

The Identity and Continuity of Croatian Philosophy

SREĆKO KOVAČ

Institute of Philosophy, Zagreb
skovac@ifzg.hr

UDK 1(091)(497.5)

1Marković, F.

1:37.01

Review article

Received: 23. 6. 2022.

Accepted: 13. 9. 2022.

[https://doi.org/10.52685/pihfb.48.2\(96\).1](https://doi.org/10.52685/pihfb.48.2(96).1)

Summary

After delineating the corpus of Croatian philosophy, the historical and conceptual identity and continuity of Croatian philosophy are analysed with respect to several aspects: (1) the historical space and time of Croatian philosophy; (2) its socio-cultural role and character (educational, linguistic and national-political); (3) its traditions and interconnections; and (4) the idea of Croatian philosophy. Special attention is paid to the difference between Franjo pl. Marković's views on Croatian philosophy and the present state-of-the-art. Finally, the roots of Croatian philosophy are considered at the moment of transition from myth to Christianity and in the introductory reflections of the Charter of Duke Trpimir.

Key words: Croatian philosophy, corpus of Croatian philosophy, identity, continuity, education, tradition, influences, Franjo pl. Marković, Trpimir.

1. Introduction

In recent decades, much research has been done on the history of Croatian philosophy, as has been presented in numerous research papers and monographs, several handbooks, a specialised journal, many conferences and, in particular, by translations of Latin works of Croatian philosophers. During this period, English globally established itself as the *lingua franca* of science, prevalingly so in philosophy as well, and international reception and recognition were imposed as an obligatory criterion for the evaluation of achievements and results in research. This is in distinction to the 19th century, with its affirmation of national philosophies, written in national languages, when Latin ceased to be commonly used as a universal language of science. From around 1850, an in-

creasing number of philosophy papers started to be published in Croatian. In the 1870s and 1880s Franjo pl. Marković encouraged the revival and translation of Latin works of old Croatian philosophers into Croatian, as well as a diversified study of other national philosophies to avoid losing the national identity and becoming simply attached to a foreign culture. It should be noted that English is presently not just a globally used language, but also a national language in the Anglo-American world, which obscures the difference between inclusion in what specifically is Anglo-American philosophy and the participation in the true international philosophical community and discourse.¹ All this prompts one to consider the identity and continuity of Croatian philosophy on the ground of the changes and results obtained between the 19th century revival of Croatian philosophy and circumstances at the beginning of the 21st century.²

In this paper, we first define the criteria for inclusion in the corpus of Croatian philosophy. We then consider various aspects of the unity of this corpus: spatiotemporal; qualitative (socio-cultural character and role); historical-structural (traditions, influences and interaction); and conceptual (idea of Croatian philosophy). In particular, we are interested in various aspects of what makes the identity and the continuity of Croatian philosophy an historically developing reality. Some final reflections are appended about the historical roots of Croatian philosophy.

2. Inclusion criteria for the corpus of Croatian philosophy

Which materials should be included in the corpus of Croatian philosophy? We, first, refer to the standard defined by the *National and University Library* in Zagreb (*NUL*) and then restrict this standard to the field of philosophy. The general criteria of the *NUL* in defining Croatian “national materials [‘građa’] of the collection *Croatica*” follow the fundamental principles of “comprehensiveness and integrity” (‘sveobuhvatnost’, ‘cjelovitost’) and are of a “cultural-historical”

¹ See, for example, the confusion about the concept of “analytic philosophy”, often almost identified with Anglo-American analytic philosophy (and contrasted with “continental philosophy”), although middle-European analytic philosophy is an essential part and source of analytic philosophy as a whole.

² For Franjo pl. Marković’s overview of and insight into the Croatian philosophical heritage, see his “Filosofijske struke pisci hrvatskoga roda s onkraj Velebita u stoljećih XV. do XVIII.”, *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 1 (1975), pp. 255–280. German translation: “Philosophische Schriftsteller kroatischer Abkunft jenseits des Velebit vom XV. bis XVIII. Jahrhundert”, *Synthesis Philosophica* 8 (1993), pp. 11–30. For the state-of-the-art in 2005, with the research programme of Kruno Krstić (from the 1970s) included, see Erna Banić-Pajnić, “Istraživanje hrvatske filozofije – (samo)kritički osvrt”, *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 31 (2005), pp. 29–42.

character, “grounded in the Croatian tradition”. The collection *Croatica* is stated to be a “physical reality”, consisting in book and non-book materials.³ The *NUL* distinguishes between the formal criterion and the criterion of content:⁴

(1) the *formal* criterion is threefold: *national* (the authors are Croats by birth, by cultural belonging or political Croats – by citizenship); *territorial* (materials are created within the borders of the Croatian state or on the territory that historically belonged to Croatia); and *linguistic* (wholly or partly in Croatian);

(2) the criterion of *content*: the content is wholly or partially related to the Croats, the Croatian land and the Croatian natural and cultural heritage.

The criteria are summarised as follows:

“The selection of materials included in the *Croatica* national collection is based on the following criteria: Croatian authorship (Croats by birth and by choice, those who have significantly and actively contributed to Croatian culture through their engagement at the national or international level), Croatian publisher (publishers registered in the Republic of Croatia, Croatian publishers registered abroad), the Croatian language (regardless of the author’s nationality and citizenship, place of publication or printing of a particular item), as well as the criterion of content according to which the national collection includes works about Croatia and Croats. Publications must satisfy at least one of the established criteria to be included in the collection.

Apart from publications gathered through legal deposit procedures, since 1992 this series has included emigrant press which the *NUL* has systematically collected since then as an indispensable part of its national holdings.”⁵

On this basis, *Croatian philosophical materials* can be defined as the part of the Croatian national materials which is wholly or partly related to philosophy. Thus, we define *the corpus of the works of Croatian philosophers* (or the *Corpus of Croatian philosophy* in the strict sense) as that part of the Croatian philosophical materials which satisfies the national formal criterion (that is, works of Croatian authors). Of course, according to the standards of research, this corpus can be investigated only in the context and with reference to *Croatian philosophical materials* as a whole.

The national formal criterion of *NUL* guarantees the basic real – natural, cultural and political – unity of the corpus of Croatian philosophers. A further, proper, philosophical question is: in what sense can this corpus be understood as

³ See Lobel Machala (ed.), “Smjernice za izgradnju zbirke *Croatica*” [Directions for the building of the collection *Croatica*] (Zagreb: Nacionalna i sveučilišna knjižnica, 2016), pp. 1–3, <https://www.nsk.hr/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Smjernice-za-izgradnju-zbirke-Croatica-3.pdf>.

⁴ See “Smjernice <...>”, pp. 3–6.

⁵ National and University Library in Zagreb, <https://www.nsk.hr/en/series-a-books/>, published February 21, 2021 (accessed 9 May 2022).

representing a conceptual as well as a historically real philosophical unity with respect to the intrinsic philosophical problems and developments in philosophy, and regarding the interconnectedness and interaction of Croatian philosophy with the Croatian socio-cultural and political life and history? We will analyse some general aspects of these questions and propose, in outline, some characteristic features which essentially shaped the history of Croatian philosophy.

3. Intrinsic and historical unity of Croatian philosophy

We focus on the intrinsic philosophical and historical real unity of Croatian philosophy (and of its corpus) by inquiring into the conceptual and dynamic socio-cultural identity and continuity of Croatian philosophy. We also summarise some related research results and add some novel or less well known aspects and facts. We distinguish four aspects:

(1) spatiotemporal identity and continuity with respect to the homeland and diaspora territories and to the variety of developing historical periods with its *terminus a quo* in space and time;

(2) the socio-cultural identity and continuity of Croatian philosophical thought, as well as the socio-cultural role of Croatian philosophy;

(3) tradition and mutual influences – schools, universities, intellectual circles, and the mutual communication and interaction of Croatian philosophers, through which Croatian philosophy lived and developed in real interaction and continuation; and

(4) the idea of Croatian philosophy, as articulated through the history of Croatian philosophical ideas (“striving for ideals”).

Taking these four points together, we should come to a comprehensive, historical-dynamic structure with an intrinsic causal interrelationship. Surely, we do not claim that, in this structure, there are no conceptual changes and oppositions, historical interruptions or discontinuities, but that, in spite of this, the Croatian philosophical corpus can be conceived as a conceptual and historical dynamic whole, embedded into its socio-political context and development.

3.1. Spatiotemporal identity and continuity

As is known, we can clearly speak of the Croatian historical homeland in the Adriatic-Dinaric-Pannonian area⁶ (cf. “territorial” formal criterion above) and approximately define the temporal beginnings of Croatian history from the

⁶ The Croatian corpus that is constitutive of present-day Bosnia and Herzegovina also belongs to this historical and socio-cultural homeland.

arrival of the Croatian tribes to this territory in the 6/7th century. These are also the spatiotemporal reference points for Croatian philosophy. For the beginnings of Croatian philosophy in the homeland area, with a strong impact on its later history, the following features should be considered essential regarding the Croatian philosophical identity, as well as the cultural identity in general:

(1) the mythical roots of Croatian philosophical thought in Slavic mythical culture, with specific traits given by Croats; Slavisation was a basic determinant in the process of the constitution of the Croatian people and had a key cultural and social role in this process; besides the largely implicit logical-philosophical structure of the adopted mythical worldview, the proclaimed form of early judicial debates, standing on the overall mythic presuppositions, attests to the initial logical-dialectical reflections;⁷

(2) the encounter with the culture of late antiquity, which permeated Dalmatian cities; for example, various stone inscriptions emphasise an aesthetic component and consciousness (e.g. “Aspice hunc opus miro quo decore facto”, “Look at this work, made with what wonderful decor”⁸);

(3) Christianity, received from Rome, from (possibly) Dalmatian bishops, and (or) from Frankish missionaries;⁹ Gottschalk’s visit to Croatia and philosophical thoughts in Trpimir’s Charter¹⁰ are confirmations of the beginnings of the Croatian Christian-philosophical reflections (see the last section in this text). Christianity had a crucial and foundational role in Croatian school education, where, for centuries, philosophy had a prominent position.¹¹

As to the birth of the Croatian national identity itself, we seem to be able to make relatively precise assumptions about when and how it happened. According to Radoslav Katičić, the key moment in the socio-cultural and political foundation of the Croatian nation was the act of baptism at Crkvina in Biskupija near Knin, carried out by Frankish Benedictines at the beginning of the 9th century, perhaps under Duke Borna (who might be the same person as Porin or Porga):

“From that moment on, Croats, as determined, represented and legitimated ex-

⁷ See Radoslav Katičić, *Litterarum studia*, 2nd ed. (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2007); idem, *Naša stara vjera* (Zagreb: Ibis, Matica hrvatska, 2017) and the last section in this text.

⁸ For example, Zlatko Posavac, “Hrvatska estetika – srednji vijek”, *Filozofska istraživanja* 18 (1998), pp. 115–134; Katičić, *Litterarum studia*, p. 242.

⁹ See, e.g., Katičić, *Litterarum studia*, pp. 211–224.

¹⁰ In Marko Kostrenčić, Jakov Stipišić, and Miljen Šamšalović (eds.), *Codex diplomaticus Regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae*, vol. 1 (Zagreb: JAZU, 1967), pp. 3–8.

¹¹ See Posavac, “Hrvatska estetika”; Franjo Zenko (ed.), *Starija hrvatska filozofija* (Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1997), the introductory text.

actly by this act, stepped on the ground of European history and became one of the nations of contemporaneous Christian Europe and that of Latin Europe.”¹²

With the progress of research into the history of Croatian philosophy, we are increasingly able to establish the continuity (traditions and changes) between various time periods and cultural-educational milieux.

For illustration, let us mention how acquaintance with Croatian philosophy grew in terms of the historical space where it was present and taught, as well as in terms of the timespan and continuity over time. Franjo pl. Marković, in his Rector’s speech (1881, published 1881 and 1882),¹³ focused on the Croatian philosophers “beyond Velebit” in the time period from the 15th to the 18th centuries. Prompted by the re-founding of the Zagreb university, he proposed a programme of revival for these philosophers as an essential part of the endeavour to renew Croatian philosophy in its genuine roots and character. In the ensuing research and overviews of the history of Croatian philosophy, (1) the work of the North Croatian philosophers and philosophy schools “this side” (from Marković’s viewpoint) of Velebit was included; (2) the beginnings of Croatian philosophy were extended back well before the 15th century and (3) the time period from, roughly, 1800 to 1880 was explored in much detail.¹⁴ On the first point, for example, in addition to the area from Cres to Dubrovnik and Kotor, with which Marković’s Croatian philosophers were connected, the philosophical work and teaching was included that was done in or was connected with, for example, Zagreb, Lepoglava, Slavonia, Bosnia, Hercegovina and other centres and areas, where we should include Rijeka and Istria if we do not consider them being “beyond” Velebit. Regarding the second point, the beginnings of Croatian philosophy have been traced back to Herman Dalmatin and further back to the 9th century and Gottshalk’s visit to Croatia and the court of Duke Trpimir. On the third point, the time period ca. 1800–1880 has been increasingly well-covered by research on the philosophers and philosophical

¹² Radoslav Katičić, *Naša stara vjera* (Zagreb: Ibis, 2017), p. 10; our translation.

¹³ Marković, “Filosofijske struke pisci <...>”.

¹⁴ See overviews by Stjepan Zimmermann (1929), Kruno Krstić (1943) and Teofil Harapin (1943) in Erna Banić-Pajnić and Filip Grgić (eds.), *O hrvatskoj filozofiji* (Zagreb: Institut za filozofiju, 2017); a translation Kruno Krstić, “Philosophie in Kroatien”, *Synthesis Philosophica* 15 (1993), pp. 31–50; and Kruno Krstić, “Počeci filozofije u Hrvatskoj”, *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine*, 1 (1975), pp. 11–20, translated as “The beginnings of philosophy in Croatia”, *Studia historiae philosophiae Croaticae* 1 (1990), pp. 7–16. For large, comprehensive reference works, see Franjo Zenko (ed.), *Starija hrvatska filozofija* and *Novija hrvatska filozofija* (Zagreb, Školska knjiga, 1997, 1995); Erna Banić-Pajnić, Mihaela Girardi Karšulin, Filip Grgić and Ivana Skuhala Karasman (eds.), *Hrvatska filozofija od 12. do 19. stoljeća*, 3 vols. (Zagreb: Institut za filozofiju, 2015).

teaching at the beginning of the century, the ambiguous national role of the “Illyrian” movement, the turning point around 1850 and the ensuing philosophical work up through the 1880s. Of course, in addition to this, Croatian philosophy after Franjo pl. Marković and Gjuro Pulić became itself a topic of research (i.e. into modern or contemporary Croatian philosophy).

Whereas Marković opted for a new start to Croatian philosophy with the revival of interest in the older south Croatian philosophers, sixty-five years earlier, Šimun Čučić, also advocating a reform of philosophy, was aware of the continuity with his Croatian predecessors in the 18th century.¹⁵ Besides mentioning (like Marković) Ruđer Bošković, he includes in his list of philosophers (by their surnames) Josip Zanchi, Franjo Bruna and Ivan Krstitelj Horváth, as well as his own predecessors at the Zagreb Academia – Vinko Kalafatić, Matija Kirinić, Antun Kukec, Andrija Minković and Juraj Šug. Except for Bošković, this continuity seems to have fallen into background during the Illyrian movement, which was primarily interested in older literary works written in Croatian. Around 1850, interest in philosophy seems to have been reborn, with new philosophical texts written in Croatian. In south Croatia, especially in Zadar, more continuity in the publication of philosophical works can be attested up to 1850, due to the published work by Pietro Bottura (especially several works published in 1830s and 1840s), which was continued by Gjuro Pulić – all these works were written in Italian, despite pressure from the Austrian government to introduce German, and in accordance with the long influence of Venice over the course of several centuries.

3.2. Socio-cultural identity and continuity of Croatian philosophy

In addition, regarding its characteristic and qualities, Croatian philosophy obtained its identity and built its continuity on the ground of its social and cultural traits and role. The educational, linguistic and national-political traits of the Croatian philosophy stand out.

(1) As is known and demonstrated in a large number of investigations, Croatian philosophy had for centuries a significant role in the Croatian *educational* system, in addition to the fact it had education itself as one of its main topics. The need for the first Benedictine monasteries, which incorporated schools and were leading education institutions in early Croatian culture, originated from the open philosophical questions about the ever-changing world and insecure consciousness, as we can judge based on Trpimir’s Charter (852). In the cathedral schools, the *trivium* (including *dialectica*) belonged to the compulsory teach-

¹⁵ Šimun Čučić, *Philosophia critice elaborata*, vols. 1–10 (Vienna: Schnierer, 1815).

ing programme.¹⁶ At the higher and university levels of education, the study of philosophy was the basic, compulsory programme¹⁷ until the university reform in the 19th century (the renewal of Zagreb university in 1874). In the context of this reform, as the remnant of the old tradition – besides the special university studies in philosophy – the compulsory teaching of philosophy in the higher classes figures as an integral part of the Croatian gymnasium programme.¹⁸

(2) Croatian philosophy is closely intertwined with the Croatian *linguistic* identity. It is the Croatian language, as specific for Croats, which, when used in philosophy, makes possible a special manner of representing and seeing things (as demonstrated, for example, in the works of Vinko Pacel, Franjo pl. Marković or, later, by Vanja Sutlić)¹⁹ and, in general, contributes to clarity and perspicuity (Derkos, Mihanović)²⁰ up to its inclusion and affinity within a general “his-

¹⁶ For example, the Zagreb cathedral school, founded in the second half of the 13th century; see Daniel Patafta, “Razvoj teoloških i filozofskih studija u Zagrebu od XIII. stoljeća do osnivanja Sveučilišta u Zagrebu”, *Bogoslovska smotra* 90 (2020), pp. 43–66. For cathedral schools in Dalmatia (especially in Zadar and Split), see Slavko Kovačić, “Katedralne škole u Dalmaciji pod mletačkom vlašću od konca 16. do početka 19. stoljeća prema biskupskim izvještajima Svetoj Stolici”, *Croatica Christiana periodica* 15 (1991), pp. 59–87.

¹⁷ The oldest university-level education institutions in Croatia are studium generale and the university in Zadar (founded in 1396) and the *Neoacademia Zagrabiensis* (founded 1669), in addition to Lepoglava *studium generale* (established 1674) and many monastery schools.

¹⁸ The first published gymnasium philosophy textbook by a Croatian author is *Logika ili misloslovje* by Vinko Pacel (Zagreb: Kr. Dalm.-Hèrv.-Slav. Vèće, 1868), preceded by Stjepan Ilišević, *Obuka malenih ili Katechetika* (Zagreb: Gay, 1850) containing elementary introduction in psychology and logic. We also draw attention to Vjekoslav Babukić’s manuscripts in psychology and logic: *Osnova dušoslovja (po H. J. Hanušu)*, *Logika iliti misloslovje*, in *Književni spisi*, National and University Library, Zagreb, ms. 3993 (probably in the 1850s).

¹⁹ Pacel, for example, emphasises as the main task of his *Logic* “to accommodate the concepts of logic, and thus the terminology, too, to the ‘conceptualizing’ in the Croatian language, and vice versa” (“pridesiti pojmove logike, a tim i nazivlje, pojmovanju hèrvatskoga jezika, i obratno” (Vinko Pacel, *Logica ili misloslovje*, p. V). In addition, cf. I. Mažuranić and J. Užarević: “The spirit of the German language is strongly different from the spirit of the Ilirian [= Croatian] language”, *Deutsch-Ilirisches Wörterbuch: Nèmačko-ilirski slovar* (Zagreb: Gay, 184), p. 21 of the Croatian preface. For a current view in the internal interrelationship between the Croatian philosophy and the Croatian language, see Bojan Marotti, *Prema domovini misli* (Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, 2019), especially the second part.

²⁰ See Ivan Derkos (after quoting *Denklehre oder Logik*, 1806, by W. T. Krug): “Quo clariores proin at magis perspicuas leges cogitandi tibi proprias reddere cupis, eo perfectius ipsam lingvam scire debes: <...> ergo debes lingvam maternam perfecte scire; quia vero ipsa perfectionem hanc non habet, debes ad id conferre, ut perficiatur.” Ivan Derkos, *Genius patriae: Super dormientibus suis filiis* (Zagreb: Suppan, 1932), p. 31. Krug himself states: “Das Sprachstudium <...> ist demnach gar nicht so unwichtig, als es manchem scheint, da eine Menge von Mißverständnissen bloß aus Mangel an Sprachkenntniß entstehen, und da jede Sprache gewissermaassen als ein Kommentar über die Logik betrachtet werden kann, indem sich in ihr

tory of languages”.²¹ Nevertheless, it should be emphasised that Latin, the first written language of the Croats²² and for centuries the official public language that was intensely incorporated in public life, should be considered, beside Croatian, a “second Croatian literary language”,²³ not just “old foreign clothes” (“staro tudje ruho”, as Marković called it, still under the lingering influence of “Illyric” “anti-Latinism”²⁴). Even the Croatian language itself does not seem to be a common genuine language for Croats, but was adopted and developed through the process of the Slavisation.²⁵ Croatian philosophy, through the whole of its history, has existed in the dynamic interrelationship of the Croatian and the so-called world languages. Even when Latin was the official language in the university and higher-level teaching, Croatian was not absent. For example, at the start of the *Zagreb Neoacademy* (*Neoacademia Zagrabiensis*), besides the textbook in philosophy by Franjo Jambrehović (1669), a Latin-Croatian dictionary was published in 1670 by Juraj Habelić, previously the Rector of the Jesuit Collegium in Zagreb, to facilitate official learning in Latin²⁶. It was thereafter

die Regeln des Denkens gleichsam abspiegeln.” Wilhelm Traugott Krug, *Denklehre oder Logik* (Königsberg: Goebbels und Unzer, 1806), p. 657; cf. I. Derkos, *ibidem*. See the 4th edition of Krug’s *Denklehre* (Königsberg: Unzer, 1833, p. 556–557). Accordingly, one’s mother tongue should be “cultivated” “before all other [languages]” (1806, p. 657; in the later editions with “profoundly mastered” instead of “cultivated”, 1819, p. 528, 1825, p. 530, 1833, p. 556). In a similar vein, Antun Mihanović remarks: “Vu njem [=vu prirodnom Jeziku] jedino moguće je jakost svoju skušavati, slobodno i odkrito očitovati, i tak skrovnosti Gerčkeh i Rimskih Mudrih spoznati. Vučimose čutiti, razmeti, i misliti, kak ovi čutili, razmeli i mislili jesu, Jezik Detinstvo prebavi, i Domorodcev kreposti svetu osvahnju”, in *Rech Domovini od Hasznovitozti Piszanya vu Domorodnom Jeziku* (Beč: Snirer, 1815), p. 6.

²¹ As of 1823, Mihanović offered a very broad picture: he argued for the kinship (‘Verwandtschaft’) of Slavic languages and Sanskrit, and envisaged a “history of languages”, which could, in the light coming from India and Sanskrit, uncover the primeval history of our race (“Urgeschichte unseres Geschlechtes”) and the prehistorical times (‘Vorzeit’) of the Slavs in particular. His list of word comparisons includes ‘bivati’ (in the sense of ‘being’) and ‘bitje’ (‘being’, ‘essence’), ‘narav’, ‘narava’ (‘nature’), ‘znanje’ (‘knowledge’), ‘redjenje’ (‘order’), ‘riječ’ (‘word’), ‘jazik’ (‘language’), etc.; Antun Mihanović, “Zusammenstellung von 200 Laut- und Sinnverwandten Wörtern des Sanskrites und Slawischen”, *Archiv für Geschichte, Statistik, Literatur und Kunst* 14 (1823), pp. 341–344, 367–371.

²² Katičić, *Litterarum studia*, pp. 321–323; Posavac, “Hrvatska estetika — srednji vijek”, p. 122.

²³ Franjo Zenko, *Aristotelizam od Petrića do Boškovića* (Zagreb: Globus, 1983), p. 15.

²⁴ Marković, “Filosofijske struke pisci <...>”, p. 32; Zenko, *Aristotelizam od Petrića do Boškovića*, p. 15.

²⁵ Katičić, *Litterarum studia*, pp. 225–226, and *Naša stara vjera*, p. 25.

²⁶ See Ivica Martinović, “Hrvatsko logičko nazivlje u Habelićevu *Dikcionaru*”. In Katja Matković Mikulčić (ed.), *Znanstveni skup o Jurju Habeliću: 400. obljetnica rođenja Jurja Habelića (1609.–1678.)* (Velika Gorica: Gradska knjižnica Velika Gorica, 2009), pp. 137–156.

largely incorporated into Belostenec's *Gazophylacium* (published in 1740). Many terms used in philosophy can be found in the Mažuranić–Užarević's German–Croatian vocabulary (1842),²⁷ although the authors did not base it on the Habledić–Belostenec tradition (moreover, they complained about the bad situation of scholarly language in Croatia; see the Preface in Croatian=Illyric),²⁸ and focused, in their conception, on the basic, everyday language to be later enriched (they proposed) with the rest of the needed scholarly expressions. Be that as it may, enough presuppositions were present to enable Stjepan Muzler, professor of philosophy in Zagreb (at the *Royal Zagreb Academy*), to be among the teachers who, in 1848, positively responded to the official inquiry about the ability to teach philosophy in Croatian, and, in 1849/50, he most probably taught in Croatian.²⁹ Perhaps the most significant philosophical contribution to the richness and systematicity of the Croatian language was made by Franjo pl. Marković.³⁰

(3) Croatian philosophy has had a significant role in building the Croatian *national-political* consciousness and identity. At the dawn of Croatian philosophy, it was the open philosophical questions, a cognitive and moral aporetic, that motivated the Croatian duke Trpimir to lay the foundations for the institutionalisation of religious culture and identity (by founding the Benedictine monastery in Rižinice).³¹ This was Trpimir's national-political act as the “Duke of the Croats” (“ego <...> dux Chroatorum”, *Codex diplomaticus*

²⁷ Ivan Mažuranić and Jakov Užarević, *Deutsch-Ilirisches Wörterbuch: Nēmačko-ilirski slovar*.

²⁸ Interestingly, despite the long and rich tradition of Croatian lexicography, starting from Vrančić's five-language dictionary (1595), the authors stated they had no predecessors to rely on in their work: “<...> die Verfasser desselben [= des gegenwärtigen Werkes] stehen auf diesem Felde auf Niemandes Schultern” (the second page of the German preface).

²⁹ Cf. Srećko Kovač, “Teorijska filozofija na Zagebačkoj akademiji 1776–1850”, *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 16 (1990), p. 26, and Lelja Dobronić, *Zagrebačka akademija: Academia Zagrabiensis* (Zagreb: Dom i svijet, 2004), pp. 132–134. For teaching materials in Croatian, see also the manuscripts on psychology and logic by Vjekoslav Babukić mentioned above.

³⁰ See Franjo pl. Marković, *Razvoj i sustav obćenite estetike*, reprint (Split: Logos, 1981) and his *Etika* (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2016). For Marković's logic terminology, see in Srećko Kovač, “Formalizam i realizam u logici”, *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 18 (1992), pp. 141–181.

³¹ See the following introductory thoughts in Trpimir's Charter: “Dum mundi ab origine cuncta per tempora facta mansisse delabissime succedentibus alia alternis simet oculis perspicimus mentis et manus fidei palpamus, nihil corporeis membris uidere, audire aliud ualemus, nisi ea quę presentantur et scripturarum auditio obtutibus pandet”. Marko Kostrenčić *et al.* (eds.), *Codex diplomaticus Regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae*, vol. 1, p. 4.

<...>, vol. 1, p. 4), confirming and strengthening the Christian identity of his nation, and accordingly, attesting at the same time his own Christianity in a personal, religious act.³²

Let us recall that philosophical ideas such as justice, truth, freedom, independence, rights, responsibility and duty were largely the leading norms and inspiration for the Croatian national-political and social organisation and life, and contributed to Croatian moral and socio-political self-consciousness. In addition, due to obligatory education regulations or by their personal choice, many Croatian statesmen and politicians – participants or leaders of political and cultural life – had philosophy as part of their curricula. According to Franjo pl. Marković (who served for a time as a Croatian parliament representative for the Independent People’s Party), no stable and strong national-political entity is possible without being firmly rooted in philosophical ideas and values (possibly as an integral part of a religion or law): a “spiritual homeland is the condition for the material one”.³³ To add just a few more examples, Marković’s successors Gjuro Arnold and Albert Bazala, as well as his predecessor Stjepan Moyses (at the *Regia Academia* in Zagreb) held prominent positions in public political and cultural institutions. Andrija Dorotić was known for his intense political activity against the French occupation and for supporting Dalmatian unity with the rest of Croatia. Gjuro Pulić was an outstanding member of the People’s Party in Dalmatia and its representative in the Diet of Dalmatia (“Dalmatinski sabor”). Ante Starčević was a particularly prominent opposition leader (Party of Rights) in the 19th century, who consistently stood for the philosophical principles as defended in his written work. Josip Stadler and Antun Bauer were appointed archbishop of Vrhbosna (Sarajevo) and Zagreb, respectively.

3.3. Identity and continuity through the Croatian philosophical tradition and through mutual influences of Croatian philosophers

To date, research has revealed many internally interconnected historical-philosophical unities (periods, institutions, schools and groups) in the shape of the tradition of philosophy at particular universities and other higher education institutions, in intellectual circles and milieux or simply in the form of mutual communication and influences between Croatian philosophers. In this

³² Cf.: “ego, licet peccator”; “incertus de die novissimo et hora”; “solicitus nimis animę meę”; “<...> cateruas fratrum adhibui <...> quorum sedulis uotis et frequens oratio nos immunes redderet deo peccatis”, *Codex diplomaticus* <...>, vol. 1, p. 4.

³³ Marković, “Filosofijske struke pisci <...>”, p. 33, and his “Logika: 1. odsjek”, *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 18 (1992), pp. 247–258, esp. p. 249.

sense, the investigations have significantly corrected Marković's picture from his Rector's speech about the Croatian philosophical corpus as the *dissecta et disjecta membra* (of Medeia's brother Absyrt, to be collected by his father).³⁴ Subsequent research discovered and reconstructed a much more interconnected and integral corpus than had first appeared to be the case. Let us just recollect the reconstructed philosophical traditions within the major older Croatian education institutions such as Zadar University (1396–1807), Zagreb Neoacademy (1669–1773), Zagreb Royal Academy (1776–1850),³⁵ the renewed Zagreb University (from 1874, with its several member institutions where philosophy was dealt with) and other higher teaching institutions led by Church orders, especially by Jesuits (besides Zagreb, in Rijeka and Slavenska Požega), Paulines (studium generale in Lepoglava, 1674–1783), Franciscans and Dominicans.³⁶ Marković was, of course, aware of the philosophy of Renaissance Dubrovnik, and mentions the philosophical-poetical circle around Cvijeta Zuzorić (Miho Monaldi and Nikola Vitov Gučetić, among whom Gučetić's wife Maruša Gundulić should be included³⁷). Marković himself inherited the reconciliatory approach between opposite philosophical principles, as can be seen in Gučetić and even better in Bošković.

It is particularly interesting to find out the connections among the Croatian philosophers working mainly outside historical Croatia with Croatia and other Croatian philosophers.³⁸ Let us recall several well-known examples from the

³⁴ Let us mention that, according to one version of the myth, the dissection of Absyrt happened in the Absyrtides, islands in the Croatian north Adriatic Sea.

³⁵ See in Stjepan Krasić, "Filozofija i filozofijska učilišta hrvatskih dominikanaca od XIII. do XIX. st.", *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 22 (1996), pp. 9–116; Zenko, *Aristotelizam od Petrića do Boškovića*, pp. 97–145; Srećko Kovač, "Teorijska filozofija na Zagrebačkoj akademiji 1776–1850", *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 16 (1990) pp. 23–39; Patafta: "Razvoj teoloških i filozofskih studija <...>".

³⁶ See, for example, Ante Sekulić, "Sustav visokoškolskog odgoja hrvatskih pavlina", *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 23 (1997), pp. 219–242; Franjo Emanuel Hoško, "Pavlinске srednje i visoke škole", in *Kultura pavlina u Hrvatskoj: 1244–1786* (Zagreb: Globus – Muzej za umjetnost i obrt, 1989), pp. 301–311, and *Franjevačke visoke škole u kontinentalnoj Hrvatskoj* (Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost, 2002); Zlatko Posavac, *Filozofski rukopisi 18. stoljeća u franjevačkim samostanima Slavonije* (Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, 1993); Franjo Emanuel Hoško, "Skotistička filozofija zagrebačkog kruga 17. i 18. stoljeća", *Bogoslovska smotra* 40 (1970), pp. 207–215; Ivica Musić, "Studij filozofije u franjevačke Bosne i Hercegovine", *Hum* (2007), pp. 178–192; Krasić, "Filozofija i filozofijska učilišta <...>".

³⁷ See Ivica Martinović, "Maruša Gundulić u obranu Cvijete Zuzorić", in Luka Boršić and Ivana Skuhala Karasman (eds.), *Filozofkinje u Hrvatskoj* (Zagreb: Institut za filozofiju, 2017), pp. 27–114; Luka Boršić, "Filozofkinja Maruša Gundulić", *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 46 (2020), pp. 287–308.

³⁸ See a remark by Erna Banić-Pajnić, "Istraživanje hrvatske filozofije <...>", p. 34.

older history, from individual encounters to firm traditions. Dragišić wrote the most significant part of his opus in Dubrovnik, where he had disciples and made a strong impact.³⁹ Petrić (who, at the end of his life entered the Croatian, i.e., “Illyric”, St. Jerome fraternity in Rome) edited the work of Giulio Camillo Delminio, adding “Delminio” to Camillo’s name.⁴⁰ The intellectual exchange between Vrančić and de Dominis is published in “Censura logicae” (appended to Vrančić’s *Logica nova*).⁴¹ Dominis referred to Petrić, whereas Zanchi and Bošković commented on de Dominis’s views;⁴² Raguseus was in correspondence with Antun Medo.⁴³ Bošković, besides his intellectual relationship with Bendikt Stay, had a strong reception of his philosophy in Croatia.⁴⁴ In particular, a medium that connected many Croatian philosophers was the universities where they studied or taught (especially the Sorbonne, Padua,⁴⁵ Vienna and Graz).

Starting from individual interrelationships, cultural-philosophical circles and school traditions, we can eventually arrive at the “historical structures” to

³⁹ Ivica Martinović, “Dubrovačko prognaništvo Jurja Dragišića (1496–1500)”, in Erna Banić-Pajnić, Bruno Čurko, Mihaela Girardi Karšulin and Ivica Martinović (eds.), *Juraj Dragišić (Georgius Benignus): Život i djela* (Zagreb: Institut za filozofiju, 2016), pp. 19–46.

⁴⁰ Ljerka Schiffler, “Giulio Camillo Delminio (ličnost i djelo)”, *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 6 (1980), pp. 133–153; Erna Banić Pajnić, “Nauk o korespondaciji mikrokozmosa i makrokozmosa u hrvatskih filozofa”, *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 44 (2018), pp. 295–331.

⁴¹ Srećko Kovač, “Faust Vrančić i aristotelizam u logici”, *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 14 (1988), pp. 17–33 (German translation in *Studia historiae philosophiae Croatiae* 2 (1993), pp. 229–252); Ivica Martinović, “Marko Antun de Dominis vs. Faust Vrančić”, *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 42 (2016), pp. 293–330.

⁴² Ivica Martinović, “Kako je Dominis pisao Petrićevo prezime?”, *Dubrovnik* 8 (1997), 315–322. Ivica Martinović, “Riječanin Josip Zanchi o Rabljaninu Marku Antunu de Dominisu”, *Filozofska istraživanja* 29 (2009), pp. 689–707. In general, for Renaissance Croatian philosophers, see Luka Boršić, Pavel Gregorić and Ivana Skuhala Karasman, “Croatian Renaissance philosophy”, in Marco Sgarbi (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Renaissance Philosophy* (Cham: Springer, 2020), pp. 1–7 (https://hra.projekti.ifzg.hr/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/Croatian-Renaissance-Philosophy_ERP_revised_FINAL.pdf).

⁴³ Mihaela Girardi Karšulin, “Je li astrologija matematika ili astrofizika: Raguseusovo pismo Medu”, *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 43 (2017), pp. 29–47.

⁴⁴ Zenko, *Aristotelizam od Petrića do Boškovića*, pp. 97–145. Ivica Martinović, “Boškovićeveci na hrvatskim filozofskim učilištima od 1770. do 1834”, *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 34 (2008), pp. 121–216.

⁴⁵ For example, see the philosophical comparison of Raguseus and Frkić, both of whom are part of the history of the teaching of philosophy at the University of Padua, in Mihaela Girardi Karšulin, “Samoobrana aristotelovske prirodne filozofije na prijelazu iz 16. u 17. stoljeće: Georgius Raguseus i Matija Frkić”, *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 44 (2018), pp. 7–22. Cf. also Damir Barbarić, “Značenje sveučilišta u Padovi za obrazovanje naših humanista”, *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 8 (1983), pp. 151–160.

be reconstructed by means of “models” for true and meaningful understanding of the “functioning of the history”, on the basis of philosophical categories and varying forms of truth.⁴⁶ Nonetheless, an essential part of these structures is also the disturbing and disabling of free inheritance, as well as the omission, falsification and even expelling of truth⁴⁷ to which Croatian philosophy, as well as other Croatian cultural branches, were largely exposed. For Posavac, for example, it is the distortion of Croatian identity, socio-politically biased evaluations, omission or ignoring of significant people, unnatural, externally motivated periodisations and historiographic fragmentation. This does not seem to be just a specifically Croatian phenomenon, but one common throughout global history.

3.4 *The idea of Croatian philosophy*

Let us mention several attempts to characterise the idea of Croatian philosophy. Bazala spoke about the “idea of a national philosophy” in general as of a “spiritually revived activity of the people’s being” and a transition from myth to logic – that is, from “live experience” (‘doživljaj’) to ratio (‘um’). What could be the Croatian characteristic, according to Bazala, is the central position of Croatia on the European cultural stage, and thus the readiness for influences and an openness (with its strong and weak sides) to the outside world. Zenko, inspired primarily by Bošković and Bazala, proactively posed as a criterion (‘mjerilo’) for the identity of Croatian philosophy the active, voluntaristic component and dynamism. Earlier, Marković seemed to intend the mediation and harmonization of the opposed principles to be the characteristic approach on which Croatian philosophy should be built.⁴⁸ The Croatian philosophical cor-

⁴⁶ Zlatko Posavac, “Problemi estetike i poetike u Hrvatskoj sredinom 19. stoljeća”, *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 12 (1986), pp. 127–154 (also his *Novija hrvatska estetika*, Zagreb: Hrvatsko filozofsko društvo, 1991, pp. 17–44). Cf., for example, Posavac’s corrections of aesthetic periodisation, with ample confirmations in art history itself, of the 19th and the 20th centuries in his *Hrvatska estetika* (Zagreb: Jurčić, 2019) and in *Novija hrvatska estetika*.

⁴⁷ Posavac, *Novija hrvatska estetika*, pp. 12, 203–204.

⁴⁸ Marković, “Logika: 1. odsjek” and “Filosofijske struke pisci <...>”; Albert Bazala, “O ideji nacionalne filozofije”, in Erna Banić-Pajnić and Filip Grgić (eds.), *O hrvatskoj filozofiji*, pp. 85–114 (pp. 109, 112); Franjo Zenko, “Boškovićeve apsolutni dinamizam i tehnološka znanost”, *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 13 (1987), pp. 3–29, and “O ideji (hrvatske) nacionalne filozofije u Alberta Bazale”, *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 14 (1988), pp. 109–126; Erna Banić-Pajnić, “The problems of national philosophy”, *Studia historiae philosophiae Croaticae*, 4 (1999), pp. 149–163. For general discussion, see, for example, the papers by Lj. Schiffler, F. Zenko and P. Barišić in Pavo Barišić (ed.), *Otvorena pitanja povijesti hrvatske filozofije* (Zagreb: Institut za filozofiju, 2000).

pus shows great diversity and opposition in the adopted philosophical attitudes and viewpoints, so it is hardly possible to find a characteristic philosophical stance that could generally characterise Croatian philosophy. Rather, it is the development of the (often simultaneously diverse) philosophical ideas in the course of history, and thus, a more or less intense absorption into and striving towards those philosophical ideas and ideals, which should be understood as that which turns the *corpus* of the works of Croatian philosophers into Croatian *philosophy* itself.

4. Roots of Croatian philosophy

What is particularly significant for the identity of Croatian philosophy is the character of its historical roots. Croatian mythic representations and views are here an important component. The essential motives of the reconstructed sacred, ritual text are order and justice, judgement and the establishing and the defence of order: Perun, the Thunderbolt, is the Master, a “good judge” (“dobar sudac”, Krk), who protects order.⁴⁹ We find these motives implemented in early Croatian legal practice: the basis is the Old Slavic opposition between right and wrong (‘pravo’ i ‘krivo’). Justice and righteousness (‘pravda’, ‘pravica’) are correction of the wrong, and this is metaphorically perceptible in the “basic myth”, according to which the Thunderbolt beats (‘ubija’, ‘bije’) his opponent, the snake (Vesles) but does not kill him (gods are immortal). Wrong (guilt) is represented as a curve (i.e. the winding movement of the snake), while judgement is the procedure by means of which wrong is corrected. The trial (‘sudenje’) is the performance of the procedure. Note how closely and internally related with one another, in Croatian language, are these three groups of words: justice (‘pravda’), to correct (‘ispraviti’ – ‘pravda’, ‘pravica’), right (‘prav’), righteousness (‘pravica’), true (‘pravi’, ‘istinski’, ‘istinit’), straight (‘ravan’, ‘prav’) and straight line (‘pravac’); wrong (‘krivo’) and curve (‘krivina’, ‘krivulja’); trial (‘sudenje’), court (‘sud’, ‘sudište’), judge and judgement (‘sudac’, ‘sud’) and the sentence of the court (‘presuda’).⁵⁰

As described by Katičić, in the trial procedure, two opposing legal standpoints are represented and endeavour that some third party, impartial and meritorious, acknowledges one of them and rejects the other. This endeavour

⁴⁹ Radoslav Katičić, *Zeleni lug* (Zagreb: Ibis, 2010), pp. 344–345; *Božanski boj* (Zagreb: Ibis, 2008), pp. 232–242. See also his *Vilinska vrata* (Zagreb: Ibis, 2014), pp. 15–54; *Naša stara vjera*, pp. 105–118; and “Praslavenski pravni termini u Vinodolskom zakonu”, *Slovo* 39–40 (1989–1990), pp. 73–85.

⁵⁰ For some of the above-mentioned aspects, see Katičić, *Litterarum studia*, pp. 313–315.

is expressed by the verb *prěti* (argue, debate):

“In the Vinodol Statute (1288) the fundamental formula is preserved which expresses the content of the court debate: *est tako vola ni?* – is it so or not? Here the argument and the counter-argument appear, Slavic *jestь:něstь*, which completely coincides with the ancient Indian *asti:nāsti* <...> Traces of this can be discerned in the archaic foundations of Greek philosophy and rhetoric. That is where dialectic came from.”⁵¹

Indeed, the concepts and the principles of non-contradiction, identity, reason and division (excluded middle) are key aspects of the judgement, trial, debate and justice. They are also encoded in the mythical characters and appearances of Perun (as a judge, representing identity, truth, word keeping and the structure of the whole) and of Veles (representing diversity, illusion, falsehood, change and particularity). Indeed, Perun’s battle and victory over Veles *are* judgement (‘sud’) and justice (‘pravda’), respectively. Moreover, as witnessed by Gottschalk, expressions of the abstract meaning decoded from the concrete (individual) could be encountered in the Croatian use of Latin. According to Gottschalk, Croats and their Latin neighbours under Byzantine rule used to say “kingdom” (‘royal power’) instead of “king”, and “empire” (‘imperial power’) instead of “emperor” (“Fuimus ad regnum”, “Ita nobis dixit regnum”, “Stetimus ante imperium”, “Ita nobis locutum est imperium”, that is: “We were at the kingdom”, “The kingdom has told us so”; “We stood before the empire”, “The empire spoke to us in that way”). Gottschalk gives these examples as a justification for his own use of ‘deitas’ and ‘divinitas’ for ‘deus’ (‘deity’ and ‘divinity’ for ‘God’).⁵²

The emergence of philosophy in Croatia, as far as we can see today, began already within myth and continued as the transition from myth to a pure philosophical conceptualisation and aporetics and to a philosophy embedded in Christian thought and culture. The structure of such dramatic turns can be found (partly implicitly and partly explicitly) described in the prooemium (arenga) of Trpimir’s Charter.⁵³ The philosophical reflections at the beginning, conjoined

⁵¹ Katičić, *Litterarum studia*, p. 316; our translation.

⁵² Gottschalk of Orbais, *Œuvres théologiques et grammaticales de Godescalc d’Orbais*, edited by D. Cyrille Lambot (Louvain: Université Catholique de Louvain, 1945), p. 208. See idem, “On predestination”, in *Gottschalk and a Medieval Predestination Controversy*, edited and translated by Victor Genke and Francis X. Gumerlock (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2010), p. 124. On the front cover of the book there is a photo of the Church of the Holy Cross in Nin, Croatia (originally from the 9th century). Cf. Katičić, *Litterarum studia*, pp. 345–346.

⁵³ Srećko Kovač, “Dom i svijet hrvatske filozofije: struktura i povijesni aspekti”, in Stipe Kutleša (ed.), *Domovina, zavičaj, svijet*, pp. 155–176 (Zagreb: Institut za filozofiju, 2021).

with our present knowledge about myth as adopted in Croatia, reveal the insufficiency of a mythical and purely philosophical-reflective worldview, and show the need for deeper foundations to our life and knowledge (see footnotes 31 and 32 above).

For Trpimir and his council, the only firm, and absolute, ground in the changing world of nature and in the moral uncertainties of a human life is given in a Christian conversion towards God. Thus, the need arises to organise and institutionalise a place for religious life in a changeable world by founding a Benedictine monastery. Benedictine monasteries were religious-educational institutions, where elementary knowledge could be acquired and complemented with philosophical insights and the religious way of life.⁵⁴ The whole approach, if seen in light of Trpimir's Charter, originates from philosophical reflections on changeability and uncertainty. It is significant to note that, while adopting Christianity and Latin as the historically first literary language, the Croatian language was preserved and emerged somewhat later, along with Latin texts, in written documents and literature:

“<...> the Croatian language <...> which we did not lose by baptism. This is a significant difference from the Franks, who, after they had conquered and permanently occupied the Roman province Gallia, mingled with the Romanised indigenes, completely assumed their culture and started to speak Latin. Why did the “barbarian” conquerors of Dalmatia behave in a so essentially different way than the ones in Gallia: we still do not know the answer to this question. Only one thing is evident: we were different.”⁵⁵

This gives us a hint about the possible cultural differentiation of nations, as well as a hint to think about possibly still uncovered, deep roots and correspondingly new inherent possibilities for the Croatian paths in philosophy. Three extremes can be pointed out: being absorbed by some other cultural identity, absorbing others in one's cultural identity, and the dualism between one's own and others' cultural identities. Explained in Franjo Marković's terms, these

⁵⁴ In the scriptoria of the Croatian monasteries, besides much religious literature, philosophically interesting are, for example, a small fragment from Isidore's *Etymologiae*, as well as exemplars of *Moralia in Iob* by Gregor I. See Katičić, *Litterarum studia*, pp. 463, 517, 535.

⁵⁵ Katičić, *Naša stara vjera*, p. 113 (our translation). “<...> hrvatski jezik <...> koji nismo pokrštenjem izgubili. To je značajna razlika prema Francima koji su osvojivši i trajno zaposjevi rimsku provinciju Galiju, u njoj se izmiješali s romaniziranim starosjediocima, potpuno poprimili njihovu kulturu i navike i počeli govoriti latinski. Tako su postali Francuzi i ni po čemu se više nisu razlikovali od starosjedilaca. <...> Zašto su se ‘barbarski’ osvajači Dalmacije ponašali tako bitno drukčije od onih u Galiji, na to pitanje još ne znamo odgovoriti. Očito je samo jedno: bili smo drukčiji.”

extremes are only some of the possibilities for the realisation of the philosophical need and ‘striving’, as well as of the fundamental structure of this striving: from “home” and “homeland” (origins, self-identity), through the “world” towards “ideals” (the “values” of truth, the good and the beautiful).⁵⁶ In general, striving for the good (from elementary, natural needs to justice and moral good), aesthetic values and truth may lead various nations in various branches of their culture between extremes towards the highest values. Croatian philosophy shows a wide and complex interweaving of its “home” and the “world” detectible in the links towards its past origins,⁵⁷ in a wide spatial dispersion stemming from the Croatian homeland and in its socio-cultural embeddedness into and interaction with the world, while persistently building its own expression and institutions on a path towards philosophical ideals.

Identitet i kontinuitet hrvatske filozofije

Sažetak

Nakon očitavanja korpusa hrvatske filozofije analizira se njezin povijesni i pojmovni identitet u nekoliko aspekata: 1) njezini povijesni prostor i vrijeme; 2) njezina društveno-kulturna uloga i karakter (obrazovni, jezični i nacionalno-politički); 3) njezine tradicije i međupovezanost; 4) ideja hrvatske filozofije. Posebna se pozornost posvećuje razlici između pogleda Franje pl. Markovića na hrvatsku filozofiju i sadašnjega stanja istraživanja. Naposljetku, razmatraju se korijeni hrvatske filozofije u trenutku prijelaza iz mita u kršćanstvo i u uvodnim refleksijama Povelje kneza Trpimira.

Ključne riječi: hrvatska filozofija, korpus hrvatske filozofije, identitet, kontinuitet, obrazovanje, tradicija, utjecaji, Franjo pl. Marković, Trpimir

⁵⁶ See Franjo pl. Marković, “Dom i svijet” [The home and the world], in *Iz mladih dana* (Zagreb: Naklada Matica hrvatske, 1883), pp. 89–160, and “Logika: 1. Odsjek”. Cf. Kovač, “Dom i svijet hrvatske filozofije”.

⁵⁷ The adjective “Croatian” (“hrvatski”) and the noun “Croat” (“Hrvat”) themselves encode a more remote, pre-Slavic identity.