

Novak, and the other, chemist Vladimir Prelog.

Slavica Stojan

Ivo Perić, *Dubrovačke teme XIX. stoljeća* (Dubrovnik Themes of the Nineteenth Century). Mala knjižnica Matice hrvatske, No.V/32 of the new series. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1997, 227 pp.

The book under review contains seven of Ivo Perić's studies that have appeared in scholarly journals over the last decade, all of which concern events and personalities from nineteenth-century Dubrovnik.

In the first article, entitled »Dubrovnik i Dubrovčani u očima Ivana Kukuljevića Sakcinskog« (Dubrovnik and its people in the eyes of Ivan Kukuljević Sakcinski), Perić focuses on Kukuljević's early contacts with Ragusans in Vienna, and his role in the promotion of Dubrovnik's literary heritage as one of the fundamental segments of the Croatian National Revival movement. He further explores Kukuljević's relations with Dubrovnik and their relevance in the context of the revival period. As a founder of *Društvo za povjesnicu jugoslavensku* (The Society for Yugoslav history) in the 1850s Kukuljević initiated multiple activities with the aim of registering, collecting, and publishing the manuscripts and archival documents. Massive sources and highly uncomfortable travel conditions discouraged Kukuljević from visiting Dubrovnik during his stay in Dalmatia in 1854. However, two years later, in September 1856, Kukuljević organized a scientific expedition to the districts of Dubrovnik and Kotor. His visit to Dubrovnik lasted from 13 October until 4 November. Sixteen years later, he penned the

impressions of this stay in *Putne uspomene iz Hrvatske, Dalmacije, Albanije, Krfa i Italije* (Travel accounts from Croatia, Dalmatia, Albania, Corfu and Italy; Zagreb, 1873). The beauty of the city and the prominence of its cultural heritage fascinated Kukuljević from the very first moment. With the utmost scrutiny he visited the city sights and crowned his stay in Dubrovnik by rooting about the archives pertaining to the Ragusan Republic period, as well as the manuscripts in the wealthy monastery libraries. He comments on the inadequate research conditions and generally poor state of the old Ragusan documents that had been kept at the District Court and offices, parts of which had already been ruined or removed to Vienna and Zadar. Despite the unprofessional care of the archives housed at different locations, Kukuljević was able to provide a systematic classification of old Ragusan documents, pointing to the value of particular series. Simultaneously, he amassed considerable sources for his future historiographic work. While in Dubrovnik, Kukuljević made contacts with the writers and intellectuals of the revival circle: Mato Vodopić, Antun Rocci, Marko Marinović, Niko Arbanas, Pacifik Radeljević, and others, whose work he was already acquainted with. The companionship of the Kaznačić family—father and son—he found most pleasing, in line with brothers Niko and Medo Pucić who assisted him in the sightseeing of Dubrovnik and its surroundings. Having established firm intellectual ties with Dubrovnik, Kukuljević proceeded to Kotor. Kukuljević's subsequent correspondence with the Ragusans is voluminous and diversified, while the publishing activity dealing with Dubrovnik's heritage remains an important and lasting feature of his career.

Perić's study »Uloga Antuna Dropca u javnom životu Dubrovnika« (The role of

Antun Drobac in Dubrovnik's public life) represents the most judicial appraisal of Antun Drobac, pharmacist and naturalist, whose life and career was unjustly disregarded. Having studied pharmacy in Padua, Antun Drobac (1810-1882) opened chemists' shop in Dubrovnik in 1832. Perić concludes that he was the first to recognize and describe the insecticide properties of tansy, as well as the promoter of its cultivation. His pharmacological skill was further proved by the preparation of ether, for use as an anesthetic. It was first used during surgery by a Dubrovnik doctor, Niko Pinelli, with the assistance of Drobac in 1847. In addition, Drobac was an outstanding businessman and among the first shipowners who invested in the *Dubrovačko pomorsko društvo* (Dubrovnik maritime company). Drobac's business reputation won him considerable prestige in Dubrovnik, and eventually he rose to the position of president of the Chamber of business and commerce. Political activities of the period were also marked by Drobac's authoritative personality. He was a member of the *Narodna straža* (National Guard) 1848-49, and from 1861 onwards one of the most distinguished members of the *Narodna stranka* (National Party). After winning the 1869 elections, the latter had two men in top positions: Rafo Pucić as mayor, and Drobac as his deputy. Drobac was a passionate collector. His collections of ores, minerals, crystals, shells, fish, and stuffed animals grew over the years to the size of a proper museum of natural history. He named his collection *Kabinet prirodopisa* (Cabinet of natural history), and housed it in the Dominican monastery, where it was to be exhibited before the public. In 1871, the Municipal Council found a new location for the collection within the municipal palace, renaming it the *Domorodni muzej* (Native Museum). Drobac enthusiastically labored

at the organization and expansion of the museum, placing thus his name among the pioneers of what is now called museology.

The third article is dedicated to by far one of the most interesting personalities of nineteenth-century Dubrovnik, Niko Veliki Pucić (1820-1883), whose intellectual qualities received much credit during his lifetime, but who, unlike his brother Medo, left no literary or scientific works. His role in the political and public life of Dubrovnik, however, cannot be overlooked. Born to privilege, Pucić was educated in Dubrovnik and Venice. As he was entrusted with running the family estate, he did not study abroad. Nevertheless, he absorbed knowledge with unflinching assiduity all his life. An adherent of the Revival Movement prior to 1848, Pucić endorsed the idea of the unification of all Croatian lands, and he remained loyal to the National Party to the end of his life. During the 1850s, in the period of neo-absolutism, he co-operated with Ivan Kukuljević. In 1850 Niko Pucić was already appointed member of the *Društvo za povjestnicu jugoslavensku*, but equally dedicated his time to cultural and political work in Zagreb. Pucić's political ideas and attitude can be gleaned from his correspondence with Baldo Bogišić, Franjo Rački, J.J. Strossmayer, and Mihovil Pavlinović. As an exponent of the National Party, in 1861 Pucić was assigned by the Dubrovnik Municipal Council to go to Vienna where he was to advocate for the unification of Dalmatia and Croatia, and the use of the vernacular language in public life and education. His mission ended in failure, for Austria's interest in keeping Dalmatia isolated prevailed. Nevertheless, Dalmatia could not be deprived of the right to its own regional parliament. Upon his return from Vienna, Pucić stopped in Zagreb, where he was introduced to the leading figures of the National Party, headed by Strossmayer, who

impressed him profoundly. That same year Pucić was elected to the Croatian Parliament as a representative from Križevci. After retiring from this office, Pucić resumed his political work in Dubrovnik, where he stood up against Italian sympathizers. During the 1860s, Pucić took part in founding *Il Nazionale* journal, and collaborated in both *Matica dalmatinska* and *Narodna štionica* in Dubrovnik. Due to the pressure of the *autonomaši* (adherents of the idea of Dalmatian autonomy), the 1864 parliament elections and the 1865 local elections in Dubrovnik proved disastrous for National Party. These events caused Pucić to indulge more in cultural activities and editorial work on the journal *Dubrovnik - Zabavnik Narodne štionice*. When the Viennese Court began to show more political tolerance towards the National Party, Pucić won the 1867 elections, and was subsequently appointed vice-president of the Dalmatian Parliament. As his party was in the minority, he was in no position to contribute to its political goals, and soon resigned. He remained an active observer of Croatian political life, and following the Austro-Hungarian Settlement he presented the Croatian Parliament with an interpretation according to which this agreement favored the Kingdom of Croatia, Slavonia, and Dalmatia. Austrian policy with regard to Dalmatia, and its interpretation of the dual monarchy soon deceived Pucić. Despite the Party's victory in the 1869 Dubrovnik local elections, and its majority in Dalmatian Parliament in 1870, Niko Veliki gradually retired from political life, as he could no longer witness the grudges inside his party. In the subsequent Croat-Serb controversies, he failed to support his brother Medo and *Slovinac*, Dubrovnik's pro-Yugoslav journal. Niko Pucić thus remained loyal to the Croatian national cause.

The fourth article deals with the politi-

cal views of the bishop of Dubrovnik, writer Mato Vodopić. The life of this popular cleric represents a pattern of cultural revival activities, which contributed to the shaping of Croatian national identity. In light of political and national maturation, Perić traces Vodopić from his early school days in Dubrovnik and seminary in Zadar, to his service in numerous parishes of his diocese. Ideas of the Revival Movement were soon to occupy him, and he began contributing to *Danica* and *Zora Dalmatinska*. He cheered the news of Jelačić being elected ban (vice-roy) of Croatia. His vast literary and intellectual interests within Dubrovnik's revival circle have been described in the works of Ida Düringsfeld and Ivan Kukuljević. The most creative phase of Vodopić's cultural and literary career began with his service in Gruž in 1857. In 1860 he entered political life by joining the National Party, having published his most outstanding prose (*Marija: povijest konavoska* and *Tužna Jele: povijest gruška*) on the pages of the journal *Dubrovnik - Zabavnik Narodne štionice*. In his clerical and literary work he promoted the goals of the nationalist cause: the unification of Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia, the official introduction of the vernacular language, and the cultural and economic development of the region. Although he did not take active part in political struggles, Vodopić was a passionate promoter of the national cause, as can be seen from the diary excerpts in which he refers to all the current political events and Austrian interference with Croatian national interests in Dalmatia. During the Croat-Serb political controversies in the 1880s, Vodopić, like Niko Pucić, discredited the pan-national orientation of the publishers of journal *Slovinac* but agreed to contribute to it. Owing to the political victories of the National Party, Vodopić was installed as bishop of Dubrovnik in 1881. Political

tensions within the National Party discouraged Vodopić in his later years, and he inclined towards a group of young Dubrovnik *pravaši* (advocates of the Croatian Party of Rights) affiliated with Frano Supilo and the journal *Crvena Hrvatska*.

In the context of Austrian policy towards Dubrovnik, Perić focuses upon the private and official visits of the Habsburgs to Dubrovnik. Founding his study on copious bibliographical information and references, Perić brings to light all the details related to the visits of the Royal family between 1818 and 1906. The Monarchy's relationship towards Dubrovnik experienced a slight shift in the course of the nineteenth century. As the motives of the visits were guided by the political climate, the reception varied accordingly from a submissive indifferent attitude and welcome to open revolt. It seemed as though these very visits fanned the political clashes between the National Party and adherents of Dalmatian autonomy. The persistent, yet dignified resistance of the Ragusans, notably the nobility and the old citizen class, represents a constant, which characterized its relationship toward the Monarchy and the Habsburgs. Francis I was the first of the Austrian Emperors to visit Dubrovnik in 1818 with the aim of pacifying the patricians and becoming familiar with the new province. In 1875, when the nationalists won the municipal elections, Dubrovnik was visited by Francis Joseph I. His stay stirred lively political activities. Archduke Rudolph, heir to the Austro-Hungarian throne, visited Dubrovnik on a number of occasions, as did his uncle, Archduke Maximilian. In 1878 Rudolph purchased the island of Lokrum, which he regularly visited every year. Dubrovnik also saw the arrival of Francis Ferdinand in 1906, who was the last of the Habsburgs to travel there in spite of the already aggravated political circumstances.

In order to provide a thorough analysis of the controversies pertaining to the building of the monument to Gundulić, Perić traces the causes and the course of the antagonism within the National Party and the emergence of the coalition of autonomists and local Serbs. The building of the Gundulić's monument in Dubrovnik, a creation of the Croat sculptor Ivan Rendić, was a long-term project which turned into a major political issue in the early 1890s. It was not an easy road from the first initiative in 1880 to the unveiling of the statue in 1893. The idea of erecting the monument stemmed from the National Party, which at that time was experiencing a serious crisis. A powerful fraction emerged—consisting of intellectuals affiliated with the journal *Slovinac*—which separated and joined the Serbian Party. The creators of the “catholic Serb” idea formed a coalition with the opposition, and thanks to the inconsistency and opportunism of the National Party, backed by election manipulation, they came to power in the Dubrovnik municipal government in 1890. In order to strengthen their ideological position, Serb attempts to misinterpret Dubrovnik's cultural heritage were evident. They even claimed that the Gundulić's monument was part of the Serb cultural legacy. This idea met with the general disapproval of the consolidated National Party espoused by the young *pravaši* following Frano Supilo and *Crvena Hrvatska*. The conflicts culminated on the eve of the monument's dedication in 1893. The committee in charge of the monument project, appointed by the new municipal council, decided to carry out the opening ceremony with Serb features dominating. This plan met with fierce opposition from the Croatian political subjects who financed the whole project. This conflict had a reverberating effect upon Croat and Serb political parties throughout the monarchy.

Perić examines the controversies between the Serb oriented journal *Dubrovnik* and Frano Supilo's *Crvena Hrvatska*. As most of the spectators who took part in the opening ceremony were Croats, the manufactured Serb prominence throughout the event ended in failure. The 1893 celebration exhibited all the shortcomings of the coalition of Serbs and pro-autonomists on the one hand, and the consolidation of Croatian political forces in Dubrovnik on the other.

»Franjo Rački i Dubrovnik« is the closing article of Perić's book. Historian Rački, founder and first president of the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts (founded in Zagreb in 1861), was connected with Dubrovnik and its heritage in many ways. The activities of the Croat Revival from the forties onwards helped Rački realize the enormous significance of Dubrovnik. Despite great many administrative obstacles, he planned a long research in Dubrovnik's archives and libraries. In 1868 he spurred the research of Petar Matković in the Dubrovnik archives, as well as the journey of two other scholars: Vatroslav Jagić and Đuro Daničić. The following year, Dubrovnik also saw Fran Kurelac upon Rački's recommendation list. In 1873 as part of his scientific travels to Dalmatia, Rački visited Dubrovnik, where he was given the opportunity to sift through the documents at the archives. Based on Rački's reports and correspondence, Perić brings to light a considerable amount of information regarding Rački's high evaluation of Dubrovnik's sources and the history of Dubrovnik in general. During his stay in Dubrovnik Rački diligently compiled the archives. In addition, he wrote several articles on the city's cultural history and published them in *Vijenac*. Rački collaborated with intellectuals from Dubrovnik and pursued ways and means for the Academy to continue to send its researchers to Dubro-

vnik. He inspired a number of Ragusans to indulge in research, some of whom (Bogišić, M. Pucić, Budmani, and Zore, to name a few) became members of the Academy. The results of Rački's efforts to cull, examine, and publish Dubrovnik's historical sources appeared in Academy's publications *Stari pisci hrvatski* (Old Croat writers), *Monumenta spectantia historiam Slavorum Meridionalium*, and *Monumenta historico-juridica Slavorum Meridionalium*. Rački was among the guests who witnessed the unveiling of the Gundulić's monument in 1893, contributing with his presence to the Croatian spirit of the ceremony. His death in 1894 was mourned in Dubrovnik, and numerous commemorations were held in honor of this cleric, patriot, and scholar. *Crvena Hrvatska* commented on his outstanding merit in unearthing the heritage of Dubrovnik, while the people of Dubrovnik paid tribute to him with a memorial service held in the church of the Friars Minor.

In the articles described above Perić has succeeded in providing most systematic and insightful surveys dealing with Dubrovnik and its citizens in the nineteenth century, placing his interpretation in the broader context of Croatian history. His work is based on masterly examination of extensive archival and published references, alongside older and current periodicals. Being published together in this book, his studies are indispensable reading for all those interested in the nineteenth-century Dubrovnik, particularly in the context of the revival and question of national integration.

Stjepan Ćosić