

DUBROVNIK UNDER FRENCH RULE (1810-1814)

STJEPAN ĆOSIĆ

ABSTRACT: The article highlights the features of French administration in the Dubrovnik province in the context of the establishment and organization of the Illyrian provinces (1810-1814). It discusses the consequences of the fall of the old aristocratic regime and a series of administrative and social reforms initiated by the French. The Dubrovnik society vigorously opposed the new government policy, partly based bourgeois values. Far-reaching reforms were hindered by the campaigns that prevailed throughout the short-term French rule. Particular attention is being drawn to the events taking place in the course of the 1813/1814 uprising against the French, the circumstances which led to the Habsburg annexation of Dubrovnik after the fall of Napoleon.

Within a year and a half of its establishment in 1808, the French administration managed to construct a new and long-term organizational framework in Dubrovnik. Napoleon's war campaigns and victories in central Europe led to closer relations between Dubrovnik and the French Empire. At the time, the Dubrovnik region was incorporated into the Illyrian Provinces, a French geo-strategic unit which primarily consisted of the subjugated countries of the Croat and Slovene ethnical territories. Considering that the circumstances

Stjepan Ćosić, member of the Institute for Historical Sciences of the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts in Dubrovnik. Address: Zavod za povijesne znanosti HAZU, Lapadska obala 6, 20000 Dubrovnik, Croatia.

This article has already been published in Croatian under the following title: »Dubrovnik u Ilirskim Pokrajinama.« *Anali Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Dubrovniku* 35 (1997): pp. 37-62. Translated by Vesna Baće.

in the then Dubrovnik were generally determined by the central administrative policy, my aim is to describe the complexity of government organization in the Illyrian Provinces, as well as the events leading to both their creation and ruin, which quickly followed.

The creation and organization of the Illyrian Provinces

According to the Treaty of Schönbrunn (14 October 1809), the Austrian Emperor, Francis I, was compelled to cede to France some Austrian crown lands, the former Venetian territories in Istria, and the whole of Croatia south of the Sava, including also *Vojna krajina* (*Militärgrenze*). On this very day Napoleon annexed these lands to Dalmatia and the Dubrovnik region, proclaiming thus a new state—the Illyrian Provinces (*Države slovinske, Les Provinces Illyriennes*). Seven provinces, each with a designated administrative center, were decreed: Carniola (Ljubljana), Carinthia (Villach), Istria (Trieste), Civil Croatia (Karlovac), Dalmatia (Zadar), Dubrovnik and Kotor (Dubrovnik), and Military Croatia, the last of which under special military administration. This newly established state covered an area of 55,000 sq km and had a population of 1,556,000.¹

Napoleon's ambition in creating Illyria was governed by strategic interests. It was necessary to control both Adriatic coasts in order to carry out a continental blockade, and the Provinces served as the basis for Napoleon's campaign to the east, across the Balkans. Thus, Austria and England were cut off in the Croatian Littoral and Trieste, and Napoleon's land route for the importation of Macedonian cotton and other goods from Turkey was ensured. This strengthened French strategic positions in their eventual alliance with the Turks against Russia, and later, in the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire itself. On account of its significant strategic role in French foreign

¹ For the most exhaustive information on the Illyrian Provinces see: Bogumil Vošnjak, *Ustava in uprava Ilirskih dežel*. Ljubljana: Matica slovenska, 1910; Paul Pisani, *La Dalmatie de 1797 à 1815*. Paris: Picard et Fils, 1893: pp. 350-398; Tullio Erber, »Storia della Dalmazia dal 1797 al 1814.« offprints of: *Programma del Ginnasio superiore di Zara 1886/7, 1888/9, 1889/90 e 1891/2* (1888): pp. 1-96; (1889): pp. 1-72; (1890): pp. 1-72; (1892): pp. 1-74; Petar Karlić, *Kraljski Dalmatin (1806.-1810)*. Zadar: Matica Dalmatinska, 1812: pp. 153-163; Ferdo Šišić, *Hrvatska povijest*, III. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1913: pp. 100-109; Mellita Pivec-Stellè, *La vie économique des Provinces Illyriennes*. Paris: Bossard, 1930; Monika Senkowska-Gluck, *Rzady napoleonskie w Ilirii 1809-1813*. Wrocław: Polska akademia nauk Institut historii, 1980.

policy, the position of *Vojna krajina* remained unchanged. Furthermore, Napoleon attributed to the provinces the importance of marches dating back to the time of Charlemagne; consequently, they became a valuable resource of recruits for the French army and navy.²

On 25 December 1809 Bonaparte appointed a provisional government of Illyria. The name of this new state was most likely suggested to Napoleon by A.-F.-L. Viesse de Marmont, who, under the influence of some bourgeois and revolutionary circles in Dalmatia, Dubrovnik, and Carniola, wished to contribute in this way to the feeling of territorial unity and ethnic identity among those populating the Provinces. In this respect, Marmont went a step further from Napoleon's concept in an attempt to secure profound impact upon the cultural, linguistic, and other integrational processes, notably in Dalmatia and Dubrovnik.³

Ljubljana was the capital of Illyria, as well as its administrative, military, and judicial center. Marmont was appointed general governor, and State Counsellor Dauchy was appointed general intendant of finance, that is, civil gov-

² Đordo Samardžić, »Motivi formiranja Ilirskih Provincija i položaj Marmonta kao generalnog guvernera.« *Godišnjak Pravnog fakulteta u Sarajevu* 5 (1957): pp. 333-360.

³ The analysis of the ideological background of "Illyrianism" within the framework of French policy, comprehensive presentation and interpretation of the emergence and development of the term, as well as the reasons which led to its attribution to the Provinces, deserve to be the subjects of a separate study. The issues concerning the ideological elements involved in the establishment of the new state are disputable and can hardly be interpreted by ideological models and political concepts created on the lower levels of the French administration (See: Drago Roksandić, »Francusko imperijalno ilirstvo u Ilirskim pokrajinama.« *Jugoslovenski istorijski časopis* 3 (1987): pp. 17-35). Napoleon was primarily guided by the military and strategic role this region could play in the context of the French campaign to the east. Napoleon's voluminous correspondence shows that his intentions with the Provinces were all but the schemes involving ethnical and national integrations, particularly not in the eastern regions under the mounting influence of Russia. Contrarily, Napoleon experienced Illyria, notably the east coast of the Adriatic, as Italian territory in terms of its cultural heritage and ethnical identity. In support of this statement was Dandolo's policy in Dalmatia, but also the military-strategic unity of Italy and Illyria which followed later (See: Melitta Pivec-Stellè, »Motivi ustanovitve Napoleonove Ilirije.« *Narodna starina* 22 (1930): pp. 91-94; Đ. Samardžić, »Motivi formiranja Ilirskih Provincija«: pp. 333-360). In choosing Illyria for the name of the Provinces, Napoleon clearly displayed his leaning towards the revival of classical geography. "Illyrianism" of the day could, most likely, be said to have been created *post festum*, a feature Drago Roksandić attributed to the general political ideology of France, suffering thus from misinterpretations and contradictions. Clearer answers to the ideological and culturo-ethnical after-math of the French rule ought to be sought on the concrete levels of the Provinces respectively. On Marmont's strong opposition to Dandolo's Italian influence and his endorsement of the Croat linguists, see Frano Baras, »Maršal Marmont i hrvatski jezik.« *Radovi Pedagoške akademije u Splitu* 2 (1977): pp. 57-79.

ernor. Because their powers were not differentiated, this lasting dualism created an overlapping of competencies and caused inefficiency in government institutions. Legal particularism was at work as a result of the differences in historical and economic development, administrative tradition, and cultural heritage between the provinces.⁴

In the course of the recurrent negotiations with the Habsburgs concerning territorial compensation (1810, 1812, and 1813), Illyria served as Napoleon's joker. Therefore, he showed no particular interest in its definite and final organization, which would have been a demanding task for such a specific community. Differences in administrative structure proved to be the greatest obstacle in the establishment of the new government. The governmental and legal position of the Provinces in relation to France was never specifically determined, as they were annexed by decree, and not by constitutional act. In addition, only a number of minor French laws were introduced in the Illyrian Provinces, for the government was avoiding a resolution of the key problem of feudal rights. Nevertheless, the links between Illyria and France remained close, and the governor answered to the ministers in Paris. With all their particularities, the Illyrian Provinces could be defined as an expansion of the French state with some constitutional elements. This meant that the inhabitants of the Provinces had their own citizenship, place of residence, passports, and identification documents. Illyria had stable borders, and because of the continental blockade, all forms of transport were strictly supervised. Shortly after Marmont's stay in Paris on 15 April 1811, a final decree on the organization of the Illyrian Province was issued. This document made a futile attempt at reconciling the inherited institutional apparatus existing in certain provinces with those of civil society and the modern French legislature. The decree, however, failed to provide a complete conception of the administrative system.⁵

⁴ B. Vošnjak, *Ustava in uprava ilirskih dežel*: p. 110. Đ. Samardžić was right that the period between the two decrees (1809-1811) was characterized by provisional government, as the temporary decree of 1809 failed to regulate the administrative and judicial authority in certain Provinces, but only the central bodies. This, particularly, was the case of Dubrovnik, in which Marmont's administrative and judicial system established in 1808 was retained long after 1809 (Đ. Samardžić, »Motivi formiranja Ilirskih Provincija«: pp. 351-360).

⁵ The text was published in the collection *Recueil de lois, décrets et réglemens a l'usage des Provinces Illyriennes de l'Empire*, V. Paris 1812. The copy of the decree exists at the State Archives of Dubrovnik.

The undifferentiated powers of the governor and the intendant created growing friction and hostility. The governor could command the military, the navy, and the national guard; appoint lower functionaries; and confirm those accredited by Paris. Because judicial authority and general administration were principally in his hands, he was authorized to make direct contact with the emperor and the ministers. This is where his authority interfered with that of the intendant of finance, whose powers were vaguely defined. In association with the state departments (ministries), the latter was to supervise the work of all the administrative bodies. The general intendant was superior to all intendants and delegates in the provinces. The decree of 1811 introduced the post of general commissioner of the judiciary performed by Baron Coffinhal, creating even greater friction in the Central Government (*Le Gouvernement Général*), which consisted of the three aforementioned highest officials. Together with the two members of the Ljubljana Courts of Appeal, the Central Government represented the Council Minor, and was authorized to act as the supreme court for major civil trials and to re-examine all police decisions. Among the higher civil servants were those responsible for customs, mortgages, state-owned properties, roads and bridges, forests, waters, etc. The commissioner of the exchequer gave orders to the regional treasurers. These magistrates constituted the Intendants' Council, headed by the general intendant. Larger communities also had military command, police, and gendarmerie, making the conflict between the military and civil authority observable at all levels.

The provinces governed by intendants were divided into smaller territorial units: districts, cantons, and communes. Subdelegates represented the highest authority in the districts, while the cantons functioned as mere territorial units. Urban communes with more than 2,500 inhabitants were administered by the mayor (*maire*) and five city councillors, each of whom would hold the rotational office of mayor. In smaller communes, however, syndics and their deputies were in charge, while village headmen would run villages in the countryside.⁶ Communes acted as executive administrative units whose

⁶ For the general survey of the territorial organization of the Illyrian Provinces see: Đordo Samardžić, »Provincijska, distriktska i opštinska uprava u našim zemljama za vrijeme francuske vladavine.« *Godišnjak Pravnog fakulteta u Sarajevu* 15 (1967): pp. 479-501.

councils were appointed by the Central Government. Territorial division and the establishment of new governmental institutions was a slow and varying process. The former was finally established in all the provinces in the course of 1812, accompanied by a number of alterations regarding communal administration.

An attempt to revamp the judiciary took even longer. On 15 April 1811, a decree was issued (art. 249 and 250) stating that French laws be enforced in Illyria. This goal was not easily attainable, due to the diversity of the social and legal structure of the Provinces. Thereby, on 30 September 1811, a special judicial decree had to be issued and subsequently subjected to interpretation by the general commissioner of justice on 5 March 1812.⁷ These supreme legislative documents were but formally introduced in the Illyrian Provinces, and like the aforementioned administrative decrees, represented an unsatisfactory compromise, particularly regarding the feudal issue. A justice of the peace was appointed in every canton. In the province centers, as well as in a number of larger towns, courts of first instance were established, while in Ljubljana, Zadar, and Dubrovnik, courts of appeal. Additionally, courts of commerce seated in Rijeka, Trieste, Ljubljana, and Dubrovnik, were to deal with commercial legal proceedings.

During their existence, the Illyrian Provinces were unable to consolidate financially. Considerable military forces burdened the state budget, which relied exclusively on its own income sources (taxes, monopolies, and customs duty), without any aid from France. Another hindrance was the previous Austrian state bankruptcy in Carinthia, Carniola, and Croatia. The organization of the complex revenue system and the administration of the state-owned estates required impressive means. In 1810, the governmental deficit amounted to 6,334,000 francs, which grew to 7,780,000 francs the following year.⁸ Strict customs regulations were enforced due to the continental blockade, which deterred every possibility of trade. In addition, maritime commerce was paralyzed by the English counter-blockade in the Adriatic.

⁷ »Décret de 30 Septembre 1811 sur l'Organisation judiciaire en Illyrie.« *Bulletin des lois de la République française* no. 396, 1811, *Arrêté de S.E. le gouverneur general des Provinces Illyriennes du 5 mars 1812 pris sur la proposition de Mr. le baron de l'Empire Coffinhal commissaire général de justice en Illyrie*. Trieste 1812. Copies of the both decrees are kept in State Archives of Dubrovnik, *Acta Gallica* (hereafter cited as: A.G.) 1811. Special positions.

⁸ B. Vošnjak, *Ustava in uprava*: 206.

Popular discontent was occasioned by unfavorable political, military, and economic conditions, the sources of which were manifold. The French made no attempt to reform the inherited feudal privileges, treating them as civil law obligations. The arbitral role they tried to play between the opposed social classes only brought them the distrust and animosity of the nobility, landowners, and peasants alike. The taxation system was subject to frequent adjustments due to the growing deficit. In addition to numerous indirect taxes, there were as many as 13 direct taxes which burdened the lower classes.⁹ Inequalities in taxation between the provinces increased the dissatisfaction even further. From 1810 onward, the lower social strata and peasants found the burden of conscription and labor on road construction intolerable. Strict customs regulations contributed to the development of smuggling and piracy at sea, striking a serious blow to the commercially-oriented bourgeoisie.

The deteriorated circumstances also resulted in the frequent replacement of highly ranked officials in the French administration. Marmont remained governor until February 1811, when, being disappointed by the decreed administrative regulations, he was transferred to the Spanish front, leaving the Croatian lands for good. He was replaced by General Henri Bertrand, who remained at the post until March 1813, when he joined Napoleon in Saxony. General Andoche Junot served as a short-term replacement until July 1813, and was succeeded by the former chief of Napoleon's police—Joseph Fouché. As early as the beginning of October, Fouché had to resign from his post, as the allies were on the offensive. The office of the general intendant of finance also went through frequent changes. Dauchy performed this duty as late as January 1810, when he was succeeded by Belleville, who remained at the post until 27 September 1811. The last intendant was Chabrol de Crouzol. The frequency with which these agents of the Central Government were replaced best illustrates the ungrateful character of their tasks.¹⁰

The dissolution of the Illyrian Provinces, as was their establishment, was closely related to the events taking place on the international scene. Napoleon's retreat from Russia in the end of 1812, coupled with the series of French

⁹ This information pertains to the Dubrovnik Province only. *A.G.* 1811. no. 65, tit. I rub. 3; no. 66, tit. I rub. 6.

¹⁰ On general governors and intendants see: M. Senkowska-Gluck, *Rzady napoleonskie w Ilirii*: pp. 94- 126.

defeats that followed in the first months of 1813, encouraged British and Austrian military activity at sea and on land. As a result, the French were forced to retreat to strategically more favorable positions. In spite of all the shortcomings of French rule in Illyria, the new administrative and judicial model set the basis for the modern governmental and judicial system in the Croatian and Slovene lands.

The contradictions of the new regime

When it became part of the Illyrian Provinces as a territorially independent unit, the Dubrovnik region, along with Boka Kotorska, already had an organized administrative and judicial system which the French had established in 1808 and 1809. During 1810, this administrative apparatus was being expanded with additional services and acquired a definite form with the implementation of the administrative and judicial decrees of April and September 1811. This governmental pattern continued until the end of French rule in the end of 1813, so that the period spanning between 1810 and 1813 represented the second phase of the French rule in Dubrovnik. In terms of organization, the Illyrian Provinces were a perfect example of administrative centralization: Dubrovnik's administrator, Dominik Garagnin, who formerly acted independently or under direct instructions of Marmont, was now kept well in hand by the central authority in Ljubljana. In fact, his commission was reduced to that of a mere subordinate agent in the hierarchy of the new and more complex Illyrian state. With Napoleon and his campaigns at their peak, the Dubrovnik region sank into insignificance by becoming but one of many administrative units on the margins of the Empire.

Following a victorious success and the establishment of political authority, the French administration resorted to a series of reforms in order to improve the Provinces' economic and financial potentials in accordance with French interests. The new organization saw the development of Dubrovnik's maritime commerce as a relevant source of state income.¹¹ However, due to

¹¹ Extensive references on the Dubrovnik region within the Illyrian Provinces can be found, dealing mostly with the diplomatic and political aspects of the events. The former, however, treat neither the organization and operation of the government nor the socio-economic effects of the reforms. Cf. P. Pisani, *La Dalmatie*; T. Erber, »Storia della Dalmazia« offprint of: *Programma del Ginnasio superiore di Zara 1886/7* (1888): pp. 80-96; Lujo Vojnović, *Pad Dubrovnika*, II. Zagreb, 1908; Harriet Towers Bjelovučić, *The Ragusan Republic victim of Napoleon and its own*

British naval supremacy, organized piracy, and the frequent seizure of Dubrovnik's and Boka's vessels, the aforementioned schemes seemed far from feasible. Napoleon failed even to consider, let alone elaborate, a means of financing the Provinces, including that of Dubrovnik, as they were supposed to support the army and the administration from their own resources. In order to surmount the growing deficit, the general intendant of finance reorganized the customs and tax administration, together with the administration of the state salt and tobacco monopolies, and the state-owned estates (the Domain). The huge bureaucratic apparatus that was necessary for the carrying out of such an organization exceeded by far the financial potential of the population and the economic resources of the country, and thus contributed to the speedy collapse of the French government.

The first months of the Illyrian Provinces brought no radical changes in Dubrovnik. The name and the seal of the new state were used in documents from March 1810, when the flag of the Kingdom of Italy was replaced by the French flag. From then onward, in accordance with the new terminology, Garagnin had the title of intendant.¹² Administrative and judicial hierarchy was established in 1808, 1809, and during 1810, was still in effect. In January 1810, Dauchy and Marmont demanded a detailed financial report from Garagnin with all the statistical data, and the budget balance for the current year. Thanks to Garagnin's very extensive report, we are able to reconstruct the conditions in the Dubrovnik region shortly before the establishment of the new model. The delegates from Ston and Cavtat were directly subordi-

conservatism. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970; Josip Bersa, *Dubrovačke slike i prilike*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1941: pp. 29-45. Information concerning Ragusan maritime commerce, piracy, and the effects of the blockade based on numerous sources and literature can be traced in the work of Vinko Ivančević, »Prilog poznavanju dubrovačkog pomorstva u razdoblju francuskog zaposjednuća (1806-1813).« *Anali Zavoda za povijesne znanosti Istraživačkog centra JAZU u Dubrovniku* 17 (1979): pp. 365-428. As for the primary sources, apart from the documents of the French Administration (*Acta Gallica*) filed at the State Archives of Dubrovnik, useful data is being provided by the printed historical accounts of two contemporary observers: Biagio Stulli, »Notizie storiche dal diario di Biagio Stulli.« *L'Epidauritano lunario raguseo per l'anno 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907*. Ragusa, (1902): pp. 33- 51; (1903): pp. 33-48; (1904): pp. 33-49; (1905): pp. 33-58; (1906): pp. 33-64, and Antun Kaznačić, »Quadro storico dei miei tempi.« *L'Epidauritano lunario raguseo per l' anno 1897, 1898*. Ragusa (1896): pp. 17-35; (1897): pp. 33-46.

¹² A.G. 1810. no. 45, F II 355; no. 54, F VII 96.

nate to the Central Administration headed by Garagnin. Luko Gozze, the Ston delegate, acted as superior to the subdelegates in Slano, Orebić and Mljet. He was also in charge of the Ston saltworks and salt warehouses. Because of Lastovo's remote position and frequent piracies, its governor, Vlaho Caboga, was directly appointed by Marmont. Marko Milli Bošković, responsible for the treasury, performed his demanding duties with the help of several clerks. The Customs office was administered by the chief officer, Luko Drobac, together with two assistants and several customs guards. Sanitary guards and public health officers, who were headed by Vlaho Stulli, worked in the Gruž port and at *Lazaretto*, with three of their officers being in charge of the storage and wholesale of salt in the city. The commissions established in 1808 to regulate the public welfare, monastery estates and commerce continued to function within the Central Administration. About sixty pandours and members of the national guard, as well as a smaller number of policemen and jailors, were directly subordinate to Garagnin. He also supervised four telegraph operators employed on the semaphore telegraph, which the French had installed on top of Mount Petka in order to survey the navigation of English ships. A similar task was assigned to the port captains in Dubrovnik, Gruž, and Cavtat. Public institutions, lycées, the hospital, the orphanage, and three poor-houses were financed by the *Opera Pia* charity organization and the confraternity of St. Anthony. The clergy of Dubrovnik's 36 parishes were converted, upon the French model, into public servants, and were financed by the same sources. Additionally, the Central Administration had to cope with some extra expenditures, including the support of teachers and physicians in Dubrovnik, Ston, and Cavtat, as well as dragomans, servants, messengers, and watchmakers.¹³ The regions of the Bay of Kotor (Boka Kotorska) and the island of Korčula remained incorporated, if only formally, into Dubrovnik Province throughout 1810. Luigi Paulucci, the subdelegate of Kotor, kept Garagnin well-informed of the state of affairs in Boka, and also received orders from the Central Administration through him. From April 1810, the subdelegate of Korčula kept authorities in Dubrovnik regularly informed, his dispatches being mainly concerned with maritime conditions and

¹³ A.G. 1810. no. 46, F II 395.

the positions of enemy vessels.¹⁴

The judiciary acted within the authority decreed by Marmont in 1808. Petar Stulli, Jakov Natali, Antun Chersa, and Luigi Cosinti were the magistrates of the Court of First Instance in Dubrovnik, over which Niko Pozza presided. In Dubrovnik, Ston, and Cavtat, Ivan Bona, Frano Liepopilli, and Nikola Facenda operated as justices of the peace.

In 1810 the Central Administration relied mostly on customs tariffs as its source of income (161,131 francs), as well as the salt monopoly (196,421 francs). Smaller sources of income were the earnings from state-owned estates, from the so-called *lively* (interest on the deposited foundation funds), judicial and health taxes, and the confiscation of the smuggled goods. The Lycée was directly financed with the funds of the abolished convents (c. 3,500 francs). The total annual income of Dubrovnik Province for 1810 amounted to 454,387 francs. The total expenditures, however, exceeded this sum and rose to 534,604 francs, forming a deficit of 81,217 francs.¹⁵ Marmont's military contribution of 45,395 francs in June 1810, together with Dauchy's re-script in August of the same year, which required Dubrovnik Province to provide as much as 103,434 francs for the provision of army and governmental institutions, represented the greatest burden to the budget. These extra expenditures were mainly paid with the last cash resources of the *Opera Pia* foundation, but the remainder was provided by the *Monte di Pietà* pawnshop. A considerable sum—over 60,000 francs—was intended for the salaries of the administrative staff, which, in the new fiscal system had been reinforced since mid-1810 by several financial and revenue clerks, whose job it was to lessen the deficit.¹⁶

The communal administration, planned its own budget.¹⁷ Between 1808 and 1811, this level of administration existed only in Dubrovnik. The com-

¹⁴ On the French administration in Boka Kotorska and Korčula, which, in its specific way, remained independent of the regional centre in Dubrovnik, see: »Pavao Butorac, Boka Kotorska nakon pada Mletačke Republike do Bečkog kongresa (1797.-1815.).« *Rad JAZU* 265 (1938): pp. 1-154. Vinko Ivančević, »Korčula pod Francuzima.« *Radovi Historijskog instituta JAZU u Zadru* 19 (1972): pp. 341-373.

¹⁵ A.G. 1810. no. 48, F II 577. *Budget Generale delle rendite e spese per il primo e secondo semestre della Provincia di Ragusa per l'anno 1810.*

¹⁶ A.G. 1810. no. 47, F II 453.

¹⁷ Cf. Zdravko Šundrica, »Osnivanje i rad Dubrovačke općine.« *Dubrovnik* 2 (1965): 52-70.

munal administration functioned as the executive body of the Central Administration in the City and its surroundings, and was responsible for public services, such as the cleaning and illumination of streets, the maintenance of city markets, public announcements, and the execution of orders issued by the Central Administration, etc. Yet the main responsibility of the Communal Council and communal administration officials was the accomodation and food supply of the French military. This demanded the most expenditures, amounting to 9,420 ducats in the first half of 1810. The primary income of the commune was collected from the Pelješac and Primorje estates, as well as those in Ston and the surroundings of Dubrovnik. During the same period, these earnings mounted to 5,642 ducats, making the six-month deficit 3,778 ducats, or 5,799 francs.¹⁸

As governor of the Illyrian Provinces, Marmont influenced considerably the development of events in Dubrovnik, and retained his position by giving orders and instructions according to the newly established circumstances. On 8 February 1810, as a tribute for commendable military conduct during the 1809 campaign, Marmont decorated Garagnin with the Legion of Honor. Six days later, the Dubrovnik and Kotor communes dispatched their representatives Baldo Trojani and Miho Giorgi Bona to express their loyalty and most sincere congratulations to Marmont upon his new office.¹⁹ By the end of April, Marmont appointed Rado Andrović and Sabo Giorgi as Dubrovnik's envoys in the Illyrian delegation to Paris, which was to bow before Napoleon in May.²⁰

In early 1810, Marmont re-issued orders concerning the rise of salt prices and alcohol taxes, along with the strong blockade measures. Salt and tobacco manufactured in Dubrovnik were declared a state monopoly, and beginning in April, French francs and Austrian florins became official monetary units in Dubrovnik Province, although the former Ragusan currency remained in

¹⁸ A.G. 1810. no. 48, F II 570. *Stato Generale Delle Spese Occorse alla Municipalità locale della Città e Borgo di Ragusa, Stato Generale delle Rendite Dirette e Indirette della Municipalità.*

¹⁹ A.G. 1810. no. 62, F XVI 38.

²⁰ A.G. 1810. no. 62, F XVI 148. Andrović and Giorgi were assigned to get the reparations from Napoleon, if not all, due to the losses and damage Dubrovnik suffered during the Russo-Montenegrin attack. In support of their demand, they presented Napoleon with the specification of the damage, which amounted to 9 million ducats. Napoleon received them on 15 August, but apart from getting promises and Legions of Honour, their mission proved a futile one.

circulation.²¹ The British naval counter-blockade conditioned the growing French restrictions on public transport and trade, and had highly recessive effects on the entire economy. Marmont recurrently banned the trade of English goods, whereas the transport of colonial goods was subject to special duty regulations. The national guard and pandours were to prevent the unloading of any smuggled merchandise and its transportation to Turkish territory.²² Conflicts and piracy became a common feature in the Adriatic with the arrival of Captain William Hoste and the British fleet. Ragusan vessels which navigated outside of the Adriatic and escaped the misfortune of being sold or confiscated, were generally hampered in trade activities. Cabotage proved very risky, on account of frequent pirate attacks. They would normally sail north as far as Senj, Rijeka, and Trieste, and southwards to Italian, Albanian, and Greek ports. Trade was almost brought to a halt and was limited to the transport of only the most vital goods, such as meat, oil, wine, cereals, pasta, beans, wax, hides, cloths, etc. Trade with the hinterland followed a similar pattern, developing along the established caravan routes from Ploče and Bosanka via Trebinje farther inland.²³

By the end of 1810, economic crisis penetrated all segments of life. As a result of the effective counter-blockade the complete administrative apparatus concentrated upon solving the problem of food supply, for which they required the aid of the military. Each month, Garagnin himself issued the prices of bread and certain basic food articles, depending on the size of the reserves.²⁴ In 1810, the British organized a market for the selling of smug-

²¹ A.G. 1810. no. 47, F II 453. Together with the official currency, the French francs and Austrian florins, Ragusan ducats and smaller coins were in use over the entire period of the French ruling in Dubrovnik. Economic crisis influenced the fluctuations of the exchange rates. One franc was estimated to 1.40 Ragusan ducats, as much as a Turkish piaster. One Austrian florin equalled to 2.586 francs. See: M. Pivec-Stellè, *La vie économique des Provinces illyriennes*: p. 349.

²² A.G. 1810. no. 44, F II 299; no. 49, F II 683; no. 55, F VII 306. On 21 April, pandours confiscated six loads of smuggled coffee in Konavle, and due to the stronger measures taken, Marmont appointed Gassellini as new head of the Customs on 19 May.

²³ For exhaustive information on the maritime history of this period see V. Ivančević, »Prilog poznavanju dubrovačkog pomorstva«: pp. 372, 373, 423-425. According to some sources, in 1810 Ragusan shipowners had 154 liners and 66 coastwise vessels, whereas 50 shipbuilders, 70 carpenters, and 15 blacksmiths were employed at the shipyard.

²⁴ A.G. 1810. no. 63, F XVI 3.

gled goods on the island of Vis. There are numerous reports by the local authorities about counterbands on land and piracies at sea, against which the national guard was helpless. In 1810, however, the French won a series of successes. In March 1810, following a shipwreck, members of the Korčula national guard captured the notorious British pirate Petar Peričević, together with his crew and booty. He had formerly seized five smaller vessels in the Korčula Channel, aiming to sell them on Vis. His trial and misfortune attracted the attention of General Henri Bertrand, the French commander in Dubrovnik.²⁵ The end of 1810 saw frequent British attacks in the coastal area, with the renewal of war with Austria in the air. This urged Marmont to order the reinforcement of the national guard on 20 August. The guards proved most efficient on the island of Lastovo. They showed exceptional courage against a British gun-boat, deserving thus a special tribute issued by Marmont, an article in the *Télégraphe Officiel*, and a financial award. At the end of 1810, they were successful in retrieving a ship formerly seized by the pirates.²⁶ Despite all the perils, the Ragusans kept on sailing. Their confiscated ships were soon replaced by new ones built in the dockyards of Gruž, the evidence of which can be found in the numerous permits issued for cutting down timber in the area. The new boats were generally smaller and equipped for fishing in Rijeka dubrovačka and around Mljet. According to the sources, in 1810 there were 66 boats of the kind in coastal traffic, but their number varied due to frequent seizures.²⁷

War and financial problems interfered with the realization of almost all the ambitious reforms of the French authorities. Garagnin demanded financial support from Napoleon himself, but received nothing but a negative answer. The construction works in *Lazaretti* could not be finished, nor the military slaughter house in its vicinity. In his attempt to find a solution to these financial problems, Garagnin contacted directly the general intendant in Ljubljana in order to get to Dubrovnik's deposit in Vienna. According to a report from 1810, those funds consisted mainly of the deposits of clerical congregations, having a total of 92,890 florins. On 29 August 1810, the gen-

²⁵ A.G. 1810. no. 59, F XII 72, 73.

²⁶ A.G. 1810. no. 63, F XVI 35; no. 64, F XVI 439.

²⁷ V. Ivančević, »Prilog poznavanju dubrovačkog pomorstva«: pp. 423.

eral intendant replied that Baron Vienny had negotiated with the Austrian commissioner in Zagreb regarding the possibility of these deposits being made payable, but with no results.²⁸

An unpopular new taxation system was introduced in July 1810 with the appointment of the central revenue administration and branch supervisors. A general tax law was passed on 24 August 1810. It regulated land taxes, that is, taxes on real estate and personal tax. These measures were not welcomed by the landowners, who were required to pay the full amount of dues, depending on the size and quality of the land they owned.²⁹ The state, in other words, looked upon the relationship between land proprietors and their tenants as a private legal matter, leaving the problem of tax collection to the landowners. This inevitably contributed to the rapid pauperization of the nobility and the discontent of all landowners. On the other hand, capitation (*glavarina*) had to be paid by all citizens above the age of 21, who were divided into three categories according to income. This new taxation system became a constant source of public dissatisfaction with the French regime.³⁰

In 1810 Marmont established a number of new services in Dubrovnik Province. According to the new police regulations, police commissioners were appointed in Dubrovnik and Kotor. Special political and criminal police forces (*alta Polizia*) were also organized.³¹ Under the supervision of the Central Administration, a state postal service was established for the first time, headed by the former police officer Angelo Frezza.³² Paolo Tironi, a civil engineer employed in the Central Administration, was responsible for the maintenance and construction of roads and public buildings.³³

Dubrovnik's Lycée, under the guidance of Francesco Maria Appendini and Bernard Zamagna, became part of the Illyrian educational system. Prior to this, Marmont had appointed Rafael Zelli supervisor of public schooling, and Bartol Benincasa general censor. The new regulations of the Dubrovnik Lycée

²⁸ A.G. 1810. no. 64, F XVI 300.

²⁹ A.G. 1810. no. 47, F II 506.

³⁰ A.G. 1810. no. 47, F II 528; no. 48, F II 611.

³¹ A.G. 1810. no. 56, F VIII, 62, 82.

³² A.G. 1810. no. 63, F XVI 204.

³³ A.G. 1810. no. 58, F X 213, 214.

were issued on 28 October 1810, based on the public school decree and Zelli's instructions.³⁴ The 1810 decree closed down the Zadar Lycée in favor of the one in Dubrovnik; the latter received 60 scholarships, most of which were granted to the students of the Lycée convent. In addition, General Bertrand encouraged the idea of establishing an Illyrian Academy in Dubrovnik; this institution, unfortunately, never saw light.³⁵ The Lycée functioned as such throughout the entire period of French administration. With the Austrian takeover, the convent was abolished, and the Lycée transformed into a Gymnasium.

The clergy and all the civil servants were ordered to take an oath of loyalty to Emperor Napoleon. This, in addition to the general French attitude toward the church, caused resentment among part of the clergy. The solemn oath was signed by sixty-nine clergymen, together with Dubrovnik's archbishop, Nikola Bani, on 8 October 1810. Sixteen members of the clergy, among whom were a number of highly respected Dominicans and Franciscans, refused to take the oath. They were imprisoned the following day. The most rebellious among them—two Dominican friars Ivan Krstitelj Resaver, and Vittorio Giaime, and three priests, the Lalić brothers and Ivan Mitrović—were banished from Dubrovnik and the whole territory under French rule.³⁶

Toward the end of October, the general intendant ordered the recruit of 400 sailors from Dubrovnik Province for the French Navy, but the large-scale propaganda campaign failed to bring satisfactory results. A special committee in charge of mobilization was formed; it consisted of Captain Letellier, commander of the French troops in Dubrovnik, General Bertrand, Garagnin, and the physician Luko Stulli. By the middle of December only sixty men had volunteered from the Dubrovnik region, and 102 from Boka Kotorska. These small figures forced the French to take more radical measures. By the beginning of 1811, 120 sailors were forcefully drafted in Dubrovnik, and 140

³⁴ A.G. 1810. no. 52, FIV 78, 139, 165, 191. *Regolamento sull' Insegnamento e la Disciplina Del Liceo di Ragusa*. The new regulations introduced reforms in the organization and programme of the Lycée. See: Josip Posedel, »Povijest gimnazije u Dubrovniku /Part II and III/.« *Program Ć.K. Velike državne Gimnazije u Dubrovniku 1901-1902* Dubrovnik (1902): pp. 29-32.

³⁵ M. Senkowska-Gluck, *Rzady napoleonskie w Ilirii*: p. 151.

³⁶ A.G. 1810. no. 52, FIV 178, 210. Aside from the Catholic clergy, the solemn oath was also signed by the Jewish rabbi and the Orthodox priest.

in Boka Kotorska. They boarded French navy vessels and set off for Toulon in January.³⁷ Military service, particularly if it was on somebody else's account, was alien to the Dubrovnik tradition, so together with the economic distress, this campaign contributed considerably to the emmigration from the province. This was especially true of the seamen of Pelješac, who, in pursuit of work, either emmigrated or joined the British pirates. This outflow of men avoiding conscription triggered Marmont to issue a decree calling for obligatory registration and punishment of those refusing to recruit.³⁸

Reforms and resistance 1811-1813

The year 1811 marked the reorganization of French administration and the enforcement of a series of administrative and judicial measures. The territorial organization of Illyria was rearranged by decree on 15 April 1811. Articles 249 and 250 of the decree announced the implementation of all laws effective in France. The draft of the decree, however, did not reach Dubrovnik until June 1811, and its implementation was postponed until the end of the same year. French laws were then promulgated on 1 January 1812. From this point on, Dubrovnik Province consisted of three districts—Dubrovnik, Kotor, and Korčula—which were further divided into ten cantons. The province had a total of 71,907 inhabitants. A magistrate and a chancellor were to be assigned in each canton center, while the districts of Kotor and Korčula were governed by subdelegates of the first and second class.³⁹

³⁷A.G. 1810. no. 64, F XVI 354, 417; A.G. 1811. no. 85, tit. XII rub. 4. This number of recruits corresponds with the number Biagio Stulli mentioned in his account. Further on the subject of drafting for the navy see Šime Peričić, »Sudjelovanje Dalmatinaca u Napoleonovoj mornarici.« *Pomorski zbornik* 5 (1967): pp. 582-584.

³⁸A.G. 1810. no. 64, F XVI 430.

³⁹By the 1811 decree (see note 5) the administration and judiciary in the Dubrovnik Province was regulated by articles; art. 70 - The jurisdiction of the Province, that is, of the former Republic, island of Korčula, and Boka Kotorska; art. 64 - Division into three districts; art. 89 and 90 - Division into ten cantons, Dubrovnik, Slano, Orebić, Cavtat, Mljet, Lastovo, Korčula, Kotor, Hercegnovi, and Budva. The responsibilities of the subdelegates and the magistrates were regulated by articles 108 and 184. Đ. Samardžić falsely asserts that the subdelegate of Hvar, instead of that of Korčula, was subordinate to the Ragusan intendant (Đ. Samardžić, »Provincijska, distriktiska i opštinska«: p. 492).

The Dubrovnik district included the following cantons: Dubrovnik, Cavtat, Mljet, Slano, Orebići, and Lastovo. It had a population of 32,000. The district of Kotor included the cantons of Kotor, Herceg Novi, and Budva, and had a population of 33,439; the Korčula district functioned as a single canton with 6,468 inhabitants. The cantons were then divided into 34 communes. The district of Dubrovnik thus consisted of 6 cantons and 19 communes. The commune of Dubrovnik was the most populous (6,289 people) and encompassed Grad, Pile, Ploče, Bosanka, and Gruž. The communes could be arranged according to size in the following order: Cavtat (2,140), Orebići (2,138), Župa (1,964), Kuna (1,945), Pločice (1,756), Rijeka (1,667), Slano (1,672), Pridvorje (1,597), Lopud (1,582), Ston (1,508), Janjina (1,277), Lisac (1,199), Imotica (981), Lastovo (958), Mljet (896), Trpanj (892), and Šipan (821). According to article 108, a commune with a population of less than 2,400 was to be administered by a syndic and his deputy. Larger communes were administered by a mayor (*maire*), together with the Communal Council. In the Dubrovnik district only the commune of Dubrovnik had a mayor, and in the Korčula district, the city of Korčula (2,517). In the district of Kotor, the following communes had mayors: Kotor (2,880), Herceg-Novi (3,869), Bijela (3,490), Perast (2,914), and Risan (3,548).⁴⁰ The institution of communal administration proved a slow process, and until the final regulation of its authorities, they acted according to Garagnin's 1808 instructions for the Dubrovnik commune.⁴¹ Napoleon was to appoint candidates for all the leading commune offices, as well as council members, as had been previously proposed in July by the general governor. This procedure took a while, and not until 17 January 1812, did the governor appoint a provisional communal council consisting of former chairman Sabo Giorgi and four vice-chairmen, Baldo Trojani, Dživo Bosdari, Nikša Pozza, and Alexander Devoulx, who

⁴⁰ *Prospetto dei Maires, Sindaci, e Supplenti delle Comuni nella Provincia di Ragusa*. A.G. 1811. (Special positions). *Télégraphe Officiel* of 7 March 1812, recorded a somewhat different territorial distribution according to which the Pelješac communes of the Orebić canton came under the jurisdiction of the district of Korčula. According to the aforementioned source, the district of Dubrovnik had the population of 31,037, and that of Kotor 38,017. However, such territorial organization was not sanctioned in practice before 1813, the year when the French were already beginning to lose their position in the region.

⁴¹ Article 11 regulated mayor's mandate which "was the same as in the French Empire". By the end of 1811, special regulations concerning the communal administrations were printed, *Extrait de l'instruction générale pour les maires*. Paris, 1811.

were to take the post of mayor in rotation. Among the members of the Communal Council were eight patricians (three from the Sorgo family, two Bonas, and one member each from the Giorgi, Menze, and Caboga families), and eight commoners. This was the first time that one Ragusan governing body included Jews (Josip Mandolfo and Danijel Terni).⁴² In March, Napoleon approved the members of the council, Giorgi as the mayor of Dubrovnik, and all the other mayors, syndics, and councillors in other administrative centers. Giorgi summoned the first Assembly of the Communal Council to meet on 19 May 1812. It was attended by the commoners only, since the six noblemen, as well as the vice-chairman, Niko Pozza, failed to show up. Some of them accounted for their absence with family obligations or ill health, but it was more than clear that the majority of patricians were neither willing nor ready to cooperate, and were showing open resistance towards the French regime. Mayor Giorgi informed intendant Rouen de Mallets about the matter, and included his deputy and loyal associate Dživo Bosdari into the Council. The Communal Council resumed its activities, although incomplete, until the end of French rule in 1814.⁴³

The decree on the organization of the judiciary of 30 September 1811 supplemented and defined the earlier mentioned judicial system. This decree abolished all the former courts and established new ones that were organized according to the concepts of the French legislature. The civil cases were to be tried according to the Ragusan laws which had been in effect prior to the French rule. The new system was slow in its establishment: the laws of the Dubrovnik Republic remained in effect throughout 1811 and later, since, due to problems mentioned earlier, numerous regulations of the French Code Civil could not be implemented.⁴⁴ On 6 January 1812, Coffinhal, judicial commissioner, gave orders for the establishment of three tribunals in Dubrovnik: a Court of Appeal, a Court of First Instance, and a Court of Commercial Affairs. As president of the Court of Appeal, he named Jerolim Bajamonti of

⁴² A.G. 1812. no. 105, tit. IX rub. 1.

⁴³ A.G. 1812. no. 105, tit. IX rub. 1.

⁴⁴ This was also confirmed by the document of the Dubrovnik Court of First Instance. A.G. 1811. no. 81, tit. X rub. 2, dated 30 May 1811, the facsimile of which was published by Bernard Stulli, »Dva pokušaja inventarizacije Dubrovačkog arhiva početkom 19. st.« *Arhivski vjesnik* 11-12 (1968-1969): p. 205.

Split; as vice-president, Petar Luković of Kotor; as magistrate, Antun Filipović-Mišetić of Brač. The French preference for non-Ragusans in judicial positions shows their distrust, as they appointed only two local noblemen as judges, Jakov Natali and Miho Giorgi Bona, and one learned and well-off citizen Rado Andrović. Petar Stulli was appointed president of the Court of First Instance, with Antun Chersa and Antun Kaznačić as his fellow judges.⁴⁵ In March, the members of the Court of Commercial Affairs were appointed. The tribunal consisted of eight prominent and well-to-do Dubrovnik merchants.⁴⁶

Commissions established in 1808 and 1809, which had formerly been under Garagnin's supervision only, were reorganized in accordance with the new centralized system. In the early days of December 1811, the post of intendant changed hands in Dubrovnik. Just as Marmont had resigned from the position of general intendant, Dominik Garagnin did the same on 8 December 1811, leaving Dubrovnik for good.⁴⁷ The post of intendant of Dubrovnik Province was soon occupied by the Frenchman Rouen des Mallets.⁴⁸ His brief career as intendant lasted until 2 June 1812, when he was replaced by

⁴⁵ A.G. 1812. no. 111, tit. XII rub. 1; no. 104, tit. VIII rub. 2. On 19 January, the appointed judges swore before intendant Mallets. On this occasion, Bajamonti, president of the court, delivered a programmatic speech in which he inaugurated the legal principles of the Code Civil. The speech was later published under the title *Discours du Chevalier Bayamonti, membre de la Légion d'honneur et Président de la Cour d' Appel de Raguse, prononcé le 19 janvier 1812 à l'installation des Tribunaux de première instance*. In 1811 the judge Miho Giorgi Bona acted as intendant of the Civil Croatia, with Karlovac as its seat. However, he soon relinquished the office to become judge in his home town. The judges were finally appointed in January 1813, when the list of the judges of the Court of Appeal was supplemented with B. Caboga, T. Tromba, I. Gozze, and A. Mišetić-Filipović. Therefore, these judicial bodies formally operated less than a year.

⁴⁶ A.G. 1812. no. 112, tit. XIX rub. 3. The following merchants were members of the Court of Commercial Affairs: Marko Tomašević, Ivan Vuletić, Miho Skurić, Stjepan Lalić, Pavo Hajtilović, Andrija Miletić, Ivan Maškarić, and Abraham Pardo.

⁴⁷ Garagnin's farewell project in autumn of 1811 was the road construction on the route from the City to Gruž where it met with the main Napoleon's road. A tablet to honour the occasion was put up at Boninovo, the destruction of which was later ordered by the Austrian commander Milutinović. It read: Magni Napoleonis/ Exempla Sequutus/ Dux Ragusae Augustus Marmontius/ Rupibus excisis aggeribus complanatis pontibus jactis/ Per/ Superioris et inferioris Illyriae/ Provincias/ Viam militarem aperuit/ Stravitque/ Maximo populorum emolumento. See: Ivan Augst Kaznačić, »Dubrovačka epigrafija.« *Slovinac* 10 (1879): p. 152.

⁴⁸ A.G. 1811. no. 77, tit. VIII rub. 10.

Baillardet de Lareinty. The latter remained at the post until the end of French rule.⁴⁹

The government's sources of income consisted mostly of taxes, income from state-owned estates, and the sale of salt, and excise taxes. From 1811 onward, several new taxes were introduced. Apart from the direct taxes imposed in 1810 (i.e., the land tax and the capitation), a new tax was initiated, the so-called *kućarina*, or tax on city houses and stores, which amounted to 25 percent of the realized income. If the house was used exclusively by its owner, or if part of it was rented to the French army, this tax was lowered, or the owner was usually exempted. Thanks to the *kućarina*, approximately 1,000 florins were collected annually. In 1812 the direct land tax was accompanied by excise taxes, levied on the production of olive oil, wine, and brandy, in addition to taxes regulating the exploitation of forests and pastures. The government also filled its budget with the salt tax, estimated at 30,000 florins. The tobacco monopoly was in the hands of the Schram trading company of Rijeka. In Dubrovnik the monopoly was worth 12,000 florins. A number of indirect taxes, such as the lottery, postal, and judicial services represented a considerable contribution to the budget.⁵⁰ In 1812 the total income accumulated by direct taxes in the Dubrovnik Province (Boka Kotorska and Korčula excluded) amounted to 12,000 florins (31,000 francs). In the year to follow, this figure fell slightly.⁵¹ The administration of the state-owned estates (Domain), headed by the Ragusan nobleman Mato Zamagna, was founded in Dubrovnik Province on 9 January 1811.⁵² At this point, the former commission responsible for the management of the property of the abolished monasteries, which had been established by Marmont in 1808, ceased to exist. The Domain was in charge of the entire administration and property of Opera Pia and other foundations, as well as all state-owned property. With the proclamation of 18 May 1811, the Domain inherited all the claims of the

⁴⁹ A.G. 1812. no. 104, tit. VIII rub. 2.

⁵⁰ A.G. 1811. no. 84, tit. XI rub. 4, 5; A.G. 1812. no. 113, tit. XII rub. 1.

⁵¹ *Prezidijalni spisi Namjesništva*, sv.255, 1841. god. kat.VIII/2-6, no. 1125 (The State Archives of Zadar).

⁵² The administration of the state-owned estates (Domain) was established by the general intendant's decree A.G. 1811. no. 67, tit. II rub. 4, the supplement of which contains all the relevant documents concerning its organization and functioning.

former state and church properties, the latter being due to make their payments by August 1811. In June 1811, the two most significant Ragusan confraternities, St. Lazarus and St. Anthony, were abolished, and their property was confiscated.⁵³ In 1812 the income of 212 state-owned real and land estates equalled 28,255 florins, making up the greater part of the provincial budget. The 1813 economic crisis influenced this inflow of income drastically, and it dropped to 17,268 florins.⁵⁴

A fiscal structure as baroque as this had to be carried out by an army of tax collectors with supervisors in all the cantons and communes. From mid-1811, Mato Saraka was in charge of personal tax collecting in Dubrovnik and Gruž, Ivan Pugliesi in Cavtat, Nikola Lissa in Slano, Ivan Ghetaldi in Ston and part of Pelješac, and Luka Ljubić on Lastovo and western Pelješac. From their reports we see that, gradually, tax collecting had become a very unpopular and dangerous job, often accompanied by incidents and conflicts, particularly in the countryside, where the peasants refused to pay the newly imposed dues.⁵⁵ The district of Kotor proved most unwilling to pay taxes, which drove its population to revolt against French rule in Paštovići in June 1812. Aided by reinforcement from Dalmatia, General Pachtod managed to suppress the uprising. The French suffered severe casualties, and the campaign itself proved more costly than the 40,000 francs of uncollected tax claims in the area.

At the initiative of the Chamber of Commerce, and with the aim of improving transport and economy, the French government abolished customs tariffs in 1812, declaring Dubrovnik a free port.⁵⁶ This, however, had no significant effect upon the development of commerce, as it was completely hampered by the British naval blockade. Captain Hoste defeated the French fleet

⁵³ A.G. 1811. no. 87, tit. XIII rub. 1.

⁵⁴ Bernard Stulli, »Građa o stanju u Dalmaciji 1818.« *Zbornik Zavoda za povijesne znanosti Istraživačkog centra JAZU u Zagrebu* 13 (1983): p. 177. For the year 1813: A.G. 1813. special positions, *Specifiche dell'annua rendita derivante dagl'affitti semplici di Terre e Case di radione del Regio Demanio*.

⁵⁵ Tax collectors were appointed by the general intendant Bertrand during his visit to Dubrovnik on 7 November 1811, and started acting in January 1812. A.G. 1811. no. 82, tit. XI rub. 1.

⁵⁶ In accordance with the new regulations the Chamber of Commerce developed from Garagnin's Trade Commission, established on 19 June 1811, for the regions of Dubrovnik and Kotor. A.G. 1811. no. 90, tit. XV rub. 10. The abolishment of customs tariffs was decreed on 4 January 1812. A.G. 1812. no. 94, tit. II rub. 2.

in Vis Channel on 11 March 1811, leaving the merchant marine, mainly from Dubrovnik, unprotected. In collaboration with domestic pirates, the British seized a number of Ragusan ships.⁵⁷ By the end of French rule in 1813, only 49 liners enjoyed the ownership of former Ragusan subjects, and they sailed under different foreign flags. In but a few years, Dubrovnik accumulated a deficit of 229 ships, which had either been sold, confiscated, or destroyed. Such a situation had far-reaching consequences for the future of this region.⁵⁸

The time of economic exhaustion proved a challenge for the Jews of Dubrovnik. Their emancipation resulted in large-scale business activities and investments.⁵⁹ In the period from 1808 to 1813, they played a major role in supplying Dubrovnik with food, primarily wheat and salt. Governed by profit, they provisioned the French troops, and speculated in insurance and trade companies. Some of the ablest Jews belonged to the families Levi-Mandolfo, Vita, Pardo, and Terni. The prosperity and well-being of Dubrovnik's Jewish community made way for the immigration of several new families to the City.⁶⁰

After the Provinces were created, Dubrovnik retained a significant role in Napoleon's campaign strategy to the east. During the preparations for the Russian campaign, in his letters to General Jacques Clarke dated March and July 1811, Napoleon stressed the position, maritime significance, and cultural contributions of Dubrovnik, and planned to invest half a million francs in the construction of fortifications and ports in the area.⁶¹ In May 1811, a French expert commission for fortifications landed in Gruž, headed by Captain Epron. In command of the engineering company which was to build the fortification

⁵⁷ For more details, see V. Ivančević, »Prilog poznavanju dubrovačkog pomorstva«: p. 372 and further.

⁵⁸ Ivo Perić, *Dubrovačko pomorstvo u 19. i 20. stoljeću*. Građa za gospodarsku povijest Hrvatske bk. 20. Zagreb: JAZU, 1984: pp. 18-22.

⁵⁹ The Ragusan Jews were generally engaged in trade business, crafts, and money transactions. As shipping had never been their major investment interest, they managed to retain the gross of their capital, and, during the French rule, emerged as leading tradesmen and businessmen. Cf. Zdravko Šundrica, »Dubrovački Jevreji i njihova emancipacija (1808.-1815.)«. *Zbornik Jevrejskog istorijskog muzeja* 1 (1971): pp. 135-184.

⁶⁰ Z. Šundrica, »Dubrovački Jevreji«: pp. 138-146; Bernard Stulli, *Židovi u Dubrovniku*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska/Jevrejska općina Zagreb, 1989: pp. 57-60.

⁶¹ L. Vojnović, *Pad Dubrovnika*: 126.

works in the port and on Mount Srđ were two construction engineers, Blanc and Sebe. Although the construction work on Srđ had started in 1808, intensive activities on the building and expansion of Fort Imperial commenced in June 1811. The local population had to make its contribution by carrying enormous quantities of construction material to the top of Srđ. The works were completed on 15 August 1812, on the Emperor's jubilee.⁶² From the end of October to mid-November 1811, a new general intendant, General Bertrand, was appointed in Dubrovnik Province. He supervised all the administrative and judicial institutions, and thus became acquainted with the implementation of the new government order. Being under the constant threat of the British army, Bertrand paid particular attention to the disposition of the French troops on the Elafiti islands, and the acceleration of the construction of Fort Srđ.⁶³

Apart from having to labor at the fortification constructions, the population was forced to take part in building Napoleon's road in October 1811. The population of Pelješac and Primorje, and later Korčula, had to work on the route which passed through the Ottoman part of Klek. Syndics and village headmen were responsible for the organization of working groups of about 60 men. As the latter received no compensation for their work, apart from half a loaf of bread per day, few men volunteered. The peasants fled from the constructions sites, or failed to report to work.⁶⁴ In order to overcome this difficulty, a special official was appointed, Petar Bratić of Cavtat, whose job it was to organize the working groups.⁶⁵ This form of labor, together with the unresolved issue of feudal rights, intensified the sense of popular resentment and revolt against the French. Finally, following an unsuccess-

⁶² Through the civil administration the military authorities forced the population of Dubrovnik to labor on the construction of army facilities. Each rural commune was obliged to organize labor groups, which exchanged weekly. Peasants were to take their mules with them, as stone was transported from Korčula. The soldiers of the Ogulin regiment of *Militärgrenze* contributed immensely to the works. A.G. 1812. no. 100, tit. V rub. 8.

⁶³ A.G. 1811. no. 77, tit. VIII rub. 10; no. 72, tit. V rub. 2.

⁶⁴ A.G. 1811. no. 73, tit. VI rub. 1. A former Venetian and later a French army engineer Lorenzo Vitelleschi, of Hvar origin, stayed on after the French downfall, remaining on the post of the district civil engineer for the Dubrovnik region until 1829. He left behind a manuscript study, dated 1827, on the buildings and landmarks of the Dubrovnik area: *Notizie Storiche e Statistiche del Circolo di Ragusa* (State Archives of Dubrovnik, RO. Razno).

⁶⁵ A.G. 1812. no. 110, tit. X rub. 2, 3.

ful conscription drive in May and June 1811, the French completely lost support from the masses. An order issued by the general intendant in April 1812 calling for the drafting of all men born in 1790 and 1791 inflamed the atmosphere even further, forcing hundreds of men to emigrate.⁶⁶

The unstable social relations following the downfall of the Ancien Régime were challenged by the vestiges of serfdom. Namely, although the French legislature had been formally established in 1812, the French authorities treated the relationship between land proprietors and tenants as a private legal matter, making no attempts at defining a new model for these relations. According to the court records from 1812, the new tribunals protected the former state of the feudal privileges.⁶⁷ Landowners were faced with even graver problems with the introduction of strict tax measures by which they, as proprietors, were liable to pay land tax. Landowners then persisted in their attempts to shift this obligation to those using the land—peasants and tenants.

Frequent conflicts and violent incidents urged the nobility to seek police intervention in some rural households. Besides the landed aristocracy, there were a number of commoners who also rented their land; they allied themselves with the nobility in their attempt to shift the tax burden to the tenants.⁶⁸ In return, the peasants refused to labor for 90 days on patrician land. Intendant Rouen de Mallets tried to avoid the intervention of police on several occa-

⁶⁶ A.G. 1812. no. 117, tit. XVI rub. 1, Of seventy registered men in the Dubrovnik canton, half were absent. The situation in other cantons proved more or less the same.

⁶⁷ A.G. 1812. no. 112, tit. XI rub. 5, cf. Nikola Z. Bjelovučić, *Rješenje dubrovačkog kmetstva i polovništva sa nacrtom novog agrarnog zakona*. Dubrovnik, 1924. The assertions of older authors (Šišić, Karlić) on the alleged abolition of serfdom in Dalmatia during the French rule cannot hold.

⁶⁸ It is difficult to establish the exact landholding pattern in the Dubrovnik region of the time. From the beginning of the 19th century onward numerous transactions took place, which, during the French rule, further multiplied. The old property law being derogated, landed aristocracy sold its land to the wealthy citizens and seamen from the Pelješac and Cavtat area, who, again, persisted in the perpetuation of feudal privileges. According to a 1813 inventory of the Dubrovnik district, 451 land proprietors were registered, including ecclesiastical institutions and the commune. Although there is no evidence of the size of the estates, the nobles, undoubtedly, were in possession of most of the land. Eleven members of the Sorgo family, 8 of Gozze, 6 of Ghetaldi, 6 of Pozza, 4 of Zamagna, and 3 members of the Saraka family were among the greatest landowners. Ragusan citizens belonging to the confraternities St. Anthony and St. Lazarus owned considerable land outside the City.

sions, determined in his interpretation of this feudal issue. His opinion was that this was a contract agreement, but one in which one of the parties was free to breach it and renounce the benefits that may result from it. De Mallets was determined in solving conflicts of the kind by judicial means only.⁶⁹ The president of the Court of First Instance in Dubrovnik, Jakov Natali, was instructed by the Central Administration to employ all the necessary measures to force the peasants to fulfil their obligation. However, these regulations had no practical effect, and lawsuits continued to multiply. According to the intendant's decree of 4 June 1812, the former taxation system remained valid in that the landowners were encouraged to seek military and police assistance in collecting dues.⁷⁰ Great pressure exerted by the nobles in high administrative and judicial places gave satisfactory results in 1813. In his report of 1 March 1813, the provincial intendant, de Lareinty, informed the general intendant about the strong influence of the Old Regime in Dubrovnik, realizing that the burden of land tax rested mainly upon the shoulders of the landowners. Therefore, he advocated the intervention of the government on their behalf. He proposed forced labor and more aggressive measures in recruiting the rural population for road and fortification construction. On the other hand, the reports reveal that one fourth of the entire male population of Dubrovnik Province emigrated due to the difficult economic situation and military conscription. General intendant Chabrol rejected these suggestions, keeping to the solutions that were neither feudal nor civil. Only the last general intendant, Joseph Fouché, supported the enforcement of French laws and the abolishment of all forms of feudal privileges in June 1813.⁷¹

The nobility were disunited in their ideas and political behavior. Article 44 of the 1811 Decree abolished the centuries-old institution of fideicommissum in inheritance law, by which the French enabled younger noblemen to participate in that part of the family inheritance, which the former law had deprived them of. The annulment of fideicommissum struck at the

⁶⁹ Antonio Degl'Ivellio, *Saggio d'un studio storico-critico sulla colonia e sul contadinaggio nel territorio di Ragusa*. Dubrovnik, 1873: 119.

⁷⁰ »Sui rapporti di contadinaggio del territorio della cassata repubblica di Ragusa.« *Zemljak* 99-101, *Zemljak* 99-101 (1843).

⁷¹ M. Senkowska-Gluck, *Rzady napoleonskie w Ilirii*: pp. 195-197; B. Vošnjak, *Ustava in uprava*: pp. 12-14.

heart of the antiquated system of landownership, and represented one of the major reasons for the rapid financial and social downfall of the nobility. Now freed from the bond of fideicommissum, mass sales of vast complexes of inherited land followed. This blow definitely shattered the aristocracy, and led to its pauperization and downfall.⁷²

The consequences of the six-year French rule briefly reflected upon all segments of Dubrovnik society. As in the rest of Illyria, the French administration in Dubrovnik was faced with resistance from all the social strata. Certain noble circles tended towards the restoration of the Republic and the Ancien Régime, while others, overwhelmed by financial difficulties, retired from political life. Some of the nobility, however, sided openly with the new ideology, attracted by the sinecures in the French administration.⁷³ Under French rule, the burden of taxation and conscription increased the dissatisfaction of the bourgeoisie. Furthermore, because the French had only a mediating role in the feudal issue, they failed to strengthen the loyalty of the rural population, which groaned under the burden of feudal dues, famine, and hardship.

Pregnant with social turbulences, this period saw the end of the antiquated and petrified social structure and the introduction of the modern state organization, but due to the general economic exhaustion and the recurring hostilities, greater steps could not have been made in terms of economic development. Therefore, the new pattern of social relations was slowed down. In the reality, only a few Ragusan Francophiles remained loyal to the French government and the ideas of the Revolution. However, we must bear in mind that here the incursion of the Revolutionary ideas took place in the corrupt form of Bonapartism and new monarchism, a fact commonly disregarded when dealing with the resistance of the local population.

⁷² In order to win the alliance of the most prominent Ragusan noblemen, General Tomašević issued a decree on 15 September 1817 (no. 16,127./6,786) by which fideicommissum was reinstated in the Dubrovnik district only, and remained the subject of numerous judicial and administrative controversies throughout the nineteenth century.

⁷³ On 30 March 1810, the French established the lodge "L'Étoile Illyrienne". In addition to the citizens Rado Andrović, Antun Kaznačić, Pasko Zuzzeri, Antun Radić and others, the following nobles were also members of the lodge: Dživo and Mato Gozze, Brnja Vlaho and Dživo Caboga, Miho, Maro and Vlaho Bona, Petar Sorgo, Ivan Bosdari, as well as one member of the Ghetaldi, Crijević, Ranjina, and Saraka family, all the judges, and other officials of the French administration. Cf. F. Š. (Ferdo Šišić), »Masonstvo u Napoleonovoj Iliriji.« *Šestar* 3-4 (1924): pp. 21-28.

The French system aroused strong hostile feelings among all Ragusans, including those who put themselves at the service of the French Government. This attitude was expressed, however, in a gentlemanly and Ragusan-like manner. Had the French succeeded in maintaining peace and granted autonomy to Dubrovnik Province, they could have modelled a civil state. Contrarily, hampered by campaigns, mobilization, high taxes, the unresolved feudal issue, and economic underdevelopment, the only way they could govern was by military force.⁷⁴

The uprising of 1813/14 and the French retreat

Unsuccessful European campaigns and mounting problems throughout the Illyrian Provinces led to a speedy downfall of the French administration in the Dubrovnik region. The French retreat started in February 1813, when the British occupied the nearby islands and part of Pelješac, and ended in January of 1814, when the French troops finally marched out of Dubrovnik. These events took place along with French campaigns in the broader region. The French were retreating from eastern and central Europe during 1812. Because of the Adriatic blockade, they left their forces cut off in the hostile hinterland. From the end of 1812, these events had an irreparable effect upon the functioning of the French administration in Dubrovnik, which seemed to be losing its breath. The nobility was encouraged by Napoleon's defeats and the stronger British position in the Adriatic. All of this suggested that the French regime would collapse and that the restoration of the Republic was an imminent reality. The French managed to pull the majority of its forces out of the Adriatic, leaving only about seventy soldiers in the City until the end of 1812, and in Ston and Cavtat even smaller numbers. The first news of the war with Austria clearly revealed the disadvantage of the French recruiting system. Beginning with April 1812, syndics from Primorje and Elafiti islands reported cases of French deserters, most of whom belonged to the Croatian units from

⁷⁴ The attitude of the Dubrovnik population towards the French is best illustrated by Đuro Hidža's two decasyllable poems (*Dvije izvorne političke pjesme*) published in 1872, in which the author describes the uprising and the French retreat in 1813/14. He depicts the French and their ruling by the following verses: Eto je veće od sedam godina/ Da pod jarmom Franačkih hajduka/ Dubrovačka tuguje država./ Izrušiše crkve, i oltare./ Poplesaše sve naše zakone./ Iz groba nam kosti izmetaše/ I sveca nam Starca ugrabiše/... Sve seljane silom natjeraše/ Gladne, uboge, bose i mlohave;/ Da jim pute priko krša ravne/ Ko će lakše plijene iznositi.

the *Militärgrenze*. They deserted their posts in great numbers, refused to obey orders, or came into conflict with the local population.⁷⁵

In March 1813, the French commander, General Pachtod, retreated from Dubrovnik to be replaced by General Montrichard. In order to prepare for the fighting against the Austrians and British, the troops had to retreat into the fortified cities of Dubrovnik, Herceg-Novi, and Kotor. British Captain Harper persisted in his attacks on the Elafiti islands from the autumn of 1812, and in February 1813, the English invaded Lastovo, Mljet, Lopud, and Koločep. In June, the English occupied Šipan, where they handed over the civil administration to Jero Natali, who was joined by several noblemen in exile. The French offered resistance only on the island of Korčula, but retreated to Pelješac on 4 February. Afterwards, the Korčula subdelegate, Vlaho M. Caboga, resumed work in Orebić, and later in Janjina.

The events that follow escalated into an insurrection of certain noble circles, commoners, and peasantry, who, joined by British and Austrian forces, played a decisive role in conquering the City and forcing the French to surrender. Lack of unity and organization, as well as a number of foreign policy factors working against the restoration, led to the inevitable failure of the revolt.⁷⁶

⁷⁵ A.G. 1812. no. 105, tit. IX rub. 2.

⁷⁶ The events pertaining to the fall of the French administration and the popular insurrection 1813/14, as well as the Austro-British invasion of the city have been comprehensively treated in earlier literature. See: T. Erber, »Storia della Dalmazia« offprint of: *Programma del Ginnasio superiore di Zara 1889/90* (1890): pp. 21-72; L. Vojnović, *Pad Dubrovnika*: pp. 135-196; Ivan Stojanović, *Povijest Dubrovačke Republike*. Dubrovnik, 1923: pp. 292-322; Jakov Matković, »Dubrovački otoci u godini 1814.« *Dubrava* 113 (1941), Giuseppe Gelcich, »Ein Gedenkbuch der Erhebung Ragusas in den Jahren 1813/14« offprint of: *Archiv für Österreichische Geschichte* 64 (1882): pp. 1-32. In the latter text I rely upon the accounts of one of the participants of the insurrection - Frano Bona. The manuscript is entitled *Memorie riguardanti l'insurrezione seguita a Ragusa nel anno 1813 e 1814*. The State Archives of Dubrovnik files several versions of these accounts, one of which was translated and published by Vice Medini under the title »Uspomene što se odnose na dubrovački ustanak od god. 1813. i 1814.« *Narodna svijest* 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 41 (1924). A similar survey of the events can be traced in the accounts of the other rebel leader Dživo Natali, entitled *Relazione della rivoluzione fattavi dai Ragusei contro li Francesi l'anno 1813 per ricuperare la patria liberta scritta dal Colonello Conte Natali Patrizio Raguseo*, which is part of the Natali manuscript legacy, today kept at the State Archives of Dubrovnik (RO. 177). The two accounts resemble in major parts, and both authors seem to share the most critical view of Vlaho Caboga, whom they blame, if indirectly, for the failure of the insurrection. The diaries of B. Stulli and A. Kaznačić published in the *L'Epidauritano* calendar also offer information on the aforementioned events. J. Bersa brings his observations of the events in *Dubrovačke slike i prilike*: pp. 46-57.

The most prominent participants in the insurrection were the brothers Dživo and Jero Natali, Frano and Pjerko Bona, and the controversial Vlaho Brnje Caboga. In July and August 1813, the English invaded the entire area of Ston and Dubrovačko primorje, where they appointed the noblemen Antun Marin Caboga and Luka Bona as administrators. Simultaneously, Frano Bona was patiently motivating Konavlian peasants to rise up against the French, and fight for the re-establishment of the Republic. The British commanders, Captains Lowen and Hoste joined Captain Harper, who had besieged Herceg-Noví.⁷⁷ On Lopud Captain Lowen, representative of Admiral Gore, issued a proclamation dated 10 October 1813, in which he indicated the English and Austrian intention to recognize the Republic's sovereignty. His proclamation called upon all the inhabitants of the Dubrovnik region to join the insurrection against the French. The proclamation was, in fact, a tactical move, designed to facilitate the accomplishment of the allies' common goals. This, however, encouraged Jero Natali to re-establish all former Dubrovnik laws on the Elafiti islands, hoping for a British-aided restoration of power. As the British spread rumors on the renewal of Montenegrin attacks, Frano Bona had an easy task of stirring the Konavlians to revolt. Outside Herceg-Noví, twenty-four Konavlian village headmen presented Hoste with their demand to join ranks with the British as they fought against the French. Their request was granted, and they were recognized as allies. The French soon reacted by sending gendarmes to Konavle. The village headmen then presented Hoste with another request, most likely composed by Bona, in which they demanded the re-establishment of the former Dubrovnik laws. At that moment Vlaho Caboga became the leader of the insurrection.⁷⁸ From June 1813 onward, Caboga kept

⁷⁷ The course of the insurrection itself is generally well-documented. In his book, Vojnović, too, describes the disunity of the nobility. Here, I shall point to the international and political aspect of the events which was crucial for the Austrian invasion, the information on which is amply provided by the British commander Sir William Hoste in his *Memoirs and letters of Capt. sir William Hoste*. London: Richard Bentley, 1833. It is absurd to attribute the revolutionary meaning to the Dubrovnik insurrection, not even to the certain nobility circle as interpreted by H. Towers Bjelovučić in *The Ragusan Republic*: pp. 138-163. Being guided by their main goal-driving the French out-not for a single moment did the politically conscious nobles and other rebels suggest or anticipate the social or political goals other than those of the former Dubrovnik Republic.

⁷⁸ L. Vojnović, *Pad Dubrovnika*: pp. 153-156; W. Hoste, *Memoirs and letters*: pp. 267-269, G. Gelcich, »Ein Gedenkbuch der Erhebung Ragusas«: pp. 22, 23. In their accounts, both Bona and Natali describe Caboga as a man of Alcibiades' qualities. Despite intelligence and ability, his ambition seemed to have been the main cause of the abortive outcome of the insurrection.

secret correspondence with Harper and Hoste, informing them about the French and advocating the insurrection. In the beginning of October, the French attempted to capture Caboga in Cavtat, but he managed to escape to Hoste's commanding ship, *The Bacchante*. On their way from Boka to Lopud on 28 October, two English vessels occupied the Cavtat port, forcing the French to withdraw toward Dubrovnik. Caboga was among the British soldiers who landed in Cavtat, and on that very day, with his approval, Frano Bona was elected provisional governor of the town. Two British gun-boats and a regiment under the command of Lieutenant McDonald remained in the port.

The seige of Dubrovnik intensified the political ambitions of the nobility, but it was clear that no recognition of the Republic could possibly take place without widespread diplomatic activities. In order to win the British over for the Republic's cause, Frano Bona set off for Trieste. He negotiated with the commander of the English Navy in the Adriatic, Admiral Fremantle. Meanwhile, the nobility tried to reassure Hoste that more rebels would flock together if they marched under the flag of St. Blaise. British policy was guided by other goals than these, which explained Hoste's indifferent attitude toward the Ragusan cause. His aim was simply to win over the Ragusans in order to defeat the French, without distinctly siding for the restoration of the Republic. Finally, on 15 November, Hoste approved the raising of the flag of St. Blaise in Cavtat, recognizing it thus as an allied one.⁷⁹ This event was honored by the crowd and accompanied by salvos from the *Bacchante*. Following the *Te Deum* ceremony in Cavtat's church, Vlaho Caboga, with the approval of the nobility who were present and the British, was named provisional governor of the Dubrovnik Republic and entrusted with the restoration of the old laws and order. From then on, the Konavlian peasants organized themselves into armed rebel units. They provided for their own food and arms, while the

⁷⁹ L. Vojnović, *Pad Dubrovnika*: p. 160; W. Hoste, *Memoirs and letters*: p. 279. In the earlier cited poem, Hidža describes Hoste's arrival (whom he addresses as "Kosto kapetane" /Kosto the captain/), and the raising of the Ragusan flag in Cavtat: *Iz pučine Inglesa Gjemija/ Srečnom zgodom u Cavtat dojedri/ Na kom bješe Kosto kapetane./ Netom začu sve nevolje naše/ i kuriastvo Franačkih vojnika./ kliknu u glas da ga svak začuje./... Tjerajte ih iz vašega grada/ A ja ću vam od pomoći biti/ Na staro se vratite vladanje/ Otadžbinu vašu ponovite./ Iz ropstva se ružna izbavite./ To izreče: i svetoga Vlaha/ Razvi barjak i prid crkvu stavi./ Ti glas kad u Konavli dođe./ Sva, sva mladost na oružje skaće/ Slijedi barjak starca Vlaha svoga/ A vlada jih Špaletiću Vlaho...*

British supplied them with ammunition. Mass disturbances in the area multiplied, challenging Caboga's ability and determination.

The Konavlian rebels were led by the nobility and the village headmen, while rebels in Župa and Brgat were under the leadership of Dživo Natali. British Lieutenant McDonald offered considerable support to the rebels in the form of training, and in return he won great popularity with the Ragusans. On 23 November, the rebels took hold of Žarkovica and Bosanka. Unable to seize Fort Imperial, the Ragusans were forced to camp on the slopes of Srđ, becoming a direct target for the French platoons in the City and on the island of Lokrum. The French forces under the command of General Montrichard consisted of 500 soldiers, 120 cannons posted in the City, 21 on Srđ, and 9 on Lokrum, while the provisions of food, water, and ammunition were sufficient for six weeks.⁸⁰ In order to cut every kind of supply to the rebels outside the City, Montrichard ordered Miho Giorgi, commander of the national guard, to summon all the patrician families which had offered shelter to the rebels. Meanwhile, on 26 November one of the rebel leaders, Pjerko Bona, reached Pile with a group of his men. Heavy fighting took place at the City gates, but the rebels were driven back. Caboga decided to move the rebel headquarters to Sorgo Palace in Gruž, while Dživo Natali, in coordination with Caboga, blocked the access to the City from the East. The British, on their part, blockaded the City port.

The disunity of the rebel leaders was intensified by that of the British commanders. Captain Lowen encouraged Caboga's ambitions, who, upon the Lowen's suggestion, dubbed himself general governor of the coastal area of the Dubrovnik Republic and commander of the rebellion and the City blockade. This step of self-declaration met with no open opposition from the nobility, but initiated disagreement between Lowen and Hoste, as the latter disapproved of actions that were contrary to the British pro-Austrian policy in the Adriatic. As a result, Hoste denied the rebels of any form of help, and proceeded to Boka on an important matter concerning the siege of Kotor.⁸¹ On the night of 8-9 November 1813, severe fighting took place outside the

⁸⁰ W. Hoste, *Memoirs and letters*: p. 299.

⁸¹ L. Vojnović, *Pad Dubrovnika*: pp. 164-166; W. Hoste, *Memoirs and letters*: p. 280.

rebels' headquarters in the Sorgo palace in Gruž. More than 250 Frenchmen tried to take hold of the palace and capture the rebel leaders. Vlaho Caboga and Pjerko Bona, together with the Konavlian leaders Mato and Miho Milić and 60 of their men, repulsed the French after a four-hour struggle. At dawn the French were forced to withdraw due to the arrival of Natali's reinforcement from Brgat. On 10 November Caboga issued a proclamation in which he described the course of the battle, expressing his debt to the rebels, and his gratitude to St. Blaise for his help. The French casualties amounted to 10 killed and 20 wounded soldiers. On the Ragusan side, Pjerko Bona, one of the rebel leaders, was wounded.⁸² In December 1813 Caboga's headquarters were removed to Rijeka Dubrovačka, where the rebels were joined by the local population. It was then that the nobility began to follow divergent paths. Whereas the members of the Natali and Bona families supported politically grounded goals, independent liberation actions, and lively diplomatic activity, the rest of the nobility opportunely sided with Caboga. Apart from being favored by Lowen, Caboga also enjoyed great popularity among the rebels. Unfortunately, he had no clear vision of the meaning and purpose of the insurrection.

Meanwhile, Austrian troops conquered Dalmatia and advanced towards Dubrovnik. Being unable to send more forces to the south, the Austrians relied on diplomatic activities and the British alliance. Things became complicated when the Abbot Brunazzi of Austria, because of a conflict with Hoste, brought into question all further cooperation.⁸³ In November, General Tomašić, bearing the title of provisional governor of Dalmatia, the Dubrovnik State, and Boka Kotorska, issued a proclamation requiring the syndics of Primorje and Pelješac to pledge his loyalty to the Austrian emperor. This act was generally welcomed by the local population, as only a few of them had joined the rebel units. By the end of December, General Danese arrived in Ston, accompanied by a small infantry unit. He demanded that the domestic population recognize Austrian rule, explaining that the Republic was a thing

⁸² L. Vojnović, *Pad Dubrovnika*: p. 166. In their detailed accounts of the actions, Bona and Natali describe Hoste's passive attitude as he observed the hostilities from the Koločep Channel, offering no aid to the rebels.

⁸³ W. Hoste, *Memoirs and letters*: pp. 272, 273, 292.

of the past.⁸⁴ Furthermore, the Austrians distributed leaflets with similar contents. Aware of the possibility that the insurrection might spread and imperil Austrian interests, General Tomašić launched two regiments of recently drafted Croats from Zadar, commanded by Todor Milutinović. On 3 January he arrived in Gruž, where he found the rebels and a British unit. Milutinović informed the rebel leaders of their basic goal—to drive out the French, and to support the provisional state of the City until the final solution. At first, the Austrians yielded to the rebels' demands, acknowledging their independent command. Caboga was soon on friendly terms with Milutinović. Having foreseen Caboga's lust for honor, Milutinović offered him a position in the future Austrian City Administration. Under these circumstances, the Austrians proceeded to Boka, as they expected Kotor, which was under siege at the hands of Hoste and his men, to surrender first.⁸⁵

Once again the fate of Dubrovnik rested upon the events taking place in Boka Kotorska, that is, upon international political affairs. The British attitude toward Dubrovnik and Austria was but a sample of the general British policy in the Adriatic. Its creator was Sir Robert Adair, the British envoy to Vienna and Constantinople. He defended Austrian interests in the Adriatic, both because of Austria's naval inferiority, which suited the British, and because of their opposition to the Russians and the Turks, who also had an interest in the Adriatic. This Anglo-Austrian alliance had been created a few years earlier, in 1806, during Adair's diplomatic service in Vienna. The British position proved particularly transparent in the cases of Dubrovnik and Boka Kotorska, as Austria claimed dynastic rights over the both territories. Contrary to the British orientation, Hoste, although a soldier, took a few wrong political steps in Boka, which had negative effect on Dubrovnik. Five British ships under his command commenced the siege of Boka in the early days of October 1813. Herceg-Novi fell into their hands first, followed by Forts Španjol and St. George. Conquering Kotor was not an easy military task, mostly because of the hostile surroundings and the delay of Austrian infantry support. Although acquainted with the national and confessional discrepancies between the population of Boka and that of its hinterland, Hoste ad-

⁸⁴ L. Vojnović, *Pad Dubrovnika*: p. 169; G. Gelcich, »Ein Gedenkbuch der Erhebung Ragusas«: pp. 25-27.

⁸⁵ G. Gelcich, »Ein Gedenkbuch der Erhebung Ragusas«: pp. 25-27.

dressed the local population, appealing for their help against the French.⁸⁶ Being a Russian exponent, Montenegro's ruler (*vladika*) Petar I saw his chance and offered assistance. Thus, the British commander found himself in a most unpleasant position between the Montenegrins and their support on one hand, and the pro-Austrian population of Boka, who were unwilling to submit themselves to Montenegrin domination on the other. The whole situation detained the invasion of Kotor, so that Hoste, following a disagreement over the cannons firing from Fort Španjol, withdrew toward the Dalmatian islands. He did not return to Boka until December, this time fully determined to occupy Kotor. The new blockade started in mid December with the help of Montenegrins and the natives of Boka. The difficult task of scattering batteries down the forbidding slopes of the Kotor hills proved the right decision, as a short cannonade was sufficient for French General Gauthier to surrender under honorable conditions.⁸⁷ In the course of the twenty-day seige, Hoste had counted on the support of Austrian infantry which failed to show up. In Gruž, Milutinović and his forces stood aside, waiting for the outcome. Hoste's attitude gave cause for new tensions among the allies. Against the orders and political instructions that had been given to him—i.e., to hand over Boka exclusively to the Austrians—Hoste, revolted by Milutinović's attitude, surrendered the town to the combined Boka-Montenegrin commission.⁸⁸ This gave rise to a serious diplomatic conflict: Hoste was severely criticized by Lord Aberdeen, who disauthorized him of making any agreements with the local population. Having learned his lesson, Hoste remained firm in his decision not to help the Ragusans with batteries prior to the arrival of Austrian troops. In sum, the Republic's independence would have represented a precedent from the British point of view, giving prince Petar the right to keep Boka and strengthen the Russian influence in the Mediterranean. Aberdeen's letter of 23 February 1814 makes it clear that the British, as far back as the Saxony negotiations, had promised to protect Austrian interests in the Adriatic by handing Dubrovnik over to the Habsburgs.⁸⁹

⁸⁶ W. Hoste, *Memoirs and letters*: pp. 280-290.

⁸⁷ W. Hoste, *Memoirs and letters*: pp. 280-290. Kotor was surrendered on 5 January 1814.

⁸⁸ W. Hoste, *Memoirs and letters*: pp. 280-290.

⁸⁹ W. Hoste, *Memoirs and letters*: p. 299.

The siege of Dubrovnik resumed in January 1814 under the aforementioned political conditions. Suffering defeat in Boka, Milutinović retreated to the Dubrovnik territory with the aim of ensuring Austrian interests there first. In the beginning of January, Frano Bona returned to Dubrovnik from Trieste. In their discussion, Admiral Fremantle had acknowledged the support the British had offered to Austria, but also pointed out that the problem of Dubrovnik remained open until the ultimate diplomatic resolution.⁹⁰ The circumstances required an urgent meeting of the nobility and their agreement to future diplomatic and political action. Unfortunately, nothing of the kind took place because the old aristocracy had fallen into complete disunity. In addition, their obstinacy prevented any communication with the commonry and peasants. Caboga kept postponing the meeting of the aristocracy, especially after Milutinović's return from Boka. Finally, Frano Bona decided to summon a meeting, which was attended by 44 ex-members of the Great Council. The assembly of the nobility was held in Rijeka Dubrovačka on 18 January 1814. Frano Bona informed those present about the current political situation, stating the impressions he acquired from his discussion with the British commanders in Trieste. In addition, reports by the Dubrovnik envoys to Vienna and Constantinople, Miho Bona and Miho Božović, were read. The nobility was to stand before the allies in defense of the fact that the Republic was taken by force, and that the Great Council had never renounced its sovereignty. Vlaho Caboga remained neutral during the meeting, making no attempts to hide his conspiracy with Milutinović. His attitude affected most of the aristocrats in that no explicit resolution related to the restoration of the Republic was passed. The Republican faction of the Bonas and the Natalis was not strong enough to neutralize Caboga's great influence upon the rebels, who also feared British and Austrian reaction. Yet it was explicitly concluded that the nobility had assembled according to their own constitution, stressing the continuity of government. The following conclusions were made: (1) Miho Bona, on duty in Vienna, was to set off for the meeting place of the allies in order to win their support for the re-establishment of the Republic and the protection of its interests; (2) Vlaho Caboga was to remain provisional governor (although, supported by Lowen and Milutinović, he had entitled himself to greater authority); (3) a letter was to be sent to Miho Božović in Con-

⁹⁰ G. Gelcich, »Ein Gedenkbuch der Erhebung Ragusas«: p. 26.

stantinople, with a request to intercede in the Republic's interests; (4) General Milutinović and the British commander were to be informed about Bona's mission in Vienna; (5) A committee was to be appointed which would be responsible for the implementation of the assembly's decisions, as well as for the collection of money to cover the expenses of the diplomatic activities; (6) The following were appointed to the committee: Dživo Caboga, Niko Pozza Sorgo, Niko Giorgi, and Frano Bona; (7) Karlo Natali was to be sent to Zadar to meet General Tomašić and inform him of the Ragusan demands.⁹¹ The subsequent committee meeting in Rijeka Dubrovačka was nothing but a loose compromise in favor of Caboga's policy.

Having acquainted himself with the above conclusions, Milutinović requested further instructions from Tomašić on 20 January 1814. It was decided that the Austrians should take no further steps until the final surrender of the City, due to the insufficient number of their troops. Milutinović even provided Karlo Natali with a letter of reference for his trip to Zadar and the meeting with General Tomašić. In defiance, Hoste completely ignored the Dubrovnik memorandum. On 22 January, however, Miho Bona, was authorized by the council of patricians to act as senator and representative of the Republic wherever the meeting of European leaders was to take place.

Meanwhile, the siege continued, and decisive battles occurred on 19 January. The efforts of the rebels were mostly hindered by the fact that they were completely cut off from the City and had no knowledge of the situation there; similarly, the urban population had no information about the activities going on outside the city walls, nor about the character and the motives of the insurrection. Aware of the strategic value of the forts on Srđ and Lokrum, Hoste sent batteries to the slopes of Srđ and the northern part of Gruž. In Brigat the British cut off the water supply and also took the Monastery of St. Jacob east of the City.⁹² Hoste, who had refused to yield cannons to the Ragusans on earlier occasions, did so now by supplying Milutinović with one large and

⁹¹ G. Gelcich, »Ein Gedenkbuch der Erhebung Ragusas«: p. 27; L. Vojnović, *Pad Dubrovnika*: pp. 177- 184, and the copy of the resolution: pp. 428-430. The original of the resolution with the Republic Seal is kept at the State Archives of Dubrovnik. A former Ragusan dragoman Miho Božović was then in the service of the Prussian consulate in Constantinople, and a loyal advocate of Dubrovnik's interests.

⁹² W. Hoste, *Memoirs and letters*: pp. 296-298.

two smaller cannons, and permitted the rebels to stand by the batteries under British command. Natali, Bona, the Milić brothers, Božo Ghetaldi, Petar Petričević, Antun Dordelli, and Vlaho Caboga, the rebel leaders, showed great courage in the battle. His position being hopeless, General Montrichard called for negotiations on the surrender of the City on 26 January. Milutinović excluded the rebels from the negotiations, which induced Natali's objection to submitting the entire rebel army under British command.⁹³ Natali's suggestion was rejected again, as most nobles had no intention of coming into direct conflict with the Austrians. Besides, a day later, Hoste handed his command over to Captain Gower, who was not acquainted with the situation in Dubrovnik. The rebels' discontent was increased by the fact that they had foreseen the Austrian scheme, but were unable to counteract. During the negotiations, Milutinović did not hesitate to stress that he would invade Dubrovnik as ordered by the emperor, and that the City's future would be resolved by diplomatic means. As the occupation of the City was not a difficult task that required respectable rebel armed forces, he agreed that, besides the Austrian and British flags, the flag of Dubrovnik would be flown during the attack on the City walls. It was also agreed that Governor Caboga and the noble committee could resume their work. Milutinović also enjoyed the support of Captain Gower, who had made it clear to the committee members that he recognized only Austrian authority in Dubrovnik.⁹⁴

Having no knowledge of the above-mentioned agreement or the victories of the rebels, the population within the City walls rebelled too. They disarmed the French guards, inactivated the batteries, and raised the flag of St. Blaise on top of Orlando's column. These very events were taking place on 27 January, while General Montrichard was still negotiating in Gruž. In support of the City rebels, Dživo Natali arrived with about 1,000 men from Župa and Brgat, who blocked the eastern entrance to the City. Having doubts about the character of the rebellion, Mayor Giorgi and his assistant Bosdari, denied them admission to the City. They defended this decision with the argument that they were protecting the City from riots and looters. In fact, the City authori-

⁹³ G. Gelcich, »Ein Gedenkbuch der Erhebung Ragusas«: p. 30; W. Hoste, *Memoirs and letters*: p. 299.

⁹⁴ G. Gelcich, »Ein Gedenkbuch der Erhebung Ragusas«: pp. 34, 35; L. Vojnović, *Pad Dubrovnika*: p. 190.

ties dreaded any conflict between the rebels and the Austrians, who were expected to arrive at any moment. Thus, due to their incapacity to act together, the Ragusans missed the last chance of liberating the City themselves.⁹⁵

Regardless of the events taking place in the City, Milutinović and Montrichard settled the French surrender of the City under honorable terms. Their aim being to avoid greater conflicts, the Austrians agreed to the French conditions. Milutinović promised that the victorious army would not march into the City before the last Frenchman was evacuated from the City by ship. On 27 January, the French capitulation was signed in Gruž and ratified the same day.⁹⁶ It was then that Caboga openly sided with the Austrians, dismissing the rebel army in Konavle. Meanwhile, Natali and his men were still waiting outside the Ploče Gates.

After almost eight years of occupation, the French troops marched out of Dubrovnik on 27 and 28 January 1814. On the afternoon of 28 January 1814, the Austrian and English troops made their way into the City through the Pile Gates, denying admission to the Dubrovnik rebels. Intoxicated by success, and with Caboga's support, Milutinović ignored the Gruž agreement he had made with the nobility in Gruž. The events which followed can be best epitomized in the so-called flag episode. The Flag of St. Blaise was posted alongside of the Austrian and British colors, but only for two days, because on 30 January Milutinović ordered Mayor Giorgi to lower it. Overwhelmed by a feeling of deep patriotic pride, Giorgi, the last rector of the Republic and a loyal Francophile, refused to do so—"jer da ga je pripeo puk" ("for the masses had posted it").⁹⁷

The oncoming events proved that Austria took every possible chance of invading the entire coast of the eastern Adriatic, from Venice to Boka Kotorska. The allies did everything in their power to eliminate the Dubrovnik issue at the Vienna Congress of 1815. The Ragusan representative, Miho

⁹⁵ G. Gelcich, »Ein Gedenkbuch der Erhebung Ragusas«: pp. 34, 35; L. Vojnović, *Pad Dubrovnika*: p. 190.

⁹⁶ W. Hoste, *Memoirs and letters*: p. 299; L. Vojnović, *Pad Dubrovnika*: p.194, and the text of the capitulation: pp. 433-439.

⁹⁷ L. Vojnović, *Pad Dubrovnika*: p.195; G. Gelcich, »Ein Gedenkbuch der Erhebung Ragusas«: p. 35.

Bona, was denied participation in the Congress, while Milutinović, prior to the final agreement of the allies, assumed complete control of the City. In his book *Pad Dubrovnika* (The Fall of Dubrovnik; 1908), Lujo Vojnović makes every effort to justify the popular actions and prove the solidarity of all social groups in achieving their common goal to restore the Republic. The records, however, seem to indicate a different situation. There was in fact little understanding between the nobility, the bourgeoisie, and the peasantry, and slim chances of these groups of having any common basis for further activities. The three groups had different reasons to be dissatisfied with the French government, and the moment when they rejoiced together over their victory was not strong enough to unite all the segments of Dubrovnik society in a struggle to restore the Republic. After Dubrovnik suffered a political breakdown, was brought to the verge of economic ruin, and was forsaken by the international community, the City and its territories were handed over to the Habsburg Monarchy in 1815 by the Congress of Vienna.