieńskich, 1903), 74.

³⁴ *Krótkie rzeczy potrzebnych z strony wolności a swobód polskich zebranie* [A short collection of thoughts needed for preserving freedom and Polish liberties] (1587), ed. K. J. Turowski (Cracow: Biblioteka Polska, 1859), 11.

³⁵ [Sebastian Dembowski], *Wolność polska rozmową Polaka z Francuzem roztrząśniona* [Polish freedom discussed in a conversation of a Pole and a Frenchman] [1732], ed. Teodor Wierzbowski (Warsaw: Biblioteka zapomnianych poetów i prozaików polskich XV—ZVIII w., z. 21: 1904), 7.

³⁶ Jan Zamoyski, *Votum... na sejmie warszawskim, już ostatnim za jego żywota, w r. 1605* [Vote at the Sejm in Warsaw, the last during his [Zamoyski’s] life, in 1605] in *Czubek, Pisma polityczne z czasów rokoszu*, 2: 94.

³⁷ Kórnik Library manuscript 1091, card 120 (copy from ca. 1770)

This likewise had an impact on how patriotism was construed. It is worth stressing the early distinction (earlier than in other countries) that was drawn between love for the fatherland and duties to the king. Jan Zamoyski still asserted: “I do not divide His Majesty from the Commonwealth, since they are one and the same and always *coniunctim*, and whosoever wants to so divide them doth ill,” mentioning “services” for both king and country in the same breath.³⁸ Yet loyalty towards the ruler/dynasty quickly receded into the background (or even further), overshadowed by loyalty to the common republic and common liberty.³⁹ Besides, this pertains not only to political discourse, but also to the practice of law and governance. As early as in 1588, many years ahead of other European countries, Polish law drew a distinction between the crimes of committing treason against the country and affronting the royal majesty. We can say that the fatherland-freedom connection in a sense supplanted the fatherland-king connection. Such loyalty to or love for the fatherland was even demanded of the monarch himself—successive kings were instructed to “cherish this fatherland of ours,” with the explanation that “kings, too, whatever they may have, they have from the fatherland, and whatever they give, they give from its riches.”⁴⁰ Importantly, one could be a patriot even while being against the king or acting in outright defiance of him, something that was stressed by those involved in the great *rokosz* rebellions against the monarchs: the Zebrzydowski rebellion (1606), the Lubomirski rebellion (1666), even until the Bar Confederacy (1768–1772).

The noble citizens in fact went even further—in their view a monarch, or at least excessive royal power, ruled out any patriotism among his subjects. Their writings evidence a deeply held conviction that

³⁸ Zamoyski, *Mowa*, in Czubek, *Pisma polityczne z czasów rokoszu*, 2: 92.

³⁹ Andrzej Walicki points out in this context that according to Kohn’s definition “the ideals of the Polish *szlachta* of the Renaissance epoch represented on the Europe-wide scale a particularly advanced form” of the western type of “political nationalism” (Walicki, *Idea narodu*, 21).

⁴⁰ Zamoyski, *Mowa*, in Czubek, *Pisma polityczne z czasów rokoszu*, 2: 95; *Pismo szlacheckie*, 368. We can find a similar argument in the pamphlet addressing John Casimir: *Respons na jawny fałsz pod tytułem “Informacja o środkach pomiarkowania się z panem marszałkiem”* [Answer to an open falsehood entitled “Information about the means of a settlement with the Marshall (i.e. Jerzy Lubomirski)"] ([1665]), printed in Stefania Ochmann-Staniszevska, ed., *Pisma polityczne z czasów panowania Jana Kazimierza*, 3:12.; Eduard Opaliński goes so far as to write about the “patriotic-political education” the ruler obtained from the noble society (*Kultura*, 93).

patriotism was only possible where free people determined their own fate and the fate of their country, in other words only citizens could have a fatherland. In the eighteenth century Polish opinions coincided with the views professed by French philosophers, expressed by the authors of the *Encyclopédie* when writing that “there is no fatherland under the yoke of despotism.”⁴¹ In Polish writings, however, this view appeared significantly earlier. As early as in the mid-seventeenth century, standing up for the Commonwealth and its government from the critique of the Scot John Barclay (1582–1621), Łukasz Opaliński wrote:

where the state is not a hereditary estate and the property of an individual, but a society bound by laws and a common fatherland of its inhabitants, there everyone is concerned for the common good. How different things are where such autocrats or lords rule, where only mercenary or forced soldiers fight, where there is no other revenue than that extracted by force from the defiant, who believe that what they give to the state is lost.⁴²

In countries where bondage prevailed—which in the *szlachta*’s view meant all absolute monarchies—*amor patriae* was impossible because their inhabitants essentially had no fatherland: “Elsewhere there are people, here we have citizens; they have a country, we have a fatherland,” Adam Wawrzyniec Rzewuski wrote with pride about Poland and Poles at the end of the eighteenth century. Elsewhere he expressed this view even more sharply: in a monarchy “you have no nation, the sweet name of the fatherland fears and flinches to come to the mouth of the slave.”⁴³

Yet this was no isolated view of an embittered defender of the Commonwealth’s old system. The same opinion (most likely not without Rousseau’s influence) was also shared at the same time by the republican Staszic and by the priest Puszet relatively favorable to monarchist

⁴¹ Sante Graciotti, *Od renesansu do oświecenia* [From the Renaissance to the Enlightenment] (Warsaw: PIW, 1991), 1:14.

⁴² Łukasz Opaliński, *Obrona Polski przeciw Janowi Barklayowi* [Defense of Poland against John Barclay], in *Wybór pism* [Selected writings], ed. Stanisław Grzeszczuk (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1959), 179.

⁴³ Adam Wawrzyniec Rzewuski, *Głos... posła z woj. wołyńskiego na sejm 1784 roku miany w izbie poselskiej* [Vote... of the deputy from the Palatinate of Wolhynia at the Sejm of 1784, in the Chamber of Deputies] in *Zbiór mów różnych w czasie sejmku sześćniedzielnego w Grodnie* [Collection of various orations held during the six-week Sejm in Grodno] (Wilno [Vilnius], 1784), 550; idem, *O formie rządu republikańskiego myśli* (Warsaw, 1790), 1:7.

solutions. The latter felt that “subjects in an autocratic state commonly do not consider the country their fatherland, only insofar as it is the country of their birth or of the property they possess in it.”⁴⁴ A person unable to affect decisions about his country did not have any fatherland; it was therefore hard to demand patriotism, love of fatherland or courage in its defense from such an individual: “A subject suppressed by the yoke of autocracy, uncertain of any fate of what he sees, what he possesses, is thus indifferent to everything. He must consider the glory of the country not his own affair, since one person constitutes, exercises and loses it.”⁴⁵

Although loyalty to the king was not an imperative particularly well respected in the Commonwealth, to earn the appellation of “patriot” one could not betray liberty. Accusations of harboring insufficiently fervent love of freedom, eagerly voiced in the political polemics of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, were essentially tantamount to accusations of insufficient patriotism and made for a highly effective political weapon. A “true Pole” had to cherish freedom, otherwise he was not worthy of being called a Pole. From the early seventeenth century, love for the Commonwealth began to be linked or even identified with a love for freedom, and the defense of the fatherland with the defense of the rights and liberties of its citizens. In 1606, the author of one *rokosz* pamphlet recommended that “everyone (...) should fully do their foremost duty to the fatherland: to defend its rights and liberty.”⁴⁶ This harked back to an old Roman tradition—Cicero and Sallust had already drawn a link between their fatherland and rights and liberty.⁴⁷

This interpretation of the connection between fatherland and liberty entailed a serious danger, one which would emerge at the end of the seventeenth century and throughout the eighteenth. When the shape of noble political discourse was moulded in the sixteenth and seventeenth

⁴⁴ J. Puszet de Puget, *O uszczęśliwieniu narodów* [On making nations happy] (Warsaw, 1788), 1:59; Stanisław Staszic, *Uwagi nad życiem Jana Zamoyskiego* [Remarks on the life of Jan Zamoyski] (1787), ed. Stefan Czarnowski (Cracow: Krakowska Spółka Wydawnicza, 1926), 182.

⁴⁵ Speech of Michał Brzostowski, Deputy from Trock [Trakai in modern Lithuania], on 27 October 1788, in *Zbiór mów i pism niektórych w czasie sejmu stanów skonfederowanych* [Collection of speeches and writings from the time of the confederated estates] (Wilno [Vilnius], 1788), 2:106.

⁴⁶ *Pismo szlachcica*, 358.

⁴⁷ Viroli, *For Love of Country*, 19.

centuries, essentially all sources were aware that since a free fatherland was the sole guarantor of liberty, love of liberty *de facto* meant love for the fatherland, concern for its strength and safe existence. Yet in time the emphasis began to shift, and concern for liberty began to chiefly entail concern for laws guaranteeing the freedoms of individuals, specifically the noble citizens. In the eighteenth century, or at least its first half, this aspect of love for liberty dominated political discourse, or even worse the general attitude of the nobility. One's love of liberty (and therefore of the Commonwealth) was in this interpretation evidenced above all by one's defense of the existing state of affairs, the old rights and political institutions. Most importantly here, a kind of shift in the hierarchy of values occurred—by the mid-seventeenth century essentially no one had any doubt that without the Commonwealth-fatherland there could be no liberty, but later, especially in the eighteenth century, it began to be suggested that without liberty there could be no fatherland. Under the latter understanding, patriotism came to entail no longer a love of the free country, but rather a love of its citizens' freedoms. Every attempt to limit these freedoms, even when necessary to strengthen the state or even later to rescue its very existence, was viewed as an attack against the common fatherland or even as treason: "Out with you, degenerate sons of the fatherland, go to others to win their favor and scorn, and leave to righteous Poles the freedom they cherish more than life, which you do not know how to use well or to preserve"—the fanatic defender of ancient customs Seweryn Rzewuski declaimed, addressing the initiators of political reforms in the Four-Year Sejm period (1788–1792).⁴⁸

It is no wonder that advocates of this interpretation accused the authors of the modern Polish Constitution of 3 May 1791 of committing treason—in their view this act of law violated the noble freedoms and therefore constituted a betrayal of the fatherland (understood to mean the noble society and its privileges). Moreover, some of them felt that in view of the overt violation of their liberty, the aforementioned principle of the mutual duties the fatherland and citizens had towards one another had been set asunder, with citizens therefore becoming in a sense relieved of their duty to serve the country. As one of the opponents of the Constitution said on 3 May 1791: "I wish to defend

⁴⁸ Seweryn Rzewuski, *O sukcesyi tronu w Polszcze rzecz krótka* [Short speech on the succession to the throne] (n.p., 1790), 10.

the country because I am free, but if there is to be despotism I will scorn it and declare myself an enemy of Poland.”⁴⁹

Such an interpretation could essentially be introduced on the one hand due to the fatherland-liberty connection, and on the other hand due to the concept of patriotism as a set of mutual duties between citizen and country—since the fatherland had ceased to fulfil its primary duty to guarantee liberty, citizens were relieved of the duty to love their country. While this was by no means a uniquely Polish interpretation,⁵⁰ it was an extreme one, somewhat at odds with the Polish vision of fatherland and patriotism. Neither was it the dominant view of the time, and polemics on the topic had begun much earlier. At least starting in the mid-eighteenth century, Poles were increasingly reminded of a truth familiar to their Renaissance-era forebears, that the only guarantor of their freedoms was their own free state: “When without councils and *sejms* our Republic and our fatherland perishes, where will that liberty be?”⁵¹ This was repeated into the 1790s: “If the name of Poland perished, where would they raise their liberty?” asked Hugo Kołłątaj a leading Polish politician from the final period of the “First Republic,” one of the most hot-headed defenders of the old freedoms. The classic republican vision of *amor patriae* was thus to a certain extent reverted to—whereby the liberties of citizens hinge upon the strength and efficiency of the state they themselves created.

At the same time as Kołłątaj was writing in the early 1790s, there also appeared certain sources (not numerous) drawing or at least striving to draw an explicit distinction between the problem of patriotism and the defense of freedoms, fatherland and liberty. Importantly, these authors were beginning to appeal to a different political discourse than the traditional republican type, above all employing a different concept of nation, treating it in cultural-ethnic rather than political terms. “I love the Poles’ name and existence in the world first of all, and then Polish liberty” declared Franciszek Salezy Jezierski, one of the most famous political writers of the time, explaining that even under

⁴⁹ Jan Suchorzewski, speech on 3 May 1791, quoted from Jerzy Michalski, *Konstytucja 3 Maja* [The 3rd of May Constitution] (Warsaw: Zamek Królewski, 1985), 48.

⁵⁰ “The citizen has an obligation towards his *patria* because he owes it all the goods of life, and he loves his *patria* because it is a place where he can enjoy sweet freedom. If the *patria* dissolves into a tyranny of arrogant men, the obligation ceases and love turns into hatred.” Viroli, *For Love of Country*, 33.

⁵¹ Konarski, *O skutecznym*, 2:152.

despotic rule, so long as it was Polish, “the nation would at least retain its name, language and character.”⁵²

A similar view was expressed by Stanisław Staszic, alongside Kołłątaj the greatest political thinker of the final period of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, when writing: “With the whole nation under despotism, it might recover its lost liberty under favorable political circumstances, given today’s emerging enlightenment. But a nation once destroyed will never rise again.”⁵³ Following the principle of “first nation, then freedoms,” Staszic went so far as to assert: “An absolute monarchy would be more useful to our nation in this case than a bad republic, since the former will preserve the nation of Poles.”⁵⁴ Such an interpretation enabled them on the one hand to move beyond the vision of the noble nation, and on the other to partially reassess the notion of patriotism, or in any event to question its direct link to the freedoms of the noble citizens. However, we have to note an important caveat here: interpretations of this sort were more of an exception. While the concept of nation began to be expanded beyond the nobility by the end of the eighteenth century (chiefly to include the bourgeoisie), it was still generally treated more in political than ethnic terms.⁵⁵ Similarly, although there was discussion of what liberty was and what social scope it should embrace, no one aside from the above-cited authors drew a distinction between fatherland and liberty, and even they were not entirely consistent here.

The disaster of the foreign partitions of Poland served more to confirm than to undermine the link between liberty and fatherland, depriving Poles of both at the same time. Foreign rule reconfirmed the old conviction that only possessing an independent state could ensure the liberty of its citizens, i.e. without a fatherland there could be no liberty. As the Kościuszko Uprising Act (1794) proclaimed, we lost our “fatherland, and with it the exercise of the most sacred rights of liberty.”⁵⁶ For participants in the uprising (by no means limited to nobles),

⁵² Franciszek Salezy Jezierski, *Niektóre wyrazy porządkiem abecadła zebrane* [Selected words collected in alphabetic order and explained with pertinent remarks] in idem, *Wybór pism* [Selected writings], ed. Zbigniew Skwarczyński (Warsaw: PIW, 1952), 215.

⁵³ Stanisław Staszic, *Przestrogi dla Polski* [Warnings for Poland] (1790), ed. S. Czarnowski (Cracow: Krakowska Spółka Wydawnicza, 1926), 210.

⁵⁴ Staszic, *Przestrogi*, 209 and 4.; idem, *Uwagi*, 52, 204 n.

⁵⁵ Walicki, *Idea narodu*, 108 n., 117.

⁵⁶ *Gazeta Krajowa* no. 31 / 22 April.

fighting for liberty meant liberating the country from foreign invaders, and at the same time liberating its citizens from tyranny. “Fellow citizens!”—the insurrectionist government joyfully announced—“Our fatherland is being regained, and liberty with it...”⁵⁷ Interestingly, in the uprising propaganda liberty appeared as an element uniting various social, religious and ethnic groups together in defense of the fatherland, even those that might have remained indifferent to slogans of national defense. “Liberty links all people regardless of their prejudices and diversity of faiths. It is pleasant to see how the inhabitants of our land, Catholics and Greeks [i.e. Greek Orthodox] and Protestants, strive solely to rescue the fatherland and regain liberty” Franciszek Dmochowski wrote in one of the final issues of *Gazeta Rządowa*.⁵⁸ This aspect was particularly highlighted by commenting on Jews’ involvement in the uprising, who “sprinkled their own blood upon the beginning of the nation’s and their own freedom, and proved to the world that while disinclined to fight at the command of tyrants, where the people can gain they do not spare their own life.”⁵⁹ In a certain sense this reverted to the same vision of a free country that had banded noble citizens of various origins together back in the sixteenth century, albeit now encompassing not just the *szlachta* but all the inhabitants of the Commonwealth, who must defend it since it alone was a “land of freedom.”

It is also worth pointing out one more aspect of the fatherland-liberty connection. Since love for the Commonwealth and for liberty were so closely linked as to be nearly identical, the defense of someone else’s freedom could also fit within the patriotic ethos. The fact that this possibility was already perceived in the eighteenth century is evidenced by the words of Antoni Pułaski, when he interceded in the Sejm on behalf of his brother Kazimierz, the American general, previously sentenced to banishment in Poland for plotting a coup against King Stanisław August (1771). Describing his brother’s contribution to the fight for US independence, he stated: “Although it would be far more pleasant for him to risk his life for his own fatherland, some

⁵⁷ Rada Zastępcza Tymczasowa [The Provisional Council] 30 April 1794, in Szymon Askenazy and Włodzimierz Dzwonkowski, eds., *Akty Powstania Kościuszki*, [Documents of the Kościuszko Uprising] (Cracow: Akademia Umiejętności, 1918), 1: 83.

⁵⁸ *Gazeta Rządowa* no. 117/ 30 Oct 1794.

⁵⁹ *Gazeta Rządowa* no. 78/ 20 Sept 1794.

glory should still be due to him for defending the freedom of others.”⁶⁰ From here it is not a far cry to the nineteenth-century slogan “for your freedom and ours.”

Patriotic obligations

So far we have discussed what patriotism and love of one’s fatherland were understood to entail. Now we should consider what obligations they imposed upon citizens, what attitudes were described with the term patriotism. We can immediately state that the requirements demanded of a “useful son of the fatherland” were precisely the same as were imposed by the republican ideology upon any member of a free society throughout Europe,⁶¹ and that they did not change essentially from the sixteenth through the eighteenth century. These requirements were very serious, as was the responsibility that rested with citizens. It was they, after all, unlike subjects deprived of any power as well as all responsibility, who were responsible not only for themselves but also for the community they were members of, therefore for their fatherland. The liberty of their countrymen and the efficient functioning of the republic depended upon their attitudes. “He [the citizen] may not withdraw from his affairs (...), righteousness imposes upon him a duty to work and labour for the good of the fatherland and contribute to it,” the author of *Katechizm narodowy* wrote in 1791,⁶² and this sounds somewhat like contemporary statements by the French Jacobins or a citation from Rousseau.⁶³ Yet at the same time this was a reference (it is hard to say whether it was conscious or not) to a much older tradition of thought about the state and liberty, which was beautifully presented in the seventeenth century by Andrzej Maksymilian Fredro:

⁶⁰ Antoni Pułaski, Sejm deputy from Czernichów, speech on 7 Nov 1778, in *Zbiór mów różnych w czasie sejmu [...] roku 1778 mianych* [Collection of different speeches from the time of the Sejm held in 1778] (Wilno [Vilnius], 1778).

⁶¹ Edward Opaliński, “Civic Humanism and Republican Citizenship in the Polish Renaissance,” in Martin van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner, eds., *Republicanism: A Shared European Heritage* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 1:160ff; Richard Vetterli and Gary Bryner, *In Search of the Republic: Public Virtue and the Roots of American Government*, 2nd edition (London: Rowman & Littlefield, 1996), 20; M. Viroli, *For Love of Country*, 27.

⁶² *Katechizm narodowy 1791*, [National catechism] n.p. [1791], 9.

⁶³ On Rousseau’s views about the citizen’s duties, compare Bronisław Baczko, *Jan Jakub Rousseau. Samotność i wspólnota* [Jean Jacques Rousseau. Loneliness and community] (Warsaw: PWN, 1964), 559 and below.

“Citizens equal in dignity serve the Republic with their virtue, fidelity and love, and faithfully care for what has been entrusted to them, not as servants but as citizens (...) who simultaneously govern and are governed—not for the power and benefit of one, but for the Republic and for liberty.”⁶⁴ Setting aside the issue of how Fredro’s lofty statements sized up against the political reality of his day, we have to assert that from the sixteenth century on, all sources on the topic agreed that there was a political and also moral imperative for a free individual to serve the fatherland. “Service to the Commonwealth is the most certain, most glorious and even most useful service above all others,” declared one participant in the Zebrzydowski rebellion in 1606.⁶⁵

This service was meant to be manifest in many domains. One of the most prominent was defending the fatherland with weapons in hand. The above-cited *rokosz* participant appealed to his fellow citizens: “Direct your valor towards rescuing the fatherland, as even if one were to die, it would be a sweet death since every such man will leave behind eternal glory to himself and his house.”⁶⁶ “*Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori*”—this Roman principle was invoked in Polish statements in both the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries. Sacrificing one’s life or even sacrificing everything (life, well-being and property) for the fatherland was an element constantly present in the political discourse of the noble republic, often in the form of the writer or speaker complaining that his contemporaries, unlike their virtuous forebears, were incapable of making such far-reaching sacrifices.

Since the fatherland, as we have already said earlier, was for its citizens the only guarantee of all benefits, especially liberty, its defense was not only worthy of the greatest sacrifice, it was essentially something obvious: “(...) where there is freedom, there is a great heart. Where there is a great heart, dangers are nothing and death is not severe,” wrote the author of a pamphlet in 1573,⁶⁷ and he would be echoed for more than 200 years. Although these were often empty platitudes, that does not change the fact that this was one of the key elements of the

⁶⁴ A.M. Fredro, *O potędze narodu (Punctum primum de potentia populi)* [On the power of the nation] [1668], from the Polish translation by J. Domański, in Z. Ogonowski, ed., *Filozofia*, 1:348.

⁶⁵ *Pismo szlachcica*, 368.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 367.

⁶⁷ *Pokazanie błędów i naprawy ich w naszej Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej* [The presentation of faults and their correction in our Polish Commonwealth] in Jan Czubek, ed., *Pisma polityczne z czasów pierwszego bezkrólewia* [Political writings from the times of the first interregnum period] (Cracow: Akademia Umiejętności, 1906), 163.

Polish vision of patriotism, of the citizen's duties to the fatherland—an element that was invoked regardless of the author's political views, including by advocates of far-reaching reform of the Commonwealth's government and more modern thinking about the state: "O country, truly fated for bondage, who wants to be free and fortunate without the slightest sacrifice, baseness will not give you what virtue can mete out, and wicked fright will not preserve what valorous courage can defend," Józef Wybicki, one of the most outstanding Polish adaptors of Enlightenment political theories, warned his countrymen in a lofty apostrophe in 1775.⁶⁸ Naturally, this motif was most frequently cited at dramatic moments of wars and internal disturbances—whereby it resurfaced essentially in the very same form. During the Kościuszko Uprising, the author of *Głosy Polaka do współziomków* wrote about death on the battlefield in nearly the same words as his forerunner in 1606: "A death that is glorious, as it is in the service of the country, a death that is desired, as it is for the sake of liberty, freedoms, laws (...) all of that is what is dearest in the world."⁶⁹ The dramatic difference consisted in the fact that the former source, despite the tense situation, was deliberating a theoretical issue, while the latter was writing about men who had truly fallen on the battlefield. Both of them, however, were invoking the same vision of love for the country—patriotism that demanded the highest sacrifice.

Sacrificing one's life for the fatherland was undoubtedly the highest form of service to the country, although by no means the only one, and it is hard to say whether it was the one most prominently emphasized in Polish writings, at least outside of moments of exceptional danger. In fact a free individual should serve his country always and in any way demanded by circumstances: "In a nation where liberty (...) is still fortunately flourishing, (...) everyone is an active member of the fatherland. Therefore everyone should contribute to its good fortune in any way he can."⁷⁰ From the outset of the noble republic's existence, it was stressed that a good citizen's duties were not just limited to defending it in wartime. Such duties were no lesser during peace-

⁶⁸ Józef Wybicki, *Myśli polityczne o wolności cywilnej* [Political thoughts on civil freedom], ed. Zbigniew Nowak (Gdańsk: Ossolineum, 1984), 168.

⁶⁹ *Głosy Polaka do współziomków* [Call of a Pole to his compatriots] (Cracow, 1794); *Głos I*.

⁷⁰ *Myśli patriotyczno-polityczne do Stanów Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej na sejm 1788 roku zgromadzonych* [Patriotic-political thoughts presented to the Estates of the Polish Commonwealth gathered in 1788] (Warsaw, 1788), 1.

time, when the demands made of citizens were perhaps even more difficult to live up to. Then, it was stressed, the citizen should serve the country not with arms, but with counsel. As Stanisław Konarski wrote in the mid-eighteenth century: “One serves the country always: either with counsel or with weapon in hand. Both fields of service are equally beautiful, honorable and meritorious.”⁷¹ This meant that everyone should participate actively in public life. The Polish concepts here fit in with the longstanding tradition of the model of “civic” attitude which the Italians (after Cicero) called *vita activa* and the English called active citizenship.⁷² They stemmed from the same source, i.e. classical thought, but also from individual political practices.⁷³ The slogan of “debate for the country” encompassed a whole range of actions that did not bring (at least in theory) direct benefits to the individual, yet were crucial for the community. We can say that in this interpretation patriotism was effort undertaken for the common good: “You have no greater or harder labor than work for the country” an anonymous politician wrote at the outset of the seventeenth century.⁷⁴ This would be reiterated for a further 200 years—in 1789 Hugo Kołłątaj pointed out that the republican government of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, while “giving them [the citizens] liberty, places upon

⁷¹ Stanisław Konarski, *Mowa o kształtowaniu człowieka uczciwego i dobrego obywatela* [Oration on the formation of a honest men and a good citizen] [1754], in idem, *Pisma wybrane* [Selected writings], ed. Juliusz Nowak-Dłużewski (Warsaw: PIW, 1955), 2: 129.

⁷² Chaim Wirszubski, *Libertas as a Political Idea at Rome during the Late Republic and Early Principate* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 8; J. G. A. Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment*, 49–66, 84–86, 333–335, 350 and passim; Q. Skinner, *Machiavelli* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981), 55–57; idem, “Machiavelli’s Discorsi and the pre-humanist origins of republican ideas,” in Gisela Bock, Quentin Skinner and Maurizio Viroli, eds., *Machiavelli and Republicanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 138; Karin Tilmans, “Republican Citizenship and Civic-Humanism in the Burgundian-Habsburg Netherlands (1477–1566),” in van Gelderen and Skinner, eds., *Republicanism*, 1:107–26.

⁷³ Historians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries point out the latter factor; see Jan Dziegielewski, “Stan szlachecki w życiu publicznym Rzeczypospolitej w pierwszym stuleciu po Unii Lubelskiej” [The noble estate in the public life of the Commonwealth in the first century after the Lublin Union] in Anna Sucheni-Grabowska and Alicja Dybkowska, eds., *Tradycje polityczne dawnej Polski* [Political traditions of old Poland] (Warsaw: Editions Spotkania, 1993), 77; E. Opaliński, *Kultura*, 117 and passim.

⁷⁴ *Przyczyny wypowiedzenia posłuszeństwa Zygmunтови, królewicowi szwedzkiemu, anno 1607 die nativitatıs Ioannis Baptistae* [Reasons for the refusal of obedience to Zygmunt, Prince of Sweden, anno 1607 die nativitatıs Ioannis Baptistae], in Czubek, *Pisma polityczne z czasów rokoszu*, 3:251.

them the yoke of labor and lasting supervision.”⁷⁵ He even went a step further, asserting in another of his works: “A nation does not become enslaved when shackles are placed upon it, but when the interest of its freedoms begins to become indifferent to it, begins to bore it.”⁷⁶

Laboring for the sake of the fatherland meant participating in *Sejm* and *Sejmik* gatherings, issuing judicious court rulings, speaking out in public debate, conscientiously holding public office, and also obeying the law and paying taxes. However, we can also express this more concisely: it meant taking all actions and making all decisions in keeping with the common interest. In accordance with the republican tradition, every participant in public life should behave as the public welfare required.⁷⁷ Let us stress: this was the republican *bonum publicum* understood to mean the common good, not an abstract *raison d'état* such as allegedly guided monarchs in absolute monarchies.⁷⁸ This imperative was all the more essential in that—as was strongly stressed—only such an attitude on the part of participants in public life guaranteed that during the political disputes inevitably present in the free state they would be prepared to concede their position for the sake of concord and unity, which formed the foundation for how the Commonwealth functioned.⁷⁹ The slogan of concern for the public welfare, the imperative of valuing the common good above private interests, were among the leading motifs of Polish discussion about the citizen's duties towards the fatherland, about patriotism. Sometimes these were even considered identical. As the anonymous author com-

⁷⁵ Hugo Kołłątaj, *Listy anonima* [Anonymous letters], ed. Bolesław Leśnodorski and Hanna Wereszycka (Warsaw: PWN, 1954), 2:20.

⁷⁶ [H. Kołłątaj], *Krótką radą względem napisania dobrej konstytucji rządu* [Short council concerning the writing of a good constitution of government] (Warsaw, 1790), in Łukasz Kądziela, ed., *Kołłątaj i inni* [Kołłątaj and others] (Warsaw: WSiP, 1991), 153.

⁷⁷ Opaliński, *Kultura*, 92 n.; “Classical civil virtue then meant the patriotic subordination of one's personal interests to the common welfare,” Vetterli and Bryner, *In Search*, 20; similarly Thomas Pangle, *The Spirit of Modern Republicanism: The Moral Vision of the American Founders and the Philosophy of Locke* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1988), 67.

⁷⁸ The concept of patriotism as action on behalf of *raison d'état*, widespread in seventeenth and eighteenth-century Europe, was absent in Polish political discourse, compare Viroli, *For Love of Country*, 43.

⁷⁹ Janusz Ekes, *Trójpodział władzy i zgoda wszystkich. Naczelne zasady “ustroju mieszanego” w staropolskiej myśli politycznej* [Tripartite power and general agreement: Main principles of mixed government in old Polish political thought] (Siedlce: Instytut Historii Akademii Podlaskiej, 2001), *passim*.

plaining about “widespread exorbitance” in 1628 wrote: “Love of the common good is a virtue, called by politicians *pietas in patriam*.”⁸⁰

Through the duration of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth’s existence, reminders appeared in political discourse that such concern was essentially not a sacrifice but rather action taken in the properly construed interests of the members of a free society. Łukasz Opaliński reminded Poles “that there can be no common good without mutual efforts and services (...), that is why if no one wanted to bear this burden, the common fatherland would have to go amiss, and with it the private liberty you love so much.”⁸¹ At the same time, however, it was realized that in order to live up to the ideal, the “good sons of the fatherland” would repeatedly have to make decisions that ran counter to their short-term objectives and individual aims, to what they could consider to be good for them. Even if these decisions were ultimately meant to strengthen the free state, to likewise guarantee their individual freedoms, the practical implementation of the principle that citizens “sacrificed all personal considerations especially to the common interests of the country” was undoubtedly not easy.⁸² As Andrzej Zamoyski level-headedly sized up the situation, “kings do not have to be persuaded to love their royal power, because their ambition and own interests lead them to do so, yet we have to be encouraged to love our country, because that maintains unity and equality among us, against ambitions and against our own interests.”⁸³ That was all the more difficult since, as we have stressed, citizens undertook all such actions voluntarily. Essentially, with the exception of laws, there was no external force in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth that could coerce a citizen to take specific actions, or to prevent specific actions. The absence of coercion, the sovereignty enjoyed by Poles in their actions and decisions was highlighted in both the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Łukasz Opaliński stated with pride: “We deal with the Commonwealth when it pleases us. We take on our duties unforced, we do not abandon them without reason, such as on command,”⁸⁴ while Stanisław Leszczyński appealed: “... since we can do as

⁸⁰ *Egzorbitancja powszechna*, 28.

⁸¹ Ł. Opaliński, *Rozmowa*, 35.

⁸² This is a typical phrase, here specifically cited from *Rada przeciwko Radzie Patriotycznej* [Counsel against the patriotic government] (n.p., 1771).

⁸³ Zamoyski, *Mowa na sejmie convocationis* [Speech at the Sejm] (n.p., n.d.).

⁸⁴ Ł. Opaliński, *Obrona Polski*, 197.

we wish, let us wish to do what is most beneficial to us.”⁸⁵ A similar appeal drafted a few decades later by Kołłątaj already sounded dramatic: “The nation’s salvation rests in its own hands. Thus it will either lift itself up and stand at the summit of decent power, or fall and place its hands voluntarily in slavish fetters...”⁸⁶

Perhaps this is why eighteenth-century Polish writings mention—no less often or perhaps even more frequently than the need to care for public welfare—that citizens were unable to live up to this ideal, that they were focused on self-serving aims, that they concealed their own (base) interests behind patriotic phrases. As one eighteenth-century author bitterly wrote: “The public welfare, the good fortune of the country, have from now on become meaningless words whose essence no one considers any longer, unless someone sometimes mentions them in a speech.”⁸⁷ Although such self-serving thinking had been complained about as far back as in the sixteenth century, in time “the oppression of the common good,” in other words the lack of patriotism and concern for the common fatherland, was recognized as the chief cause of all the misfortunes of the Commonwealth—whose political system was after all perfect, but its citizens were just not virtuous enough.

That leads us to another issue: the cultivation of patriotic attitudes, an issue which occupied much space in Polish political discourse. There is an almost universal conviction among Polish sources that people should be brought up to act on behalf of the common republic of their own volition. “It is not enough to establish governance, to enact laws, one also has to educate people to know how to love and defend their fatherland, to determine the law and to be obedient,” Andrzej Zamoyski stated in one of the most famous Sejm speeches of the eighteenth century.⁸⁸ Here, too, Polish sources fit in with the European republican discourse that extended back into classical times.⁸⁹ Like there, much attention was devoted in the Polish-Lithu-

⁸⁵ Leszczyński, *Głos wolny*, 79.

⁸⁶ Kołłątaj, *Listy Anonima*, 1: 259.

⁸⁷ *Suum cuique* (n.p., 1770).

⁸⁸ Zamoyski, *Mowa*.

⁸⁹ Quentin Skinner, “The Republican Ideal of Political Liberty,” in *Machiavelli*, 305 n.; Norman Hampson, *Will and Circumstance: Montesquieu, Rousseau and the French Revolution* (Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1983), 32; Maurizio Viroli, “The concept of ‘Ordre’ and the Language of Classical Republicanism in Jean-Jacques

anian Commonwealth to what means could be used to mould “citizens who love their country.” Quite a lot of attention was devoted to this issue in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, when Polish sources (Górnicki, Wolan, Opaliński) clearly evidenced the influence of Italian concepts of “forced virtue.”⁹⁰ This returned at the end of the eighteenth century. Such authors as Wielhorski, A. W. Rzewuski and Staszic, this time undoubtedly under Rousseau’s influence, proposed a whole extended system for instilling citizens with the patriotic spirit. Not everyone wanted to educate citizens throughout their whole lives as these authors did, but everyone did consider the patriotic upbringing of young people to be a highly important issue. It repeatedly surfaced in political sources starting in the sixteenth century, dating back at least to Jan Zamoyski’s famous statement that “republics are as good as the education of their youth” and running through late eighteenth-century discussions. A sizeable number of treatises and much attention were devoted to the issue on the fringes of political debate, in a deeply-held conviction that “national education is of public interest.”⁹¹ Indeed, since the fate of the common fatherland hinged upon the attitudes of its citizens, while at the same time no means existed to force them to take specific action, the issue of cultivating their characters was a weighty political issue.

Rousseau,” in Anthony Pagden, ed., *The Languages of Political Theory in Early-Modern Europe* (Cambridge University Press, 1987), 173.

⁹⁰ The context makes it clear beyond doubt that this meant the virtue of love for one’s fatherland and the public welfare; see Andrzej Wolan, *O wolności Rzeczypospolitej albo szlacheckiej* [On the liberty of the Commonwealth or the nobility] [1606], ed. Kazimierz Józef Turowski (Cracow: Biblioteka Polska, 1859), 41; Łukasz Górnicki, *Rozmowa Polaka z Włochem o wolnościach i prawach polskich* [Conversation of a Pole with an Italian on the liberties and rights of the Poles] (1616) in Łukasz Górnicki, *Pisma* [Writings], ed. Roman Polak, (Warsaw: PIW, 1961), 2: 364–65. Górnicki said so openly, placing the words of Machiavelli into the mouth of his Italian interlocutor, while his Polish character took up a polemic with this view; Ł. Opaliński, *Rozmowa*, 19.

⁹¹ *Uwagi o nowym instrukcyi publicznej układzie* [Remarks on the new project of public instruction] (n.p., 1776); on the old traditions of this conviction, compare Kalina Bartnicka, *Wychowanie patriotyczne w szkołach KEN* [Patriotic education in the schools of the National Educational Commission] (Warsaw: “Żak”, 1998), 37 and following.

Conclusion

The interpretation of patriotism presented here viewed the ideological construct mainly in terms of the citizen's duties to the political community (to the nation or Commonwealth). While integrating the multinational noble society of the "Republic of the Two Nations," nevertheless, in the seventeenth century this construction led a significant portion of the Commonwealth's inhabitants, deprived of political rights and therefore not included within this community, to be excluded from debate about patriotism. The linking of patriotism to action in the forum (and only in the public forum), or essentially considering these two as identical, was related to a conviction that only those who had an influence over public affairs could be concerned for the common good. In other words, only a citizen could be a patriot. "His objective is his own good fortune," the burgher was described in the eighteenth century by one author opposed to the cities, noting that the noble citizen, by contrast, was concerned for the "good fortune of the nation."⁹² The republican concept of patriotism failed to perceive a whole domain of action which had begun to be incorporated into the patriotic model in western thought—chiefly the ethos of hard work for oneself as the basis of a country's strength and wealth. Until the 1770s, this problem essentially remained beyond the horizon of Polish political discourse. It was touched upon first by authors demanding certain social reforms (Leszczyński, Garczyński, Wybicki), later by those demanding that the concept of nation be expanded to include other estates, chiefly the bourgeoisie (Kołłataj, Staszic and some other "bourgeois" authors). These authors, clearly under the influence of Enlightenment concepts, began to stress that both the bourgeoisie and peasants "served society at large," and that the common good of the country required not only action in the public forum, but also work in farming, commerce and craftsmanship. Yet such concepts did not dominate Polish sources. While certain political writers, followed by the law concerning the government of towns (from April 1791) and the Constitution of 3 May, did expand the concept of nation (at least to include the burghers), the conviction about the patriotic duty to do

⁹² *O skutkach z poniżenia stanu szlacheckiego* [On the results of the humiliation of the gentry estate], in Jerzy Michalski, Emanuel Rostworowski, and Janusz Woliński, eds., *Materiał do dziejów Sejmu Czteroletniego* [Materials on the history of the Four-Year Sejm] (Warsaw: Ossolineum, 1955–1964), 2:482.

public service and its superiority over any other form of action for the country remained quite stable.

Indeed, we can say that the whole concept of patriotism which appeared in the political discourse of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth back in the sixteenth century proved to be very stable. It was deeply rooted in the classical tradition of “republican patriotism,” as Maurizio Viroli described it. This was, besides, a concept similar to what was being deliberated by the thinkers of the Italian Renaissance, and later by English theoreticians during the time of Cromwell. This was the patriotism of free individuals, determining their own fate, participating in political life, closely linking the notions of liberty and fatherland, and seeing their duties to the latter as being identical to their duties to the community of citizens. This concept lasted in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth longer than in most European countries, where it became replaced in the seventeenth century by the notions of *raison d'état* and loyalty towards the ruler—ideals which were never accepted by noble Polish citizens. In the eighteenth century this concept found support in the deliberations of Montesquieu and Rousseau—tellingly, the most popular Enlightenment philosophers in Poland. Despite the distortion that it partially underwent, this concept of patriotism then proved attractive enough to be adopted by social groups that had previously been deprived of civil rights and were excluded from the “noble nation”. In a certain sense, it is what laid the foundation for the patriotism of nineteenth-century Romantics struggling to regain their fatherland and liberty.

(Translated by Daniel Sax)

PART II

THE POLITICS OF THE ESTATES AND THE
LOVE OF FATHERLAND

CHAPTER NINE

POLITICAL HUMANISM AND THE CORPORATE THEORY OF STATE: NATION, PATRIA AND VIRTUE IN HUNGARIAN POLITICAL THOUGHT OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

Benedek Varga

When we assess the influence¹ of humanist political thought or reason of state on early modern Hungarian political thought it is important not to ignore other political and legal discourses of the age. Thus one might note the paradoxical effect of late 20th century historiography on early modern political ideas which, in its eagerness to shift attention from the theory of jurisprudence towards the languages of classical republicanism, civic humanism or the debate on resistance and their derivatives (like reason of state or elect nationhood) did indeed open up new horizons for research, but overlooked many earlier known features.

16th century Hungarian ancient constitutionalism with its several roots in the works of early glossators, civil and canon lawyers, chronicles, customs, corporate theories and Thomist political thought was the product of a long running development, and in many cases

¹ Hungarian historians of early modern political thought have paid relatively little attention to the historiographical developments initiated by Pocock, Skinner, Pagden, Tuck, Viroli and others since the mid-1970s. See e.g. Tibor Klaniczay, Katalin S. Németh, Paul Gerhard Schmidt, eds., *Antike Rezeption und nationale Identität in der Renaissance insbesondere in Deutschland und in Ungarn* (Budapest: Balassi, 1993). Even the erudite monograph by Marianna D. Birnbaum, *Croatian and Hungarian Latinity in the Sixteenth Century* (Zagreb and Dubrovnik: Slavica Publishers, 1993) failed to take into consideration the research of the aforementioned authors on the ideas of *virtù*, participatory community, the republican concept of liberty or politics, the art of state and the reason of state discourses. On the other hand the characteristic feature of contextual discourse analysis, which has become arguably the predominant approach on the history of early modern political thought, carefully avoided investigating legal documents and constitutional theory. In the Hungarian case one ought to research both sets of sources: partly because the comparatively few indigenous political thinkers of the age provide an inadequate amount of theoretical material and also because legal thought influenced historians, political theorists and political actors at least as deeply as contemporary Italian, Spanish, French or German political philosophy.

it clearly indicated universal ways in which ideas about communities, politics, nation and *patria* could have been contemplated. This is not to say that 16th century philosophical or cultural developments did not have their impact on the mind of contemporary Hungarian subjects, but only that theoretical phenomena were altering somewhat slowly and also that the contemporary political situation of the country was equally significant in calling up new theories about society or community. Ideas were of course changing, just as society was in rapid transformation in 16th century Hungary, but the influence of either civic humanism, or elect nationhood fell within the context of earlier ideas on nationhood or *patria*.

By the mid-16th century one might speak about, by and large, three distinct interpretations of *patria* and nation in Hungary. The first and clearly the dominant discourse was rooted in the corporate theory of the ancient constitution of the country which had been taking shape since the mid-13th century. This is today widely regarded as a narrowed interpretation of nation (which indeed it was), the nation being identified with the privileged groups, which were multilingual (even though using Latin as *lingua franca*) and culturally heterogeneous (containing, among others, sizeable Croatian and Saxon communities). But oddly, from the time of its origins in the late 13th century, it was built on the fiction of a community not only of shared language and customs but of shared origin as well: the mythical Scythian-Hun-Hungarian identification.

The second discourse was represented by Hungarian humanists who, in renewing the ancient topos of *patria* and making it a central element of their argument, also focused their reasoning on the institutionalization of liberty, virtue and fortune in political societies. These two discourses, as we will see, had utterly different origins and at first sight rather confronting goals, yet by the end of the 16th century they produced a consistent political theory, which during the Bocskai uprising reshaped medieval corporate ideas as well.

Since the 1960s it has also widely been held that a third discourse played an important role in this development. This current of ideas, about the elect nationhood of the Hungarians, which was originally invented by the Franciscan observant movement during the 1510s (arguing that true Hungarian Christians—i.e. the peasantry—ought to fight both the infidels and the nobility to avoid divine punishment for the vices of Hungary) was a major factor contributing to the outbreak of the Dózsa peasant uprising in 1514, and following the fall of the

medieval kingdom at Mohács it was taken up by Lutheran and Calvinist preachers.

I suggest that by the 1570s corporate ideas influenced by late humanist political theory presented a modified version of nation and made *patria* a common issue of all virtuous inhabitants of the country. The significance of the Bocskai uprising (1604–1606) has long been regarded as being the first occasion when this idea of a substantially enlarged nation appeared,² but the theoretical structure had been put together, it seems, already three decades earlier.

*The medieval heritage regarding the conceptualization of the nation
and the languages of the political community in the early modern
period*

In order to grasp what ideas were shared about nation and *patria* in 16th century Hungary we ought to check this first against medieval Hungarian political and social concepts. Though early medieval chronicles often presented histories of the nation, what they understood by the term was in fact a history of a *gens regis* or *populus regni*, which from the aspect of the Christian monarch was the body of *populus subiectus*. The pre-Christian or pagan past was nothing but a genealogical introduction in the teleological process through which Hungarian tribes became full members of the *Respublica Christiana*.³ The object was to adapt the country into Christian Europe by any means possible. Nation was to be but a secondary category of history: for real history started with the baptism of the Hungarian tribesmen, as the *legenda maior* of King St. Stephen made elegantly clear.⁴ As a consequence, the

² Kálmán Benda, “A kálvini tanok hatása a magyar rendi tanok ideológiájára” [The influence of Calvinist ideas on the ideology of Hungarian corporative ideas] *Helikon* (1971): 187–226; László Makkai, “A Bocskai-felkelés” [The Bocskai rebellion] in Zsigmond Pál Pach, ed., *Magyarország története* [History of Hungary] (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1985), vol. 3/1: 532–41.

³ “Non remansit patria neque natio, ubi quorundam miserationis Christi non fuisset assumptio”. *Legenda Maior Sancti Stephani Regis*, Ch.1.1. published by Emma Bartoniek in Imre Szentpétery, ed., *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum* vol. II. (Budapest: MTA, 1937), henceforth: Szentpétery SRH II—pp. 365–440, here p. 378.

⁴ “Igitur iubente principe fit ubique congregatio gentis indomite, per Sanctum episcopum fiunt orationes continue, convertuntur et baptizantur alumpni patrie, statuuntur multis in locis ecclesie. ‘Lux’ quippe, ‘que illuminat omnem hominem’ tenebris

Hungarian nation was but a multitude of the subjects of the King and his successors, and the *gens Hungarica/Hungarorum* was not a special national indicator but rather a derivative of the subjects of *regnum Hungariae*⁵ which embraced all people regardless of ethnic, cultural or linguistic differences who lived under the *imperium* of the monarch.

By the late 13th century, when the ideology of the ancient constitution was in the making, the principle of nation was understandably still restricted to the nobility, but this notion was transcended in the writing of the famous theorist Simon of Kéza (in Hungarian, Kézai Simon).⁶ Kézai's work, which included an interpretation of the origins of the nobility projected back into the nomadic past, claimed that those who in the past had failed to join the warriors in times of wars out of fear for their lives rightly deserved to be punished either by execution or by perpetual serfdom for themselves and their successors.⁷ The historical rights of the *communitas nobilium* together with those of

expulsis cepit in Ungaria ænitescere, et impleta sunt verba prophete dicentis: "*Gentium populus, qui ambulabat in tenebris, vidit lucem magnam*". Lux lucis invisibilis Christus est, quem tunc gentes videre meruerunt, quando revocati de tenebris, ipsum verum lumen, Deum et hominem verum æsse crediderunt". (Ch. 1.4) Szentpétery SRH II. 380.

⁵ Jenő Szűcs, "Társadalomelmélet, politikai teória és történelemszemlélet Kézai Gesta Hungarorumában. A magyar nacionalizmus középkori genezisének elméleti alapjai" [Social theory, political theory and the view of history in Kézai's Gesta Hungarorum. The theoretical foundations of the medieval genesis of Hungarian nationalism] *Századok* 107 (1973). I used the reprinted text in Jenő Szűcs, *Nemzet és történelem* [Nation and History] (Budapest: Gondolat, 1984), 467–69.

⁶ The following interpretation is heavily indebted on the excellent works of Imre Madzsar, "A hun krónika szerzője" [The author of the Hun chronicle], *Történeti Szemle* 11 (1922) 1–4: 75–103; Sándor Eckhardt, "A pannóniai hun történet keletkezése" [The origins of the Pannonian Hun history], *Századok* (1928): 18–29; József Deér, "Közösségérzés és nemzettudat a XI–XIII. századi Magyarországon" [Sense of community and sense of nation in 11th–13th century Hungary], *A Klebersberg Kuno Magyar Tudományos Intézet Évkönyve* 4 (1934), 93–111; János Horváth, *Árpád-kori latin nyelvű irodalmunk stílusproblémái* [Questions of style in Hungarian Latinity during the Age of the Árpáds] (Budapest, 1954); József Gerics, "Adalékok a Kézai-krónika problémáinak megoldásához" [Contributions to solving the problems of the Kézai chronicle], *Annales Universitatis Scientiarum Budapestiensis de Rolando Eötvös Nominatae. Sectio Historica* I. (Budapest, 1957); Elemér Mályusz, *A Thuróczy-krónika és forrásai* [The Thuróczy Chronicle and its sources] (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1967); and Jenő Szűcs, "Társadalomelmélet," 569–641, 823–873.

⁷ Simonis de Kéza: *Gesta Hungarorum*, ca 7. The original and standard edition is in Imre Szentpétery, ed., SRH I. (Budapest: MTA, 1937), I: 141–94, published by Sándor Domanovszky. A Latin-English bilingual edition has been edited by László Veszprémy and Frank Schaer (Budapest: CEU Press, 1999). For these and other textual references see Jenő Szűcs' introductory study in Veszprémy and Schaer, xlii, n. 8. I cite Szentpétery SRH I. in the following.

the king constituted but one of the pillars of Kézai's work, which was combined with a substantially new theory of nationhood. He not only broke away from the narrow interpretation of nation as a multitude of royal subjects or even as members of the *communitas regni*, but created a double system in which both Hungarians and non-Hungarians could belong to either the nobility or to the peasantry.

According to Kézai's theory, there was an undoubted community of origin among the Scythians-Huns-Hungarians, who all descended from Hunor and Mogor (forebears of the Hun and Magyar nations, respectively) and whose successors formed the original 108 clans of Scythia. Consequently, the Hungarians were not the heirs of the Huns nor were they related to them: they were in fact identical with the Huns.⁸ These 108 clans (which also formed the same number of provinces) were the original community of the nation, which lacked any mixture of population (*absque omni missitalia*⁹): they constituted a pure Hungary (*pura Hungaria*), whereas the rest only joined them later as immigrants (*advenae*) or were descendants of captives (*ex captivis oriundi*).¹⁰ The dichotomy between the pure Hun/Hungarians and the noble immigrants brought a profound change in the medieval Hungarian concept of national identity, as all 108 noble clans regarded themselves as descendants of the former 108 Hun/Hungarian clans of Scythia. It was to become, nevertheless, weakened by the existing feudal structure of the country, which certainly included non-Hungarians among the aristocratic clans. The way Kézai bypasses the problem is typical of his new approach towards the genealogy of Hungarian nobility. The illustrious foreigners, coming from all foreign nations (*fere ex omni externa natione*) and having served the kings or other barons of the country and acquiring fiefdoms, in due process of time, were absorbed into the nobility.¹¹

⁸ The occupation of Pannonia by the Huns is referred as *ingressus Hungarorum*, Attila as *rex Hungarorum* etc.

⁹ For an etymology of this odd term see Szűcs, *Nemzet és történelem*, 476–76.

¹⁰ "Habet etiam provincias centum et octo propter centum et octo progenies, quae dudum per filios Hunor et Mogor, quando Scitiam invaserunt, sunt divisae. Centum enim et octo generationes pura tenet Hungaria et non plures. Aliae autem, si quae ipsis sunt coniunctae, advenae sunt vel ex captivis oriundi, quum ex Hunor et Mogor in palude Meotida centum et octo progenies absque omni missitalia fuere generatae." Kézai, ca 6. Szentpétery SRH I., 146

¹¹ "Intraverunt quoque temporibus...Boemi, Poloni, Graeci, Bessi, Armeni et fere ex omni externa natione...qui servientes regibus vel caeteris regni dominis ex ipsis

Kézai's emphasis on the blood relationship of the Hungarians (be they noble or *rustici*) was in sharp contrast to other writers both earlier and contemporary such as Magister Ákos, whose main concern remained to present the ideology of a unified aristocracy. For Ákos the illustrious immigrants were *noblilitate pares Hungaris*, equals in terms of nobility to the Hungarians, and his interpretation consequently remained within the earlier medieval idea of nationhood.¹²

The ambivalence of Kézai's attitude towards the noble and non-noble Hungarians fits well into the corporatist theories of the period. For him nation is a *communitas*, an ancient corporate entity, which was divided into a major part (the nobility), whose virtue placed them over the rest of the nation, and a minor part, the *vulgus*, who were to live under perpetual serfdom.¹³ The core of the nobility was not only pure Hungarians in terms of ethnic origin but also in their qualities, which raised them over the rest of the other pure Hungarians. Virtuous immigrants after some time could be adopted to them, taking over their values and customs. This nobility was to represent the whole Hungarian nation, as a senior *pars* would represent any *universitas*.

Kézai's ideas on nation permeated Hungarian legal language as early as the 1290s,¹⁴ but from the early 14th century a new line of argument appeared which drew a distinction between all inhabitants of Hungary (*omnes Hungariae regni cohabitatores*) and those who belonged to the political community of the country (*generatio regnicolarum*), who constituted the realm's overall community of nobles (*regni universe nobilitatis communitas*) and were sharply distinguished from the plebs.

This corporate theory of nation, with its fiction of a community of ethnic origin, constituted a new, and probably the sole, national identity of the Hungarian nobility from the Angevin times up to the

pheuda acquirendo nobilitatem processu temporis sunt adepti." Kézai, ca 94. Szentpétery SRH I. 192.

¹² Mályusz, *A Thuróczy-krónika és forrásai*, 24.

¹³ For the European and Hungarian context of the idea of *communitas* in Kézai see József Gerics, *A korai rendiség Európában és Magyarországon* [Early society of estates in Europe and Hungary] (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1987), 253–58. For the influence of Roman and canon law on Kézai's interpretation of the origin of principality within the context of Hun community, see Gerics, "Az államszuverenitás védelme és a 'két jog' alkalmazásának szempontjai XII–XIII. századi krónikáinkban" [Defense of state sovereignty and the applications of the "two laws" in 12th–13th century Hungarian chronicles], *Történelmi Szemle* 18 (1975): 353–72.

¹⁴ Szűcs, *Nemzet és történelem*, n. 211.

mid-15th century. One may put emphasis either on its exclusivity to the nobles or on the potentiality to extend it to other ethnically identical social groups outside of the *corpus politicum* of the country. But clearly, so long as the medieval realm became increasingly multiethnic (partly due to the expanding influence of the kingdom over its southern borders and partly, from the early 15th century, because of the flight of Christians from Ottoman domination), and so long as the service of the ethnically heterogeneous peasantry was the main source of labor nobles and clergy depended on, there was not much sense in meditating upon an extension of nationhood, i.e. political rights. The expansion of the Ottoman Empire towards the north, which Hungary was increasingly unable to resist, was to change the political situation of the country.

Patriotism in the humanist historiographical paradigm

During the mid-15th century, however, when the alternative discourse first appeared through the new humanist political culture in various courts of the country, the Turkish danger was not yet its *Leitmotiv*. Instead, literary style and the arts were what could contribute to the development of nation and consequently of *patria*, as János Vitéz put it in his letter to the archdeacon Paul when he claimed, “I always wanted to serve the interests of my country with my pen.”¹⁵ According to this discourse, the *salus populi* required a strong commitment to *vita activa* by those educated in classics and/or humanist studies, and it was this which could bring about the development of the nation. The users of this discourse criticized, although usually mildly and empathically the primitive Latinity and rusticity of their compatriots, while accepting their virtue in the martial arts, but it seems, the ultimate objective was the enriching and polishing of Hungarian customs, manners and lifestyle.¹⁶ From this point of view, a new face of the fiction of the community of nobles appears, or perhaps even this is a rather new community: those learned and trained in humanist studies, a Hungarian

¹⁵ A letter to archidiaconus Paulus, protonotarius regis, 24th April, 1445. *Johannes Vitéz de Zredna, Opera quae supersunt*, ed. Iván Boronkai, (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1980), 31.

¹⁶ Letter to archidiaconus Paulus, protonotarius regis 18th March, 1448. *Johannes Vitéz, Opera quae supersunt*, 38.

group of the *respublica litterata*, who ultimately did not share a common origin, be it ethnic or corporate.

In contrast to this 15th century humanist discourse, formulated at, arguably, the zenith of late medieval Hungary, the mid-16th century humanists' main concern was about politics yet again, specifically on how to avoid division, faction or selfishness among the Hungarian political groups in order, not only to bring about peace, but to achieve the reunification of the country and gain back its former glory. Disillusion over the fate of the country as victim of two irresistible neighbors—a pagan superpower, the Ottoman Empire, and a suddenly strengthened Habsburg *archiregnum*—formed an intellectually somewhat familiar climate for them, recalling as it did Italian politics between 1492–1530s, which had been abundantly analyzed by Italian political theorists. The new genre of 16th century Hungarian humanism produced a series of histories by István Brodarics, Johannes Sambucus (János Zsámboky), Miklós Istvánffy, István Szamosközy and the most remarkable though lesser known perhaps by Ferenc Forgách, which all investigated virtue and fortune, selfishness or self-sacrifice. The collapse of the country for them was not caused by the structure of political institutions or the country's limited natural resources and too little manpower but by the loose social cohesion and above all by the lack of adequate virtue of the political groups. In their histories a modernized understanding of virtue will appear, a virtue which could be gained by any person regardless of faith, social standing or ethnic origin.

Certainly it is not only a new humanist discourse which is peculiar to post-1526 Hungarian discussions on *patria*. Following the dismemberment of the country, during the shaping of Tripartite Hungary, the feeling of the intimate connection, a perpetual affinity among the three parts long survived, as Katalin Péter has pointed out.¹⁷ The sources she cites may be supplemented by a remarkable document written in 1527 in the Chancery of King John I (1526–1540). This is an invitation letter to the *országgyűlés* (diet) sent to the city of Bártfa (Bartfeld, present-

¹⁷ Katalin Péter, "A haza és a nemzet az ország három részre hullott állapota idején" [The patria and the nation during the tripartite state of the country] in *Papok és nemesek. Magyar művelődéstörténeti tanulmányok a reformációval kezdődő másfél évszázadból* [Priests and noblemen. Studies on the cultural history of Hungary during the one and a half century starting with the Reformation] (Budapest: Ráday Gyűjtemény, 1995).

day Bardejov), a German-speaking free royal city in Upper Hungary. In inviting the representatives of Bártfa to the assembly King John, whose main opponent was the counter-king, Ferdinand Habsburg (1526–1564), argues that they ought to defend the realm in the current dangerous situation which could have led to the extermination of the nation and the Hungarian language!¹⁸ One can argue that by the “lingua Hungarica” the King meant the Hungarian nation, i.e. all subjects living under the jurisdiction of the Holy Crown, but in this case the distinction between *gens* and *lingua Hungarica* would be needless. An equally problematic interpretation would be the danger of the extinction of the Magyar tongue, unless the Chancery has copied the invitation letters mechanically regardless of the ethnic origin of the addressees. Sadly, no other invitation letter has survived.

The original late medieval corporate idea of the fiction of the common origin of Hungarians, and the nobility as distinctive representatives of pure or real Hungarians, certainly survived up to the 16th century. Its extension, that by an acceptance of Hungarian manners, customs and virtue one could be adapted to the Hungarians, remained the same, as we shall see in the writings of the main Hungarian customary law theoretician, István (Stephanus) Werbőczy (1458–1541). But this adaptation to the pure Hungarians was not only open to foreign nobles but to the Hungarian-speaking or non-Hungarian-speaking lower classes as well, on two conditions: 1) of presenting “Scythian” virtue, i.e. being free warriors, and 2) of receiving, individually or universally, corporate privileges from the monarch. In this way any sort of arm-bearing group or individual could become members of the body politic.

To understand the context of late 16th century ideas we need to have a short look at Hungarian customary law, of which we have a splendid compendium: Werbőczy’s *Tripartitum*.¹⁹ For a start it is

¹⁸ “Ad quae propellenda necessarium est, cum Dominis Praelatis, ac aliis Regnicolis nostris tractare, consultareque, et de remedio mature providere.... Non enim desunt plerique, qui sub specie boni zizaniam seminare, et sub nomine tutelae ad defensionis Regni periculum, et exterminationem Gentis, ac linguae hujus Hungaricae quaerant et procurant”. Vilmos Fraknói, ed., *Magyar Országgyűlési Emlékek* [Papers of Hungarian Parliaments] Vol. I (1526–1536) (Budapest: MTA, 1874), 42.

¹⁹ Werbőczy’s *Tripartitum opus juris consuetudinarii incltyti regni Hungariae* was first published at Vienna in folio form in 1517. During the next three centuries it was republished numerous times: there were 12 editions in the 16th century, 13 in the 17th, 11 in the 18th century, and 8 in the 19th. According to tradition the text (or some form of it) was presented to the *országgyűlés* of 1514 and although approved by the king and the orders alike it was not declared as law and consequently never

worth mentioning that Kézai's understanding of the adoption of illustrious foreigners into the country's customs and virtue, had become so prevalent in legal language by the early 16th century that in the royal approbation of Werbőczy's book the "foreign" king Wladislas II Jagiello (1490–1516) refers to winning the *imperium* of Hungary as an act of divine grace, which let him be adopted into it!²⁰

One of the peculiar features of Werbőczy's book is the terminology he applied to describe peoples. The term "nation" appears quite rarely in the text, and is replaced by *gens* or *populus*.²¹ Werbőczy uses the term *populus* widely in the introduction of his *Tripartitum*, in which he explains the general categories of law, custom, *ius naturale*, *ius gentium* etc. Here *populus* indicates some particular people (like *populus Scythicus*) or appears in general phrases like *assensu populi* or *constitutio populi* or *pax popolorum*.²² Subsequently, in the division of the rights and customs of Hungary he narrows the use of the term notably. Explaining legislative processes he analyzes what he understands by it in Part II Tit. 4, where *populus* refers exclusively to 1) the two orders of prelates, barons, and other magnates; and 2) also to the nobility but by no means to the non-nobles.²³ He agrees that the term generally speaking includes both nobles and non-nobles, but because non-nobles (whom he calls *plebs*) play no part in legislation, there is no need to talk about them concerning these processes.²⁴

The Szeklers, together with the Cumans (Kuns), occupy a delicate position in the theory. Werbőczy suddenly raises the question of their

became a decree of the *országgyűlés*. Nevertheless, following its publication in Vienna the Hungarian counties put it into practice and it was widely used as the main reference handbook on Hungarian law in courts up to the mid-19th century. It is quite often overlooked that there was not much sense to make a decree regarding this code, for its very essence lay in its nature as a compendium and explanation of the unwritten, customary laws of the country.

²⁰ Et postquam hujus Inclyti regni Hungariae sceptrum, atque imperium, beniginitate Dei *adepti sumus*, et sacro ejus diademate redimiti... Werbőczy, *Tripartitum*, Approbatio.

²¹ This was a breakaway from 14th–15th century usage, a period when *natio* was quite extensively used.

²² Werbőczy, *Tripartitum*, Prol. Tit. 4; Tit. 10; etc.

²³ "Nomine autem, et appellatione populi, hoc in loco intellige; solummodo dominos prelatos, barones, et alios magnates, atque quoslibet nobiles; sed non ignobiles." Werbőczy, *Tripartitum*, Part II, tit. 4.

²⁴ "Licet iste terminus *populus*; includat omnes nobiles, et ignobiles pariter; de ignobilibus tamen (qui plebis nomine intelliguntur) in hac parte nihil est ad propositum." Werbőczy, *Tripartitum*, §.1

origin, claiming that they descended directly from the Scythian people (*populus Scythicus*) from the time of their first appearance in Pannonia, and mentions that they still live according to their ancient customs. The odd thing is not this, but that he refers to their parts as *regnum*.²⁵ It would not be so much of a surprise if it were Croatia, Bosnia or Serbia, as these indeed were independent, autonomous realms or principalities, with local customs, law and special local authorities. But for the Szeklers or Kuns he could have used *provincia* instead of *regnum*. So if he did not, he must have intended to say that their political autonomy within the kingdom of Hungary (the *communitas Siculorum*, or *Cumanorum*) was more significant. This usage also appears in various legal texts of the Szeklers of the early and late 16th century. The term behind *regnum* was obviously not *királyság* (as literally it should have been) but *ország*, which had a strong corporate legal meaning as it appears in *országgyűlés*, i.e. *congregatio generalis*. *Ország* therefore referred not only to the geographical unit but equally to a politically structured entity endowed with corporate rights, and (because it never appeared for the *universitas Saxonum* of Transylvania nor for the chartered royal cities of Hungary proper) implying a shared Scythian origin.²⁶

The idea of the Szeklers having an independent realm of Scythian origin preserving its own constitution throughout the centuries, where the ultimate legislative forum is a general congregation of all Szeklers, was a clearly corporate idea of community, and had become standard even without Werbőczy's theory. In 1505 and 1506 after holding a congregation at Udvarhely and Agyagfalva on their own initiative without royal ordinance²⁷ the three orders of the Szekler community (*primores*, horsemen and commoners) adopted some harsh regulations against those who had turned against the community. The rolls also mention

²⁵ "Reliqua autem jura horum regnorum, atque nobilium municipalia (...) ampliori declaratione non egent." Werbőczy, *Tripartitum*, Part. III Tit. 5.

²⁶ For the etymology of "ország" [land, country] as a derivative of "urusag" [lordship], see Loránd Benkő, Lajos Kiss, and László Papp, eds., *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára* (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1970). For its political meanings see László Péter, *The antecedents of the XIXth century Hungarian state concept: an historical analysis. The background and the creation of the doctrine of the Holy Crown* (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation at Oxford University, 1965). See esp. 8–23.

²⁷ Sándor Kolosvári and Kelemen Óvári, eds., *A magyar törvényhatóságok jogszabályainak gyűjteménye* [Compendium of the Acts of Hungarian Municipalities], vol. I, *Az erdélyi törvényhatóságok jogszabályai* [Acts of Transylvanian Municipalities] (Budapest, 1883), 16–23.

that the Szeklers regardless of their independent status are members of the Hungarian state and ought to keep the faith they owe to its prince, the king of Hungary.²⁸ According to the decrees the Szekler community constitutes an independent nation with a similar or identical origin to the Hungarians, as both are Scythian descendants. The Szeklers form a separate kingdom (*ország*) which has the right to summon general congregations, enact laws and regulations and demand and judge faith and trust towards the *communitas Sicolorum* from its members. On the other hand they respect the power of the king of Hungary, and claim that the *ország* of the Szeklers is a member of the Hungarian kingdom (*ország*), which connection is due to a very ancient custom, which they inherited from Scythia.²⁹

All in all, Werbőczy's book lacks the strong emphasis that Hungarians not only share a community of power, privilege and liberties (with the burden of joining the king's banner in times of war) but form also a community of ethnic origin, as appears in language, customs, traditions and virtue. The latter had been mentioned in the rather short historical introduction to the Hungarian social fabric, but supports no important structure in the whole system of argumentation. Werbőczy's main idea was rather the fiction of a single nobility, with the same rights and duties regardless of wealth, ranks or titles.³⁰ It has long been disputed whether we can take it for granted that an average nobleman with 2–3 peasant families could have been really esteemed similarly to a baron, or later count, with tens of thousands of peasant families. One typical example is that of Count Péter Perényi, who from his Viennese captivity addresses one of his noble servants as "my brother," but also addresses as brother one of his peasant servants. During the political imbalance of the great Ottoman campaigns between 1526–1570 it seems that even the strongest pillars of social order began to erode.

There is another typical example about 16–17th century ideas on "patria" and nation in the works of the famous writer and humanist, the archbishop of Esztergom and later chancellor, Miklós Oláh (Nicolaus Olahus) (1493–1568). Oláh, himself of Romanian descent, wrote his *Hungaria* (1536) and *Attila* (1537) while in the court of the

²⁸ "ki keozwnkben meltatlan es nemzetwnknek aruloja es hamishitw" [who is unworthy and traitor of our nation and treacherous among us] Kolosvári and Óvári, eds., *A magyar törvényhatóságok*, 18.

²⁹ Kolosvári-Óvári, *A magyar törvényhatóságok*, 18–19.

³⁰ Werbőczy, *Tripartitum*, Part I Tit. 9.

former Hungarian Queen Mary who was then Governess of the Netherlands.³¹ The book gives a short overall account of Hungary, including its history, its legal and political institutions, its geographical and natural settings with some remarks on its population. Oláh uses three words for indicating the peoples of the kingdom and the territories of the Holy Crown *gens*, *natio* and *populus*, and these terms are used as well for other nations that he mentions in the text. The usage of the terms is, however, hierarchically organized: the *gens* is exclusively used for the Hungarians, the Huns, and the Szeklers, i.e. for the Scythians. Sometimes he nominates these peoples as *nationes* as well, just like the French, the Germans, the Italians, the Bohemians, the Croats, etc. But he never indicates the Slavons,³² the Romanians or any of the other ethnic groups of Hungary with these words: these are only referred as *populi*. Oddly, he also uses *populus* for women (*populus albus*) which is a clear set phrase from the Hungarian *fehérnép*.

So according to Oláh's thinking every human group (ethnic or cultural) is a *populus*, but only those with a political organization of their own are *nationes*, whereas in terms of Hungary those who contributed to the organization of the kingdom of the Danube valley and who form the political community of the country, the representatives of Scythian-Hun-Hungarian triad, could be called *gentes* as well. From this point of view the *gentes* of Hungary are only those who belong to the body politic of the Holy Crown.

Could there be an ethnic (linguistic and/or cultural) precondition for one to belong to the *gens Hungarica*? Could there be for Oláh, who was ultimately of Romanian descent, any difficulty in considering himself as a member of the Hungarian *gentes*? The answer to the first question seems to be negative and to the second positive. Negative it must be, as legally speaking the Hungarian political community

³¹ Editions: of Sambucus Vienna, 1568.; Bél Poson 1735; and Koeler 1763 and 1774. Standard edition: Nicolaus Olaus, *Hungaria-Athila*, eds. Kálmán Eperjessy and László Juhász (Leipzig, 1938). For Oláh's education and literary connections: Pál Schleicher: *Oláh Miklós és Erasmus* (Budapest, 1941), and Pál Ács, *Az idő ósága. Történetiség és történelemszemlélet a régi magyar irodalomban* [The antiquity of time—Historicity and historical vision in ancient Hungarian literature] (Budapest: Osiris, 2001). For Oláh's role in Hungarian politics and humanism see Birnbaum, *Croatian and Hungarian Latinity in the Sixteenth Century*, 155–211.

³² "Slavons" was the general denomination of Slavs living in southern Hungary between the rivers Drava and Sava. In pre-Mohács Hungary the area was distinguished from the Kingdom of Croatia. See e.g. the geographical terms of Slavonia, or Sclavonia.

(which included the church, the Estates, and the privileged cities) was ethnically divided within itself, with clear differences of ethnical origin, regardless of the fiction that the bulk of the Hungarian nobility was a descendant of the conquering free warriors. And it also explains a positive answer for the second question, which again depends on the 13th century idea of adaptation to the Hungarians.

Oláh was, however, much criticized, not least because of having a Romanian father, by his former protégé, Ferenc Forgách, himself a great humanist of the second half of the 16th century. Beside his political career Forgách was famous for his main historical book which had a slightly old fashioned title: *De statu rei publicae Hungariae*.³³ Forgách was born in Buda during the early 1530s. Like many other aristocrats, and most of the lesser nobility, his father, Zsigmond, joined the Protestant cause, though Ferenc himself had reconverted to Catholicism by 1550, when his name appears in the *matriculae* of the university of Padua. Although Miklós Oláh, then cardinal, was the patron of his Italian studies, Forgách was extremely critical of him, suggesting that because of his low origin and his Romanian father his promotion was an offence for many, as he was not dignified enough to occupy his seat.³⁴ Returning to Hungary as a *doctor philosophiae*, Forgách received some lesser ecclesiastical offices and in 1556 was appointed bishop of Nagyvárad (Oradea, Grosswardein), the former seat of the late János Vitéz. Being on the side of King Ferdinand and cut off from the eastern parts of the realm he had no chance to occupy his seat, so he abdicated

³³ The *De statu rei publicae Hungariae*, remained in manuscript until 1788 when it was first published—full of misreadings—by Sándor Horányi at Pozsony and Kassa. Almost a century later the Hungarian Academy decided to commission a better edition by Fidél Majer which came out in 1866 at Pest. I use the edition of Majer in the following. Recently on Forgách: Gábor Almási, “Variációk az értelmiségi útkeresés témájára a 16. században: Forgách Ferenc és társai” [Variations on the theme of intellectual careers in the sixteenth century: Ferenc Forgách and his associates], *Századok* 140 (2006): 6, 1405–1440 with references to previous literature.

³⁴ “Absumpti sunt altercando multi dies, *potentia vincente aequam sententiam*; frendente tamen multitudine. [Nicolaus Olahus] Archiepiscopus strigoniensis, Nicolaus Zrinius, Franciscus Batthiany, secretis principem sermonibus hortati, fama erat, Coronam, regaliaque insignia in manibus esse, ne inauguratio statim fiat, quem contra ausurum? Archiepiscopus [Olahus] *ex sordidissimo loco, et valacho patre natus, ad summum locum aliorum odio evectus*, locumetentiam et regium sigillum retinere studebat. Haec enim omnia summa officia tenebat cum gravi omnium offensione, quod multorum dignitates, et loca indigne occuparet [!]. Forgách, *De statu rei publicae Hungariae*, 254. On the use of ethnic stereotyping in this context, see Gábor Almási’s contribution to the present volume.

the post nine years later. In 1558 he was the leader and chief orator of the Hungarian mission to the *Reichstag* at Regensburg, and won the support of the German Estates for a defense force against the Ottomans. His success was noted by the king, who made him his councillor and in 1560 royal chancellor.³⁵ In 1562 he went on yet another diplomatic mission, this time to Antwerp. During the following years he gradually lost confidence in the Habsburg dynasty, became disillusioned with the policies of King Maximilian (1564–1576), resigned from all public offices and returned to his beloved Italy. When he realized that the Habsburgs were either too weak to liberate Hungary from the Turks or lacked the intention, he decided to change political party and joined the court of King John Sigismund (Prince of Transylvania 1556–1571) in Transylvania. After a brief visit to Italy again in 1569 he returned to the Transylvanian court at Gyulafehérvár (Alba Iulia), where the new prince (who did not claim the royal title), István Báthory (1571–1586), appointed him immediately to the chancellorship in 1571. It is quite significant that he wrote his work during his Transylvanian chancellorship for his political position on the Transylvanian side obviously influenced his interpretation of contemporary Hungarian history. His next diplomatic mission was to Cracow to represent his prince at the coronation of Henry Valois as king of Poland. His health, however, declined by 1576, and although he paid a visit to Italian physicians in Padua, he could find no cure and died in 1577.

Since the late 15th century Padua itself had been one of the most popular universities where the Hungarian nobility used to send their children. Regretfully the central role of this university in shaping scientific methodology in the form of sixteenth century neo-Aristotelianism seems to have had no effect on Forgách's thinking.³⁶ In contrast, the contemporary Florentine tradition of historiography, which presented

³⁵ During his chancellorship at Vienna he gave to Sambucus the manuscripts of the last five unedited books of Bonfini's *Rerum Ungaricarum decades*, which Sambucus published at Oporinus in Basel in 1568.

³⁶ Forgách is not an exception, however. The pioneer English political humanist, Thomas Starkey, for example, also spent years in Padua during the 1530s and shows hardly any signs of a deeper understanding of contemporary Paduan anatomy, mathematics or logic, though his search for a method of political analyses makes his work original and lifts him above the commonplace of literary genres. For Starkey see Thomas F. Mayer, *Thomas Starkey and the Commonwealth: Humanist Politics and Religion in the Reign of Henry VIII*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989). For the Paduan teaching of science see John Herman Randall, *The School of Padua and the Emergence of Modern Science* (Padua: Editrice Antenore, 1961). For a critique of

a model for political narrative from the early works of Salutati and Bruni through Machiavelli and Guicciardini up to the incipient reason of state discourse of the 1560s, had an effect on his *ars historica*. Nevertheless, he moves, one might argue, further than his Florentine models, but regressively. For, as we shall see, his art is closer to that of Tacitus than to his contemporaries.

Forgách virtually ignores any theoretical consideration in his work, although he follows the example of the 15th century humanist, Flavio Biondo, in comparing the perfection of earlier times to the corruption of the present;³⁷ but for him earlier times are those of the united, still flourishing and influential realm of Hungary before 1526. Pessimism regarding worldly affairs, a disillusioned attitude about human nature, with its selfishness and overconfidence, and above all the vices of political actors provide the main motifs of Forgách' work. He finds his age hopelessly miserable as compared to those of other writers of history: others were lucky to be able not to write on so sorrowful (*tristis*) and miserable (*miserabilis*) events in such a way that they cannot balance or vary them with their pleasing (*laetus*) and cheerful (*jucundus*) style.³⁸ His own writing is rather a mournful complaint of the calamities of our perpetual fate than history.³⁹ What is the aim of his book after all? His answer is a common humanist one: to teach everybody through the old annals of his nation, through the writers and their own examples.⁴⁰

the Randall-thesis, as it is commonly called in the history of science: C. B. Schmitt, *The Aristotelian Tradition and the Renaissance Universities* (London: Variorum, 1984).

³⁷ Flavio Biondo, *Historiarum ab inclinatione Romanorum Imperii decades* (Venice, 1483); Denys Hay, "Flavio Biondo and the Middle Ages," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 45 (1959): 97–128; and Eric Cochrane, ed., *Historians and Historiography in the Italian Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 118.

³⁸ Enimvero vereor, ne ullam vel minimam partem assequar eorum, quae omnes omnium aetatum, omniumque gentium scriptores assecuti sunt, qui inter ceteras eximias virtutes ea felicitate usi sunt, ut nihil tam triste, tam miserabile ad scribendum habuerint, quod non laeto ac jucundo quandoque stilo commutare potuerint; qua varietate ipsos etiam lectores in lectione retinere possint. Forgách, *De statu rei publicae Hungariae*, 32.

³⁹ At nobis omnia contraria eveniunt, qui uno ac perpetuo fato nostras calamitates lugere potius quam historiam scribere videmur. Forgách, *De statu rei publicae Hungariae*, 32.

⁴⁰ Quod unum tamen mihi vel maxime notandum videtur, et monendi omnes, ut causas advertant, cum ex priscis annalibus nostrae gentis, tum vero ex serie nostrorum scriptorum, nostroque exemplo sibi omnes norint, velintque consulere. Forgách, *De statu rei publicae Hungariae*, 32.

But apart from these few sentences he is not interested in the theorizing methods of history of the 1560s—neither in the contrasting values of history *versus* rhetoric of Francesco Patrizi da Cherso (1529–1597), nor the *norma Polybiana* of Uberto Foglietta (1518–1571), nor the ideas of his friend Johannes Sambucus (1531–1584), not to speak of the Aristotelian debates on the inferiority/superiority of history *vs.* poetry or philosophy. Neither can we trace any signs of contemporary French method in combining humanist literary criticism with the methods of comparative civil law and jurisprudence in general.⁴¹ But what we have instead, right from the beginning of the book, is a strikingly Tacitist minimalism as in the first sentence of the text: “When John changed life for death civil war was renewed.”⁴² The style of the book, the carefully selected adjectives, the continuous striving to use as few words and as complex a syntax as comprehension can bear makes Forgách’s prose very close to that of the ancient historian. Since Forgách’s writing of *De statu* coincided with the publication of Lipsius’ first modern edition of Tacitus in 1574, it seems we have in it one of the earliest examples of a neo-Tacitean text. Although Forgách never mentions Tacitus in his work, the literary style and indeed the very structure he puts in place to shape the narrative of the events is closer to the ancient author’s approach than the Florentine tradition of history writing.

Forgách presents very few positive figures, which made later romantic and 20th century historians quick to criticize him on charges of not only disparaging the Hungarian past but also of using his pen against his political adversaries. These charges are seen to be baseless when one realizes that his objective was to imitate Tacitus in his contempt of flattery, his ironic manner and indeed his rejection of theory.⁴³

⁴¹ For the French “method” see Donald R. Kelley, “The theory of history,” in C. B. Schmitt and Q. Skinner, eds., *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 756–58, including his bibliography. Skinner gives a somewhat different interpretation of the *mos docendi Gallicus*, as he was more interested in the effects of the French method on political thought than on historiography. Skinner, *Foundations*, vol. I., 205–7.

⁴² “Postquam Johannes vitam cum morte commutavit bellum civile est renovatum”. Forgách, *De statu rei publicae Hungariae*, 1.

⁴³ The originality of 16th century humanist culture in the region was much criticized by R. J. W. Evans in his *The Making of the Habsburg Monarchy 1550–1700* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1979): “Central European humanism flowered late, with little originality, but with a powerful urge to harmonize what others had already created elsewhere,” (15). In contrast Birnbaum presented a wide selection of literary examples

Confusing surely for most Hungarian readers was that one of his rare heroes is Suleiman the Great (1521–1566), the arch-adversary of both Hungary and Christianity, a figure who, with all his cunning actions and cruelty on the one hand, displayed personal bravery, wisdom, immense power, *grandezza* and magnificence on the other. Suleiman's figure endowed with *grandezza* recalls one of the main motifs of the "*optimus status rei publicae*" literature.⁴⁴ But his abundance in virtue⁴⁵ makes Forgách's position somewhat specific in its Hungarian context: virtue is no longer limited to Scythians, nobles, aristocrats or even Christians, for it "is the same in whichever person or times." Consequently, if virtue is the pre-requisite of nobility as much as nobility is a condition for making one a member of the body politic, then the defense of *patria* by demonstrating virtue opens up the horizons for non-nobles. To be sure, not only the ancient authors from Horace to Seneca, as well as scholastic writers like Brunetto Latini (c. 1220–1294) claimed that *virtus est vera nobilitas*; early 15th century humanists from Buonaccorso da Montemagno (1391/93–1429) to Poggio Bracciolini (1380–1459) also claimed the two categories are one and the same.⁴⁶ Moreover, the idea appears in Hungary during the Dózsa peasant uprising in 1514 as well, when observant Franciscans

which prove the originality of Olahus, Stephanus Brodaricus, Antonius Verantius and Forgách. Birnbaum, *Croatian and Hungarian Latinity in the Sixteenth Century*, 210–211.

⁴⁴ Werner Conze, "Der Staat," in Otto Brunner, Werner Conze and Reinhart Koselleck, eds., *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland* (Stuttgart: Klett, 1972–94) Vol. 6. 4–25; Q. Skinner, "States and the Freedom of Citizens," in Quentin Skinner and Bo Stråth, eds., *States and Citizens: History, Theory, Prospects* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 11–27.

⁴⁵ "Solymano imperatore Turcarum bellum gerente, quod illis incredibile videbatur, adeo *virtus ubique in quocunque homine et tempore eadem est*, et qui se prius, quam hostes vincit, duplici gloria dignus est habendus." And a few pages later about his motivation for leading a campaign against Hungary despite his failing age: "Solymanus enim, quamquam senio et imbecillitate corporis oppressus, in hoc postremo laudis tempore nihil sibi parcendum putabat *nullum impedimentum satis ad gloriam arbitratus*. Memoratur in concilio purpurratorum dissvandentium talia verba prodidisse: *non sibi honoris ac praeclararum laudis gloriam eos paravisse; unum illud inquit, meum est*, non modo mihi vivo, sed etiam ex hac mortali vita decessuro ad aliam et immortalem vitam ex omnibus bonis remansurum, quod precor Deum maximum, ut cum supremo meae vitae exitu, quam pro religione Deo consecravi, in hostili solo atque ipsa in hostis patria, ad ipsius urbis Viennensis moenia, felici victoria velit confirmare. *Praeclara vox tanto imperatore digna...*" Forgách, *De statu rei publicae Hungariae*, 308.

⁴⁶ Quentin Skinner, "Political philosophy" in Schmitt and Skinner, eds., *The Cambridge History*, 421–23; and Skinner, *Foundations*, I: 81–84.

hastily put together an ideology that the two main foes of Christianity are those of the Turks and the nobles, and those peasants who display virtue are indeed the only true Christians, who fight for the Christian religion and for the defense of the country.⁴⁷ The natural consequence of this line of argument was not an extermination of the nobility as a whole but only those nobles whom they regarded infidels, and if the peasants turn out to be victorious at the end anyone may come to occupy noble status.⁴⁸ Already by late mediaeval times this ideology formed a third type of discourse *about* patria and nationhood, as has been mentioned above, but when Forgách, himself of aristocratic descent, proud of his ancestors and the inborn virtue of many aristocrats, could envisage in the 1570s virtue being one and the same in all people and all times, and which can manifest itself as *amor/caritas*⁴⁹ and ultimately as *defensio patriae*⁵⁰ in anyone, it shows that something had dramatically changed.

⁴⁷ The Franciscan vicar's circular, "pro religionis Christiane et presertim huius regni defensione," cited by Jenő Szűcs, "Dózsa parasztháborújának ideológiája" [The ideology of the Dózsa peasant war], in Szűcs, *Nemzet és történelem*, 640.

⁴⁸ "si...victoriam optinemus, quilibet nobilium habebit," Szűcs, *Nemzet és történelem*, 49.

⁴⁹ "Sed promissis, quod Ferdinandu semet in bellum personaliter venturum sponderet...praecipue tamen est precipus et patriae caritate impulsus." Forgách 31. [Losonczi, Captain of Temesvár] Non deerat tamen crebris concionibus, atque alloquiis militem firmare, non quo spem, aut auxilium, sed ut pulcherrimae mortis gloriam pro fide, pro patria, et praemium apud Deum immortale ostentaret. Ibid. 39. "Accidit preaterea, ut *explorator* quidam Aly bassae, in castra missus, *christianae fidei ac patriae amore* Matthiam conveniret, ac palam confiteretur, se minis promissisque adactum, ut vera de se et exercitu referret." Ibid, 41.

⁵⁰ On the defense of the castle of Eger in 1552 "... nostris pro divina inprimis laude, dulcissimaque patria, conjugibus ac liberis, quorum salus virtute ipsorum consistebat, atque propria salute ita propugnantibus, ut mortem honestissimam obirent potius, quam pedem referrent, vicitque tandem pars illa, *unde Deus et virtus stabant*. Namque Mechcaeus praestantissimum ducem militemque se quamvis in eo certamine ostendisset, innumeram prope tamen hostium multitudinem si paucitati nostrorum conferas, quibus vel saltem caedendis nostri defatigari potuissent, quis nisi divina potentia fugare [sic!] potuisset? Ita post vespertinarum precum tempus, magna suorum multitudine caede amissa ac convulnerata, in castra fuga rediere, quo nostri posteris rarum virtutum exemplum adversum praesertim hostem, sibi gloriam ac perpetuam memoriam tradiderunt, locum nobilitarunt." Forgách, *De statu rei publicae Hungariae*, 71–72.

The extension of the concept of nation in the context of the Bocskai uprising

The principal shift was of course caused by the prolonged war against the Turks, and from 1526 the continuous civil war between the pro-Szapolyai (and later pro-Transylvanian) and the pro-Habsburg parties. The enlarged theatre of war which came to embrace almost the whole country displaced huge populations and shook the social structure at its very fundamentals. This new development became strikingly clear by the time of the Fifteen Years' War (1591–1606) when the long running military campaigns had devastated lands which for centuries had been the most fertile in the country and produced a demographic catastrophe. Tens of thousands of former peasants became warriors either in the king's or baronial armies or acted as free horsemen or foot-soldiers, the most famous and notorious type being the *hajdú* ("heyducks"). From the 1580s these groups were often referred to as the *vitézlő rend* (valiant order)⁵¹ and contributed fundamentally to the success of the Bocskai uprising (1604–06), when for the first time the Hungarian nobility at large joined forces with the Turks to defend the "true," Protestant religion and enforce a peace between the Ottomans and the Habsburgs. The outcome was a renewed and strengthened system of the ancient constitution: one might even claim that the statecraft of corporate monarchy was shaped. The ideology of the revolting Estates showed close similarities to those that emerged at the time of the Huguenot wars or in some aspects even to the revolts in the Low Countries.⁵²

From the perspective of the meaning of *patria* and nationhood we meet yet again an enlarged concept of the nation, where all arm-bearing men were considered part of the nation. One of Bocskai's letters to an unnamed Transylvanian lord from 1605 summarized the rea-

⁵¹ Note that "*vitézség*" meant both bravery/valor and virtue in 16th–19th century Hungarian. Even 20th century translations of Machiavelli render virtue as *vitézség*. See *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára*, and e.g. Machiavelli, *A fejedelem* (Il Principe), tr. Éva Lutter, (Budapest: Európa, 1978).

⁵² For the French parallel see István Gy. Tóth, "Augsburg, Nantes, Bécs—Bocskai és a "pálista religió," [Augsburg, Nantes, Vienna—Bocskai and the Papist religion], *Studia Caroliensa* (2006) 1: 43–55. For the similarities between the Dutch and the Hungarian case see Benedek Varga, "Szempontok a Bocskai-felkelés ideológiájának európai kontextusához" [Remarks on the European context of the ideology of the Bocskai revolt] *Studia Caroliensa* (2006) 1: 29–41.

sons why and how the rebellion broke out and what was the position of those involved in the events from the very beginning. Bocskai mentions the role of the *hajdú* troops, these ethnically and culturally heterogeneous, though mainly Hungarian and predominantly Calvinist horsemen whom the imperial general (Count Belgiojoso) tried to use against the Protestant city of Kassa (Kaschau/Košice) in Northern Hungary, an ethnically German settlement:

Your Excellency asked us what might have been the main cause of this anger. Was it religion, money or possessions? I answer your Excellency with a single word. *It has been to defend the life and also the religion and possessions of ourselves and those of the whole nation.* [The imperial attack against Kassa] was reasoned that they [the imperial forces] could not have accepted the faith of its main church and in their fear they conspired against the Hungarians, and against the lords. So they *wanted to have this thing* [the attack on Kassa] *to be done by the hajdúk, carried out by our own nation*, whom for their support, the cities of Várad, Debrecen and Kereki were offered for plunder by the image of the King [Count Belgiojoso]. But considering the issue, they [the hajdúk] decided that *they do not want to become the hangman of their own nation* and got so irritated that they would have attacked the Germans on their own. Well, there is no need to recount what we and the whole Hungarian nation has done, and is doing in order to defend ourselves.... we trust that you do not attribute it [the rebellion] to human self-conceit nor greed, but the thoughtful order of God's greatness who made us *defend the ancient liberty of our nation and our faith*.... We want the promotion of that *patria* [Transylvania] so much that although we have had ample opportunity to send a sizeable army there and without doubt we could have made them surrender.... on the contrary we have been protecting them as a light of our nation.⁵³

In the beginning of the letter the defense of the possessions of the nation could easily refer to the nobility as the legal language would surely use it, but although the *hajdúk* possessed no lands and remained outside of the body politic, Bocskai counts them among members of the nation. And they also saw themselves as such, which clearly shows that the idea of nation had now been renewed and enlarged. We also learn that there are two Hungarian *patrias*, one of Hungary proper and one of Transylvania, and that the later is also a "light of the Hungarian nation." The phrase of "the light of the nation" reveals

⁵³ Kálmán Thaly, ed., *Bocskay István Leveleskönyve 1605. martius 20-tól april 29-ig* [Correspondence book of István Bocskay 1605 20th March–29th April], Magyar Történelmi Társulat XIX (Budapest: MTA, 1886), 102–105.

Bocskai's political vision that the semi-autonomous principality under Ottoman suzerainty could and ought to support the Hungarian nation (or Estates) and by doing so balance the overwhelming power of the Habsburg composite monarchy.

A similar interpretation appears in a letter of Balázs Lippay and Balázs Némety, two *hajdú* captains of Bocskai's army, writing for support to the chartered mining cities of northern Hungary in 1604:

We do not think there is need to cite how much misery and how much misfortune, perish and decay have affected Hungary during the last couple of years, not without the consent of the German Emperor, but indeed carried out by his very troops. It stands clearly in the memory of every inhabitant of the country. Hungary is no more than a shadow of herself by now and from the acts of his captains everyone could have seen the intention of the Emperor: *to devastate the country and extinguish even the Hungarian name*. But so long as it is but being a worldly affair and temporary it might have been sufferable for us, had not it happened on the last national diet that against the will of the inhabitants of the country... James John Barbiano, Count Belgiojoso, the chief captain of the country, this malevolent man had not started harassing the true and pure Christian religion... He and similarly his Walloon soldiers, not to say executioners, bullied and tortured the priests... he attacked lord István Bocskai, our Excellent Lord, with the whole imperial army so that after ruining him it would be easier to depress other lords and gentlemen of the country... *We therefore took up arms for the Christian religion, and for our sweet patria in the name of Jesus Christ, our Savior.*⁵⁴

The danger of extinguishing the Hungarian name can be interpreted as a vivid example of the *hungarus* mind-set, where regardless of cultural or ethnic divisions all members of the body politic (*ország*) sharing ancient liberties and interests stood for the nation against a common enemy. The usage on this occasion is significant, for the northern Hungarian cities were German-speaking entities, and as further events showed, reminding them of the necessity of defending the sweet *patria* against the imperial pretensions to extinguish the Hungarian name (i.e. the structure of the country) proved to be reasonable. The country (*ország*) was not simply a geographical unit populated by various ethnic groups but was presented as a common issue, supplied with common liberty and having common interests which they found worthy to defend. What makes this example symptomatic of the change of ideas

⁵⁴ *Memorabilia augustanae confessionis in regno Hungariae a Ferdinando I. usque ad III*, ed. Ioannes Ribini ([Pozonii, Carol Gottlob Lippert], 1787) I: 329–330.

about the nation, however, are not the addressees but the senders. For the *hajdúk* used to be outside the body politic, and so technically speaking were not members of the *ország*; but on this occasion (and similarly throughout the rebellion) they claimed to be representing it all the same. What further shows the serious change of the paradigm is that one of the signatures, as was well known by the recipients, was that of Balázs Lippay, apparently a Gipsy, i.e. from a population which formed no *universitas* whatsoever and could in no way be regarded as a privileged order.

A similar argument for a new concept of nation is found in Bocskai's letter calling up all men to his camp in December 1st, 1604:

It is required from every man who loves his nation and fatherland that he according to his capacities urgently join us in our camp, in defense of the fatherland and against our common enemy. We remind them especially to the duty of faith they owe to me; and let them imagine what disorder and eternal infamy our nation would otherwise be brought to, should we not persevere against the German furor.... I instruct and command every valiant man who loves his fatherland and nation, first of all the noble, valiant and land-owning gentlemen, that immediately and personally with every resource they have at their disposal, and secondly of each chimney of the villages⁵⁵ with all able bodied men, be they cavalry or foot-soldiers, to set forth for our camp without delaying an hour or a day.⁵⁶

Bocskai's calling the nation to arms was a reaction to a defeat at Edelény in a few days earlier which he overestimated and which caused him to panic. The result was, however, yet again to require everybody, be he noble or peasant, to join his camp against the common enemy. The *patria* and the nation therefore is no longer exclusively a nation of the nobility with a supplement from the chartered cities. The common enemy, and its *furor teutonicus* (though the imperial army consisted mainly Walloon pike-men and was led by an Italian count), required an effort from everybody to meet it. This view of the nation is remarkably different from those presented by Werbőczy, Oláh or any of the authors that lectured on corporate theory. The same idea was repeated in the manifesto of the rebelling Estates to the Christian nations about

⁵⁵ Since the reign of Matthias Corvinus (1458–1490) taxes had been collected for each “chimney”. It thus became a typical method of counting peasant families.

⁵⁶ Kálmán Benda, *A Bocskai-szabadságharc*, Okmánytár [The Bocskai war of independence. Documents] No.5. (Budapest: Művelt Nép Könyvkiadó, 1955), 73–74.

the causes of the rebellion, which is at the same time a detailed critique of absolute royal power:

Let Christians neighboring to Hungary know and understand what all the rest of the world has already accepted, and what historical data has also revealed,... that the Hungarians, these strong and steady people, held and defended their faith in times of war, and chose death for themselves and their descendants and were ready to endure even the last, but did not detach themselves from the Christian nations.

But by now, against all expectation, this metal wall of Christianity has been demolished... it was not caused by enemy cannons, nor destroyed or torn down by the strength of the enemy, but by a single one who should have been their protagonist, the one whom they regarded as their defender and avenger, by their elected and sworn king, King Rudolf. Rudolf, Prince of Austria, whom once the Hungarians had so enthusiastically wished and elected and crowned solemnly to be their King, having him sworn to defend their rights and laws, was welcomed as King of Hungary by them. This election opened up the route for him to the Czech Crown and to the Roman Imperial Title....

First of all he did not care about God, about law or justice, nor about the advice of nations or even those of his brothers, *and started, like an absolute monarch, a despotic rule against each of his nations*, and especially against the Hungarians. Subordinate nations were taxed with unheard gravity, for he claimed that he is above all laws, as being a King. *It is but the good and perfect God who alone has absolute power, but even He governs temporal life with ordered laws, as philosophers confirm day by day. And you, King Rudolf, though you may occupy the most salient place, you are a mortal man and not a deity. You may be mysterious and invisible, inaccessible to anyone, but you are mistaken. Justice and law must guide you in all your actions. For if you get rid of good laws and proper practice, if you push them aside, then you place yourself not only outside of the kingdom but, similarly to Nebuchadnezzar, outside of humanity as well. Oh, what a frightening servility to claim that Kings are not bound by law and oath!...*

But Bocskai by divine providence escaped to his other castle, Ke-reki, and when it was besieged and captured, fled to the Hungarian foot-soldiers, the 3000 free *hajdúk*. He explained to them this extraordinary series of events, describing what danger had overtaken not only himself, but all Hungarians. The soldiers grew angry, and with the help of Bocskai's subjects [subditi(!)] attacked the German camp and defeated them. *The people [plebs] of the area, which had grown exasperated with royal tyranny, considered the occasion as a sign of divine intervention and joined Bocskai in order to defend their patria.*

What rights and liberties Hungary had had, all were taken away by Rudolf, what gold and silver she had possessed he spent, what honor she had had, he offended, what honesty and glory she had had, he insulted; and lastly he aspired to expel and exclude them [i.e. the Hungarians] from their own country and fatherland.

Therefore Christian kings, princes and nations...we declare that we shall defend ourselves until the last breath we have against the tyranny of this king, since natural rights allow even the mindless animal to defend itself in danger.⁵⁷

The manifesto claims that the tyranny of King Rudolf forced Hungarians to rebel against their king as he had already excommunicated himself from both his country and from mankind.⁵⁸ It repeats the earlier compositions of Bocskai's chancery that the *hajdúk*, Bocskai's servants, and the people in general were all fighting for their *patria*, and by the end declares that natural rights allowed them to defend their life. Understandably, the text does not go into details about the royal attack on Protestant communities and churches as many countries it was addressed to were Catholic, although one of the main driving force of the rebellion was to secure liberty of faith. It seems from the manifesto that the theory of customary law about the rigid structure of the nation of the privileged few was being replaced by a far more flexible system in which virtue in taking up arms against the supposed enemies of the country potentially makes everyone a member of the nation.

The political imbalance and continuous warfare of the late 16th century might have changed the social structure of the country by reorganizing the group of political actors, but it still cannot explain on its own the seemingly rapid development of the expanded concept of nation. We should once again turn to Forgách in order to understand the double development of a strengthened ancient constitutionalism and the side effect of the new interpretation of nation as a result of the Bocskai rebellion, which in the long run, however, proved to be but a temporary development. The main thrust of Forgách's book (and those of other humanists at the court of Gyulafehérvár in the 1560s and 1570s) was not towards a new understanding of nation, but to the infusion of the values of civic humanism into the language of ancient constitution. The problem Forgách faced was similar to that of any contemporary historian or political theorist who did not live in a

⁵⁷ *Querelae, excusationes cum protestatione Regni Hungariae presertim partium superiorum corum Deo et toto orbe Christiano*, in Árpád Károlyi, ed., *Magyar Országgyűlési Emlékek*, Magyar Történelmi Emlékek III.o. (Budapest MTA: 1899), XI: 169–84.

⁵⁸ That the absolute monarch excludes himself from humanity is strikingly similar to the Lockean interpretation 80 years later. The origins of the present manifesto are similar to those of the English philosopher, namely the discourse of Protestant resistance theory.

merchant city-republic but in a territorial monarchy. Their common challenge was how to introduce the topics of *vita activa*, the institutionalization of civic and not corporative liberty, the idea of participatory government, and the ethos of virtuous citizens ready to defend the collective liberty of the *respublica* into the political thought of a nation with a strong, landed aristocracy, and yet having a constitution, or the idea of fundamental laws guaranteeing corporate rights.⁵⁹ Forgách was thus not describing a self-governing state in which leaders were elected for a limited period. He stressed the Hungarians' right to elect their king⁶⁰ and also the elected office of the *nádor* (*palatinus*), whom he considered to be an arbiter between king and country,⁶¹ but his ideal of Hungary was a governance of a few best families (*optimates*) whose members were by nature virtuous and educated, though they might be supplemented by anyone (be it noble or from the *vulgus*) whose virtue made him eligible to occupy lesser offices. This might still seem feudal, but in fact it is a rather usual presentation of a *governo stretto* regime of the early 16th century theories. The king is nothing more than *a primus inter pares*, the country is governed by him and the aristocrats, and social condition or status are not for ever, as individual virtue can overwrite social positions, nor is there any such nonsense (as Werbőczy or customary law claimed) as *una et eademque nobilitas*, one and the same nobility of the aristocrats and the common nobility. There are nevertheless a set of the common interests of the country and the nation whom everybody belongs to, be they Catholic or Protestant, Hungarian or German or coming from any Slavic ethnic community.

Every now and then Forgách points to the low origin of certain political actors, interpreting their personality by their inherited poor characteristics, but on the other hand he emphasizes that virtue could elevate anybody to higher social positions. The way he uses virtue, however, is not equal to the *virtù* of the Italian theorists. What he

⁵⁹ The most typical example, of course, is the English theoretician, James Harrington, two generations later.

⁶⁰ "Electionem regiam a Lacedaemoniis, qui ex Heraclidarum familiis reges eligebant, vel more Romanorum sumptam a majoribus accepimus". Forgách, *De statu rei publicae Hungariae*, 285.

⁶¹ "Quod apud Lacedaemonis aphori, apud romanos tribuni plebis, idem Ungaris [sic!] est palatinus, penes quem pace belloque secundum regem summa potestas, populi inventus, ac proprius magistratus, causarum inter regem populumque iudex, quin et regni arbiter." Forgách, *De statu rei publicae Hungariae*, 286.

understands by the term also differs from the three Christian and the four cardinal virtues. It appears most clearly in his description of persons like Sultan Suleiman, Captains Losonczi and Mekchey and other military persons, including his own father, or some Turkish commanders. It seems for him that virtue requires most of all mental strength to face the enemy, the talent for leading other people and an active life for one's *patria*. It is not simply a political *virtù* of participating in the city's (i.e. the community's) affairs, but above all a capacity for commanding military actions.⁶² Eloquence, culture and the study of the classical authors of antiquity and the moderns no longer carried equal importance, a sharp contrast to the milieu of the 15th century courts of Matthias Corvinus or János Vitéz. Although Forgách, not the least by his eloquent prose, still presented virtue as incorporating *studia humanitatis* as one of its components, this development of the idea of virtue was undoubtedly beginning to point to a narrower and restricted interpretation by which it was to acquire equal footing with military capacities. This narrowed understanding of the 16th vernacular usage of *virtus*>valour/bravery (*vitézség*) instead of *virtus*>integrity (*erényesség*) remained virtually unchanged well into the 18th century in Baroque devotion and was preserved in many phrases until even into the 21th century.⁶³

The idea of ancient constitution as a set of liberties and privileges of the orders, the *corpus politicum* (*ország*) guaranteed by the political structure of the country forms the other main pillar of both Forgách's work and the ideology of the Bocskai uprising. In this aspect Forgách displays his aristocratic identity at once. Commenting on the proceedings of the election⁶⁴ and coronation of Maximilian as king of Hungary in 1563, he points out immediately that Archbishop Oláh advised the archduke that having the Holy Crown and the royal insignia in

⁶² From the many examples let me refer to that of Frater György Martinuzzi (1482–1551): “Jam vero homines recordatione ingentium factorum, Georgii virtutem admirabantur, atque optabant, omnibus locis, omnibus coronis, omni hominum coetu praedicare Georgium... Non excitaturum suam illam virtutem? Non succursurum afflictæ patriæ? Eadem quippe esse, quæ tum fuere, arma, vires, regna; non homines ducibus, sed duces hominibus defuisse. Illius viri virtutem unius et auxilia desiderare.” Forgách, *De statu rei publicæ Hungariæ*, 146.

⁶³ And still shows its origin in phrases like: *virtuskodás*, showing off one's strength/daring.

⁶⁴ Only a few barons were against the election: “pauci quibus libertas et salus publica potior, majori ex parte in qua erat nobilitas, et plurima multitudo ceterorum statuum assentiebat.” Forgách, *De statu rei publicæ Hungariæ*, 254.

his hands he has no need to wait for the coronation. As archbishop of Esztergom, Oláh was the keeper of the royal seal and governor of the realm and thus united extraordinary power, and this prompted Forgách's critical remarks: "This archbishop, born of an especially low degree, of a Wallachian father...occupied undeservingly (*indigne*) many dignities."⁶⁵

But a *laudatio* of ancient constitutionalism and the lawful monarch's duty to defend it appears oddly enough also in his remarks on the German war of religion against Emperor Charles V in the 1540s. According to Forgách's explanation Charles V, having—with the help of the Duke of Alba—arrested Mauritz of Saxony (1521–1553), held *Reichstags* in Augsburg, Strassburg and other cities and introduced new and previously unused ordinances. These initiatives were taken in order to establish a "Spanish tyranny" which aimed to weaken and oppress German liberty. Forgách asserts that there used to be an old constitution of Germany, which he leaves undefined, but claims to be common among free peoples (*inter liberos populos*), which had originated many generations earlier. This constitution was challenged by Emperor Charles, who deployed foreign (namely Spanish) troops in Germany. The common cause of the *patria* required that Germany ought to be defended so as to let the next generations inherit a land as their forebears had. In contrast, Henri II of France (1547–1559), supporting the Protestant orders of Germany, claimed that Gallia from the very beginning had been an ally of Germania (*ab initio conjunctissima semper fuit*), and even that the two nations shared a mutual origin (*etiam ejusdem sint originis*) and had similar benefits and similar interests (*etiam mutua beneficia, mutuas necessitudines*), and assured that, since the German princes asked him to help them, he would do so with all his strength in a legitimate war.⁶⁶ Princes Maurice and Albert for their part also sent letters to the imperial orders and mourned the pitiful state of religion and the German *patria*, citing over-taxation, the foreign advisors, troops and envoys, the attack to destroy Germany and the expulsion of Germans from their own country.⁶⁷ There are close parallels between the language, style and structure of Forgách's

⁶⁵ Ibid., 254.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 80.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 81–2.

narrative of the German events in 1540 and the 1605 manifesto of the Bocskai rebellion. The list of grievances, the tyranny of the Habsburg dynasty, the hidden agenda, the secret objectives of the Crown have very many similarities in wording, which presents a new context for the 1605 manifesto.

Forgách's attempt to transfer the principles of political humanism to the Hungarian context of a strong and exclusive ancient constitutionalism ultimately ran into many contradictions. Certainly even his interpretation of Hungary's public affairs and its political system was unfounded, as constitutionally speaking the nobility was indeed one and the same, not least in the sense that only nobles could have ownership over the lands,⁶⁸ whereas non-nobles remained tenants and were excluded by birth from proper rights of possession. The help of the peasantry might have been made use of in times of destruction and war, they could have been accepted as members of the country and by doing so the dangers of the 1514 peasant uprising could have been avoided, but the basic structure of the Hungarian corporate system was so characteristically exclusive that it could easily return to the exclusion of non-nobles from nation and *patria*. The elements of the humanist discourse were, on the other hand, quite meaningful *within* the body politic, and proved to be very useful against the crown's pretensions to gaining absolute power.

The Bocskai rebellion, when ended with the peace of Vienna (1606), led to the replacement of King Rudolf by his younger brother Matthias who guaranteed the rights and liberties of the Estates and their liberty of faith and strengthened fundamentally the ancient constitution. Most of the *hajdú* troops were settled down on the lands of Bocskai and other aristocrats, receiving letters of privileges not from the Crown but from the Estates. Thus, the enlarged idea of nation shrunk again to the old *corpus politicum* of the country, although the possibility of mobilizing the unprivileged strata with a "national", though by no means ethnic, rhetoric remained open and was able to be actualized at the height of conflicts between the Estates and the Habsburg ruler throughout the "long seventeenth century."

⁶⁸ Decree of *Aviticitas* in 1351 by King Louis. The law was valid until the 19th century, when the XV:1848 Act of Parliament abolished it.

CHAPTER TEN

THE HUNGARIAN ROOTS OF A BOHEMIAN HUMANIST: JOHANN JESSENIUS A JESSEN AND EARLY MODERN NATIONAL IDENTITY¹

Kees Teszelszky

From the point of view of national identity one of the most intriguing figures at the early modern Habsburg court was Johann Jessenius a Jessen (Jeszenszky, Jesenský, 1566–1621). He was born in the Silesian town of Breslau (present-day Wrocław in Poland) and is described in different sources as a member of the Polish, Bohemian or German nation, but he presented himself in his own works as an *eques Ungarus* (Hungarian knight).² During his lifetime he acted as doctor, academic, historian and politician in Hungary, Bohemia and Austria. He studied in Padua, Wittenberg and Leipzig, where he wrote several influential books in which he displayed his knowledge of his various areas of interest.³ As a writer he promoted neo-Platonic ideas at the Habsburg court in Prague and Vienna and wrote an important work

¹ This article is a revision of a part of my dissertation, Kees Teszelszky, *De sacra corona regni Hungariae. De kroon van Hongarije en de ontwikkeling van vroegmoderne nationale identiteit (1572–1665)* [De sacra corona regni Hungariae: The crown of Hungary and the development of early modern national identity (1572–1666)] (Groningen: University of Groningen, 2006); <http://irs.ub.rug.nl/ppn/295012633>.

² On the life and work of Jessenius, see László Mátrai, ed., *Régi magyar filozófusok XV–XVII. század* [Ancient Hungarian philosophers from the 15th till the 17th century] (Budapest: Gondolat, 1961), 48–49; Josef Polišínský, *Jan Jesenský-Jessenius* (Prague: Impresum, 1965); Nicolette Mout, *Bohemen en de Nederlanden in de zestiende eeuw* [Bohemia and the Netherlands in the sixteenth century] (Leiden, Universitaire Pers Leiden, 1975), 78; László Ruttkay, *Jeszenszky János (Jessenius) és kora 1566–1621* [Johann Jessenius (Jeszenszky) and his age] (Budapest: A Semmelweis orvostörténeti múzeum és könyvtára, 1971), 18–88; Robert J. W. Evans, *Rudolf II and his World: A Study in Intellectual History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973, ²1984), 136–38; László András Magyar, “Jessenius,” in Péter Kőszeghy, ed., *Magyar művelődéstörténeti lexikon* [Hungarian lexicon of cultural history] (Budapest: Balassi, 2005), 4:446–48.

³ A German translation of the work of Jessenius on surgery, *Institutiones chirurgicae*, published in 1601, was still in use hundred years after his death; see Magyar, “Jessenius,” 447.

on this subject.⁴ He was a good friend of the Danish court astronomer Tycho Brahe, the court historian Jacobus Typotius and many influential intellectuals and politicians in the Habsburg Empire during the reign of Rudolf II (1572–1612) and Matthias (1608–1618).⁵ Jessenius became the rector of the university in Prague and showed himself a Bohemian patriot. His political activities on behalf of the Bohemian estates after 1616 led to his cruel execution in 1621 at the orders of Emperor Ferdinand II.

The work which will be analyzed here is Jessenius' description of the coronation of Matthias of Habsburg as king of Hungary. This event took place in the then Hungarian capital Pozsony (present-day Bratislava in Slovakia) on the 19th of November 1608.⁶ The work consists of two parts: a detailed account of the actual coronation ceremony, and a chronological overview of all the kings who ruled the Hungarian kingdom. In his description of the ceremony the author justifies Matthias' ascension to the throne by giving a "diagnostic" analysis of the history of Hungary and thereby stresses his own Hungarian roots.

The political context of Jessenius' book

Because of the political, intellectual and personal background of this "Hungarian" knight or Bohemian intellectual, this work is particularly interesting from the point of view of early modern national identity. How does Jessenius represent himself as a Hungarian and how does he represent the Hungarians? How is this image constructed; which medical, historical and philosophical elements does he use to shape

⁴ Iohann. Iessenii a Iessen, *Zoroaster nova, brevis veraque de universo Philosophia* (Witebergae, 1593). On Jessenius' early modern magical humanism, see György E. Szönyi, "Scientific and Magical Humanism at the Court of Rudolf II," in Eliška Fučíková et al., eds., *Rudolf II and Prague* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1997), 224–25.

⁵ Evans, *Rudolf II and his World*, 136–38.

⁶ Johannes Jessenius, *Regis Ungariae, Matthiae II. coronatio; Johan: Jessenio a Jessen, Regio Medico, Descriptore. Adiecta, regni, regumque Pannoniae, brevis Chronographia* (Vienna, 1609), OSZK Régi Magyar Könyvtár (RMK), III 1071; Johannes Jessenius, "Der Königlichen Majestät zu Ungarn / Matthiae des Andern dieses Nahmens / Krönung," in András Vizkelety, ed., *Wolfhart Spangenberg Sämtliche Werke* (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1982), IV/2:261–316. I have used the latter edition. The manuscript of this work can be found in the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, Codex 8790.

this image; and in what political and intellectual context should all this be viewed?

First of all, let us consider the work and its background and at the same time examine the question why the Bohemian physician Jessenius undertook to write a study about a Hungarian coronation ceremony. The coronation in question took place in 1608. In that year, the ill-famed feud between the brothers Matthias of Austria and emperor Rudolf II came to a peaceful end with the handing over of the crown of Hungary in June, a symbolic act by which Matthias took over the Hungarian throne from his brother.⁷ It was the last in a chain of events between 1606 and 1608 during which Matthias opposed his brother with the help of most of the Protestant estates in the east of the Habsburg Empire. He was elected by the Hungarian estates as king and the crowning took place on the 19th of November. In return for their having supported him against Rudolf, the newly crowned ruler was forced to accept all the conditions the Hungarian estates imposed on him. This compromise turned out to be an almost complete victory of the—mainly Protestant—estates-general in Hungary, who by imposing these conditions made the king and his government completely dependent on them.⁸

This compromise between a member of the Habsburg house and the estates was, as such, a novelty in the Habsburg Empire. The only thing comparable was the political situation in the Netherlands at that time, in which Matthias had also had a hand at an earlier stage.⁹ But the Hungarian throne was not the final goal of Matthias' political ambitions. After being crowned as king of Hungary, Matthias sought to obtain the crown of Bohemia and the imperial regalia which were still in the hands of Rudolf. In order to gain authority in the rest of the empire, he had to convince the estates of the Habsburg Empire of his

⁷ Herbert Haupt, "From feuding brothers to a nation at war with itself," in Fučíkova, *Rudolf II and Prague*, 238–47.

⁸ H. G. Koenigsberger, "Epilogue: Central and Western Europe," in Robert J. W. Evans and T. V. Thomas, eds., *Crown, Church and Estates* (London: Macmillan, 1991), 308.

⁹ Emile Lousse, "Qui donc était l'empereur Mathias?," in Louis Carlen and Fritz Steinegger, eds., *Festschrift für Nikolaus Grass zum 60. Geburtstag dargebracht von Fachgenossen, Freunden und Schülern* (Innsbruck: Wagner, 1974–75), I:135–43; H. G. Koenigsberger, *Monarchies, States Generals and Parliaments: The Netherlands in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 280–88.

good intentions. In this regard, the Hungarian coronation ceremony was an important propagandistic event in Matthias' political strategy.

The aim of Jessenius in describing the ceremony was to legitimate the authority of the newly crowned King Matthias, to support his political compromise with the Hungarian estates and to justify the latter's recently acquired political rights. Jessenius describes the personal virtues of King Matthias and demonstrates his estates-friendly policy. Because the text's aim was to promote the ambitions of Matthias in Europe, it was given a widespread international distribution. It came out two times in Latin, once in German and perhaps even in a French edition, all in 1609.¹⁰ Hieronymus Ortelius incorporated the description of the coronation in a work on Hungarian history which was published in 1613 and which was translated into Dutch five years later.¹¹ The text was again included in a work about the ceremonies at Matthias' coronation published in 1613.¹² We can therefore conclude that there exist at least seven editions of this work.

Another reason Jessenius wrote this work is connected with his personal ambitions. After his move to Prague Jessenius failed to obtain a permanent position there as court doctor to Rudolf, and his career at the court reached an impasse. Then in 1608 he changed his allegiance and became a member of Matthias' newly formed court. The political description of the handing over of the Hungarian crown and the coronation ceremony, both of which he attended, therefore serves the personal interests of the author.¹³ His efforts in this direction were finally successful, because he was appointed King Matthias' court doctor in the year the book was published.

¹⁰ For an overview of the various editions, see Péter Kulcsár, ed., *Inventarium de operibus litterariis ad res Hungaricas pertinentibus ab initiis usque ad annum 1700* (Budapest: Balassi kiadó and Országos Széchényi könyvtár, 2003), 262–63, 769–70.

¹¹ Hieronymus Ortelius, *Appendix Partis Quartae Chronologiae Ungaricae...*, in Hieronymus Ortelius, *Chronologia oder historische Beschreibung aller Kriegeempörungen und Schlachter so in ober und under Ungern auch Siebenbürgen mit dem Türken geschehen, 1395–1598* (Nürnberg, 1613), MTA RMK III. 7541 8–25; Hieronymus Ortelius, *De chronycke van Hungarie* (Amsterdam, 1619).

¹² S.n., *Inauguratio, coronatio... imperatorum* (Hannover, 1613), quoted in Ruttay, *Jeszszky*, 176.

¹³ Jessenius described the events in a colourful letter to Péter Révay, the keeper of the Hungarian crown, which was published in Petrus de Rewa, *De sacrae coronae regni Hungariae ortu, virtute, victoria, fortuna, annos ultra D C clarissimae, brevis commentarius* (Augustae Vindelicorum, 1613), appendix.

Now let us turn to the content of the work. Jessenius' book is not a dry description of what happened during the crowning. Quite the reverse, what strikes us today is the detailed observation of the author and his almost journalistic style of description. He writes about such things as the color of the chairs and the typical Hungarian garments of those present and describes in detail the contents of the orations and oaths which were delivered during the ceremony. This description is preceded, on the first page, by an elaborately detailed etching of the crown of Hungary, as far as we know the oldest printed true-to-life image of this famous crown.¹⁴ Due to the author's journalistic method and vivid style, the modern reader has almost the sensation of being actually present at the coronation. This indeed was exactly the author's intention, as he states in his book.¹⁵

When confronted with this elaborate description of Jessenius, we also get the suspicious feeling that the content of this whole ceremony was perhaps not so transparent for a contemporary reader. In 1608, a coronation was still in essence a medieval sacral ritual the purpose of which was to legitimate the authority of the ruler and the dynasty and which was based on the liturgy of the Catholic Church and on the century-old traditions of the kingdom of Hungary.¹⁶ It is therefore striking that the author scarcely refers to the rich past of the crowning ceremonies of the Hungarian kings. In contrast to his predecessors' descriptions of earlier coronations, Jessenius almost never refers to the history of Hungary or to the Bible to explain the ceremony.¹⁷ Instead, he quotes classical authors like Pliny, Herodotus, Diodorus Siculus and the Church Fathers, or uses analogies from nature and everyday life to interpret the ceremony to his readers.

An example of his peculiar method is the description of the anointment of the king. The author starts by making reference to an

¹⁴ Teszelszky, *De sacra corona regni Hungariae*, 162–63.

¹⁵ Jessenius, "Der Königlichen Majestät zu Ungarn" 303 r. 12–13.

¹⁶ On Hungarian coronations, see Emma Bartoniek, *A magyar királykoronázások története* [The history of the Hungarian royal coronations] (Budapest: Magyar Történelmi Társulat, 1939, 1987²), 85–96; Géza Pálffy, "Koronázási lakomák a 15–17. századi Magyarországon" [Coronation banquets in 15th to 17th century Hungary], in *Századok* 138 (2004): 1005–1101; Teszelszky, *De sacra corona*, 161–62.

¹⁷ A useful collection of these descriptions is Martinus Georgius Kovachich, *Solenia inauguralia serenissimorum ac potentissimorum principum utriusque sexus, qui ex augusta stirpe Habspurgo-Austriaca Sacra Corona Apostolica in reges Hungarorum, reginasque periodo tertia redimiti sunt*. (Pestini: Typis Matthiae Trattner, 1790).

explanation of this ritual by St. Cyprian.¹⁸ Then he states that the oil provides the king a “Freydigkeit des Gemuets”, like the use of oil by wrestlers. He also refers to the property of oil which prevents a knife from rusting and includes at the end of his account the image of balm and its fragrance which affect the mood of the user in a positive way. By giving this and other explanations of the anointment—which is of course the climax of the whole event—it seems that Jessenius intended in a subtle way to distract the attention of the reader from the original sacral, Roman Catholic context of the ritual and direct it towards a new interpretation that conveyed a positive image of the crowned king.

The political content of Jessenius’ account of the anointing is even more striking. He does not write a word about its medieval Christian origin but refers instead to similar pagan Egyptian rites as described by Herodotus and Pliny.¹⁹ The function of this is to persuade the reader of the antique roots of the ceremony. By citing the classic authors, Jessenius implies that the content of this coronation predates Christianity. This interpretation diminishes the dominant role of the Catholic Church in the coronation and undermines the notion of the sacral origins of royal power. This reflects the political goals of Jessenius and his fellow Protestant members of the Hungarian estates, who wanted to justify their political claims at the cost of the authority of the Catholic Church in Hungary.

Jessenius uses a different interpretation when he describes the origin of the Hungarian crown regalia, namely the cross, the sword and the holy crown of Hungary. Here he does refer to medieval sources and the Bible. Jessenius explains the meaning of the double cross used during the ceremony by alluding to the well-known Hartvic legend from the 11th century.²⁰ According to the interpretation of the author of the legend, the first king of Hungary, St. Stephen, received this cross as a token of gratitude for spreading Christianity in the Hungarian kingdom. Jessenius states that the cross together with the other crown regalia is a symbol of the defense of the kingdom. He then quotes the words of Cardinal Ferenc Forgách at the coronation ceremony, who

¹⁸ Jessenius, “Der Königlichen Majestät zu Ungarn,” 288.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 281.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 285. On the Hartvic legend, see Gábor Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses: Dynastic Cults in Medieval Central Europe*, trs. Éva Pálmai (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 123–34.

stated that the sword of St. Stephen is the sign of protection which the king was obliged to afford to the kingdom and the “*Kirche Gottes*” in Hungary.²¹ Of course, the Cardinal was referring here to the Catholic Church, which the Habsburg king was bound to support. However, Jessenius lures the reader towards a different interpretation, arguing on the basis of the Book of Maccabees that the sword obliges the king to protect Christianity without denominational differences.²²

Jessenius again omits references to medieval sources when describing the Hungarian people and Hungary. He does not use the traditional medieval and early modern description of a Hungarian, namely as a descendant of the Huns with a rich history of martial conquests in Europe and of defending the Catholic faith against the infidels from the East. In place of these notions which had been repeated in countless chronicles, pamphlets and history books, Jessenius instead describes Hungarian nationhood in a very original way,²³ using a laudation of Matthias, the fatherland and the Hungarians to suggest once again a contemporary political message.²⁴

He starts with describing Hungary as having been an erstwhile “land of happiness”. After this, Jessenius proceeds, like a doctor, to make a diagnosis of the present state of the kingdom. He asserts that the country is ill because of the Turkish attacks, and is therefore called “Angaria” (“Angary”, land of misery) instead of “Ungaria” now.²⁵ Then he switches his attention to the Hungarians and the virtues which he attributes to them. The inhabitants of Hungary are a warlike people. They voluntarily sacrifice their life for their country, are satisfied with meager payment and are not rebellious but pious, moderate, chaste and brave. Hereafter, he sets this description of the Hungarians against a dreadful image of the Turkish threat. He depicts the Turks as a storm tide which will pour over Europe and the kingdom of Hungary and the Hungarians as the only wall of defense which separates the Turks from the Germans. As long as the Hungarian kingdom is powerful, the “*Teutsche Nation*” can be at ease and sleep securely, he argues. But if this wall (or dike) breaks, the Turks will flood all over Germany like

²¹ Jessenius, “Der Königlichen Majestät zu Ungarn,” 289.

²² Ibidem, 289.

²³ Teszelszky, *De sacra corona*, 48–66.

²⁴ Jessenius, “Der Königlichen Majestät zu Ungarn,” 303–305.

²⁵ This can be related to his thinking about the disease of the “body politic” which he analyses in his dissertation, *Pro vindiciis contra tyrannos*. . . . This work was written in 1591 and published in 1614 (Ruttkay, *Jeszelszky János*, 25).

a wild sea and all freedom will be washed away, as in the Deluge. Jesenius ends this part with a call for help to God and to the Christian princes to support Hungary. The function of this description is again the justification of the political aims of the Hungarian estates towards the Habsburg king and the rest of Europe: if the Germans and the rest of Europe desire to be saved from the Turks, they must support the Hungarians and satisfy their political demands.

The image of Hungary as a bulwark was a very popular theme in early modern political writing.²⁶ It is frequently used in pamphlets and other texts about the Turkish menace as a plea for international support. Even King Matthias II, when he was still Archduke Matthias of Austria made use of this theme in a declaration to the rulers of Europe, written in April 1608, to justify his resistance against his brother Rudolf.²⁷ He described the Crown of Hungary (“Crown Hungary”) as the defense wall of Christian Europe. In so portraying the crown, Matthias connected the territory of the kingdom of Hungary with royal power in this country, and so justified his future claims to the Hungarian throne and crown.²⁸

²⁶ Lajos Terbe, *Egy európai szállóige életrajza* [The biography of a European winged word], in *Egyetemes Philológiai Közöny* (Budapest, 1936), 60:297–350; József Deér, *Pogány magyarság, keresztény magyarság* [Heathen Hungarians, Christian Hungarians] (Budapest: Holnap, 1938, ²1993), 219–62; Kálmán Benda, *A magyar nemzeti hivatástudat története a XV-XVII. században* [A history of the consciousness of Hungary’s national mission from the fifteenth to the seventeenth century] (Budapest: Bethlen Nyomda, 1937); Ágnes R. Várkonyi, “A török kiűzésének tervei Európában és Magyarországon” [The plans in Europe and Hungary to drive out the Turks], in Ágnes R. Várkonyi, ed., *Magyarország keresztútjain* [On the crossroads of Hungary] (Budapest: Gondolat, 1978), 177–84; Ágnes R. Várkonyi, “A török kiűzésének eszméje a magyar politikai gondolkodásban a XVII. század közepén” [The idea of driving out the Turks in Hungarian political thinking in the middle of the seventeenth century], in Ágnes R. Várkonyi, ed., *Magyarország keresztútjain*, 393–403; Ágnes R. Várkonyi, “Az egység jelképei a megosztottság másfél évszázadában” [Symbols of unity in the century and a half of partition], in *A hadtörténeti múzeum értesítője* (Acta Musei Militaris in Hungaria) 4 (2002), 65; Lajos Hopp, *Az “antemurale” és “conformitas” humanista eszméje a magyar-lengyel hagyományban* [The humanist idea of “antemurale” and “conformitas” in the Hungarian-Polish tradition] (Budapest: Balassi, 1992).

²⁷ [Matthias of Austria], “Kurzer bericht der fürstl. Dhlt. Erzherzogs Matthiassen zu Österreich etc. vber das Vngerische Wesen, cum refutatione objectorum. Also einkommen jm April 1608.,” in Mihály Hatvani [Mihály Horváth], ed., *Magyar történelmi okmánytár a brüsszeli országos levéltárból és a burgundi levéltárból* [The collection of Hungarian historical charters in the National Archive in Brussels and in the Burgundian Archive] (Monumenta Hungariae Historiae. Diplomataria IV.) (Pest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1859), III: 282–295.

²⁸ Teszelszky, *De sacra corona*, 139.

Jessenius broadens this classic definition of the defense wall by personifying it.²⁹ According to him, the imaginary wall against the Turks consists not only of the territory of Hungary but of the Hungarian people too. He also connects the character of the members of this community with his notion of the dike, through the description of their virtues. By incorporating this image of embodiment, he constructs a new national identity for the Hungarians, which combines a geographical notion, an ethnic notion and an ethical notion. This construction of a Hungarian identity is a vital and important part of his political argumentation: he created this notion of the defense wall to justify the demands of the Hungarian estates and to protect their interests against the authority of the Catholic Church and the Habsburg king.

In connection with the defense wall, Jessenius also defines his own identity as a Hungarian in a unique way. He declares himself a part of the Hungarian people, and describes Hungary as his “Heymath und eygentliches VatterLand” of his forefathers.³⁰ To illustrate this statement, Jessenius presents the example of the plant which germinates on one place and is transplanted elsewhere later but which always stays connected with the original soil. This sounds like the words of a proud early modern patriot, but his biological metaphor has again a specific political meaning. As already stated, Jessenius was not born in Hungary and he resided not there but in Prague, in Bohemia. Still, he tried to play a political role in the Hungarian kingdom during the strife between Matthias and Rudolf (1607–1608) and afterwards. According to the law codes of the Hungarian kingdom, the political rights of Hungarians were confined to the members of the *regnum*, the Hungarian political community.³¹ The aristocrats, the prelates and the nobility of Hungary were the members vested with political rights.³² But these

²⁹ Jessenius’ image of Hungary as the dike of Europe is unparalleled in Hungarian political literature.

³⁰ Jessenius, “Der Königlichen Majestät zu Ungarn,” 304, lines 12–13.

³¹ See for instance Sándor Kolosvári and Kelemen Óvári, eds. *Werbőczy István Hármaskönyve* [The Tripartitum of István Werbőczy] (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1897, ²1989) I, 2; “Matthiae II. decr. a. 1608 post. cor.(I) 2, art. 27,” in Sándor Kolosvári and Kelemen Óvári, eds., *Corpus Juris Hungarici* (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1900), II:38–40. See also the analysis with extensive overview of the existing literature in László Péter, *The antecedents of the 19th century Hungarian state concept, an historical analysis: The background and the creation of the doctrine of the Holy Crown* (dissertation, Oxford, 1965), as well as Teszelszky, *De sacra corona*, 58–61, 64–66.

³² József Gerics, “Az “ország tagja (membrum regni)” és az “ország része (pars regni)” kifejezés középkori magyarországi használatáról” [The medieval Hungarian

rights did not belong to the individuals who together made up the political community but to the *regnum* as a whole. The political rights of the community were thus justified with reference to the historical identity of the Hungarian realm, the *regnum Hungariae* and common ethnic descent.

For Jessenius, it was these collective political rights that counted when he described his own personal ethnic identity in his work in 1609. It is remarkable that he calls himself only in 1608 for the first time an *eques Ungarus*.³³ It seems therefore that in the description of the Hungarian coronation a year later he was not testifying to his individual identity. Instead, he wanted to justify his own political role in the Hungarian *regnum* by demonstrating his biological relation with the Hungarian nation and the Hungarian realm. Jessenius' patriotic phrases were not a private person's declaration of identity, but proof of his membership in a certain political, social and constitutional network and a claim to political rights which were connected to this membership. The statement of Jessenius can thus be related to the function of ethnic Hungarian identity within the *regnum*. Here, the main function of the expression of one's own ethnic identity was to defend the political rights against the authority of the king.³⁴

For the individual members of the *regnum*, the ethnic origin was much less important than modern scholars often assert. This can be proved for example by a special ceremony. During the gatherings of the *regnum* (diets), there was a festive ceremony in which people from other nations (*extra nationes*), after taking an oath, were admitted to the community of the Hungarians (*in Hungaros recipiuntur*). This happened for instance in 1608 with Karl of Liechtenstein and another Austrian aristocrat.³⁵ These new members were definitely not ethnic Hungarians and did not share the historical identity of the Hungarian community. Still, they were considered as Hungarians and could claim political rights in the *regnum*, although these rights were legitimized by an idea of a common ethnic descent.

use of the expressions "member of the country (membrum regni)" and "part of the country (pars regni)", in Marianne Rozsondai, ed., *Jubileumi csokor Csapodi Csaba tiszteletére (tanulmányok)* [Jubileum bouquet in honor of Csaba Csapodi (studies)] (Budapest: Argumentum, 2002), 88–89.

³³ Ruttkay, *Jeszenszky János*, 165.

³⁴ Teszelszky, *De sacra corona*, 66.

³⁵ "Matthiae II. decr. a. 1608 post. cor.(I) 2, art. 27," 38–40.

The symbolism of the crown in the works by Berger, Révay and Jessenius

As I have shown, Jessenius constructs in his work a new Hungarian identity by introducing novel characterizations and definitions. I have explained the changing of tradition in terms of the political constellation around 1608 and demonstrated his political motives. But politics alone cannot account for the innovative way Jessenius described his people and his "motherland." Where did his new ideas come from? To answer this question, we need to consider his academic background, his intellectual references and the European context of his ideas.

First of all, let us turn to Jessenius' academic background. The way he approaches the subject of politics, his self-identity and the identity of his imagined fellow countrymen resembles the thoughts of other European physicians of his time.³⁶ Nancy Siraisi argues that these early modern doctors did not confine their curiosity to the secrets of the human body but also anatomized the body politic.³⁷ Jessenius and the others saw an affinity between medicine and history and treated political science, medical knowledge and historical insights as interchangeable and complementary ways of gaining knowledge of the world. They viewed the learning of history as a way to heal the sickness of the body politic. For many of them therefore, including Jessenius, the reading and writing of historical works was a form of medical politics. Jessenius' way of filling his work with classical quotations is also typical of early modern medical rhetoric.³⁸ This use of citations is also characteristic of the anatomy classroom, but could be applied to the political sphere as well. Through such efforts these physicians, including Jessenius, played an important role in the development of a national discourse in their country.

Secondly, there is a strong relation between the content of Jessenius' work and the writings of others who worked at the court of Matthias. These court intellectuals included the palatine István Illésházy, the court historian Elias Berger a Grünenberg, the royal advisor Péter Révay, the

³⁶ According to Peter Burke, this is especially true for those of them who, like Jessenius, had studied in Padua. Peter Burke, "Images as Evidence in Seventeenth-Century Europe," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 64 (2003) 2: 294.

³⁷ Nancy G. Siraisi, "Anatomizing the Past: Physicians and History in Renaissance Culture," *Renaissance Quarterly* 53 (2000): 1–30.

³⁸ Nancy G. Siraisi, "Oratory and Rhetoric in Renaissance Medicine," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 65 (2004) 2: 192.

court historian Johannes Bocatius and of course king Matthias himself.³⁹ The ideas of Jessenius about the Hungarians, the kingdom and the crown of Hungary can be considered to represent a certain phase in the broader development of a legitimation strategy and the national discourse in Hungary. The main symbol was the “holy crown of Hungary”, which received an important legitimizing function in the political culture of Hungary at the beginning of the 16th century. According to Ágnes R. Várkonyi, the crown began to symbolize the unity of the divided *regnum* after the kingdom of Hungary was dissolved in 1541 following the fall of Buda.⁴⁰ Due to the political weakness of King Rudolf II of Habsburg, the crown was used increasingly in political literature between 1572 and 1606 to strengthen the demands of the Hungarian *regnum*. The crown changed from being a symbol of the legitimacy of royal power to becoming, during the insurrection of Bocskay, a symbol of the political claims of the community against Habsburg authority. This development is shown mainly in the creating of the fiction of “the refusal of the Turkish crown” by Bocatius in 1605 and the content of the political testament of Bocskay in 1606.⁴¹

The crown of Hungary became the central point of political rhetoric in 1608 after the handing over of the crown regalia to Matthias by Rudolf and the subsequent returning of the Hungarian crown and the other regalia to the Hungarian estates.⁴² In an oration to the estates

³⁹ Teszelszky, *De sacra corona*, 130–32.

⁴⁰ Ágnes R. Várkonyi, *A megosztottság évszázada 1526–1606* [The century of division 1526–1606] (Budapest: Korona kiadó, 1999) I:81; Ágnes R. Várkonyi, “...Jó Budavár magas tornyán...” A magyar államiság szimbólumairól Mohács után” [“...On the high towers of Budavár...”: The symbols of the Hungarian state after Mohács], in Sándor Gebei, ed., *Hagyomány és történelem* [Tradition and history] (Eger: Heves Megyei Múzeumi Szervezet, 2000) 77–100; Ágnes R. Várkonyi, *A korona és a budai vár* [The crown and the Buda castle], *Tanulmányok Budapest múltjából* [Studies in the history of Budapest] vol. 29. (Budapest: Budapesti Történeti Múzeum, 2001), 37–47; Ágnes R. Várkonyi, “A magyar államiság Mohács után” [The Hungarian state after Mohács], in Jenő Gergely and Lajos Izsák, eds., *A magyar államiság ezer éve* [A thousand years of the Hungarian state] (Budapest: Eötvös Kiadó, 2001) 121–139; Ágnes R. Várkonyi, “Az egység jelképei” [The symbols of unity], 59–69; Teszelszky, *De sacra corona*, 62–64.

⁴¹ Kees Teszelszky, “A Bocskay-korona mítosza; a koronázás körülményeinek leírása a fikció és a valóság tükrében” [The myth of the Bocskay-crown: The description of the circumstances surrounding the crowning in fact and fiction], in Tivadar Petercsák and Máttyás Berecz, eds., *Magyarország védelme—Európa védelme* [The defense of Hungary—the defense of Europe], *Studia Agriensia* 24 (Eger: Heves Megyei Múzeumi Szervezet, Dobó István Vármúzeum, 2006).

⁴² Teszelszky, *De sacra corona*, 127–44.

delivered in July 1608, Illésházy presented the newly returned crown as the symbol of the political rights of the estates and the promises of Matthias.⁴³ Berger elaborated this notion further in an oration in October or November 1608 delivered during a gathering of the *regnum* before the crowning of Matthias. This oration was printed together with Illésházy's and can be considered as the first early modern work regarding the history and the meaning of the crown.⁴⁴

In his work Berger, the court historian, personifies the crown as an object that influences the destiny of the political community and the fatherland. In his eyes it embodies the divinely sanctioned laws, rules and essence of Hungarian history. Berger maintains that the essential element of the "personality" of the crown is the *numen* or *religio sacrae coronae*, its God-given protecting power, its sanctity and the veneration shown to it by human beings.⁴⁵ Because the crown, due to its sacred meaning, incorporates the character of the *regnum* and the fatherland and, according to Berger, the *regnum* venerates the crown, it follows that the *regnum* venerates itself through its cult of the crown. Following the publication of Berger's work in 1608 this sacred meaning of the crown became one of the most influential elements of the national identity of the Hungarians. It is therefore not surprising that two exact drawings of the crown of Hungary can be found in the manuscript of the work of Jessenius.⁴⁶ These drawings are among the earliest true depictions of the Hungarian crown in history. It is very likely that Jessenius made them himself. Finally, only one of these drawings was published as an etching in the final work.

The most important and influential work which mediated the reception of these ideas about the crown was written by Péter Révay after

⁴³ [István Illésházy], "Anno 1608. Peroratio sive preambulum propositionum 29. Julii Cassoviae exhibita regnicolis per C. Stephanum Illésházy," in *Történelmi Tár* 2 (1879) 388–89; Gábor Kazinczy, ed., *Gr. Illésházy István Nádor följegyzései 1592–1603. és Hídvégi Mikó Ferencz históriája 1594–1613. Bíró Sámuel folytatásával* [The notes of Count István Illésházy 1592–1603 and the history of Ferencz Hídvégi Mikó 1594–1613 with the addition of Sámuel Bíró], *Monumenta Hungariae Historiae VII* (Pest: A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1863), 327–31.

⁴⁴ Elías Berger, *D.O.M. Jubilaeus de origine, errore et restitutione S. Coronae Hungariae Regni fortiss. ac felicissi. Praeterea corolla mixta ad faelicissimam ac meritiss: coronationem novi regis Hungariae pijßimè status, humilime texta ab Elia Berger, A.G. L. et R.H. Historico* (s.l., 1608) (RMK III. 1054)

⁴⁵ Berger, *D.O.M. Jubilaeus*, A2r., A4r.

⁴⁶ Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Codex 8790, fol. 1r. and fol. 1v. Published in: Kees Teszelszky, *Az ismeretlen korona. Jelentések, szimbólumok és nemzeti identitás*. (Pannonhalma: Bencés Kiadó, 2009), 390.

1608 and published in 1613.⁴⁷ The main ideas of this work had already been presented in a short oration which Révay gave after his election as keeper of the crown after the crowning of Matthias in November 1608.⁴⁸ But Révay's study of the crown also embodies the results of the intellectual interaction between Berger, Jessenius and himself. The support which Berger and Jessenius offered in writing this work is attested by two letters published at the end of the book as well as in the extensive correspondence between Révay and these two authors.⁴⁹ Berger's elaborate theory of the holiness of the crown is included in the book of Révay, while Révay quotes Jessenius several times in his own work, as I will show hereafter.

It is nevertheless remarkable that even though these three authors worked so closely together on the same theme, the image and description of the crown in their books still differ from each other. First of all, the etchings of the crown in the books of Révay and Jessenius are different. (There was no picture of the crown in the book of Berger, as far as we know.) This is striking, because both authors had the opportunity to view the crown from close up after Matthias' coronation and were both closely involved with the making of the pictures.⁵⁰ We also know that Révay received a copy of Jessenius' book and must therefore have seen this etching. The picture of the crown in Jessenius' book, an almost exact copy of the original, was drawn above the armor of Matthias. The crown in Révay's book is more symbolic, being decorated with all kind of images which in reality do not exist on the actual crown. The description of the crown in the work of the three authors also differs. Berger writes only of the twelve—in reality, eight—apostles on the crown.⁵¹ According to him, these figures and their exact number are an admonition to the king to defend the apostolic faith and the Catholic church.⁵² Jessenius omits the apostles but describes the chains

⁴⁷ Petrus de Rewa, *De sacrae coronae regni Hungariae ortu, virtute, victoria, fortuna, annos ultra D C clarissimae, brevis commentarius* (Augustae Vindelicorum, 1613).

⁴⁸ [Péter Révay], "Postulata conservatorum sacrae coronae," Slovak National Archive, *Decreta et mandata regia*, fasc. VII. No. 33, published in György Bónis, *Révay Péter* (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1981), 101–103.

⁴⁹ Tszelszky, *De sacra corona*, 183.

⁵⁰ See for instance the signature on the left of the etching of the crown in Révay's work: *D. Pet. Rew.C. T.* On the right is the signature of the etcher, Wolfgang Kilian: *Wolfg: Kilian: Aug: sculp.*

⁵¹ Berger, *D.O.M. Jubilaeus*, A3r.

⁵² *Ibid.*, A3v.

hanging from the crown.⁵³ In his view, these chains, because of the sound that they make when the king moves his head, have the same function as the servants of the Persian kings. Here Jessenius is citing Plutarch, who wrote that these servants whisper daily in the king's ear to remind him of his royal duty. This interpretation was taken over by Révay with slight modification and without any acknowledgement of Plutarch or Jessenius.⁵⁴ According to Révay, the chains of the crown convey heavenly and earthly truth to the ears of the king through the sound they make when the king moves his head. By "heavenly and earthly truth" Révay means the same thing as Berger's *religio sacrae coronae*, as the author explains in his book.

These differences between the views of these two authors can be seen in the various functions of the pictures and the descriptions of the crown in their work and the political context at the time when they were created. The main objective of the work of the Catholic Berger was to promote and legitimize the political compromise between the Protestant estates and Matthias before the crowning and to create a sense of unity between the Catholic and Protestant members of the *regnum*. It is therefore understandable that he focused on the Catholic aspects of the crown, in order to please the Catholic members of the *regnum* and to gain their support. As mentioned earlier, Jessenius' purpose was to defend the authority of the newly crowned king Matthias, to support the political compromise and to justify the recently acquired political rights of the estates after the crowning. His explanation of the chains must be seen from this point of view. Jessenius presents not a Catholic but a secular interpretation that stressed the obligations of the king. As we have seen in the work of Illésházy and Berger, the crown became the symbol of the promises of the king towards the Protestant estates regarding their rights. This interpretation of Jessenius can therefore be seen as a reference to the duty of Matthias to respect the political rights of the estates after the crowning. Révay provides a historical legitimation for the political compromise through his history of the crown, drawing on the ideas of Berger and Jessenius. His work is based on the idea of a sacred truth which can be found in the history of the holy crown, but he modifies the explanation of Jessenius by stating that this truth is communicated to the king

⁵³ Jessenius, "Der Königlichen Majestät zu Ungarn," 291.

⁵⁴ De Rewa, *De sacrae coronae*, 279.

through the sound of the chains. This explanation can be regarded as an exhortation to the king to respect the political compromise with the Hungarians after Matthias was crowned as emperor in 1612. We can therefore observe the description of the crown changing with the change of political circumstances.

But why did these authors focus so much on the crown and its appearance? Why did the visible characteristics of the crown play such an important role in their political thinking? It was, indeed, the first time in the history of Hungary that writers had written about the crown in such detail. To explain this, we must turn our attention to the broader context outside Hungary. According to Peter Burke, a cultural change occurred in Europe at the end of the sixteenth century and the beginning of the seventeenth, a change he called the “visual turn” in the minds of Renaissance scholars.⁵⁵ The main feature of this change was the turning from texts to material remains of the past like images and objects. The attention of scholars also turned away from the written Christian heritage to the barbarian, pagan history and the unwritten prehistoric past of their own country, what Burke describes as an “alternative antiquity”.⁵⁶ Their aim was to find fresh historical evidence for the support of new political theories with which they could oppose either the authority of the Catholic Church or the power of the ruler.⁵⁷ The study of this hitherto unutilized past also brought to these scholars a changed knowledge about the history of their own nation and stimulated the development of the early modern national discourse.

But if the combined efforts of Berger, Révay and Jessenius are the result of this “visual turn,” then how can we explain that their views differ so much? To answer this question we must take into account another cultural change in the early modern period: the new use of historical evidence for political purposes.⁵⁸ The main characteristic

⁵⁵ Peter Burke, “Image as Evidence in Seventeenth-Century Europe,” 273.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 283–84.

⁵⁷ On such use of historic evidence see also Jacob Soll, “Introduction: The Uses of Historical Evidence in Early Modern Europe,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 64 (2003): 149–57.

⁵⁸ See Jan Waszink, “*Inventio* in the *Politica*: Commonplace-Books and the Shape of Political Theory,” in K. Enekel and C. Heesakkers, eds., *Lipsius in Leiden: Studies in the Life and Works of a Great Humanist* (Voorthuizen: Florivallis, 1997), 141–62; Jacob Soll, “Empirical History and the Transformation of Political Criticism in France from Bodin to Bayle,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 64 (2003): 304–305; Jan Waszink, “Introduction,” in Justus Lipsius, *Politica: Six Books of Politics or Political Instruction*,

of this changed use was to construct an argument based on quotations from well-known classical authors and historical *exempla*. These examples could be from antiquity or medieval times.⁵⁹ However, they were often taken out of their original historical context and modified to serve the purpose of the author. The authors were not concerned with the original intention of a classical author or the precise historical context of an example but tried to find new and convincing interpretations of them to support their view on contemporary political issues. It was therefore more a rhetorical strategy than a scholarly method, since the intention of the authors was rather to bring their readers around to their political ideas than to find the historical truth.⁶⁰ The reason why the historical content of the work of Berger, Révay and Jessenius differs, is that they had to confer a different political message, by using the same historical sources.

Conclusion

What all these authors had in common was that they could no longer exploit the familiar sources of Hungarian history, because these legitimated the old situation and the former ruler. Instead, they had to find new methods and fresh evidence to justify the changes in ceremony and politics. They needed to re-interpret a centuries old ceremony from a new perspective which expressed the changing political situation and the revolutionary politics of Matthias. To persuade their audience of their political arguments all three invoked the authority of classical authors, modified historical examples and gave an interpretation of the meaning of the Hungarian crown. In this sense their study of the crown cannot be considered the product of an academic search for historical truth but rather the manipulation of historical

ed. and tr. Jan Waszink (Assen: Van Gorcum, 2004), 199; Kees Tszelszky, *De sacra corona*, 176–78.

⁵⁹ Robert Bireley, *The Counter-Reformation Prince: Anti Machiavellianism or Catholic Statecraft in Early Modern Europe* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1990), 78; Jan Papy, “The Use of Medieval and Contemporary Sources in the History of Louvain of Justus Lipsius (1547–1606): The Lovanium (1605) as a Case of Humanist Historiography,” *Lias: Sources and Documents relating to the Early Modern History of Ideas* 29 (2002): 45–62.

⁶⁰ Anthony Grafton, *Bring Out Your Dead* (Cambridge, Ma., and London: Harvard University Press, 2001), 241.

evidence to support a political cause. Likewise, the references to Hungarian national identity in the work of Jessenius were indicative of the changed political context and the recent intellectual developments in Europe. We can therefore assume that the self-image presented by Jessenius, just like his description of the coronation in Hungary, was also a construction to support the political cause of the Hungarian estates and the court career of Jessenius himself.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

PIETY AND INDUSTRY: VARIATIONS ON PATRIOTISM IN SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY HUNGARIAN POLITICAL THOUGHT

Hanna Orsolya Vincze

In his dedication to the 1641 Hungarian translation of Lipsius' *Politica*, the translator, János Laskai, explained his choice of patron with the noble gentleman's love of country.¹ Love of country was properly—and conveniently for men of letters, the same Lipsius would add with some irony—manifested by a love of books, the support of learned men and constancy in religion:

I judge your lordship to be outstanding in your patriotism, too. Not that I would compare your power in supporting the *patria* with that of those more powerful, but with regard to your striving to do so, in which the lesser estates can equal the greater. Holy striving is judged even by God to equal action, especially if constancy in one's religion and diligent industriousness pertain to patriotism. And you love your *patria* perfectly. The two are inextricably connected: religion and *patria*. Holy is the *patria*, holy is religion, and the virtuous die equally for both.²

The Hungarian translator appears to introduce Lipsius' text with a reference to a version of patriotism that the latter is known to have repudiated. Lipsius, the standard modern interpretation goes, promoted at a time of civil and religious strife total disengagement and detachment from feelings that might engage one in the wars, central among which

¹ János Laskai, who probably became acquainted with Lipsius' work during his studies at Leiden, was the secretary of István Bethlen, best known for his translations from Lipsius. On his life in general see Márton Tarnóc's introduction to the modern edition of these translations: Márton Tarnóc, ed., *Laskai János válogatott művei. Magyar Justus Lipsius* [Selected works of János Laskai: Hungarian Justus Lipsius] Régi Magyar Próza Emlékek 2 (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1970).

² János Laskai, *Justus Lipsiusnak a polgári társaságnak tudományáról írt hat könyvei*, trs. of Justus Lipsius, *Politicorum sive civilis doctrinae libri sex* (Bártfa, 1641). Here quoted from p. 162 of the modern edition: *Laskai János válogatott művei*, 157–413. I shall return later to the choice of word "patriotism" in rendering the above quotation, instead of the more common "love of country."

was patriotism. Patriotism, Maurizio Viroli showed, “based on vain-glorious dissimulation (*malitiosa simulatio*), misplaced compassion (*pietas*), commiseration (*miseratio*), three affections equally pernicious to constancy,”³ was according to Lipsius to be avoided as belonging among the false opinions and false evils causing unnecessary distress. He also refuted the parental image that was customarily used to connect love of God and country, dedicating in *De Constantia* several pages to separating patriotism from piety. Piety was the honor and love of God, owed only to Him, whereas patriotism was *amor privatus*, stemming from personal interest, one’s love for one’s possessions, and fear of personal loss:

For most of us are concern’d in Publick Calamities; whether it is that they rush upon us with an impetuous vehemence: Or as it were in a form’d Battalia do overwhelm the Opposer, or rather that they flatter us with a kind of Ambition, that keeps us ignorant and insensible, that through them a sickness is bred in our Minds. For whoever he is that bows under a private Grief, he must of necessity acknowledge his vice and weakness; although he amend it not, for what excuse hath he? But he who falls under this other; so farr is he many times from the acknowledgement of his fall and fault, that he often makes it his boast, and esteems it a praise-worthy thing. For it is styl’d Piety and Commiseration, and there wants but little; that this publick Feaver is not consecrated not only amongst the Virtues; but the very Deities themselves.⁴

³ Maurizio Viroli, *For Love of Country: An Essay on Patriotism and Nationalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 45. See also Richard Tuck, *Philosophy and Government 1572–1651* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 52–53.

⁴ Justus Lipsius, *A Discourse of Constancy in Two Books Chiefly Containing Consolations Against Publick Evils... translated into English by Nathaniel Wanley* (London: James Allestry, 1670.) Laskai’s version of the passage reads: “Mert a közönséges romlásokon sokan igen szánakoznak miközülünk: avagy azért, hogy azok ugyan rohanva és háborogva túlulnak, és mintegy fegyveres seregek borítják azt, aki ellenek áll: avagy inkább azért, hogy néminemű hízelkedéssel kelletik magokat, és a mi szíveinkben azokból származott keserűséget gyakorta eszünkbe sem vesszük, meg sem érezzük. Imé, aki az maga bánatja miatt ellankadott, szükséges, hogy azt ömagában véteknék és erőtelenségnek lenni megvallja, ha szintén meg nem jobbítja is, mert; mivel men-tegetheti attúl magát? De aki közönséges veszedelmek alatt hanyatlik meg, gyakorta annyira nem vallja azt meg véteknék és esetnek lenni, hogy találkozik, aki kérkedik inkább avval és dicséret gyanánt tartja. Mert azt kegyességnek és könyörületességnek nevezik: és micsoda híja vagyon, hogy e közönséges vétek a jóságos cselekedetek, sőt a szentek közé nem számláltatik?” Laskai János, *Justus Lipsiusnak az állhatatosságról irt két könyve*, trs. of Justus Lipsius, *De constantia libri duo* (Debrecen, 1641), here quoted from 556 of the modern edition: *Laskai János válogatott művei*.

Thus, in the dedication Laskai reinscribed into Lipsius a meaning of patriotism that appears opposite to what Lipsius had in mind. And indeed, it is hard to read Chapter 11 of Book One of *Constancy* as anything but a repudiation of the idea referred to there by Laskai: that God and the *patria* are due the same kind of loyalty and love.

There is, however, another meaning of patriotism given by Laskai in the same few sentences: patriotism defined as constant and industrious striving for the good of the country, a definition of patriotism that was also current in the mid-seventeenth century, and indeed which relied on central concepts in Lipsius' work.

Laskai's translation came out in 1641, at a time when Lipsian neo-Stoicism had already enjoyed a wide reception in Hungary⁵ and had impacted on the very definition of patriotism. It thus recorded rather than defined the characteristics of Hungarian Lipsianism. Laskai's dedication mixed two languages of patriotism in use in the period. One was what we shall call pious patriotism, equating duties toward God, religion and country. The other was neo-Stoic patriotism, which was not a contradiction in terms in this period. Neo-Stoic authors took up the Lipsian challenge to patriotism based on piety and redefined its content based on other neo-Stoic virtues, namely, constancy and industriousness. János Pataki Füsüs for example, author of the first political treatise in the Hungarian vernacular, a mirror of princes dedicated to Prince Gábor Bethlen of Transylvania, defined a ruler's patriotism as constant and industrious striving to promote the welfare of his subjects, quoting Seneca: "Omnium domos illius vigilia defendat, omnium otium illius labor, omnium delicias illius industria, omnium vacationem illius occupatio,"⁶ and using the same term as Laskai ("serénység") to render the word *industria* (industriousness).⁷

⁵ For an overview see Tibor Wittmann, "A magyarországi államelméleti tudományosság XVII. század eleji alapvetésének németalföldi forrásaihoz. J. Lipsius" [On the Dutch sources of the early 17th century foundations of state theory in Hungary. J. Lipsius], *Filológiai Közöny* 3 (1957): 1, 53–66; Balázs Trencsényi, "Conceptualizing Statehood and Nationhood: The Hungarian Reception of 'Reason of State' and the Political Language of National Identity in the Early Modern Period," *East Central Europe* 29 (2002): 1–2, 4–5; Nicolette Mout, "Die politische Theorie der Bildung der Eliten: Die Lipsius-Rezeption in Böhmen und in Ungarn," in Joachim Bahlcke et al., eds., *Ständefreiheit und Staatsgestaltung in Ostmitteleuropa* (Leipzig: Univeritätsverlag, 1996), 243–264.

⁶ János Pataki Füsüs, *Királyoknak tüköre* [Mirror of kings] (Bártfa, 1626), 108.

⁷ Pataki Füsüs, *Királyoknak tüköre*, 108; cf. Laskai, *Justus Lipsiusnak a polgári társaságnak tudományáról*, 162.

It is these versions of patriotic discourses, the ones we shall term pious and neo-Stoic, that this paper is concerned with, along with the moves performed by the latter when re-grounding patriotism in neo-Stoic rather than religious virtues. Before discussing these, however, some terminological remarks are necessary, in order to explain the use of the term “patriotism” rather than “love of country” in rendering Laskai’s remarks.

The conceptualization of patria

In Hungarian there is a difference between the term for the country as a territorial unit (“ország,” as in “Magyarország,”—Hungary) and the term for “*patria*” (“haza”). The term for *patria* was originally used, as in other languages, to denote the place of origin, its stem also having the related meaning of “house.” The territorial reference of the Hungarian term widened to coincide with that of the country in sixteenth century renaissance humanism.⁸ At the end of the century, this use of the term became more widely used, for example in popular religious works and schoolbooks. Here a significant contribution can be credited to Albert Molnár,⁹ a central figure in the circles of Hungarian *literati* at home and abroad, both in his personal role in promoting the Heidelberg peregrination, and in the linguistic and religious works he wrote or edited.¹⁰

One could argue that the difference between the two terms was territorial, with the term for country referring to the different territorial units that came into being on the ruins of the medieval kingdom, and the term for *patria* referring to the whole. The case has indeed been made by Katalin Péter, who argued that throughout the early modern

⁸ The Renaissance poet Bálint Balassi, for example, used it as synonymous with Hungary (“Ó én édes hazám, te jó Magyarország”) [Oh my sweet homeland, you good Hungary], with the emotional overtones known from Petrarch.

⁹ See Gábor Tolnai and Judit Vásárhelyi, eds., *Szenci Molnár Albert válogatott művei* [The collected works of Albert Szenci Molnár] (Budapest: Magvető, 1976), preface by Gábor Tolnai, 18–21.

¹⁰ Molnár’s *oeuvre* includes a re-issue of the first full translation of the Bible into Hungarian (Hanau, 1608), a translation of the Geneva psalter (Herborn, 1607) and a Latin-Hungarian dictionary (Nürnberg, 1604). On his life and work in general see Judit Vásárhelyi, *Eszmei áramlatok és politika Szenci Molnár Albert életművében* [Currents of ideas and politics in the oeuvre of Albert Szenci Molnár] (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1985).

period, despite the dismemberment of the medieval state, there existed a consciousness of a common nation and common *patria*.¹¹ Although there were instances when the two terms were indeed used with different territorial references, there were also numerous occasions when the two terms, the one for country and the one for *patria*, were used together, as if interchangeably. György Szepesi Korotz, for example, when translating the phrase “maiolem ortus tui partem patria vendicat” from King James VI and I’s *Basilikon Doron*,¹² used the two terms synonymously, together to render the meaning of “patria”: “nagyobb részét az te életödnek az te hazád, és országod magának tulajdonítja.”¹³

The difference between the two terms was (and in present-day usage still is) normative rather than territorial. As with the Italian renaissance humanists, the Hungarian term for “patria” set ethical and emotional standards, expressed by a patriotic discourse with ethical and pathetic loci. “Love of country” as patriotism can only be formulated using the second term, “haza,” and the choice of the term carries emotional overtones, as expressed by obligatory epithets like “sweet,”¹⁴ as well as the prescribed proper behaviour. The true patriot, wrote Márton Szepesi Csombor in his introduction to a book of manners dedicated to a young nobleman, loved his country with his heart, not with words, and would willingly die for it if this would serve the *patria*.¹⁵ It was nature itself, Csombor added, that required one to be loyal to one’s *patria*, a duty the failing of which would lead to perdition of the soul.¹⁶ This was the version of patriotism attacked by Lipsius

¹¹ Katalin Péter, “A haza és a nemzet az ország három részre szakadt állapotára” [The fatherland and the nation in the time of Tripartite Hungary], in idem, *Papok és nemesek. Magyar művelődéstörténeti tanulmányok a reformációval kezdődő másfél évszázadból* [Priests and noblemen. Studies on the cultural history of Hungary during the one and a half century starting with the Reformation] (Budapest: Ráday Gyűjtemény, 1995), 211–233.

¹² King James VI and I, *Basilikon doron, siue Regia institutio ad Henricum principem primogenitum filium suum, & hæredem proximum* (London: Norton, 1604), 114.

¹³ György Szepesi Korotz, trs., *Basilikon Doron* (Oppenheim: Galler, 1612), 125 (my emphases).

¹⁴ See note 8 above.

¹⁵ Márton Szepesi Csombor, *Udvári schola* [Courtly schooling] (Bártfa, 1623), here quoted from p. 192 of the modern edition: Iván Kovács Sándor and Péter Kulcsár, eds., *Szepesi Csombor Márton összes művei*. Régi Magyar Próza Emlékek 1. (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1968), 115–291.

¹⁶ “mindazonáltal az természet dictálja, hogy hüttel kötelesek vagyunk az mi házáknak, mely ellen veténi kárhozatos dologh”, *ibid.*, 162.

for positing patriotism as a natural feeling viewed as coextensive with religious duties.

Coupling the defense of country and religion was nothing new. Representing the fight against the Ottomans as a fight for both country and Christianity had in itself a long tradition, crystallized in the topos of *querela Hungariae*, widely spread both in Hungarian and German *Türkenliteratur*. Here the allegorized Hungary was represented as appealing to her German sister and warning the latter that if they did not overcome their internal discord, they would meet the sad fate of war-torn Hungary.¹⁷ This rhetoric then took on denominational overtones when a pamphlet using the same topos as a title turned the traditional anti-Ottoman arguments against the Catholic clergy, representing them as the cause of all the ills of the country, including the losses to the Ottomans, and of the plight of the true evangelical religion.¹⁸ The pamphlet was an enumeration of Protestant grievances presented as the suffering of the whole country at the hands of the Catholic clergy and the foreign oppressors behind them. It used a violent language and was meant to legitimate the first intervention of Gábor Bethlen, prince of Transylvania (1613–1629), in Upper Hungary.

The strong coupling of the cause of religion with that of country was reinforced by the propaganda around Gábor Bethlen and his military campaigns in Upper Hungary. The elements of this literature were eloquently summarized in the preface to a pamphlet against anti-trinitarianism addressed to Bethlen and serving his princely representation.¹⁹ There are two main virtues of a man, the argument went: to serve God and to defend the country. Two motivations drove one to pursue these virtues: piety and love. Piety towards God and love of country were so powerful that they drove men to sacrifice their lives rather than accept offences against the worship of God or threats to the country. Pious and patriotic men knew that free worship and peace

¹⁷ The monographic treatment of this literature is Mihály Imre, “Magyarország panasza.” *A Querela Hungariae toposz a XVI–XVII. század irodalmában* [“The Complaint of Hungary”. The *Querela Hungariae* topos in 16th–17th century literature] (Debrecen: Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó, 1995).

¹⁸ *Querela Hungariae* (Kassa, 1619), traditionally attributed to Péter Alvinczi, here quoted from p. 166 of the modern edition: Márton Tarnóc, ed., *Magyar gondolkodók 17. század*. [17th century Hungarian thinkers.] (Budapest: Szépirodalmi, 1979), 165–185.

¹⁹ István Melotai Nyilas, *Speculum Trinitatis* (Debrecen, 1622) (Modern edition of the introduction: László Makkai, ed., *Bethlen Gábor emlékezete* [The Memory of Gábor Bethlen] (Budapest: Európa, 1980), 593–611.

drew onto the country all spiritual and material blessings of God. Piety was owed both to God and country, and both were to be loved as parents. This argument again strongly connected the cause of religion and that of the country: threats to the former were represented as threats to the welfare of the latter, hence patriotic men by definition also needed to be defenders of religious worship. The purpose of the whole argument was to show that Prince Bethlen conformed to these norms, as he had proven by his intervention into Hungary in defense of country and religion.

The fate and the faith of the country were thus coupled at a time of religious strife. Political actors legitimated their actions in terms of religious grievances and as a fight for religious freedom. Before Bethlen, Transylvanian prince István Bocskai (1605–1606), who had also led an anti-Habsburg insurrection, remembered in his will—probably drafted by Péter Alvinczi—that he had been joined in his fight by the estates of Hungary “for the restoration of their ancient freedoms and religion.”²⁰ In his letters to the Hungarian estates aimed at enlisting them behind his cause, Bethlen too appealed to their love of country along with their love of God and the necessity to restore political and religious freedom.²¹ Ecclesiastic figures like Alvinczi of course also tried to cast political actors as much as possible in the pose of defenders of (their) religion in order to enlist them to their agenda, formulating the promotion of religion as a central marker of loyalty to one’s country.

Catholic counter-propaganda spoke the same language. Tamás Balásfi, engaged in a veritable pamphlet-war with Alvinczi, cast himself as a patriot (defined as “a true Hungarian”) and argued that all Bethlen’s supporters, from aristocrats to free cities and private soldiers, were betraying God, the country and the nation. Serving his Ottoman masters, he argued, Bethlen had forced his supporters to act against their better judgement as well as against the calls made upon them by their God, country and people.²²

²⁰ István Bocskai, *Testamentomi rendelése* [Last will and testament] (1606), here quoted from p. 11 of the modern edition: Tarnóc, ed., *Magyar gondolkodók*, 9–22.

²¹ E.g. to György Széchi, September 2, 1619; to György Rákóczi, September 5, 1619; to Imre Thurzó, September 12, 1619. Reprinted in Sándor Szilágyi, ed., *Bethlen Gábor fejedelem kiadatlan politikai levelei* [The unpublished political letters of Prince Gábor Bethlen] (Budapest: MTA, 1887).

²² “Akármit paranchollyon akárkinek-is, à vagy Istene, à vagy Hazája, à vagy Nemzete, s ha maga-ellen vagyon-is; azt kéuánnya, hogy a’ néki valo kötelességből,

The coupling of the cause of country and religion went deeper than the traditional defense of religious freedom as a political right of the estates. The requirement of loyalty to one's country came to be expressed by a patriotic discourse which used the religious terminology of faithfulness, imbuing the conceptual field of patriotism with meanings taken from that of faith- and truthfulness.

Márton Csombor, for example, described the loyalty owed to one's *patria* with a term that could mean allegiance, but also religious faith: "hüt" ("hüttel kötelesek vagyunk az mi házáknak," "it is our duty to be faithful to our *patria*"). "Hüt" appears as the equivalent of Latin "fides" in Molnár's contemporary dictionary.²³ The term's religious connotations are shown by the fact that it was also used as the root in rendering "sacrosanctus," as well as "impius" and "infidelis," the derived privative forms being synonymous with terms for "faithless" and "Godless."²⁴ That this is not a simple case of incidental homonymy is shown by the fact that the consequences of faithlessness in the sense of failing in one's duties towards the *patria* was, according to Csombor, perdition.²⁵ In the dedication to his Hungarian translation of King James VI and I's *Basilikon Doron*, György Korotz referred to the ideal ruler as "the prince striving to preserve his country, faithfully and truly discharging his office,"²⁶ using the same terminology as Csombor when describing the pious and true ministers to be promoted,²⁷ and faithful and true servants to be chosen.²⁸ As is most obvious in this latter example, this language of truthfulness and faithfulness was strongly biblical, one of the key references being Psalm 101: "Mine eyes shall

mint azokat megchielekedgie; à mint ez rakua mindennapi példákkal." Tamás Balásfi, *Magyar orszagnak mostani állapotjáról egy hazájaszereteo igaz magyar embernek tanachlása* [Advice pertaining to the present situation of the country, by a true Hungarian man loving his fatherland] (Vienna, 1621), 37–38.

²³ Albert Szenci Molnár, *Dictionarium Latinoungaricum* (Nürnberg, 1604).

²⁴ "sacrosanctus: hütös, szentséges"; "impius: Istentelen, hitötlen"; "infidelis: nem hiv, hütetlen," Ibid.

²⁵ See the quotation in note 15. The term for perdition in the quotation is "kárhozat."

²⁶ "az hű és igaz tisztiben eljáró, s hazája megmaradására törekvő fejedelem..." Korotz, tr., *Basilikon Doron*, Dedication.

²⁷ "Az jámbor szelíd erkölcsű és tudós egyházi embereket, az anyaszentegyházban híven munkálkodó szolgálát igen szeressed," *ibid.*, 84–85.

²⁸ "az hű igaz, és mind tekintetre, s mind pedig böcsületre méltó szolgálát válasszad magad mellé." *Ibid.*, 136.

be upon the faithful of the land, that they may dwell with me: he that walketh in a perfect way, he shall serve me.”²⁹

The language of patriotism³⁰ thus connected loyalty to the *patria*, political legitimacy and religious piety by transferring the terminology of religious piety to the formulation and forms of loyalty to one’s country, owed by both subjects and rulers. It is this version of patriotism, imbued with the religious semantic field of piety and faith, that we have referred to in the introduction as pious patriotism.

The transfer of the terminology of religious faithfulness to loyalty to one’s country had several implications. As “true piety” meant for authors their own denomination, this denominational discourse of patriotism could be used to give legitimacy to—and deny the legitimacy of—political actors on such bases. According to Balásfi for example, Bethlen’s supporters, from aristocrats to free cities and private soldiers, were simultaneously betraying God, the country and the nation. Conversely, the author(s) of the pamphlet *Querela Hungariae* described the actions of the Catholic clergy and the Habsburgs as the works of Satan.³¹ Political differences, or differences in views regarding the good of the country and the people, became differences between true and false views, one leading to salvation, the other to damnation both in this world and the afterlife—hence Csombor’s reference to perdition as the consequence of betraying one’s country.

²⁹ Psalm 101:6. Molnár’s translation, reprinted as a paratextual element of the Hungarian *Basilikon Doron*, reads “Az én szemeim azokra nézzenek, /Az kik ez országban igazán élnek, / Nálam ezek lakjanak, s hű szolgák / Szolgáljanak.”

³⁰ Our references to patriotism as a language presuppose an understanding of political languages in the vein of the following definition taken from the later work of J. G. A. Pocock: “We will chiefly be concerned with idioms or modes of speech, existing within a given vernacular. Those languages will vary in the degree of their autonomy and stability. From ‘idioms’ they shade off in the direction of ‘styles’ and towards a point where the distinction drawn here between *langue* and *parole* may be lost; but we are typically in search of modes of discourse stable enough to be available for the use of more than one discussant and to present the character of games defined by a structure of rules for more than one player.” J. G. A. Pocock, “The State of the Art,” in *Virtue, Commerce and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 7.

³¹ *Querela Hungariae*, 166. On apocalyptic expectations and identification of the pope or the Habsburgs with the Antichrist see in general Graeme Murdock, *Calvinism on the Frontier 1600–1660: International Calvinism and the Reformed Church in Hungary and Transylvania* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 266–67.

Competing understandings of patriotic allegiance

Pious patriotism was an idiom in which duties towards one's *patria* were of the same nature as duties owed to God. Behind the linguistic manifestations of this mode of thinking stood the argument that loyalty owed to God, to one's religion and to one's country were essentially of the same nature, with differences in views and political stances being differences between faith and faithlessness, or between beliefs true and false, right and wrong.

It was this version of patriotism that Laskai was referring to when affirming that "the two are inextricably connected: religion and *patria*. Holy is the *patria*, holy is religion, and the virtuous equally die for both."³² Lipsius' Hungarian translator, who translated both his *Politica* and *De Constantia*, was thus apparently inscribing into the paratext of one of Lipsius' books praise for an affection strongly attacked by the author he was translating. Patriotism understood as zealous love of country, equalling the love of God and religious fervor, was the version of patriotism that Lipsius mounted his strongest attack on, as he contemplated the pain and suffering brought about by wars waged in the name of pious patriotism:

Notwithstanding it falls out well, that this Affection doth so readily present it self and advance before its colours, which I had before determin'd to charge and to overthrow with some light endeavour. But in the first place I must seize upon as spoil that very beautiful Garment wherewith it hath unhappily attyr'd it self: For this Love unto our Country is commonly call'd Piety; which for my part as I do not understand, so neither am I able to endure. For how comes it to be Piety? Which I acknowledge to be an excellent Virtue, and properly nothing else but a lawful, due, honour and love to god, and our parents. With what Fore-head now doth our Country seat it self in the midst of these? Because say they it is that which is our most Ancient and Reverend Parent. Ah silly Souls! And herein injurious not only to Reason but also unto Nature it self. Is that a Parent? Upon what account, or in what respect?³³

Was Lipsius' Hungarian translator simply misunderstanding, or maybe consciously misappropriating Lipsius? Although all translations are necessarily appropriations, with meanings and uses deriving from the new contexts texts are understood in and the new uses they are put

³² Laskai, *Justus Lipsiusnak a polgári társaságnak tudományáról*, 161.

³³ Lipsius, *A Discourse of Constancy*, 55–56.

to,³⁴ the case of Lipsius' Hungarian reception is more complicated, and may affect the modern interpretation of Lipsius himself.

In the same passage referred to above, Laskai also defined patriotism with reference to two central concepts of Lipsian neo-Stoicism, constancy and industriousness: "Holy striving is judged even by God to equal action, especially if constancy in one's religion and diligent industriousness affect patriotism."³⁵ Laskai was mixing two languages of patriotism: the pious, connecting religion and patriotism, and the neo-Stoic, defining patriotism in terms of constancy, industry and necessity.

Despite his attack on pious patriotism, Lipsius still offered linguistic and conceptual tools for formulating a normative version of patriotism. Lipsius' Hungarian readers could thus turn to him to formulate an alternative version of patriotism, one that could be opposed to the pious one, but which still had the normative force of the ancients' love of country, summarized by Lipsius himself as follows:

Now that Community doth express (as it were) a kind of forme and face of a new State, which we call a Common-wealth, and the same thing (properly) our Country. In which when Men did understand how much of moment there was in reference to the safety of every particular Person, there were then also Lawes made concerning the improvement and defence of it, or at least a Custome derived from our Ancestours, which hath the force of a Law. Hence it comes to pass, that we rejoyce in its advantages, and grieve in its Calamities: Forasmuch as in very deed our private substance is safe, in the safety of it, and perishes in the devastations of it. Hence is charity or Love towards it, which our Ancestours (upon the account of the publick good, whereunto also a certain secret providence of God doth attract us) have encreased, while they endeavour'd in every of their words and deeds to advance the Majesty of their Country.³⁶

Lipsius' main point in the chapter he dedicated to patriotism was that patriotism needed to be separated from piety. Love of country, the argument went, was not a natural affection implanted into us by God,

³⁴ "For translation in history is not primarily an instance of inter-cultural communication, aiming to penetrate the Other in its fullness and make it intelligible in its otherness, but a communicative act whose purposes are predominantly intra-cultural and consist in supporting domestic agendas to which the translated text seems instrumental." László Kontler, "Translation and Comparison: Early-Modern and Current Perspectives," *Contributions to the History of Concepts* 3 (2007), 98.

³⁵ Laskai, *Justus Lipsiusnak a polgári társaságnak tudományáról*, 161.

³⁶ Lipsius, *A Discourse of Constancy*, 60–61.

but an understanding that one's fortunes were connected with that of one's country. Thus he opposed to the conception of natural patriotism "the republican conception of *patria* as a political community and a way of life."³⁷ He refuted the parental image that was customarily used to connect love of God and country, but added that good men were good citizens who defended their country as long as such fight had a prospect of success:

Oh how happy (according to your determination in these matters) are those Wood-men and Rusticks, whose Native soile is ever in its flourish, and almost beyond all the hazzards of Calamity or Ruine! But certainly that is not our Country; No, but (as I said before) some one State, and as it were a common Ship under one Lord, or under one Law; Which if you will have (of right) to be beloved by its Natives; I shall confess it: If to be defended I shall acknowledge it, If death to be undergone for its sake, I shall not be against it; but shall never yield to that that we should also grieve, be cast down, lament,

If once our Country for it cry
'Tis sweet and glorious then to dye.

Said the Poet of *Venusia* with the loud applause of the whole Theatre; but then he said to dye, not to weep. For we ought so to be good Citizens, as that we may also be good Men; which we cease to be, as oft as we decline to the ejulations and laments of Children or Women.³⁸

Lipsius' main move in *De Constantia* with regard to patriotism was thus not "altogether to erase it, but to temper and moderate it."³⁹ "Tempering" patriotism was, in its turn, a linguistic action: he set out to redefine patriotism by giving it a new name and definition, to deny it the name of "piety"⁴⁰ and force it "to be contented with the honest name of Charity."⁴¹ The Latin terms used in this redescription were *pietas* and *caritas*, while the action undertaken was described by the terms *emendare*, *temperare*, *circumcisio*.⁴² Laskai in his translation opposed the terms *kegyesség*, a customary choice for "piety," to *szeretet*,⁴³ the Hungarian term for love, used in contemporary as well as in present-day Hungarian to express the affection implied by love

³⁷ Viroli, *For Love of Country*, 47.

³⁸ Lipsius, *A Discourse of Constancy*, 63–64.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 38.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 58.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 59.

⁴² Justus Lipsius, *De constantia libri duo* (Oxford: William Hall, 1663), 34.

⁴³ Laskai, *Justus Lipsiusnak az állhatatosságról*, 88.

of country (“hazaszeretet”; Laskai has “hazának szereteti”).⁴⁴ Thus, the terminology and argumentation of the Hungarian translation of *De Constantia* was consistent with that of the Latin text, and even with Nathaniel Wanley’s 1670 English one.

The discussion of patriotism in *De Constantia* comes under the discussion of the false ills men experience which deter them from the exercise of constancy. In allowing for the fact that customs—which had the force of law—required people to love and defend their country, defined as their common possessions (including the land) and political organization, Lipsius was moving from a definition of love of country as a natural given to one stemming from custom and interest. The difference impacted the way the individual was supposed to experience troubled times rather than the way he or she was to act publicly. As concerns the latter, customs, law and one’s own good still required individuals to defend their country. The aim was not to renounce love of country or the classical requirement to die for it; the point was to refrain from grieving and lamenting for it, in favour of personal constancy and steadfastness.⁴⁵

Laskai’s commendation of patriotism in his introduction to Lipsius’ *Politica* as constant and industrious striving to support one’s country was thus a possible reading of Lipsius’ discussion of patriotism, since, as we have seen, that discussion was not meant to repudiate, but to “temper and moderate” it, to give it its “true” designation and content, a content quite in line with that given to it by Laskai. Laskai’s identification of patriotism with constancy and industriousness was also characteristic of Hungarian neo-Stoicism. True, this literature was sometimes silent about patriotism. The letter of István Vetéssi on the art of governing, for example, while explicitly following Lipsius’ taxonomy of virtues and vices, did not discuss patriotism.⁴⁶ At other times, Lipsius was turned to for eloquent descriptions of war-torn countries.

⁴⁴ See the quotation in note 2.

⁴⁵ Gerhard Oestreich’s careful reconstruction of Lipsius’ arguments allows that Lang “admits, as a man and a citizen, to love of country, but he is always concerned to moderate it,” and goes on to point out that the *patria*, redefined as “a common ship under one king and one law . . . must be loved and defended by its citizens.” See Gerhard Oestreich, *Neostoicism and the Early Modern State*, trs. David McLintock (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 20–21.

⁴⁶ István Vetéssi, *Levél az uralkodás művészetéről I. Rákóczi György fejedelemhez* [Letter to Prince György Rákóczi I on the art of governing], (1631) (Modern edition: Tarnóc, ed., *Magyar gondolkodók*, 120–132.)

Lipsius argued that identification with the troubles of the country stemmed from fear of, and was itself the cause of personal grief. He offered as a solution constancy, patience, steadfastness—solutions aimed at the individual and intended to help him survive troubled times. That the state of the *patria* was grievous and a cause for great personal grief was also a commonplace in Hungary throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and the parallelism was seen as contributing to Lipsius' relevance:

Let us place Lipsius into Hungary... I do not think he could have better fitted his book to us if he had spent most of his time in this patria. Of all nations of this wide world, which is in more need of constancy than the Hungarian nation? But for fragmented people oppressed and deprived of all political organization, I would be lying if I said there was any more miserable than the Hungarian nation. Her old name and fame, her much feared military valor, her dignified freedom is all but a memory, its reality passed away.⁴⁷

The downfall of the medieval kingdom and the lack of progress against the Ottomans led other authors, too, to lament the degenerate present and to view past heroism with nostalgia. At the beginning of the seventeenth century, the neo-Stoic poetry of János Rimay had reacted by focusing on the private virtues of the individual, which were meant to strengthen him in the face of calamities. Patriotism is touched upon in this poetry in nostalgic recollections of heroic defenses of the country in the previous century. The main attribute of this *patria*, lost in fights and remembered with grief, is freedom.⁴⁸

A parallel move was the redefinition of virtue itself. In János Pataki Füsüs' mirror of princes, virtue was no longer defined as the traditional military bravery of the nobility. On the one hand, he wrote, peasants made the best soldiers. On the other hand, military virtues were defined as exhibiting prudence, wisdom, constancy or piety in different situations, qualities that defined in different applications civil virtues as well. This shift of emphasis from the military to the civil, and sometimes the private and the spiritual is generally described as a devaluation of the former, stemming from disappointment with the military situation in the country, and manifested in neo-Stoic with-

⁴⁷ Laskai, *Justus Lipsiusnak az állhatatosságról*, Introduction, 70.

⁴⁸ E.g. János Rimay, *Kiben kesereg a magyar nemzetnek romlásán s fogyásán* [In which he laments the decay and decrease of the Hungarian nation], in *Összes művei* [Collected works], ed. Sándor Eckhardt (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1955), 83–84.

drawal from an active to a passive life.⁴⁹ A somewhat divergent account described the devaluation of *heroica virtus* as giving over to legitimating private gain.⁵⁰ Both arguments connect the loss of pre-eminence of military virtue to the loss of legitimacy of all kinds of political action aimed at the public good.

Füsüs' discussion of military virtues in terms that made them similar to civil ones, and the general shift of emphasis towards civil virtues and duties, however, cannot be understood in the above oppositions between public and private, politically active or passive. The idea of hereditary nobility possessing military virtue was being undermined with reference to Petrarchan "true nobility,"⁵¹ and the civil virtues that took over predominance were neither passive nor private. Innocence, temperance, affability, prudent eloquence, fidelity, clemency were virtues actively pursued, with the aim of promoting the common good.⁵²

Füsüs' mirror of princes discussed patriotism in terms of the princely virtue of industry. Exercising industry was a manifestation of the ruler's patriotism, and meant that the prince was to constantly guard over the peace and the preservation of the country, as well as the subject's property and everyday endeavors, even idle ones.⁵³ For a work framed by paratextual elements as serving the aims of the

⁴⁹ E.g. István Bitskey, "A vitézség eszményének változatai a régi magyar irodalomban" [Variations of the ideal of military valor in Old Hungarian literature] in idem, *Virtus és religio* [Virtue and religion] (Miskolc: Felsőmagyarország Kiadó, 1994), 114–132.

⁵⁰ László Szilasi, "Argumenta mortis. (Érvek és ellenérvek a hősi halálra: becsület és méltóság a régi magyar elbeszélő költészetben és emlékiratokban)" [Argumenta mortis. Arguments and counter-arguments for heroic death: honesty and dignity in old Hungarian epic poetry and memoirs], *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 101 (1997) 3–4: 217–234.

⁵¹ "Helyesen mondja tehát Petrarca: Verus nobilis non nascitur, sed fit. Igaz nőmös ember nem születteik, hanem leszen. Illetlen azért az ki ő magát azzal magasztalja, hogy ő megh az Anya hasábanis nőmös ember volt. Senki semmit onnan nem hozhat, hanem csak kárhozatot és romlott természetet (...) Nem illetlenül szól azért az keresztyén Poéta: Nobilitas vera est, virtus quam vivida nutrit. Az igaz nőmössegh az, mellyet az élő iosagos czelekedetek táplálnak." Füsüs, *Királyoknak tüköre*, 27.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 3, 139, 253.

⁵³ "az királynak valamely dologhnak véghez vitelében való serénysége mely nem egyéb, hanem buzgó indulattya, és hazáiához való szereteti, melytől kényszerítettik hogy országának békességiért, és meg maradásáért szorgalmatosan vigyázzon. (...) Az királyoknak vigyázása mindeneknek házokat meg oltalmazza, munkájával mindeneknek tunya hivalkodásokat, szorgalmatosságával mindeneknek gyönyörű kötte-téseket, foglalatosságával mindeneknek henyléseket." Pataki Füsüs, *Királyoknak tüköre*, 108–9.

princely representation of Bethlen,⁵⁴ with the chapter on industry also ending in a praise of the prince for his diligence, this was a toned down presentation of his patriotism indeed. The contexts in which the work used the term for *patria* were very different from the way it was used in legitimizing Bethlen's Hungarian campaigns, where love of country was portrayed as love of truth, freedom and true religion. For example, former Reformed bishop István Melotai, court preacher of Bethlen, described Bethlen's patriotism in denominational and pious terms, presenting the prince's military successes as proofs of his righteousness and the divine sanction of his mission.⁵⁵ With Füsüs, on the other hand, the prince's military successes were proof of his patriotism because they proved his industriousness, defined previously as defense of peace and everyday endeavors. The work did present Bethlen as holding a commission from God to defend true religion—but patriotism was not part of that argument. Religion was only connected to the notion of *patria* in the discussion of piety as belief in the eternal *patria*. Thus Füsüs followed Lipsius in separating religion and piety from patriotism, and defined the latter with reference to the neo-Stoic virtue of industry.

This use of Lipsius was, as we have seen, consistent with Lipsius' discussion of patriotism in *De Constantia*. It kept religious and patriotic duties separate, but maintained the commendation of patriotism as the defense of the public good. The effects of the redefinition were significant for issues much wider than the meaning of patriotism.

Conclusion

The shift from being faithful and “true” to constancy did away with the semantic reference to truth and righteousness, defined in the case of pious patriotism in religious terms, and resulting in denying the patriotism of actors with different beliefs regarding the essence of the truth. It moved from arguing from the ontological structure of the world, or nature, as Lipsius would have had it, to focusing on the

⁵⁴ The printer, for example, suggested that Bethlen embodied all virtues. Jakab Klósz, *Az olvasónak*, dedication to Füsüs, *Királyoknak tüköre*.

⁵⁵ István Melotai Nyilas, *Speculum trinitatis*, (Debrecen, 1622). Modern edition of preface in László Makkai, ed., *Bethlen Gábor emlékezete* (Budapest: Gondolat, 1980), 593–611.

individual's behaviour and its effects within one's power, effects not primarily concerning spiritual salvation, but rather the public good. In neo-Stoicism, the duties of the individual always concerned others. This was true for Rimay⁵⁶ at the beginning of the seventeenth century, but also for Sámuel Kéri, a Franciscan monk and author of a treatise called "The Christian Seneca" in the second half of the century.⁵⁷

This discourse of individual constancy, industriousness and concern for others, including concern for the common good, was again used to give content to an appeal to patriotism in the middle of the century by one of its most prominent defenders, Miklós Zrínyi. In 1660 Zrínyi put forward a passionate argument for militarily defending the *patria* against the Ottomans.⁵⁸ The motto was Horace's classical definition of patriotism, cited above from Lipsius. The form of the argument was ethical and pathetic as with the preacher-polemists in the previous decades, speaking the language of pious patriotism, and even using their apocalyptic imagery. But it was not with regard to God or truth that action needed to be taken. The decisive argument for the defense of the country was "fatal necessity" (*fatalis necessitas*): the heart and will should be hardened by *desperatio*.⁵⁹ The neo-Stoic outlook on the condition of the individual was thus transferred onto the people, leading to the behavior and motivations expected of individuals to be transferred to the level of the community, acting in defense of the *patria*.

Thus the redescription of the notion of patriotism, from an affection similar to the love and honor owed to God and one's parents, and described in a terminology implying faithfulness and truthfulness, to industrious and diligent striving towards the common good achieved in the case of patriotism the articulation of an idea in a language denominationally neutral and widely acceptable. Its being based on secular and denominationally neutral arguments is the feature of neo-Stoicism generally regarded as accountable for its wide popularity in

⁵⁶ See *Az idő ósága nevel magas fákat...* [The antiquity of time grows high trees...], defining virtue with reference to behavior towards others, in Rimay, *Összes művei*.

⁵⁷ Edited in Vienna, 1654. (Modern edition: Tarnóc, ed., *Magyar gondolkodók*, 558–608.

⁵⁸ Miklós Zrínyi, *Az török áfium ellen való orvosság* [Antidote to the Turkish opium] (1660). Modern edition: Tarnóc, ed., *Magyar gondolkodók*, 240–71.

⁵⁹ Zrínyi, *Az török áfium ellen való orvosság*, 243.

Hungary.⁶⁰ If the language of pious patriotism implied an understanding of patriotism as something of an epistemological condition, and thus referred to faith and beliefs when granting and denying loyalty and legitimacy, its neo-Stoic version was centred around the virtues of industry and constancy, and used as its final reference common good and necessity rather than any metaphysical instance. Making reference to Lipsius in such discourses was no misappropriation or misreading: Lipsius' main move when repudiating patriotism as piety and love identical to the one owed to God was to redescribe it as love of country stemming from concern for and interest in the common good. The lamenting and self-righteous rhetoric of pious patriotism he did rebuke, but referred the reader back to classical republican patriotism: Horace "said to dye, not to weep."

⁶⁰ See Trencsényi, "Conceptualizing Statehood and Nationhood," 4; also Sándor Bene, *Theatrum Politicum. Nyilvánosság, közvélemény és irodalom a kora újkorban* [Theatrum Politicum: Public sphere, public opinion and literature in the early modern period] (Debrecen: Kossuth, 1999), 357–63.

CHAPTER TWELVE

ILLYRIA OR WHAT YOU WILL: LUIGI FERDINANDO MARSIGLI'S AND PAVAO RITTER VITEZOVIĆ'S "MAPPING" OF THE BORDERLANDS RECAPTURED FROM THE OTTOMANS

Sándor Bene

What country, friends, is this?¹

"Where there is no illusion there is no Illyria"—thus did Oscar Wilde characterize Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night* in a famous theatrical review,² and he probably had no idea how well he grasped the essence of both early modern Illyrian discourse and modern, romantic Illyrism. In step with the gradual advance of the Ottoman power in the Balkans the one-time Illyria becomes in the early modern era the uncertainly defined homeland of national illusions and imperial hopes: it is a land where nothing and no one is what it seems to be, where notions of the glorious past and day-dreams about political utopias partly or entirely overlap, and reality is hardly distinguishable from the colorful weave of imagination. In the following, I will write about the early 18th-century encounter between two scholars who tried to map the dreams and to probe the boundaries in which the long-ago vanished (or perhaps never existing) virtual *patriae* could become inhabitable in reality—real *patriae* for imagined communities. What makes the encounter and the conversation significant is the special nature of the situation. If a patriotic discourse comes into existence and one of its forms solidifies in a legitimized, accepted way, it is usually the result of a collective negotiating process centered around identity, and apart from creating a "language" in a wider sense (national *topoi*, a sense of origin and ancestry, common symbols), it also establishes its own

¹ *Twelfth Night or What You Will*, Act I, Scene 2.

² Oscar Wilde, "Twelfth Night At Oxford," in Oscar Wilde, *Selected Journalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 59.

institutions or tailors existing borders to the new ideas.³ However, in the times following the peace treaty of Karlowitz (1699) which put an end to the Ottoman wars of the 17th century, the southern borderlands of the Habsburg state can be considered as a fascinating laboratory where elite intellectuals tried to come to an agreement about the frames of the would-be collective discourse: what and who should be the communities that would (perhaps) create their own patriotic discourse, where should they live, what language should they speak.

The protagonists of my case study are Count Luigi Ferdinando Marsigli (1658–1730) and Pavao Ritter Vitezović (1652–1713).⁴ Marsigli, who originated from Bologna, served Leopold I with genuine dedication, both as a soldier and a versatile scholar. From the 1680s onwards he traveled repeatedly across the Ottoman-Hungarian theater of war and served as member of a diplomatic mission in Constantinople. With the aim to finalize the country borders that had been only roughly drafted in the treaty of Karlowitz he toured and surveyed the southern borderlands from Dalmatia to Transylvania between 1699 and 1701 as *commissarius plenipotentarius* of the Habsburg ruler, continuously negotiating with the commissioners of the Ottoman Empire (and for a while, those of the Serenissima). He sent to the Viennese government thirty-six richly illustrated reports of the results of his activities in carrying out diplomatic research⁵—material which he later used for

³ See Hans W. Blom, “Patriots, Contracts and Other Patterns of Trust in a Polyarchic Society: The Dutch 17th Century,” in Robert von Friedeburg, ed., *‘Patria’ und ‘Patrioten’ vor dem Patriotismus: Pflichten, Rechte, Glauben und die Rekonfigurierung europäischer Gemeinwesen im 17. Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2005), 193–213, especially 195–98.

⁴ It is not the task of this study to give a bibliographic summary of the continuously growing literature on Marsigli and Vitezović. The basic works are Raffaella Gherardi, *Potere e costituzione a Vienna fra Sei e Settecento: Il “buon ordine” di Luigi Ferdinando Marsili* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1980); John Stoye, *Marsigli’s Europe 1680–1730: The Life and Times of Luigi Ferdinando Marsigli Soldier and Virtuoso* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994); Vjekoslav Klaić, *Život i djela Pavla Rittera Vitezovića 1652–1713* [Life and Works of Pavao Ritter Vitezović, 1652–1713] (Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1914); Zrinka Blažević, *Vitezovićeva Hrvatska između stvarnosti i utopije* [Vitezović’s Croatia between reality and utopia] (Zagreb: Barbat, 2002). On the collaboration of Marsigli and Vitezović specifically, see Zrinka Blažević, “Croatia on the Triplex Confinium: Two Approaches,” in Drago Roksančić and Nataša Štefanec, eds., *Constructing Border Societies on the Triplex Confinium* (Budapest: CEU Press, 2000), 221–38.

⁵ Luigi Ferdinando Marsili, *Relazioni dei confini della Croazia e della Transilvania (1699–1701)*, I–II, ed. Raffaella Gherardi (Modena: Mucchi Editore, 1986). The written forms ‘Marsili’ and ‘Marsigli’ are both in use; in the main text I use Marsigli, in the references I follow the usage of the sources.

his own scholarly work as well. Already in 1691, upon receipt of the preliminary outline of his monumental work *Danubius Pannonico-Mysicus*,⁶ which described the ethnography, geography and demography of almost the entire Danubian Basin, he was elected a member of the Royal Society in London. After his scandalous and much debated dismissal from the service of the Habsburgs (1704), Marsigli made a serious scientific career. He founded a still functioning scientific institute, the *Istituto delle Scienze*, in his hometown (1714) and a year later he became an associated member of the Royal Academy in Paris (1715). As for Ritter Vitezović, he was born in the town of Senj on the coast of the Adriatic, a descendant of German immigrants from Alsace. Poet, scholar, printer, historian, the unifier of the Croatian literary language, an intellectual of encyclopedic education and knowledge, he advised Marsigli and aided his work for two years as a local consultant commissioned to the committee surveying the borders.

In the traditional view Marsigli is unquestionably the representative of absolutist (mercantilist and centralizing) politics, who saw the future of the Habsburg Empire in a multi-ethnic state led by a supranational bureaucratic, economic and military elite. Being in favor of the rational resettlement of various ethnicities for economical and political reasons, he was hostile to any nationalistic mindset protecting particularist interests. Vitezović, on the other hand, as the most important forerunner of the 19th-century national revival movement, would have built the modern Croatian state on a national community—a community of common origin, speaking the same language and relying on organic tradition. His writings are infused with unmistakable national fervor. At first sight it would seem that two bureaucrat-intellectuals of very different character and different political aims were struggling to reconcile their “internal maps” and their visions pertaining to the future of the area. At the same time, it has long been a dilemma of researchers that if this is indeed so, then what explains the harmonic cooperation between the Habsburg diplomat and the Croatian polyhistor—a cooperation which seems all the deeper and more interdependent, when more extensive and thorough philological inquiries unravel the intertextual connections of the two oeuvres. In recent years, the most

⁶ *Danubius Pannonico-Mysicus observationibus geographicis, astronomicis, hydrographicis, historicis, physicis perlustratus et in sex tomos digestus ab Alysio Ferd. Com. Marsili socio Regiarum Societatum Parisiensis, Londinensis, Monsperliensis* (The Hague and Amsterdam: Grosse, Alberts, De Hondt, 1726).

serious attempt to solve the dilemma is Zrinka Blažević's monograph on Vitezović. Blažević made a convincing argument that the knight of Senj belonged to an elite, reformist group of the contemporary Croatian political community; this group, while kept together by particularist interests, made attempts to realize its modernizing aspirations from above, while negotiating with the Viennese government.⁷ Both his scholarly disposition and his political aims put Vitezović on the side of Marsigli rather than the Croatian "nation." Nevertheless, his national commitment is unquestionable, although the Illyrian/Croatian nation to which he was loyal did not yet exist and remained—like the Habsburg state of Marsigli's dreams—to be created in the future. This discovery is indeed revealing, and it makes it possible to examine the parallels and conflicts between the two scholars and politicians in a new light. However, the *explanation* of the cooperation between Vitezović and Marsigli is far from completed. For this we need to unravel the motivations of the other participant, Marsigli. What was it that made him open to Vitezović's (proto)nationalist arguments—or was he in truth lacking all political or even national fervor?⁸

I believe that this is the point where the history of patriotism can fruitfully contribute to the sensitive (even in terms of today's politics) process of interpretation, as—contrary to the exclusive "absolutist vs. nationalist" antithesis—it provides a common conceptual and methodological framework in which the parallels and clashes of the two protagonists' aspirations can be considered at the same time. Marsigli's loyalty to the Emperor (Leopold I), manifested in the form of an almost religious devotion, can be viewed as a precursor of later "imperial patriotism," while his counterpart's passionate commitment to the ideal Illyrian nation, defined in ethnic-linguistic (cultural) terms, also represents a special, (proto)nationalist kind of "patriotism." In the following I propose first to analyze the Bolognese polyhistor's concept of the fatherland and his relationship to his fatherland(s), and then to attempt to contextualize this relationship by considering his diplomatic

⁷ Blažević, *Vitezovićeva Hrvatska*, 164–74; idem, "Performing National Identity: The Case of Ritter Vitezović (1652–1713)," *National Identities* 5 (2003): 251–67.

⁸ Zlatko Pleše's excellent article has left a number of questions open, especially regarding Marsigli. See Zlatko Pleše, "Bolonjski grof i hrvatski barun: Odnosi Luigija Ferdinanda Marsiglija i Pavla Rittera Vitezovića u utvrđivanju hrvatskih granica" [Bolognese Count and Croatian Baron: The relation of L. F. Marsigli and P. R. Vitezović during the process of confirmation of the Croatian borders], *Croatica Christiana Periodica* 46 (2000): 49–76.

and scholarly cooperation with Vitezović. My thesis is the following: The two types of patriotic discourse were linked by their efforts to quell, or at least overwrite an earlier Illyrian “patriotism,” which lacking a better term I am going to call conservative. This silent (silenced) patriotic discourse was tied to another kind of modernizing notion which, unlike the exclusively future-oriented aspirations, aimed at preserving existing—feudal, ecclesiastical, regional—autonomies and integrating them into a new constitutional system, and which therefore did not define patria in technical-rationalist or cultural-ethnic terms but on a historical and constitutional basis.

Patriae in Heaven and on Earth: The conceptual framework

In order to follow the clashes and interferences of the patriotic discourses in question it is necessary to explain the concepts I will be using to describe the phenomena. A few lines above I used the word “patriotism” in apostrophes in connection with the early 18th century. Indeed, if we consider patriotism—like any other “-isms” in the history of political ideas—to be a characteristic of political modernity, an institutionalized identity discourse comprehensive of the whole spectrum of civic allegiance, then in the space (Central Europe) and the time (the end of the premodern era) examined in this article we can presume the existence of a kind of early patriotism only in the case of certain city states (Ragusa, for instance). Taking realities into account (the area was mostly divided between two multiethnic monarchies, the Habsburg and the Ottoman), it seems more advisable to talk about the hierarchic system of the loyalties exhibited in different locales.⁹ From the configurations of these it was possible for a characteristic

⁹ For a short survey in the history of these concepts, see Mary G. Dietz, “Patriotism: A Brief History of the Term,” in Igor Primoratz, ed., *Patriotism* (Amherst, N.Y.: Humanity Books, 2002), 201–15. The question is what can be used from the extensive theoretical literature on the aspects of patriotism in relation to each early modern sub-period, and in what way. Regarding the sub-period and special aspects discussed in this article, see Michael J. Seidler, “Wer mir gutes thut, den liebe ich”: Pufendorf on Patriotism and Political Loyalty,” in Robert von Friedeburg, ed., *‘Patria’ und ‘Patrioten’ vor dem Patriotismus*, 335–65, esp. 335–37. I find the loose typology explicated below useful in fields where a strict approach based on institutional history yields few results (that is, in the case of the broadest Illyria envisioned by Vitezović, see the section on *Croatia rediviva* below). From the theoretical literature on the subject (especially on the separation of the overlapping concepts of nationalism and patriotism) I

type of patriotic discourse to come into existence, just as we can count with several “Illyrisms” in the Southern Slav context in the mid-17th century. The classic methodology of the history of concepts (*Begriffs-geschichte*) stands almost helpless in front of the semantic confusion which often manifests itself through the use of different national terminologies for Slavs, Slovenians, Illyrians, Croatians or Dalmatians in the texts of the same author. Sometimes these are synonyms, sometimes they express historical continuity, at other times they are in a metonymic relationship to each other; while at different times they are connected to the *natio*, the *populus*, the *gens*, the *civitas*, or the *patria*. Naturally, the usage of these terms is arbitrary, and the authors often call patria what we would call nation today and the other way around. Even the borders of the lands in question are fluid: these can be anything from one town (Šibenik, Ragusa, etc.) to the “Slavic Kingdom” encompassing the Czech, Polish and Russian lands. It is hardly accidental that Marsigli himself calls the Southern Slav / Illyrian world, the historical and constitutional relations of which he wanted orientate himself in, a “labyrinth” or “purgatory.”¹⁰

We can turn chaos into something approaching order if we try to outline the constitutional notions on the form of government that lie behind each line of argument. These were in great part defined by “foreign policy.” It was questionable at the time whether Dalmatia, the Austrian military frontiers¹¹ or, possibly, other territories to be liberated from Ottoman rule could be integrated into the Croatian state; furthermore, the form in which the personal union between the Croatian and the Hungarian kingdoms would maintain its existence was also problematic. Which amounted to raising the question about the borders of the *patria*. Most importantly, would they coincide with the religious and linguistic borders?

have relied especially on the thoughts of Igor Primorac, “Patriotism: Mundane and Ethical,” *Croatian Journal of Philosophy* 4 (2004): 81–98.

¹⁰ “L’uscire una volta di Croazia sarà liberarsi da un purgatorio...”. Marsigli, *Relazioni*, I, 221. “spero di esser uscito fuori di sì confuso labirinto di Croazia,” *ibid.*, 265.

¹¹ On the subject of Croatian military frontiers see Dragutin Pavličević, ed., *Vojna krajina: povijesni pregled, historiografija, rasprave* [The military border: Historical overview, historiography, discussions] (Zagreb: Liber, 1984); more recently Alexander Buczynski, *Gradovi Vojne krajine* [The towns of the military border] (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 1997).

These questions had been open a good 150 years before the encounter of Marsigli and his Croatian colleague, and the possible attempts of solution (the different versions of the patriotic discourse) were rarely formulated as political memoranda or cartographic plans. The image of the future coded into the representation of the past, that is, the political use of history as an indirect “text act,” was much more common. Nonetheless, these historical visions of the future are situated on a much wider spectrum than what can be reviewed through the special questions of the history of political ideas. They deal with customs, language, religion and various myths of origin, and these, while they do not strictly belong to the political discourse systems of the age, have to be regarded as natural components of the sense of *patria* which was in the process of formation. I believe that the most appropriate thing to do in regarding the early modern *patria* is to interpret it widely—at least in the case of “Illyria.” It is not merely a territory, or the community that is metonymically attached to it, but rather every real and virtual place and community where someone can find a home guaranteeing his or her identity. This means a wide range of loyalties that can bind someone to religion (denomination), vernacular language (and the culture it carries), common origin (or at least a common history of the *gens/natio*), state (as a *communitas* regulated by laws, or specifically to one of its components, like the estates or the ruler), and finally a territory (this can be one’s hometown, the current state or a greater unit defined by a wider aspect, religion, for instance). Naturally, the imaginary-utopist versions of these, projected into the future, can be viewed as *patria*—it is not only possible to have a connectedness to existing institutions or “languages” in a patriotic way, but also to those that would be created in the future. An obvious example of this duality is when someone considers as his or her *patria* the religious community and at the same time—optionally leaving behind the mediation of the church—the celestial home, the place of the *visio beatifica* as well: this is, in fact, the primary meaning of *patria* documentable in patristic and scholastic literature.

We must imagine a system of two variables.¹² A fundamental condition for the development of a plausible patriotism-model for the

¹² For the distinction of the object and mode for the earlier period see Robert von Friedeburg, “The Problems of Passions and Love of Fatherland in Protestant Thought: Melancthon to Althusius, 1520s to 1620s,” *Cultural and Social History* 2 (2005), 1: 81–98.

region is that we have to observe the two variables—the mode and object of loyalty—separately, even though in reality they are strongly determined by each other. Already the term loyalty in itself is only compatible with certain ideas of *patria* and not with others. We could also call it obedience or fidelity. After all, we are talking about a certain kind of intention, joining a *communitas* providing a homeland, and identifying oneself as part of this entity. Perhaps it is more fortunate to replace the term “intention” with volition, referring to a theological and emotional background at the same time (*voluntas*); the manifestations of *voluntas* range from instinctive to conscious, from a rational approach concentrating on self-interest to a devotional, cultic attitude. Even if we consider early modern Latin terminology alone, its richness will still show the diversity of conceptualization (*cupido, amor, dilectio, amicitia, fides / fidelitas, oboedentia, obligatio, caritas, pietas* etc. *erga patriam*).

The object the will aims at, the *obiectum voluntatis*, is always a community (“*patria*”) of a certain—cultural, religious, political, etc.—definition. The expression or collision of this definition with other definitions through argumentative, narrative, direct or indirect text acts results in types of patriotic discourse. We can only rarely find clear types: alongside confinement and exclusive speech acts, patriotic discourses also move in the direction of interference (as the communities engaged in the discourse can also have several consciousnesses of *patria*). They can try to integrate each other’s terminology, give a new meaning to a term used in a different discourse, or they can also try to recode a whole rival patriotic language. In this way different configurations, “patterns”, come into existence—these are the forms of discourse that are shaped historically, the imprints of which are preserved by the sources and which can change characteristically from region to region, country to country, and even within one state. (A common case is the “bringing down” of the conceptual category of the *patria coelestis* and the connected modes of attitude connecting the discourse of sanctity to a certain territory or ethnicity—“holy land” and “chosen people” are terms that define and structure the whole discourse of early modern patriotic languages of the area.)

Such a system of two variables, while an ahistoric, *a priori* construct, is suitable to represent the historical movements of the discourses happening within its coordinates precisely because of its ahistoric nature. It is not merely the change of the *patria*’s reference (from religious to political, territorial, linguistic and ethnic communities) that the system

helps us to follow. What is perhaps even more important is the examination of the changes in the history of emotions. The topical question emerged during the theoretic refinement of the power techniques of the *ragion di stato* was: what counted, fear of the ruler, or boosting the love directed towards him? Which method was more appropriate to enhance loyalty to one's sovereign?¹³ Parallel to the separation of sovereignty from the personal status of rulers, patriotic sentiments were also directed towards more abstract subjects; however, their intensity did not diminish, and they could still be subjects of regressive manipulation. On the other hand, the techniques of resistance were also treading on more numerous, though parallel paths. Changing the subject of patriotic sentiments (redirecting allegiance from higher to lower magistrates, from political to ecclesiastical power, from the current sovereign to another sovereign designated by some *ephorus*) was not the only way to get rid of the oppressive power. It seemed that the force of emotional commitment could also be moderated. In this respect, the *De Constantia* of Justus Lipsius, one of the most well-known texts of the early modern era and one received without regard to denominational differences, provided a well thought-out and terminologically well-developed theory.¹⁴ The love of fatherland does not operate with the force of a law of nature but is created by custom and learning—this is why, just like other emotions (*affectus, passio*), it is to be kept under the control of *ratio*. One holds onto it in the sphere of the politicum, it has to be defended *civiliter* while it is possible and worth it, but by no means beyond the line where attachment dissolves the sound judgment of the individual (*iudicium*) and detains one from attaining passion-free wisdom. In such a case one should withdraw into private life and complete political passivity.

Familiarity with the *De Constantia* was part of the basic level of education of the era, and it was not outdated even on the turn of the

¹³ A key point of importance in the reception of the Machiavelli-tradition is Botero's treatise, *Della riputazione del Prencipe*. I have used the following edition: Giovanni Botero, *Relationi universali e La ragione di Stato* (Venice, 1640), 217–29. See also Victoria Kahn, *Machiavellian Rhetoric from the Counter-Reformation to Milton* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 75–84.

¹⁴ See Vol. I, chapters 9–11—printed on pp. 13–18 in the edition which I have used: Justus Lipsius, *De constantia libri duo qui alloquium praecipue continent in publicis malis* (London: Bishop, 1586). See Maurizio Viroli, *For Love of Country: An Essay on Patriotism and Nationalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 45–51; Seidler, *Pufendorf on Patriotism*, 340 (see footnote no. 9).

17th and the 18th century. Marsigli, for example, wanted to include it in the ideal library designed for his Istituto delle Scienze in Bologna,¹⁵ and Vitezović makes emphatic references to it in his apology written on the occasion of his dismissal and political failure.¹⁶ It is a question, though, how much either of them followed at the peak of their careers and political influence the neo-Stoic philosopher's teaching that *caritas in patriam temperanda est*. In the following, I intend to focus on Vitezović's and Marsigli's concepts of patria, relating them to each other and the traditions to be erased or rewritten, and I attempt to reconstruct the patterns of the patriotic discourses in question in the conceptual framework explained above, with a special emphasis on two aspects: the referential community implied by their mode of speech (what are the linguistic, religious, cultural characteristics of the population of the supposedly ideal patria) and the time construction of the argumentation or the historical narration (linear or cyclical, apocalyptic or typological, etc.). Nevertheless, I hope that through all this, even if only indirectly, something will emerge not only regarding their imagined ideal homeland but also about their mode of relating to it: that is, how much they interiorized the theses of *De Constantia*. This latter aspect might be helped by the application of a third aspect (again borrowed from Lipsius): an examination of the stylistic characteristics of the terminology used to describe the *patriae*, and the analysis of the conceptual and metaphorical use of that language.

Scholars on the frontier

The first encounter between the two scholar-politicians came about through official channels. In September 1699, Vice-Ban Stjepan Jelačić replied to Marsigli, who had asked him to provide some historical information, as follows: "In the meantime, we summoned the gentleman Paulus Ritter who also happens to be the Vice-Captain of Lika

¹⁵ Cf. Gherardi, *Potere e costituzione*, 453–54.

¹⁶ Vjekoslav Klaić, *Obrana Pavla Rittera Vitezovica od god. 1710* [P. Ritter Vitezović's apology speech of 1710] (Zagreb: JAZU, 1915), 4, 13. (Special thanks to Zrinka Blažević for this reference.)

and Krbava counties and who made his departure yesterday or today. He will be bringing quite a few documents for your Excellency.”¹⁷

Following their meeting, Vitezović prepared with remarkable speed a memorandum titled *Responsio ad postulata Aloysio Ferdinando Marsilio* which he presented to Marsigli on September 25.¹⁸ Marsigli asked two questions of his expert: the first pertaining to the statehood of Dalmatia, the second to the borders of Croatia. Why these two questions? When feelers were put out preparatory to the peace treaty of Karlowitz in 1690, Marsigli had already noted the doubtful legal status of the “Kingdom of Dalmatia.”¹⁹ At the time the borders were being staked out in the aftermath of the peace treaty, the issue of Dalmatia was already recognized as a delicate one (*delicata materia*), but interestingly not *vis-à-vis* the Turks but *vis-à-vis* the Venetians. The treaty of 1684 which created the Holy Alliance against the Turks gave both the Venetians and the Habsburgs the right to reclaim their old territories and acquire new ones, but on one condition: “The territories captured in war or recaptured lost territories belong to that side which had formerly possessed them.”²⁰ Thus the Serenissima could keep the territories of the Dalmatian Kingdom it conquered by force of arms. The Venetians jumped at the opportunity and greatly enlarged their Dalmatian estates, even going beyond the geographical borders of Dalmatia.²¹ Marsigli’s conclusion was that the Habsburg Empire could not do without access to the sea, and he set about collecting information

¹⁷ Stjepan Jelačić to Marsili, Novi, 14 September 1699. University Library of Bologna, Marsili papers (hereafter referred to as BUB FM, comprising Mss 1–146), Ms 63 (*Lettere ricevute nella divisione de’ Confini della Schiavonia e Croazia*), 141r.

¹⁸ BUB FM, Ms 103, 27r–34r. The text is published in Pavao Ritter Vitezović, *Oživjela Hrvatska*, ed. Josip Bratulić and Zlatko Pleše (Zagreb: Golden marketing, 1997), 187–215. For an analysis of the text see Blažević, *Vitezovićeva Hrvatska*, 85–87.

¹⁹ Marsigli complained in a letter to his Viennese mentor, Chancellor Kinsky, that the borders of all the countries in the region had changed very often in the course of the centuries, that historians had conflicting and often obscure opinions in these matters and documents, and that charters that would settle these uncertainties were hard to come by. See BUB FM, Ms 54 (*Manuscripti diversi*, VI) 701r–709r, a draft in autograph.

²⁰ Jean Dumont, ed., *Corps universel diplomatique du droit des gens* (Amsterdam and The Hague: Wetstein, Le Vier, 1731), VII/ 2, 72.

²¹ The Venetian reception of the conflict needs further research. An essential work is Kenneth M. Setton, *Venice, Austria and the Turks in the Seventeenth Century* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1991), 389–415. A contemporary treatment known to Marsigli is Pietro Garzoni, *Istoria della repubblica di Venezia in tempo della Sacra Lega*, I (Venice: Manfre, 1707).

to be used in case a diplomatic solution should prove possible and at least a part of the coastline stretching from Rijeka to Dubrovnik might be reclaimed from the Republic. At this time, however, Marsigli only went as far as saying that “all that the Republic of Venice conquered by force of arms in this present war sanctioned by the Holy Alliance outside the borders of Dalmatia should be returned to the Kingdom of Hungary.”²² Vitezović’s response to his queries fulfilled Marsigli’s wildest expectations. According to the *Responsio*, Dalmatia was primarily a geographical concept and could not be regarded as a separate state, therefore the real question was the former location of the borders of the Kingdom of Croatia, which included Dalmatia.

From this point on, the collaboration between the Croatian poet and the imperial envoy took the form of involved discussions and brainstorming sessions in the course of which one idea was tabled after the other and the subsequent reports and memoranda became an intricately entangled web of inter-textual connections.²³ Following the *Responsio* Vitezović hastily drew up two more memoranda. The one titled *Croatia* was devoted to his long-standing dream of radically extending Croatia’s historical borders, but he tried to dress up his poetic inspiration in a cloak of historical arguments. He compared, he amended, he profusely cited a great number of sources—but all these spectacular efforts served a purpose, namely to confirm the thesis already unfolded in the *Responsio*: Serbia, Bosnia, Istria and Dalmatia should be attached to Croatia.²⁴ In his other treatise, titled *Dissertatio Regni Croatiae*, he used a leaner legalistic argument: since Dalmatia was but a geographical concept and never existed as a state (the Hungarian kings in their charters only used the term “Regnum Dalmatiae” out of their respect for ancient Roman traditions) therefore Leopold in the treaty could only cede the *title* to the Republic. So until the Venetians came up with convincing proof, “they have to content themselves with

²² Marsili, *Relazioni*, I, 182.

²³ The Vitezović-Marsigli correspondence (BUB FM, Ms 79) has been published: Sándor Bene, “Pavao Ritter Vitezović levelei Luigi Ferdinando Marsiglihoz, 1699–1700” [The letters of Pavao Ritter Vitezović to Luigi Ferdinando Marsigli], in Milka Jauk-Pinhak, Csaba Gy. Kiss and István Nyomárkay, eds., *Croato-Hungarica: Uz 900 godina hrvatsko-mađarskih povijesnih veza* [Croato-Hungarica: On the 900 years of Croatian-Hungarian historical relations] (Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 2002), 167–79.

²⁴ BUB FM, Ms 103, 35r–45r (treatise by Ritter Vitezović in autograph). The longer version of the title, found in the table of contents of the same volume, is: *Croatiae erudita descriptio*. For a detailed account see Blažević, *Vitezovićeva Hrvatska*, 87–88 (the original text is published in the annex: 221–34).

the mere name of Dalmatia” and can have no claims to the territory itself.²⁵

It is hardly surprising that this thesis appeared in Marsigli’s summary on Croatia submitted at the end on 1699: Dalmatia never existed as a state and belonged to Croatia as a territory, which was proof that the Venetians had no historical claims to it.²⁶ Marsigli accompanied his 8 May 1700 dispatch with a research plan that was a veritable call to arms in a war over archives.²⁷ He petitioned Leopold to secure access for his agents to the archives of the Croatian *Sabor*, the archives of the Zagreb Chapter and the archives in Vienna and to help to track down the lost portions of the Frangepan, Karlović and Zrinyi archives, while he made preparations “to compose a document on the borders of Croatia common with Dalmatia.”²⁸ This, however, was never sent and only half of it was ever prepared.²⁹ What might be the reason for this? I suggest that Marsigli changed his tactics while he was working. He knew that Vitezović’s arguments about Dalmatia would be closely imbedded in a concept of longer perspectives, and he must have felt that while the “undeniable” historical arguments of his Croatian specialist were beguiling, only a concrete initiative (the reclaiming of Croatia) could have political reality. This is why he did not opt for petitioning with the greater plan and left the matter for the wheels of fortune (that is, the self-movement of Viennese bureaucracy). Vitezović first mentioned his plan in a piece that he intended to be the synopsis heralding a great scholarly work (*Croatia rediviva*, 1700),³⁰ and in the next year in a memorandum submitted to Chancellor Bucellini entitled *Regia Illyriorum Croatia* he explicitly expounded on his political

²⁵ *Dissertatio Regni Croatiae*, BUB FM, Ms 103, 130v-131r. Published in Blažević, *Vitezovićeve Hrvatska*, 259.

²⁶ Marsili, *Relazioni*, I, 250.

²⁷ *Peilok sull’ affare con i Veneti* (annex to the report dated 8 May 1700), in Marsili, *Relazioni*, II, 331–32.

²⁸ Marsili, *Relazioni*, II, 328. The person he had in mind to search the archives must have been Vitezović, who shortly afterwards sent a copy of the Zrinyi genealogy to Marsigli: Marcus Forstall, *Stemmatographia Mavortiae familiae comitum a Zrin* (the Bologna copy in Vitezović’s autograph: BUB FM, Ms 103, 277–321).

²⁹ *Principio di notizie sulla Parte Maritima della Croazia*, BUB FM, Ms 70 (*Miscellanea per la Commissione dei confini*, nr. IX).

³⁰ The document (BUB FM, Ms 103, fasc. IV in the Marsili papers in Bologna) is also available in two modern bilingual editions with excellent commentaries: Pavao Ritter Vitezović, *Oživljena Hrvatska*, ed. Zrinka Blažević (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, Zavod za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskog fakulteta u Zagrebu, 1997) and Vitezović, *Oživjela Hrvatska* (the text is printed at 61–141).

arguments.³¹ In this work, which he dedicated to Emperor Leopold, he not only argued that Dalmatia was an integral part of Croatia, he also suggested that instead of basing his territorial claims in the Balkans on the medieval rights of the Hungarian crown, the Habsburg ruler should act as the king of “the whole of Croatia” (*tota Croatia*) and mold the already and to be (re)conquered Slavic territories into one state. By Slavic territories, Vitezović meant the Illyria of his dreams (Greater Croatia) which, in its boldest manifestation, would have incorporated Hungary itself.³²

This attractive proposal would have provided ideological ammunition for the Viennese government to suppress the rebellious Hungarians, since it would have eliminated the legal basis for their anti-Habsburg resistance movements. However, Marsigli’s caution proved to be justified. After a long period of waiting, Vitezović finally received permission from the Emperor to conduct archival research. His commission, however, was not to justify Leopold’s title *Rex totius Croatiae* for the whole of Croatia (or for an even larger territory) but to legitimize the historical right of the Hungarian Kingdom to the territories north of Dalmatia. Marsigli progressed to the point of adopting a position of *duplex veritas*: as a politician and a diplomat serving the Habsburgs he continued to think of the Carpathian Basin and the Balkans as belonging under the legal administration of *Regnum Hungaricum*, even if as a scholar Vitezović’s Illyrian (or Croatian) project might have been a more fertile ground for him. At least this is what his later statements suggest. In the letter introducing the catalog of his Eastern manuscripts and his books he writes:

In the course of my travels of the border regions I realized that a work containing many centuries of the history of Illyria could be compiled by gathering a collection of old Illyrian songs, more precisely the old historical songs that one may hear sung by blind bards and the new songs they

³¹ The memoir titled *Regia Illyriorum Croatia sive Croatia rediviva* can be found in Zagreb, Nacionalna i sveučilšna knjižnica, R 3570. It is briefly discussed in Blažević, *Vitezovićeva Hrvatska*, 90–91. See Klaić, *Život i djela Pavla Rittera Vitezovića*, 164–166. See also Jenő Berlász, “Pavao Ritter-Vitezović az illirizmus szülőatyja: Magyar-horvát viszony a 17–18. század fordulóján” [Pavao Ritter-Vitezović, the founding father of Illyrism: Hungarian-Croatian relations at the turn of the 17th and 18th centuries], *Századok* 120 (1986), 5–6: 943–1002 (on the Viennese reception of the memoirs, see 984–87).

³² On the concept of the “entire Croatia” in the context of the contemporary historical and legal literature, see Blažević, *Vitezovićeva Hrvatska*, 184–96.

also produce. I have been greatly impressed by the graceful dexterity this nation demonstrated in this and by the fact that blind minstrels living near the borders, upon being advised of the debate between myself and the Turks, would week to week prepare these songs in their own poetic metres and then come to sing them before my tents and the tents of the Turks, sometimes accompanying them by dancing. Cavaliere Ritter, who versifies in both Latin and Illyrian, has confirmed this conviction of mine, showing me a book containing a collection of historical songs, which describe many historical events which have been lost due to the lack of writers or preserved writings and are remembered solely by the blind bards who hand them down to their blind offspring. Now that the imperial troops have captured most of Serbia and Wallachia, I can realize my plans for the benefit of our modern literature and collect and publish all these fragments—especially those which bring us news of the countries which have been excluded for centuries from communicating with our learned nations.³³

The current location of the book containing the historical songs and naïve epic fragments on which Vitezović was relying remains unknown, and tracking it down would be an interesting task for literary historians. However, the material collected by Marsigli was not lost and can be found today mostly in Volume 103 of the Marsigli papers in Bologna, under the title *Documenta rerum Croaticarum et Transylvanicarum*. The collection of sources is a mix of historical, ethnographical, onomastic, topographic, heraldic, genealogical and literary historical documents pertaining to Bosnia, Croatia and Transylvania, including copies of charters, treatises on legal history, hagiographies and explanations of antique ruins and inscriptions. Marsigli is largely to be credited with editing the material, while most of the sources were copied or transcribed by Vitezović himself.³⁴ This joint collection

³³ Marsigli's *Lettera di prefazione a mons. ill.mo Passionei* was published by Albano Sorbelli, "Lettera-prefazione al catalogo dei manoscritti orientali," in *Scritti inediti di Luigi Ferdinando Marsili raccolti e pubblicati nel II centenario dalla morte* (Bologna: Zanichelli, 1930), 185–86. Marsigli, writing about the rulers of Bosnia, also makes a note of the significance of oral epics in the preservation of historical memory in his monograph *Monarchia Ungarica* (BUB Ms, 28, "Ad tabulam genealogicam regum Bosnae apodixis"), 27.

³⁴ Apart from the works already cited (*Responsio, Croatia, Disertatio regni Croatiae, Prodromus*) and the copy of Forstall's *Stemmatographia*, the following documents are in the autograph of the Croat scholar: *Denominationes montium, fluviorum, civitatumque et aliorum locorum, plerumque per Illyricum, eorumque ab antiquo differentiae et significata* (BUB FM, Ms 103, 1r–13r—a copy of which can also be found in Zagreb, Archives of the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Art, Ms IV. b. 57); *Authores qui de Illyrico et Croatia scripserunt* (BUB FM, Ms 103, 14r–15v); *Notae de titulis regum Croatiae, Serbiae et Ungariae* (ibid., 19r–21r); *Antiquae Romanor[um]*

of sources was later used by both Marsigli and Vitezović—in fact the two probably mutually influenced and shaped each other's research methods and scientific ideals.

The particular goal of the Croatian scholar was to organize and correct earlier historiographical tradition. His most prominent precursor and opponent was the Croatian Ivan Lučić (Giovanni Lucio, Joannes Lucius), the author of *De regno Dalmatiae et Croatiae* which had been published a few decades earlier and by and large indirectly served the interests of Venice. In essence, Vitezović wanted to overwrite this work using the new system of political criteria described above.³⁵ He envisioned producing a work which would have provided, on the one hand, a continuous narration of the stories of the medieval states formed on the territories of what the Classical period knew as Illyria and, on the other, a detailed geographic, demographic, genealogical and heraldic description of the region's towns and fortifications and the origins of its noble families. His goal was to merge the great genealogical summaries popular in his day (such as Giovan Piero Crescenzi's *Corona della nobiltà d' Italia*)³⁶ with the genre of scientific topography with which he had become familiar while working with Schönleben, Valvasor and Marsigli, who at the time was preparing to write his *Danubius*.³⁷ To realize this *opus ingens* he needed money and

inscriptions, quae per Croatiam visuntur (ibid., 22r–23v; Zagreb copy: Archives of the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Art, Ms III. d. 194); *Catalogus familiarum in libro insigniorum Illyricae nobilitatis comprehensarum* (ibid., 132r–138r; drawings of coats of arms are attached); *De Valachis, sive vlahis* (ibid., 139r); published in Drago Roksandić, “Pavao Ritter Vitezović o Valasima ili Vlasima [Pavao Ritter Vitezović on the Vlachs],” in *Etnos, konfesija, tolerancija* [Ethnicity, confession, tolerance] (Zagreb: Srpsko kulturno društvo, 2004), 75–77.

³⁵ Joannes Lucius, *De regno Dalmatiae et Croatiae libri sex* (Amsterdam: Blaeu, 1666). See Miroslav Kurelac, *Ivan Lucić Lucius, otac hrvatske historiografije* [Ivan Lucić Lucius, father of Croatian historiography] (Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1994). The upshot of decades of Vitezović's “wrestling” with Lučić was a voluminous bundle of refutations, preserved in manuscript: *Offuciae Joannis Lucii de Regno Dalmatiae et Croatiae refutatae* (ca. 1706; Zagreb, Nacionalna i sveučilišna knjižnica, R 3454). On the relationship between the texts of the two scholars see Blažević, *Vitezovićeva Hrvatska*, 130–34.

³⁶ On the work, published in 1639 in Bologna, see Roberto Bizzocchi, *Genealogie incredibili: Scritti di storia nell'Europa moderna* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1995), 19–21.

³⁷ Johann Ludwig Schönleben, *Carniolia antiqua et nova sive annales sacroprophani* (Ljubljana, 1681); Johann Wechard Valvasor, *Topographia Archiducatus Carinthiae antiquae et modernae completa* (Nürnberg, 1688). In the 1680s Vitezović participated in the writing of the latter, monumental work on the settlements of Carinthia and penned one of the dedicatory poems in the introduction: *Ad Archiducalem Carinthiae Nympham*. On Valvasor's influence on Vitezović, see Catherine Anne Simpson, *Pavao*

data. As early as 1696 he put out a public appeal in the form of a *prodromus* to finance the publication which bore the working title *De aris et focus Illyriorum*,³⁸ but this met with a lukewarm reception. Of data he received little, of money none at all. His meeting with Marsigli and their subsequent collaboration rekindled his hopes. By this time he was calling the historical part of the project *Croatia rediviva*, to which he wanted to attach a monumental Latin-Croatian and Croatian-Latin dictionary (*Lexicon Latino-Illyricum*).³⁹ In 1700 he managed to get the *prodromus* he wrote for the *Croatia rediviva* into print, in which he included the 1696 appeal with some modifications. At the same time, as their correspondence shows, he also wanted to secure support from Marsigli for the publication of his *Lexicon*.⁴⁰ It perhaps reflects the close collaboration between the two scholars that they each published in the same year, 1700, the “previews” to *their opus magnum*, both dedicated to Emperor Leopold I.⁴¹

Decades later, in *Danubius Pannonico-Mysicus*, Marsigli not surprisingly made use of the data accumulated in his *Documenta rerum*, especially with regard to the names of localities and to Roman relics and inscriptions. It would be fascinating to study which political and which scientific aspects were preserved in this work of the original Illyria concept, but it is a fact that Marsigli does not go as far—neither here, nor in his earlier political reports—as what Vitezović dreamed about, that is, the forging together of a pan-Croatian (pan-Illyrian) state under Habsburg dominance. In the first volume of the *Danubius* he lists Slavonia, Bosnia, Croatia, Dalmatia(!), Bulgaria, Moldavia,

Ritter Vitezović: *Defining National Identity in the Baroque Age*, Doctoral thesis, School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London, 1991. Valvasor in turn appreciated the talent of his younger colleague, as pointed out by Stjepan Antoljak, *Hrvatska historiografija do 1918* [Croatian Historiography up to 1918] (Zagreb: Matrica Hrvatska, 1992), I: 203–204.

³⁸ The extant manuscript fragments are contained in Zagreb, Metropolitan Archives, MR-74.

³⁹ The Croatian-Latin part was lost, the manuscript of the Latin-Croatian part is in the Metropolitan Library, Zagreb, MR-112. See Tomo Matić, “Vitezovićev Lexicon Latino-Illyricum” [The Latin-Illyrian Dictionary of Vitezović], *Rad JAZU* 303 (1955): 5–49.

⁴⁰ See mostly his letter dated 4 March 1700, Vienna, in Bene, “Pavao Ritter Vitezović levelei” (op. cit. in note 23), 175.

⁴¹ Aloysius Ferdinandus Comit. Marsigli, *Danubialis Operis Prodromus, ad Regiam Societatem Anglicanam* (Nürnberg, 1700); Paulus Ritter, *Croatia rediviva, regnante Leopoldo Magno Caesare* (Zagrabiae, 1700); the inner title of the work is “Prodromus in Croatiam redivivam”; for modern editions see note 30.

Wallachia and Bessarabia as “countries belonging to the Kingdom of Hungary,” while he lists Transylvania as one of its “provinces.” In connection with the Slavs he also specifically mentions that “[t]he Slavic nation... by a general term is also called Illyrian, and when referred to separately they are named after the state in which they live.”⁴²

Marsigli, nevertheless, showed great appreciation of and gratitude towards his Croatian colleague. Upon leaving the country he recommended Vitezović with warm words to the attention of the Croatian estates,⁴³ and I have the impression that his feelings were genuine.

*The physician of the Balkans: The fatherlands of Luigi Ferdinando
Marsigli between Vienna and Bologna*

The basis of Marsigli’s thinking was a scholarly belief characteristic of the age he lived in. According to this, it is not only the character of a given community (a nation, for example) that influences the constitutional order it had formed and shapes the system of political institutions in which they live. The converse is also true: their identity and disposition can be formed effectively by the rational reconstruction of the same system of political institutions. This latter assumption served as the basis for the so-called *Einrichtungswerk*, the most comprehensive proposal for state reform in the Hungarian Kingdom at the end of the 17th century.⁴⁴ In the present case, however, we do not have to go this far for a suitable example. Among the reports that Marsigli sent to Vienna we can find the short summary on Croatia mentioned earlier (*Relazione di tutta la Croazia*).⁴⁵ This text outlines the possibili-

⁴² Marsigli, *Danubius Pannonico-Mysicus*, I, 25.

⁴³ “Ceterum non possum non quin debita laude deprædicem quod perillustris dominus baro Paulus Ritter per aliquod tempus fidelia Commissioni isti præstiterit officia, et ad promovenda Imperatoris servitia omnem navaverit operam. Unde ut recommendatum sibi eundem habeat inclitum Regnum, sicuti merita eius postulare quodammodo videntur, ita etiam expresse ego hisce rogo promittens vicissim me semper permansurum...” Marsigli’s letter to the Croatian Estates, 27 July 1700, in Marsigli, *Relazioni*, II, 386.

⁴⁴ *Hauptrelation über die Einrichtung des Königreiches Ungarn*, see Theodor Mayer, *Verwaltungsreform in Ungarn nach der Türckenzeit* (Vienna: Gerlach & Wiedling, 1911). For a detailed analysis, see Gherardi, *Potere e costituzione*, 215–43.

⁴⁵ “Relazione di tutta la Croazia, considerata per il geografico, politico, economico e militare,” in Marsigli, *Relazioni*, I: 249–65. For evaluations, see Blažević, *Vitezovićeva Hrvatska*, 190–96; Pleše, “Bolonjski grof i hrvatski barun,” 64–66.

ties for the modernization of the country, and it is quite possible that it was the result of the close collaboration of the Imperial *commissarius* and his local specialist. "Until this time, in Croatia neither does the King know his own country, nor does the country know its own king," begins Marsigli.⁴⁶ What he sees as the objective of the reform is to "return the country to its real order" (*rimetterlo nel suo vero ordine*), which in this case is the same as the "old order" (*antico ordine*).⁴⁷ The key word, thus, is "order," which is able to overcome the disorder that leads to barbarism. The work, which systematically reviews the nature and characteristics of the population, is hardly flattering to Croatian pride. It derides the Croats' military virtues ("they show an affinity for the handling of weapons, but they rather excel in pillage and marauding"). Moreover, they are lazy and fond of their own convenience, and jealously guard their privileges. All this makes it extremely difficult to govern the country ("they pay attention to the little profit they can make from the military functions on the frontiers, church offices and, especially, from practicing law, as this last one is still profitable among nations that flaunt their liberty and privileges, so they can satisfy their nature which has a tendency to be restless").⁴⁸ Nevertheless, there is a significant difference between the inhabitants of the inlands on one hand and the Vlachs (immigrants from Ottoman territories who were guarding the frontiers) and the Croatians living on the sea-coast on the other. The description of these "borderland" populations emphasizes their childlike characteristics (they are vengeful, proud, have basically no idea of what obedience means and are led by their immediate interests); but these also mean that they can be tamed more easily. Following the introduction of the necessary economic and military reform, "it is likely that they would take to commerce, give up pillaging and, through the betterment of their fortunes, become loyal subjects [of his royal majesty]."⁴⁹ The idea that the *Relatione* suggests is that the happiness of the subjects and the prosperity of the country are closely connected to each other. According to Marsigli, the primary condition for this is the standardization of the legislation and

⁴⁶ Marsili, *Relazioni*, I: 249.

⁴⁷ This idea is less characteristic of Marsigli than of his Croatian assistant: "Per adempire dunque l' intrapreso assunto di rimettere colle mie dimostrazioni nel puro suo antico ordine questo regni di Croazia, e mostrare quello che fu e dovrebbe essere, lo distinguo in tre periodi di tempo..." Marsili, *Relazioni*, I: 249.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 254–55.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 255.

the administration—if he succeeds in these, the ruler “could consider himself to be the King of Croatia more and more, and his subjects will esteem him as such.”⁵⁰ What is quite telling of Vitezović’s presumed influence is Marsigli’s continuous intention to give a preferential role in the defense of the southern borders of the Habsburg state to the county of Lika-Krbava, where Vitezović held the title of *deputy steward* (*alispán / podžupan*; this was a nominal title, not based on the election by the Croatian estates, as the territory itself belonged under Habsburg military administration).⁵¹ Beyond personal interests, the plans suggest a model where the feudal states could be controlled by establishing military frontiers in their neighborhood: from the East, Transylvania would protect the Empire, in a status similar to that of Lika-Krbava. (The separation of Transylvania from the Hungarian Kingdom would carry another advantage: “it would constrain the arrogance, greediness and restless nature of the Transylvanian people within the chains of the mountains.”)⁵² At this point, it is difficult to imagine how much Vitezović could have been in agreement with the whole idea, or even with the final formulation of the report on Croatia.

We are treading on a well-worn track when we try to draw lessons about Marsigli. It has long been recognized that Marsigli’s activities on military and administrative reforms in Hungary (together with Croatia, Serbian and Transylvanian) were closely connected to the Viennese circles who advocated mercantilist reforms and to the leaders of the military party who proposed drastic methods to break down the resistance of the estates. Marsigli can basically be seen as a mediator between the two trends—at least, it is not accidental that his person was seen as a compromise at the Karlowitz peace talks and at the head of the delegation to finalize the borders.⁵³ He drafted the plans of action for the protection of the country by bringing up-to-date the earlier memoranda of Raimondo Montecuccoli and Antonio Carafa. Stabilizing the borders and providing for their permeability, pacifying the population and

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 258.

⁵¹ Josip Bratulić, “Oživjela Hrvatska u obzoru života i djela Pavla Rittera Vitezovića” [The ‘Revived Croatia’ in the context of the life and works of P. Ritter Vitezović], in Pavao Ritter Vitezović, *Oživjela Hrvatska*, 22.

⁵² Marsigli, *Relazioni*, II: 441. (Annex “I” to the fourth Transylvanian report, 14 December 1700.) On the role of Lika-Krbava, see 441, 450.

⁵³ In his border survey reports he combines a hard-line, military approach with the more practical, economy-oriented model of the *Einrichtungswerk* (Gherardi, *Potere e costituzione*, 262–71).

providing enough work force for agriculture through repopulation and immigration, making the flow of information between the center and the countryside quicker and more efficient, raising the income of the treasury—the desiderata emphasized by Marsigli had been for decades recurrent points in the program of the Viennese reform circles. The aim of these was to connect the Habsburg state to international trade and make it the equal of other modernizing European powers. Their theoretical background is easy to identify.⁵⁴ Raffaella Gherardi's research has revealed that Marsigli's political knowledge was closely connected to the *Polizeywissenschaft* represented by Hermann Conring and his school and to the "notitia rerumpublicarum" that aimed at processing the demographic, geographic, military, economic and national characteristics of each country by scientific methods. It is also widely known that this new, scientific conception of politics, alongside the new thinking based on the theory of natural law,⁵⁵ owed a lot to the contemporary "cameralist" ideas which assigned a key role to economic control.⁵⁶

I nevertheless believe that in Marsigli's case, what is relevant and worthy of research is not only what made him conform to the norms determined by his age and environment but also the points in which he differed from these. One of these differences is his patriotism sublimated in his reverential relationship to his ruler. It appears that Marsigli not only loved the abstract ideal of Order, he was also deeply fond of its unworthy representative, the Emperor Leopold.⁵⁷ His effusive

⁵⁴ For a survey of Carafa's reform plans, see Giambattista Vico, "Vita di Antonio Carafa," in idem, *Scritti storici*, ed. Fausto Nicolini (Naples: Giannini Editore, 1980), 225–29; on Montecuccoli's political thought see Gherardi, *Potere e costituzione*, 253–62.

⁵⁵ Richard Tuck, "The 'Modern' Theory of Natural Law," in Anthony Pagden, ed., *The Languages of Political Theory in Early-Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 99–119; Gherardi, *Potere e costituzione*, 447–48.

⁵⁶ See Gherardi, *Potere e costituzione*, 413–30; Raffaella Gherardi, "Itinerario di un Staatswerdung: Il patrimonio austriaco di modernizzazione fra XVII e XVIII secolo," in Pierangelo Schiera, ed., *La dinamica statale austriaca nel XVIII e XIX secolo: Strutture e tendenze di storia costituzionale prima e dopo Maria Teresa* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1981), 65–92; idem, "Scienza e governo della frontiera: Il problema dei confini balcanici e danubiani nella pace di Carlowitz," *Il pensiero politico* 32 (1999): 323–51.

⁵⁷ On Leopold see L. F. Marsigli, *Primo abbozzo del Compendio storico dell' Ungheria, per servire d' introduzione al trattato 'Acta executionis pacis'*, quoted by Gherardi, *Potere e costituzione*, 57. The relationship between Marsigli and Leopold was close; for instance, this is how Marsigli records their first meeting after he was freed from Ottoman imprisonment: "His majesty, with infinite goodness, allowed me to bow at his feet and let me know how happy he was that I was given my freedom back and

loyalty is not explained by any existential constraint: he belonged to an illustrious aristocratic family and, unlike many of his military and traveling intellectual colleagues, he had a secure financial background during the decades he spent in Hungary. He exhibits no trace of the kind of pragmatic interpretation of patriotism that often results in cynicism, such as can be illustrated by the words of Samuel Pufendorf: "I value the state where things [...] go well with me; I am glad to be where my interests are furthered."⁵⁸ There is a serious theory behind the tart *bon mot*: in his treatise *De obligatione erga patriam* written in 1663 and republished several times in the decades to follow, Pufendorf makes an attempt to shift the unreflected emotional relationship between patria and patriots into a consciously reflected relationship between *civitas* and *civis*, in which the advantages of loyalty would be rationally calculated. Thus, the individual's degree of liberty would also grow: no one could be tied forever to their country of birth but would have the right to choose a new one if he wanted to. Nonetheless, Marsigli, who like many others had experienced the drawbacks of loyalty for a chosen country and ethnically based suspicion and discrimination in the Habsburg military and administration, does not make references to Pufendorf's widely known writings or their antique sources, the texts of Cicero or Seneca.⁵⁹ Neither does he refer to Pufendorf's words in which he might have found justification and consolation during his trials in Vienna—he laments the barbarian environment that would not accept the immigrant—nor when he was forced to leave the Habsburg capital.⁶⁰

could return to his regal service" (*Autobiografia di Luigi Ferdinando Marsili*, 63). The key terms of communication are "amore" and the "gratitudine" received in exchange; for example, see Marsigli's conversation with Chancellor Kinsky, *ibid.*, 203.

⁵⁸ Letter from Pufendorf to Thomasius, 25th February, 1688. See Seidler, *Pufendorf on Patriotism*, 351.

⁵⁹ See Cicero, *De legibus*, II, 5 on the distinction between *patria germana* (*patria naturae*, *patria loci*) and *patria civitatis* (*patria iuris*); also Seneca, *Dialogi*, 12, 6.

⁶⁰ Marsigli makes several references to antipathy towards Italians on the part of the Viennese administration and to discrimination against his own self because of his "foreignness": see Emilio Lovarini, ed., *Autobiografia di Luigi Ferdinando Marsili, messa in luce nel II centenario dalla morte di lui dal Comitato Marsiliano* (Bologna: Zanichelli, 1930) 201, 209–210, 212. Diplomats serving in Vienna saw the situation the same way. The papal nuncio Giovanni Antonio Da Via attributed the harsh punishment of Marsigli and Prince Arco (and the postponement of the sentence of Baron von Eck) after the capitulation of Breisach to national enmity: "sfogata la giustizia contro due italiani si farà grazia al nazionale". See Paolo Silvani, *Il generale Luigi Ferdinando Marsili e la nazione ungherese* (Bologna: Riuniti, 1931), 17–18.

Following his forced departure from Leopold's service, Marsigli formally did everything that could be expected from a person who switched loyalties. He went through a legal procedure of termination of his duties towards the Habsburg state and made legal record of this in an apologetic document. He had perhaps never invested more time and energy in any of his works as he did in the case of this apology, which was published in several languages and which he intended to be the means through which he could clear himself of the unjust accusations.⁶¹ In 1706 he offered his services to Louis XVI, and he narrowly missed coming to Hungary as the French liaison of Ferenc Rákóczi who had rebelled against Vienna.⁶² In 1708, when he was called to the service of his country by Pope Clement XI—Marsigli being a subject of the Papal state!—he did not hesitate to undertake the leadership of the defense against the Habsburg troops. In his report to the Pope (1709) he gives a realistic account of the billeting practices of the Imperial troops and, indirectly, an indictment of the harsh nature of Habsburg imperialism in general which had already “ruined Hungary and thrust it into desperation” and was now threatening Italy.⁶³ Nevertheless, the foreword to the *Danubius* has the aggrieved tone of a jilted lover who cannot break his attachment to the one who betrayed him: “Oh, unhappy work that has lost its protector and benefactor! But unseemly it would be to search for a new benefactor, a new protector for my work, for all gratitude is due to the Emperor and no-one else. Let it then be dedicated to no-one and enjoy the patronage of no-one.”⁶⁴

In all this I see an emotionally based, quasi-religious relation to the Emperor, who is metonymically identified with the ideal *patria*. While this kind of identification is not without parallels in the era,⁶⁵ such reverential love is much more rare. This type of attachment can actually be regarded as a confusion of levels of allegiance. Marsigli probably was aware of this, as he did everything in his power against it. The

⁶¹ Stoye, *Marsigli's Europe*, 261.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 264–65.

⁶³ Quoted by Antonio Rosati, “La relazione del generale Marsigli dell’agosto 1709,” conference paper delivered at the conference “Le armi del sovrano”, Rome 2001, and available at <http://www.assostoria.it/Armisovrano/Rosati.pdf> (Accessed 26 July 2008)

⁶⁴ *Danubius Pannonico-Mysicus*, I, Preface.

⁶⁵ There are several examples from the early modern period where the dynasty (or the actual ruler) is equated with the fatherland; see e.g. (surveying the Austrian case as well) Philip M. Soergel, “Religious Patriotism in Early-Modern Catholicism,” in Friedeburg, *‘Patria’ und ‘Patrioten’ vor dem Patriotismus*, 91–104.

differentia specifica of his patriotic loyalty can be grasped through the way he tries to cover or quell his emotions. This is a conscious attempt, not *ad hoc* reactions. As we seek the mechanism of dissimulative behavior and the pattern of the manifestations of emotions, it is not very hard to notice that the behavior of the Bolognese Count follows a certain archaic, “knightly” model. He aims to serve his ruler as an *eminence grise*, occasionally in incognito. His diplomatic missions are secret; he acts as a spy on many occasions. At the end of his mission he reveals his identity. Yet he does not expect to be rewarded: the only thing that counts for him is the appreciation and gratefulness of his ruler. When disappointed—just like when he was publicly humiliated after the loss of Breisach—, he withdraws, holds back his emotions and finds the order and purity that he had been vainly seeking in real life in a certain layman seclusion associated with lonely research. Meanwhile, he takes care to express his pain—and also his attraction to the ideal order of another lifestyle, as was his regular practice during his fevered military and diplomatic activities. (Well-known anecdotes are that he sketched a rare butterfly during the siege of Belgrade, and he was collecting rare mushrooms around Breisach during the siege.)⁶⁶

This repressive, rarely opening mental mechanism which was constantly striving for anonymity was perhaps the most important characteristic of his personality. If we pay close attention while reading his autobiography we are struck by the repeated motif of star-crossed love. Returning from his studies in Rome and Naples, the young count was selected by his benefactors to be a member of a council of eight of Bologna, representing the city’s nobility. In this capacity, whilst organizing Carnival activities, Marsigli distinguished himself by reviving the ancient tradition of jousts. He entered the competition himself under the name of Armisillo (an anagram of Marsigli), and in the obligatory letter of challenge to the other competitors he proclaimed that the soul of a knight should be moved by desire for glory rather than by love. However, as he wrote, it took only three days to find himself enmeshed in the net of the latter: on the closing night of the Carnival, he could not bear to part with the lovely Eleonora Zambeccari. He knew his chances were slight: Eleonora was not only beautiful but wealthy as well, while the number of his siblings and his constrained finances made it nearly impossible for him to dream

⁶⁶ Stoye, *Marsigli’s Europe*, 225, 237; on the Breisach episode see 238–50.

of marriage. After serenading his lady amidst spectacular props and standing on an antique chariot of triumph, he took off to attempt the impossible and find fame and glory in the world. However, he had not even finished his mathematical studies at the University of Padua when news of Miss Zambecari's wedding reached him. Desperate and downcast, he sought his father's permission to join the Venetian delegation to Constantinople, thus taking the first step on his decades-long peregrinations.⁶⁷ Then in the capital of the Ottoman Empire his heart was broken again: he fell in love with the beautiful daughter of the French ambassador, by whom even the Sultan was so enchanted that he wanted to have her portrait painted. The maiden was receptive to Marsigli's advances, but fulfilment was never reached. The ambassador wanted her to marry a rich knight from Normandy, and while initially Marsigli entertained ideas of a duel with his competitor his friends dissuaded him. "Repressing my emotions, I accepted that luck favoured the deserving," he wrote dejectedly in his autobiography.⁶⁸

The same emotional mechanism surfaces when Marsigli comes to his homeland. Shortly after he was captured by Ottoman troops in Hungary (in this he followed the example of his great predecessor, Montecuccoli), he was ransomed by his Venetian benefactors in 1684 and could not wait to return to Bologna—but once back in his home town, he learned that an assassin had been paid an advance to murder him. "This incident," he wrote, "opened my eyes to the unbounded wickedness of my *Patria*, and notwithstanding the efforts of my loving friends and family I disregarded their advice not to be caught up in the winds of war again and took off for Innsbruck..."⁶⁹

He would not set foot in Bologna again for nearly two decades. At certain intervals he sent home parts of the collection he accumulated during his peregrinations—valuable manuscripts, statues, minerals—and by the time he fell out of favor with the Emperor and returned to Bologna his earlier resentment for the city had subsided. According to his own statement the idea of founding a scientific and educational institution to propagate the achievements of natural science and modern mathematics had been germinating in his mind for years, but he provided peculiar reasons and motivations for his plans

⁶⁷ *Autobiografia di Luigi Ferdinando Marsili*, 7–8.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 27 (for the whole affair see 21–27).

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 62–63.

retrospectively. He originally wanted to put the old—six hundred years old at the time—university of Bologna into “good order.” When it proved to be an impossible endeavor to reorganize it and transform it into a modern, European institution, he reconciled himself to the idea of a smaller institution to establish alongside the Studio.⁷⁰ After a long negotiating process with the Pope he managed to obtain financial support for the realization of his idea,⁷¹ and the Senate of Bologna provided the Istituto with an appropriately sized palace. After this long—and this time, mostly successful—period of patriotic cultural and scientific activity, events took a familiar turn again. When his compatriots failed to give him the kind of appreciation and gratitude that he thought he deserved for his unselfish and generous work, he decided to take a radical step: to leave Bologna for the third and final time and to spend the rest of his life in Provence.⁷² In his farewell letter to his homeland, this is how he writes about the idea of the Istituto:

I had thought that the realization and the operation of my idea could rely on the support of the Senate that I had made a contract with about the founding of a permanent body. This body was to be made up of six senators who would have been lifelong directors of the institution. The aim of this was to reach a point when the senators, having been acquainted with and attached to the institution I had founded, would make it even more useful to you and to all the other nations in the world. [...] But while serving you the fruits of a life of vicissitudes I could not achieve general recognition and approval; I am leaving you now and start on a journey to find my ideal resting place where, I hope, I will find more tranquility for the short time left of my life, and which would contribute more to my eternal salvation...⁷³

It seems to me important to emphasize the emotional element in Marsigli, because the myth of the emotionless, cool-headed scholar, sol-

⁷⁰ On Marsigli's original plan, see his “Parallelo dello stato moderno della Università di Bologna con le altre di là de' monti,” in *Memorie intorno a Luigi Ferdinando Marsili pubblicate nel secondo centenario dalla morte* (Bologna: Zanichelli, 1930), 406–19.

⁷¹ *Autobiografia di Luigi Ferdinando Marsili*, 233–43.

⁷² Marsigli had to return home in the end due to a serious illness—he died in Bologna a few months later. Nevertheless, we have every reason to take seriously the spectacularly documented emigration that he had planned to be the conclusion of his career. See Stoye, *Marsigli's Europe*, 307–309.

⁷³ L. F. Marsigli, “A tutti gli ordini della città di Bologna,” in *Atti legali per la fondazione dell' Istituto delle scienze, ed arti liberali per memoria degli ordini ecclesiastici, e secolari che compongono la città di Bologna*, V–VI (Bologna: Stamperie di San Tommaso d' Aquino, 1728; reprint ed. Marco Bortolotti, Bologna: Clueb, 1979).

dier and bureaucrat is still very much present in the literature.⁷⁴ On the other hand, I believe that we can only appreciate the repressive emotional mechanism and the Bolognese *virtuoso's* internal conflicts if we have an idea of the nature and the force of the repressed passions. Given our knowledge of its emotional background the discourse which appears on the surface of the diplomatic reports he sent to the Habsburg ruler is interesting as it transgresses the contemporary norms. In these professional texts dealing with political, economic or military themes, Marsigli codes his reverential love for his ruler and country into a scientific language appropriate to his era, creating a quite special type of patriotic discourse. The terminology and argumentation of this type of discourse is strongly influenced by the religious character of the emotions mentioned above.

The sources of Marsigli's religiosity are as yet undiscovered, but it is quite safe to say that—not very surprisingly—he was attracted to Thomist theology, which underplayed the significance of emotional-volitional factors as opposed to the intellect. According to Thomas, the soul, during its mortal life, prepares for happiness (which is equal to *fruitio Dei*) by the acquisition of knowledge. The very same terms—“happiness (*felicità*) and “knowledge,” or the “acquisition of knowledge” (*informazione, cognizione*)—have a central role in Marsigli's political language. The purpose of the state's existence is to assure the happiness of the subjects, which means—as also became clear from the report on Croatia—that the subjects should come to know their ruler and respect him in his real nature (the two verbs used are “conoscere” and “venerare,” the second of which has religious implications).⁷⁵ As a prerequisite of this it is necessary that the ruler should have access to scientifically validated information to exercise his power and in order for this power not to suffer any diminution of his sovereignty (*somma potestà*) it must prevail entirely in the field (*giurisdizione*) in which it is exercised.⁷⁶ Such diminution of power can primarily be caused by internal disorder (*disordine naturale*) or the unsettledness of

⁷⁴ E.g. Stoye, *Marsigli's Europe*, 309.

⁷⁵ Marsili, *Relazioni*, I: 258.

⁷⁶ On the connections between the concept of “order” and “sovereignty” in contemporary German political theory that Marsigli followed, see Merio Scattola, *Dalla virtù alla scienza: La fondazione e la trasformazione della disciplina politica nell'età moderna* (Milan: FrancoAngeli, 2003), 262–80.

outer borders. Marsigli's whole political and scholarly activities were directed at establishing "good order" in these two directions.

In discussing internal, political order Marsigli often uses the term nation (*nazione*) in a general sense to designate the state or political power (*la nazione Turca, la nazione Inglese, la nazione Italiana, etc.*)⁷⁷ On the other hand, whenever he puts his whole scholarly apparatus into motion, the term is given a more specific meaning. In Marsigli's usage, national existence is a sort of "natural state of being", a form of "pre-political" existence. The "nazione Ungherese" or the "nazione Germanica" obviously do not inhabit one state. At the same time, neither do those who speak the same language constitute one nation: in the report on Croatia, the seaside Croatians and the Vlachs are different "nations," and Marsigli also refers to Hungarian-speaking Transylvanians as a separate nation. What determines a nation is—besides its language—its past, its geographical position, its current form of government and its economic and religious situation. They make up what Marsigli's texts call the "nature," "spirit," "heart" or "moral constitution" (*natura / il naturale / natura e qualità; cuore, genio, corpo morale*) of a given nation. The most serious illness of the spirit of the nations is emotional imbalance (*inquietudine naturale*), which is in a close relationship with the senseless desire for freedom (*affezione alla libertà*).⁷⁸ This can be transformed by a quasi-medical intervention, and in order to reach the ideal state of affairs the nation has to be reformed.⁷⁹ The correction can only be indirect, and it is always connected to the disorder or disfunction of the formal institutional system. (In the case of Hungary, this could mean the customary law codified in the *Tripartitum* or the internal borders of the Kingdom with Transylvania,⁸⁰ while in the case of Croatia it might be the church structure, where the necessary correction involves the weakening of the too strong institutional network of monasteries.)⁸¹ If the interven-

⁷⁷ E.g. *Autobiografia di Luigi Ferdinando Marsili*, 4, 157, 167.

⁷⁸ This is how he writes about Hungarians in his memorandum called *Memoriale al Principe Giuseppe figlio di Leopoldo* (1684): "The Hungarian nation is of a very different spirit (*di genio*) from the German, it is by nature (*di natura*) unsteady and fond of novelties, stubborn and arrogant, like the nations who are vain regarding their liberty (*vantano d' essere libere*)..." Cf. Gherardi, *Potere e costituzione*, 199.

⁷⁹ Medical metaphors already appear in the writings of Montecuccoli, Marsigli's role model, especially in the memorandum *L'Ungheria anno 1672*, see Gherardi, *Potere e costituzione*, 253–57. Marsigli refers to Montecuccoli's writings, see *ibid.*, 267–68.

⁸⁰ Marsili, *Relazioni*, II: 440–42.

⁸¹ Marsili, *Relazioni*, I: 254.

tion is successful the correction of the “corpo politico” has an effect in turn on the financial contentment of the subjects, and through this on the psyche of the nation; this means that the new order generates continuous happiness. In this system the Ruler—who is venerated as an earthly God—is at the origo, in his role as inducer of the system. Only he can be the source of the intervention (whatever kind of reform it is), but he cannot do without the advice of a specialist, as the specialist provides the ruler with the diagnosis necessary for the action (*natura e qualità del paese e suoi abitanti*).⁸²

On the subject of borders Merio Scattola rightly observes that “in the same era when the concept of homogeneous and unified territory was developed, within which every governmental action and legal regulation originated from the same political source, the theory of borders as the extension and separation of sovereignty emerged.”⁸³ In Marsigli’s account, though, the drawing up of the borders is described in almost religious overtones. In an undated geographical reform plan (possibly written during his border review commission) he writes:

God, after creating the world in the form of a globe, divided it into water and land. The land he further divided into continents, islands and even further: plains, hills, mountains; water turned into springs, brooks, streams, rivers of various sizes, lakes, swamps and seas. [...] As soon as the human race started spreading, the different parts of the land were divided, and different cities under various forms of government, laws and customs emerged; these were appropriated by various peoples, which developed their own character in the confusion of languages, from place to place, territory to territory...⁸⁴

The *Deus terminator*—God of boundaries—began his work of creation by drawing up frontiers, and as a result of this the creating and adjusting of frontiers (and securing their permeability) is not merely a scientific activity but also a cultic one. The continuation of creation, unraveling and bringing to completion the hidden order of the world,

⁸² Ibid., 252. In the dedication (“A chi legge”) of *Descrizione naturale, civile e militare delle Misie, Dacie ed Illirico* (BUB FM, Ms. 108), Marsigli explicitly claims that he is obliged to provide information to the Emperor because “il Principe è il più vivo ritratto che in terra possa darsi di Dio”.

⁸³ Scattola, *Dalla virtù alla scienza*, 269. For a detailed account see idem, “Die Grenze der Neuzeit: Ihr Begriff in der juristischen und politischen Literatur der Antike und Frühmoderne,” in Markus Breuer and Thomas Rahn, eds., *Die Grenze: Begriff und Inszenierung* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1997), 37–72.

⁸⁴ L. F. Marsigli, “Introduzione alla mia riforma della geografia,” in *Memorie intorno a Luigi Ferdinando Marsili*, 229–30.

is the ruler's task. The scientist only supplies him with the tools by processing the geographic and historical knowledge related to each and every frontier.

Such a perpetual, uninterrupted activity of knowledge acquisition and organization could never be entirely successful. It was too optimistic of Marsigli to expect that the reconstruction of the state structure would change the nature of the population: the reforms had not really begun, as they were stalled in the machinery of Habsburg bureaucracy and by the resistance of the estates that proved to be stronger than expected (both in Croatia and Hungary).⁸⁵ Similarly with his rationally organized Istituto, the task of which (beyond its scholarly activities) was to have been the same, beginning with the reeducation of the town leadership. While Marsigli succeeded in founding the institute, the "reeducation attempt" failed: reality did not match the ideas. Thus it is not surprising to find that Marsigli, prior to leaving his home, donated his printing press to the town's Dominican priests and changed the motto on his coat-of-arms to that attributed by the Dominicans to Saint Thomas: "Nihil mihi." He even discarded his ancestral name and began his search for the "ideale sepolcro" under a new name, which could only be the knight of Aquino.⁸⁶

I am not the first to notice that Marsigli's activities as institutional organizer mirror on a smaller scale the same passionate desire for Order as his former actions in the service of the Emperor.⁸⁷ I would only like to modify the conclusions that can be drawn. It is not the case that Marsigli was compensated by his "real" patria for the humiliation he suffered in the service of the Habsburgs. Just the opposite: the analysis of his relationship to his immediate patria provides a key to the deeper understanding of his career in Vienna. These are analogous

⁸⁵ This paper concentrates on Marsigli's and Ritter Vitezović's conceptions of patria, so it cannot address the extensive literature on the question here. It is nevertheless important to note that the Karlowitz peace talks, which were conducted without Hungarian or Croatian representatives (and where Marsigli played a key role), and the talks finalizing the borders happened at the time when the government in Vienna was ignoring any attempt at compromise. These policies led inevitably from 1697 to the war of independence in Hungary (1703–1711) led by Ferenc Rákóczi II, which was followed by a new compromise with the estates. See Ágnes R. Várkonyi, "Thököly politikája és Magyarország esélyei a hatalmi átrendeződés korában" [The policies of Thököly and the chances of Hungary in the period of the reconfiguration of balance of powers], *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 118 (2005): 363–99.

⁸⁶ Stoye, *Marsigli's Europe*, 307–308.

⁸⁷ Pleše, "Bolonjski grof i hrvatski barun," 61–62.

cases: as the main attributes of the ideal *patriae*—orderliness and the rational way to make the subjects happy—were the same, the strongly charged emotional loyalties shown towards them could not come into real conflict, and the objects of *voluntas* were, with only a little exaggeration, interchangeable. For a while, they really seemed unifiable. Let us not forget that the idea of the Istituto was born during Marsigli's Vienna years, at the peak of his career;⁸⁸ and that, as he wrote, it was conceived "so that I can be of service to my Patria, especially the young noblemen, who could train themselves in the arts that make a good soldier of a man—so that with such training they could break out of all this lassitude at home and try their luck abroad."⁸⁹ In other words, the original function of the institute would have been to provide a permanent connection and communication between the two virtual *patriae*. This attempt was doomed to shipwreck, but the parallelism remains obvious. Marsigli oversaw the functioning, the work based on experiments and demonstrations and combining research and education, and even the room allocation, with the same maniacal passion for order as he had overseen the establishment of the systems of transportation and military defense and the postal networks of the frontier zone. The emotional motivation is the same in both cases: an (over)compensation based on feelings of backwardness and provinciality. He had hoped that the establishment of the Istituto would make "this town, even if not superior, certainly equal to the greatest universities and academies of France, England and the Netherlands, enriching it with the kind of institutions those do not have."⁹⁰ He had used the same language to describe the backwardness of the Habsburg institutional system and the necessity for its modernization. Finally, his gesture directing his loyalty from the ideal patria to another, higher level—following a series of disappointments—is also logical. Preparatory to his emigration he organized the whole documentation on the border negotiations after the Karlowitz treaty into a number of volumes. He gave the title *Acta executionis pacis* to the collection—which he wanted to publish in print as a huge series of collected sources—and dedicated it to Pope Clement XI, not as the ruler of the papal

⁸⁸ Cf. Stoye, *Marsigli's Europe*, 221–25.

⁸⁹ L. F. Marsili, *Istruzione finale al signor Biagio Antonio Ferrari per la riduzione e regolamento migliore dell' Istituto*. Published in Ettore Bortolotti, "La fondazione dell' Istituto e la Riforma dello "Studio" di Bologna," in *Memorie*, 420.

⁹⁰ Marsigli, "A tutti gli ordini della città di Bologna," V.

state but as the head of universal Christianity. The publication of the documents was offered as a service to the whole of Europe. Following the end of the Ottoman wars he wanted to promote coexistence with Muslims and the development of trade relations, which making his experiences public was intended to facilitate.⁹¹ At the end of the day, the ideal patria is Europe itself.

In summary, I see the characteristics of Marsigli's patriotism as the following. His terminology is traditional, he calls his hometown his patria, and he distinguishes it from "Italy"; thus, his loyalty is not connected to a common language or a common origin. Nevertheless, we can speak about his consciousness of a cultural patria, registering that he was attracted by a new ideal of science and culture that was not domesticated in Italy in his era. The patria that provides identity—be it the hometown or the Habsburg state—is in either case a future community which is to be born. His patriotic discourse unfolds along a linear axis: development progresses from the disorder of the present to the order of the future, and this development can be based on acquaintance with the past by means of scientific methods. Marsigli describes society—and the human psyche in general—by means of quite rigid models taken from the natural sciences: the *genio* of the nation is the mere sum of geographical conditions, the constitutional system and collective historical experiences. In his case, historical research which aims to establish a basis for the future is limited to the operation of the function of the memory—amassing/storing "ars." The "vis" function of the memory, a selective mode of remembering that sorts the past in a cultural sense, does not play a part in his thinking.⁹² He regards language as a phenomenon to analyze, and not as a factor of identity; the archiving type of memory and the belief in the transparency of the language are related. It was excellently observed by John Stoye that the establishment of the Istituto delle scienze would have fitted into the programme of the—at that time already evolving—widely interpreted Italian "literary patriotism" (basically, a scientific patriotism) connected to Muratori, but the most fundamental characteristic of this program, its Italianness and Italo-centricism (in

⁹¹ See Sándor Bene, "Acta Pacis—Peace with the Muslims: Luigi Ferdinando Marsigli's Plan for the Publication of the Documents of the Karlowitz Peace Treaty," *Camoenae Hungaricae* 3 (2006): 113–46.

⁹² For this typology of memory see Aleida Assmann, *Ricordare: Forme e mutamenti della memoria culturale* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 2002), 27–33.

other words, nationalist interest), was missing from Marsigli (not in terms of Italy, but in a general, theoretic way).⁹³ He nearly always talks about Bologna in a European context, and the question of the division of Italy does not even occur to him. At the same time, his particularly strong quasi-religious attachment to the sovereign as representing the patria is undeniable, and this is what makes the language he uses to describe the ideal state so interesting and unique. The mechanism that stifles emotions establishes a scientific political discourse, but its user's strong emotional attachment to the country hoped for and to be created transpires through the neutral *termini tecnici*.

The repression of emotions, as I have tried to illustrate through biographic examples, was one of the most basic characteristics of Marsigli's personality, and we can consider it as an instinctive form of behavior. This was strengthened not only by Thomist Scholasticism, but also by the Lipsian requirement of rational control of the affects. His papers only contain a few pale traces as to whether he was aware of the 17th century *affectus*-literature that had swollen to a previously unimaginable size or of the teachings of Descartes or Leibniz. He had a deep contempt for authors of political theory who devoted special interest to the manipulation or neutralization of emotions because he considered them anti-religious or heretical (he called Hobbes a "criminal" and Spinoza "accursed").⁹⁴ The author represented by the greatest number of volumes in Marsigli's library was the interconfessionalist Lipsius,⁹⁵ who spectacularly connected the control of the human psyche with the political control of the emotionally manipulated masses (as the developer of the flexible technique of power and obedience he became one of the most important influences on the German political science followed by Marsigli).⁹⁶ My feeling is that Marsigli tried to put the program of the neo-Stoic philosopher into practice throughout his career: on one hand, when he attempted to suppress his own strong emotions, and on the other, by the programmatic depassionization of the subjects (or compatriots) whom he wanted to make happy. Lipsius, who questioned the divine or natural origin of *amor patriae* in

⁹³ Stoye, *Marsigli's Europe*, 255–56.

⁹⁴ Cf. Gherardi, *Potere e costituzione*, 450.

⁹⁵ Gherardi, *Potere e costituzione*, 453–55.

⁹⁶ See Michael Stolleis, "La ricezione di Lipsius nella letteratura giuridico-politica del Seicento in Germania," in *Stato e ragion di stato nella prima età moderna* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1998), 201–37.

his *De Constantia* and offered a recipe for the *civis* (that is, the subject) to “temper” his patriotic emotions, analyzed the methods that can be used to control the emotions of the people from the viewpoint of the practitioners of power, the magistrates in his *Politica*. Love of the country is an empty space among the affects catalogued here. The hiatus is telling: Lipsius’ attempts are all directed to the transposition of the emotions of the people from the patria to the ruler.⁹⁷ When Marsigli acted as a patriot of Bologna or a subject of Habsburg rule, he contained his emotions in the spirit of the *Constantia*; when acting as an advisor to Emperor Leopold he tried to realize the program of the *Politica*, as a physician of the “corpo politico.”

“The love of the country is the greatest love of all”: The Croatian
Illyria of Pavao Ritter Vitezović

For Marsigli, the reference point to which the human psyche could be formed is the rational order of the state. For Pavao Ritter Vitezović, it was just the opposite: he took the pre-civil patriotic characteristics in the antique sense of the word,⁹⁸ and he was looking for a proper framework for the national genius. What makes his working relationship with Marsigli special is that their programs, though diametrically opposed, could tread the same path for a surprisingly long time. Before going further, it is important to clarify his discursive position, the people he represented, and the virtual *Hinterland* he could rely on.

Recent research has demonstrated convincingly that Vitezović was not simply the representative of Croatian national interests (in the present context, those of the Croatian estates) but was also connected to an elitist political group that was trying to reform the Croatian state radically from above. The sluggish working of the traditional Croatian feudal institutions as well as political necessity (retributions following the anti-Habsburg movement of 1670 and the execution of its leaders in 1671) together led to a point in 1685 when the Croatian leaders in their negotiations with Vienna (led by the ban and the

⁹⁷ Iustus Lipsius, *Politicoꝝ sive civilis doctrinae libri sex* (Antwerpen: Plantin, 1596), lib. IV, ch. 11–13. See also Richard Tuck, *Philosophy and Government 1572–1651* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 45–63.

⁹⁸ Cf. Seidler, “Pufendorf on Patriotism,” referring to the distinction between *politai* / *patriotai*.

bishop of Zagreb) created an operative body that was narrower than the Diet. This had a dual task.⁹⁹ On the one hand, it was to make state administration more efficient; on the other, it was to negotiate with the Habsburg power that had made territorial gains during the Ottoman wars and to try to arrange for more of the regained territories to be placed under the *iurisdictio* of the Croatian ban and fewer under the control of the centrally directed military frontiers. It was the *Conferentia Regni* that delegated Vitezović to Vienna in 1686 as an *agens aulicus*, a sort of lobbyist. This is how he came to gain his title of *vice comes*, after the *Conferentia* put his name forward as a possible secretary of the Hungarian Chancellery which was to be set up following the recommendations of the *Einrichtungswerk*. It was also the *Conferentia* that sent him to act as a local specialist to work with Marsigli.¹⁰⁰ It is not surprising, all in all, that the Imperial envoy found him a useful colleague in every regard, as it was through Vitezović's assistance (and the help of his supporters, Ban Batthyány and Bishop Selišćević) that he was able to overcome the suspicion and occasional resistance which was manifested not only in the inadequate supply of his retinue but also in missing archival documents (the existence of which was denied).¹⁰¹ The collecting of basic information was difficult for other reasons as well. Marsigli was besieged by addle-pated fantasists and dreamers who kept offering him biblical genealogical charts about the ancestry of the Illyrian nation and by self-styled leaders aspiring to rule never-existent countries and dioceses who waved

⁹⁹ Blažević, *Vitezovićeve Hrvatska*, 67–82.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 170–72.

¹⁰¹ I should point out that a separate treatment should be devoted to the organisation of Marsigli's mission, the supply of his retinue and his relationship to the Croatian Estates, to the *Conferentia Regni*, to Ban Ádám Batthyány, to Stjepan Selišćević, bishop of Zagreb and to the Zagreb Chapter. Only one part of the relevant papers is located in Bologna (BUB Ms 63, 99r–216v), the other part is in Zagreb: Metropolitan Archives (Kaptolski i nadbiskupski arhiv), *Epistolae ad Episcopos Zagradienses*, tom. XXVII, nr. 37, 82; tom. XXVIII, nr. 6, 13, 28, 30, 31, 34, 39, 45, 97; tom. XXIX, nr. 26; *Acta politica*, tom. VI, nr. 478, 480; and Croatian State Archives (Državni arhiv Hrvatske), *Acta commissionalia*, kut. 1. fasc. 1. nr. 47. The rest of the relevant Parliamentary papers were published in Josip Buturac et al., eds, *Zaključci hrvatskog sabora* [Decisions of the Croatian sabor], II 1693–1713 (Zagreb: Državni arhiv NR Hrvatske, 1958), 195–97, 212; and Josip Barbić et al., eds., *Hrvatske kraljevske konferencije* [Croatian royal conferences] I, 1689–1716 (Zagreb: Arhiv Hrvatske, 1985), 116, 118, 129, 134, 147, 151–52, 154, 155–56, 160, 162–63. For a general overview of the modernization efforts and the problem of the resistance of the orders, see Jean Béranger, "Resistenza dei ceti alle riforme dell' Impero 1680–1710," in *La dinamica statale austriaca*, 1981, 19–64 (see note 56).

fake documents or muddled historical arguments in his face. Ritter Vitezović, however, was not one of these: on the contrary, he was the special weapon, the “silver bullet,” that the Emperor’s commissioner used to get rid of them. Marsigli also in turn supported Vitezović, not only in Zagreb, but as much as he could in Vienna as well. He may well have had a role when Vitezović was appointed as secretary to the Chancellery on 15th August 1701 and received a commission from the Emperor to systematically examine the holdings of the Croatian archives in order to further the border negotiations and the modernization of the country.¹⁰²

Vitezović, who felt that he was at the highest point of his life,¹⁰³ thanked Marsigli in a rhyming epistle, but his happiness was cut short after two weeks. The reformist elite of the *Conferentia*, while formally representing the Diet (the Sabor), constrained the autonomy of the estates in many respects; consequently the nobility, fiercely protective of their interests, grew more and more suspicious. The tension exploded in a conflict on 30th August 1701, and the Sabor dissolved the *Conferentia*. This is when Ritter Vitezović’s tribulations start as well: he was denied access to the Sabor’s archives (it had been arranged for the documents to be published, but the Ritter, who was cooperating with Vienna, was not elected to the archival committee).¹⁰⁴ Further misfortune ensued: the state printing house that Vitezović was the director of burnt down in a fire, and a few years later he was practically chased out of the country following a controversial possessory action. He was to spend his last years in miserable circumstances in the Two Bears Hotel in Vienna.

These facts are well known and researched. The literature, however, is not unbiased. The only aspect regarding Vitezović on which there is a unity of opinion is that he was a hero of “nation-building” and an influential representative of (proto)nationalist ideology.¹⁰⁵ Authors who see nationalism as the ultimate evil disapprove of the polyhistor

¹⁰² Klaić, *Život i djela Pavla Rittera Vitezovića*, 164.

¹⁰³ See Blažević, *Vitezovićeva Hrvatska*, 113.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 173. On the political suspicion that fell on Vitezović (as an agent of the Habsburgs, acting against the Croatian interests), see Antoljak, *Hrvatska historiografija*, I: 216.

¹⁰⁵ Simpson, *Pavao Ritter Vitezović*, passim; Blažević, *Vitezovićeva Hrvatska*, 197–200.

and portray him as chasing dangerous dreams,¹⁰⁶ while narratives on the other side emphasize his efforts on behalf of modernization and his role as a cultural initiator in the creation of a culture of the national language and the formation of the historical self-image of the area.¹⁰⁷ (There is a broad continuum between these two poles, including those who criticize Vitezović's contemporaries for not noticing his honest love for the country and those who blame them for not understanding the necessity for the reforms he advocated.¹⁰⁸ The perspective of the history of patriotism could offer a more flexible framework to understand and interpret why Vitezović's layers of loyalties (towards his hometown Senj, the Kingdom of Croatia, his ruler) became conflicted in him after a long time of seemingly peaceful internal coexistence—if they ever did become conflicted at all. It also might become easier to understand the actions of his contemporaries who rallied against him, without “condemning” anyone. We are even more justified to focus on the concept of the patria because, although Vitezović can be considered the constructor of Croatian national identity—that is, a nationalist author—on the surface of his writings, both in the vernacular and Latin, the terminology of patria is of primary importance.

In his dictionary, he does distinguish between the two meanings of patria (*patria germana / prava domovina* is the place of birth, and *patria terra / domovina otačbina* the homeland in today's wider, political sense), but he makes great efforts to transfer the emotions connected to the first meaning to the second one.¹⁰⁹ A contemporary was right to write about him in the epigram saluting Vitezović's short work on Saint Ladislaus: “Restituis Patrem Patriae; Patriota mereris / Esse Pater Patriae. Sic Patriota puto” (“You give back its father to the patria; as a patriot, you deserve to be called a father of the patria—this

¹⁰⁶ E.g. Nada Klaić, “Comment et pourquoi Pavao Vitezović est-il devenue prêtre de Doclea moderne,” in Vittore Branca, ed., *Barocco in Italia e nei paesi slavi del Sud* (Florence: Olschki, 1983), 79–92; Giovanna Brogi Bercoff, “La storiografia umanistica di Dalmazia e Croazia: modelli italiani e miti nazionali,” *Ricerche slavistiche XXXVI* (1989): 101–17.

¹⁰⁷ E.g. Rafo Bogišić, “Hrvatski barokni slavizam” [Croatian Baroque Slavism], in *Zrcalo duhovno: Književne studije* [Spiritual mirror: Literary studies] (Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, 1997), 150ff; Bratulić, “Oživjela Hrvatska u obzoru života i djela Pavla Rittera Vitezovića,” 38–40.

¹⁰⁸ For brief overviews of the history of the reception, see Antoljak, *Hrvatska historiografija*, I: 231–33; Bratulić, “Oživjela Hrvatska u obzoru života i djela Pavla Rittera Vitezovića,” 29–32; Blažević, *Vitezovićeva Hrvatska*, 31–38.

¹⁰⁹ Simpson, *Pavao Ritter Vitezović*, 56–57.

is what I say as a good patriot").¹¹⁰ If there existed a patriotic discourse in "Illyria," then Vitezović is certainly one of its protagonists. His example is a proof that nationalism and patriotism are tendencies that neither exclude each other nor react against each other, but the former is the possible dialect, a subtype of the latter. The real question is rather the shade which this (proto)nationalist patriotism represents within the ideological spectrum of contemporary Illyrism(s).

Bearing in mind that Vitezović's oeuvre is quite rich and well-researched, I will only summarize the main characteristics of his patriotism. There has been extensive research on the *territorial borders* of his ideal patria.¹¹¹ There are basically three versions that emerge from the memoirs and historical works. The widest Illyria reaches from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea and the Aegean Sea—in this case, Vitezović bases his arguments on Slavic prehistory and a certain desired cultural unity, using the *topoi* of humanist tradition. His *Responsio*, given to Marsigli, is more realistic, but it still defines a country of considerable size: the borders of Croatia following a successful anti-Ottoman Habsburg expansion would embrace the Balkans interpreted in a narrow sense (that is, roughly 20th century Yugoslavia). Finally, the narrowest version of the three, outlined in the *Dissertation*, is limited to the contemporary Kingdom of Croatia and the attached Dalmatia and Bosnia.

When it comes to *political* structures, it is no question that Vitezović's preferred form of government is monarchy. While his standpoint on the question of narrower Croatian autonomy fluctuates, there seems to be a tendency to decrease the power of the ban (Viceroy). *Croatia rediviva* clearly suggests the layering of the *župans* and royal power, which mirrors the Habsburg modernizing intentions, and which was a scheme to suppress the sovereignty of the estates.¹¹² This was indeed the way out of the labyrinth of the inextricably interconnected local, central, ecclesiastical and secular jurisdictions; at the same time, it would have provided a model example for the most crucial problem

¹¹⁰ The epigram, by Georgius Gladich, canon of Ljubljana (*Epigramma in Authorem De restituto Slavis S. Ladislao rege*), is published in László Szörényi, "Paulus Ritter Szent László-életrajza" [The biography of St Ladislaus by Paulus Ritter], *Irodalomtörténeti közlemények* (1999), 3–4: 448.

¹¹¹ See e.g. Blažević, "Performing National Identity," 260–62.

¹¹² Blažević, *Vitezovićeve Hrvatska*, 146–148. I do not agree with the author that this political structure would have served both the centralizing and feudal interests (48); I believe that the decrease in the importance of the bans and the Sabor hurt the latter.

of the entire Habsburg state structure following the integration of the Danubian basin into the hereditary provinces. True, this would have made the constitutional status of the Kingdom of Croatia quite questionable. This is what the suggestion elaborated in the memorandum *Regia Illyricorum Croatia* was trying to counterbalance: the Habsburg monarch would rule only the eastern parts of his empire on the grounds of his rights to “tota Croatia.” The root of the idea comes from the first half of the 17th century. Ivan Tomko Mrnavić, the Counter-Reformation Bosnian bishop, had made the same proposal in a national hagiographic work¹¹³ dedicated to Ferdinand III, King of Hungary, basing it on sacral legitimacy and genealogical combination (by declaring Austria as a part of ancient Illyria, and annexing the Hungarian saints from the house of Árpád—Stephen, Emeric, Ladislaus and Elizabeth—into the body of Illyrian saints).¹¹⁴ Vitezović was moving on a really narrow path—without success.

Concerning the community which lies behind these ideas, it is perhaps surprising to find that the object of the patriotic discourse is a community which belongs to the same religion (Roman Catholic) but does not speak the same language and does not have the same origin. To be more accurate, Vitezović’s standpoint is not without contradictions. On the one hand, we could cite several examples from Vitezović to illustrate the importance of the vernacular language and to the proclamation and performative linguistic creation of a strong cultural-linguistic sense of patriotic identity (let us not forget his publications in the vernacular language, the way he more and more uses the adjective “Croatian” instead of “Illyrian”, or his own change of name).¹¹⁵ On the other, in a number of his works he lists all five of

¹¹³ Joannes Tomcus Marnavitijs, *Regiae sanctitatis Illyricanae foecunditas* (Romae, 1630); Vitezović quotes its Preface in his *Croatia rediviva*, 10.

¹¹⁴ See Sándor Bene, “A Szilveszter-bulla nyomában: Pázmány Péter és a Szent István-hagyomány 17. századi fordulópontja” [The falsification of the ‘Sylvester-bull’: Péter Pázmány and the turning point of the Hungarian St Stephen tradition in the 17th century], in Sándor Bene, ed., “*Hol vagy István király?*” A Szent István-hagyomány évszázadai [Where are you, King Stephen? The centuries of the tradition of St. Stephen] (Budapest: Gondolat, 2006), 89–124; Sándor Bene, “Ideološke koncepcije o staleškoj državi zagrebačkoga kanonika” [The concept of a Zagrabian canon regarding the state of the estates], in Juraj Rattkay, *Spomen na kraljeve i banove Kraljevstva Dalmacije, Hrvatske i Slavonije* [Memory of kings and bans of the kingdoms of Dalmatia, Croatia, and Slavonia] (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2001), 72.

¹¹⁵ Blažević, *Vitezovićeva Hrvatska*, 148–50, 178–81; Bratulić, “Oživjela Hrvatska u obzoru života i djela Pavla Rittera Vitezovića,” 17–19, where Vitezović’s relevant lines are quoted from the Croatian appendix of *Kronika aliti spomen vszega szvieta vikov* [Chronicle or memory of all the ages of the world] (Zagreb, 1696); he admonishes his

the current (and mutually contradictory) Croatian theories of descent without making a stand and choosing one.¹¹⁶ We could explain the inconsistencies (his ideal of the patria presupposed a linguistic community, but this community is gradually created out of different ethnic groups), or one could argue that his permissive approach to the *origination of peoples* follows from his German origins.¹¹⁷ However, it is more important to point out that Vitezović, while not smoothing down all the inconsistencies of his arguments, does intend a key role to be assigned to language, ethnic belonging and origin in the creation of the ideal patria.

The perception of time is closely connected with the question of language and origin. Unlike Marsigli, Vitezović concentrates on the selective, identity-making, “vis” function of historical memory. His view of history is not linear but typological: what will happen has already happened, the past prefigures the future. The past (the historical “truth”), however, is not static: it is always born in the moment and with the gesture of asking about it (he had been the one who lined up those blind bards in front of the tent of the imperial commissioner, and it is possible that he made them recite his own poetry), and it is in great part the “result” of linguistic operations (Vitezović was among the most practiced fabricators of fake genealogies in his time, and he was the anonymous writer who produced most of the *Trophaeum nobilissimae ac antiquissimae domus Estorasianae*, which certified the Hun-Scythian descent of the Hungarian Esterházy family).¹¹⁸ The Croatian borders flexibly change in the different versions of his memoirs not because his imagination was motivated by insatiable expansionist ambitions but because in his definition of patria he consciously mixes historical and linguistic-cultural criteria and criteria of origin, never giving preference to either. His argumentation, embedded in historical narrative and source quotations, is like a kaleidoscope—the patria is at one moment larger, then smaller, first monolingual then not, now led by the estates, then by the bans—but it is still held together and recognizable in any shape by a mysterious element. This element is not to

historiographer predecessors for writing in Latin: Antoljak, *Hrvatska historiografija*, I, 207. On the Croatization of his original name (Ritter), see Ferdo Šišić, “Hrvatska historiografija od XVI. do XX. stoljeća” [Croatian historiography from the 16th to the 20th century], *Jugoslavenski istoriski časopis* I (1935): 39.

¹¹⁶ Blažević, *Vitezovićeve Hrvatska*, 151–52.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 165.

¹¹⁸ Szörényi, “Paulus Ritter Szent László-életrajza,” 422.

be found in the factors making up the objects of loyalty—borders (territory), the constitutional system and the attributes of the referential community—but in the emotional component of patriotic discourse, the mode of loyalty to the patria. Here Vitezović is in his element. For he was a master of evoking and shaping patriotic emotions.

At this point, it is worth returning to the question whether he was really unsuccessful in representing Croatian national interests while he was working with Marsigli. Judged from the short term aspects of contemporary politics he definitely was not successful: as a result of the border negotiations the influence of the Inner-Austrian Chamber and the *Hofskriegsrat* (Court war council) in Graz grew at the expense of the Croatian state (at this point, the interests of the *Conferentia Regni* and the Sabor happened to coincide).¹¹⁹ Nonetheless, I believe that for Vitezović it was more important to plant the seeds of *amor patriae* into the widest possible social layer than the integrity of the state or the protection of the autonomy of the estates. The different versions of “tota Croatia” merely formulated the possibilities to bring to fruition this deeply rooted intention. In Vitezović’s work the cult of the past manifested in his various historical works, his plans for source publications and genealogical and heraldic research or the cult of the language shown in the edition of his dictionary merely served the aim of forming a national soul. His intentions were in perfect harmony with the trend of Muratori’s cultural patriotism and with the strengthening Hungarian attempts at literary history, the knowledge of the country (*Landeskunde*) or source collecting. The outline of *De aris et focis* was probably inspired by the *Modus materiae conquirendae* of the Hungarian Jesuit historian, Gábor Hevenesi (the two scholars knew each other personally).¹²⁰ Ferenc Otrokocsi Foris’ work on Hungarian prehistory, *Origines Hungaricae*,¹²¹ was published at the same time as *Prodrumus*, while Vitezović’s grandiose lexicographical work has a direct parallel in Ferenc Pápai Páriz’s (still-in-use) Latin-German dictionary. His experiments to collect oral poetry were parallel to the Hungarian initiatives for the writing of literary history, manifested in the work of the Burius brothers, Mihály Rotarides and Dávid

¹¹⁹ Pleše, “Bolonjski grof i hrvatski barun,” 73.

¹²⁰ Blažević, *Vitezovićeva Hrvatska*, 170.

¹²¹ Franciscus Foris Otrokocsi, *Origines Hungaricae seu liber quo vera nationis Hungaricae origo et antiquitas e veterum monumentis et linguis praecipuis panduntur*, I–II (Franeker: Strik, 1693).

Cwittinger. These cultural-patriotic initiatives—which continued until the end of the century—included the Protestant Mátyás Bél’s grandiose project of describing the patria as well as the source editions of the Jesuit historians Sámuel Timón, István Kaprinay, István Katona and György Pray all played a very significant role in the modernization of Hungarian national identity and in shaping the ideal of a “Hungaria litterata” to replace the old Hun-Scythian community with its traditions of martial valor.¹²²

Compared to all these, Vitezović brought something new, or rather something more ancient. A common feature of the listed Hungarian initiatives is that they were born in a linguistically non-Hungarian community, and that their new, state-patriotic approach was trying to overwrite the anti-Habsburg national patriotic tendency, a mostly Protestant patriotic tradition where the topos of the “chosen people” guaranteed the salvation history horizon and sacral legitimation of the struggles for independence. Vitezović’s Illyrism seems to have tried to amalgamate the two trends: filling up the characteristic literary forms and genres (dictionary, historical source edition, genealogical works, etc.) with the Catholic topoi of the “holy nation” and the “martyr nation.” His Latin epos, *Plorantis Croatiae saecula duo* (1703), rises above the countless other examples.¹²³ This publication, dedicated to General Johann F. Herberstein, Vice President of the *Hofkriegsrat* in Graz and carrying Vitezović’s elegy to Marsigli as an appendix, is actually not a historical epic, but a poeticized chronicle. Croatia, personified as an allegorical female figure (the mother of its citizens, *mater civium*), recounts her sad fate in the first person: the devastation, the loss of her sons and her territories during the fight with the Ottomans, the blows she suffered through wars and natural disasters, epidemics and famine. The feeling of belonging to the patria gains a sacral dimension as the mother figure impersonating Croatia assumes the

¹²² See Andor Tarnai, *Tanulmányok a magyarországi historia litteraria történetéről* [Studies in the History of the *historia litteraria* in Hungary], ed. Gábor Kecskeméti (Budapest, Universitas, 2004); Sándor Bene, “Latin Historiography in Hungary: Writing and Rewriting Myths of Origins,” in István Monok, ed., *Myth and Reality: Latin Historiography in Hungary, 15th–18th Centuries: Exhibition in the National Széchényi Library 7 July–3 September, 2006* (Budapest: National Széchényi Library, 2006), 3–27.

¹²³ On this poem see Antoljak, *Hrvatska historiografija*, I: 217–18; Zrinka Blažević, “Plorantis Croatiae saecula duo: Discursive Adaptations and Performative Functions of the Baroque ‘stabat mater’ Topos,” in Johann Anselm Steiger, ed., *Passion, Affekt und Leidenschaft in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2005), I: 929–39.

features of the *mater dolorosa*. The historical narrative about the sufferings of the Croatian people thus enters the dimension of salvation history, turning into a collective martyrdom in which they play the role of the chosen people. The conceptual framework of the love of the *patria* becomes sacralized by poetic invention: if the *patria* is the mother of every citizen, and she also happens to be Christ's parent as well, then love for the *patria* is not simply *amor in patriam* but rather *pietas erga patriam*. Vitezović also draws the political conclusions: the religious love for the *patria*, which connects patriots to each other, also extends to the ruler, the father of the *patria*.¹²⁴ The political community becomes a community of love: Marsigli's exclusive, religious love for the ruler is extended to everyone who is part of the reference community of the *patria*. This community is unambiguously defined by origin and religion. This is why Vitezović's concept "de aris et focus" cannot be identified with the *topoi* of "pietas Austriaca", as the latter does not include the component of ethnic inherence.

The emotional world of *pietas* would not be completed without the complementary national passion, *odium*, directed against the oppressors and exploiters of the suffering, martyr people. Besides the Ottomans (the old, constant, barbaric enemy threatening the whole of civilization), the Croatian poet-scholar draws the picture of the current, political enemy in the rebel Hungarians who had left the true religion. His technique is not straight vituperation: he brings out a whole rhetorical and historiographical arsenal of indirect defamation from reticence and ambiguous "compliments" in the paradiastolic form through the modification of the accepted narratives of national memory. Let us consider an example of this process. The main objective of *Natales Divo Ladislavo Regi Slavoniae Apostolo Restituti* (1704),¹²⁵ a short work combining national hagiography with genealogy, is—without the grievance of any nation (*citra ullius nationis injuriam*)—to give back to the Croatian nation St. Ladislaus, the king from the House of Árpád who was venerated everywhere as a Hungarian saint. In order to achieve this, he does not exclude Illyrian descent even in the case of

¹²⁴ "Principibus servare fidem de iure tenemur: / Principibus, decus est, servare fideliter; horum / est eadem Populique salus. Si Patria mater civibus est, / Princeps est dignus honore paterno." Quoted *ibid.*, 936.

¹²⁵ The whole opusculum is published in the original in Szörényi, "Paulus Ritter Szent László-életrajza," 423–47. On its evaluation see also N. Klaić, "Comment et pourquoy Pavao Vitezović est-il devenu prêtre de Doclea moderne," 91; Antoljak, *Hrvatska historiografija*, I: 218–218.

Géza, the father of Saint Stephen: in his name, the Slavic word “gojac”, or “gojzo”, meaning “educator”, is hidden, and he must have had arrived in Hungary with the intent of taming the ferocious Hungarians. He provides an “undeniable” proof in Ladislaus’ case: by misinterpreting a bull of Béla IV he suggests that Ladislaus was of Croatian origin and held the title of Croatian ban before occupying the Hungarian throne.¹²⁶ Thanks to clever genealogical combination the whole House of Árpád proves to be of Croatian origin, and this means that Hungary must be a part of Northern Croatia (*Croatia septentrionalis*), that is, Illyrian territory. In the poem (*Acrostichon ad natale solum divi regis Ladislai*) accompanying the short but substantial treatise, Vitezović again personifies Croatia in the form of a mother who is overjoyed to find her beautiful son after thrice two decades and who can celebrate the promise of the future in him—the apostle of Slovenia and the founder of the Zagreb bishopric.

I have not cited this impossible treatise to discredit its author but to demonstrate that although Vitezović treats the past in the free spirit of a 20th century deconstructionist, his aims are serious and his intentions—in his patriotic way—noble and pure. Where Marsigli wanted to conduct “medical” interventions by realigning borders or modifying the constitutional structure, Vitezović performed the same operation on historical sources and the past, and with no less professionalism. The objective was ostensibly the same: to make Illyria happy. This is also where the decisive difference between the two of them shows itself. For the Bolognese scholar, *felicitas*, the highest level of happiness, was a calm and emotion-free state, a sort of political *ataraxia*, and the way leading to this state lay in the repression and rationalization of the emotions—including those felt for the patria. Contrariwise, the Croatian polyhistor identified happiness with the emotions felt for the patria, which are valuable in themselves. In his view, *amor patriae* is an instinctive, unconditional love that all patriots are bound

¹²⁶ Szörényi, “Paulus Ritter Szent László-életrajza,” 424, 446. The notion of the Croatian extraction of St. Ladislaus can be found first in a Vitezović paper passed on to Marsigli: *Denominationes montium, fluviorum, civitatumque et aliorum locorum, plerumque per Illyricum, eorumque ab antiquo differentiae et significata*, BUB Ms 103, 4r, where Vitezović writes: “Goricza: Parvum montem significat: et est nomen diversorum locorum in Illyrico. Goricia est arx una cum suo Comitatu in Croatia, ex qua S. Ladislavus Pannoniarum Rex oriundus.” (The same in *Croatiae erudita descriptio*: BUB FM, Ms 103, 43v.)

to feel without any sense of self-interest or financial considerations.¹²⁷ In his famous apology, he refers to Justus Lipsius and quotes Seneca (“I am not the son of this one corner alone: the whole world is my fatherland”):¹²⁸ still, he spent his entire career realizing the opposite of Lipsius’ teaching. He consciously built back around the affects the metaphoric language criticized by Lipsius: he wrote of passionate love for country in the terms of religious fervor, *fides* and *pietas*. In the introduction to his work on Saint Ladislaus he claims that by giving the saint back to his homeland, “I do no less for the Patria than for God. Nature has imbued every soul with the reverential love of the homeland; and I doubt even less that we have to revere our national saints in heaven with the same religious veneration.”¹²⁹ In the introduction to *Plorantis Croatiae saecula duo* he also talks about how he was motivated to write by his “nativa erga patriam pietas.”¹³⁰ It would be simple to connect this with the originally Protestant tradition with which Lipsius took issue, fearing the rampage of religious wars. Melanchton, for instance, writes, “A wondrous love of the country has been injected into the hearts of all people by divine intention.”¹³¹ We must not forget, though, that while according to Melanchton and his followers the love of the patria must be a school for God’s love, Vitezović would also have enlisted the saints in the service of the *religio patriae* and used religious feelings for political aims—that is, prefiguring the Illyrian nationalism of Romanticism.

Indeed, those contemporaries who ousted him from the Croatian lands could not understand the modernity of Vitezović’s patriotism. There was also something else they did understand: the dreams of both men, Marsigli’s rationalist one and Vitezović’s nationalist one, threatened the freedom of “Illyria.” As the noblemen who dissolved the *Conferentia Regni* and hid the key to the archives from the committed

¹²⁷ See his eulogy (*Vinculum ex Pindiis hortis*) dedicated to Aleksander Mikulić, archdeacon of the Zagreb chapter: “Oh! Love for the patria transcends all other loves; / The man who loves the patria is a man who is worthy of love. / He who is aflame in his entirety with a fierce love for his patria / Is a man for whom the patria is likewise wholly aflame.” (Quoted and translated by Simpson, *Pavao Ritter Vitezović*, 50.)

¹²⁸ Klaić, *Obrana Pavla Rittera Vitezovica*, 381. The Seneca locus (“non sum uni angulo natus, patria mea totus hic mundus est”) appears in *Epistulae morales ad Lucilium*, 28, 5.

¹²⁹ Cited in Szörényi, “Paulus Ritter Szent László-életrajza,” 424.

¹³⁰ See Blažević, “Plorantis Croatiae saecula duo,” 933.

¹³¹ Quoted by Friedeburg, “The Problems of Passions and Love of Fatherland in Protestant Thought,” 88; from a letter added to a 1538 edition of Tacitus’ *Germania*.

modernizers also referred to the patria, the question is, where is the Illyrian/Croatian patriotic tradition that put *libertas* in the center of its discourse?

Triune Illyria: The forgotten tradition

If something has to be searched for, obviously it is hidden; at least it is not in the foreground. As in the case of every loudly polemizing author moving around great reference material, the really telling places in Vitezović's texts are the silent spaces and the missing references. Only a few works of high standard, encompassing the entirety of Croatian history, were born before the 18th century. One of them has already been mentioned: Ivan Lučić's influential history of Dalmatia (1666), a work based on archival material with which Vitezović engaged in an ongoing polemic throughout the course of his life. Vitezović could not accept Lučić's history primarily because of its political tendency; but he also discovered some professional mistakes and devoted a monograph to a detailed critique of it.¹³² He barely mentions the other work,¹³³ although he must have known and perused it (because it was widely used by his contemporaries): the *Memoria regum et banorum Dalmatiae, Croatiae et Sclavoniae* of György Ráttkay, a former canon of Zagreb, published in Vienna in 1652.¹³⁴ The first of its two dedications was addressed to Ferdinand IV, the elected King of Hungary, the second to Miklós Zrínyi, ban of Croatia, and his brother Péter; its proemium turned to the "noble estates of Croatia and Slavonia." If we want to hear and understand the patriotic language that Vitezović felt such a deep antagonism for that he wanted to delete it from his own and his readers' memory, this is the work we need to look at.¹³⁵

Ráttkay's history is the product of a political and intellectual climate very different from the one in which Vitezović's works were born. The

¹³² See note 35.

¹³³ *Croatiae erudita descriptio*, 42v, 43r (see note 24); *Kronika aliti szpomen vszega szvieta vikov* (see note 115), quoted in Blažević, *Vitezovićeva Hrvatska*, 179; see also note 146.

¹³⁴ Georgius Rattkay, *Memoria regum et banorum regnorum Dalmatiae, Croatiae et Sclavoniae inchoata ab origine usque ad praesentem annum MDCLII* (Viennae: Cosmerovius, 1652).

¹³⁵ Modern Croatian translation and reprint edition: Rattkay, *Spomen* (op. cit. in note 114).

author, while a man of the church, was a baron, the descendant of an important Croatian aristocratic family. His intention was the historical legitimization of Croatian feudal consciousness, the formulation of feudal representation and a possible political program at the same time. The essence of this program was placing the relationship of the Hungarian and Croatian feudal state on new foundations, that is, creating a system for those “liberties” (*libertates*), i.e., ecclesiastical and secular autonomies, which in Marsigli’s eyes half a century later were the main causes of the pestilent “disorder.” Mutual historical grievances and current political interests made it necessary to come to an agreement. Following the battle of Mohács in 1526, which meant the fall of the medieval Kingdom of Hungary and opened up a new phase of expansion for Ottoman power in East Central Europe, the Croatian and Slavonian estates quit the state union with the Hungarians, univocally proclaimed Ferdinand I to be their king, and accepted hereditary succession to the throne (that is, they gave up their right to free elections).¹³⁶ The course of the next century, however, demonstrated that their political gesture was not really (as a matter of fact, it was less than barely) rewarded. The Habsburg government—which did not officially acknowledge the declared change in the constitutional situation of Croatia—could not effectively protect the country from further Ottoman expansion either, but by the establishment of the military frontiers and giving preferential treatment to the Vlachs Vienna committed serious violations against the liberties of the Croatian Estates. By the mid-17th century, after the conclusion of the Thirty Years’ War, there was an increased expectation in Croatia of a general war of liberation against the Ottomans, which would have brought obvious changes in the political relations of the area. In order for the Croatian state, which had melted down to the size of the “remainder of the remainder” (*reliquiae reliquiarum*), to come out favorably from the prospective changes, the Estates had to draw the conclusions from historical experiences. As a separate deal with the Habsburgs had proved to be impossible (moreover, Vienna had no wish for such a thing), it seemed more advisable to return to the institution of elected kingship and renegotiate the relationship with the Hungarians. Such a desire

¹³⁶ See Tomislav Raukar, *Hrvatsko srednjovjekovlje: Prostor, ljudi, ideje* [Croatian middle ages: Space, people, ideas] (Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1997), 59–60; and Stanko Guldescu, *The Croatian-Slavonian Kingdom 1526–1792* (The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1970), 23–26.

was expressed in the famous 1643 epigram of János Szakmárdy, notary and treasurer of the Kingdom of Croatia, in which the impersonated Croat declares his wish: “Prima mihi de Rege Novo sunt Vota legendo; Primus in Hungarica Nobilitate locus.” (“I am the first to be entitled to a vote in the election of the new king / and have the first place among the ranks of the Hungarian nobility.”)¹³⁷ György Ráttkay’s history was driven by the same motivation, but its program was more realistic.

In the beginning of the third volume of *Memoria*, Ráttkay remonstrates against the contemporary (17th century) terminology of the Hungarian Chancellery, arguing that it does not follow from the Árpád family’s ascent to the throne that Slavonia and Croatia can be called “subjected parts” (as is the practice in their documents), as this term can only be used for territories occupied in war. He tries to prove his point by referring to the *Tripartitum*, which—he claims—makes a distinction between *regna incorporata* (countries joined to the Hungarian Crown) and *partes subiectae* (parts subjected to the Crown). Croatia would be an example of the former and Transylvania of the latter. Ráttkay’s line of argument clearly shows the system of equal autonomies that he would like to imagine as the Kingdom of Hungary: he believes that any *regnum* acknowledging the Holy Crown can have “subjected parts”: examples of a *pars subiecta* are Moldavia, Wallachia and Transylvania (to Hungary), Lyburnia (to Croatia) and Istria (to Dalmatia!). He continues: “We would also accept that our countries [Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia] are subjects of the Hungarian Crown, were they equally governed by the same main power.”¹³⁸ While he does not discuss in detail the legislative rights of the equal states belonging under one crown, it is perhaps not an exaggeration to say that this is a sort of confederation of the countries of Saint Stephen’s crown, with a regulated relationship between the fellow countries (*regna socia*), including not only the territories which are already associated, but also those (primarily Dalmatia) which are still to be liberated from foreign powers (Venice and the Ottoman Empire).¹³⁹

In the outline of the prospective patria, the emphasis is visibly placed on the development of a constitutional framework, and not on mapping questions of language and ethnicity. Ráttkay’s term Illyria

¹³⁷ Cf. Bene, “Ideološke koncepcije o staleškoj državi,” 80–82.

¹³⁸ Ráttkay, *Memoria*, 58.

¹³⁹ See Bene, “Ideološke koncepcije o staleškoj državi,” 88–99.

stands in every case as the all-embracing name for the three Croatian *regna*, Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia, which means that it signifies a politically and constitutionally conceived territory. In the part of the *Memoria* on prehistory the canon of Zagreb places the Slavs' move to the south in the nebulous ancient past and relates the swarm of the people trying to find a new homeland from Zagorje towards the north as a fable (and in so doing reconciles Orbini's Gothic-Slavic and Pribojević's Illyrian-Croatian continuity theories).¹⁴⁰ He excludes the Styria and Pannonia of Tomko Mrnavić's Great Illyria, and Bosnia is considered part of the "*natio Illyrica*" only conditionally, as a territory to be liberated. Drawing up the borders this way can be traced back to political reasons, and goes against the argument of common ties of language: Carniola (today's Slovenia) and Serbia are not included in the future patria. Shortly after the publication of the *Memoria*, Rátkay entered a sharp battle of words with Juraj Križanić, who was dreaming about the reunification of Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism and about pan-Slavic unity. In a letter to Križanić, he makes it clear: "the Illyrian kingdoms have always been free, and these provinces [Styria, Carinthia and Carniola] fell under the servitude of hereditary rights."¹⁴¹

"Triune Illyria" was introduced by the ban of Croatia and of Slavonia, who was not merely a Viceroy (*Pro-Rex*) but also the representative of the political community of the estates, independently of whoever the formal ruler of the state confederation might be at the time. One of the rhetorical peaks of the *Memoria* is the inaugural speech by Miklós

¹⁴⁰ On Orbini's *Il Regno de gli Slavi* (1601) see Franjo Šanjek, "Povijesni pogledi Mavra Orbinija" [Historical views of Mauro Orbini], in Mavro Orbini, *Kraljevstvo Slavena* [Kingdom of the Slavs], ed. Franjo Šanjek (Zagreb: Golden marketing-Narodne novine, 1999), 9–45. The oration of Vinko Pribojević (Vincentius Priboevus), *De origine successibusque Slavorum*, (original ed.: Venice, 1532) has been published in a modern bilingual edition edited by Grga Novak and Veljko Gortan, *O podrijetlu i zgodama Slavena* (Split: Književni krug, 1991). On the relationship between the two works see Giovanna Brogi Bercoff, "Il Pribevo e il 'Regno degli Slavi' di Mauro Orbini," *Ricerche slavistiche* XXII–XXIII (1975–1976): 137–54. On Rátkay's borrowings from Orbini, see "L'historiographie croate du XVII^e siècle: de l' *opus oratorium* a la recherche documentaire," in Branca, ed., *Barocco in Italia e nei paesi slavi del Sud*, 96. On the recent historiography of Croatian ethnogenesis, see Ivo Goldstein, *Hrvatski rani srednji vijek* [The Croatian early middle ages] (Zagreb: Novi Liber, 1995), 22–26; Lujko Margetić, "Etnogeneza slavena" [Slavic ethnogenesis], *Rad Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 492 (2005): 89–143.

¹⁴¹ Cf. Bene, "Ideološke koncepcije o staleškoj državi," 73.

Zrínyi, ban of Croatia, the terminology of which points expressively at the essence of this kind of constitutional patriotism:

Whatever happens, my lords and compatriots, I am not too afraid of any turn of fortune when I see the goodwill of so many illustrious dignitaries unified with my own promptitude; I am thus offering and dedicating my services, property and life to this most beloved country: I am only asking you, in the name of God, to be united in the service of this country, and if you see me bending under this heavy burden, to rush to my assistance with advice and your other excellent virtues.¹⁴²

Amatissima patria is the community of virtues of the *patriotae*, which is also identical with the *incltyi huius regni congregatio*. The reference community of Ráttkay's patriotic discourse is the estate of the nobility. Within this estate the final say belongs to the great dynasties, due to their financial power: the Zrínyi-Subić, the Frangepáns, the Guzić and the Karlović. The decisions of the noble *Respublica* are collective and univocal. During times of internal struggle and threat of foreign attack the concentration of power in the hands of the governing ban (*banus sine collega*) is legally permitted,¹⁴³ but when the danger passes, the ideal is to return to the practice of dual governance. At the roots of the idea it is easy to discover the outlines of a more archaic state structure based on the Classical readings of the author. The *comitia*, the Croatian Diet, evokes the Roman Senate, the old aristocratic dynasties fill the roles of the Senators (*optimates*), the ban governing alone is the equivalent of the *dictator* elected for the interim, and the dual government of the bans reminds us of the Consuls' division of power. Concerning the relationship between the ruler and the estates of the nobility represented by the ban, Ráttkay's constitutional ideal lies somewhere halfway between the noble republic and a moderate monarchic government. This is signified by the gesture when, in his first *Epistola dedicatoria*, he commends the Illyrian *regna* into the grace of the *de jure* King of Croatia, Ferdinand IV, and not the wielder of *de facto* power, Emperor Ferdinand III—he negotiates as an equal partner with the man of the future, in the voice of the self-assured aristocrat, with a gesture implying necessary and almost unavoidable political changes. The text of the dedication and the composition of the woodcut illustration showing Ferdinand in his coronation finery

¹⁴² Ráttkay, *Memoria*, 255–56.

¹⁴³ Cf. *ibid.*, 40.

carry a political message spelling out the behavior expected from the ruler: just governance and leading a war of liberation against the Ottomans. These are also the conditions for the election of the ruler and for the legitimate exercise of his power.¹⁴⁴ Ráttkay does not consider any Habsburg to be automatically a legitimate heir (*legitima proles*) to the Illyrian rulers, in the way Marnavić did. In Ráttkay's vision this position had to be deserved. He intimates several times, at points of special emphasis within the text, that if necessary the Illyrians would go their own way without Vienna. Illyria, the sacred land, is looking for a leader worthy of it, and the "judgement and authority" of the ancestors vest the historian with the right to show, "as in a mirror," the "merits stamped by the blood of excellent and most loyal leaders," which would oblige the ruler undertaking the liberation and revival of the country to fulfill his historical mission.¹⁴⁵

Now this was exactly the tone and spirit against which Marsigli hotly raged—while simultaneously demonstrating its continued existence—in his report on Croatia when he criticized the Croats for bragging of their past sacrifices and noble liberties. And Vitezović—who did not make more than three written references to Ráttkay during his whole life—smites the Illyrian patriotic tradition represented by him with a seemingly complete *damnatio memoriae*. The reality, however, is more complex. We can find among Vitezović's manuscripts substantial notes in which he discusses one particular part of the *Memoria*, that is, Ráttkay's polemics about the terminology used by the Hungarian chancellery.¹⁴⁶ Nonetheless, he refrained from openly referring to Ráttkay's notes. Vitezović's argument with the canon of Zagreb was hidden below the surface: he took over the key concepts and some theses of the patriotic discourse of the *Memoria* (Illyria, the *amatissima patria*, the

¹⁴⁴ In this respect, mid-17th century "Illyrian" patriotism can be placed in the context of a new type of discourse of patriotism within the whole of the Holy Roman Empire. See Robert von Friedeburg, "The Making of Patriots: Love of Fatherland and Negotiating Monarchy in Seventeenth-Century Germany," *The Journal of Modern History* 77 (2005): 881–916; on the earlier period, see his "In Defense of Patria: Resisting Magistrates and the Duties of Patriots in the Empire from the 1530s to the 1640s," *Sixteenth Century Journal* XXXII (2001) 2: 357–82.

¹⁴⁵ Ráttkay, "Epistola dedicatoria Ferdinando Quarto apostolico Ungariae, Dalmatiae, Croatiae [etc.] regi," in *Memoria*, without page numbers.

¹⁴⁶ "Protestatio Georg[igii] Rakay [sic!] in eos qui Regna Illyrici Hung[ari]ae subiecta putant," in Pavao Ritter Vitezović, *Miscellanea*, Zagreb, Nacionalna i sveučilišna knjižnica, Ms 3451, 110r.

sacred land, criticisms of the Hungarians, etc.) and, taking them out of their original context, wrote a new “program language” using them. In this he was justified by the future: for both Croatian and European historiography now classify Ráttkay as his predecessor.¹⁴⁷ This is not merely a simple misunderstanding but the fatal interplay of the different layers of reception, a genuine comedy of errors. Vitezović was only partly misunderstood by 19th century romantic Illyrism when they started to revere him as the father of the Croatian national awakening or the one with the prophetic dream about a kind of Southern Slav nationalism, but they were entirely mistaken when they saw him as the person encompassing all earlier patriotic attempts as well.¹⁴⁸ When the history of the evolution of nationalism became linear with the annexation and disappearance of the estates-patriotic discourse represented by Ráttkay, the only alternative were Habsburg centralizing and absolutist tendencies. However, we have seen that Vitezović and Marsigli, the representatives of pre-modern nationalist patriotism and rationalist imperial reform attempts, could cooperate well enough in a given historical moment—and the foundation of their agreement was that they both, although for different reasons, stood against the earlier patriotic tradition that was directed to the formation of a new system of feudal and church autonomies which aimed at the integration of those autonomies over linguistic and ethnic borders.

There is no linear causality in history, but perhaps there is a reason for the recurrence of certain similar or parallel constellations. Today, in the time of a struggle (and background negotiation) between local ethno-nationalist forces and an enlightened and rationalist world power politics lending a hand to create order in the remains of the Balkans, it hopefully does make sense to address the silent (or silenced) local traditions. The patriotic discourse which places liberty—as opposed to happiness and order—in its center and which promotes loyalty to the institution of autonomy instead of the values of linguistic and ethnic

¹⁴⁷ E.g. Giovanna Brogi Bercoff, “La storiografia umanistica di Dalmazia e Croazia: modelli italiani e miti nazionali,” *Ricerche slavistiche* XXXVI (1989): 101–17; Miroslav Kurelac, *Ivan Lucić Lucius, otac hrvatske historiografije* [Ivan Lucić Lucius the father of Croatian historiography] (Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1994), 141–42. Cf. Bene, “Ideološke koncepcije o staleškoj državi,” 26–38.

¹⁴⁸ On Vitezović as the precursor of the romantic Illyrian ideology, see Antoljak, *Hrvatska historiografija*, I: 232–33; Bratulić, “Oživjela Hrvatska,” 27–32, 38–39.

belonging, might have a chance for success—at least, it has managed to thwart the elimination of eternal Illyrian disorder.¹⁴⁹ If the elimination eventually succeeds, we all lose something: where there is no Illyria there is no illusion.

(Translated by Katalin Stráner)

¹⁴⁹ Ráttkay's idea of confederation was shaped in the circle of Miklós Zrínyi, Ban of Croatia and Hungarian poet (1620–1664) to a form (supplemented by the idea of religious tolerance) which appeared in the early 18th century in the political program of Ferenc Rákóczi and his opponents. On Rákóczi in this respect, see Ágnes R. Várkonyi, "A Közép-Európa-gondolat II. Rákóczi Ferenc politikájában" [The idea of Central Europe in the politics of Ferenc Rákóczi II], in Géza Dukrét, ed., *Istennel a hazáért és a szabadságért* [With God for fatherland and freedom] (Oradea: Királyhágómelléki Ref. Egyházker., 2005), 145–61. The pamphlets of Count Miklós Bethlen—who was opposed to the Rákóczi movement—which imagine the modernization of the Transylvanian Principality and its integration into the Habsburg Empire, would deserve an individual article. Bethlen, who was deeply influenced by Miklós Zrínyi in his youth, was the Chancellor of the "Gubernium," a Transylvanian institution somewhat similar to the Croatian *Conferentia Regni* at the turn of the 17th and 18th century. He was also in contact with Marsigli. See József Jankovics, "Bethlen Miklós két levele Luigi Ferdinando Marsilihez" [Two letters of Miklós Bethlen to Luigi Ferdinando Marsili], in Péter Tusor, ed., *R. Várkonyi Ágnes Emlékkönyv* [Festschrift for Ágnes R. Várkonyi] (Budapest: ELTE BTK, 1998), 428–31. Bethlen's pamphlet *Moribunda Transylvaniae*, dealing with the political situation in Transylvania, was included in the Marsigli papers in two copies: BUB FM Ms. 57 and Ms103. I also believe it is possible that the anonymous *Probabile ac morale tertium expediens ac moderamen aulicum super statu Appafi et Transylvania circa Apafium* (BUB FM Ms. 57, 142–59), found among the papers of Marsigli, is also the work of the Transylvanian chancellor. Because of another pamphlet, *Columba Noe*, Bethlen was imprisoned by General Rabutin, the military governor of Transylvania, and later interned in Vienna, where he died in 1716.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

PATRES PATRIAE OR PRODITORES PATRIAE?
LEGITIMIZING AND DE-LEGITIMIZING THE
AUTHORITY OF THE PROVINCIAL ESTATES IN
SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY BOHEMIA

Petr Maťa

This contribution is concerned with patriotic sentiment and language in Bohemia in the second half of the seventeenth century.¹ It aims primarily at providing greater historical context to what has been written on this topic. Here, I will introduce new evidence framed by a case study. Yet a case study might be exactly a good starting point given the current state of knowledge. Hitherto, interpretations have been built up on a markedly limited scrutiny of source material, and historians have usually overprivileged a few texts and figures at the expense of many others. Being interested primarily in tracing the lineage of a national consciousness, they have perpetuated the tendency, deep-rooted in the traditional master narrative of a Czech national history, to line up seventeenth- and eighteenth-century “patriots”—mostly authors of historiographical and hagiographical writings—in a chain of canonized witnesses of national awareness. This tendency has predetermined both the selective research interests and the interpretation of these texts as primarily manifestations of Czech national consciousness.

¹ In this article, I deliberately avoid the term “patriotism”. Beyond the general problematic nature of the “ism” terms, especially when applied to the premodern and early modern situations, it is precisely the notion of patriotic talk as primarily an expression of consistent patriotic positions or even a political doctrine that I intend to problematize here. The wide variety of possible uses of *patria* and related terms is documented in Robert von Friedeburg, ed., *Patria und Patrioten vor dem Patriotismus. Pflichten, Rechte, Glauben und die Rekonfigurierung Europäischer Gemeinwesen im 17. Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2005) as well as in many papers of the present volume. On “ism” terms see H. M. Höpfl, “Isms,” *British Journal of Political Science*, 13 (1985): 1–17. My thanks to Howard Louthan for his help on linguistic revisions of this article.

For many generations, historians have focused on a few authors who were portrayed as representatives of the Czech national mission that faced up to the ominous changes in ethno-cultural patterns after the enforcement of the Habsburg hereditary rule over Bohemia in the decades after 1620. It has not been patriotic talk in general but only patriotic utterances compatible with the history of Czech national (language-based) awareness that has been regarded as worth studying. Thus patriotic identity (*vlastenectví*) and national identity have been linked closely together.² Marginally, an ethnically indifferent province-based patriotic identity has been recalled too. More often than not, however, this *Landespatriotismus* implied strong essentialist and reifying connotations. Instead of highlighting and differentiating by whom, in what situations and discourses, how and why *patria* was invoked, historians have tended to understand *Landespatriotismus* as a homogenous set of values rooted in a patriotic identity and professed by the inhabitants of early modern Bohemia regardless of ethnicity. Even recent attempts to open new perspective on the issue and to apply a more text-sensitive approach depart only with difficulties from this canon.³

² It is difficult to provide a concise reference here, for we lack a critical recapitulation of how nation and fatherland were conceptualized in modern Czech historiography dealing with the early modern period. The tendency to search mainly for national awareness seems to have been, on the other hand, omnipresent since the emergence of Czech historiography as a scientific discipline in the nineteenth century, entering major compendiums of both history and the history of literature as well as numerous articles on individuals, their works and their use of particular concepts such as *natio* and *patria*. Attempts to summarize the argument in distinct publications were made mostly on the eve of—and shortly after—the Second World War (though some of them were published much later), see Kamil Krofta, *Nesmrtelný národ. Od Bílé hory k Palackému* [Immortal nation. From White Mountain to Palacký] (Prague: Jan Laichter, 1940); Albert Pražák, *Národ se bránil. Obrany národa a jazyka českého od dob nejstarších po přítomnost* [The nation defended itself. Apologies of the Czech nation and language from the oldest times to the present] (Prague: Sfinx 1946); František Kuttar, *Obrozenecké vlastenectví a nacionalismus. Příspěvek k národnímu a společenskému obsahu češství doby obrozené* [Revivalist patriotism and nationalism. On the national and social content of Czechness in the revival period] (Prague: Karolinum, 2003). Though without doubt ratcheted up by the actual political situation, these texts seem to be fully consistent with the general approach to the subject in Czech historiographic discourse. For a more recent overview see Josef Petráň and Lydia Petráňová, “The White Mountain as a symbol in modern Czech history,” in Teich Mikuláš, ed., *Bohemia in History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 143–163.

³ Martin Svatoš, “Der Begriff *patria* und die patriotischen Tendenzen in der lateinischen Historiographie und Hagiographie in den böhmischen Ländern im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert,” in Gabriele Thome and Jens Holzhausen, eds., “*Es hat sich viel ereignet, Gutes wie Böses.*” *Lateinische Geschichtsschreibung der Spät- und Nachantike* (Munich-Leipzig: K. G. Saur, 2001), 203–213.

This customary way of thinking about patriotic sentiment in seventeenth-century Bohemia produced at the same time a special hierarchy within the group of renowned patriots, assigning the most prominent place (and thus the most attention) to Bohuslav Balbín (1621–1688). Balbín is without doubt an imposing personality—an erudite Jesuit historian, hagiographer, genealogist and poet, author of voluminous patriotic works published in Latin between the 1650s and 1680s. Though his literary, heuristic and collecting activity climaxed without doubt in his encyclopedic *Miscellanea historica regni Bohemiae* (the project remained however incomplete as Balbín finalized only 12 of 30 planned volumes),⁴ historians have usually paid the most attention to his defense of the Czech/Slavic language (“*Bohemica, seu Slauica lingua*”), that was published in print posthumously in 1775 and helped energize the national movement in the late eighteenth century.⁵

Other patriotic writers of the second half of the seventeenth century were most frequently portrayed in the shadow of Balbín, as his friends or belonging to “his circle.” Moreover, historians have tended to exclude tacitly others, who—because of their supposed national allegiance or simply because of the ideas they espoused—did not fit this image. Thus Christian Augustin Pfaltz von Ostritz (1629–1701), a German-speaking canon of the metropolitan chapter of Prague and author of a set of patriotic sermons on Bohemian saints (published in German in 1691), has been practically unknown to historians.⁶ Still

⁴ Two of them were published posthumously in the late eighteenth century. Historians sometimes mistakenly speak about only 20 planned volumes. Balbín himself, however, wrote 1678 to Christian Weise, commenting on his first three volumes of *Miscellanea*: “Alii deinde libri triginta numero (...) huiusmodi sequentur, ut tres historiarum decades compleantur.” See Adolf Patera, “Dopisy Bohuslava Balbína ke Kristianu Weisovi z l. 1678–1688” [Letters of Bohuslav Balbín to Christian Weise, 1678–1688], *Věstník královské české společnosti nauk, třída filos.-histor.-filologická*, 1887 (Prague, 1888), 72–117, here 73.

⁵ The significant body of literature on Balbín has been summarized by his most recent (and most judicious) biographers Jan Kučera and Jiří Rak, *Bohuslav Balbín a jeho místo v české kultuře* [Bohuslav Balbín and his place in Czech culture] (Prague: Vyšehrad, 1983). The important volume *Bohuslav Balbín a kultura jeho doby v Čechách* [Bohuslav Balbín and the culture of his time in Bohemia] (Prague: Památník národního písemnictví, 1992), eloquently demonstrates the central place Czech historians continue to assign to Balbín.

⁶ Christianus Aug(ustin) Pfaltz von Ostritz, *Theatrum Gloruae, Daß ist Schau=Platz der Ehren Oder Lob=Predigten Von denen heiligen außerswählten glorwürdigen Patronen des hochlöblichen Königreichs Böhmeimb...* (Prague, 1691). Only recently, Pfaltz and his writings have been brought back to scholarly attention by Jiří M. Havlík, “Morová kázání Christiana Augustina Pfaltze (1629–1701)” [Sermons on the plague by Christian

more strikingly, Maximilian Rudolf von Schleinitz (1606–1675), a Counter-Reformation bishop of Litoměřice, who, in the early 1670s, wrote an extensive and challenging tract called *Vandalo-Bohemia*, discussing the ethnogenesis of the *natio bohémica* and the origins of the nobility of Bohemia (the social class he himself descended from), has only occasionally been mentioned. Ironically, the only reason why historians did find him worth mentioning was usually the fact that Balbín resolutely refuted his theories. The very structure of his remarkable work has never been analyzed and his argument has often been misunderstood.⁷

I am not going to provide an analysis or reclassification of these neglected authors and their literary works, important as that subject is. Rather I am interested in another aspect, namely in the local political background from which these texts emerged. While focusing narrowly on a few “established” figures, historians have not only underestimated the literary context of the patriotic writing of Balbín and others, excluding some important authors and texts from their focus. They have likewise oversimplified the political context in which these works were written, despite the fact that most of these texts—Balbín’s writings in

Augustin Pfaltz], *Listy filologické* 129 (2006): 145–160, and Radmila Pavlíčková, “‘Dobrá památka’, pohřební kázání a starší dějepisectví. Německé pohřební kázání nad kardinálem Harrachem z roku 1667” [“Good memory,” funeral sermons and old historiography. A German funeral sermon on Cardinal Harrach from 1667], *Theatrum historiae* 2 (2007): 137–155. A complex analysis of his work remains to be written.

⁷ Characteristically, Schleinitz was not discussed in the detailed history of Czech historiography by František Kutnar and Jaroslav Marek, *Přehledné dějiny českého a slovenského dějepisectví. Od počátků národní kultury až do sklonku třicátých let 20. století* [Overview of Czech and Slovak historiography. From the beginnings of national culture to the end of the 1930s] (Prague: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, 1997). Basic facts on him can be found in Johann Evangelist Schlenz, *Geschichte des Bistums und der Diözese Leitmeritz*, vols. I–II (Warnsdorf: Opitz, 1912–1914); Kurt A. Huber, “Schleinitz, Maximilian Rudolf Freiherr von (1606–1675),” in Erwin Gatz, ed., *Die Bischöfe des Heiligen Römischen Reiches 1648 bis 1803. Ein biographisches Lexikon* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1990), 424–425. There exists no satisfactory information on the *Vandalo-Bohemia* in the literature up to this day despite the fact that this tract, as a handful of copies testifies, continued to be read in the eighteenth century. In his article, “Maximilián Šlejnic jako mecenáš Karla Škréty. (Ke vzájemným vztahům barokní historiografie a výtvarného umění)” [Maximilian Schleinitz as sponsor of Karel Škréta: On the relationship of Baroque historiography and visual arts], in *Bohuslav Balbín*, 136–145, Vít Vlnas, one of few who have ever displayed any interest in Schleinitz, mistakenly presents its main argument, as if the bishop derived the origin of the Bohemian nobility from the entourage of the mythical forefather *Čech*, thus failing to understand the main argument (Schleinitz denied the very existence of a forefather *Čech*).

particular—reflected a recognizable political dimension. Admittedly, this political dimension has never been actually denied. Rather it has been interpreted without a detailed knowledge of the political issues that were at stake. Thus instead of analyzing Balbín's patriotic texts and their literary context, I am going to highlight the political struggle within the ruling elite of Bohemia⁸ (that was supposedly the main target group of the majority of these patriotic texts) and the role patriotic reasoning played in it.

Towards this end I will focus my following discussion on the influential and controversial royal minister Bernhard Ignaz Count Martinitz (1615–1685), the dominant political figure in the Kingdom of Bohemia of the second half of the seventeenth century. I will begin by discussing how the power struggle within the Bohemian elite affected Balbín's texts, mostly with regard to his inflammatory polemic against Count Martinitz in the early 1670s. This quarrel, certainly not unimportant with respect to the development of Balbín's argument, has found some (though not fully satisfactory) attention in the literature. But I suggest it needs to be put in a broader context and analyzed with respect not only to the network of patriotic historians of late seventeenth-century Bohemia but to the political struggle within the ruling elite of Bohemia in order to be understood properly. Secondly, I will highlight the recurring rivalries within the Bohemian estates and raise the question of whether and how patriotic vocabulary was used by this elite to legitimize collective and particular goals and specifically how this was represented by Balbín in his writings.

⁸ In this contribution, I use the terms "ruling elite" and "estates" more or less as synonyms because, contrary to expectations, it seems hardly possible to distinguish royal officers ruling the kingdom on behalf of the monarch from those nobles who regularly attended the diet in the second half of the seventeenth century. Rather than to draw an artificial line of demarcation between a supposed royal party and an estates party, it seems reasonable to approach this group as a link between the court and the province—a group for which a double loyalty was typical, not exceptional. The situation was significantly different with the prelates for they were normally excluded from royal offices in Bohemia. But as the prelates entered the estates administration of the province, they can be subsumed under the term "ruling elite" to a certain extent too. The authority of royal towns remained, on the other hand, only symbolic, after the composition of the provincial estates in Bohemia had been redefined in the 1620s. See Petr Maťa, "Wer waren die Landstände? Betrachtungen zu den böhmischen und österreichischen 'Kernländern' der Habsburgermonarchie im 17. und frühen 18. Jahrhundert," in Gerhard Ammerer et al., eds., *Bündnispartner und Konkurrenten des Landesfürsten? Die Stände in der Habsburgermonarchie* (Vienna-Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 2007), 68–89.

Denouncing a royal minister: Bohuslav Balbín's polemic against the Grand Burgrave Martinitz

The controversy between Balbín and Count Martinitz is certainly a *cause célèbre* in the history of Bohemia in the second half of the seventeenth century. As such, it has been touched on by all historians who have ever dealt with Balbín. It arose when the printing of Balbín's major historical writing named *Epitome historica rerum Bohemicarum*, an outline of the history of Bohemia written in a patriotic tone, was interrupted in January 1671 after a denunciation had reached the Jesuit general in Rome suggesting the work contained passages prejudicial to the Habsburg dynasty and thus potentially dangerous to the Society of Jesus. This denouncement was undoubtedly inspired (and presumably written) by Count Martinitz. As grand burgrave (*nejvyšší purkrabí* or *Oberstburggraf*) from 1651, Martinitz headed the royal government in Bohemia—the so-called “vicegerency” (*místodržitelství* or *Statthaltere*)—composed of about a dozen nobles.⁹ Thus he enjoyed a highly influential position, often equated (though with some exaggeration) with the position of viceroys in the kingdoms of the Spanish monarchy. Besides being a royal minister, Count Martinitz accounted himself a learned intellectual and displayed many-sided interests (he had a lively correspondence with Athanasius Kircher for instance). In fact, the emergence of the enmity between the Jesuit historian and the royal officer might appear somewhat surprising, for in autumn 1668 Count Martinitz issued a recommendation to Balbín, who was visiting the court library in Vienna. But Martinitz was obviously a complicated personality, who radically changed his attitudes several times during his life.¹⁰

⁹ The members of the vicegerency held at the same time the highest provincial offices in the kingdom and were the most influential individuals at the diet. Being regularly appointed from the native or at least naturalized nobility, they embodied the overlap between royal authority and the high Bohemian nobility.

¹⁰ No biography of Martinitz exists and accounts on him have been brief and repetitive. Recently, however, Alessandro Catalano, *La Boemia e la riconquista delle coscienze. Ernst Adalbert von Harrach e la Controriforma in Europa centrale (1620–1667)* (Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 2005), has collected valuable information on his early career. See also Id., “Příběh jednoho mýtu. Bernhard Ignác z Martinic—Kardinál Arnošt Vojtěch z Harrachu—Jezuité” [The history of a myth: Bernhard Ignaz of Martinitz—Cardinal Ernst Adalbert of Harrach—Jesuits], in *Slánské rozhovory 2005—Itálie a Čechy* (Slaný: Královské město Slaný, 2006), 25–34.

As a consequence of Martinitz's denunciation, Balbín's historical work became politicized and had to be read by additional censors. Monitoring the procedure, Martinitz himself compiled his own critical reservations about the subversive potential of Balbín's text. At the same time, however, the case became the focus of power struggle among the high nobility. Balbín found an effective supporter in Martinitz's rivals. In 1674, his noble patrons succeeded in convincing the Viennese court about the harmlessness of the work, after the emperor had received a positive assessment from the renowned court librarian Peter Lambeck. The *Epitome* was finally published in 1677.¹¹

In the meantime, however, Balbín wrote two passionate texts familiar to historians for both their patriotic zeal and damning critique of the grand burgrave. The first of these texts, *De Regni Bohemiae felici quondam, nunc calamitoso statu ac praecipue de Bohemicae, seu Slavae Linguae in Bohemia auctoritate, deque eius abolendae noxiis consiliis, aliisque rebus huc spectantibus brevis, sed accurata tractatio*, which was mentioned above, is well known. It is the most famous text Balbín ever wrote, and as such it has been often analyzed by historians. This Latin discourse praising the Czech/Slavic language and criticizing state affairs within Bohemia was launched against two opponents, both anonymous, but supposedly identifiable by informed readers. The first one, whom Balbín labeled as *Miso-Bohemus*, was a German author who questioned the linguistic maturity of the Slavic languages. His identity, however, remains unclear. Some historians have identified him as Melchior Goldast (1578–1635), the usual target of Balbín's critique, but this seems to be a rather unlikely, for Goldast, so far as I can determine, never devoted much attention to the Czech or Slavic language beyond his claim that "*Bohemos origine quidem esse Slavos*,

¹¹ Most records of this episode have been collected by Rafael Ungar, Ferdinand Menčík and Antonín Rejzek, whereas later authors generally paraphrased what had been written by them: *Bohuslav Balbini e S. I. Bohemia docta, opvs posthvmvm editvm, notisque illvstratum ab Raphaelē Vngar...*, pars I (Prague, 1776), 10–21; Ferdinand Menčík, "Petr Lambeck a Balbinova Epitome" [Peter Lambeck and Balbín's Epitome], *Věstník Královské české společnosti nauk, třída filosoficko-historicko-jazykozpytná 1889* (Prague, 1890), 182–202; Antonín Rejzek, *Bohuslav Balbín T. J. Jeho život a práce* [Bohuslav Balbín. His life and work] (Prague: Knihtiskárna Družstva Vlast, 1908), 205–234. See a call for further research on this issue by Josef Hejnic, "Balbínův spor s Bernardem Ignácem z Martinic ve světle korespondence Rudolfa Maximiliána ze Šlejnic s Tomášem Pešinou z Čechorodu" [Balbín's debate with Bernhard Ignaz of Martinitz in the light of the correspondence of Rudolf Maximilian of Schleinitz with Tomáš Pešina of Čechorod], *Bibliotheca Strahoviensis*, 1 (1995): 134–136.

sed situ & et regione Germanos; siue patriam suam a Teutonibus, linguam a Slauibus habere...)¹² The second target of Balbín's invective, on the other hand, can be easily identified as Bernhard Ignaz Count Martinitz. As the title of the tract suggests, Balbín linked two issues together: the decline of the Czech language in Bohemia and the perversion of domestic politics. Both in his eyes were a product of the influx of foreigners into Bohemia (mostly Germans, unwilling to adapt to the domestic language and habits), and the willingness of the governors of Bohemia (equated with Count Martinitz) to allow the Czech language to disappear, and then to prey upon and enslave the inhabitants of the kingdom.¹³

Balbín's second text, written in 1672, targeted Grand Burgrave Martinitz directly. It was a bitter Latin satire containing four fictive sepulchral inscriptions (*Trophaea sepulchralia*), each compiled as if dedicated to Martinitz by one of the estates or professional groups of the kingdom: clergy, nobility, royal towns and scholars. Here, Martinitz was boldly portrayed as a highly incompetent and evil-minded *oppressor* of his own fatherland (in both texts, the fatherland was equated with the Kingdom of Bohemia), systematically striving for the impoverishment of its inhabitants of all social classes. The question of language and ethnicity was not directly addressed in this text. Like the *Tractatio*, this latter text was not published during Balbín's lifetime.

¹² Melchior Goldast Heiminsfeldius, *De Bohemiae Regni, incorporatarumque provinciarum, iuribus, ac privilegiis; necnon de hereditaria Regiae Bohemorum familiae successione, Commentarii* (Francofordiae, 1627), 9 and passim. In spite of the great impact Goldast had on the interpretation of the history of Bohemia outside the kingdom, there has been surprisingly little research on this issue. Generally on Goldast see Heinz Schecker, "Das Prager Tagebuch des Melchior Goldast von Haiminsfeld," *Abhandlungen und Vorträge der Bremer wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft* 5 (1930), 217–280; Gerhard Knoll and Klaus Schmidt, "Die Erschließung der Bibliothek des Humanisten Melchior Goldast von Haiminsfeld (1576–1635) in Bremen," *Wolfenbütteler Notizen zur Buchgeschichte* 5 (1980): 203–223; Anne M. Baade, *Melchior Goldast von Haiminsfeld: Collector, commentator and editor* (New York: Peter Lang, 1992); Jiří Hrbek, "That feckless Bohemomastix.' The life and work of Melchior Goldast of Haiminsfeld," *Acta Comeniana* 22 (2008), forthcoming.

¹³ The first (and only) edition in Latin: *Bohuslai Balbini Dissertatio apologetica pro lingua Slavonica, praecipue Bohemica* (Prague, 1775). There are three editions in Czech translation from 1869, 1923 and 1988, see Milan Kopecký, "Literatura v Balbínově Rozpravě krátké ale pravdivé. (K 300. výročí smrti Bohuslava Balbína)" [Literature in Balbín's *Short but truthful discourse* (Dedicated to the 300th anniversary of Bohuslav Balbín's death)], *Studia Comeniana et historica* 18/35 (1988): 44–63.

In fact, it was rediscovered only a couple of years ago.¹⁴ Similarly, the reception of both texts remains rather obscure. Supposedly they were read only in a narrow circle of confidants, transmitted by Balbín's friend Tomáš Pešina of Čechorod, a canon of the metropolitan chapter in Prague and another patriotic historian, to whom the *Tractatio* was dedicated and among whose papers the *Trophaea sepulchralia* were rediscovered. No contemporary comment on any of these texts has been discovered to this point.

Balbín expressed his political ideas in many other texts. His political concern was rooted, as Josef Válka pointed out, in his very epistemology and methodology.¹⁵ His approach to the past and present was politically relevant for it was based on a notion of a crucial discontinuity in the Bohemian past in 1620, with the complex political and social upheaval in the wake of the rebellion of the Protestant estates. As a historian, Balbín paid nearly exclusive attention to what he defined as *vetus Bohemia*, ignoring more recent events. This approach implied an explicit disavowal of the state of affairs in his lifetime.¹⁶ Thus, in the *Tractatio* and *Trophaea sepulchralia* Balbín included not only his general idea about the Kingdom of Bohemia, its glorious history and less shining present, but he also included his direct comments on the current administration and the political quarrels within the ruling elite during his lifetime. In both texts, he presented examples of Count Martinitz's incompetence and a rich set of details on his misconduct

¹⁴ Josef Hejnic, ed., *Bohuslav Balbín. Pamětní nápis Bernardu Ignácovi z Martinic* [Bohuslav Balbín: Memorial inscription on Bernhard Ignaz of Martinitz] (Prague: Vyšehrad, 1988).

¹⁵ Josef Válka, "Politický smysl Balbínovy historiografie" [The political significance of Balbín's historiography], *Česká literatura*, 36 (1988), 385–399. This is, in my opinion, the finest analysis of Balbín's historical work. See also idem, "Balbínova 'Politica'" [Balbín's "Politica"], in *Bohuslav Balbín*, 33–39. On Balbín's reception of classical historical literature see Josef Hejnic, "Balbínova cesta za antikou" [Balbín's search for antiquity], *Listy filologické*, 97 (1974): 217–233.

¹⁶ Among many of Balbín's comments on this issue, one of his late remarks is particularly telling: "...ego (...) veterem Bohemiam, non hanc novam, neque hodiernum statum, sed Regnum et rem publicam unius sensus et voluntatis (pene etiam dixissem unius linguae) respexi, quod tempus usque ad Rudolphi II. Regnum a prima Czechorum origine per annos amplius mille protractum est", cited in Bohumil Ryba, *Soupis rukopisů Strahovské knihovny Památníku národního písemnictví v Praze*, [Register of manuscripts at the Strahov library of the Monument of national literature in Prague] vol. IV (Prague: Památník národního písemnictví, 1970), 31. In this respect, Balbín emulated the Protestant exile Pavel Stránský (1583–1657) who published his *Respublica Bojema*, a compendium on the geography, history, law and customs of Bohemia in 1634 omitting any reference to the changes after 1620.

in the administration of the kingdom. This suggests, in fact, that the controversy between the Jesuit scholar and the royal minister resulted not only from a personal animosity but was rather embedded in a broader political and social context. Many of his accusations refer to particular quarrels among the Bohemian estates, and they were without doubt comprehensible for informed contemporaries.¹⁷

Historians, however, have made little effort to examine this political background and the way Balbín represented it.¹⁸ Instead, Balbín's attitudes have been generally adopted by historians. Thus while Balbín has been portrayed as a defender of his fatherland, describing the political and social decline of the kingdom under the rule of the seventeenth-century Habsburgs, Count Martinitz has been regarded with less empathy. We may read that the grand burgrave "had no patriotic affection and even despised his mother tongue".¹⁹ He was considered a "Catholic in whom the last sparks of the Czech national feeling were suppressed by his affection towards the church"²⁰ or displaying "so little of Czech awareness that it is truly difficult to talk about it".²¹

¹⁷ Balbín's representation of the power struggle within the estates is not fully coherent. While his glamorous depiction of the ancient domestic nobility is obvious, Balbín's attitude towards the estates of the kingdom in his lifetime is less clear. The *Tractatio* contains a general critique against the nobility of his time and Balbín presents himself as swimming against the current. By contrast, the *Trophaea sepulchralia* suggest that Martinitz's domestic policy met a resistance among the estates, who were, however, repeatedly betrayed and terrorized by the grand burgrave. It even denounces several collaborators of Martinitz—his brother Maximilian Valentin, who, according to Balbín, used to simulate conflicts with the grand burgrave only to spy out the sentiments of his brother's opponents at the diet, or the archbishop Matouš Ferdinand Sobek of Bilenberk, who, unlike his predecessors, supported the policy of Martinitz. Far from displaying a general critique against the estates, Balbín in the second text rather attempts to match the estates against the grand burgrave.

¹⁸ The analysis has usually ended by a simple enumeration of Balbín's supporters within the nobility, Olga Květoňová-Klímová, "Styky Bohuslava Balbína s českou šlechtou pobělohorskou" [Contacts of Bohuslav Balbín with the nobility of Bohemia in the period after the Battle of White Mountain], *Český časopis historický*, 32 (1926): 497–541.

¹⁹ "...neměl citu vlasteneckého; pohrdal i mateřským jazykem..." Jan Jakubec, *Dějiny literatury české* [History of Czech Literature] vol. I.: Od nejstarších dob do probuzení politického (Prague: Jan Laichter, 1929), 890.

²⁰ "Katolík, v němž oddanost k církvi udusila poslední jiskry češství," Květoňová-Klímová, *Styky*, 511.

²¹ "...českého vědomí tak málo, že je opravdu těžko o něm mluvit..." Jan Muk, *Po stopách národního vědomí české šlechty pobělohorské* [Tracing the Czech national consciousness of the nobility in the post-White Mountain period] (Prague: Politický klub ČSND, 1931), 119.

More recently, a literary historian contended that Martinitz “in his function of the grand burgrave manifested a political incapacity and a fierce wrath against his own nation”.²²

Such judgments are disputable for several reasons. Far from being politically incapable, Count Martinitz was among the most powerful ministers of Leopold I. Known and feared for his belligerent nature, he was acknowledged as politically skillful and highly influential. After he succeeded his father in the office of grand burgrave in 1651, he dominated the public life of Bohemia for more than thirty years, mediating between the court and the estates and presiding over the diet with an iron hand. Though Catholic, his alleged affection towards the church must be revised, for he belonged to those who assisted princely power in limiting the authority of the Catholic church, and for this reason he was almost constantly at odds with the prelates.²³ In general, Martinitz was portrayed as a highly controversial figure by many of his contemporaries. It is, however, far from certain whether he simply displayed hatred towards the *natio bohémica*, whether he struggled to suppress the *lingua bohémica* or whether he infatuatedly patronized foreigners to the disadvantage of natives, as Balbín suggested.

A closer scrutiny of the records reveals a multi-faceted picture. On occasion, we may hear Count Martinitz encouraging an Austrian minister at the Imperial court that he urge his sons to learn the Czech language, not only for pragmatic reasons (administration of their property in Bohemia) but also as a language understandable in Hungary, Poland and even Russia, although Martinitz regarded this familiarity with the “Muscovite barbarians” as somewhat less worthy.²⁴ In 1661, Martinitz explained to another Austrian aristocrat that he could not support the promotion of Michael Oswald Count Thun (1631–1694), a second-generation “Bohemian” (his family was of Tyrolean origin) into the provincial administration as he does not know “our

²² “...ve funkci nejvyššího purkrabího (...) projevoval politickou neschopnost a zavlou zlobu proti vlastnímu národu,” Kopecký, *Literatura*, 59.

²³ Significant evidence has been gathered by Catalano, *Boemia*, passim.

²⁴ “Creda V. E. che è per servizio de’ Signori Conti ch’imparino nella gioventù la lingua Bohema perch’il saperla a chi ha beni in questo Regno porta pure seco questo Vantaggio al manco che nell’economia meno si resta ingannato, et è lingua ch’in Ongheria tutta s’intende ancho nella Polonia, sebbene non ci è gran lode, che ne sia tanto familiare a barbari sino moscoviti,” Martinitz to Ferdinand Bonaventura Count Harrach, Feb. 20, 1683, Österreichisches Staatsarchiv (Vienna), Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv, Familienarchiv Harrach (= FA Harrach), carton 283.

Czech language” well enough.²⁵ The Premonstratensian abbot Vincenz Macarius Franck recorded more often the grand burgrave’s complaints about the influence of foreigners in the matters of Bohemia. Thus Martinitz criticized the abbot’s protection of foreigners against the natives²⁶ or he denounced the abbot when he presented at the Bohemian diet the vote in German.²⁷ On another occasion, Martinitz compelled the archbishop (who preferred to confer important ecclesiastic benefices on foreigners as he saw them as more reliable than natives in matters of Catholic Reform) to allow a *Bohemus* to succeed Prague’s suffragan bishop, an ethnic Italian.²⁸

This evidence suggests that Count Martinitz’s attitude towards his mother tongue and fatherland was far more complex than what Balbín presented and what historians later have believed. A closer examination of patriotic language within the Bohemian ruling elite will provide further elucidation and place Balbín’s accounts in perspective.

²⁵ “Io un pezzo fa fui pregato dal Monsig. Arcivescovo di Salisburgo affine aggiustassi che nella prima vancanza [!] fosse promosso il suo Signor Frattello, risposi che esso s’ingegni un poco a sapere la nostra Cechica lingua, perché per altro gli sarà molto difficile a sodisfar ed al publico et alla sua propria coscienza sicche m’imagno facilmente che con questo sarà l’impegno di SMC e questo ci basta...,” Martinitz to Johann Maximilian Count Lamberg, June 15, 1661, Oberösterreichisches Landesarchiv (Linz), Herrschaftsarchiv Steyer, Akten, carton 1228. The word “Cechica” was inserted by Martinitz in addition. Symptomatically, he interceded in the same letter for his own son-in-law Count Wrba to be promoted at occasion, thus using the language issue to assert his own familial interests.

²⁶ “Sumpto prandio accessi Excellentissimum Dominum Burggraffium, qui audito negotio Siloensium retulit, sibi fuisse dictum, quod Siardum reprobaverim eo quod Bohemus,” *Diarium abbatibus Strahoviensis*, Knihovna kláštera premonstrátů na Strahově (Prague), DJ III 1, 114, Dec. 5, 1661; “Eidem Excellentissimo Domino Burggraffio causam Siloensem commendavi, qui ad male narrata informatus, me reprobasse Siloensem professum, eo quod nolim promovere Bohemum, quare iniuria cadat in nationis offensam,” *ibid.*, 140, Jan. 30, 1662.

²⁷ “Dominus Burggraffius ad odium suum prosequendum et manifestandum Domino Praeposito Metroropolitano insinuavit, ut sibi unum Bohemum pro Referendario submitteret, esse moris, ut votum in Bohemica lingua proponeretur. Ubi per Camerarium de tabelis invitati, si ad relationem faciendam velimus descendere, annuentibus aliis ipsi responsum dedi, voluisse Dominum Burggraffium, ut aliquis Bohemus descenderet, cum vero nullus sit pro hoc dispositus, velle [?] rescire, utrum velit, ut differeretur, vel ut Germanus germanico idiomate relationem faceret,” *ibid.*, 899, Feb. 10, 1668.

²⁸ “Renunciatum Canonicum Cathedralium Nastopill natione Bohemum Pragensem promovente imprimis Burggraffio Suffraganeum declaratum. Ostendit haec Eminentissimi submissio et resolutio multos, quod nimium Burggraffio deferat, multa ac magna praepudicia clero et ecclesiastico statui per hoc faciat,” *ibid.*, 449, June 1, 1664.

Defining true patriots: Prelates versus nobles

Bohuslav Balbín himself descended from the lower nobility of Bohemia, a group that was dramatically affected by the social changes of the 1620s. This fact seems to have both fuelled and limited his empathy towards the nobility administering the kingdom in the following decades for this group was largely composed of wealthy magnates (Martinitz for example), a class who sought to distinguish themselves from the lower nobility. Balbín's attitude to the prelates was also complex and at times difficult. Relations of the Bohemian Jesuits (not represented at the diet and closely collaborating with domestic barons) with the episcopate and other prelates entering the clerical estate were, as Alessandro Catalano recently demonstrated, highly competitive and even explosive for the most part of Balbín's life.²⁹ Thus being noble by origin and Jesuit by profession did not necessarily predetermine Balbín to share the values of these respective estates. On the one hand, Balbín assigned an important role to both the nobility and the prelates in his conception of *vetus Bohemia*, which was thus firmly estates-based even when bolstered by ethno-linguistic identification.³⁰ On the other hand, however, Balbín's attitude towards the representatives of the estates in his own time was critical even though prominent magnates commonly sponsored the publication of his writings and some members of the prelates supported his work or—like the canon Tomáš Pešina—belonged among his friends.

A comparison of the state of affairs within the ruling elite of the kingdom in Balbín's lifetime with how he represented it in his polemical writings reveals a substantial divergence, originating probably from both a lack of understanding for the policy of the respective estate and a tendentious misrepresentation of the domestic power struggle. Though Balbín recognized deep frictions within the Bohemian estates, he tended to interpret them as if there was a simple rupture between royal officers representing the *aula*, and patriots representing

²⁹ Catalano, *Boemia*, passim. In earlier studies on the patriotic attitudes of the Bohemian prelates, this crucial moment has been generally ignored. See Anna Skýbová, "Zur Problematik des Patriotismus der böhmischen Kirchenhierarchie am Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts," in Miloš Řezník and Ivana Slezáková, eds., *Nations—Identities—Historical Consciousness. Volume dedicated to Prof. Miroslav Hroch* (Prague: Filozofická fakulta UK, 1997), 203–228.

³⁰ Balbín wrote a number of patriotic genealogies of native noble families as well as a laudatory biography of the first archbishop of Prague.

the *patria*. Significantly, the crucial controversy between the nobility, especially the estate of barons,³¹ and the estate of prelates, that disturbed the inner politics of the kingdom from the 1620s until the end of the century, was successfully obscured by Balbín. He occasionally pointed to certain incidents but he misrepresented them at the same time as if they were only the result of the grand burgrave's hatred towards patriots.³²

The prelates, excluded from the political life of Bohemia during the Hussite wars in the fifteenth century, were installed as a political estate (even the first estate with a right of precedence over the barons) in the 1620s. From that time a deep hostility between the members of the two corporations emerged, fuelled by multiple conflicting claims. The prelates aspired to a large-scale restitution of church property alienated by the nobles from the fifteenth century. Further, they attempted to implement Tridentine reform at the local level—an objective that collided with the rights of patronage (*ius patronatus*) as well as with other powers traditionally exerted by the nobles but perceived as abuses by the prelates. Last but not least, the prelates strove to gain positions in the administration of the kingdom and thus to break the monopoly of the high nobility to govern Bohemia in the name of the king. Alessandro Catalano's revealing study of the Cardinal Ernst Adalbert of Harrach (1598–1667) has recently uncovered how deep and lasting this controversy was. The clash was significantly reinforced by the fact that the newly organized estate of prelates was headed for a long time by ambitious newcomers. Cardinal Harrach was a scion of an Austrian high noble family, and he was largely Italianized. Moreover, he built up a brain trust primarily composed of Italians (the central place belonging to the famous Capuchin Valeriano Magni) and other foreigners who became a target of the domestic nobles' hatred. Besides the episcopate, newcomers found influential positions among the superiors of Bohemian monasteries. The Premonstratensian abbot of the wealthy Strahov-monastery in Prague, Kaspar of Questenberg (1571–1640), is probably the most prominent example of this type of

³¹ The Bohemian nobility consisted of two estates. While the *panský stav/Herrenstand* (estate of barons or lords) embraced the magnates and well-to-do nobles, the *rytířský stav/Ritterstand* (estate of knights) was generally composed of the petty nobility.

³² The very fact that this crucial friction has been overlooked for such a long time reveals the extent to which Balbín's interpretation has influenced modern historians.

prelate embodying foreign origin, clerical ambition and assertiveness against the domestic nobility.³³

Catalano brought to our attention that the high nobility of Bohemia—for decades headed by Jaroslav Count Martinitz (1582–1649), father of Bernhard Ignaz—readily adopted patriotic rhetoric when opposing the pretensions of prelates in the 1630s and 1640s. The reference to the foreign origin of the prelates, their linguistic shortcomings and their ignorance of local laws and habits served to legitimize the noble estates' pretensions to the exclusive rule over the province on behalf of the king. Thus when Martinitz junior admonished Abbot Franck (successor of Questenberg) in 1668 for referring the prelates' vote at the diet in Czech rather than in German, he was echoing a long tradition.³⁴

Symptomatically, newcomer prelates struck back by appropriating the rhetoric of *patria* and turning it against the domestic barons. In 1628 Valeriano Magni referred to the *patria* when he criticized the barons for all the impediments they had laid in the way of Catholic reform and the reconstruction of the episcopate. In the course of negotiations with Grand Burgrave Adam of Waldstein, Magni warned that Archbishop Harrach would be compelled to resign his seat and leave his fatherland ("*prender bando dalla Patria*") unless the native barons reappraised their attitude towards the claims of the prelates.³⁵ Certainly, this must have been perceived as a truly insolent argument in the eyes of the Bohemian nobility for Harrach was an Austrian and he was promoted to Bohemia only in 1623 with the decisive support of the court. But in the following decades, the deepening rupture between barons and prelates increasingly encouraged the self-perception of the latter as true defenders of the fatherland against the excessive power of local barons.

In 1634, as tensions were escalating, Abbot Questenberg and the Moravian canon Platejs (who belonged to a minority of natives among the influential prelates) composed a 76-page document—later entitled *Defensio Ecclesiasticae Dignitatis*—justifying the claims of prelates to be represented in provincial offices, along with the nobles and actually

³³ Catalano, *Boemia*. On Questenberg Cyrill Ant(onín) Straka, *Albrecht z Valdštejna a jeho doba. Na základě korespondence opata strahovského Kašpara z Questenberka* [Albrecht of Waldstein and his time. On the basis of the correspondence of the abbot of Strahov, Kaspar of Questenberg] (Prague: Rozpravy české akademie, 1911).

³⁴ See above.

³⁵ Catalano, *Bohemia*, 133.

preceding them. By means of arguments drawn partially from world history, but mostly from the Bohemian and Moravian past, they argued for the legitimacy of the participation of clerics in the public sphere. Moreover, they established a close link between the welfare of the “*status ecclesiasticus*” and the welfare of the fatherland (“*patriae emolumentum*”). Anytime prelates were oppressed or put aside in the history of “*Boëmia nostra*”, bad things started to happen: “... *non aliunde hanc nobilissimi regni stragem, ruinam et perniciem profluxisse deprehendemus, quam e status Ecclesiastici oppressione*”. And it was usually nobles (“*proceres*”) who initiated quarrels if not tempered by prelates. Clerics, by contrast to nobles, were portrayed as generally more trustworthy. Their participation in public office was thus necessary for “*pax in Boëmia*” and to prevent “*patriae ruina*”. Certainly with respect to the actual composition of the estate of prelates, the authors argued that even the rule of neighboring and foreign prelates, in cases where the domestic prelates had been expelled, was better than an exclusion of prelates: “*Capisne iam o Boëmia (Moravia), sacerdotum semper tibi profuisse principatum, non domesticorum duntaxat, uerum etiam (quando expulisti tuos) vicinorum et extraneorum!*” And referring to the miserable state of the province they concluded: “*Nunquam, o infelix Patria, talia vidisti, quando sacerdotum utebatur consiliis.*”³⁶

Thus the talk of *patria* was used by both groups in order to de-legitimize the aspirations of the other, the prelates denounced as foreigners and violators of tradition and the barons as collaborators with the court at the expense of the kingdom’s welfare. According to the prelates, the welfare of the fatherland was much better entrusted in their hands regardless their origin and linguistic skills than to the *signori Bohemi* as this group was frequently referred to.

The issue of the Czech language seems to have played a secondary role in this struggle. The prelates of foreign origin usually did not hasten to learn it and the domestic magnates increasingly preferred to use other languages (German and Italian, later French) when communicating

³⁶ For the only copy of this document I have discovered see Národní archiv (Prague), Premonstráti Strahov, book 50, 1–76, here 18, 22, 32, 36, 39, 48, 75f. The text has already been cited in Petr Maťa, “‘O felix Bohemia, quando sacerdotum consiliis regebaris.’ Geschichte als Argument im politischen Denken des höheren Klerus Böhmens und Mährens im 17. und zu Beginn des 18. Jahrhunderts,” in Joachim Bahlcke and Arno Strohmeyer, eds., *Die Konstruktion der Vergangenheit. Geschichtsdenken, Traditionsbildung und Selbstdarstellung im frühneuzeitlichen Ostmitteleuropa*, Beiheft der Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung, 29 (2002), 307–322, here 320ff.

within their group. Though neither the barons, nor the prelates seem to have based their notion of *patria* on the Czech language, the linguistic issue might have become a subsidiary argument. This often happened at the diet where the Czech language continued to play the role of a symbolic code, even when the deliberations increasingly took place in German. In 1668, as mentioned above, Count Martinitz urged a prelate of German origin to cast his vote in Czech, but on another occasion, namely at the diet in 1652, it was the prelates who aspired to be—in the words of the Archbishop Harrach—the guardians of tradition (“*più puntuali osservatori dell’uso*”) with respect to language. After the curia of barons had reported to the prelates its collective vote in German, the prelates gave their answer in Czech, even though there was only one among them who was able to fulfil this task.³⁷

To further understand the *patria*-based self-image of the prelates, Vincenz Macarius Franck (1617–1669), abbot of the Strahov monastery in Prague from 1658, is a good example to explore. In his eloquent Latin diary he carefully kept from 1661 until his death,³⁸ he described the affairs of the Premonstratensian monasteries, the litigations in which he was involved, and his social contacts. Yet the prelate as a regular participant in the diet also displayed a systematic concern about what he commonly termed the *status publicus*, i.e. domestic political affairs.³⁹ The *patria* was often invoked in the diary. Franck frequently

³⁷ The case reported by Catalano, *Bohemia*, 425.

³⁸ *Diarium abbatis Strahoviensis*, see above. The diary has not been examined by historians yet. Beyond writing a personal diary, Abbot Franck significantly encouraged the annalist tradition in his monastery, see Pavel Křivský, “Strahovská analistika v době Balbínově” [The annals of Strahov in Balbín’s time], in *Bohuslav Balbín*, 83–88, here 86. On Franck see Dominik K(arel) Čermák, *Premonstráti v Čechách a na Moravě* [Premonstratensians in Bohemia and Moravia] (Prague: Cyrillo-Methodějská kněhtiskárna, 1877), 85–89.

³⁹ The role of the Bohemian diet deserves a few words for historians have tended to overlook its importance after the enforcement of the authoritarian monarchical system in Bohemia in 1620 and the years following. The Bohemian *sněm/Landtag* was in many respects a “tamed” institution when compared with the political practice of the sixteenth century. Most of the estates’ political prerogatives were annulled by the Crown, but the estates continued to exercise a great deal of administrative power given both their right to approve and administer taxes and their position as landlords. In this sense, Bohemia remained a consultative monarchy well into the eighteenth century. The time-consuming negotiation between the estates and the Crown at the diet was an integral part of the state functioning, and the diet was still an important point of contact for those of the estates who were involved in the administration of the kingdom. As such, it witnessed several lasting contradictions within the Bohemian ruling elite. See Petr Maťa, “Český zemský sněm v pobělohorské době (1620–1740). Relikt stavovského státu nebo nástroj absolutistické vlády?” [The diet of Bohemia in the post-White Mountain period (1620–1740).

complained about contemporaries who betray the fatherland⁴⁰ and, as in Balbín's writings, criticism was targeted at Grand Burgrave Martinitz and the Imperial court which, persuaded by the grand burgrave, "thirsted for the blood of poor subjects".⁴¹ Franck shared with Balbín the radically critical view of Martinitz as a promoter of a short-sighted fiscal policy in Bohemia. In the course of the 1660s, Franck even became one of the most passionate opponents of Martinitz at the diet. On the whole, his accounts of the *exactiones* and the *oppressio regni* due to the bad government of the grand burgrave closely resembled the critique of Balbín. Much like the latter's *Tractatio* and *Trophaea sepulchralia*, the abbot's diary can be read as an enumeration of multiple abuses of the burgrave's authority at the expense of the writer himself, the clerical estate and the Kingdom of Bohemia—Franck's fatherland.⁴²

Despite these similarities, no closer relationship between Franck and Balbín developed⁴³ and a careful look at their texts reveals that

A survival of the estatist state or an instrument of absolutist rule?, in Marian J. Ptak, ed., *Sejm czeski od czasów najdawniejszych do 1913 roku* [The Bohemian diet from the oldest times to 1913] (Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski, 2000), 49–67; Id., "Landstände und Landtage in den böhmischen und österreichischen Ländern (1620–1740). Von der Niedergangsgeschichte zur Interaktionsanalyse," in Petr Maťa, Thomas Winkelbauer, eds., *Die Habsburgermonarchie 1620 bis 1740. Leistungen und Grenzen des Absolutismusparadigmas* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2006), 345–400.

⁴⁰ See for instance: "Post prandium invisi Supremum Regni Praefectum, ubi diversa intellexi de statu publico et dolosas aliquorum machinationes, qui patriam produunt et proditorie evertunt," *Diarium abbatis Strahoviensis*, 499, Dec. 5, 1664; "Nonnemo Vienna mihi scripsit, vulgari ibidem, status seculares per Burggraffium esse territios, ecclesiasticorum conatus per Archiepiscopum, & sic patriam praedam dari, & relinqui," *ibid.*, 1050, March 19, 1669.

⁴¹ "Conclamata omnium querimonia, Burggraffium potenter regnum opprimere (...) quibus machinationibus et dolosis persuasionibus Caesarem lucratur & totam dementat aulam, quae alias exactionibus inhiat, & insatiabilis quoad sanguinem pauperum," *ibid.*, 653, Feb. 26, 1666.

⁴² See for instance: "Excellentissimus Regni Burggraffius Comes Bernhardus a Martinicz Viennam discessit, non pro patriae sublevatione, sed maiori oppressione, ad bonum publicum praegravandum, nullatenus sublevandum, & cum posset multa praeclara praestare, maluit, se et conatus suos perpetuo odio & execratione involvere," *ibid.*, 634, Jan. 1, 1666; "De Burggraffio mentio facta, quod expectet in se complendum *Ponam inimicos tuos scabellum pedum tuorum*, sic hostis patriae huius defensores inimicos suos reputat et ut tales prosequitur," *ibid.*, 636, Jan. 8, 1666; "Renunciatum mihi fuit, Excellentissimum D. Burggraffium triduanam suam devotionem de B. Virgine Dolorosa instituisse in gratiarum actionem, quod contra hostes suos in comitiis praevaluerit, hoc est, quod oppressionem regni et liberum possit imperium exercere contra omnes, quos oderit, & sic regni oppressionem in gloriam victoriae trahit," *ibid.*, 1060, Apr. 16., 1669.

⁴³ There is only one general remark on Father Balbín in Franck's diary, which in itself is evidence of the distance between them: "Inquisivi de vetustis documentis & et

even their perceptions of the ethnicity and language issue substantially diverged. Franck himself was a German born in Potsdam, son of a Lutheran pastor. He came to Bohemia only in 1636 and converted there to the Roman faith.⁴⁴ Rather than being the kind of model patriot Balbín depicted in his writings, he epitomized the abhorrent figure of a newcomer German, exploiting the hospitality of his new fatherland and refusing to assume its language and habits⁴⁵—exactly the type of figure Balbín so passionately criticized in his *Brevis sed accurata tractatio*.

Unlike Balbín, Franck did not link the oppression of the fatherland to the suppression of its language or the immigration of foreigners. Instead, he followed the tradition established by newcomer prelates who tended to regard the miserable state of affairs in Bohemia as caused by the hostility of secular authorities towards the clerical estate. Rather than *gens*, *natio* and *lingua*, as with Balbín, it was *status ecclesiasticus* that Abbot Franck identified with and as member of which he perceived himself being oppressed.⁴⁶ In June 1662, Franck noted that Archbishop Harrach had been reproached at the court for

inaudivi, Balbinum Iesuitam magnam rerum antiquarum copiam eruisse,” *ibid.*, 362, Oct. 5, 1663.

⁴⁴ “...natus sum Potstami in Marchia Anno 1617...,” *ibid.*, 909, March 6, 1668; “Dies hic est anniversarius, quo Anno 1636 Pragam veni ex patria et postmodum in festo S. Bartholomaei pleno ad fidem Catholicam conversus...,” *ibid.*, 71, July 20, 1661. Note the different usage of the term *patria* in this context, denoting the “home-land,” the place where Franck was born and brought up.

⁴⁵ Frequently, the abbot resolutely refused to accept a letter written in Czech and not in German: “Tabulae regiae communicarunt querelam Aulae-regiensis in Bohemico, quam submisi D. Zobell, [ut] conficeret protestationem, me in ignoto idiomate non posse causam suscipere litigatoriam,” *ibid.*, 141, Feb. 1, 1662; “Memoriale Milovicenses in causa sua Bohemicum obtulerunt, quod eisdem sine resolutione restitui, eo quod Bohemicum,” *ibid.*, 254, Dec. 13, 1662; “Ex Appellationis collegio scriptura praesentata fuit Bohemica, quam illico restitui excusans, me Bohemice non intelligere,” *ibid.*, 946, June 18, 1668. In September 1666, he rejected the nomination into the cadaster survey commission since “ich der böhmischen sprach unerfahren”, Národní archiv (Prague), Stará manipulace, sign. 15/4, carton 2037, undated deprecation (delivered to the vicegerency on Sept. 18, 1666).

⁴⁶ See for instance the abbot’s reaction against a decision of the vicegerency: “... respondi, [ut] mitius mecum agerent & me paratum esse ad insinuandam aulae, quod tam despotice tractarent statum ecclesiasticum,” *ibid.*, 33, March 28, 1661; “...invisi (...) Priorem Melitensium, ubi intellexi, quam dolose contra statum ecclesiasticum multi machinentur ad suppressionem ipsius...,” *ibid.*, 294, March 16, 1663; “Ad consessum comitalem ecclesiasticorum accessi, ubi variae quaerelae contra D. Burggraffium, qualiter nos ecclesiasticos traducat Viennae, per nos comitia protrahi, Suae Majestatis interesse impediri,” *ibid.*, 1037, Feb. 22, 1669. These examples might be easily multiplied.

“speaking together with the estate of prelates for the welfare of the fatherland”.⁴⁷ The prelates were, at least in his eyes, those who cared for the *patria* and thus the welfare of the prelates coincided with the welfare of the fatherland. One year later, he sympathetically noted a claim of the Moravian Jesuits that “*non superesse spem restituendae salutis publicae, nisi de statu ecclesiastico reassumerentur ad consilia et officia aulae. Tamdiu domum Austriacam floruisse, quamdiu hi consiliis interfuerint, illis eliminatis fortunam emigrasse*”.⁴⁸ These were much the same arguments Questenberg (Franck’s predecessor) articulated in 1634.⁴⁹

Yet Franck’s identification with the Bohemian *patria* was complicated, for he was a foreigner by origin. Despite his identification with the kingdom as a polity, for whose welfare he proclaimed he was ready to resign the abbey and leave the order,⁵⁰ he never depicted himself as a *Bohemus* in his diary. Any time he mentioned *Bohemi* in his diary, he portrayed them as the ethnic other (i.e. Czechs).⁵¹ Moreover, his attitude towards the *Bohemi* remained rather ambivalent. On one hand, he was affected by the negative image that *Bohemi* continued to have at the court as a result of the 1618 rebellion, and he readily recorded the gossip of his time.⁵² Thus he characterized the *Bohemi*

⁴⁷ “Eminentissimus in aula fuisse traductum, quod pro patriae bono cum statu ecclesiastico fuerit locutus,” *ibid.*, 183, June 2, 1662.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, June 21, 1663.

⁴⁹ A recognition of Franck’s patriotic attitude among the prelates is witnessed by an epitaph (“*Vincentio Macario Abbati Strahoviensi, de Religione, de Patria hac, et de sacro suo ordine optime merito*”) written by Bishop Schleinitz soon after Franck’s death. Here Franck’s “*Patriae mens Populoque studens*” was praised and sorrow of the “*Czechica tellus*” expressed, see *Knihovna kláštera premonstrátů na Strahově* (Prague), DH I 22, 269.

⁵⁰ “*Nonnemo suadere voluit, ut et me accommodarem, constanter reposui, me nihil habere nec movere contra Burggraffium, loqui pro regni incolumitate & conservatione, pro cuius libertate stando paratus sim non solum abbatiam, sed si opus sit habitum relinquere & cum gaudio recedere,*” *Diarium abbatis Strahoviensis*, 649, Feb. 14, 1666.

⁵¹ The term *Bohemi* and its equivalents in other languages could have two meanings. On one hand, it might have implied ethno-linguistic identification and thus point to what would today be called Czech. On the other hand, the term could be applied to the inhabitants of the Kingdom of Bohemia regardless their language and ethnicity. In order to distinguish both meanings, the adjective *czechicus* began to appear from the seventeenth century in Latin texts, albeit only occasionally.

⁵² See for instance: “*Adii eodem Dominum Priorem Melitensium, qui pluribus pudendam traditionem Neo-Castelli exposuit, clandestinam subesse conspirationem Ungarorum, qui malunt Turcis subesse quam Austriacis more Bohemorum subiacere,*” *Diarium abbatis Strahoviensis*, 362, Oct. 5, 1663.

as a target of mockery at the court because of their willingness to pay taxes.⁵³ Another time he recorded an influential aulic minister's satiric comment on the *gens Bohemorum*⁵⁴ and a secret strategy of the dynasty (*arcantum Austriacum*) to dominate the Bohemians.⁵⁵ Thus Franck was fully aware of the consequences of the negative image of the *Bohemi* in relation to increasing fiscal pressure and the oppression of the kingdom.⁵⁶ When he recorded in 1665 that the promotion of Wenzel Eusebius Prince of Lobkowitz, a Bohemian by origin, to an influential aulic office raised "new hopes for the reinforcement of the fatherland" among the *Bohemi*, he displayed a certain sense of solidarity with them.⁵⁷

On the other hand, Franck paid significant attention to the attitudes of the *Bohemi* towards foreigners. Thus he recorded in 1668 what Count Losy, a second generation newcomer, related to him about the displeasure aroused in the Bohemians by the great number of Germans and foreigners in Bohemia: Grand Chancellor Vilém Count Slavata (1572–1652) had purportedly invoked St. Wenceslas to exhume the bones of foreigners from graves and to scatter them, if contemporaries were not able to prevent further settlement of the newcomers in

⁵³ "...audivi lamentationes de oppressione miserorum subditorum, negotium statuum de modo contribuendi cessisse in risum aulicorum, Bohemos non sollicitos [?] de quanto contributionis sed de modo contribuendi," *ibid.*, March 6, 1663; "Post prandium Illustrissimus de Halbweil invisit et sub fiducia singulari miserrimum aulae statum exposuit, derideri Bohemos quod ultra vires cum iactura regni in postulas exactiones gravissimas consentiant," *ibid.*, 311, May 7, 1663.

⁵⁴ "Hostem gentis Bohemorum infensissimum esse Principem Portiam, qui vocet Bohemos canes & debere primo recte tangi," *ibid.*, 183, June 2, 1662.

⁵⁵ "Meminit quidam & pro arcanto Austriaco vulgavit opprimere [?] Bohemos ut praecisis alis consurgere aut respirare nequeant," *ibid.*, 292, March 8, 1663.

⁵⁶ On the odium of "rebels" and on the theory of collective blame applied to Bohemia after 1620 see Milan Šmerda, "České země a uherská stavovská povstání. K otázce 'kolektivní viny' a 'kolektivní odpovědnosti' v myšlení feudální společnosti" [The Bohemian lands and the revolts of the Hungarian estates. On "collective blame" and "collective responsibility" in feudal social thought], *Slovanský přehled* 71 (1985): 462–474; Jiří Mikulec, "Das Odium des Verrats und der Mythos der Loyalität. Die Böhmen in der Habsburgermonarchie in der ersten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts," in Walter Leitsch and Stanisław Trawkowski, eds., *Polen und Österreich im 18. Jahrhundert* (Warsaw: Semper, 2000), 7–17.

⁵⁷ "Fama divulgata, Principem de Lobcowicz Supremum Praefectum Caesaris fuisse constitutum, unde Bohemis nova spes pro patriae incremento affulgere caepit," *Diarium abbatis Strahoviensis*, 525, Feb. 27, 1665. See Franck's account on the sudden death of the young archbishop Kolovrat: "In viro hoc multum habet Bohemia quod lugeat, perdidit patriotam, & pastorem zelosum, caetera cogitare, non autem exuerere licet," *ibid.*, 941, June 4, 1668.

the kingdom. Emperor Leopold I, on the other hand, revealed to Losy a secret strategy of the dynasty consisting in the continuous support of Germans and foreigners.⁵⁸ Moreover, many passages in the diary clearly identify *Bohemi* as “the other”. The diary contains numerous grievances against the *Bohemi* who detested Franck and other *Germani*. It was against Franck himself that Count Martinitz raised the complaint in 1668, urging the prelates to delegate another person who could present the vote in Czech, but finally the abbot, though *Germanus*, had to be accepted.⁵⁹ Franck realized that he was perceived as a foreigner (*externus*) and consequently calumniated by “malicious Bohemians”⁶⁰ and discriminated in his litigations by domestic judges because his clerical career was perceived as prejudicial to *patriotae*.⁶¹ To sum up, in the Kingdom of Bohemia, his *patria*, Franck perceived himself to be oppressed by both the court councillors and by the indigenuous *Bohemi*. It was in the person of Grand Burgrave Martinitz that both enmities coalesced.

The diary of Abbot Franck mirrors competing notions of *patria* and patriots, as they emerged from the discord between the high nobility and the prelates which began in the 1620s. It reveals that patriotic reasoning played a significant role in the self-perception of seventeenth-century Bohemian prelates. Indeed, the use of patriotic language by prelates and its employment against indigenous nobles in order to challenge their self-image as true patriots, to unmask their collaboration with the court and to de-legitimize their ambition to govern Bohemia might have been an important source of Balbín’s ideas. Thus Balbín’s belonging to the clergy and his friendly contacts with several

⁵⁸ “Eadem occasione conveni Illustrissimum Comitem a Losenthall, cum quo diversa de statu publico contuli, et inter alia occurrit, quam aegre ferant Bohemi, Germanos et externos in Regno admitti, adeo quod antiquus Comes Slawata, vir alias pientissimus, in haec eruperit lamenta, S. Wenceslaum aliquando gladio suo ossa exterorum effossurum & proiecturum de sepulchris, si vivos impedire non potuerit. Econtra Leopoldum Imperatorem sibi concedidisse, in secretis testamento a parente relictis pro arcana domus insertum, ut Germanos & externos semper foveat & protegat,” *ibid.*, 905, Feb. 26, 1668. Count Losy’s father, an Italian by origin, was a tax farmer and an influential social climber in Bohemia in the course of the Thirty Years’ War.

⁵⁹ See above.

⁶⁰ “In via plurima intellexi de malignantium Bohemorum conatibus contra me, qualiter actiones meas, & maxime Dominicus, traducant et calumnientur,” *ibid.*, 538, Apr. 19, 1665.

⁶¹ “Bonus quidam amicus renunciavit, Bohemos ex appellationis consilio repugnare et contrariari, eo quod sim externus et patriotis per abbatialem dignitatem bolus panis praeripiatur,” *ibid.*, 460, July 10, 1664.

prelates are by no means unimportant with respect to his critique of the domestic nobility as insufficiently patriotic. On the other hand, Balbín's notion of *patria* diverged in many respects from how it was represented in Franck's diary. Clearly, Balbín's simplistic identification of *gens*, *natio*, *lingua* and *patria* did not correspond with the complicated reality of the seventeenth century. It was hardly congenial for the prelates—Germans and newcomers for the greater part—who perceived themselves as being oppressed by the Bohemian nobility. It appears that the rhetoric of *patria* might have been used to legitimize very different claims. We may develop this argument by means of the following case.

*Governing the patria between the king and the estates:
Count Martinitz versus Count Kinsky*

Besides the rivalry between barons and prelates, historians have overlooked another important dispute within the ruling elite of Bohemia, though it was even more closely linked to the case of Father Balbín. In the course of the 1660s, Franz Ulrich Kinsky (1634–1699) became the principal rival of Count Martinitz in domestic politics. Kinsky descended from the old Bohemian nobility and belonged to the same social strata as Martinitz. Being a nephew of the influential Johann Ferdinand of Portia (1605–1665), the *Obersthofmeister* of Leopold I and the leading personality in the Emperor's entourage, Kinsky was among the great luminaries of the Imperial court in the first decade of Leopold's reign. The tension between him and Martinitz arose as late as in 1665, when Kinsky, by then a member of the *Reichshofrat* engaged in diplomatic missions to Poland, was appointed to the Bohemian Chancery in Vienna and began to criticize the fiscal policy of the grand burgrave. The animosity deepened after Portia's death, when Kinsky as the consequence of a court intrigue was installed as president of the *Appellationsgericht* in Prague in 1667, thus being moved away from the court against his will. In February 1668, open hostility broke out between the two royal officers as they entered upon a scandalous quarrel at the diet and refused to collaborate with each other. Subsequently, both struggled to gain protection at the court and submitted apologetic letters. Even after a formal reconciliation was arranged several months later, the antagonism did not disappear between the two ministers who were entering the vicegerency in Prague. Thus it is not

surprising to find that it was Count Kinsky who extended support and patronage to Bohuslav Balbín after Martinitz had attacked the Jesuit scholar in 1670. In fact, Kinsky became Balbín's most active protector, and it is far from certain whether the Jesuit would have won his struggle against the hostile censors had he not been backed by him.⁶²

Thus the case of Count Kinsky and that of Father Balbín became closely connected. Yet the struggle between Martinitz and Kinsky was politically much more relevant. Unlike the Jesuit Balbín, who was very much a harmless scholar, Kinsky as a royal minister, well positioned within social networks and a confidant of Leopold I, was a dangerous rival for the grand burgrave. The conflict also did not remain solely within the border of Bohemia. Both Martinitz and Kinsky repeatedly appealed to the Emperor, and their quarrel helped polarize the ministers at the court. Martinitz won the support of Leopold I's *Obersthofmeister* Wenzel Eusebius Prince Lobkowitz (1609–1677) who was himself frequently at odds with Kinsky, while Kinsky was effectively shadowed by Lobkowitz' rival, *Oberstkämmerer* Johann Maximilian Count Lamberg (1608–1682). Both were powerful personalities from the highest echelon of the court.⁶³ The defeat of one or another group might have easily resulted in a reconfiguration of patronage networks both at the court and in the province. No wonder to learn that it was Count Lamberg who helped push through Balbín's *Epitome* past the censors. Nor was it a coincidence that at this time Balbín wrote a short historical account of the house of Lamberg (a purely Austrian family) providing it with a prominent place within the medieval nobility of Bohemia.⁶⁴

⁶² On Kinsky's patronage of Balbín, Květoňová-Klímová, *Styky*, 511–521. On Kinsky's career Petr Maťa, *Svět české aristokracie (1500–1700)* [The world of the aristocracy of Bohemia] (Prague: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, 2004), 360f., 422f., 432; Aleš Valenta, *Dějiny rodu Kinských* [The history of the Kinsky family] (České Budějovice: Veduta, 2004), 62–72. Balbín was one of Kinsky's teachers as he studied at the Jesuit college in Prague, but it is not clear enough whether their relationship was particularly close before 1670.

⁶³ Lamberg's daughter married Prince Portia's son in 1661. Thus he was closely related to Kinsky. Martinitz was distantly related to Lamberg too but the confidential correspondence between both ministers (see ft. 25) seems to have ended abruptly in 1661.

⁶⁴ Oberösterreichisches Landesarchiv (Linz), Herrschaftsarchiv Steyer, Akten, carton 1238. In this (hitherto unnoticed) account sent to Lamberg on Dec. 20, 1670, at the very beginning of his controversy with Martinitz, Balbín traced the question, whether "prosapia dicta a Lamberg (...) in Bohemia habitavit aliquando, et an in Bohemia nobilitate sit censa". Having established a connection between the Austrian Lambergs

If we look into papers Martinitz and Kinsky produced in the course of their dispute,⁶⁵ we find the term “fatherland” employed on both sides. Neither for Martinitz, nor for Kinsky however, was *patria* the key term they used to define themselves. Both ministers relied primarily on the language of merits and service to the king. In doing so, they both emphasized their individual career whereas fatherland was mostly invoked—besides the prince—as the goal towards which service should be performed.⁶⁶ In general, this rhetorical usage of the term “fatherland” appears to have been broadly shared within the noble society of the Habsburg monarchy. Moreover, it was commonly invoked by the Bohemian Court Chancery as well, usually linking prince, fatherland and *bonum commune* together without specifying which body politic (whether the Kingdom of Bohemia or all Habsburg possessions) was meant.⁶⁷ It was a usage that emphasized the duties

and an extinct Bohemian noble family of similar name, he concluded: “Lambergios in Regno Bohemiae pro extraneis haberi non posse” because “Lambergios (hoc nomine) non modo in Nobilitate nostra, sed etiam inter maximos Regni Procere sedisse, imo adeo ductasse Exercitus, quod dubio procul nulli, nisi homino patrio (...) datum fuisset”. Contrary to the keen critique of the great influx of foreigners to Bohemia reflected in his other texts, Balbín proclaimed here sympathies for the immigration of the foreign nobility: “Nihil Majores nostri optabant magis, quam ut sibi quam plurimos ex Styria, Austria, Carinthia etc. atque etiam ex Ungaria adjungerent, ut exempla nos docent. Ita Serinius, Stubenbergios, Ungnadios seu Weissenvolffios, Hoffmannos, Hardekios, Turnios, Windissgratzios, de Arcu, Botianos, Salmianos, Banffios, Starembergios, Althamios, Rogendorffios, Harrachios, Towarios, de Eitzing, Swendios, Trautsonios, Hoiios, Sebottendorffios, Poppios, innumerosque alios in Nobilitate Bohemica numerabant.” Balbín retraced his argument on the alleged Bohemian ancestry of Lambergs in the dedication of his *Epitome* to Lamberg in 1677. According to him the family was banished from Bohemia in the middle of the thirteenth century. On Lamberg’s support towards Balbín see Květoňová-Klímová, *Styky*, 514–521.

⁶⁵ There is a rich evidence about the quarrel in various archives, though the greatest number can be found in the papers of Wenzel Eusebius Prince Lobkowitz and Count Czernin as well as in Kinsky’s private diary (see below). There is however no study to date on the dispute.

⁶⁶ “...in dießer Euer Kay. unndt Könnig. Mt. dienst unndt deß vatterlandts wolfahrt,” Kinsky’s memorial from February 1668 (without name and date), Státní oblastní archiv v Třeboni, pracoviště Jindřichův Hradec, Rodinný archiv Černínů (= RA Černín), carton 183; “ex zelo erga bonum publicum Suae Maiestatis et Patriae incolumitatem,” *Consilium Theopoliticum* written by Martinitz against Kinsky 1668 (without date), Státní oblastní archiv v Litoměřicích, pracoviště Žitenice, Lobkovicové roduičtí—rodinný archiv (= LRRRA), Q 16/28, f. 164–169.

⁶⁷ Thus the Emperor officially thanked the diet commissioner Czernin for his acting at the diet 1668 “k prospěchu a fedrunku obecného dobrého, milé vlasti, neměně i milostivému zalíbení našemu,” Aug. 8, 1668, RA Černín (see ft. 66), carton 185. Only in the course of the first half of the eighteenth century did the term *Staat* begin to enter royal rescripts. Unfortunately, the governmental usage of the terms *patria* or *Vaterland* for the legitimization of royal goals has never been examined.

towards a polity without defining its specifics. Leopold I himself used this kind of patriotic reasoning in his famous autographic letters and *Handschriften*.⁶⁸ Thus in a letter to the royal commissioner to the Bohemian diet written in 1672, Leopold expressed his hope that not only the leading figures in each estate, but even “*ogni altro buon et prudente patriota, che ben facilmente può cognoscere per il publico et per il privato l’urgentissimo bisogno del presente stato*” will consent to the king’s financial demands.⁶⁹ In 1692, the emperor asked an Austrian aristocrat to support his financial claims at the diet arguing that “*ein jeder treüer Patriot zu allgemeiner undt seiner aignen conservation sein eüßeristes beyzutragen von selbst schuldig ist...*”⁷⁰

On the other hand, we find *patria* employed by both opponents, Kinsky and Martinitz, in more specific meanings as well. In Kinsky’s private diary (1663–1671), patriotic vocabulary was occasionally employed when he criticized the government in Bohemia and opposed the politics of the grand burgrave. Thus he denounced Martinitz in 1665 by means of a memorial, claiming that the grand burgrave “deceives the court’s ministers and oppresses the kingdom”.⁷¹ Similarly, he complained in 1669 of having been delegated, together with two other opponents of the grand burgrave, to the diet in the role of commissioner, so that they were kept away from deliberations and hampered in promoting the interests of the king, the fatherland and their own.⁷²

⁶⁸ On Leopold I’s autographic correspondence (written “privately”, outside the chanceries) see Petr Maťa and Stefan Siennell, “Die Privatkorrespondenzen Kaiser Leopolds I.,” in Josef Pauser, Martin Scheutz and Thomas Winkelbauer, eds., *Quellenkunde der Habsburgermonarchie (16.–18. Jahrhundert). Ein exemplarisches Handbuch*, in MIOG Ergänzungsband 44, (Vienna-Munich: Oldenbourg, 2004), 838–848. *Handschriften* or *Handbriefl* were less formal letters written by an amanuensis and subscribed by the Emperor who sometimes appended an autographic postscript. They were used as special appeals on specific occasions (for instance during the diets or if a loan was requested).

⁶⁹ Leopold I to Czernin, Oct. 30, 1672, RA Černín (see ft. 66), carton 248.

⁷⁰ Leopold I. to Franz Josef Count Lamberg, Jan. 2, 1692, Oberösterreichisches Landesarchiv (Linz), Herrschaftsarchiv Steyer, Akten, carton 2.

⁷¹ “... ipsum aulae ministros fallere et regnum opprimere...,” Kinsky’s diary, Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, Handschriften, B 220, 109.

⁷² “Comes Slabatha 1mus, ego 2dus, Scheidleren 3us Commissarius ad Comitia hoc anno in Patria Regno Bohemiae habita creati et facti fuimus, non alio quam Burgraviae gratificationis fine, et ut Regi, Patriae et nobis deesse cogere mur,” *ibid.*, 112. Royal commissioners normally did not take part in the diet deliberations.

By contrast, Martinitz talked about the fatherland mostly with respect to the “laws of the fatherland” (*leges patriae*).⁷³ By doing so, he pointed to the *Verneuerte Landesordnung*, the famous constitution that was imposed on Bohemia by Ferdinand II in 1627 after the defeat of the Protestant estates in order to guarantee the hereditary succession and to circumscribe and set narrow limits to the rights of the estates. The language Martinitz used in order to disqualify his opponents is very much a language of loyalty towards the ruler, elaborated with the help of the classical Aristotelian forms of government (monarchy being preferable against its variants). Thus he depicted the *patria* as a monarchy run by law, defined himself as the guardian of the monarchical order in Bohemia, and interpreted any challenge against him as an affront to majesty and as a subversion of the monarchical state. He denounced Count Kinsky, for instance, as if the latter aimed to transform the political structure of the monarchy⁷⁴ or he sarcastically referred to Kinsky as a “*tribunus plebis*”.⁷⁵

Although the political thought of Count Martinitz has yet to be examined, sporadic comments in his correspondence and memorials suggest that he may well have sought to legitimize an authoritative government in Bohemia in collaboration with Melchior Goldast, who saw the *natio bohémica* as rebellious by nature, and thus requiring a strong government.⁷⁶ This would also explain the grand burgrave’s attack upon Father Balbín, who passionately refuted Goldast in his

⁷³ “...non esserne riuscita al Chinski la sua attentata oppositione (...) contra il giuramento sopra le leggi Patriae...,” Martinitz to Humprecht Johann Czernin, Feb. 24, 1668, RA Černín (see ft. 66), carton 183; Martinitz denounced Kinsky as not observing the *leges patriae* on other occasions as well, thus in 1674: “...non frequenta la Cancelleria, con che dichiara publica la competenzaa contro l’ordine prescritto nelle legi patrie,” Martinitz to Ferdinand Bonaventura Harrach, Jan. 6, 1674, FA Harrach (see ft. 24), carton 283. In 1684, it were prelates who did not observe *leges patriae*, Martinitz to Harrach, Sept. 30, 1684 (“...domandargli si dichiarino se vogliono tenerla coll’uso antico e delle leggi patriae et dipender da SMCR nelle contributioni secondo le leggi Patrie”), *ibid.*

⁷⁴ Quoted by Petr Maťa, “Monarchia / Monarchy / da einer allein herrschet.’: The Making of State Power and Reflection on the State in Bohemia and Moravia between the Estates’ Rebellion and Enlightenment Reforms,” in Halina Manikowska and Jaroslav Pánek, eds., *Political Culture in Central Europe (10th–20th Century)* (Prague: Historický ústav AV ČR, 2005), 349–367, here 349–367.

⁷⁵ Martinitz to Czernin, Feb. 18, 1668, RA Černín (see ft. 66), carton 183.

⁷⁶ Goldast developed this argument in the second book of his *De Bohemiae Regni Commentarii*, 105–258. The argument was based on his interpretation of the Kingdom of Bohemia not as an independent polity defending its autonomy from the Holy Roman Empire, but as a rebellious member of the Empire that had to be subjugated.

Epitome and many later writings. Martinitz' critical comments on the *Epitome* (in the literature on Balbín hitherto neglected)⁷⁷ reveal that the issue of Goldast's credibility played a significant role in the dispute. Martinitz interpreted Balbín's frequent attacks on Goldast as potentially subversive, especially with regard to the hereditary succession of Habsburgs in Bohemia: "*Nam si totus Goldasti liber scateret mendaciis, mendacium etiam foret haereditaria successio Austriacae Domus in Regno Bohemiae, quam sane solidissime, etsi haereticus, demonstrat Goldastus...*"⁷⁸

Be it as it may, Martinitz declared in his memorials against Count Kinsky in 1668 that "*Regnum Bohemiae semper fuit novitatibus obnoxium*" and he defended a strong government that alone would prevent any "*violatio legis*". He even drew parallels between Bohemia and the troublesome provinces of other composite monarchies such as Portugal and Naples, equating Kinsky with Bragança and Masaniello. These were rather fantastic claims, for such separatist notions were certainly not widespread in Bohemia any longer, but they could certainly discredit his rival.⁷⁹ Likewise, Martinitz pointed several times to Kinsky's relatives who had taken part in the rebellion of the Protestant estates and in Wallenstein's conspiracy some decades earlier and who had given "*non levem (...) impulsus ruinae propriae patriae*".⁸⁰

Thus the reference to *patria* by means of *leges patriae* was employed not to de-legitimize the authorities or to defend the privileges of the province, but to sustain the monarchical order of the polity. Martinitz,

⁷⁷ Anonymous and undated comments entitled laconically "Notae" were transcribed by Balbín in 1675 "ex ipso autographo D[omini] B[urgrav]ii" (according to his concluding remark), *Knihovna kláštera premonstrátů na Strahově* (Prague), DH I 23, 494–506. Martinitz' authorship is beyond doubt as he mentions his brother, provost of the Vyšehrad-chapter, at one place in the text.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 504.

⁷⁹ See a short Latin dialogue containing six objections against the grand burgrave (with regard to his quarrel with Kinsky) and refuted by him, *LRRRA*, Q 16/28, f. 150–154.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.* Similarly: "...nissuno meno ch'il C. Chinski haveva da muover questo; la razza pero et la natura difficilmente si cuopre, perché et nella prima rebellione uno di quella casa gettò al mio Padre, et nella Fridlandica fu amazzato col Terschka et altri..." Martinitz to Humprecht Johann Count Czernin, Feb. 11, 1668, RA Černín (see ft. 66), carton 183; "V. E. la prego non si scandalizi, che l'ho scritto dell'Avo del Chinski, bandito dal Regno, dell'altro che buttò dalle finestre al mio Padre, et del terzo che col Fridlando cercò disradicare quest'Augustissima Linea (...), il quarto viddi portar prigionie a Ratisbona preso col Schlang un Kinski, che servì contro la propria persona Augustissima del S. Padre del nostro Clementissimo Padrone," Feb. 24, 1668, *ibid.*

repeatedly reprovved for an unpatriotic administration and misrule of Bohemia, employed the term *patria* against his critics. His usage of *patria* aimed at de-legitimizing the emerging opposition against his style of government and at portraying his opponents as violators of the laws of the fatherland. At the same time, Martinitz emphatically declared himself to be ready to “leave this fatherland” and to serve the emperor in another capacity rather than to collaborate with Kinsky and “to watch arise from Kinsky’s seed a fruit pernicious for the lord and the fatherland.”⁸¹ Under such circumstances, he unambiguously preferred to “*obedire in aula quam dirigere in patria*”.⁸²

Yet the position of Martinitz as the middle-figure between the court and the province was a complex one, and it allowed different roles to be performed in different situations. We saw already that he skillfully employed patriotic rhetoric against the newcomer prelates. This can be further illustrated by a situation when he addressed himself as a *patriota* referring unambiguously to the welfare of the kingdom on one occasion. In 1684 he reported from the diet to the court that he had to play the role of patriot for a while in order to prevent the overburdening of tax-payers.⁸³ This understanding of a patriot as a situational role of a royal officer that could be played in the course of a negotiation rather than as a principal position, amply demonstrates the general dilemma of many of the seventeenth-century Bohemian magnates.

Moreover, Count Kinsky had to solve much the same dilemma as Martinitz. Although the coalition between him and Balbín against Martinitz rested partially on a similar conceptual basis (the grand

⁸¹ “Jo son risolutissimo o di ceder da questa Patria in servizio di SMC...”; “Jo perciò non voglio assolutamente restar a veder crescer da semi Kinskiani un frutto sì pernicioso al Padrone et alla Patria, voglio naturalmente uscire per la porta della Cancelleria et non per la finestra...” [= allusion to the defenestration of Catholic ministers in 1618 when Martinitz’ father was thrown out of the window together with two other colleagues], Martinitz to Humprecht Johann Czernin, Feb. 29, 1668, RA Černín (see ft. 66), carton 183; “...et sendo questa cosa a me sì importante, dalla quale dipende di pigliar un perpetuo esilio dalla Patria...,” March 6, 1668, *ibid.* Besides an office at the court, Martinitz suggested for himself a diplomatic mission to Spain or Venice as possibilities, or a position in the administration of the Tyrol (probably having the governorship of the province in mind).

⁸² In his six objections (see ft. 79), where he declared in addition, “quod velit deserere patriam potius quam perdere clementissimam Suae Maiestatis erga se confidentiam,” because he esteems His Majesty “*pluris...quam totum Regnum.*”

⁸³ “Nella dieta già si cominciava a dire che non ci è chi se n’appigli de’poveri gravati, onde dovetti sta volta far un poco il Patriota...,” Aug. 2, 1684, Martinitz to Ferdinand Bonaventura Count Harrach, FA Harrach (see ft. 24), carton 283.

burgrave as *oppressor regni*), it does not seem it was energized by a basic agreement in the attitude towards the princely service and the court. Kinsky, it seems to me, adhered to the very same institutional culture as Martinitz did. He was firmly integrated into the networks at the court of Vienna—a place Balbín displayed no sympathy for at all. His influential uncle Portia enjoyed in Bohemia a reputation of being “the most hateful foe of the Bohemian nation, who calls Bohemians dogs.”⁸⁴ Kinsky himself married an Austrian noblewoman and he aspired to reestablish his position at the court after he had been relegated to the province in 1667. His opposition against the grand burgrave seems to have been primarily situational. As late as 1683, when Kinsky became the grand chancellor of Bohemia, thus moving from Prague back to Vienna, he pursued a similar political agenda as Martinitz before him, aiming at the stabilization of the monarchical rule of the Austrian Habsburgs. Under Kinsky as grand chancellor, the tax burden in Bohemia resulting from the expansion of the fiscal-military state continued to rise significantly. Much like Martinitz in the early 1670s, Kinsky belonged to those aulic ministers who pursued the establishment of a strong royal government in Hungary in the 1680s and 1690s. And in 1694, Kinsky effectively assisted in suppressing the emerging opposition of the Bohemian prelates against fiscal pressure and to diminish their prerogatives.⁸⁵ Again, we may see that the question of who appealed to *patria* and why was much more complex than Balbín’s polemical writings might suggest.

⁸⁴ Testimony of Abbot Franck, see above (ft. 54).

⁸⁵ The role of Kinsky as royal minister in Vienna, however, has not been illuminated significantly. For his integration in the offices see Stefan Sienell, *Die Geheime Konferenz unter Kaiser Leopold I. Personelle Strukturen und Methoden zur politischen Entscheidungsfindung am Wiener Hof* (Frankfurt am Main e. a.: Peter Lang, 2001). For the fiscal pressure in Bohemia see Josef Pekař, *České katastry 1654–1789* [Czech cadastres, 1654–1789] (Prague: Historický klub, 1932); Jean Béranger, *Finances et absolutisme autrichien dans la seconde moitié du XVII^e siècle* (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1975). For Kinsky’s involvement in the question of Hungary see Gustav Turba, *Die Grundlagen der Pragmatischen Sanktion*, vol. I.: Ungarn (Leipzig-Vienna: Deuticke, 1911), 9–11, 52; Oswald Redlich, *Österreichs Großmachtbildung in der Zeit Kaiser Leopolds I.* (Gotha: Perthers, 1921), 528, 535, 537. On the suppression of the opposition of the Bohemian prelates in the early 1690s see Václav Bartůněk, *Stručné dějiny kollegiální kapituly a královské kaple Všech svatých na Pražském hradě. Pražský arcibiskup Jan Bedřich z Valdštejna* [Short history of the chapter and the royal chapel of All Saints in the Prague Castle. Johann Friedrich of Waldstein, the archbishop of Prague] (Litoměřice: Římskokatolická cyrilometodějská bohoslovecká fakulta v Litoměřicích, 1979).

Last, but not least, Balbín himself used different arguments when writing about Count Martinitz in another context and genre. In a genealogical account of the Martinitz family the Jesuit compiled sometime between 1685 and 1688, a few months after the grand burgrave's death and soon before he himself died,⁸⁶ he described Bernhard Ignaz in very flattering terms. Referring to him and his father Jaroslav in the office of the grand burgrave of Prague, Balbín reported: "...*diese beede verdienen ein grosses lob und bringen ihren geschlecht ein sonderbahres ansehen.*" Contrary to the *Trophaea sepulchralia*, where the ostentatious and superficial piety of the grand burgrave (described by Balbín as atheist) became the target of ironic comments as simulated for only secular purposes, Balbín spent many words in this genealogical account describing the pious character of the grand burgrave and concluding: "...*ja ich wurde zu keinen end gelangen, da fern ich alle fueßstapfen der freygebig- und großmüthigkeith in göttlichen sachen, welche oft benandter Graff Bernardus hinter sich gelassen, aufführen wolte...*" The Jesuit even revised his original argument concerning the family's origins. Instead of tracing its beginnings to the lower and newer ranks of the nobility, this time he claimed that the family could trace its lineage back to the forefather Čech and thus the best possible pedigree within the ancient domestic nobility, while vociferously contradicting those who would stand for other opinions.⁸⁷

Naturally, the genealogical genre conformed to different rules of logic and followed different arguments.⁸⁸ Moreover, Balbín was now

⁸⁶ I found only an anonymous German translation, although the original version was obviously written in Latin: *Genealogische Beschreibung der hochgräflichen Famili von Martinitz in welcher das herkommen und alter deren Martinitz enthalten wird. Mit sonderbahren fleiß aus geschriebenen büchern und anderen alten geschichten treulich zusammen getragen und verzeichnet. Ihro hochgräflichen Excellenz dem Hoch- und Wohlgebohrnen herrn herrn Georgio Adamo Grafen von Martinitz zugeschriben*, Archiv Národního muzea (Prague), H 39. Due to references to his prior writings, Balbín's authorship is undisputable. Though the literature on Balbín occasionally mentions that he wrote a genealogy of the Martinitz family (Rejzek, *Balbín*, 440), this text has been considered lost. Supposedly, this account was intended for Balbín's *Stemmatographia* projected as the second decade of his *Miscellanea historica*. Balbín, however, managed to finalize only the first two volumes (*Liber Proemialis ad Stemmatographiam* and *Tabularium stemmatographicum seu Genealogicae tabulae*). Other genealogical accounts (usually called *Syntagma*) of Bohemian families by Balbín have been found in his papers. Few were published posthumously.

⁸⁷ "...die Martinitzen alte böhmische Inwohner seynd, die da Czechus mit sich anhero gebracht hat..." *ibid.*

⁸⁸ By 1665 Balbín elaborated a frame for this type of historiographical writing, applying it to various families in following decades, see Zdeněk Kalista, *Mládi*

writing for a different audience as well. Here, he was exhorting the nephews of the deceased minister to use the glory of their family “zum nutzen, heyl und glori des vatterlands”, because it is true “daß unsere erste lieb auf das vatterland müsse gerichtet seyn und daß in solcher alle liebs-beziehungen enthalten werden”. Thus in one of his last writings, the Jesuit—admitting he had not written enough about the Martinitz family in his texts⁸⁹—attempted to embed the hated minister in his own patriotic vision of the past. Balbín the pamphleteer now receded and gave way to Balbín the historian and genealogist.

Fathers of Fatherland

By linking early modern patriotic discussion with national identity, historians have often misunderstood the term *patria* in its seventeenth-century meaning as they supposed it denoted primarily a particular space, area or territory. In the early modern understanding, however, the term seems to have referred (beyond completely specific meanings as *patria coelestis* or birthplace) to a body politic in the first place. Given the composite and fragmented character typical of the early modern monarchical states, many polities and administrative entities emerged that could be perceived as *patria*—kingdom, province (*Land*) and urban community in particular. The early modern Habsburg monarchy, recently labeled as a “monarchische Union monarchischer Unionen von Ständestaaten”,⁹⁰ was by no means an exception. While it still needs to be examined at what time and how effectively the dynasty attempted to extend the term *patria* to their entire possessions, the persistence of traditional representations is without doubt.⁹¹

Humprechta Jana Černína z Chudenic. Zrození barokního kavalíra, I–II [The youth of Humprecht Johann Czernin of Chudenice. The birth of a Baroque cavalier] (Prague: Zdeněk Kalista, 1932).

⁸⁹ The preface begins with following words: “Eines großen fehlers förchtend ich mich schuldig zu machen, dafern in meiner stammen beschreibung der Martinitzischen nahmen nicht gelesen wurden und ich das vatterland der wissenschaftt dieser uralten famili berauben solte...,” *Genealogische Beschreibung*.

⁹⁰ Thomas Winkelbauer, *Ständefreiheit und Fürstenmacht. Länder und Untertanen des Hauses Habsburg im konfessionellen Zeitalter*, I–II (Vienna: Ueberreuter, 2003), here I, 25.

⁹¹ Grete Klingenstein, “The meanings of ‘Austria’ and ‘Austrian’ in the eighteenth century,” in Robert Oresko, G. C. Gibbs and H. M. Scott, eds., *Royal and Republican*

Given this coexistence of various meanings, the usage of the phrase *Pater Patriae* seems to be relevant when we examine the seventeenth-century patriotic discussion within the ruling elite of Bohemia. Originally a honorific title conferred by the Roman Senate, it belonged to a set of rhetorical tools to glorify the prince and it contributed to the overall patriarchal legitimization of the monarchic government.⁹² In the Bohemian context with its distinct royal tradition, the phrase was traditionally associated with Charles IV. The confessional re-evaluation of his reign (1347–1378) in seventeenth and eighteenth-century Bohemian historiography emphasized the tendency to portray him as *the father of the fatherland*⁹³—a tendency whose repercussions remain vital even in today’s historical consciousness. Balbín himself, for instance, developed this accentuation of Charles IV’s exclusivity by feminizing his attitude towards Bohemia. For Balbín, the title *Pater Patriae* seemed to have been insufficient for expressing Charles IV’s motherlike care of the kingdom’s welfare. He, thus, repeatedly suggested to re-title him as *Mater Patriae*.⁹⁴

It was, however, not only—and maybe even not primarily—Habsburg rulers who were honoured by this title in the seventeenth-century Bohemia. At the same time, it was not only the Kingdom of Bohemia that was associated with this phrase. Canon Christian Augustin Pfaltz announced in a sermon dedicated to St. Wenceslas and published in 1691 that the saint admonished the nobles they should not be *poplivori*

Sovereignty in Early Modern Europe: Essays in memory of Ragnhild Hatton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 423–478.

⁹² Paul Münch, “Die ‘Obrigkeit im Vaterstand’—zu Definition und Kritik des ‘Landesvaters’ während der Frühen Neuzeit,” *Daphnis* 11 (1982): 15–40.

⁹³ Zdeněk Kalista, *Česká barokní gotika a její žďárské ohnisko* [Czech Baroque Gothic and its center in Žďár] (Brno: Blok, 1970); Helmut Slapnicka, “Karl IV. als Gesetzgeber in der Legende des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts,” in Ferdinand Seibt, ed., *Kaiser Karl IV. Staatsmann und Mäzen* (Munich: Prestel, 1978), 404–407; Jiří Mikulec, “Tradice a symbolika české státnosti u barokních vlastenců” [The tradition and the symbolism of Czech statehood in the works of Baroque patriots], in Karel Malý and Ladislav Soukup, eds., *Vývoj české ústavnosti v letech 1618–1918* [The development of Czech constitutionalism, 1618–1918] (Prague: Nakladatelství Karolinum, 2006), 171–191.

⁹⁴ “... Carolus Imperator & Bohemiae Rex invictus, Patriae pater, ac verius Mater, morbis senilibus confectus Pragae moritur...”, Balbín, *Epitome*, 380; “Caroli IV. Imperatoris ac Regis in Bohemiam tanta sunt merita, ut Patriae Pater, & quod saepius dixi, Patriae Mater debeat appellari...”, idem, *Miscellanea historica Regni Bohemiae*, dec. I, vol. 7 (Prague, 1687), 151. Though early modern princesses were often addressed as *Mater Patriae*, I was unable to find any other example of extension of the title to male rulers.

or „*Volckfrässige Wölffe*“, but rather „*gute Hirten, Patres patriae, Väter ihrer Lande und Leute*“, thus extending the title on noble landlords in general.⁹⁵ Similarly, the burial of Adam Pavel Count Slavata (1603–1657), a wealthy Bohemian magnate, in his residential town took place (at least according to a Jesuit chronicle) “with sorrow of all burghers, as if they bewailed the father of the fatherland”.⁹⁶ On another occasion, the mayor and councillors of the royal town of Plzeň were addressed as *Patres Patriae* in the dedication of a speech delivered at the University of Prague by a student whose family apparently came from the town.⁹⁷ This usage might have been no exception, for the term *patria* was quite frequently related to the urban communities.

At other times, the phrase clearly referred neither to towns, nor to manors (as in the case of Adam Paul Slavata), but to the kingdom. If so, it was mostly high dignitaries, secular as well as clerical, among the ruling elite of the kingdom, who were honoured—in different contexts and by different authors—as *Patres Patriae*. My evidence has been by no means collected systematically, but it includes one archbishop (Johann Friedrich Count Waldstein, d.1694),⁹⁸ one grand chancellor (Vilém Count Slavata, d.1652),⁹⁹ four grand burgraves (Adam of Waldstein, d.1638;¹⁰⁰ Bernhard Ignaz Count Martinitz, d.1685;¹⁰¹ Hermann Jakob Count Czernin, d.1710,¹⁰² Johann Ernst Anton Count Schaffgotsch

⁹⁵ Pfaltz, *Theatrum Glorae*, 87.

⁹⁶ “*Elatu est (...) communi Civium luctu, quasi Patriae Patri parentaretur,*” *Historia Collegii Novodomensis*, 189, Státní oblastní archiv v Třeboni, pracoviště Jindřichův Hradec, Velkostatek Jindřichův Hradec, sign. IIIKb, inv. num. 84.

⁹⁷ Josephus Mathias de Hana, *Filia Gratiarum Cui Pallas Lucina, Virtus Nutrix, Caelum Hymenaeus Diva Parthenosopha Catharina Coram Senatu Populoque Academico (...) Universitatis (...) Pragensis (...) Panegyrico adumbrata* (Prague, 1722).

⁹⁸ *Chronici Plassensis privati “Tilia Plassensis” inscripti, a F. Mauritio Vogt, S. O. Cist. Plassii professo exarati pars tertia*, ed. Ant(ónín) Podlaha (Prague, 1909), 98.

⁹⁹ Bohuslaus Balbinus, *Miscellanea historica Regni Bohemiae*, dec. I, vol. 4 (Prague, 1682), 132: “*Patriam comendare Regi suo nunquam desistebat Wilhelmus, & cum aliquando ab Oratore in Collegio Novodomensi Pater Patriae appellatus esset, grantanter accepit, responditque: unum hunc titulum se ambitiose expetere, licet ab ipsis Patriotis, ut ajebat, impediretur, qui ob sua privata commoda, & commendationem ad Principem, nescirent, aut scire nollent: Patriam longe Patribus & Matribus cariorem esse nobis oportere.*”

¹⁰⁰ Georgius Crugerius, *Sacri Pulveris Incltyti Regni Bohemiae...* (Litomislii, 1761), 122 (the text dates back to mid-seventeenth century); Johann Jakob Weingarten, *Fürsten-Spiegel Oder Monarchia Deß Hochlöblichen Ertz-Hauses Oesterreich...* (Prag, 1673), 98.

¹⁰¹ See below.

¹⁰² *Supremus Honorum Gradus In Scala Jakob (...) Piis Manibus (...) Hermanni Jacobi S.R.I. Comitis Czernin (...) Pompa Funebri adornatus...* (Pragae, 1710).

d.1747),¹⁰³ and one *Obersthofmeister* of Leopold I (Wenzel Eusebius Prince Lobkowitz, d.1677).¹⁰⁴ One *Landeshauptmann* in the neighboring Moravia (Ferdinand Prince Dietrichstein, d.1698)¹⁰⁵ might be mentioned in addition. It seems, then, that it was not uncommon to associate the term *Pater Patriae* not only with the royal family but with the prominent members of the ruling elite in the Habsburg hereditary lands or even with the clerical and noble estates in general.¹⁰⁶ Despite the significant changes in the political system after the defeat of the Protestant estates in 1620, this trend mirrors eloquently the continuing ambition and the self-image of the Bohemian high nobility.

But we may notice the opposite strategy as well—criticizing and mocking important dignitaries or groups within the estates as traitors of fatherland. This rhetoric was frequent in the course of the contest between the Catholic dynasty and the Protestant estates in the decades around 1600, and it was used on both sides. In 1619, the rebelling Protestant estates of Bohemia employed the phrase “the betraying sons of the fatherland” against the Catholic pro-Habsburg nobles and clergymen who were subsequently proscribed and exiled.¹⁰⁷ One year later, Ferdinand II declared those members of the Austrian estates

¹⁰³ *Fides et Constantia a Constantino Chlora Romanorum Imperatore In aulae suae probata; In (...) Joanne Ernesto Antonio Schaffgotsch (...) Supremo Burgravio...* (Prague, 1735).

¹⁰⁴ Weingarten, *Fürsten-Spiegel*, 47.

¹⁰⁵ Aug(ustin) Neumann, “Z paměti preláta Hufnagla” [From the memoirs of prelate Hufnagel], *Sborník Historického kroužku*, 20 (1919), 26–56, here 54.

¹⁰⁶ In a dedication of 1664, Bohuslav Balbín extended the title *Patres Patriae* on the entire estates of the county of Glatz (a largely autonomous district incorporated into the Kingdom of Bohemia): “Illustrissimis Sac. Rom. Imp. Comitibus, Dominis Dominis, Illustrissimis Liberis Baronibus, Perillustribus et Generosis Equitibus, Patriae Patribus; Amplissimis, Ornatisissisque Civitatum Primoribus ac Civibus; Totiusque adeo Comitatus Glacensi Dominis et Patronis meis praecipua veneratione collendis.” Note the significant distinction: the title “Fathers of Fatherland” should not appertain to the burghers but only to nobles (counts, barons and knights) whose names were specified further in the preface. Bohuslav Balbín, *Vita Venerabilis Arnesti (vulgo Ernesti), Primi Archiepiscopi Pragensis...* (Prague, 1664), preface (unpag.).

¹⁰⁷ “...neupřímých synů vlasti...”, Pavel Skála ze Zhoře, *Historie Česká*, ed. Josef Janáček (Prague: Svoboda, 1984), 124. “...jsouce přirození Čechové a obyvatelové země, vlasti se zpronevěřili...”, *Apologie (první i druhá) stavův království Českého, tělo a krev Pána Ježíše Krista pod obojí způsobou přijímajících, která roku 1618 na ospravedlnění Čechův před Evropou (...) na světlo vyšla*, [First and second apology of the estates of the Bohemian kingdom...] ed. Václav Šubert (Prague: Tisk a sklad K. Seyfrieda, 1863), 66.

who collaborated with the Bohemians as “*Rebellen und Feind des Vatterlands*”.¹⁰⁸

As the disputes in the 1660s and 1670s demonstrate, the tendency to de-legitimize authority by means of patriotic language did not cease after the defeat of the estates in the 1620s. In his *Tractatio*, Balbín ironically addressed “[i]idem optimi scilicet Patres Patriae” and derisively mocked Count Martinitz “*o te verum Patriae Patrem*” for his “merits” in persuading the king to distrust Czechs.¹⁰⁹ Characteristically, it was the controversial Grand Burgrave Bernhard Ignaz Martinitz again who became subject of a debate of whether he was father or rather traitor of his fatherland. A eulogy, published shortly after his death in 1685, contained a chronogram “*PrIMa Die soLIIs hVIVs annI obIIt VICe ReX RegnI et Pater PatrIae*”.¹¹⁰ Another eulogy, whose author used the pseudonym “Philomusus Bernardophilus”, referred to him as a “*Medicus Regni*”.¹¹¹ Martinitz’ rivals used less gentle terms to describe the grand burgrave’s attitude towards the kingdom. In 1664, for instance, Abbot Franck, after he had received the grand burgrave’s proposal of reconciliation, answered, “I wish no reconciliation with the enemy of the fatherland”.¹¹² Four years later, Franck reported to be himself held in esteem as “*Pater Patriae*” in public since he dared to challenge Count Martinitz’ projects at the diet.¹¹³ And Father Balbín, though less publicly, had addressed Martinitz as “*Patriae proditor*,” “*Patriae suae hostis*,” “*Parricida Patria*,” “*Pestis Patriae*” and even “*Patriae Carnifex*.”¹¹⁴

¹⁰⁸ Arno Strohmeier, *Konfessionskonflikt und Herrschaftsordnung. Widerstandsrecht bei den österreichischen Ständen (1550–1650)* (Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 2006), 342.

¹⁰⁹ Balbín, *Tractatio*, 30, 37. See *Trophaea sepulchralia* for similar irony, Id., *Pamětní nápis*, 28, 54, 64.

¹¹⁰ Knihovna kláštera premonstrátů na Strahově (Prague), DG II 6, 275f.

¹¹¹ *Philomusus Bernardophilus, In solatium Illustrissimorum et Excellentissimorum Dominorum, Dominorum amicorum Excellentissimi et Illustrissimi Domini D. Bernardi Ignatii S. R. I. Comitis De Martinitz...* (Neo-Prague, 1685).

¹¹² “...rescivi, Dominum Burggraffium velle mecum reconciliari; respondi, me nihil cum illo differentiae aut offensae habere; si pro bono publico et Regni incolumitate constanter egerim, haec ipsi promovere ex officio et conscientia incumbere, quod si negligat, mihi non debere imputare, quod cum hoste patriae nullam reconciliationem admittam,” *Diarium abbatis Strahoviensis*, 496, Nov. 25, 1664.

¹¹³ “Satis notabiliter aversionem D. Burggraffii notavi, qui ex hoc, quod in comitiis Regni conatibus ipsius obsistam, implacabile odium fovit, quod aliorum favor et affectus mitigant, qui palam pro Patre Patriae venerantur et extollunt,” *ibid.*, 900, Feb. 12, 1668.

¹¹⁴ Balbín, *Pamětní nápis*, 18, 32, 34, 48. See *Idem.*, *Tractatio*, 119.

Conclusion

Historians have usually treated Bohuslav Balbín as either a mouthpiece of a patriotic opposition within the estates or a lone voice. While reading and analyzing only literary texts produced by Balbín and “his circle”, historians have on the other hand largely underestimated the political background against which they were written. A closer look into other evidence, including private papers, indicates that matters were much more complex. Rather than being an exclusive and constitutive sign of a cohesive group of patriots and thus a manifestation of their patriotic identity, the *patria* (having been mostly identified with the Kingdom of Bohemia in the sense of polity—*regnum*) was invoked by different individuals, in different situations and—most importantly—to legitimize very different and sometimes contradictory goals.

In the course of the 1660s and 1670s, there was a lively debate concerning legitimacy and authority within Bohemia’s ruling elite. While the politically dominant and controversial figure of the Grand Burgrave Bernhard Ignaz Martinitz (who frequently supported the unpopular measures resulting from the emergence of the fiscal-military state) certainly helped to galvanize this debate, it is less certain whether it can be explained as simply a dispute between the patriotic-minded estates and the central power. Neither the estates nor the court can be clearly defined by a homogenous policy or even clearly separated one from another. Within the estate of barons, the corporation both Martinitz and his rival Kinsky belonged to, both spheres overlapped to a great extent. The double identity of many magnates as both members of the estates and holders of royal offices (or even court councillors) let them play a special role as mediators between the king and the province. Since they were expected to serve the fatherland as well as the king, while group solidarities and familial interests were at stake in addition, conflicting loyalties and at times seemingly contradictory behaviour was a result. Moreover, the rivalry between the prelates and the aristocrats placed the debate about the nature of a true patriot in Bohemia on a different level. Both groups used patriotic language to buttress their antagonistic aspirations. Even Count Martinitz, treated by many as his fatherland’s traitor, was able to turn the patriotic talk against his opponents. If we focus on the estates and not their alleged spokesmen (Father Balbín), the friction between court councillors on

the one side and Bohemian patriots on the other, a friction historians usually took for granted, appears much less clear and the supposed patriotic wing within the estates remains rather elusive indeed.

Though the dual scheme “court versus patria” did not always correspond with reality, the very argument of *patria* certainly had great importance for political negotiation in seventeenth-century Bohemia. The quarrels—between distinct corporations (barons and prelates) as well as between individuals (Martinitz and Kinsky)—were fuelled by patriotic reasoning. The welfare of *patria* appears to be a relevant argument within the Habsburg composite monarchy, but it was at the same time an argument that could be employed for different reasons.

Through his patriotic works and especially his polemic against the grand burgrave beginning in the early 1670s, the Jesuit Balbín entered this debate. He collected many of the objections against Martinitz that circulated in public discourse, but he linked them with the issue of language and foreigners. With regard to Martinitz, this appears as a skilful manipulation because the issue of language and foreigners was normally employed by indigenous aristocrats to de-legitimize the aspirations of the newcomer prelates, and it was exactly the newcomer or German-speaking prelates who mostly fought against the fiscal policy of the court at the Bohemian diet and opposed the grand burgrave. And it was exactly Martinitz who, emulating his father, repeatedly admonished the prelates to use the Czech language in appropriate situations. Thus Balbín’s simplifying equation of *oppressio regni, lingua germanica* and *alieni* simply did not fit the real situation within the ruling elite of the kingdom. Although the Jesuit Balbín, Abbot Franck and Count Kinsky faced the same enemy, their ideas of how and by whom the fatherland should be governed diverged substantially. We still have much to learn and understand concerning the ethnically, culturally and politically complicated situation that emerged in Bohemia in the seventeenth century. Illuminating the process of appropriation and re-definition of patriotic values and embedding the talk of *patria* into the contemporaneous context may help us to understand it a little bit better.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

FORMS OF PATRIOTISM IN THE EARLY MODERN POLISH-LITHUANIAN COMMONWEALTH

Stanisław Roszak

Deliberations about patriotism belong to that group of topics which are reinterpreted by every generation. They come under various political influences and they go through social and cultural changes. What is most surprising is the fact that every period uses its own terminology which, although it sounds similar, creates a new quality of meaning. So firstly these notions must be defined precisely in order to understand them properly to make a more coherent discussion possible.

For instance, the symposium on “Real and Pretended Patriots” which took place during the 13th Meeting of Polish Historians in Poznań in 1984 revealed that Polish and mainstream European interpretations of “patriotism” in the eighteenth century could be fairly different.¹ According to Emanuel Rostworowski, there were two interpretations of patriotism in Europe: first the royalist one which underlined the ambitions of glory, and then a second that concentrated on fighting against monarchical despotism in the name of liberty. In the Polish republic of nobles the expression “real patriotism” was extremely popular and, as Hugo Kołłątaj expressed it, it was a symbol of political realism, while “pretended patriotism” meant strong and stubborn belief in rules created by family tradition. However, there were many other interpretations which depended on the circumstances, events and the political opinions of their authors. One should add that the term “patriotism” became widely used in the eighteenth century by the participants in internal conflicts, for example by supporters of the first

¹ Barbara Grochulska, “Patrioci prawdziwi i fałszywi. Historyczne kryteria patriotyzmu (II połowa XVIII–XIX w.)” [Real and pretended patriots: The historical criteria of patriotism (from the second half of the 18th century to the 19th century)], in *Pamiętnik XIII Powszechnego Zjazdu Historyków Polskich*, Poznań 6–9 września 1984 roku, cz. 2, sprawozdania z sympozjów [Reports from the 13th Convention of Polish Historians] (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1988), 67–76.

Polish constitution, as well as by its opponents. Such a multiplicity of interpretations is well summarized by an Austrian diplomat who in 1788 expressed the view that an ability to understand changes as they happen creates a real, enlightened patriot.²

In order to depict the phenomenon of patriotism in Poland in the early modern period properly, it is necessary to present it in manifold contexts that are very often related to each other. I propose to structure this discussion of the issues connected with patriotism in Poland by presenting a range of contexts within which further deliberations are possible. I will concentrate mainly on the development of those concepts that enable us to describe the changing forms of patriotic discourse which took shape in early modern times in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The principal contexts are the philosophical, political, religious and educational. My main concern in this article is to clarify the understanding of these conceptions of patriotism and the contexts within which references to the love of fatherland were used in the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Research on patriotism in the Republic of Nobles must be extremely careful and cautious in its approach. Such notions as “patriotism” and “patriotic behavior” achieved their full and precise meaning quite late in the second half of the eighteenth century. In Enlightenment publications the word “patriotism” became one of the most crucial notions, and opponents as well as supporters of political changes taking place in Poland used this word in order to support their opinions. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, however, such a notion was practically non-existent. Of course this does not mean that humanists and the proponents of the Sarmatian ideology in this period wrote nothing about patriotic behavior. It also does not mean that there were no discussions and disputes concerning allegiance to the fatherland. Thus, in order to present the evolution of patriotism and patriotic behavior, and to understand the changes in the notion in modern times, it is necessary to analyze some other keywords.

To some extent the discussion in the eighteenth century concerning patriotic behavior and the traits of a patriot was similar to the one that

² Letter to Adam Kazimierz Czartoryski, dated 29 October 1788, written from the Vienna court, in which the political situation in Poland is characterized and flexible behaviour depending on changing situations is called “patriotisme vrai et éclairé.” Haus-Hof und Staatsarchiv in Vienna, Polen, sign. III 8: Correspondence of Polish magnates with Vienna.

took place much earlier and was connected with such notions as “the fatherland”, “public good” and “citizenship”. Thanks to these notions, political, social and literary discussions were possible in the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries. Failing to analyze these key notions could cause a historian to fall into “a trap of obviousness.” The absence of a specific mention of “patriotism” in a source does not mean the non-existence of the concept of fatherland or of patriotic behavior as such. Jerzy Ronikier has analyzed the behavior of the political and military elites during the reign of August II of the Wettin dynasty. It turned out that in letters of this period there is no mention of the *Sejm* (Parliament), the most important contemporary political body. For these elites the functioning of a political system with the *Sejm* as its most crucial part was so obvious that it needed no commentary.³ What is more, there were other terms expressing personal opinions which could be used with reference to a political system. In order to avoid “traps of obviousness” let us start our deliberations by presenting the evolution of the key notions.

Keywords: patria, citizenship, common good

The word “*patria/ojczyzna*” significantly widened its meaning between the sixteenth and the eighteenth century. At the beginning of the period *patria* was understood to mean inherited land. As time passed new ideas emerged, linking territory, state and people with *patria*. In the 1560s *patria* was defined as one of the most important source of virtues possessed by every nation,⁴ in relation to which its inhabitants could identify themselves. So an evolution towards a more symbolic

³ Jerzy Ronikier, *Hetman Adam Sieniawski i jego regimentarze. Studium z historii mentalności szlachty polskiej 1706–1725* [Hetman Adam Sieniawski and his regiments: A study in the history of the mentality of Polish noblemen 1706–1725] (Cracow: Universitas, 1992), 85. See also the analysis by Piotr Kowalski, *O jednorożcu, Wiczniku i innych motywach mniej lub bardziej ważnych* [About a unicorn, Wicznik, and other motives more or less important], (Cracow: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2007), 95–116.

⁴ A full analysis of what the word “Poland” meant was made by Ewa Bem-Wiśniewska, *Funkcjonowanie nazwy Polska w języku czasów nowożytnych (1530–1795)* [The functions of the name “Poland” in the language of the early modern period (1530–1795)] (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo DiG, 1998).

sense is visible. For instance, in 1579 the Jesuit priest Piotr Skarga wrote that being a patriot means craving for the fatherland.⁵

In the literature of the sixteenth century one finds different meanings of *patria*. In the works by Mikołaj Rej, known as one of the fathers of Polish literature, we find the traditional references to territory or lands. The best Polish poet of the Renaissance, Jan Kochanowski, used the term in connection with a particular territory, but also in a more symbolic way, as a “community.” Clear emotional differentiation was introduced by a political writer and Catholic polemicist of Ruthenian origins, Stanisław Orzechowski (1513–1566). In one of his polemical writings describing the contemporary situation in Poland, entitled “Chimera, or the shameful heresy in the Polish Kingdom” (*Chimera czyli o haniebnym kacerstwie w Królestwie Polskim*), he recalls the lands belonging to his family. The author—a nobleman and Catholic priest—for the first time in Polish literature introduces clear symbolic categories which allow him to be precise about the territory that he originated from:⁶

- Orzechowce (the village belonging to his family)—familial heritage
- Przemyśl (the nearest town), and Przemyśl district
- Ruś (a province of the Republic)—the province of his upbringing
- Poland—mother
- Catholic church—land of redemption.

This new conception of the notion of *patria* introduces the consideration of the traits of a citizen. The anonymous author of the treatise *Philopolites* (1588) characterized the ideal citizen in the following way. First of all, the author claimed that such a person must love his fatherland. Then he presented how such love should look, describing a sort of “patriotism” *avant la lettre*. Amongst the most important aspects are: concern for the country’s security, abiding by the law, justice, accord, bravery and sacrifice. The political writer Jakub Przyłuski stated that true citizenship is not limited to the nobility alone. In his

⁵ “a nad inne miłe człeku rzeczy najmiłsza jest ojczyzna, naród i dom między którymi kto się urodzi i wychowa, okrom nich by się z człekiem najlepiej działo, przyrodzona jednak tęskliwość ciągnie i najlepszą krainę za wygnanie sobie poczyta.” Quoted by Ewa Bem-Wiśniewska, *Funkcjonowanie nazwy Polska*, 164.

⁶ Stanisław Orzechowski, *Wybór pism* [Selected writings], ed. J. Starnawski (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Ossolineum, 1972), 292.

treatise *Prawa czyli statuty i przywileje Królestwa Polskiego* (Laws, statutes and privileges of the Polish Kingdom) he tried to prove that love of country is the most essential virtue of a nobleman, although it is not a trait which can be acquired only as an inheritance. Przyłuski claimed that people belonging to the lower social groups could advance towards and even enter the noble class thanks to their efforts in fighting and working hard for the good of the country.⁷ Such beliefs, however, did not gain popularity in the sixteenth century. Another opinion, expressed by Wawrzyniec Goślicki in 1568 in a treatise *O senatorze doskonałym* (About a perfect senator) was dominant—the noblemen, because of their origin, are obliged to love their country. In the eighteenth century, at the end of our period, the journal *Monitor* launched a discussion on patriotic allegiance with reference to inborn and acquired traits. In the enlightened writings of Stanisław Staszic and Hugo Kołłątaj we find the opinion that nobility did not automatically imply love of the fatherland but rather that the opposite is true—love for the country guarantees real nobility.

In the seventeenth century, when the idea of Sarmatism flourished and the nobility attained the peak of its political rights, the term for fatherland, “patria,” overlapped with noble freedom. Łukasz Opaliński in a treatise *Obrona Polski* (Poland’s defense) (1648) claimed that the country’s happiness is possible thanks to the maintenance of civil liberties, alongside the preservation of all the rights of the nobility. Andrzej Maksymilian Fredro, the most representative political writer on Sarmatism, extolled the perfection of the Commonwealth. If the Republic is an ideal fatherland, it must be defended against any changes. The “*liberum veto*” rule, allowing one nobleman to veto any decision by the Sejm, was perceived as a guarantee of the status quo as it in fact guaranteed noble liberties.

Defense of the country meant fighting against enemies coming from outside as well as from inside. Both were dangerous, the first because he crossed the frontiers, the second because he tried to destroy noble rights. In such an interpretation the defense of the country was the same as the defense of freedom, which was sanctioned by religion.

⁷ Jakub Przyłuski, “Prawa czyli statuty i przywileje Królestwa Polskiego” [Laws, statutes and privileges of Polish Kingdom], in Lech Szczucki, ed., *700 lat myśli polskiej. Filozofia i myśl społeczna XVI wieku* [700 years of Polish thought: Philosophy and social thought in the XVIth century] (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1976), 236–38.

Łukasz Opaliński in pointed to the divine sources of noble freedom. Noble freedom is a gift from God to the country, it is a gift characterizing the nobility.⁸ The eighteenth century finally brought the problem of social and political reforms and the introduction of the concept of personal freedom. Freedom became a category of thinking with reference to all citizens, not only to the noblemen. Stanisław Staszic in his *Przestrogi dla Polski* (Warnings for Poland) (1790) stated that freedom belongs to the inborn rights of every human being.

During the period of partitions the old interpretation of the word “fatherland” returns. While the Polish nation had lost its country in a very material sense, a strong symbolic connotation between fatherland and language, tradition and culture emerged. From then on there were attempts to rescue the lost *patria* by saving its institutions of culture and science, identified as its most valuable virtues.

The second keyword which enables us to interpret varied historical sources is the notion of citizenship. In the sixteenth century the Polish humanists Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski, Łukasz Górnicki and Wawrzyniec Goślicki created the ideal of a citizen who is ready to sacrifice himself for his country. He is intelligent, well educated, brave and loves his fatherland. Naturally, he is an owner of lands, a nobleman deeply engaged in his country's affairs. A good citizen is also described as a “citizen loving his *patria*” or a “resident citizen.” People who could not sacrifice themselves for their country were not perceived as real citizens, which is why women, children, old people and servants were excluded from this group. Only the previously mentioned anonymous treaty *Philopolites* linked the ideal of citizenship with the ideal of humanity.

The model citizen of the sixteenth century is mainly a countryman who takes care of his estates and family. Such an ideal was fully described by Mikołaj Rej in his *Żywot człowieka poczciwego* (The life of a good man) (1568). However, it was understood that such a countryman at the same time actively takes part in the political life of his region. Very special traits were demanded from a person who was a senator. According to Wawrzyniec Goślicki, such a person had to

⁸ Łukasz Opaliński, “Apoteoza polskiej wolności” [Apotheosis of Polish freedom], in Zbigniew Ogonowski, ed., *700 lat myśli polskiej. Filozofia i myśl społeczna XVII wieku* [700 years of Polish thought: Philosophy and social thought in the XVIIth century] (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1978), 206.

be well educated in many fields. The tasks of a senator were difficult and delicate as he was supposed to mediate between the king and the noblemen (as member of an intermediate body, the “*ordo intermedius*”). That is why he had to possess such traits as courage, virtue, love for his country and in addition to these also conciliatory talents. All those abilities were reserved for the true humanist alone.

In the seventeenth century the “Arcadian” ideal of a countryman co-existed with the ideal of a knight. The wars of this century made people realize that their faith as well as the frontiers of the country were in danger. Hence in political treatises of this period a nobleman, till now described as a good farmer, becomes a knight whose task it is to protect his fatherland and the Catholic religion. An existing strong myth of Poland as “a bulwark of Christianity” supported the ideal of the citizen as a knight who protects the Catholic faith.⁹ Courage, honor and knightly deeds were glorified in literature and art. The brave military deeds of one’s ancestors were praised in the diaries and manuscript books of the noblemen, which were called “*silva rerum*.” The ideal of a nobleman-knight can also be found on gravestones and in Baroque epitaphs.¹⁰ The citizen-protector of the seventeenth century was responsible for the security of frontiers and for the preservation of noble privileges as well. Eloquence was one of the most important advantages of such a good citizen. An active citizen had to be a politician and a speaker, in short, a person capable of the fluent use of arguments against “tyrannical” politics.

In the eighteenth century, schools established by the religious orders, the Jesuits and the Piarists reinforced the ideal of a citizen-nobleman as a Catholic and an active politician engaged in public affairs. A reformer who reshaped the educational system of the Scholarum Piarum, Stanisław Konarski, claimed in the treatise *De viro honesto et bono cive* (1754) that a good citizen is predestined to “love God

⁹ Hanna Dziechcińska, “Wzory osobowe” [Personal patterns], in *Słownik literatury staropolskiej* [A dictionary of Old Polish literature], ed. T. Michałowska (Wrocław-Warsaw-Cracow: Ossolineum, 1998), 1063–66. The problem of noble personal patterns is extensively discussed in Janusz Tazbir, *Kultura szlachecka w Polsce. Rozkwit-upadek-relikty* [The noble culture in Poland: Bloom—downfall—relics] (Warsaw: Wiedza Powszechna, 1979).

¹⁰ Mariusz Karpowicz, *Sztuki polskiej drogi dziwne* [Strange byways of Polish art] (Bydgoszcz: Excalibur, 1994), 175–88.

and his fatherland.”¹¹ It was not until the eighteenth century that the notion of citizenship widened. In the writings of Stanisław Staszic and Franciszek Salezy Jezierski the status of citizen could be achieved by burghers and peasantry.¹² It is rather strange to find that a new political and social situation was expressed by old linguistic means. The authors certainly did not try to negate the leading role of the nobility. Members of other social groups had only the potential power to become real citizens. In order to acquire full recognition as a citizen they had to be accepted by the body of noblemen. In the new political situation at the end of the eighteenth century the humanist debate about *vera nobilitas* came back. In the case of the noblemen, “real nobility” meant enrichment of a family tradition by virtues and personal advancement. In the case of other groups, virtues and personal advancement would result in admittance to the nobility.

This plurality of meanings is illustrated by the way Polish citizens defined themselves in contact with another culture and unfamiliar habits. Aleksandra Niewiara, who recently has been investigating how Polish voyagers perceived other nations between the sixteenth and the nineteenth centuries, noticed that what was perceived as “strange” strongly depended on the conception of citizenship typical of that particular period.¹³ As proof it is possible to state that the diaries of the sixteenth century were dominated by a vision of a nobleman as good farmer. In the seventeenth century it was the Catholic soldier, in the eighteenth century the citizen of a declining polity, while in the nineteenth century the ideal of a “European citizen” that defined the identity of the viewer.

Finally, the third key motif which enables us to describe and analyze patriotism in early modern times is the distinction between the common and the private good. For the humanists, concern for the former equated with love for the fatherland, while concern for the latter was

¹¹ Stanisław Konarski, *Moralność człowieka uczciwego i dobrego obywatela* [Morality of an honest man and good citizen], in *700 lat myśli polskiej. Filozofia i myśl społeczna w latach 1700–1830*, vol. 1, Okres saski [700 years of Polish thought: Philosophy and social thought 1700–1830, v. 1, The Saxon Period] (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Filozofii i Socjologii PAN, 2000), 449–54.

¹² Franciszek Salezy Jezierski, *Wybór pism* [Selected writings], ed. J. Skwarczyński (Warsaw: PIW, 1952), 227.

¹³ Aleksandra Niewiara, *Wyobrażenia o narodach w pamiętnikach i dziennikach z XVI–XIX wieku* [Images of nations in memoirs and diaries written between the 16th and 19th centuries] (Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 2000), 24–32.

interpreted as self-love. Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski clearly stated that “the Republic constitutes an association of people created for their common good and usefulness.” Public offices and estates were factors which made people more responsible for realizing the common good. According to Modrzewski it was the noblemen who were supposed to take care of the common good. Thanks to the attention given to the public good (the security of the fatherland) it was possible to take care of private goods (property, family, individual liberties). During the “execution movement” of the 1560s (involving attempts by the nobility to preserve their privileges) the notion of the public good became synonymous with the rights and privileges of the nobility. At the beginning of the seventeenth century, during the Zebrzydowski *rokosz* (rebellion) against the king, concern for the common good was presented in political propaganda as the fight to preserve noble privileges. In the writings of Andrzej Maksymilian Fredro, Łukasz Opaliński and Andrzej Radawiecki it is clear that these two notions—public and private good—are used in counter-position. Neglect of public matters and care of one’s own home affairs meant the destruction of tradition and the rules introduced by the ancestors.

Finally, in the eighteenth century “private good” was accepted as something positive. Already in the first half of that century public and private good became linked in a closer manner. In a philosophical context, with reference to Christian sources, Stanisław Leszczyński asserted that love for the country would be impossible without love for oneself. In a political context Stanisław Poniatowski (father of the future Polish king Stanisław August Poniatowski) in 1744 highlighted the fact that an earlier experience of love towards one’s own family was indispensable in the development of love for the country. In the context of Enlightened political economy Stefan Garczyński in his treatise, *Anatomia Rzeczypospolitej* (Anatomy of the Republic) (1751), pointed out the need to link “personal success” with a success of “the fatherland.” Pursuing private good entails richer individuals, and thanks to their wealth the *patria* also becomes rich. In this way economic doctrine was included in patriotic discussion.

The political and social context

Patriotism in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was intimately connected with the idea of republicanism. A powerful king constituted a threat to the freedom of the fatherland, so a real patriot was somebody who loves and defends the republican constitution. That is why the noblemen treated the republic as the natural form of their state. Their beliefs were so strong that they tried to change some historical facts in order to evade anything that could be perceived as dangerous for their republican ideal. In the seventeenth century historians from Royal Prussia rejected those mythological constructions (the lists of legendary rulers) which could have suggested that the state had royal origins.¹⁴ On the other hand, the second half of the eighteenth century introduced the expression “*pater patriae*” which was undoubtedly linked with monarchy and referred to the ruler.¹⁵ Analyzing the terminology and phraseology of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Franciszek Peplowski showed that during the Enlightenment such expressions as “father of the fatherland” and “son of the fatherland” were widely used.¹⁶ The vision of an ideal ruler was strongly supported by art and literature in the eighteenth century.¹⁷ The figure of the last Polish king Stanisław August Poniatowski was transformed from a traditional knight into a monarch who is intelligent and tolerant towards his subjects. In the Romantic period, the notion “father of the fatherland” disappeared because previously it had denoted the king. When Poland became independent again—after 1918—the notion of a brave

¹⁴ Karin Friedrich, “Better in Perilous Liberty than Quiet Servitude: The idea of freedom in the writings of two Protestant burghers in seventeenth-century Royal Prussia,” in *Między wielką polityką a szlacheckim partykularzem. Studia z dziejów Polski i Europy* [Between national politics and noblemen’s preoccupations: Studies in the history of Poland and Europe] (Toruń: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, 1993), 73–78.

¹⁵ Franciszek Peplowski, *Słownictwo i frazeologia polskiej publicystyki okresu oświecenia i romantyzmu* [Terminology and phraseology in Polish publications from the Enlightenment and Romanticism] (Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1961).

¹⁶ F. Peplowski, *Słownictwo i frazeologia*, 12–14.

¹⁷ Jakub Pokora, *Obraz Najjaśniejszego Pana Stanisława Augusta. Studium z ikonografii władzy* [The image of His Majesty Stanisław August Poniatowski: Studies in the iconography of power] (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Instytut Sztuki PAN, 1993); A. Norowska, *Wizerunki władcy. Stanisław August Poniatowski w poezji okolicznościowej (1764–1795)* [Images of the king: Stanisław August Poniatowski in circumstantial poetry (1764–1795)] (Cracow and Warsaw: Collegium Columbinum, 2006).

and wise “father of the fatherland” was developed with reference to Józef Piłsudski.¹⁸ The second term, “son of the fatherland,” remained popular throughout the nineteenth century, and could even be found in the twentieth century.

In early modern times an understanding of patriotism as service to the country was typical of the noblemen. Thanks to the pioneering research of Jerzy Ronikier, who concentrated on the description of “soldiers” taking part in the Great Northern War, it seems that *patria* was a central value which could bring about an agreement between fighting sides. As he wrote: “It does not matter what different opinions they had; they were still members of one nation where some common rules functioned. Somebody’s disobedience resulted in protests by the rest; fidelity to the fatherland was the first priority.”¹⁹ At the same time, for the ministers of King August II, *patria* meant the rights, liberties and privileges of the nobility.²⁰

The second half of the eighteenth century turned out to be crucial in many respects. This was partly because some expressions widened their meanings and thus someone loving his country and ready to sacrifice himself came to be called a “patriot.” In 1761 Tobias Bauch in a journal *Patryota Polski* (Polish Patriot) underlined clearly that every Christian “who improves his fatherland” can be perceived as a patriot.²¹

Tobias Bauch represented a new way of thinking about patriotism. The following formulation, “Every Christian may do good for his fatherland,” meant that patriotism was not reserved for the noblemen

¹⁸ Piotr Okulewicz, “Józef Piłsudski. Między popularnością a kultem” [Józef Piłsudski: Between popularity and cult], *Wiadomości Historyczne* 5 (2006) 1: 18–28. An interesting point of view is provided by Cichoracki, *Z nami jest On. Kult marszałka Józefa Piłsudskiego w Wojsku Polskim w latach 1926–1939* [He is with us: The cult of Marshall Józef Piłsudski in the Polish army 1926–1939] (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Ossolineum, 2001).

¹⁹ Jerzy Ronikier, *Hetman Adam Sieniawski i jego regimentarze. Studium z historii mentalności szlachty polskiej 1706–1725* [Adam Sieniawski and his regiments: Studies in the history of the mentality of Polish noblemen 1706–1725] (Cracow: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 1992), 38.

²⁰ Andrzej Leon Sowa, *Świat ministrów Augusta II. Wartości i poglądy funkcjonujące w kręgu ministrów Rzeczypospolitej w latach 1702–1728* [The world of the ministers of King August II: Their values and opinions, 1702–1728] (Cracow: Bibliotheca Jagiellonica Fontes et Studia, 1995), 34–41.

²¹ *Patryota Polski* [Polish Patriot], 5 February 1761.

and Catholics alone.²² No doubt social background had its influence on the editor of *Patryota Polski*. He was brought up in a rather poor Protestant family in Toruń. His father was a coachman and a town soldier.²³ He came across new enlightened ideas in the Gimnasium Academicum in Toruń, then in Gdańsk and Elbląg. He encountered the thought of Johann Christian Gottsched, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz and Christian Wolff during studies in Leipzig and Halle. Traces of his fascination with their philosophy can be found in his journal. In 1761, when *Patryota Polski* was published, this new bourgeois conception supported by Bauch, the citizen of Toruń and Royal Prussia, did not find acceptance in the noble intellectual environment of Warsaw and the Commonwealth. It is thus no surprise to find that only 24 issues were published (from 29th January to 9th July, 1761).

Although Bauch's ideas did not gain approval in Warsaw,²⁴ a similar conception of commonly shared patriotism was fully accepted and supported by the journal *Monitor* a little later. In December, 1769, Józef Epifani Minasowicz explained Bauch's earlier ideas in more detail: "Everyone is obliged to fulfill those duties that create common happiness." He made women and men, soldiers and priests, workers and scientists equally responsible for the good of the *patria*. But according to him, representatives of the nation are particularly obliged to behave properly and to try as hard as possible to create the happiness for all.²⁵ We should remember that at the same time the idea of nobleman's patriotism was still wide-spread. The participants in the Confederation of Bar, fighting against the Russian army between 1768 and 1772, talked about a "genealogical" conception of patriotism. For them, one of the sources of patriotism was virtue inherited from their ancestors.²⁶

²² Roman Kaleta and Mieczysław Klimowicz, *Prekursorzy oświecenia* [Precursors of the Enlightenment] (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1953), 82–93.

²³ Jerzy Dygdała, "Toruńczyk Tobiasz Bauch—redaktor warszawskiego "Patryoty Polskiego" z 1761 r." [Tobiasz Bauch from Toruń—Editor of the Warsaw publication "Polish Patriot" in 1761], in *Wiek Oświecenia* [The age of the Enlightenment], 19 (2003): 109–20.

²⁴ Stanisław Roszak, *Środowisko intelektualne i artystyczne Warszawy w połowie XVIII wieku. Między kulturą sarmatyzmu i oświecenia* [The intellectual and artistic circles in mid-eighteenth century Warsaw: Between the cultures of the Sarmatian and Enlightenment periods] (Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, 1997), 108–10.

²⁵ *Monitor 1765–1785*, ed. E. Aleksandrowska (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1976).

²⁶ Arkadiusz Michał Stasiak, *Patriotyzm w myśli konfederatów barskich* [Patriotism in the thought of the Bar Confederates] (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 2005).

In such a context, patriotism was a special heritage closely connected with a noble tradition.

It is important to stress for a reader who is unfamiliar with the specific features of early modern Polish political discussion that the traditional understanding of freedom and patriotism cannot be easily separated from Enlightenment slogans. Eighteenth-century Polish writers used the vocabulary of “patriotism” which had been created in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Citizen, freedom, virtue, public good—these notions were well known in Poland since the times of the political writers and philosophers of the sixteenth century. As recent research by Anna Grześkowiak-Krwawicz has shown, Polish writers in the eighteenth century preferred traditional notions of freedom and common good (developed in the age of humanism and Sarmatism) to French enlightened ones. She says that

references to Montesquieu and Rousseau popular since the 1770s did not introduce into Polish considerations anything new connected to the problem of freedom. Their theories were eagerly mentioned only because they fitted in with the Polish tradition and the Polish authors were eager to buttress this tradition using the authority of modern philosophers.²⁷

Italian historians often point out that, rather than representing a complete breach of continuity, the sources of *Illuminismo* reach back to humanism and to the seventeenth century. Vincenzo Ferrone, for instance, asserted that the “intellectual heritage of the Renaissance” constituted a very important source of the Italian Enlightenment.²⁸ Similarly, the controversy concerning the nature of nobility was a key topic in the seventeenth century. In political and legal treatises such as *Dottor volgare* (1673)²⁹ we find *onore* and *virtù* as two traits characterizing real patriotism. Honor was an inherited value, while virtue was more personalized.³⁰ A real nobleman-citizen should possess them both. When analyzing Polish or Italian discourses of patriotism one

²⁷ Anna Grześkowiak-Krwawicz, *Regina libertas. Wolność w polskiej myśli politycznej XVIII wieku* [Regina libertas: Freedom in Polish political thought in the XVIIIth century] (Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Słowo/Obraz/Terytoria, 2006), 256–57.

²⁸ Vincenzo Ferrone, *Scienza, Natura, Religione. Mondo newtoniano e cultura italiana nel primo settecento* (Napoli: Jovene, 1982); Vincenzo Ferrone, *I profeti dell'illuminismo. Le metamorfosi della ragione nel tardo settecento italiano* (Roma and Bari: Laterza, 1989).

²⁹ Giambattista de Luca, *Il Dottor volgare, ovvero Compendio di tutta la legge civile, canonica, feudale e municipale* (Roma, 1673).

³⁰ Claudio Donati, *L'idea di nobiltà in Italia* (Roma and Bari: Laterza, 1995), 291–97.

needs to be careful in contrasting “Enlightenment” and “pre-Enlightenment” forms. Rather than a complete rupture, the eighteenth century conferred new meanings on the existing notions, such as freedom, fatherland, virtue and nobility. Thus different meanings and usages of the same notions could co-exist at the same time. That is why in the second half of the eighteenth century adding an adjective “real” or “pretended” to the word “patriotism” was the only rhetorical device which enabled people to explain how the same word could have quite opposite meanings (and was used both by ultraconservative magnates and the pro-reform “patriotic group”).

Religious and educational contexts

Polish noblemen derived “love of the fatherland” from a divine source. According to them, God gave their ancestors this highly valued ability which was transmitted by every following generation.³¹ Because of the similarity between the rules on Earth and those governing in Heaven, it was natural to look for inspiration in Christ’s behavior. He taught love and respect towards the family, which meant the same in relation to the *patria*. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the Virgin Mary was specially worshipped, and in the hierarchy of values her cult took a very important position. This cult was the basis on which Bishop Andrzej Chryzostom Załuski built a vision of emotional bond between the state and its citizens. “It is as strongly forbidden by the Decalogue to say or do anything in opposition to a mother as is obtaining private profit without respecting the needs of others. Evil thoughts, not to mention hatred towards her who loves us, should be severely punished. Is there anybody else who loves us as our *patria* does?”³² In contrast, secular motives explaining love of country became prevalent in the mid-eighteenth century and they derived from respect for the place in which one lives and acts.

Apart from religion, ancient philosophy was the second source for understanding patriotism. Aristotle, Sallust and Cicero were well known to students in schools taught by monks and in Protestant

³¹ Piotr Badyna, *Model człowieka w polskim piśmiennictwie parenetycznym XVIII w. (do 1773 r.)* [The model of a human being in Polish parenetic writings of the eighteenth century (up to 1773)] (Warsaw: DiG, 2004), 114–27.

³² Badyna, *Model człowieka*, 117.

schools in Royal Prussia. In order to explain republican patriotism, Sallust's thought was cited: "Libertas illa tribuitur, potioem etiam saepe, cum lepido habet vel periculosam libertatem quieto servitio" (For Liberty it is better to live in danger, than enjoy safe slavery).³³ Stoic and neo-Stoic ideals strengthened the notion of a state of balance, creating an order where everyone should consciously fulfil his duties, as a father, son, husband, friend and a good citizen. Thus, being a highly moral person meant also being faithful to the ideal of a virtuous citizen. Such a conception was presented by panegyric poetry and dedicatory letters in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries,³⁴ for example in the writings of Łukasz Opaliński in the first half of the eighteenth century. He was inspired by the thoughts of Justus Lipsius, for whom good government and virtue were the main conditions making possible the creation of a strong, happy country. According to Lipsius, because of these values the government was concerned with ensuring the wealth of the governed, while the citizens were supposed to be obedient and disciplined. But between the conceptions of Lipsius and Opaliński there was an essential difference which was pointed out by Maria O. Pryshlak.³⁵ For Lipsius, virtue meant obedience by the citizens, while in Polish republican thought it was interpreted as an engagement in the political life of the country.

The educational ideal was a combination of knight and landowner, who was as well a patriotic citizen devoted to his family and country. In order to achieve such a perfect standard it was indispensable to experience education, first at home, then at school directed by clerics (mainly Piarists and Jesuits), then abroad, and to experience public practice in a magnate's court, in a tribunal and in a *sejmik* (which was a local meeting of the noblemen). At the very beginning the *vir bonus* was presented as a good landowner or an honest knight. Eventually, the conception of Jan Zamoyski (a leading Polish politician of the six-

³³ Cf. Gaius Sallustius Crispus, *Oratio Lepidi*, 26. This thought of Sallust was quoted e.g. by Reinhold Curicke, *Commentarius iuridico-historico-politicus de privilegiis*, (Dantisci, 1670), 173.

³⁴ Estera Lasocińska, "Cnota sama z mądrością jest naszym żywotem". Stoickie pojęcie cnoty w poezji polskiej XVII wieku ["Virtue and wisdom create our life": The Stoic comprehension of virtue in Polish poetry in the 17th century] (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Badań Literackich, 2003), 19–20.

³⁵ Maria O. Pryshlak, *Państwo w filozofii politycznej Łukasza Opalińskiego* [The state in the political philosophy of Łukasz Opaliński], trs. and ed. G. Chomiccki (Cra-cow: Historia Iagiellonica, 2000), 91–94.

teenth century) linked the attributes of a careful landowner with those of a brave knight ready to fight and die for his state, creating the ideal of a good citizen. Zamoyski wanted to see students of his academy as people prepared to sacrifice themselves for God's faith and for the happiness of their country.³⁶

Following humanist precepts, it was believed that by being shown good examples young people would achieve the ideal. Erazm Glicznier, author of a pioneering book of advice, suggested that such a method would be highly efficient because of the natural tendency of a child to follow what he sees.³⁷ That is why education at home was so important. The father was especially obliged to influence his children by giving them a proper example. In the seventeenth century Andrzej Maksymilian Fredro insisted that education should be adjusted to the needs of state and nation. He underlined the importance of subjects preparing men for public service, such as history, geography and rhetoric. Everyone ought to serve both himself and his country.³⁸ Piotr Myszkowski in his book of advice (1602) suggested that a young man should take part in wars and be an observer of the *Sejm* (the Polish parliament), which would give him knowledge concerning the secrets of public life. Myszkowski explained that people were born for their country and not only for themselves.³⁹ Andrzej Maksymilian Fredro claimed that participation in public life as an observer was possible even for a seven-year-old child.

Another issue which has been investigated in depth recently is that of schools directed by clerics.⁴⁰ The Piarists as well as the Jesuits used to prepare their students in practical ways by giving them the most

³⁶ Łukasz Kurdybacha, *Ideal wychowawczy w rozwoju dziejowym* [The educational ideal in its historical development] (Warsaw: Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza "Czytelnik," 1948), 85.

³⁷ Erazm Glicznier, *Książki o wychowaniu dzieci* [Books about children's upbringing], ed. W. Wisłocki, Biblioteka Przedruków 2 (Cracow: D. E. Friedlein, 1876), 35.

³⁸ Henryk Barycz, *Andrzej Maksymilian Fredro wobec zagadnień wychowawczych* [Andrzej Maksymilian Fredro and educational matters], *Archiwum do dziejów oświaty i szkolnictwa w Polsce* 6 (Cracow, 1948), 4.

³⁹ Piotr Myszkowski, "Instrukcja dla syna" [Instructions to my son], in J. Skoczek, ed., *Wybór pism pedagogicznych Polski doby Odrodzenia* [A selection of Polish pedagogical writings of the Enlightenment period] (Wrocław, 1956), 389.

⁴⁰ Kazimierz Puchowski, "Przemiany w szkolnictwie zakonnym Rzeczypospolitej czasów saskich" [Changes in Polish Education in the Saxon Period], in Stanisław Achremczyk, ed., *Między Barokiem a Oświeceniem. Edukacja, wykształcenie, wiedza* [Between Baroque and Enlightenment: Education, instruction, knowledge] (Olsztyn: Ośrodek Badań Naukowych im. W. Kętrzyńskiego, 2005), 14–23.

important information and teaching them the abilities indispensable in future public activity. In their program, history took a very special place. Karol Wyrwicz, a Jesuit reformer, perceived history as a means for teaching how to protect the faith and to serve for the benefit of the fatherland.⁴¹ Another reformer, Stanisław Konarski, believed that history's main task was "to promote virtue and condemn evil."⁴² One of the most popular methods of stimulating correct patriotic behavior was declamatory presentations prepared by students and delivered at school. During such small-scale performances different topics were raised, and the young people had a wonderful opportunity to present their beliefs and get accustomed to the point of view of their opponents. Finally, these presentations constituted not only a chance to practice rhetorical abilities, but were also a kind of appeal for the country's improvement.

Conclusion

Discerning the forms of Polish patriotism in the early modern period is a complicated issue. On the one hand, analyzing the problem requires a diachronic perspective—a presentation of the development of notions over the course of three hundred years. On the other hand, a synchronic perception is also necessary—an analytical comparison of notions in their political, legal and educational contexts. The intellectual source of the patriotic discourse poses another essential dilemma. In political and philosophical treatises we find entangled Polish and foreign perspectives. However, the use of Enlightened notions in the eighteenth century did not necessarily mean the acceptance of western intellectual ideals, but rather the reception of new concepts within the network of traditional terms structuring Polish political thought. As a consequence, the very same notions could mean something totally different in Poland and abroad.

In discussing patriotism, we have been able to see how such terms evolved and acquired varied meanings. I have sought to provide an

⁴¹ Kazimierz Puchowski, *Edukacja historyczna w jezuickich kolegiach Rzeczypospolitej 1565–1773* [Historical education in Jesuit schools in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, 1565–1773] (Gdańsk, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego, 1999), 185.

⁴² Juliusz Nowak-Dłużewski, *Stanisław Konarski* (Warsaw: Instytut Wydawniczy PAX, 1989), 203.

analysis of conceptual transformation with reference to the notion of *patria*. In a nutshell, during the Renaissance a particularist understanding (referring to property, land, territory) was gradually separated from—and contrasted to—a symbolic meaning (denoting the political community). This second conception—fatherland as freedom, a combination of noble rights and political community—dominated the Polish political discourse for the ensuing two centuries. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, after losing independence, the concrete/material connotations came back and mingled with the symbolic one. Thus, in *Słownik języka polskiego* (Dictionary of the Polish language) (1807–1814), Samuel Bogumił Linde defined “patriot” as a citizen taking care of the good of his country, at the same time as the good of his own property.⁴³

It is hoped that these introductory remarks will facilitate an understanding of the specifically Polish traits in the debate on patriotism in the early modern period and that they will be useful to readers seeking to devise a comparative interpretation of similar phenomena in Central Europe and beyond.

⁴³ Samuel Bogumił Linde, *Słownik języka polskiego* [Dictionary of the Polish language] (Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1951), 4: 64.

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

TWO PATRIOTISMS? OPINIONS OF TOWNSMEN AND SOLDIERS ON DUTY TO THE FATHERLAND IN SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY POLAND

Urszula Augustyniak

In the Polish tradition the concept of patriotism, traditionally understood as “love of the fatherland,” is inseparably linked with the nation, whereas “fatherland” and “nation” are regarded as “ideological communities joined by a system of attitudes.”¹ In practice this leads to a situation where “patriotism” is used as a politically correct synonymous term to nationalism.² In modern historiography, “patriotic” feelings were attributed only to the “political nation”—that is, the nobility—which actively participated in the governing of the country, this being one of the constituents of their integration within the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.³ Since the 1970s the culture and ideology of the nobility have been commonly identified with the so-called Sarmatism, without further interest or deeper research on the problem. Historians of ideas make a leap from the Renaissance to the eighteenth century,⁴ skipping practically everything in-between. Faint

¹ Stanisław Ossowski, *Wielogłowy Lewiatan i grupa społeczna* [Leviathan with many heads and a social group], in idem, *Dzieła* [Works], vol. IV. (Warsaw: PWN, 1967); idem, “Analiza socjologiczna pojęcia ojczyzny” [A sociological analysis of the concept of fatherland], in idem, *O ojczyźnie i narodzie* [On fatherland and nation] (Warsaw: PWN, 1984); Wojciech Modzelewski, *Tożsamość narodowa jako zjawisko polityczne* [National identity as a political phenomenon], *Studia Filozoficzne* 118 (1972) no. 9, 111.

² Konrad Górski, *Patriotyzm i nacjonalizm* [Patriotism and nationalism] (Toruń: Wojewódzka Biblioteka Publiczna i Książnica Miejska im. M. Kopernika, 1988).

³ Edward Opaliński, *Kultura polityczna szlachty polskiej w latach 1587–1652. System parlamentarny a społeczeństwo obywatelskie*, [The political culture of the Polish nobility between 1587 and 1652: The Parliamentary system and civil society] (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe: Kancelaria Sejmu, 1995), 35–36.

⁴ Recently Arkadiusz Michał Stasiak, *Patriotyzm w myśli konfederatów barskich* [Patriotism in the thought of the Bar Confederation], TN KUL, Źródła i monografie 287 (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 2005); with the exception of Anna Grześkowiak-Krwawicz, *Regina libertas. Wolność w polskiej myśli politycznej XVIII wieku* [Regina libertas: Freedom in eighteenth-century Polish political thought] (Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Słowo/Obraz Terytoria, 2006).

interest in the mentality of social strata other than the nobility has not only led to the questioning of their national consciousness, but also their active contribution to the formation of Old Polish culture.⁵

However, in the pre-industrial era devotion to fatherland was not necessarily linked to national consciousness.⁶ It is hard to extract the “patriotism” of the early modern period from among other forms of emotional bonds, like religious, corporate and political allegiances. It could apply to communities narrower than the “nation” (city, province) and broader than the “nation” (Christianity) alike. With no research on the semantic evolution of the terms connected with “patriotism” such as “fatherland”, “nation”, “public welfare”, and “Commonwealth,” there is no scientific basis to take “love of the fatherland” away from the plebeians. Of course, the meaning of these terms was evolving in the course of time and depended on the social context of use.

The present study seeks to confront the understanding and perception of the patriotic phraseology and conduct of townsmen and soldiers—two groups of people living in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Given their multi-ethnic composition, the submission of an individual to the group, as well as—against all appearances—similar social status, the two are akin. This is so because of their limited civil rights—since the end of the fifteenth century for townsmen and since the end of the sixteenth century for nobility during their military service.

My former research was based primarily on *belles-lettres* and normative texts,⁷ which reveal the mentality of townsmen and soldiers,

⁵ Tomasz Kizwalter, *O nowoczesności narodu—przykład polski* [On the Modernness of the Nation: The Case of Poland] (Warsaw: Semper, 1999), 58; Andrzej Wyrobisz, “Mieszczanie w opinii staropolskich literatów” [Townsmen in the opinion of Old Polish writers], *Przegląd Historyczny* LXXXII (1991) 1: 51–77.

⁶ Benedykt Zientara, *Świt narodów europejskich. Powstawanie świadomości narodowej na obszarze Europy pokałolińskiej* [The dawn of European nations: The emergence of national consciousness in post-Carolingian Europe] (Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1985), 17.

⁷ See Urszula Augustyniak, *Koncepcje narodu i społeczeństwa w literaturze plebejskiej od końca XVI do końca XVII w* [Concepts of nation and society in plebeian literature between the end of the 16th century and the end of the 17th century] (Warsaw: Wydawnictwa UW, 1989). *Dissertationes Universitatis Warsowiensis* nr. 32, rozdział III: Rozumienie pojęć... [chapter III: Understanding of concepts]; Urszula Augustyniak, *W służbie hetmana i Rzeczypospolitej. Klientela wojskowa Krzysztofa Radziwiłła (1585–1640)* [In the service of hetman and the Commonwealth: The Military Clientela of Krzysztof Radziwiłł (1585–1640)] (Warsaw: Instytut Historyczny Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Semper, 2005), Ch. III: Mentalność [Mentality], 123–170.

including their attitude towards the fatherland. Lately I have become more interested in individual opinions on patriotism and reports on actual actions for the “common good” rather than ideological declarations. For the sake of exactitude I have relied on very homogenous sources: chronicles and diaries written by townsmen⁸ as well as soldiers⁹

⁸ [Anonim], *Kronika mieszczanina krakowskiego z lat 1575–1595* [Anonym, Chronicle of the Townsman of Cracow from 1575–1595], ed., Henryk Barycz (Cracow, 1930); *Topographia civitatis Leopolitanae a Joanne Alnpekio, Leopolis studioso (1603–1605)*, ed. and trans. Stanisław Rachwał, as: [Jan Alnpek], *Opis miasta Lwowa* [Description of the city of Lviv] (Lwów, 1930); *Diariusz Jana Tymowskiego obywatela Nowego Sącza (1607–1625)* [Diary of Jan Tymowski, a citizen of Nowy Sącz (1607–1625)], ed. Julian Sygański, “Przewodnik Naukowy i Literacki” [„Scientific and literary guide”], 1905, 371–384, 465–480; Andrzej Kazimierz Cebrowski, *Roczniki miasta Łowicza pisane w latach 1648–1659* [Annals of the city of Łowicz, written between 1648 and 1659] trs. Marian Małuszyński (Łowicz, 1937); Józef Bartłomiej Zimorowic, *Vox Leonis* (1650), tr. and ed. Juliusz Korneli Heck, (Lwów, 1887); *Pamiętnik Jana Golliusza mieszczanina polskiego (1650–1653)* [Journal of Jan Golliusz, a Polish townsman 1650–1653], ed. Józef Kallenbach, in *Archiwum do Dziejów Literatury i Oświaty w Polsce* (Cracow, 1892), vol. 7; Jan Tomasz Józefowicz, *Kronika miasta Lwowa od 1634 do 1690 obejmująca w ogólności dzieje dawnej Rusi Czerwonej* [Chronicle of the City of Lviv from 1634 to 1690, including general history of former Red Ruthenia], ed. Marcin Piwocki (Lwów, 1854).

⁹ Józef Budziło, *Wojna moskiewska wzniecona i prowadzona z okazji fałszywych Dymitrow od 1603 do 1612 r* [The Moscow War initiated and conducted on the occasion of the False Dimitriys from 1603 to 1612], ed. Janusz Byliński and Józef Długosz (Wrocław: Wydaw. Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 1995); *Diariusz drogi Króla Jmci Zygmunta III od szczęśliwego wyjazdu z Wilna pod Smoleńsk w roku 1609 a die 18 Augusta i fortunnego powodzenia przez lat dwie do wzięcia zamku Smoleńsk w roku 1611* [Diary of the way of king Sigismund III from his fortunate departure from Wilno to Smoleńsk on the 18th of August 1609 till the capturing of the castle of Smoleńsk in 1611], ed. Janusz Byliński, *Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis* nr 2098 (Wrocław, 1999); *Pamiętniki Samuela i Bogusława Kazimierza Maskiewiczów (wiek XVII, 1594–1670)* [Journals of Samuel Maskiewicz and Bogusław Kazimierz Maskiewicz (seventeenth century, 1594–1670)], edited, introduction and notes by Alojzy Sajkowski, ed. and introduction by Władysław Czapliński (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1961); Jan Chryzostom Pasek, *Pamiętniki* [Journals], ed. Roman Pollak (Warsaw: Państw. Instytut Wydawniczy, 1971); Aleksander Dionizy Skorobohaty, *Diariusz (1639–1697)* [Diary (1639–1697)], ed. Tadeusz Wasilewski (Warsaw: “DiG”, 2000); Mikołaj Jemiołowski, *Pamiętnik dzieje Polski zawierający (1648–1679)* [Journal containing the history of Poland (1648–1679)], ed. Jan Dziągiewski (Warsaw: “DiG”, 2000); Jakub Łoś, *Pamiętniki towarzysza chorągwi pancernej (1695–1712)* [Journals of an armoured companion in the squadron], ed. Romuald Śreniawa-Szypowski (Warsaw: “DiG”: TiSS [Towarzystwo im. Stanisława ze Skarbimierza], 2000). As a means of comparison: Stanisław Żółkiewski, *Pamiętniki o wojnie moskiewskiej* [Journals of the Moscow War], ed. Waclaw Sobieski (Cracow, 1920), BN, seria I, nr 12; Wojciech Dębołęcki, *Przewagi elearów polskich (1619–1620)* [The deeds of Polish Elears, once known as Lisowczycy], ed. and introduction by Radosław Szyber (Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, 2005); Maciej Vorbek-Lettow, *Skarbnica pamięci. Pamiętnik lekarza króla Władysława IV* [Journal of the doctor of King Władysław IV], eds. Ewa Galos and Franciszek Mincer (Wrocław-Warsaw-Cracow, 1968); *Pamiętniki Filipa, Michała i*

between the late sixteenth and early eighteenth century. Other types of literature and correspondence are used as a means of comparison.

The main aims of the paper are: a) to compare the general findings of linguists¹⁰ and the results of historical research; b) to assess the impact of the conflict between townsmen and soldiers during the wars of the seventeenth century and how the antagonism of their basic values (townsmen's pacifism *versus* soldiers' valor) reflect their attitude to patriotism; and c) to test the commonly accepted thesis that the political dominance of the nobility meant a lack of alternative beliefs and attitudes, including the patriotic ones.

Obviously, the authors of diaries and city chronicles do not represent the whole "urban estate" which in any case did not officially exist until the legislation of the Constitution of 3rd May 1791. The majority of the authors originate from the so-called *plebs*: craftsmen, petty merchants (Golliusz, Tymowski) and low municipal clerks (the commune heads Cebrowski and Komoniecki, the mayor Zimorowic). This community nevertheless considered itself to be "true townsmen-citizens" (middle-class), in opposition to "patricians" and "commoners" ("rogues"). This is why, since the second half of the sixteenth century, they struggled to democratize the City Council.¹¹ An account of this struggle can be found for instance in *Kronika mieszczanina krakowskiego* [literally: Chronicle of the Townsman of Cracow]. This struggle, however, was lost. The members of the town council effectively protected themselves against the King's intervention in city affairs.¹² They were successful

Teodora Obuchowiczów (1630–1707) [Journals of Filip, Michał and Teodor Obuchowicz], eds. Henryk Lulewicz-Andrzej Rachuba (Warsaw: DiG, 2003).

¹⁰ Jerzy Bartmiński, "Polskie rozumienie ojczyzny i jego warianty" [The Polish understanding of fatherland and its variants], in *Pojęcie ojczyzny we współczesnych językach europejskich* [The concept of fatherland in Modern European languages], ed. Jerzy Bartmiński (Lublin, 1999).

¹¹ Jan Ptaśnik, "Walka o demokratyzację Krakowa w XVII i XVIII w." [The struggle for the democratization of Cracow in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries], *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, 43 (1929) 1: 1–33; idem, "Walka o demokratyzację Lwowa od XVI do XVIII w." [the struggle for the democratization of Lviv from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century], *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, vol. 9 (1925) 2: 228–57; Maria Bogucka, "Walka opozycji mieszczańskiej z patrycjatem gdańskim w 2 połowie XVI w." [The struggle between Patricians and Townsmen's Opposition in Gdańsk in the Second Half of the sixteenth century], *Przegląd Historyczny* XVV (1954) 2/3: 408–59.

¹² Janina Bieniarzówna, *Mieszczanstwo krakowskie XVII wieku. Z badań nad strukturą społeczną miasta* [Cracow Townspeople in the seventeenth Century—Research on the city's Social Structure] (Cracow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1969), 14, 51; [Anon.] *Kronika mieszczanina krakowskiego*, 18.

because they fell back on the system of magnate favoritism and corruption thus imposing all duties on the *plebs* and the so-called “institution of 40 men,” the members of which were selected from among the commoners.

In the privileged cities at the turn of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the urban oligarchy was closed within the circle of its own egoistic interests and the connection between *plebs* and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth began to come down to permanent financial demands and paying off people to represent the city at the parliament (in Polish, *Sejm*). These men were selected from patricians who not only did not represent the interests of the majority of the city inhabitants, but also failed to submit reports on their own work. In “private” cities (subject to landowners, e.g. Żywiec) and those subject to the Church (e.g. Łowicz) even the personal freedom of the townspeople was limited. In the second half of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century these cities were bound to the state’s activity mainly by taxes,¹³ wars and military requisitions.¹⁴

The soldiers whose diaries are analyzed here originated from the middle nobility of the Polish Crown (Jemiołowski, Pasek) and the Belarussian landed gentry (the Maskiewicz, the Skorobohaty, the Obuchowicz families). They obtained “civilian” posts when they were already elderly and usually retired from military service. Their views were thus not representative for “the whole nobility” which itself was rather an ideal phenomenon than living reality. Soldiers serving in Cossack units or armored companies considered themselves as “real army” in contrast to “rogues and dragoons”. Like the authors of townsmen chronicles they too complained about their burdens, such as the costs of military service (supplying weapons, horses, food) which their “elders” put on them, as well as of the lowering of the amount of ore in coins and the embezzlement of their pay by officials responsible for the treasury. In this sense, the analysis of the “material situation,” which conditioned the fulfillment of duties towards the fatherland, was similar in the perspective of the authors of both groups.

¹³ Tomasz Opas, “Miasta prywatne a Rzeczpospolita” [Private cities and the Commonwealth], *Kwartalnik Historyczny* (1971) 1: 34–35.

¹⁴ Komonieccki, *Chronografia*, 285, 299: (on Swedish requisitions in 1702 and 1705); 1, 343: (on Russian requisitions in 1707 and 1710 during the so-called Great Northern War).

Patriotic phraseology and images of the community

The main sources of this study are Polish and Latin texts coming from the communities in question. These chroniclers definitely knew Latin, and taking into consideration the fact that Polish commanders of that time (e.g. Stanisław Żółkiewski) corresponded with their enemies and exhorted their military subordinates in Latin we can assume with a high degree of probability that state soldiers had at least a basic command of this language as well.

In the period of our inquiry the rhetorical conventions of Roman state patriotism (*amor patriae*) was a permanent point in the program of Jesuit colleges and Protestant schools, so all graduates of these institutions were taught the inherent phraseology. Declarations of their emotional bond with the “sweet fatherland” (“*patria dulcis*”) strengthened by set phrases and *topoi* such as “love of the fatherland inborn in all people”, place of birth, and heritage of the ancestors as well as “the superiority of public good over the private one” became a well-ingrained cliché.

Ceremonious ideological declarations by townspeople (in the introductions to these chronicles)¹⁵ joined by soldiers’ ones (e.g. the speeches in the diary of Jan Chryzostom Pasek or the numerous references to the speeches of state dignitaries included in other soldiers’ diaries)¹⁶ prove the familiarity with the classical rhetorical tradition gained through school readings of Cicero and Seneca without implying any independent patriotic contemplation. The Latin term “*patria*” which refers to the public obligations of individuals is, however, only seemingly synonymous to the Polish word “fatherland” (*ojczyzna*)¹⁷ which originally denoted personal and existential affairs. In the sixteenth century *ojczyzna* equals: 1. succession = inheritance, (especially

¹⁵ Komoniecki, *Chronografia*, 1: “Dulce solum Patriae, dulcis mea Patria Żywiec”; “Cara tuo nomen Patria dulce mihi”; also Cebrowski, *Roczniki Łowicza*, 41, 43: “Wracamy do Łowicza, ojczyzny naszej słodkiej, której kłękę i nieszczęścia będę opisywać.”

¹⁶ Jemiołowski, *Pamiętnik*, 49, 51, 161, 305, 443–4, 457; Czarniecki, *Pamiętniki*, 6; Pasek, *Pamiętnik*, 330; Skorobohaty, *Diariusz*, 108.

¹⁷ On the dangers of misreading the medieval Latin sources see Aron J. Guriewicz, “Język źródła historycznego. Średniowieczny bilingwizm” [Language of a historical source: Medieval bilingualism], *Studia Źródłoznawcze* [Studies on Sources], XVIII (1973): 1–13.

of the manor) after the deceased father; 2. country “where one was born.”¹⁸

Only one study exists which has sought to analyze the changes in the understanding of the word “fatherland” in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, based mainly on literary sources.¹⁹ Its author concludes that for the majority of Renaissance authors this word meant territory (land) and the place of birth, often in opposition to the state (i.e. the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth). In the Baroque period on the other hand, the word gained a vast range of meanings, beginning with “patrimony” in the sixteenth century and ending with an understanding proximate to the present-day usage. In texts from the second half of the seventeenth century the word “fatherland” became synonymous in terms of duties and services with the state and in terms of reward and punishment it became synonymous with power as well as being the highest virtue of civil ethics—contrary to the thesis of the older literature that non-material elements of heritage came to the fore only in the eighteenth century.²⁰

In military diaries “fatherland” equals: 1. the state—in the first half of the seventeenth century also hereditary foreign state (e.g. False Dimitry—the usurper tsar); 2. the territory of Poland in terms of broadening its frontiers. In the second half of the century it also refers to—in contrast with Ewa Bem-Wiśniewska’s findings—the people, as can be judged from such phrases as “the fatherland being ruined”, “that groans”, because “God deprived it of bread”, that “regrets” the deceased citizens, or that the hetman’s standing “depended on his popularity with it.”

The term “nation” (“folk,” “people of the nation,” “kin”) in the analyzed sources is more ambiguous than “fatherland”, being used with reference to “us” (“our nation”) and “them”—enemies (in negative connotations: “nation of bears,” “devious nation,” “coarse nation”—about Muscovites in texts by Józef Budziło and Obuchowicz; “nation of pigs”—about the Swedish in Pasek’s diary). At times “nation” was

¹⁸ Samuel Bogumił Linde, *Słownik języka polskiego* [Dictionary of Polish Language], vol. 3 (Lwów, 1857), 526.

¹⁹ Ewa Bem, “Termin «Ojczyzna» w literaturze XVI i XVII wieku. Refleksje o języku” [The term “fatherland” in sixteenth and seventeenth century literature: Reflection on the language], *Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce* [Renaissance and Reformation in Poland] XXXVI (1989): 131–56.

²⁰ Danuta Butler, *Rozwój semantyczny wyrazów polskich* [Semantic development of Polish words] (Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 1978), 84.

used also to describe ethnically diversified communities (“people of the borderland nation” in Kochowski’s writings). Nation occurs much more often in soldiers’ diaries than in urban sources. Almost as frequently as the term “fatherland” (e.g. in Budziło’s report from the “Dimitriad”) next to a synonymous expression referring to the communion of origin as soldier “commonalty”, there appears “kin” (about the dynasty), also as a synonym to “blood brothers”—nation of noblemen. The term “our brothers” refers only to the nobility—however understood not formally or legally but culturally, as a hypertrophy of family bonds. “Brotherly” love is considered as one of the main duties of “chivalrous men.”

One can observe a significant interrelation between the terms “fatherland” and “nation” and the character of the text. In *Dzieje elearów polskich* (Deeds of Polish Elears once known as Lisowczycy) by Wojciech Dębołęcki, which was devoted to the Lisowczycy, a mixed lot of people of various ethnic origins who were a hired light cavalry in the pay of the Austrians, references to fatherland are far more frequent than references to nation. References to the Commonwealth and the state (instead of the emotionally marked fatherland) are most common in the anonymous diary describing King Sigismund III Vasa’s expedition to Smolensk and Stanislaw Żółkiewski’s diary which took Caesar’s reports on “The Gallic Wars” as a model. Since “nation” (understood politically) is only the estate of the nobility, this concept could not serve as an axis of integration above the division of the estates. In official appeals of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth authorities in the times of the “Deluge” (*Potop*—a period of insecurity and civil strife in the mid-seventeenth century, starting with the Khmelnytsky Uprising and reaching its climax in the Swedish invasion of 1655–60) from the Tyszowce Confederation onwards, people of “all condition” were summoned to defend not the “nation,” but the homeland.

As is shown by the linguistic analysis of plebeian literature, in the second half of the eighteenth century the terms “patria” and “fatherland” were most often used as indicators of a feeling of familiarity and nativity.²¹ The wide spreading of the term “fatherland” in the community of townsmen, understood in a territorial way as “land of the fathers” or “patrimony,” is signaled by the frequent use of synony-

²¹ Urszula Augustyniak, *Koncepcje narodu i społeczeństwa* [Concepts of nation and society], tables III and IV, 219–20.

mous terminology for members of the local community, among which “patriota” is the most noteworthy.

In chronicles written by townsmen the feeling of “kinship” and political community—demonstrated by the concepts of “kin” (gens) and “Sarmatian nation,” advocated by the nobility—is definitely surpassed by a feeling of customary, cultural community, attachment to local traditions and to family lands. The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was identified not by the institution of the nobility state, but by its territory. The term “commonwealth” is unquestionably more often used by chroniclers to describe the people rather than the establishment.

Public interests and identification with the community

Two types of bonds coexisted in the consciousness of the analyzed authors: nationwide—with the Commonwealth which is an ideological fatherland, and regional, which is a smaller fatherland²²—their own province or city commonwealth. Whereas for the nobility during their military service their entitlement as well as duty to take part in the protection of, and political decisions affecting the whole country, especially free election,²³ was obvious, in the consciousness of town chroniclers the duties towards their own city and place of birth definitely dominated.

Private matters and local affairs prevail in the spectrum of interests of the diarists and town chroniclers. Typical examples of such attitudes are provided by the works of poets and chroniclers originating from Red Ruthenia²⁴ (Szymon and Józef Bartłomiej Zimorowic, Sebastian Fabian Klonowic), or the clergyman from Lviv (Lwów, Lemberg) of Armenian origins, Jan Tomasz Józefowicz. He kept the name of “fatherland” for the Ruthenian land “lying between the Devil of the Scythians and the deep blue sea of the Poles” and made an attempt to

²² Stanisław Ossowski, “Analiza socjologiczna pojęcia ojczyzny,” in idem, *O ojczyźnie i narodzie* [About fatherland and nation] (Warsaw: PWN, 1984).

²³ In fact, since 1632 only a delegation of (20) soldiers had been allowed to the “sejm elekcyjny.”—see *Volumina Legum. Przedruk zbioru praw xx. Pijarów* [Volumina Legum: Reprint of the collection of laws of the Piarists], vol. III, J. Ohryzko (Peterburg, 1859), 350, 46. During military service, the nobility was excluded from taking part in sejms and sejmiks.

²⁴ In Ukrainian nomenclature: Western Ukraine.

describe the history of Lviv as it was ignored by Polish chroniclers.²⁵ In agreement with the erudite convention, the chroniclers situated their “minor fatherland”—Ruthenia—within the mythical Sarmatia. This, however, did not result in an unconditional acceptance of “Sarmatian ideology” by the nobility.

Authors of urban chronicles were obliged to note important political events in the Commonwealth (like the Zebrzydowski Rebellion in 1606–1607) but they were more interested in regional affairs. In the light of the literature on the matter, this attitude was typical for “an ordinary townsman” in the Commonwealth of the seventeenth century including the inhabitants of Royal Prussia,²⁶ maybe with the exception of the capital city of Cracow.²⁷ Still, during the king’s stay in the capital, the people of Cracow had direct access to him, so they sent legates directly to the monarch even during war campaigns or *sejms*.²⁸ On the other hand, chroniclers of Lviv—formally also a privileged city—and to an even greater extent of private cities (Zamość or Żywiec) kept a distance toward the affairs of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth as if they were observers from the outside. They limited the information about events of nationwide significance to noting free elections, coronations, deaths, and funerals of consecutive kings, and what is noteworthy, they confused these events or ascribed incorrect dates. They did not note what happened in other cities—unless these faced a calamity, which was treated as a warning from God. They gave accounts of wars only when their own city was threatened or the city owners fought in them.

²⁵ Jano Tomasz Józefowicz, *Kronika miasta Lwowa* [Chronicle of the city of Lwów] (Lwów, 1854), 2.

²⁶ Maria Bogucka, “W kręgu mentalności mieszczanina gdańskiego w XVII wieku, Notatnik Michała Hancke” [The circle of Gdańsk Townsman’s mentality in the seventeenth century: The diary of Michał Hancke], in *Ars historica. Prace z dziejów powszechnych i Polski poświęcone Gerardowi Labudzie* [Ars historica: Works on the history of the world and Poland, dedicated to Gerard Labuda], Uniwersytet Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu, seria Historia, nr 71 (Poznań, 1971), 617–633.

²⁷ For instance “Księga, w której się zamykają różne dzieie, które tak w polskich iako y inszych odprawowały się natiach przez pana Marcina Golińskiego, rajcę kazimierskiego w Roku Pańskim 1658,” manuscript of Biblioteka Ossolińskich 188/II, k. 1–465, mf BN 425 Marcin Goliński’s Book contains materials on most international affairs, written down from the *Kroniki wszystkiego świata* [Chronicle of the whole world] by Marcin Bielski, the chronicles of Marcin Bielski and Joachim Bielski and the chronicle of European Sarmatia by Gwagnin and other sources.

²⁸ For instance to Batory at Wielkie Łuki in 1581, in [Anon.], *Kronika mieszczanina krakowskiego*, 12.

It is evident especially in the *Chronografia* [Chronography] of Żywiec. Żywiec formally belonged to the Cracow province but in fact it lay on lands of an almost autonomous “state”—the estates of the Komorowski family and later of the Wielkopolski family—governed according to their own laws and even conducting their own “foreign policy” on the Polish-Austrian border, which included non-aggression pacts with Silesian and Hungarian magnates. A chronicler of Żywiec was incomparably more interested in what had been happening in his “fatherland” or in Hungary or Silesia than in Warsaw. For him, the Vasas were above all “lords of Żywiec” and only after that rulers of the Commonwealth.

The comparison of city chronicles to soldier sources illustrates the distinctiveness of the two versions of patriotism. Middle class patriotism, which one could call “cultural,” referred throughout the seventeenth century to a community of tradition, custom, language and, religion and to an emotional bond with the closer fatherland. Localism, or even an ethnographic approach, is especially noticeable in Komoniewski’s *Chronografia*, which in agreement with the tendency of late Baroque encyclopedism, gives etymologies of names of places, lists of settlement processes, and traditional rituals and customs of the area of “the estate of Żywiec.”

The superiority of territorial, cultural and customary bonds in urban sources resulted from the multiethnic character of the big cities and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth on the whole. The attitude to this issue remained unchanged throughout the seventeenth century. In the first half of the century the ethnic factor did not hinder the process of conferring citizenship, and foreign nationality did not necessarily mean “strangers” to the town’s authorities. Local patriotism substituted for the ethnic bond.²⁹ In the manifestos of urban intellectuals (e.g. Jan Jurkowski),³⁰ the multi-ethnicity of the Polish-Lithuanian

²⁹ Stanisław Gierszewski, *Obywatele miast Polski przedrozbiorowej* [Citizens of Polish cities before the Partitions] (Warsaw: Państw. Wydaw. Naukowe, 1973), 75; Janusz Tazbir, “Świadomość narodowa” [National Consciousness], in *Rzeczpospolita i świat. Studia z dziejów kultury XVII wieku* [The Commonwealth and the World: Studies on the culture of the seventeenth century] (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1971), 37 and 42.

³⁰ Jan Jurkowski, *Lutnia na wesele Zygmunta III* [Lute for Sigismund III’s Wedding], in idem, *Utwory panegiryczne i satyryczne* [Panegyrics and satires], ed. Cz. Hernas, M. Karplukówna, M. Eustachiewicz and M. Hernasowa (Wrocław, 1968), 196, v. 1–14.

Commonwealth and the cities was presented as something to be proud of. Nevertheless already in the “national characteristics” prepared by Jan Tomasz Józefowicz and Jan Alnpek, presenting the ethnic groups, religious, and legislative communities inhabiting the “Lviv commonwealth,” assimilated ethnic groups known for a long time (Armenians and Germans) were treated differently than ethnical and religious aliens not belonging to Latin Christianity, such as the people of Ruthenia and above all Jews, whose access to guilds and citizenship was limited.³¹ In the seventeenth century, in cities where multi-ethnicity and religious diversity overlapped with an anachronistic guild structure, an evolution in terms of solidarity and patriotism occurred. In the majority of the analyzed chronicles and diaries from the second half of the century, multi-ethnicity came to be treated as an explicitly negative phenomenon.

Soldiers’ patriotism, which is usually described as “political” or “national,” also underwent changes in the first half of the seventeenth century³² and the significance of cultural bonds became noticeably stronger. Regardless of referring to the community of “brother lords,” in military diaries it is possible to spot a consciousness and acceptance of the multi-ethnic composition of the army. During the intervention in Moscow, the army—comprised of Germans, Poles and “people of Moscow”—was united by group solidarity, including not only the nobility but also sometimes foreign infantry (“Germans”). It shows the superiority of the corporate bond over the ethnic and estate ones.

In the second half of the seventeenth century a peculiar regionalization of the patriotism of the nobility took place—comparable to the superiority of the territorial bond in urban patriotism resulting in the progressing decentralization of power in the Commonwealth. According to Wespazjan Kochowski, in the times of “the Deluge” only those lands were sincerely perceived by Poles as their own, which were “the properties of the Crown by the law of the ancient and true king-

³¹ Łucja Charewiczowa, *Ograniczenia gospodarcze nacji schizmatyckich i Żydów we Lwowie w XV i XVI wieku* [The economic limitations imposed on schismatic nations and Jews in Lviv in the fifteenth and the sixteenth century] (Lwów, 1925), 19–28.

³² Urszula Świdarska, *Szlachta polska wobec Boga i ojczyzny* [The Polish nobility’s attitude towards God and fatherland] (Poznań: Księgarnia Świętego) Wojciecha, 2001); Urszula Świdarska, “Patriotyzm polskiego rycerstwa i szlachty na przełomie średniowiecza i czasów nowożytnych” [The patriotism of the Polish knighthood and nobility at the turn of Middle Ages and modern times], *Przegląd Zachodniopomorski* XV (2000) 1: 105–116.

dom.”³³ That is why in soldiers’ diaries of that time the term “Poland” is used more often in reference to the lands of the Crown (parallel to Lithuania, Ruthenia and Prussia) than to the “Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.”

It is easiest to define the level of identification with the community by studying the frequency and context of the use of the pronoun “we.” Analysis conducted from this angle shows that participation of townspeople in the defense of the capital against Maximilian III of Austria’s army in 1587 played a special role in the development of the communal consciousness of townsmen (not only of Cracow). This fact was noted both in plebeian literature and chronicles—e.g., such as the *Chronografia* of Żywiec written a hundred years later.

By providing a detailed coverage, the *Kronika mieszczanina krakowskiego* serves as a model example of changes in the mentality of the *plebs* under the influence of direct participation in important political events. In the beginning of the narration covering the period of interregnum after the flight of Henry de Valois, the author of the chronicle considers himself to be only a member of the town’s community (*communitas*). Furthermore, he contrasts this group, namely the “common people,” “guilds,” and tradition “of ours” (craftsmen predecessors) to the patricians, who treat the representatives of the people of Cracow as foreigners, as if they were citizens of other towns.

At the beginning of the siege of Cracow by Maximilian’s supporters, in the process of individual consultations the acceptance of Sigismund III Vasa was passed by representations of patricians and plebeians. The next step was a spontaneous mobilization of all city inhabitants including women, “rogues” (commoners and people who did not own citizenship) and students of the Cracow Academy. From that moment, the Crown’s troops under the command of hetman Zamoyski also became “ours” for the chronicler. In his struggle with Maximilian’s forces, Zamoyski was aided by the “cry of the rogues,” who did not restrain themselves from cheering on the city walls and actively participated in the fights. At the same time, the inhabitants of Garbary suburbs were suspected of supporting Maximilian and hiding Germans. Up till then they were “ours” but soon they were accused of treason,

³³ Wespazjan Kochowski, *Lata potopu 1655–1657* [Years of the Deluge 1655–1657], selected and translated by Leszek Kukulski, introduction by Jan Krzyżanowski, epilogue by Adam Kersten (Warsaw, 1966), 87.

robbed and murdered by their fellow-citizens and by peasants from the villages in the neighborhood of Cracow which had been burned to the ground by Maximilian's forces.

The communal consciousness of the author of the Cracow chronicle comes to the fore in its broadest range in religious issues—at the end of the text he declared solidarity with “our Christians and people of the Christian Emperor.” It was impossible to reach the level of identification “we—Poles” because “Polish lords” turned out to be enemies, blamed for setting the Commonwealth at variance with Christian rulers and leading to domestic conflicts. With heavy irony the chronicler showed “noble lords” both on Zamoyski's side, in panic fleeing the battlefield in spite of appeals to their noble duties and “their love of fatherland,” and among Maximilian's supporters who out of revenge set manors nearby Cracow on fire as “lovers of their own brotherhood”. It is interesting that in soldiers' diaries such as the writings of Jemiołowski and Łoś the terms “lovers of the fatherland” or “lovers of the Commonwealth” were also treated as propaganda slogans not corresponding to reality.

By analogy, for urban chroniclers, “we” equals the townspeople: craftsmen and guilds, just as for the nobility serving in the army “we” equals soldiers of the same formation (for Budziło—participants of the “Dimitriads”; for Obuchowicz—the left wing of the Lithuanian army; for Pasek—Czarniecki's division) and the nobility of their own province. Simultaneously, in the analyzed diaries there are no symptoms of hate towards their opponents perceived as “strangers.” On the contrary (according to Pasek), “you're the same man as he is, the same soldier as he is.”

Declarations of “love” and solidarity are related primarily to the nobility of their own province (“semi-patriots”—as they were called by Jan Chryzostom Pasek) beyond which a nobleman is regarded as a stranger—newcomer (“advena”). A typical example of such attitude was the Polonized Calvinist, Maciej Vorbek-Lettow, who did not display a sense of togetherness with the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth but with the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and its hetman Janusz Radziwiłł as well as the “brotherhood of noblemen.” Together with his son, for the “love of the fatherland,” he posted a retinue under the local banner. In both groups corporate and regional solidarity seems to be stronger than the estate-wide not to mention the nationwide one.

Sources, motivations and aims of patriotism

A primary source of urban patriotism lay in the remembrance of predecessors, which was based on conscientious historical and archival studies.³⁴ Commemorating history of the city in writing was regarded as a civic duty: “It does not befit a man to live in his own fatherland as if in an unknown country.”³⁵ Patterns of chronicle writing of townsmen in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries passed from individual notes on daily house and farm issues through annual registration of most important local events to fully mature literary forms (usually stemming from the circle of the administrative staff).³⁶

Interest in “the tradition of the forefathers” is regarded as unique and characteristic for urban culture in the Commonwealth of the seventeenth century, adopting to its own use Sarmatian genealogical narratives and making Sarmatism an ideology bridging the division of estates. In the analyzed sources the use of the term “old townsman” (here: owning citizenship for a long time) only with a positive connotation may be regarded as a colloquial sign of respect for tradition. In sources written by soldiers in the first half of the seventeenth century the “tradition of the forefathers” is referred to by the king and the hetmans, and not by their subordinates. What is more, the deeds of the descendants and the achievements of the Polish army in Moscow during the “Dimitriads,” especially their reaching of the White Sea, are proudly counter-posed to lesser successes of the Batory era. One aspect deserves to be underlined—that not only soldier diarists, but also King Sigismund III and Chancellor Feliks Kryski in official writings quoted by Budziło and Maskiewicz and even a royal historiographer, Wespazjan Kochowski, refer not to written historical accounts, statutes and privileges, but to the “remembrance of the grandfathers” as a source of common law regulating duties to the fatherland. The

³⁴ Łucja Sieciechiewiczowa, *Życie codzienne w renesansowym Poznaniu w latach 1518–1619* [Everyday life in Renaissance Poznań] (Warsaw: Państw. Instytut Wydawniczy, 1974), 147; Witold Maisel, “Księgozbiory mieszczan poznańskich w drugiej połowie XVI w.” [Poznań townsmen’s libraries in the second half of the sixteenth century], *Studia do Dziejów Wielkopolski i Pomorza* (1960): 257–308.

³⁵ Cebrowski, *Roczniki miasta Łowicza*, 19; also Józefowicz, *Kronika miasta Lwowa*, 2

³⁶ Wanda Baczkowska, *Z rozważań nad historiografią mieszczańską XVI-początku XVII wieku* [Reflections on townsmen’s historiography in the sixteenth and in the beginning of the seventeenth century], *Prace Historyczno-Literackie* [Historical and literary works], vol. 77 (1985), 53–69.

limitations of distributing the royal demesne by the king to those who deserved it (as the participants of the wars with Russia demanded) was explained by “the custom of the predecessors”. The same goes for duties connected with the defensive duties of armed forces (only two weeks in the country) and even free elections.

The account of the forefathers mythologized in the collective consciousness and in *silva rerum* (archives of the nobility)³⁷ was more important than what was in fact written in *sejm* constitutions and “Polish chronicles,” which were known by only the most educated people. It illustrates the superiority of verbal communication in the noble community.³⁸ To judge by the analyzed sources, the models of patriotism in the middle nobility and landed gentry were formed through living examples of multi-generational military service—e.g. Pasek recalls that his parents demanded that he served in the army in spite of the fact that he was their only son.

Regardless of the medium (written or oral) of preserving the tradition from generation to generation, both townsmen and soldiers treated their own and their predecessors’ deeds as a message to their descendants: children, grandchildren, and also a broadly understood “*posteritas*” from whom they expected “immortal remembrance and glory” and continuation of the duty of commemoration. Just as Jemiołowski addressed the “Polish reader,” Cebrowski, an alderman of Łowicz, appealed to his son to continue the chronicler’s work: “By doing so, *he would leave a faithful remembrance* that he thought more of the public welfare than of his own convenience and that he defended and adorned his fatherland in which he was born and raised, being certain that *he did not do it without hope of reward.*”³⁹ (my emphasis—UA)

Soldiers behaved analogously as in return for “spilt blood” they summarily demanded withdrawal of criminal cases and bestowal of lands. But potentially they expressed hope “that the fatherland would reward them with gratitude and immortal glory.”⁴⁰ The goal of patri-

³⁷ Stanisław Roszak, *Archiwa sarmackiej pamięci. Funkcje i znaczenie rękopiśmiennych ksiąg silva rerum w kulturze Rzeczypospolitej XVIII wieku* [Sarmatian archives: Functions and meaning of *Silva Rerum* manuscripts in the culture of the eighteenth century Commonwealth] (Toruń: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, 2004).

³⁸ Andrzej Mencwel, “Łącznik: Ziemiańska wtórna oralność,” [Connection. Nobleman second orality], in *Wyobrażenia antropologiczne* [Anthropological imagination] (Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 2006), 99–106.

³⁹ Cebrowski, *Roczniki Łowicza*, 19.

⁴⁰ Budziło, *Wojna moskiewska*, 82.

otic enterprises according to both groups of authors was linked to the commemorative function of deeds which included both individuals and the community represented by them.

Between the patriotic phraseologies of townsmen and soldiers there is no difference in terms of “transcendental” references. God is the universal Creator and at the same time “hetman and protector” of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and its inhabitants. God’s intervention signaled by extraordinary signs in the sky and other omens was looked for by people especially in extreme situations like the wars with Sweden and Russia (1655–1660) and later the Great Northern War (1700–1710) when, in comparison to the first half of the seventeenth century, the frequency of references to God in soldiers’ texts increased considerably.

A Messianic ideology exhibited the unique assignment of the Polish nation to spread Catholicism and fight against heresy, schism, and paganism. In the first half of the seventeenth century it was present in the works of Father Wojciech Dębołęcki, who stressed that “no nation would protect God’s Church of its own will [...] except the Polish”;⁴¹ as well, he sought to prove that Poles were an elect nation (*Wywód jedyńownłasnego państwa świata* [Disquisition on the most peculiar country of the world], 1633). Favorable conditions were created for Catholic propaganda (spread by the Church in the times of the “Deluge”) which promoted faith in the extraordinary tutelage of Divine Providence over the Commonwealth.

In texts from the second half of the seventeenth century God is ascribed military victories (e.g. getting Poland and Poles out of a hopeless situation during the “Deluge”) as well as defeats, which were treated as punishment for blasphemy and sacrilege. At the same time an increase of “catastrophism” and fatalism is traceable. In the soldiers’ milieu the belief that “victory is not in the hands of man” was especially dangerous, because it freed them from responsibility. Acceptance of the concept of “God’s plan” towards the Commonwealth and the futility of man’s opposition to it, resulted in intellectual incapacitation and relying on Providence rather than on reform of the army. Even on the eve of the partitions of Poland this was the source of a conviction that Poles ought to be afraid not of “neighboring nations” but only of punishment for their own wrongdoings and sins.

⁴¹ Dębołęcki, *Przewagi elearów polskich*, 175.

As far as faith is concerned, its protection was a priority in the army's rules and regulations,⁴² however, in diaries from the first half of the seventeenth century only general notes on "Christian religion" can be found. Protection of the "Catholic faith" was not mentioned in reports from the Polish intervention in Moscow. The motive of "protection of the true faith" (Eastern Orthodoxy *versus* the Latin Church and "heretics") was treated skeptically by Wasyl Szujski in his *Diariusz podróży Zygmunta III do Moskwy* [Diary of Sigismund III's journey to Moscow], as a camouflage for the actual aim of the fight—gaining control of the "country," which equaled power. On the Polish side, Budziło underlined the peaceful coexistence of "Latin" and "Ruthenian" faiths in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, regarding it as a chance for a peaceful introduction of Catholicism by Tsar Dmitriy and an opportunity of forming an alliance with Moscow against "enemies of the Holy Crucifix". Also in official royal propaganda which in the times of the intervention in Moscow agitated in favour of Prince Władysław, prevention of "spilling Christian blood" was given as a main goal of his candidature.

It can be found in the sources that not until the second half of the century did identification of Catholicism with Polishness take shape. One of the reasons for this was the hostility towards "heretic" Swedes and "schismatic" Muscovites, and the other the impact of official propaganda of the State and Church directed to all circles of addressees⁴³ which exhibited an integrating role of the "religion of the forefathers." It is in Charles Gustav's guarantees of respecting Catholicism that Kochowski sought justification not only for the acceptance of Swedish authority by the Crown's army but also for the Agreement of Kėdainiai.

Promoting religion as a basic criterion of social divisions resulted in the fact that "heretics" and Jews became the main object of attacks during the Swedish Deluge and the Northern War. In private cities in the beginning of the eighteenth century an increase of hostility toward

⁴² Władysław IV's articles for foreign infantry from 1635, in Stanisław Kutrzeba, ed., *Polskie ustawy i artykuły wojskowe od XV do XVIII w.* [Polish laws and military articles from the fifteenth to the eighteenth century] (Cracow: Polska Akad. Umiejętności, 1937), 234–235.

⁴³ Paulina Buchwald-Pelcowa, "Pieśni patriotyczne i pieśni religijne po 'potopie'" [Patriotic and religious songs after the Deluge], in Janusz Pelc and Barbara Otwinowska, ed., *Literatura i kultura polska po "potopie"* [Polish literature and customs after the Deluge] (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1992), 75–90.

these two groups was quite often caused by their special status guaranteed to them by city owners for economic gain or simply by introducing them to cities as a result of state intervention, which was treated as a violation of the rights of legitimate citizens (e.g. Charles XII of Sweden's extortion of the Emperor's agreement for building Protestant temples in Silesia in 1709, or the favoritism shown to Jewish leaseholders in Żywiec by the house of Wettin and the Wielopolski family).

Popularization of Catholic piety among soldiers is attested by mentions of liturgies before and after battles combined with commanders' and soldiers' prayers for victory or thanksgivings. In the second half of the seventeenth century and in the beginning of the eighteenth the significance of the Cult of the Virgin Mary became stronger, also among townsmen (e.g. in the introduction to Komoniecki's *Chronografia*). In turn, the authors of diaries sought to prove the inferiority of "foreign faiths" using not theological, but social arguments. The inferiority of the Orthodox Church is proven by the "boorishness among common people with respect to faith" and the idolatrous cult of icons (Maskiewicz). The inferiority of "Luther's religion" is affirmed by the fact that Lutherans invoked only the name of Jesus and not Jesus and Mary as Catholics did (Pasek), which was the proof of their low religious education. An anecdote about Pasek who served as an altar-server with his hands stained with enemies' blood is an example of the degeneration of the soldiers' religiousness. Father Piekarski, the celebrant, reacted to this by saying: "God is not taken aback by blood spilled for His Name"⁴⁴—whereas the preceding generation was encouraged by father Piotr Skarga to repent after a military triumph and pray for God's forgiveness for spilling blood.⁴⁵

"Establishing lasting peace" in the Commonwealth, which was prayed for publicly in cities during periods of interregnum, was given as an official motivation for military actions and at the same time was the highest category of "common welfare". Despite the sublime form of addressing "supernatural forces," secular arguments definitely prevails

⁴⁴ Pasek, *Pamiętniki*, 26.

⁴⁵ Piotr Skarga, *Żołnierz chrześcijański, czyli zabawy pobożności chrześcijańskiej dla stanu żołnierskiego na widok podane* [The Christian soldier] (Sandomierz, 1789), rozdz. 14, Jako się po wygranej bitwie zachować ma chrześcijański żołnierz: "naprzód: nie ma się z tego weselić, że się ludzka krew polała, i owszem na ową nędzą pobitych płakać przystoi" [Chapter 14—How should a Christian soldier behave after a victorious battle: First of all he should not cheer the spill of blood but cry over the miserable condition of the defeated].

in the set of motivations and goals of patriotic actions declared by soldiers, even in official speeches.

Revenge was the most often declared motivation. In the first half of the seventeenth century it was announced for disgracing the Commonwealth and “spilling brothers’ blood” during a slaughter of Poles and Lithuanians at False Dmitriy’s wedding.⁴⁶ Collective revenge, which is considered by anthropologists as typical of primitive societies, was regarded by both parties as an inevitable element of military actions. Even in 1658 Kochowski treated the Cossacks’ barbaric behavior in Volhynia, Belarus and Ukraine as a revenge for excesses committed by the Crown’s army during their intervention in Moscow under the reign of Sigismund III Vasa. This triggered the escalation of war crimes and was contradictory to the concept of “just (i.e. defensive) war,” viewed in literature as a specific feature of Polish war doctrine.⁴⁷

Apart from glory, the most frequently evoked value in official war propaganda was freedom. According to the royal administration who called for mobilization of the armed forces in Chocim in 1621, precisely the unique attachment to freedom distinguished Poles and Lithuanians from nations defeated by the Turks and at the same time it was a sign of solidarity and a guarantee of victory. However, freedom was addressed much less frequently in appeals to soldiers than in articles on political subjects directed to the “non-military” nobility. The freedom of a nobleman—citizen—was in obvious clash with discipline, a basic rule of soldiers’ life.

However, the duty of “protecting faith and freedom” stated routinely as a priority in military rules and regulations found faint reflection in the analyzed diaries. Justification of the intervention in Moscow as an attempt “to export Polish freedom” was disparaged by Samuel Maskiewicz who recalled (without commentary) a Moscow boyar’s answer: “Your freedom is good for you, and our captivity is good for us, because your freedom is anarchy.”⁴⁸ The only diarist who presented an apology for “the free nation” in confrontation with “Moscow captivity” was Filip Kazimierz Obuchowicz. He was a governor of

⁴⁶ Budziło, *Wojna moskiewska wzniecona*, 68; *Diariusz drogi Zygmunta III*, 100; Kochowski, *Lata potopu*, 45.

⁴⁷ Stefan Herman, *Wojna i żołnierz w okresie kontrreformacji. Szkice z dziejów literatury polskiej i obcej* [War and soldiers during the Counter-Reformation: Sketches on the history of Polish and foreign Literature] (Zielona Góra, 1983).

⁴⁸ Maskiewicz, *Pamiętniki*, 146.

Smolensk and was prosecuted for surrendering it to the Russians, so his credibility as a patriot is rather low. The absence of freedom among the values referred to by soldiers is significant because it reflects their real location outside the “political nation” and the system of values ascribed to it by historians.

In the whole analyzed period the value which was declared as the main motivation behind undertaking “war labor” was (next to revenge) glory. It was endorsed by commanders and by clergy who blessed soldiers before battle. “The glory of his Majesty” and the welfare (alternatively: safety) of the fatherland (the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth) is the most often used set phrase in soldiers’ diaries and correspondence and illustrates the hierarchy of public values. This can be interpreted as the ostentatious stressing of an immanent bond between king and country. In extreme cases a spectacular defeat might be presented as a premise to “the immortal glory of the Polish nation.” An example of this was the surrender of a Polish garrison in the Kremlin preceded by an exceptionally long siege, during which acts of cannibalism took place⁴⁹—a violation not only of religious rules but also of elementary principles of civilization. Criticism of too much aspiration of commanders for glory leading to them risking their subordinates’ lives and to rivalry and discord in the army is rare in the soldiers’ diaries analyzed.

It is hard to examine such motivations only in patriotic categories, because they also come from the chivalric ethos. It required not only readiness to die for the fatherland, but also considering honor more important than the norms of Christian ethics valid in civil life. The thesis that honor was a prime value for soldiers is supported by the difficulties in convincing the nobility in Dmitriy II’s garrison near Kaluga to abandon him and join Sigismund III Vasa, as their duties to their own fatherland and their own king were superior to those to a foreign ruler. On the other hand, servants rejected serving “against the king, their own lord”—thus demonstrating a higher level of royalist (that is: patriotic!) consciousness than their lords. Not until the times of the “Deluge” did soldiers learn (at least according to Kochowski) the rule that duties to God and fatherland are more important than bonds of

⁴⁹ Budziło, *Wojna moskiewska* [Moscow War], 171: List więźniów dany Andrzejowi Radwanowi w Niżnym Nowogrodzie 14 I 1617 [A letter of prisoners to Andrzej Radwan in Nizhny Novgorod, January 14th 1617].

honor, and an army has the full right to abandon the commander who had abandoned his fatherland. The subordination of patriotic phraseology to glory was linked with the dominance of corporate bonds and *esprit de corps* in the military community. The term “fatherland” was most often recalled by military confederates, together with an appeal to the nobility for solidarity, as the final argument to support their demands for pay. For instance the Smolensk Confederation’s commanders did so in 1612 in spite of the fact that when royal negotiators “mentioned the fatherland,” the confederated soldiers threatened to slash them with sabers.⁵⁰

This ambiguity in soldiers’ mentality may originate from the lack of uniformity of the only formally “noblemen” army. The concept of a disinterested duty to fatherland as a privilege of chivalrous men might appeal to wealthier noblemen, but rather less to the majority of soldiers—people of diversified social and ethnic origin, making a living thanks to war, and being guided by pragmatism. Of course many a time real contributions were not awarded any material rewards apart from personal satisfaction—like in the case of Aleksander Skorobohaty who “*sine respectu*” served the Commonwealth for 37 years; but certainly that was not something that soldiers expected when they made their mind up for military service.

The concept of “glory” can be found also in townsmen’s texts in two contexts. Firstly, “Polish glory” is referred to in the ornate speeches of Polish legates on the international scene and “the glory of the city” is seen on the occasion of the taking part by townsmen in celebrations (usually the ceremonious entry to the city by kings or the owners of private cities) being a “huge cost to poor people.” Secondly, in acceptance of the model of “chivalrous glory” gained on the battlefield—especially in wars against pagans—by people “bringing glory to their fatherland” by participation in famous campaigns. In both cases glory and “festive character” is linked to the person of the king and the privileged stratum. The townsmen’s satisfaction was derived from the fact that they contributed to showing their “honesty” (here: reliability)—the prime virtue of their estate.

⁵⁰ Urszula Augustyniak, *Klientela wojskowa*, 146.

Manifestations of patriotism

In older literature it was common to treat the use of the Polish language in the seventeenth century by representatives of the urban elite—people capable of speaking many languages—as a patriotic manifestation. Polonization in the sense of linguistic fluency was the first stage of assimilating immigrants who were not given a full range of civil rights in Polish cities. However, it did not necessarily entail cultural Polonization of people who by custom, religion, and every day language use often remained “Germans,” nor did it automatically guarantee their loyalty to the Polish Commonwealth.

Therefore it is questionable to acknowledge linguistic Polonization as an “ideological manifestation,”⁵¹ excluding cases of conscious decisions to swap language and fashion. Among the latter was Jan Gollusz, a townsman of Zamość, originating from a family of German immigrants. Before his departure to study in Leipzig “he could barely speak German” and after his mother’s death he “wore Polish mourning dress.”⁵² It was rightly pointed out that townsmen did not pay attention to “purity” of style in their dress so they often mixed (especially in the second half of the seventeenth century) elements of Polish and Western European clothes.⁵³ “Polish” clothes were a celebratory and luxurious dress which could have been treated both as a capital investment and a manifestation of wealth and patriotism. In the end of the sixteenth century they were not regarded as the “national” dress, as Turkish, Arab, Italian and even “Negro” clothes were also worn: “a Pole can be dressed as he wishes, he is with one heart, though wearing various dresses.”⁵⁴

⁵¹ Maria Bogucka, “Miejsce mieszczanina w społeczeństwie staropolskim—atrakcyjność wzorów życia szlacheckiego w Polsce XVII wieku” [Position of a townsman in the Old Polish society: The attractiveness of models of life in the seventeenth century Poland], in Andrzej Wyczański, ed., *Spółczesność staropolskie. Studia i szkice* [Old Polish society], vol. 1 (Warsaw: Państw. Wydaw. Naukowe, 1976), 185–200.

⁵² Gollusz, *Pamiętnik*, 87, 99.

⁵³ Magdalena Bartkiewicz, *Odzież i wnętrza domów mieszczańskich w Polsce w drugiej połowie XVI i w XVII w.* [Houses interiors and clothing in Poland in the second half of the sixteenth century and in the seventeenth century] (Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich. Wydaw. PAN, 1974), 14; Irena Turnau, *Odzież mieszczaństwa warszawskiego w XVIII wieku* [Clothing of a Warsaw townsman in the eighteenth century] (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1967) 14, 133.

⁵⁴ *Kronika mieszczanina krakowskiego*, 106, 1595 r.

In communities represented by the authors of the analyzed texts, the choice of dress was determined primarily by practical reasons, like leaving or coming back to the Commonwealth, and also by the innate tendency of Poles to adopt foreign fashion indicating (according to Pasek) the “*summa levitas* of our nation”—not only of the nobility but the whole society—which was one of the reasons of its impoverishment. Wearing Polish dress instead of French dress had a symbolic meaning as late as in the second half of the seventeenth century and only at the highest level of the elite of authorities, when monarchs (as John II Casimir in Zborów, or Frederick William of Prussia while meeting Czarniecki’s division heading for Denmark in 1658) wore “Polish” garments in order to endear themselves to the army. In the beginning of the rule of the Wettin dynasty wearing Polish dress became the manifestation of loyalty of people connected with the court (the example of Franciszek Wielopolski is noted in the chronicle of Żywiec).

The basic form of urban patriotism was peaceful work for the fatherland, which was in agreement with the rule: “*dulce est pro patria mori, sed decorum pro ea vivere*.”⁵⁵ Working on a town’s chronicle was regarded as a work useful for the commonwealth because it preserved old privileges and “freedoms” of the town neglected by “lords councilors” (patricians). For instance, in the beginning of the eighteenth century Andrzej Komoniecki, a chronicler of Żywiec, used archival documentation gathered by himself to gain affirmation of the privileges of the guilds by the new owners, the Wielopolski family, who were praised because “they held to their ancestors (here: predecessors).”⁵⁶

For pragmatic reasons the reconstruction of the history of the cities concentrated on the towns’ institutions, with special consideration of guilds, courts and churches. The fates of individuals deserved to be remembered in two cases: first, extremely brutal crimes and forms of punishment (described in detail), as warnings; second, merits for the city, as positive models. Analogously, in soldiers’ diaries, as in king’s and hetmans’ official texts, military service is treated as a “craft” and war operations as “works,” “piece of work,” “labor” undertaken for the wealth of the fatherland, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, as a sort of investment for which not only pay is due but also an award. In

⁵⁵ Komoniecki, *Chronografia*, Przemowa do miasta Żywca jako ojczyzny swej, 3. [Speech addressing the city of Żywiec as his own fatherland].

⁵⁶ Komoniecki, *Chronografia*, 272.

both cases the actions of the individuals conjoin in a coherent whole according to the rule that public welfare is the sum of individual welfares (“*ex privatis publica constant*”).

Expenditure for the city was an elemental form of townsmen’s actions for the community: the foundations of public buildings like towers, town halls (in the writings of Cebrowski and Komoniecki), a cloth hall, and a gallows made of brick (in *Kronika mieszczanina krakowskiego*), enrollments for free of charge baths in the town’s bathhouse (in Żywiec) and above all the purchase or testamentary bequeathing of lands, thus rendering the city’s territory larger. The significance of the purchase of lands for the city as a patriotic deed is underlined by Komoniecki who ascribed the name of “public good” to grazing lands.⁵⁷ Cebrowski regarded in a similar way efforts made by “good and fatherland-loving citizens” to buy the aldermanship lost by the city back from the chapter of Łowicz.⁵⁸

“Pious” foundations such as sacral buildings, priests’ endowments, private gravestones and grave chapels treated as an element enriching sacral buildings, but also smaller donations and bequests (e.g. for repairing the church gate), played a special role in towns. To a different extent they were available for all residents—even the poorest and those without citizenship. Pious foundations helped in the process of democratization of the city community and encouraged its integration above religious divisions: Catholics together with “heretics” (Lutherans) provided for the restoration of the Virgin Mary’s parish in Cracow. A similar function was played by characteristically Baroque religious initiatives: the organization of rosary fraternities and charitable fraternities, and the initiation of cults of holy icons and pilgrimages. Intellectual activities were also treated as a symptom of patriotism and a benefit to the “fatherland”: teaching in towns’ schools or literary works like scenarios of interludes acted out on the occasion of religious feasts. It needs to be underlined that all forms of work “for the benefit of the city commonwealth” mentioned above were disinterested—commemoration in archives and chronicles could be the only form of “a reward.” In unusual circumstances, contributions for the city could also be treated as mitigating circumstances in the towns’

⁵⁷ Komoniecki, *Chronografia*, 99, also 91, 162.

⁵⁸ Cebrowski, *Roczniki dziejów Łowicza*, 25.

judicature.⁵⁹ Numerous priests were a reason of unique pride for the city in the late seventeenth century. They were precisely enumerated in the *Chronografia* of Żywiec, next to examples of priests who “made their fatherland famous.” It is telling that despite respect for educated people, the chronicler of Żywiec thought higher of thrifty and hard-working priests — “good administrators of God’s Church”—than of priests engaged in politics or of “melancholics” not interested in public matters.

Townsmen chroniclers and soldiers were joined together by the cult of professionalism, work and maintenance of their inborn status, but also by aversion to sloth and the fact that the patriotism of representatives of these two communities was pragmatic. It is interesting to study in soldiers’ diaries the hierarchy of contributions qualifying for a reward. According to participants of the interventions in Moscow, an award was deserved for “great labors, victories, spilling of blood and ruining one’s own affluence”⁶⁰ (as the result of providing for weapons and horses). In contrast, readiness to die for the fatherland was listed only twice. This leads to an unexpected conclusion, that as far as manifestation of patriotism was concerned, *pro patria mori* was an issue of secondary importance. Constructive activities were of primary significance.

Contrary to townsmen, soldiers counted on material rewards (money or lands) for “financial cost, works, and courage.” Especially Budziło’s report (which included correspondence between the armed forces and the king and *sejm*) of the intervention in Moscow provides an interesting example of considering a war campaign as an investment based on rational calculation of costs and “common benefits.” The problem was that Sigismund III’s understanding of “common benefit” differed from the soldiers’ one. Soldiers underlined that they conducted the campaign on their own cost (the Commonwealth did not give any subsidies), the benefit of which was extending the fatherland’s borders (broadening the State’s territory) and “the glory of the Commonwealth” among Christian monarchs which strengthened its international position. The indirect benefit was the internal pacifica-

⁵⁹ Komoniecki, *Chronografia*, 91 (pardon by the city court of the Żywiec school president owing to his contribution to the city).

⁶⁰ Budziło, *Wojna moskiewska wzniecona*, 130, also 117.

tion of the country after the Zebrzydowski Rebellion (1606–1607).⁶¹ The king referred to the phraseology used by soldiers and appealed to them to “raise their chivalric ploughshare in the service of the common good.”⁶² At the same time, he rebutted a demand of paying gratifications for financial losses and announced that the costs of equipping soldiers should be carried by their brothers and uncles. Remuneration should be paid to an army “which survives only owing to money” (i.e. mercenaries). In this case it was a hidden encouragement to them to feed themselves at the cost of the people of the conquered country. He said he would “consider” a reward after capturing the capital of Muscovy. Participation in a military expedition was regarded as a private or family enterprise, not as “duty to the fatherland.”

Quite telling is the stress on the monarch’s disinterest in official propaganda as well as his lack of private benefit from the intervention in Moscow because the whole conquered land would belong to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The contraposition of “jobbery” to “common good” was originally attributed to the pair: king—nobility, and only later, in the second half of the seventeenth century, did it start to be viewed as a conflict between the benefit of fatherland (the country) and private interests of individuals.

Similarly to the participants of the Moscow interventions, the armed forces of mercenaries during the defensive wars of the first half and war confederates in the sixties of the seventeenth century negotiated with the country’s authorities. The main difference was that the representatives of these armies underlined the financial losses, wounds and deaths of ordinary soldiers even more strongly but simultaneously stressed their willingness to give up a part of their pay on account of the country’s devastation out of respect for their good names given that interest clashed with chivalric honor.

An interesting fact is the emotional attitude of soldier diarists towards the fatherland and their contractual one towards the State—the Commonwealth which was regarded mainly as a source of “financial” contention. Examples of noblemen’s altruistic behavior noted by Pasek are the readiness of citizens of some provinces to give non-returnable loans for raising province squadrons against the Turks in

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 90–93, 116–117, 131–132, 143.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 126–127.

1672 (in practice: for participation in the Confederation in Gołęb), or an initiative of the Związek Święcony confederates to transfer the pay of the dead soldiers to help ruined plebeians but these were not the rule and they supported people, not the institution of the country, like the authorities.

“Defending the fatherland with arms” against external threats is usually regarded as a basic sign of patriotism and by no means was this limited to the nobility. On the level of “the minor commonwealth,” cities of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (even private ones) had their own military forces whose role was not limited to parading in armor during towns’ celebrations. In the seventeenth century, the city militia was obliged to keep order. At times of interregnum and during an increase of external threat, city militia forces were called to readiness and councillors were personally on guard. As well, inspections of battle readiness were conducted. Townsmen and peasants from private latifundia also took part in “wars” conducted by their owners and treated them analogously to the “war” of the Polish King John Casimir with Jerzy Lubomirski near Częstochowa or the “great civil war in Poland” between August II’s and Stanisław Leszczyński’s supporters. It is telling that the author of the *Chronografia* did not betray his liking for either August or Leszczyński—apparently for him it was all the same. The attitude of plebeians and patricians to military duties owed to their town’s commonwealth was drastically dissimilar: for money-saving reasons and also for the sake of maintaining their autonomy (“freedom”), craftsmen preferred keeping guard personally, while patricians preferred hiring military troops which could be used for suppressing riots of the plebeians if such a situation occurred. It is vital to mention that analogical controversies about the range of duties of defending the fatherland had already taken place on the level of the “major fatherland”—the Commonwealth. While the nobility opted for national mobilization when needed, the king strove to create a regular army. It illustrates the fundamental difference in approach to war—as defensive (with the use of “civic militia”) or as offensive (with the use of a “professional army” of mercenaries).

Military service in the state army was the most probable way, and the one most exhibited in plebeian literature, of plebeians’ transition from local patriotism to state patriotism. It was not without a reason that Sebastian Petrycy of Pilzno argued for including townsmen in citizenship. He recalled that the majority of the military squad (apart from

officers and “companions” from hussar squadrons) were plebeians.⁶³ Royal and private cities officially took part in wars waged by the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the first half of the seventeenth century by providing (sporadically) a few “armed menials”, but in the first place they organized means of transport, for instance the wagons provided by Nowy Sącz for the Polish garrison at Chocim in 1621 (according to Tymowski).

During the “Deluge,” the personal participation of plebeians in war campaigns was introduced, and at the end of the seventeenth century and in the first Northern War this new law was more and more frequently implemented. Furthermore, the cities of the Crown (Cracow, Przemyśl, Gdańsk, Toruń, Lviv, Bydgoszcz, Zamość) were forced at that time to defense in cooperation with the army. An example of this is the heroic defense of Stary Bychów by the army under colonel Nieczaj aided by the town’s inhabitants (Poles, Belarussians and Jews), who gave an example of “constant faith to our king and our fatherland, no matter what estate they belonged to.”⁶⁴

Under pressure of circumstances a confrontation of two patriotisms took place: urban patriotism *versus* noble patriotism. Nevertheless, sometimes (e.g. during the defense of Cracow under the command of Stefan Czarniecki) townsmen were treated as partners. Surrendering the country’s capital required consultations with representatives of all estates participating in the defense including the city council, which was commissioned to decide on the matter of national significance.

The fact that also squadrons from far provinces of the Commonwealth fought in defense of (also private) cities (e.g. Lithuanians coming from the campaign in Moscow defended Żywiec) made townsmen aware of how extensive their federative country was, which widened their geographical horizons and made them more interested in the Commonwealth’s affairs. However, the conclusions from these experiences were not necessarily conducive to developing patriotic feelings, which was confirmed by Komoniecki’s commentary on the excesses of the Polish army in the lands belonging to Żywiec: “Many wrongdoings happened to Poland and innocent people, but most of them were

⁶³ Sebastian Petrycy z Pilzna, *Przydatek do Księgi VI Polityki Arystotelesowej. Przydatek do Księgi Trzeciej* [Addition to the VIth book of Aristotle’s Politics], in *Pisma wybrane* [Selected writings] (Warsaw: PWN, 1956), II: 383.

⁶⁴ Vorbek-Lettow, *Skarbnica pamięci*, 285–286. 1638 r.

caused by an uncontrolled Polish army.”⁶⁵ Although civilians, like the citizens of Jasna Góra or the students taking part in the defense of Cracow, during fights with the Swedish often displayed valor comparable to the soldiers’, protection of their life and possessions against direct threats remained the main motivation and goal of the townsmen. Townsmen writing chronicles declared respect for “soldierly common people” and professional soldiers being at their post—“as the most dependable walls” who bravely fought in the battle of Byczyna or with the Cossacks in 1649. However, it may be easily concluded that the level of their liking of “our” (Polish) army was the greater, the farther away the battles took place.

Janusz Tazbir’s thesis that in the Baroque the concept of an internal enemy was unknown in the Commonwealth cannot be held. In the townsmen’s eyes this enemy was part of the nobility: “lords Poles, a soldier and an enemy of fatherland.”⁶⁶ During the “Deluge,” some cities like Cracow, Warsaw, Łowicz and many more were pillaged both by foreigners and by “ours,” and the gravest damages were caused by the Polish army. It is not surprising that as far as military help from a noblemen’s army was concerned, townspeople were distrustful and they did not want to open the city gates. This heavily outraged Bogusław Maskiewicz at the walls of Lviv. Refusal to let the army into the city could have ended up with an accusation of treason, robbery (initiated by the Polish army and finished by neighboring peasants), or setting the town on fire—as in the case of Leszno. Townspeople were terrified by the nobility’s mobilized army and military confederations. In *Roczniki Łowicza* [Annals of Łowicz] it was noted that in 1626 “the nobility which was passing by robbed their poor subjects of everything they wished and caused more harm to the peasants than the enemy.”⁶⁷ Every kind of resistance against confederates was regarded as justified. In 1662 in Żywiec highwaymen were used to fight against the Związek Pobożny confederates.

From their perspective, the soldiers considered the fear of the army by the city dwellers “ridiculous.” They returned the aversion towards them with aversion especially towards the Lutheran cities of Royal Prussia, Toruń and Gdańsk, “that were disparaging all estates” and

⁶⁵ Konomiecki, *Chronografia*, 482, 1716 r.

⁶⁶ *Kronika mieszczanina krakowskiego*, 51; Cebrowski, *Roczniki dziejów Łowicza*, 51.

⁶⁷ Cebrowski, *Roczniki dziejów Łowicza*, 30.

in the second half of the seventeenth century allegedly insulted the king's majesty and the Catholic Church. The plebeians' presence in the regular army and their participation in offensive wars was considered by the nobility as an usurpation of their estate's privileges. Father Dębołęcki sneered at Protestant partisans who fought against the Emperor's dragoons during the Thirty Years' War, calling them scornful names and suggesting they should have threshed oats for the elears' horses. Similarly, Łoś and Jemiołowski sarcastically commented on the infantry's (the peasant army's) demand to have garrisons analogously to the Polish cavalry. And in a broader sense, they were sarcastic on the subject of introducing in the time of the "Deluge" plebeians to the army as such.

The very introduction of armed "rabble" into the army was blamed for the pillages committed by soldiers. It affected not only townspeople but noble manors, churches and the Crown's army wagons as well.⁶⁸ In reality however, in the light of town chronicles and soldiers' diaries during the whole seventeenth century the military forces of both nations of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth acted on the lands of their federative neighbor as if they were in a foreign country: volunteers from the Crown who accompanied Sigismund III Vasa on his way to Smolensk robbed Lithuania and White Ruthenia, whereas the Lithuanian nobility and Lithuanian Tatars paid them back by robbing the Crown during the "Deluge" and Lubomirski's Rebellion.⁶⁹ Draconian punishment, for instance dragging by horses, introduced and used by Czarniecki for robbery were ineffective, just like attempts during Sobieski's times to pacify the demoralized army by allotting land at the borderland of Volhynia for development to particular squadrons so that they could feed themselves. This was treated by veterans as an innovation unbecoming to the military profession.

Townsmen who wrote chronicles and soldiers shared an aversion towards peasants, who irrespective of their contribution to the struggle against Maximilian's forces during the siege of Cracow in 1586 and against the Swedes at Podgórze were treated as a threatening element to the social order, through the combination of their urge to taking part in pillages of cities (Leszno, Łowicz) with their small value on the

⁶⁸ Obuchowicz, *Pamiętniki*, 471–478.

⁶⁹ Jemiołowski, *Pamiętnik*, 199: Tatarzy litewscy w Wielkopolsce, 1656 r.; Pasek, *Pamiętniki*, 71: Litwa k. Sielca.

battlefield. Forced by external threat, the temporary integration of all social strata of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth during the “Deluge” was an existing but not socially acceptable situation. Favorable opinion in terms of civil duties was ascribed to practically every form of benefits and “socially useful” actions. Townsman’s patriotism could be considered as democratic, accessible (naturally to a different extent) to all inhabitants, not only those citizens of the city commonwealth who had full civil rights. The criteria of individuals’ assessment present in soldiers’ sources, like personal bravery, stout heart and war glory were addressed both to “ours” and “strangers” as they had an autonomous character, and were not directly linked to patriotism. Portrayals of the “fatherland’s good sons” or “fatherland’s fathers” (*patres patriae*) were created rather in reference to commanders (Jeremi Wiśniowiecki and Stefan Czarniecki) than to ordinary soldiers. Their character was elitist and served to create a myth of a “noblemen’s army” rather than to form “open access” models.

In the two analyzed social segments the attitude to the question of treason differed. In the whole period in question treason was regarded by the soldiers almost exclusively as a violation of solidarity of the group (e.g., abandoning of brothers in arms by Zborowski’s troops who defected from Dmitriy II to the king) or a “non-Christian” lack of help from “the Crown’s brotherhood” for soldiers of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania who suffered as prisoners in Moscow in 1657–1658. Michał Leon Obuchowicz also regarded as a departure from “brotherly love” the demand for paying for Lithuanian captives kept in Moscow instead of the customary exchange of hostages, which in consequence led to a situation that the release of the Lithuanian prisoners depended on collecting the needed money by their families and the king. The prisoners survived owing to the help of the Smolensk nobility who surrendered to Moscow,⁷⁰ supporting the tsar against the Crown in the Battle of Połonka on 28 June, 1657.

The acceptance of the authority of the tsar by the nobility of Polonia Major at Ujście was not regarded as an act of treason. It was called “an agreement,” not capitulation, to cover this disgraceful deed.⁷¹ Similarly, surrendering to Moscow by the Belarussian nobility, which

⁷⁰ Obuchowicz, *Pamiętniki*, 471–478.

⁷¹ Kochowski, *Lata potopu*, 31.

followed the example of other provinces and districts,⁷² was also not regarded as treason. The term “treason” was not ascribed to the acceptance of the authority of Charles Gustav by the Crown’s army, who explained themselves by saying that “as it was impossible to save the Commonwealth in any other way, it was necessary to play for time.”⁷³ Maciej Vorbek-Lettow with horror but also with compassion gave an account of the execution of neighbors convicted of conducting raids on noblemen’s manors (and not for treason!), one of whom “only came back to the fatherland after 15 years long military service under Khmelnytsky.”⁷⁴

At the same time, the label of “traitor” was eagerly ascribed to Cossacks, Khmelnytsky, “heretics”, Jews, “faithful Swedish adherents” and political adversaries. Janusz Radziwiłł, Hieronim Radziejowski and Jerzy Lubomirski were condemned for excessive ambition, insulting the “reputation” and “good name” of the king, usurping power—but not for betrayal of fatherland. Treating the pillaging of Greater Poland by the quartered army and the Lithuanian army as a “punishment” for the capitulation at Ujście, when not only “Swedish patriots but also the almost innocent nobility was harmed,”⁷⁵ is a proof of the relativism of the concept of treason both in the community of civil nobility and the nobility in military service.⁷⁶

Much more unambiguous was the concept of treason from the townsmen’s point of view, for whom “treason” equaled the surrender of the city to an enemy for private benefits without making a stand. Since 1588 it could serve as a basis for bringing a lawsuit against the traitors and depriving them of office.⁷⁷ After the “Deluge,” instances of executing this law took place on the basis of inquisitions conducted

⁷² Maskiewiczze, *Pamiętniki*, 276.

⁷³ Jemiołowski, *Pamiętnik*, 147.

⁷⁴ Vorbek-Lettow, *Skarbnica pamięci*, 280.

⁷⁵ Jemiołowski, *Pamiętnik*, 195–196.

⁷⁶ Mirosław Korolko, “Topos zdrady ojczyzny w literaturze polskiej lat 1655–1668” [The topos of betrayal of the fatherland in Polish literature 1655–1668], in Barbara Otwinowska, Janusz Pelc and Bożena Fałęcka, eds., *Literatura i kultura polska “po potopie”* [Polish literature and culture after the “deluge”] (Wrocław—Warsaw—Cracow: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1992), 53–64.

⁷⁷ Adam Lityński, “Zdrada kraju w polskim prawie karnym końca XVIII wieku” [Betrayal of the country in Polish criminal law in the late eighteenth century], in Anna Grześkowiak-Krwawicz, ed., *Bo insza rzecz jest zdradzić, insza dać się złudzić. Problem zdrady w Polsce przełomu XVIII i XIX wieku* [It is one thing to betray and another to be fooled. The question of treason in Poland at the turn of the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries] (Warsaw: IBL, 1995), 9–10.

in the city by a royal commission. For instance in Żywiec, alderman (*starost*) Piegłowski was deprived of office for surrendering the city to the Swedish without resistance, in an attempt to prevent the robbery of suburban manors. However, loyal townspeople were rewarded by a broadening of the propination laws (permission for alcohol production). This is one of numerous examples of a consistently royalist, that is “patriotic” attitude which dominated in the Crown’s cities throughout the seventeenth century.

Conclusion

The analysis of patriotic phraseology shows an ambiguity of basic terms—“fatherland” and “nation”—present throughout the seventeenth century. Apart from formal introductions to chronicles and fragments of official propaganda quoted in soldiers’ diaries it is difficult to find unambiguous testimonies regarding “love of the fatherland” as an autonomous value—the most important criterion of assessment of people and events. The patriotism of townsmen on the level of “the minor fatherland”—their own city—is obvious, but on the level of “the ideological fatherland”—the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth—it is shown only when political affairs activated plebeians to actions in cooperation with the nobility. Undoubtedly inhabitants of the Commonwealth, being under the influence of Polish culture, were forced to integration over the dividing lines of the estates during the “Deluge” and later (partly) during the Northern War. In order to assess if this situation was unique or a symptom of a constant tendency, further research on the language of the sources directly made by townsmen (correspondence, diaries, testaments and *silva rerum*) would be essential.

Continuation of the seventeenth century townsmen’s patriotism can be found in the comment of the eighteenth century urban publicist, Tobiasz Bauch: “It seems to us that some served only themselves, whereas in fact they sometimes without realizing it gave their fatherland more than what a great-hearted patriot could have given.”⁷⁸ Contrary to Jacek Jezierski’s insinuations, I am of the opinion that “urban patriotism” in the period of the Great Sejm (1788–1792) was not born

⁷⁸ Cited by Arkadiusz M. Stasiak, *Patriotyzm*, 22.

outside the Commonwealth's borders.⁷⁹ Whereas the allegedly "disinterested" patriotism of the Polish civil army in contrast to Western European regular armed forces (*condottieri*) is, in the light of soldiers' diaries, a historiographic myth preserved also by the youngest generation of Polish historians "to raise the spirits."⁸⁰

In my view, the sharp contrast between the two "commonwealths", i.e. the plebeians' commonwealth (in a social and economic sense) and the "commonwealth of the noble nation" (in a political sense) and the identification of the "political nation" with the noble estate as "an internally cohesive group and strongly set apart from the rest of the community"⁸¹ is a generalization acceptable only on the level of an "ideal type." Considering our present knowledge, theses advanced by some researchers about the "precursory" character of the Polish ideology of the "political nation" and "civil society"⁸² are definitely overstated.

In reality—as an effect of economic disintegration, increase of clientelism and the weakening of the nobility's civil consciousness which was gradually replaced by a submissive attitude—the "political nation" became (as was rightly pointed out by the historical anthropologist Andrzej Mencwel)⁸³ equivalent of the Polish "political class". Not only were all dependent nobility and nobility with no land left outside, but also the nobility in the army were pushed behind the borders of noble

⁷⁹ Jacek Jeziński, "Wszyscy błądzą" [All err], in Artur Eisenbach, Jerzy Michalski, Emanuel Rostworowski and, Janusz Wolański, eds., *Materiały do dziejów Sejmu Czteroletniego* [Materials to the history of the Great Sejm], (Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy imienia Ossolińskich, 1969), I: 301.

⁸⁰ Anna Czekaj, *Obywatele czy kondotierzy? Postawy obywatelskie i moralne żołnierzy narodowego autoramentu wojsk Rzeczypospolitej w pierwszej połowie XVII w.* [Citizens or condottieri? Civil and moral behaviour of the Commonwealth's army in the first half of the seventeenth century], in M. Nagielski, ed., *Staropolska sztuka wojenna XVI-XVII wieku. Prace ofiarowane prof. Jaremu Maciszewskiemu* [Old Polish military art: Works dedicated to Professor Jarema Maciszewski] (Warsaw: DiG, 2000), 85–101.

⁸¹ Tomasz Kizwalter, *O nowoczesności narodu*, 45, 53.

⁸² Andrzej Walicki, *Trzy patriotyzmy. Trzy tradycje polskiego patriotyzmu i ich znaczenie współczesne* [Three patriotisms: Three traditions of Polish patriotism and their current meaning] (Warsaw: Res Publica 1991), 25–27; Andrzej Sulima Kamiński, *Imponderabilia społeczeństwa obywatelskiego Rzeczypospolitej wielu narodów* [Imponderabilia of Civic Society in the Commonwealth of Many Nations], in Andrzej Krzysztof Link-Lenczowski and Mariusz Markiewicz, eds., *Rzeczpospolita wielu narodów i jej tradycje* [The Commonwealth of Many Nations and its traditions] (Cracow: Historia Iagellonica, 1999), 33–58.

⁸³ Andrzej Mencwel, "Łącznik: Ziemiańska wtórna oralność," 102.

estates or “isolated” themselves from the nobility who owned lands. However, there are no reasons why intellectuals of urban origin (from Sebastian Petrycy of Pilzno and Jan Jurkowski to Krzysztof Hartnocht) should be excluded from the “political nation”—people who co-authored the “Sarmatian” ideology and a set of patriotic models belonging to it, or patricians (not only of cities of Royal Prussia) who owing to their education or fortune had often real, though informal, influence on decisions of national significance.

(Translated by Marcin Mochal and Dorota Sobstel)

PART III

POLITICAL THEOLOGY AND DISCOURSES OF IDENTITY

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

PATRIOTISM AND ELECT NATIONHOOD IN EARLY MODERN HUNGARIAN POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Balázs Trencsényi

While the conception of elect nationhood as a “metahistorical” interpretative tool is usually linked to Protestantism, the “providentialist” narrative of “national history” was present prior to the Reformation. For instance, Aenea Silvio Piccolomini’s admonishing letter, *Ad legatos regni Hungariae*, deploring the Hungarians’ infidelity to their king, connected the motif of divine punishment with that of the apparent “historical decline” (the imminent ruin of the “once flourishing kingdom”) well before the fateful Battle of Mohács in 1526.

The subject of this narration is the “elect nation”—the community analogically identified with Israel. In the late medieval period, however, the chosen community was not a particular political/cultural entity, but universal Christendom. Even the fifteenth-century Hungarian humanist clergyman, János Vitéz, used the analogy this way. Christianity “was raised by God, and is never finally abandoned by Him, and we have to hope that, exactly as the Philistines for the Jewish people, this enemy [i.e. the Turks] is ordered by Him for the Christian soldier as an ordeal and not elimination (...).”¹ In some sense, this “providentialist” vision of determining responsibility for the decline of “ancient glory” and meditation on the punitive instrument of God were at the root of both the Catholic and Protestant narratives of history that emerged in the sixteenth century. The beginning of the sixteenth century also witnessed the rise of popular preaching with eschatological overtones, rooted mostly in Franciscan spiritualism. As Jenő Szűcs documented, the encompassing “national” community envisioned in the writings of Pelbárt Temesvári and especially Osvát Laskai challenged the corporate paradigm by setting the examples of

¹ Vitéz János, *Levelei és politikai beszédei* [Letters and political speeches] (Budapest: Szépirodalmi, 1987), 350.

the Hungarian holy kings against the corruption and egotism of the present privilege-holders.² Eventually, these ideas could also be traced in the ideology of the Peasant War of 1514.

The considerable discursive continuities notwithstanding, the use of the “providentialist” framework was profoundly transformed by the emergence of denominational plurality in the sixteenth century. Although the advent of Protestantism was not without conflicts—in the 1520s the “national” party demanded Draconian legislation against the Lutherans whom they saw as agents of “German” influence, its triumph after 1526 was close to all-encompassing. The emerging Hungarian Protestant communities maintained a lively relationship with the Western ecclesiastic centers of the Reformation—the fact that in the course of the sixteenth century approximately a thousand students of Hungarian provenience are attested at the University of Wittenberg speaks for itself.³ Thus the specific dynamism of the development of Protestantism in the Hungarian territories was a product of the interaction of intellectual influences from the most important cultural and religious centers of Europe and the pressing need for local adaptation. In keeping with this, the key questions of the Hungarian Reformers were borrowed from Luther’s “political theology,” but were quickly translated into the local context: the responsibility for the fall from “ancient glory,” the role of the Turks in the providential scheme and the right of resistance to religious oppression.

*“Hungarian Zion”: the Protestant construction of “elect nationhood”
and the Hungarian political context of the sixteenth century*

Significantly, the sixteenth-century Hungarian thematizations of elect nationhood were not rooted in the (Eusebian) collective hagiography characteristic of, for instance, the English version (as in Foxe’s *Book of*

² See Jenős Szűcs, “Nép és nemzet a középkor végén” [People and nation at the end of the Middle Ages], and “Dózsa parasztháborújának ideológiája” [The ideology of Dózsa’s peasant war], in *Nemzet és történelem* [Nation and history] (Budapest: Gondolat, 1974), 557–600 and 601–66.

³ Ágnes Szalay Ritóókné, “A wittenbergi egyetem magyarországi promoveáltjai a 16. században,” [The Hungarian graduate students at the university of Wittenberg in the sixteenth century], in Tibor Fabiny, ed., *Tanulmányok a lutheri reformáció történetéből* [Studies on the history of the Lutheran Reformation] (Budapest: A Magyar Evangélikus Egyház Sajtóosztálya, 1984), 222–39.

Martyrs), but were much more centered on the analogical interpretation of history, drawing a parallel between the destiny of Hungary and Israel of the Old Testament. Based on the duality of *idolatry* and *subsequent punishment*, the Hungarian apocalyptic tradition (being born in a period of tragic ordeal, involving the collapse of the Kingdom) concentrated on the analysis of crimes and punishments rather than conceptualizing “divine election” in terms of immemorial customs and a normative past of glory. Importantly, this vision of the alternation of sin and punishment could be, and in fact was integrated into the humanist historiographical pattern.

While in Elizabethan England the normativity of the “laws of the realm” was the object of this alternation of *transgressing and reinforcing* the Law, and thus the pattern of elect nationhood could be appropriated by the power-center (the upholder of the Law), in sixteenth-century Hungary one can hardly find a homogenous Protestant power-discourse which was able to rely on such a normative institutional and legal history. What can be found, instead, is a plurality of visions about the providential character of the “national past,” inserted into the broader framework of Biblical analogies and political precepts.

Although the classical historiographical canon tended to conflate the radicalism of theological vision and political radicalism, thus locating both the right of resistance and the apocalyptic vision of national history in the context of Calvinism, one has to be extremely cautious in both cases.⁴ As a matter of fact, the Calvinist construction (spelled out in Calvin’s *Petit traité de la Sainte Cène*, 1541) was much less inclined to allow for the conception of an “elect nation” than the Lutheran one.⁵ Calvin made a radical distinction between national and religious allegiances—and it is not by chance that many protagonists of Calvinism, along with Calvin himself, chose exile and settled in other polities, asserting that their true *patria* was where they could freely practice their religion.

Therefore, even though many descriptions of the Hungarians as an “elect nation” did stem from a Calvinist background, the origins of

⁴ For the former problem, see most importantly the masterpiece of Quentin Skinner, who challenged the thesis of the Calvinist origins of the theory of resistance and proved that its origins, and thus that of political radicalism, go back to Lutheranism. See his *Foundations of Modern Political Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), vol. I.

⁵ Alain Tallon, *Conscience nationale et sentiment religieux en France au XVI^e siècle* (Paris: P.U.F., 2002), 60ff.

this discourse must be sought as well partly in Luther's interpretation of historical calamities (especially the "Turkish peril") as divine punishment and partly in the Melanchtonian intellectual network around Flaccius Illyricus and the Magdeburg Centuriators, who sought to elaborate a Protestant-*cum*-humanist vision of history by "overcoding" the world chronicle tradition of the late-fifteenth century. The emerging new vision of "providentialist" history, which modern Hungarian historiography has called "the Wittenberg conception of history," rearranged the existing *topoi* of collective self-description (in time and space), utilizing fragments of humanist historiographical tradition in a "new key".⁶ The vision of the *antemurale* (the Bulwark of Christianity), which was central to late medieval Hungarian self-narration, lost its pivotal position. Similarly, while the topology of *elogium* (*Fertilitas Pannoniae*) provided a counter-image to the "deplorable present," the symbolic fusion of "national history" with the Old Testament vision of collective transgression of the norm and subsequent divine punishment relaunched a number of powerful variants of late medieval identity discourse parallel to similar developments in Western Europe, such as the *Querelae* (the personification of the complaining Nation in the person of a "sorrowful Lady").⁷

In his verse chronicle, "On the Jewish and Hungarian nations" (1538), András Farkas, who also studied in Wittenberg in 1531, transferred the entire narrative framework of Old Testament providential history to the Hungarian nation.⁸ The starting-point of Farkas' text was the analogy of the "old Hungarians" wandering from Scythia to Pannonia ("a country with plenty of bread... fat soil... abundant of gold, silver, iron, salt, cattle") with the Jews finally settling in Canaan. In the same key, he compared the Babylonian captivity of the Jews to the scheme of the "two conquests of the land" by the Hungarians—first by Attila's Huns, then by Árpád's Hungarians. Thanks to divine grace, the ancient Hungarians extended their realm to incorporate "guest peoples" (such as the

⁶ Bodo Guthmüller and Wilhelm Kühlmann, eds., *Europa und die Türken in der Renaissance* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2000), especially József Jankovics, "The Image of the Turks in Hungarian Renaissance Literature," 267–73; and István Bitskey, *Virtus és religió* [Virtue and religion] (Miskolc: Felsőmagyarországi, 1999).

⁷ Mihály Imre, "Magyarország panasza": a *Querela Hungariae* toposz a XVI–XVII. század irodalmában [The Complaint of Hungary: The *Querela Hungariae* topos in the literature of the 16th–17th centuries] (Debrecen: Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó, 1995).

⁸ András Farkas, "Az zsidó és magyar nemzetéről" [On the Jewish and Hungarian nations], in *Régi Magyar Költők Tára*, XVI. Század (Budapest, 1880), 2: 13–24.

“wild Wallachs”). Later, however, they provoked God’s punishment with their infidelity, blindness and falseness. God’s revenge reached them in the form of internal discord, which started with persecutions against the true believers and led gradually to the loss of their provinces, until God finally raised the Turkish emperor—another Nebuchadnezzar—against them to threaten them with final destruction.

In Farkas’ vision, however, the Turks, similarly to the Assyrians and Babylonians, are not actors but mere instruments of the story of salvation. This is why he does not find the compact of his king, John Szapolyai, with the Turks in any way objectionable:

The king saw that he cannot overcome
The numberless heathen Turkish mass,
He acted wisely: made a treaty with them
So that the crippled country could thrive.⁹

Instead, he attributes responsibility to the selfish “Hungarian lords,” who turned away from the Hungarian king and invited in a ruler “from Germany” (i.e., Ferdinand II Habsburg), thus turning discord into wholesale division. Farkas’ thematization of division does not entail, however, a vision of irreversible decay—in fact, this perspective is based on the promise of imminent recovery, embedded in Old Testament parallels. The “providentialist” scheme suggested that the suffering of the people could be terminated by God’s infinite mercy: as in ancient times, after seventy years of captivity he had sent prophets “to teach and educate the people,” the modern prophets (i.e. the Protestant preachers) are also heralding a spiritual liberation, which is the first and foremost precondition of “national” recovery. On the other hand, obviously with reference to the actual denominational division of the country, the Jewish parallel also posed a fearful warning to those Hungarians who remained reluctant to convert. As only a small fraction of the Jewish nation accepted Christ, they were punished collectively with the destruction of Jerusalem.¹⁰ The present is thus open-ended. Divine providence implies the possibility of sudden recovery—similar to the prophets of the Old Testament, recently pious teachers “were sent by God” to preach the Word, but their work is hindered by the idolaters, who do not subject themselves to the will of God, and “who

⁹ Farkas, “Az zsidó és magyar nemzetről,” 20.

¹⁰ Farkas, “Az zsidó és magyar nemzetről,” 23.

want to be saved by other means” than pure belief. Such persons are putting their whole “national” community into mortal danger.

The providentialist narrative thus serves very concrete ecclesiastico-political aims. Farkas seeks to legitimize the proselytizing of Protestant preachers and to defend them from persecution, which, in his opinion, is not a purely ecclesiastical issue, but concerns the entire “national community.” This meta-political narrative does not entail, however, apart from an outspoken loyalty to the “national king” (i.e., John Szapolyai), any specific institutional arrangement: The “national regeneration” is placed on the purely moral-theological ground of collective repentance: “Let us follow God: he forgives us, / And thereupon good Hungary/ Will be resurrected by Him, and he gives power once again.”¹¹

The “prophets” are mediators between God and the people, but they do not aspire to secular (or quasi-theocratic) power. Alluding to Solomon the Wise, Farkas asserts that “God directs the kings’ heart”—so the only way to reach collective salvation is to “pray to God to direct the king”, and to turn “the factious hearts of the Hungarian lords to the side of the pious king.” The partisans of Reformation thus do not “divide the polity”, but quite to the contrary offer the only way to “regaining unity.”¹² This concern with unity shows also that Farkas was aiming at the incorporation of the basic humanist themes of collective identity into his narrative. Most of all, he made considerable efforts to fuse the core of the humanist vision of history with the “providentialist” scheme. He thus alludes to the genre of *elogium* of the land, to the myths of origins, and to the *mutationes* (i.e. the extension of territory over time), but inserts them into a denominational framework—suggesting that the only way of regeneration is by return to God, in other words, by accepting the Reformation.

Following in Farkas’ steps, a whole new genre of writing emerged around the theme of “elect nationhood”—describing past and present calamities as divine punishment for the sins of the nation (i.e., deviation from the true religion).¹³ Far from being a homogenous *corpus*, these writings diverged considerably from each other in terms of

¹¹ Farkas, “Az zsidó és magyar nemzetről,” 23–4.

¹² Farkas, “Az zsidó és magyar nemzetről,” 24.

¹³ Sándor Öze, “Bűneiért bünteti Isten a magyar népet.” *Egy bibliai párhuzam vizsgálata a XVI. századi nyomtatott egyházi irodalom alapján* [“God is punishing the Hungarians for their sins”: Analysis of a Biblical parallel on the basis of sixteenth-century printed Church literature] (Budapest: Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum, 1991).

the ways of translating the “providentialist” scheme into the Hungarian context. One of the major points of departure was the question of Antichrist. While the early writings of Luther did not describe the Turks as Antichrist and located the root of evil rather within the Church, Melancthon, Flaccius and Bullinger tended to identify two Antichrists (the Pope and the Turk).¹⁴ While Farkas and some of the early reformers were closer to Luther’s early conception in this respect, others subscribed to the conception of two Antichrists. Of course, this theological divergence had direct political relevance as the Hungarian population came to be trapped between the Habsburg and Ottoman imperial frameworks. In general, even if the Turks could occasionally feature in the role of the Antichrist, the political and geographical complexities catalyzed a more subtle relationship towards them. As the political lines became increasingly blurred, for many authors the Turks lost their previous position of being the “natural enemy” of Hungarians. Furthermore, their politics of religious indifference towards the Christian denominations made it possible for the Protestant preachers to organize flourishing communities under Ottoman dominion. As a result, they occasionally came to be contrasted favorably to the “Catholic intolerance” in the territories under Habsburg rule.

This does not mean, however, that the vision of two Antichrists was entirely set aside. There was an apocalyptic direction potentially involved in this providentialist scheme, and some of the theological writers of the first generation of Protestant preachers, such as András Batizi (ca. 1515—after 1546), experimented with these schemes. In his “World Chronicle,” Batizi used a tripartite structure, presenting an apocalyptic interpretation of world history and also describing the actions of two Antichrists—the “Turkish weapon” and the “false science of the Pope” (i.e., a corporeal and a spiritual Antichrist).¹⁵ While the Turks (originating from the people of Gog and Magog) were thus given an outspokenly apocalyptic function, Batizi’s narrative was not so far from that of Farkas, and he also retained the conception of the Turks

¹⁴ István Botta, “Luther Antikrisztus-fogalmának hatása a magyar reformátorok társadalomszemléletére” [The impact of Luther’s notion of Antichrist on the social theory of the Hungarian Reformers], in Fabiny, *Tanulmányok*, 51–65.

¹⁵ András Batizi, “Meglőtt és megleendő dolgoknak teremtéstül fogva mind az itéletig való história” [History on the things that have happened and that are to happen from the Creation to the Last Judgment], in *Régi Magyar Költők Tára*, XVI. Század (Budapest, 1880), 2:109ff.

as being the “instruments of God’s punishment.”¹⁶ The simultaneous use of these registers was facilitated by the fact that his apocalypticism remained derivative, nor did it lead to the formation of millenarian political radicalism.

The emblematic figure of early Protestantism in Hungary was András Szkhárosi (d. after 1549). He too sought to describe Hungarianness in the light of a specific relationship to God, without, however, developing excessively strong eschatological overtones: “You are a royal nation, even if you are small, yet you are dear to Father God.”¹⁷ Szkhárosi’s writings, especially his treatise in verse, “On Principality” (1540s), are also paradigmatic for the new understanding of the origins and limitations of princely authority in view of the “national” community generated by Protestantism. Szkhárosi in practice avoided tackling the problem of active resistance in terms of “national” privileges, although he sanctioned transgressions on the part of the ruler in the light of the *longue durée* of “national history.” This means that “national discourse” became part of a “prophetic dialogue” calling the nation to repentance—“You, Hungarian nation, have a hard neck, and you are very deaf”¹⁸—rather than addressing the rulers. In this “prophetic” rhetoric, Szkhárosi also instrumentalized the Jewish-Hungarian parallelism: it was divine providence that “brought the Hungarians out of Scythia” and converted them to Christianity, but as they became corrupted, God sent the Turks “as a divine warning.” This scheme also entails the notion that Catholic intolerance, by suppressing the true faith, was one of the principal causes of moral corruption, with the Turkish destruction (and the collapse of Hungarian statehood) as the result. Along these lines, Szkhárosi also devised a providentialist reading of “national” history: “Hungary has fallen into Egyptian captivity,” for “locusts, plague, Turks, alien peoples are ruling us.”¹⁹

In the works of Mihály Sztárai, too, one can find a similar model. Sztárai (d. 1575?) was another key figure of the first generation of Reformation in Hungary, whose shift from Lutheranism to Calvinism symbolized the local dynamics of Protestantism in the mid-century. In

¹⁶ See also Balázs Radán, “Háborúságnak idején való könyörgés” [Supplication in time of war], in *Régi Magyar Költők Tára*, XVI. Század (Budapest, 1886), 5: 3–4., where the Turks are defined as “divine punishment for our fearful sins.”

¹⁷ András Szkhárosi, “Az fejedelemségről” [On Principality], in *Régi Magyar Költők Tára*, XVI. század (Budapest, 1880), 2: 161.

¹⁸ Szkhárosi, “Az fejedelemségről,” 206.

¹⁹ Szkhárosi, “Az fejedelemségről,” 206.

addition, he was the first Hungarian author to make reference to Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*, in an apologetical poem about Archbishop Cranmer. In his actualized translations of the Psalms, he stressed the connection between Catholic intolerance and the expansion of the Ottoman Empire at the expense of Christians. He also fused the political and "national" registers with the Biblical one: in Psalm XII he applies "the heathen walking" to both the Turks and the Habsburgs (Germans). The promise of liberation is also formulated in terms of a Biblical parallelism—like many of his contemporaries Sztárai had recourse to the story of the Maccabees as an example of religious and "national" liberation.²⁰

In this dynamism of bringing together the Wittenberg-style theology of history with the local political discourse, the conception of "two churches" became gradually nationalized and fused with some form of "elect nationhood" rhetoric, contrasting the Protestant-Hungarian "True Church" to the "oppressors" or "aliens." As István Szegedi Kis put it: "On the one hand, around us are the holy virtuous, / On the other hand, the alien nation."²¹ This analysis made genres like the Jeremiads extremely popular: as the anonymous author of "On Manasseh and Nebuchadnezzar" put it, "we can say the same about ourselves that Jeremiah wrote about the Jews."²² The complaint over the religious persecutions of the Protestants was blended with the depiction of the lamentable situation of the Hungarians trapped between the two "alien" Empires. István Szegedi Kis' "Sorrowful song"²³ is a dialogue with God, complaining about the persecutions suffered at the hands of the Tatars:

²⁰ Such as Antal Zombori, Miklós Bornemisza; or Dezsi András, whose interpretation of the Maccabees (1549) set forth a program of moral recovery, promising the "liberation of Hungary by God." See "A Makkabeusról," in *Régi Magyar Költők Tára*, XVI. század (Budapest, 1886), 5:41. See also Pál Ács, "The Names of the Holy Maccabees: Erasmus and the Origin of the Hungarian Protestant Martirology," in Marcell Sebők, ed., *Republic of Letters, Humanism, Humanities: Selected Papers of the Workshop held at the Collegium Budapest in Cooperation with NIAS between November 25 and 28, 1999*, Workshop Series, 15 (Budapest: Collegium Budapest, 2005), 45–62.

²¹ István Szegedi Kis, "Az anyaszentegyháznak siralmas panaszkodása Krisztus előtt; az ő ellenségeinek ellene" [Sorrowful complaint of the Mother Church in front of Christ, against her enemies], in *Régi Magyar Költők Tára*, XVI. század (Budapest, 1896), 6: 4.

²² "Manassesről és Nabugodonozorról" [On Manasseh and Nebuchadnezzar], in *Régi Magyar Költők Tára*, XVI. Század (Budapest, 1896), 6: 85.

²³ István Szegedi Kis, "A magyaroknak siralmas éneke a tatár rablásáról" [The sorrowful song of the Hungarians over the Tatar devastation], in *Régi Magyar Költők Tára*, XVI. század (Budapest, 1896), 6: 8–14. The text paraphrases a thirteen-century Latin memoir of the Mongol invasion.

That merciless nation wants to destroy us
 That's why it started to show its wrath
 It is time for You, God Lord,
 To have mercy on us.²⁴

By in a way stepping out of the passive role of “suffering divine punishments for past sins,” and fusing the earlier discourse of the “Bulwark of Christianity” (or the *Athleta Christi*) with the Protestant denominational narrative, Szegedi was symbolically expanding the Protestant identity construction to the whole country and relegating the source of persecutions entirely to the “aliens.” This meant that the suffering of the Hungarians “as a nation” now has a martyrological character:

Because of You by the heathen we are chased,
 For the Christian faith, your holy Word, persecuted,
 Therefore, True God, your honor
 Do not leave unprotected.”²⁵

This symbolic fusion of the providential and the “national” community made it possible to confer the normativity of the national past on the community of “true believers.” The author of “On Manasseh and Nebuchadnezzar” asks God to “protect the miserable country, and to allow its ancient liberty,”²⁶ while the “Complaint of Hungary” cries out: “Why did you let us become so corrupted and destroyed in our nation? / Why, God, did you leave us so far from Yourself?”²⁷ The text goes on to narrate the calamities of the nation not so much in terms of a historical correspondence between the Jews and the Hungarians, but rather in terms of a dialogical relationship between God and nation (thus transposing the discursive situation of the Psalmist to the national “collectivity”). Significantly, the text is written not in the first person singular (for the Country, in the way the usual “Complaints” tended to personify the nation), but in the first person plural—establishing a link between the national body and the religious community, as they turn to God in prayer: “You took away our country and king, / Threw our crown to the earth, / Cast away our sacrifice.”²⁸

²⁴ Szegedi Kis, *A magyaroknak siralmas éneke a tatár rablásáról*, 11.

²⁵ Szegedi Kis, *A magyaroknak siralmas éneke a tatár rablásáról*, 11.

²⁶ “Manassesről és Nabugodonozorról,” 81.

²⁷ “A magyarország siralma” [Complaint of Hungary], *Régi Magyar Költők Tára*, XVI. század (Budapest: 1896), 6: 87–88.

²⁸ “A magyarország siralma,” 87.

Along similar lines, the Protestant preachers sought to impose this “providentialist” discourse on the military stratum of society fighting in the border zones and evidently not sparing the civil population as they did so. The author of an anonymous poem from 1560 protests to the “military people” [“vitézlő nép”] that they were sent by God to defend his Country” and not “to ruin the poor people, but to spill your blood for them.”²⁹ The permeation of the narrative of “national” history with providentialism influenced as well the more popular registers rooted in “heroic poetry” (called “historical song”—*históriás ének*—in the Hungarian context). Not only did sermons take over references to national history, but by a reverse process the more archaic frameworks of history-telling became saturated with “providentialist” rhetoric.

The religious and historical songs became also generically intertwined: one anonymous author even claimed that “he had talked enough about the Holy Script, now he would like to talk about the ancient Hungarians.”³⁰ Another author, György Vasányi, chose to tell in the same “historical song” genre the story of Xerxes—fusing the discourse of exemplarity typical of this register (“... to take examples from the changes which happened in many countries”) with apocalyptic overtones (alluding to the four monarchies of Daniel) and asserting that “we will not live in our lives longer, because the world is ending now.”³¹

While this blurring of discursive registers and genres made it possible to develop different applications of the “providentialist” narrative, it was precisely this that made it increasingly problematic to keep to a codified framework of correspondences (as projected by Farkas) between the events of Hungarian history and the Old Testament narrative of the divine will made manifest in Jewish history. In consequence, rather than converging into an all-pervasive narrative of “elect nationhood” and conferring legitimacy on a particular set of institutions, the parallel between Hungarian and Jewish history became a hypertrophical

²⁹ Küküllei névtelen, “Historia Abigail Uxoris Nabal etc.,” *Régi Magyar Költők Tára*, XVI. század (Budapest, 1912), 7: 36–46.

³⁰ Nikolsburgi névtelen, “Igen szép história az Kenyér mezején Kenesy Pálnak és Báthory Istvánnak az Törökkel megvívásáru” [A fair story of the fight of Pál Nenesy and István Báthory with the Turks at Kenyérmező], in *Régi Magyar Költők Tára*, XVI. Század, (Budapest, 1930), 8: 36.

³¹ György Vasányi, “Egy szép história Perzsa királyru Xerxes neve” [A most fair story of the Persian king called Xerxes], in *Régi Magyar Költők Tára*, XVI. Század, (Budapest, 1912), 7: 91.

rhetorical *topos* which could be turned to different directions and used for different purposes.

Ultimately, this vision reshaped the narratives of the national past in the light of a Biblical referential system, and thus brought the symbolic spheres of “normative past”, “kingdom”, “community of believers” and “divine providence” together into a structurally open discursive framework which could be used to confer legitimacy on a number of particular political projects. This could also mean the insertion of the Hungarian myth of ethnic origins into the Biblical genealogical narrative, achieving what in other (Western European) cultures was usually performed by humanist historiography, often based on the pseudo-Berosian history by Annius da Viterbo, who successfully conflated the genealogical traditions of the Book of Genesis with classical antiquity.

In the work of András Valkai, for instance, we encounter a genealogical narrative connecting Adam, Noah and Attila,³² depicting the ethnic continuity of Huns and Hungarians in terms of a vision of the alternation of indigenous rulers (flourishing times) and alien kings (times of troubles). This meant the immanentization and tentative “nationalization” of the providentialist scheme. The sin of unfaithfulness to God becomes symbolically fused with unfaithfulness to the ethnic community; while the veneration of alien Gods (idolatry) becomes equated with the veneration of alien kings. Thus the cause of division is identified with the wickedness of lords and their consequent factionalism, while the “original sin” becomes the election of a “German king.” What is more, by making division the root of all evils the “unity with God” envisioned by the providentialist discourse could be metaphorically conflated with “national unity.” This scheme could easily transcend denominational borders, as the concrete case of Valkai shows, and it could be instrumentalized to legitimize the rule of the (as it happened, Catholic) Prince of Transylvania István Báthory, thus converging into the ideology of “national monarchy.” Ultimately, this entailed the fusing of the demand for moral regeneration—familiar from the providentialist narrative—with the demand for loyalty to the ruler, on the assumption that

³² András Valkai, “Az magyar királyoknac eredetéről” [On the origins of Hungarian kings], in *Régi Magyar Költők Tára*, XVI. század (Budapest, 1990), 9: 22. Written in 1567, printed first in 1576.

“if the lords will reform themselves and serve the king, Hungary will be rebuilt.”³³

The most characteristic attempt at fusing elements of the eschatological vision with politics was the treatise, *Két könyv*, by Gáspár Károlyi (ca. 1530–1591). Károlyi studied in Wittenberg (1556) and became a major figure of the Hungarian Reformed (Calvinist) Church, publishing the authoritative Calvinist Bible-translation (1590) which is still in use. His “Two Books” was intended to formulate a “theology of history,” bringing together Protestant political theology with some elements of the humanist vocabulary. The two spheres (apocalyptic and political) meet in the framework of a moral-theological interpretation of historicity: as he puts it, “both induce us to penitence.”³⁴ Consequently, the fusion of humanism and eschatology is expressed in terms of historical causation in interpreting the phenomenon of corruption: “It is greater issue than to be attributed to Fortune or pure chance.”³⁵ The humanist analysis of corruption is embedded in the theological construction: “If a country and nation serves you not, it must be destroyed.” Likewise the humanist counter-position of integrative and disruptive characteristics (wise prince, counsel, unity *versus* discord, contention, ingratitude) is used to reinforce a moral canon based on the *Decalogue*. Stating that “the country has its own set of laws,” Károlyi does not push for the introduction of a Biblical regulation but takes the Mosaic precepts as a set of regulative norms, the abandonment of which results in the destruction of the community. Károlyi also alludes to the humanist discourse of exemplarity in describing his model of a Godly Ruler: “If the kings were godly, like David (...) they led their subjects towards godliness as well.”³⁶ This implies that the alternation of idolatry and expiation is the hidden pattern behind history; thus, Károlyi can describe the Turkish peril in terms of *divine chastisement* for idolatry as well.

The context of this treatise is the debate about the responsibility for the destruction of the “once flourishing” unitary realm. The usual response of the Catholics was that it was precisely the appearance of Protestantism that posed the lethal danger of division. Károlyi had to show that

³³ Valkai, “Az magyar királyoknak eredetéről,” 111.

³⁴ Gáspár Károlyi, “Két könyv” [Two books], in András Szabó, ed., *Károlyi Gáspár a gönci prédikátor* [Gáspár Károlyi, preacher from Gönc] (Budapest: Magvető, 1984), 11.

³⁵ Gáspár Károlyi, “Két könyv,” 15.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 51.

the normativity of the religious community was not in contradiction to patriotic allegiance to the common weal. On the contrary: “The fact that this country has not sunk completely by now is the result of God’s unspeakably vast grace, due to the prayers of the elect.”³⁷

In the end, Károlyi failed to devise a fully-fledged eschatological patriotism on the basis of his comparison of *Canaan* and *Pannonia*. Contrary to the English development, the vision of prescriptive institutional continuity and the apocalyptic construction of electedness did not crystallize into a compact symbolic structure. When turning to the rhetoric of divine election and the imagery of the comparison with Israel, Károlyi applied the notion of “elect nation” to two different types of community. On the one hand, the narrower community of true believers (Protestants) is perceived as the subject of electedness; on the other hand, the realm (Hungary) is held to be the object of providence.

In attempting to devise a project of collective regeneration, Károlyi faced a serious shortcoming: the lack of a *Godly Prince* to lead the community, making corruption even more overwhelming. As religious and civic corruption are strongly intertwined, dissolution is ultimately the result of the collapse of values both secular and spiritual. The persecution of the Protestants means that falsehood is preferred to truth, and thus religious intolerance is ultimately a harm to the entire political community. The world is turned upside down: “The wicked man is said to be good, and the good is declared wicked.”³⁸

All in all, Károlyi’s treatise is a good example of the theoretical conflict between the “normativity of the national past” and the moral theology of a divine election. This notion of chosenness was not easy to extend to the entire Hungarian national community. The question of providential historical continuity posed further difficulties. In fact, Károlyi has to repudiate this option because the appearance of Protestantism and the collapse of the medieval polity historically followed quite closely on one another—handing a perfect weapon to Catholic pamphleteers. Although “there was external peace then, and not the arms of the heathen, nevertheless God had an even harsher punishment than his external scourge. Because this country was in great darkness and idolatry, the Word of God was not preached. Today, though we are unhappy in externals, we

³⁷ Ibid., 69.

³⁸ Ibid., 82.

are indeed happy and peaceful in our souls, because (...) the Word of God is preached freely.”³⁹

It is not by chance that Károlyi turns to Psalm LXXIX (“O God, the heathen are come into Thine inheritance”), so important, too, in Luther’s eschatological interpretation of the Turkish threat, to claim that the past is the world of “our fathers’ sins” and not of exemplary virtue. The conflict of the two layers of election (Hungary-Israel as an exegetical subject, and the “Hungarian Zion” of the Protestant believers) is a discursive trap which ultimately paralyzes all public activity. What remains is a passive reliance on divine providence: “Let us be peaceful and silent, and let us wait our liberation and then our eternal freedom.”

As we have already seen, the failure to fuse the eschatological and the national registers did not mean the separation of national and denominational discourses. As a matter of fact, with the dynamic expansion of Protestantism in Hungary between 1550 and 1590 it became more and more plausible to envision the entire Hungarian nation in terms of a Protestant community. The “nationalization” of Protestant popular and political culture (i.e., identifying the community of “true believers” with the Hungarians) was especially tangible in the territories of the emerging principality of Transylvania. At the same time, the discourse of “elect nationhood” could hardly be used to buttress the notion of Transylvanian statehood as the denominational and political lines were generally blurred. The Habsburgs relied on Lutheran noblemen and city governments in Western Hungary, while the emerging Transylvanian polity, even though dominated by the Protestant nobility, tried to assert itself in terms of multi-confessionalism, making it possible for both a radical Protestant, John Sigismund (1559–1571), and a devout Catholic, István Báthory (1571–1586), to rule the country.

There were, however, other possible directions as well. Some of the radical Protestants, for example Péter Melius, one of the mid-sixteenth century protagonists of Hungarian Calvinism, totally undermined the possible identification of Antichrist and the Turks by symbolically fusing the Turks and the Hungarians in the genealogical fiction of Scythians (referring to the legend of Gog and Magog, who were considered

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 72.

to be related to both, and also played an important role in apocalyptic speculations).⁴⁰

While the original conflict was between those who described the Turks as Antichrist and those who located them in an apocalyptic scheme (thus almost repudiating resistance), in the last decade of the sixteenth century, alongside the eruption of the Fifteen Years' War a new narrative emerged, developing a providentialist notion of "national" community on the basis of an anti-Turk mobilizing narrative. The most important work of political theory along these lines coming from Royal Hungary (i.e. the territory under Habsburg rule) was the treatise "On the Causes of the Many Corruptions in Hungary" (1602) by István Magyari. Magyari (d. 1605) was a Lutheran preacher in the service of Ferenc Nádasdy, one of the major military leaders of the anti-Turkish struggle on the western borders.

Magyari's intellectual sources mirrored the complex ideological context of the time: he used Károlyi, Melanchton, Sleidanus, and most importantly an older work by the Erasmian historian Aventinus (*Ursachen unsern der Christen Jammern*).⁴¹ He was returning to the theme of "*propugnaculum*," in a way reshuffling the stereotypes launched by Enea Silvio Piccolomini, where Hungary is described as a lost earthly paradise. While for the humanist Aventinus it is rather Fortuna who determined the course of history, Magyari conceptualized historical developments in terms of Predestination, trying to make sense of events from a transcendent perspective. He devised a specific version of the providentialist interpretation of Hungarian history in which he sought to combine the Protestant eschatological discourse with a reconsideration of the national past. At the same time, his conception transgressed the limits of moral theology, as he put forward a series of concrete proposals concerning military organization and fundamental political reforms which he deemed necessary to resist the Turkish advance. While his direct reception was limited, this narrative of identity became subse-

⁴⁰ Pál Ács, "Az idő ósága." *Történetiség és történetiszemlélet a régi magyar irodalomban* ["The Antiquity of Time": Historical aspects of old Hungarian literature] (Budapest: Osiris, 2001), 162.

⁴¹ See Imre Bencze, *Magyari István sárvári prédikátor élete és munkái* [The life and work of István Magyari, preacher of Sárvár] (Budapest: Evangélikus Országos Múzeum, 1995); József Túróczi-Trostler, "Az országokban való sok romlásoknak okairól—Forrástanulmány Magyari István könyvéről" [On the causes of the many corruptions in Hungary: A study of the sources of István Magyari's book], *Minerva* IX (Budapest, 1930).

quently an important ideological asset which transcended actual political cleavages and state boundaries. This was obviously facilitated by the traumatic experiences of the Fifteen Years' War, when the inability or reluctance of the Habsburgs to expel the Ottomans became clear.

*The "Second Reformation" and the collective identity discourse of
Péter Alvinczi*

The transformation of religious discourse was rooted in the deeper intellectual shifts of the European spiritual landscape. A formative new ideological development with strong impact on the Hungarian context was the eirenism of David Pareus. Originally, eirenism was not intended as an all-encompassing ecumenism, but aimed rather at an anti-Catholic Protestant solidarity, thematizing *concordia* as the instrument to counter the increasing threat of the Counter-Reformation. Its impact is also visible in Albert Szenci Molnár's (1574–1634) "Preface" to his *Lexicon*, where he lists the followers of Pareus in Hungary. The importance of this group became obvious in the 1610s, when they came to influence Prince Gábor Bethlen's cultural policies. This coincided with a definitive shift in orientation from Wittenberg to Heidelberg, which emerged as the preferred goal of academic *peregrinatio* after 1614.⁴²

Together with János Keserői Dajka (1580–1633), Bethlen's principal advisor on educational issues, Péter Alvinczi (ca. 1570–1634) was the most important catalyst of this intellectual re-orientation. Educated in Nagyvárad (Gross-Wardein, present-day Oradea, Romania), Wittenberg and Heidelberg, he became in 1605 the preacher of the Hungarian parish of Kassa (Košice). Alvinczi first surfaced as a personality of political importance as Bocskai's preacher during his campaign in 1605 against the Habsburg forces. He also contributed to the wording of the prince's Political Testament. Having returned to Kassa and having temporarily withdrawn from national politics, he became active again under Gábor Bethlen, advising him on educational issues from 1615 onwards.

⁴² For the intellectual context of Alvinczi, see János Heltai's excellent monograph, *Alvinczi Péter és a heidelbergi peregrinusok* [Péter Alvinczi and the peregrination to Heidelberg] (Budapest: Balassi, 1994).

The new cultural project elaborated by Alvinczi and Keserői Dajka in the 1610s aimed at a close cooperation with the centers of European Calvinism, which fitted well into Bethlen's broader political aspirations. Especially during his campaign at the beginning of the 'Thirty Years' War (1619–23), Bethlen sought to bring together national and international agendas: to assist the international Protestant coalition through attacking the Habsburg forces and to unify Transylvania and Royal Hungary under his elective kingship. During this campaign, Kassa became a strategic focus for Bethlen's military and political actions, and Alvinczi assumed the role of chief propagandist of the prince, editing and authoring a number of manifestos and pamphlets in which he sought to legitimize Bethlen's offensive by employing the language of lawful self-defense.

The most important feature of these texts was that they formulated the *gravamina* of the estates in a broader theoretical context, describing the clash of Protestant and Catholic confessions in terms of the harm done to constitutional privileges. The most famous product of the pamphlet-war was the *Querela Hungariae*, which, though traditionally attributed to Alvinczi, is now considered to be a product of collective authorship. The text adopted a somewhat apocalyptic tone in describing the struggle between the two sides, and its rhetoric was employed on behalf of the predominantly Protestant Hungarian estates, fusing the "corporate," religious and national registers. Directed to an international audience, it sought to justify the turning of the estates against their ruler while at the same time asserting that the principal enemy of the nation was not the king and not even the Turk, but the Catholic clergy who inspired the oppressive policies.

The word *nation* in the pamphlet is markedly polysemic. The text speaks of the "human nation" ("emberi nemzetség") as well as the "alien nation" (referring to the Turks), but this terminological hesitation covers a rather determined political project. Its starting-point resembles that of Károlyi in that it seeks to present the ordeals of the Protestant community in terms of "national" grievances. It relies on the same imagery of the "world turned upside down" ("the wicked fare here well, the good badly"), transmitting the message that disregard of religious law harms the entire civil community. In turning its sights against the Catholic priests it uses the same secular rhetoric and refers to the "citizens of this country" (including the Transylvanian Principality) as the normative focus of loyalty. Speaking "in the name of Hungary" and retaining even the symbol of "the Bastion of Christendom" as a source of pride, it transgresses the framework of

the Protestant noblemen's appeal for "Hungarian" civil liberties. This discursive strategy, which was obviously in line with the broader political platform of the Protestant nobility of the country (and throughout Europe), was an attempt to redescribe the harms suffered by the religious community in terms of a violation of constitutional liberties, by which the sympathy of the non-Protestant nobility might be attracted as well.

The purport of this argument is more general: the Catholic priests' activity (especially their persecution) not only violates constitutional liberties, it endangers the social framework of the realm as a whole (promises and oaths are broken; the law is disregarded; the "will of the country" is hurt). This means that in terms of the pamphlet's rhetoric Catholicism as a whole is anti-national, as it seeks to destroy the realm "in order finally to destroy Christ's *Ecclesia*."⁴³ It states that according to the pro-Habsburg Catholics "it is better to have Hungary a desert inhabited by wild animals and beasts than to have the true service of God allowed." Thus, the pamphlet fuses the generic image of "aliens" with that of the Catholics who "aim to make a province from Hungary."⁴⁴ In face of this "foreign" threat from within, it is the Transylvanian state—considered to be "outside" by many of the politicians of Royal Hungary—that is truly Hungarian ("they are our relatives by blood").

Another pamphlet, entitled *Defensio querelarum Hungaricarum* and reiterating the *Querela*'s claims in a slightly modified register, is more likely to be the individual work of Alvinczi.⁴⁵ It was clearly written as a reaction to the allegations of pro-Habsburg Catholic pamphleteers, in particular Péter Pázmány. The author's central aim was to assert the estates' right of resistance if the ruler failed to serve the common good. The *Defensio* targeted mainly the Jesuits, whom Alvinczi accused of sanctioning the breach of contracts (on the basis that promises made to heretics are not binding).

The pamphlet defends the author(s) of the *Querela*, once again in a patriotic register—declaring that "they were born as true, lawful and

⁴³ "Magyarország panasza" [The complaint of Hungary], in Márton Tarnóc, ed., *Magyar gondolkodók. 17. század* [Hungarian thinkers: the 17th century] (Budapest: Szépirodalmi, 1979), 179.

⁴⁴ Alvinczi, "Magyarország panasza," 182.

⁴⁵ Péter Alvinczi, "A nemes Magyarország panaszainak megoltalmazása" [The defense of the complaints of noble Hungary] in *Magyarország panaszainak megoltalmazása és válogatás prédikációiból, leveleiből* [The defense of the complaints of noble Hungary and a selection of his sermons and letters] (Budapest: Európa, 1989).

in no way Hispanicized sons of Hungary, in liberty and nobility”—and attacks those who “intend to make Hungary subject as a province.”⁴⁶ By evoking these references, Alvinczi was operating with the noblemen’s “discourse of privilege” as the basis of his argument. As János Heltai pointed out, this line of argument fitted into the broader strategy of the estates in Royal Hungary, which had a dual target: to strengthen their privileges against the king, and to seek to control the central offices.⁴⁷

Due to the specific political context, however, Alvinczi had to refer to other modalities of collective identity as well. As he was supporting the policies of Bethlen, he had to incorporate the Transylvanian polity symbolically into the Hungarian framework. He once again reiterated the interconnectedness of the fortunes of Hungary and Transylvania—if Transylvania is destroyed, Hungary cannot maintain itself against the tyrannical government of the “Germans.” In turn, if Hungary is downtrodden, Transylvania will become easy prey to the Turks.

Alvinczi hailed Bethlen for his military involvement in the European conflict: “Not only turning away evil from himself, but knowing well the old and current harms, he took up arms also against the proud and avaricious enemies of Christians.”⁴⁸ He has restored “the liberties and rights ignominiously downtrodden by the priests,” intervening in Hungary on the basis of “neighborhood, brotherhood, friendship, religion and common danger.” In keeping with this he reiterated the Hungarianness of Bethlen: “We take refuge with a prince who stems from the noble stock of the Hungarians, who diligently loves the common truth.”⁴⁹

Alvinczi’s instrumentalization of the “patriotic” discourse did not imply an all-pervasive presence of national references: in fact, there are clear limits of the use of “national” markers. On the one hand, he was trying to avoid the accusation of being “xenophobic.” In keeping with this, the scope of his symbolic alliances was international—after all, the conflict Bethlen had entered upon was, at least in the first phase, marked by clear-cut denominational dividing-lines. It is not surprising, then, that he felt it important to stress that the noblemen of royal Hungary “were not driven by inborn hatred towards the illustrious

⁴⁶ Alvinczi, *Magyarország panaszainak megoltalmazása*, 25.

⁴⁷ Heltai, *Alvinczi Péter és a heidelbergi peregrinusok*, 131ff.

⁴⁸ Alvinczi, *Magyarország panaszainak megoltalmazása*, 39–40.

⁴⁹ Alvinczi, *Magyarország panaszainak megoltalmazása*, 40.

German nation,” pointing out that Bohemia, Moravia (“Hungary’s allies, old companions and brothers”) and Pfalz were all close confederates. The reference to Bohemia indicates that in this conceptualization “the German nation” was understood exclusively in terms of *Das Heilige Römische Reich Deutscher Nation*, and not in ethnic terms. On the other hand, in describing, at least metaphorically, the Spanish and in general the papists (again along a denominational line) as being characterized by “Scythian wildness” he was turning the usual *topos* of Hungarian self-description (and occasionally of the description of the Turks) against his denominational opponents.

On a different level, the intertwining of the different registers of collective identity makes “The apology of Gábor Bethlen” (1627), co-authored by Alvinczi, also extremely ambiguous. While the mobilizational discourse at the outbreak of the war was an attempt to fuse the denominational, estate-based and ethno-cultural registers, in this later text which seeks to legitimize Bethlen’s separate peace with the Habsburgs the fusion of the perspectives of the “nation,” the ruler and the religion became even more problematic.

The pamphlet is full of resentment toward the Hungarian estates who failed to support wholeheartedly Bethlen’s campaign and used him to blackmail the Viennese court for more advantageous arrangements, without, however, being determined to break with the Habsburgs. The *Apology* contrasts “our liberty and religion” to “their (i.e. the Hungarians) inconstancy” in not giving any support for Bethlen’s fight. The focus of discourse thus becomes Transylvania in contrast to the nobility of Royal Hungary: “As they had neither willingness nor strength, I was afraid that I will bring to ultimate danger both myself and my tiny principality with all its estates.”⁵⁰

The hitherto clear-cut division of “alien” and “Hungarian” thus becomes totally blurred. Alvinczi seeks to defend Bethlen from the accusation that by supporting the Bohemian estates he subordinated the “national interest” to that of foreigners on the pretext of Protestant denominational solidarity. “If God did not ally us with alien nations from his limitless mercifulness (...) now Hungary would be even more miserable than Bohemia (...), and we would be wandering around like Jews and Gypsies.”⁵¹ The international alliance was the

⁵⁰ Alvinczi, *Magyarország panaszainak megoltalmazása*, 191.

⁵¹ Alvinczi, *Magyarország panaszainak megoltalmazása*, 198.

only way to prevent the Habsburgs and other enemies from “extirpating our nation.” At the same time, the *Apology* also criticizes the character of the Hungarian nation and makes an emphatic distinction between the Hungarians (the nation) and the Transylvanians (the fatherland): “As I knew and experienced our nation’s nature and customs, I did not want to assist to the danger of my fatherland with the harm of my conscience.”⁵² This also involves another facet of the interplay of religious and patriotic identity—an assertion that patriotism was a spiritual duty (“my conscience”) and not a matter of solidarity with co-nationals. This narrative opened a way to formulate a register where Hungarians (“magyarok”) and the Hungarian nation (magyar nemzet) become colored by the motive of “otherness.” Bethlen’s bitterly ironic exclamation, “I thank the Hungarian nation for all this!”⁵³ already in its grammatical shift from “us” to “it” establishes, if not an unbridgeable dividing-line, definitely a recognizable cleavage.

In appealing to “elect rulership” Alvinczi got close to the apologetic literature of the 1610s regarding Bethlen. Immediately after Bethlen’s accession to power the main line of legitimation was the contrast between his “suitability” and the unsuitability of his predecessor, Gábor Báthory. This line of argument became gradually superseded by a discourse of divine election (in the writings of Gáspár Bojti Veres and János Keserői Dajka), and this narrative reached its climax in the late 1610s with the writings of János T. Redmeczi, Mihály Forró Háportoni and István Milotai Nyilas. We also find this discourse in Albert Szenci Molnár’s preface to his translation of Calvin’s *Institutio*, or in the parallel drawn between King David and Bethlen (and occasionally even between Alexander the Great and Bethlen) by János Mikola. The ideal type of the genre was Psalm CI, describing the godly character of David’s rule. In the propaganda around Bethlen’s campaigns in the early 1620s, this discourse came to play a crucial role.

Transferring the Calvinist conception of “pneumatic-charismatic” rulership into the Hungarian context, Bethlen’s propagandists strove to support a “patriarchal national absolutism,” with a providentially chosen ruler, in accordance with an aristocratico-monarchic model, governing in favor of the subjects.⁵⁴ The references to Providence were

⁵² Alvinczi, *Magyarország panaszainak megoltalmazása*, 199.

⁵³ Alvinczi, *Magyarország panaszainak megoltalmazása*, 202.

⁵⁴ Heltai, *Alvinczi Péter és a heidelbergi peregrinusok*, 158ff.

often used to legitimize the prince's unusual political moves. According to the "Political Testament" of Bethlen (1629), "experience showed" that a friendly disposition towards the Habsburgs was destructive to the liberties and the religion of the Hungarian nation, while the same towards the Turks—"miraculously"—proved to be conducive to the preservation of both.⁵⁵ This point is linked with advice, of a *politique* inspiration, against quarrels over religion. Finally, it is implied that seeking the protection of the Turks was merely exploiting an *occaseo* presented by Providence, and thus was compatible with loyalty to Christendom.

Péter Pázmány: Counter-Reformation and "elect nationhood"

The greatest figure of the Hungarian Counter-Reformation, Péter Pázmány (1570–1637), Archbishop of Esztergom from 1616, also relied on the "national discourse" to legitimize his position. The power and the expansion of this rhetoric can be clearly seen from the fact that Pázmány, just as much as Alvinczi, felt it necessary to repudiate the charges of being somehow "anti-national," and both of them sought to devise a discourse by which they could identify themselves with the "true national cause." Pázmány himself came from a Protestant family but converted to Catholicism, entered the Jesuit order and, after having studied in Kolozsvár (*Ger.* Klausenburg, *Rom.* Cluj), Cracow and Vienna, traveled to Rome and became a disciple of Bellarmino. He emerged in the course of the first two decades of the seventeenth century as the most important Catholic apologete in Hungary. He introduced a new style of debating and appropriated many of the intellectual weapons used previously only by Protestant preachers. He never failed to underline his loyalty to his nation when corresponding with the magistrates of Royal Hungary or with the Transylvanian Prince, inserting in these letters sentences like, "I love and I pray for the honor and peace of my country, my nation."⁵⁶ When he corresponded with Bethlen, he appealed to their "common nation" in seeking to dissuade him from invading the

⁵⁵ Gábor Bethlen, "Végrendelete" [Testament], in Márton Tarnóc, ed., *Magyar gondolkodók*, 108.

⁵⁶ Péter Pázmány, *Válogatás műveiből* [Selection from his works], 3 vols (Budapest: Szent István Társulat, 1983), I: 377.

territories of Royal Hungary and appealed for peace, “having seen the horrible destruction of our poor country and nation.”

But Pázmány had a distinct manner of referring to Royal Hungary. He located the focus of the nation on his side rather than in the Principality, describing it as the “poor remnant from our country,” which entailed an implicit claim that Transylvania is a Turkish territory. He was thus repudiating Bethlen’s propaganda that his state was the last bastion of Hungarian liberty and the only natural focus of allegiance for the Hungarian nation. Along these lines, Pázmány also turned frequently in his preaching to the question of the “corruption” of Hungary, developing his own moral theology which was sometimes strikingly parallel with the Protestant discourse in form but which drew diametrically opposed political conclusions.

When the two moral theologies (the Protestant and Pázmány’s) met, it is quite natural that the framework of the debate turned out to be the “national discourse.” Pázmány’s early work (“Answer,” 1603), replying to István Magyari, illustrates this perfectly.⁵⁷ While Magyari had combined Protestant eschatological discourse with an interpretation of Hungarian history, Pázmány retained the inherent “providentialist” framework of Magyari’s discourse in terms of its self-critical modality (“it is obvious for those who have eyes that our nation is under the vengeful and angry whip of God”)⁵⁸ without accepting the corollary of Magyari’s argument “that they [the Protestants] are the only ones who still uphold the country.”

Pázmány rejected the claim that the true Church is the one being persecuted, and introduced a distinction between two kinds of chastisement inflicted by God—“as sons” and “as evil servants” (claiming that the instrument of this second are the alien “nations”). Referring to the devastation of the Transylvanian civil war, he claimed that while the Hungarian nation in general could hope for correction at the hands of a merciful God, the Protestant hotbed of Transylvania had become the object of God’s destructive wrath: “the rich, full, abundant, glorious, and famous country has become like a shadow, almost completely lost.”⁵⁹

⁵⁷ Péter Pázmány, *Felelet az Magiari Istvan sarvari praedicatornak, az orzag romlasi okairul, irt koeniure* [Answer to István Magyari, preacher of Sárvár, concerning his book on the causes of the corruption of the country], ed. Emil Hargittay (Budapest: Universitas, 2000) (original edition: Nagyszombat, 1603).

⁵⁸ Pázmány, *Felelet*, 238.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 239.

Thus, rather than rejecting it, Pázmány ultimately turned the Protestant discourse of Hungarian-Jewish parallelism upside down. To this end he evoked Josephus Flavius and used the Jewish parallel as a warning to the nation: as the Jews were punished for their religious waywardness with the destruction of Jerusalem, so the Hungarians, if they follow the Protestant-Transylvanian option, are also facing their ultimate ruin.

As was the case with most of the “providentialist” schemes, the focus of his argument relied on an interpretation of the normative past of the nation that contrasted with the deplorable present. The cause of destruction is obviously moral: “spiritual error” is at the root of corruption. To prove his charge that this crisis is closely connected to the appearance of Protestantism, he gives a partisan interpretation of the medieval past: “Our nation was such a perfect, simple, pious nation before that it was impossible to find a comparable one anywhere around.”⁶⁰

The country was thus ruined by the Protestants: “You are the greater causes, with your patchwork religion stitched together from cursed heresies.” Protestantism is inherently evil, as it “gives liberty to all evil” in society. In attempting to suppress this evil, Pázmány defended the claim that the “Church can rely on the princes to suppress heresy,” asserting that the “Christian princes” are usually much less violent than “the sword sharpened by the new Gospel” of Protestantism. At the same time he also sought to counter the theological-political implications of the Protestant attack on the mediation between God and the nation in the form of the cult of saints by reiterating the basic features of the Counter-Reformation popular patriotic culture. He asserted that the “souls of dead saints do know and understand our needs” and that the Virgin Mary had a specific relationship to the Hungarians as the *Patrona Hungariae*—whom “even the Lutherans venerate.” In his polemic he also reiterated the motif of the *antemurale*, accusing the Protestants of undermining the very essence of Hungarian identity—“your belief supports the bulwark of this corrupt Hungary as much as gunshots at it do.”⁶¹

Pázmány had also engaged in a series of polemics with Alvinczi (e.g., “Five Fair Letters,” 1609), and this conflict was revived as a result of the outbreak of the Thirty Years’ War. In his answer to Alvinczi’s

⁶⁰ Ibid., 239.

⁶¹ Ibid., 240.

pamphlets entitled *Falsae origines motuum Hungarorum*, he focused on the issue of the obedience of subjects, identifying the Habsburg ruler as the only legitimate sovereign and thus defining Bethlen as a *de jure* rebel. Nevertheless, while he attacked the policies of the Hungarian Protestants and blamed the Transylvanians for posing a mortal threat to the nation, he kept to an all-Hungarian position and, especially in his later years, grew increasingly suspicious of the Viennese court. He kept a personal connection with the Transylvanian Prince, George Rákóczi I, and even if his alleged outburst about the Germans—telling the Transylvanian envoy that the Hungarians in Royal Hungary are safe only while Transylvania remains strong, otherwise the “Germans will spit under our collars”—is just an anecdote, *se non è vero, è ben trovato*, and illustrates his complex stance towards the problem of national, religious and political cleavages.⁶²

We can thus see two partially overlapping modalities of the providentialist narrative of identity in the early-seventeenth century context. The Protestants were forced to apply a more dynamic scheme to Hungarian history, asserting that corruption was, at least potentially, always present and that the history of the nation was marked by the alternation of sinfulness and truthfulness until the Reformation finally restored at least part of the nation in its true faith, bringing the promise of “national” salvation. In contrast, Pázmány’s construction could capitalize on the cultural memory of medieval glory, claiming that the Reformation itself had sown the seeds of discord and constructing a symbolism of the relationship of the national to the transcendental sphere through the mediation of holy persons, objects and places. This option was to become the Hungarian version of “Baroque patriotism,” comparable to the mid-seventeenth century Bavarian or Czech versions. In contrast to these cases, however, the ambiguities of the Hungarian political framework caused additional twists in the national discourse. The Catholic camp in the first quarter of the seventeenth century tended to describe Royal Hungary as the “last bastion of Hungarianness.” On the one hand, this entailed a transfer of political loyalties to this entity; on the other hand, the very normativity of Hungarianness opened up the possibility of intertwining identifications. This meant that even though the Catho-

⁶² Ágnes R. Várkonyi, “Erdély és a törökkérdés Pázmány politikájában” [Transylvania and the Turkish question in the politics of Pázmány], in *Europica varietas—Hungarica varietas* (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1994), 37–61.

lics sought to legitimize Habsburg rule, their conceptualization of collective identity, like that of the Protestants, transgressed the political borders, and by seeking to command the solidarity of all Hungarians wherever they were living, they contributed to maintaining the symbolic framework and normative memory of the “Hungarian nation.”

*Protestant radicalism and the challenge to the corporate
concept of nation*

The 1630s saw the arrival of political ideas of Puritan inspiration into Transylvania, where traditions of religious dissent, dogmatic divergences and the rarity of persecution still amounted to a generally tolerant atmosphere, even though the anti-Trinitarians were gradually pushed to the political periphery. After the flourishing of the 1610s, the intellectual climate of Hungarian Calvinism shifted once again in the mid-1620s. Pfalz, the earlier focus of Transylvanian cultural orientation, being occupied by Imperial troops, peregrination turned towards Dutch (Leiden, Franeker, Hardewijk, Groningen) and English (Oxford, Cambridge) universities.⁶³ While the former attracted considerably more students, for a short time the students of the latter gained special importance. The famous “covenant” of students in London (1638), having vowed to introduce into their country Presbyterian principles, posed a serious threat to the official Calvinist hierarchy of the Partium and Transylvania.

The first generation of foreign scholars, such as Alsted and Bisterfeld, invited to Transylvania from Herborn, were radical Calvinists. Their impact was also supplemented by the short but influential presence of J. A. Comenius (1592–1670) in Sárospatak (1650–1654), the famous Calvinist college under the patronage of the Rákóczi family. Adapting his philosophical ideas to the local context, Comenius sought to turn pansophism into a practical-institutional program of national

⁶³ According to Miklós Szabó, the number of Transylvanian students studying abroad was the following: 1520s—166; 1590s—135; 1650s—418; 1670s—200. Miklós Szabó, “Erdélyi diákok külföldi egyetemjárása a XVI-XVII. században” [Transylvanian students studying abroad in the 16th-17th centuries], in Elek Csetri, Zsigmond Jakó, Gábor Sipos and Sándor Tonk, eds., *Művelődéstörténeti tanulmányok* [Studies in cultural history] (Bucharest: Kriterion, 1980), 152–68.

education, as witnessed by his treatise *Gentis Felicitas*, which proposed a thorough spiritual and structural reform.⁶⁴

Gentis Felicitas (1654) was dedicated to Prince György Rákóczi II (1648–1660). It was composed in the form of a letter written after Comenius left Hungary as a final admonition to the Transylvanian court on political and cultural issues. The text is extremely interesting due to its peculiar thematization of the concept of “nation” which cuts across the dividing lines of estate-based *versus* ethno-cultural, as well as secular *versus* ecclesiastical collective identity discourses. In the introductory passage, Comenius defines the “nation” as a community of people “stemming from the same root, living in the same place of the world (as if in a common house, which is called fatherland), speaking the same language, and bound by the bonds of mutual love, concord and desire for the common good.”⁶⁵ The specificity of nations is their normative self-centeredness (“nations love themselves”), but this fits into a broader scheme of harmony, as through their “mutual competition they encourage each other to success.” National self-preservation and “the human condition” are thus intricately related: “a people that fails to cultivate itself has lost its human nature.” This naturalist imagery fits into a higher harmony of spiritual values: the ultimate aim of nations is to reach the divinity. “The nation realizing the magnificence of human nature” is “seeking to mount the highest level of blessed glory.”

In Comenius’ theory the state of blessedness is not merely the contemplation of divinity, but acquires quite concrete political-institutional features which were very much in line with the contemporary reason of state and mercantilist doctrines. He mentions eighteen markers of *felicitas*—such as the land being densely populated; having good soil; not being mixed with foreigners; having peaceful manners; being capable of self-defense; living in peace at home; governed by good laws and good magistrates; having indigenous magistrates who do not seek to subjugate their own kin; whose citizens fulfil their duties; economically flourishing; marked by plenty, power and security; cultivating education; having a “pure and intimate cult of God”; enjoying God’s special favor; and becoming objects of veneration in the eyes of other peoples.

⁶⁴ Johannes Amos Comenius, “Gentis felicitas,” in *Dílo Jana Amose Komenského* [Collected works of J. A. Comenius], (Prague: Academia, 1974), 13: 37–60.

⁶⁵ Comenius, “Gentis felicitas,” 39.

Comenius supports this with examples drawn from the Biblical context, and thus alludes to the motive of *elect nationhood*, i.e., God's providential relationship to his people; but, at the same time, he subverts this perspective, negating the uniqueness of this referential system, and asserting that he can as well illustrate his claim "with the example of greater and happier nations" than the Old Testament Jews. The history of Israel thus becomes an instance of a more encompassing theory of historical change, inspired by the humanist vision of Fortuna: the destiny of every nation is exposed to change, "once rising, then collapsing."

When he turns to the Hungarian nation, he warns his audience that, contrary to the self-stereotypes and the mainstream conceptualization of nationhood (as the community of the privileged), the Hungarians are not at all a "great people," as part of their lands, "if not the greater part, is inhabited by Germans, Slovaks, Ruthenians, Romanians and Turks." Their natural conditions are excellent, but the actual output is very modest: "they have good soil, but still suffer famines." Together with the "ethnic" diversity, Comenius does not fail to register the linguistic multiplicity of the country, which he considers a serious hindrance to communication—"these languages are separated from each other by a whole world," leaving Latin, a dead language, in the role of a mediating language. In sum, "the mixture of nations, languages, manners causes a certain barbarism, or reminds of it, and clearly hinders the common happiness."⁶⁶

The core of Comenius' rhetoric was to instrumentalize the local self-descriptive narratives (being locked "between two enemies," the legitimacy of the Prince was rooted in divine providence; the aspiration to national regeneration radiating from Transylvania), but to subvert their meaning and turn them to the service of a discourse of "regeneration", that is, to plead for educational, economic and administrative reforms. This can be most clearly seen from the way he uses the traditional geo-political self-positioning of the Hungarian "national discourse." On the surface, he subscribed to the local narrative of being trapped between the two world Empires (German and Ottoman), but rather than operating with inflexible counter-concepts he also gave it a more context-sensitive interpretation. The "Germans were defending them for some time, but became their oppressors", so the

⁶⁶ Ibid., 43.

Hungarians became marginalized and “were forced to ally themselves with the Turks.”⁶⁷ This geo-political predicament is also responsible for the fact that the Hungarians permanently “lack internal peace” and live in eternal discord, which means the “abandonment of the common good, and envy and hatred everywhere.”

The main reason, however, is not to be found in external oppression, but rather in the anachronistic legal system and the lack of social and institutional integration: the Hungarians have “no such laws that would fit everybody,” and have a legal system which serves the “heavy subordination of the uncultivated population.”⁶⁸ What is more, even the privileged “do not live according to their laws, but are directed by their customs.” The lack of reasonable legal norms leads to the dissolution of social bonds and the inhabitants’ inability to exploit their available resources: “they rarely learn any art,” they lack economic efficiency, the security of possessions, the ability to exploit natural resources, primary schools, and on the whole their religious feelings are shallow.

The way to recovery should start from the existing frameworks that could trigger the expansion of socially useful knowledge, but its ultimate aim is the total reconfiguration of the political and social structure based on the combination of reason of state and spiritual regeneration. The envisioned reforms should promote the numerical growth of the population, limit the feudal burdens, stimulate the development of agricultural technology and eliminate idleness by education, which would also converge with the program of “completing the Reformation.” The aim of this national reform is “to make the whole country like the republic of ants,” with flourishing industry, schooling and commerce.⁶⁹ Even national and linguistic plurality is tolerable, “if there is peace among the communities,” education, concord, and finally, “a national ruler.”

It is this last crucial condition that introduced the providentialist element into Comenius’ theory. The focus of national recovery is a divinely chosen “autochthonous” ruler such as “only God can raise.” He warned of easy deceptions: care must be taken to ensure that the one who seems to be “chosen” is really capable of implementing the required reforms. In this vision of regeneration Comenius fused a series of registers into a coherent unity: the discourse of providential rulership, the “transcend-

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 43.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 44.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 51.

dental” rationalism of his philosophical doctrine connecting knowledge and salvation, the program of a Second or Complete Reformation propagated by the Puritans, the language of “national” recovery prevalent in the context of Hungarian politics in the mid-seventeenth century, some elements of the humanist analysis of politics (such as the description of corruption and discord and of a “normative past”), and the emerging socio-economic thought of Cameralism. This convergence of secular and religious registers is apparent in his thematization of the “*occasio*” of national recovery. He asserts that the actual political conditions of Transylvania—its relative power, Protestant culture and “national dynasty” (of the Rákóczi)—offer the possibility of a “heroic re-foundation” of Hungary which would then restart the circle of history. “Here is the occasion which is without parallel for so many centuries. If you let this out of your hand, when can you expect another?” The implementation of the reforms thus means “fulfilling God’s commands.” Enumerating the various registers of solidarity, Comenius once again fuses the providential and the humanist-prudential understanding of community. The eschatological rhetoric merges with the patriotic thematization of *occasio*, which in turn implies responsibility for the future of the nation: if we do not obey, we abandon “ourselves, our fatherland, the Church and all our progeny.”⁷⁰

Eventually, his plea for reform can only be understood in an apocalyptic framework: “the destiny of the Hungarian nation is laboring now.” And rather than being a phenomenon locked into the national framework, it has universal significance: the destruction of the whore of Babylon “will give rebirth to the true Christianity embracing all the peoples of the world.” Alluding to the history of the Maccabees, Comenius reiterates the references to divine providence, national monarchy and national liberation formative of Transylvanian political culture: “It is necessary that this redeemer should be expected from that nation, the rise of which we are concerned with.”⁷¹ The figure of the “man blessed with heroic spirit, a leader chosen by God” becomes actualized in the young prince of Transylvania, György Rákóczi II. “Who could he be, if not you, György Rákóczi, magnificent Prince of Transylvania? You alone, you yourself, and finally you! You are the last hope of your

⁷⁰ Ibid., 56.

⁷¹ Ibid., 57.

followers!”⁷² This mobilizational rhetoric ultimately turns into a full-scale evocation of “elect nationhood”: “See, your Jewish people, your whole nation is shaking from the Turks, oppressed by the Jebusites [the reference to the Canaanite tribe is a pun frequently made on the name of the Jesuits] and the neighbors oppressed by the yoke of Antichrist are also crying out to God for a liberator.”⁷³

Late seventeenth-century modalities: “Hungarian Israel” and/or Transylvania as an “elect nation”?

The providentialist narrative of identity was a pivotal modality of self-narration for those Protestant preachers and communities who became victims of Counter-Reformation persecutions in the 1670–90s and were often forced to leave their dwelling in Eastern Hungary in search of a more secure settlement. A good example of this rhetorical modality can be found in the sermons of Mihály Szöllősi, addressing “the exiled wandering Hungarians.”⁷⁴ Szöllősi sought to make sense of the disasters happening to his flock by appealing to divine providence—integrating the recent events into the continuity of “national” history and inserting the “national” narrative into the general framework of the story of salvation. By doing so, he once again reiterated the core *topoi* of Hungarian identity prevalent in the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries. He turned to God with his plea, “reminding” Him of the intertwining of the national past and the Biblical pattern: “You called out our ancestors from Scythia”, turning them into the “bulwark of Christianity” and the “prince of provinces.” But “we turned away from you in our good fortune and started to hate you”, committing sins “under the veil of liberty”; as a result, “aliens came to your heredity...and they chased us out of our sweet fatherland.”⁷⁵ The allusion to Hungary as God’s heredity was clearly a Protestant “over-writing” of the Catholic narrative of *Patrona Hungariae*, which described the kingdom as being under the special

⁷² Ibid., 58.

⁷³ Ibid., 58.

⁷⁴ Mihály Szöllősi, *Az Úrért s hazájokért elszéledett és számkivetett bujdosó magyarok füstölgő csepűje* [The smoking flax of the Hungarians scattered and exiled for the Lord and their fatherland] (Budapest: A Reformáció és Ellenreformáció Korának evangéliumi keresztyén egyházi írói III., 1940). Originally published in Kolozsvár, 1676. On this modality see also Zsombor Tóth’s article in this volume.

⁷⁵ Szöllősi, *Az Úrért s hazájokért elszéledett és számkivetett bujdosó magyarok*, 12–13.

protection of the Virgin Mary and which reappeared as the central narrative of Counter-Reformation propaganda. Furthermore, this formulation had certain “theocratic” overtones as well, implicitly defining the preachers as the only legitimate mediators between the ultimate source of authority and the people.

This narrative becomes saturated with the rhetoric of divine election: “We are your people and heredity...whom you brought out from the spiritual Egypt and chose as a shining army for yourself.” The symbolism of “Hungarian Israel” permeates the counter-positions of Hungarians and “aliens,” making this distinction the crucial normative modality of historical and actual “national existence.” The principal suffering of the Hungarians is that “we have to serve aliens,” the “persecution of our lords,” “our goods given to our enemies,” “aliens, who are living among us, are encouraged against us,” “our strong castles and cities are given into the possession of the German nation.”⁷⁶ This discourse of chosenness is, however, rather complex, as the assertion of God’s special relationship to the Hungarians (“your Hungarian people”) does not exclude that ultimately every nation might have its own community of true believers who are equally favored by God. Nevertheless, with this symbolism the Protestant community becomes metonymically identified with Hungarianness: the “Hungarian Zion is weeping for its sons and daughters,” “the glory is taken from the Hungarian Israel,” “the daughter of Hungarian Zion is being ravaged.” In a sequence, Szöllösi comes close to nationalizing God when he asks, “Where is the God of Hungarian Christianity?”⁷⁷

By linking the national and denominational narratives, Szöllösi was closer to the mid-sixteenth century type of Protestant writers than to the mainstream discourses of the seventeenth century, which either transferred the modality of divine election to a “godly prince,” or used the providentialist narrative in relation to the post-humanist languages of politics (such as “interest theories”, the analysis of political action in terms of *occasio/congiuntura*, and “national education”). In Szöllösi’s case, the political-institutional and personal aspects of the mobilizational narrative are superseded by the eschatological references. “We do not have anyone to predict the end of our exile, and we do not have a strong prince to

⁷⁶ Szöllösi, *Az Úrért s hazájokért elszéledett és számkivetett bujdosó magyarok*, 16–17.

⁷⁷ Szöllösi, *Az Úrért s hazájokért elszéledett és számkivetett bujdosó magyarok*, 18. The noun “Christianity” (*keresztyénség*) is ambiguous in this connotation, but most probably it implies “the community of Christians.”

bring the exiles home”;⁷⁸ the apocalyptic fight is between the “camp of Antichrist” and the “Hungarian Ecclesia.”⁷⁹ In this sense, Hungarianness is not a mediating narrative between the different denominational and social groups, but becomes identified with the closed community of true believers and potential martyrs.

Szöllősi’s voice was far from exceptional in the context of religious and political persecutions in Eastern Hungary. We find the same apocalyptic overtones in the “Prayers” of Ferenc Foris Otokócsi, a prominent Calvinist clergyman and scholar, whose itinerary brought him far both spatially (after he was arrested by the Habsburg authorities, he was sentenced and sold to a Venetian galley, and then after his liberation he traveled extensively to Germany, the Netherlands and England) and spiritually (he eventually converted to Catholicism). Written in the stormy 1670s at the onset of his calamities, Otokócsi’s prayers also turned to the same “providentialist” inspiration as Szöllősi’s sermons. He tried to transfer the Old Testament metaphors of “suffering Israel” to the Hungarians, evoking such *topoi* as the “Hungarian nation eating the flesh of its own arm” (alluding to Isa 9: 20).⁸⁰

However, in contrast to Szöllősi, Otokócsi’s narrative of Hungarian identity was more multi-layered. He deplored the lack of national solidarity, asserting that “charity to national brethren” (alluding to Isa 9: 19) is one of the basic human duties sanctioned by religion. The dissolution of this solidarity was the root of the dissolution of the once flourishing monarchy: “the previous fame, name and glory of our Nation” became lost, exposing the members of the nation to Antichrist’s rage and depriving them of their “sweet fatherland.” The subject of divine providence is, on the one hand, the entire nation, but on the other hand, Otokócsi also allotted special status to the community of “true believers” within the body of the nation (“your little flock within the wretched Hungarian Nation”), who are the “active subjects” in the story of salvation. This means that within “the orphaned Hungarian nation” Israel denotes the Protestant community, and “the help promised to Israel” is not so much “national liberation” as the eventual expansion of the Protestant faith.

⁷⁸ Szöllősi, *Az Úrért s hazájokért elszéledett és számkivetett bujdosó magyarok*, 32 (mispaginated as 23).

⁷⁹ Szöllősi, *Az Úrért s hazájokért elszéledett és számkivetett bujdosó magyarok*, 36.

⁸⁰ Ferenc Otokócsi Foris, *Hálaadó és könyörgő imádságai* [Thanksgiving and supplicatory prayers] (Budapest: A Reformáció és Ellenreformáció korának evangéliumi keresztény egyházi írói XIII., 1940), 3. Originally published in Kolozsvár, 1682.

Although these two (ethno-linguistic and denominational) focal points of solidarity could be adjusted to each other, they did not necessarily overlap. In fact, it might be argued that Otrokócsi's later progress from this Protestant conception towards the identification of "Hungarian Israel" with the ethno-cultural aspect of Hungarianness, making it possible for him to eventually shift his denominational identity without questioning the "national" narrative, was rooted in the ambiguities of his identification of the subjects of Providence with the suffering Protestants.

In his academic writings on the history of the Hungarian language and ethnicity (*Origines Hungaricae*),⁸¹ we can trace this symbolic transfer from the denominational narrative to a symbolically more encompassing "national antiquarianism." In his preface, he reiterated the commonplaces (from Diodorus Siculus, etc.) about the usefulness of historical knowledge, asserting that to study national origins is a godly venture ("Deo acceptissimum est"). As with all sixteenth and seventeenth century academic projects concerned with ethnogenesis, he also tried to reconcile the Biblical narrative with the sources from classical antiquity in the light of humanist philology. He started from the familiar *topos* of the identification of the Hungarians with the Huns ("in genere Scythae, ac inter Scythas Hunni"), deriving them both from Japheth's branch of the post-diluvian nations.⁸²

Otrokócsi considered his antiquarian venture a religious ("Deum glorificare") and a patriotic duty at the same time, and duly dedicated his volume to his "*natio*"; he also alluded to the task of studying the vernacular language, even though his scientific treatises were written in Latin. Curiously, he transferred the *topoi* of divine providence from the ethno-religious community to the Hungarian language, asserting that the survival of the Hungarian language shows the special grace of God to this nation. Therefore, he claimed, God's will can be documented by philological work as well. The fate of the nations lies in the *exempla* left behind by their precursors, and this scheme of exemplarity launches a circular motion regulated by divine providence—"non est novum sub sole."

⁸¹ Ferenc Otrokócsi Foris, *Origines Hungaricae seu, Liber, quo vera nationis Hungaricae origo & antiquitas, è veterum monumentis & linguis præcipuis, panduntur* (Franequer: Leonard Strik, 1693).

⁸² Otrokócsi, *Origines*, Dedication, 4a–4b.

In this circularity of *exempla*, “elect nationhood” becomes a “mythomoteur” rather than a historical occurrence: not only the Jews are “chosen,” but also some of the Gentiles. Otrokócsi came close to asserting that actually every archaic people of Europe is somehow God’s “elect nation,” and that they are connected by powerful linguistic affinities. Thus, he suggested the interconnectedness of divine providence and genealogy, linking some peoples directly to the origins of human civilization. Otrokócsi set about the task of observing the similarities of Hungarian with other archaic languages such as the Celtic, going so far as to argue that if not a direct connection, at least a proximity could be conjectured between their respective ancestors (“olim vetustissimos Britannos & Hungarorum majores, sibi vicinos fuisse”).⁸³ Along the same lines, he made heroic efforts to document the connections between Hungarian and Hebrew (which he considered to have preserved the closest resemblance to the primordial language of the Paradise), pointing out that some Hungarian words sounded exactly like Hebrew. It is not at all surprising, then, that in this semi-typological, semi-genealogical reconfiguration of the topology of elect nationhood, the concept of “Hungarian Israel” becomes a proof of the intimate ethno-linguistic connection between Jews and Hungarians, rather than the identity-narrative of denominational solidarity.

In the intellectual context of the second half of the seventeenth century, the metaphor of “Hungarian Israel” could thus become the core of a Protestant mobilizational narrative, but also the basis of a Hungarian national “antiquarianism.” At the same time, the traumatic experiences of the Transylvanian polity after the fateful Polish campaign of György Rákóczi II also triggered a providentialist narrative which drew on a Protestant political culture but which was, nevertheless, in many ways opposed to the self-perception of Protestants in Eastern Hungary.

The most important Transylvanian historical writer of the period is János Szalárdi (c.1616–1666), who wrote his “Sorrowful Hungarian Chronicle” (1662–1664) in order to put the traumatic events of the 1650–60s into a broader historical perspective.⁸⁴ As personal secretary to György Rákóczi I he was member of the inner circles of power

⁸³ Otrokócsi, *Origines*, Preface, XVIII.

⁸⁴ See Ferenc Szakály’s “Introduction” to Szalárdi’s chronicle, in János Szalárdi, *Siralmas magyar krónikája* [Sorrowful Hungarian chronicle] (Budapest: Magyar Helikon, 1980), 7–63.

until the death of his patron, when the new prince, György Rákóczi II, reshuffled the personnel of the chancellery. Szalárdi then moved to Nagyvárad (*Rom.* Oradea, *Ger.* Gross-Wardein), where he was one of the protagonists of the 1657 reorganization of the city government as a *regimen democratico-aristocraticum*, an attempt to create an “exemplary” polity based on the a fusion of Puritan and republican precepts. It survived, however, only for three years, as the Turks, taking advantage of the civil war in Transylvania, occupied the territory, and the remains of the Puritan movement were scattered all over the region.

Szalárdi’s historiographical work also reflected his political convictions and resentments. His work was concerned with the modalities of collective identity and was marked by profound ambiguities. On the one hand, he was a proponent of cultural “Hungarianization.” He considered the nation’s lack of historical knowledge as the source of their miseries, and promoted vernacularism as a means of transmitting this knowledge to the broader masses. On the other hand, his perspective was separated from that of Royal Hungary, and he failed to mention even such important developments outside of Transylvania as the activities of Miklós Zrínyi.

This meant the gradual separation of “national consciousness” and the concept of “fatherland.” Szalárdi also repudiated any kind of ostentatious assertion of Hungarianness (“magyaros magyarkodás”—“Hungarianish Hungarianizing”) on the part of the Transylvanians, considering the blurring of their state interest with that of the Hungarians extremely dangerous in the light of the tragic fate of Rákóczi’s campaign. This is exactly where the residual elements of the “elect nationhood” discourse came to play a certain role in his narrative. He inserted his observations into the Calvinist historico-theological discourse, connecting Protestant theology of history and humanist historiography—dressing the alternation of *corsi* and *ricorsi* in a Protestant cloth—and describing misfortunes in terms of divine punishment. His historical narrative was meant to buttress his Transylvanist political agenda, which was characteristic of the more radical Transylvanian Protestants in the 1660–1670s.⁸⁵ Giving up the century-long legitimation of Transylvanian statehood as a “proxy” Hungarian state, to be

⁸⁵ Although this orientation goes back to the turn of the seventeenth century—the historical work of Szamosközy was arguably the root of the Transylvanist orientation. See Péter Gunst, *A magyar történetírás története* [History of Hungarian historiography] (Budapest: Csokonai, 2002), 123.

submerged if the international constellation changes, Szalárdi asserted that it was not possible to fuse Royal Hungary and Transylvania. In fact, he considered Royal Hungary as “contaminated” by the Counter-Reformation, and thus saw no alternative to a Transylvanian state protected by the Ottoman Empire.

The Transylvanian “elect nation” discourse reached its climax in a curious work by Mihály Cserei (1667–1748), a Calvinist clergyman from Transylvania.⁸⁶ The manuscript was mostly written in Brassó (*Rom. Braşov, Ger. Kronstadt*) in 1709, during the Rákóczi uprising. Cserei’s position was ambiguous: on the one hand, he was a devout Protestant, on the other hand, he remained loyal to Vienna, and consequently suffered persecution at the hands of Rákóczi’s *kuruc* troops. Cserei was emphatically against the intrusion of outsiders into the Transylvanian political space, considering this the tragedy of his fatherland. He had to make serious efforts to bring his allegiances conceptually together: while he professed his loyalty to the Habsburg Emperor, he also asserted his national allegiance (“we are true Hungarians”), but, at the same time, he distinguished between the dwellers of Transylvania (his fatherland) and the non-Transylvanian Hungarians: “Do not make friends, my dear fatherland, with men from Hungary, do not bind yourself with Hungary.”⁸⁷

His text is unique in the sense that he tried to insert his political argument into the broader framework of a philosophical speculation on the course of world history. The treatise is mainly a commentary on Josephus Flavius, but Cserei also used a plethora of other classical sources—Seneca, Livy, Plutarch, Suetonius, Florus, Curtius—as well as modern Western ecclesiastical and political authors—Barclay, Georg Horn, Pufendorf, Guevara—and also Hungarian historical writers: János Bethlen, Farkas Bethlen and Istvánffy.

The use of this providentialist narrative had to be adjusted to the specific political-denominational context, as the pro-Viennese faction was mostly Catholic. That is why the subject of Cserei’s narrative could not be the denominational community but had to be reformulated in terms of the political entity. Not surprisingly, Cserei also connected a wide-ranging religious toleration with patriotism: “Compatriots

⁸⁶ Lajos Szádeczky, ed., “Cserei történetbölcseleti műve I–II.” [Cserei’s work on the philosophy of history], *Történelmi Társulat* (1906): 455–552.

⁸⁷ Szádeczky, “Cserei történetbölcseleti műve,” 529.

professing the four received religions should cease persecuting each other, let them live *civiliter* among themselves, leaving the conversion of souls to God.” He demanded the same politics of concord from the three Transylvanian *nationes*:

Do not intrigue against each other (...), search rather for the common good with common reason, since the Hungarian, the Szekler and the Saxon have only this Transylvania as a fatherland, you have to live here and suffer, nobody will accept you elsewhere, and if you are going to live in the future as you have until now, the justly judging God will send you finally to damnation.⁸⁸

The providentialist rhetoric with its threat of divine punishment thus underpins a political program of separating the religious and political spheres and defending the common weal. Cserei criticized those princes who were so much absorbed by personal religiosity that they neglected the administration of their realm. He was thus implying that religious piety separated from the world might easily be abused by “traitors” (*álnok*). It is not hard to recognize the edge of criticism directed towards Emperor Leopold I, driven by his devout Catholicism to allow campaigns against the Protestants. For all his loyalism, Cserei is categorical: “You were not ordained by God to become a priest, but to become a magistrate. Do not pray then all the time, but prevent the wolves from preying on the sheep” and “if you are not used to work, to *negotium*, leave the kingdom, or the principality, in peace.”⁸⁹ Somewhat paradoxically, but very much in line with this train of thought, he not only threatens with God’s punishment those rulers who neglect their secular duties in favor of practicing personal devotion, but even goes so far as to recommend as positive examples “Bethlen, Botskai and György Rákóczi I,” in other words, the Calvinist princes of Transylvania, who were actually opponents of the Habsburgs.

Of course, these references witness the enormous obstacles Cserei had to overcome when trying to reshape the Transylvanian narratives of identity. The Transylvanian local historical canon was intertwined with the Hungarian anti-Habsburg tradition, and this meant that it was almost completely impossible to erase these references while keeping to the formative *topoi* of identity. Cserei was also forced to instrumentalize the discourse of Hungarian nationhood, speaking of

⁸⁸ Ibid., 468.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 473–74.

“the glorious Hungarian princes, the dear stars of our nation,” and even using the usual ethno-cultural counter-images (“the Wallach does not deserve the Translyvanian principality”). He also indignantly remarked that “had the Viennese court been more respectful of this poor Hungarian nation, not harming its laws and liberties, not paring it to the bone, there would not be such a terrible revolution upon us.”⁹⁰ His position in this sense was quite close to Szalárdi’s: the Transylvanian Hungarian “*natio*” is part of the Hungarian nation, but Transylvanian patriotism must be distinguished from the Hungarian one, and Transylvanians have specific interests which set them apart from their co-nationals.

Cserei reiterates the *topoi* of Hungarian elect nationhood in a warning put into the mouth of Christ: “Hungarian, Hungarian, see, I brought you out of wild Scythia, liberated you from the spiritual Egypt, planted you in the land flowing with milk and honey, made you rule many countries, and still you became ungrateful to me.”⁹¹ Ingratitude does not mean here purely denominational deviation but—in keeping with Cserei’s political project—denotes resistance to divine judgment as manifested by history. It is from this perspective that Josephus Flavius becomes a role model for him. This means turning the “elect nation” discourse against the rhetoric of confrontation: the “Jews were blindly fooling around against the Roman Empire”, and their fate is a warning to the Hungarian nation of its imminent doom if it engages in a war against the current “Roman Empire” (which would be equivalent to “fighting against God”). “Poor Hungarian,” (...) “you also took the same road as Jerusalem”—“God, who did not spare the Jews, will not spare the Hungarians either.”⁹²

Thus in Cserei’s work “elect nationhood” becomes, in line with the original Calvinist conception, a tool of calling the community to repentance. However, the implied parallels with Jewish history do not carry the promise of “national liberation” (employed by most Protestant preachers of the sixteenth century), but a terrible threat. The fate of the Jews after their uprising casts the shadow of the death of the nation on the Hungarian rebels. This means the conceptual separation of “divine election” of a given nation and general “providence”: God’s Gospel is

⁹⁰ Ibid., 481.

⁹¹ Ibid., 483–84.

⁹² Ibid., 484.

ultimately not connected to one nation, and the destruction of the sinful becomes an example for other peoples. Exploiting the ambiguity of the providentialist rhetoric, he also tries to transfer the *topoi* of divine election to Transylvania, reconfiguring the threat of destruction (“I am afraid that God will erase us once and for all with all our nation”)⁹³ as a punishment for abandoning the old laws and customs of the country. “Transylvania, Transylvania, my dear fatherland, why is it that you still do not return back to your Lord and God?”⁹⁴

Once again, however, Cserei has to face the complexity of the Transylvanian identity discourse: even though he wants to define Transylvania as his *patria*, the Hungarian context is embedded in the Transylvanian identity discourse as a framework of “normative memory.” This can be seen from the ambiguity of his claim that the “original sin” was the disunion (“the Hungarian lords forming factions against each other”) of the sixteenth century: “As long as our unhappy Hungarian nation was unified, neither the Turks nor the Germans could defeat them.”⁹⁵ Of course, this is a highly paradoxical claim, because without the disunion of the sixteenth century no Transylvanian statehood would have ever emerged.

There is an irresolvable conflict between these registers. On the one hand, “for the last 180 years” God has made “a *theatrum* out of Hungary”, so “if someone wants to observe in Europe all perils and, together with them, all evils in one sum, he should come to Hungary.”⁹⁶ But this quite evidently contradicts the Transylvanian “local time” (“seven years ago there was still wealth, vine, wheat, peace”), as its flourishing in fact overlapped with the division of Hungary. The only framework that keeps together these partially overlapping, partially conflicting identity discourses is again the providentialist scheme—as if between the lines Cserei was suggesting that Transylvania, as an island of peace and plenty, was temporarily spared the divine punishment meted out to Hungary, but now by meddling with the “contagious” body of the nation (he uses the medical *topoi*: the Hungarians before Rákóczi having been “in great but supportable illness”) can easily contract the disease of corruption, evoking God’s terrible wrath.

⁹³ Ibid., 496.

⁹⁴ Ibid., 497.

⁹⁵ Ibid., 508.

⁹⁶ Ibid., 509.

On the whole, Cserei's position remained highly ambiguous. The normative connotations of the Hungarian identity discourse were too strong to be erased by this reference. What is more, the Protestant denominational discourse was too much intertwined with the anti-Habsburg narrative to support a fully-fledged politics of loyalism. Occasionally, he contrasted the looting of the *kuruc* armies to "the liberation struggle of the Belgians and Swiss" (two anti-Habsburg movements!). This implied that he did not repudiate the ultimate aim of the struggle for liberty but only its actual means and prospects and the current style of warfare (guerrilla tactics). He even complained that the *kuruc* army did not dare to fight the Germans although "without blood, freedom is never given." He admits that as a "good patriot" (apparently, a Hungarian patriot) he would condone the resistance if there was any chance of it succeeding—"if you had so much cleverness, strength and skill to vanquish the Germans, to restore your fatherland to its ancient glory and happiness, it would be advisable to take up arms."⁹⁷ While describing the Rákóczi-family as a "fateful race," at another point he praised "Helena Zrinyi," the mother of Ferenc Rákóczi II, for heroically defending the castle of Munkács against the Austrians.

Although Cserei sought to distinguish the Transylvanians from the Hungarians, he could not stretch the distinction too far, as he had to protect himself from the accusation of being a traitor ("we are true and loving sons of our dear fatherland, which gave birth to us and raised us... we are true Hungarians").⁹⁸ He thus symbolically reconfirmed that the Transylvanian patriotic modality, even if buttressed by the rhetoric of elect nationhood, could not be turned completely against the Hungarian "national" discourse.

Conclusion

If one places the Hungarian case of "elect nation" into a broader European context one can find similar ideological mechanisms. Since the appearance of William Haller's influential book on Foxe,⁹⁹ the central

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 520.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 524.

⁹⁹ William Haller, *Foxe's Book of Martyrs and the Elect Nation* (London: John Cape, 1963).

question of the interpretative literature has been whether the model of the “chosen people” was assumed by early modern communities as a framework of identification or whether the reference to “elect nationhood” was just a matter of Biblical parallelism, without implying a belief that one’s nation had a peculiar relationship to God.¹⁰⁰ Reflecting on the Hungarian sources, one can see the futility of this debate and the circularity of both arguments, which are based on the reification of discursive structures. It is misleading to assume that an assertion of God’s peculiar grace, manifested in the national history, could entail a complete substitution of the Israel of the Old Testament by the given national community. The Biblical story remained the master-narrative of early modern Europe, and nobody could aspire to “autochthonize” Christianity to that extent. At the same time, the Biblical analogies were more than just metaphors—they were considered to transcend history and format human experience in communication with the divine—endowing the historical events with a deeper meaning, and providing the community with a supra-historical principle of solidarity.

Of course, in any Christian “political theology” apocalyptic rhetoric and national self-identification could overlap—though mostly in an “imperial” framework (through the eschatological potential inherent in the idea of *translatio imperii*). What made this discourse peculiarly linked to the Protestant context is rather its existential predicament: its “prophetic” perspective in a way replicated that of the Protestant preacher. The use of the topos of elect nationhood was structurally similar to the way sixteenth-century Psalm-translators attached short appendices to their texts referring to their actual situation, or actualizing some of its aspects, such as the name of the enemies, according to their current preoccupations.

This intimacy with the nation as a historical projection, as a way to grasp the supra-historical, is linked to the changes introduced by the Reformation: while the late medieval national discourses mostly focused on patron saints as special mediators between the secular

¹⁰⁰ Paul Christianson, *Reformers and Babylon: English Apocalyptic Visions from the Reformation to the Eve of the Civil War* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978); Patrick Collinson, *The Birthpangs of Protestant England: Religious and Cultural Change in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1988); Gerrit Groenhuis, “Calvinism and National Consciousness: The Dutch Republic as the New Israel,” in Alastair C. Duke and Coenrad A. Tamse, eds., *Britain and the Netherlands* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1981), 7: 118–33.

community and the divinity, in this model there is no institutional mediation but a potentially dialogical relationship between the national community and God. There is a metonymical relationship between the individual (speaking in his own name, but also standing for a collective entity who potentially—and ritually—assumes the individual perspective of the Psalmist) and the community, and also between past and present—evoking the erstwhile gesture of addressing God, stepping out of the ephemeral world to merge with the eternal. The concept of “elect nationhood” was thus used to confer meaning on the seemingly meaningless flow of events. Of course, this framework could be reintegrated into the ideological framework of Catholicism, based on the increasing historicization of apologetics and the promotion of a nationalized cult of the Virgin Mary and national patron saints as mediators.

It was precisely this dialogical relationship, and the multiplicity of perspectives inherent in it, that made it possible to create divergent modalities of the discourse of elect nationhood. These structures became integrated into a densely woven framework of identity discourses, which engaged in a complex dialogue with the overall providentialist scheme. Sometimes this entailed prioritizing certain of its elements over others, sometimes establishing functional equivalences between its constitutive elements and other discourses (such as in the case of the insertion of the Biblical references into the classical schemes of genealogy), sometimes conferring legitimacy on secular institutions, and occasionally exploding the topology of “elect nationhood” altogether, due to the internal contradictions it became loaded with during its dialogue with its intellectual environment.

When we analyze the Hungarian texts using this providential scheme, the most important finding is the extreme flexibility of this discourse in the light of the possible normative connotations and implied “messages.” The basic lines of the discourse were there from the very beginning (indeed, even pre-dating the Reformation). These were the propensity to redescribe historical facts in accordance with the story of salvation, locating the responsibility for God’s wrath and the thematization of the “instruments” of divine punishment. These patterns became permeated with specific political and cultural discourses of identity. One of the emerging patterns was the overwriting of the humanist analysis of unity and division, and connecting the providential narrative to the question of the social and religious integrity of the community. The cat-

egory of *ultima necessitas* (“breaking laws”) fused with the symbolism of predestination (as Gábor Bethlen expressed it, “God acted through me”), legitimizing even reliance on the Turks (they themselves having their apocalyptic pedigree). The self-defense of the Hungarians could be thus “re-described” in the language of eschatology, legitimizing the actions of the political leader in terms of divine Providence. The vision of “elect nationhood” also engaged in a complex interplay with the problematization of resistance, substituting the theoretical arguments for active resistance with a more vague, but still powerful, vision of collective punishment in the form of tyranny, and an eventual “divine sanction” against the tyrants themselves.

Most importantly, “elect nationhood” became a crucial modality for negotiating the relationship between the community of (usually Protestant) “true believers” and the broader symbolic framework of the nation, resulting in an ambiguous relationship between the different conceptions. In similar ways, this vision came to play a crucial role in relating the Transylvanian and Hungarian frameworks of identity to each other, offering the possibility of a supra-political and trans-denominational Hungarian discourse, but eventually also supporting a Transylvanian modality which sought to differentiate between the focal points of the national and patriotic allegiances. Last but not least, it also created the possibility of narrating the national history in expectation of an imminent liberation depending on God’s grace, involving a *longue durée* interpretation of the ups and downs of the national past, which rewrote the *corsi* and *ricorsi* in terms of divine providence, and finally warning the community of imminent destruction, with reference to the destruction of the Jews after their rebellion (making the narrative of Josephus Flavius an internal alternative of the liberation-centered vision of “elect nationhood”).

This curious process of diffusion resulted in the ubiquity and, at the same time, extreme fragmentariness of this discourse in the Hungarian context. It could legitimate a Protestant denominational project, but also an attempt to transgress the denominational division; the power-claims of an irregularly elected ruler, as well as the oppositional claims of the Estates against the inherited kingship. It could support the Counter-Reformation subversion of Protestant national discourse and the radical Protestant attempt to separate church and state. It could underpin the attempt to keep together the lands of the Crown of St. Stephen, but also the narrative of a Transylvanian “common weal”

in contrast to the Hungarian interests. Its compass thus transgressed various political, religious, social and cultural borders. What it could not produce, however, was an institutionalized self-narration of the “national” community—reproducing its own discursive structures by the help of a gradually stabilizing politico-ethno-religious core of identity. As so often in the history of Hungarian identity discourses, the narratives seeking to overarch the existing divisions themselves contributed to the proliferation of these divisions. And conversely as well, the emerging diversity made it possible to accommodate mentally to the sweeping series of changes and challenges, a more unequivocal answer to which would have been, most probably, utterly self-destructive.

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

THE HOMILETICS OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE:
MARTYROLOGY AS A (RE)INVENTED TRADITION IN THE
PARADIGM OF EARLY MODERN HUNGARIAN PATRIOTISM

Zsombor Tóth

János Komáromi, the most faithful servant of Imre Thököly, in exile with his master first in Constantinople, then in Nicomedia, wrote in 1701 a remarkable entry in his diary. Deeply impressed by the history of the region, he not only remembered the Christian martyrs persecuted and killed there during the rule of Emperor Diocletian, but he found a moving parallel between their own exile and the persecution of the early Christians: “I feel as a release that *our martyrdom* has been ordained to this place. Blessed be God!”¹

Although the quotation’s textual context refers to a violent episode of church history, Komáromi’s parallel did not imply a religious experience on his part or any kind of religiously motivated sacrifice. He simply equated their present status, that of political refugees, with the condition of the Christian martyrs. Since no religious or confessional references are implied by the expression of “our martyrdom”, one should accept that Komáromi’s discourse had a secular aspect. Furthermore, the analogy between the supreme sacrifice of the martyrs, that is, their death for the early Christian church, and the refugees’ sufferings for their homeland and ultimately the possibility of their death as a sacrifice, suggests a political interpretation of martyrdom relying on the topos of *pro patria mori*.²

Accordingly, the aim of this article is to explore the political connotations³ potentially available in the exile account of János Komáromi.

¹ *Késmárki Thököly Imre secretariusának Komáromi Jánosnak törökországi diariumja s experienciája* [The diary and experience of János Komáromi, the secretary of Imre Thököly of Késmárk, in Turkey] ed. Iván Nagy (Pest: Ráth Mór, 1861), 76.

² Ernst Kantorowicz, “Pro Patria Mori in Medieval Political Thought,” *American Historical Review*, 56 (1951): 479–92.

³ Pocock asserted that the study of political thought consists of the exploration of political language: J. G. A. Pocock, *Politics, Language and Time: Essays on*

For the diary and his other writings conceived and written during his exile (1697–1705) convincingly exhibit a particular discourse promoting a proto-nationalistic⁴ view of the concept of *patria* and of the patriot as martyr. Consequently, I will attempt to decipher the historical, literary and poetical contexts of Komáromi's discourse⁵ in order to reveal those probably (re)invented tradition(s),⁶ such as the Protestant and especially Calvinist martyrology, which articulated the textual representation of exile as an extreme experience and attributed political significance to it. Moreover, I will assess the functions and uses of these (re)invented traditions in order to exhibit the homiletics of this political discourse. I will conclude my argument by suggesting that early modern patriotic discourses were strongly connected not only to the medieval heritage of political theology but to the homiletic tradition of the 16th and 17th century as well. Thus the multiplicity of political reality rendered into representations by homiletic practice⁷

Political Thought and History (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 15.

⁴ Eric Hobsbawm, *Nation and Nationalism since 1780*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 76.

⁵ According to Quentin Skinner, the primary task of the intellectual historian is to see and think as his ancestors, and my interpretation is committed to this methodology, relying on an exhaustive contextualization which, hopefully, will result in a plausible explanation of this complex historical phenomenon. Quentin Skinner, *Visions of Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 51.

⁶ I rely on the concept proposed by Hobsbawm: "Invented tradition is taken to mean a set of practices normally governed by overtly or tacitly accepted rules and of a virtual or symbolic nature, which seek to inculcate certain values and norms of behaviour by repetition, which automatically implies continuity with the past." Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, eds., *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 2.

⁷ Hungarian historians commonly underestimate the political significance of early modern Hungarian sermon-literature. In spite of the impressive ideological potential and persuasive power of the genre, few historians have attempted to estimate the social and political impact of this homiletic corpus. During the Middle Ages homiletics were continuously engaged in the task of adapting pagan rhetoric and poetic traditions to the use of the Church. The Reformation made a further major contribution to the political uses of homiletic devices. Melanchthon in his rhetoric, *Elementorum Rhetorices libri duo*, set aside a fourth *genus*, the *genus didascalicon*, solely for the homiletic, theological and political function performed by the Reformed *sermo*. In consequence, starting with the sixteenth century the Reformed sermon, as an oration delivering political messages, had a remarkable influence on the Christian political attitude toward the Ottoman expansion. The main corpus of the so-called *literatura antiturcica* which proliferated in Germany after the battle of Mohács consists mainly of sermons; these employ an impressive repertoire of homiletic devices in urging the German estates to stop the pagans before it was too late. However, the primary target of those involved in the exploration of political rhetoric has been the analysis

resulted in a large variety of patterns meant to conceptualize proto-national bonds⁸ and political or national identities.

Historical contexts revisited: the emergence of Imre Thököly and the persecution of Hungarian Protestants

Since the time the peace treaty of Vasvár (1664) was signed, loyalty to the Habsburgs, even within the territory of Upper Hungary, was in continuous decline. The Hungarians' hostile attitude was fuelled by the Habsburg administration's unpopular activities which patently promoted the imperial interests, quite often against the expectations and immediate interests of the Hungarian estates. Thus conflict, indeed rebellion, was unavoidable. Although the Habsburgs had managed to uncover the initial conspiracy (1671) and execute its protagonists, the supporters of the opposition were still far too numerous and a military conflict was unleashed. The rebellion, led first by Mihály Teleki (1672) and then by Imre Thököly (1680), was sustained by the Ottoman Porte and assisted by the principality of Transylvania.⁹

Amidst the sometimes entangled and multiple political interests Thököly at first seemed to be more successful than his predecessor,

of historiography and pamphlet-literature, and only the literary historians seemed to have been preoccupied with the homiletic tradition and its political functions. See Mihály Imre, "Magyarország panasza." *A Querela Hungariae toposz XVI-XVII. század irodalmában* ["The Complaint of Hungary." The Querela Hungariae topos in the literature of the 16-17th centuries] (Debrecen: Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó 1995); Mihály Imre, ed., *Retorikák a Reformáció korából* [Rhetorical literature from the Reformation period] (Debrecen: Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó, 2000).

⁸ Reflecting upon nationalism, Hobsbawm defined the concept of proto-national bonds: "...in many parts of the world, states and national movements could mobilize certain variants of feelings of collective belonging which already existed and which could operate, as it were, potentially on the macro-political scale which could fit in with modern states and nations. I shall call these bonds proto-national." E. J. Hobsbawm, *Nation and Nationalism since 1780: Program, Myth and Reality*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: University Press, 1990), 46.

⁹ On various interpretations of these events in the Hungarian historical tradition, see Gyula Pauler, *Wesselényi Ferenc nádor és társainak összeesküvése, 1664-1671* [The conspiracy of Palatine Ferenc Wesselényi and his fellows, 1664-1671] (Budapest, 1876); Zsolt Trócsányi, *Teleki Mihály. Erdély és a kuruc mozgalom 1690-ig* [Mihály Teleki and the Kuruc movement in Transylvania up to 1690] (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1972); László Kontler, *Millenium in Central Europe* (Budapest: Atlantisz, 1999), 179-84; Ágnes R. Várkonyi, *Erdélyi változások* [Transylvanian changes] (Budapest: Magvető, 1984); idem, *Magyarország visszafoglalása* [The reconquest of Hungary] (Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó, 1987).

Teleki. After having consolidated his position as supreme commander of the rebels—the so-called “Bújdosók” (the Refugees)—in 1682, he concentrated on his own political ambitions. With Ottoman support he occupied the strategically important cities of Upper Hungary, married Ilona Zrínyi, the widow of Ferenc Rákóczi (and daughter of Péter Zrínyi, one of the leaders executed in 1671), and then launched his claim for the title of King of Hungary. The lack of reaction from the Habsburgs’ side, due in part to Vienna’s preoccupation with the war against France, and the continuous political and military support provided by the Ottomans, facilitated his political success markedly. Thus by 1682, as an *atname* sent by the Porte attests, Thököly had become the King of Upper Hungary.

Yet his rule proved to be fugitive. The frustrations caused by a demoralizing series of military defeats made the Ottomans reconsider their political and military strategies. Disgraced, Thököly ended up in an Ottoman prison (1685). Still, in the precipitating events of the years to come he was given a new chance, and he was resolved to exploit the newly emerging conjuncture. Even though the Ottomans lost Buda (1686) and Transylvania was occupied by the Habsburgs (1687), the year 1690 revived their hopes. Thököly’s unexpected victory at Zernyest (*Rom. Zărnești*) over the joint Transylvanian and Habsburg forces created the impression, in the context of the contemporary events, that the Christians might still lose the great war against the Ottomans. Thököly’s attempt to push the advantage of his position was, however, only partially successful. He became prince of Transylvania, but was subsequently forced to leave the principality together with his “kuruc” army. Then the lost battle of Zenta (1697) and the peace treaty of Karlowitz (1699) nullified all his political ambitions. In exile in Turkey, the Ottomans provided him a residence in Nicomedia (1701), where he lived for only four years longer. He was buried by his faithful servant János Komáromi in 1705.

These various military conflicts were not isolated from other major events taking place in the confessionally demarcated region of East Central Europe in the second part of the 17th century. Tripartite Hungary, situated between the Christian and Muslim worlds, was itself confessionally divided. The principality of Transylvania, as the last bastion of Western civilization, was a Calvinist state, while the Hungarian Kingdom, although inhabited by Lutherans as well, was transformed due to the escalating Jesuit and Habsburg pressure into a predominantly Catholic region. The confessional differences, and

especially the ebullient fanaticism of the religious debates, were intertwined with political intentions, interests and motivations. The problematic church-state antagonism as an expression of apparent balance was often the result of political challenges and responses conceived in regional and confessional contexts.

It seems plausible that the unfortunate military expedition against Poland (1657–1658) undertaken by Transylvania undermined its power and authority as the regional protector of Protestantism. Thereupon the Habsburgs under the plausible pretext of uncovering a conspiracy organized a merciless campaign against the intellectual elite, mostly Protestant priests (both Calvinists and Lutherans) and teachers, accusing them of ideological agitation and of inciting the population against their ruler the emperor. The elimination of the leaders who might have mobilized military units or gained foreign political support was followed by a second wave to eliminate the ideologically and politically influential strata of intellectuals, the representatives of the Reformed Churches, and in April 1674 three hundred Calvinist and Lutheran priests and teachers were sentenced to death on the charge of treason against the Emperor and the Kingdom.¹⁰

Eventually, those Calvinist and Lutheran priests who had refused to recant were sent to labor as galley-slaves (1675).¹¹ Those who survived were released only after the political intervention of the Netherlands, when the Habsburgs, probably under the international political pressure and burdened by multiple wars, decided to withdraw the initial sentence (1676). In the meantime a number of parishes were violently occupied and Calvinist or Lutheran communities and their priests regularly persecuted. It is notable that the seemingly separate chain of events—the military actions undertaken by the refugees under the command of Wesselényi, Teleki and Thököly, and the persecution of the Protestant priests, converges in some relevant consequences. The Habsburgs' political, military and confessional attitudes created widespread discontent among Hungarians living in the different regions of tripartite Hungary.¹² The sufferings of the priests and the heroic fight

¹⁰ Katalin Péter, "A magyarországi protestáns prédikátorok és tanítók ellen indított per 1674-ben" [The process against the Hungarian Protestant priests and teachers in 1674], in *A Ráday Gyűjtemény évkönyve* 3 (1983) 31–39.

¹¹ László Makkai, *A magyarországi gályarab prédikátorok emlékezete* [The memory of the Hungarian priests sent to the galleys] (Budapest: Helikon, 1976), 5.

¹² Miklós Bethlen, the son of the chancellor of Transylvania, János Bethlen, wrote a Latin letter to all the priests sent to the galleys, as a gesture of his solidarity with

and death of the rebels must have been regarded as the almost martyr-like undertakings of a small number of extraordinary men. Moreover, political freedom became identified with religious and confessional freedom. Thus “national church” and the “homeland” were again brought closer to each other and integrated in the common desires, expectations and actions of both suffering priests and fighting rebels. Most importantly, due to their often similar end—their unavoidable death occurring in combat or during persecution—both priests and soldiers might have easily become *martyrs*, or they could represent the quintessence of the *nation*, which was to define itself in this extreme experience.

Theological and political literature of the “Persecutio Decennalis”

Having briefly surveyed both the military operations of the followers of Thököly and the persecution of the Protestant priests, we can reasonably assume that an ideological link was created between these two series of events.¹³ It is quite possible that the ideological sources animating the Hungarians’ opposition was organically related to the theologically and homiletically formulated discourses of the Hungarian Calvinist Church. Indeed, the Catholic expansion launched against the Hungarian Protestants was overtly sustained by Vienna. The Habsburg administration provided military troops or sent clear orders to the military forces garrisoned on the territory of Upper Hungary to contribute to the (re)occupation of churches and parishes. The military interventions often descended into extreme violence. In addition to this, the humiliating experiences endured by the priests on the galleys directly contributed to the emergence of the concept and collective

their noble cause and to focus the attention of the other Protestant states on the events taking place in the Hungarian Kingdom. The letter was published in the Netherlands: *Epistola Nicolai Bethlen Sedis Siculicalis Udvarhely, Capitanei Supremi, ad Ministros Exules tam Helveticae quam Augustanae Confessionis, Ex Hungaria per hodiernam persecutionem ejectos* (Ultrajecti, 1677).

¹³ The Hungarian literary historian Mihály Imre, after analyzing the sermon-literature of the 1670s, has pertinently pointed out the overlapping perspectives of the events and ideologies displayed. Mihály Imre, “Nemzeti önszemlélet és politikai publicisztika formálódása egy 1674-es prédikációskötetben” [The formation of national self-reflection and political discourse in a volume of sermons published in 1674], *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 2 (1988) 1: 18–45.

memory of “*persecutio decennalis*,”¹⁴ the decade of persecution, referring to the period 1671–1681.

The political impact caused by the impressive corpus of Hungarian,¹⁵ Latin,¹⁶ English¹⁷ and German writings performed a double function. Firstly, by promoting anti-Habsburg political feelings to converge with the traditional confessional dichotomy (Protestantism vs. Catholicism), they cemented the ideological grounds for both confessional and political counter-attacks. Secondly, by invoking Protestant solidarity they successfully transformed this internal affair into an international scandal. Due to its vivid and multilingual European reception, the sufferings and persecution of the Hungarian Calvinists and Lutherans received an enormous amount of sympathy and political support. In addition, the political and military rivals of the Habsburg, such as the French, eagerly exploited the political benefits of the discontents.

Yet the most important consequence of the persecution consisted in the formation of a political-ideological paradigm promoting a sophisticated and homiletically shaped discourse in early modern Hungarian political and cultural life. It was this particular language that reinvented the originally theological tradition of martyrology and transferred it

¹⁴ Pál Okolicsányi used this term for the first time in his book dealing with the history of the Evangelical estates: “...eruperit dira illa persecutio decennalis ab Anno 1671. usque ad Annum 1681.” Pál Okolicsányi, *Historia Diplomatica de statu religionis evangelicae in Hungaria* (Frankfurt, 1710), 51.

¹⁵ The sermon literature of the period was intensely preoccupied with these events and their somber consequences; see Miklós Técsi, *Lilium Humilitatis* (Kolozsvár, 1675); Mihály Szöllösi, *Az Úrért s Hazájából el széledett és számkivetett bujdosó Magyarok Füstölgő Csepűje...* [The smoking flax of the Hungarians persecuted for their God and fatherland] (Kolozsvár, 1676). Mihály Tholnai, *A sűrű kereszt-viselésnek habjai közt csüggedező leleknek lelki Bátorítása...* [The encouragement of the soul despaired by continuous afflictions] (Kolozsvár, 1673).

¹⁶ Bálint Csergő Kocsi (1647–1700) was one of those priests who survived this harsh experience and wrote a Latin memoir entitled *Narratio brevis*. Péter Bod (1712–1769) as a Protestant priest and historian was strongly interested in the history of Hungarian martyrs and translated this text into Hungarian. Péter Bod, *Kösziklán épült ház ostroma* [The siege of the house erected upon rocks], ed. Sándor Szilágyi (Leipzig, 1866).

¹⁷ In 1675 an anonymous book was published in London, providing an account about the Protestants in France and also containing a shorter text referring to Hungarian Protestants. “The Case of the Persecuted and Oppressed Protestants in some Parts of Germany and Hungary: laid open In a Memorial, which was lately presented at Vienna to His Majesty, By His Majesty the King of Sweden’s Ambassador Extraordinary, the Count of Oxenstierna, Bengt Gabrielsson,” in *A True Relation of the Sad Estate of the Reformed Church in France* (London, 1675), 1–16.

to the use of political argumentation and persuasion. While the early Christian martyrs were revered for their sacrifice undertaken for the *Ecclesia*, the early modern, especially Calvinist, martyrology emphasized the politically relevant sacrifices of the contemporary martyrs for the *national church*, and ultimately for the nation and *patria* as well. Thus in Hungary, the Calvinist and Lutheran priests committed themselves to a long-lasting and dangerous ideological war in order to mobilize the population's anti-Habsburg feelings and determination. It was István Szőnyi Nagy, himself a victim of the persecution, who in 1675 published two books¹⁸ which set forth the determining concept of the movement. Szőnyi provided a new concept of the martyr—without the slightest similarity with the saints of Catholicism—which promoted the idea that everybody could become a martyr. In point of the fact, Szőnyi, in the spirit of Foxe, did not simply redefine the concept of martyr and martyrology, but fused it with the discourse of patriotism.

In order to adequately assess the impact and functions of Hungarian Protestant martyrology, it is useful to outline its historical and ideological contexts. The most important Protestant antecedent of Szőnyi's martyrology was Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*. Available both in Latin¹⁹ and English²⁰ versions in early modern Europe, the *Book of Martyrs* was quite soon incorporated in the spirituality of Hungarian Protestantism. During the sixteenth century, through the Latin version, Foxe's work had a direct influence upon Mihály Sztárai's writings.²¹ Later on,

¹⁸ István Szőnyi Nagy, *Kegyés Vitéz...* [The pious champion] (Debrecen, 1675); idem, *Mártírok Coronája...* [The Crown of the Martyrs] (Debrecen, 1675).

¹⁹ RERVVM IN ECCLESIA GESTARVM, quae postremis et periculosus his temporibus euenerunt, maximarumq; per Europam persecutionum ac Sanctorum Dei MARTYRVM, &c., Commentarij. In quib primū de rebus per Angliam et Scotiam gestis, atque in primis de horrenda, sub MARIA nuper Regina, persecutione, narratio continetur. Autore IOANNE FOXO Anglo (Basel: per N. Brylingerem, et. Io. Oporinum, 1559).

²⁰ John Foxe, *Acts and Monuments of these latter and perilous dayes, touching matters of the church*. [The Book of Martyrs] (1563). When quoting from Foxe, I use the following edition: *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe*, ed. Rev. Stephen Reed Catley (London: R. Seeley and W. Burnside, 1841).

²¹ Mihály Sztárai was so impressed by the story of the martyr Thomas Cranmer that he subsequently wrote a version in Hungarian, offering a moving example of Protestant martyrdom. Mihály Sztárai, *Historia Cranmervs Thamas erseknek az igaz hitben valo alhatatosagarol, ki mikor az papa tudomaniat hamisolnaia, Angliaban Maria kiralne aszszony által szörnii halalt szenuedet. Stárai Mihaly által enekben szereztetett* [The history of Bishop Thomas Cranmer...] (Debrecen, 1582). RMKT V., 241–262.

the Hungarian translation of Bailey's *Practice of Piety*²² helped spread the concept of martyr as Foxe had conceived it. Finally, Szőnyi and all the other priests working on the theme of martyrdom during the 1670s, made use of the Latin version and transposed Foxe's ideas into a convincing homiletic scheme.

Although the widely accepted thesis presented in Haller's study of Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* is undoubtedly the idea of the emergence of elect nationhood, his interpretation²³ cannot be reduced to this single idea. He also reflects upon the narrative and conceptual particularities of Foxe's work. The conceptualization of the theme of two churches (true vs. false church) and the invisible community of the elect as martyrs²⁴ are in fact the basic components of Foxe's theological and political vision about the national church and the nation as well. Furthermore, Foxe's particular treatment of church history, his deliberate gesture of omitting the Catholic Middle Ages with its impressive and universal hagiography, had a political message. In this reinvented history the "true Church" starts with the early Christians and abruptly resumes with the Reformation and its martyrs. The provocative dismissal of the Catholic church, its saints and its history during the Middle Ages because of its deplorable contemporary ethical and sinful condition, otherwise a recurrent motive of Protestant discourses, involved a highly problematic fictionalization about the history of the "true" church.

It is this refashioned line of evolution which might well have provided a direct relation between the Protestant saints and their early Christian ancestors, but it still needed a historical, theological and presumably political justification. Foxe's daring argumentation, transgressing the traditional anti-papist discourse, was something like an invention or reinvention of martyrology as a tradition for the sake of a highly influential, first of all ideological/political and then theological argumentation validating the present status of the English Church.

²² Bailey's well-known book was first translated into Hungarian by Pál Medgyesi in 1636. The book contains a reference to Martyr Glover and his heroic attitude in front of the unavoidable death to come. Pál Medgyesi, *Praxis pietatis, Azaz: Kegyesség gyakorlás, melybe befoglaltatik, mint kellyen a keresztyén embernek, Isten és a maga igaz ismeretiben nevékedni* [Praxis Pietatis that is, the Practice of Piety, which contains the rules concerning the education of the godly Christian...] (Lőcse, 1641), 870.

²³ William Haller, *Foxe's Book of Martyrs and the Elect Nation* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1963).

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 135.

Haller in turn was quick to point out the passionate and prejudiced character of the narrative provided, especially in the later English editions of the *Book of Martyrs*, nevertheless, he not only revealed the historical, theological and eschatological interferences,²⁵ but convincingly grasped its astonishing political/ideological impact as well.

All the same, Foxe's martyrology, with its dominant secular tone and focus upon the possible and plausible martyr condition of the average Protestant as opposed to the supporters of Catholicism, can be best modeled relying on Hobsbawm's concept of invented tradition. Hobsbawm claims that the main function of invented traditions is to build an ideologically and politically functioning link with the past, in order to validate certain values and norms of behavior for the sake of a *continuity*.²⁶ Moreover, he argues that the peculiarity of invented traditions consists of the fact that this continuity proves to be largely fictitious.²⁷ He also asserts that especially political institutions or ideological movements, including nationalism, are disposed to undertake the fabrication of historical continuity by inventing an ancient past. Foxe's martyrology, as promoted by his impressive collection of martyr narratives ideologically loaded with English and Latin prefaces, matches convincingly this concept. In Foxe's discourse the authentication of both Elizabeth's reign and the condition of the Church under her rule was so urgent that the contrasting reminder of Mary's rule had to be supplemented with a fictitious but efficient ideological artifice, that is, the redesigning of early martyrology as the immediate, but in fact invented, historical, theological and ideological/political antecedent of the persecutions during the 1550s.

The continental impact of this martyrology produced remarkable consequences and applications, well beyond the primary English political context in which it had emerged. The distinct and somehow independently circulated "invented tradition of martyrology" would become firstly, *the* Protestant, and then, the Calvinist version of a more and more secular sainthood which ignored hagiographic antecedents but became more and more infused with proto-national feelings and political agendas. The debate²⁸ over whether Foxe's work or English Protestantism did or did not contribute to the emergence of

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 130.

²⁶ Hobsbawm, *Invented Tradition*, 1–2.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 2.

²⁸ J. C. D. Clark, "Protestantism, Nationalism and National Identity 1660–1832," *Historical Journal*, 43 (2000) 1: 249–76.

an English national identity based upon the idea of an elect nation will surely have further repercussions, but for the moment I will confine myself to underlining the invented character of Protestant martyrology and its incorporation into the political discourse of confessionally organized European Protestantism. Briefly put, Foxe's work, although primarily rooted in a typically English early modern political reality, not only reshaped the theological and political paradigm of Elizabethan England, but arguably had a powerful impact upon the formation of continental Protestantism and Calvinism later on as well, including such distant states as the kingdom of Hungary and the principality of Transylvania.

In the light of this historical, theological and ideological/political context in which Hungarian Protestant martyrology was embedded, it is possible to decipher the subtleties of the Hungarian discourse which sought to mobilize public opinion against the Habsburgs. István Szőnyi Nagy (1633–1709) promoted a powerful pattern of martyrology which seems to have had a remarkable reception during the decade of persecution. Szőnyi studied first in Debrecen, then in Utrecht and Groningen. After his return to Hungary he became the minister of Torna, but was unable to remain, since he was driven out by the Jesuits with the military support provided by the Habsburgs (1671). This humiliating event deeply influenced his life. Forced to leave, he went to Debrecen, then to Zilah (*Rom. Zaláu*) in Transylvania. In 1675 he joined the army of the refugees and was active as a preacher. His deep commitment to the cause is illustrated by his literary activity as well.

His first work, signed with the telling *nom-de-plume*, *Philopatrius*, was entitled "The Pious Champion" and ostensibly dedicated to the memory of Gustavus Adolphus, the great protector of European Protestantism. In fact, Szőnyi's intention was to adopt the motif of the *miles Christi* or *athleta Christi* modeled on Gustavus' example, in order to explore the implications of the struggle for religious and political freedom. The subtitle of the work, "The Short History of the Pious Champion or the Late Sovereign Gustavus Adolphus King of Sweden and his most praiseworthy fight for bodily and spiritual freedom," clearly reveals his preoccupation to create multiple parallels between the deeds of the late king, the spiritual fight of the Protestant priests and the military combat undertaken by the refugees.²⁹

²⁹ Szőnyi, *Kegyés Vitéz*, Ar.

The construction of “bodily and spiritual freedom” as a perspective or motive for military resistance refers to the core of the ideology formulated by Szőnyi. The religious discourse in fact displayed an impressive repertoire of homiletic devices designed to persuade the readership of the organic link between the urgent need to liberate both the Church and the fatherland from their common enemy. Cast in the form of a long sermon upon the example of the pious Swedish king, Szőnyi’s work sets forth the ideal behavior pattern of all true Christians, that is, to undertake the moral, spiritual and, if needed, the physical fight against the enemy threatening the Church, the fatherland and their freedom. Thus he emphasized that the main purpose of his work is to exhibit “in a steel mirror...the indissoluble unity between Bravery and Piety.”³⁰

Szőnyi’s ideological argument introduced a new concept, the existence of a dichotomy between the private and common good (*privatum* vs. *publicum*). He claimed that most importantly everybody should give up desperate selfishness or individual welfare for the sake of common values. Thus, his political argument set the need for individual survival against the undertaking of the common, even social burden for the sake of collective rights and freedom:

Forget the continuous striving to attain your own personal comfort (*Privatum*) and try to obtain the common good (*Publicum*), the glory of God, the restoration of the bodily and spiritual freedom of your religion. If you gained this, you would possess in the Common good (*Publicum*) a plenty of private goods (*Privatum*) as well.³¹

Szőnyi’s attempt to amalgamate piety with bravery, and the spiritual and physical dimensions of the struggle, resulted, it seems, in a coherent propaganda focused upon *freedom* as an unalienable right in both a political and a religious-confessional sense. Moreover, Szőnyi sought to equate military combat with religious and confessional resistance by attributing a common motivation, aims and ideology to their supporters, namely soldiers and priests. Thus a common propagandistic background had been devised to validate the resistance as ideological war and military combat as well. However, Szőnyi’s greatest merit was the formulation of individual and collective behavior and identity patterns complemented by his preoccupation to interpret this in the context of

³⁰ Ibid., A1r.

³¹ Ibid., 6.

the *privatum* vs. *publicum* relation. His vision, beyond the immediate historical context of the 1670s, was also remarkable as a theological and political effort to project a political order inhabited by (imagined) political communities, in which individual interests, at least theoretically, would be subordinated to the common good.

Szőnyi's second book, also published in 1675, crowned his previous efforts to design a Protestant martyrology following the example of Foxe. This time he presented the archetype of the martyr equally committed to the true Church as *Ecclesia* and the homeland as *Patria*. Like Foxe, his main concern was to impregnate the notion of martyr with a certain everyday rationality so as to persuade his readers that every Christian potentially could become a martyr. In this way, the saint of the Catholic hagiographic tradition, whose superhuman character was illustrated by the miracles he so easily performed, was replaced with the much different character of the *elect*, the godly but average man, willing to undertake the renewed task of the martyr which involved not necessarily death, but the act of witnessing:

He who witnesses the Justice of Christ and undertakes in any possible manner suffering for the Gospel's truth is declared to be a martyr. In this broad sense, therefore, all those persons who serve honestly with their mind and soul the Lord every day, are considered to be martyrs, for they are witnessing the Truth.³²

At the same time, Szőnyi incorporated in this secularized concept of martyrdom the traditional attributes of true Christians, such as patience, constancy and unconditional obedience to God. The common spiritual heritage of Protestantism and Neo-Stoicism must have certainly been determining factors, for Foxe³³ and

³² Szőnyi, *The Crown of Martyrs*, 5.

³³ Foxe, while narrating the events relating to John Hooper (*The Story of John Hooper*), introduced a most convincing artifice in order to strengthen the persuasive power of his book; he simply added to the narrative the martyr's supposed last letter (*To all my Dear Brethren, my Relievers and Helpers in the city of London, September 2nd, anno 1554*). This text, in spite of its probably fictive origin, was a suggestive example of the patience and obedience shown by the martyrs in their most extreme moments. The letter, resembling a testament or a farewell, must have had devastating propagandistic impact: "...and from my heart I wish Their salvation, and quietly and patiently bear their injuries, wishing no further extremity to be used towards us. Yet, if the contrary seem best unto our heavenly Father, I have made my reckoning, and fully resolved myself to suffer the uttermost that they are able to do against me, yea death itself, by the aid of Christ Jesus, who died the most vile death of the cross for us wretches and miserable sinners. But of this I am assured, that the wicked world, with

Justus Lipsius³⁴ were highly influential exponents of these ideas. According to Szőnyi, “all those who patiently suffer their afflictions are martyrs.”³⁵

It is this recurrent concept of *patience* which became the main attribute of the Protestant martyr—who, in the context of double predestination, was willing to undertake without the least complaint whatsoever had been foreordained to him. This particular patience had the function of enabling the martyr to endure all extremities and afflictions during exile.

Thus, all those who patiently suffer, even though their lives were spared, could become martyrs: “Martyrs are those persons who bore witness to Justice, suffered prison or any kind of affliction, even though they did not meet their death.”³⁶ While the early Christian martyrs or the saints of the Middle Ages were often declared martyrs because of a major sacrifice they had undertaken, the Protestant and especially Calvinist martyrology appreciated more the act of witnessing and patient suffering than deliberate death. Protestant martyrs seemed to be more preoccupied with earthly duties and values, which meant the heroic but passive undertaking of death did not have the same significance. Although the supreme sacrifice was also appreciated, suffering and survival was more important than a passive death. According to Szőnyi, “All those who were delivered into the hands of their persecutors are surely martyrs, for this is a sign that God sends them to

all its force and power, shall not touch one of the hairs of our heads without leave and license of our heavenly Father, whose will be done in all things. If he will life, life be it: if he will death, death be it. Only we pray, that our wills may be subjected unto his will, and then, although both we and all the world see none other thing but death, yet if he think life best, we shall not die—not although the sword be drawn out over our heads: as Abraham thought to kill his son Isaac, yet, when God perceived that Abraham had surrendered his will to God’s will, and was content to kill his son, God then saved his son” (Foxe, *The Acts and Monuments*, 671).

³⁴ The most popular product of European neo-Stoicism was Justus Lipsius’ *De Constantia Libri Duo*. After its first edition in Leiden (1584) it was translated into Hungarian by János Laskai. János Laskai, *Iustus Lipsius nak az alhatatossagrol irt ket könyve. Kikben főkeppen (Lipsiusnak és Lángiusnak) a közönseges nyomorságokban-valo beszélgetések foglaltatik. Mostan magyarra fordittattak Laskai Ianos által* [The two books of Iustus Lipsius about Constancy...] (Debreczen, 1641). See also Orsolya Hanna Vincze’s article in this volume.

³⁵ Szőnyi, *Mártírok Coronája*, 5.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 6.

martyrdom and glorifies Himself through the persons of these most dear Christians."³⁷

One can conclude that the shift from passive death toward patient suffering and survival added a new perspective to the Christian view of martyrdom. Indeed, one might argue that the very act of witnessing had thoroughly changed. While in the Catholic tradition the death of the martyr was the ultimate act of witnessing and commitment, early modern Protestantism and most importantly Calvinism preferred the survival of the martyr and so refused to identify martyrdom with the obligatory suffering of death. The political and ideological functions attributed to Protestant martyrology might have been more easily performed by *living martyrs* than by dead persons, whose cult often proved to be problematic and controversial. Moreover, the escalating tendency to associate *Patria* with *Ecclesia* definitely favored the extreme experience of exile or persecution over passive death. It was this extreme experience of exile, the necessity to leave one's homeland, church or religion, which underpinned Szőnyi's concept:

Martyrs are those persons who are refugees, who fled from the bloody hands of the persecutors, for they witnessed the Truth. Therefore, they lost all their fortune, houses and values and became servants among strangers and foreign peoples. They are in continuous necessity, and they are crying and sighing. Petrus Martyr writes about them: *Est enim ipsa fuga confessionis species. Quis enim non maluerit domi suae manere, bonis suis frui, suae gentis hominum familiaritate uti, quam pauper et ignotus in longinquam regionem peregre proficisci?* (Fleeing from persecutors is, so to say, a way to witness the Truth. For, who would rather not stay at home at his own place and house, keep all his fortune and live amongst his own nation, than migrate in exile to distant places?)³⁸

An illustration of these theoretical considerations was also provided by Szőnyi. The extreme experience of exile, during which, although one is not killed, one is forced to leave one's home and give up one's preoccupations and activities, was something directly experienced by him. I have already referred to the fact that he was himself persecuted in 1671 when he was forced to leave the parish of Torna. The humiliating experience, the fact that he as a pastor had to leave his flock, surely became incorporated in his concept of martyrology. Furthermore, he clearly felt the need to make a direct association between the theory

³⁷ Ibid., 6.

³⁸ Ibid., 5–6.

of martyrology and his own persecution. Consequently, he added a short narration to his book, entitled: “The Sad Story of the Persecution and Exile of István Szőnyi Nagy from the Parish of Torna.”³⁹ The story is a detailed account of how the Jesuit Pater Hirco, sustained by military forces, occupied with violence the Calvinist church of Torna and caused him to flee.

However, the significance of the story, as a form of memoir, is multiple. The strong link between, the theory of martyrdom and his experiences of persecution are more than a late justification or a sort of Calvinist self-fashioning. It is the ultimate confirmation of all the claims made in the book about the nature, function and importance of martyrdom. By the integration of the story about his persecution he was clearly offering an illustration, an example, confirming the assertions he had introduced in his book. He was relying on the very basic rule of homiletics (*applicatio*), that the theoretical argument must always be applied to or illustrated with examples (*exempla*). The ideological and political message has thus been delivered through the mediation of homiletics. Szőnyi followed the prescription of devotional literature, which demands that every text, written or oral, conceived according to the rules of homiletics, must be employed to perform the idea of *docere, delectare, flectere, movere*.⁴⁰

Teaching, delectation, persuasion and moving are the basic rules upon which the universal devotional literature and homiletics has been built. Szőnyi, as a good priest, chose to exemplify his theological teaching with a gripping illustration proving his own involvement and commitment. But he also managed to add further propagandistic value and political significance to his martyrology, since he witnessed the truth, confessed his experiences and presumably convinced his readership. We cannot claim that János Komáromi ever read this book, but his diary and other writings convincingly illustrate the powerful

³⁹ Ibid., O5r–O8v.

⁴⁰ In the twelfth chapter of his *On Christian Doctrine* (*De Doctrina Christiana*), Augustine, referring back to Cicero, asserts that the aim of the Christian orator is to teach, to delight, and to move. Then he adds: “To teach is a necessity, to delight is a beauty, to persuade is a triumph.” And he also asserted that “the eloquent divine, then, when he is urging a practical truth, must not only teach so as to give instruction, and please so as to keep up the attention, but he must also sway the mind so as to subdue the will. For if a man be not moved by the force of truth, though it is demonstrated to his own confession, and clothed in beauty of style, nothing remains but to subdue him by the power of eloquence.” (<http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/jod/augustine/ddc4.html>). Accessed on 5 December 2008.

impact produced by Szőnyi's martyrology on the Calvinist believers of the period.

"Martyr of his sweet fatherland": János Komáromi's case

The invented character of Protestant and especially Calvinist martyrology of the 17th century as a tradition and its political/ideological uses in an English and an European context, introduced in the previous part of this article, functions as a primary context providing relevant connotations to Komáromi's considerations about his and Thököly's *martyrdom*. The aim of the present section is to reevaluate Komáromi's concept of martyrology contextualized in the interpretive frames of early modern Protestant martyrology.

Even though the two first met as enemies on the battlefield of Zernyest in 1690, János Komáromi (d. 1711) was soon to become the follower of Prince Thököly. Since Komáromi's former lord and Thököly's great political rival, Teleki, died in the battle, he apparently accepted to join the *kuruc* army and serve their leader. Yet, their relation seems to have had a previous background. Thököly might even have known him fairly well, as testified by a letter written by him to János Komáromi in 1678.⁴¹ However, it must have been a decision that proved of benefit to both parties, because János Komáromi faithfully served the *kuruc* leader and proved his unfailing loyalty in the most extreme situations. He looked after both Imre Thököly (d. 1705) and his wife Ilona Zrínyi (d. 1703) until their last moments, and afterwards arranged their burials.

Although we lack detailed information about Komáromi's life, it seems clear that he embodied the type of the literate servant or familiar,⁴² whose task it was, thanks to his literate skills, to serve his lord as

⁴¹ The letter dated March 18, 1678 was published in a volume of Imre Thököly's correspondence (*Gróf Thököly Imre levelei, a Gróf Teleki család Marosvásárhelyi levéltárából* [The letters of Count Imre Thököly from the archive of the Teleki family], ed. Farkas Deák (Budapest, 1882), 229–30.

⁴² This is the typically Hungarian version of clientelism, which still functioned according to feudal principles. The young noblemen, especially those who had lost their lands and held only the titles attached to them, were often engaged by richer aristocrats to undertake all kinds of military or even diplomatic duties. The longer the period they spent with him, the more intimate a relation united them with their patron, who not just paid them but helped them to arrange a good marriage or any other means for social advancement (András Koltai, introduction to András Koltai,

a *secretarius*, that is, a confidential secretary. Already while in service with Teleki, Komáromi proved his reliability as a *secretarius*, writing letters in both Hungarian and Latin, delivering messages and performing various diplomatic missions. It seems reasonable to assume that he performed similar tasks while in Thököly's service. We lack information about his studies, but we can presume that while he may have studied abroad, he was neither a priest nor a student of theology. He followed Thököly into exile, first in Constantinople, and then to Nicomedia. He recorded his experiences of exile in a diary, starting from 1697, after the lost battle of Zenta, and continuing to 1705. Moreover, in 1699 he also found time to translate from Latin into Hungarian the book of the Jesuit Hieronimus Drexel entitled *Gymnasium Patientiae*.⁴³

Komáromi's choice to translate the work of a Jesuit could be considered, at very least, interesting, given Komáromi's patently expressed Calvinism as revealed in a number of entries in his diary. Yet it seems that Drexel was a favorite with all confessions. The work was widely read and, most importantly, translated during the 17th century and even after: two English (1640),⁴⁴ a French (1633), a Czech (1633) and three Italian (1639, 1803, 1889)⁴⁵ translations were published, giving the book the status of an early modern European bestseller. Moreover, this extraordinary multilingual reception coincides with the notable fact that the book seemed to deliver a supra-confessional message. For the *Gymnasium Patientiae*, as a detailed and artfully presented allegory, uses a set of homiletic devices in order to teach, persuade and move and provide spiritual "delectation" for all true believers, no matter what their confessional affiliation.

ed., *Magyar udvari rendtartás. Utasítások és rendeletek* [The Organization of early modern Hungarian courts. Statutes and directions], (Budapest: Osiris, 2001), 7–13.

⁴³ This unpublished translation I discovered in 2004 is unknown to Hungarian scholars. János Komáromi, *Békességes Tűrésnek Oskolája, Mellyet Édes hazáján kívül való boldogtalankodásában Deákbul magyarra fordított KOMÁROMI János, Magyarországi s Erdélyi bujdosó Fejedelem Secretariussa, s édes Hazája Martyrja* [The School of Patient Endurance translated from Latin into Hungarian by János Komáromi, the *secretarius* of the exiled prince of Hungary and Transylvania, and the martyr of his sweet fatherland, while in exile] (1699), 251 v.

⁴⁴ Both translations were finished in 1640 by R. Daniel and R. Stanford. See A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave, eds., *A Short Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland & Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad 1475–1640*, 2nd ed. (London: The Bibliographical Society, 1986), 325.

⁴⁵ *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, nouvelle édition, ed. Carlos Sommervogel SJ (Bruxelles-Paris, 1892), 193.

Though Drexel did not take special care to avoid the use of a typically Catholic style or references, the “plot” of the book provides, indeed, a universally valid and most fitting devotional message.⁴⁶ Thus the book, divided in three parts, firstly describes what kind of punishments and crosses are to be endured in the “school of patience”;⁴⁷ secondly, demonstrates that afflictions do indeed teach us fortitude and fidelity;⁴⁸ and finally, persuades the reader that afflictions are to be endured patiently.⁴⁹ The main aim and conclusion of this teaching is that afflictions are to be suffered in conformity and resignation to the will of God (*Afflictiones omnes perpetiendas esse cum Conformatione Humana ad voluntatem divinam*).⁵⁰

The amazing popularity of Drexel’s work cannot be attributed merely to its supra-confessional character and its promotion of traditional Christian themes (obedience, patience, modesty and persevering trust in God). Of notable importance in this respect are the two English translations, published seven years after the appearance of the *editio princeps*. It can scarcely be denied that a number of similarities between 17th century English, mostly non-conformist, puritan religiosity and Drexel’s ascetic devotion fundamentally contributed to the making of the English translation. Indeed, the stoic attitude to endure all afflictions, recommended by Drexel, could have been associated or even equated with the popular teaching of Protestant neo-Stoicism, promoting something very similar in the concept of *constantia*. Moreover, the genre and homiletic particularities of the book, its deliberate aim of teaching, persuading and providing pious delectation, might have seemed familiar for a readership accustomed to the conduct book, the leading genre of puritan devotional literature.

Still, it seems likely that another significant factor is at work as well. In its English version (*The School of Patience*) Drexel’s work promoted the most important attribute of Foxe’s martyrology, that is, patient

⁴⁶ The edition that I have used for citation is Hieronimus Drexel, *Reverendi Patris. Hieremiae Drexelii e Socie: Jesu OPERA OMNIA, in Duos Tomos nunc distributa* (Mainz, 1645), 1–91.

⁴⁷ “Quae poenarum genera, seu quae cruces sint in gymnasio patientiae ferendae.” Drexel, *Gymnasium Patientiae*, 3–35.

⁴⁸ “Afflictio docet Fortitudinem et Fidelitatem.” *Ibid.*, 35–62.

⁴⁹ “Afflictiones sustinendas esse patienter.” *Ibid.*, 62–91.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 82.

suffering,⁵¹ which was the most important distinguishing mark of the early modern Protestant martyr.⁵² In the spiritual context of a more and more haunted puritan imagination mercilessly opposing election to eternal damnation, the martyr represented the elect person freed from the pressure of religious despair.⁵³ Therefore, a book providing advice and teaching on how to perform the practice of piety with the deliberate aim of assimilating the total obedience to God was surely welcome. Furthermore, it could also render into practice the idealistic behavior of the martyrs promoted by the great variety of narratives available in Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*. It is, therefore, quite possible that Drexel's Latin work was integrated, thanks to translation as an act of cultural transfer, into the devotional literature promoting the Protestant martyrology.⁵⁴ We may therefore conclude that Drexel's Protestant reception implies a process of cultural transfer too, since the hermeneutical act of understanding, explaining and applying resulted in a rather innovative (mis/ab)use of the original text.

Accordingly, it might prove productive to assess Komáromi's use of martyrology in this particular context. Drexel's Latin work in his translation is directly associated with the Protestant and especially the Hungarian Calvinist martyrology promoted by Szőnyi. He made his translation/transfer very clear. The title of the manuscript is eloquent: "The School of Patient Endurance translated from Latin into Hungarian by János Komáromi, the *secretarius* of the exiled prince of Hungary and Transylvania, and the martyr of his sweet fatherland, while in exile."

The immediate textual context of this translation is also relevant and revealing. Komáromi finished his translation in 1699, but in the

⁵¹ "...when I weighed with myself what memorable acts and famous doings this latter age of church hath ministered unto us by the *patient sufferings of the worthy martyrs*, I thought it not to be neglected, that so precious monuments of so many matters, meet to me recorded and registered in books, should lie buried by my default, under darkness of oblivion." Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, 521.

⁵² Master Hooper's Prayer: "Lord I am hell, but thou art heaven, I am swill and a sink of sin, but thou art a gracious God and a merciful Redeemer. Have mercy therefore upon me, most miserable and wretched offender... But all thing that are impossible with man, are possible with thee: therefore strengthen me of thy goodness, that in the fire *I break not the rules of patience*, or else assuage the terror of the pains, as shall seem most thy glory." (Ibid., 657)

⁵³ Michael Macdonald, "The Fearfull Estate of Francis Spira: Narrative, Identity, and Emotion in Early Modern England," *Journal of British Studies* 31 (1992): 32–61.

⁵⁴ For the evaluation of this cultural phenomenon see John R. Knott, *Discourses of Martyrdom in English Literature 1563–1694* (Cambridge: University Press, 1993).

meantime he had been keeping a diary covering, essentially, the whole period of exile started in October 1697 and ending in 1705. The fact that the diary, which covers systematically this period of eight years, does not contain any entries for the year of 1699 might indicate he was preoccupied with the translation during this time. In all the following years, excepting 1704, longer or shorter entries were written on more or less regular base.

The very first reference to martyrology in this diary is the one already cited, which was recorded in Nicomedia (1701) and makes an association with the persecution of early Christians. It is worth revisiting: "I feel as a release that *our martyrdom* has been ordained to this place. Blessed be God!"⁵⁵ At this particular point, a number of pertinent contexts are available for exploring the meanings and significance of the statement. The use of the construction *our martyrdom* is neither a coincidence nor an extravagant assertion caused by the remembrance of the Christian martyrs. By the time Komáromi arrived to Nicomedia, he had already finished a translation dealing with the Christian duty of Patience, and most importantly he had previously defined himself as a *martyr* of his dearly loved homeland.⁵⁶ Furthermore, by the time Thököly and his court reached Constantinople and started their *martyrdom*, that is, their exile, both the tradition of European Reformation, especially Foxe, and the Hungarian Calvinists, especially Szőnyi, had worked out and promoted an ideological-political discourse centered on the figure and pattern of the martyr. This latter concept was rooted in a shared experience, namely, the common persecution endured by the refugees and the humiliated priests during the 1670s. Komáromi not only assimilated the concept of *patience* associated with the neo-Stoic concept of *constantia*, he might also have read Szőnyi's works and surely was acquainted with the more and more secular ideology of the martyr as a patriot promoted by Thököly and his supporters.⁵⁷

⁵⁵ Komáromi, *Diarium*, 76.

⁵⁶ An almost similar statement was written by him in his translation (1699), when he referred to his condition of martyr, a status of suffering and deprivation. "As an old man being forced to stay in exile amongst strangers I have to endure all kinds of afflictions, but blessed be the Lord for that, for He takes all those who do not want to attend His school of Patience and teaches them most severely in his School of Justice" (Komáromi, *Békességes túrés*, 4r).

⁵⁷ Katalin Péter, while exploring the different meanings and references of the *homeland as Patria* in tripartite Hungary, emphasized the particular ideological discourse promoted by the refugees, often suggesting that their sufferings were meant to be a *sacrifice for the homeland (Patria)*. Katalin Péter, *Papok és nemesek. Magyar*

Similarly in a way to Szőnyi, who added the narrative of his persecution as a diary to the “Crown of Martyrs” and thus promoted the theory of Hungarian Calvinist martyrology and its immediate application, Komáromi, while in exile, combined the narrative of the diary with his translation. Thus, the reference to martyrology recorded in an entry of his diary (1701) anticipated by his translation which also makes references to his martyr status, creates a similar impression; the translation as the theory of martyrology was exemplified by its application, that is, the experiences narrated in his diary. Still, Komáromi was not a priest and had not received the education or the training of a student of theology. His religiosity was surely augmented by his hopeless situation, thus his decision to accomplish the translation did not have a typically religious motivation. This consideration is also confirmed by his approach to the whole issue of martyrdom.

Even though the determining influence of the Protestant and especially Calvinist paradigm starting with Foxe and continued by Szőnyi cannot be denied, it is worth pointing out the major differences of Komáromi’s discourse. Foxe and Szőnyi added a strongly confessional character to their martyrology, meaning that the opposition between the True Church and False Church implied a second antagonism as well, Catholicism vs. Protestantism. This suggested that only Protestants (Lutherans and Calvinists) were to become martyrs. However, Komáromi simply ignored the criterion of confessional identity. Thus Thököly, who was born Lutheran by birth but under the pressure of the French became Catholic for a short period of time, was also considered by Komáromi a martyr. While narrating the circumstances of Thököly’s burial he depicted the monument erected to honor the memory of the prince, “so that everyone could see and say that for his long exile and his martyrdom undertaken for his nation and dearly loved fatherland: REQUIESCAT IN PACE. AMEN.”⁵⁸

The likely explanation for this phenomenon is that the common experience, rendered into a common political/ideological discourse, which had been promoted in the 1670s both by the refugees and the persecuted priests, entered a new phase of development under

művelődéstörténeti tanulmányok a reformációval kezdődő másfél évszázadból [Priests and noblemen. Studies on the cultural history of Hungary during the one and a half century starting with the Reformation] (Budapest: Ráday Gyűjtemény, 1995), 230–31.

⁵⁸ Komáromi, *Diárium*, 89.

the influence of the events that had taken place during the decade of the 1690s. The incorporation of Transylvania (1687–1691) in the Habsburg empire, the ultimate and decisive failure of the policy based upon directing the Ottoman influence against the Habsburgs must have revealed that not solely the theologically conceived notion of True Church (*Ecclesia*), but a more comprehensive, politically determined unit, the homeland's existence (*Patria*), was imperiled. The danger influencing all social strata, the experiences and feelings related to this somber perspective, might have percolated the collective even if confessionally divided consciousness of the population.

It is therefore quite plausible to claim that it was with this particular modification that Komáromi, though influenced by the Protestant and especially Calvinist martyrology, set forth a discourse transgressing the limits of confessionalism. Moreover, his applied martyrology bearing the signs of a more secular and politically functional translation/transfer, had already conceived and promoted exile as an extreme experience equivalent with religious persecution. Accordingly, his concept of martyrdom was no longer organically linked to the Church, having freed itself from the perspective of the struggle between the True Church and False Church, in order to focus upon its most important component, that is, instead of Church (*Ecclesia*), the fatherland (*Patria*). Consequently, he used the theological teaching about the patient endurance of affliction to promote the pattern of the martyr, but with the deliberate aim to demonstrate the relevance of the *pro patria mori*⁵⁹ concept without any theological references. Thus, solely love towards the homeland (*patria*), or exile as an extreme experience undergone as a consequence of this feeling and attitude, was promoted as the chief criterion of his Martyrology, in fact, his patriotism.

While the martyr/patriot in his discourse seemed to be the direct descendant of the persecuted Protestant, the community of the martyrs/patriots could not be related to the Invisible Church. For they, most importantly, constituted an imagined, political community and its structure or functions did not rely on solely theological sources. The popular concept of elect nation promoted especially by Protestant propaganda was replaced by another fiction which attempted to cross the limits of confessional identity and transpose all the confessionally

⁵⁹ Kantorowicz, *Pro Patria Mori*, 487–88.

delineated groups into the frame of one comprehensive concept of community.

Conclusion

This article's main concern has been to reveal how the tradition of Protestant martyrology was "reinvented" and applied first by the representatives of the Calvinist Church and then by secular persons to exploit its ideological connotations and create political representations. Furthermore, contrasting the set phrases readily used about the rhetoric of early modern political language, I have sought to exhibit a different perspective emphasizing the role played by homiletics in early modern political discourses in the context of theological politics. Finally, I have attempted to formulate a plausible explanation of the re-configuration of "patriotic" political discourse, while keeping in mind that the emergence of patriotism or national identity writ large were but small components of the multi-layered political reality of the early modern period.

One can draw the conclusion that the emergence of the martyrological discourse around the exiles of Thököly and the remnants of his court, commemorated by Komáromi, witnesses to the evolution starting with the Reformation and culminating in the repeated attempts of liberation undertaken by a multilingual, multi-confessional and multicultural community to formulate a shared identity. Analyzing Komáromi's writings we could grasp this proto-nationalistic process imbued by confessional and regional initiatives during the 16th and 17th centuries, tracing the formation of patriotism and the political communities conceived in this frame, ready to incorporate all the inhabitants of the *Patria* in those sophisticated political representations and fictions which eventually endowed the modern Nation with political, legal and historical substance.

CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

DEFENDING THE CATHOLIC ENTERPRISE: NATIONAL SENTIMENT, ETHNIC TENSIONS, AND THE JESUIT MISSION IN SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY HUNGARY

Regina Pörtner

The story of the rise and fall of the first Society of Jesus like no other religious order's epitomizes the fate of the Counter-Reformation as a centrally co-ordinated enterprise. The Society's difficult start in the years 1534–40, which saw its motives and even its orthodoxy questioned by the authorities, resembled the tribulations of the Catholic humanist reformers in Spain and Italy whose quest for reform and reconciliation with the Protestant schismatics exposed them to similar charges from Rome. The hardening of confessional frontiers from about the mid-1540s spelt the end for the broadly inclusive and in parts crypto-Protestant Erasmian movement in southern Europe. Some of its leading lights who remained loyal to the Church, like cardinals Gasparo Contarini (1483–1542), Girolamo Seripando (1493–1563) and Giovanni Morone (1509–1580), played a crucial part in furthering the cause of ecclesiastical reform for which Contarini's *Consilia de emendanda ecclesia* of 1536 were to set the tone.¹

However, the contraction of scope for inter-confessional debate of which the convocation of the Council of Trent (1545–63) formed part resulted in the Society of Jesus turning into the shock troops of the Counter-Reformation Church in the ensuing religious conflicts. Few

¹ The origins of the Society are discussed from within the wider context of early Catholic reform in Southern Europe in Outram Evennett, *The Spirit of the Counter-Reformation* (Notre Dame and London: University of Notre Dame Press), 43–66. On the three cardinals' views and the reform party at Trent see Evennett, *Counter-Reformation*, 29–30, 112ff. Still indispensable for the study of Catholic Evangelism are the pioneering studies by Frederic C. Church, *The Italian Reformers 1534–1564* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1932), Philip McNair, *Peter Martyr in Italy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), and Dermot Fenlon, *Heresy and Obedience in Tridentine Italy: Cardinal Pole and the Counter-Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972).

historians have questioned the crucial importance of the Jesuits' activities as court confessors, envoys, missionaries and educators for the success of the Counter-Reformation especially in Central Europe in the age of confessional strife between about 1560 and 1648. They were important, though by no means always pliable, instruments of papal policy in the sphere of high politics: thus during the Thirty Years' War, Jesuit court confessors in Vienna, Munich, Madrid and Paris were exhorted by the Curia to work ceaselessly towards reconciling the Catholic monarchs and aligning them against the Protestant powers.² Ironically, such alignment came about, if briefly, after the end of the age of religious warfare as an unintentional side-effect of the Diplomatic Revolution and the Seven Years' War in which all parties, with the notable exception of the Prussian, were keen to play down the confessional dimension of the conflict.³

The process of confessional polarization in the sixteenth and early seventeenth century has been identified as a key determinant in the formation of national identities in Protestant Britain and Europe.⁴ Conversely, this process contributed to the survival of the Church as a state-backed institution in the Catholic countries. Perhaps the most historically significant outcome of this constellation was a gradual but inexorable shift since the second half of the seventeenth century in the balance of power between the Church and the Catholic princes on the one hand and the institutions of the secular state in the Catholic countries on the other. In the Austrian Habsburg Monarchy, the balance had tilted firmly in favour of the Viennese and provincial governments by the mid-eighteenth century. The origins of this transformation arguably reached back to the very start of the Counter-Reformation under Ferdinand II (1619–1637), it continued in the reigns of Emperor Ferdinand III (1637–57) and Leopold I (1657–1705) and it had become the firm basis of governmental attitudes towards

² The Jesuit court confessors' activities as advisers and negotiators during the conflict are discussed by Robert Bireley, *The Jesuits and the Thirty Years' War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

³ For the attitude of the Curia see Johannes Burkhardt, *Abschied vom Religionskrieg. Der Siebenjährige Krieg und die päpstliche Diplomatie* (Tübingen: M. Niemeyer, 1985), 42–55.

⁴ For recent appraisals of the links between confession, identity and state formation see Brendan Bradshaw and Peter Roberts, eds., *British Consciousness and Identity: The Making of Britain 1533–1707* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), and Ethan Shagan, ed., *Catholics and the 'Protestant Nation': Religion, Politics and Identity in Early Modern England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005).

the Church by the reign of Charles VI (1711–40) and his devout but resolutely interventionist daughter Maria Theresa (1740/45–80). The conspicuous personal piety of the seventeenth-century Habsburg rulers gave ideological legitimacy to their gradual assumption of control over the religious life of their subjects and the activities of the clergy. Men of the Church were treated increasingly as specially favoured, privileged and protected subjects, but subjects nevertheless. The fact that papal influence diminished as a concomitant of the emergence of Catholic national churches is, of course, a more general feature of changing state-church relations in late seventeenth and eighteenth-century Catholic Europe. In the case of the Holy Roman Empire this transformation had a parallel in the strengthening of the centrifugal political power of the territorial princes by the terms of the Westphalian Peace at the expense of Imperial authority. By the second half of the eighteenth century, contemporaries commented on the hollowness of papal power outside Italy of Imperial power in the affairs of the Empire: a Hanoverian government memorandum of 1760 thus noted the utter ineffectualness of Imperial decrees and court ordinances and likened them in this respect to the papal ban and excommunication.⁵

In a desperate move to halt the erosion of papal authority at national level, Popes Benedict XIV (1740–58) and Clement XIV (1769–74) adopted a policy of concessions towards national governments. The dissolution of the Society of Jesus in 1759–1773 formed part of these efforts by which the papacy tried to redefine its position *vis-à-vis* the national churches in Spain, France and Germany. In the German lands, anti-Jesuitism was less pronounced than anti-curialism which in the shape of Febronianism, named after the pseudonym Febronius of the German theologian Justus Hontheim (1701–1799), made an unsuccessful but much-noted Catholic case for a German national church or “Reichskirche” that would be independent from Rome, thus providing an institutional platform from which to pursue the irenic quest for ending the Christian schism. The movement at one stage was supported by the influential archbishops of Cologne, Mainz, Trier and

⁵ Quoted in Reinhold Koser, “Brandenburg-Preußen in dem Kampfe zwischen Imperialismus und reichsständischer Libertät,” *Historische Zeitschrift*, N.F. [New Series] 60 (1906): 193–242, at 218. For changing state-church relations in this period see James E. Bradley and Dale Van Kley, eds., *Religion and Politics in Enlightenment Europe* (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001).

Salzburg and hence should not be dismissed as a fringe phenomenon in Central European religious history.⁶

Against these currents the Roman Catholic church upheld its universalist claims, which in the late eighteenth and in the nineteenth century were to gain strength from the ultramontane movements in the Catholic countries. Ultramontanism also spread among the clergy in early eighteenth-century France in response to the challenge of Gallicanism. In the nineteenth century it became a considerable social force in Catholic Europe as an oppositional ideology backing the national churches against the forces of secularization, liberalization and absorption into the nation state.⁷

If a case could thus be made for nineteenth-century political Catholicism as the last redoubt of Catholic universalism at national level this should not obscure the fact that the dissolution of the Jesuit order in 1773 effectively acknowledged the termination of the Counter-Reformation enterprise that had been universalist in spirit. The program for spiritual and ecclesiastical reform that had been agreed upon at the Council of Trent had encapsulated this spirit, and in the sixteenth and early seventeenth century the Society of Jesus had become its very embodiment by its supranational organization, its insistence on strict obedience to the higher levels of the hierarchy, and its principle of rotation of offices and personnel among the Jesuit colleges and provinces. However, the very success of the Society in terms of its geographical and numerical expansion undermined the foundations of its universal mission in the seventeenth century: to carry out their mission the Jesuits had to win the hearts and minds of the Catholic princes and the noble and urban elites who as patrons and pupils became the most important transmitters of the Society's religious and educational message. The following case study for the Austro-Hungarian province seeks to illustrate the dilemma confronting the Jesuits in their struggle

⁶ See Richard van Dülmen, "Antijesuitismus und katholische Aufklärung in Deutschland," in Richard van Dülmen, *Religion und Gesellschaft* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Verlag, 1989), 141–71, and the collections of essays in Harm Klütting, ed., *Katholische Aufklärung: Aufklärung im katholischen Deutschland* (Hamburg: Meiner, 1993) and Elisabeth Kovács, ed., *Katholische Aufklärung und Josephinismus* (Vienna: Wiener Dom-Verlag, 1979).

⁷ See Gisela Fleckenstein, ed., *Ultramontanismus: Tendenzen der Forschung* (Paderborn: Bonifatius-Druckerei, 2005), and Elisabeth Kovács, *Ultramontanismus und Staatskirchentum im Theresianisch-Josephinischen Staat* (Vienna: Wiener Beiträge zur Theologie 51, 1975).

to successfully establish the Counter-Reformation mission in the largely hostile environment of war-torn, faction-ridden Hungary, while at the same time preserving the unity of the Society against the centrifugal forces of nascent national sentiment and ethnic conflict amongst their own ranks. As will be shown, the Austrian province came close to break-up as a result of tensions that were causally linked to the social and political pressures exerted by the conflicting demands of the Hungarian nobility on the one side, and the royal government of Leopold I on the other. Finally, the Generals' correspondence as evidence from the Society's centre will be drawn on to demonstrate the strengthening of national sentiment among the Jesuits in the Habsburg Monarchy, and to show how this reflected a wider trend towards proto-national "patriotism" in seventeenth-century European society. As will be seen, the Generals strongly opposed expressions of patriotism and ethnically motivated national sentiment as inimical to the universalist approach of the Society and subversive of its worldwide enterprise.

The germs of the dilemma arising from the Jesuits' supranational organization operating in more or less developed national contexts of the seventeenth century are already detectable in the late sixteenth century: if the Jesuits' efforts at winning the trust of Catholic princes and converting or instructing the élites were to be successful they almost inevitably entailed social and political commitments which ran counter to the Society's regulations.⁸ For example in August 1589, General Claudius Acquaviva (1585–1615) issued the Austrian provincial with detailed instructions for his conduct while at the Emperor's court. The instructions repeated the main points of the guidelines Acquaviva had laid down for the head of the Polish province on a similar occasion in the previous year in issuing a warning against becoming involved in political affairs or matters relating to a third party which were of no concern to the religious mission of the Society. The very "shadow" and false rumour of such involvement were to be avoided at all cost.⁹ In practice, however, such reticence was incompatible with the wishes of the Catholic Monarchs: the Jesuits actively aspired to the position of Court confessors, which entailed a relation of exceptional trust and

⁸ *Constitutiones Societatis Iesu*, Anno 1558, reprint from the original edition (London, 1838), especially part 8, 70–73.

⁹ Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu (cited in the following notes below as ARSI), Fondo Gesuitico, 720/A/II/3, "Instructio pro missione ad Aulam Regia [sic]," 9 August 1589.

proximity to the ruler. Even matters of state that were not directly concerned with the Church and faith could raise cases of conscience, and in any event dealings were of a confidential and often delicate nature. Predictably, the Catholic princes had no mind to let their spiritual advisers be removed and replaced at the behest of the Society's remote central authority. From the princes' point of view, the Society's regulations for rotation of office had been a nuisance right from the start, and the General's letters to the Austrian province from the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century testify to the extent to which some of the Austrian Jesuits had become involved in politics and other secular affairs of the court regardless of existing prohibitions.¹⁰

Even if they were mindful of the hazards attending life at court the Jesuits were often unable to avoid the worldly pleasures of the elites they had to mingle with, and in the course of the seventeenth century they increasingly showed little inclination to refrain from such distractions. Such transgressions were defended on grounds of furthering the Society's relations with the population of those towns in which they opened colleges, schools and universities, which in turn formed the basis from which the Society launched its rural missions. There was no dearth of opportunities for indulging in conviviality such as banquets with the towns' notables and noble patrons. The disciplinary problems arising from the Jesuits' successful integration into provincial society are well documented by the Generals' Austrian correspondence for the second half of the seventeenth and early eighteenth century: the letters abound with examples of Jesuits becoming embroiled in local political affairs and long drawn-out litigation over bequests and other disputed property, they socialized with the notables and mixed freely with the nobility of both sexes, whom they treated to lavish banquets and even accompanied on hunting parties.¹¹ In 1653, the recently elected German General of the Society, Goswin Nickel (1652–1664), devoted his first letter to all members of the Society to the disintegrating effects

¹⁰ Examples for the court of Archduke Karl II and Ferdinand of Inner Austria in Graz can be found in ARSI, Austria, *Epistolae Generalium* 1 II, 1573–1600, e.g. Karl II's letter of 13 December 1586 protesting against the transfer of his confessor Nikolaus Coprivitz, ARSI, Austria, *Epistolae Generalium* 1 II, 1573–1600, 305–6. The problem is dealt with in detail in Bernhard Duhr, *Jesuiten an den deutschen Fürstenhöfen des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Basel and Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1901).

¹¹ Documentation relating to the above instances and the general decline of discipline and academic standards in the Austrian province can be found in the Austrian correspondence, ARSI, Austria, 7–11, 1656–1725.

and spiritual dangers resulting from the prevailing lax interpretation of the vow of poverty. Indulgence in luxury, inappropriate dress and personal conceit, acceptance of valuable gifts and accumulation of personal wealth, and a concomitant reluctance to return to the austerity of the college and its arduous duties were the most widespread and pernicious abuses among Jesuits whose spiritual duties entailed presence at the princes' courts and in the houses of the nobility.¹² Detachment from the colleges and the discipline they imposed went hand in hand with the strengthening of bonds based on favour, kinship, and love of one's country or community of descent: in 1666, Nickel's successor General John Paul Oliva castigated the abuse of sending misleading information and even slanderous reports from the provincial houses, which as he believed was motivated by "love of one's people or kinship."¹³ There is further evidence from the late seventeenth century for a nascent sense of national identity among the Jesuit provinces that had distinct ethnic overtones. The following episode reveals that the Austrian Jesuits by that time viewed the statutory inspections by external, foreign Visitors General of the Society as unwarranted interference. Their opposition was backed by Leopold I, who claimed that his sovereign rights of jurisdiction were infringed if the clergy in his lands were made subject to foreign visitations when General Thyrsus Gonzalez de Santalla (1687–1705) appointed the former German provincial P. Jakob Willi for an inspection of the Bohemian province in 1692 and subsequently sent him to the Austrian province in 1695. Gonzalez's decision met with vociferous protests from both the Bohemian and Austrian provincials who believed they were singled out for disciplinary action, considering that the appointment was neither for a Bohemian nor an Austrian. It took a considerable diplomatic effort by the General and his representatives in Vienna to persuade Leopold that the proposed visitation was a normal procedure under the statutes

¹² Goswin Nickel S. J., Missive of 30 September 1653, "De Amore & studio perfectae Paupertatis," *Epistolae Praepositorum Generalium ad Patres et Fratres Societatis Jesu, Pragae, Typis Universitatis Carolo-Ferdinandae in Coll: Soc: Jesu ad S. Clementem*, Anno 1711, 639–98.

¹³ "Infidelis informatio oritur ex Nationis, vel cognationis affectu," from "De informationibus," letter by John Paul Oliva, 8 September 1666, *Epistolae Praepositorum Generalium ad Patres et Fratres Societatis Jesu, Pragae, Typis Universitatis Carolo-Ferdinandae in Coll: Soc: Jesu ad S. Clementem* (Prague, 1711), 756–57.

of the Society and would neither prejudice his jurisdictional rights nor reflect on the provinces' reputation abroad.¹⁴

The case of the Austrian Jesuits' objections to a German Visitor General is not only indicative of internal disciplinary problems within the Society, it also testifies to the existence of tensions based on national sentiment between Austrians and Germans. This ran straight counter to the spirit of fraternal unity on which Ignatius had put so much emphasis in the eighth unit of the Society's Constitutions.¹⁵ Such unity was crucial for keeping the potentially powerful influence of national interests out. It is also a reminder of the fact that, while the Counter-Reformation was supposed to be a universal enterprise in spirit, it was in practice launched at Trent from a rather narrowly circumscribed patch of common ground shared by the papacy and the Catholic Monarchs, with the bishops and cardinals acting frequently as spokesmen of their sovereigns' particular wishes and, in the German case, divisive interests.¹⁶

As the conflict about foreign Visitors illustrates, the imperative need for the Society to accommodate the Catholic Monarchs' wishes effectively strengthened the centrifugal forces in the provinces. From the beginning of the Counter-Reformation in the sixteenth century the Habsburg dynasty had exerted a formative influence on the definition of the various religious orders' provincial boundaries. The Austrian Jesuit province had emerged as a result of the rapid expansion and division of the German province in the sixteenth century. In the seventeenth century it covered all of Habsburg Austria and Hungary, counting in 1665 no less than 1065 Jesuits. Only half of them were ordained priests, and they were scattered over twenty-one colleges and twenty-nine houses of the society.¹⁷ The creation of a separate Bohemian province in 1622 had been an important part of the program for the conversion and consolidation of the defeated kingdom, but it also reflected Ferdinand II's desire to align ecclesiastical and political boundaries.¹⁸ The rapid progress of the Bohemian province was to

¹⁴ The episode is related in Bernhard Duhr, *Geschichte der Jesuiten in den Ländern deutscher Zunge*, vol. III (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1913). The letters by Leopold and Gonzalez are cited at 188–89.

¹⁵ *Constitutiones Societatis Iesu*, 70–73.

¹⁶ The impact of factionalism at Trent is outlined deftly by A. G. Dickens, *The Counter Reformation* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1968, reprinted 1992), 107–33.

¹⁷ Duhr, *Geschichte der Jesuiten*, III:184.

¹⁸ Duhr, *Geschichte der Jesuiten*, II:315ff, III:185.

a considerable extent the fruit of the exertions of Ferdinand's Jesuit confessor and adviser William Lamormaini who in cooperation with Heinricus Philippi S.J., who subsequently became confessor to Ferdinand III, drafted a detailed blueprint for the spiritual reconquest of the Bohemian lands.¹⁹

In general, the Habsburgs urged the streamlining of ecclesiastical and political boundaries, which followed the pattern of political and military events in spreading from the Austrian heartlands to Bohemia and then to Hungary. As early as 1577, Duke Charles II of Inner Austria had successfully requested the creation of a Styrian-Carinthian province, uniting the monasteries in his duchies, and in 1604, Rudolph II obtained the consent of the Augustinian prior general Ippolito Fabri for the creation of a Bohemian-Austrian province. The redrawing of provincial boundaries to create separate vicariates and provinces for Moravia, Bohemia, Austria and Styria-Carinthia in c. 1636–1651 was to some extent justified by the increase in the number of new foundations and a general monastic revival. It likewise reflected the coincidence of the wishes of Ferdinand II and Ferdinand III with the provincial clergy's who were keen on achieving regional autonomy.²⁰ This drive was not diminished by the reality of ethnic and linguistic pluralism in each province. The united Austrian and Styrian province, for example, was in 1653 composed of a majority of Slovenes and Croats, and of a small contingent of "imported" Italians and Irishmen.²¹ In 1670, the Augustinians gained a basis in Hungary after the Augustinian Vicar General Nicholas Donellan—another Irishman—had made a convert of the ill-fated Ferenc Nádasdy. Nádasdy's foundation of an Augustinian monastery at Léka became the basis for the Augustinian mission in Hungary, but it also illustrates the limitations of this mission before the reconquests of the end of the century: until 1683, the priors of Léka were foreigners who had no knowledge of Hungarian and preached exclusively in German.²² The Augustinians were brought

¹⁹ ARSI, Austria, Epistolae 23 (1624–1630), fol. 1–21: "De mediis necessariis ad fidem et pietatem catholicam in Bohemia plantandam [...]" Wilhelm Lamormaini, Heinricus Philippi, n.d. (1624?). Interestingly, the memorandum places the creation of schools for boys and girls in every town, market-place and major village at the top of the agenda, even before the creation of seminaries for the native clergy.

²⁰ Johannes Gavigan O. S. A., *The Austro-Hungarian Province of the Augustinian Friars, 1646–1820* (Rome: Analecta Augustiniana, 1975), 1: 5–46.

²¹ Gavigan, *Austro-Hungarian Province*, 105.

²² Gavigan, *Austro-Hungarian Province*, 100.

temporarily into disrepute with Emperor Leopold I through the activities of their scintillating and somewhat devious Irish provincial Mark Forstall (1659–62). Following his eviction from Austria for extensive misconduct, Forstall withdrew in the 1650s to the palace of Count Péter Zrinyi (Petar Zrinski) at Čakovec. It would seem that he was also in touch with Ferenc (Fran) Frangepán, another key figure in the political intrigues of 1668–71, but after the collapse of the conspiracy he somehow managed to dispel charges of involvement. Leopold nevertheless quite justly remained suspicious of him, and Forstall prudently decided to transfer to Ireland, where he was appointed incumbent of the episcopal see of Kildare in 1672.²³

As will be shown in the following, the campaign for the creation of an independent Hungarian province of the Jesuits was indicative of a rising tide of Hungarian patriotism and national sentiment in the second half of the seventeenth century. It was fuelled by a growing sense of discontent and estrangement of the Hungarian and Croatian Jesuits vis-à-vis the German and Slovene members of the province. The divisive issues were partly of a political nature and resulted from pressures created by Leopold I's Hungarian Counter-Reformation policy, in which the Jesuits played a conspicuous part, but which potentially posed a dilemma to native Hungarian Jesuits. Secondly, as will be explained, there were inequalities built into the institutional structure of the Austrian province which disadvantaged native Hungarians and Croats with regard to their academic training and prospects of promotion to the higher ranks of the Society's hierarchy. This issue was to cause a deep rift between the Austrian and Hungarian Jesuits which affected relations between the Hungarian part and the provincials and Generals of the Society until the dissolution of the Society in 1773.

The proposal for a separation of the Hungarian part from the Austrian province was made for the first time at the Provincial Congregation in 1649, and the matter continued to be urged by the Hungarian Jesuits in the early 1650s. However, the then General of the Society, Goswin Nickel, endorsed the position of the Austrian provincial Zacharias Trinckellius, erstwhile Rector of the College in Graz, that a separation was undesirable and indeed not viable in view of the small number of Hungarian clergy and houses.²⁴ Trinckellius' memorandum

²³ Gavigan, *Austro-Hungarian Province*, 111–16.

²⁴ Duhr, *Geschichte der Jesuiten*, III:185.

on the general state of the Austrian province is primarily concerned with the state of the institutions in Graz and suggests that he opposed the move for separation to avoid a financial drain on their resources.²⁵ Until the college and university of Nagyszombat (Trnava, Tyrnau) took charge of the lands across the Leitha, the burden of raising priests and missionary clergy for Hungary and Transylvania rested entirely with the Styrian colleges and the university in Graz. Further support came from the foundation of a college in Zagreb by the recently (re-)converted Styrian family of Thanhausen, who were to found a further college in Fiume for the Illyrian mission. Trinckellius was responsive to the Hungarians' plea for support and suggested opening a novitiate at the Styrian college in Leoben for the training of priests for Hungary, but he remained adamantly opposed to the idea of a separation.²⁶ The issue was nevertheless raised again by the Hungarians at the Provincial Congregation in 1655. At this meeting, two options were discussed: the first was for a simple separation of the lands of royal Hungary from the Austrian province. This option was said to be strongly favoured by the Hungarian magnates and clergy, an indication that this issue was felt to affect the national interest. The Austrian critics of this idea argued that the numerical and financial strength of the Hungarian houses did not allow for this solution. An alternative proposal was made for an Austrian-Hungarian and an Austrian-Illyrian province. It was argued that this would go a considerable way towards solving the problems of distance and hence communication with the Provincial which the Hungarian Jesuits had raised, but a tacit implication would have been the continued Austrian presence in both provinces.²⁷

²⁵ ARSI, Austria, Epistolae (1601–1660), 293–96.

²⁶ For Leoben see ARSI, Austria, Epistolae (1601–1660), 294. The Styrian link is discussed by Johann Andritsch, "Die Grazer Jesuitenuniversität und der Beginn der katholischen Restauration im Karpatenraum," Johann Andritsch, Othmar Pickl et al., eds., *800 Jahre Steiermark und Österreich, 1192–1992* (Graz: Historische Landeskommission für Steiermark, 1992), 247–94, and Johann Andritsch, *Studenten und Lehrer aus Ungarn und Siebenbürgen an der Universität Graz (1586–1782)* (Graz: Forschungen zur geschichtlichen Landeskunde der Steiermark, 1965). The documents and correspondences relating to the Thanhausen donation for the colleges in Zagreb and Fiume can be found in the Diocesan Archive Graz-Seckau, Jesuiten (9), XIX-c-38, "Familie Thanhausen betreffend (2)."

²⁷ ARSI, Austria, Epistolae 22 (1661–1766), 211–27: "De forma dividendae Provinciae Austriae."

These setbacks did not discourage the proponents of Hungarian independence: the demand for a division of the province was thus back on the agenda at the next Provincial Congregation in Vienna in 1658. This time the Hungarian Jesuits supported their plea with a lengthy list of complaints which focused on the neglect of the Hungarian mission and the lack of support from the Austrian provincial. With regard to the government of the province it was criticized in particular that the Hungarian Patres were not consulted on matters of faith and discipline. The appointment of a separate Provincial or Vice-Provincial was hence vigorously urged as the obvious remedy.²⁸

Much to the disappointment of the Hungarians, the General's answer remained evasive in failing to engage with their complaints and the issue of alleged discrimination. Instead, he postponed the decision, as it turned out indefinitely, while at the same time expressing his disapproval of the idea of a separation. Steadfast opposition to a division along national or ethnic lines effectively remained the Generals' response for the rest of the seventeenth century.²⁹ The most tangible reasons for this were political considerations, i.e. the Society's concern for the wishes of Emperor Leopold I, who abhorred the idea of an autonomous Hungarian province while otherwise continuing his predecessors' policy of aligning political and ecclesiastical boundaries in the politically stable Habsburg heartland. In 1679, for example, he supported the creation of the province of Tyrol-Salzburg for the Augustinian order.³⁰

However, the Hungarian case was obviously different, given the destabilizing impact of war, confessional tensions and political volatility; moreover, Leopold's deep-seated fear that a division of the province might strengthen native support for the Hungarians' struggle for autonomy became more pronounced with the political crisis of

²⁸ Duhr, *Geschichte der Jesuiten*, III: 185–86.

²⁹ For a detailed account see László Lukács, *A független magyar jezsuita rendtartomány kérdése és az osztrák abszolutizmus: 1649–1773* [The question of an independent Hungarian Province of the Jesuits and Austrian absolutism, 1649–1773] (Szeged: József Attila Tudományegyetem, 1989). The English abstract has been consulted as well as a selection of Latin documents as cited below. The documents in Lukács's book complement with few exceptions the sources from the Generals' Archive cited in this present article.

³⁰ The creation of the province of Tyrol-Salzburg came about at the request of Archbishop Max Gandolf von Khuenburg and Emperor Leopold I, see Gavigan, *Austro-Hungarian province*, 16, n. 72.

the 1680s.³¹ The political conflict of the late seventeenth century in fact posed a grave dilemma for the Hungarian Jesuits: on the one hand, they took a conspicuous part in Leopold's repressive Counter-Reformation as well as producing religious propaganda that extolled its achievements, and they attempted to rationalize the violence involved to make it acceptable to Hungarian Catholics.³² The Society even paid a blood toll for their involvement, as the first Vice-Provincial, Baron László Sennyey (1631–1702), pointed out in 1698 with reference to the assaults on Jesuit houses in the 1680s and the eviction and murder of Jesuits by the rebels.³³ On the other hand, there was evidence of patriotic sentiment among the Society's Hungarian recruits which was fuelled by a sense of frustration at the exclusion of native Hungarians from higher offices within the provincial hierarchy. A Hungarian memorandum that was sent to the General in 1700 thus highlighted inequities resulting from the Austrian provincials' policy of recruitment and promotion: the memorandum argued that the large proportion of Germans and Slovenes among the province's clergy who had no knowledge of the Hungarian language considerably diminished the Society's prestige with their Hungarian patrons. The catalogues of novices were cited as evidence of the provincials' deliberate policy of preferring Germans and Slovenes over native Hungarians and Croats. Moreover, it was claimed that once they had taken this first hurdle, native Jesuits would then be tied down as school teachers for lengthy periods. The Germans and Slovenes, by contrast, were reluctant to learn Hungarian and be held back in the progress of their studies by teaching and missionary duties. They hence completed their courses

³¹ Duhr, *Geschichte der Jesuiten*, III: 186–87.

³² For Jesuit propaganda relating to the religious persecutions in Hungary see Maria Goloubeva, *The Glorification of Emperor Leopold I in Image, Spectacle and Text* (Mainz: Philip Zabern, 2000), 155–63. The Jesuits' involvement in the Counter-Reformation campaigns are described by Franz von Krones, "Zur Geschichte des Jesuitenordens in Ungarn, 1645–71," *Archiv für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 79 (1892): 280–354 and Franz von Krones, "Zur Geschichte Ungarns (1671–83) mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Thätigkeit und die Geschichte des Jesuitenordens," *Archiv für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 80 (1893): 353–455.

³³ Sennyey's letter of 29 April 1698 to General Gonzalez is transcribed in Duhr, *Geschichte der Jesuiten*, III, 187. For Baron Sennyey, who held a doctorate in philosophy and theology, produced at least three books (one on the "true idea of nobility") and was chancellor of Graz and Nagyszombat/Trnava, see the biographical information in Richard Peinlich, *Geschichte des Gymnasiums in Graz* (Graz: Verlag des k.k. Gymnasiums, 1869), 1: 77, and the relevant entries in the lists of authors, professors and other office holders at 1: 81–104.

faster and stood a much better chance of being promoted to the higher ranks of the Society. The memorandum affords an instructive glimpse of the complexities of national and ethnic tensions in making the further claim that the Slovene Jesuits from Carniola were deliberately slow to learn the Croatian language because they abhorred the Croats' *patria*.³⁴

Far from reflecting a paranoid state of mind, the Hungarians' suspicion that discrimination was intentional rather than accidental were all too well-founded, as a closer look at some contemporary memoranda from German and Austrian members of the Society reveals: in 1678, a secret consultation of eight leading members of the Austrian province took place, among them the provincial P. Nicolaus Avancini and P. Michael Sicuten, rector of the college and university in Graz which played an important part in the Hungarian-Transylvanian mission.³⁵ Their memorandum on the Hungarians' proposal for a separate province made a forceful case against this idea, taking its stand not only on the Emperor's known hostility to the project, but also maintaining that native Hungarians were innately unfit to be admitted to the government of the Society and its houses. This claim is supported by an unsympathetic account of the Hungarian national character, which, so the argument, made Hungarians stick together in a way that one could only marvel at, and they were "more national than other peoples." They hence always strove for autonomy and hatched plots against the Habsburgs.³⁶ The authors go on to cite past and recent examples as evidence of the rebellious spirit of the Hungarian nation, whose aristocracy reportedly maintained in private that it was not for the Society to rule them, but for the nobility to rule the Society. Given the constant threat of rebellion, the Austrian Patres' presence served an indispensable political service: it was imperative for the Emperor

³⁴ These grievances are related in a memorandum that was probably written by Sennyey for the General in 1700, ARSI, Austria, Epistolae 22 (1661–1766), 288. The memorandum urges the creation of a fully autonomous province.

³⁵ The memorandum for the General that was drafted on the basis of their deliberations is reprinted in Lukács, *A független magyar jezsuita*, 62–64. It is likely that it strengthened the General's determination to prohibit the creation of a separate Hungarian province.

³⁶ "Primum, quia hungarorum genius est sibi invicem mirum quantum adhaerere, et plus quam alia gens nationales esse; exteros nihili pendere, contra austriacos reges semper querelas miscere, in eosque (quos saepe contumaciae imputare dicunt) rerum sinistrarum eventus devolvere, sicut in familiaribus eorum congressibus persaepe audire est." Lukács, *A független magyar jezsuita*, 63.

to have reliable German informants in the towns and fortified places who would faithfully report on the state of affairs.³⁷

The fact that these statements apparently were not picked up by the General is instructive of the way in which the headquarter's attitude towards political involvement had changed since Acquaviva's instructions for the German provincial in the early seventeenth century. It is likewise notable, but only at first sight paradoxical that relations between the German and Hungarian members of the Austrian province deteriorated further as the Catholic reconquest made progress. In his memorandum of 1695, the Austrian provincial P. Franciscus Voglmayr, who was a native Austrian, rejected the proposal for an independent Hungarian province in strong terms that are outspoken on the issue of national antipathy. The Hungarians are yet again described as a "very nationally-minded people" who harboured sinister feelings towards the Germans, whom they scattered over the various Hungarian houses so that they could treat them despotically and tyrannically. Apart from their hostile disposition towards Germans, they were also unfit for governing themselves as they were inexperienced in the economic and financial side of running their colleges, hence wherever they were allowed to run houses they became impoverished and neglected: "Ubi opus est industria, non quaeras in Ungaria, conformiter ad genium nationis." Given the General's concern for the moral and spiritual integrity of the Society, Voglmayr's most powerful blow against the Hungarians' ambitions was delivered under the guise of pastoral care: he thus insinuated that the Jesuits of an independent province were likely to degenerate in their standards of honesty and moral and decorous conduct. Experience taught that the raw and uncouth Hungarian novices needed to be exposed to the civilising influence of their German peers. For that reason previous Generals like John Paul Oliva (1664–1681), Charles de Noyelle (1682–1686) and others had recommended sending German students to Trnava (Nagyszombat) and Hungarians to Vienna. Voglmayr's self-congratulatory account of German achievements included a swipe against allegedly mediocre Hungarian professors who were no match for those who had benefited from studying at German institutions.³⁸

³⁷ Lukács, *A független magyar jezsuita*, 63.

³⁸ Voglmayr's memorandum of 1695 for General Thyrsus Gonzalez is reprinted in Lukács, *A független magyar jezsuita*, 69–73, citations at 70–72.

This was a forceful and vitriolic rebuttal indeed, and its reverberations were still palpable in a memorandum of 1698 by the Hungarian Vice-Provincial László Sennyey. Sennyey obviously felt it was important to support his renewed appeal to the General for the creation of a Hungarian province with a strenuous denial of suspicions that the native Hungarians would relinquish their loyalty to the Habsburgs and join the Hungarian opposition's cause.³⁹ However, Sennyey's plea failed to persuade General Gonzalez, who hinted that it would be years before a full separation could be contemplated. At the same time he reassured Leopold I that the separation plan would not be decided without prior consultation with him,⁴⁰ which was tantamount to declaring it stillborn.

Antagonizing the Emperor to please the obstreperous Hungarians was obviously not an option any Jesuit General would contemplate, but there were wider concerns for the integrity of the Society and its global mission. While considerations of political and economic expediency played a major part in the Generals' unrelenting opposition to the Hungarian project there is evidence that they were also motivated by a genuine abhorrence of the stirrings of separatism and nationalism among the Jesuits in the Austrian province and in other parts of Europe. At the beginning of the Austrian-Hungarian provincial controversy in 1658, General Goswin Nickel wrote to the Austrian Provincial to express his concern at reports that national sentiment was getting stronger by the day among members of the province ("Spiritus nationalis dicitur magis in dies invalescere."). On the one side, the Hungarians complained about the small number of natives who held prestigious offices, on the other there were Jesuits who publicly declared that Hungarians should not be admitted at all to governing positions in the Society. The General ordered the Austrian Provincial to end these quarrels, and to make sure to eradicate the national spirit entirely ("spiritum nationalem penitus eliminat").⁴¹

While the political and confessional circumstances of Hungary made it a special case, national sentiment and its destructive potential had been attacked vigorously by General Nickel in his lengthy second mis-

³⁹ Duhr, *Geschichte der Jesuiten*, III, 187.

⁴⁰ Duhr, *Geschichte der Jesuiten*, III, 187–88.

⁴¹ ARSI, Austria 7 (1656–1663), General's letters of 6 April 1658 and 25 May 1658 to Johann Bertholdi, at 101–3 and 109–10.

sive in 1656 as an issue that affected the Society globally and needed to be addressed on that level.⁴²

In a fervent appeal to all members of the Society he condemns the “pernicious national and provincial spirit” that was spreading among the Jesuits and was threatening to undermine its spiritual purpose. Nickel sets out with a definition of his nomenclature which uses the republican terms of the common good and conflicting particularist interests. He then applies this simile to the Society, which he describes as a composite body (“corpus [...] pluribus coalitum ex membris”), composed of men from many nations, and comprising houses in many and varied towns, regions and kingdoms. Their sole unifying bond was their dedication to the common work for the greater glory of God.⁴³ However, if the provincial or national spirit prevailed, this would spell the end of the Society, as it subverted its government which was based on unity and obedience. The Society would become ungovernable if members were promoted to their respective office not because of their merits and aptitude, but because of their national and social background. Nickel illustrates the dangers of discord at length with biblical examples and references to the early history of the Society. In particular, he cites the example of Ignatius and the early Jesuits, whose sole concern had been for the common good and the higher purpose of the Society, regardless of individual and national interests. National considerations had never moved them, even in times of war and hatred.⁴⁴ Nickel concludes with the revealing lament: “Whither have those happy times of golden liberty gone, when the General could make appointments with sole regard to usefulness and the requirements of the task in question, without giving any consideration to the nationality, family, fatherland or ancestry of the appointed, and without anyone remonstrating?”⁴⁵ Nickel concludes with a flaming appeal to the provincials and all Jesuits to help purge and liberate the Society

⁴² “De Nationali, Provincialique pernicioso Spiritu in Societate vitando,” second letter by General Goswin Nickel, 16 November 1656, *Epistolae Praepositorum Generalium*, 699–729.

⁴³ *Epistolae Praepositorum Generalium*, 703.

⁴⁴ *Epistolae Praepositorum Generalium*, 706–12, 716–17, 721–22. The problem of provincial separatism is referred to at 706–8.

⁴⁵ “Quo nunc abierunt illa aureae libertatis felicia tempora, quibus Praepositus Generalis nullo discrimine nationum, aut cognationum, nullo patriae, aut antiquitatis, cuique suum, nemine reclamante, pro usu, pro necessitate locum, munusque assignabat?” *Epistolae Praepositorum Generalium*, 722.

“from this pestilentious spirit” by setting an example that would encourage emulation.⁴⁶

The General’s appeal for the preservation of the unity and universal spirit of the Society is revealing of the problems involved in governing a universal religious organization in the changing intellectual and political climate of post-Westphalian Europe.

However, he was arguably fighting a battle of retreat, as the Hungarians’ demand for national alignment of provincial boundaries was not an isolated case. A similar request was submitted in 1651 for the separation of Poland and Lithuania from the German *Assistenz*. Its proponents argued that national pluralism was making the vast and ethnically varied *Assistenz* ungovernable. From about the mid-seventeenth century there is evidence from the Jesuits’ annual reports and the Generals’ provincial correspondence to illustrate that national or ethnic antipathies which in some cases had been simmering for a long time were now more likely to result in open clashes and demands for solutions that took account of national sensitivities.⁴⁷

The case of the Jesuits’ mission in Hungary thus provides an early example of the centrifugal power of cultural identities which were a by-product of the rise of the modern nation state in Western Europe and eventually became a major factor in the dissolution of the Habsburgs’ multi-ethnic Monarchy.

⁴⁶ *Epistolae Praepositorum Generalium*, 727–29, quotation at 727.

⁴⁷ Duhr, *Geschichte der Jesuiten*, III:188. In 1665 the magistrate and Italian Jesuits of Trent pressed for the removal of the German Patres of the College to make it entirely Italian, and there was evidence of mutual and public national antipathy, Duhr, *Geschichte der Jesuiten*, III:162. In 1702, General Gonzalez ordered the public punishment of a Scottish Jesuit in Graz for breaching the Society’s regulations “ex spiritus nationalis fervore,” ARSI, Austria, 10 (1695–1705), 600. The late seventeenth-century school dramas mentioned in the *Litterae Annuae* from Dillingen at Eichstätt in Germany document the popularity of patriotic, “national” themes such as the debilitating cultural impact of Italian and French fashions and mores. Examples are quoted by Duhr, *Geschichte der Jesuiten*, III:495–96.

CHAPTER NINETEEN

PATRIA LOST AND CHOSEN PEOPLE: THE CASE OF THE SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY BOHEMIAN PROTESTANT EXILES

Vladimír Urbánek

The concept of a chosen people or elect nation and its role in the formation of early modern “national consciousness” has recently been discussed in several important studies. The most well-known cases are the Netherlands¹ and England² where the representations of “national identity” were closely linked to the Calvinist tradition and the semantics of “Hebraic patriotism,” which drew a parallel between the people of Israel and the early modern “Protestant” nations. Already in the mid-1980s Simon Schama drew the attention of the broader western scholarly community to a similar phenomenon among the Calvinists of smaller territories—not merely such examples as the Huguenot enclave in France, but as well those in Bohemia and Hungary “where Calvinism was on the defensive within a larger territory.”³ While

¹ Gerrit Groenhuis, *De Predikanten: De sociale positie van de gereformeerde predikanten in de Republiek der Verenigde Nederlanden voor 1700* (Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff, 1977); Gerrit Groenhuis, “Calvinism and National Consciousness: The Dutch Republic as the New Israel,” in A. C. Duke and C. A. Tamse, eds., *Britain and the Netherlands*, vol. 7, *Church and State Since the Reformation* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1981), 118–33; Simon Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age* (London: Collins, 1987), esp. 93–125; Paul Regan, “Calvinism and the Dutch Israel Thesis,” in Bruce Gordon, ed., *Protestant History and Identity in Sixteenth-Century Europe*, vol. II, *The Later Reformation* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1996), 91–106; Philip S. Gorski, “The Mosaic Moment: An Early Modernist Critique of Modernist Theories of Nationalism,” *American Journal of Sociology* 105 (2000): 1428–68.

² See esp. the classic work by William Haller, *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs and the Elect Nation* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1963); then its later critiques by e.g. Katharine R. Firth, *The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain, 1530–1645* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979); and Patrick Collinson, *The Birthpangs of Protestant England: Religious and Cultural Change in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1988). For a different perspective on sixteenth-century English nationalism see Liah Greenfeld, *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992).

³ Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches*, 96.

Hungarian Calvinists and their identification as a new chosen people have been discussed by both Hungarian and British historians,⁴ the Bohemian case has received considerably less attention.

Rather than the seventeenth-century discourse of chosenness, Czech historians have focused much more on earlier Hussite nationalism and Messianism.⁵ Rudolf Urbánek saw the beginning of Czech Messianism in the times of Charles IV when in the mid-fourteenth century the Bohemian kingdom was called *regnum christianissimum*, and surveyed the expressions of Czech Messianism in the period of the Hussite reform movement and the following wars. Urbánek explored the Messianistic mood in the second half of the fifteenth century both among the Utraquists and Catholic intellectuals. He noted especially an Utraquist manifesto from 1469 where, in the context of the war with Matthias Corvinus, Bohemians were once again presented as a people chosen by God. According to Urbánek, the Utraquist Messianistic tradition gradually weakened and lost its vitality with the growing influence of the European Reformation. The idea of chosenness remained to play a role only within the small church of the Unity of Brethren.⁶ František Šmahel criticized Urbánek for his straightforward simplistic identification of the idea of the chosenness of the Czechs with the construction of a Messianistic mission and even expressed skepticism regarding the interpretation of the Hussite Messianism

⁴ An overview of Hungarian scholarship on the topic has been accessible to me in Balázs Trencsényi's dissertation. I am grateful to the author for sending me a copy. See Balázs Trencsényi, *Early Modern Discourses of Nationhood* (unpublished PhD diss., Central European University, 2004), especially ch. III/3. For the British contribution see Graeme Murdock, *Calvinism on the Frontier: International Calvinism and the Reformed Church of Hungary and Transylvania, c. 1600–1660* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), esp. 243–49, 261–90.

⁵ See especially Rudolf Urbánek, "Počátky českého mesianismu" [The beginnings of Czech Messianism], in Otakar Odložilík, Jaroslav Prokeš and Rudolf Urbánek, eds., *Českou minulostí. Práce věnované profesoru Karlovy university V. Novotnému jeho žáky k 60. narozeninám* [From the Czech Past: Festschrift Dedicated to V. Novotný] (Prague: J. Laichter, 1929), 124–45; idem, "Český mesianismus ve své době hrdinské" [The heroic times of Czech Messianism], in idem, *Z husitského věku* [From the Hussite Era] (Prague: Nakladatelství Československé akademie věd, 1957), 7–28; František Šmahel, *Idea národa v husitských Čechách* [The idea of the nation in Hussite Bohemia] (Prague: Argo, 2000). The first edition of Šmahel's monograph appeared in 1971, and it is also available in a slightly shorter English version as "The Idea of the 'Nation' in Hussite Bohemia: An Analytical Study of the Ideological and Political Aspects of the National Question in Hussite Bohemia from the End of the 14th to the Eighties of the 15th Century," *Historica* 16 (1969): 143–247 and 17 (1969): 93–197.

⁶ Urbánek, "Český mesianismus," 281–84 (for the second half of the sixteenth century).

as being “Czech” (in an ethnical sense) rather than “Hussite” (in the sense of the Hussites being the true followers of “God’s law”).⁷ More recently, Josef Macek has collected evidence of Czech Messianism from the late fifteenth century, not only accepting the concept itself but even speaking of the “general Messianism of the Bohemian Reformation.”⁸ At any rate all three scholars have not doubted the existence of a national consciousness, which was, according to them, reflected in the literary works they examined.

But until recently, there has been no research on sixteenth-century representations of chosenness in the Bohemian lands. In particular, the problem of its continuity or discontinuity with fifteenth-century Hussite Messianism and other earlier modalities of the discourse of chosenness remains obscure. We may assume with the previous researchers that the Utraquist discourse of chosenness lost its currency with the arrival of Lutheranism. At the same time, it seems that the influence of the Lutheran apocalyptic and the Melancthonian providentialist concept of history enabled reformulations and a new spread of the elect nationhood theme at the end of the sixteenth century and the first half of the seventeenth century. A comparison with Hungarian developments may be revealing here. What was so unique about the Hungarian discourse of elect nationhood was the coincidence of the spread of the Reformation and the new conception of providentialist history coming from Wittenberg with the calamities following the Battle of Mohács or, in general, with the “Turkish peril.” Of course, in the Czech case there was no such “fateful event” as Mohács in the sixteenth century and the Turks were considered to be a divine punishment of Christianity generally, not an instrument of God’s punishment for the sins of a particular nation. The Turks did not become the dominant motive of any new providentialist narrative of Czech history, though they played a role in eschatological historical schemes as one of the signs of the end of the world which would soon come. This different context might have been responsible for the fact that a fully articulated Czech reception of Melancthon’s eschatological conception of history came probably as late as the 1580s and 1590s in the works published by Daniel Adam of Veleslavín (1545–1599). Lucie Storchová has recently

⁷ Šmahel, *Idea národa*, 93, 96. See below, under “The typology of chosenness.”

⁸ Josef Macek, *Jagellonský věk v českých zemích* [The Jagiellonian age in the Bohemian lands] (Prague: Academia, 1999), 4:200–202.

argued that the central position of religious topics in Veleslavín's concept of history and especially its eschatological perspective was a new phenomenon in Bohemian humanist historiography of the sixteenth century.⁹ The influence of Melanchthon's circle on the "generation" of Veleslavín may, however, be traced back to the 1560s when some of its main representatives studied in Wittenberg. About the same time, some elements of the Melanchthonian conception of history, such as *fatales periodi* and *fatales anni*, appeared in the Bohemian context.¹⁰ Further traces of the influence from Wittenberg can be found in two translations into Czech (in 1567 and 1576) of the famous book, *De origine imperii Turcorum*, by Bartholomeus Georgijević, where the Protestant and Catholic translators alike included a highly eschatological introduction by Philipp Melanchthon.¹¹

Modern researchers, especially literary historians, have tended to interpret the literary production of the exiled Protestants who were forced to leave Bohemia and Moravia after the defeat of the Bohemian Revolt in 1620 as an epilogue of the Bohemian humanist culture and have overlooked to a great extent the polarization of the confessional languages and the intensification of apocalyptic semantics which had its roots in the two decades preceding the military conflict. According to Matthias Pohlig, the apocalyptic explanatory framework and various versions of the theology of history strengthened not only different confessional identities but influenced also the polarization of European international politics in the early seventeenth century.¹² Each

⁹ Lucie Storchová, "Der eschatologische Ton in den Vorworten der Drucke Veleslavíns. Zur Position der Eschatologie als Quelle der Ethik im späthumanistischen Diskurs," *Acta Comeniana* 18 (2004): 7–41. See also her contribution in the present volume.

¹⁰ The earliest example is a poem *Libellus de partibus reipublicae et causis mutationum regnorum imperiorumque* (Vienna, 1560) by the Hungarian (ethnic Slovak) humanist Martin Rakovský who spent few years in Bohemia in the 1550s. Another is a public disputation on "fatal periods" at the University of Prague given by Adam Huber after his return from Wittenberg in 1567. Huber, who became a collaborator of Veleslavín and a leading physician, returned to the topic several times later. See Martin Rakovský, *Opera omnia*, ed. Miloslav Okál (Bratislava: Veda, 1974), 279–330. For Huber, see Josef Hejnic and Jan Martinek, eds., *Rukověť humanistického básnictví v Čechách a na Moravě / Enchiridion renatae poesis Latinae in Bohemia et Moravia cultae* (Prague: Nakladatelství Československé akademie věd, 1966), 2:365.

¹¹ Tomáš Rataj, *České země ve stínu půlměsíce: Obraz Turka v raně novověké literatuře z českých zemí* [The Czech lands in the shadow of the crescent: The image of the Turk in early modern Czech literature] (Prague: Scriptorium, 2002), 172–73.

¹² For the apocalyptic semantics see Matthias Pohlig, "Konfessionskulturelle Deutungsmuster internationaler Konflikte um 1600—Kreuzzug, Antichrist, Tausendjähriges Reich," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 93 (2002): 278–316.

confession created its own ways of dealing with apocalyptic and millenarian explanatory frameworks including apocalyptic thematizations of the “self” and the “other.” Especially Protestant confessions made both eschatological expectations of the near end of the world and the understanding of the Reformation as a culmination in the history of salvation central elements of their confessional identities.

Analogical processes can be traced in the Bohemian and Moravian context as well. They were certainly caused by the greater influence of the confessionalized universities and academies on the new generation of students from the Bohemian lands who studied abroad. The Lutherans and Utraquists usually studied at the University of Prague but very frequently made their *peregrinatio academica* to such centers of Lutheran orthodoxy as Leipzig and Wittenberg, while Catholics were educated at the Jesuit colleges both at home and abroad, and the members of the Unity of Brethren were sent to Calvinist intellectual centers like Heidelberg, Herborn and Basle. Polarization of the confessional languages, intensification of the apocalyptic semantics and the radicalization of political actions of both the Protestant estates opposition and the Catholic pro-imperial minority during the 1600s and 1610s prepared the soil for the revival of the elect nationhood theme. While some leaders of the Bohemian Revolt, such as the prominent member of the Bohemian Brethren, Václav Budovec of Budov, were clearly deeply influenced by eschatological expectations, it is less evident to what extent generally eschatological and apocalyptic speculations played a role in their political thought and activities.¹³

Chosen and punished

The Bohemian discourse of chosenness builds both on biblical (mostly Old Testament) parallels and allusions and on the reactivation of Husite symbolism. In discussing its manifestations in the post-1620 exilic literary culture we should go back to the previous period of the Bohemian Revolt when the Bohemian lands appeared for two years as the

¹³ Noemi Rejchrtová, *Václav Budovec z Budova* [Václav Budovec of Budov] (Prague: Melantrich, 1984), 107–115; Nicolette Mout, “Chilastic Prophecy and Revolt in the Habsburg Monarchy during the Seventeenth Century,” in Michael Wilks, ed., *Prophecy and Eschatology* (Oxford and Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers, 1994), 93–109.

focal point of European diplomatic efforts and military affairs and the center of international political and religious propaganda. Statistical research on illustrated broadsheets and pamphlets published during the Thirty Years' War reveals that output culminated in the times of the Bohemian-Palatine War in 1619–1621 and at the beginning of the Swedish war in 1631–1632.¹⁴ An important component of the first peak of this flood of propagandistic pamphlets was the pro-Palatine and pro-Bohemian propaganda. The necessity to legitimize the Bohemian Revolt and the election of Frederick V of the Palatinate as King of Bohemia is obvious not only from the political pamphlets and the apologetic and polemical literature, which focused mainly on the legal arguments regarding constitutional problems, such as the principle of free election, but also from the broadsheets, songs and religious pamphlets that used the theme of divine Providence and often included reminiscences to the Hussite past. Some of the pamphleteers, most notably Johannes Kärcher of Berne known under the pen-name of Johannes Plaustrarius, identified Frederick with the “roaring lion” and “the great Midnight lion” from the apocryphal Second book of Ezra who would defeat both the Austrian eagle and the Roman Antichrist.¹⁵ These apocalyptic prognostications were republished in Prague and influenced the Bohemian physician Andreas Habervešl of Habernfeld in his anonymously published treatise on the comet of 1618, *De asterisco comato magico theosophica Consideratio*.¹⁶ According to Habernfeld, the comet heralded the coming of the last times of the world when the lion from Ezra's prophecy would snatch away the eagle's sceptre. Here the lion was identified with Bohemia whose wounds made by the apocalyptic beast would be cured by the most Christian

¹⁴ Michael Schilling, *Bildpublizistik der frühen Neuzeit* (Tübingen: M. Niemeyer, 1990), 177–78. Schilling's figures differ only slightly from those based on earlier literature and discussed in the standard work by Geoffrey Parker, *The Thirty Years' War* (London and New York: Routledge, 1984), 110–11. Parker defines two peaks in the publishing of illustrated flysheets, as falling between the years 1618 and 1621 and between 1629 and 1633.

¹⁵ Carlos Gilly, “The «Midnight Lion», the «Eagle» and the «Antichrist»: Political, Religious and Chiliastic Propaganda in the Pamphlets, Illustrated Broadsheets and Ballads of the Thirty Years War,” *Nederlands archief voor kerkgeschiedenis* 80 (2000): 46–77, esp. 52–53.

¹⁶ Published in late 1619 or early 1620. On Habernfeld and his work, see Vladimír Urbánek, “The Comet of 1618: Eschatological Expectations and Political Prognostications during the Bohemian Revolt,” in J. R. Christianson et al., eds., *Tycho Brahe and Prague: Crossroads of European Science* (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Harri Deutsch, 2002), 282–91.

king, Frederick.¹⁷ Habernfeld's Latin treatise illustrates to what extent apocalyptic semantics found their place in a scholarly work directed to a learned audience and to patrons interested in the occult arts. The vernacular pro-Palatine pamphlets published in Czech and German had certainly a much broader impact. Certain ones printed in 1619–20 represented the newly elected Calvinist king Frederick as King David sent by God to Bohemia, the land of Hus, Žižka and George of Poděbrady, while other leaflets compared him to King Jehoshaphat who had been sent by God to his people to help them against a superior force of enemies.¹⁸

Such parallels were, of course, common in other countries as well. King David as a prototype of the godly ruler became a model for the apologists of William the Silent in the Netherlands as well as for those extolling Gábor Bethlen in Hungary and Transylvania.¹⁹ As the role of new David had been assumed by King Frederick it is obvious that in Bohemian pamphlets Bethlen would have to be cast in a different role as an ally of the Bohemian estates in their fight with the Habsburgs. In one of them he was identified with “the news from the East” from the eleventh chapter of the book of Daniel.²⁰

Some of these pamphlets, such as *Decisio prophetica belli Bohemici* (1620) by a pro-Palatine Lutheran “new prophet” Paul Felgenhauer (1593–ca. 1677), included strong apocalyptic accents.²¹ In his polemics with Saxon theologians, Felgenhauer rejected the image of Bohemians as rebels who were not able to live under any rule. Instead, he outlined the special place assigned to Bohemians in the history of Salvation (since the times of Jan Hus) and pointed out that no other nation had experienced such a long persecution for the true religion. Already in a

¹⁷ *Consideratio*, fols. a1a, L2b, L3a–L3b.

¹⁸ Jana Hubková, *Obraz Fridricha Falckého v letácích jeho doby* [The image of Frederick of the Palatinate in the pamphlets of his time] (unpublished MA thesis, Ústí nad Labem, 1998), 53–55, 65–66. Hubková quotes the pamphlet *Currier mit guter und tröstlicher neuen Zeitung* (s. l., 1619) and another one called *FrIDerICVs I. ReX BoheMiae et RhenI* (s. l., 1620). See also Rudolf Wolkan, *Deutsche Lieder auf den Winterkönig* (Prague: J. G. Calve, 1898), 29–35, 40–42.

¹⁹ See e.g. Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches*, 102–3; Gorski, “The Mosaic moment,” 1438; Murdock, *Calvinism on the Frontier*, 243–49.

²⁰ Paul Felgenhauer, *Bon' avisa / Neue Avisen* (s. l., 1622), 14–15.

²¹ *Decisio prophetica belli Bohemici* (s. l., 1620), e.g. fols. A2a–A4b, D3a–D3b. On Felgenhauer, see especially Ernst Georg Wolters, “Paul Felgenhauers Leben und Wirken,” *Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte* (1956): 63–84; (1957): 54–94; and Josef Volf, “Pavel Felgenhauer a jeho náboženské názory” [Paul Felgenhauer and his religious opinions], *Časopis Českého musea* 86 (1912): 93–116.

previous pamphlet Felgenhauer identified the seven churches of Revelation with the seven ages of world history. In this apocalyptic scheme the church of Thyatira represented the Hussite period, that of Sardis stood for the Lutheran Reformation while Philadelphia was identified with the Rosicrucian Fraternity.²² His use of Revelation to interpret the Bohemian revolt gave him the basis both to address political issues via religious language and to employ patriotic rhetoric within a universalist scheme. The apocalyptic explanatory scheme served to provide “arguments” supporting the right of the imperial princes and the Bohemian estates to resist the emperor and to defend the true faith.²³

Whatever role the Hebraic and apocalyptic imagination played in the short period of optimistic expectations associated with the Palatine reign, it appears to have gained even greater importance in the atmosphere of disillusion which set in among the Bohemian Protestants after the fall of the Revolt in 1620–21. In a number of pamphlets and religious tracts the Bohemians and Moravians were portrayed as an elect people that had (perhaps just temporarily) failed to fulfil its mission. They were chosen by God to become the first people in Europe to struggle against the Antichrist, but having subsequently failed to live as they should they were punished for their sins by exile.²⁴

Such symbolism of divine punishment appeared most prominently in a number of works of Jan Amos Comenius (1592–1670), a minister and later elder of the Unity of Brethren. In the first half of the 1620s, he published two volumes of his *Truchlivý* (Sorrowful), a work that searched for the answer to the frustrating question of why punishment had to come.²⁵ The topos of an elect people punished for its sins appears repeatedly, most notably in the dialogue between Sorrowful and Jesus Christ. In his answers to the doubts expressed by Sorrowful, Jesus assured him again and again that God has not canceled His covenant with the Bohemian Protestants. They remain to be

²² *Speculum temporis / Zeit Spiegel* (s. l., 1620), fols. B1a–B1b, H2a–H2b.

²³ *Decisio prophetica*, fols. F2b–F3a.

²⁴ On the dualism of idolatry and subsequent punishment in the Hungarian tradition, see Trencsényi, *Early Modern Discourses*, Ch. III/3. The topos of divine punishment had a long history going back to the sixth century when Gildas drew a parallel between a sinful Israel and the Britons punished for their sins by the Germanic invasions. See Anthony D. Smith, *Chosen Peoples* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 116–17.

²⁵ Jan Amos Comenius, *Truchlivý* [Sorrowful], I–II, ed. Marie Kyralová, Naděžda Lupinková, Amedeo Molnár and Věra Petráčková, in Milan Kopecský, gen. ed., *J. A. Comenii Opera omnia* (Prague: Academia, 1978), 3:19–101.

chosen in a same way as “the old people” of Israel had been, however, God expected from the Bohemians sincere repentance and fulfillment of their obligations arising from the covenant.²⁶ While the notion of an elect people is applied here to the community of the Bohemian Protestants, the “true believers” are at the same time understood as the “faithful Czechs.” Comenius thus equated to a certain extent the confessional community with the ethnic, or rather territorial one. This overlap, which may appear strange to a modern reader and even cause a degree of misunderstanding, was perfectly acceptable for an early modern audience because the very model for early modern elect nationhood, the chosen people of Israel, was at the same time both a religious and an ethnic community.²⁷

It seems that a similar scheme was in common use, no matter whether an author belonged to the Bohemian Brethren or was an adherent of Lutheranism. An important example is a letter written in July 1621 by Heinrich Matthias Thurn (1567–1640), a Lutheran nobleman and one of the military leaders of the Bohemian Revolt.²⁸ The soldier Thurn’s answer to the question why the uprising ended in such a catastrophic defeat is strikingly similar to that of the clergyman Comenius: it was not the army of enemies but the sins of the Bohemian people that caused the military defeat. Thurn used the language of Hebraic patriotism in drawing parallels between the people of Israel and their Egyptian captivity and the fate of the Bohemians who became either slaves in their own kingdom or exiles. To give heart to his compatriots he expressed his hopes that God would send new leaders to the Bohemians similar to the heroes who had come to the aid of Israel and to the Hussite army leaders, and finally they would win victory over the house of Austria.²⁹

²⁶ Comenius, *Truchlivý*, 32–34, 36–37.

²⁷ See also Smith, *Chosen Peoples*, 23: “...in the Jewish case *par excellence* a community of descent is also a faith community and vice versa.”

²⁸ The letter, addressed to “einen Oesterreichischen Landherrn” (perhaps Georg Erasmus Tschernembel), is published in Otakar Odložilík, ed., *Z korespondence pobělohorské emigrace z let 1621–1624* [From the correspondence of the post-White Mountain emigration in the years 1621–1624] (Prague: Královská česká společnost nauk, 1933), 54–64; see also František Hrubý, *Ladislav Velen z Žerotína* [Ladislav Velen of Žerotín] (Prague: Historický klub, 1930), 120; Vladimír Urbánek, “Patriotismus pobělohorského exilu” [Patriotism of the post-White Mountain exiles], *Historické listy* 4 (1995): 3–6.

²⁹ Odložilík, ed., *Z korespondence*, 60: “Wan wir uns dann, wie gehört, mit bussfertigen Herzen gegen Not wenden, so seind wir in unserem Herzen und Gewiessen

The 1620s saw a flood of apocalyptic and eschatological tracts by Bohemian authors. Paul Felgenhauer continued to publish his pro-Palatine propagandistic pamphlets identifying the exiled King Frederick with the lion defeating the eagle from the apocryphal Second book of Ezra and Bohemia with “a woman clothed with the sun” from Revelation. He drew a parallel between the exiled King David and the exiled Bohemian Winter King and used the story of Joshua leading his people to Canaan to allude to Frederick’s military adventure of March 1622 when it seemed for a short time that Fortune was on his side.³⁰

Writing in 1626, another Bohemian refugee, Simeon Partlicius, still believed in Frederick and his mission and employed the same apocalyptic and Hebraic language to describe the role of Bohemia in the last period of the world’s history.³¹ For him, the last eight Habsburg emperors were the eight kings from Revelation (17,9–11). The last of

wohl versichert, dass Gott gegen uns betrangte und jetziger Zeit umb alle unsere Freiheiten gebrachte Böhmen, allermassen und gestalt er das den Israeliten bewiesen, Gnad einwenden und durch einen gewaltigen Arm und mechtige Hand aus unserem Egyptischen Diensthaus erretten, und in vorige Religions und Lands Freiheiten restituiren werde. Dergestalt wir uns das erinnern, dass der allmechtige Gott vor etlich Tausend Jahren gegen seinem Volk Israel bei obangezogenen Betrangnussen auf ihr bussfertiges Herz je und alwegen ein genädige Erlösung geschickt, und sie vermittels eins dapferen streitbaren Kriegshelden von der Hand ihrer Feind erretten lassen, wie auch Josua, Jephtha, Gideon, Simson, Jonatan, Gedalia, Juda Machabeg und seine Brüder auch viel andere gewesen. Desgleichen unsere geehrte liebe Voreltern durch streitbare Händ Johannis Zisca und Georgii Rachozi gleichermassen von ihren sehr mechtigen Feinden erlöset und bei ihrer christlichen Religion und Libertet mechtighen geschützt und gehandhabt worden.” The name of Rákóczi was inserted somewhat illogically into this copy by a later copier. Other surviving copies show that the original name was that of Žižka’s follower Prokop Holý.

³⁰ *Flos propheticus* (s. l., 1622), 16–18; *Bon’ avisa / Neue Avisen*, 20–21. On the broader context of the symbolic fight between the lion and the eagle see Alastair Hamilton, *The Apocryphal Apocalypse: The Reception of the Second Book of Esdras (4 Ezra) from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999).

³¹ Simeon Partlicius, *Metamorphosis mundi* (Lugduni Batavorum, 1626). Simeon Partlicius (ca. 1590–after 1640) was educated at the Lutheran gymnasium of Görlitz, the Utraquist University of Prague and the Calvinist University of Basel. He was trained as physician and published works on history, chronology, astronomy, astrology and medicine. He was a prolific author of almanacs. See especially Vladimír Urbánek, “Simeon Partlicius and His Works: Rudolfiner Mood in Bohemian Exile,” in Lubomír Konečný, Beket Bukovinská and Ivan Muchka, eds., *Rudolf II, Prague and the World* (Prague: Artefactum, 1998), 291–96; Vladimír Urbánek, “Chronologie, astrologie a prorocství v dílech exulantů Paula Felgenhauera a Šimona Partlice” [Chronology, astrology and prophecy in the works of exiles Paul Felgenhauer and Simeon Partlicius], in Michaela Hrubá, ed., *Víra nebo vlast? Exil v českých dějinách raného novověku* [Faith or fatherland? Exile in early modern Bohemian history] (Ústí nad Labem: Albis International, 2001), 156–73.

them, Ferdinand II, reached the peak of impiety, cruelty and tyranny and launched a persecution more terrible than those of Diocletian and the Pharaohs. Against this, Frederick of the Palatinate is portrayed as King David who would return soon from his exile.³² Partlicius combined the language of the Bible with astrological predictions according to which a new Moses, Joshua and Elijah in one person would come to purify the Empire eight hundred years after Charlemagne. This was based on the astrological theory of great conjunctions of Saturn and Jupiter which Partlicius borrowed from the chronological works of Johann Heinrich Alsted, one of the leading professors of the Herborn academy.³³ In another prophecy he predicted that the kingdoms of Bohemia, Poland and Hungary would join together in one kingdom to defend their peoples, customs and languages against foreign nations.³⁴ In this rather fantastic vision, political hopes in Gábor Bethlen appear along with awareness of the fact that some Hungarians were ethnic Slavs (*Hungari ad Vagum fluvium*), while in the case of the Poles Partlicius drew on the common Slavic myth of origin appearing in the story of Čech and Lech and the apocalyptic view of the two Antichrists, an eastern and a western one.³⁵

At the beginning of the 1630s it seemed that the military success of the Swedes would enable Bohemian and Moravian exiles to soon return home. A new wave of pamphlets and tracts appeared especially in the autumn 1631 and spring 1632 when Saxon troops occupied Prague and part of Bohemia and some of the exiles did indeed return. In this atmosphere of great hopes Comenius wrote his *Haggaeus redivivus* in which he again contemplated the reasons for divine punishment and the necessity of further reform of life, church and doctrine. The Bohemians had been punished because of their sins which had

³² Partlicius, *Metamorphosis mundi*, 127, 154.

³³ Partlicius, *Metamorphosis mundi*, 27, 129, 155. On the theory of great conjunctions in Alsted's works, see Howard Hotson, *Johann Heinrich Alsted 1588–1638: Between Renaissance, Reformation and Universal Reform* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 41–53.

³⁴ Partlicius, *Metamorphosis mundi*, 158–159: “Et ego mihi penitus persvadeo, futurum, ut ista tria Regna nimirum Ungariae, Poloniae et Boemiae, in unum coalescant regnum: vel saltem mutuas operas navabunt, quo ab injuria exterarum nationum suam gentem et moribus et idiomate parum dissimilem defendant.”

³⁵ Partlicius, *Metamorphosis mundi*, 56, 157–158.

spread in their fatherland more than among the other nations, which gave rise to the saying *luxus perdidit Bohemos*.³⁶

If in the 1620s and 1630s the defeat of the Bohemian Revolt was regarded as a divine punishment for the sins of the Bohemians, it seems that after the peace of Westphalia the Bohemian Protestants began to represent themselves as martyrs to the Protestant cause. A good example of this change in self-assessment is Comenius' letter of October 1648 to the Swedish chancellor Axel Oxenstierna, which was full of bitter reproaches to the Swedish diplomats for abandoning the Protestant refugees from the lands of the Bohemian Crown. Comenius claimed that his nation was the first in Europe to have fought the Antichrist a whole century before the Reformation started, and likewise the first nation to be attacked by enemies at the beginning of the Thirty Years' War. The Bohemians had therefore sacrificed themselves to give other nations an opportunity for defense.³⁷

To what extent was such a representation of Bohemian destiny a component of general intellectual discourse and how far can we go in constructing any broader identification with it? The evidence we have is only indirect and the answer, therefore, remains hypothetical. The members of the exiled Brethren community in the Polish town of Leszno heard some of the arguments used in the letter to Oxenstierna in a funeral sermon which Comenius delivered in January 1649.³⁸

³⁶ Jan Amos Comenius, *Haggaeus redivivus*, ed. Stanislav Králík and Rudolf Řičan, in Antonín Škarka, gen. ed., *J. A. Comenii Opera omnia* (Prague: Academia, 1971), 2:319–20, here 319: “Poněvadž pak někteří obzvláštní hříčové v naší vlasti před těmito časy škodlivě se byli rozmohli, v těch napraviti potřebí bude;...Nebo jsme takovým zlým darů božích užíváním jiné národy daleko byli převýšili, přípovědku z sebe udělali, že *luxus perdidit Bohemos*.” The saying appeared already in fifteenth-century humanist poetry as a warning for the future, and with reference to the past it was allegedly used by the Swedish king, Gustavus Adolfus. See the commentary of the editors to Comenius, *Haggaeus redivivus*, 381.

³⁷ Adolf Patera, ed., *Jana Amosa Komenského korrespondence* (Prague: Česká Akademie císaře Františka Josefa pro vědy, slovesnost a umění, 1892) 144–45: “Quam volupe antehac popularibus meis, pro evangelio afflictis, audire fuit, quae per me et alios renunciari jusserat Celsitudo Tua, NON DESERTUM IRI NOS, tam triste est audire nunc: DESERI NOS, adeoque jam DESERTOS in pacis Osnabrugensibus tractatibus...Respicite gentem, quam inter Europaeas primum respicere dignatus est Christus, ex Antichristianis eam eripiens tenebris, et quae antequam caeterae acciperent illuminationem, sola Antichristianae rabiei sustinuit furorem integro saeculo. Prima etiam nuper, quum evertere statuissent omnes, alios post alios, excepit impetu, eventu eo, ut sua ruina reliquis defendendi sui relinqueret occasionem.”

³⁸ Jan Amos Komenský, *Kázání pohřební nad...Pavlem Fabriciem* [A funeral sermon for Pavel Fabricius from 1649], in Antonín Škarka, ed., *Nový komeniologický nález: Kázání pohřební nad Fabriciem z r. 1649* [A new Comeniological discovery: A

Here he again drew a parallel between the people of Israel whom their brothers from the land of Edom refused to let pass through to the Promised Land and the Bohemians who were abandoned by their fellow-Protestants at the end of the Thirty Years' War and were not allowed to return to their fatherland. In addition, he compared Pavel Fabricius, the deceased Brethren senior, with Aaron, the spiritual leader of the people of Israel.³⁹ No doubt, these parallels impressed the audience and perhaps might have supported identification of the community with certain aspects of Hebraic patriotism. Without more texts using the same language, however, it would be difficult to conclude that Comenius represented any broader "consciousness" among the exiled Bohemians.

The self-presentation of the Bohemian Protestants as martyrs appeared once again in an ambitious and successful historical work of Comenius directed chiefly towards a European readership, *Historia persecutionum Ecclesiae Bohemicae*.⁴⁰ Materials for the book, which was meant to be part of a new edition of the well-known martyrology of John Foxe entitled *The Acts and Monuments of the Church*, had been collected as early as the 1630s. Eventually, the book, edited by J. A. Comenius and Adam Hartmann, was published independently, but not until the end of the Thirty Years' War. A Latin edition appeared in Leiden in 1647 and again in 1648. A German translation was published in Basel in 1650, and again in Zurich in 1669 with a changed but symptomatic title, *Böhmisches Martyr-Büchlein*. An English version, *The History of the Bohemian Persecution*, appeared in London in 1650, and finally a Czech version was published in Leszno in 1655 and in Amsterdam in 1663. The historical narrative is constructed here to prove the continuity of the true believers in Bohemia from the times of the Christianization at the end of the ninth century until 1632 when the Bohemian Protestant refugees lost their hopes for an immediate return home. The stories of individual martyrs were occasionally put into an eschatological and apocalyptic framework, but neither this framework nor the Hebraic rhetoric used by the authors dominate the book and

funeral sermon for Pavel Fabricius from 1649] (Prague: Královská česká společnost nauk, 1938), 60–75.

³⁹ Komenský, *Kázání pohřební*, 63.

⁴⁰ Jan Amos Komenský, *Historia o těžkých protivenstvích církve české / Historia persecutionum Ecclesiae Bohemicae*, ed. Amedeo Molnár, Věra Petráčková, Zuzana Pospíšilová and Noemi Rejchrtová, in Milan Kopecký, gen. ed., *J. A. Comenii Opera omnia* (Prague: Academia, 1989), 9/1:49–338.

any articulated concept of chosenness is lacking. The motive of punishment for sins appears in an introductory greeting to the readers but it is applied to the Bohemian church and not to the nation as a whole.⁴¹ This is also apparent in a final prayer appended to the Czech version of the book where the Bohemian church is called “a daughter of Bohemian Zion” and “the Bohemian Jerusalem.”⁴² Rather than as a narrative of an elect nation, the *Historia persecutionum* was conceived as a survey of the major changes (*mutationes*) in the Bohemian church, of its sufferings and martyrdom at the hands of pagans, popery and “pseudo-Hussites.” In order to prove continuity between the Byzantine mission to Moravia and the Hussite times, and especially the long and unbroken tradition of the communion *sub utraque specie*, the authors insisted that the communion *sub una* was introduced to Bohemia as late as the mid-14th century under Charles IV.⁴³

While the authors of the narrative on the Bohemian persecution preferred to present their cause to the international audience in a martyrological perspective without focusing on the idea of chosenness, the hopes of a new shift in the European balance of power after the Peace of Westphalia and of a consequent return of the exiles home fixed on potential supporters of an apocalyptic foreign policy. It was again Comenius who played a key role in such propaganda. As in his earlier works he applied the elect nationhood theme to the Bohemians and Moravians, in the first half of the 1650s he used the same theme in his appeals to the Transylvanian Prince György II Rákóczi, to the English Lord Protector Oliver Cromwell and to the Swedish king Charles X Gustav, each of them in turn being attributed the role of divine ruler and awaited saviour of the Protestant cause.

This rhetoric strategy is most obvious from Comenius' well known treatise *Gentis felicitas*, written in 1654 at the end of his stay in Hungary and published five years later. Until recently scholars have concentrated especially on his definition of nation (*gens, natio*) and the program of

⁴¹ Komenský, *Historia o těžkých protivěstích*, 54–55.

⁴² Komenský, *Historia o těžkých protivěstích*, 194.

⁴³ This construction first appeared in Utraquist thought in the second half of the fifteenth century and became well known especially from a chronicle by Bohuslav Bilejovský published in 1537. Comenius and Hartmann took over the idea from the historian of the Bohemian Brethren, Jan Jafet. See Komenský, *Historia o těžkých protivěstích*, 66.

practical reforms that he proposed to Rákóczi.⁴⁴ Both were often seen as surprisingly modern and influenced by mercantilist theories. Comenius' concept of nation has even been interpreted as if Comenius was aware of the priority of nationhood over statehood in the context of Central European composite monarchies.⁴⁵ Recent reinterpretations of Comenius' tract offer a more complex analysis putting the work into the broader historical and discursive contexts.⁴⁶ First, it is obvious that Comenius wrote his tract in the atmosphere of exalted millenarian expectations of the mid-1650s which he shared with other similar-minded intellectuals. In this perspective, the reforms in one nation were just part of a much broader universalist scheme of improvement of all human affairs, and even this scheme was conceived as just a prelude to the millenarian empire of Jesus Christ. Therefore it is not surprising that there is a certain disproportion between Comenius' rather concrete criticism of the Hungarian people and the means of recovery that he proposes. The remedies against unhappiness are in many cases not specific; rather, it seems that Comenius looked to divine grace which was to reveal itself before the coming of the millennium. The main instrument who would implement and guarantee the reforms was a divinely chosen native ruler who by so acting would cooperate with God and fulfil His plans. Clearly it was György II Rákóczi whom Comenius had in mind, as he drew parallels between the Transylvanian prince and Old Testament heroes like Moses, Josiah, Gideon and David, as well as significant figures of Christian history like Constantine

⁴⁴ Jan Amos Comenius, *Genitis felicitas*, ed. Julie Nováková and Martin Steiner, in Antonín Škarka, gen. ed., *J. A. Comenii Opera omnia* (Prague: Academia, 1974), 13:35–66; František Kutnar, "Komenského pojetí národa a jeho poměr k současným a pozdějším výměrům" [Comenius' concept of nation and its relationship with other seventeenth- and eighteenth-century concepts], *Archiv o bádání o životě a díle Jana Amose Komenského* 19 (1960): 225–30; Jan Patočka, "Doslov" [Afterword], in Jan Amos Comenius, *Gentium salutis reparator*, trs. and ed. Metoděj Klučka (Prague: SPN, 1956), 131–42; László Makkai, "Die ungarischen Quellen der *Genitis felicitas*," *Archiv pro bádání o životě a díle Jana Amose Komenského* 19 (1960): 198–99; Josef Válka, "Obsah pojmů národ a vlast u Komenského: K otázce Komenského 'moravanství'" [The notions of "nation" and "fatherland" in Comenius' work: The question of Comenius' "Moravianness"], *Vlastivědný věstník moravský* 22 (1970): 281–90.

⁴⁵ Válka, "Obsah pojmů národ a vlast u Komenského," 281.

⁴⁶ See Vladimír Urbánek, "The Idea of State and Nation in the Writings of Bohemian Exiles After 1620," in Linas Eriksonas and Leos Müller, eds., *Statehood Before and Beyond Ethnicity: Minor States in Northern and Eastern Europe* (Brussels: P.I.E.-Peter Lang, 2005), 67–83, esp. 73–76; Trencsényi, *Early Modern Discourses of Nationhood*, Ch. III/3. See also Trencsényi's contribution in this volume for a more detailed discussion.

the Great and Charlemagne. Rákóczi, therefore, was destined to lead his "Israel" to a victorious fight with the Antichrist.⁴⁷ In such a way Comenius skillfully alluded to the elect nationhood theme having in mind a much broader agenda: apocalyptic military conflict and the peaceful reform of human affairs preceding the millenium.

It remains unclear to what extent his appeal to the Transylvanian prince was coordinated with the plans of another Bohemian refugee, Václav Sadovský of Sloupno, to win the financial and moral support of Oliver Cromwell for the idea of the "liberation" of Bohemia.⁴⁸ Sadovský formulated his plans in May 1654 while Comenius was still in Hungary. After Comenius returned to Leszno he supported Sadovský's initiative and recommended his compatriot to Samuel Hartlib who was to mediate Sadovský's correspondence with Cromwell. It was at this point that Sadovský formulated a draft of a manifesto intended for the inhabitants of the Bohemian lands who, as he hoped, would start an uprising against the Habsburgs to support his planned military campaign.⁴⁹ The manifesto again uses constitutive elements of the elect nationhood theme, retelling the story of the faithful Bohemians protected by God since Hussite times who were punished for the decline of their original piety by executions, exile, forceful conversions and the loss of all liberties. Now, the sons of the *patria* were to fight the Antichrist and the foreign power in order to liberate themselves and the true faith. The apocalyptic tone culminates in a call for just revenge. It is not clear who was expected to become ruler of a liberated Bohemia or whether Comenius would have insisted on a native king as he did in the case of Hungary.

In fact, in pragmatically changing his opinion regarding the idea that the ruler should have been of native origin Comenius proved to be remarkably flexible. Just one year later, in October 1655, during the Swedish-Polish war he wrote his *Panegyricus Carolo Gustavo* identify-

⁴⁷ Comenius, *Gentis felicitas*, 49–52, 57–59.

⁴⁸ Jan Kumpers and Josef Hejnic, *Poslední pokus českého exilu kolem Komenského o zvrát v zemích České koruny* [The last attempt of the Czech exiles in Comenius' circle to reconquer the lands of the Bohemian Crown] (Brno-Uherský Brod: Muzejní a vlastivědná společnost v Brně-Muzeum Jana Amose Komenského v Uherském Brodě, 1988). The book includes an introductory study and an edition of the manuscript documents relating to Sadovský's plans preserved in the Hartlib Papers, University of Sheffield Library.

⁴⁹ "Formula Manifesti, qvo expeditionis Bellicae praesentis causae erunt reddendae," in *ibid.*, 68–72 (Latin original and Czech translation).

ing the Swedish king Charles Gustav with God's chosen ruler and the savior of the Protestant cause.⁵⁰ This time he supported a foreigner's claims to the Polish throne, however, he called upon the king to maintain Polish liberties and even to enlarge freedom of conscience for the lower social orders. Again Comenius' approach is highly eclectic: he combined a triumphalist rhetoric of elect nationhood in which Sweden was compared with Israel⁵¹ with a discourse stemming from the mirror-of-princes tradition.⁵²

One of the major motivations behind these various usages of the rhetoric of elect nationhood in the first half of the 1650s, was the attempt to inspire a new anti-Habsburg coalition composed of England, Sweden and Transylvania which would help to change the post-Westphalian status quo. As a theme the chosenness of the Bohemians now retreated in significance while the search for a new chosen ruler gaining in prominence. In Comenius' view such a ruler would "liberate" the lands governed by the Habsburgs and start reforms in one country, be it Hungary or Poland, which would lead to the general reform of human affairs. But both the "liberation" and the universal reformation envisaged by Comenius were meaningful only within the broader millenarian view of human history which looked to the imminent Second Coming of Christ.

The typology of chosenness

Anthony Smith has recently analyzed various manifestations of the idea of the chosen people in a broad geographical and chronological framework from the perspective of the long-term persistence of a number of different national identities.⁵³ While some of Smith's generalizations are problematic, his attempt to identify certain ideal types of chosen peoples seems useful. He divides chosen peoples into two

⁵⁰ Jan Amos Comenius, *Panegyricus Carolo Gustavo*, ed. Marie Kyrálová and Julie Nováková, in Antonín Škarka, gen. ed., *J. A. Comenii Opera omnia* (Prague: Academia, 1974), 13:67–94.

⁵¹ Comenius, *Panegyricus Carolo Gustavo*, 73–74.

⁵² For detailed comparison of the *Panegyricus* with Erasmus' *Institutio principis christiani* see Jürgen Beer, "Comenii *Panegyricus Carolo Gustavo* (1655): A Laudatory and Exhortatory Political Pamphlet Written for Charles X Gustavus of Sweden," *Acta Comeniana* 12 (1997): 105–25.

⁵³ Smith, *Chosen Peoples*, 1–5.

main groups, which he calls “covenanted peoples” (or peoples of the covenant) and “missionary peoples”. While the former type is characterized by the tendency “to turn inwards, away from the profane world” in its dedication to the true faith, the latter type, while equally dedicated to the true faith, seeks to expand into that same world and to transform it.⁵⁴ A similar distinction was made by František Šmahel who, speaking about pre-Hussite Bohemia, pointed out that the idea of chosenness was not necessarily identical with a sense of faith in a special messianistic mission. Therefore, he argued, the Bohemian kingdom under Charles IV, while termed *regnum christianissimum*, had neither a specific mission nor could its chosenness be extended to the *nacio* or *gens bohémica*. The idea of the messianistic mission of the Czechs appeared for the first time in sermons of the Hussite preachers. However, Šmahel refused to identify this Messianism totally with ethnicity and rather interprets it as an expression of the mission of the Hussite followers of “God’s law.”⁵⁵

What was then the nature of the Bohemian Protestant discourse of chosenness in the first half of the seventeenth century? It seems that it mixed characteristic features of both ideal types distinguished by Smith. In some of its manifestations an explicit awareness of the nation’s historical mission was expressed and at least retrospectively this mission was identified with the role of the Hussite Czechs in the history of Salvation. This “missionary” self-confidence was reinforced in some of the apocalyptic pamphlets and optimistic prognostications issued during the Bohemian Revolt which stressed the divine role of the newly elected Calvinist king of Bohemia. In the situation of war the “missionary” rhetoric had, of course, various functions including a mobilizatory one as well as that of legitimizing the new Palatine rule. After the Battle of the White Mountain the rhetoric of chosenness tended to employ more of the elements characteristic of “covenanted peoples.” The topos of divine punishment for sins, the necessity of repentance and the renewal of the covenant played a central role in this rhetoric. This version of chosenness might be called “defensive chosenness” and perhaps could be compared with the similar discursive

⁵⁴ Smith, *Chosen Peoples*, 66–130, esp. 95. As examples of covenanted peoples Smith discusses the medieval Gregorian Armenians and Amharic Ethiopians and the modern Afrikaners and Zionist Jews. Among the missionary peoples he includes not only the English and the French but also among others the medieval Greeks and Russians.

⁵⁵ Šmahel, *Idea národa*, 93–96.

strategies of the Hungarian and Transylvanian Calvinists especially in the 1640s and 1650s.⁵⁶

A different attempt to formulate a typology of Hebraic imagery and Old Testament parallels was made by Paul Regan, who focused on Dutch Calvinist thought.⁵⁷ Regan tried to solve the crucial question of “what Reformed Protestants in the Low Countries understood by the parallels they drew with the Israelites” by analyzing these parallels within the period between the 1550s and the 1650s with special regard to the concurrent changes in the Reformed church and political structures.⁵⁸ Before the Dutch Revolt, Regan argues, Israelite parallels were employed just by the members of the Reformed churches and applied only to themselves as true believers. After 1565, Hebraic imagery began to be used in political propaganda to support the fight against Spain. But during both periods the notion of a universal Israel, a universal church of true believers continued to be used in contrast to the idea of an elect nation until the 1590s. According to Regan, the Hebraic imagery used by Calvinists of the Low Countries from the 1540s to the 1580s could hardly be described as an exclusively national conception.⁵⁹ It was only in the first half of the seventeenth century, in the context of “the increasing strength and self-confidence of the Dutch Republic,” that the notion of a Dutch Israel became more frequent not only as a parallel to the Old Testament but as a strong alternative identification.⁶⁰

Similar uncertainties appear when we ask what the Bohemian Protestants understood by the theme of chosenness. As I have already argued, the elect nationhood theme reappeared in the Czech context at the end of the sixteenth century without any direct continuity with its fifteenth-century Hussite variations. The motive of election was polysemantic and had various connotations: in Velešlavín’s works, for example, it was related both to the nation and to the church. Similarly to the Dutch case before the 1580s, it cannot be understood as exclusively national but it could hardly be seen as exclusively ecclesiastical

⁵⁶ See, for example, the sermons of Pál Medgyesi from 1648–1660 preached on the occasions of the deaths of István Bethlen, György I Rákóczi and Zsigmond Rákóczi as well as with the failure of György II Rákóczi’s Polish campaign. See Murdock, *Calvinism on the Frontier*, 265–66, 284–85.

⁵⁷ Regan, “Calvinism and the Dutch Israel Thesis,” 91–106.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, esp. 92–93.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 96 and 103.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 105–6.

either. In the years of the Bohemian Revolt it had strong political connotations functioning as propaganda against the emperor. Later, in the circles of Bohemian exiles, it played a role of an explanatory scheme and consolation using the topos of divine punishment and stressing the continuing covenant between the once chosen people and God. By the end of the war, the dominant self-representation of the Bohemians was as martyrs of the Protestant cause whose special place in the history of salvation had finished.

Other patriotic discourses

To be sure, the Bohemian and Moravian exiles were far from using a single political-religious language, namely that of Hebraic patriotism. Sometimes the same author expressed ideas from different discourses within one work. Thus Sorrowful, the character in Comenius' treatise, speaks with Christ in the language of chosenness, but with the figure of Reason in a neo-Stoic tone borrowed from Justus Lipsius.⁶¹ It can hardly be a surprise that they discuss issues related to the meaning of *patria* and the value of patriotism in the period of war cataclysms.

Similarly, Simeon Partlicius in his tract *Flagellum Dei* put the humanist discussion of various types of wars and of the right to resist into an eschatological framework. His lament on the recent developments of the *patria* is based on the topos of decline where the heroic past of the *patria* is set in contrast to the lack of bravery and power of her current unfaithful sons. He was able to describe the horrors of the civil wars drawing on his recent experience from the Bohemian Revolt, at the same time, however, he supported a theory of the right to resist a tyrant who persecuted his subjects for their religion and stressed the role of the lower magistrates in such resistance. He did not connect this topic to the idea of chosenness, nor did he seek a special place for the Bohemian kingdom in the history of Salvation.⁶²

⁶¹ Comenius, *Truchlivý*, II:69–85. A substantial part of the dialogue between Sorrowful and Reason is either a translation or paraphrase of Justus Lipsius, *De constantia* (Antverpiae, 1605).

⁶² Simeon Partlicius, *Flagellum Dei: To jest Bič aneb metla Boží* [Flagellum Dei: i.e. a Whip or a Scourge of God] (Prague, 1620), 4–81, esp. 62–69. See Vladimír Urbánek, “Simeon Partlicius a jeho příspěvek k politickému myšlení doby bělohorské. Typologie válek a právo na odpor” [Simeon Partlicius and his contribution to the political

The late humanist discourse stemming from classical sources and from domestic (most notably historiographic) and European humanist traditions remained influential, especially in works directed to the learned international readership. An example is Pavel Stránský's *Respublica Bojema* (1634, 1643) which depicted the pre-1620 Bohemian state as a flourishing land, nearly as a "paradise lost."⁶³ Stránský defended the estates conception of the Bohemian state but consciously avoided any aggressive confessional rhetoric. He was familiar with the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century humanist literature and cited Bohemian and Moravian authors like Václav Hájek of Libočany, Johannes Dubravius, Daniel Adam of Veleslavín, Polish authors like Marcin Kromer, the histories of Hungary by Antonio Bonfini and Johannes Thuróczi, and European humanists such as Aeneas Sylvius and Jean Bodin among others. Together with classical authorities these authors formed the referential framework of his book, which, by contrast, lacks any reference to the Bible, not to mention any sort of Hebraic allusions. Neither the chapter on the inhabitants of Bohemia nor the chapter on religious developments includes any allusions to elect nationhood. Stránský built his narrative regarding the Czechs on a medieval myth of origin, the story of the forefather Čech, which was revived and widely discussed in humanist constructions of Bohemian history.⁶⁴ His survey of religious developments was based on the idea of the continuity between the Slavonic liturgy established by the Greek missionaries Constantine (Cyril) and Methodius and the Hussite reform movement.⁶⁵ One of the longest chapters traces the "constitutional" history of Bohemia in an attempt to prove that Bohemia had always been an elective monarchy.⁶⁶ Stránský used a distinctive patriotic

thought of the period around 1620: The typology of wars and the right to resist], *Studia Comeniana et historica* 62 (1999): 61–75.

⁶³ Pavel Stránský, *Respublica Bojema* (Lugduni Batavorum, 1643). The book appeared for the first time under a slightly different title, *Respublica Bohemiae*, in 1634. Both editions were published by the Elzevier press in Leiden.

⁶⁴ For humanist discussion of the pre-Slavonic history of Bohemia and the coming of the Czechs, see Zdeněk Beneš, *Historický text a historická skutečnost: Studie o principech českého humanistického dějepisectví* [Historical text and historical reality: A study on the principles of Bohemian humanist historiography] (Prague: Karolinum, 1993), 120–28.

⁶⁵ Stránský, *Respublica Bojema*, 262–322 (chapter 6, "De Religionis Mutationibus et Regimine Ecclesiastico in Bojemia"). On the idea of a long and unbroken tradition of the communion *sub utraque specie*, see above, note 43.

⁶⁶ Stránský, *Respublica Bojema*, 166–261 (chapter 5, "De Regimine Politico in Bojemia"). See Urbánek, "The Idea of State and Nation," 71–72.

rhetoric stressing his “inherent love of the patria” and his wish to increase the honor of his fatherland. His work represents a striking example of a very complex mixture of loyalties including “land patriotism” and strong ethnic consciousness together with the politically and constitutionally based pro-estates concept of statehood. In a way, this was a strong alternative to the elect nationhood theme, similar in some respect to the alternative Netherlandish identity developed about the same time as the idea of Dutch “New Israel”, namely the Batavian myth.

It is no wonder that Stránský’s work became popular among patriotic Jesuit intellectuals in the re-Catholicized Bohemian lands. Of course, the passages about the Hussite period, the author’s sympathy for Protestantism and his criticism of Ferdinand II provoked disagreement, as is obvious from their marginal notes in copies of the book.⁶⁷ They could adopt, however, elements of both his “land patriotism” and ethno-linguistic self-identification which were compatible with the new confessionally distinctive discourse of *Bohemia Sacra*. That discourse was, of course, completely antithetical to the Protestant story of a chosen people with its understanding of the Bohemians as a Protestant nation.⁶⁸

Conclusion

The experience of the Bohemian revolt, of its defeat and the subsequent exile of the Protestants from Bohemia and Moravia reinforced eschatological and apocalyptic expectations and produced a specific discourse of what I have proposed to term “defensive chosenness,” which used the language of so-called Hebraic patriotism. Elements of

⁶⁷ On the corrections and marginal notes of a Jesuit reader of Stránský, see Bohumil Ryba, “Doslov” [Afterword], in Pavel Stránský ze Zápské Stránky, *Český stát, Okřík*, ed. and tr. Bohumil Ryba (Prague: Státní nakladatelství krásné literatury, hudby a umění, 1953), 438–39.

⁶⁸ It is well known that the Jesuit historian Bohuslav Balbín was an admirer of Stránský’s *Respublica*. See e.g. Jan Kučera and Jiří Rak, *Bohuslav Balbín a jeho místo v české kultuře* [Bohuslav Balbín and his place in Czech culture] (Prague: Vyšehrad, 1983), 85, 148. On Balbín’s concept of *Bohemia Sancta*, see esp. Jiří Šitler, “Svaté Čechy Bohuslava Balbína” [The Holy Bohemia of Bohuslav Balbín], in Zuzana Pokorná and Martin Svatoš, eds., *Bohuslav Balbín a kultura jeho doby v Čechách* [Bohuslav Balbín and the culture of his times in Bohemia] (Prague: Památník národního písemnictví, 1992), 40–45. On Balbín see also Petr Matá’s paper in this volume.

this discourse included the notion of a godly ruler, the construction of apocalyptic enemies, the special place of the Bohemians within the history of Salvation and the theme of divine punishment. The story of the people of Israel was used as a model for understanding the Bohemians' past, their present situation and their future expectations. Quite often it combined Biblical motives with reminiscences of the Hussite times. It seems that at least in the 1620s this discourse was used both in pamphlet literature and in religious tracts produced by the Lutherans and the Bohemian Brethren. From the mid-1630s it probably lost its currency along with the general decline of apocalyptic expectations,⁶⁹ but it remained to play some role in the exiled communities of the Bohemian Brethren, most notably in the works of their leading intellectual representative, Jan Amos Comenius. The important historical narratives published by the Bohemian exiles in the 1630s and 1640s and directed primarily to an international readership did not use either an elect nationhood theme or an eschatological framework. Instead, they constructed stories based on the genre of Protestant martyrology and on the humanist patriotic legal discourse.

⁶⁹ For these general developments, see e.g. Robin Bruce Barnes, *Prophecy and Gnosis: Apocalypticism in the Wake of the Lutheran Reformation* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1988), especially 256–60.

CHAPTER TWENTY

PATRIOTIC AND “PROTO-NATIONAL” MOTIVES IN LATE MIEVEAL AND EARLY MODERN BULGARIAN LITERATURE: THE CONTEXTS OF PAISIJ HILENDARSKI

Alexandar Nikolov

Schematically, modern nations are often divided into two groups regarding the genesis of their respective nationalist ideologies. There are “historical” and “non-historical” nations, the first category having political traditions and an independent state dating from the medieval and early modern period, and the second group lacking such traditions.¹ In South-East Europe, however, modern nations which emerged after centuries of political non-existence often claimed at least nominally a continuity with medieval traditions of independent “national” states which in most of the cases had been interrupted by the Ottoman conquest. The rise of modern Bulgarian nationalism, which projected such a continuity without any real institutional link, is a case in point.

There are many theories regarding “the invention of the Bulgarians.” The most eccentric one, noted by Anastasia Karakasidou, claimed that the modern Bulgarian nation was “invented” by American Protestant missionaries during the second half of the nineteenth century.² According to more mainstream theories, the Bulgarians emerged as a distinct national community in the first half of the nineteenth century due to the Panslavist ideology propagated mostly by Russia. The “official” theory connects the rise of nationalism among the Bulgarians with specific social and economic changes in the Ottoman Empire in the eighteenth century and the efforts of a group of early modern intellectuals led by the monumental figure of the Chilandar (Hilendar in Bulgarian) monk Paisij, the author of the “Slavo-Bulgarian History” which he finished around 1761–62. Paisij himself became a legend

¹ Konstantin Symmons-Symonolewicz, *Nationalist Movements: A Comparative View* (Meadville, Pennsylvania: Maplewood Press, 1970).

² Anastasia N. Karakasidou, *Fields of Wheat, Hills of Blood: Passages to Nationhood in Greek Macedonia, 1870–1990* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997), 83.

and a starting point of the whole process, described as “the Bulgarian national revival.”³

The aim of this paper is to seek the domestic sources of Paisij’s nationalist fervor, which he directed against Turks, Greeks and to some extent Serbs who—especially the first two of these “nations”—were constantly oppressing the “humble Bulgarians.” Paisij’s aim, proclaimed in the “Foreword” of his work, was to help Bulgarians to awake, to stop being “ashamed” of their origin and to discover the glorious past of their independent state and church before the Ottoman conquest, that is, during the medieval period.⁴

Paisij’s sources include the Russian translations and compilations of the *Annales ecclesiastici* of Cardinal Cesare Baronio and the *Il Regno degli Slavi* of the Ragusan Benedictine abbot Mauro Orbini, known to Paisij as “Mavrubir the Latin (*Latinec*).” The rest of his sources were the treasures of medieval Slavic literature hidden in the libraries of the two southern Slavic monasteries on Mount Athos, Chilandar (nominally Serbian) and Zograph (nominally Bulgarian), and also the archives of the Serbian Patriarchate in Sremski Karlovci. We know that he also used the anonymous “History of Zograph,” written around the same time, and other sources connected to famous Bulgarian saints, such as St. Petka of Tyrnovo, St. John of Rila and so on. He was well aware of the role of the Apostles of the Slavs, SS. Cyril and Methodius, and he also collected a lot of information on Serbian medieval history, which he included in his work, partly as a comparison to the Bulgarian history of the period, in order to prove how glorious the Bulgarians were before the appearance of the Ottomans.⁵

³ Nikolaj Genčev, *Българското възраждане* [The Bulgarian Revival] (Sofia: Издателство на ОФ, 1988); Hristo Hristov, *Паисий Хилендарски* [Неговото време, животен път и дело] [Paisij Hilendarski: His times, his life and his work] (Sofia: Наука и изкуство, 1972).

⁴ Paisij Hilendarski, *История словеноболгарская* [A Slavo-Bulgarian history] (Sofia: Университетско издателство “Св. Климент Охридски”, 2000) This is a facsimile of the original manuscript of 1762.

⁵ Riccardo Picchio, “Gli Annali di Baronio-Skarga e la Storia di Paisij Hilendarski,” *Ricerche Slavistiche*, III (1954): 25–68.

Medieval constructions of identity

The career of Paisij was preceded by a period described in Bulgarian historiography as a kind of a “Dark Age” for Bulgarian development. It is especially difficult to find domestic sources for the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries—usually regarded to be the low-point of the decline of the independent cultural development of the Bulgarians as an ethnic community. The surviving material is largely a repetition of medieval forms and texts, mostly with purely religious content and on limited topics. A little different is the so-called “*Damaskinar*” literature which imitated Greek popular collections and was named after the *Thissavros* (“Treasure”) of Damaskinos Stouditis, from the second half of the sixteenth century.⁶ Thus, if we wish to find signs of “proto-nationalism” we should probably go back to the late medieval period preceding the Ottoman conquest. Here it is likely that we could identify certain patriotic and “proto-national” motives which Paisij and his followers later developed during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.⁷

It is worth mentioning here as well the lack of continuity in the medieval development of the Bulgarian state, church and ethnic community. The First Bulgarian Empire (Tsardom) had been crushed at the beginning of the 11th century after an epic struggle, in Gustave Schlumberger’s words the “*Épopée Byzantine*.”⁸ The former territories of Bulgaria hence became part of the Byzantine Empire for about two centuries. The first proto-national layer is to be sought mostly in the popular literature of the period. These pieces of so-called apocrypha from the eleventh–twelfth centuries were obviously connected with the popular and not the official ecclesiastical tradition and were probably widely read among the lower classes. Here we can list firstly the “Bulgarian apocryphal annals,” “The Prophecy of the Sybil” and the *Razoumnik-oukaz*, dated to between the last decades of the 11th and the beginning of the 13th centuries—a period, including the Byzantine rule in Bulgaria and the restoration of Bulgarian independence at the

⁶ Nikolaj Genčev, *Българската култура (XV–XIX в.)* [Bulgarian culture (fifteenth–nineteenth centuries)] (Sofia: Университетско издателство “св. Климент Охридски” 1988).

⁷ Bojan Penev, *История на новата българска литература*, т. 1 [A history of modern Bulgarian literature, v.1] (Sofia: Български писател, 1976), 1: 304–307.

⁸ Paul Stephenson, *Byzantium’s Balkan Frontier: A Political Study of the Northern Balkans, 900–1204* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

end of the 12th century. What connects these three pieces? First and foremost, their popular origin, but also the main lines of the contents. Here one finds a popular version of early Bulgarian history mixing real events with apocryphal and legendary motives and united by the idea that independent Bulgaria was a glorious kingdom which had to be restored and that Bulgarians were the real and only keepers of the true Christian faith.

Let us start with the excerpts from the “Bulgarian Apocryphal Annals.” This work dates in the eleventh–twelfth centuries, though the oldest manuscript preserved today is from the seventeenth century. It is a compilation of motives from very old apocrypha originating in the early Christian tradition and translated and adapted from Greek into the Old Bulgarian language. The contents include “The Tale of Isaiah,” “The Vision and the Comment of Daniel,” “The Revelation of Methodios of Patara,” “The Vision of Isaiah,” “The Vision of Baruch” and so on. Many are believed to have been very popular among the lower social strata, and according to some scholars several ideas of the Bogomil heresy can be identified in their texts.⁹ The introductory “historical” part of the Bulgarian apocryphal annals, dedicated to a popular version of the history of Bulgarians, deserves special attention. Its title is “The Tale of Prophet Isaiah, how he was lifted to the seventh sky by an angel”:

And later I heard a voice saying to me something else: Isaiah, my beloved prophet, go to the west from the upper side of Rome [unclear geographical area] and separate the third part of the Cumans, called Bulgarians, and populate the land of Karvouna, which was abandoned by the Romans and the Hellenes. Then I, brothers, by divine order came to the left side of Rome [also geographically unclear] and separated the third part of the Cumans, and later I led them, showing [the way] by a stick of rush [*trjstju*], and I brought them to the river called Zathiousa and another one called Ereousa. And then there were three large rivers. And I populated the land called the land of Karvouna and the Bulgarian land as well, which had been abandoned by the Hellenes for 150 years.

The writer continues with a short description of a popular version of the history of the Bulgarian Tsardom. According to this, the first ruler was called Slav, probably a legendary eponym related to the broader Slavic cultural and linguistic identity of the Bulgarians at that time,

⁹ Jordan Ivanov, *Богомилски книги и легенди* [Bogomil books and legends] (Sofia: Наука и изкуство, 1970).

and “in these years there was an abundance of everything.” The second was Ispor, usually identified with the pagan founder of Danubian Bulgaria at the end of the seventh century (the traditionally accepted date of this foundation is A.D. 681), Khan Asparuh (Isparih) (circa 665–701):

And he destroyed many Ismaelites on the Danube... And after the death of Ispor, the Tsar of the Bulgarians, the Cumans got the name Bulgarians, and earlier in the time of Tsar Ispor they were pagans and true infidels and lived very dishonestly, and they were always enemies of the Greek Tsardom. He built the towns of Drystyr and Pliska, and a big *prezid* [from Lat. *praesidium*: fortification] along the Danube.

The son of Ispor, Izot, defeated King Oziah from the East and Goliath the Frank from the Sea Coast. These events cannot be identified with certainty, and they correspond only superficially with the victory of Asparuh’s heir Tervel (circa 701–718) over the Muslim Arabs near Constantinople in 718.

The story continues with “his son” Boris, obviously Boris-Michael of Bulgaria (852–889), the first Christian ruler, who converted the Bulgarian people in 864/65 and who:

baptized the Bulgarian lands and created churches around the Bulgarian lands and on the river Bregalnica, and here accepting the Tsardom, created white churches... He ruled for 16 years without sin or woman. And his Tsardom was blessed, and he died in peace with the Lord.

His “brother” Simeon (893–927) (in fact his third son) begot Preslav, and he performed many miracles. And in the time of Simeon the taxes were:

throughout the countries of his Tsardom a little amount of wool, one spoon of butter and one egg for one year. This was the tax from his land and from his people, and he did not demand anything else. And there was large abundance of everything in the times of this Tsar Simeon.

This idealistic description suggests a kind of Golden Age and is often represented with similar pathos even in modern Bulgarian historiography.

Simeon’s son is the holy Tsar Peter (927–970), “a holy and perfectly sinless man”. He was also:

Tsar of the Bulgarians, and besides of the Greeks. He ruled in the Bulgarian land for twelve years without sin or woman, and his Tsardom was blessed. At this time, moreover, in the days and the years of the holy Peter, the Bulgarian Tsar, there was abundance of everything, that

is wheat and butter, honey, and milk, and wine, and it was abundant in every kind of goods in accordance with the will of God. And then, in the years of the holy Peter, the Tsar of the Bulgarians, there appeared in the land of the Bulgarians a woman, a widow, young and wise and very righteous, with the name Elena. And she gave birth to Tsar Constantine, a holy and rightful man. He, by the way, was son of Constantine the Green [Chlorus] and of Elena, and this Constantine, called *Bagrenorodni* [Born in the Purple, Porphyrogenetus)], was Emperor of Rome...

And so on. At the end of the story Tsar Peter is forced to leave his Tsardom and to flee to Rome, and there he dies in exile. There are many others listed as co-emperors of the Bulgarian and the Greek Tsardoms. Some can be connected to real Byzantine and Bulgarian rulers, such as Basil (probably Basil II the Bulgar-slayer, 976–1025), his opponents the *Komitopouloi* Samuel (Bulgarian Tsar, 997–1014), Moses and Aaron, and even Roman (977–997), the last representative of the dynasty of Boris and Simeon. In particular, the image of Peter as the Holy Tsar of the Bulgarians was so strong in the popular mind and in tradition that all three major uprisings against Byzantine rule during the 11th and 12th centuries have their own Tsar Peter: Peter Delyan in 1040, perhaps a grandson of Tsar Samuel; Constantine Bodin (Peter III), prince of Zeta and tsar of the Bulgarians during the uprising of George Vojteh in 1078, elected because of his relation to the dynasty of Samuel; and last but not least, Theodore-Peter, who, together with his brother Asen, led the uprising that began in 1185, which ended with the restoration of the Bulgarian state on the Lower Danube.¹⁰

The unifying ideas are the idealization of the Bulgarian past during the centuries of independence; a stress on the favorable economic conditions as being in sharp contrast with Byzantine taxation (both major uprisings against the Byzantines in 1040 and 1185 AD were provoked by the introduction of new taxes); the idea of the rightfulness and the Christian legitimacy of the Bulgarian Tsardom; and last but not least, the fact that they settled in the “Land of Karvouna” following a divine command and soon abandoning paganism.

I would next like to quote some passages from the *Razoumnik-oukaz*, another compilation from the beginning of the thirteenth cen-

¹⁰ Vasilka Tyrkova-Zaimova and Anisava Miltenova, *Историко-апокалиптичната книжнина във Византия и в средновековна България* [Historical and apocalyptic literature in Byzantium and medieval Bulgaria] (Sofia: Университетско издателство “Св. Климент Охридски,” 1996), 192–207.

ture whose roots and origin are still disputed. These passages consist of questions and answers on different matters. This text, too, was probably popular among the lower social strata.

Then you, brothers, should know that there are three Emperors in the world, three like the Holy Trinity in the Heaven. The first Empire is the Greek one, the Second Empire is the Bulgarian, the Third one is the Iberian [Georgian]. The Father is in the Greek Empire, the Son is in the Iberian and the Holy Spirit is in the Bulgarian Empire. The Greeks will transfer the Empire to God, the Bulgarians will transfer Christianity, and the Iberians will also transfer Christianity to God [meaning probably preservation of the true Christian faith] Among all these peoples there are twelve books. The orthodox books are three, Greek, Bulgarian and Iberian; the semi-orthodox are the Frankish, the Alemannish, the Hungarian, the Czech, the Armenian. The books of the infidels are four, Jewish, Saracen, Turkish and Lithuanian. And the number of all the nations is 72, and only a half of them have the law.

As for the origin of the orthodox peoples, the five orthodox nations are connected with Shem (Sim): the Syrians, Iberians, Greeks, Bulgarians and Russians. The twelve semi-orthodox nations have their origin from Japheth: the Franks and Latins, Hungarians, Armenians, Arcadians (the people from Arcadia—probably the real one in Central Peloponnesus), Czechs, Poles, Germans, Croats, Arbanas (Albanians), Sakoulats (Szeklers) and Hyzians (maybe the Turkic-speaking Ghuzz from the Pontic steppes). The infidels, of course, are referred to Ismael and his mother Agar, the result of incest, while to Ham is ascribed the origin of the “Egyptians and the Pharaohs” who were doomed by God, probably one of the earliest notes of the presence of the Roma population in Europe.¹¹

In “The Prophecy of the Sybil”, dated almost to the same time, we find reference to the Slavic origin of the Bulgarians. Here the Sybil, “a child with legs of a goose” who bears the name Maria, rules over Rome and expects to give birth to Christ. Commenting on a dream about nine suns over the earth, she answers the “judges”:

The nine suns are the nine nations. The first of them are the Slavs, that is, the Bulgarians: hospitable, humble, honest, good, loving foreigners and Christianity. They will transfer [i.e. preserve] to God the right faith more than anyone else in the world. The second nation is the Georgians,

¹¹ Търкова-Займова and Милтенова, *Историко-апокалиптичната книжнина*, 277–311.

friendly towards foreigners, good, kind, respecting priests, asking about God. The third nation are the Hellenes, that is the Greeks: elevating [i.e. ruled by] the Emperor, mixing with all nations, boasters, false witnesses, arrogant, avaricious, venal, they will hesitate in their faith three times, they will transfer to God the kingdom, they love churches.¹²

The second trend is connected to the “Bulgarianization” of the deeds of SS. Cyril and Methodius, found in the “Short Life of S. Cyril” and the “Legend of Salonica,” both from the 13th century. Here we shall follow the motifs connecting the two brothers from Salonica with Bulgaria and the Bulgarians, despite the fact that in reality they hardly had any real connection with them and it was their disciples who were welcomed in Pliska, after the collapse of the Moravian mission.

The “Short Version” of the “Vita of St. Cyril” repeats the main facts concerning the Apostle of the Slavs and is also dated to the 13th century. However it contains certain details, which are absent in the earlier “Full Version” of the *Vita*. Thus, we discover here that Cyril was born in Salonica, being Bulgarian by origin, of rich and eminent parents, Leon (Lev) and Maria. Then we have the motif of his mission on the river Bregalnica (in the modern Republic of Macedonia), where he baptized several thousand Slavs in the Orthodox faith and created for them “the Slavic books” (i.e. the Slavic alphabet). This event precedes the famous mission among the Saracens.¹³ The mission in the region of Bregalnica, dated 857 AD, is the only event which might directly link the brothers from Salonica with Bulgaria, because at that time this region was probably part of the Bulgarian state and the local Slavs were subjects of the Bulgarian ruler.

More explicit is another apocryphal text, the “Legend of Salonica,” which also narrates the life of St. Cyril, this time in autobiographical form (“The Tale of Cyril the Philosopher, how he baptized the Bulgarians”). According to the story told there, Cyril was born in Cappadocia and studied in Damascus and later in Alexandria at the Church of the Great Patriarchate, and there he heard a voice from the altar calling him to go to the “*ieziiki slovinskie se rekshe Blijgare*” (“the Slavic people, named Bulgarians”), to convert them and to give them the law. Cyril explains that he does not know where the land of the Bulgarians is, and later he travels to Cyprus and wants to travel back home, but

¹² Ibid., 251–77.

¹³ Jordan Ivanov, *Български старини из Македония* [Bulgarian antiquities from Macedonia] (Sofia: Държавна печатница, 1931), 283–288.

then he arrives in Crete and there someone tells him that he has to head to the city of Salonica. He arrives there and the local metropolite John tells him that he must be mad if he wants to find the Bulgarians, because they are cannibals and will eat him. Cyril visits the market and listens for the first time to the Bulgarian language and gets scared, for “*bi jako v ade i tme*” (“it was like being in Hell and darkness”).

One day during Holy Sunday, as the philosopher sits in the church in grief and pondering, a pigeon flies to him and gives him a bunch of thirty two sticks from a fig-tree. He puts the sticks in his pocket but then suddenly forgets the Greek language, and when the metropolite invites him for a lunch he does not understand a word. All the people of Salonica gather there to see this miracle.

The Bulgarians hear of him and they come to Salonica, led by the “great prince of Morava [a region in modern Serbia], Desimir” and the “prince of Preslav [Bulgarian capital between 893–971], Radivoj.” They fight for three years around Salonica with much bloodshed, saying, “Give us the man who was sent among us by God.” They receive him with a great joy and take him to the town of Ravno [identification unsure] on the river Bregalnica. Cyril invents for them 32 letters. “I taught them a little, and they learned by themselves much. The Lord chose them to spread the Orthodox faith.”¹⁴ Of course, the whole story has nothing in common with the real story of the Slavic apostles who perhaps never visited Bulgaria, it being their disciples and followers who spread the Slavic alphabet and liturgy there.

The third trend is connected to the attempt to organize a proto-national narrative and to link the Bulgarian imperial idea with the idea for a second or a third Rome. Here we shall examine the notes to the Bulgarian translation of the *Chronicle* of Constantine Manasses from the 14th century. Here one can trace the beginnings of an attempt to construct a framework of “national” history linking the First and Second Bulgarian Tsardom, and also traces of an emerging ideology of a “*translatio imperii*” from Rome and Constantinople to Tyrnovo (Bulgarian capital between 1185–1393).

The “chronicle” of Constantine Manasses is a poetic work from the second half of the 12th century. The author was bishop of Naupaktos (Nafpaktos, Italian Lepanto) in central Greece and compiled a *Synopsis istoriki* outlining the events from the Creation of the World to the

¹⁴ Ibid., 281–83.

reign of Emperor Nicephorus III Botaniates (1078–1081). It is thus a work typical of the so-called Renaissance of the Comneni in the 12th century.

There are three manuscripts of the Bulgarian translation of Manasses' *Chronicle*. Two are from the 14th century and another is from the sixteenth century, from Tulča (modern Tulcea) in northern Dobruzha, now in Romania. The translation was probably done in the reign of John Alexander (1331–71), a time of relative cultural and political revival in medieval Bulgaria. Appended to the translation are notes, comments and additional passages concerning the history of Bulgaria, related in a patriotic tone. For example, following the fall of Western Rome and the abdication of Romulus Augustulus (475–476)—*Romil* in the Bulgarian text—the translator adds the note:

Such things happened to Old Rome. And our own *Tsarigrad* [City of the Emperor] is growing, strengthening and getting younger—let it grow in this way, O You, Emperor, ruling above all! It has such an excellent Emperor, full of light, a great ruler and great champion, originating from the roots of the noble John Asen, Emperor of the Bulgarians, called Alexander, modest, generous and protector of monks, feeder of the poor, the great emperor of the Bulgarians! Let his power be supported by countless suns!”

Then, about the time of the Eastern Roman Emperor Anastasius I (491–518) the translator adds:

Under this Emperor Anastasius the Bulgarians started to conquer this land, crossing by Bydin [modern Vidin in Bulgaria]. And before that they occupied the “Lower Land” of Ohrid and after that, all that land. From the arrival of the Bulgarians 870 years have passed.

Another note assigns the occupation of the eastern Balkans by the Bulgarians to the reign of Constantine IV Pogonates (668–685), coinciding with the real settlement of the Bulgarian tribe of the *Ounnogoundouroi* (*Nándorok* in the ancient Hungarian tradition),¹⁵ mentioned by Theophanes the Confessor and Patriarch Nicephorus:

Under Constantine the Bearded the Sixth Oecumenical Council was held. Under this Emperor Constantine the Bulgarians crossed the Danube and took from the Greeks this land in which they live up to now, after they had defeated them. This land before that was called Moesia. And because

¹⁵ Gyula Kristó, *Hungarian History in the Ninth Century* (Szeged: Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 1996), 63.

they were numerous, they filled this and the other side of the Danube up to Drach [modern Durrës in Albania] and beyond, because they and the Vlachs and the Serbians and so on, they all are the same.

Another important note concerns the reign of Leo III the Isaurian (more correctly the Syrian) (717–41):

By this Emperor Leo, the Cumans [here Cumans means simply infidels, this being the last major siege of Constantinople by the Muslim Arabs in 717–18 AD] attacked Constantinople and all the earth, but they were drowned in the sea, eradicated by the Greeks, and the rest of them were slaughtered by the Bulgarians.

Here we see the great victory of the Byzantines and the Bulgarians specially mentioned by the translator as a source of patriotic pride.

Last but not least, the translator commemorates with a special text the victory of Khan Krum (803–813) over the famous Byzantine Emperor Nicephorus I Genicus (802–811) in 811 AD, which ended with a total disaster for the Byzantines and the death of the Emperor himself:

This Emperor Nicephorus entered the Bulgarian lands in the time of Prince Krum, and in the beginning defeated him and plundered the wealth that he was carrying. Thereafter Krum, collecting those of his men who remained after the defeat, attacked the Emperor during the night, and not only defeated the Greeks but cut off the head of the Emperor himself, covered it with silver and, pouring wine into it, gave it to the Bulgarians to drink.¹⁶

The victories of the pagan rulers from the early medieval period were still a source of patriotic pride in the late medieval, strictly Orthodox Second Bulgarian Empire, just as they continued to be during the time of the national revival in the nineteenth century, especially during the time of the Greek-Bulgarian ecclesiastical controversy, which ended with the establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate—the first internationally recognized institution of the emerging modern Bulgarian nation. And at the end of the Chronicle there is also an attempt to link the Bulgarians with the heroes of antiquity, especially Achilles and his Myrmidonians, who in the Bulgarian version of the *Story of Troy* and the Bulgarian translation of the *Chronicle* of John Malalas

¹⁶ Ivan Bujukliev and Ivan Božilov, eds., *Хрониката на Константин Манаси* [The Chronicle of Constantine Manasses] (Sofia: Университетско издателство “Св. Климент Охридски”, 1992), 111; 123; 143–44; 154, 160.

are described as Bulgarians. This is probably an attempt to compensate for the Bulgarians' lack of a classical tradition in the "competition with the closest neighbors and 'perennial rivals' of Bulgaria: the Greeks of Byzantium."¹⁷

The early modern visions of Bulgarian history

As for how he came to his knowledge of the medieval Bulgarian past, Paisij was well educated in the Old Church Slavonic tradition, and he was probably able to communicate in Greek and Turkish, though he did not know Latin or any other "European" language. Despite that, he was able to read the Russian versions of both Cesare Baronio and Mauro Orbini. These were entitled respectively: (1) *Deyaniya cerkovniye i grazhdanskiye* [Ecclesiastical and civil deeds], a short version of the *Annales ecclesiastici* of the famous cardinal (written at the end of the 16th and the beginning of the 17th centuries), translated and abridged firstly by Piotr Skarga, a Polish Jesuit, and later translated into Russian on the order of Tsar Peter I the Great (1672–1725); (2) *Kniga-istoriografiya* [The Book of Historiography], a Russian version and translation of *Il Regno degli Slavi* of Mauro Orbini (written in 1601). Paisij made extensive use of both Russian compilations, and their fate deserves broader attention in this paper.

As has been documented by such scholars as Cyriac Pullapilly, Generoso Calenzio and Angelo Roncalli the *Annals* of the cardinal Cesare Baronio (Caesar Baronius) and their continuations by Rainaldus, Bzovius and Spondanus were one of the most effective propaganda tools in the epoch of the Counter-Reformation, being directed against both the Protestant propaganda represented by the *Magdeburg Centuries* of Matthaeus Flaccius and the conservative group in the Roman Catholic Church itself, opposing to the reforms in the Church.¹⁸ The propaganda character of the *Annals* is obvious, but the erudition of

¹⁷ Petyr Dinekov, Kujo Kuev and Donka Petkanova, eds., *Христоматия по старобългарска литература* [A chrestomathy of Old Bulgarian literature] (Sofia: Наука и изкуство, 1974), 357–72.

¹⁸ Alexandar Nikolov, "Българската тема в *Аналите на Бароний*" [Bulgarian topics in the *Annals* of Baronius], in *Католическата духовна култура и нейното присъствие и влияние в България* [Catholic spiritual culture and its presence and influence in Bulgaria: A collection of essays], (Sofia: Университетско издателство "Св. Климент Охридски", 1993), 115–22.

the author and his continuators conferred on this work a value which extended far beyond its immediate goals. This accounts for the appearance as early as 1603 of the abridgement by Skarga in the Polish language which made the work of Baronius popular in the Western Slavic area, not only among intellectuals but also among a broader circle of readers.

Polish-Russian cultural contacts in the seventeenth century were accelerating, and as a result Skarga's abridgement was first translated into Russian by Ignatij Muromskiy in 1678. This translation became known as *Baronius* and was used predominantly by the "Razkol'niki" or "Staroobryadcy"—a group which did not accept the reforms promoted by the Muscovite Patriarch Nikon and was therefore persecuted by the authorities so severely that part of these "Schismatics" settled in Dobrudzha, under Muslim governance, in order to avoid repression. Another version of *Baronius* emerged in 1719, namely the aforementioned *Deyaniya*. This time it was an official version approved by the Holy Synod of the Moscow Patriarchate, and this fact opened the door for a broader circulation of this text among the Orthodox Slavs, including the Bulgarians. Despite being aware that Baronius was a Catholic cardinal, Paisij and other Orthodox writers accepted him as a highly authoritative source in ecclesiastical and political matters. Baronius, indeed, used a rich variety of sources when dealing with the medieval history of Bulgaria. He was fluent in Greek and Latin and introduced into his account of Bulgarian history all the important facts and issues, and in particular those related to the extensive "flirt" between Bulgaria and the Western Church during the 9th and the 13th centuries.¹⁹

The other main source of Paisij's *Istoriya Slavyanobolgarskaya* [the "Slavo-Bulgarian History"] was the book of Mauro Orbini (Mavar Orbin in Croat, Mavrubir Latinec in Bulgarian), another important person at the time of the revival of the Slavic peoples on the south-east periphery of the Catholic world. His popularity, however, spread beyond the area of the Catholic Slavic world and among the Orthodox Slavs as well, reaching as far as Sremski Karlovci, Moscow and probably the Slavic monasteries of Mount Athos (Zograph, Chilandar and Roussikon). Orbini was a Catholic priest and archimandrite from Ragusa (Dubrovnik), and despite the fact that he wrote his work in Italian he was a follower of the Illyrian theory, according to which all

¹⁹ Ibid., 116.

“Illyrians” (his term, i.e. Slavs) have common descent and they should be regarded as a more or less homogenous community. On this basis the Slavs acquired deep ancient roots, similar to those of the Italians and the Greeks. He was not troubled by the religious and cultural difference among the Slavic peoples, divided between the Western and the Eastern Church and even partly Islamicized during the time of the Ottoman conquest of the Balkans.

According to most scholars, the Illyrian theory was created by the Renaissance Croat writer Vincentius Priboevius (Vinko Pribojević), and the first version of it appears in Priboevius’ *De origine successibusque Slavorum*.²⁰ Orbini was influenced by the ideas of Slavic unity promoted by Priboevius and as a result in 1601 he published his *Il Regno degli Slavi* in Pesaro, Italy. Here the Bulgarians were logically included in the family of the Slavic nations because of their linguistic affiliation to the southern branch of the Slavic community. Orbini followed the tradition of the Scandinavian origin of the Bulgarians, linking their name to the River Volga, which was their second homeland before they migrated to the Danube and Thrace. He offers an interesting remark on his sources, commenting that Bulgarian history was a construction of the Greek sources, and because of the hostility between Greeks (who are called *Rhomaioi*, but are not the true Romans) and Bulgarians, many heroic deeds of the latter were consciously omitted by the Byzantine writers. This recalls one of Paisij’s favorite themes about the hostility of the Greeks towards the Bulgarians and the *Graikomania* among the latter, which he holds must be abandoned.²¹

Of course, Paisij also had personal experience of this, having lived among Serbian and Greek monks on Athos and participating in disputes among these learned men on the glorious past of their respective nations. Very often the Bulgarians were put in an unfavorable position by such disputes, and, as it is quite clear from his introduction, this was one of Paisij’s motives in starting to collect information about the history of his people. Paradoxically enough, Baronius and Orbini emerged as more important sources for the Bulgarian national revival

²⁰ Vinko Pribojević, *O podrijetlu i zgodama Slavena* [On the origin and the glory of the Slavs] [transl. by Veljko Gortan] (Zagreb: Jugoslavenska Akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1951). On Pribojević see further the contribution of Domagoj Madunić in this volume.

²¹ Mauro Orbini, *Царството на славяните* [The Kingdom of the Slavs] (Sofia: Наука и изкуство, 1983).

in the eighteenth and the first years of the nineteenth centuries than the Catholic propaganda among the Orthodox and Paulician Bulgarian population which started to be disseminated at the end of the sixteenth century. Nevertheless, we cannot totally exclude some probable influence on the Bulgarians, coming from missionaries, from the Ragusan merchant colonies in several major cities in Ottoman Rumelia, such as Sofia, Skopje (Üsküb), Plovdiv (Philippople, Filibe), Ruse (Rusçuk), Edirne (Adrianople, Odrin), and last but not least, from the Catholic Bulgarian settlements in several parts of the country which emerged and flourished during the seventeenth century.

Of particular importance among the latter centers was Čiprovci (Kiprovac) and its surroundings—a strongly Catholic enclave in modern northwestern Bulgaria. Its population consisted of converted Bulgarians and several assimilated Saxon and Albanian families. Nearby there was a Franciscan convent founded by Franciscan friars from Bosnia, who disseminated Catholic Slavic culture from Croatia and Bosnia among the local population. Čiprovci was the birthplace of several prominent Bulgarian Catholic priests, such as Peter Parčević, Peter Bogdan Bakšič (Bakšev)—not to be confused with Peter Bogdani, the Albanian Catholic Archbishop in Macedonia and Kosovo, who had also been trained in Čiprovci and lived at the same time as Peter Bogdan Bakšev, the Catholic bishop of Sofia, and so on. They had all received a good education in Rome and at the Illyrian College in Loreto, and their mission was to increase the numbers of the converts to Catholicism and to represent the “oppressed Bulgarian nation” in Europe. Another influx of converts came from the numerous Paulician community living around Plovdiv to the south and Nikopol to the north of the Balkan range. The Paulicians were heretics, some of them of distant Syrian and Armenian origin, who were close to the medieval Bogomils in their doctrines and were heavily persecuted by the Orthodox Church. Probably this is the reason that they accepted Catholicism en masse (while others even converted to Islam) and became the core of the Bulgarian Catholic community. The Paulicians did not have such an educated elite, as did the community of Čiprovci, nevertheless their bishop Philip Stanislavov had the first book in modern Bulgarian, the so-called *Abagar*, printed in Rome in 1651. In 1688, during the Great War between the Holy League (Austria, Venice, Poland and other states) and the Ottomans, the Ottomans and their Protestant Hungarian allies led by Imre Thököly laid waste to Čiprovci and suppressed a local uprising provoked by the Austrians. This fortress of Catholicism

was thus destroyed, and the local population, together with part of the Paulicians, migrated to the Austrian Banat.²²

The rest of the Catholic community, mostly Paulician, was left totally without links with the West, and their communities were rediscovered only at the beginning of the nineteenth century by the Italian Passionists.²³ The Catholic community in Bulgaria in the seventeenth century was well organized and it had, especially among the people of Čiprovci, a rather clear Bulgarian identity. Bishop Peter Bogdan even wrote a *History of Bulgaria* (1667) in Latin, which of course was not known outside the narrow frames of the Catholic community. Despite this it is an interesting work, demonstrating the existence of pre-modern Bulgarian identity among at least a part of the Catholic elite in the country. In his Foreword, Peter Bogdan wrote the following:

Many writers have written on Bulgarian history (with what correctness and distinction it is for others to decide). But clearly what has been called for was for someone of this people to bring to light not only things which he has heard or read of in books, but those things he had learnt regarding his fatherland by his own long experience, and distinguish truth from falsehood about the traditions of his ancestors and bring a surer knowledge about the land and the counties, rivers and mountains. I was born in the land of Bulgaria, and now, when I am almost worn out by old age, the same fatherland (*patria*) supports me like a ship falling apart after long and various journeys. However, I do not intend to cover everything, but my intention is to clear up just a few things, to disperse the errors [lit. darkness/obscurity] spread by others, to defend the ancient roots of the Catholic faith and the rule of the Church in these areas, to tell how the community of the Seraphical Institute [i.e. the Franciscan mission] settled down in this land...²⁴

²² Ljubomir Miletič, *Изследвания за българите в Седмиградско и Банат* [Research on the Bulgarians in Transylvania and the Banat] (Sofia: Наука и изкуство, 1987); Blagovest Njagulov, *Банатските българи* [The Bulgarians in the Banat] (Sofia: Парадигма, 1999), 348–54, 359–66.

²³ Ivan Elenkov, *Католическата църква от източен обряд в България от времето на съединението на част от българския народ с Рим през 1860 г. до средата на XX век.* [The Catholic Church of Eastern rite in Bulgaria since the time of the union of a part of the Bulgarian nation with Rome in 1860 to the middle of the 20th century] (Sofia: ЛИК, 2000), 15–16.

²⁴ “Bulgarorum res gestas conscripsere complures, qua fide, quave laude viderint alii. Illud sane expositi videbatur ut aliquis ex ea gente non modo quae audisset, aut in libris perlegisset, sed quae longo usu rerum de patrio solo didicisset, quaeque maioribus accepta vera a falsis discriminasset in lucem educeret, locorum simul ac provinciarum, fluminum montiumque certiozem cognitionem ingereret. Me vero licet Bulgarianum solum ediderit, ac senio pene confectum eadem patria post longa ac varia itinera iam veluti cymbam fatiscentem foveat, non subit illud consilium universa com-

The patriotism of Peter Bogdan, however, was deeply connected to his Catholic faith, and he totally ignored the reality of the predominantly Orthodox traditions of the Bulgarian medieval past. Here, and in other writings, like the “Description of the Kingdom of Bulgaria” (1640, in Italian, in a unique manuscript), “History of Sofia” (1653) and “History of Ohrid” (1655) he concentrated mostly on the Catholic mission among the Bulgarians. In addition, he composed two other writings with historical themes, but as they are not directly connected to the history of Bulgaria they need be mentioned only in passing here: “When and how the Marcomans [the Moravians] embraced the Faith of Christ,” dedicated to the Moravian mission of *Crhu* (Cyril the Philosopher) and *Strahota* (Methodius), and a short “History of Serbia and the Archbishopric of Prizren.” Peter Bogdan was well acquainted with the Western traditions, quoting Baronius and Orbinus among others. His writings, however, remained popular only among a very narrow circle of educated men from the Catholic community, and they did not affect at all the ideological world of the Bulgarian revival in the next century.²⁵

An echo of this Catholic seventeenth century in Bulgaria was another *History of Bulgaria* in Latin, written by Blasius Kleiner in 1761. Although of German origin, Kleiner lived as a Franciscan friar in the convent of Alvinc (modern Vințul de Jos) in Transylvania, which belonged to the Franciscan province of Bulgaria. Being part of the so-called Bulgarian Franciscans, Kleiner felt it his duty to write a history of the Bulgarians, because, as he put it, he was an “adopted son” of this community. He was, however, convinced that he was the first one to write about the history of Bulgaria in a concise way. This implies that even he was unacquainted with the efforts of Bogdan in this direction. His history, too, did not affect the general course of the early Bulgarian national revival in the eighteenth century.²⁶

plectendi, sed aliqua solum enucleari in animo est, tenebras temere offusas a nonnullis excutere, fidei Catholicae antiquitatem ecclesiaeque regimen his in regionibus tueri, Seraphici Instituti familia quomodo hic sedem fixeri exponere ac inter (ea) miscere complura, quae legentibus non minus iucunda rerum varietate, quam utilia veritatis perceptione fore confido.” Cited after Janja Jerkov, “Un fragment inédit de l’histoire de la Bulgarie de Petăr Bogdan Bakšič,” *Etudes Balkaniques*, 1 (1978): 103.

²⁵ Božidar Dimitrov, *Петър Богдан Бакшев: Български политик и историк от XVII век*. [Peter Bogdan Bakšev: A Bulgarian politician and historian of the seventeenth century] (Sofia: БАРД, 2001), 110–16.

²⁶ Blasius Kleiner, *История на България* [History of Bulgaria] (Sofia: Издателство на БАН, 1977).

Paradoxically, the influence of humanist historiography among the Orthodox Bulgarian majority did not originate from the missions and enclaves directly, but spread through foreign, namely Serbian, Russian and Greek mediation. Paisij is indeed the best example of this. He knew nothing of the Catholic Bulgarians, their Franciscan convents or the histories of Peter Bogdan and Kleiner. His two main Western sources were Baronius and Orbini, but only because they had Russian translations which were available in the archive of the Patriarchate of Sremski Karlovci.

Conclusion

To sum up, it is obvious that Paisij—who, rightly or not, came to be labeled as the “father” of the modern Bulgarian nation—was ideologically influenced by some late Renaissance ideas about identity and nation. However, his patriotism sought affirmation in the remnants of the Bulgarian medieval political tradition preserved in Mount Athos and other spiritual centers (such as Sremski Karlovci) of the Orthodox world. He was one of the few among the Orthodox Bulgarians who were able to educate themselves so as to create the first nucleus of a modern “intelligentsia” or the first Bulgarian nationalists. In a way, his case is paradigmatic for the ensuing development: while Bulgarian nationalism in the nineteenth century was catalyzed by foreign influences from different cultures and of various trends, the common theme was that its ideologists were always seeking to establish a symbolic link with the specific domestic sources of (proto-)nationalism.

PART IV

ENLIGHTENMENT MODALITIES OF PATRIOTISM

CHAPTER TWENTY-ONE

MODALITIES OF ENLIGHTENED MONARCHICAL PATRIOTISM IN THE MID-EIGHTEENTH CENTURY HABSBURG MONARCHY

Teodora Shek Brnardić

With the publication of Montesquieu's *Spirit of the Laws* in 1748 it became clear that for enlightened political thinkers it was not so much the form of government that was the focus of interests but rather its character or the *spirit* of its actions. They aimed at providing legal security for citizens and were not concerned with the issue of theoretical freedom. Generally speaking, the word "republic," Franco Venturi argues, found an echo in the minds of many eighteenth-century thinkers, but as a *form of life*, not as a political force. The ethical aspect of the republican tradition appealed to Enlightenment writers such as Diderot and d'Alembert, and most of all to Rousseau. The ancient republics of Rome and Greece left to posterity "a republican friendship, a republican sense of duty, a republican pride," which could exist in the very heart of a monarchical state, within people who seemingly belonged exclusively to the absolutist world. Thoroughly depoliticized republicanism invited men to act as Roman citizens while being subjects in a Christian absolute monarchy.¹ The question where sovereignty lay and how far it extended, did not matter anymore. "Apolitical patriotism"²—which involved the requirement to imitate the willingness to self-sacrifice for the country in ancient republics—became a sort of

¹ See David A. Bell, *The Cult of the Nation in France: Inventing Nationalism, 1680–1800* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001), 51. Bossuet argued already in 1709 that a king should rule over his unvirtuous people by appealing to their self-interest and by using it for the promotion of the "public good". Fénelon also defended virtue as a vital attribute of kingship and promoted the idea that virtuous citizenship was essential for the well-being of a nation. See Marisa Linton, *The Politics of Virtue in Enlightenment France* (Houndmills: Palgrave, 2001), 29–30.

² Wolfgang Martens describes the patriotism to which a citizen was invited in German moral weeklies as a "basically apolitical public spirit (*Gemeinsinn*)". The *gemeinnütziger Bürger* was not supposed to become a *citoyen*. Idem, *Die Botschaft der Tugend* (Stuttgart: J.B. Metzlerische Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1968), 325.

social virtue and only had to stimulate a “sense of independence, liberty and equality.”³

The new patriotism, whose inspiration in France came from England especially through the writings of Shaftesbury,⁴ was, in Venturi’s words, “cosmopolitan and indissolubly linked with freedom,” freedom which in the first place implied civil freedom under the laws. However, Shaftesbury’s collection of essays *Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times* (1711) was actually legitimizing the post-1688 Whig regime and thus argued against the absolutist form of government. In his view (and experience), absolutism nullified *the publick* along with the sense of patriotism or love to one’s country—“off all human affections, the noblest and most becoming human nature.” Yet this blessing belonged to the people who in fact possessed “a real constitution and polity by which they are free and independent,”⁵ that is, the subjects of the British Crown.

In France, the neologism “patriotism” (*patriotisme*) started to appear from 1750 onwards (Count d’Argenson), whereby it became interchangeable with the word “civism” (*civisme*), which became its synonym.⁶ Moreover, the idea of patriotism became closely linked to the philosophy of Enlightenment and patriots were simultaneously considered the most enlightened.⁷ The French patriotism did, however, substantially differ from the English variant according to contemporary observations and sources: the French were deemed royalists, and

³ Franco Venturi, *Utopia and Reform in the Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), 71–72.

⁴ The bridge was made by Diderot’s translation, *Principes de la philosophie morale ou Essai de M. S.*** [Shaftesbury] sur la mérite et la vertu* (Amsterdam: Z. Chatelain, 1745). See Giuseppe Rutto, “‘Patrie’, ‘patriotisme’, ‘citoyen’, ‘civisme’ nella Francia del settecento,” in Daniela Bianchi and Giuseppe Rutto, eds., *Idee e concezioni di Patria nell’Europa del Settecento* (Torino: Il Segnalibro, 1989), 109–110.

⁵ Anthony Ashley Cooper, Third Earl of Shaftesbury, *Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times*, ed. Lawrence E. Klein (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 399–400.

⁶ Werner Krauss, “‘Patriote,’ ‘patriotique,’ ‘patriotisme’ à la fin de l’Ancien Régime,” in W. H. Barber et al., eds., *The Age of the Enlightenment: Studies presented to Theodore Besterman* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1967), 388–89. Peter Sahlins even speaks about to the “eighteenth-century revolution of citizenship” in France. Idem, “The Eighteenth-Century Citizenship Revolution in France,” in Andreas Fahrmeir, Olivier Faron and Patrick Weil, eds., *Migration Control in the North Atlantic World: The Evolution of State Practices in Europe and the United States from the French Revolution to the Inter-War Period* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2002), 11–24.

⁷ Mirabeau announced in 1775: “Il n’y a plus de patriots parce qu’il n’y a plus d’hommes éclairés.” Quoted in Krauss, “‘Patriote,’” 391.

their love for the sovereign was “the strongest support for the state, the unshakable foundation of the power and glory of this monarchy.” They seemed to have developed a “royal patriotism,” which identified love for kings with love for the country. On the other hand, the English appeared to be attached to their liberty, rights and privileges rather than to their king.⁸

The typology of enlightened and/or monarchical patriotism

In the context of the eighteenth-century Habsburg Monarchy, the forms of patriotic loyalties were particularly varying, since the sovereign could not entirely embody the composite state, which was held together by a personal union rather than by common institutions.⁹ In my paper I am particularly interested in exploring different modalities of enlightened patriotism with regard to the form and art of government, that is, monarchical and republican, which competed in different discourses. I intend to apply a contextualist approach based on the discursive and conceptual analyses of the texts belonging to different genres (public speeches, educational and political treatises and pamphlets) and written in the aftermath of the Seven Years’ War (1756–1763). The focus of my interests will be texts written in German and Latin propagating or rejecting different variations of “monarchical patriotism” in the mid-eighteenth century Habsburg Monarchy, and more specifically in the kingdoms of Bohemia and Hungary-Croatia (Karl Heinrich Seibt, Prague moral weeklies, Baltazar Adam Krčelić, Franz Adam Kollár) with a limited comparison of Prussian (Thomas Abbt) and Austrian (Joseph von Sonnenfels) texts on the subject. I argue that the composite character of the Monarchy became the source of a conflict of loyalties in cases where a citizen-patriot was not necessarily a royalist, that is, where love for one’s country did not in all

⁸ Louis Basset de La Marelle, *La Différence du patriotisme national chez les Français et chez les Anglais. Discours lu à l’Académie des sciences, belles-lettres et arts de Lyon* (Paris: Rozet, 1766, c1762), 9. Quoted in Krauss, “Patriote,” 393. See also Bell, *Cult*, 53 and esp. 63–68.

⁹ Michael Hochedlinger stresses the multiple terminology used by historians to describe “the Austrian variety of half-baked absolutism that rested on the bi-polarity of sovereign and Estates”: “dualism, diarchy, coalition, co-rulership or dynastic union of Estates-based provinces.” Michael Hochedlinger, *Austria’s Wars of Emergence 1683–1797* (London: Longman, 2003), 26.

cases coincide with love for one's king as in Prussia or France or even Great Britain.

Special attention will be paid to the identification of political languages which featured as discursive domains of enlightened monarchical patriotism—such as civic humanism, natural law and cameralism—along with the vocabulary used by the authors in their argumentation. The textual meaning and functioning of the keywords “(public) happiness,” “common good,” “common weal,” “general welfare,” “virtue,” “citizen,” “patriot,” “patriotism” will be explored, partly in comparison with their use in the texts of key cameralist authors such as Christian Wolff, Johann Heinrich Gottlob von Justi and Joseph von Sonnenfels. It will be argued that the discourse of enlightened monarchical patriotism was mostly a blended mixture of the cameralist and natural law discourse with civic humanism or classical republicanism.

“Enlightened patriotism” as a research problem has hitherto received considerable attention on the part of social rather than intellectual historians of the Enlightenment. It was first investigated by those dealing with its “provincial” variants (as in Scotland and Germany), that is, by those interested in national rather than political context(s). In such a framework, local enlightened patriots were seen as dedicated adherents of the “progress of arts and sciences” and chiefly aimed at the “improvement” of the condition of their proper fatherlands, by privately gathering in different institutions of cultural sociability.¹⁰ “Patriotism” with its catchword “improvement” allowed investigation into the “microscopic or little enlightenments” in local frameworks, for instance, of institutions of sociability such as coffee houses, salons, clubs of all sorts and so on. Rudolf Vierhaus first identified two ideal types in discussions of eighteenth-century German patriotism(s): there was “enlightened patriotism,” which was morally and didactically ori-

¹⁰ See esp. Nicholas Phillipson and Rosalind Mitchison, eds., *Scotland in the Age of Improvement: Essays in Scottish History in the Eighteenth Century* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1970), and Rudolf Vierhaus, *Deutsche patriotische und gemeinnützige Gesellschaften* (Munich: Kraus International Publications, 1980). For a limited comparison of the German idea of *bürgerliche Verbesserung* and the Scottish idea of “improvement,” see Fania Oz-Salzberger, *Translating the Enlightenment: Scottish Civic Discourse in Eighteenth-Century Germany* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995). László Kontler successfully managed to “translate” the Scottish paradigm of improvement into the context of the Hungarian Reform Era in “Historians from the Periphery: William Robertson and Mihály Horváth,” *The Hungarian Quarterly* 45 (2004) 173: 109–26.

ented, whereas “conservative patriotism” was historically oriented, leaned on traditional ties and appealed to emotions.¹¹

Such a typology proved successful in other national contexts as well. Jiří Kroupa in his analysis of the Enlightenment in Moravia also used the same paradigm. He identified the three main characteristics of Moravian “enlightened patriotism,” which in many respects overlapped. Patriotism was the attitude of an enlightened man who wants to serve others and promote the well-being and prosperity of his community and country, which would in turn advance the whole humanity. It was also related to the state in which the patriot lives, and more specifically to the Habsburg-Lorraine dynasty. Finally, patriotism applied also to regional historicist patriotism bound to Moravia itself. Kroupa also pointed out a difference between “territorial patriotism” (*Landespatritismus*), which emerged from “regional patriotism,” and “enlightened patriotism,” which regarded as basic that the patriot always desires his own happiness, yet simultaneously the happiness and progress of all mankind.¹² Hence the classical argument formulated by Franco Venturi argues for the “marriage” of enlightened patriotism and cosmopolitanism,¹³ the former being the framework for the *local* or *civic*, whereas the latter strove for the *universal*.

By contrast, if we turn our attention to political contexts, a legitimate question must first be raised: is there such a thing as enlightened monarchical patriotism? In general, monarchism and monarchical patriotism in the eighteenth century received notably less attention on the part of eighteenth-century historians,¹⁴ even though the glorification of the person of the king was the hallmark of the early modern *ancien régime*, in contrast to the Middle Ages when more abstract concepts such as the Crown and the Throne had been held in higher

¹¹ Rudolf Vierhaus, “Patriotismus-Begriff und Realität einer moralisch-politischen Haltung,” in idem, *Deutschland im 18. Jahrhundert. Politische Verfassung, soziales Gefüge, geistige Bewegungen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987), 96–109.

¹² Jiří Kroupa, “The Alchemy of Happiness: The Enlightenment in the Moravian Context,” in Mikuláš Teich, ed., *Bohemia in History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1998), 175.

¹³ Franco Venturi, “The European Enlightenment,” in idem, *Italy and the Enlightenment. Studies in a Cosmopolitan Century*, trans. Susan Corsi (New York: Longman, 1972), 18–19.

¹⁴ See esp. the critical introduction written by the editors in Hans Blom, John Christian Laursen and Luisa Simonutti, eds., *Monarchisms in the Age of Enlightenment: Liberty, Patriotism, and the Common Good* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007), 3–16.

esteem than the king himself.¹⁵ Patriotism is, therefore, usually related to the history of the French Revolution, and more generally to the revolutions from the end of the eighteenth century.¹⁶ Moreover, it is regarded as inseparably linked to republicanism, whereas recent research has proven that monarchism and republicanism were not only alternative forms of government, but were thoroughly compatible. They were mixed and blended, which was actually a variation of the old Aristotelian ideal embodied in the *monarchia mixta*.¹⁷ To be sure, such a mixture could produce various results, as we shall see.

The context of the Seven Years' War (1756–1763)

The Seven Years' War (1756–1763) is widely acknowledged to have been a particular catalyst for the rise of patriotic discourses throughout Europe.¹⁸ Prussia, Hannover and Great Britain were pitted against Austria, France, Russia, Sweden and Saxony. The French especially attributed the British success in this war to the cultivation of a citizen-based patriotic ideology that William Pitt used on behalf of the British war effort. In general, the war was publicly represented less as a struggle between kings than a struggle among peoples, whereby every citizen-subject was called out to sacrifice his interests for those of the nation. The defeats on the French side raised the question, whether self-sacrificing “civic spirit” had retreated before “self-interest”/“self-love”,¹⁹ since contemporaries felt that in those days patriotism or love

¹⁵ Philippe Hamon and Laurent Bourquin, “Dieu, les Hommes et le Roi dans la France du XVI^e siècle,” in Joël Cornette et al., eds., *La monarchie entre Renaissance et Révolution, 1515–1792* (Seuil: L’univers historique, 2000), 18–21.

¹⁶ Raymonde Monnier, *Républicanisme, patriotisme et Révolution française* (Paris: L’Harmattan, 2005), 7.

¹⁷ Blom, Laursen and Simonutti, “Introduction”, 7; Aristotle *Politics* 4. 1297a5–10.

¹⁸ See, for example, Benjamin W. Redekop, “Thomas Abbt and the Formation of an Enlightened German ‘Public’,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 58 (1997) 1: 81–103; Edmond Dziembowski, *Un nouveau patriotisme français, 1750–1770: la France face à la puissance anglaise à l’époque de la guerre de Sept Ans* (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 1998).

¹⁹ This was a dominant seventeenth and eighteenth century passion, “a symptom of the emerging sovereignty of the individual,” to which Descartes, Hobbes, the *philosophes*, Mandeville, Smith and Rousseau made reference. See Elena Pulcini, “La passione del moderno: l’amor di sé,” in Silvia Vegetti Finzi, ed., *Storia delle passioni* (Rome: Laterza, 1995), 133–80.

for one's country was in decline.²⁰ Rousseau in his *Émile* (1762) was among those who pointed to the contradiction between *man* and *citizen*, since to be fully human and to fulfil one's nature as man meant to be independent and self-sufficient or to be "whole" in oneself. On the other hand, to be a *citizen* or a responsible member of society implied an existence that was related to others and made one dependent on other people. Being human included natural selfishness and was directed mostly to the duties towards oneself, whereas being a citizen pointed to self-sacrifice according to the models of ancient states—Sparta, Athens and Rome. Identification with the classical republican constitutions, which was a constituent part of education, became crucial for the diffusion of the republican-patriotic discourse.²¹

Using this identification, French writers put much effort into proving that love of *patrie* was compatible with monarchy. The language of love of one's country in monarchies had to be equal or at least compatible with the language of love of kings. This announced a new moment in the development of the concept of patriotism, which hitherto was associated only with the republican form of government. The question of how to encourage patriotism in monarchies became one of the most disputed issues not only in France, but in all the states which participated in the Seven Years' War such as Prussia, Russia and the Habsburg Monarchy.

How was it possible to create a "public man" filled with "public spirit" in a monarchy, where citizens did not participate in the political decision-making? The moral autonomy of a citizen without sovereignty, who would nevertheless pursue the public good and forget self-interest, became a critical question in the debate on monarchical patriotism, which proved to be especially fruitful in Prussia. Under the leadership of Frederick the Great Prussia's success in military campaigns became the object of national pride. At the end of the Seven Years' War German thinkers argued that a constitutional state could be realized under any form of government. In this sense any state could be free, no matter if monarchy or republic, as long as its members are

²⁰ Bell, *Cult*, 41.

²¹ However, most eighteenth-century European states had a monarchical form of government. Only a handful, such as Venice, Genoa and Dubrovnik, retained republican constitutions, and these were considered outdated in comparison to the monarchical state, which after the seventeenth-century religious wars was regarded as "the guarantor of justice and order and the source of harmonious, polite human relations." Bell, *Cult*, 31.

ruled as free people, that is, as citizens and not as slaves. Legal security, that is, freedom under civil laws, was considered more important than political freedom. In such discussions “republic” was not regarded as a form of government, but a *form of rulership*.²² Monarchical supporters especially in German-speaking countries were eager to take issue with Montesquieu, who suggested that *honor* should be the main spring of political action in monarchies, whereas *virtue*, meant as public spirit and patriotism, was characteristic exclusively of the republican form of government. Could *political virtue* be induced in monarchies, too?—asked the philosopher Thomas Abbt, the state minister of Prussia Karl Abraham de Zedlitz and the Prussian king Frederick II himself in their treatises.²³ They answered in the affirmative: a “republican monarchy” headed by a “virtuous king,” as imagined by Fénelon in his *Les aventures de Télémaque* (1690), could indeed be brought into being on the German territory.²⁴

In the Prussian context Thomas Abbt’s *Vom Tode für das Vaterland* (1761) was a canonical work. Apart from propagating sacrificial duty for the fatherland, it was intended to imbue Abbt’s Prussian fellow citizens of every social order with a sense of public-spiritedness and pride in having as fatherland a “well-ordered monarchy.” This fatherland was nothing other than a moral community of citizens—a societal whole—which had the role to inspire the members of the

²² Hans Erich Bödeker, “The Concept of the Republic in Eighteenth-Century German Thought,” in Jürgen Heideking and James A. Henretta, eds., *Republicanism and Liberalism in America and the German States, 1750–1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 45–46. This work emphasizes the personal style of rulership of each individual king.

²³ Thomas Abbt, *Vom Tode für das Vaterland* (Berlin: n., 1761). I have used the edition by Johannes Kunisch, *Aufklärung und Kriegsführung. Der Siebenjährige Weltkrieg 1756–1763 in klassischen Texten der Zeitzeugen: Archenholz, Friedrich der Große, Borié, Abbt* (Frankfurt am Main: Deutscher Klassiker Verlag, 1996), 589–650. Karl Abraham von Zedlitz, *Sur le patriotisme considéré comme objet d’éducation dans les états monarchiques* (Berlin: Voss, 1776) was translated into German as *Ueber den Patriotismus als einen Gegenstand der Erziehung in monarchischen Staaten: eine Vorlesung aus dem französischen übersetzt* (Berlin: Voss, 1777). Frederick II, *Lettres sur l’amour de la patrie, ou correspondance d’Anapistemon et de Philopatros* (Berlin: Decker, 1779), was translated into German as *Briefe über die Liebe zum Vaterlande; oder Briefwechsel zwischen Anapistemon und Philopatros. Aus dem französischen* (Berlin: Decker, 1779) and in the same year into Russian as *Pisma o ljubvi k otecestvu ili perezpiska Anapistemona i Filopatrosa* (St. Petersburg: Vejtbrecht i Snor, 1779). It was reprinted in a German version even in Croatia as *Briefe über die Liebe für das Vaterland, oder Correspondenz des Anapistemon mit dem Philopatros aus dem französischen übersetzt*. (Zagreb: Joseph Karl Kotsche, 1780).

²⁴ See more in Linton, *The Politics*, 29–31.

community to virtuous actions based on a feeling of belonging to this “informal socio-political entity.”²⁵ Based on the theory of natural law and the interconnectedness of individual and society, man and citizen, part and whole, *Vom Tode* is praised by its author as “a new way of thinking.” Abbt argued that, regardless of the form of government, “in every society there is a deep, original relationship between each individual and the whole” which in time had been displaced by self-love.²⁶ This “activist stance” for the societal whole was to be achieved by transplanting republican virtue/civic spirit (=“public spirit”) into a monarchy, which also had to serve as a source of inspiration for such feelings.

Abbt also criticized the divisive consequences of separated social orders in monarchical society, arguing that citizenship must be grounded in one political virtue: “If general good is ever to occur, however, ... there must be only *one political virtue*.... Everyone becomes united, aligning themselves behind the formerly majestic name of “citizen’.”²⁷ To be sure, citizenship thus defined existed rather in relation to the common good than in relation to the exercising of individual rights, nor did it imply the dissolution of the corporate orders (*Stände*).²⁸ Love for the fatherland was represented as a passion open to all “hearts” and as a medium of all-embracing citizenship which widened its scope beyond social boundaries. Every subject was to be a citizen (*Bürger*) as in the “freest republic,” which assumed that everyone was in the same measure subject to the laws. Nobody was completely free, but “the spirit of the state constitution (*Staatsverfassung*)” provided freedom under the aegis of the laws.²⁹

²⁵ Redekop, “Thomas Abbt,” 89.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 90.

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 90 and 98.

²⁹ Rudolf Vierhaus, “Montesquieu in Deutschland,” in *idem*, *Deutschland im 18. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 21.

“Do we want nations to be virtuous?—let us begin by making the people love their country!”³⁰

In the Habsburg Monarchy, the professor of cameral sciences, Joseph von Sonnenfels, was the “Austrian Thomas Abbt,”³¹ who just like his German counterpart strove to promote one social class of citizenry alone on the basis of natural law. The Habsburg “monarchical patriotism,” which is historiographically usually labeled as “(Austrian) state patriotism (*Staatspatriotismus*),” was mostly propagated by Sonnenfels in his moral weekly *Der Mann ohne Vorurtheil* (1767) and the booklet *Über die Liebe des Vaterlandes* (1771). In *Der Mann ohne Vorurtheil*, where he extensively uses the German neologism *Patriotismus*,³² Sonnenfels follows common lines of argument of the post-Seven Years’ War republican-patriotic discourse, which heavily relied on the identification with the classical republics and Rousseau’s writings: the ancients left behind the most beautiful examples of patriotic prowess, but the idea of love for the fatherland finds no place in contemporary education, and in his days was held in mockery; Rousseau showed how the greatest marvels of virtue were generated through the love of the fatherland; Socrates was an example of a cosmopolitan, whereas Cato was a patriot; it is impossible to make a nation wise, but it is possible to make it patriotic. Sonnenfels’ purpose was to make the Austrian public sensible to patriotism by reminding them of their double con-

³⁰ “Wollen wir daß die Völker tugendhaft seyn?—fangen wir damit an, ihnen das Vaterland werth zu machen!” Joseph von Sonnenfels, *Der Mann ohne Vorurtheil*, 3 (1767), 54. This is actually a quotation from Rousseau’s *Discours sur l’économie politique* (1755): see Jean Jacques Rousseau, *Discourse on political economy and the social contract*, translated by Christopher Betts (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1999), 18.

³¹ On Sonnenfels’ understanding of the “fatherland,” see Grete Klingenstein, “Sonnenfels als Patriot,” in *Judentum im Zeitalter der Aufklärung*, ed. Walter Hesselbach (Bremen: Jacobi Verlag, 1977), 211–28; Ernst Wangermann, “Joseph von Sonnenfels und die Vaterlandsliebe der Aufklärung,” in Helmut Reinalter, ed., *Joseph von Sonnenfels*, (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1988), 157–69; Harm Klueting, “‘Bürokratischer Patriotismus’. Aspekte des Patriotentums im theresianisch-josephinischen Österreich,” in Günter Birtsch, ed., *Patriotismus* (Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 1991), 37–52; Jean Philippon, “Patriotes et patriotisms d’après Joseph von Sonnenfels,” in Gertrude Stolz, ed., *Les prémices de la Révolution française en Autriche* (Nice: Association des publications de la Faculté des lettres de Nice, 1990), 113–23. The only comparative volume about the relationship between different forms of patriotism and the Austrian *Gesamtstaatsidee* is Moritz Csáky and Reinhard Hagelkrysz, eds., *Vaterlandsliebe and Gesamtstaatsidee im österreichischen 18. Jahrhundert* (Vienna: VWGÖ, 1989).

³² Sonnenfels, *Der Mann*, 3 (1767), 114, 126, 179, 309.

dition both as citizens and as subjects in a monarchy, which in turn doubled their duties both toward the fatherland and toward the most gracious monarch. In this way he tried to reconcile love for the fatherland, which was a duty of the citizen, and love for rulers, which was a duty of the subject.³³ But, what was the fatherland in a composite state such as the Habsburg Monarchy?

The booklet *Über die Liebe des Vaterlandes* was published on the occasion of a public defense at the Vienna Theresianum of the thesis in political science written by the Hungarian noble graduate Count Antal Apponyi.³⁴ The young count was evidently the embodiment of the model student who would devote himself to the service of his fatherland after having graduated.³⁵ Sonnenfels' concept of the "fatherland" was designed to be acceptable to the multiethnic outlook of the noble students who came from all parts of the Monarchy. The concept of fatherland encompassed five elements: first, the "country" (*Land*) where a person has his permanent residence; second, the "laws" to which the inhabitants of this country are subject; third, the form of established government; fourth, the fellow inhabitants of this country; and finally, fellow holders of the same rights. "Love for the fatherland" manifests itself through *active* allegiance to the fatherland, which springs from the conviction that its well-being is directly related to one's own well being.³⁶

³³ "... kann euch das Vaterland, kann der Regent euch nicht fragen: Bürger! Unterthan! Was habe ich dir gethan, daß deine Empfindlichkeit sich bis auf mich erstrecket? Hat darum der allgemeine Vertrag, den du mit allen deinen Mitbürgern errichtet, seine Gültigkeit verloren, weil vielleicht einer derselben dawider verstossen hat? Kann das Vergehen eines Untergeordneten dich von der Pflicht lossagen, die du deinen Obern schuldig bist?" Sonnenfels, *Der Mann*, 3 (1767), 381. Moreover, Sonnenfels argues that the subject cannot love the monarchy, but can love the monarch (... *er liebt den Monarchen, aber nicht die Monarchie...*), that is, a good prince toward whom he feels a personal family attachment. Joseph von Sonnenfels, *Über die Liebe des Vaterlandes* (Vienna: Joseph Kurzböck, 1771), 93. The dedication of Count Apponyi to Maria Theresia in *Über die Liebe des Vaterlandes* is in this way also symptomatic: "Weisheit und Güte auf dem Throne bilden den Unterthan der Monarchie zum Patrioten."

³⁴ The booklet was translated into Italian under the title *Sull'amore della patria trattato* (Vienna: Joseph Kurzböck, 1772) by another noble graduate, Baron Antonio Zois, at the occasion of his defense, which points to its significance in the framework of the Vienna Theresianum.

³⁵ Wangermann, "Joseph von Sonnenfels," 158.

³⁶ Sonnenfels, *Liebe*, 10. It should be noticed that Sonnenfels' book provoked different responses. Among others, Johann von Goethe in his review objected to a love for the country and patriotism which would depend on the soil. According to him, it was relationships of a people (*die Verhältnisse eines Volkes*) that determined nations (*Nationen*), and in this sense the Jews had more patriotism and composed a nation

In Sonnenfels' view, love for the fatherland is simply another form of self-love (*Eigenliebe*), thus linking the nature of "man" and the responsibilities of "citizen":³⁷ "We look for what is best for us, while we look for the best of the fatherland, we love *ourselves* in the fatherland."³⁸ Love for the fatherland could seem in this way somewhat belittled because it shows the human side of demigods in history, but one must acknowledge that virtue, which springs from the hardest effort, is hardly imitable. Only very few noble souls are capable of this, but if the basis of patriotism is self-love, then patriotic feelings can be evoked even at home. In this way, "one can turn a whole nation (*Volk*) into patriots."³⁹ Sonnenfels argues that a whole nation can be patriotic: he gives definitions of the regent as patriot, the patriotic nobility, the official as patriot, the soldier as patriot, the scholar as patriot, the artist as patriot, and finally the common people as patriots, and especially fathers⁴⁰—central figures in monarchical political theory, whose natural duty was to prepare their sons for obedience towards the authority of state.⁴¹ In order to be appropriately patriotic in harmony with their social position, the whole nation needs a national education (*Nationalerziehung*), which would be organized according to the diversity of the country and which would show the people the advantages of

(*Nation*) than a hundred serf families. *Frankfurter gelehrte Anzeigen*, 22 May 1772. In addition, Johann Adam von Haslinger wrote a book entitled *Ich will kein Patriot seyn* (Vienna: Ghelen, 1771) as a direct response to Sonnenfels, where he argues in favor of love for humanity (*Menschenliebe*) and protests against the vices of national pride.

³⁷ Education for man and citizen as formulated by Rousseau was the basic tenet of Enlightenment pedagogy.

³⁸ Sonnenfels, *Liebe*, 13–14. The pursuit of self-interest within the framework of society was one of the central definitions of social virtue in Enlightenment discourse. Daniel Gordon, *Citizens without Sovereignty: Equality and Sociability in French Thought, 1670–1789* (Princeton, N.Y.: Princeton University Press, 1994), 66.

³⁹ Sonnenfels, *Liebe*, 14. Similarly, James Leith argues that the French theoreticians of public education, such as La Chalotais, also thought that "man's very pride and selfishness could be exploited for social advantages." James Leith, "The Hope for Moral Regeneration in French Educational Thought 1750–1789," in Paul Fritz and David Williams, eds., *City & Society in the 18th Century* (Toronto: Hakkert, 1973), 219.

⁴⁰ Sonnenfels, *Liebe*, 110, 115, 119, 123, 126 129–130.

⁴¹ The paternalist ideology was reflected in the fact that the sovereign in a monarchy was regarded and addressed as "the father of the territory" (*Landesvater*), which had its roots in the classical ideal of the *pater patriae*, but was transformed by reformed Christianity and Neosticism. This model of fatherhood delineated and buttressed the duty of the subjects to obey as "the children of the territory" (*Landeskinder*). For more on this concept see Peter H. Wilson, *Absolutism in Central Europe* (London: Routledge, 2000), 57–58.

their position. For Sonnenfels “a patriot” was synonymous with “a citizen.”⁴²

It seems that Sonnenfels also admired the British success in the Seven Years’ War and their variant of civic patriotism, which he thought should serve as a model. In the above-mentioned moral weekly, *Der Mann ohne Vorurtheil*, he introduces the term “*spirit public*,” an English phrase which Sonnenfels translated into German as the “spirit of society” (*die Gesellschaftsgeist*)—“a powerful mainspring of beautiful and publicly useful actions” (*die mächtige Triebfeder der schönen und gemeinnutzbaren Handlungen*).⁴³ Its advancement, in Sonnenfels’ view, should be the most significant endeavor of the “modern legislator, educator and artist”: “Therefore it must be recognized that the most important aim is to ensure the uniting of the individual with the general good...through which the individual citizen is bonded with society as a whole, bringing the understanding of the honorable citizen to enlightenment, and at the same time, ensuring that his own desires are met.”⁴⁴ Such an articulation of patriotic virtue had the consequence of equalizing all the social orders in terms of the performing of civic duties⁴⁵ (especially direct taxation), which will be a problem for the estates-based Hungarian constitution, as we shall see.

The new language of patriotism, with its insistence on fulfilling civic duties in civil society, was in my view derived from the language of natural law and based on the idea of progress, in which all members of society should equally take part.⁴⁶ The new citizen-subject was actually

⁴² “Da, wo die häusliche Erziehung aufhört, muß die öffentliche ihren Anfang nehmen, um den Bürger, oder welches eben *dasselbe* ist, den Patrioten auszubilden [my italics].” Sonnenfels, *Der Mann*, 3 (1767), 305.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 412.

⁴⁴ Quoted in Nicholas Till, *Mozart and the Enlightenment: Truth, Virtue and Beauty in Mozart’s Operas* (New York: Norton, 1995), 92.

⁴⁵ “Der Adel ist nicht eine andere, er ist nur die erste Klasse der Bürger. [...] Der Adel ist sogar der kleinste.—Das freye aber wahre Wort sey ausgesprochen—ist der entbehrlichste Theil der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft.” Joseph von Sonnenfels, “Ueber den Beweggrund der Verwendung. Vor dem jungen Adel der sav. Akademie im Jahre 1768,” in *idem, Gesammelte Schriften* (Vienna: Baumeister, 1786), 8: 201–2.

⁴⁶ Natural law as a source of monarchical patriotism was clearly a strictly Central European phenomenon restricted to the German states and the Habsburg Monarchy. In Poland, for example, such a discourse emerged only in issue no. 33 (17 June 1765) of the moral weekly *Monitor*, sponsored by the King Stanisław Poniatowski. See Arkadiusz Michał Stasiak, *Patriotyzm w myśli konfederatów barskich* [Patriotism in the thought of the Confederates of Bar] (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 2005), 127. The situation was the same in France, where

the “natural law citizen,” which meant that mid-eighteenth century exhortations had to be filled with republican or civic patriotic discourse because natural law did not cover the duties to the fatherland.⁴⁷ Natural law propagated the morality of obligation, treated the duties both of man and citizen and of a sovereign and subject and in this way comprised ethics and politics. Natural law as formulated by the German thinkers Samuel Pufendorf, Christian Thomasius and Christian Wolff can be regarded as the core language of monarchical patriotism since it explained how sovereignty lawfully became concentrated in the person of a monarch.⁴⁸

The duties of man and citizen reflect the basic structure of “the social contract,” which enabled the transition from *status naturalis* to *societas civilis* and the transformation of *libertas naturalis* into *libertas civilis*. The “natural law citizen (*civis*)” was subject only to the state, at first without privileges. The *societas civilis*, which came into being with the social contract and was identical with the “state,” represented “a means to advance the “common welfare” (*die gemeine Wohlfahrt*).⁴⁹ Authorities promise to subjects “alle ihre Kräfte und ihren Fleiß dahin anzuwenden, daß sie zur Beförderung der gemeinen Wohlfahrt und Sicherheit diensame Mittel erdenke, und zu deren Ausführung nöthige

until the French revolution the royal discourse refrained from using contract theory and natural law for its legitimatization. Bell, *Cult*, 67.

⁴⁷ The first ever Patriotic Society (*Patriotische Gesellschaft*) was established in Hamburg in 1724. The German term “Patriot” first emerged in the *Reichstadt* in that year as the title of a moral weekly, which was not a mere translation of the English model. The *Patriot* published a treatise “On love of the fatherland (*Über die Liebe zum Vaterland*),” in which the Hamburg republican patriots focused attention on their homeland, unlike the various contemporary doctrines of natural law, which primarily stressed social duties. The anonymous writer similarly remarks: “Human duty has various stages and we are suitably taught what we owe to our God, to ourselves and to our neighbor (*Nächsten*)... But very few remember perhaps the duty to the fatherland. Simple minds think that such concern is [...] futile in our times.” Dependent relationship between patriots and their fatherland is always interconnected: if the fatherland is doing fine, its inhabitants will be fine, too. If the fatherland suffers, everyone feels it. Hans Hubrig, *Die patriotischen Gesellschaften des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Weinheim: Beltz, 1957), 16–17.

⁴⁸ This kind of natural law is sometimes called “absolutist.” See Dietrich Berding and Diethelm Klippel, “Droit naturel et droits de l’homme,” in Michel Delon, ed., *Dictionnaire européen des Lumières* (Paris: Quadrige/Puf, 2007), 405.

⁴⁹ Christian Wolff, *Vernünfftige Gedancken von dem gesellschaftlichen Leben der Menschen: und insonderheit dem gemeinen Wesen (Politik)* (Frankfurt: Renger, 1740³), § 4. Quoted in Michael Stolleis, “Untertan–Bürger–Staatsbürger. Bemerkungen zur juristischen Terminologie im späten 18. Jahrhundert,” in Rudolf Vierhaus, ed. *Bürger und Bürgerlichkeit im Zeitalter der Aufklärung* (Heidelberg: Lambert Schneider, 1981), 67.

Anstalten mache: hingegen die Unterthanen versprechen dargegen, daß sie willig seyn wollen alles dasjenige zu thun, was sie für gut befinden wird.”⁵⁰ If a “man” accepts these conditions, he becomes a “citizen”. This concept of “citizen” is not only de-Christianized, but also de-politicized because it lacks the ancient element of political participation in the state. In fact, a “subject” and a “citizen” were interchangeably used as synonyms. In the period between 1650 and 1750 the “contract theory” as the foundation for the concepts of *societas civilis* and *civis* remained mostly intact.⁵¹

The science of state (*Staatswissenschaft*) in the Habsburg Monarchy, which was in the 1760s formulated by Carl-Anton Freiherr von Martini (1726–1800) in Vienna and by Franz Lothar Joseph von Schrodtt (1727–1777) in Prague, reflected a new understanding of the state grounded in natural law.⁵² It was thoroughly adapted to the cameralist economy and enabled the implementation of its political-economic requirements by legally justifying the sovereign’s omnipotence. In this view, the state is no longer deduced from God’s grace: it originates from the social contract (*pactum unionis*) made by family heads living in the natural state, who gave up all their natural freedom and transferred their sovereignty to the state (*pactum subjectionis*). Along those lines they gained for themselves a safe life and could enjoy acquired rights in a “civil society.” For the state-objective (*Staatszweck*) the best solution is to concentrate all power in one person, that is, a monarchy, of which absolute monarchy is the best form. None of the subjects is entitled to criticize the monarch, or even less to control him, whereas he himself is not bound by the very laws issued by him.⁵³ The content of *pactum subjectionis* according to Schrodtt and Martini implied that with the social contract people gave up all their rights

⁵⁰ Wolff, *Gedancken*, §§ 230 and 433. Quoted in Stolleis, *Untertan*, 67.

⁵¹ The Wolffian concept differed from the Hobbesian because its eudemonistic emphasis was on good order, respect for the laws and, on the part of the sovereign, tolerance, the duty of compensating the dispossessed and the happiness of individuals as a duty of the state. The Hobbesian Leviathan had as its aim the installation of a single sovereign power with a rational and supra-confessional legitimization, the protection of freedom inside and outside. In Stolleis’ view, the Wolffian ideology is a sign of a transition to enlightened absolutism. Stolleis, *Untertan*, 68.

⁵² The system of Schrodtt’s *Staatswissenschaft* appears in his *Systema juris publici universalis* (Prague: Fitzky, 1765) and that of Martini in his *Positiones de iure civitatis in usum auditorii Vindobonensis* (Vienna: Trattner, 1768).

⁵³ Jiří Klabouch, *Osvícenské právní nauky v českých zemích* [Enlightened legal sciences in the Czech lands] (Prague: ČSAV, 1958), 182–83.

once and for all, so that they are deprived of all claims on the state. They thoroughly reject the doctrine of the sovereignty of people and their right to control a sovereign or to depose him in a revolt if he violates the bilateral contract with the people. “The common weal” (*das Gemeinwohl*) was the aim of government, and the sovereign’s duty was to pass clear, articulated and general laws and to implement them as generally binding on all citizens.⁵⁴

Johann Heinrich Gottlob von Justi (1717–1771) merged natural law and cameralism, emphasizing in his doctrine of the “state-objective” the concept of “civic freedom.” This was neither a human right nor a guarantee of positive law. Its main characteristic was “obedience to the laws enacted for the common happiness.” Legally free citizens—enjoying civil freedom under the laws—had a duty to contribute to the common good. Legal freedom was bound up with the issue of laws, which brought legislative power and legislature in general to the focus of interest in Central European monarchical regimes. “Benevolent and enlightened laws” had the function of safeguarding property and privileges, which in turn would stimulate the patriotic sense of the subjects, as well as encouraging an optimistic and positive stance towards both the government and the state.⁵⁵

Natural jurists re-actualized the ancient doctrine of *summum bonum* and secularized the meaning of “happiness,” which then became the central state-objective.⁵⁶ The *topos* of the “happiness of society” or “public happiness” was also a key word of the cameralist philosophy of state. Christian Wolff, the most relevant influential philosopher for the cameralist understanding of man and the world, defined “happiness” as “the state of lasting joy” achieved through the reasonable and the virtuous acting in accordance with nature. The natural law axiom of sociability said that “men are bound to live with each other in order to advance mutual happiness,” so that “society” was actually a contract between a number of persons for advancing their common good through their joint powers. “The welfare of society” (*die Wohlfahrt der*

⁵⁴ Matthias Bohlender, “Metamorphosen des Gemeinwohls. Von der Herrschaft guter polizey zur Regierung durch Freiheit und Sicherheit,” in *Gemeinwohl und Gemein Sinn—Historische Semantiken politischer Leitbegriffe* (Berlin: Akademie, 2001), 250.

⁵⁵ Vierhaus, “Montesquieu,” 19.

⁵⁶ Ulrich Engelhardt, “Zum Begriff der Glückseligkeit in der kameralistischen Staatslehre des 18. Jahrhunderts /J. H. G. v. Justi,” *Zeitschrift für historische Forschung* 8 (1981): 41.

Gesellschaft) was understood as “uninhibited progress in the advancement of the common good” (*des gemeinen Bestens*), so this was “the highest or the ultimate law in society.”⁵⁷

The keyword in the new cameral system appears to be “police” (*Polizei*) or a “program for total regulation.” It was non-judicial in its nature and attempted to define the terms of good order and public security not subsequently as ordinary laws did, but rather *in advance*, that is, by predicting a set of possible situations which could be regulated.⁵⁸ However, Keith Tribe notes that it would be misleading to presume that “police ordinances” (*Polizeiordnungen*) or “the science of police” (*Polizeiwissenschaft*) resulted from the rise of the powerful centralized state and its instruments of control. In contrast to common opinion, police ordinances were manifestations of *local* activities, they were autonomous and had no unitary provenance.⁵⁹ Such a policy must have left large scope for independent action to local administrators, who had an open hand in issuing different ordinances based on the common principles of procuring general happiness and security—the highest state objectives.

For Sonnenfels the concept “police” contains not only a functional, but also a moral component as “an instrument for the advancement of a secure moral order—the task of promoting ‘good morals’ through religion, education and the sciences.” Such social morality could be achieved through an equilibrium promoted by laws, regulations and decrees which treated all subjects as free insofar as they identified with the goals of security, welfare and the common good. These goals were in turn endangered by the power to oppose the will of the state which was exercised by the estates and distinguished families. Their privileges, which pertained to the exclusivity of their private persons, appeared to be detrimental to any endeavor to make the freedom of the subject subordinated to the common good. Such freedom would not be unlimited, but constrained by social duties prescribed for each social class. Cameralism could be thus regarded as the ideological foundation of a new “collective mentality” of the Habsburg public servants coming from different social orders.⁶⁰

⁵⁷ Ibid., 42.

⁵⁸ Keith Tribe, *Strategies of Economic Order: German Economic Discourse, 1750–1950* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 21.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 21–22.

⁶⁰ The politico-cameral trivium in the Sonnenfelsian division of 1765 included the “science of police” (*Polizeiwissenschaft*), “concerned with the principles according

Cameralist thinking equated state with civil society. In such a discourse of government the state is synonymous with the social body and they denote the same political order, governed by an enlightened ruler.⁶¹ All members of society are thus guided by the endeavor toward the common good and the happiness of the state. Sonnenfels distinguishes four classes or social orders: clergy, nobility, the “industrial order” (manufacturers, merchants and owners of houses) and propertied and taxed peasantry,⁶² who are all bound by the common duties of citizenship.⁶³ In an enlightened manner, he believes in the perfectibility of man by means of education, which is the best training for citizenship. The term “citizen” denotes for Sonnenfels the individual in society or an emancipated subject who voluntarily accepts his duties.⁶⁴ In fact, it was Wolffian natural law which prescribed the duty of useful public activity (*zu gemeinnütziger Tätigkeit*)⁶⁵ or of public happiness for *all* members of society. Inasmuch as no member of the body should be useless, this was related to the mechanistic view of society. The clockwork of the Habsburg Monarchy, however, proved to be rather complicated, as we shall see.

to which *internal security* is founded and maintained”, the “science of trade” (*Handlungswissenschaft*), “concerned with the *multiplication of the means of subsistence* through the most advantageous use of what the earth and labour can produce” and finally the “science of finances” (*Finanzwissenschaft*), which “shows the most advantageous manner in which the *revenues of the state* should be raised.” Joseph von Sonnenfels, *Grundsätze der Polizey, Handlung, und Finanz* (Vienna: Kurzbeck, 1787⁵), 1: 39. Quoted in Keith Tribe, *Strategies*, 22–23.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 20.

⁶² Ernst Wangermann, *From Joseph II to the Jacobin trials: Government Policy and Public Opinion in the Habsburg Dominions in the Period of the French Revolution* (London: Oxford University Press, 1959), 75.

⁶³ On Sonnenfels’ theory of the state see Karl Heinz Osterloh, *Joseph von Sonnenfels und die österreichische Reformbewegung im Zeitalter des aufgeklärten Absolutismus. Eine Studie zum Zusammenhang von Kameralwissenschaft und Verwaltungspraxis* (Lübeck: Matthiesen, 1970), 40 *et sqq.*

⁶⁴ Some writers label this enjoyment of merely civil rights or the rights of the private individual without participation and political rights as “passive citizenship”. See Pietro Costa, “The Discourse of Citizenship in Modern Europe: An Elementary Map,” available at <http://dexl.tsd.unifi.it/cittadin/papers/costa.htm>, accessed on 20 March 2001.

⁶⁵ Wolff, *Gedancken*, § 334, and *idem*, *Vernünfftige Gedancken von der Menschen Thun und Lassen*, § 524.

The nature of the monarchical form of government in the Habsburg Monarchy

Otto Brunner has perhaps best summarized the complexity of the constitution of the composite early modern Habsburg Monarchy, and especially of the relationship between the ruler and the estates, when he described it as *monarchische Union von Ständestaate* (“the monarchical union of the states through the estates”).⁶⁶ What this means is that each territory preserved its own *ständische Verfassung* and the only element common to the Habsburg territories was the ruler. However, Hans Sturmberger emphasises that though it was a *monarchische* rather than *ständische Union*, *das Ständentum* was still an important principle, which, once it along with *das Fürstentum* made a compromise, formed the Habsburg state in the first half of the eighteenth century. This was particularly visible in the Kingdom of Hungary where the diarchy between the *Landesfürst* and *Herrenstand* was legalized in the theory of St. Stephen’s Crown. Such a bipolarity has been expressed in various ways by historians, who have used different terms to express the same phenomenon, for example dualism, diarchy, coalition, co-rulership or the dynastic union of the estates-based provinces.⁶⁷

It may be inferred that such bipolarization necessarily split political loyalties and identities, whereby it was one thing to serve the king as a subject and another to serve the fatherland as a citizen. In my opinion, this was a special characteristic of the Habsburg Monarchy in comparison to France and Prussia, where such a distinction did not exist (a citizen was equal to a subject, and there was just one fatherland, France or Prussia). In Poland, where it did exist, the whole Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was regarded as one fatherland and it was not scattered among several independently-standing fatherlands. In another composite state, the Hohenzollern monarchy of Brandenburg Prussia, the unity of the state was achieved by the elimination of the territorial parliaments, so that it could then be regarded as one fatherland headed by one ruler of national origin. In contrast to such examples, the composition of the Habsburg Monarchy can be regarded as *sui generis*.

⁶⁶ Raffaella Gherardi, *Potere e costituzione a Vienna fra Sei e Settecento* (Bologna: Mulino, 1980), 90–93.

⁶⁷ Hochedlinger, *Wars*, 26.

However, in the period that interests us there were strong efforts to build up a new kind of monarchical patriotism:⁶⁸ this patriotism would develop loyalties toward only one all-compassing fatherland, that is, the Habsburg or Austrian Monarchy,⁶⁹ and would be best manifested in the equal taxation of all the social orders, including the possessions of the Catholic Church and the nobility.⁷⁰ In order to achieve such a goal, it was crucial to build up new central administrative institutions. For the Hereditary Lands the year 1749 was in this sense a breakpoint: on May 1 Maria Theresa established a new Directory of Administration and Finance (*Directorium in Publicis et Cameralibus*) under the direction of Count Friedrich Wilhelm von Haugwitz without consulting the estates. It was modeled after the Prussian General Directory (*Generaldirektorium*, founded in 1722) instead of the separate Austrian and Bohemian Court Chancelleries, which were then abolished, and it was meant to control all political and financial matters of government. Judicial matters were transferred to the Supreme Court established in Vienna, which featured as the court of appeals for all the Bohemian and Austrian provincial courts. This was regarded as a decisive break (the “Haugwitz Revolution”)⁷¹ with the traditional system of government and traditional law, in the sense that administrative and judicial powers were separated obviously for practical reasons.

In 1762 the Directory was extinguished with the further separation of political and financial matters: the Bohemian–Austrian Court Chancellery was to control political matters and taxation, the Court Treasury the mint and mining along with inspection, whereas the Vienna City Bank would become almost a public banking institution. In addition, the estates were less present in local administration, although the

⁶⁸ Robert J. W. Evans shrewdly notices that the structural changes from the 1740s onwards were characterized by the forming up of “a deliberate patriotism and state identity, based on increasingly material notions of the common weal—that terminology of ‘general good’ (*allgemeines Wohlsein*) or ‘the general best’ (*das allgemeine Beste*) or similar, which constantly recurs in the enactments of Habsburg absolutism.” Robert J. W. Evans, “Maria Theresa and Hungary,” in idem, *Austria, Hungary, and the Habsburgs: Central Europe c. 1683–1867* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 18.

⁶⁹ This idea has been usually presented in Austrian historiography as the *Gesamtstaatsidee* and was opposed to particularistic local historiographies of the successor-states, which were predominantly preoccupied with national histories.

⁷⁰ Daniel Gordon defines taxation as “the principal instrument for extracting revenue from the national economy”. The ideal citizen became the one who pays direct taxes to the state. Daniel Gordon, “Citizenship,” in Alan Charles Kors, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Enlightenment* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 1: 242.

⁷¹ Hochedlinger, *Wars*, 267.

aristocracy continued to have a hold on the top positions.⁷² The Bohemian and Austrian Lands became one unit while Bohemia appeared to have lost its independent statehood but became an important member of the core states of the Habsburg Monarchy.

However, since the sovereignty of state justified itself through the common good which was actually its “reason of state,”⁷³ it can be argued that these steps were rooted in the doctrine of natural law, which was preoccupied with proving the lawfulness of sovereignty.⁷⁴ This was in turn reduced to a single principle which incorporated the duties of the sovereign. For Samuel Pufendorf, who was on the reading list at the Austrian universities, this was the Ciceronian maxim *Salus populi suprema lex esto*—the epitome of the reason of state paradigm.⁷⁵ For Christian Wolff, it was the promotion of the common welfare (*das Wohlfahrt*). To be sure, all of this was possible if and only if the king held the legislative power in his hands. In Bohemia this was regulated by the Renewed Constitution (*die Verneuerte Landesordnung*) of 1627 issued by Ferdinand II, by which the king became the only master in the process of legislation.⁷⁶

Already at the beginning of her reign, Maria Theresa’s intention was to subject the Church and the nobility to the general system of taxation.⁷⁷ This was actually an encroachment upon the sphere of private property, which was especially protected by natural law.⁷⁸ In Bohemia, the nobility was already in the second half of the seventeenth century

⁷² Robert J. W. Evans, “The Habsburg Monarchy and Bohemia 1526–1848,” in idem, *Austria, Hungary, and the Habsburgs: Central Europe c. 1683–1867* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 92.

⁷³ Henry E. Strakosch, *State Absolutism and the Rule of Law: The Struggle for the Codification of Civil Law in Austria 1753–1811* (Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1967), 45.

⁷⁴ In his excellent but rather neglected book Strakosch argues that the doctrine of natural law brought an ideological shift in the understanding of the dominion of the king which had now been replaced by the sovereignty of the state (before this, the state was regarded as a personal dominion or “property” of the king). At the same time the personal rights of *domini minores*, who were now turned into “subjects,” were left intact. This shift was meant to be an effective check on the arbitrariness of the royal power. *Ibid.*, 44–45.

⁷⁵ Hans von Voltellini, “Die naturrechtlichen Lehren und die Reformen des 18. Jahrhunderts,” *Historische Zeitschrift* 105 (1910): 76.

⁷⁶ Hans-Wolfgang Bergerhausen, “Die ‘Verneuerte Landesordnung’ in Böhmen 1627: Ein Grunddokument des habsburgischen Absolutismus,” *Historische Zeitschrift* 272 (2001) 2: 333 and 339.

⁷⁷ Strakosch, *State Absolutism*, 46.

⁷⁸ Bergerhausen, *Landesordnung*, 340.

voluntarily paying enormous war taxes, the so-called *Extraordinarium militare*, for the purpose of waging wars usually in other provinces of the Habsburg Monarchy.⁷⁹ After the War of the Austrian Succession in which the Bohemian nobility proved itself unfaithful to the young Queen, a new system of direct taxation came in. In 1747 a fresh land register was produced and from January 1 1748 the nobility had to submit themselves to the general ordinary tax, which was established under the principle of “the equality of all as intended by God” (*gottgewollten Gleichheit aller*).⁸⁰ In this way, a monarchical citizenship based on paying taxes to the Crown could be imposed upon the whole society.

*Bohemia: Propagating duties of love for the fatherland
and for the king*

In the public sphere of Prague in the 1770s the propaganda for monarchical patriotism underwent a boom in different genres such as public speeches, moral weeklies and assorted (pedagogical) treatises. All of them used the language of natural law and promoted civic patriotism in a monarchical surrounding. In 1771 the moral philosopher Karl Heinrich Seibt held a speech on the influence of education upon the happiness of the state, which he equates with the welfare (*die Wohlfahrt*) or the best (*das Beste*) of the state. What was this? He answers: the establishment of all the ultimate purposes which were in focus in the formation of civil society, namely, internal and external security and the comfort of citizens. All this depended on the cleverness, perspicacity and wisdom of the laws. Another thing was to make citizens respect the laws out of their own impetus: this is why they had to be taught virtue, which molded the citizens’ moral character and their manners. A look into the texture of a state shows the inseparable connection between the common welfare and the manners of citizens. Only virtue and good manners can provide the state with lasting happiness. Moreover, the general happiness of a state is nothing but the individual happiness of its citizens. In turn, the individual happiness

⁷⁹ Jörg K. Hoensch, *Geschichte Böhmens von der slavischen Landnahme bis zur Gegenwart* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1997³), 251.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 278.

of each citizen is dependent on their morality. With this, Seibt stands against the theory of “unsocial sociability,” which teaches that a vicious man can still make a good citizen and that civic or political virtue owes its existence to this mistake. For Seibt, similarly to Sonnenfels, a true patriot is synonymous with a virtuous citizen:

A true patriot, or—what is the same—a virtuous citizen, who restricts his whole ambition to the fulfillment of his duties; who does not look for any other approval than the silent approval of his conscience and of the invisible legislator who summons him through the same [medium]: “Be an upright citizen!”; who offers his services and staunch loyalty for no other reward than the one which grants him virtue and which indirectly becomes a part of him by means of the promotion of the common welfare—such a citizen will be a silent advancer of the common weal even in secret, without witnesses, in every instance, and even there where no human law obligates him or can obligate him.⁸¹

The Addisonian moral weeklies, which were published in Prague and usually under Seibt’s aegis, mostly dealt, like their English and German forbearers, with cultural and social criticism. The first German-language weeklies bore titles such as *Die Sichtbare*, *Die Unsichtbare(n)* and *Meine Einsamkeiten*, and were aimed at the reformation of manners of fellow citizens primarily in Prague. The public seems to have been favorably inclined to them, but nevertheless they were short-lived and lasted only for a few years. The topic of “monarchical patriotism” was promoted in the first Prague moral weeklies from 1770 till 1772, which abound with patriotic themes.⁸² Let us see some of them.

Friedrich Kepler in one of his essays in *Meine Einsamkeiten* equates patriotism with love for kings and promotes a “natural law citizen.” In his view, a citizen should visibly express his love both for the fatherland and for the king. In order not to turn love for the fatherland into mere enthusiasm, a citizen should discern the interest of his nation: he should love the common best, but also must be convinced that there is indeed the common best in the state where he lives. This sense of

⁸¹ Karl Heinrich Seibt, “Von dem Einflusse der Erziehung auf die Glückseligkeit des Staates” (Prague: im Verlag der Mangoldischen Buchhandlung, 1771), available at http://www.goethezeitportal.de/fileadmin/PDF/db/werke/seibt_erziehung.pdf, accessed on 1 May 2007.

⁸² See for example [Anonymus], “Vom Patriotismus,” *Die Unsichtbaren*, 15 September 1770, 226–32; [Anonymus], “Eingeschikter Brief über den Patriotismus. Antwort der Uns,” *Die Unsichtbaren*, 26 January 1771, 378–85; [Friedrich Kepler], “Vom Patriotismus,” *Meine Einsamkeiten*, 16 July 1771, 73–80.

happiness can be guaranteed only by good legislature.⁸³ “Half-learned scholars,” who want to follow Montesquieu, too often relate patriotism to ancient martial nations such as the Spartans and Romans, but this is inapplicable in the writer’s time: a patriot needs not to be a hero, but a quiet citizen, who is “satisfied in his sphere, free from sad ambition.” A good citizen longs for the laws which make him happy, and therefore the duty of obedience is not difficult to him. His main characteristic should be *inactivity* (*Unthätigkeit*), which in well-ordered constitutions makes him a good subject with regard to the fatherland.⁸⁴

The anonymous writer in *Die Unsichtbaren* directly connects the image of Joseph II with the rise of patriotism not only in Prague, but in whole Germany. He pays homage to the heir to the throne, who visited Prague in 1770 and stirred patriotic feelings in the hearts of its citizens. Furthermore, he relates patriotism and cosmopolitanism. To him, true patriots are those men who prefer the common welfare to the pursuit of private interests of all kinds. The object of their love is not only their fatherland, but the whole Creation.⁸⁵ The opposite of a patriot is a pseudo-patriot or a false patriot, who just wants to satisfy his self-love and to whom no law is holy.⁸⁶ The meaning of the patriotic life is explained in moral rather than strictly political terms:

To live for the fatherland means [...] to strive to promote its general welfare (*Wohlfahrt*) through all actions. This final purpose may be achieved only by a common love for humanity (*Menschenliebe*) and by the untiring spreading of truth and virtue in that state with which a person is connected through the holy duties of geographical (*landeskundliche*) loyalty and devotion.⁸⁷

⁸³ [Kepler], “Vom Patriotismus,” 75.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 76–79.

⁸⁵ [Anonym], “Vom Patriotismus,” 226 and 231.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 229–30. The patriotic Count Franz Joseph Kinsky (1739–1805), on the other hand, in his writings *Erinnerung über einen wichtigen Gegenstand von einem Böhmen* (Prague: Wolfgang Gerle, 1773) and *Über die Hofmeister. Ein Nachtrag zu den Erinnerungen von einem Böhmen* (Prague: Wolfgang Gerle 1776) in which he discusses private noble education, sought to use his aristocratic authority for persuading the Bohemian nobility to raise their children as useful public-spirited citizens rather than as self-centered Frenchified fops. For more on this issue as well as on the clashes between different patriotic groups in Prague in the 1770s see Teodora Shek Brnardić, *The Enlightened Officer at Work: The Educational Projects of the Bohemian Count Franz Joseph Kinsky* (Ph.D. diss., Central European University, 2004).

⁸⁷ [Anonym], “Eingeschikter Brief,” 383.

The kingdom of Hungary-Croatia: "no monarch, no nobility; no nobility, no monarch"

Due to historical circumstances and particularities, the situation in Hungary was somewhat different than in Bohemia, especially when it came to the question of direct taxation as the basis of citizenship in the Habsburg Monarchy. The Kingdom of Hungary was proud of its legal independence in comparison to the Hereditary Lands, and one of its fundamental laws was that "Hungary could not be governed in the same way as the Hereditary Provinces." Likewise, Art. 8 of 1741 confirmed that the nobles and their lands were exempt from all burdens and this also became one of the cardinal constitutional rights of the Hungarian *natio politica*.⁸⁸ The introduction of direct taxation, Henrik Marczali observes, would therefore have required not only material sacrifice on the part of the nobility, but above all "a renunciation of the separate existence of the country as a sovereign State."⁸⁹ The faithful Hungarians were ready to sacrifice their lives and blood for the young Queen, but not their oats (*damus vitam et sanguinem, sed avenam non*)!

Moreover, the Hungarian nobility found the justification of their political attitudes in Montesquieu's *The Spirit of the Laws*, where the French political thinker showed a great deal of sympathy for the Hungarian collection of customary rights, which he indirectly proclaimed to be a "constitution."⁹⁰ The nobility especially liked the theory of the division of powers and Montesquieu's argument on the indispensability of the nobility in a monarchical regime ("without monarchy there was no nobility; without nobility, no monarchy. For there is only a despotic prince").⁹¹ So, the monarch and the nobility were mutually interconnected, albeit independent of each other. Whereas the monarch held the executive and judiciary power, legislation had to be explicitly shared between the monarch and the Diet (*jus suffragii*).⁹²

⁸⁸ Henry Marczali, *Hungary in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910), 355.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*

⁹⁰ Montesquieu, *The Spirit of the Laws*, trs. Anne M. Cohler et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), Book VIII, chapter 9.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, Book II, chapter 4. On the whole issue see László Péter, "Montesquieu's Paradox on Freedom and Hungary's Constitutions 1790–1990," *History of Political Thought* 16 (1995) 1: 79–82.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 80.

Law could be enacted only if voted by the Diet and sanctioned by the King, who retained the right of interpreting and enforcing laws.⁹³ In this way, the powers were regarded as divided and the danger of despotism at least diminished, if not removed. This principle of the division of powers became a commonplace in subsequent Hungarian political thought, especially after 1790.

The period after the Seven Years' War in the Kingdom of Hungary was characterized by disputes about the Hungarian constitution, especially on the eve of the Diet of 1764. The order of the day was reform of the Hungarian war tax (*Contribution*), because the royal treasury was exhausted and it was more convenient to maintain a standing army paid on a regular basis. The problem was that, unlike in other states of the Habsburg Monarchy, taxes in Hungary were related to persons, and not to land and incomes, so that the nobility took the exemption from taxation as their *property* rather than the royal privilege, that is, as something that was inalienable to them.⁹⁴ Any monetary donation on their part was regarded as their voluntary donation to the King.⁹⁵ The extraordinary fiscal devices applied in the Austrian and Bohemian lands could not be implemented in Hungary without the consent of the members of the Diet, which tended to pass any increase in taxes on to their serfs.⁹⁶

The newly-established (in 1760–61) Council of State (*Staatsrat*), which according to Franz Szabo was meant to be “a permanent pan-monarchical institution” and the first body ever to discuss issues concerning the entire Habsburg Monarchy, albeit only as a consultative organ, represented the new ideal of full integration. As such, it was authorized, although not officially, to discuss Hungarian issues, including the issue of the taxation of the nobility. The chance to impose taxes

⁹³ Ivan Beuc, *Povijest institucija državne vlasti u Hrvatskoj (1527.-1945.)* [A history of state institutions in Croatia (1527–1945)] (Zagreb: Arhiv Hrvatske, 1969), 19–20.

⁹⁴ “Tertia est: quod justis eorum juribus, et omnibus proventibus intra terminos territoriorum suorum adjacentibus, liberam semper prout volunt, fruendi habent potestatem; ab omni conditionaria servitute, ac datiarum, et collectarum, tributorum, vectigalium, tricesimarumque solutione, per omnia immunes et exempti habentur: militare duntaxat pro regni defensione tenentur.” István Werbőczy, *Hármaskönyve* [Tripartitum], ed. Márkus Dezső (Budapest: Franklin-Társulat, 1897, reprint, Pécs: Pécsi Szikra Nyomda, 1989), 1.9.5.

⁹⁵ Andor Csizmadia, *Adam Franz Kollár und die ungarische rechtshistorische Forschung* (Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1982), 5.

⁹⁶ Franz A. J. Szabo, *Kaunitz and enlightened absolutism 1753–1780* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 320.

was spotted in the possible change of the antiquated feudal noble levy (*insurrectio*) in time of war into a regular money tax paid in time of peace because this practice proved to be outdated in the Seven Years' War. Besides, the Court wanted to tax the vast estates of the Catholic Church, which were also exempt from taxation.

However, every attempt proved to be unsuccessful because in the course of time the nobility developed a discourse of noble resistance based on arguments from the *Tripartitum* and the *Corpus juris Hungarici*, which in case of the Church dignitaries were additionally spiced with the quotations from the Bible and the canons.⁹⁷ The keywords in this discourse were “republic,” “nation” and “freedom,” whose meanings Franz Szabo deconstructs by arguing that “republic” actually meant the right of self-government for the privileged classes alone, “nation” designated only the *populus* (nobles, clergy and free cities) while “freedom” was actually equated with “privilege.”⁹⁸ Such a stubborn preservation of the noble prerogatives necessarily split loyalties between the *patria*, that is, the *patriae leges*, and the monarch. In such a mindset “a citizen” was not equal to “a subject” and love for the country was not equal to love for the king, who on the top of all was a foreigner of the German blood and not even resident on the Hungarian soil. However, the Kingdom of Hungary was undoubtedly a monarchy and a good citizen should display loyalty with that fact in mind:

Above all, one should bear in mind that we do not live either in a free republic (*libera republica*) or in an aristocratic regime (*sub optimatibus*), but under the kings to whom God has given the right of deciding about the life and death of their subjects. Therefore, it is superfluous to exhibit high aspirations and an inappropriate love of freedom; rather let us accept the conduct in accordance with times and circumstances, and let us completely perform all duties of loyal subjects toward their prince. [...] Correspondingly, in every way one should pay attention to adhere to the behavior of a good subject; but, in my opinion, one should also avoid forgetting—by excessively trying to fulfil the obligations of a subject—that we are also citizens, otherwise we could become the traitors of our fatherland in our ardent desire to satisfy the prince. [...] Citizens, we act foolishly, really foolishly if we appreciate our fatherland so little

⁹⁷ Csizmadia, *Kollár*, 6.

⁹⁸ Szabo, *Kaunitz*, 304.

that we are ready to neglect it because of some kind word of the prince or because of some minor dignity!⁹⁹

Such reminders that the Hungarian form of government is monarchical are an essential part of the monarchical writings written during the Diet of 1764, which repeatedly cited historical evidence that the Hungarian kings from Stephen I onwards held the whole legislative power in their hands and that their power was in fact absolutist. It was during the reign of King Sigismund that the legitimate monarchical form of government started to change into an aristocratic or even a republican constitution which was eventually codified in the “Bible of the Hungarian nobility,” the *Tripartitum* (1517) compiled by István Werbőczy.¹⁰⁰

These monarchical writings included the *De originibus et usu perpetuo potestatis legislatoriae circa sacra apostolicorum regum Ungariae* [On the origins and perpetual use of the legislative power of the Hungarian apostolic kings in Church matters] (Vienna, 1764) by the erudite librarian of the Court Library Adam Franz Kollár and the clandestine manuscripts *Dissertatio de Tripartito sive opere Verbőczy* [A treatise on the Tripartitum, or the work of Werbőczy] (unpublished, 1764) and *De sublimium duarum in mundo potestatum fundamento et concordia* [On the foundation and harmony of the two lofty powers in the world] (unpublished, 1764) by the learned but persecuted Zagreb canon Baltazar Adam Krčelić. The Estates did not fail to answer back, so that not only was Kollár’s book publicly burnt, but a number of anti-monarchical pamphlets were circulated during the Diet. The most important of these was the anonymous *Vexatio dat intellectum* [Hardship improves the understanding] written by the Esztergom canon György Richwaldsky. It explicitly affirmed that the nobility had the right to participate in legislation (*jus condendae legis*), that the king is legally not allowed either to pass or simply to abolish laws on his own initiative and that no foreign laws could be introduced at the cost of the *leges patriae*.¹⁰¹

⁹⁹ [Nikola Škrlec], “Četvrti dijalog Za politiku, a potom o domovinskoj politici ili Kako se živi u Hrvatskoj (*Dialogus quartus Pro politica, tum de politica patria sive De modo vivendi in Croatia*),” in Stjenko Vranjican, ed., *Nikola Škrlec Lomnički (1729–1799)* (Zagreb: Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1999), 1: 39.

¹⁰⁰ Csizmadia, Kollár, 14.

¹⁰¹ [György Richwaldsky], *Vexatio dat intellectum*, Croatian National Library, R 4258, 1r and 4r.

The monarchical camp used the language of the reason of state, natural law and cameralism in order to prove that in following Werbőczy the uncooperative Hungarian nobility was driven only by private interests and did not want to contribute to the public happiness. Canon Krčelić was absolutely sure of the necessity of the reason of state and held the opinion that the Hungarian constitution or fundamental laws should adapt to historical circumstances and need not stay unchanged forever.¹⁰² In his critique of the *Tripartitum* the canon argued that Werbőczy was a danger both for kings and the state, and even for the Ottomans and other enemies, because many mutinies emerged due to him and his privileges. Krčelić concludes that “as long as this theatrical monarch has not been toppled from his majestic seat, the kings will not be kings and Hungary will not become a true kingdom and state.”¹⁰³

Certainly, in the whole of Werbőczy you will not find [anything] about the interest of looking after the public happiness. He [says] nothing about the duties of the prince and public servants, election, nothing about the treasury, pacts, agriculture, commerce and a thousand other interests of public happiness. Rather [he deals entirely with] taking care of private advantages (*commoda*) [...].¹⁰⁴

The Queen and her councilors failed to achieve what they wanted at the Diet of 1764, so the new strategy was not to convene the Diet at all (the next took place only in 1790, after the death of Joseph II), because the bargain on the issue of taxation with the stubborn estates proved to be completely unfruitful. The ideal form of government for the Hungarian nobility was the already-mentioned Aristotelian ideal of *monarchia mixta*, but where the estates were in a position to share the exercise of legislative power with the monarch on equal terms.¹⁰⁵ From

¹⁰² [Baltazar Adam Krčelić], *De sublimium duarum in mundo potestatum fundamento et concordia adeoque de legislationis etiam ecclesiae potestate atque juris ecclesiastici fundamento*, Croatian National Library, R 3446, 48v ff.

¹⁰³ [Baltazar Adam Krčelić], “Dissertatio de Tripartito sive opere Werbőczy,” in idem, *Dissertationes variae ad historiam patriam spectantes*, Croatian National Library, R 3447, 96v.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 103r.

¹⁰⁵ See Gergely Berzeviczy’s essay, *De statu monarchico-democratico*, which was preserved in his school exercise book. Éva H. Balázs, *Hungary and the Habsburgs 1765–1800: An Experiment in Enlightened Absolutism*, trs. Tim Wilkinson (Budapest: Central European University Press, 1997), 137.

Vienna's point of view, such a constitution seemed to be "republican"¹⁰⁶ or better said, "particularist."¹⁰⁷ Since this was a serious threat to the integrity of the Habsburg Monarchy, new means of inculcating monarchical patriotism had to be found. One of them was education—not only by providing stipends to Hungarian students for studying cameral and police sciences, which offered the best instruction in the duties of a good citizen of the state (*Pflichten eines guten Bürger des Staates*),¹⁰⁸ at the University of Vienna, but also by the establishment of cameral schools funded from the Royal Treasury on Hungarian soil. Such an education would produce loyal state administrators who would exhibit love both for the country and the king.¹⁰⁹

Conclusion

This paper has sought to outline the difficulties of prompting enlightened monarchical patriotism throughout the territory of the Habsburg Monarchy in the aftermath of the Seven Years' War. The monarchical discourse used the language of natural law, reason of state and civic humanism in order to instigate a sense of belonging to the *Gesamtstaat* and to suppress particularist endeavors. The state-objective of enlightened monarchism was in the first place the establishment of civil freedom, that is, legal security, for which legal uniformity was necessary. Many *patriae* needed to be transformed into one single *patria*, but this was achieved with a varying success because it meant encroachment

¹⁰⁶ Győző Ember, "Der österreichische Staatsrat und die ungarische Verfassung 1761.–1768.," *Acta Historica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 7 (1960): 152, 156 and 167.

¹⁰⁷ According to the historians of political thought, this was the nature of the opposition to central authority in France, Spain and the Habsburg Monarchy. See W. M. Spellman, *European Political Thought 1600–1700* (Houndmills: Macmillan, 1998), 105.

¹⁰⁸ Ember, "Der österreichische Staatsrat," 167.

¹⁰⁹ In the 1760s a number of specialist schools for state bureaucrats were founded in the Kingdom of Hungary-Croatia, which provided scholarships funded from the Royal Treasury and whose names bore the monarchical token: the Szenc Collegium Politico-Economicum in 1763; the Vác Theresian College in 1767; the Varaždin Studium Politico-Camerale in 1769; the Buda Theresian Academy in 1777. For more, see Olga V. Khavanova, *Заслуги отцов и таланты сыновей. Венгерские дворяне в учебных заведениях монархии Габсбургов. 1746–1784* [Fathers' merits and sons' talents: Hungarian nobles in the privileged schools of the Habsburg Monarchy, 1746–1784] (St. Petersburg: Aleteia, 2006).

upon the legislature of each particular state. The key question was: who has the right of passing laws (*jus legis condendae/ferendae*)? In Bohemia according to the Renewed Constitution of 1627 it was *only* the king, whereas in Hungary-Croatia according to the Tripartitum of 1517 it was the king *and* the Parliament. As a result, the Bohemian lands proved to be more receptive to monarchical patriotism and were in the forefront of enlightened reforms in the Theresian-Josephinian period, of which they were a genuine laboratory.¹¹⁰ In Hungary-Croatia by contrast the situation was more tense due to the everlasting necessity to bargain with the Estates. Eventually in the 1780s Joseph II tried to impose a new administrative system willfully and by force, which proved to be unfortunate and incited a great deal of opposition. However, a readiness to serve the common good seemed to be the only way to preserve the unity of the Habsburg Monarchy. In 1790 when everything seemed to be falling apart, the ex-State Chancellor Kaunitz prophetically stated that “unless the constituent lands of the Habsburg Monarchy were prepared to subordinate themselves to what he called ‘the supreme law’ of the common good, they would suffer together to their common regret.”¹¹¹ In the end, although the fate of Poland did not befall the Habsburg Monarchy, the argument of reason of state proved to be useless in front of the centrifugal forces of nineteenth-century nationalist ideologies.

¹¹⁰ Similarly, Charles O’Brien emphasizes the “malleability” of the lands of the Bohemian and Austrian crowns. Idem, “Ideas of Religious Toleration at the Time of Joseph II. A Study of the Enlightenment among Catholics in Austria,” *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, 59 (1968) 7, 14.

¹¹¹ Szabo, *Kaunitz*, 345.

CHAPTER TWENTY-TWO

PATRIOTIC SCHOLARSHIP:
THE ADAPTATION OF STATE SCIENCES IN LATE
EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY TRANSYLVANIA

Borbála Zsuzsanna Török

When Martin Schwartzner (1759–1823), author of the first comprehensive statistics of the Kingdom of Hungary, wrote about the benefits of acquiring knowledge about the state, he appealed to the patriotism of lawgivers, merchants, newspaper readers and especially politicians. Yet among all categories of the population it was the Magyar, according to Schwartzner, who most needed this knowledge, “lest he be blinded by the hot love of his country, or if he wants to assert himself intelligently, in order to operate wisely for the dignity of the crown and the well-being of his country.”¹ My essay asks about this “scientific turn” in the passion for the fatherland in late 18th-century Transylvania. The cameralistic coloring of contemporary patriotism has already been noted by Hungarian historiography; however, in-depth studies about its most specific manifestation, the scientific exploration of the “fatherland,” are lacking. Moreover, traditional perspectives that treat contemporary politics, press, travel, learned societies and university disciplines in isolation fail to identify their common ground which took the form of a new academic sociability.² My essay is an attempt

¹ Martin Schwartzner, *Statistik des Königreichs Ungern. Ein Versuch von Martin Schwartzner, Professor der Diplomatie, und erstem Bibliothek-Custos auf der Kön. Ungarischen Universität zu Pest* (Pest: Matthias Trattner, 1798).

² Szekfű Gyula, *Magyar Történet*. [Hungarian history] vol. V of Bálint Hóman and Gyula Szekfű, eds., *Magyar Történet* [Hungarian history] (Budapest: Királyi Magyar Egyetemi Nyomda, 1936); Robert J. W. Evans, *Austria, Hungary, and the Habsburgs: Essays on Central Europe, 1683–1867* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006); Éva H. Balázs, *Hungary and the Habsburgs, 1765–1800: An Experiment in Enlightened Absolutism*, trans. Tim Wilkinson (Budapest: Central European University, 1997); László Kontler, “The Enlightenment in Central Europe?” in Balázs Trencsényi and Michal Kopeček, eds., *Discourses of Collective Identity in Central and Southeast Europe (1770–1945)* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2006), 33–44; Teodora Shek Brnardić, “Intellectual Movements and Geopolitical Regionalization: The Case of the

to address local practices of patriotic scholarship (called *Landeskunde* by German speakers and *honismeret* by Hungarians), locating these within a larger Central European tradition of scholarship and the circulation of knowledge.

In his examination of early modern Hungary Robert Evans identified two competing political visions that shaped the emerging scholarship of the social realm. He summarizes these two perspectives as qualifying Hungary on the one hand as a country and on the other as a province of the Habsburg Monarchy. The same ambiguity is valid regarding Transylvania whose status was similar to its larger neighbor. The first view sustaining the persistence of the state was fed upon memories of the medieval kingdom, as handed down through the centuries. The latter, newer perspective, derived from the growing body of knowledge about the Habsburg Empire and its component parts. To bring the two opposing views together involved engaging the whole issue of (con)federal elements within the structure of Habsburg government, a subject that emerged in debates in the 1790s and framed scholarly investigations and disputes. The issue was of political importance, since it was closely linked to matters of sovereignty, to the status of Hungary and Transylvania within the Monarchy, and also to local rights.³

The notion of “composite monarchy” is indeed useful to define not only the political force lines but also the “vectors of assemblage” in

East European Enlightenment,” *East Central Europe/L’Europe du Centre-Est: Eine wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift* 32, 1–2 (2005): 147–78. Case studies that discuss how specific empirical scientific disciplines, such as medicine, studies of domestic economy, and history emerged in the framework of enlightened sociability and commitment to welfare are: Josef Spielman, “Die Aufklärungsperiode in der Medizingeschichte Siebenbürgens,” in Reinhard Mocek, ed., *Die Wissenschaftskultur der Aufklärung* (Halle: Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, 1990), 176–87; Jenő Pataki, *Az erdélyi orvoslás kultúrtörténetéből* [About the cultural history of medicine in Transylvania] (Piliscsaba: Magyar Tudománytörténeti Intézet, 2004); Lajos Hanzó, “Tessedik gazdaságtudományi nézeteinek forrásaihoz” [About the sources of Tessedik’s economic concepts], *Századok* (1962): 11–564; Éva H. Balázs, *Európai gazdaságpolitika—magyar válasz* [European economic politics—Hungarian answers] (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézet, 1996); Éva V. Windisch, “Kovachich Márton György és a magyar tudományszervezés első kísérletei” [Márton György Kovachich and the first attempts at organizing Hungarian science], *Századok* (1968): 90–141.

³ Robert J. W. Evans, “Hungary in the Habsburg Monarchy in the 19th Century: The British Dimension,” *The Hungarian Quarterly* 171 (Autumn 2003), available at <http://www.hungarianquarterly.com/no171/13.html>, accessed on 14 April 2008.

the East Central European provinces of the republic of letters.⁴ Taking the composite state as a political frame for divergent patterns of collective identification is particularly helpful in an area with as strong socio-political cleavages as Transylvania. These loyalties were more or less strongly connected to the Habsburg state-frameworks—recent literature casts the Hungarian agendas articulated at the provincial Diets in the post-Josephist decade less and less in terms of open antagonism, and rather as Habsburg loyalty with vested local interests. Clearly, in terms of taxation and economic reform in Hungary and Transylvania the relationship was fairly cold; while Vienna sought legal means to justify its centralizing efforts it met the legitimist counter-movement of the estates in defense of the “ancient constitution” and local feudal prerogatives. My narrative embarks at the moment after the death of Joseph II, which exposed the rift between the conflicting loyalties in Transylvania in terms of political calculation and changing cultural attitudes.⁵ Its focus of interest is the amalgamation of politics and the incipient science of the social realm and the adaptation of its meliorist social vision in the local context.

A pivotal question concerns the modernizing potential of this “scientific” patriotism. As I will argue in my essay, the question remained a complicated one. Even this “progressive” view on the advancement of public good based on general welfare and modern state management did not detach itself from a sociopolitical system rooted in social inequalities. State science was a field characterized by the Enlightenment’s novel “statistical gaze,” i.e. a concern for an encyclopaedic knowledge of the social realm. It was “experiential” and “open-air,” based on empirical perception that distinguished it from the traditional academic practice. As a university discipline studying the state, its history, order, and government was meant to train an emerging modern bureaucracy.⁶

⁴ John H. Elliott, “A Europe of Composite Monarchies,” *Past and Present* 137 (1992): 48–71, 70.

⁵ Elliott, “Composite Monarchies,” 68–70.

⁶ Schwartner, *Statistik*, 5; Hans Erich Bödeker, “On the Origins of the «Statistical Gaze»: Modes of Perception, Forms of Knowledge and Ways of Writing in the Early Social Sciences,” in Peter Becker and William Clark, eds., *Little Tools of Knowledge: Historical Essays on Academic and Bureaucratic Practices* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2001), 169–171; David F. Lindenfeld, *The Practical Imagination: The German Sciences of State in the Nineteenth Century* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1997); Marc Raeff, “The Well-Ordered Police State and the Development of Modernity in Seventeenth—and Eighteenth-Century Europe: An

Also, “patriotic scholarship” was inseparable from another “modern” phenomenon, the creation, thanks to a growing educated constituency, of a scholarly public with its characteristic institutions both in the centers of learning and their provincial counterparts in other parts of Europe. As so often happens, the intellectual foundation of local attachment was thus the outcome of intensified international circulation of knowledge. Within this dynamic German-speaking scholars closely connected to the academic centers, and in particular to the universities of the German states (Göttingen, Tübingen, Halle, Jena), had a central position, as their scholarly perceptions largely defined the field. They were the arbiters of the measures of “improvement” of other states and other nations, sometimes involuntary authors of the “othering” and “orientalization” of farther lands, including those across the Leitha—one thinks in particular of the most famous journal of political criticism, the *Staatsanzeiger* written by the Göttingen scholar August Ludwig Schlözer. However, the ethno-civilizational stereotypes abounding about Hungary and Transylvania (among numerous other provinces) originated not only from “malevolent” Austrian pamphleteers but had also to do with the first large-scale comparative statistical exploration of the actually dismal conditions (and obsolete political traditions) of these lands.⁷

For all its methodological innovation, the sociopolitical stance of contemporary state science was ambiguous; even the North-German vanguard, such as Schlözer, was no advocate of social emancipation.⁸

Attempt at a Comparative Approach,” *The American Historical Review* 80 (December 1975) 5: 1221–43.

⁷ Éva H. Balázs, “A Magyar jozefinisták külföldi kapcsolataihoz” [About the international connections of the Hungarian Josephists], *Századok* 97 (1963) 6: 1187–1203; János Poór, “August Ludwig Schlözer und seine ungarländische Korrespondenz,” in Alexandru Duțu, Edgar Hösch and Norbert Oellers, eds., *Brief und Briefwechsel in Mittel-und Osteuropa im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert* (Essen: Reimar Hobbing Verlag, 1989); János B. Poór, “Gróf Hofmannsegg utazása a XVIII. század végi Magyarországon” [The travel of Count Hofmannsegg in Hungary at the end of the eighteenth century], *Budapesti Negyed* 4 (1994), 2, available at <http://www.bparchiv.hu/magyar/kiadvany/bpn/04/hofmann.html>, accessed on 14 april 2008. In the Transylvanian Romanian context see the excellent analysis by Sorin Mitu, *National Identity of Romanians in Transylvania* (Budapest-New York: CEU Press, 2001).

⁸ About Schlözer and his contemporaries in Göttingen see Lindenfeld, *Practical Imagination*, 4–6, 22–28. In general see Anthony J. LaVopa, *Grace, Talent and Merit: Poor Students, Clerical Careers, and Professional Ideology in Eighteenth-Century Germany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 49–52; James Van Horn Melton, “From Enlightenment to Revolution: Hertzberg, Schlözer, and the Problem of Despotism in the Aufklärung,” *Central European History* 12 (1979): 103–23.

This ambiguity became even stronger in local emulations, where it was colored by conflicting political attitudes. The Transylvanian case is another proof of how easily modern scholarship combined with conservative agendas. Its social meliorism did not translate into mobility: its improvement-oriented vision merely reconfigured traditional hierarchies into new ones, without leveling them out. This ambiguity was clearly visible in the political epistemology manifest in debates about the status of the vernacular languages, the hierarchy of civilizations, or constitutional reforms in Hungary and Transylvania.

One cannot speak about scholarly modernization in the period without considering its most important local feature, the vernacularization of knowledge in the Monarchy. The status of German scholarship is remarkable in this process, since it figures simultaneously as the accepted educational norm but also as part of a policy imposed from above. From the mid-18th century onwards, loosely connected networks emerge around German universities, including scholars from the German-speaking regions of Europe from Switzerland to Prussia and extending into the Baltic and as far as the Russian academic institutions in Saint Petersburg. A comparative study of this intricate pattern of networks enables the modeling of distinct yet interlocking channels of communication that linked the provincial outposts with the relevant centers of scholarship. Important nodes in the circulation of knowledge were the patriotic societies and journals that initiated the study of the fatherland. In this context I will look at the two major scholarly enterprises in contemporary Transylvania, the Saxon *Siebenbürgische Quartalschrift* and the *Erdélyi Magyar Nyelvmívelő Társaság* (Transylvanian Hungarian Language Society), and seek to demonstrate both their adherence to European scholarship and their local specificities.

Patriotic science in the composite monarchy

Transylvania had a separate status in the monarchy, and until the mid-nineteenth century its internal administration was controlled by the estates comprised of the Hungarian county nobility, the Hungarian-speaking Szeklers and the patriciate-based Transylvanian Saxon social elite. These “noble nations” were defined by ethno-linguistic or confessional markers, while the peasantry had little social standing and no corporate political rights. The sharp economic and social gap

between them and the Hungarian and German social elites was further compounded by linguistic and religious differences and geographic distance.

The Theresian and Josephist reforms worked in favor of the lower social strata, most of whom belonged to confessions and spoke languages other than the Hungarian and German elites. Their effect was inimical to the privileges of the Hungarian nobility and the Szekler and Saxon estates, and after the lifting of the exclusive Saxon right to citizenship in the multi-ethnic administrative unit of *Königsboden* (1781) the legal basis of Saxon political autonomy was abolished. The “anti-constitutional” measures generated protest but also gave an impetus for studies on the history of the old “nation,” that is, estates, viewed as a reservoir of corporate rights. The first provincial diet after the death of Joseph in 1790, also called the Diet of Restitution, generated many writings on legal history for direct use in the process of restoration—a phenomenon by no means unique to Transylvania. The titles are indicative: *Verfassungszustand der sächsischen Nation in Siebenbürgen* (The constitutional status of the Saxon nation in Transylvania), *Das Recht des Eigenthums der Sächsischen Nation in Siebenbürgen* (The right to property of the Saxon nation in Transylvania), *Über das ausschliessende Bürgerrecht der Sachsen in Siebenbürgen auf ihrem Grund und Boden* (About the exclusive citizenship rights of Transylvanian Saxons on their territory), *Die Siebenbürger Sachsen, eine Volksschrift; herausgegeben bei Auflebung der für erloschen erklärten Nation* (The Transylvanian Saxons, a writing for the people, published on the revival of the nation held to be extinct).⁹

The Diet of 1790 brought to the fore the tensions between the local elites. Among others, the imperial language reforms turned the Saxon and the Hungarian estates against each other as the concept of *natio* acquired an ethno-linguistic dimension. Saxon concerns grew as the

⁹ Daniel Graeser, *Der Verfassungszustand der sächsischen Nation in Siebenbürgen* (Hermannstadt: Hochmeister, 1791); Johannes Tartler, *Das Recht des Eigenthums der sächsischen Nation in Siebenbürgen auf dem ihr vor mehr als 600 Jahren von ungarischen Königen verliehenen Grund und Boden, in soweit seibiges unbeschadet der oberherrschafftlichen Rechte des Landesfürsten der Nation zusteht, aus diplomatischen Urkunden und Landes-Gesetzen erwiesen und denen auf dem Landtag in Klausenburg versammelten Landes-Ständen vorgelegt von den Repräsentanten der Nation* (Vienna, 1791); Michael Fronius, *Über das ausschliessende Bürgerrecht der Sachsen in Siebenbürgen auf ihrem Grund und Boden: Von den Repräsentanten der Nation* (Vienna, 1792); Friedrich von Sachsenheim, *Die Siebenbürger Sachsen: Eine Volksschrift, herausgegeben bey Auflebung der für erloschen erklärten Nation* (Hermannstadt, 1790).

reestablishment of the old corporate veto right, the *curiatum votum*, was denied, exposing the vulnerability of the small German-speaking minority in the face of an emerging Hungarian political and cultural movement. On both sides of the border the Hungarian nobility aspired to build a single political roof over Transylvania and Hungary. They advanced Hungarian as the official language of the province, replacing Latin, hitherto the language of administration. The commissioning of a Hungarian grammar for use by students, scholars and “our foreign [-tongued] neighbours to learn our language” and the plan for a provincial Hungarian academy was a part of this policy.¹⁰

Hungarian interest in the records of the past, especially in the institutions of state power since the Middle Ages, equalled those of their Saxon counterparts. Political events gave further impetus to the already existing interest in legal history.¹¹ But it was not only the restoration of lost privileges that kept scholars, statesmen and educated private persons preoccupied, but also the reform of state administration in a cameralist spirit. The rationalization of state bureaucracy demanded usable data on the inhabitants and their environment, and these data were to be available in compendia and handbooks. The chief initiator of this utilitarian scholarship was the government, but there was

¹⁰ Sámuel Gyarmathi, *Okoskodva tanító magyar nyelvmester* [Reasoningly tutoring Hungarian language teacher], 2 vols (Kolozsvár and Szeben, 1794).

¹¹ Hungarian legal historiography casts the relation between the court and the estates in dichotomous terms. According to this view, there was a tension between the centralizing, natural-law-based efforts of the Crown, aimed at the dismantling of feudal privileges, and the Hungarian estate-preserving legal tradition. The Hungarian legal “thought” on the other hand, was at that time hardly more than the beginning of the systematic collection and study of the “laws of the Hungarian kings,” and of the legal status of the nobility. In my opinion this antagonistic view is simplistic and in need of revision. A prominent intermediary position that obscures this dichotomous perspective is the one taken by the 18th century imperial librarian in Vienna, Adam Franz Kollár, whose extensive publication of legal documents was meant to bolster the royal claim of the monarch as Hungary’s “apostolic ruler.” The logic of his work, entitled *Historia diplomatica iuris patronatus Apostolicorum Hungariae Regum* [Documentary history of the rights of (ecclesiastical) patronage of the apostolic kings of Hungary] and *De Originibus et usu perpetuo potestatis legislativae circa sacra Apostolicorum regum Hungariae* [On the origins of legislative power in the ecclesiastical sphere and its perpetual exercise by the apostolic kings of Hungary], is exactly the same as the one of the “adversary” estates. Evans, *Austria, Hungary, and the Habsburgs*, 24. For the “dichotomous” view see Pál Horváth, *A magyar jogi gondolkodás az állam és jog fejlődéstörténetéről* [Hungarian legal thinking about the developmental history of the state and law], in Andor Csizmadia, Kálmán Kovács and László Asztalos, *Magyar állam- és jogtörténet* [The history of the Hungarian state and law], 12th edition (Budapest: Nemzeti tankönyvkiadó, 2001), 7–13.

growing interest in economic and social reform among the educated strata of the society as well. Learned societies were created to establish methods for improving the material well-being of the state's subjects, mostly through enlightened *Menschenbildung*. The rhetoric of this pedagogy targeted accurate knowledge and the "humble love of the fatherland" resulting from this intimate knowledge.¹²

Comprehensive reform of the state, society, and education was thus a major catalyst of regional scholarship. In 1790 Transylvanian high bureaucrats, clerics and the educated gentry formed circles and societies and launched learned journals. A nascent learned public described and reflected on social betterment. Conscious of their distance from the larger university towns, these groups prepared the diagnosis of regional society, its fragmentation, the educational differences between its "civilized" and "uneducated nations" and the ways of overcoming these. Here too immersion into *Landeskunde/Vaterlandeskunde* or its Hungarian version, *honismeret* (study of the fatherland), was grounded in the patriotic claim to render useful service to the statesman or authorized administrator of power.¹³

The example had been set by a number of well-established Masonic lodges, with their keenness on self-formation that gradually extended into plans for the cultural improvement of the entire society. Monarchy-wide the lodges were immersed in questions about the interrelated nature of individual virtues and the public good, the love of the fatherland in relation to the love of mankind, and the aims of education.¹⁴

¹² Joseph von Sonnenfels, *Der Mann ohne Vorurtheil*, cited in B. Becker-Cantarino, "Joseph von Sonnenfels and the Development of Secular Education in Eighteenth-Century Austria," in James A. Leith, ed., *Facets of Education in the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 1977), 29–47, 29; Moritz Csáky, *Von der Aufklärung zum Liberalismus. Studien zum Frühliberalismus in Ungarn* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1981), 172.

¹³ Bödeker, "Statistical Gaze," 189; Henry E. Lowood, "Science for the Fatherland," in *Patriotism, Profit and the Promotion of Science in the German Enlightenment* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1991), 205–61, 207.

¹⁴ The questions formulated by the so-called Draskovics Observance, the "catechism" of Hungarian Freemasons, reflected well the entanglement. It offered a range of topics for reflection to its readers, including those related to "the love of one's homeland," the ways of propagating this, and the offering of it as an aim of education. It also raised the famous contemporary issue about the reconciliation of "the love of mankind" with "the love directed entirely towards the homeland." The Observance left no doubt about the legal and political dimensions of these questions: "What is the true nature of our country's constitution? How should those parts of the constitution that may be unsound be repaired? What is the best form of government? Is it permissible for any constitution whatsoever to be introduced willy-nilly into any country or

They sought cultural and moral improvement in a framework of a new type of sociability, establishing “sites of social compromise” between different social classes of educated men.¹⁵ These exclusive circles comprised members of the aristocracy, the higher nobility, high office bearers from the provincial government and the top of the ecclesiastic elite. In Transylvania as well, between cycles of control and persecution the 1780s witnessed a burgeoning of Masonic life, involving mentors from the political elite (governors, such as Baron Samuel Brukenenthal, founder of the first private museum in Transylvania, and Count György Bánffy, patron of the first Transylvanian learned society) and scholars of various ethnic backgrounds. The concern of these provincial patriots was similar to those of their counterparts everywhere in the Monarchy, namely the constitution of a national public beyond the narrow circle of learned men via shared language and (regional) culture.

Although the activities of these circles have not been extensively documented, their impact on regional scholarship is clearly discernable. Several programs for the institutionalization of language improvement and cultural and educational reform, which would lead to Hungarian, Saxon and Romanian national Enlightenments, had common Masonic roots. The parallel emergence of plans for establishing Saxon, Hungarian and Romanian scholarly societies and even universities in the last decade of the century enables one to think that such plans must have been debated at a common forum—for instance in the lodges. The fact that many of the proponents of these projects were former masons is a further hint to such a presupposition. Not accidentally, the lodges were closely connected to the reform politics of the Viennese Court and in particular to Joseph II. Especially the non-Catholic (Protestant and Orthodox) brothers, elevated by the emperor to public offices, were supporters of his administrative modernization (some Magyar adherents in Hungary went even as far as endorsing the Germanizing Language Edict). This contributed to a new ethic and a commitment to society and scholarship unprecedented before.¹⁶

should it be adapted to the local circumstances?” From the anonymous “Systema constitutionis latomiae Libertatis sub Corona Hungariae in provinciam redactae,” cited in Balázs, *Hungary and the Habsburgs*, 140.

¹⁵ Margaret C. Jacob, *Living the Enlightenment: Freemasonry and Politics in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 72.

¹⁶ See for instance Count Samuel von Brukenenthal, president of the Transylvanian Gubernium, member of two lodges, the “Andreas zu den drei Seeblätter” in

Studies abroad and improvement at home

The larger interpretative framework for effective state management both in the Habsburg Monarchy and the German states had been state science (*Staatswissenschaften*) and *cameralism* (the latter a variant of state science emphasizing the management of economy), two inter-related fields of empirical knowledge designed to train bureaucrats for more effective management of public affairs, and thus improving the public lot. It was a loosely defined field that varied from university to university, involving lectures in economics, statistics, finance, politics, police science (*Polizeiwissenschaft*, meaning approximately “public administration”), agriculture, forestry, mining, “technology” and social policy, with the emphasis not on “scientific method” or even an in-depth investigation of a particular subject but on comprehensiveness and systematic knowledge of the state. Throughout the 18th century the priority was not specialization but rather the establishment of categories to describe the particularities of the social-physical environment and the historical-legal development of the polity.¹⁷

In the Habsburg Empire, Switzerland and Prussia, this empirical scholarship was also known as *Landeskunde* or *Vaterlandeskunde*—this term was also in use in Transylvania. It was a less formal variant of the state sciences and was concerned, like its academic counterparts, with building up an inventory of useful knowledge. It had a smaller regional scope and was not taught at the universities. But the methods and encyclopaedic scope, the mapping of the local environment and the classifying system present in it were identical. Both varieties were indebted to the taxonomies of Linneus, especially in their preference for the physical: weather, topography, population, natural resources and animal life, a strong interest in natural science, with an emphasis on the particularities (*Merkwürdigkeiten*) of the fatherland.¹⁸

Hermannstadt/Szeben/Sibiu and the Viennese “Au trois canons.” Balázs, *Hungary and the Habsburgs*, 36.

¹⁷ See for instance Christian Wolff, *Vernünfftige Gedanken von dem gesellschaftlichen Leben der Menschen, und insonderheit dem gemeinen Wesen* (Halle, 1721); David F. Lindenfeld, *Practical Imagination*, 14.

¹⁸ It was not present-centric, but integrated a historical perspective, whether anti-quarian or constitutional—a feature characteristic of the Göttingen tradition. In their vision history and statistics interconnected (where history did not consist only of the biographies of kings or the chronicles of battles, but also of agriculture, commerce, legal systems etc.—the very subjects of statistics): “history is continuous statistics, and

The term *Merkwürdigkeiten* or *Staatsmerkwürdigkeiten* (meaning “state peculiarities”) deserves special attention here. A concept introduced by Gottfried Achenwall, it designated any domain worthy of scientific observation. Schlözer endowed every “fact” of the social world with statistical meaning, so *Statistik* became an all-encompassing repository for the study of social life. The definition of what could be classified as a *Staatsmerkwürdigkeit* changed over time, but principally it meant the most relevant data for state administration, such as the extent of lands, information about mineral riches, agricultural resources, population statistics and the like. The data were ordered in the light of the administrative map of the country, thus leading to a close connection between geography and statistics, and the presentation of facts took place both in narrative form (history) as well as in the shape of descriptions (encompassing the present state of affairs or “history standing still”).

The methods were “open air,” to be practiced outdoors—hence the preference for scientific hikes and travels—and fostered exchange among the practitioners.¹⁹ There was a distribution of tasks, so that while engaged amateurs were responsible for the collection of data, trained academics, the *Stubenforscher*, were in charge with the processing and classification. The societies exchanged scientific data and participated in networks of correspondence worldwide. Based on the information they possessed they could function as experts, political counselors or political journalists, and following the example set by scholars like Schlözer they all ran journals to publish their findings and to convey to their readers “useful truths.”²⁰

After 1750 state sciences boomed in the German states, and by the 1790s nine new university chairs had been created, despite the general decline of higher education. An alternative curriculum of the sciences of state came out of Göttingen, one that merged cameralism with legal studies and combined portions of it with history and statistics. The systematic description of the state was given the name *Statistik* or *Staatenkunde* by Gottfried Achenwall, who developed it into a discipline of its own. It was closely connected to politics and embraced the

statistics is static history.” Lowood, “Science for the Fatherland,” 205–206; see also Schwartner, *Statistik*, 2–4.

¹⁹ Bödeker, “Statistical Gaze,” 178, 184; Lowood, “Science for the Fatherland,” 210–11; 239–40.

²⁰ Lowood, “Science for the Fatherland,” 223, 229–31.

descriptive investigation of the entire public, legal, economic, financial, military and cultural condition of individual states.²¹ It was, however, August Ludwig Schlözer who made the most compelling attempt to create an all-embracing conception of the social sciences. His course on state science consisted of a segment on history that introduced a diachronic dimension into the static accounts. His *Staatenkunde* or *Statistik* combined a present-oriented description (how states presently are) with a diachronic one (how states came to be what they are), the latter divided into civil history (the development of existing states) and a theoretical inquiry into the functioning of states. The latter branch involved disciplines such as “metapolitics,” state law, state constitution, forms of government, state administration and practical politics.²²

Higher learning was needed above all in the state bureaucracy, and an interest in university training at the end of the 18th century signals the emergence of new social groups who would occupy such positions. These developments appeared in Transylvania as well. The reform of state administration opened new chances to the lower social elites, who embraced the ethos of learning as a way to social advancement. The broader demand for university education was in tension with the archaic local educational system, since higher education institutions in Transylvania from the second half of the 18th century onward offered only the rudiments of a vocational training in law, theology and medicine. Operating under the patronage of competing religious confessions—Roman Catholic, Calvinist, Lutheran, Greek Catholic, Greek Orthodox and Unitarian—they did not constitute a coherent network of higher education, let alone of empirical learning.²³ The exigencies of education were a widespread topic of discussion among regional intellectuals who had had the privilege of studying abroad.²⁴

²¹ Lindenfeld, *Practical Imagination*, 39–40; Bödeker “Statistical Gaze,” 172.

²² August Ludwig von Schlözer, *Theorie der Statistik: nebst Ideen über das Studium der Politik überhaupt* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1804); Bödeker, “Statistical Gaze,” 175; Lindenfeld, *Practical Imagination*, 44.

²³ Lucian Nastașă, “University Education and Culture in Kolozsvár/Cluj,” in Viktor Karády and Lucian Nastașă, *The University of Kolozsvár/Cluj and the Students of the Medical Faculty (1872–1918): A Historical and Prosopographic Study* (Budapest and Cluj: CEU-CRDE, 2003), 15–45.

²⁴ “Sámuel Gyarmathis Bericht nach Siebenbürgen 1798,” in István Futaky, ed., *Selige Tage im Musensitz Göttingen. Stadt und Universität in ungarischen Berichten aus dem 18. und 19. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 73–74.

The training of clergymen and professors (the two tracks were close and co-dependent) at universities abroad had been an established custom since the Middle Ages. By the end of the 18th century the University of Vienna was the most progressive university in the monarchy. It was there that Sonnenfels taught his courses on *Policey—und Kameralwissenschaft*, and his lectures on *Staatistik* were compulsory for future pastors and professors. For all the reservations of the Protestants the University of Vienna remained one of the institutions most frequented by Transylvanians and more influential than its Western counterparts. In the period of 1701–1849 it led the field with its 1980 matriculants, high above Jena (669), Halle (326), Göttingen (214), Berlin (151), Leiden (151), Utrecht (108), the rest of universities having a Transylvanian presence of under 50 students.²⁵

University studies were mostly undertaken by the middle strata, the bulk of whom were of Saxon origin.²⁶ The destinations too differed according to religion and language. Lutherans (Saxons) traditionally attended the Pietistic citadels of Halle, Jena, Tübingen and Heidelberg. Towards the end of the century the newly founded and exclusive Göttingen with its distinguished professors became attractive to many Protestant Transylvanians. Hungarians joined their German compatriots relatively late at the Prussian universities—studies in German were supposedly an extra burden for these students educated in Latin. On the other hand, the Language Edict of 1784 demanded that higher bureaucrats in the public administration should be acquainted with the German language and German education. According to Elek Csetri, by 1799 almost all Transylvanian officers spoke German, Hungarian and Romanian besides Latin (since the late Middle Ages Hungarian counted as the second official language of Transylvania, spoken not only by a great part of the population but also by the aristocracy).²⁷

²⁵ See Miklós Szabó and László Szögi, *Erdélyi peregrinusok. Erdélyi diákok európai egyetemeken, 1701–1849* [Transylvanian Peregrines: Transylvanian students at European universities] (Tîrgu Mureş: Mentor, 1998), 21, 23–25.

²⁶ Of the Transylvanian university students at the end of the 18th century, 6.7% were of aristocratic or higher nobility background, but the overwhelming majority, that is, 81.0%, was *honoratiores* (non-noble). The overwhelming majority of students originated from towns, more than half from the Saxon districts (64.4%). Szabó and Szögi, *Erdélyi peregrinusok*, 35.

²⁷ According to the statistics, of 109 staff members of the Gubernium and the related central institutions of government, besides the compulsory Latin language requirement almost everybody spoke German (99), Hungarian (101), and Romanian (96). It is the Romanian knowledge that deserves most attention; given the extremely

The University of Pest—founded as a Jesuit college in Nagyszombat (Slo. Trnava/Ger. Tyrnau), then moved to Buda and later to Pest—could not compete in fame and competences with its established German and Austrian counterparts. In the post-Josephist decades the accomplished statistician, Martin Schwartner, applied in vain for a professorship in state science and the teaching of “political-cameralist sciences,” including historical geography, statistics, Hungarian common law, diplomatics and the history of the Hungarian state remained largely plans on paper.²⁸ However, the university did create a common venue of sorts for scholars of Hungarian state science. Besides Schwartner, the legal historian Béla Barits published comparative statistics on Hungary, and the impressive source publications of Mathias Bél (1684–1749), György Pray (1723–1801) and István Katona (1732–1811) applied the methods of state science, namely the critical study of historical sources, statistics, comparison (*ars combinatorica*) and auxiliary disciplines such as diplomatics, genealogy and chronology.

There are no studies on the scholarly exchange between the professors in Pest and Transylvanian scholars, but there is evidence of a mutual familiarity in their prefaces, introductions and bibliographies. Schwartner’s *Statistik des Königreichs Ungern*, for instance, was widely known, and conversely the book betrays a fair knowledge of recent statistical publications on the province in all languages. Especially Transylvanian Saxons had had a considerable local tradition in state sciences since the seventeenth century, and in the wake of the formidable impact of Martin Schmeizel (1679–1747), who had taught

small Romanian representation in this circle (members of the estates and the received religions). The statistics is indicative of practical considerations: the bureaucrats might have needed Romanian to keep contact with the majority population. See Elek Csetri, “Az erdélyi központi hatóságok tisztviselőinek nyelvtudásáról a XVIII. század végén” [About the language competence of the functionaries of central administration in Transylvania at the end of the 18th century], in István Orosz, Ferenc Pölöskei and Tamás Dobszay, eds., *Nemzeti és társadalmi átalakulás a XIX. században Magyarországon* [National and social transformation in 19th century Hungary] (Budapest: Korona, 1994), 19–29.

²⁸ Balázs Pálvölgyi, “A magyar állam-és jogtörténeti tanszék története a kezdetektől Eckhart Ferencig” [The history of the faculty of Hungarian state sciences and legal history from the beginnings to Ferenc Eckhart], in Barna Mezey, ed., *Eckhart Ferenc emlékkönyv* [Festschrift for Ferenc Eckhart] (Budapest: Gondolat, 2004), 389–409; Ferenc Eckhart, *A Jog- és Államtudományi Kar története, 1667–1935* [The history of the faculty of law and state sciences, 1667–1935] (Budapest: Királyi Magyar Egyetemi Nyomda, 1936).

state sciences at the university of Halle in the first half of the century, these older patriotic histories were broadened and enriched by modern methods of source publication, geopolitical contextualization and source criticism. Neither did they abandon the “utilitarian” educational purpose and continued to address themselves to the *Bürger* of the city—yet another continuity with the previous century’s patriotic historians.²⁹

As this brief presentation of the academic landscape suggests, German students, including Transylvanian Saxons, had a situational advantage over their non-German peers in their access to modern knowledge, an advantage which resulted from a combination of infrastructural, linguistic and denominational factors as well as from intellectual socialization. The peregrinating Saxon students had better access not only to the “pragmatic” histories of cities, provinces and states, but also to the venues of academic sociability, namely the more cosmopolitan German-speaking academies, learned societies and scholarly journals.³⁰ These differences left their stamp on the local adaptations of state sciences manifest in the formation of linguistically separated intellectual milieus. Saxon publications in *Landeskunde* exceeded their Hungarian counterparts statistically. Also, Saxon *Landeskunde* applied the encyclopaedic approach of state sciences more consistently than its Hungarian counterpart, and strove for an inclusive map of all the peoples of Transylvania. In contrast, the encompassing supra-national interest of Saxon scholarship disappeared from Magyar *honismeret*. A narrower ethno-cultural focus made the latter similar to the practice of the Romanian *Școala Ardeleană* (Transylvanian School), which concentrated on initiating studies on national history and language. Hungarian *honismeret* urged self-assertion against the domination of a more advanced German culture, and the perceived cultural and political superiority of Transylvanian Saxons.

²⁹ See especially János Szalárdi, *Siralmas Magyar krónikája* [Sorrowful Hungarian chronicle] (reprinted edition: Budapest: Magyar Helikon, 1980); Georg Krauss, *Siebenbürgische Kronik des Schäßburger Stadtschreibers Georg Kraus 1608–1665*, reprint edited by the Presidential Committee of the Society for Transylvanian Landeskunde, part I (Vienna, 1862), part II (Vienna, 1864).

³⁰ Edit Szegedi, *Geschichtsbewusstsein und Gruppenidentität. Die Historiographie der Siebenbürger Sachsen zwischen Barock und Aufklärung* (Cologne, Weimar and Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 2002), 309.

The Siebenbürgische Quartalschrift

Contemporary scholarly writings reflect a heightened appreciation for the learned career, but also an awareness of its unfavorable domestic circumstances—the topic of the opening article of the first Saxon learned journal written in the vernacular, the *Siebenbürgische Quartalschrift*. Its author, Daniel Georg Neugeboren (1759–1822), depicted the hindrances to a learned career, and the possibilities of overcoming them in the Enlightenment fashion: improvement through the cultivation of public spirit through learning.³¹ Neugeboren's ideal intellectual is an *Aufklärer* in the service of his country. The service of the state however, does not mean bureaucratic enslavement, but an active mobilization of private and public resources to increase public good. His ideal patriot is a scholar with an impact on his “nation and time,” “inviting and motivating” the state to support socially useful scholarship.

The editorial article reflected on the potential for a domestic reading public to match the boom of learning and education in Germany, England and France, which would lead to the establishing of durable patterns of comparison between the cultivated models and the circumstances at home. Protestant Germany emerged as the norm, with its universities and intellectual effervescence, against which the Transylvanian developments were measured. The diagnosis identified the causes of their shortcomings in contrast to their more advanced neighbors. For this Neugeboren regarded the knowledge of German and the spread of German science, i.e. the new state sciences, as the remedy.

He argued for a knowledge-based society, assigning key role to those educated abroad in the process of “making the fatherland acquainted with itself.” These people could reveal the “important truths that may be useful from the moral, scientific and economic point of view,” more precisely “save pieces from the closer knowledge of the geography and natural history of Transylvania and the morality of its inhabitants in the present and the past, and to prepare the pragmatic historical treatises for public assessment,” but also present the “important events of our time and the survey of the newest literature.” Simultaneously, and in synchron with initiatives of his time, the author urges his peers to

³¹ Daniel Neugeboren, “Ueber die Lage und Hindernisse der Schriftstellerei in Siebenbürgen,” *Siebenbürgische Quartalschrift* 1 (1790): 1–27.

establish the venues of scholarly sociability: academies, publications: books and journals; all this should build an Enlightened public.³²

Yet the editors of the *Quartalschrift* did not advance cosmopolitan projects. As members of overlapping German, Austrian and Transylvanian cultural networks they argued for region-wide communication. Not without gestures of fatherly condescension towards the two other Transylvanian “nations,” this stance committed itself to a Monarchy-centered *Reichspatriotismus*. The call for the use of German in public affairs and scholarship was a political stance in the battle over language, but also indicates that Saxon scholars understood themselves as the agents in collecting and communicating local knowledge at home and disseminating it in a larger scholarly environment. Because of this the scholarly focus and envisioned audience of the *Quartalschrift* transcended narrow ethno-cultural boundaries. The journal translated the writings of established authors of *Landeskunde* and reported on meetings of the *Erdélyi Magyar Nyelvmívelő Társaság* (Transylvanian Hungarian Language Society) and other learned societies at home.³³ According to the *Quartalschrift*, it was uniformity (*Gleichformigkeit*) and a sense of community (*Gemeinschaft*) that formed the basis of a “sound” public. The composite monarchy was seen as an impediment to progress, improvement and social cohesion as the ground of scholarly sociability, a major evil that caused the fragmentation of public life. The political, geographic, religious, economic, linguistic and civilizational cleavages are all detrimental because they hindered access to modern learning, the glue of a unified public. So the “cultural differences” among the Transylvanian “nations” were diagnosed as the main obstacle to the development of public spirit.

As an illustration, Daniel Neugeboren classified the Transylvanian population by ethnic categories and stages of education and improvement. The word “nation” was used here in the sense of a status group demarcated not only by confession and rank in the political system but also by a common language and history. Cultural refinement was related to the ability of the national tongues to serve as a vehicle of scholarly communication—an idea familiar both from politics (Joseph II)

³² Neugeboren, “Ueber die Lage und Hindernisse,” 25.

³³ History was the main field of *Landeskunde*. Other fields involved medicine (15); statistics, especially mortality (11); geography (5); agriculture (3); physics (1); botany (1); matters concerning the fatherland: short reports on weather, population statistics, obituaries, literary reviews, politics, history and economy (26).

and the late-Enlightenment German theorists of culture. The author set up a civilizational hierarchy among the largest ethnic groupings of the region—religion and rank in the feudal order being disregarded. The Romanians were situated at the lower end of this cultural scale: they were presented as a population of noble (Roman) descent, but uncultivated because of their social and political status in Transylvania. This portrayal has echoes of the contemporary depictions of “savages” in the New World in conjectural historiography:³⁴

Half of the country’s population is Wallach, a nation still at the lowest stage of civilization: the absence of scholarship and the sciences is not even felt among them. And their language will continue to resist foreign cultivation until there are enough intelligent people among them to select with discernment and translate for the public good the writings of other cultivated nations and spread these through schooling.³⁵

The case of the “two Hungarian tribes,” the Hungarians and the Szekler, was more complex. In the Late Middle Ages the Magyars were in possession of a glorious scholarly culture, but the centuries-long barbarism resulting from the Turkish Wars, internal conflicts and religious conflicts had eroded “taste and scholarship.” Meanwhile Europe had changed, especially in the advancement of scholarship in the national languages, relative to which the Magyars, clinging to old-fashioned Latin, remained at an impasse. Neugeboren closed his survey with the Saxons who, as he suggested, had the best perspectives for “Enlightenment and the refinement of taste.” The Saxon *Nationalgeist* was enhanced by a unity which was both political (the Saxon constitution) and ecclesiastic (among the Transylvanian “nations” only the Saxons were not divided by confessional differences but belonged to the Lutheran Church). This “othering” ethno-civilizational hierarchy was, of course, no local discovery but resulted from the hierarchical logic of ethnic classification, manifest most notably in the magisterial “Universal History” of Schlözer and its adaptations in Hungary

³⁴ See especially Lisbet Koerner, “Daedalus Hyperboreus: Baltic Natural History and Mineralogy in the Enlightenment,” in William Clark, Jan Golinski and Simon Schaffer, eds, *The Sciences in Enlightened Europe* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), 389–422; Anthony Pagden, *The fall of Natural Man: The American Indian and the Origins of Comparative Ethnology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 27–56; Jorge Cañizares-Esquerro, *How to Write the History of the New World: Histories, Epistemologies, and Identities in the Eighteenth-Century Atlantic World* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2001), 1–10, 60–129.

³⁵ Neugeboren, “Ueber die Lage und Hindernisse,” 6.

and Transylvania.³⁶ The focus remained on Saxon history, religion and education, but there was interest in Transylvanian Hungarian culture as well. The silence regarding the Romanians is telling—the practitioners of *Landeskunde* had little appreciation for the intellectual achievements of the then emerging Romanian scholarship and for its emancipating potential. Lucas Joseph Marienburg (1770–1821), author of a later treatise on Transylvanian *Landeskunde*, had only a contemptuous half-sentence for the “uncivilized Romanians” and their “foolish political attempts.”³⁷ This is but a covert hint at Romanian attempts to achieve political emancipation and at the widespread aversion of the privileged minority *vis-à-vis* the underprivileged majority.³⁸ The articles on history center on the feudal privileges of the Saxon estate, as well as the history of corporate rights under various kings and governors. The dominant topic of this pragmatic account is thus the history of the corporate nation, a subject of chief political importance for the contemporary Saxon public.

The Hungarian Language Society

The inadequacy of the Magyar language in scholarly exchange, mentioned by Neugeboren in the *Quartalschrift*, was a chronic concern of Hungarian scholars. Since the mid-eighteenth century there had been attempts to “embellish and strengthen it, as other nations do,” by establishing “some Literata Societas with members from Hungary and Transylvania.” The plan was further elaborated by György Aranka (1737–1817), the politically well-connected polymath and assessor at the provincial Royal Court (*Tabula Regia*, or, in Hungarian, *Királyi Tábla*). His arguments linking *Landeskunde* with improvement are

³⁶ August Ludwig Schlözer, *Vorstellung seiner Universalhistorie* (Göttingen/Gotha, 1772–1773). See also Schwartner’s statistical classification of Hungary’s peoples according to language (here the more numerous main nations (*Hauptnationen*) including Hungarians, Slavs, Germans and Wallachs, were to be distinguished from the smaller sub-peoples (*Nebenvölker*) such as Armenians, Roma, Jews, Macedonians and other); moreover, the author commented positively or negatively about the usefulness or perceived dangers of each ethno-denominational cluster based on their “morality.”

³⁷ Lucas Joseph Marienburg, *Geographie des Grossfürstenthums Siebenbürgen* (Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1987), 95.

³⁸ See Klaus Heitmann, “Die Rumänen Siebenbürgens aus deutscher Sicht im 19. Jahrhundert,” in Konrad Gündisch, Wolfgang Höpken and Michael Markel, eds, *Das Bild des Anderen in Siebenbürgen* (Cologne, Weimar and Vienna: Böhlau, 1998), 33–56.

very similar to those presented by the authors of the *Quartalschrift*, only here the emphasis is on vernacularizing knowledge through translating not only “books written about our fatherland, so that all the sons and daughters of the fatherland have the opportunity to read them in their own language without learning with pain foreign languages,” but also the works of classical authors.³⁹

Since the draft of the “Transylvanian Society for the Cultivation of the Hungarian Language” did not receive authorization as a state-funded institution, Aranka launched the “Transylvanian Hungarian Language Society” (Erdélyi Magyar Nyelvmívelő Társaság) and the “Manuscript Editing Society” (Kézírók Társasága) as private societies.⁴⁰ Echoing the opinion of the contemporary Hungarian press, Aranka pleaded for vernacular learning in order to broaden the circle of the educated. He argued that unless the written sources of scholarly innovation are accessible in the native tongue, knowledge would never spread beyond the narrow multilingual educated elite. Against German advocates of improvement he demanded the introduction of Hungarian as the language of administration, legislation and science, in order to raise the “dividing curtain” separating the educated and the ignorant. The only way Enlightenment could be “indigenized” was to translate its masterpieces into the language of the (Hungarian) common people. For the Hungarian emulator of German language reformers, linguistic issues like the translation of scholarly works, the writing of modern grammars, dictionaries and lexica, their diffusion through public libraries and museums, the drawing up of *catalogues raisonnés* and the provision of reading rooms were as important as the systematized collection of data on the fatherland.⁴¹

Like the Saxon practice of *Landeskunde*, *honismeret* involved studies in natural science, statistics and history, in conformity with the aims of cameralist improvement. The items to be collected included antiquarian findings (“portraits of the great forbearers,” “old coins and stamps,” “Roman inscriptions that abound in Transylvania”), as well as documents and narratives of national history; specimens of botanic

³⁹ Cited by Sándor Enyedi in Sándor Enyedi, ed., *Aranka György Erdélyi társaságai* [The Transylvanian societies of György Aranka] (Budapest: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó, 1988), 9–39, 12–13.

⁴⁰ György Aranka, “Egy Erdélyi Magyar Nyelvmívelő Társaság felállításáról való rajzolat az Haza Felséges Rendjeihez” [A draft on setting up a Transylvanian Hungarian Language Society, addressed to the honorable estates of the country], in Sándor Enyedi, ed., *Aranka György*, 42–68, 48.

⁴¹ Sándor Enyedi, ed., *Aranka György*, 43–59.

and mineralogical interest (“translating the categories of Linné and Valerius”); reports on meteorology; European and domestic news; and finally, all kinds of statistics from home and abroad, including “reports on the morality statistics of the population” and of those who studied abroad.⁴² The more knowledge the state accumulated about its intellectual and skilled capital, argued Aranka, the more effectively material culture could be administered and improved. Thus “this subject... has little benefit to society, but is of great utility to the *patria*, and it is the task of the noble estates of the country to publicize it.”⁴³

The national scope of the Hungarian agenda met considerable skepticism. German contemporaries from Schlözer to Neugeboren presented Hungarian culture as inferior and inadequate for learning and recommended German instead. In his *Kritische Sammlungen zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Siebenbürgen* Schlözer even expressed his worries about the loss of German as official language in the province. He feared the dissolution of a small linguistic minority within a sea of ignorant and foreign-tongued peasants. The consequences would be fatal, according to Schlözer, since

...it would also bring to an end their connection to Germany and German scholarship, which until now, especially since the Reformation, each and every year had been stable and continuous. It would turn all the [Transylvanian] German nation into half-barbarians; German industry, German commerce, German refinement would perish (...) here too (...) if they amalgamate with a raw, but through its majority constraining mass. I do not speak here about the noble part of the nations there—they are obviously on a par with the cultivated noble peoples of Europe. But who can deny the immeasurable lag between a Hungarian, Slav or Wallach commoner and a German one from there?⁴⁴

The hierarchical vision not only ranked the “nations” of the province according to their perceived stage of improvement but also ethnicized (and racialized) social differences. This rhetorical strategy was most manifest in debates on legal reform regarding the status of the province within the empire and the prerogatives of the Hungarian nobility. The inconsistency of the Hungarian reformers’ claims is well represented in the pleas of Aranka, who with one breadth demanded more freedom for Hungarians *vis-à-vis* the Crown and yet would retain serfdom

⁴² Ibid., 71–101.

⁴³ Ibid., 93.

⁴⁴ August Ludwig Schlözer, *Kritische Sammlungen zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Siebenbürgen* (Göttingen, 1795–1797), 662–63.

on manorial lands, shrewdly pointing to the inequalities between the British and the Irish, as well as the colonies:

In England there is great difference in the nature and the law of the English and the Irish, between the American and Indian provinces and nations, between the whites and the unfortunate blacks, all of them differ from one another before the law. What intelligent man could claim in the English parliament that all of them share the same freedom simply because they are all men?⁴⁵

Aranka's relativism in measuring personal liberties well reflected the limitations of the dominant pattern of thinking among Hungarian patriots:

A noble Hungarian man...is different from his peasant, as much as an owner differs from his property. He is obliged to attend with all his efforts to the happiness of the latter, and he indeed tends to do so, but to place his peasant near him, a member of the crown, to make the other have the same rank and measure as him, and especially to deprive him of his original national honor and to sentence him to the same low fate that nature and providence allotted to his peasant, [and] to carry all peasant burdens with the latter, this would be the opposite of the great and...mighty truth. To take from him with a stroke of the pen what he cannot discard without offending the law...! This seems to be the will of some evil councilors. Because they have said: one man in the society is like the other one... [Yet] law and justice has the same commercial function as money: its value depends on where and how it is used.⁴⁶

Were Hungarians uniquely obstinate in their clinging to an inhumane social order? Or was it a more intransigent stance within an elitist social vision dissociated from social egalitarianism—one thinks of Schlözer's concern about the Transylvanian Saxon elites. Ignaz Aurelius Fessler, another Lutheran *Hungarus* patriot proclaimed the truism of the day: "Der rechtschaffene Bürger und wahre Patriot unterscheidet das Vaterland von dem Volke".⁴⁷ True, these ethnic German

⁴⁵ György Aranka, *Anglus és magyar igazgatásnak egyben vetése* [Comparison of English and Hungarian administration] (Kolozsvár, 1790), cited by Győző Concha, "Az angolos irány politikai irodalmunkban a múlt század végén" [The English direction in our political literature at the end of the previous century], in idem, *Hatvan év tudományos mozgalmái között* [Within the scientific movements of the past sixty years] (Budapest: Tudományos Akadémia, 1928), 213–27.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 221.

⁴⁷ Ignaz Aurelius Fessler, *Dr. Fesslers Resultate seines Denkens und Erfahrens als Anhang zu seinen Rückblicken auf seine 70 jähriger Pilgerschaft* (Breslau: Wilhelm Gottlieb Korn, 1826), 168–69.

scholars never shared either the extreme social conservatism or the defiant nationalism of the provincial Hungarian gentry, who found a true spokesman in Aranka. The latter went as far as asserting: "In Europe, (everybody) from the learned professors in Göttingen to the Viennese literati calls the provinces of the Hungarian crown Austrian lands, although Austria owns as much land in Hungary as the number of hairs on one's palm."⁴⁸

At the same time, Aranka's society attracted the attention of the "noble estates" and of the Saxon circle around the *Quartalschrift*. Supported by the Protestant Chancellor Sámuel Teleki and the Catholic freemason gubernator György Bánffy it became the meeting place of professors and pastors (both Catholic and Protestant), lawyers and gentlemen amateurs. During its thirteen years of existence, their encyclopedic interest in Transylvania's past and present led to the establishment of a natural science museum with a library of manuscripts, thanks to a network of supporters in Hungary, Vienna and even at German universities.

Conclusion

The mentality of German state science practitioners has been characterized as neither liberal in the classical sense nor a Foucauldian "discipline" of "prisons and barracks," but one which insisted on clear and strict boundaries between the sphere of state activities and individual self-improvement.⁴⁹ The cameralist/state scientist classificatory mind met the expectations of the absolutist state and the emerging civic networks owing to its static vision of society and its notion of social equilibrium. It recognized an autonomous society based on talent, but this did not translate into an argument for social and political emancipation.⁵⁰ State science and its local variants had a strong modernizing potential. They served the technical and economic optimization of the state machinery, contributing thus to the perfection of the techniques of central power at the expense of feudal practices and authority. The professionalization of the training of civil servants created a

⁴⁸ Cited by Concha, *Hatvan év*, 219.

⁴⁹ Lindenfeld, *Practical Imagination*, 23–24.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 22–24, 28; LaVopa, *Grace, Talent and Merit*, 49–52.

functional elite where hierarchy was determined by knowledge and service instead of birth. In the Habsburg Monarchy it was mostly the university-trained, German-speaking intelligentsia who produced and circulated patriotic science. David Lindenfeld describes the mission of such enlightened reformers in Habermasian terms: “Statistik translated the authorities’ knowledge into the sphere of bourgeois publicity or *bürgerliche Öffentlichkeit*.” Through informed critique of public affairs and by publishing feedback from informants the scholar knowledgeable about the facts of society was able to pierce through the arcanum of power.⁵¹

Social betterment through knowledge was the banner under which the political content of civic activism (i.e. active participation in the polity to the benefit of the community) shifted towards education and a more general social concern. The case of state science illustrates how by the end of the 18th century the patriotic citizen was regarded as one knowledgeable regarding the conditions of a fatherland that stood in need of improvement. Participating in the gathering and circulation of knowledge meant contribution to the public good. Transylvanian patriots too established domestic surveys and classified, described and qualified their social environment in comparison with the “advanced abroad.” *Landeskunde/honismeret* placed the province on the periphery of the improved (Western and Central European) territories. On the other hand, this novel tradition established also an intra-regional hierarchy based on the dominance of the old Hungarian and the German political elites. It helped solidify a new type of national character, as represented by an internally uniform social group, defined by language and customs. The adaptations of state science thus legitimized the conservative outlook of these elites who sought the restoration of feudal legislation including control over the largely peasant non-Hungarian and non-German-speaking population. Eventually, it recast the older socio-political cleavages into new, ethnic ones. The ethnic perspective of state science identified stages of improvement in the traditional society and became the frame of internal hierarchical distinctions between the “civilized German,” the “less cultivated Hungarian” and the “uncivilized” Romanian, Slav, Roma, etc. The language of modern nationality thus cast the distinction between the elites and

⁵¹ Lindenfeld, *Practical Imagination*, 44.

non-elites into the ethno-culturally distinct categories of the civilized and the barbaric.

In sum, this study illustrates again how scholarly practices and knowledge production are socio-culturally embedded and how these practices can be deployed by conflicting political agendas. It draws attention to the fact that scholarship is deeply rooted in the social order and its inequalities, in the legislation that reproduces these as well as in systems of schools and learning. It is this that makes these cleavages so resilient. The ethno-national perspectives were conceived on a symbolic map of hierarchically arranged differences. The competing stances evolved along intra-regional, inter-ethnic dividing lines. In Transylvania as well as in Hungary advocates of national reform measured their own standing against that of their ethnic neighbors, thus creating a permanently challenged and rebuilt civilizational hierarchy of the domestic “other.” The contrast between them illustrates how groups that were already positioned differently in the socio-cultural and political system were brought into the discourse of nationality as distinctive loci in their internal developments. Locating the peculiarities of *Landeskunde vis-à-vis* German state science, I have argued that local practices of this German tradition of scholarship in a predominantly Protestant, German-speaking milieu were framed by emerging vernacularist movements. The scope and end of these scholarly projects was decisively shaped by the nationalization of politics and public life—proving that contemporary patriotism was multifaceted and comprised of seemingly antagonistic elements: attachment to the locale, to the province or land, and loyalty to an ethno-linguistically conceived nation, but also a feudal identity. The ethno-cultural differences constituted a clear divide between the competing regional Hungarian and Saxon patriotisms (to which one should add a third, Romanian one). I have mentioned the discrepancy between the territorial and national scopes of German and Hungarian *Landeskunde*, which Otto Dann and Miroslav Hroch attribute to the existence of administrative entities and micro-regions without clearly defined political borders, similar to Moravia or Alsace.⁵² Transylvania was such a territory, and indeed,

⁵² Otto Dann and Miroslav Hroch, “Einleitung,” in Otto Dann, Miroslav Hroch and Johannes Köll, eds, *Patriotismus und Nationsbildung am Ende des Heiligen Römischen Reiches* (Cologne: SH-Verlag, 2003), 9–18.

its inhabitants have retained a complex array of national, ethnic, religious, intra- and extra-territorial identifications until the present day.

These characteristics, obsolete as they might have seemed in the French, English or North-American context, were by no means peculiar to the province of Transylvania but characterized the entire Holy Roman Empire, as Dann and Hroch have pointed out. The two authors attest to a proliferation of political identities in a disintegrating state, where diverging and overlapping allegiances competed with each other. Patriotism itself was in a process of transformation: in the time frame of my essay it ceased to signify exclusively the political ethics of the nobility, i.e. the corporate rights which they enjoyed in exchange for loyalty to the territory, and started to associate itself with the modern engagement to the social, to the *bonum commune*. Dann and Hroch distinguish between “conservative” and “reformist” patriotisms in the states and administrative units of Holy Roman Empire. The first category comprised the feudal *Landespatritismus* of the political elites and the state/administrative unit-oriented patriotism of the non-elites, while the second involved the actual “reform-patriotism” of the social modernizers, and a national patriotism founded on the constitutional rights of their individual members. As my case study illustrates, the scientific-scholarly aspect of patriotism blurred the boundary between these distinct categories, especially towards the end of the eighteenth century, when scholarly modernization became attached to the novel linguistic nationalism. The political arch-conservatism of György Aranka was nuanced by learning, and *vice versa* the “modern” scholarly attitude of the Göttingen professor Schlözer and his Transylvanian Saxon circle bore the stamp of social elitism.

CHAPTER TWENTY-THREE

REFLECTIONS ON PATRIOTISM IN POLISH LITERATURE IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

Teresa Kostkiewiczowa

Samuel Bogumił Linde's *Słownik języka polskiego* (Dictionary of the Polish Language) published between 1807 and 1814, yet capturing the state of language awareness of the Polish tongue in the latter half of the eighteenth century, offers a single-word definition of "*patriotyzm*" (patriotism)—"*obywatelstwo*" (citizenship)—and exemplifies it with the following statement derived from a text published in an early-nineteenth century periodical: "From enlightened valor stems patriotism, which breathes solely the common weal, and heroism which devotes itself to it". In turn, according to the above-mentioned Dictionary, a "*patriota*" (patriot) is the "citizen [who] cares for his homeland's welfare with zeal, abiding by his homeland as if it were his own property." This denotation is exemplified with a quotation from the magazine *Monitor*: "Patriot, the citizen who persistently contributes to the common weal of his homeland with all that he can contribute and all that is of service to it." The main recurrent motif in both definitions is the "common weal" (the welfare of one's homeland) which constitutes the main determinant of patriotic attitude. However, this is quite a general formulation calling for a more precise description and more explanations. Therefore, the question arises: What does the good of one's homeland mean? Who is the addressee of the requirement of strivings for its implementation? Finally: What are the motivations behind the inclination to show patriotic attitude?

It is known that in early modern Poland, the duty to strive for the well-being of one's fatherland rested primarily with the nobility—the members of the "political nation" who were supposed both to protect by force of arms the country against enemies and to offer advice and participation in building its prosperity. At the onset of the Polish Enlightenment we find attempts to change the composition of the social circle of the people charged with the requirement of demonstrating patriotism.

In 1761, Tobias Bauch,¹ a burgher hailing from Toruń, and Wawrzyniec Mitzler de Kolof,² also a middle-class townsman who had come to Poland from Württemberg, started a weekly which bore the highly significant title: *Polak Patriota* (The Polish Patriot).³ Mitzler was a well-educated philosopher, physician, musicologist and publisher whose many-faceted activity made him an important protagonist of Polish Enlightenment culture; he was raised to nobility for his service and enjoyed the respect of a number of distinguished contemporaries.

*The transformation of the understanding of patriotism in
mid-eighteenth century periodicals*

Polak Patriota—being an implementation of the model of a moral periodical, so characteristic of the Enlightenment age—was addressed to the middle-class townsfolk whose professional occupation was also regarded as work for the common prosperity and well-being. Issue number two of the magazine included an article to explain the nature of its title and the meaning of the word patriot, defining him as an individual “who not only wishes the welfare of his beloved homeland in every respect but also works towards such welfare as far as he can.” It also emphasized the need for a broadly defined active attitude, a commitment to work for the benefit of one’s fatherland. The periodical was supposed to pursue educational goals by teaching middle-class townsfolk to regard their respective occupations in this light. At the same time, it sought to bring home to other social strata the importance and significance of the achievements of middle-class burghers in promoting the welfare of their fatherland. “The Polish Patriot” reinforced the notion that hard work and honesty are the main virtues of the middle-class burgher class, and emphasized the importance of

¹ The figure of Bauch is presented by Jerzy Dygdała, “«Toruńczanin» Tobias Bauch—redaktor warszawskiego ‘Patryoty Polskiego’ z 1761,” [Tobias Bauch of Toruń—the editor of the Warsaw *Patryota Polski* from 1761] *Wiek Oświecenia*, 19 (2003): 109–23, “Oświecenie północne.”

² For more on him see Mieczysław Klimowicz, “Mitzler de Kolof, redaktor i wydawca” [Mitzler de Kolof—editor and publisher], in Roman Kaleta and Mieczysław Klimowicz, *Prekursorzy Oświecenia* [Precursors of the Enlightenment] (Wrocław: Zakład Imienia Ossolińskich, 1953), 221–308.

³ For an extensive discussion of the periodical, see Roman Kaleta, “Monitor z roku 1763 na tle swoich czasów [The *Monitor* of 1763 against its contemporary background], in Kaleta-Klimowicz, *Prekursorzy Oświecenia*, 76–92.

upbringing and the acquiring of knowledge, the upgrading of one's occupational skills and the constant use of an enlightened mind. It also devoted space to women and their role in the life of the society, a motif which found a lasting place in Polish debates on patriotic attitudes. Although it was only published until the middle of 1763, the appearance of the periodical was an important sign of the change which took place in the second half of the eighteenth century in the understanding of patriotism.

Love of the fatherland and one's attitude towards the common weal was an issue also repeatedly discussed in the moralist periodical *Monitor*, published 1765–1785, even though the term “patriotism” was not frequently used on its pages. However, already in its early issues, the magazine's authors laid down its goals when they wrote that they planned to stigmatize both “debauchery” and indifference to the common good, as well as to “awaken virtue in some and strengthen it in others, and excite them to things that might be useful for mankind and society, advantageous for this country and serviceable for the entire nation.”⁴ The said common weal was conceived primarily in moral terms, whereas moral instruction for citizens—addressed to the nobility in the first place—promoting actions “of benefit to mankind” and the country, was understood as a manifestation of patriotism too.

Next to an extensive program to improve the customs and the ways one should think about the state, *Monitor* also initiated a debate on manifestations of love of the fatherland and the examples one should follow in this respect. Condemning private pursuits in which individual interests are put before the good of the community, the magazine's authors promoted a widely conceived notion of the fatherland which encompassed all inhabitants of the country. At the same time, they pointed to the interdependence of their lot and the situation from which a peculiar internal solidarity stemmed: “Just as the entire people make one family, the name of which is the fatherland, so does the happiness or unhappiness of it become a particular loss or a generosity for every individual.”⁵ Here we can find a budding understanding of one's fatherland in terms which go beyond social stratification and attempts to set on an equal level all actions which promote the common good, irrespective of their character. The citizens of the ancient republics

⁴ *Monitor* (1765), Issue No. 5.

⁵ *Monitor* (1765), Issue No. 23.

were cited as examples to be followed in one's love of fatherland: "True lovers of the fatherland find it pleasurable to bring to mind all those famous Romans adored throughout centuries. For them, the integrity of the fatherland was the best trait in every citizen. [...] Delighting only in service, they left profitless fame to their offspring as part of their praiseworthy heritage."⁶ They willingly saw the political system in ancient republics as an example to be followed by the government of the Polish Republic, whose citizens were encouraged to follow the example of ancient leaders and legislators. Issue No. 97 of 1767, read at one point:

In those and in the present Republic alike, the aim of all debate, effort [and] activity was the integrity of the peoples, that is: of the Republic, in keeping with the following sentence: *Salus populi suprema lex esto*, voiced and even more cherished in their hearts. The means to preserve the Republic undivided was their love of the fatherland, sucked in with their mothers' milk, multiplied in the course of years, lasting until death; and a love which vests each citizen with the duty to renounce any hope, give up wealth, undertake any work and effort, even sacrifice one's own life should a common benefit be derived from such conduct.

Pointing out personal examples to be followed by young Poles of the eighteenth century, *Monitor* reminded them that "the great Romans and Greeks served their homeland faithfully, were frugal when it came to their own needs, were generous for the public needs, paid off the debts of the poor, endowed orphans and supported the impoverished" (1767, Issue No. 33). Rooted in the tradition of the ancients and developed by the *Monitor*, the patriotic attitude featured complementary elements: putting the common weal before individual welfare and the readiness to sacrifice one's utmost personal property, including life, should the demands of war call for it. The requirement of solidarity with those in need was also becoming an increasingly evident part of the patriotic ethos, as love of fatherland—manifest in concrete activities and actions—was conceived as a virtue as much personal as social. Implementation of this virtue by the citizens of the Republic was seen as prerequisite to one's successful functioning in social and individual terms. It is important that the argument for abiding by this virtue was, on the one hand, the timeless moral code binding to the knighthood (and the noblemen later on) and, on the other hand, the tradition dat-

⁶ *Monitor* (1766), Issue No. 84.

ing back to ancient times from which descended dictates and examples of sacrifice for one's homeland.

Educational initiatives undertaken by the National Education Commission schools and other institutions after the first partition of Poland followed a similar direction. In the set of requirements addressed to the alumni of the Cadet Corps, founded in 1765, the question of "What a cadet should be like?" was given the following answer: "He should have love and fear of God and attachment to religion before his eyes; he should love his homeland and its welfare above all, and prepare to sacrifice himself fittingly in its service."⁷

The problem of patriotism after the First Partition

The first partition of Poland in 1773 as well as the Confederation of Bar—the latter being aimed as much against the interference of Tsarist Russia in the internal affairs of Poland as against the pro-Russian policy of the royal court—came as a severe shock to the citizens of the Republic. The two events also played an important role in shaping the way Poles perceived their homeland and their commitment to it. Many of them became subjects of foreign rulers and by virtue of this they found themselves in a situation where they had to put up with a host of disadvantages, losses and humiliation. The fundamental question arose: how to be a patriot under these new circumstances—in a situation where not only a part of the country's territory was lost, but where further threats to its sovereignty and integrity loomed as well. Literature took an active part in reflecting on this subject. In 1774, the literary magazine *Zabawy Przyjemne i Pożyteczne* [Pleasant and Useful Entertainment] carried a poem by a distinguished contemporary poet Ignacy Krasicki which was later to become *Hymn do miłości ojczyzny* [Hymn for Love of the Fatherland]:

Oh, holy love of beloved fatherland
 Only noble minds can feel you!
 If for thy sake, venomous poisons are tasty
 If for thy sake, the bonds and fetters are not insulting.
 You grace with honored scars the cripple's band,
 You breed true delights in one's mind.

⁷ *Katechizm moralny dla uczniów Korpusu Kadetów* [Moral Catechism for the Pupils of the Cadet Corps] (n., [1774]), 2.

If one can only help you, only support you,
One does not regret life in misery, nor death.⁸

The lyric is an expression of the new, post-partition experience and conveys a particular view of patriotic duties. Krasicki too conceives one's attachment to one's homeland and concern for its well-being as a virtue manifested in an individual's attitudes and behavior, however, at the same time, he points out the basic condition on which it can be fulfilled: "Only noble minds can feel you!". Thus, fairness in all walks of life is the prerequisite for and the foundation of patriotism. In this one can find echoes of events mentioned in parliamentary debates of the era of partitions, a time marred not only by corruption and treason but also by the plundering of crown property by people who allegedly acted in the public interest at a time when the criteria of what was good and what was wrong for the community were becoming vague.

However, Krasicki's poem introduces more novelty in regard of the hitherto prevalent understanding of what constituted actions for the common good. The requirement of sacrificing one's life in the defense of one's homeland, of shedding one's own blood and suffering wounds had been a component of the traditional patriotic ethos, however, under the new circumstances it was significantly reformulated and expanded. Not only sacrificial fight for the country but also the sacrifice of health and freedom and even the "bonds and fetters"—hitherto conceived as signs of humiliation and demeaning—have now become an expression of utmost sacrifice consisting not only in giving up the most essential determinants of human dignity for the sake of the supreme good but also in treating such sacrifice as "true delights."⁹ Emerging early in the time of partition, the linked ideas of personal doom and limitless sacrifice for the country—central to Polish Romantic writings—may be regarded as characteristic of weak and constrained communities which are not able to confront factors threatening their well-being and integrity. At the same time the poem expands and particularly intensifies those requirements which condition actions and behavior seen as

⁸ Works by Ignacy Krasicki quoted after: *Dzieła wybrane* [Selected works], ed. Zbigniew Goliński, 2 vols (Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1989).

⁹ This subject has been discussed at length by Roman Wołoszyński, "Tadeusza Mikulskiego rozprawa o hymnie 'Święta miłości kochanej ojczyzny'" [Tadeusz Mikulski's treatise on the hymn, "Holy Love of Beloved Homeland"], *Pamiętnik Literacki* (1959), vol. 3/4.

useful for the common good and thus constituting a manifestation of patriotism.

The redefinition of patriotism in Krasicki's poem was not the only proposal written down in Polish literature after the first partition of Poland. To a community which had been exposed to traumatic experience writers presented not only the ideas of patriotic ethos of particular maximalism as well as emotional and volitional intensity, but also formulated more concrete and practical indications stemming from the scrutiny of the recently experienced developments. Efforts to reinvigorate public affairs so as to preserve the independence of the remaining Polish land as well as activities aiming to unite the until recently opponents in different political groupings had become the call of the moment. All these issues were discussed by poets, too, who not only pointed out the political, social and moral causes of the drama of partition but also mobilized their readers to take steps to amend the situation. In his series *Satyry* [Satires] Ignacy Krasicki stigmatized the faults in his contemporaries, writing that "Blameworthy customs,/ recalcitrance, debauchery, licentiousness, follies bring about destruction to countries."¹⁰ In keeping with this, he called for concerted actions to save what was left:

Despair—divides the mean ones! Waves build up,
The tempest is near, the skies roar; the ship shall not sink,
When deckhands and skipper stand up in defense, in unison;
Though safer it is to leave the vessel and swim away,
'Tis more fair to stay on board, to save [it] or perish.

According to the poet, an active and responsible attitude and concerted activity which may save the "ship" of the Republic defined concern for the common good at that moment. The title of another piece by Krasicki—the poetical letter *O obowiązkach obywatela. Do Antoniego hrabi Krasickiego* [On a citizen's duties: To Count Antoni Krasicki]—announces that the poem is presenting a model of civic, i.e. patriotic, attitude to the contemporary Poles. Identifying himself with the community and at the same addressing it, the poet writes:

We are all children of one mother, and [our] mother is in distress.
Motherland—is an empty name for those who feel no virtue,
It is holy, gallant there where fairness still rules.

¹⁰ Ignacy Krasicki, "Satyra 1, *Świat zepsuty*" [Satire 1, Corrupt World].

It rules there where happiness is the aim of common fate:
The greatest honor of the free is to be a citizen.

Here, the poet makes ethics (“fairness”) the foundation for concern for “the common fate”, but immediately refers also to other arguments based on circumstances shared by all: “worthy of loving is the Country,/ the Country which feeds you, honors you, houses and protects you,/ the Country of which we are a tiny part, and an essential one.” In Krasicki’s analysis of civic duties, freedom and equality are the key notions, while exercising them, governed by reason and the laws, is the prerequisite for achieving the common happiness and well-being of the country:

Equality is the soul of freedom, and virtue gives rise to it,
The public affair is its own, to slaves it is foreign.
Where the master says—it is mine, the free one says—it is ours.
Feel your respectable privileges, my fellow countrymen.
He who is free has no masters but the law is his superior authority,
He knows his honor, and abiding by the law apace,
He is no rebel, but one that is warmed by virtue’s heat
When in the divisions he knows the hierarchy of the parts,
He serves the law, honors his brothers, pays tribute to the monarch.

Thus, the patriotic attitude is manifested by adherence to the principles of the republican system, free of erroneous interpretations and abuse, resting on the foundations of personal morality.

A similar direction is followed by other poets of the time in their reflections on citizenship and duties in respect of one’s homeland. In his ode *Na powrót senatorów* [On the return of the senators], Adam Naruszewicz—like Krasicki—saw effort on strengthening the country weakened by partitions as a patriotic duty. Also referring to the *topos* of the ship of state, he appealed to the inhabitants of the country: “Whoever is an honest descendant of Poles, / Grab the steering wheel and save what is left.” He also emphasized the indispensability of national consensus, and the need to refrain from the recent conflicts and differences, warning that further discord might lead to ultimate disaster:

Past discords, go to hell!
It is necessary for all to rise from the common ruin.
[...]
Defend the nation with the king and with the nation,
Otherwise, thoughts rack your mind to no avail,

'Cause when matters stay as they are,
You shall find your own exile in your own homes.¹¹

The poet's patriotic appeals—permeated by concern for the independent existence of the country's territories unaffected by the partitions—employed emotional persuasion but also referred to arguments devised to convince his audience that the interests and well-being of an individual are closely related to and even dependent on the situation of the country at large. In his *Oda o powinności człowieka w towarzystwie* (Ode on Man's Duty in Society), the author reminds his contemporaries that the traditions and institutions of the free state not only shape a man from his early years on but—first and foremost—safeguard the security and property of citizens, and if only for that reason people should care about the continuation and integrity of these institutions: "Homeland led your early years along virtue's lines, / Superior authority safeguarded your property with the laws, / A soldier generously sheds his blood on your behalf."

Poems by Naruszewicz also carry the belief that civic attitudes, duties towards one's homeland, are not only a moral requirement, that they are not only founded on the individual's virtue but also on an "organic" dependence of fellow countrymen on the efforts and labor of other members of the community. Love of the common good is not only a respectable virtue but also a necessity stemming from the indispensable need of benefiting from the common store of goods:

The roofing with which you shelter your home, where you find cover,
The robe which keeps you warm, the food that you eat,
All these imprint in your memory: when benefiting from others' toil,
Remember to be a hard working man.

Naruszewicz's reflection on civic attitude is founded on the belief—a seemingly commonsense one in this case—that social bonds are of an organic character, that the state is an integral body whose members are bound together by a network of mutual relations and commitments safeguarding individuals' benefits and common well-being alike. It is then that concern for the common good, and even the sacrifices made to this end, become the kind of behavior which testifies as much to the virtue of patriotism as to an accurate and selfless recognition of one's

¹¹ Naruszewicz's works are quoted after *Dzieła* [Works], 2 vols (Warsaw, 1778).

own situation within the common body. In this case, patriotism rubs elbows with utilitarianism and loses some of its solemn character and heroic color.

Changing understanding of tradition

The issue of native tradition—not only the political one but also as regards language, customs and even people's attire—played an important role in reflections on civic attitudes which developed in the period spanning the first partition of Poland and the Four-Year *Sejm* (Parliament) from 1788 to 1792. The notion that the republican system, which had taken shape in the sixteenth century, should be treated as a political pattern to be followed after being purged of distortions which had appeared along the way and which contradicted the very essence of it, found expression in journalism and *belles-lettres* alike. Such opinions were frequently voiced during the debates preceding and accompanying parliamentary deliberations. The statements of Stanisław Kostka Potocki—who pondered on the direction of change which should be implemented by the *Sejm*—are an illustration of such opinions:

I do not intend to shake the ancient principles of our government, I want to revisit them, I do not want to fill our country with novelties, I want to abide by those holy, ancient legal acts of ours among which Polish respected freedom and might flourished. [...] Our forefathers were enlightened enough to order the Republic and had enough courage to defend it once it was ordered. We, by following a different line, have lost all."¹²

This way of thinking about the past and present of the country was founded on the myth of honest forefathers instilled with a common consciousness which contributed to, among other things, the building of national pride and the strengthening of attraction to the homeland which boasted laudable political traditions and which in turn let the citizens enjoy civil freedom and influence over the government.

As well, concern for the improvement and development of the native tongue and letters was seen as a manifestation of patriotic atti-

¹² Stanisław Kostka Potocki, *Myśli o ogólnej poprawie rządu krajowego* [Thoughts on the general improvement of home government], [n. n.d.].

tude.¹³ The numerous opinions uttered on these issues included the imperative of following the example of foreign achievements based on universal values and, first and foremost, the imperative of availing oneself of Poland's own past accomplishments.¹⁴ Much space had been devoted to that matter already in the journal *Monitor*, which wrote in 1765 (Issue No. 10): "The honor and glory of the nation which rises to perfection always depends on education and the expansion of the native tongue". The author, Ignacy Krasicki, continued:

Only then shall we preserve things in their own order, shall we present ourselves as true lovers of our country, support our glory and surely make our language not unimportant, if not the number one. [...] The citizen who loves his country can by no means see his native language as abominable and, it seems to me, should he start hating the native tongue he would be violating himself.

This article also features the motif—frequent in discussions on the improvement of the native language—of a special role of women in this respect: "In every nation it has been confirmed by experience that the fair sex is the best in improving the language," because "nature has given their lips sweet attraction and ease of utterance that they always have all means of emotional movement with their mild ingenuity of language." Such a view, present in many writings devoted to the improvement of the native language, conceived as a sign of patriotic attitude, was formulated also by Józef Szymanowski, the author of *List o guście, czyli smaku* (Letter on Liking or Taste) (1779), in which he addressed women on this issue: "Should you, the fair sex, endeavor to endow the native tongue with the sweetness which comes so easily for you, should you celebrate the native Muse with a just caress from time to time, the nation shall owe the pleasant softness of the language to you [...]."¹⁵ Concern for the purity and beauty of the native

¹³ For more on this subject see Teresa Kostkiewiczowa, *Polski wiek światel. Obszary swoistości* [The Age of Enlightenment in Poland: Domains of peculiarity] (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 2002), 69–90.

¹⁴ Documents regarding discussions on this subject in *Ludzie oświecenia o języku i stylu* [People of the Enlightenment On Language and Style], ed. Maria Renata Mayenowa, vol. 1–3 (Warsaw: PIW, 1958).

¹⁵ Quote after Teresa Kostkiewiczowa and Zbigniew Goliński, eds., *Oświeceni o literaturze. Wypowiedzi pisarzy polskich 1740–1800* [The enlightened on literature: Opinions by Polish writers 1740–1800] (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 1993), 170.

language was seen as one of the ways in which women fulfilled their civic duties.

Discussion of national attire and customs—named by the researchers “a debate between the dress coat and the robe of an ancient Polish nobleman”—was another area where views on attraction to the fatherland became evident. In his *Oda do wąsów* (Ode to the Moustache), written in its first version in 1783, Franciszek Dionizy Kniaźnin treated the moustache as a distinct symbol of Polish nationality: “Let those who feel shame for their mothers, fathers and brothers, / Sneer at their country; / I, in turn, being proud of the native image / Being still a Pole, shall twirl my moustache.”¹⁶ From then on, the advocates of the traditional robe of the Polish noblemen and the followers of the dress coat transferred from the salons of Western Europe, voiced their opinions in dramas, occasional poems, novels and the press. The former treated the cultivation of the ancient style of dress as an expression of their bond with the native character and insisted that “giving up our own dress and donning a foreign costume stands for a preference of sorts and out of the latter rises indifference and, ultimately, contempt for one’s own country.”¹⁷ The latter insisted that those wearing the fashionable dress coats may also be virtuous citizens and brave defenders of the homeland. A particularly spectacular return to Polish costume took place at the onset of the Four-Year *Sejm* when the national dress became a symbol of a patriotic attitude and a factor rallying the community around the cause of national reforms.¹⁸ That attitudes towards the native language, dress and customs were among the issues discussed in connection with the understanding of patriotism points to the special importance of this question to Poles living in the latter part of the eighteenth century.

Patriotism, citizenship and the law

In 1777, in connection with the work on codifying the laws of the Republic, Józef Wybicki published his *Listy patriotyczne* (Patriotic Letters). The author—by then a well-known writer and political activist—

¹⁶ Quote after Franciszek Dionizy Kniaźnin, *Wybór poezji* [Selected Poems], ed. Waclaw Borowy (Wrocław: Wydaw. Zakł. Narod. im. Ossolińskich, 1948), 111.

¹⁷ Ignacy Krasicki, *Pan Podstoli* [Lord High Steward], preface and ed. Krystyna Stasiewicz (Olsztyn: Wyższa Szkoła Pedagogiczna. Wydaw., 1994), 14–15.

¹⁸ More on this phenomena in T. Kostkiewiczowa, *ocit.* 46–48.

addressed fourteen letters to the public in which he aimed at discussing basic problems of civil law and outlining changes needed in that respect. The word “patriotic” in the title of his publication was meant to point not only to the author’s commitment to the problems of his country but, first and foremost, to his perception of the work on the reforms as patriotic activity. In his arguments he often voiced the belief that putting the national laws in order and then observing them was a sign of striving for the common good and at the same time for the well-being of individual citizens.

In his first four letters, Wybicki puts forth his philosophical assumptions concerning the origins and early period of the communal life of human beings and the mutual relations between them. He promotes the view that, by the nature of things, man was meant to live in a community. He outlines the hypothetical frame of mind of people who started putting together organized communities: “Man sensed his existence; he learned that he was thinking; he saw that he was not alone; he felt and relished the love of his own well-being—therefore he thought immediately that remote isolation runs counter to his nature, his possessions and his most essential needs.”¹⁹ Thus, social life is an implementation of the human condition: “It is founded on the laws of the natural order of things created—it is unfringeable. It vests everyone who is in company with the duty to strive to keep so holy a union—it is natural.”²⁰ Living within a community, man “contributed to its benefits, because he found his own happiness in the common welfare.”²¹ Further development of human communities and the clashes between the self-love of individuals and the common interests resulted in the creation of public laws and bodies governed by these laws being adopted by a majority of the community. Thus, people should obey the common law which is binding on the entire human race as well as the particular, or civil, laws of “the state of which they are members.” After all, the laid down laws are in a way rooted in the natural law: “The community is always the work of nature, and the civil state is but its perfected form.”²² Civil law is the foundation of common welfare, but it is based on coexistence of benefits and responsibilities: “Through the clear description of each and everyone’s duties and permitted

¹⁹ Józef Wybicki, *Listy patriotyczne*, ed. Kazimierz Opałek (Wrocław: Zakł. im. Ossolińskich. Wydawnictwo, 1955), 15.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 14–15.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 16.

²² *Ibid.*, 29.

benefits, under the government's guard security and freedom arose for everyone."²³ At the same time, the "legislative power"—as Wybicki calls it—based on natural law is situated at the very center of social life and constitutes a fundamental value of communal life. In order to describe its importance Wybicki uses terms which had been hitherto applied to devotion to one's homeland and patriotic attitudes: "Great people knew this, and they confirmed the truth with great examples, putting obedience and respect for the laws before their own lives."²⁴

Such a way of thinking about the state, and the place citizens occupy in it, is what is presented to contemporary Poles in *Listy patriotyczne*. In a direct appeal to his readers, Wybicki offers the following summary of his arguments:

My dear nation, respected fellow citizens, [...] I have proved the need to have a government and laws. Because I wanted to convince you that as people you should fulfil your innate duties, [you should] desire a community; as citizens—also through nature's order—you should desire a government and obey and fulfil the established laws, so that you can stay in a happy society.²⁵

Thus, according to Wybicki, the duty to demonstrate patriotic behavior stems from the very fact of being a human being and a citizen belonging to a defined community. Regarding concern for the matters of the community as the duty of every member of it, the author, unlike the representatives of patriotic attitudes presented so far, perceives motivation for this duty not in the domain of morals but in natural law and, by the same token, endows it with the attribute of necessity and indispensability. Failure to fulfil duties which stem from this law is seen as both a departure from the strivings to attain one's own individual happiness and an obstacle on the road to welfare for all.

What are the consequences of such an understanding of the origins and essence of patriotism? First of all, it is a requirement that concerns all people of all estates, which are duty-bound to take care of the common well-being and benefit jointly and severally from such well-being. Wybicki insists that only "the agreement of all estates and justice for all gives the state an unfringeable foundation; [it] makes [the state] strong, because it peoples it and makes it rich."²⁶ The author devotes

²³ Ibid., 26.

²⁴ Ibid., 33.

²⁵ Ibid., 34.

²⁶ Ibid., 53–54.

much space to this issue and revisits it in the closing part of his letters which sums up his entire argument. He argues that the laws, the objective of which is to ensure the integrity and happiness of the state, at the same time strengthen the civil freedom of its citizens. On this issue he addresses a direct appeal to his readers:

If such is your way of thinking now, fellow citizens, I would like you to ponder in minute detail whether the *conservation and happiness* of the country's inhabitants is the goal pursued by the supreme authority and the intention of national laws, as it is an infallible truth that such a society shall be composed of particularly numerous and useful members which shall show the utmost care for conservation of members in a united body.²⁷

The greatest prosperity and satisfaction reigns in those countries where "the legislative power shows care for public happiness, i.e. the happiness of the humblest inhabitant of the country."²⁸ Hence the necessity to ensure equal rights to the townspeople and concern for the lot of the peasants. Wybicki regards actions in that direction as a sign of love of the fatherland and a component of the patriotic attitude, which finds expression also in the specific persuasive rhetoric frequently used in the "Letters":

Out of love for mankind and love for your country, free the towns from the burdensome tyranny imposed by many! Restore to them freedom which, having improved the lot of the townsfolk, will improve their way of thinking so that they rise from the stupor and barbarity in which they remain through the oppression by district heads and all sorts of offices.²⁹

However, at the same time, retaining all established rights by all members of the community is not an expendable requirement: "The civil law is a rule for every man in the society—how he is supposed to behave in front of others and how others are supposed to behave in front of him."³⁰ The thirteenth letter, summing up the work's argument, presents a specific code of patriotism for people living in a republican state governed in accordance with the fundamental requirements of natural law:

²⁷ Ibid., 257 (emphasis by the author).

²⁸ Ibid., 258.

²⁹ Ibid., 252–53.

³⁰ Ibid., 268–69.

I know the law and I should live only according to what it wills. I know what gave me an order, so no one can order me to do a different thing. I committed an offence—and I refer to the laws to see what sort of punishment is ahead of me. I did a praiseworthy thing—and I know that praise will not miss me. I live convinced that there is nobody in the company who would control my life, honor and property but only *legislative power*—here, fellow citizens is *freedom*, here is the lot of the *free people!*³¹

In Wybicki's reasoning the sphere of patriotic principles stemming from natural law is completed by a repertoire of concrete requirements related to the Republic's social and political reality after the first partition of Poland. Thus, the author confronts his contemporaries with the duty to start actions aimed at increasing the country's population as indispensable to stimulating economic activity and economic consolidation. He calls for legislation which would elevate the rank and social standing of the townsfolk, promote the growth of trades people, commerce and manufacturing, the emergence of new workshops and the domestic production of consumer goods. He proposes for consideration the question of the legal status of the peasants and the necessity to make changes in this respect. Finally, he stipulates a reform of the judiciary and more intensive work on the reform. All these actions are treated as an indispensable manifestation of patriotic concern for the common weal and the collective prosperity of the inhabitants of the country whose situation and interests are related to the natural bonds of belonging to one entity. From such a point of view, patriotism—or the practical implementation of the requirement of concern for the common well-being, i.e. of love of the fatherland, in keeping with traditional rhetoric—did not assume the emergence of a conflict between the individual and collective interests, nor did it call for putting the common welfare before the strivings of individuals, as both of these areas were inseparably tied together and determined by each other. The patriotic attitude was to a lesser degree seen as an expression of beliefs of an ideological character, as it assumed a utilitarian character.

To sum up, Wybicki's "Patriotic Letters" contained an understanding of patriotism as an attitude which stemmed from natural law and demanded joint actions from the organically understood community, an understanding which was new to the Polish way of reflecting on

³¹ Ibid., 293 (the original author's emphasis).

patriotism. From this point of view, the sphere of personal ethical motivation and emotional attitudes—hitherto seen as the foundation of patriotism—became merely a component of a persuasive rhetoric which strengthened the rational belief that work for the common good was indispensable.

True and false patriotism

Polish authors' reflections on patriotism unfolded within the context of Poland's internal developments and external political situation, and referred to behavior and rhetoric used by the parties and groupings taking part in public discourse. Throughout the period of the Four-Year Sejm, patriotism became a slogan used and abused by representatives of different orientations who demagogically exploited the positive tinge present in the term's meaning. This situation was described by Franciszek Salezy Jezierski, the author of the characteristically titled book *Niektóre wyrazy porządkiem abecadła zebrane* (Selected words collected in alphabetic order). Published in 1791, it has the form of an encyclopaedic dictionary which, with a dose of irony, perversity and surprise describes arbitrarily selected notions and terms and uses these descriptions as an opportunity to criticize blameworthy behavior and formulate positive guidelines. The entry on Patriotism first refers to the Latin origins of the word and—in keeping with a long tradition—Roman models of such an attitude: "Mucius Scaevola, the Fabiuses, the Catos, the Brutuses, these are the heroes of patriotism."³² Pondering on the contemporary functioning of the word, he notes that: "Being the love of your homeland, Patriotism does not have a form of its own, just as spirit does not have a natural form, it merely invented an image of sorts for the sake of one's senses." That was why—according to Jezierski—in contemporary Poland, too, patriotism assumed different, sometimes surprising shapes, "and thus [you have] a Muscovite patriot, a Prussian patriot, a fellow-traveler patriot, a patriot who is a friend of a greater patriot, an aristocratic patriot... Where can you find a patriot in his true essence? One who would stand up against

³² F. S. Jezierski, "Niektóre wyrazy porządkiem abecadła zebrane i stosownymi do rzeczy uwagami objaśnione" [Selected words collected in alphabetic order and explained with pertinent remarks], in idem, *Wybór pism* [Selected writings], ed. Zdzisław Skwarczyński (Warsaw: PIW, 1952), 235–36.

himself to bring about the public welfare should a need demand it?" The author seems to approve of the classic understanding of patriotism as sacrifice for the benefit of the community whereas his ironic argument stigmatizes things that are only "superficial signs" which in turn are not "solid guides to truth." Reproaching even the "patriotic caps" worn during the parliamentary deliberation by people who saw themselves as members of the patriotic party, Jeziński warned against demagoguery which exploited the positively charged word to smoke-screen strivings which had nothing to do with the welfare of their homeland.

Parallel to the book by Jeziński, an anonymous author published a piece called *Katechizm narodowy* (National Catechism). The work affirmed unequivocally the presence of true and false patriotism in the public domain and put forth determinants of the two opposing attitudes. The profile of the true patriot is drawn first through negation of negative traits which are the opposite of patriotism—clandestine actions, hypocrisy, intrigues, fraud, striving to benefit financially from public activity—and only then by listing the positive features such as: "honesty, the strength of one's spirit or bravery, sober mind, faithfulness, and attraction to the public well-being," these being followed by "justice [...], perseverance in the good, virtuous and continuous hatred of traitors and all those who are our homeland's enemies."³³ The false patriot, in turn, is a man who is corruptible, uses a mask, is treacherous, self-conceited and uppish, one who "sees nothing but his own advantage under the cover of public weal."³⁴ Significantly in this case, the reflection on patriotism does not focus on comprehension of the very notion of it, but—in a way referring to occurrences known in public life—it relates to the conduct of people who lived in Poland's political reality of the closing decade of the eighteenth century. We are dealing here with a specific updating of the notion of patriotism and a "delineating of its meaning under the influence of behavior demonstrated by public figures. The duties of the citizen—including the requirement of defense of homeland "against enemies at home and abroad"—are also formulated from this point of view.³⁵ Whereas in the 1770s pursuit of national unity was an important component of

³³ [Anon.], *Katechizm narodowy* [National catechism] (Warsaw, 1791), 10, 13, 14.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 10.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 7.

the patriotic attitude, now the true patriot was required to be able to clearly differentiate between internal opposition and “never allow himself to be deceived” by those who act to “attain an office or an honor.”³⁶ Here we come across a manifestation of patriotism which may be called an updated one, shaped in reference to a concrete social and political situation of the community.

However, parallel to that, this very same publication carries a new motif in reflections on patriotism. Love of fatherland is founded not only on the ethical plane, it is buttressed not only by the natural law: it is built on joint experience of the same land, nature, history, culture and interpersonal relations:

This, which is commonly called fatherland, is the vastness of land composed of people whom we call inhabitants, [it is] studded with towns, villages, cabins, woods, bushes, rivers and the like. In a word, this is the country from which we derive the order of life. It is here that you can find the attributes we like most and which are worth our special respect, i.e. parents, relatives, friends, fellow citizens, laws, customs etc., towards which we develop an attraction, through duty and addiction alike.³⁷

It is only thanks to all these factors that you can build the foundation for patriotism, bound together by experience and emotions, the domesticated nature and jointly created culture as well as a union of rights and duties. In this respect *Katechizm narodowy* is an important document of a wider, cultural and not solely institutional or political understanding of fatherland and patriotism.

However, the course of historic events brought ever stronger bearing on the way patriotism was discussed and comprehended. Following the Confederation at Targowica, the *Sejm* deliberations at Grodno and the second partition of Poland, right at the time of the Kościuszko Insurrection a brochure entitled *Co to jest być prawdziwym patriotą* (The meaning of being a true patriot) was published.³⁸ It had been written during the hard times of uprising and clashes and the growing radicalization of the social mood which turned as much against the foreign, brute force of the Tsarist army as against the domestic traitors

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid., 3.

³⁸ Kazimierz Hoszkiewicz was credited with its authorship. See Józef Szczepaniec, “Co to jest być prawdziwym patriotą?”—jakobińska broszurka z 1794 roku. Zagadnienia autorstwa i tekstu” [The meaning of being a true patriot—a Jacobin brochure of 1794: Problems of authorship and text], *Ze Skarbca Kultury*, 24 (1973): 25–26.

and supporters of the foreign power. Hence the extent of reflections which focused on pointing out behavior and views which ran counter to the love of homeland and patriotism. "There has never been a more praiseworthy word in the Republic than patriotism or patriot; alas, there are so few willing to learn the meaning of the word and, equally, so few who deserve it,"³⁹ says the author early in his work and proceeds to indicate attitudes antonymous with the true love of fatherland. Therefore he stigmatizes "the scoundrels" who "dared to veil their crimes and the sale of the country behind the name of patriotism."⁴⁰ He denies the right to bear this name to those who pay lip service to their attraction to the country without committing themselves to actions for its well-being, as well as those who persist in their attraction to the "ancient spirit of aristocracy"⁴¹ and refuse to stop believing in the privileges of the nobility: "Worshiping the slogan *Freedom, Unity, Independence* while keeping the former, the middle and the latter as solely one's own property does not stand for being a true patriot,"⁴² as it is a sign of class egoism which runs counter to the patriotic attitude. The patriot is not a faint-hearted man who scares others with stories of the preponderance of the enemy forces nor one who forgets about the principle well-tested in the past which said that "though lesser in might, the Pole resisted the more powerful and won."⁴³

Hoszkiewicz starts his list of traits of the true patriot by laying in the foreground the moral foundation on which the love of homeland should rest:

Oh, virtue! Thou art the scales of the world and a warrant of free nations, the spring of republican government and a consolation for the oppressed on earth [...] Virtue is the foremost feature of him who wishes to be a patriot, virtue and religion alone are the foundation and the spring of republican government. Virtue alone can be the [underlying] principle of the laws, the retractor of vice and the cause of eager obedience to national laws. Therefore if you wish to be a true patriot, first arm yourself with virtue and only then with gallantry and weapons.⁴⁴

³⁹ [K. Hoszkiewicz], *Co to jest być prawdziwym patriotą* [The meaning of being a true patriot] (Warsaw, 1794), 7.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 8.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 10.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 12.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 15.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 17 and 19.

Outlining the history of the emergence of monarchy based on inequality, followed by despotism and tyranny as a consequence of people's departure from virtue, the author insists that only those citizens can be true patriots who are

free of prejudice, agreeing with each other in unanimous accord, reasonable in laying down the laws, zealous and obedient in exercising them, agreeable in countenance, modest in using all sorts of commodities and so zealous for the integrity of their country in a host of ways that they would offer their lives in sacrifice for it, as if it were nothing.⁴⁵

In this case however, the emphasis on the moral basis of patriotism is not identical with the belief boasting a long tradition in reflections by Polish authors and expressed in, among other works, the *Hymn do miłości ojczyzny* by Ignacy Krasicki. Earlier on, virtue had been a personal and individual virtue, now it came to be understood as a social feature and as such it would manifest itself in civic behavior, and one that is implemented by the entire community. The author cites "The Spirit of Laws" by Montesquieu and insists after the French thinker that "within the republic and within the government which governs the commons, where the people govern themselves and the entirety of the nation, [...] virtue is necessary, good laws and strict customs are necessary,"⁴⁶ otherwise the country would suffer a downfall. Virtue and patriotism resting on the foundation it offers become manifested in civic life which is governed by laws adopted by all estates, ones that put each estate under the obligation to serve the community: "Being a true patriot means being a perfect and faithful servant of the estate [one] adopted, as 'a patriot soldier', 'a patriot minister', 'a patriot judge', 'a priest patriot', 'a merchant and craftsman patriot', and 'woman patriot'"⁴⁷—each of them in their own way contributing to the common weal. However, all of them are animated by the "spirit of true patriotism," which

unites people with people, does not differentiate between estates, makes them mutually useful, worships religion as the homage owed to God and despises superstition as a pestilence which poisons true virtue and simple customs, empowers only virtues and abilities while eradicating

⁴⁵ Ibid., 21.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 23.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 24–26.

from its soil the intrigue, pursuit of private interest and appearances as if they were bad seed.⁴⁸

That spirit of patriotism has nothing in common with vehemence and harassment, it is

full of discretion in the face of weaknesses and errors and equally severe [when it comes] to any obstinacy, it is generous when it comes to misery and serious adversity, and reasonable in investigating any lie, shows eagerness in offering enlightenment to those for centuries abandoned in slavery's darkness through tyranny's privilege and despotism.⁴⁹

Consequently, this is not the spirit of scornful radicalism but one of calm level-headedness which strives to secure agreement and collaboration with what is the genuine concern for the homeland seen as a value for all estates. The author appeals for the defense of such understanding of the homeland by "all in common" fellow citizens and tries to instill in them the spirit of patriotism and the will to fight for an existence independent from tyrants and despots.

The concept of patriotic spirit evident in his brochure came as a response to the political situation at the time and the needs of the Kościuszko Insurrection and, at the same time, as a demonstration of mature thought on the national community and unity supported by universal ideas of freedom and equality of people. This concept may be regarded as a key component of Polish eighteenth-century understanding of patriotism which had a significant impact on the political discourse in the years to come.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 22.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 22–23.

CHAPTER TWENTY-FOUR

REPUBLICAN AND MONARCHICAL PATRIOTISM IN POLISH POLITICAL THOUGHT DURING THE ENLIGHTENMENT

Arkadiusz Michał Stasiak

The Enlightenment was a period during which the multi-dimensional shape of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth—its territorial and political unity—was under threat and indeed eventually collapsed. This influenced the frequency of references to patriotic allegiance, often in connection with accusations towards other peoples as responsible for the crisis of the fatherland. The present analysis seeks to understand the logic of patriotic discourse during the Enlightenment, focusing on Polish political thought between the 1730s and the 1790s. The most valuable sources for my study are political treatises. Few previous studies have dealt with these in connection to the question of patriotism. Urszula Świdarska¹ and Andrzej Walicki² have written about the perception of patriotism from the perspective of intellectual history, while Richard Butterwick³ has done so mostly from a biographical perspective. In my own research, I have analyzed the idea of patriotism during the Enlightenment in terms of a process of transition between different cultural structures.⁴

¹ Urszula Świdarska, *Szlachta polska wobec Boga i ojczyzny* [The Polish nobility's attitude towards God and fatherland] (Poznań: Księgarnia Świętego Wojciecha, 2001); eadem, "Patriotyzm polskiego rycerstwa i szlachty na przełomie średniowiecza i czasów nowożytnych" [The patriotism of the Polish knighthood and nobility between the Middle Ages and the modern age] *Przegląd Zachodniopomorski* XV (2000) 1: 105–16.

² Andrzej Walicki, *Trzy patriotyzmy: trzy tradycje polskiego patriotyzmu i ich znaczenie współczesne* [Three patriotisms: three traditions of Polish patriotism and their present-day importance] (Warsaw: Res Publica, 1991).

³ Richard Butterwick, "Stanisław August Poniatowski—patriota oświecony i kosmopolityczny" [Stanisław August Poniatowski—An enlightened and cosmopolitan patriot], *Wiek Oświecenia* XV (1999): 41–55.

⁴ Arkadiusz Michał Stasiak, *Patriotyzm w myśli konfederatów barskich* [Patriotism in the thought of the Bar confederates] (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 2005); idem, "Nagroda i kara. Źródła patriotyzmu według Michała Wielhorskiego" [Reward and punishment: Sources of patriotism according

The period in question was marked by the arrival of “Enlightenment ideas” in Poland. In turn, the dominant early modern framework of identification was the culture of Sarmatism.⁵ However, one cannot write about the two cultures as contrary to each other. It is also impossible to analyze such phenomena as Sarmatism and Enlightenment with cognitive methods applicable for example to the history of the Northern Wars, the publication of the French *Encyclopédie* or the life of John Locke. These cultural phenomena did not exist just as wars or books. I therefore use the terms Sarmatism and Enlightenment as ideal-types. Theoretically they may be defined as pragmatic presuppositions, i.e. values agreed upon in a cognitive process and taken into account in formulating a narration.⁶

to Michał Wielhorski], in Urszula Borkowska, Czesław Deptuła, Ryszard Knapieński et al., eds., *Peregrinatio ad veritatem. Studia ofiarowane Profesor Aleksandrze Witkowskiej OSU z okazji 40-lecia pracy naukowej* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 2004), 499–506; idem, “Jedność istnienia i postrzegania. Umiarkowanie republikański wymiar patriotyzmu jako indywidualnej relacji wobec ojczyzny” [Unity of existence and perception: A moderately republican dimension of patriotism as individual relation towards the fatherland], in Janusz Drob, Hubert Łaskiewicz, Arkadiusz M. Stasiak et al., eds., *Kościół, kultura, społeczeństwo. Prace ofiarowane Profesorowi Wiesławowi Müllerowi z okazji pięćdziesięciolecia pracy naukowej i dydaktycznej* (Lublin: Werset, 2004), 535–42; idem, “Przedmonarchistyczna idea oświeceniowego patriotyzmu” [The pre-monarchist idea of Enlightenment patriotism], *Roczniki Humanistyczne* LIII (2005) 2: 73–89.

⁵ Sarmatism was a cultural form dominant in the Republic of Poland from the end of sixteenth century till the end of the eighteenth century. It had a significant influence on shaping the mentality, customs and ideology of the Polish aristocracy. The main political values of Sarmatism were the political and civil freedom of the nobility and a form of government based on the community of noblemen. See Andrzej Walicki, “The Political Heritage of the 16th Century and its Influence on the Nation-building Ideologies of Polish Enlightenment and Romanticism,” in Samuel Friszman, ed., *The Polish Renaissance in Its European Context* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988), 34–60.

⁶ See Tadeusz Buksiński, *Interpretacja źródeł historycznych pisanych* [The interpretations of written historical sources] (Warsaw and Poznań: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1992), 113. Academic literature concerning pragmatic presupposition is more developed, see Edward L. Keenen, “Two Kinds of Presupposition In Natural Language,” in Charles Filmore and Terence D. Langedoch, eds., *Studies in Linguistic Semantics* (New York, Duke University Press 1971), 45–52; Haskell Fain, *Between Philosophy and History: The Resurrection of Speculative Philosophy of History within the Analytic Tradition* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1970), 5–61. All these interpretations have in common a reference to the theory of pragmatic presupposition by Robin George Collingwood. See R. G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1946), 226.

Sources of patriotism

In the mid-eighteenth century, patriotism in the Polish Commonwealth was seen in the context of contrasting public and private interest. This classical republican perception was shared by authors such as Jan z Dębion Dębiński⁷ and Stanisław Dunin-Karwicki.⁸ It was only the former king Stanisław Leszczyński who argued that caring for private interest is characteristic of human beings. The ideas of Leszczyński, uncommon in the political thought of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, were not accepted immediately. Stanisław Konarski, an author well considered by his contemporaries, wrote explicitly and repeatedly that caring for private interest excludes endeavors for public interest.⁹

In the theory of the early Enlightenment, Polish political writers such as Konarski,¹⁰ Kasjan Korczyński¹¹ and, at the turn of sixties and seventies, the journalist of the royalist journal, the *Monitor*, Józef

⁷ Jan Dębiński, “Mowa na consilium walnym lubelskim pro die 23 maj naznaczonym, anno 1707 miana przeze mnie jako posła województwa krakowskiego destynowanego” [Speech at the general Council of Lublin, held on 23 May 1707, delivered by me as a deputy designated by the Cracow voivodship], in Marian Skrzypek, ed., *Filozofia i myśl społeczna w latach 1700–1830*, vol. I, *Okres saski 1700–1763* [Philosophy and Social Thought 1700–1830: Vol I, The Saxon Period] (Warsaw: Instytut Filozofii i Socjologii Polskiej Akademii Nauk 2000), 519.

⁸ Stanisław Dunin-Karwicki, “Egzorbitancje we wszystkich stanach Rzeczypospolitej krótko zebrane a oraz sposób wprawienia w ryżę egzorbitancji i uspokojenia dyfidencji między stanami podany a przez szlachcica koronnego dany cenzurze statystów” [Exorbitances in all estates of the Commonwealth shortly collected, together with a way to tame these exorbitances and to pacify the diffidence between estates, given by a nobleman of the Polish crown for the consideration of politicians], in Józef A. Gierowski, ed., *Rzeczypospolita w dobie upadku 1700–1740. Wybór źródeł* [The Republic in the epoch of decline 1700–1740: Selected sources] (Wrocław, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich 1955), 231.

⁹ Stanisław Konarski, “O skutecznym rad sposobie albo o utrzymaniu ordynaryjnych sejmów” [On the efficient way of councils, or on keeping the ordinary diets], part II, in idem, *Pisma wybrane* [Selected writings], ed. Juliusz Nowak-Dłużewski (Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy 1955), 1: 203, 273, 281.

¹⁰ Idem, “O uszczęśliwieniu własnej Ojczyzny. Na czym dobro i szczęście Rzeczypospolitej naszej zaległo?” [On making our own fatherland happy: What does the good and the happiness of the Republic consist of?], in *Pisma wybrane*, w, 11: 379.

¹¹ Kasjan Korczyński, “Kazanie miane podczas solemnej o Duch Świętym Wotywy w dzień zaczęcia Sejmu Convocationis 7 maja 1764 r.” [A sermon delivered during a solemn votive mass to the Holy Spirit on the day of the commencement of the Diet of Convocation, 7th of May, 1764], in Kazimierz Panuś, *Kaznodziejstwo w Katedrze krakowskiej*, Vol I, *Od początków do czasów rozbiorów* [Preaching in the Cracow Cathedral: Part I, From the beginnings until the Partitions] (Cracow: Papieska Akademia Teologiczna, 1995), 448.

Epifani Minasowicz,¹² all asserted that the main sources of patriotism were education and religion. These were not new suggestions. Already at the end of the first decade of the eighteenth century, Stanisław Antoni Szczuka wrote that “by educating citizens the will towards serving the common good will be introduced.”¹³ However, it was only Antoni Wiśniewski in the “Saxon period”¹⁴ who provided a justification of Szczuka’s thesis. Wiśniewski, a Piarist and a professor of the Collegium Nobilium, followed the example of Cicero¹⁵ in stating that the education of the youth contributes significantly to creating patriotism. In this regard, any activities aimed at the development of education were a sign of love for the fatherland.¹⁶ This coherent vision led Wiśniewski to argue for the devising of a “political ethics”, a result of the educational process, which would lead to the advancement of the common interest.¹⁷

In general, divine providence and the Catholic religion as sources of patriotism held a long-lasting position in Polish political theory, at least up to seventies of the eighteenth century. Such a stance was quite widespread among republicans. Franciszek Rostworowski included in a letter to Adam Stanisław Krasiński the prayer: “Let the Holy Spirit direct their hearts towards the love of the Fatherland.”¹⁸ However, with the change in the intellectual climate in the eighties and the nineties of the eighteenth century such rhetoric could still appear in journalism or in propaganda, but no longer in normative political theory.

¹² *Monitor*, no. 97, 6 December 1769, 250.

¹³ Stanisław A. Szczuka, *Eclipsis Poloniae orbi publico demonstrata*, in J. A. Gierowski, ed., *Rzeczypospolita w dobie upadku*, 244.

¹⁴ “Saxon times” were the period of the reign of the kings from the Saxon dynasty of the Wettins covering the years 1697–1763, when the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was ruled by August II and then his son August III.

¹⁵ Marcus Tullius Cicero, *On divination*, ed. David Wardle (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 391–2.

¹⁶ Antoni Wiśniewski, “O etyce w ogólności,” [On Ethics in general], in idem, *Filozofia i myśl społeczna...*, ed. M. Skrzypek, I: 444; idem, “Mowa o korzyściach, jakie spłyną na Polskę z warszawskiej Akademii Szlacheckich Sztuk i Umiejętności,” in *Filozofia i myśl społeczna...*, [Speech on the benefits which will flow on Poland from the Noble Academy of Arts in Warsaw] I: 322.

¹⁷ Idem, *O etyce*, 490.

¹⁸ Letter of Franciszek Rostworowski to Adam S. Krasiński, 18 X 1769, in Henryk Schmitt, *Źródła odnoszące się do pierwszego okresu panowania Stanisława Augusta do r. 1773* [Sources connected to the first period of the rule of Stanislas August to 1773] (Lwów: Drukarnia Narodowa W. Manieckiego, 1884), 42.

The philosophical bases of the idea of patriotism in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the first half of the eighteenth century were fairly uniform. Political thinkers were largely inspired by concepts popular in the political thought of ancient Rome. For instance, Stanisław Leszczyński formulated his vision on love of the fatherland on the basis of Cicero's thoughts. He wrote:

If the general Justice led all our activities, would we then need supervision? She [Justice] is a bond uniting the subjects with the fatherland, she is this soul that pours into them the feeling of patriotism and makes them invincible wherever the defense of the fatherland is necessary.¹⁹

Justice, as all the virtues in the thinking of Marcus Tullius, had a value.²⁰ Our natural tendency towards these virtues was related to an "embryonic knowledge" about the most important things, a knowledge which becomes extended in the process of achieving the given virtue. Cicero's idea was adopted by Leszczyński who stated that patriotism was such an innate value which can be enriched by cultivation. Another view of hereditary patriotism was presented by Stanisław Herakliusz Lubomirski. This magnate, disrespectful towards the aristocracy and often called "a Polish Solomon,"²¹ instructed his sons that patriotism is a value which "...our ancestors left to us, so that the dignity of the house and the family does not die."²² This "aristocratic" vision of innate patriotism was different from Leszczyński's concept,

¹⁹ Stanisław Leszczyński, "O sprawiedliwości albo o prawach cywilnych i moralnych" [On justice, or on civil and moral laws] in idem, *Głos wolny, wolność ubezpieczający* [Free voice, insuring freedom], ed. Stanisław Jedynak (Lublin: Krajowa Agencja Wydawnicza, 1987), 42.

²⁰ Giovanni Reale, *Historia filozofii starożytnej*, vol. III, *Systemy epoki hellenistycznej* [History of ancient philosophy, vol. III, Systems of the Hellenistic epoch] (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1999), 544.

²¹ Józef Andrzej Gierowski, "Stanisław Herakliusz Lubomirski jako polityk" [Stanisław Herakliusz Lubomirski as a politician], in Wanda Roszkowska, ed., *Stanisław Herakliusz Lubomirski. Pisarz, polityk, mecenas* [Stanisław Herakliusz Lubomirski: Writer, politician, patron of arts], (Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1982), 24.

²² Stanisław Herakliusz Lubomirski, "Instrukcja synom moim [do] cudzych krajów ode mnie wyprawionych, Teodorowi i Franciszkowi Lubomirskim, w Jazdowie. D. 29 Novembris A. 1699" [Instruction given to my sons, Teodor and Franciszek Lubomirski, sent by me to foreign countries, in Jazdow, 29 November 1699], in S. H. Lubomirski, *Wybór pism* [Selected writings], ed. Roman Pollak (Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1953), 273.

despite the fact that it was also based on Cicero's idea of virtue as an "embryonic" capability.²³

Rewards and punishments

Patriotism was also to be triggered by means of rewards and punishments. If one traces the development of such thinking in the sources from the turn of seventeenth and eighteenth century, it seems that the first to voice an opinion on this matter was Stanisław Dunin-Karwicki, a politician whose "head—as the historian Konopczyński put it—worked for the whole generation."²⁴ Karwicki suggested only indigenous rulers should be elected to the throne. The throne itself was to be a reward for distinguished service to the Republic, given to a person who is experienced and has performed meritorious service for the Republic.²⁵

Karwicki's thought was developed further by Stanisław Leszczyński. He spoke of reward to the meritorious and rivalry in striving for this reward. The remuneration for service to the fatherland was to be two-fold, the first being honor. He saw this value in dual terms: as the holding of an official position, but also as exhibiting the capability to carry it out. The throne was for Leszczyński the highest reward. In contrast with Karwicki, he provided a whole hierarchy of rewards for patriots. The other reward for love of the fatherland was fortune.²⁶ The call for material remuneration for service to the fatherland began in time to multiply in the writings of political theoreticians and continued till the end of the First Republic.

The concept of rivalry in service for the fatherland, which according to Karwicki is subject to rewards, was distant from Leszczyński's system. While the ex-king Leszczyński did not talk about rivalry, Karwicki proposed a punishment for faults committed against the fatherland,²⁷ a rivalry system which was left unspecified. Fifty-four years after the

²³ Eugeniusz Jarra, *Historia polskiej filozofii politycznej* [History of Polish political philosophy] (London: Księgarnia Polska Orbis, 1968), 215.

²⁴ Władysław Konopczyński, *Polscy pisarze polityczni XVIII wieku (do Sejmu Czteroletniego)* [Polish political writers of the 18th century (until the Four Years Diet)] (Warsaw: PWN, 1966), 33.

²⁵ Dunin-Karwicki, *Egzorbitancje*., 237.

²⁶ Leszczyński, *Głos wolny*, 85, 159.

²⁷ Dunin-Karwicki, *Egzorbitancje*, 241.

suggestion of Karwicki, Antoni Wiśniewski in 1757 indicated another aspect of punishment. "A person exiled from the fatherland, once he returns to her, loves her incomparably more than he did before."²⁸ This idea, taken from Ovid and based on the thought that the most excellent actions are preceded by the greatest evil, not only justified the punishment but also gave hope that exile from the fatherland does not exclude the highest degree of patriotism.²⁹ It was a double justification of the punishment for faults towards the fatherland, a justification which allowed sanctions to be applied without moral doubts about consequences, both in political practice and for public interest. Stanisław Konarski referred back to the thought of Karwicki. In the first part of the treaty *O skutecznym rad sposobie* (On the efficient way of [conducting] the councils) he presented a whole range of punishments for faults towards the fatherland, including confiscation of property, the depriving of political rights and exile.³⁰ Karwicki's concept has thus been completed with a sanction.

A multi-stage system of material and symbolic rewards and punishments as a manner to achieve an ideal patriotism was presented in 1775 by Michał Wielhorski. He perceived an opportunity to build an ideal country of "compulsory patriots" by means of rewarding and punishing the members of an otherwise equal and free community of citizens. According to his project, the rewards and punishments were to be accorded by the decision of the nation possessing the totality and exclusivity of political rights and being prior to the state.³¹ Wielhorski,

²⁸ A. Wiśniewski, *O uszczęśliwieniu człowieka w życiu* [On making man happy in life], in *Filozofia i myśl społeczna...*, vol. I, 446.

²⁹ Ovid, *Tristium Libri V* (Leipzig: G. B. Teubner 1897), 22–37. This thought emerged, I suppose, in the period of the exile of the author to Tomi on the Black Sea. The judgement in this matter, issued in 8 BC, was a personal decision of Octavian Augustus. The idea itself seems to be Ovid's argument to Augustus for his return. See Michael Drucker, *Der verbannte Dichter und der Kaiser-Gott. Studien zu Ovids späten Elegien* (Diss. Heidelberg, 1977), 3–10. Contrary to Ovid, Cicero did not predict the return to the fatherland of its enemies and traitors separated from patriots and gathered in one place from which the walls of the city separate us. For Mark Tullius they are guilty: alive and dead they shall suffer eternal punishment. Marcus Tullius Cicero, *In Catilinam oratio prima*, in M. T. Cicero, *Select Orations*, ed. Benjamin L. D'Ooge, (Chicago–New York–Boston: Sanborn & Co., 1915), 62–3.

³⁰ Konarski, *O skutecznym rad sposobie*, part I, 143.

³¹ Michał Wielhorski, *O przywróceniu dawnego rządu według pierwiastkowych Rzeczypospolitej ustaw* [On reestablishing of the ancient order according to the primordial laws of the Commonwealth] ([Paris], 1775), 113, 140–41, 200. See A. M. Stasiak, *Nagroda i kara*, 499–506.

being a deputy of the Bar Confederation in Paris, built his theory of patriotism from a foreign, French perspective. This theory might well have been a result of confrontation of his ideas with those of Gabriel Bonnot de Mably and of Jean Jacques Rousseau. In turn, these two representatives of French Enlightenment, inspired by Count Wielhorski, prepared projects for repairing the constitutional system of the Polish Commonwealth, which had been ravaged by the Bar Confederation (1768–1772). It is important to note that, on the whole, Polish political theory till the end of the First Republic did not adopt the idea, increasingly popular in Western Europe, that the source of patriotism was the command of the sovereign as a valid authority.

Another subject in the theoretical discussion on patriotism in eighteenth century Poland was the issue of xenophobia and cosmopolitanism. These factors had an important role in defining the shape of love of the fatherland. Polish political theoreticians expressed numerous complaints regarding their compatriots' xenophobia. They often pointed out the negative effects of isolationism. Already in the first part of the eighteenth century the intellectual elites described patriotism as openness towards foreign influences. It thus got close to cosmopolitanism, which used to be perceived as the contrary to it. This does not mean that the supporters of cosmopolitan patriotism turned to an absolute negation of Old Polish patterns. On the contrary, they often extolled the patterns of native culture, especially referring to the "ancient Polish virtues."

The idea of patriotism both as an act and as a sacrifice is easy to discern in Polish political thought. A true proof of love of the fatherland was an action for its interest, a constructive and peaceful act which did not need words, as it was equally meaningful in itself. According to these principles, which are especially present in Konarski, the fatherland shall not require from the citizens sacrifices and heroism. This was a pragmatic patriotism, so self-evident for the creators of this view, as consistent with *mind* and *nature*. In the period from the beginning of his work on the treatise, *O skutecznym rad sposobie*, until the time it was published, Konarski can be considered the main propagator of the ideology of the "patriotic act" in Poland.

The idea of patriotism as a sacrifice of life and property was often referred to in rhetorical discourse. Traditionalist speakers used to propagate the idea that real love of fatherland should be proved first of all on the battlefield. The emotional load of the idea made such

a perception of patriotism very popular, being “easier” to be accomplished during war than during peace. The concept of the patriotic act referred mainly to the view of fatherland as a polity. As this view was already present in the Renaissance period,³² the reference might have been a reference to tradition. I suppose that the feature of the past which was common to both concepts (that is to say, the idea of act and the idea of sacrifice), namely the pride in the past which was developing during the crisis of the Commonwealth, determined their mutual intertwining.

Models of patriotism: between traditionalism and republicanism

The patriotism of the period of the Saxon dynasty was still a moralistic patriotism linking republican and royalist motifs. A decisive influence on political thought regarding the problem of patriotism in this period was exerted by the specific type of intellectual sources. These were almost exclusively the works of Cicero—not only in aristocratic literature, but also for bourgeois thought.³³ Also, Polish humanist thought had a strong moralistic feature, and the moral philosophy of the Renaissance was also influenced by Cicero’s works. Cicero’s thoughts concerned only the obligations of an individual towards the

³² Ewa Bem, “Termin «ojczyzna» w literaturze XVI i XVII wieku. Refleksje o języku,” [The term “ojczyzna” (fatherland) in the literature of the 16th and 17th centuries: Reflections on language] *Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce* 34 (1989): 155. The author proves that the vision idea of fatherland as identical with the state appeared in Poland already in the works of Jan Kochanowski.

³³ “Patriota Polski. Kartka tygodniowa” [Polish patriot: A weekly page], XII, 88. From the beginning of the sixteenth century till the beginning of the seventeenth century the authors most often cited and studied were Plato, Aristotle and Cicero; see Jan Czerkawski, *Humanizm i scholastyka. Studia z dziejów kultury filozoficznej w Polsce w XVI i XVII wieku* [Humanism and scholasticism: Studies in the history of philosophical culture in Poland in the 16th and 17th centuries] (Lublin: RW KUL 1992), 156–57; Mariusz Karpowicz, *Sztuka Oświeconego Sarmatyzmu* [The art of Enlightenment Sarmatism] (Warsaw: PWN 1986), 152. In the first half of the eighteenth century the works of the Roman orator, especially those concerning the relationship towards the fatherland, seem to have been more popular than the works of his Greek antecedents. The case was similar in the second half of the seventeenth century; see Janusz Drob, *Trzy zegary. Obraz czasu i przestrzeni w polskich kazaniach barokowych* [Three watches: The image of time and space in Polish Baroque preaching] (Lublin: TN KUL, 1998), 190.

fatherland and the community (and not those of the fatherland towards the individual).³⁴

Thus two competing tendencies appeared in the patriotic discourse of the first part of the eighteenth century. One of them aimed at change and creating an efficient state, the other one was conditioned by tradition. The first one required socially responsible action, not words; the other one used the rhetoric of heroism and life sacrifice. Not surprisingly, these ideas were often intertwined in the works of individual authors.

The Polish aristocracy of the eighteenth century in general subscribed to a traditionalist ideological vision. For them the idea of patriotism as a sacrifice of life and property for the fatherland dominated. The members of the traditional community aimed at the revival of culture by instilling traditional values into the younger generation. One might argue that such a reproduction of political culture was nothing else than a cynical ideological construction aiming at preserving the social *status quo*. But if the term “political culture” is to be defined in a broader sense as political knowledge, ideas (including the key idea of patriotism) and views dominating in a given place and time, then we can analyze these phenomena in terms of political socialization. This socialization is the means thanks to which knowledge, ideas and views were transferred to the next generation. Examples set for the younger generation were important in this process. However, traditionalists heavily restricted any patriotic examples by grouping them into the canon of “Old Polish virtue.” Arguably, the omnipresent past led to the mental stagnation of this social stratum.

The critique of traditionalism was first articulated by the republicans. This group includes the bishop of Kamieniec, Adam Stanisław Krasieński, a consistent opponent of the political plans of the King Stanisław August Poniatowski. In his *Traktat o naprawie Rzeczypospolitej* (Treatise on the emendation of the republic) Krasieński saw the fatherland in three dimensions: communal (nobility), spatial (the territory of Poland) and institutional (the institutions of the state).³⁵

³⁴ Lech Szczucki, “Aspekty myśli polskiej XVI wieku” [Aspects of 16th century Polish thought], in L. Szczucki, ed., *Filozofia i myśl społeczna XVI wieku* [Philosophy and social thought of 16th century] (Warsaw: PWN, 1978), 14.

³⁵ Władysław Konopczyński, ed., “Biskupa Adama Krasieńskiego Traktat o naprawie Rzeczypospolitej” [Treatise of Bishop Adam Krasieński on the emendation of the Republic], *Przegląd Narodowy* 4 (1913): 348–59; and (vol. II) 5 (1913): 492–515. See too “List Józefa Wybickiego do Generalności, 1772 r.” [Letter of J. Wybicki to the

I suggest that for Krasiński patriotism depended on the quality of actions performed in the interest of the fatherland, and most of all on the coherence of love of the fatherland seen in these three dimensions. Thus his understanding might be defined as an unusually coherent vision of patriotism.

Another republican reading of the patriotic discourse was presented by radical republicans such as Michał Wielhorski and Franciszek Rostworowski. Like Krasiński, these republicans were opponents of the king and constantly in conflict with the royal court. In June 1770 Rostworowski sent to Wielhorski a letter regarding a political project devised by himself, entitled *Projet sur le gouvernement de Pologne*. In this letter Rostworowski demanded a reform whereby all ranks and positions would be made elective, including the choice of the king. The right to choose the king was, according to the author of the project, to be accorded to the aristocracy participating in regional diets. All elections were to be secret.³⁶ Rostworowski shared with Wielhorski the conviction that free and secret elections would allow the electors to choose according to objective criteria. Reflecting on the suggestions of Rostworowski, Count Wielhorski built his own view of patriotism:

If motivation is given for an honest and decent magnanimity, then the love of fatherland will be continually incited. Whatever high dignity one attains, there always exists a higher and more venerable one to be desired, thus the senators will aim at becoming commissaries and the commissaries ministers, whereas the ministers will try to fulfil their duties so carefully and seriously as to become worthy of obtaining them

Estates General, 1772], in Adam M. Skalkowski, ed., *Archiwum Wybickiego*, vol. I (1768–1801) (Gdańsk: Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauki i Sztuki w Gdańsku, 1948), 26; Jerzy Puttkamer, “Krótkie zebranie okoliczności, jakimi rozpoczęta, w postępach swoich pomnożona i dotąd utrzymana Generalna Konfederacja” [Short collection of circumstances through which the General Confederation was started, broadened in its progress and existing until now], *Archiwum Komisji Historycznej Polskiej Akademii Umiejętności* [Archive of the Historical Commission of the Polish Academy of Knowledge] (Cracow, 1930), 14: 75; Michał Karpowicz, *Kazanie na uroczystość imienin najjaśniejszego pana naszego miłościwego Stanisława Augusta króla pamiątkę ustanowienia orderu tego imienia* [Sermon on the festivity of the namesday of our gracious lord King Stanislas Augustus, to commemorate the establishment of an order bearing his name] (Wilno [Vilnius], 1786), A1r; Jan F. Nax, *Uwagi nad “Uwagami,” czyli obserwacje nad książką, która w roku 1785 wyszła pod tytułem Uwagi nad życiem Jana Zamoyskiego, kanclerza i hetmana wielkiego koronnego* [Remarks on “Remarks”, or observations on a book published in 1785 under the title “Remarks on the life of Jan Zamoyski, Chancellor and Great Hetman of the Crown”] (Warsaw, 1789), 155.

³⁶ Emmanuel Rostworowski, *Projet sur le gouvernement de Pologne*, AGAD, Zbiór Anny Branickiej 9, 15–28.

for a second or third time, and perhaps even of the crown as a final reward of their virtue, work and good features.³⁷

The core of the idea of patriotism as formulated by Wielhorski and Rostworowski was the rivalry of citizens who are free and have equal rights. In this rivalry only merits were supposed to be taken into account when deciding upon the subsequent level of political career.

The idea of the relationship to the fatherland formulated by these two proponents of radical republicanism were inspired by John Locke's "Whig" concept of state. Locke and his followers saw the state as the result of a social contract concluded in order to accomplish utilitarian goals, including building relationships above states and obeying the norms of social morality. According to the English philosopher, individuals create society, and society creates the state. The authorities were bound to protect the life, property and freedom of individuals. Public interest was for Locke the sum total of individual interests.³⁸ It seems that regarding social morality, the ideas of Locke were naturally closer to the Polish republicans than those of the French *philosophes*. This is seen in the fact that for the English philosopher one of the chief aims of the utilitarian state was the protection of Christian morality. In this concept morality was the fundament of the state institutions.³⁹ This norm and the relationship of the individual and the state resulting from it were eventually undermined by David Hume in his reflections upon the conflict between patriotism and morality.⁴⁰

Rousseau focused mainly on the notion of rewarding patriots. He noted that expenses of such a kind would be compensated twice thanks to the actions of *citizen-heroes* recruited by means of rewards.⁴¹ It may seem that this thought is close to the idea of rewarding radical republicans, a view especially propagated by Wielhorski. However, Rousseau proposed only symbolic rewards of honor. The rewards were

³⁷ Wielhorski, *O przywróceniu*, 320–21.

³⁸ Jules Steinberg, *Locke, Rousseau, and the idea of consent: An inquiry into the liberal-democratic theory of political obligation* (London: Greenwood Press 1978), 25–27, 57, 60–65.

³⁹ John W. Yalton, *Locke: An Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 55–56.

⁴⁰ See Dieter B. Stilz, "Hume, Modern Patriotism, and Commercial Society," *History of European Ideas* 1 (2003): 15; Alasdair MacIntyre, *Is Patriotism a Virtue? The Lindley Lecture* (Lawrence: University of Kansas, Philosophy Department, 1984), 4.

⁴¹ Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Considérations sur le Gouvernement de Pologne*, in *Oeuvres complètes de Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, ed. Jean Fabre, (Paris: Gallimard-Pléiade, 1964), 91.

to be a motivating factor for the citizens and simultaneously a form of limiting access to power. It appears that the philosopher from Geneva considered rewarding citizens only as a substitute value. According to Andrzej Walicki, Rousseau was in many issues “more Sarmatian” than Wielhorski.⁴² It is not surprising then that the philosopher warned the Sarmatians about the imminent dangers posed by the Europeanization of Poland.⁴³ This does not mean that in his didactic concept of patriotism Rousseau accepted the system of the Republic of Poland. In his “Considerations on the Government in Poland” he expressed his surprise that such an unusual state as the First Republic had survived for as long as it had.

Another Parisian “collaborator” of Wielhorski, Gabriel Bonnot de Mably, was of similar opinion on the matter of rewarding citizens. He wrote about heroes “being made” thanks to some laurel or oak leaves. He looked for the model of this system of honour rewards in ancient Rome.⁴⁴ Although Wielhorski was in intensive contact with Rousseau and Mably in Paris, his political vision was distant from their ideas. As Jerzy Michalski notes, for Rousseau patriotism meant love for the community and was an emotional value.⁴⁵ Such an idea of patriotism was far from the utilitarian views of Wielhorski and Rostworowski. However, the proposal of returning to the fundamental rights of the gentry state (expounded by Wielhorski and related to the substance of Rousseau’s philosophical assumptions) seems to be probably the only rhetorical argument directed towards the gentry, the principal addressees of the Polish republican discourse.

Polish republicans defined the fatherland mainly in state categories. This idea was in conflict with the traditionalistic view of the fatherland as a community. In propagating the love of the fatherland the republicans focused mostly on institutional-legal aspects. Here Wielhorski decided to enter in polemic with Rousseau. He did so, I suppose, from an intellectual position going back to John Locke, whose philosophy was in conflict with the ideas of Rousseau.⁴⁶ Significantly, neither

⁴² Andrzej Walicki, *Idea narodu w polskiej myśli oświeceniowej* [The idea of the nation in Polish Enlightenment thought] (Warsaw: Instytut Filozofii i Socjologii PAN, 2000), 31.

⁴³ Jerzy Michalski, *Rousseau i sarmacki republikanizm* [Rousseau and Sarmatian republicanism] (Warsaw: PWN, 1977), 61.

⁴⁴ Gabriel B. de Mably, *Zasady praw* (Warsaw: PWN, 1952), 1: 177.

⁴⁵ Michalski, *Rousseau i sarmacki republikanizm*, 59.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 33–34.

Rostworowski nor Wielhorski referred to Cicero. The ideas of Locke were sufficient for them to present the image of an emancipated individual within a state, built according to a republican model. While their ideas were not contradictory to those of Cicero, who assumed that “power should always apply to the cause which created the state,”⁴⁷ that is to say, the will of the society, they referred their constructs back to Locke’s philosophical assumptions. Locke stated that the great and superior goal for which people gather in communities and subordinate themselves to the government is the preservation of their property.⁴⁸ According to this rule, the criterion of the usefulness of authority was preserved as long as property was preserved—the property of life, freedom and fortune. In contrast to the traditionalist rhetoric, republicans (being compliant with the above mentioned rule) could not expressly state their readiness to sacrifice these values. Such an agreement—the antithesis of which was war—was for republicans paradoxically, as in Locke, both the condition and the result of the social contract.⁴⁹ Drawing on these ideas, it was Wielhorski and Rostworowski who introduced republican vitality and civic commitment in Poland.

Monarchical patriotism

The third main modality of the idea of patriotism during the last thirty years of the First Republic was monarchism. This was a trend which stood in fundamental conflict with the two other doctrines described above. This clash was due to the fact that traditionalism and republicanism were opposed to the king, and the function of traditionalistic and republican projects was the defense of aristocratic freedom in preference to the majesty of the king.

An ideal source for examining the monarchist understanding of patriotism is the royalist periodical, *Monitor*. Founded by King Stanisław August Poniatowski, it was meant to propagate his political assumptions and to be a forum where the main supporters of the royal camp could express themselves. In this magazine, originally edited by Ignacy Krasicki, an anonymous journalist in an article of 17th July

⁴⁷ M. T. Cicero, *De re publica*, ed. James E. G. Zetzel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 57–8.

⁴⁸ John Locke, *Two tracts on government*, ed. Philip Abrams, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 192.

⁴⁹ Yalton, *Locke*, 55–56.

1765—possibly Krasicki himself⁵⁰—concluded his reflections on the relationship between common interest and private interest thus: “The truth is clearer than the Sun: where the community is happy there the individuals will eventually also become happy.”⁵¹ The dependence of private interest on common happiness expressed by a naturalistic comparison was not new. Despite the fact that this idea was often mentioned in *Monitor*,⁵² it did not become a reflection characteristic of the period of the Saxon rulers. In contrast to Leszczyński and Konarski,⁵³ who also reflected on these issues, the anonymous authors of the magazine did not elaborate on the contents of public interest or on the cause of this dependence. Is this a sign of the decline of moralistic patriotism of the “Saxon period”? In any case, other sources outside *Monitor*, the authors of which were persons close to Stanisław August, as well as the monarch himself, also avoided elaborating on the theory of patriotism. So the discourses in *Monitor* are probably representative for the group in question, i.e. the royalist camp.

It was also not a new idea that the contributors of *Monitor* searched for sources of patriotism in the education of citizens. But service of the fatherland had, according to these authors, two more sources: law and divine providence.⁵⁴ Although in the previous “Saxon era” greater emphasis was put on establishing laws rather than applying them, their vision of patriotic education was, in my opinion, similar to the concepts of the preceding era, especially to Konarski’s. Similarly, perceiving divine law as a source of the love of the fatherland was common and valid throughout the described period. The cited issue of *Monitor* of July 1765 appears to be the first Polish eighteenth-century text in which natural law is identified as the source of patriotism. What may be surprising is that none of the discourses of the king’s supporters proposed acknowledging the will of the sovereign as having a binding authority as a source of patriotism.

In the same issue of *Monitor* which described the sources of patriotism, one also finds an explicit negation of the idea of rewarding citizens as a catalyst of patriotism.⁵⁵ As previously mentioned, the idea of

⁵⁰ Elżbieta Aleksandrowska, “Problemy monitorowego autorstwa Krasickiego,” *Pamiętnik Literacki* 1 (1999): 153–66.

⁵¹ *Monitor*, no. 33, 17 July 1765, 254–55.

⁵² See *Monitor*, no. 87, 29 October 1766, 679; no. 73, 12 September 1767.

⁵³ Stasiak, *Patriotyzm w myśli konfederatów barskich*, 20–25.

⁵⁴ *Monitor*, no. 33, 17 July 1765, 253.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 257.

rewarding members of the society in order to make them love their fatherland was very common in the “Saxon period.” Its propagators were among others Stanisław Dunin-Karwicki, Stanisław Leszczyński, Stanisław Konarski and the father of the King Stanisław Poniatowski, and the idea was developed further in a complex manner by Michał Wielhorski and the radical republicans. In contrast, on the pages of *Monitor* the royal camp questioned this thought categorically and consistently. In a letter of June 1765 one reads that:

A man who really loves his fatherland, not induced by gain or vainglory, if only he sees a possibility, he serves his fatherland only because he is a citizen, and the service itself is his reward. If his services are recognized, he is almost ashamed to be rewarded, as he feels that the reward insults his virtue.⁵⁶

The author of the text rejected both material reward (profit) and honor (glory). The anonymous author doubted the authenticity of the love of fatherland rewarded materially or by honour. A sufficient reward for a patriot was the privilege of serving the fatherland out of civic duty. Examining the discourses of the “Saxon period” and the later works of state theoreticians I have not found a similar criticism of rewarding the service for the fatherland.

In contrast to many authors of the Saxon period, the early issues of *Monitor* did not criticize xenophobia as a factor impairing the development of the fatherland. The authors of the magazine often evoked examples from the history of Poland, insisting that their ancestors loved the fatherland and that it was “no wonder that this virtue [patriotism] was loved by the Ancients so much.”⁵⁷ But the royal camp also tried to encourage the body of the nobility to benefit from foreign examples. In order to do so, they put forward examples of great Poles who were also cosmopolitans. “To know people abroad, to want to observe their customs, sciences, trade and ways of government in order to attempt to accept what is best into our Fatherland, is the fulfillment of the duties of a good citizen. This is how these great people of our antiquity behaved, like Jan Zamoyski, Jan III Sobieski, etc.”⁵⁸ Decorating these foreign ideas with Sarmatian flavour was not an innovation. This mod-

⁵⁶ *Monitor*, no. 23, 19 June 1765, 178.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 175.

⁵⁸ *Monitor*, no. 28, 7 July 1765, in *Monitor 1765–1785. Wybór* [Monitor 1765–1785: A selection], ed. Elżbieta Aleksandrowska (Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1976), 33.

erate cosmopolitanism which propagated the education of the society was also characteristic for many groups of the Republic under the Saxon dynasty of the Wettins. This idea was expressed perfectly by Ignacy Krasicki in the *Monitor* of May 1765, when he despised the heedless imitation of foreign solutions, but recommended the use of good foreign examples.⁵⁹

The arguments of Stanisław August Poniatowski's supporters were often constructed in confrontation to their political opponents. They especially often rejected the idea of patriotism as a sacrifice of life, so popular among traditionalists. On the whole, however, the contents of the first issues of *Monitor* were not limited to criticism; they also sought to answer the question, What is patriotism? Patriotism was seen as a civic duty. According to an anonymous author:

There is nothing that comes to men without work and hardship... and to go daringly against hardships and overcome them is a high value and veritable heroism. This is how the citizen of the fatherland proves himself to be a real citizen, when, not deterred by an adversity, he sets aside in a manly way all conflicts and seeks the happiness of his fatherland.⁶⁰

According to this definition, patriotism is work, acting for the fatherland, being heroic, struggling with difficulties. It is worth mentioning that this thought was already propagated in the "Saxon period."

In the June 10th 1769 issue of *Monitor* King Stanisław August Poniatowski himself expressed his opinion on patriotism. He accused his opponents of hypocrisy and the rejection of the common good in order to achieve their private interest. In this interpretation patriotic rhetoric had become an instrument to veil the violation of law. The king attacked the stereotypes and the discourse of patriotism of his opponents, be they traditionalists or republicans. Patriotic sacrifice was considered by him only an empty slogan. Those who overused this were not ready for the slightest sacrifice at all for the country. The traditionalists, limiting themselves to negation of any reforms based on jealousy, ambition and superiority of private interests, were the example of anti-patriots for Poniatowski.

Stanisław August rejected the notion of giving rewards as a method of instilling love for the fatherland. He repeated the principle included

⁵⁹ *Monitor*, no. 10, 5 May 1765, in *Monitor 1765–1785*, 18.

⁶⁰ *Monitor*, no. 83, 15 October 1766, 645, 649. Similar arguments can be found in an anonymous letter in one of earlier issues (no. 33, 17 July 1765, 253).

in first issues of *Monitor*, namely that the opportunity to serve the fatherland is for patriots a sufficient reward. According to the king, rewards did not reinforce the commitment of citizens.⁶¹ Rewards (usually accorded without objectivity) could only cause false rivalry, and as such became a nuisance to the public interest. The king was polemicizing here with the republican concept of patriotism and referring to the attack on radical republicanism begun by *Monitor* in July 1765. The monarch's article was thus based on the negation of other visions of patriotism. Thus the program of the royal camp was marked by the criticism of the other competing discourses.

Monarchist patriotism became fully shaped only after 1775. An important stage in this process was Józef Wybicki's joining the royal camp and publishing his "*Myśli patriotyczne o wolności cywilnej* [Patriotic thoughts on civil liberty]. The main ideologue of monarchist patriotism was Adam Naruszewicz. He built his thought on the slogan, first announced in April 1777: "The king with the nation, the nation with the king."⁶² One might argue that the origins of royal patriotism were the events in 1771⁶³ when Konarski and Naruszewicz founded the basis of Polish monarchism, developing a monarchist interpretation of Polish history.⁶⁴

The traditionalists focused on the family as the key medium of political socialization. In contrast, for the "Enlightened" representatives of the royal camp the care for the future implied efforts towards growth and stabilization of the nation. The authors gathered in the royalist camp attempted consciously to improve the functioning of the country, labeling the old ideas (including traditional patriotism) as obsolete. This future was no longer simply the projection of past reality. That is why according to the monarchists the old was similar to the

⁶¹ *Monitor*, no. 46, 10 June 1769, in *Monitor 1765–1785...*, 240–243.

⁶² Letter of Adam Naruszewicz to S. A. Poniatowski, 12 April 1777" in *Korespondencja Adama Naruszewicza 1762–1796. Z papierów po Ludwiku Bernackim* [Correspondence of A.N. 1762–1796: From the papers left by Ludwik Bernacki], ed. Julian Platt and Tadeusz Mikulski (Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1959), 72.

⁶³ In the night 3/4 November 1771 a group of Bar Confederates opposed to the king kidnapped Stanisław August Poniatowski, wounding him and committing lese-majesty. The ineffectuality of the kidnappers allowed the king to regain his freedom the next day. These events were used by royal propaganda to attack ideological opponents and their ideas of patriotism.

⁶⁴ See Andrzej F. Grabski, "Adam Naruszewicz jako historyk," *Wiek Oświecenia* XIII (1998): 28.

evil. Contrary to this radical stance, they introduced relatively little innovation into the discourse in comparison with the radical republicans—one might say that they evolved less dramatically. In any case, like the republicans, the monarchists referred to love of the fatherland less frequently than the authors of the “Saxon period.” Instead, the royalist camp focused above all on criticizing the models of their adversaries.

When in 1774 Adam Kazimierz Czartoryski proposed his own model of patriotism, he limited himself to propagating the principle of acting for the common interest and of avoiding private interest and empty rhetoric. This proposal did not include any innovative elements compared to the first issues of *Monitor* (1765).⁶⁵ Kamila Bartnicka argues that it was Czartoryski’s—and Krasicki’s rather similar—model that allowed the development of the concept of patriotism instilled in the alumni of the schools established by the *Komisja Edukacji Narodowej*. This was a model which was already quite obsolete in face of the innovative solutions emerging at the end of the Bar Confederacy, both on the republican and the monarchist sides.⁶⁶

In 1789 Józef Pawlikowski rejected the idea of patriotism as a sacrifice of life. He stated that

Perhaps I will not be to the taste of present-day patriotism, that I do not take sword and do not call the nation to arms so that it fights, but I assure you that I would behave very badly if I tried to stoke this fire. I very much counsel caution for the nation: one should be very hesitant to expose other men’s necks for slaughter, for it is very easy to destroy the people, but it is most difficult to compensate the damage.⁶⁷

At the same time, the author himself was a supporter of patriotic actions. It was this idea that dominated in Poland in the first half of the nineties. An anonymous text of 1791 proves this expressly, by

⁶⁵ Adam K. Czartoryski, “O prawdziwym i fałszywym patriotyzmie” [On real and false patriotism], in Kazimierz Budziło and Jan Pruszyński, eds., *Dla dobra Rzeczypospolitej. Antologia myśli państwowej* [For the good of the Commonwealth: An anthology of political thought] (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 1996), 111–12.

⁶⁶ Kamila Bartnicka, *Wychowanie patriotyczne w szkołach Komisji Edukacji Narodowej* [Patriotic education in the schools of the Commission of National Education] (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Akademickie Żak, 1998), 43. See Ambroise Jobert, *Komisja Edukacji Narodowej w Polsce (1773–1794)* [The Commission of National Education in Poland (1773–1794)] (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1979), 27.

⁶⁷ Józef Pawlikowski, *Mysli polityczne dla Polski* [Political thoughts for Poland] (Warsaw, 1789), 30.

encouraging patriotic action and advocating the punishment of traitors with capital punishment without a trial.⁶⁸ However, the distinction between patriotism as sacrifice and patriotism as a constructive, peaceful action for the fatherland proved to be exceptionally persistent. Even texts of the most active journalist and reformer, Hugo Kołłątaj, saw patriotism as a sacrifice.⁶⁹

Patriotism in a collapsing state

The end of the Republic (which came about with the abolition of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth as a result of the third partition by Prussia, Russia and the Habsburg Monarchy in 1795) created new conditions for the evolution of the idea of patriotism. When in 1791, at the nadir of the Polish-Lithuanian state, Franciszek Salezy Jezierski reflected upon the idea of Polish patriotism, he saw it as something relative, a value which does not stand the comparison with the patriotism of the citizens of such absolute, well-organized states as Russia or Prussia.⁷⁰

Already at the beginning of the nineties the state which could not secure the existence of its citizens began to be seen as a state requiring heroic patriotism. Another political theorist, Kajetan Skrzetuski, described the idea of patriotism as an act of heroism.⁷¹ The destruction of the state triggered the revival of the idea of patriotism as a sacrifice of life for the fatherland, a theory which during the Enlightenment period appeared to lose its meaning and be replaced by the patriotism of peaceful action. The specificity of the history of the Poles in the nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth century—a nation without a state—contributed to the prevalence of the idea of patriotic

⁶⁸ Anonymous, "Patriotyzm" in *Dla dobra Rzeczypospolitej*, 124.

⁶⁹ *Obraz patrioty i pseudopatrioty* [Picture of a patriot and a pseudo-patriot], in *Kołątaj i inni. Z publicystyki doby Sejmu Czteroletniego* [Kołątaj and others: Selected journalism from the period of the Four Years Diet], ed. Łukasz Kądziała (Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Szkolne i Pedagogiczne, 1991), 46.

⁷⁰ Franciszek S. Jezierski, "Niektóre wyrazy porządkiem abecadła zebrane i stosownymi do rzeczy uwagami objaśnione" [Some words collected in alphabetical order and explained by appropriate remarks], in *Wybór pism* [Selected writings], ed. Zdzisław Skwarczyński (Cracow: PIW, 1952), 235–36.

⁷¹ Kajetan Skrzetuski, *Widok polityczny w terażniejszych okolicznościach Polski* [Political views on the present situation of Poland] (Warsaw, 1791), 139.

sacrifice. Along these lines, Polish national mythology was to be built around the subsequent failed risings and lost wars.

According to the traditionalists the cultural reality did not require any changes. The realization of the cultural ideal of patriotism, a concept inherited from the ancestors, was a sufficient proof of true love for the fatherland. For the representatives of the Enlightenment it was an essential condition for a proper functioning of the state. It appears that the model of traditional patriotism did not become obsolete with the demise of Sarmatism. As new cultural trends appeared, patriotic thinking became variegated, but it still implied the Sarmatian view of the love for the fatherland, with reference to tradition and "ancient laws," an argument used also by republicans and (to a lesser extent) by monarchists. However, due to their functional modification of these references to tradition and history, republicans and monarchists treated the idea of the past instrumentally, not emotionally, as the Sarmatian traditionalists did.

In the article entitled *Patriotisme* published in the *Encyclopédie*, de Jaucourt asserted that the most perfect kind of patriotism is cosmopolitanism, seen as caring for the rights of all the nations of the world.⁷² Love of the fatherland defined in such a manner may be called the universal patriotism of the Enlightenment. In 1773 this idea was echoed by the Polish priest, Wincenty Skrzetuski, who stressed that patriotism implied a duty towards other nations.⁷³ According to Paul Hazard, the mere fact that some republicans and representatives of the royalist camp accepted the law of nature as a source of patriotism determined their view of the community of nations transgressing separate societies. In accordance with this assumption, the citizens of one country had certain rights and duties towards other societies, as a universal society of humans was an institution of nature. In this theory, duties towards fellow-citizens of the state did not liberate a person from duties towards humankind.⁷⁴

⁷² Louis de Jaucourt, "Patriotisme," in *L'Encyclopédie, ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers* (Paris, 1765), 12: 181.

⁷³ Konopczyński, *Polscy pisarze*, 335.

⁷⁴ See Paul Hazard, *La pensée européenne au XVIII^e siècle. De Montesquieu à Lessing* (Paris: Fayard, 1979), 184.

Conclusion

The antinomy between the traditionalistic and republican versions of patriotism was that the former identified fatherland with the community and the latter first and foremost with the state. An innovative civic identification with the institutions of the state generated the feeling of distinction among neighboring societies and of duty towards the fatherland. Republicans justified the ideas of patriotism independently and rationally. Reflecting the view of the fatherland as a state they assumed that the interest of the state is the highest law, being superior to the interest of local and social groups. The republicans' openness toward the future meant facing the challenge, being ready to revise the existing forms of the relationship towards the fatherland. The complexity of this process resulted in the diversity of ideas and views of patriotism among the republicans.

Enlightenment as a cultural construct implied "contrasting" tendencies: republicanism and monarchism. These two positions were linked by a common opinion that a new social-political system had to be consistent with nature and reason. The concepts republicans and monarchists developed were based on the idea of patriotism as action. This idea, based on the identification of the fatherland with the state, was fully functioning in Poland already during the reign of August III, and went back to sixteenth-century antecedents.

If one assumes that the patriotism of the Enlightenment aimed to repair the state and increase the prosperity, strength and general happiness of the country through political and economic reforms, and that patriots in the period of the Enlightenment proposed extending civil and political freedom, and that the patriotism of the Enlightenment was related to cosmopolitanism, i.e. interest in the foreign in order to bring happiness to the fatherland, then both the ideas of republicans and the royalists can be labeled as Enlightened patriotism. At the same time, the traditional vision of patriotism as a sacrifice (contrary to the above mentioned ideas) included numerous Sarmatian features. The great diversity of the republican views may be explained by the process of evolution—from the Sarmatian images of the fatherland as a community (traditionalists), through the joint concept of community and institution (Adam Krasiński), to the idea of fatherland as a state institution (Michał Wielhorski, Franciszek Rostworowski). On the whole, Polish republicans used the ideas of the Enlightenment

creatively. Their method of drawing on European examples led to a coherent system of views, as opposed to the chaotic methods of reception of new trends in Western thought on the part of the supporters of King Stanisław August Poniatowski. Thanks to this, the republicans managed to step beyond the eclecticism which the supporters of the monarch usually resorted to in order to fill ideological gaps and opened the way to a new understanding of state and nation.

CHAPTER TWENTY-FIVE

DAS LANDESPATRIOTISCHE PROGRAMM DER GALIZISCHEN STÄNDE UM 1790: VON DER POLNISCHEN TRADITION ZUR ETABLIERUNG EINES NEUEN LANDESPATRIOTISMUS

Miloš Rezník

Einführung: Identitätsgeschichtliche Perspektive des „österreichischen Einrichtungswerkes“

Die Angliederung Galiziens an die Habsburgermonarchie brachte für den kleinpolnischen und „rotreußischen“ polnischen Adel nicht nur völlig neue politische, ökonomische, soziale und kulturelle Bedingungen mit sich, sondern löste auch eine Identitätskrise aus, in der sich die Angehörigen der ständischen Gesellschaft in vielen Situationen gezwungen sahen, über ihre kollektiven Zugehörigkeiten nachzudenken. Das „selbstverständliche“ ständisch, staatlich und territorial orientierte kollektive Bewusstsein der Angehörigen eines einzigen politischen Standes im bisherigen Polen wurde in vieler Hinsicht in Frage gestellt und konnte nur mit Schwierigkeiten ohne Weiteres in der bisherigen Form weiter entwickelt werden. Ganz im Gegenteil war es notwendig, auf viele Elemente der bisherigen Identitätsschichtung zu verzichten, oder sie zu verteidigen bzw. zu modifizieren. Diese Auseinandersetzungen entwickelten sich in den unterschiedlichsten Formen und auf den verschiedensten Ebenen: von den alltäglichen Handlungsräumen und Strategien über den Bereich des landadligen Wirtschaftens bis zu gezielten programmatischen Äußerungen und politischen Konzepten.

Die Lebenswelt des polnischen Adels in den nun von Österreich annektierten Gebieten war von vielseitigen Umwandlungen zu tief betroffen, als dass es ohne individuelle oder kollektive, bewusste oder unterbewusste Auseinandersetzungen hätte vonstatten gehen können. Der Herrschaftswechsel sowie die Reformen und „Einrichtungsmaßnahmen“ des Staates betrafen ja die zentralen Punkte des ständischen Bewusstseins des polnischen Adels einschließlich der ständischen und territorialen Identität, der politischen Kultur, der Wertevorstellungen,

der Ethik und Mentalität. Dies zu untersuchen bedeutet sehr verschiedene Segmente und Elemente der politischen, sozialen, wirtschaftlichen und kulturellen Welt der damaligen Akteure zu thematisieren. Im Folgenden wird jedoch der Blick vor allem auf den Fragenkomplex von territorialen Identitäten des polnisch-galizischen Adels gerichtet.

Dadurch wird die Thematisierung und Hinterfragung zweier Problemkreise ermöglicht: Erstens ist das die Reaktion auf und Auseinandersetzung mit neu geschaffenen territorialen und „staatsrechtlichen“ Umständen auf der Seite des polnisch-galizischen Hochadels, zweitens dann jedoch die Hinterfragung der territorial orientierten Identitäten und Loyalitäten des polnischen Adels schon vor der ersten Teilung der *Rzeczpospolita*. Dazu müssen zwei kurze Erläuterungen formuliert werden:

1. Die Einrichtungs- und Reformmaßnahmen der habsburgischen Monarchie hatten unter anderem zum Ziel, einige Segmente der sozialen, kulturellen und politischen Strukturen nicht nur zu ändern, sondern von Grunde auf neu anzulegen. Dies betraf unter anderem den Adel einschließlich des Verständnisses der Adligkeit. Das traditionelle polnisch-litauische Modell, in dem die Inanspruchnahme des Adelsstatus von der Seite der Einzelnen sowie die allgemeine Anerkennung von anderen Mitgliedern des Adelsstandes eine nicht unwichtige Rolle spielte, wurde hier mit Gesetzmäßigkeiten durch ein neues System ersetzt, das auf der historischen und juristischen Nachweisbarkeit basierte und die Zugehörigkeit zum Adelsstand an formale Kriterien knüpfte. Dazu gehörte der Druck, den Adelsstatus von einzelnen Familien nach 1772 mit Urkunden, schriftlichen Beweisen oder im Notfall mit zuverlässigen Zeugenaussagen von unumstrittenen Angehörigen der Adselite glaubhaft zu machen. Weitere Maßnahmen sollten schrittweise zur Ausgrenzung des besitzlosen „Adelsproletariats“ aus dem Adel oder zumindest von den ständischen Rechten führen. Dies konnte langfristig eine noch stärkere Verbindung zwischen Adligkeit und der Zugehörigkeit zur Ständegemeinde einerseits und dem materiellen Status andererseits mit sich bringen. Allerdings führte das zu einem partiellen Verzicht auf Standessolidarität innerhalb der adligen Gruppe, auch wenn sie früher in vieler Hinsicht auch eher formal und illusorisch gewesen war. Die formale Differenzierung und Anerkennung von faktischen Unterschieden innerhalb des Adels brachte die Einführung von zwei gesonderten Adelsständen (Heren- oder Magnatenstand und Ritterstand) bei der Adelsreform der 1770er–1780er Jahre zum Ausdruck. Dies erfolgte nach dem Vorbild

von anderen, vor allem den böhmischen Ländern und sollte die Integration und Kompatibilität des galizischen Adels und des Adels in den anderen habsburgischen Erbländern ermöglichen. Alle diese Maßnahmen problematisierten unvermeidlich das zentrale Element des gesellschaftlichen Selbstverständnisses und der kollektiven Identitäten des polnischen Adels in Galizien und stießen in vielerlei Hinsicht sowie vor allem bei solchen Gruppen, die zu den „Verlierern“ dieser Prozesse gehörten, auf Kritik und Ablehnung. Andererseits wurden aber Räume geschaffen für Kompromisse zwischen der monarchischen Regierung und der aristokratischen Elite Galiziens, die sich in ihrem symbolischen Elitenanspruch aus formaler Sicht nie zuvor so anerkannt sehen konnten. Gleichzeitig eröffneten sich, wenn auch zögerlich und schrittweise, neue Aufstiegschancen durch Integration in der österreichischen aristokratischen Elite.

2. Der Herrschaftswechsel von 1772 brachte nicht nur eine neue formale Staatszugehörigkeit mit sich, sondern auch viele neue Probleme und neue Tendenzen. Dies hing mit dem Nationsverständnis des polnischen Adels zusammen, das stark in Richtung einer ständischen und quasistaatlichen (politischen) Fundierung des Begriffs ging. Noch stärker als nach 1772 zeigten sich diese Probleme nach der dritten Teilung, also dem staatlichen Untergang Polens im Jahre 1795: aufgrund der Nichtexistenz eines polnischen Staates war für viele bisherige Angehörige der Stände die weitere Existenz der polnischen Nation kaum vorstellbar. Viele, darunter auch patriotische Anhänger oder aber Gegner der früheren Reformpartei und der Mai-Verfassung, sahen sich nun aufgrund ihrer neuen Staatszugehörigkeit und des nun nicht mehr möglichen Bezugs auf einen existierenden polnischen Staat nicht länger als Polen, sondern als Österreicher, Preußen und Russen.¹ In der Zwischenzeit hatte sich die Frage für manche, vor allem aristokratische Angehörige des galizischen und polnischen Adels noch nicht so zugespitzt, denn viele von ihnen hatten weiterhin Besitzungen, Verwandte und Interessen nicht jetzt in Galizien, sondern auch in anderen Teilen des Landes, darunter auch im unabhängigen Polen selbst. Aufgrund eines Reichstagsbeschlusses von 1775 (*Ubezpieczenie*

¹ Vgl. u.a. Norman Davies, *Boże igrzysko. Historia Polski*. Bd. 2. Od roku 1795. [Gottes Spielplatz. Vom Jahre 1795] (Kraków: Społeczny Instytut Wydawniczy Znak, 1991), 52, und Stefan Kieniewicz, *Dramat trzeźwych entuzjastów. O ludziach pracy organicznej* [Das Drama der nüchternen Enthusiasten. Über die Menschen der organischen Arbeit]. (Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna, 1964), 13.

honoru szlacheckiego) wurden sie in Polen auch als Einheimische mit allen ständischen Rechten anerkannt und beteiligten sich in mehreren Fällen auch am weiteren politischen Leben im Lande, einschließlich der Zeit des so genannten Großen Reichstags (1788–1792). Ihr patriotisches Engagement in Polen-Litauen stand jedoch nicht im grundsätzlichen Widerspruch zu ihrer Staats- und Dynastietreue im österreichischen Galizien, so dass sie beide Loyalitäten – die polnisch-nationale (im damaligen Sinne!) und die galizisch-ständische verknüpfen konnten. Sie genossen das Vertrauen von beiden Seiten. Aus diesen Kreisen etablierten sich schliesslich staatsloyale Sprecher der galizischen Interessen in Österreich, an die sich Tadeusz Kościuszko 1794, nach dem Ausbruch des Aufstandes mit der Bitte um Vermittlung zwischen der Aufstandsführung in Polen und den zentralen Stellen in Wien, wandte.² Übrigens hat sich Galizien im Jahre 1794, nicht zum allgemeinen polnischen Aufstand erhoben, und ähnliche Perspektiven stießen beim Adel dort sowohl damals als auch später vorwiegend auf Skepsis. Während die ältere polnische Geschichtswissenschaft darin Taktik, erzwungenes Schweigen, Egoismus oder gar fehlendes nationales Bewusstsein (wenn nicht Verrat von nationalen Interessen) zu sehen neigte, versuchten mehrere Autoren im letzten Jahrzehnt diese Tatsache nicht nur durch damalige Loyalitätsvorstellungen zu begründen, sondern sie eigentlich auf eine Tradition von starken regionalen Identitäten beim polnischen Adel zurückzuführen, die möglicherweise doch eine stärkere Rolle gespielt hätten als ein Bekenntnis zum polnisch-litauischen Staat.³ In dieser Hinsicht wäre ein galizischer Patriotismus im Rahmen von Österreich eine kontinuierliche Anknüpfung an alte Identifikationen, etwa mit Wojwodschaften, Bezirken oder historischen Landschaften innerhalb der *Rzeczpospolita*. Wenn auch die These über eine schwächer als vermutet dominierende gesamtpolnische Identität noch kritische Überprüfung benötigt (etwa die Beschlüsse und Instruktionen von litauischen Wojwodschafts- und Kreistagen der Zeit um 1790 belegen sie nicht)⁴, bietet sich hier eine der

² Vgl. bspw. *Tadeusz Kościuszko, jego odezwy i raporty* [Tadeusz Kościuszko, seine Proklamationen und Rapporte], Hg. v. Ludwik Nabelak (Kraków: Centralne Biuro Wydawnicze NKN, 1918), 50–51.

³ S. u. a. Hugo Lane, „Szlachta outside the Commonwealth. The Case of Polish Nobles in Galicia,“ *Zeitschrift für Ostmitteleuropa-Forschung* 52, (2003): 526–542, hier 526–528.

⁴ Vgl. Miloš Řezník, „Zemský patriotismus mezi stavovstvím, modernizací a vnějším ohrožením: Litva před rokem 1795 a možnosti její komparace s Královským

wichtigsten Erklärungen, die in einem dynastietreuen galizisch-österreichischen polnischen Patriotismus nicht zwangsweise einen Bruch mit der früheren Tradition sieht. Dies ermöglicht, wie schon erwähnt, neben der Thematisierung des galizischen adligen Patriotismus nicht nur die Hinterfragung der kollektiven territorialen Identitäten des polnischen Adels der Vorteilszeit, sondern auch eine komplexere und multiperspektivische, darunter auch ideengeschichtliche Sicht auf die Entwicklung der adligen Welt in Galizien.

Wie reagierten die hochadligen Schichten auf die Angliederung an Österreich und die Erfahrungen in der – für sie – neuen Welt? Wie haben sie sich mit ihren Identitätsproblemen auseinandergesetzt, welche Identifikationsreaktionen und Strategien haben sie entwickelt? Auf welche Art wurden die Elemente bisheriger polnischer ständischer Identität sowie von regionalen Identifikationsbezügen fortgeführt, welche Umdeutungen und neue Identifikationsmöglichkeiten wurden wahrgenommen, entwickelt? Welche Bezüge zwischen verschiedenen Patriotismusverständnissen wurden hergestellt und ausgehandelt? Um diese breite Problematik des adligen (bzw. genauer: vor allem des aristokratischen) Patriotismus in Galizien komprimiert darstellen zu können, wird hier der Blick auf eine relativ kurze Zeit konzentriert, in der der galizische Adel nach zwanzig Jahren habsburgischer Zugehörigkeit die Möglichkeit bekam und nutzte, seine Vorstellungen über die Stellung und das innere System seines Landes zu formulieren. Daraus ergibt sich die Tatsache, dass dieses Konzept eng mit einem konkreten Kontext verbunden war und die formulierten Vorstellungen sich im Rahmen des Möglichen bewegen mussten. Doch stellen die Desiderien des galizischen Adels vom Jahre 1790, bei Berücksichtigung des breiteren kulturellen und politischen Kontextes, darunter auch der Entwicklung der vorangegangenen zwanzig Jahre, eine gute Möglichkeit dar, nicht nur die Verbindung der polnischen Nationalinteressen mit dem österreichischen Staatspatriotismus darzustellen, sondern auch deutliche Ansätze zur Etablierung eines galizischen Landespatriotismus, der mit beiden Identitätskomponenten nicht nur kombinierbar, sondern auch eng verbunden war.

Pruskem,” [Landespatriotismus zwischen Standschaft, Modernisierung und Außenbedrohung: Litauen vor 1795 und Perspektiven eines Vergleichs mit dem Königlichen Preußen], in *Obraz druhého v historické perspektivě II. Identity a stereotypy při formování moderní společnosti*, Hg. v. Karel Kubiš (Prag: Univerzita Karlova, 2003), 147–176.

Die Krise der Habsburgermonarchie um 1790 im galizischen Kontext

Der Regierungswechsel von 1790 in Österreich erfolgte im Schatten einer politischen Krise, in der sich mehrere habsburgische Kronländer am Rande eines Widerstandsausbruches befanden, so dass die Regierung selbst in den Ländern, in denen die ständische Macht längst gebrochen schien, zu vorsichtigen Schritten gezwungen war. In den südlichen Niederlanden, in Böhmen, Ungarn und anderen Provinzen erhob sich ein starker Widerstand gegen den Regierungskurs Josephs II., wobei in den meisten Ländern nicht die weiteren Eingriffe in die ständischen Befugnisse, sondern in erster Linie die faktische Beschränkung der obrigkeitlichen Macht über Land und Leute, d. h. die landesfürstliche bzw. staatliche Intervention in die obrigkeitlich-bäuerlichen Beziehungen, den wichtigsten Hintergrund der Krise um 1790 bildeten.

Die Thronbesteigung Leopolds II., obwohl er durch seine vorherige Reformregierung in der Toskana wohl bekannt war, erweckte also in den adligen Kreisen allgemeine Hoffnungen auf Verbesserung der Lage und Zurücknahme von verschiedenen Maßnahmen.⁵ Ein Zeichen für das Entgegenkommen, das die ständischen Repräsentationen in den einzelnen Ländern zunächst beruhigen sollte, war die Initiative des Hofes, die Stände zur Vorlage eigener Wünsche aufzufordern. Wohl bekannt ist etwa das böhmische Beispiel, dessen Entwicklung zusammen mit der böhmischen königlichen Krönung Leopolds in Prag den Hintergrund schuf für die neue Aktivierung der dortigen ständischen Opposition, die in ihren Desiderien selbstbewusst (gemessen an der Aktivität der Stände im 18. und im frühen 19. Jahrhundert) auftrat.

Eine ähnliche Entwicklung kann nicht nur in den böhmischen, österreichischen und ungarischen Ländern beobachtet werden,⁶ sondern auch in Galizien, einem Land, das immer noch als ein Neuerworbenes galt, obwohl seit seiner Angliederung ans Habsburgerreich schon fast zwanzig Jahre vergangen waren. Dies war auch der Hintergrund für die besondere Lage des Landes und die besonderen Umstände, die für

⁵ Vgl. Karl Vocelka, *Österreichische Geschichte 1699–1815. Glanz und Untergang der höfischen Welt. Repräsentation, Reform und Reaktion im habsburgischen Vielvölkerstaat*. Hg. v. Herwig Wolfram. (Wien: Ueberreuter, 2001), 387.

⁶ Vgl.—als Beispiel—etwa für Tirol Georg Mühlberger: *Absolutismus und Freiheitskämpfe (1665–1814)*. in Josef Fontana u. a., Hg., *Geschichte des Landes Tirol*. Bd. 2. (Bozen–Wien: Athesia 1984), 395–403; Helmut Reinalter, *Aufklärung, Absolutismus, Reaktion. Die Geschichte Tirols in der zweiten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Wien: Schendl, 1974), 100.

die galizische ständische Aktivität der Jahre 1790–1792 doch andere Bedingungen und Voraussetzungen als in Böhmen schufen.

So allgemein die galizischen Spezifika bei der Formulierung der ständischen Wünsche in der Regierungszeit Leopolds II. auf die polnische Vergangenheit mit all ihren politischen und sozialen Charakterzügen zurückgeführt werden können, so uneindeutig war damals ihre Bedeutung. In diesem Kontext reicht es nicht, mit der politischen Kultur des polnischen Adels, mit dessen verlorenen „goldenen Freiheiten“ oder mit seiner Mentalität zu argumentieren, obwohl alle diese Umstände zweifellos von gravierender Bedeutung waren. Die unruhige Lage des Jahres 1790/1791, der Tod Josephs II. und die damit zusammenhängende innenpolitische Situation in der Habsburgermonarchie stellten zwar einen starken österreichischen Bezug der Aktivität des galizischen Adels dar, doch müssen seine Bemühungen dieser Zeit auch in einen anderen Kontext gestellt werden: den *aktuellen* polnischen. Während im Habsburgerreich günstige Voraussetzungen für programmatische Überlegungen und Äußerungen der galizischen Aristokratie geschaffen wurden, erreichte in Polen-Litauen die Reformtätigkeit des Großen Sejms schon im Frühling 1791 mit der Verabschiedung der Mai-Verfassung ihren Höhepunkt. In diesem Sinne war die galizische Entwicklung 1790/91 ein integraler Bestandteil sowohl der österreichischen als auch der polnischen Geschichte. Dies war nicht nur durch die Gleichzeitigkeit der Ereignisse in beiden Ländern gegeben, sondern vor allem durch die schon erwähnte beiderseitige Orientierung der galizischen aristokratischen Eliten selbst am Anfang der 1790er Jahre. Stanisław Grodziski hat zu Recht hervorgehoben, dass sich vor diesem Hintergrund beim galizischen Adel die Tradition des altpolnischen adligen Republikanismus, der sich zu dieser Zeit in reformorientierten Kreisen unter kritischer Auseinandersetzung zu konstitutionell monarchischen Konzepten entwickelte, mit dem habsburgischen Aufklärungsabsolutismus und dynastischen Loyalismus teilweise verbunden war, sich teilweise mit ihm gegenseitig beeinflusst hat.⁷

Unter dem Einfluss der Verhandlungen des Großen Sejms in Warschau und der ständischen Bewegung in anderen Ländern Österreichs kam es spätestens in den Jahren 1789–1790 zu ersten Besprechungen

⁷ Stanisław Grodziski, Wstęp. in *Projekt konstytucji dla Galicji z 1790 r.* („Charta Leopoldina“). *Tekst i przekład* [Verfassungsprojekt für Galizien aus dem Jahre 1790 („Charta Leopoldina“). Text und Übersetzung]. Hg. v. S. Grodziski und Arthur S. Gerhardt. (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1981), 7–16.

unter führenden galizischen Aristokraten mit dem Ziel, ihre Beschwerden und Wünsche zum Ausdruck zu bringen. Den allerletzten und wichtigsten Impuls stellten allerdings ähnlich wie in anderen Erbländern nicht die ständischen Angelegenheiten, sondern die schon erwähnte Vorbereitung bzw. Einführung der josephinischen Steuer- und Urbarialreform dar, gegen die sich im letzten Regierungsjahr Josephs II. ein heftiger Widerstand der Dominikalobrigkeiten erhob. Diese Entwicklung erreichte den galizischen Adel relativ kurz nach der Errichtung der ständischen Repräsentation des Landes und der Realisierung der lange vorbereiteten ständischen Reform im Lande (1775–1782). Sie hat symbolisch die Integration Galiziens in der österreichischen Monarchie und eine „Normalisierung“ der inneren Zustände im Lande, die ja lange Zeit als provisorisch angesehen werden konnten, symbolisiert.⁸ Der galizische Hochadel musste sich nicht zufrieden fühlen, andererseits hatte er aber Grund genug, sich in der Habsburgermonarchie zu „akkommodieren“.

Unzufriedenheit bildete sich vor allem aufgrund solcher Eingriffe, die die Stellung der Aristokratie als Grundobrigkeit schwächten und damit ihre wirtschaftliche Basis vermeintlich oder tatsächlich unterbanden. Wenn im Tauwetterklima nach dem Tode Josephs II. eine relativ direkte Kritik am Herrschaftsstil in Galizien geübt wurde, dann orientierte sie sich vornehmlich in diese Richtung und schilderte den wirtschaftlichen Verfall des Landes, der teilweise durch allgemeine Tendenzen in der ostmitteleuropäischen Strukturentwicklung verursacht wurde, zum Teil jedoch auf die Abtrennung vom polnischen und internationalen Markt (die unterbrochene Verbindung mit Danzig) und nicht zuletzt auf die staatlichen Maßnahmen zurückzuführen war. Die Reformmaßnahmen im Urbarial- und Steuerwesen stellten also in den Augen der galizischen Grundobrigkeiten den logischen Höhepunkt dieses wirtschaftlichen Niederganges dar und drohten den totalen ökonomischen Ruin des Landes herbeizuführen. Waren sie als Ergebnis der illegitimen staatlichen Eingriffe angesehen, die von den dem Lande gegenüber ungünstig eingestellten Beamten getragen wurden, dann war es nun verständlich, dass der Ausweg aus der Krise

⁸ Vgl. ausführlicher dazu Horst Glassl, *Das österreichische Einrichtungswerk in Galizien (1772–1790)*. (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1975); Stanisław Grodziski, *Historia ustroju społeczno-politycznego Galicji 1772–1848* [Geschichte der gesellschaftlich-politischen Verfassung Galiziens 1772–1848] (Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1971).

in der Verstärkung der galizischen Landesautonomie, in einer ausgeprägteren ständischen Selbstverwaltung gesucht wurde, und dass umgekehrt dieser Zustand als Ausgangspunkt für die Legitimation des geforderten ständischen Einflusses benutzt werden konnte.

Diese Gedanken waren der Hintergrund der ersten Konzepte, die aus den Besprechungen innerhalb der galizischen hochadligen Kreise hervorgingen.⁹ Vor allem wurden sie aber zur Basis der Projekte, die sich im Jahre 1790 zunächst innerhalb eines engeren Kreises galizischer Aristokraten, der als Vertreter des Landes auftrat, herauskristallisierten. Zu seinen Initiatoren gehörten der Anwalt Józef Dzierzkowski und der Bischof von Przemyśl Antoni Gołaszewski, Sprecher wurden allerdings sechs Adlige, die sich nach Wien begaben, jedoch im Kontakt mit dem Lande und indirekt mit Warschau blieben und dem Kaiser ein Reformprojekt für Galizien vorlegten: Fürst Józef Maksymilian Ossoliński, Jan Batowski, Jan Bąkowski, Stanisław Jabłonowski, Mikołaj Potocki und Piotr Zabielski.¹⁰ Erst während des Aufenthalts in Wien versuchte diese Delegation ihre Tätigkeit durch die Unterstützung zahlreicher galizischer Standesgenossen auf eine sicherere Basis zu stellen.¹¹

Die ständische Kritik richtete sich nicht nur in Galizien gegen die Urbarialreform und nach dessen Tode direkt oder indirekt gegen Joseph II. Doch blieben die Staatsbeamten, vor allem auf der Kreisebene, das vordergründige Ziel der immer heftigeren Kritik von Seiten der galizischen Stände: es waren die Kreisbeamten und die Kreise überhaupt an sich, die zum Symbol der fremden Einrichtungen, der Nichtrespektierung der Landesgewohnheiten, der Ignoranz und der Kränkung galizischer Eliten wurden, denn diese Kreisämter waren

⁹ Uwagi and rządem galicyjskim. Przyczyny, dla których do tego stopnia nikiemności prowincya ta przyszła, a nakoniec sposoby jakimiby los tego kraju poprawić można [Bemerkungen über die galizische Regierung. Ursachen, warum die Provinz in eine solche verheerende Lage gekommen ist, und schließlich die Art, wie das Schicksal dieses Landes verbessert werden könnte], o. O. 1790 (abgedruckt auch in Ernest Traugut Kortum: Magna Charta von Galizien oder Untersuchung der Beschwerden des galicischen Adels polnischer Nation über die österreichische Regierung, Beilage 2, Jassy 1790; der Autor dieser Abhandlung, E. T. Kortum, war damals Gubernialrat bei der Lemberger Landesstelle und den Desiderien klar abgeneigt); vgl. auch Ossolińskis Memorandum an den Kaiser Joseph II. gegen die Steuer- und Urbarialreform vom Mai 1789, abgedruckt in Roman Rozdolski, *Stosunki poddańcze w dawnej Galicji* [Untertanenverhältnisse im alten Galizien]. Bd. 2, (Warszawa: PWN, 1962), 281–285.

¹⁰ Grodziski: Wstęp, 9.

¹¹ Vgl. Walerian Kalinka, *Sejm Czteroletni* [Das Vierjährige Sejm], Bd. 2, (Lwów: Seyfarth i Czajkowski, 1881), 90.

mit der Ausführung der unpopulären Maßnahmen beauftragt und durch landesfremde, deutschsprachige Beamte, meistens österreichischer, böhmischer oder mährischer Herkunft besetzt. In den Augen des galizischen Adels verkörperten sie alle negativen Merkmale, die der österreichischen Verwaltung das Aussehen einer Fremdherrschaft zu verleihen drohten. Aber nur so stand dies nicht im grundsätzlichen Widerspruch zur aristokratischen Dynastietreue, denn nicht die Herrschaft des Kaisers als König von Galizien und Lodomerien, sondern die Verwaltung des Landes und der Kreise wurde vor allem als fremd wahrgenommen und negativ beurteilt. Dass die landesfürstliche Verwaltung den Einheimischen beinahe ganz verschlossen war, hatte zwar aus der Wiener Sicht seine Gründe in der vermuteten „republikanischen“ Gesinnung oder zumindest Nichtgewöhnung der Galizier an monarchische Prinzipien, doch wurde diese Tatsache selbst in der Zentrale nicht immer als richtig angesehen. So hob bspw. im Dezember 1791 der Vizepräsident des böhmischen Landesguberniums Wenzel Margelik in seinem Bericht an Leopold II. die Tätigkeit des Kreishauptmanns von Rzeszów Vinzenz Jakubowski hervor: „ein geschickter und thätiger Mann, ist der erste von der Nazion, der sich in politischen Diensten mit besonders gutem Erfolg verwendet, und sich vor allen anderen immerhin, vorzüglich aber zur Zeit der im Republikanischen, und im Lande selbst bestandenen Gährungen durch Anhänglichkeit an seinen Landesfürsten, und eifrige Besorgung des höchsten Dienstes ausgezeichnet hat.“¹² Die Regierung wünschte sich prinzipiell mehr solcher Beispiele, hatte aber wenig Vertrauen in die Möglichkeit, aus Galizien die Beamteneliten rekrutieren zu können.

Der erwähnte Kreishauptmann Jakubowski war schließlich eine der Ausnahmen, die nichts an der Abneigung der galizischen Stände den Kreisämtern und den Staatsbeamten gegenüber änderten. Selbst er brachte sich mit seinem Engagement angeblich in Schwierigkeiten, wie wir von einem zeitgenössischen Gutachter erfahren: denn sein Vater versuchte ihn unter der Drohung der Enterbung zum Verzicht auf eine weitere Laufbahn als hoher Verwaltungsbeamter im Staatsdienst zu bewegen.¹³

¹² Haus-, Hof und Staatsarchiv Wien [weiter nur HHStA], Kabinettsarchiv, Kaiser-Franz-Akten [weiter nur KFA], Fasz. alt 11, Nr. 9.

¹³ Ebd., Nr. 6.

Die Kreisämter waren deswegen neben der Urbarialreform der vornehmlichste Kritikpunkt der galizischen politischen Projekte, die sich im Jahre 1790 herauskristallisierten. Ihr Höhepunkt war der Verfassungsentwurf für Galizien, der von der erwähnten ständischen Delegation in Wien unter der faktischen Führung von J. M. Ossoliński im Frühling und Sommer erarbeitet und Kaiser Leopold II. vorgelegt wurde. Nach dem ersten Memorandum vom 23. April 1790 folgten Äußerungen der Zentralstellen und Änderungen im Text, der dann am 19. August definitiv als *Charta Leopoldina* dem Kaiser überreicht wurde.

Charta Leopoldina und das patriotische Programm des galizischen Adels

Die *Charta Leopoldina* stellte einen umfangreichen Verfassungsentwurf dar, der die wichtigsten Fragen der politischen Ordnung im Lande umfassend regeln und ein grundlegendes Gesetz werden sollte, dem alle anderen Gesetze und Regelungen untergeordnet wären und damit auch entsprechen müssten. Diese Grundgesetzidee, auf dem Konzept des Gesellschaftsvertrags sowie des Naturrechtes beruhend, war mehreren ständischen Verfassungsentwürfen des damaligen Habsburgerreiches eigen (sehr ausgeprägt war es zum Beispiel in den böhmischen Desiderien)¹⁴, und vor allem darin stand sie im grundsätzlichen Widerspruch zu den Prinzipien der monarchischen Macht in Österreich.

Die Regelungen der *Charta Leopoldina*¹⁵ betrafen also die wichtigsten Bereiche der politischen Ordnung: die individuellen Rechte, die ständische Vertretung einschließlich der Landtage und des Landesauschusses, die Organisation der Landesverwaltung, das Gerichtswesen und andere Problemkreise.

¹⁴ Nationalarchiv (Národní archiv) Prag, Fonds Landesauschuss (Zemský výbor) 1791–1873, Kart. 1. Zu den böhmischen Desiderien vgl. u. a. Anna M. Drabek: Die Desiderien der böhmischen Stände von 1791. in F. Seibt Hg., *Die böhmischen Länder zwischen Ost und West*. (München: Collegium Carolinum 1983), 132–142.

¹⁵ Eine vollständige Edition aller Punkte einschließlich der Kommentare zu jedem Kapitel haben 1981 Stanisław Grodziski und Arthur S. Gerhardt herausgegeben: Projekt konstytucji dla Galicji z 1790 r. („Charta Leopoldina“). Tekst i przekład [Verfassungsprojekt für Galizien aus dem Jahre 1790 („Charta Leopoldina“). Text und Übersetzung]. Hg. v. S. Grodziski und A. S. Gerhardt (Warszawa—Kraków: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1981).

Unter vielen anderen Perspektiven kann die *Charta* aus der Sicht der Problematik der politischen und gesellschaftlichen Stellung des Adels und damit als Ausdruck der galizischen aristokratischen Politik betrachtet werden, die sich auch in diesem Kontext mit wichtigen Herausforderungen der Zeit auseinandersetzen musste. Die Forderungen nach mehr Landesautonomie, nach Verstärkung des ständischen Einflusses verbinden sich hier mit der Verfolgung der hochadligen Interessen zwar eng, jedoch bei weitem nicht geradlinig oder eindeutig. In diesem Sinne und aus der—gewiss teleologischen—Sicht des langfristigen Identitäten- und Elitenwandels der späten Frühneuzeit und des „langen“ 19. Jahrhunderts zeichnet sich die *Charta Leopoldina* durch starke Tendenzen zur Persistenz der territorial und politisch geprägten adlig-patriotischen polnischen Ausgangspunkte der aristokratischen Elite, gleichzeitig aber durch Offenheit für Umdeutungen und Neuorientierungen (Stichwort Staatstreue und galizischer Landes-patriotismus) sowie Anpassungen aus, die den Rahmen der politischen Kultur und ständischen Denkweise des *ancien régime* sprengten.¹⁶ Aber auch hier waren wahrscheinlich die aktuellen Debatten in Warschau von gravierender Bedeutung.

Die partielle Verfolgung von adligen Interessen wird im Dokument mit der Betonung dessen verbunden, dass das Gegenteil das Ziel der Entwurfsverfasser gewesen sei. Damit reagierten sie auf Vorwürfe, die nicht nur damals wiederholt wurden, sondern auch bei späteren Verhandlungen über die Reform der ständischen Verfassung anklagen.¹⁷ Schon im einführenden Exposé wird ausdrücklich betont, dass es hier nicht um Interessen einer privilegierten Gruppe von einigen Tausenden Menschen, sondern um das Glück von drei Millionen Einwohnern gehe.¹⁸ Ausdrücklich und programmatisch wird hier also im Namen des ganzen Landes und *eben* dieses Landes sowie seiner ganzen Bevölkerung gesprochen. Interessanterweise wird hier für die ganze Bevölkerung Galiziens der Begriff „nation“ benutzt, was für eine

¹⁶ Vgl. dazu Hannes Stekl, *Zwischen Machtverlust und Selbstbehauptung. Österreichs Hocharistokratie vom 18. bis ins 20. Jahrhundert* in Hans-Ulrich Wehler, Hg., *Europäischer Adel 1750–1850* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1990), 144–165.

¹⁷ S. aus der damaligen Zeit z. B. E. T. Kortum: *Magna Charta*.

¹⁸ Im Jahre 1786 lebten in Galizien 3,28 Mio. Einwohner. Davon waren 32 Tsd. erwachsene adlige Gutsbesitzer. Vgl. „Tabellarische Ausweise über Böhmen und Gallizien von Vice Presidenten Margellik“—Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv Wien, Kabinettsarchiv, Kaiser-Franz-Akten, Fasz. alt 6, Nr. 1.

neue Auffassung oder zumindest für einen neu reflektierten Umgang mit diesem Wort sprechen würde.¹⁹

Doch steht schon die Formulierung des ersten der hier erörterten individuellen Grundrechte deutlich im Interesse der Grundobrigkeiten und zielt gegen die josephinische Urbarial- und Steuerreform: zum Eigentumsrecht gehöre auch die Unantastbarkeit der Inventare und die daraus resultierenden obrigkeitlichen Rechte, die entweder erhalten oder entschädigt werden müssten. Dies war noch im ganzen Vormärz das grundsätzliche Argument von Obrigkeiten für die Beibehaltung der obrigkeitlich-untertänigen Beziehungen oder für Indemnisierung als Ersatz für Grundentlastung.²⁰

Bei der Konzipierung der Organisation der Stände sowie der einzuführenden provinziellen Versammlungen (das Wort Kreis wird vermieden) wurde von der Überzeugung ausgegangen, dass der Grundbesitz die wichtigste Bindung zwischen Bürger und Land und damit auch die verlässliche Basis für Staatstreue sei. Sollte ein Teil der Landtagsabgeordneten gewählt werden, so sollte das Wahlrecht dementsprechend nur den Immobilienbesitzern zustehen. Die Wähler wären in zwei Klassen einzuteilen—die städtische und die der landtäflichen Gutsbesitzer. Darüber hinaus sollte das Recht, im Landtag persönlich zu erscheinen, an einen Steuerzensus von 75 Gulden gebunden sein. Damit wäre der Einfluss der Großgrundbesitzer gesichert. Bei den Gutsbesitzern sollte es um im Lande geborene oder über das Landesindigenat verfügende Adlige gehen (Forderung nach galizischen Ämtern nur für Einheimische), gegen die zur Zeit der Wahl keine strafrechtliche Ermittlungen eingeleitet sein dürften und die nicht im landesfürstlichen oder privaten Dienst stehen würden. Die Abgeordneten des adligen Standes könnten dann verschiedene Vorteile genießen, u. a. Vorzüge bei der Besetzung der Kronämter, bei Standeserhebungen, Mitgliedschaft im Landesausschuss und Immunität. Rücksicht auf andere Bevölkerungsschichten wurde zwar genommen, blieb aber beschränkt: es sollte zur Verstärkung der Vertretung der königlichen Städte kommen, und auf dem Landtag sollten mit beratender Stimme auch drei Untertanenanwälte anwesend sein, denen es aber verboten wäre, Vorschläge einzubringen, die die gesetzlich verankerten Rechte in Frage stellen würden.²¹

¹⁹ *Projekt konstytucji*, 55.

²⁰ *Projekt konstytucji*, 62.

²¹ *Ebd.*, 80–86.

Bei dem so gesicherten Übergewicht der Großgrundbesitzer war es möglich, die Abstimmung durch einfache Landtagsmehrheit in der Vorlage zu verankern. Die Landtagsbeschlüsse sollten erst nach der königlichen Sanktion in Kraft treten, wobei der König lediglich das negative Vetorecht hätte, d. h. nur die Beschlüsse als solche ablehnen, jedoch nicht ändern könnte.

Vor diesem Hintergrund versuchten die Verfasser, eine Einteilung der Macht vorzuschlagen, die den Ständen mehr Mitspracherecht einräumen würde. Als Grundidee benutzten sie die Doktrin, dass sich die Länder, Nationen und Völker nach ihrem eigenen Rechtssystem richten sollen – eine Idee, die eine Kontinuität zwischen dem landespatriotischen Autonomismus und dem modernen Nationalismus darstellt. Es wird hier auf dem Recht beharrt, einen entscheidenden Einfluss auf das Steuerwesen zu haben. Da die galizischen Deputierten wussten, in welche Richtung die Argumente ihrer Gegner gehen würden, betonten sie sicherheitshalber gleich, dass dieser Einfluss des Landtags in keinerlei Widerspruch zum monarchischen Prinzip stehe, und wiesen dabei nicht nur auf Ungarn und Brabant als Beispiele hin, sondern auch im negativen Sinne auf die josephinische Steuerreform, um den Schluss zu ziehen, dass die eigenverantwortliche Festsetzung der Steuer eine unabdingbare Voraussetzung für den Schutz des Eigentumsrechtes sei.²² Diese Positionierung der Frage nach der steuerlichen Zuständigkeit ins Zentrum der galizischen Forderungen und der autonomistischen Argumentation kann in dreierlei Kontext gesehen werden: erstens ist dies der Zusammenhang mit den aktuellsten politischen Fragen des Landes sowie der ganzen Habsburgermonarchie in der damaligen Zeit, zweitens die Verfolgung von grundobrigkeitlichen Gruppeninteressen, drittens dann eine Kontinuität zum frühneuzeitlichen Ständewesen in Ostmitteleuropa – allerdings wohl vielmehr in den habsburgischen Erbländern als in Polen-Litauen selbst, denn gerade im westlichen Teil des Habsburgerreiches stellten diese Rechte das wichtigste Element des ständischen Einflusses und damit auch das bestimmende Merkmal in den Beziehungen zwischen den Ständege-meinden und dem König, zwischen den Hofstellen und dem Land dar.

Trotz der deutlichen Vorteile des großgrundbesitzenden Adels im Landtag wurde die Argumentation für die ständischen Versammlungen in Regionen („Provinzen“) in eine entgegen gesetzte Richtung

²² Ebd., 98.

formuliert: die Regionalversammlungen sollten mehr Kompetenz bekommen als die bloße Wahl von Landtagsabgeordneten, damit die „Stimme des Volkes“ nicht ohne Einfluss bleibe. Ziel war es – zumindest in dieser Proklamation –, dass die Bande zwischen Bürgern und Vaterland verstärkt werden.²³

Die Kompetenzen des Landtags oder der „Generalstände“ sollten die wichtigsten politischen und wirtschaftlichen Bereiche betreffen: von Anfang an insbesondere die Vorbereitung von Kodifikationen (gesetzgeberische Gewalt); außerdem die Steuerrepartition unter Beibehaltung des Unterschiedes zwischen Dominikal- und Rustikalboden, was eine deutliche Polemik zu den josphepinischen Reformprojekten war und von vornherein im Interesse der adligen Gutsbesitzer lag, ebenso wie die Forderung, über Ausfuhrzölle entscheiden zu können, die die Erträge der Gutwirtschaft beträchtlich beeinflussen konnten; Zustimmung zu Veräußerungen von Kameralgütern, deren Loskauf den Marktpreis von allen Gütern mitbestimmte; gesetzliche Initiative, Beschwerden und Remonstrations beim König, Verleihung des Landesindigenats und die Vertretung von Interessen der nichtadligen Gutsbesitzer vor dem König – dies alles sollte den adligen Gutsbesitzern die Kontrolle über den Zugang zur eigenen Gruppe sowie über die Vertretung der gutsherrlichen Interessen sichern.

Wie schon angedeutet, richtete sich ein entschiedener Angriff gegen Kreise, Kreisämter und Kreisbeamte. So wie auf der Landesebene mit einem ständischen Landesausschuss gerechnet wurde, der die laufenden ständischen Geschäfte in der Zeit zwischen den Landtagen besorgen sollte, wurden ähnliche Ausschüsse auch für einzelne Regionen vorgeschlagen. Die bisherigen Kreishauptleute wären zu entlassen und durch Landesangehörige zu ersetzen. Der Provinzausschuss hätte unter anderem die Aufgabe, die Konflikte zwischen Untertanen und Obrigkeiten als zuständige Gerichtsinstanz zu lösen. Darüber hinaus hätten diese regionalen Provinzialdeputationen die Kompetenz, alle Änderungen der dominialen Inventare zu registrieren, was eine Voraussetzung für deren Gültigkeit wäre. Damit würden die Urbarialangelegenheiten völlig unter die Kontrolle der durch den Adel dominierten Stände gestellt. Außerdem sollte der Adel privilegierter Gerichtsstand bleiben und der Dominikalgrund Steuervorteile genießen.²⁴

²³ Ebd., 90.

²⁴ Ebd., 142, 150.

Im Zusammenhang mit der projizierten regionalen Selbstverwaltung bekräftigten die Verfasser wieder ihren Ausgangspunkt, dass jedes Land nicht von fremden Beamten, sondern nur von Landansässigen richtig und legitim verwaltet werden könne. Eine besondere Kritik wurde an den Abgrenzungen zwischen Beamten und den Landansässigen geübt, falls sich die hohen Beamten nicht aus den Kreisen der Landesangehörigen rekrutieren:

C'est un énorme défaut de constitution, quand les employés forment une nation dans la nation, un état dans l'état, un ordre isolé et séparé d'intérêts de tous les autres. Ils n'ont alors aucun zèle pour le bien public, ils regardent la service uniquement comme moyen de subsister, pourvû qu'ils tirent leurs pensions, ils sont contents, et ils savent qu'elles ne leur manqueront jamais, telle que soit la situation du pays, qui leur fournit [...] L'intérêt des étrangers sera toujours opposé au nôtre.²⁵

Das war nicht nur ein direkter und unzweideutiger Angriff auf die josephinische Bürokratie in Galizien, sondern auch eine Überzeugung, die zum Ethos des hohen Beamtentums der josephinischen Ära diametral gegenläufig war: die Beamten – damals etwa der Landesgouverneur Graf Joseph von Brigido oder der Gubernialrat Max von Lezzeni – setzten das Interesse des Souveräns mit dem Wohl des Landes grundsätzlich gleich, und es war im Gegenteil die Bindung des Adels zum Land, die in ihren Augen seine Uneigennützigkeit und Loyalität in Frage stellte.²⁶ Es war ein Bereich, wo zwischen der josephinischen Provinzialnomenklatur und dem altständischen Autonomismus wenig Raum für Kompromisse blieb, zumindest was die grundsätzlichen theoretischen Ausgangspunkte betraf.

Es ist sicher kein Wunder, dass die *Charta Leopoldina* keinerlei Zweifel an der Legitimität und Zukunft der Zugehörigkeit Galiziens zur Habsburgermonarchie äußerte. Dies scheint nicht nur ein taktischer Schritt, sondern auch Ausdruck von Überzeugungen und Realabschätzungen der galizischen Aristokratie gewesen zu sein.

Der ständische Landesautonomismus hebt sich im galizischen Falle kaum von Forderungen ab, die zur gleichen Zeit die böhmischen Stände gestellt haben. Interessant an der galizischen Argumentation sind jedoch die häufigen Hinweise auf ungarische Beispiele und sogar

²⁵ Ebd., 126–128.

²⁶ Vgl. etwa die Meldungen Lezzenis an den Kaiser Leopold II. im HHStA Wien, KFA, Fasz. alt 11, Nr. 9.

Forderungen nach einer engeren Verbindung mit Ungarn. Die galizischen Stände haben hier die habsburgische dynastische Legitimation der Annexion Galiziens von 1772 indirekt beim Wort genommen. So hat die *Charta Leopoldina* nicht nur ungarische Vorbilder erwähnt, nach denen bestimmte Angelegenheiten in Galizien geregelt werden könnten (bspw. Komitate als Vorbild für galizische provinzielle/regionale Selbstverwaltung), sondern auch die Überführung der galizischen Agenda von der böhmisch-österreichischen Hofkanzlei (in diese wurde die erst seit zwei Jahren existierende galizische Hofkanzlei bereits 1776 eingegliedert) in die ungarische, in deren Rahmen als Abteilung eine galizische Hofkanzlei mit eigenen Beamten und Personal errichtet werden sollte, ähnlich, wie es im siebenbürgischen Fall geschehen war.²⁷ Ganz am Ende haben die Verfasser als Mittel zur Sicherung der Verfassung die ungarische Königskrönung vorgeschlagen, die automatisch als galizisch-lodomerische gelten würde. Schließlich wurde sogar der Vorschlag einer „incorporation indirecte“ mit Ungarn gemacht, mit der Aussicht, „qu'enfin les Galiciens eux mêmes, s'ils sont déjà destinés à ne point former un peuple en eux, se consoleraient plutôt de leur existence particulière, étant joints à une nation avec laquelle ils ont le plus de conformité, qu'ils ne seront contents de dépendre d'une autre d'un génie tout à fait opposé à leur“,²⁸ womit Böhmen und die Wiener Zentrale gemeint wurden.

Nach der Vorlegung der *Charta Leopoldina* wurde mit deren weiteren Behandlung die böhmisch-österreichische Hofkanzlei unter der Leitung von Leopold Graf Kolowrat-Krakowsky beauftragt. Infolge der innenpolitischen wie außenpolitischen Stabilisierung zeigten sich jedoch die Zentralstellen immer unnachgiebiger. Schließlich wurde der galizischen Delegation nahe gelegt, dass sie nicht als legitime Repräsentation des Landes angesehen werde, und ab Oktober 1790 galten nur Ossoliński und Bąkowski als Gesprächspartner.

Eine speziell berufene Hofkommission erörterte die galizischen Desiderien am 21. und 28. Januar 1791. Ihre Betrachtung der ständischen Forderungen war sehr vorsichtig und lehnte sich streng an die absolutistisch monarchischen Prinzipien an, doch kann Stanisław

²⁷ *Projekt konstytucji*, 136.

²⁸ *Projekt konstytucji*, 160. Allerdings gingen die Vorstellungen der Stände nicht deutlich in die Richtung einer „habsburgischen Sekundogenitur“, wie S. Grodziski meinte, bloß aufgrund der Tatsache, dass sie sich für die Zukunft habsburgische Erzherzöge als Landeschefs (Landesgouverneure) wünschten. Ebd., 134.

Grodziski, der bisher das ständische Programm von 1790 am ausführlichsten behandelt hat, nicht zugestimmt werden, dass die Kommission nur unbedeutende Zugeständnisse vorschlug und sonst die ganze Charta gänzlich ablehnte.²⁹ Übrigens ist bekannt, dass Leopold II. im Vergleich zu seinem Vorgänger und Bruder eine relativ günstigere Meinung über die mögliche Rolle der ständischen Vertretung in einem absolutistisch regierten Staat hatte.³⁰ Was die Betrachtung der in der *Charta* vorgelegten Wünsche anbelangt, hat die Kommission der Hofkanzlei in Wien in vielen Punkten der *Charta* zugestimmt, auch wenn häufig mit mehr oder weniger gravierenden Modifikationen und Vorbehalten.³¹ Doch ist bemerkenswert, dass bei der Hofkommission vor allem jene, zum großen Teil tatsächlich zentralen Punkte eindeutige Ablehnung gefunden haben, die in deren Augen die Einflussverstärkung der Aristokratie und der größten Grundbesitzer zuungunsten von anderen Ständen und Bevölkerungsschichten zum Ziel hatte. Dies betraf etwa die Vorstellung, dass sich nur die Besitzer der landtäflichen Güter und städtischen Realitäten am ständischen Mitspracherecht (allerdings ohne Unterschied ihrer ständischen Zugehörigkeit!) beteiligen können, wobei für die damaligen ständischen Legitimationsmuster das typische Argument von der galizischen Delegation benutzt wurde, dass mit dem Bodenbesitz einerseits die Leistungen zugunsten des Staates, andererseits eine feste Verbundenheit mit dem Land und daher auch der echtste Patriotismus verknüpft sind. Die Kommission war dagegen der Meinung, dass ein solches „persönliches Stimmrecht einer privilegierten Klasse“ zugunsten der breiteren Vertretung verschiedener „Volksklassen“ abgelehnt werden müsse.³² Ähnlich deutlich ablehnend reagierte die Kommission, wo sie eine direkte oder potentielle Bedrohung des Zusammenhalts des Staates sah, wobei sie nicht zu betonen vergaß, dass „Gallizien keinen Staat für sich, sondern nur einen Theil des Oesterreichischen Staats ausmacht“.³³

Nicht eindeutig stellte sich die Hofkommission zu den Forderungen nach Reservierung der Landesämter für einheimische Ständeangehörige, d. h. für die Träger des galizischen Indigenats, die im Lande

²⁹ S. Grodziski, Wstęp, 11.

³⁰ Vocelka, *Österreichische Geschichte*, 387.

³¹ „Auszug aus dem k. k. Hofkommissions Protokoll, über die den 21. und 28. Jenner 1791 gehaltene Zusammentretungen, die Begehren der Gallizischen Ständischen deputierten betreffend“. HHStA, Staatskanzlei, Provinzen, Galizien, Kart. 1, Fol. 25–44.

³² Ebd., Fol. 26a.

³³ Edb., Fol. 32a.

ansässig und der polnischen Sprache mächtig waren. Die Position der Kommission schwankte zwischen der Anerkennung der Nützlichkeit der Respektierung solcher Grundsätze, sie weigerte sich aber zu empfehlen, dass solche Bedingungen verbindlich festgelegt werden sollten. Internen Materialien zufolge scheint hier also eine Akzeptanz der Forderung nach der Landeszugehörigkeit der Beamten und der Benutzung der Landessprache zu herrschen, verbunden jedoch mit der Überzeugung, dass sich der Herrscher in dieser Richtung nicht völlig beschränken und binden sollte. Doch wurde eine Beseitigung der deutschen Sprache in der Verwaltung völlig abgelehnt, genauso wie die Vorstellung, dass die damaligen Kreishauptleute entlassen werden sollten. Es wurde die Nützlichkeit eines Vorzugs von Einheimischen anerkannt, nicht aber deren ausschließliches Recht. Die Argumente der Kommission sind in dieser Richtung bemerkenswert: es waren „die dem Staate so äusserst wichtige Umgestaltung der Gallizier zu einem *deutschen* Volk, und die Umschaffung ihres Charakters“; die Mahnung, „es könnten Zeiten wiederkommen, wo es sehr gefährlich wäre, wenn alle Aemter mit Nationalisten besetzt wären“; die Behauptung, „es fehlt der Nation dermalen wohl nicht an Fähigkeit, aber wohl noch an Bildung und Kenntnissen“; die Feststellung, dass „die Nation [...] mit den *pohlnischen* Beamten selbst noch viel unzufriedener [war] als mit den *deutschen*“, sowie die Annahme, dass „auch izt [...] dieser Antrag bey weitem nicht der Wunsch grössern Theils der Nation“ sei.³⁴

Mit den Kommissionsberatungen im Januar 1791 endeten die Verhandlungen über die Desiderien im Prinzip. Die Lage komplizierte sich in den folgenden Monaten, insbesondere mit der Entwicklung in Polen und der Verabschiedung der polnischen Verfassung am 3. Mai. Einerseits drohte hier die Möglichkeit, dass sich die aristokratischen Sprecher durch das Warschauer Vorbild inspirieren lassen, was eher gegen die Weiterführung von Verhandlungen sprach. Andererseits war Nachgiebigkeit ratsam, wie das der Präsident des Lemberger Landesguberniums Graf Brigido im November 1791 empfahl (übrigens hatte Brigido selbst einen eigenen Vorschlag zur Landesverfassung, in dem er nicht zu betonen zögerte, dass die josephinische Organisation des politischen Systems dem Lande keinen Wohlstand und kein Glück brachte).³⁵ Zwar hat Leopold II. eine neue Kommission unter dem Vorsitz des Erzherzogs und Thronfolgers Franz berufen, doch haben

³⁴ Ebd., Fol. 37b.

³⁵ HHStA, Kabinettsarchiv, KFA, Fasz. alt 11, Nr. 1.

mit dem baldigen Tod des Kaisers alle Handlungen in der Sache der ständischen *Charta Leopoldina* aufgehört.

Die Ereignisse der Jahre 1790 und 1791 stellten nicht nur in Galizien für eine lange Zeit den Höhepunkt der Aktivitäten der Stände bzw. des Adels dar. Nie zuvor und eigentlich auch nie wieder danach waren die galizischen Stände in der Lage, ein so umfangreiches Verfassungsprojekt zu formulieren. Die ständische Opposition hat sich zwar ab den 1820er Jahren wieder, wenn auch gemäßigt, herausgebildet, ist aber in ihren Vorschlägen bis in die 1840er nie so weit gegangen wie in der kurzen Regierungszeit Leopolds II. Zwar versuchte sechs Jahre nach der *Charta Leopoldina* der Adel im neu angegliederten Westgalizien seine relativ weitgehenden Wünsche vorzulegen (1796–1797), dabei handelte es sich jedoch nicht um ein derart kohärentes Verfassungsprojekt.³⁶

Die politische Entwicklung und insbesondere die französischen und napoleonischen Kriege führten dazu, dass eine erneute Reform des ständischen Systems in Galizien, deren Notwendigkeit man nach der Annexion Westgaliziens sowohl im Lande als auch in Wien noch viel stärker empfand, auf Eis gelegt wurde. Übrigens wurden auch keine galizischen Landtage mehr einberufen. Erst im ersten Jahrzehnt des 19. Jahrhunderts wurden bei den Wiener Zentralstellen Konsultationen und Beratungen durchgeführt, die die Modifizierung der ständischen Verfassung für das viel größer gewordene Galizien zum Gegenstand hatte.³⁷ Weitere Beratungen wurden dann wieder 1811 eingeleitet.³⁸ Die neue Reform musste von veränderten Umständen ausgehen und konnte auf die alte ständische Verfassung Galiziens aus den 1770er und 1780er Jahren zurückgreifen, ihre Durchführung verschob sich jedoch erst auf die Jahre nach den napoleonischen Kriegen.

³⁶ S. zur Genese und Inhalt Tadeusz Mencel, *Galicja Zachodnia 1795–1809. Studium z dziejów ziem polskich zaboru austriackiego po III rozbiórce* [Westgalizien 1795–1809. Studie aus der Geschichte der polnischen Länder im österreichischen Teilungsgebiet nach der dritten Teilung]. (Lublin: Wydawnictwo Lubelskie, 1976), S. 56–66.

³⁷ HHStA, Staatskanzlei, Provinzen, Galizien, Kart. 1, Fasz. „Correspondenz der Staatskanzlei mit dem galizischen Landesgubernium 1781–1811“, Fol. 108–148.

³⁸ Ebd., Fol. 234–246.

Fazit

Die patriotischen Ausgangspunkte, Konzepte und Forderungen der Sprecher des galizischen Großadels weisen viele Kontinuitäten zum frühneuzeitlichen polnischen territorialen, politischen und staatlichen Ständepatriotismus, ebenso wie viele Innovationen nicht nur in der territorialen Ausrichtung, sondern auch im Inhalt auf.

Die Argumentationsgrundlage arbeitet gewiss mit vielen Elementen eines „klassischen“ frühneuzeitlichen mitteleuropäischen Patriotismus, zum Teil auch in der Form, wie er aus den habsburgischen Erbländern des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts oder teilweise sogar des Vormärz bekannt war. Dieser Landespatritismus der Angehörigen des Adelsstandes bzw. der Ständegemeinde richtete sich auf die politische Einheit des Landes, betonte die Landesspezifika, ging jedoch – wenn auch eher unbetont – vom Zusammenhalt des Staates aus. Ohne diesen Zusammenhalt in Frage zu stellen, stellte er die Beziehung zwischen dem Land und dem Staat bzw. dessen Zentrale sowie die Beziehung zwischen der Ständegemeinde als Repräsentant des Landes einerseits und dem König als Landesfürst und zugleich dem Souverän des Gesamtstaates andererseits in den Mittelpunkt der verfassungsmäßigen Konzepte. Es ist also ein ständischer Patriotismus, der fest von der ständischen Verfassung ausgeht und die Stände als Träger der Landesrechte und Landesinteressen versteht. Doch musste diesmal der ständische (adlige) Landespatritismus angesichts der (in Österreich eher staatlichen als bürgerlichen) Adelskritik programmatisch mit ethischen Argumenten verteidigt und rechtfertigt werden. Die Argumentation mit Gutsbesitz als der sichersten Bindung zwischen Menschen und Land, als verlässlichste, da unvermeidliche Grundlage für einen wahren Landespatritismus zeigt, dass man sich immer weniger mit dem „bestehenden“ ständischen System und mit der formalen ständischen Zuordnung als Rekrutierungsmerkmal der Elite zufrieden geben konnte und auf die Legitimationsmuster der Zeit reagieren musste. Damit kann sicherlich nicht behauptet werden, dass eine solche Rechtfertigung oder die Mobilisierungsfunktion des Patriotismusbegriffs in der zweiten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts neu gewesen wäre, doch scheint ihre Legitimationsfähigkeit, moralische Beladung, politische Direktrelevanz und Mobilisationskraft im Kontext der gesellschaftlichen Aufklärungsideen deutlich gestiegen zu sein. Davon musste auch der galizische Patriotismuskurs beeinflusst sein, obwohl eine heftige politische und stark moralisch geprägte Debatte über den „wahren Patriotismus“ weder in Österreich noch in Galizien selbst solch eine bestimmende Bedeutung

hatte, wie das in Polen-Litauen in den Jahren des Großen Sejms und des Kościuszko-Aufstandes der Fall war.³⁹

Der Landespatriotismus, der in den Konzepten der Jahre 1790–1791 zum Ausdruck kam, wies zum Teil ähnlich den frühneuzeitlichen Landespatriotismen in Mitteleuropa starke politische und rechtliche Züge auf. Was die politische Fundierung anbetrifft, bezog er sich stark auf die klar definierte und eindeutig abgegrenzte politische Einheit des Landes in seinen damaligen Grenzen, ohne auf die polnischen Bezüge im kulturellen Bereich (Sprache) zu verzichten. Es ergab sich aus dem Kontext, dass die Äußerungen der Jahre 1790/91 besonders politisch geprägt waren, doch gehörte vor allem die Wirtschaftsproblematik sowohl damals als auch in späteren Jahrzehnten zu den zentralen Topoi des galizischen Patriotismuskurses, selbst bei den politischen Aktivitäten der galizischen Repräsentanz. Die politische Prägung des (hoch)adligen Patriotismus äußerte sich auch in der Akzeptanz des staatspolitischen Rahmens in der Habsburgermonarchie. Dies betraf neben der Zugehörigkeit des Landes zu Österreich, von der nicht nur in offiziellen oder halboffiziellen Äußerungen Wien gegenüber realistisch ausgegangen wurde, auch die Orientierung im politischen System der Monarchie. Die Formulierung, die Sprecher des galizischen Adels haben hier sogar durchaus Realitätsnähe gezeigt, die Möglichkeiten realistisch beurteilt, kann zwar bei der Betrachtung einiger Punkte der *Charta Leopoldina* ziemlich übertrieben scheinen – solange die *Charta* nicht mit den ständischen Bitten und Forderungen des Jahres 1773 verglichen wird. Denn damals, kurz nach der Angliederung Galiziens an das Habsburgerreich, konnten sich die österreichischen Behörden in den galizischen Verhältnissen nicht viel besser orientieren als der polnische Adel im österreichischen monarchischen System. Zwei verschiedene Lebenswelten prallten im politischen Bereich aufeinander. Vorstellungen, die der galizische Adel als Wünsche vor dem Hintergrund der bevorstehenden Huldigung an Maria Theresia formulierte, verfehlten völlig die politische Realität des Habsburgerreiches und

³⁹ [Hugo Kołłątaj], *Korespondencja jednego obywatela z podkomorzym pewnego województwa z okoliczności przyszłego rządu* [Die Korrespondenz eines Bürgers mit dem Kämmerer einer gewissen Wojwodschaft bezüglich der zukünftigen Regierung]. (Warszawa, 1789), abgedruckt bei Bogusław Leśnodorski, ed., *Kuźnica Kołłątajowska. Wybór tekstów*, (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 2003), 109–120; s. auch Bogusław Leśnodorski, *Polscy jakobini. Karta z dziejów insurekcji 1794 roku* [Die polnischen Jakobiner. Aus der Geschichte der Insurrektion von 1794], (Warszawa: Książka i wiedza, 1960), 348–349. Waclaw Tokarz, *Ostatnie lata Hugona Kołłątaja 1794–1812* [Die letzten Jahre von Hugo Kołłątaj], Bd. 2, (Kraków: Gebethner i Wolff, 1905), 245.

waren von Anfang an, grundsätzlich und in allen wichtigen Punkten völlig außerhalb des Rahmens dieser Realität und entsprangen den traditionellen polnischen Politik- und Adelsverständnissen.⁴⁰ Dies ist abgesehen von starken ständischen und autonomistischen Tendenzen in der *Charta Leopoldina* bei weitem nicht so der Fall: sie verfehlt den Rahmen des politischen Systems im Habsburgerreich nicht, sie kommuniziert und korrespondiert mit ihm, auch wenn mit wohl übertriebenen Erwartungen und zugespitzten Vorschlägen.

Dies zeigt sich in der Akzeptanz des neuen staatlichen Rahmens und im relativ neuen Vokabular der galizischen Elite: Die Eliten lassen deutliche Bezüge auf ihre historische und kulturelle Zusammengehörigkeit mit Polen verlauten, doch geht es – nicht nur hier und nicht nur auf der offiziellen Ebene – um die Interessen Galiziens im Rahmen der Monarchie. Der Landespatriotismus des galizischen Adels um 1790 ist ein galizischer Landespatriotismus, orientiert auf ein Land in dem Umfang und in den Grenzen, wie sie völlig neu bei der ersten Teilung Polens gezogen wurden. Es ist ein Landespatriotismus im Rahmen des durch die Teilungsmacht Österreich neu geschaffenen Königreiches und erblichen Kronlandes. Die galizischen politischen Sprecher des Jahres 1790/91 sind zwar immerhin polnische Patrioten, dabei aber auch unmissverständlich galizische Landespatrioten. Sie bezeichnen Galizien als ihre Heimat und sich selbst als Galizier. Wenn über die „Nation“ gesprochen wird, dann ist zwar nicht immer klar (und dies ist doch ein Anzeichen für eine Bewegung des Nationsverständnisses), ob die Stände, der (Guts)Adel, die politische Repräsentanz oder die Einwohner des Landes gemeint sind. Doch wird dieses Wort ohne Adjektiv benutzt, versteht sich darunter die Nation des Landes, die galizische Nation. Sie ist durch den politischen, nicht durch den kulturellen Rahmen definiert. Dies ist dann eine in der zwanzigjährigen Perspektive nach 1772 neue Erscheinung: wenn nicht die Jahre nach 1772, dann sind spätestens die Jahre um 1790 die Geburtszeit des galizischen Landespatriotismus, dessen politische Relevanz und identitätsstiftende Bedeutung – zunächst zumindest in den hochadligen Kreisen – uns berechtigen könnten, über einen Galizismus zu sprechen. Doch müssen vor allem die kulturellen Aspekte der Neuentwerfung, Projektierung und Konstruierung dieser territoriumsbezogenen Identität weiterhin als Forschungsdesiderat gelten.

⁴⁰ Vgl. Waclaw Tokarz, *Pierwsze dezyderaty szlachty galicyjskiej* (1773) [Erste Desiderien des galizischen Adels] (1773) in *Studia historyczne wydane ku czci prof. Wincentego Zakrzewskiego* (Kraków: J. Filipowski 1908), 357–369.

AFTERWORD

R. J. W. Evans

East-central Europe has never been an area easy to define in any satisfactory fashion. Indeed, the term is essentially a recent scholarly construct, still less familiar than its equally ineffable parent locutions, central Europe and eastern Europe.¹ Yet we all know roughly where it was, and why it mattered, at certain crucial stages of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. 'East-central Europe' was the troubled provinces of the Habsburg and Russian empires, often actively or passively insubordinate from the 1840s onwards; and it shaded into the northern Balkans, where Ottoman rule was likewise increasingly contested. After World War One, on the ruins of the old empires, this region yielded the model of the new nation-state in Europe and beyond, but with all the associated political, social, economic and diplomatic weaknesses which allowed first Hitler's Third Reich and then the Soviet Union to dominate east-central Europe for half a century from 1939.

The chief cause of instability in modern east-central Europe has, by common consent, been its nationalist movements and its nationality frictions, on collision course with each other and with existing regimes unwilling or unable to accommodate them. Two features of nationalism have appeared particularly characteristic of the area. On one hand it drew on a powerful sense of *linguistic and ethnic* identity, in a part of Europe where these were widely discrepant. On the other hand, this combined in various ways with *territorial-historical* claims of settlement and institutional development, continuous or discontinuous, over a range of periods from the recent past to the most shadowy antiquity. As the Czech awakener Josef Jungmann put it, 'there are two infallible signs of nationality: one's past and one's language, or

¹ This work is copiously provided with general bibliography, especially in the Introduction. References in this Afterword are therefore held to an absolute minimum. There is an excellent introduction by Robin Okey, "Central Europe/Eastern Europe: Behind the Definitions," *Past & Present*, 137 (1992), 102–33. Cf. R. J. W. Evans, "Coming to Terms with the Habsburgs. Reflections on the Historiography of Central Europe," in Thomas Row, ed., *Does Central Europe Still Exist? History, Economy, Identity* (Vienna: Diplomatische Akademie Wien, 2007), 11–24.

history and literature, the fruits of national life.²² Claims were made for the Slavs in general, and for specific groupings of them, led by Poles, Czechs, Croats, and Serbs; for Hungarians/Magyars and Rumanians; for Albanians, Greeks, and Baltic peoples on the eastern and southern fringes of the region. The claims intermixed, overlapping and conflicted, both with one another and on the western and northern fringes of the region also with Germans and Italians in their home territory and as minorities beyond it.

It must be important to investigate where these national allegiances came from. Yet their origins have been commonly ignored or foreclosed. Nationality has been perceived as an essentially modern phenomenon, generated by the political, social, and economic evolution after c. 1789. Its antecedents in east-central Europe have been neglected, the more so since that area appeared backward by precisely the criteria which would generate more advanced forms of identity. It presented a picture of multinational commonwealths in decay: the Holy Roman Empire itself gradually forfeiting its *raison d'être*; Poland-Lithuania and Hungary in steep decline as autonomous polities. The ravages of Turkish occupation, the Thirty Years war, the Northern wars and the contests of the mid-eighteenth century highlighted its vulnerability and aggravated its 'peripheral' status. So did the shifting frontiers and population movements which further complicated the very mixed and variegated pattern of existing linguistic, cultural, and religious groups.

The subject-matter of this volume is thus largely unfamiliar. The commonest term to give some coherence to the prehistory of nationalism in Europe as a whole is patriotism, and the present collection seeks to explore the fortunes of that word and its cognates through the east-centre of the continent. While illuminating, it does not simplify. Perhaps the strongest impression it leaves is of the extreme complexity of the picture presented, the myriad sorts of (self-)designation involved. Not that individuals necessarily possessed subtle identities: many would have been puzzled by the very notion. Yet collectivities of people—just what leaders, theorists, and propagandists were trying to actualize—never thought or felt alike. Besides, the words used

²² "Dvě jsou známky neomylné národnosti: dějiny a jazyk, čili historie a literatura, plody národního života": "O klasičnosti literatury a důležitosti její" [On the classical nature of literature and its importance (1827), in *Boj o obrození národa; výbor z díla Josefa Jungmanna*, Struggle for the rebirth of the nation. Selection from the works of Josef Jungmann], ed. Felix Vodička (Prague, 1948).

to describe them were confused and confusing, whether the usage of ‘populus’, ‘gens’, ‘natio’, and other international Latin expressions, or their multifarious vernacular equivalents. In what follows I shall reflect a little further on four thematic fields mapped out in previous sections (with bracketed reminders of the *contributors* who have here commented on the topic).

The clearest bridge to later developments, and the most distinctive feature of earlier east-central European society was the noble-corporative base for its primary, territorial identity. The ‘fatherland of the noble nation’, as laid out here for the Commonwealth, the *Rzeczpospolita*, of Poland-Lithuania (**Grześkowiak-Krwawicz**), provided a focus of loyalty in countries where members of the noble estate were both numerous and—in principle—equal in rank. It involved notions of a republican commitment to the common good, defence of liberty, and stewardship of landed property; but always with noble rights at its root (**Roszak**). The symbols of estates’ authority were correspondingly important, witness the role of the Holy Crown of Hungary as an organic metaphor for that country’s noble community. However, such native patriotism could also overlap with that of neighbours, as the case of the amphibian intellectual Johann/Jan/János Jessenius/Jesenský/Jeszenszky shows (**Teszelszky**).

Jessenius became a leader, and then a victim, of the severest confrontation between noble patriots and their rulers in early modern east-central Europe: the abortive confederal revolt against the Habsburgs in 1618–20. At the best of times the incorporation of rulers into this patriotic framework remained fitful, notably in Poland and Hungary, although the later Croat version developed by Pavao Ritter-Vitezović (**Bene**) did assume a more Habsburgophile form. It underlay the voluntary adhesion by the Croatian estates to the dynasty’s new inheritance arrangements—the first formulation of the celebrated Pragmatic Sanction—in 1712. The Bohemian variant of noble patriotism was duly domesticated after the revolt, but it still carried enough of a cachet to be appealed to by all sides, especially rival aristocrats and prelates (**Maťa**), although there appears to have been a good deal of shadow-boxing involved, and all parties were thoroughly Habsburg-loyalist, maybe *gesamtmonarchisch* at times.

The Polish terminology of territorial patriotism was particularly exclusive—dismissing most foreigners as ‘subjects’ to their purportedly arbitrary monarchs, as well as all non-nobles at home. But that did not mean such sentiments were unavailable to other social groups, even in

Poland, where commoners would look to their urban *patria*, maybe at risk from predatory local nobles, or to the solidarity of service in the army (**Augustyniak**). Other parallel examples discussed here are the civic pride of Ragusans, the *natio Ragusea*, with its clear urban context, hard-edged like the city walls of Dubrovnik (**Kunčević**); and the hajducks, or freebooting peasants, who became representatives, at least temporarily while under arms against the Habsburgs at the start of the seventeenth century, of the whole land (*ország*) of Hungary (**Varga**). Yet the ultimate reward of the hajducks was inclusion within the corporate body of the estates: confirmation rather than subversion of the dominant patriotic values.

The second mode of patriotism in east-central Europe was humanistic. The region's intellectuals felt themselves an integral, and yet also a marginal part of the revived classical culture which lent them prestige. It presented itself to them as both an international and a national phenomenon: they sought linkage to perceived centres of humanist learning, but in return for recognition of their own place, however modest, within the *Respublica Litteraria*.³ Whereas that was an entirely suitable aspiration in sixteenth-century Poland, with its flourishing and at times strongly Italianate aulic and academic institutions, it was harder to sustain elsewhere. Hungary and Croatia, succumbing largely to Turkish occupation, provide us with the extremest case. In the immediate aftermath of the disaster at Mohács, Benedek Komjáti sought to make Magyar a 'vulgaris illustris' on the best Erasmian lines; while decades later János Baranyai Decsi, surveying the continued ruination of the Hungarian state, reflected stoically that 'we should at least dedicate our language, history and literature to immortality'⁴ (**Ács**). Thus even the obscure little Upper Hungarian borough of Bartfeld could be extolled in Ciceronian terms for its municipal virtues (**Kiss**). That made it a less refined and more provincial version of Ragusa; and local humanists placed Dalmatia at the heart of a great Slav 'Illyrian' brotherhood, with classical antecedents and major historiographical vindication (**Madunić, Blažević**).

Yet there was hierarchy as well as sodality on the periphery. Most striking is the example of the Wallachians, or proto-Romanians, who

³ My own reflections on this experience in R. J. W. Evans, "Europa als Peripherie in der Frühen Neuzeit," *Jahrbuch für Europäische Geschichte*, 3 (2002), 59–79.

⁴ Cited above in this volume, 54.

could claim Roman ancestry on the basis of their language, but were often derided as at best degenerate, if not outright barbarians, even their most successful scions, such as the mid-sixteenth-century primate of Hungary, Nicholas Olahus (**Almás**i). Altogether the civic and secular virtues reinstated from antiquity sat uneasily with other kinds of patriotic priority. Besides, they underwent a shift after 1500 from Italian towards more French and Netherlandish forms, with corresponding revaluation of the claims of the urban versus the courtly milieu as their proper locus. The stoic treatises of Justus Lipsius were hugely popular, especially in Hungary, during his own time and later, even into the days of Ritter-Vitezović, in their call for a civilian and active allegiance, rather than the pious and personal liens enjoined by religion (**Vincze**). Evidently, however, the conflicting denominational assertions of the age acquired a significance of their own for our purposes, as a third, religious, theme in this volume explains.

The distinctiveness of east-central Europe in the centuries of Reformation and Counter-Reformation was that Protestantism initially won out there, over much of the terrain and through much of society, but then lost out with almost equal completeness.⁵ It was Protestants, in the first instance, who developed the notion of an ‘elect nation’ as focus for patriotic allegiance. That was already fully elaborated by the 1530s in the parallel between Hungarians and Jews, which for a time could seem to embrace almost the whole Reformed Magyar nation (**Trencsényi**). The sense of quasi-biblical travail and of common ground with the children of Israel also became prominent among Czechs in the aftermath of the Hussite awakening; there too it combined with domestic humanist models, notably in the work of Daniel Adam Velešlavín (**Storchová**).

After 1600, as the Catholic Church recovered ground under the aegis of Habsburg political dominance, the path of providentialist patriotism bifurcated. On one hand, it led to eschatological confessional mentalities in defeated Protestants who suffered persecution and sacrifice (albeit not often physical martyrdom) à la John Foxe. That was apparent among exiles from Bohemia, whose *Historia Persecutionum* took Foxe’s *Actes & Monuments* as its model (**Urbánek**),

⁵ Thorough coverage of this whole process in Thomas Winkelbauer, *Ständefreiheit und Fürstenmacht: Länder und Untertanen des Hauses Habsburg im konfessionellen Zeitalter*, 2 vols (Vienna: Verlag Carl Ueberreuter, 2003).

and later from Hungary (**Tóth**); though such pleas always served only in part as claims to a national calling, since they grew out of larger salvationist purposes, above all in the universal schemes of a Comenius. On the other hand Catholics could adapt the idea of a national religious agenda—Cardinal Pázmány in Hungary did so to great effect—and once restored to power they might squabble over it too (**Pörtner**), drawing on recognizably ethnic stereotypes, in relation to the provincial organization of the Society of Jesus and other religious orders. Moreover, Catholicism could constitute a major part of collective national identity, whether in the case of the hazy overlaps of Dalmatian-Illyrian-Croat loyalty or in the Sarmatian ideology of the Polish establishment.

The three pillars of early modern patriotism in east-central Europe then, the territorial loyalty of noble estates, humanists' assertion of the cultural values of their marginal homelands, and national understandings of religious community in the shifting contest of Protestants and Catholics: these pillars, whether separately or in combination, reflected and accentuated the special features of the region. But they touched limited groups of people, mainly in the upper echelons of society, and it remains to ask how they came to acquire that wider and dynamic quality which would later attach to them. Several authors explore here aspects of transition in the eighteenth century. Its underlying feature was the creation of a more focused 'state patriotism'. Now cameralist and natural law arguments were added to existing ones based on *bonum commune*, civic virtue and confessional solidarity to sustain movements of progressive and centralizing reform. These made increasing play with ideas of citizenship, and of the homeland as requiring engagement, but also delivering corresponding benefits. The famously equivocal slogan of 'ubi bene, ibi patria' encapsulated *Aufklärung* notions of improvement.⁶ The Polish meliorist Konarski expressed something similar with his remark that 'no one can be for-

⁶ A variant of the phrase is cited from Pufendorf above, 224. Cf. Moritz Csáky and Reinhard Hagelkrys, *Vaterlandsliebe und Gesamtstaatsidee im österreichischen 18. Jahrhundert* (Beihefte zum Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Gesellschaft zur Erforschung des 18. Jahrhunderts) Bd. 1 (Vienna, 1989); and Ernst Wangermann, "Joseph von Sonnenfels und die Vaterlandsliebe der Aufklärung," in *Joseph von Sonnenfels*, ed. Helmut Reinalter (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für die Geschichte Österreichs 13.) (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1988), 157–69.

tunate in an unfortunate fatherland'; so did the tendency to reverse the terms of the traditional adage that 'the fatherland guarantees liberty'.⁷

How far would this *Staatspatriotismus* be explicitly monarchical and dynastic, tributary to the enlightened 'absolutists' or 'despots' of the day? In east-central Europe the Austrian Habsburg case was decisive (**Shek Brnardić**). Italians, including the great projector featured in the present book, Count Luigi Marsigli, had been prominent among early propagators of such patriotism; then came Joseph von Sonnenfels and other ideologues of the rule of Maria Theresa and Joseph II.⁸ They sought to broaden the base of an involvement in the *patria* that was now clearly no longer indissolubly associated with landholding. The German model of *Landeskunde*, statistical evaluation of state resources, attained an influence across the area as far as Transylvania (**Török**), even if it adapted there to social circumstances, and we encounter the same disparagement of 'Wallachians' as two centuries earlier. The Holy Roman Empire also generated an ideal of sacrifice for the whole greater or lesser fatherland, a blend of rhetoric and practical service, which soon fell heavily in thrall to the hero figure of Frederick II of Prussia.⁹

That repertoire of sacrificial patriotism came to be most fully activated in our region by the demise of historic Poland during the 1790s. But there, and to a lesser degree in Hungary, it was harder to associate with monarchical power. The new terminology of state allegiance served as a vehicle for the Polish republican values (**Stasiak**); in the crisis of the *Rzeczpospolita* communal virtues replaced individual ones (**Kostkiewiczowa**). A good example, and one invoked here, is that of the *Listy patriotyczne* of Józef Wybicki (better remembered as the author of the words to the later Polish anthem), compiled to promote the cause of legal and commercial reform during the 1770s.¹⁰ The most striking comparative case is the one area which actually shifted bodily from the Polish to the Austrian sphere: the province of Galicia (as it became under Habsburg sovereignty), where compromise was eventually reached at the level of this individual crownland between the

⁷ Cited above in this volume, 159.

⁸ Major reevaluation of the entire Josephinist venture in Derek Beales, *Joseph II*. Vol. I: *In the Shadow of Maria Theresa, 1741–80*. Vol. II: *Against the World, 1780–90* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987–2009).

⁹ Christoph Prignitz, *Vaterlandsliebe und Freiheit: deutscher Patriotismus von 1750 bis 1850* (Wiesbaden: Steiner Verlag, 1981).

¹⁰ Józef Wybicki, *Listy patriotyczne*, [Patriotic letters] ed. Kazimierz Opalek (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1955).

older corporative-republican and the newer civil-dynastic patriotism (**Řezník**).

The Galician solution, however, proved slow to reach, uneasy to sustain, and ultimately unstable. Meanwhile both the territorial and the cultural coordinates of identity were changing their character. There emerged on the one hand those fuller, inclusive political communities which were noted at the beginning of this sketch; and on the other, the tensions that resulted above all from a shift in the valency of language and of particular language-related ethnic heritages.¹¹ That is part of a different story, inseparable from radically new challenges of the 1780s and 1790s. Those who were consolidating state structures sought loyalty to a hegemonic language—thus notably with the Josephinist campaign, in Hungary and elsewhere, for linguistic alongside other kinds of homogeneity—but besides engendering resistance they actually encouraged rival linguistic commitments, through their backing for the vernaculars as the medium of teaching and edification.¹² The destruction of the *Rzeczpospolita* left the Polish language as the clearest surviving badge of the identity of its dispossessed elites. In the background stood the French Revolution with its assertion of integral nationhood, and the beginnings of romantic reaction to it which rested largely on the values of speech communities.

Even here, however, we can conclude that antecedents were available in early modern east-central Europe, and some have featured in this book. Previously ethnic identity may have been vague and language secondary, as with Ragusan use of the word ‘Slav’ or the ‘Illyrian’ notions reborn through Ritter-Vitezović as a Croatian political campaign. But thinking about the nation in the region usually involved the idea of a common tongue (for example with Comenius). Later it became important that such perceptions could be rewritten in national(ist) mode, like the Czech patriotic vocabulary of *vlast* and *národ*. Moreover, ‘golden age’ or humanistic forms of language could be revived as standard, and their propagators paraded as precocious linguistic nationalists: the model of Daniel Adam Velešlavín and Bohuslav Balbín respectively, to look no further than Czech cases.

¹¹ See now the sprawling but valuable synthesis of Tomasz Kamusella, *The Politics of Language and Nationalism in Modern Central Europe* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).

¹² A sketch of this dynamic in R. J. W. Evans, *Austria, Hungary, and the Habsburgs. Central Europe, c. 1683–1867* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 134–46.

Earlier philological researches too, like Fóris Ferenc Otrókoci's dabblings in the *Ursprache*, might be wholly overtaken by modern taxonomies—Indo-Germanic, Slavonic, Finno-Ugrian—but they already adumbrated the same kinds of ethnic and political obsession.

The one more exotic contribution to this collection, hardly relating directly to east-central Europe at all, nevertheless serves as a summation of the whole argument. For Paisij Hilendarski, the Balkan monk and Orthodox saint (**Nikolov**), could draw on earlier Catholic chroniclers and ideas of common Slavdom to fashion a historical account which became the foundation document of Bulgarian national identity, combining territorial and linguistic allegiance. Ironically, Paisij's *Istoriya Slavyanobolgarskaya* was first published in Buda-Pest long after his death, in 1844, the very year when Magyar became the full state language of Hungary, precipitating the most violent of all the nineteenth-century national conflicts in the region.

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

PÁL ÁCS is Vice-Head of the Center of Renaissance Studies, Institute for Literary Studies, Hungarian Academy of Sciences. He graduated in Hungarian and Russian literature from Eötvös Loránd University (ELTE), Budapest, and obtained his Ph.D. at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. He is the author of two volumes on early modern Hungarian literary history, *Az idő ósága—Történetiség és történeteszemlélet a régi magyar irodalomban* [The antiquity of time—Historicity and historical vision in ancient Hungarian literature] (2002) and *Elváltzott idők* [Changed times] (2006), as well as a large number of articles and book chapters, among them: “Hungarian Friends of Erasmus in the Sixteenth Century and Today,” in Arnoud Visser, ed., *In Search of the Republic of Letters: Intellectual Relations between Hungary and The Netherlands 1500–1800* (1999), 21–28; “Tarjumans Mahmud and Murad: Austrian and Hungarian Renegades as Sultan’s Interpreters,” in Wilhelm Kühlmann and Bodo Guthmüller, eds., *Die Türken in Europa in der Renaissance* (2000), 307–16; and “Historischer Skeptizismus und Frömmigkeit. Die Revision protestantischer Geschichtsvorstellungen in den Predigten des ungarischen Jesuiten Péter Pázmány,” in Anna Ohlidal and Stefan Samerski, eds., *Jesuitische Frömmigkeitskulturen. Konfessionelle Interaktion in Ostmitteleuropa 1570–1700* (2006), 279–94.

GÁBOR ALMÁSI obtained his Ph.D. in history at the Central European University in 2005. He is currently working as Bolyai-fellow of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences on the publication of the correspondence of Johannes Sambucus. Among other publications, he is author of “I Valacchi visti dagli italiani e il concetto di barbaro nel Rinascimento,” *Storia della Storiografia* 52 (2007): 49–66; “Humanisten bei Hof: Öffentliche Selbstdarstellung und Karrieremuster,” in Gertit Walther and Thomas Maissen, eds., *Funktionen des Humanismus. Studien zum Nutzen des Neuen in der humanistischen Kultur* (2006), 155–65; and “The riddle of Themistius’ ‘Twelfth oration’ and the question of religious tolerance in the sixteenth century,” *Central Europe* 2 (2004) 2: 83–108.

URSZULA AUGUSTYNIAK is Professor at the Institute of History, University of Warsaw. She was awarded her doctorate and habilitation at the University of Warsaw and is a member of the editorial board of the periodical “*Barok*” *Historia—Literatura—Sztuka*. Her principal field of interest is early modern Polish political and intellectual history. Among her most important publications are: *Informacja i propaganda w Polsce za Zygmunta III* [Information and propaganda in Poland under Sigismund III] (1981); *Koncepcje narodu i społeczeństwa w literaturze plebejskiej od końca XVI do końca XVII wieku* [The concept of nation and society in plebeian literature from the end of the 16th to the end of the 17th century] (1989); and *Testamenty ewangelików reformowanych w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim w XVI–XVIII wieku* [Testaments of Lutherans in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the 16th–17th centuries] (1992). Her most recent book is a synthetic overview: *Historia Polski 1572–1795* (2008).

SÁNDOR BENE is Senior Researcher at the Institute of Literary Studies, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Associate Professor in literary history at the Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church (Budapest), and Vice Secretary-General of the International Association of Hungarian Studies. He obtained his Ph.D. at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in 1997. His main research field is the history of political ideas in early modern Central Europe, with special emphasis on the interrelations between theology, politics and literary theories of the time. He has published two monographs, *Theatrum politicum* (1999) and *Egy kanonok három királysága: Ráttkay György horvát története* [The three kingdoms of a Prebend: The Croatian history of György Ráttkay] (2001), and a number of text editions including Zrínyi Miklós, *Válogatott levelei* [Select Letters of Miklós Zrínyi] (1997).

ZRINKA BLAŽEVIĆ is Assistant Professor of History at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb and Secretary of the Center for Comparative and Intercultural Studies at the Faculty of Philosophy in Zagreb. Her main field of interest is early modern Croatian intellectual history, especially the discourse of Illyrism. Among numerous other publications she is the author of *Vitezovićeva Hrvatska između stvarnosti i utopije* [Vitezović’s Croatia between reality and utopia] (2002) and *Ilirizam prije ilirizma* [Illyrism before Illyrism] (2008).

ROBERT JOHN WESTON EVANS is Regius Professor of History at the University of Oxford. He works on the post-medieval history of Central and Eastern Europe, especially of the Habsburg lands, 1526–1918. He has a particular interest in the place of language(s) in historical development. His main current research commitment is to a history of Hungary, 1740–1945. He is the author of a number of important monographs and studies on early modern and modern Central European history, among others *Rudolf II and his World. A Study in Intellectual History, 1576–1612* (1973); *The Making of the Habsburg Monarchy, 1550–1700. An Interpretation* (1979); and most recently the collection of essays, *Austria, Hungary and the Habsburgs. Essays on Central Europe, c.1683–1867* (2006). He is also the editor of a number of collective volumes, such as *Crown, Church and Estates. Central European Politics in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, with T. V. Thomas (1991); *Great Britain and Central Europe, 1867–1914*, with Dušan Kováč and Edita Ivaničková (2003); *Curiosity and Wonder from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment*, with Alexander Marr (2006); and *Czechoslovakia in a Nationalist and Fascist Europe 1918–1948*, with Mark Cornwall (2007).

ANNA GRZEŚKOWIAK-KRWAWICZ is Senior Researcher at the Institute of Literary Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences. A historian of 17th–18th century Polish political thought, she is a member of the executive committee of the International Society of Eighteenth Century Studies and the author of a number of studies on Polish republicanism, among them “Anti-monarchism in Polish Republicanism in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries,” in Martin van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner, eds., *Republicanism: A Shared European Heritage*, vol. I, Republicanism and Constitutionalism in Early Modern Europe (2002), 43–60; and *Regina libertas. Wolność w polskiej myśli politycznej XVIII wieku* [Regina libertas: Freedom in Polish political thought in the 18th century] (2006). She also edited the volume *Bo insza rzecz jest zdradzić, insza dać się złudzić. Problem zdrady w Polsce przełomu XVIII i XIX wieku* [It is one thing to betray and another to be fooled. The question of treason in Poland at the turn of the 18th and the 19th centuries] (1995).

FARKAS GÁBOR KISS is Assistant Professor at the Institute of Literary Studies, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest. He graduated in classics and Hungarian literature at Eötvös Loránd University and obtained

his Ph.D. there in 2006. His principal areas of interest are the history of Renaissance and Baroque literature in Hungary and Central Europe, especially humanist literature in Hungary, and the epic and lyric poetry of Miklós Zrínyi. He has published a number of studies on the interplay of Hungarian and European literary and cultural paradigms in the 15th-16th centuries, among them “Dramen am Wiener und Ofener Hof: Benedictus Chelidoniumus und Bartholomaeus Frankfordinus Pannonius (1515–1519),” in Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi, eds., *Maria von Ungarn (1505–1558). Eine Renaissancefürstin* (2007), 285–304, and “Constructing the image of a humanist scholar—Latin dedications in Hungary (1460–1526),” in I. Bossuyt, ed., *Cui dono lepidum novum libellum?* (2008), 141–59.

TERESA KOSTKIEWICZOWA is Professor Emeritus at the Institute of Literary Studies at the Polish Academy of Sciences and Professor at the Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw. A historian and theoretician of literature and a leading Polish authority on the history of Enlightenment literature, she is the author of more than a dozen books on the Polish Enlightenment as well as comparative works on relations between Polish and European cultures in the 18th century. Her publications include studies on the poetry of Franciszek Karpiński and Franciszek Dionizy Kniaźnin. Her work on Polish Enlightenment literature, *Klasycyzm, sentymentalizm, rokoko* (1975), remains highly influential. She is an editor and contributor to the *Słownik literatury polskiego oświecenia* [Dictionary of Polish Enlightenment literature] (1977, 2nd expanded edition 1991) and contributor to *Słownik terminów literackich* [Dictionary of literary terms] (1976).

LOVRO KUNČEVIĆ is Junior Researcher at the Institute for Historical Sciences of the Croatian Academy of Arts and Sciences, Dubrovnik, and a Ph.D. candidate at the Medieval Studies Department of the Central European University, Budapest. His main field of interest is Renaissance and early modern Dalmatian culture and politics. He is a member of the research project “Freedom and the construction of Europe: New perspectives on philosophical, religious and political controversies,” directed by Martin van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner.

PETR MAŘA is Assistant Professor (Universitätsassistent) at the Institute of History, University of Vienna. He obtained his Ph.D. at the

Charles University in Prague. Among other publications on the early modern nobility and estates he is the author of *Svět české aristokracie (1500–1700)* [The world of the aristocracy of Bohemia] (2004) and co-editor (together with Thomas Winkelbauer) of the conference volume *Die Habsburgermonarchie 1620 bis 1740. Leistungen und Grenzen des Absolutismusparadigmas* (2006).

DOMAGOJ MADUNIĆ is a Ph.D. candidate at the History Department of the Central European University, Budapest. After graduating in history and information sciences at Zagreb University he obtained his MA in History at CEU. His field of research is the social and intellectual history of 16th and 17th century Dalmatia, especially the frontier culture of territories wedged between the Habsburg and Ottoman empires and the Venetian republic.

ALEXANDAR NIKOLOV is Associate Professor at St. Kliment Ohridski University, Sofia. He received an M. Phil. in Medieval Studies at the Central European University, Budapest, and a Ph.D. and habilitation at St. Kliment Ohridski University, Sofia. His principal field of interest is medieval Bulgarian history, the socio-cultural impact of medieval migrations, and problems of ethnicity and proto-nationalism in medieval Southeast Europe. He published, among others the monographs *Вярвай или аз ще ти убия! “Ориенталците” в крестоносците (1270–1370)* [“Believe or I shall kill you! The “Orientals” in the Crusaders’ propaganda (1270–1370)] (2006); and *Селището на куманите в България и Унгария (XII–XIII в.): Паралели и различия*, [The Settlement of the Cumans in Bulgaria and Hungary (12th–13th centuries): Parallels and differences] (2008).

REGINA PÖRTNER studied in Oxford and subsequently in Bochum, from where she graduated in 1991. She was a Rhodes Scholar 1991–1995 and was awarded a D.Phil. in Modern History from Oxford University in 1998. Research Fellow at the German Historical Institute in London in 1998–2003. Lecturer in History at the University of Bochum (Germany) 2003–2005. Duke-Ernest Research Fellow at the University of Gotha in 2004; since September 2005 Lecturer in History at Swansea University (UK); and recipient of a Helmut-Coing Award (2008) and Research Fellowship at the Max-Planck Institute for European Legal History in Frankfurt in October 2008–January 2009.

Her publications include *The Counter-Reformation in Central Europe: Styria 1580–1630* (2001) as well as a number of articles on the religious, political and economic history of Central Europe. She also edited the volume *Research on British History in the Federal Republic of Germany* (2002).

MILOŠ ŘEZNÍK is Professor of European Regional History at the University of Chemnitz, Germany. He graduated in history at the Charles University in Prague, where he also obtained his Ph.D. in 1999, and received his habilitation in 2007 at Olomouc on the subject of the Polish national uprisings between 1794 and 1864 from the perspective of the elite and identity change. Among other publications he is author of *Pomoří mezi Polskem a Pruskem. Patriotismus a identity v Královském Prusku v době dělení Polska* [Pomerania between Poland and Prussia: Patriotism and identities in Royal Prussia in the period of the partitions of Poland] (2001); *Formování moderního národa* [The formation of the modern nation] (2003); and *Za naši a vaši svobodu. Století polských povstání* [For our freedom and yours: A century of Polish uprisings] (2006). He has also edited the volume *Grenzraum und Transfer* (2007).

STANISŁAW ROSZAK is Associate Professor at the Institute of Historical and Archive Studies, Nicolas Copernicus University, Toruń, Poland. His main areas of research are the history of culture in the Baroque age and the Enlightenment. His major publications are: *Środowisko kulturalne i artystyczne Warszawy w połowie XVIII wieku. Między kulturą Sarmatyzmu i Oświecenia* [Intellectual and artistic circles in Warsaw in the mid-18th century: Between the cultures of Sarmatism and the Enlightenment] (1997); “Politik und Mäzenatentum. Einstellungen und Verhaltensweisen der polnischen Bischöfe angesichts der kulturellen und politischen Wandlungen unter August dem Starken und August III,” *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung* (2002): 323–43; “La bibliothèque des frères Zaluski, collection des livres d’un magnat ou première académie des sciences polonaise?,” in J. C. Bonnefont, ed., *Stanislas et son Académie* (2003): 325–31; and *Archiwa sarmackiej pamięci. Funkcje i znaczenie rękopiśmiennych ksiąg „silva rerum” w kulturze Rzeczypospolitej XVIII wieku* [Archives of Sarmatian memory: Functions and significance of “silva rerum” manuscript books in

the culture of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the 18th century] (2004).

TEODORA SHEK BRNARDIĆ is Research Associate in History at the Croatian Institute of History in Zagreb. A graduate in classics and history from Zagreb, she obtained her Ph.D. at the Central European University in Budapest. Among other publications, she is author of "Intellectual Movements and Geo-Political Regionalisation: The Case of the East European Enlightenment," *East Central Europe* 32 (2005): 147–78, and "The Enlightenment in Eastern Europe: Between Regional Typology and Particular Microhistory," *European Review of History* 13, 3 (2006): 411–35.

ARKADIUSZ MICHAŁ STASIAK is Associate Professor at the Institute of History, Catholic University of Lublin. His main field of interest is Polish political and philosophical thought, especially during the Enlightenment. Among other publications he is author of the monographs *Ideal monarchy w pismach Marcina Kromera* [The ideal monarch in Marcin Kromer's works] (2003) and *Patriotyzm w myśli konfederatów barskich* [Patriotism in the thought of the Bar Confederates] (2005).

LUCIE STORCHOVÁ is a Research Fellow at the Institute of Philosophy of the Czech Academy of Sciences and an editor of *Acta Comeniana. International Review of Comenius Studies and Early Modern Intellectual History*. She obtained her Ph.D. in Anthropology at Charles University in Prague, where she also currently gives lectures on historical anthropology. She has published on early modern Orientalism and discourses of Othering, among others also *Mezi houfy lotrův se pustiti. České cestopisy o Egyptě 15.–17. století* [Setting forward among crowds of robbers: Bohemian travel literature on Egypt between the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries] (2005). Within the last two years she has focused on early modern discourses of gender: *Nádoby mdlé, hlavy nemající? Diskursy panenství a vdovství v české literatuře raného novověku* [Empty vessels, headless vessels? Discourses of virginity and widowhood in early modern Czech literature] (2008), and *Žena není příšera, ale nejmilejší stvoření Boží. Diskursy manželství v české literatuře raného novověku* [Woman is not a monster, but the sweetest creature of God. Discourses of matrimony in early modern Czech literature] (2009), co-editing both books with Jana Ratajová. Her Ph.D.

thesis on the subject of Bohemian humanist intellectual networks and self-fashioning is forthcoming in Summer 2010.

KEES TESZELSZKY is a Postdoctoral Fellow at the Habsburg Institute in Budapest. He graduated from Leiden in political science and from Amsterdam in East European studies, and obtained his Ph.D. at Groningen University with a dissertation about the crown of Hungary and the development of early modern national identity. Among other publications he is author of “A Bocskai-korona és koronázás mítosza” [The Bocskai crown and the myth of coronation], *Confessio* 30 (2006): 54–59, and “Üzenet az utazótáskában. Diplomáciai kapcsolatok Németalföld és Magyarország között a Bocskai-felkelés alatt” [Message in the travel bag: Diplomatic relations between the Netherlands and Hungary during the Bocskai uprising], in Ildikó Horn and Nóra G. Etényi, eds., *Portré és imázs. Politikai propaganda és reprezentáció a kora újkorban* [Portrait and image: Political propaganda and representation in the early modern period] (2008), 127–47. A Hungarian version of his Ph.D. dissertation (*Az ismeretlen korona. Jelentések, szimbólumok és nemzeti identitás*) was published in 2009.

BORBÁLA ZSUZSANNA TÖRÖK is Postdoctoral Fellow at Zukunfts Kolleg/Konstanz University, Department of History and Sociology. She received her Ph.D. in Comparative History at the Central European University (2004). Her main field of interest is academic sociability and knowledge circulation in Central Europe in the late 18th and 19th century, a subject on which she has published a number of articles including “The Friends of Progress: Learned Societies and Public Sphere in the Transylvanian Reform Era,” *Austrian History Yearbook* 36 (2005): 97–124. She is the co-editor of the book: *The Exile and Return of Writers from East-Central Europe. A Compendium* (2009).

ZSOMBOR TÓTH is a lecturer at the Department of Hungarian Literature of Babeş-Bolyai University Cluj/Kolozsvár. He received his Ph.D. at the University of Debrecen in 2004. Has also studied history at the CEU (2006) and anthropology at the Babeş-Bolyai University Cluj/Kolozsvár (2003–2009). His main field of interest is the history of Hungarian literature in the 16–17th centuries and the application of the methods of historical anthropology in literary studies. Apart from a number of edited volumes he published a collection of studies, *A történelmem*

terhe. *Antropológiai szempontok a kora újkori magyar írásbeliség textusainak értelmezéséhez* [The burden of my history. Anthropological aspects of interpreting the texts of early modern Hungarian literary culture] (2006), as well as a monograph, *A koronatanú: Bethlen Miklós. Az „Élete leírása magától” és a XVII. századi puritanizmus* [The crown witness. Miklós Bethlen’s “Autobiography” and seventeenth-century Puritanism] (2007).

BALÁZS TRENCSENYI is an Assistant Professor at the History Department of Central European University, Budapest, and co-director of Pasts, Inc., Center for Historical Studies at CEU. He holds a Ph.D. in Comparative History from CEU (2004). His main field of interest is the history of political thought in East Central Europe. In 2008 he received a European Research Council grant as principal investigator in the project “*Negotiating Modernity*”: *History of Modern Political Thought in East Central Europe*. He has co-edited a number of volumes on political ideas and historiography in the region, including *Nation-Building and Contested Identities: Romanian and Hungarian Case Studies* (2001); *Discourses of Collective Identity in Central and Southeast Europe (1775–1945): Texts and Commentaries*, Vols. I–II (2006–7); and *Narratives Unbound: Historical Studies in Post-Communist Eastern Europe* (2007). A collection of his studies on the history of political thought, *A politika nyelvei* [The languages of politics], has been published in Hungarian (2007).

VLADIMÍR URBÁNEK is Research Fellow of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic. He graduated in history at Charles University in Prague and obtained his Ph.D. at Masaryk University in Brno. Among other publications he is author of a monograph *Eschatologie, vědění a politika: Příspěvek k dějinám myšlení pobělohorského exilu* [Eschatology, knowledge and politics: On the intellectual history of the post-White Mountain Bohemian exiles] (2008) and a chapter, “The Idea of State and Nation in the Writings of Bohemian Exiles after 1620,” in Linas Eriksonas and Leos Müller, eds., *Statehood Before and Beyond Ethnicity: Minor States in Northern and Eastern Europe, 1600–2000* (2005), 67–83. He co-edited the volume *Mezi Baltem a Uhrami. Komenský, Jednota Bratrská a svět středoevropského protestantismu* [Between the Baltic and Hungary: Comenius, the Unity of Brethren and the world of Central European

Protestantism] (2006), and is an editor-in-chief of the *Acta Comeniana: International Review of Comenius Studies and Early Modern Intellectual History*.

BENEDEK VARGA is Director of the Ignác Semmelweis Museum, Library and Archive of the History of Medicine, Budapest, and Lecturer at the Károli Gáspár University, Budapest. Graduated in history, archival studies and philosophy at the Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest. His main field of interest is early modern intellectual history, especially the history of the interplay between political, social and medical discourses. Among other publications he authored the studies "The term 'libertas' in 17th–18th century Hungary," *Studia Caroliensia* (2004/3–4): 309–323; "Szempontok a Bocskai-felkelés ideológiájának európai kontextusához," [Aspects of the European ideological context of the Bocskai Uprising], *Studia Caroliensia*, (2006), 1: 29–41; and "Sections of time, culture and medicine. The birth of modern medical history collections," *Medicina nei Secoli. Arte e Scienza*, vol. 18. (2009, forthcoming). Co-edited the volume *The Art of Healing in Africa: Between Tradition and Modernity* (2005).

HANNA ORSOLYA VINCZE is Lecturer in the Faculty of Political Science, Public Administration and Communication at Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj. She holds a Ph.D. in Comparative History from the Central European University Budapest (2008). Her research interests include the history and theory of translation, intercultural communication, the transmission and reception of political ideas, and theories of the public sphere. Among other writings she is the author of "A kora újkori magyar fordítások tétje" [The stakes of translation in early modern Hungary], *Korall* 23 (2006): 116–32, and "The Beginnings of the Hungarian Translation Culture and its Implications on the Public Sphere," *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai* (2006) 2: 3–14.

MÁRTON ZÁSZKALICZKY is a Ph.D. candidate at the History Department of Central European University, Budapest. His dissertation is entitled *Protestant Political Theology and its Impact on Corporate Constitutionalism in 16th–17th century Hungary*. His main field of interest is early modern political thought and the history of the Reformation, especially in Hungary, England and Scotland. He is a member of the research project "Freedom and the construction of Europe: New perspectives on philosophical, religious and political controversies," directed by Martin van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner.

INDEX

- Achenwall, Gottfried 673
Acquaviva, Claudius 573, 583
Albert of Hohenzollern 182
Alnpek, Jan 472
Alsted, Johann Heinrich 525, 597
Alvinczi, Péter 515–521, 523
Appian of Alexandria 190, 193, 196, 211
Apponyi, Antal 641
Aranka, György 681–685, 688
Aristotle 4, 92, 93, 242
Asch, Ronald G. 238
Asparuh, Khan (Ispereh) 615
August II, King of Poland 445, 453, 488
August III, King of Poland 732
Augustine, Saint (Aurelius Augustinus) 4, 218
- Bailey, Lewis 553
Balásfi, Tamás 339, 341
Balbín, Bohuslav 64, 248, 407–442, 766
Baranyai Decsi, János 86, 762
Baron, Hans 7, 8, 241–242, 244
Baronio, Cesare (Caesar Baronius) 218, 612, 622
Bartnicka, Kamila 729
Bassegli (Basiljević), Tomo 171
Batizi, András 505
Bauch, Tobias 453–454, 494, 690
Bell, David Avrom 2, 41
Bem-Wiśniewska, Ewa 467
Berger, Elias 325, 327–331
Beroaldo, Filippo the Elder 133, 135, 141
Bethlen, Gábor 335, 338–39, 341, 348, 515, 516, 518–520, 522, 593, 597
Bezděží, Pavel Jeřín z 249
Biondo, Flavio 11, 12, 107, 193, 194, 300
Bocattus, Johannes 326
Bocskai, István 287, 304–309, 311, 313, 339
Bogdan Bakšič (Bakšev), Peter 625–28
Bohorič, Adam 215
Bonfini, Antonio 76, 103, 121–23,
Boris-Michael of Bulgaria 615
- Bracciolini, Poggio 107, 302
Branković, Đorđe 221
Brigido, Joseph von 750, 753
Brukenthal, Samuel 671
Bruni, Leonardo 7, 12, 20, 300
Brunner, Otto 649
Bruto, Giovanni Michele 104
Budovec, Václav 591
Budziło, Józef 467, 468, 474, 475, 478, 486
Burke, Peter 8, 31, 330
Butterwick, Richard 711
- Calvin, Jean 30, 501, 520
Canter, Jacobus 147
Capeci, Ferrante 127–28
Carbo, Ludovico 121
Cebrowski, Andrzej Kazimierz 464, 476, 485
Celtis, Konrad 98, 147, 183
Cerva, Elias L. 154, 164
Chabod, Federico 167
Charles II, Duke of Inner Austria 204, 577
Charles IV of Luxemburg, Holy Roman Emperor 227, 437, 588, 600, 604
Charles V, Holy Roman Emperor 144, 312
Charles VI, Holy Roman Emperor 571
Charles X Gustav 478, 493, 600, 603
Chesserius (Kesserű), Michael 133
Cicero, Marcus Tullius 6, 11, 87, 131, 140, 142–145, 147, 242, 267, 275, 714–716, 719, 724
Clement V 26
Clement XI 373, 381
Clement XIV 571
Coccio, Marc' Antonio (Sabellico) 181, 198
Constantin, Tsar of Bulgaria 616, 620
Constantine, Saint 213, 214, 219, 601
Contarini, Gasparo 569
Cottret, Bernard 41
Coyer, Abbé Gabriel-François 42, 43
Cromer, Martin (Marcin Kromer) 114, 607
Cromwell, Oliver 600, 602

- Cserei, Mihály 536–540
 Csombor, Márton Szepesi 337, 340, 341
 Cyril, Saint 213, 607, 612, 618–619, 627
 Czartoryski, Adam Kazimierz 729
 Czernin, Hermann Jakob 438

 Dann, Otto 687–688
 Dębiński, Jan z Dębion 713
 Dębołęcki, Father Wojciech 468, 477
 Desan, Philippe 14
 Dietrichstein, Ferdinand 439
 Długosz, Jan 59, 188, 189
 Dobrovský, Josef 71, 249,
 Drexel, Hieronimus 562–564
 Du Bellay, Guillaume 17
 Du Bellay, Joachim 18, 21–24
 Dudith, Andreas 116, 124
 Dunin-Karwicki, Stanisław 713, 716, 726
 Dziembowski, Edmond 43

 Eck, Valentin 134–148
 Ehlers, Joachim 13
 Elliott, John H. 47
 Erasmus of Rotterdam 75–90, 91, 137, 142, 144, 147
 Estienne, Henri 18, 19, 23, 24
 Evans, Robert J. W. 650, 664

 Farkas, András 502–505
 Febronius, Justinus (Bishop Johann Nikolaus von Hontheim) 571
 Febvre, Lucien 24
 Felgenhauer, Paul 593–594, 596
 Fénelon, François 638
 Ferdinand I, Holy Roman Emperor 82, 109, 120, 293, 298, 397
 Ferdinand II, Holy Roman Emperor 219, 316, 431, 439, 570, 576, 577, 597, 608, 651
 Ferdinand III, Holy Roman Emperor 219, 389, 400, 570, 577
 Ferdinand IV, King of the Romans, Czech and Hungarian King 396, 400
 Ferrone, Vincenzo 455
 Forgách, Ferenc 106, 115, 116, 292, 298–303, 309–313
 Forstall, Mark 578
 Foucault, Michel 228, 230, 231, 233
 Foxe, John 238, 507, 552–555, 557, 564, 566, 599, 763
 Franck, Vincenz Macarius 416, 419, 421–427, 440, 442

 Frangepán, Katalin 82, 85
 Frankfordinus, Bartholomaeus 136
 Frederick II, Prussian king 484, 637–638, 765
 Frederick V of the Palatinate, King of Bohemia 592–593, 596
 Fredro, Andrzej Maksymilian 263, 272, 447, 458
 Friedeburg, Robert von 140, 146
 Füsüs, János Pataki 335, 346–348

 Galla, Bernardin 184
 Garczyński, Stefan 451
 Georgijević, Bartholomeus 590
 Gilmore, Myron 6
 Glavinic, Franjo 218, 219
 Goldast, Melchior 411, 431, 432
 Golliusz, Jan 483
 Gonzalez de Santalla, Thyrsus 575, 584
 Górnicki, Łukasz 448
 Goślicki, Wawrzyniec 447, 448
 Gottsched, Johann Christian 454
 Greenblatt, Stephen 230
 Grodziski, Stanisław 741, 752
 Gromo, Giovanandrea 105
 Guarino, Battista 134
 Guicciardini, Francesco 33, 181

 Habervešl, Andreas 592
 Haller, William 238, 540, 553, 554
 Hankins, James 8
 Harrach, Ernst Adalbert 418, 419, 421, 423
 Hartlib, Samuel 602
 Hartnocht, Krzysztof 496
 Haugwitz, Friedrich Wilhelm von 650
 Hazard, Paul 731
 Heltai, Gáspár 103, 123, 124
 Heltai, János 518
 Henry de Valois 299, 473
 Hirschi, Caspar 226
 Hobsbawm, Eric 247, 554
 Honterus, Johannes 101–102
 Hontheim, Justus 571
 Hroch, Miroslav 687, 688
 Hume, David 722
 Hunyadi, János 120–124
 Hus, Jan 58, 250
 Hutterus, Albertus 102, 126

 Illésházy, István 325, 327, 329

 Jakubowski, Rzeszów Vinzenz 744
 Janus Pannonius 131

- Jaucourt, Louis de 731
 Jemiołowski, Mikołaj 465, 474, 476, 491
 Jessenius, Johann (Jeszenszky, Jesenský) 61, 315–322
 Jezierski, Franciszek Salezy 269, 450, 705, 706, 730
 John II Casimir, King of Poland 484, 488
 John Sigismund, Prince of Transylvania 299, 513
 Joseph II, Holy Roman Emperor 654, 661, 665, 671, 740, 741, 742, 743, 765
 Józefowicz, Jan Tomasz 469, 472
 Jungmann, Josef 227, 248, 251–253, 759–760
 Justi, Johann Heinrich Gottlob von 634, 646
- Kačić Miošić, Andrija 221, 222
 Karakasidou, Anastasia 611
 Kärcher of Berne, Johannes (Johannes Plaustrarius) 592
 Károlyi, Gáspár 511–513, 516
 Kaspar, Abbot of Questenberg 418–19, 424
 Kepler, Friedrich 653
 Kézai, Simon 288–290, 294,
 Kidd, Colin 2, 173
 Kinsky, Franz Ulrich 427–434, 441,
 Kleiner, Blasius 627, 628
 Klenner, Aladár 141
 Kniaźnin, Franciszek Dionizy 700
 Kochanowski, Jan 446
 Kochowski, Wespazjan 468, 472, 475, 478, 480, 481
 Kollár, Adam Franz 658, 669
 Kołłątaj, Hugo 70, 269, 270, 275, 278, 443, 447, 730
 Komáromi, János 545–546, 548, 560, 561–568
 Kombol, Mihovil 198
 Komenský, Jan Amos (Comenius, Johannes Amos) 66, 71, 253, 525–530, 594–595, 597–603, 606, 609, 764
 Komjáti, Benedek 75–90
 Komoniecki, Andrzej 464, 471, 479, 484, 485, 489
 Konarski, Stanisław 713, 717, 718, 725, 726, 728, 764
 Kopecký, Milan 227, 228
 Korczyński, Kasjan 713
 Korotz, György Szepsi 337, 340
- Kościuszko, Tadeusz 738
 Kovacsóczy, Farkas 111, 115, 124, 126
 Krasicki, Ignacy 693, 694, 695, 699, 709, 724, 725, 727, 729
 Krasiński, Adam Stanisław 714, 720–721
 Krčelić, Baltazar Adam 633, 658–659
 Krleža, Miroslav 198
 Kroupa, Jiří 635
 Kryski, Feliks 475
- L'Hospital, Michel 30, 34
 Lambeck, Peter 411
 Lamberg, Count Johann Maximilian 428
 Lamormaini, William 577
 Laskai, János 333, 335, 336, 342–345, 499
 Lebelius, Johannes 103, 110
 Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm 383, 454
 Lemaire de Belges, Jean 15–17, 19
 Leopold I Holy Roman Emperor 352, 354, 362, 363, 364, 367, 371, 373, 384, 415, 426, 430, 537, 570, 575, 578, 580, 581, 584
 Leopold II 740, 741, 752, 753
 Leszczyński, Stanisław 263, 277, 451, 488, 713, 715, 716, 725, 726
 Lezzeni, Max von 750
 Linde, Samuel Bogumił 460, 689
 Lippay, Balázs 306, 307
 Lipsius, Justus 245, 301, 333–335, 337, 342–350, 359
 Lobkowitz, Wenzel Eusebius Prince of 425, 428–429, 439
 Locke, John 722–724
 Lubomirski, Jerzy 488, 493
 Lubomirski, Stanisław Herakliusz 715
 Lučić, Ivan (Giovanni Lucio, Joannes Lucius) 366, 396
- Maass, Christiane 20–21
 Mably, Gabriel Bonnot 718, 723
 Macek, Josef 58, 589
 Machiavelli, Niccolò di Bernardo dei 11, 19, 32, 62, 97, 172, 279, 300 304, 359
 Magni, Valeriano 418–419
 Magyari, István 65, 514, 522
 Manutius, Aldus 77
 Margelik, Wenzel 744
 Maria Theresa 641, 650–651, 668, 765
 Marienburg, Lucas Joseph 681

- Marsigli, Luigi Ferdinando 63,
351–404, 765
- Martini, Carl-Anton Freiherr von 645
- Martinitz, Bernhard Ignaz 409,
410–416, 417, 419, 421–422, 426,
427–436, 438, 440–442
- Martinitz, Jaroslav 419
- Martyr, Petrus 559
- Maskiewicz, Bogusław Kazimierz 463,
490
- Maskiewicz, Samuel 463, 480
- Matthias Corvinus 77, 120–124, 133,
311, 588
- Matthias II 61, 313, 316–318, 322–323,
325–331
- Maximilian III of Austria 116, 117,
299, 311, 473, 474, 491
- Medgyesi, Pál 553, 605
- Mela, Pomponius 94–95, 106
- Melanchthon, Philipp 395, 502, 505,
514, 546, 589–590
- Melius, Péter 513
- Melotai, István 338, 348
- Michalski, Jerzy 723
- Miechowita, Maciej z 184, 188–189
- Minasowicz, Józef Epifani 454, 714
- Mitlzer de Kolof, Wawrzyniec 690
- Modrzewski, Andrzej Frycz 59, 448,
451
- Montesquieu, Charles de Secondat 42,
281, 455, 631, 638–639, 654, 655, 709
- Montreuil, Jean de 15
- Mrnavić, Ivan Tomko 213–214, 219,
389
- Myszkowski, Piotr 458
- Nádasdy, Ferenc 514, 577
- Najemy, John M. 244
- Naruszewicz, Adam 696–697, 728
- Naudé, Gabriel 39
- Nejedlý, Jan 246, 250–252
- Neugeboren, Daniel Georg 678–681,
683
- Nickel, Goswin 574–575, 578, 584–585
- Niewiara, Aleksandra 450
- Noyelle, Charles de 583
- Obuchowicz, Filip Kazimierz 463–464,
467, 474, 480
- Obuchowicz, Michał Leon 492
- Olahus, Nicolaus (Miklós Oláh) 55,
115–120, 122–125, 129, 296–298, 301,
307, 311–312, 763
- Oliva, John Paul 575, 583
- Opaliński, Edward 256–258, 265,
272
- Opaliński, Łukasz 256, 266, 277, 279,
447–478, 451, 457
- Orbini, Mauro (Mavar Orbin in
Croatian, Mavrubir Latinec in
Bulgarian) 160, 169, 172, 173, 196,
201, 217, 221, 399, 612, 622–624,
627–628
- Orzechowski, Stanisław 60, 259, 446
- Ossoliński, Fürst Józef Maksymilian
743, 745, 751
- Otrokocsi Fóris, Ferenc 391, 532–534,
767
- Ovid (Publius Ovidius Naso) 94, 139,
717
- Oxenstierna, Axel 551, 598
- Paisij Hilendarski 611–613, 622–624,
628, 767
- Palmieri, Matteo 6
- Partlicius, Simeon 596–597, 606
- Pasek, Jan Chryzostom 463, 465, 466,
467, 474, 476, 479, 484, 487
- Pasquier, Etienne 31, 35, 36–38, 39
- Paštrić, Jeronim 219
- Paul, Saint 55, 75–89
- Pawlikowski, Józef 729
- Pázmány, Péter 65, 517, 521–524,
764
- Peplowski, Franciszek 452
- Pešina of Čechorod, Tomáš 413, 417
- Peter I the Great, Tsar of Russia 622
- Peter, Tsar of Bulgaria 615, 616
- Péter, Katalin 336
- Petrarca, Francesco 15–16, 20, 96–97,
336, 347
- Petrycy of Pilzno, Sebastian 488–489,
496
- Peucer, Caspar 102–103, 112
- Pfaltz von Östritz, Christian Augustin
407–408, 437–438
- Philippi, Heinrich 577
- Piccolomini, Enea Silvio (Pope Pius II)
9, 108–109, 111–112, 119, 121–122,
138, 183, 499, 514, 607
- Piłsudski, Józef 453
- Piso, Iacobus 132
- Platejs, Jan Arnošt 419
- Poděbrady, George of 493
- Pohlig, Matthias 238, 590
- Poniatowski, Stanisław August 271,
451–452, 643, 720–721, 724–728,
733

- Portia, Johann Ferdinand of 427–428, 434
- Postel, Guillaume 17, 30, 98
- Potocki, Stanisław Kostka 698
- Priboevius, Vincentius (Vinko Pribojević) 57, 71, 177–202, 214–215, 399, 624
- Procházka, František Faustin 246, 248–249
- Pryshlak, Maria O. 457
- Przyłuski, Jakub 446–447
- Pufendorf, Samuel 372, 384, 536, 644, 651, 764
- Rabil, Albert 81
- Radawiecki, Andrzej 451
- Radziejowski, Hieronim 493
- Radziwiłł, Janusz 474, 493
- Rákóczi, Prince Ferenc II 373, 403
- Rákóczi, Prince György I 524, 534, 537
- Rákóczi, Prince György II 526, 529, 534–535, 600–602, 605
- Rattkay, Juraj (György Rátkay) 56, 62, 396–403
- Regan, Paul 605
- Reicherstorffer, Georg 101, 105, 113–114
- Rej, Mikołaj 446, 448
- Révay, Péter 318, 325–331
- Richwaldsky, György 658
- Ricoeur, Paul 207–208
- Rohan, Henri de 40
- Ronikier, Jerzy 445, 453
- Rostworowski, Emmanuel 443
- Rostworowski, Franciszek 714, 721–724
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques 42, 266, 272, 279–281, 455, 631, 636–637, 640, 642, 718, 722, 723
- Rudolf II, Holy Roman Emperor 248, 251, 308–309, 313, 315–318, 322–323, 326, 413, 577
- Sadovský, Václav 602
- Saint Jerome 83, 86, 179, 181, 188, 191, 193–195, 212
- Salutati, Coluccio 7, 12, 96, 167, 300
- Savonarola, Girolamo 26–28
- Schaffgotsch, Johann Ernst Anton 438–439
- Schama, Simon 587
- Schellhase, Kenneth 182, 183
- Schleinitz, Maximilian Rudolf von 408
- Schlözer, August Ludwig 666, 673, 680, 683–84, 688
- Schrodt, Franz Lothar Joseph von 465
- Schwartner, Martin 71, 663, 676, 681
- Seibt, Karl Heinrich 633, 652–653
- Seigel, Jerrold 7–8
- Seneca, Lucius Annaeus 141, 147, 302, 335, 349, 372, 395, 466, 536
- Sénellart, Michel 32–33
- Sennyey, László 581–582, 584
- Seyssel, Claude de 17–18, 21, 29
- Shaftesbury, Lord Ashley Earl of 632
- Sicuten, P. Michael 582
- Sigismund III Vasa 468, 473, 475, 478, 480, 481, 486, 491
- Sigismund, Holy Roman Emperor and King of Hungary 121, 124, 658
- Simeon, Tsar of Bulgaria 615
- Simone, Franco 15
- Siraisi, Nancy 325
- Šižgorić, Juraj 181–182, 193, 214–215
- Skarga, Piotr 66, 255, 446, 479, 622–623
- Skinner, Quentin 243, 285, 301, 501, 546
- Skrzetuski, Kajetan 730
- Skrzetuski, Wincenty 731
- Slavata, Adam Pavel 438
- Slavata, Vilém 429
- Šmahel, František 588–589, 604
- Sobieski, Jan III 491, 726
- Socrates 640
- Sonnenfels, Joseph von 43, 54, 633–634, 641–643, 647–648, 653, 675, 765
- Spontone, Ciro 104
- Stanislavov, Philip 625
- Staszic, Stanisław 70, 266–267, 270, 279, 280, 447, 448, 450
- Stephen I King of Hungary 56, 287, 320–321, 389, 394, 398, 543, 649, 658
- Stránský, Pavel 63, 413, 607–608
- Strayer, Joseph 25–26
- Świdarska, Urszula 711
- Szabó, Franz 656–657
- Szalárdi, János 534–536, 538, 677
- Szamosközy, István 105, 109, 292, 535
- Szántó, István 110
- Szczuka, Stanisław Antoni 714
- Szegedi Kis, István 507–508
- Szenci Molnár, Albert 336, 340–341, 515, 520
- Szkhárosi, András 506
- Szóllósi, Mihály 530–532, 551
- Szőnyi Nagy, István 552, 553, 555–561, 564, 565, 566

- Sztárai, Mihály 506–507, 552
 Szűcs, Jenő 44, 288, 499
 Szujski, Wasyl 478
 Szymanowski, Józef 699
- Tallon, Alain 30–31
 Taurinus, Stephanus 112
 Tazbir, Janusz 449, 490
 Teleki, Mihály 547–549, 561–562
 Teleki, Sámuel 685
 Tepeş, Vlad 108, 118
 Thököly, Imre 545, 547–550, 561
 Thomas Abbt 54, 633, 638–639, 640
 Thomasius, Christian 372, 644
 Thurn, Heinrich Matthias 595
 Thurzó, Alexius (Elek) 137, 140
 Tranquillus, Andreis 57, 111
 Tribe, Keith 647
 Trinckellius, Zacharias 578–579
 Tubero, Ludovicus Cerva (Ludovik Crijević Tuberon) 123, 160
 Tymowski, Jan 463–464
- Uncius, Leonhardus 103
 Urbánek, Rudolf 588
- Valkai, András 510–511
 Veleslavin, Daniel Adam (Daniel Adam z Veleslavína) 58, 226–253, 589–590, 605, 607, 763, 766
 Venturi, Franco 631–632, 635
 Verantius (Verancsics), Antonius 100–102, 104–105, 109, 112–113, 124, 302
 Vierhaus, Rudolf 634
 Vietor, Hieronymus 85–87, 89
 Viroli, Maurizio 152, 261, 269, 276, 281, 285, 334
 Vitéz, János (Iohannes Vitéz de Zredna) 55, 132–133, 291, 298, 311, 499
- Vitezović, Pavao Ritter 63, 201, 213, 220–221, 351–355, 360–368, 370, 384–396, 401–402, 761, 763, 766
 Voglmayr, Franciscus 583
 Voltaire, François-Marie Arouet 43
 Vorbek-Lettow, Maciej 474, 493
- Waldstein, Adam 419, 438
 Walicki, Andrzej 265, 711–712, 723
 Weinstein, Donald 27
 Wenceslas, Saint 425, 437
 Werbőczy, István 293–296, 307, 310, 656, 658–659
 Wernher, Georg 100–101, 136
 Wesselényi, Ferenc 549
 Wielhorski, Michał 69, 279, 711–712, 717–718, 721–724, 726, 732
 Williamson, Arthur 2
 Wimpfeling, Jakob 131, 135, 140, 147
 Winnifith, Tom 126–127
 Wiśniewski, Antoni 714, 717
 Wolff, Christian 454, 634, 644–646, 648, 651, 672
 Wybicki, Józef 274, 280, 700–704, 728, 765
 Wyrwicz, Karol 459
- Załuski, Andrzej Chryzostom 456
 Zambeccari, Eleonora 374–375
 Zamoyski, Andrzej 258, 277–278
 Zamoyski, Jan 264–265, 279, 457–458, 473–474, 726
 Zedlitz, Karl Abraham 638
 Zimorowic, Józef Bartłomiej 463–464, 469
 Žižka, Jan 253, 563
 Zmajević, Andrija 218
 Żółkiewski, Stanisław 466, 468
 Zrínyi, Miklós (Nikola Zrinski) 45, 48, 62, 220, 349, 363, 396, 399–400, 535
 Zrínyi, Péter (Petar Zrinski) 578
 Zrinyi, Ilona 540, 548, 561