

UDK 32-05Mažuranić, I.
323.272(44)“1789“

Izvorni znanstveni rad / Original scientific paper

Primljeno 17. 2. 2024. / Received 17-02-2024

DOI: 10.38003/zrffs.17.5

Josip Miletić
Sveučilište u Zadru, Odjel za kroatistiku
HR-23000 Zadar, Ulica Mihovila Pavlinovića 1
jmiletic@unizd.hr
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1465-2793>

THE INFLUENCE OF THE IDEAS OF THE BOURGEOIS REVOLUTION IN FRANCE ON IVAN MAŽURANIĆ

Abstract

The French Revolution is the culmination of ideological and political confrontations of various groups with the *ancien régime*. Such groups were inspired primarily by the political philosophy of French enlighteners and encyclopedists, who described the principles of a new constitutional state (Sunajko 2008). The various constitutional models aimed at uniting free people into a community that would satisfy the principle of freedom as a basic and inalienable human right (Rodin 1989). Immediately after its outbreak, the Revolution had a negligible impact in Croatia, noticeably smaller than in the rest of the Habsburg Monarchy, where it was also of minor extent and meant freedom only for the nobility. After almost six decades a favorable revival climate was created in Croatia and a great figure who could valorize this rose on the Croatian political scene. His name was Ivan Mažuranić, writer and future ban commoner. This paper analyzes how the ideas of the Revolution influenced Mažuranić's work. Particular attention is given to his political writings *Hrvati Mađarom* [*Croatians to Hungarians*] and *Manifest naroda hrvatsko-slavonskog* [*Manifesto of the Croatian-Slavonian People*], published in the revolutionary year of 1848, when Mažuranić was inspired by revolutionary ideas. After that, he turned completely to politics, in a response to the Hungarian hegemonic demands toward the Croats and other non-Hungarian peoples from March and April 1848, whereby the Hungarians referred exclusively to their historical right. Accepting the ideas of the Revolution and the then views of Croatian revivalists, Mažuranić refers to the natural rights as well. He advocates the freedom and equality of Croats and their fundamental historical and natural national rights, including the right to equality of Croatian. Moreover, he advocates the language equality of all peoples in the Monarchy. As a true Christian, he condemns the feudal social order, thus reconciling Christian motives and libertarian ideas.

Key words: French Revolution, Ivan Mažuranić, language equality, political ideas and writings

1. Introduction

Croatian writer and poet, revivalist, lawyer, polyglot, translator and politician Ivan Mažuranić left a remarkable trace on the entire range of social fields. He is

considered to be one of the pioneers of liberalism in Croatia and one of its most important statesmen of the 19th century. During the Croatian Revival Period, he gained the reputation of being the most renowned writer of the generation (Barišić 2017: 438). His literary genius deserves even greater appreciation in the context of the claim by Mijo Krešić, one of the supporters of the movement, saying that no other man of the pen, before or after the Revival, gained such a reputation. Moreover, writers were viewed with “pious awe”, while a published literary work would give the author a greater social reputation than the noble origin (Horvat 1990: 68, as ctd. in Barišić 2017: 438). Mažuranić consciously sacrificed his exceptional literary talent and devoted himself to public service, estimating that this would be more beneficial to his people and his homeland. When it comes to rising from peasant roots to the honor of a ban, many will compare his ascent in the social hierarchy of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy to the achievements of the celebrated Roman *hominum novorum* (new people), who from the plebeian circles managed to gain the highest public honors and become Roman consuls (Barišić 2017: 442). Mažuranić never allowed his success to make him vain or alienated from his own people, whom he greatly respected and whose efforts he had striven for throughout his life. Moreover, he performed the most responsible state duties modestly and humbly, considering them a huge burden that he would gladly get rid of. He spent his whole life on the edge of poverty, borrowing money not only from his relatives and friends, but also from moneylenders, never thinking for a single moment of abusing his public office for corruption and personal enrichment. For this reason, in parallel with holding the highest state duties, in permanent fear of poverty, he took care of family affairs, such as buying vineyards, selling wine, timely settling his bills, etc. (Živančević 1988: 115, as ctd. in Miletić 2022: 222).

Mažuranić was born in Novi on August 11, 1814, at the time of the final fall of the Napoleon’s Empire (Živančević 1988: 16), in the year which, according to some theorists, marks the end of the Bourgeois Revolution in France (Sunajko 2008: 28). His father Ivan had participated in the liberation of southern and trans-Sava Croatia from the French occupation forces a year earlier (Pavličević 1999: 10). It was precisely the ideas of the French Revolution that greatly influenced the formation of the philosophical and political attitudes of the future first Croatian ban commoner and launched him into the world of high politics. The turning point of his life is the publication of the famous writings from the revolutionary year of 1848 under the titles *Hrvati Mađarom* [*Croatians to Hungarians*] and *Manifest naroda hrvatsko-slavonskog* [*Manifesto of the Croatian-Slavonian People*], which Mažuranić wrote inspired by these ideas and then turned entirely to politics. In this paper, we will analyze the influence of the ideas of the bourgeois revolution on Ivan Mažuranić, which is best seen precisely in the aforementioned writings, which advocate the equality of Croats, but also the rights of other peoples as well as the equality of all languages within the Monarchy.

Only two weeks after the publication of the famous piece of writing *Hrvati Mađarom* ban Josip Jelačić invited Karlovac-based lawyer Ivan Mažuranić to join him in Zagreb and became one of his closest collaborators (Szabo 2014: 4). The two municipalities of Cvetkovići and Draganići followed the example and, without his knowledge,

elected Mažuranić their representative in the first Croatian parliament of citizens (Pavličević 1999: 21-22, as ctd. in Miletić 2022: 221).

Historians claim that “he is particularly significant for the liberal reforms accepted in the Croatian Parliament at the time of his holding the office (1873–1880), which represented a key intervention in the modernization of Croatian society. The laws passed at that time adopted the modern principles of government organization” (Cipek and Vrandečić 2004: 95).

2. *The Bourgeois Revolution in France*

There is a quote from Hobsbawm mentioned in Gross: “(...) revolutions are, we could say, lenses that direct and magnify all history, they are microcosms of society and its transformations, and therefore not a single area of human life lies outside the field of view of historians of revolution. E. J. Hobsbawm” (Gross 1976: 47).

Half a century before the beginning of the French Revolution, there were early signs of confrontation between numerous ideological and political groups with the old regime (*ancien régime*) that made many different and ambivalent claims inspired by the philosophy of politics of the men of French Enlightenment and encyclopedists, who in their writings enacted the principles of the new constitutional state. They emphasized Montesquieu’s division of power, Voltaire’s deism and tolerance, and Rousseau’s theory of a democratic republic based on the sovereignty of the people principle (Sunajko 2008: 32; enciklopedija.hr). Their constitutional models offered the possibility of uniting free people into a community that would be able to satisfy the principle of freedom as a fundamental and inalienable human right (Rodin 1989: 7).

The republican form of government does not appear for the first time in history within the framework of the French Revolution, but presents an old European heritage. The abolition of the monarchy and the introduction of a republican form of government was already known in ancient Greece and Rome, later in England under Cromwell, but the French Revolution had the widest impact on the events on the continent and in the world marking a historical and social turning point (Kale 1989: 66–68).

Bourgeois revolutions tried several indivisible sources of direct sovereignty: God, the people, and the tyrant. The French Revolution differs from all the previous revolutions (American, English, Dutch, Lutheran) in the universality of its principle of freedom, which permeates all forms of human relation to the world, but also in its universal separation from the previous form of historical life. The very beginning of the revolution indicated that its most significant problem was how to curb freedom, and not how to get rid of slavery (Rodin 1989: 6–21).

The Bourgeois Revolution in France was preceded by the despotic rule of Louis XIV (1643–1715). The King established an absolute monarchy based on the divine law (*jure divino*). He centralized the legislative and executive branches in the institution of the monarch, while directly controlling the judicial branch (parliaments). Both the bourgeoisie class, affirming and seeking political rights and equality, and nobility and clergy, who did not want to easily lose their privileges, were equally dissatisfied by the absolutism (Sunajko 2008: 29). During the reign of Louis XV (1715–1774) the

economic and political positions of the three estates (clergy, nobility, bourgeoisie) gradually strengthened, especially the third estate of the bourgeoisie. In an effort to consolidate absolutism, the court seeks to strengthen the third estate (*tiers état*) through enlightening, thereby unconsciously opening up, ideological space to the revolutionary reflections of the men of enlightenment and encyclopedists, who got the opportunity for public criticism of the current social system (Sunajko 2008: 29). Rousseau was a theoretician of direct democracy or dictatorship, in which the holder of sovereignty, that is, the people, can deprive any citizen of legal protection making them the object of political repression by the masses who would not hesitate to kill them (Rodin 1989: 9). Accepting Rousseau as his teacher, Robespierre emphasized the following in his speech held before the Convention on 25 December 1793: "The Revolution is the war waged by liberty against its foes. The Constitution is the regime of victorious and peaceful freedom" (Rodin 1989: 7).

One of the main causes of the revolution is certainly the implementation of political activity and the developed awareness of the political necessity of involving people in political processes, expressed in the demands of the third estate, which, under the influence of J. J. Rousseau and his theory of sovereignty of the people, were noted in E. J. Sieyes' political writings entitled *Qu'est-ce que le tiers état* [*What is the Third Estate?*] published in 1789 (Sunajko 2008: 29).

The French Revolution was a distinctly heterogeneous period. Usually, it is considered to last from the Storming of the Bastille on 14 July 1789 to 1799 (Nujić 2011: 32), when Napoleon Bonaparte overthrew the government of the Directory by a military coup and assumed all power as the first consul (enciklopedija.hr). Sunajko (2008: 28) points out that the revolution consisted of a series of smaller, mutually opposing revolutions, each of which aimed to abolish the previous one and to annul its postulates and concrete interventions in the structure of the French political system. The author breaks the revolution as a whole into the events of 1789, when (by attacking the Bastille), through restricting the monarchical system, the absolute monarchy was transformed into a constitutional monarchy, followed by the establishment of the republic in 1792, and the Jacobin Reign of Terror from 1793 to 1794. According to some theorists, Napoleon's taking power in 1799 marks the ending of the revolution (Soboul), while according to others (Mignet) it lasts until the collapse of Napoleon's Empire (1804–1815) and the restoration of the system Sunajko (2008: 28).

Čepulo (2003: 18) states that the French revolution, in contrast to previous social movements, was modern in its reforms designed as a radical negation of the old. The author claims that, "unlike other regimes of that time, the French Revolution was founded on faith in progress based on human nature and reason, and on rational institutions consistent with abstract values while the old was equated with the bad" (Čepulo 2003: 18). At the time of the revolution, France already existed as a national state, unlike many other European states that still had to fight for that status and integration of the nation. The French could devote themselves to transforming an aristocratic state into a free state, inspired by the theory of natural right about the priority of individual rights before the state and defining the state as an institution whose basic goal is to protect and develop the rights of individuals (Čepulo 2003: 19).

It is essential to point out the achievements of the revolution. *The Decree Abolishing the Feudal System* introduced the abolition of feudal privileges (Kale 1989: 73) and the estate system, i.e., the feudal social hierarchy. On 26 August 1789, the National Constituent Assembly passed the famous *Déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen* [*Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen*], in which, among other things, freedom, individual political equality and inviolability of private property were declared inalienable human rights (Antoljak 1989: 211).

The Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen is the ideological platform and preamble of the Constitution of 1791, which expresses the basic postulates of the revolution of 1789. Its basic intention is to condemn the *ancien régime*, limit the state apparatus, bring the state closer to society, and affirm civic ideals as common human assets. It confirmed that equality and freedom, sovereignty of the people, individual autonomy and the limitation of the state by the control mechanism of the division of power were universal principles. Therefore, similar to the French revolution, it transcends its own boundaries and takes on epochal importance (Čepulo 1989: 164).

The Constitution of 1791 was replaced by the Jacobin Constitution of 1793, which sanctioned the principle of unity of power with the supremacy of the legislative body elected on the basis of universal suffrage and direct elections (Čepulo 1989: 165). The Declaration of 1789 as a preamble to the Constitution was replaced by a new one that removed the provision on the separation of powers, replacing it with a statement in Article 29 that the boundaries of "public functions must be clearly established by law" (Vile 1967: 192, as ctd. in Čepulo 1989: 165). The new Declaration establishes, among other things, the right to work, social assistance, education and the right to revolt, and unlike the 1789 Declaration, it recognizes the mutual duties of the individual and the state, which creates a basis for intervention in the sphere of individual autonomy (Čepulo 1989: 165).

On 21 September 1792 the National Convention decided to abolish the monarchy and establish the republic. The new Montagnard constitution of 24 June 1793 established a new political system based on the people as the totality of French citizens, on universal suffrage, equality of citizens, right to work and education, freedom of press and inviolability of private property (Sunajko 2008: 30–31). Kale (1989: 73) stresses that the French Revolution, with the slogan "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity" and the affirmation of the ideology of the natural rights of humanity, announced a completely new order on European soil with the free person and the citizen as an active subject. The liberal events in France during the revolution are paradigmatic for numerous other social movements that followed, which were instigated precisely by the French Revolution and regularly followed its pattern.

The French Revolution, among other things, introduced sovereignty of the people, a national and unitary state, a written constitution and the right to change it, a strict principle of legality, universal suffrage and electoral censuses, freedom of the press and new modalities of its control, separation of church and state, educated bureaucracy, republicanism, etc. (Čepulo 2003: 18).

During the revolution, a series of processes typical of the evolutionary direction of Western society were crystallized. The revolution brings a key social transformation,

especially in the political system, by inaugurating the principle of general inclusion, based on seeing the individual as the fundamental political subject. The natural understanding of human rights, as one of the basic projects of the revolution, was concisely expressed in the *Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen* from 1789. In addition to basic human rights, this document also contains a list of civil and political rights and freedoms, proclaims the sanctity of the separation of powers principle, which lays the foundation for the idea of complete political democracy and becomes the symbolic basis of modern society and the state, as well as a constant stimulus to contemporary social movements (Čepulo 1989: 161–162; Čepulo 2003: 19).

3. Echoes of the French Bourgeois Revolution in Croatia immediately after the Revolution

Even before the outbreak of the French Revolution, there were clear traces of a deep crisis of the feudal order in bourgeois Croatia, and the growth of the grain trade greatly favored the creation of a mercantile citizenry. Yet, immediately after the revolution, only rare individual cases of responding to the call of the revolution from France were recorded in Croatian society (Šidak 1973: 87).

In some Dubrovnik-based circles, there were discussions about these libertarian topics, which spread through banned books mostly problematizing religion. Warned by the Vatican, the government resolutely suppressed such actions. It should be mentioned that Juraj Antun Matutinović tried to gather the popular opposition against the rule of the nobility in Split, but without serious organizational success, as shown by the court proceedings against him in 1793. The three satires that appeared in public places in 1792 mentioning French people as a role model are brought into connection with him. When it comes to the intelligentsia of plebeian origin who were supporters of the social ideas of the French Revolution, we should also mention the chamber official Josip Kralj, a member of Martinović's secret society, who, in order to avoid arrest, committed suicide in early 1795. He was brought into direct connection with the Hungarian Jacobin conspiracy (Šidak 1973: 87–88).

The Catholic Church in the Habsburg Monarchy, especially in the part along the Danube, advocated for a complete state, in its dynastic and state-patriotic orientation. For the Church, the Monarchy, with its universalistic structure, was the only legitimate successor to the Holy Roman Empire. It recognized the people and nationality, but only if they did not take extreme chauvinist-racist positions or stand against state authority (Haselsteiner 1997: 89).

During the French rule in Dalmatia, the Church was subject to state power, which tended to secularize public life. Apart from the monasteries, all brotherhoods were abolished, so the authorities found themselves under attack not only from the Catholic clergy, whom they completely alienated from themselves through church reforms, but also from the broad masses of society, whose deep-rooted beliefs they tried to change overnight (Šidak 1973: 91). Furthermore, Antoljak claims that slogan of the French Bourgeois Revolution "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity!" in the revolutionary year of 1789 reached Croatia as well, but this primarily meant freedom "only for the nobility who, according to Verböczy, meant the people" (Antoljak 1989: 211), although the arbitrary behavior of Joseph II provided an opportunity for the slogan to fall on fertile soil here as well (Antoljak 1989: 211). Namely, at the time of the outbreak of the revolution, the reforms and absolutism of Joseph II were met

with fierce resistance (Šidak 1973: 88). Moreover, Šidak emphasizes: “In the ideas of the social contract and constitutional monarchy, the nobility found a powerful theoretical weapon in their struggle to maintain their own class positions. If they showed any understanding of social problems at all, they were satisfied with the thought of some patriarchal relationship towards the serfs or, in the best case, they expressed a willingness to take on part of the tax burden themselves” (Šidak 1973: 88). While in France the revolutionary movement brought freedom to peoples, “in Croatia and Hungary they cursed the Emperor Joseph II for giving the peasants freedom. The eternal fraternity with the Hungarians was to ensure freedom to the nobility, so that no king would ever overthrow it” (Antoljak 1989: 211; cf. Smičiklas 1878: 389, 390). In Croatia, the situation was even worse than in Hungary. There, for example, as early as in 1789, the Hungarian János Bacsányi spoke about the French Bourgeois Revolution in the poem “A franciaországi változásokra” [On French Changes], calling on peoples and states to free themselves from the shackles of slavery, following the French example (Antoljak 1989: 211):

Narodi, države! Koji u kavezu
 Stenjete sred mučnih robovskih lanaca,
 Vi, koji svoj jaram željezni do sada
 S vrata svog zbacili jošte ne mogoste,
 A i vi, čiju krv zakon pravde traži,
 Posvećeni, moćni krvnici kmetova,
 Hod'te! da sudbinu si unapr'jed vidite,
 Oči svoje s pažnjom u Pariz uprite!¹ (Bogdanov 1960: 57)

In a letter to his friend György Aranka, Bacsányi writes about the situation in Hungary and about the French Revolution: “Here they are very careful of the people who think in the French way; even people who soberly think and speak are shortly called Jacobins (...) I cannot conclude anything else from what I see and hear that is happening, but that in our country a revolution is inevitable...” (Bogdanov 1960: 58). While Bacsányi calls for a revolutionary liberation of peoples modeled on the Paris events through his verses and correspondence, in Croatia there is hardly any news about the events because the then Croatian nobility opposed new ideas and upheavals while at the same time coming into conflicts with the emperor and reformer Joseph II (Antoljak 1989: 212). In the tumultuous year of 1789, only one news emerged about revolutionary events in France. In a text entitled “Innländische Nachrichten”, the Zagreb-based newspaper *Kroatischer Korrespondent*² brings an extensive review from the

1 *Peoples, countries! Which in a cage
 You moan in the midst of torturous slave chains,
 You, who so far the yoke of iron
 Did not manage to throw off
 And you, whose blood the law of justice seeks,
 The holy ones, powerful executioners of the peasants,
 Come forward! to see your destiny in advance,
 Fix your eyes with care on Paris!* (Bogdanov 1960: 57)

The translation of quoted poems and other texts was done by I. D.

2 No XXI, Agram den 11 August 1789.

Vienna-based newspaper (*Wienerzeitung*) “about the libertine behavior of Parisian communion on the occasion of the latest commotion, i.e., revolution, where the army had to act to appease the people” (Antoljak 1989: 212). The author of the article notes that only “General Esterhazy, although of Hungarian origin, in the service of the French king, dared to oppose the masses and therefore paid for it with his head” (Antoljak 1989: 212). He sees no possibility of similar revolutionary events in the black and yellow monarchy, explaining it as follows: “... if a descendant from Hungary did so out of love for the king who was not of his nationality, what should the Emperor Joseph II as a monarch expect from the people who worship him” (Antoljak 1989: 212). However, the love for the Emperor is only apparent, because the war with the Turks brought a drastic increase in taxes, causing dissatisfaction among the nobility, clergy and peasantry. All this was further encouraged by the violent methods of Hungarian Protestant ban Francisco Balassa de Gyarmath, who was imposed on Croats (Antoljak 1989: 212).

Aware of the possible uprising for the above reasons, the emperor Joseph II issued a Latin-language proclamation for all Hungarian-Croatian counties on 28 January 1790, immediately before his death, thereby withdrawing all his provisions, except for the patent on tolerance and emancipation, as well as the provisions of the hated ban Balassa de Gyarmath. He further announced the imminent convening of the Parliament and, as of 1 January of the current year, he ordered the return of the old conditions which he had found in Hungary and Croatia in 1780 after the death of his mother (Antoljak 1989: 212). This caused a flood of enthusiasm and patriotism in Hungary and Croatia so that no one wanted to speak other language than Hungarian in Hungary, and Croatian in Croatia (Antoljak 1989: 212–213; cf. *Memoiren des Grafen Adam Orssich de Szlavetich* 1869: 262–263).

One of the decisions of Joseph II was also to grant permission to bring the crown of St. Stephen from the Imperial Treasury of Vienna to Budapest (Antoljak 1989: 212). Patriotic enthusiasm and Croatian consciousness, well before the national revival, are evidenced by the then-printed folk-style poem in Croatian on the occasion of visiting the crown in Budim by a group of Croatian aristocrats and nobles (“Pisma od plemenite čete Horvatov u Budim za pohodit svetu krunu odlazećih” [A Poem by the Noble Crew of Croats Visiting the Holy Crown in Budim], 1790, in: Antoljak 1989: 213):

Veseli se ti Hrvatska ravna, mogu reći da si puno slavna. Svakojakim bogatstvom si sita i na glasu jur od mlogo lita. Ti si majka konja i konjika na oružju silenih vojnika. U Tebi se junaci rodiše koji tebe lipo zahodiše, kako zvizde nebo previsoko i zenica svako vidno oko. Kitne gore željno pramaliće ravna polja, travice i cvijeće – Tako oni naresiše tebe, mlogo više nego sami sebe. Tvoj je vitez Šubić ban Nikola kog se boja Turska sila ohola, Tvoj ban slavni Tomo Erdeodi, Gedeoana ki srićom nadhodi, još ostali junaci brez broja, O hrvatska, to je dika Tvoja.³

3 *The Plains of Croatia are looking forward to you, I can say that you are famous all through. You are wealthy, you are strong, they have spoken of you since long ago. You are the mother of horses on our farms and of horsemen, our mighty soldiers in arms. You gave birth to our heroes who rise just like stars high in the sky, just like pupil in the seeing eye. Flaming hills, desired spring, our plains, grass and flowers – they adorned you with all their powers. Our Šubić ban Nikola is your knight, who gives the vain Turkish force fright, Your famous ban Tomo Erdeodi, who in front of Gedeoan does not hide, other numerous heroes, Oh Croatia, they are your pride.*

Mainly courage, patriotism and wealth of Croatian nobles are praised.

After the death of Joseph II, in 1790 Leopold II came to the throne. The Croatian nobility, led by Bishop Maximilian Vrhovec of Zagreb, directed all their energy to prevent the return of the hated ban Balass de Gyarmath, who fled Zagreb after the provisions of Joseph II. They succeeded in bringing a new ban, i.e., count Ivan Erdödy, while knowing nothing about the development of the French Revolution nor showing particular interest in these events (Antoljak 1989: 213).

It is worth mentioning that before the outbreak of the 1848 revolution, there was no freedom of the press in Banska Hrvatska. In its entire territory, only two political newspapers were published, of course, in Zagreb: *Novine dalmatinsko-horvatsko-slavonske* and *Agramer Zeitung*. Their editors had to work and live in very difficult circumstances. They were under strict censorship and double pressure. On the one hand, the conservative Austrian government tried to impose their influence, and on the other hand, the Hungarian Council of Governors tried to promote their interests (Markus 1998: 577).

Čepulo (2003: 51) states that the European environment was significant for the processes in Austria and Hungary. He notes that “until 1848, and especially after the interruption of the Josephine reforms in 1790, that is, with regard to Hungary’s subservient position towards the Court of Vienna, the development of institutions in these countries was characterized by lagging behind the Western Europe which was largely under the influence of France Revolution” (Čepulo 2003: 51).

4. Echoes of the ideas of the French Revolution in the writings of Ivan Mažuranić

Almost six decades passed from the beginning of the French Revolution when a favorable revival climate was created in Croatia and the Croatian political scene got a great political figure who knew how to adequately valorize this. The influence of the ideas of the Bourgeois Revolution on Mažuranić was first mentioned by Montenegrin philologist Vojislav Nikčević, upon analyzing his article “O sveslavenskom jeziku” [On the Panslavic Language], in which the Croatian poet rebelled against the conclusion of the Matrix Illyrian Assembly of 27 February 1851, on the founding of the Panslavic language (Nikčević 1986).

On 23 October 1847, the Croatian Parliament unanimously passed a decision on declaring the language of the people, i.e., Illyrian Štokavian, a “diplomatic” language (Šidak 1990: 161), in other words, on introducing Croatian as an official language in public use. At the beginning of 1848, the Hungarian Parliament passed the:

legal basis “on the Hungarian language and nationality” [...] Contrary to the conclusion of the Croatian Parliament on the language of the people as official in the entire territory of Croatia and Slavonia, this basis only allowed Croatian counties to continue using the Latin language for its internal regulation, and it set a deadline of six years for the Slavonian counties which should accept the Hungarian language as the exclusive official language after this period. For the so-called The Hungarian Coast (Rijeka with Vinodol), on the other hand, the Parliament allows only the use of the Italian language in addition to the Hungarian language. For administration with Hungarian districts, the official language should, of course, be exclusively Hungarian. (Šidak 1990: 162)

Mažuranić participated in the well-known National Assembly held on 25 March 1848 at the National Home in Zagreb, where the 30-point Narodna zahtjevanja [People's Demands] were accepted. This was a Croatian political, economic, social and cultural program aimed at protecting against the onslaught of aggressive Hungarian nationalism and the feudal organization of the Monarchy, influenced precisely by the ideas of the French Bourgeois Revolution. It called for, *inter alia*, the abolition of the feudal system, the unification of all Croatian countries, the separation of the Croatian from the Hungarian government, the appointment of Josip Jelačić as ban (Pavličević 1999: 20–21). Mažuranić was also a member of a delegation that presented the people's desires to the King personally. Since most of the requests were not accepted, he returned disappointed to Karlovac and created his own, as it would turn out to be, landmark, the epistle entitled *Hrvati Mađarom*. The epistle analyzes in more detail the basic political thoughts of Narodna zahtjevanja (Šidak 1973: 283). This was a response to the Hungarian proclamations of March and April of the revolutionary year of 1848, in which they, in their hegemonic claims to Croats and other non-Hungarian peoples, relied exclusively on historical right. The text was printed on 10 April 1848, at the printing house of Ivan Nepomuk Prettner in Karlovac, and shortly afterward a translation into Hungarian was published in Zagreb at the printing house of Franjo Župan (Pavličević 1999: 21; Barišić 2015: 406). In a letter to his brother Antun from 19 April of the same year, he asks him to arrange for the distribution of 336 copies sent to him and try to persuade the county prefect to print translation for German audience and "novine zagrebačke niemačke"⁴ because "nebi zlo bilo da saznadu i Niemci, ugarski i neugarski, kako mi pojmujemo jednakost, slobodu i bratinstvo ne samo osobah nego i narodah"⁵ (Mažuranić 1979b: 75).

The epistle was undoubtedly written under the influence of Mickiewicz, whose passages from a prophetic prose with Biblical references were translated by Mažuranić in his youth (Frangješ 1963: 84; Šidak 1973: 283; Živančević 1988: 122). Yet, Mickiewicz did not overshadow Mažuranić's poetic personality (Šidak 1973: 283). Frangješ (1963: 84) believes that Mažuranić, unlike Mickiewicz and Lamennais, whose mysticism fully corresponds to Mažuranić's words, rejects mysticism because "he is not by nature a mystic, his religiosity is the practical faith of a hardworking man from Primorje. Mažuranić uses the Bible, its imagery and rhythm, exclusively for the purpose of conveying the content [...] For Mažuranić, Biblical rhythm and metaphors are above all a craft,⁶ they present the need to fulfill the desire for 'prophecy' that he talks about in his letter to his brother Antun" (Frangješ 1963: 85): "Kad sve ove naloge i poslove svèršiš, a svèršit ćeš, ako bog da, lako za jedan dan svekoliko, tad dodji, molimo te svi lijepo, za ove blagdane amo k nam da se o golemom ovom novom svijetu, štono nam se evo pred očima otvorio, porazgovorimo i o bližnjoj budućnosti domovine naše naprorokujemo [...]"⁷ (Frangješ 1963: 73–74).

4 Zagreb and German newspapers.

5 *It would not be bad for the Germans, Hungarian and non-Hungarian alike, to find out how we understand equality, freedom and fraternity not only of persons but also peoples.*

6 Frangješ's claims should certainly be taken with a grain of salt, because all publications created during socialist Yugoslavia had to have a certain ideological patina. This was especially the case with religious issues, as religion in the state was officially considered "opium for the masses."

7 *When you finish all these orders and tasks, and you will finish them, God willing, easily in one day, then come, we all beg you, come to us for holidays to talk about this vast new world, which has opened before our eyes, let's talk and prophesy about the near future of our homeland [...].*

Unlike the Hungarians, who in their claims referred to historical rights, Mažuranić, following the ideas of the French Bourgeois Revolution and the current views of the Croatian revivalists, also called for the natural rights of the people.

The political writing entitled *Hrvati Mađarom* symbolically begins with the motto of the French Revolution: "Liberté, égalité, fraternité!" (Mažuranić 1979a: 181). Mažuranić will paraphrase this slogan in the introductory part of the text as well, opposing it to the Hungarians' effort to subjugate all other nations through their language: "Jednakost i sloboda općenita' ori se po Parizu, zamnija po Beču, razlijege se po Pešti."⁸ (Mažuranić 1979a: 182), adding further: "Jednakošću i slobodom odaziva se Ugarska s pridruženijem kraljevinami, odgovara sva Austrija, odjekuje ukupna Europa"⁹ (Mažuranić 1979a: 182).

After the introduction, the first part will begin in the same tone: "Jednakost, sloboda i bratinstvo za sve pod krunom ugarskom živeće narode i jezike"¹⁰ (Mažuranić 1979a: 183), and it will continue as follows:

Zakonom dakle ustanovit valja da u Ugarskoj i stranah ne ima gospodujućega ni naroda ni jezika nikakova. Svako bo gospodstvo isključuje jednakost, isključuje slobodu, isključuje bratinstvo. Između sluge i gospodara, roba i gospodina ne ima jednakosti, ne ima bratinstva. Ne ima blagoslova nego prokletstvo. A prođe već evo vijek preimućstva ne samo osoba, nego i naroda i jezika. Biljege bo ovoga vijeka jest: uskrisivanje narodnosti, bratinstvo i sloboda naroda i jednakost jezika.¹¹ (Mažuranić 1979a: 183)

Thus, in the spirit of the libertarian ideas of the *Declaration on the Rights of Man and the Citizen*, which advocates the equality of all citizens before the law (Kale 1989: 67), he strongly advocates the equality and freedom of all peoples and languages of the Monarchy.

As a true Christian and Catholic, Mažuranić, in condemning the feudal social order, manages to reconcile the motives of Christianity and the libertarian ideas of the French Bourgeois Revolution. For him, equality and freedom are holy words like the Gospel, and unfortunately, they still do not fall on fertile ground:

Jednakost i sloboda, dvije svete riječi izuštene i upućene pod kraj prošastoga vijeka, nezrelu jošte svijetu; okupane u krvi despotizmom najprije bezvladnijem i krvožednijem, poslije samovladnijem i vojničkim; ukopane sasna rukama krunjenijeh kukavicah Ludovika XVIII. i Karla X.¹² (Mažuranić 1979a: 182)

8 *Equality and freedom in general is echoed in Paris, resounds in Vienna, and spreads in Pest.*

9 *With equality and freedom Hungary responds with the associated kingdoms, all Austria joins, echoes the whole Europe.*

10 *Equality, Freedom and Fraternity for all living peoples and languages under the Hungarian Crown.*

11 *It should be, therefore, established by law that there should be no ruling people nor language in Hungary and around. For every rule excludes equality, excludes freedom, excludes fraternity. There is no equality between servant and lord, slave and master, no fraternity. There is no blessing but a curse. And now there has been a century of advantage not only for persons, but also for peoples and languages. The hallmark of this century is: the resurrection of nationalities, fraternity and freedom of nations, and equality of languages.*

12 *Equality and freedom, two holy words expressed and directed by the end of the last century, to our yet immature world; bathed in blood with despotism, first the more anarchical and bloodthirsty, followed by the more authoritative and military; buried with the hands of the crowned cowards of Louis XVIII and Charles X.*

The resurrection of equality and freedom of the people is compared to Christ's resurrection from the grave. The popular movements of the tumultuous 1848 will be compared with the heavenly force from which the Roman soldiers fell due to the supernatural movement of the gravestone, while the proclamation of freedom will be compared with the message of love and equality of Christ the Savior:

...i čuvane u grobu svetogrdnijem oružjem europskoga peterovladstva; pošto od straha glasa narodnoga uzdrktaše ovi stražari i postadoše kao mrtvi, – uskršnjuju opet kao spasitelj dobitnice iz rake svoje ter se u slici ljepšoj i sjajnijoj ukažu učenicom svojim, božanstvenijem svojim glasom veleći jim: "Idite i naučite sve narode, budeći jih u ime jednakosti, slobode i bratinstva; učeći jih da sve drže što vam zapovijedismo; i evo mi smo s vami u sve dane do svršetka svijeta."¹³ (Mažuranić 1979a: 182)

Frangeš (1963:87) notices not only a stylistic affinity of Mažuranić's epistle with the Bible, but also a skillful use of the Biblical text: "in the dawn of political freedoms, instead of the Gospel sentence: 'Baptizing them in the name of the father, the son, and the holy spirit', he puts forward his political program: 'awakening them in the name of equality, freedom and fraternity', and ends with an almost literal citing of the Biblical text for his own purposes, thereby giving his text the character of prophesy, which is what he most strived for" (Frangeš 1963: 87).

He also announces tumultuous events in his homeland: "Nebeski glas ovaj dospje već, vjerujte, i do nas. Nikad se nije glušio Hrvat od poziva slobode, a ne gluši se ni danas"¹⁴ (Mažuranić 1979a: 182).

Manifest naroda hrvatsko-slavonskog is an official document dated 5 June 1848, addressing the Croatian Parliament, "in order for the Parliament to take a stand towards the Hungarians who strived for Jelačić's removal and obtaining an independent ministry from Vienna which should govern Banska Hrvatska and Slavonia" (Cipek and Vrandečić 2004: 95). In that document, Mažuranić explains the historical and natural rights of the people: "Dva gledišta ima, s kojih se gibanja svih naroda smatrati mogu: jedno je gledište naravnog, a drugo historičkog prava. *Glavna je naša namjera slobodnim narodom u slobodnom austrijskom carstvu biti.* Ma s kog od rečena dva gledišta se naša stvar uzela, svakako se odobriti mora [...] *Prirodno pravo* uvijek ostaje najveće pravo, jer je u prirodi osnova i temelj svakoga prava."¹⁵ (Mažuranić 1979: 211). Moreover, he describes in detail the historical position of

13 ... and kept in the grave by the sacrilegious weapons of European five-side rule; after the guards were shaken by the fear of the voice of the people, and appeared dead; – they rise again like our savior from his grave to show more beautiful and shiny to their disciples, saying in a divine voice: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, wakening them up in the name of the equality, freedom and fraternity; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever we have commanded you: and, lo, we are with you always, even unto the end of the world."

14 This heavenly voice has already come, believe us, here as well. Croat has never turned a deaf ear to the call of freedom, and he will not do it today either.

15 There are two points of view from which the movements of all peoples can be considered: one is the point of view of natural right, and the other is of historical right. Our main intention is to be a free people in the free Austrian empire. No matter from which of the two points of view our case is considered, it must be approved [...] Natural right always remains the greatest right, because nature is the basis and foundation of every right.

the Croatian people and Croatia in the kingdom, which the Hungarians are trying to change by a unilateral decision. He points out: "Ko postupanje mađarskoga naroda sproću drugih nemađarskih, osobito sproću slavenskih naroda poznaje, morao bi naše težnje za slobodom odobriti, da i nije na tako nazvanom zakonitom historičkom temelju osnovano. Jer je svakog naroda prva najveća dužnost svoju slobodu, svoju narodnost tj. svoj život braniti i uzdržati."¹⁶ (Mažuranić 1979a: 215). Thus, in addition to the historical, he also relies on the natural rights of people, in accordance with the basic principles of the French Revolution.

Thus, in *Manifest naroda hrvatsko-slavonskog*, Mažuranić sees the nation as a collective person with its natural rights to freedom, equality and fraternity. Accordingly, in his first speech in Parliament in 1848, he mentioned the "Croatian people" in the context of defining relations with the Hungarians. For pragmatic reasons, he advocated that in the negotiations with the Hungarians priority be given to the legitimist basis, so instead of the "Croatian people" they should enter the negotiations as a "kingdom" with the aim of including Vojvodina. He also advocates a linguistic criterion to ensure the entry of Međimurje into the Croatian borders (Miletić 2022: 228).¹⁷

The question of nation states was one of the main preoccupations of all liberal parties, especially in Central Europe, where all liberal parties were also national parties. The members of Mažuranić's People's Party were characterized by a combination of liberalism and romantic nationalism (Gross and Szabo 1992: 160–161). Accordingly, Gross and Szabo (1992: 160–161) conclude: "in European countries, the liberal ideology of the civil intelligentsia played an exceptional role in national integration movements, and vice versa, growing national consciousness and action influenced the acceptance of civil liberalism and achieved an increasingly greater role in the self-understanding of the citizenry." On the other hand, the "'Foreigners' who tried to prevent the advancement of Croats [...] towards modern society were precisely members of the German and Italian liberal citizenry and the Hungarian nobility. Although they proclaimed liberal principles, they implemented them only within the narrow framework of their own interests" (Gross and Szabo 1992: 161). Cipek and Matković conclude that Hungarian liberals were no different: "Hungarian liberals were born as a party of radical reforms which were supposed to integrate the Hungarian people into a modern nation and form an independent Hungarian state. Therefore, their liberalism with the ideas of sovereignty of the people, separation of powers, civil rights, free market, etc. primarily had the function of emancipating the Hungarian nation. Hungarian liberals proved the thesis that 19th century liberalism went hand in hand with nationalism. Therefore, liberal ideas were

16 *He who knows how Hungarian people treat non-Hungarians, especially Slavic people, should approve our strive for freedom, even if this was not founded on the thus called lawful historical basis. For every nation's first and foremost duty is to defend and maintain its freedom, its nationality, that is, its life.*

17 Cf. Čepulo, D. 2019. "Mažuranićeve reforme 1873.–1880.: modernizacija kao izgradnja države i nacije" [Mažuranić's Reforms of 1873–1880: Modernization as State and Nation Building], in Dalibor Čepulo, Tea Rogić Musa, Drago Roksandić (eds.), *Intelektualac, kultura, reforma: Ivan Mažuranić i njegovo vrijeme. Zbornik radova sa znanstvenog skupa održanoga u Zagrebu 5. studenoga 2014.* [Intellectual, Culture, Reform: Ivan Mažuranić and His Age: Proceedings from the Scientific Conference held in Zagreb on November 5, 2014] (pp. 1–72), Zagreb: Pravni fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu; Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, p. 12; Horvat, R. 1930, "Ban Ivan Mažuranić. O 40-godišnjici smrti njegove" [Ban Ivan Mažuranić: On the 40th Anniversary of His Death], *Hrvatsko kolo*, II, p. 51; Živančević, M. 1988. *Ivan Mažuranić*, Novi Sad – Zagreb: Matica srpska – Globus, pp. 85–88 (as ctd. in Miletić 2022: 228).

dosed 'properly' only to the extent that they did not threaten the power of the Hungarian elite, and they turned the principles of the citizens, the so-called "Hungarian political people", into a means of Hungarianization" (Cipek and Matković 2006: 36).

Contrary to the prevailing beliefs in Pest that national problems will be solved only if individual freedoms are achieved (Šidak 1973: 283), Mažuranić points out the following: "A može osoba biti na izliku slobodna a podjarmljen narod. Velimo 'na izliku samo' jer istine osoba slobode ne ima do one koja izvire iz slobode narodne, drugom riječi neodvisnosti naroda"¹⁸ (Mažuranić 1979: 188, as ctd. in Šidak 1973: 283). Mažuranić continues: "Varate se dakle ako mislite da ste oslobodili narod ako ste oslobodili osobu, ili da ste oslobodili osobu ako ste oslobodili narod. Ine bo želje i potreštine imadu osebe kao osebe, a ine kao udi živi i članovi živi naroda svoga. Zajedno dakle oboje učinit valja, jer je jedno bez drugoga polovično i nepravo i nenaravno. A polovičnost svaka popunit će se, a nepravda svaka ispraviti će se, a nenaravnost svaka naravi će svoje mjesto ustupiti"¹⁹ (Mažuranić 1979: 188, as ctd. in Šidak 1973: 283). He explains this more concretely in the following way: "Jer laže koji veli da narod nije ništa ino do gromada osoba i pojedinijeh ljudi. Koji to kaže, taj uzima u račun samo tijelo a duha ne uzima. I račun njegov stoji i valja samo o narodu mrtvu. Ali gdje su, kao u Ugarskoj našoj, narodi živi a ne mrtvi, probuđeni a ne spavaćivi, tu narod nije gomila ljudi, nego jedna jedina, u sebi omeđana, samoznana, golema osobnost, prema kojoj su pojedini ljudi ono što prema tijelu pojedini članci"²⁰ (Mažuranić 1979: 188, prema Šidak 1973: 283). Therefore, he concludes that the spirit of the new age does not only demand the abolition of the "boljarovlada (aristocracy) of persons", but also the "boljarovlada of the people" (Mažuranić 1979: 186, as ctd. in Šidak 1973: 283; Frangeš 1963: 79). He will apostrophize and radically condemn the Hungarian suppression of other languages and national identities: "Oni su sve narode gnjeli i gonili, narivajući jim u silu boga svoj jezik – oni u Ugarskoj nikog drugog naroda do mađarskog priznavali nisu, ime Slaven dobilo je u njih značenje poruge, poruge koja je padala na narod za našu ukupnu otadžbinu najzaslužniji, – jednom riječi oni su propast i grob svim inim narodima i narodnostima pripravljali, nad kojim se gospodujuće kao od Boga jedino na to pozvano i izabrano mađarstvo u trijumfu podiglo"²¹ (Mažuranić 1979: 215, as ctd. in Miletić 2022: 228–299).

18 *And a person may be on the pretext free, but the people subjugated. I say "only on the pretext", for a person cannot have true freedom but the one originating from the freedom of the people, in other words, the independence of the people.*

19 *So you are mistaken if you think you have liberated a people if you have liberated a person, or that you have liberated a person if you have liberated a people. For persons as persons have different desires and needs, and different as living limbs and living members of their people. Therefore, both should be done together, because one without the other is partial and wrong and unnatural. And every partiality shall be complete, and every injustice shall be righted, and everything that is unnatural shall give its place to the natural.*

20 *Because he lies who says that a people is nothing but a mass of individuals and individual people. Whoever says that takes into account only the body and not the spirit. And his account stands and is valid only for the dead people. But where, as in our Hungary, peoples are alive and not dead, awakened and not asleep, there the people is not a crowd of persons, but one single, self-contained, self-aware, immense personality, to which individual people are what individual parts are to the body.*

21 *They oppressed and persecuted all peoples, forcing their language on them by the force of God – they did not recognize any other people in Hungary but the Hungarians, the Slav name took on the meaning of a mockery, the mockery of the people most deserving for our entire homeland, – in a word, they prepared the downfall and the grave for all other peoples and nationalities, over which the ruling Magyaranism, as if called and chosen by God, rose in triumph.*

Advocating for the right of all peoples of the Kingdom to use their standard language freely in official correspondence, in the court and in the official state offices, he would point out that the Hungarians “u prijedlogu zakona ‘O mađarskom jeziku i narodnosti’, još uoči reforme učinjenom mađarski jezik za jedini jezik zakonotvorstva i javnog upravljanja, i za službeni jezik kako kod crkvenih tako i kod građanskih oblasti proglasili, tako ‘da ni jedno poslije proglašenja tog zakona u drugom kom jeziku sastavljeno službeno ili svjedodžbeno pismo nikakve vrijednosti imalo ne bi’²² (Mažuranić 1979a: 216). Therefore, in the text entitled *Hrvati Mađarom* he asks logical questions: “Da li je Mađar bolji od Nijemca? da li Nijemac bolji od Slavenina? da li Slavenin bolji od Vlaha?²³”²⁴ (Mažuranić 1979a: 184). And he gives rhetorical replies: “Po naravi doista nije, a zašto da bude po zakonu?”²⁵ (Mažuranić 1979a: 184). He will ironically ask: “Ili morda dužnosti Mađar imade od Nijemca veće? ovaj od Slavenina? taj napokon od Vlaha? Ako nije tako, reći će, zašto da jedan od naroda bude tuđin u vlastitoj domovini i Zašto da jezik jednoga uživa sva prava, a drugi ako hoće da svojijem ili piše ili govori, da se mora pred državom, domovinom svojom, sakrivati da toga radi ne sagriješi nasuprot zakona i ne bude kriv sudu?”²⁶ (Mažuranić 1979a: 184). He proposes the only possible solution in the libertarian spirit of the French Revolution, specifically the *Declaration on the Rights of Man and the Citizen*, according to which no one can be prevented from thinking and believing and everyone accordingly has the freedoms of speech, writing and publishing (Kale, 1989: 67): “Za jednake dužnosti pravo je da se uživaju i prava jednaka. U svom dakle jeziku poslove svoje i posebne i javne bez iznimke, nek vodi Mađar, nek vodi Slovak, nek vodi Hrvat, Slavonac i Srblijin, nek vodi Vlah, nek vodi Nijemac. Govori i pisma i dopisi svijeh ovijeh naroda nek imadu u državi jednaku valjanost pred svakijem poglavarstvom i sudom”²⁷ (Mažuranić 1979a: 184). His final proposal is almost identical to the 1974 constitutional changes in the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, which regulated the procedure for publishing laws and regulations in authentic texts in the languages of the peoples of Yugoslavia, influenced by the *Declaration on the Name and Status of the Croatian Literary Language* (cf. Miletić 2019: 68–69; Miletić 2020: 226-241): “Za svaki od spomenutih naroda nek se izdaju zakoni pisani u jeziku njegovu, imajući za nj krijepest izvornika”²⁸ (Mažuranić 1979a: 184). He finds arguments for this precisely in the French Revolution: “Na stranu dakle s idejama vijeka staroga o preimućtvu ovoga ili onoga naroda ili jezika. Jer kako

22 *In the draft law “On Hungarian Language and Nationality”, even before the reform made the Hungarian language the sole language of lawmaking and public administration, and the official language of both the ecclesiastical and the civic realms, so that “no official letter or certificate written in another language would have any value after the promulgation of this law.”*

23 Here he refers to a Romanian.

24 *Is a Hungarian better than a German? Is a German better than a Slav? Is a Slav better than a Vlach?*

25 *By nature he really is not, and why should he be by law?*

26 *Or perhaps a Hungarian has more duties than a German? And this one from a Slav? And the latter finally from Vlach? If not, they say, why one of the peoples should be a stranger in their own homeland and why one should enjoy all the rights of the other, and the other if he wants to write or speak in his own language, why must he hide in front of the state, his homeland, so that he does not sin against the law, and is not found guilty before the court?*

27 *For equal duties, it is right to enjoy equal rights. In their own language, therefore, both special and public business should be led, without exception, by Hungarian, by Slovak, by Croat, by Slavonian and by Serb, by Vlach, by German. The speeches and letters and notes of all these peoples should have equal validity in the state before every government and court.*

28 *For each of the aforementioned peoples, laws written in their own language should be issued, having the virtue of the original.*

narodi, tako i svi jezici stvoreni su od naravi jednijem pravom i jednoga uzroka, to jest porazumljenja radi. (...) Jer zakoni naravni jedni su"²⁹ (Mažuranić 1979a: 183–187). His reflections on the relationship between rulers and people show the spirit of the ideas of the French Bourgeois Revolution to abolish the estate system, that is, the feudal social order: "Jer je pravično da se poglavar ravna po narodu, a ne narod po poglavaru. Čvrsta volja i ljubav pravde nadvlada teškoću ma još toliku, ali naravi nikada. Gazit narav donjekle moreš, ali pogaziti nikad. A narav gazi i laž brani koji tvrdi da je narod poglavara radi, ne poglavar naroda radi"³⁰ (Mažuranić 1979a: 185).

He will say the following to the aggressive Hungarian nationalists: "A razdor i omraza ne dolikuju ovome vijeku koji valja da diše duhom jednakosti, slobode i bratinstva, a ne preimućstva, jarma i nesloge. Cjelovitost dakle potpuna Hrvatskoj, Slavonskoj i Dalmatinskoj kraljevini našoj"³¹ (Mažuranić 1979a: 190). He sends a serious message to them: "Jer zaista onaj Ugarske naše dio koji je slavenski, mađarski nije, i koji je vlaški, mađarski nije, i koji je njemački, mađarski nije"³² (Mažuranić 1979a: 192). He will ask ironically: "A i kojijem pravom ugarska zemlja i sveta joj kruna mađarske da budu? ugarske da ne budu? Da l' pravom većine broja mađarskoga puka? da li pravom preimućstva kakova naravna ili upisana? da li napokon pravom njegdašnjega osvojenja?"³³ (Mažuranić 1979a: 192). The first does not count because they are a distinct minority in comparison to other peoples of the Monarchy, and the second does not count, "Jer vi po naravi niti ste bolji od inijeh narodah ugarskijeh glavom, ni mišicom, ni poštenjem, ni srcem. A preimućstva nenaravna a od vas upisana [...] Izbrisat će se istijem onim pravom kojijem vi onomadne izbrisaste preimućstva Austrie nad Ugarskom našom"³⁴ (Mažuranić 1979a: 192). He will also reject the third assumption in a revolutionary mood and express readiness for armed resistance to the expressed Magyar hegemony: "Jer koji se poziva na pravo osvojenja, na pravo se jačega poziva; a koji se poziva na pravo jačega, na mač se poziva; a onome koji se poziva na mač, mačem će se, vjerujte, kad ustreba odgovarati. I jaoh slabijemu u uri onoj. I jaoh onome koji mogaše u iskrnjem svojem steći brata, a nehtjedè pa steće neprijatelja"³⁵ (Mažuranić 1979a: 192).

29 Therefore, aside with the ideas of the old age about the advantage of this or that people or languages. For peoples and all languages are made by nature by one right and for one cause, that is, by reason of understanding. (...) For the laws of nature are one.

30 For it is fair that the ruler should act according to the people and not the people according to the ruler. The strong will and love of justice overcomes no matter how great a difficulty, but never the nature. You can stomp on nature to some extent, but you can never beat it. And he who claims that people exist for the ruler, and not the ruler for the people stomps on nature and defends a lie.

31 Discord and hatred do not suit this age, which is to breathe in the spirit of equality, freedom and fraternity, not advantage, yoke and disagreement. The completeness, therefore, to Croatian, Slavonian and Dalmatian kingdoms of ours.

32 For indeed, the part of our Hungary that is Slavic, Magyar is not, and which is Vlach, Magyar is not, and which is German, Magyar is not.

33 And by what right are the Hungarian country and its holy crown Magyar? And not Hungarian? By the right of the majority of the Magyar people? By the right of natural or written advantage? And finally, by the right of the old conquest?

34 Because you are by nature no better than other peoples of Hungary, neither with head, neither with muscle, with honesty, nor with heart. And unnatural advantage written by you [...] will be erased by the same right that you, at the time, erased Austria's advantage over our Hungary.

35 For he who refers to the right to conquer refers to the law of the stronger; and he who refers to the law of the stronger, refers to the sword; he who refers to the sword, trust me, will be responded by sword when needed. And woe to the weaker in that hour. And woe to him who could make a brother but did not want and thus made enemy.

The historians Cipek and Vrandečić emphasize that “the document was written in the circumstances of the structure of the Ban government and Jelačić’s preparations for war, when it became clear that a peaceful agreement with the Hungarians was impossible” (Cipek and Vrandečić 2004: 96). They conclude that “Starting from the principles of the French Revolution, according to which the rights of peoples stem from the natural rights of the individual, Mažuranić leaves the traditional framework of Croatian municipals and in an official parliamentary document advocates for the equality of the peoples of Austria, based on the natural right of every people to freedom and equality. Starting from these liberal principles, Mažuranić derives the principle that every people has a natural right to its national state, because only the state can provide sufficient protection for an unhindered political and economic life” (Cipek and Vrandečić 2004: 96).

Šidak (1973) divides Mažuranić’s political activity into three stages: the time of the revolutionary year 1848, the period of Bach’s absolutism and the 1860s, and finally the time of his holding the ban office in the 1870s. “The three stages are connected by the basic guiding thread of this liberal politician claiming that Croatia wins and secures the position that, in the real relationship of political forces, it can really achieve in each of those stages” (Šidak, 1973: 279–280, prema Gross, 1974: 132–133).

Gross supports the thesis of the English historian Hobsbawm who argues that revolutions, “dramatize key aspects of the social structure because they are strained here to the breaking point [...]” (Gross, 1976: 49, prema Hobsbawm, 1972: 20). The author is among the first ones to claim that historiography should be more focused on the research of social structures, that it should generalize without dealing only with unique individualities. He discusses how the French Revolution changes social structures, and therefore he analyzes different areas of the new society such as crafts and industry, the conditions at the countryside, the position of the nobility, the bourgeoisie, changes in diplomacy, warfare, administration, religion, philosophy, science, art, literature, etc. (Gross, 1976: 49).

It is worth mentioning how much the legacy of the French civil revolution reflected on Mažuranić’s contribution to the modernization of Croatian society. Taking upon himself the responsible duty of the first ban commoner, Ivan Mažuranić undertakes the mission of creating a modern Croatian state with the greatest possible autonomy within the framework of the Monarchy. His vision of a “legal state” required guaranteeing security and property, but also more efficient organization of administration and judiciary, legislation, modernization of production, education, as well as consolidation of national culture in all areas of life (Szabo 2014: 22–23, as ctd. in Miletić 2022: 233). The period in which Mažuranić performed the ban duties, “gave birth to a wide range of reforms by which previously inappropriate and partly archaic institutions, which were considered a brake on the development of Banska Hrvatska, were replaced by rational institutions based on Austrian laws and models present in developed countries” (Čepulo 2019: 1, prema Miletić 2022: 233). Gross and Szabo (1992: 370) note that “as an extremely well-educated bureaucrat, accustomed to systematic activity and a rational approach to problems, the new ban was perfect for continuous care of reforms. In addition, he tried to organize a competent government and cooperation with good experts.” They apostrophize Mažuranić’s merciless fight against corruption and his efforts to establish a legal state: “In contrast to the previous violence and illegalities, the ban wanted to implement a »legal and constitutional state«, the rule of

the law from top to bottom, for the sake of greater efficiency, cheaper administration and mitigation of corruption” (Gross and Szabo 1992: 370).

Čepulo (2003: 60) draws attention to the contribution of Ivan Mažuranić in the construction of the modern Croatian judiciary, “when the basis of the modern Croatian judiciary was completely (but not finally) regulated.” In Banska Hrvatska, the division of the judiciary and the administration was introduced, along with more pronounced guarantees of the independence of the judiciary, a relatively autonomous disciplinary procedure, a modern criminal procedure, jury trial for press offenses (Čepulo 2003: 60). In Mažuranić’s time, as part of the aforementioned separation of the judiciary and administration, and harmonization with the corresponding practice in European countries, a law was passed according to which prisons, previously under the jurisdiction of the Department of Internal Affairs, should be under the administration of the Department of Justice (Čepulo 2003: 65).

Mažuranić’s modern, liberal point of view, influenced by the ideas of the French Revolution, is also reflected in his denying the ruler who rules thanks to his origin, and does not draw the legitimacy of holding office thanks to the will of the people: “Ima vladara, koji još danas misle, da su narodi radi njih stvoreni, a ne oni naroda radi. Otud dolazi i ona ostarjela formula ‘Mi, N. N. božjom milošću, itd.’ Kad će takovi vladari uvidjeti, da sve na svijetu opstoji po milosti božjoj, da oni isti vladaju samo po volji naroda. [...] U ustavnoj monarkiji primljeno je načelo da je osoba vladara sveta i nepovrediva. No umnom čovjeku nameta se i nehotice pitanje, imadu li se i oni vladari za svete i nepovredive, kojima na svijetu ništa nije sveto?”³⁶ (Mažuranić 1999: 217, as ctd. in Miletić 2022: 233).

Gross rightly stresses that Mažuranić “became one of the main victims of our public’s desire to turn historical figures into paper, unambiguous, white or black characters. That is why the poet Mažuranić could be separated from the ‘reactionary’ politician who, at best, was recognized for his positive activity only around the age of 1848” (Gross, 1974: 132). Not infrequently, in many cases, he was not recognized even that by the tendentious, ideologically Marxist-oriented Croatian and wider Yugoslav historiography, under the influence of Marx’s editorial theses written in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* [New Rhine Newspaper], critically oriented towards those Slavic peoples whose armies opposed the Hungarian uprising against the Austrian Habsburgs in the stormy revolutionary year of 1848, especially the Croats and their ban Josip Jelačić (Švoger, 2013: 269–270), Mažuranić’s close associate. Marx is essentially the first among German intellectuals who wrote negatively about a Slavic people. In his comment on the aforementioned victory of the “counter-revolution” in Vienna in November 1848 in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* magazine, he uses the term Memeluks of the dynasty to refer to the Croats who, under Jelačić’s command along with Windischgrätz, suppressed the revolution (as ctd. in Pederin 1982: 281). Another ideologist of Marxism, Friedrich Engels, is not far behind him. Analyzing the

36 *There are rulers who still think today that peoples were created for them, and not they for the sake of the people. This is where the old formula “We, N. N. by the grace of God, etc.” comes from. When will such rulers see that everything in the world exists by the grace of God, that they rule only by the will of the people. [...] In the constitutional monarchy, the principle that the person of the ruler is sacred and inviolable is accepted. However, the question arises for an intelligent person, do those rulers also consider themselves sacred and inviolable, to whom nothing in the world is sacred?*

pan-Slavic issue in the article "Der magarische Kamp,"³⁷ "in Austria and Hungary he sees two wedges, two focal points of Germanization, that is, the Hungarianization of raw Slavic peoples and little peoples ['Nationen und Natiönchen'], who – according to him – use some foreign language as the literary language. He justifies Germanization or Magyarization by the fact that the Hungarians, Germans and Poles are revolutionary peoples, while the rest of the Slavs are those 'waste peoples' ['Völkerabfall'], bearers of the counter-revolution that is expressed through pan-Slavism, desiring Russian subjugation" (Pederin 1982: 281). Engels therefore wishes and predicts that these reactionary Slavic peoples will disappear along with reactionary classes and dynasties in the future world war. In the faces of the Croatian soldiers who fought against the revolution, he sees the true face of reactionary pan-Slavism (Pederin 1982: 281). Engels elevates excessive hatred towards Croats and other so-called "counter-revolutionary" Slavic peoples to almost revolutionary virtues, while ignoring the fact that Croatian national interests coincided with the interests of the imperial court whenever it came to Hungarian expansionism, hence the necessity of the intervention of Croatian troops under Jelačić's command during the revolutionary year of 1848 (Pederin 1982: 281–282).

In his work "Demonizacija Habsburške monarhije kao metoda historijskih istraživanja" [Demonization of the Habsburg Monarchy as a Method of Historical Research], Markus proves that the demonization of this state "is found in the relations of individuals, groups and parties towards the Habsburg Monarchy and its historical development *en gros*, i.e., towards its fundamental institutions *en detail*" (Markus 1994: 81). Using a comparative method, he analyzes and proves the existence of demonization in historical research on the history of the Habsburg monarchy, with a tendency to portray the Habsburg state and its fundamental institutions in the most negative context possible. The author places particular focus on the presence of demonization in historical research into the history of the Monarchy, which refers to South Slavic areas before 1918, and especially in relation to the history of Croatia (Markus 1994: 81–82). There are few objective historians from the Yugoslav period, including Šidak, who objectively valorized the facts from that time. Gross well notes that he presents Mažuranić "as an uncommunicative, aloof man, yet a statesman with a distinct sense for assessing the needs of civil politics at certain stages, in a word, as a practical, far-sighted civil politician who in certain situations best knew how to establish the necessary political direction and engage to achieve at least modest frameworks for the functioning of politics in the interest of the Croatian citizenry" (Gross 1974: 132). Šidak (1973: 279) believes that Ivan Mažuranić was a distinct civil liberal who persisted in his political belief from the beginning to the end of his political activity. Antun Barac, on the other hand, concludes: "Although there are apparently no connections between his literary work and his political activity, Mažuranić as a man, and therefore also as a poet and politician, is a unique personality. His most important features are manifested equally in his literary work and in his work as a statesman" (Barac 1945: 6; usp. Šidak 1973: 279).

37 *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, no. 194, 13 January 1848, Marx and Engels 1959: 165–181 (as ctd. in Pederin 1982: 281).

5. Conclusion

The Bourgeois Revolution in France, initiated by the philosophy aimed at reforming monarchist absolutism and by the demands of the third estate, has resulted in several significant achievements. By abolishing the estate system, that is, the feudal social order, the new political system allowing the inclusion of all social classes in political processes was established based on the sovereignty of citizens, i.e., people, on the universal suffrage, equality of citizens, right to work and education, freedom of press and inviolability of private property.

These ideas of the revolutionary 1789 had an insignificant echo in Croatia, even weaker than in the rest of the Habsburg Monarchy, due to the dominance and disinterest of the Croatian nobility and the insufficient strength of other social classes. A suitable social climate for the ideas of the bourgeois revolution was created only at the time of the Croatian national revival.

In particular, these ideas are reflected in the political writings of Ivan Mažuranić entitled *Hrvati Mađarom* and *Manifest naroda hrvatsko-slavonskog*, written in 1848 in response to aggressive Hungarian nationalism. While the Hungarians, in their hegemonic claims toward Croats and other non-Hungarian peoples, relied exclusively on historical rights, Mažuranić also invoked the natural rights of peoples following the ideas of the French Revolution and the current views of the Croatian revivalists. He strongly advocates the freedom and equality of Croats and their fundamental historical and natural national rights, including, of course, the right to equality of the Croatian language. However, he does not limit his claims to rights to his people and his language, but he equally commits to the linguistic and national equality of all peoples within the Monarchy. Just like the Hungarians seek freedom and equality for themselves, Mažuranić believes, these rights, linguistic and national, should apply to all peoples of the Habsburg Monarchy. Interestingly, the signatories to the 1967 *Deklaracija o nazivu i položaju hrvatskog književnog jezika* [Declaration on the Name and Status of the Croatian Literary Language] expressed almost identical demands, advocating the linguistic equality of all peoples within the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Thus, almost 120 years later, which testifies to the devastating democratic deficit in the Slavic South, unlike in European countries with a long democratic tradition.

The spirit of the ideas of the Bourgeois Revolution in France to abolish the estate system, that is, the feudal social order is felt in Mažuranić's reflections on the relationship between ruler and people whereby the ruler should act according to the people and not the people according to the ruler.

References

- Antoljak, S. 1989. "Odjeci i posljedice Francuske revolucije (1789) u hrvatskim zemljama" [The Reflexes and Consequences of the French Revolution (1789) in the Croatian Provinces]. *Radovi*, 22, 211–266.
- Barac, A. 1945. *Mažuranić*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Barišić, P. 2015. "Tko je autor *Političkih iskrica* – Ivan Mažuranić, Ante Starčević ili ...?" [Who is the Author of Political Sparks – Ivan Mažuranić, Ante Starčević or ...?]. *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine*, 41, 2 (82), 401–432.
- Barišić, P. 2017. "Odnos Ivana Mažuranića i Ante Starčevića – od poredbe osoba do filozofije prava" [The Relationship between Ivan Mažuranić and Ante Starčević: from Comparison of Persons to Philosophy of Law]. *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine*, 43, 2 (86), 437–472.
- Bogdanov, V. 1960. *Jakobinska zavjera Ignjata Martinovića* [Ignjat Martinović's Jacobin Conspiracy]. Zagreb: Novinarsko izdavačko poduzeće.
- Cipek, T.; Matković, S. 2006. *Programski dokumenti hrvatskih političkih stranaka i skupina 1841.-1914.* [Program Documents of Croatian Political Parties and Groups 1841-1914]. Zagreb: Disput.
- Cipek, T.; Vrandečić, J. 2004. *Hrestomatija Liberalnih ideja u Hrvatskoj* [An Anthology of Liberal Ideas in Croatia]. Zagreb: Disput.
- Čepulo, D. 1989. "Francuska revolucija i Deklaracija o pravima čovjeka i građanina 1789. godine: problemi političke demokracije" [The French Revolution and the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen of 1789: Problems of Political Democracy]. *Časopis za suvremenu povijest*, 21, 1–3, 161–178.
- Čepulo, D. 2019. "Mažuranićeve reforme 1873.–1880.: modernizacija kao izgradnja države i nacije" [Mažuranić's Reforms of 1873–1880: Modernization as State and Nation Building]. In Dalibor Čepulo, Tea Rogić Musa, Drago Roksandić (eds.), *Intelektualac, kultura, reforma: Ivan Mažuranić i njegovo vrijeme. Zbornik radova sa znanstvenog skupa održanoga u Zagrebu 5. studenoga 2014.* [Intellectual, Culture, Reform: Ivan Mažuranić and His Age. Proceedings from the scientific conference held in Zagreb on November 5, 2014] (pp. 1–72). Zagreb: Pravni fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu – Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža.
- Čepulo, D. 2003. *Prava građana i moderne institucije: Hrvatska i europska pravna tradicija* [Citizens's Rights and Modern Institutions: Croatia and the European Legal Tradition]. Zagreb: Pravni fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.
- Fališevac, D. 2003. *Kaliopin vrt II. Studije o poetičkim i ideološkim aspektima hrvatske epike* [Calliope's Garden II. Studies on Poetic and Ideological Aspects of Croatian Epic]. Split: Književni krug.
- Fališevac, D. 1998. "Naracija u stihu u doba preporoda" [Verse Narration in the Time of Revival]. *Dani hvarškoga kazališta: Građa i rasprave o hrvatskoj književnosti i kazalištu*, 24, 1, 124–140.
- Francuska revolucija [French Revolution] // *Hrvatska enciklopedija* <available from <http://www.enciklopedija.hr/natuknica.aspx?id=20397>> (18/10/2018).
- Frangeš, I. 1963. "Mažuranićev spis 'Hrvati Mađarom'. Jedno poglavlje iz povijesti hrvatske proze XIX. stoljeća" [Mažuranić's Writing "Croats to Hungarians": A Chapter from the History of Croatian Prose of the 19th century]. *Forum*, 1963, 1, 72–91.

- Gross, M. 1976. "O novim pristupima istraživanju revolucija" [On New Approaches to the Research of Revolutions]. *Časopis za suvremenu povijest*, 8, 2–3, 47–50.
- Gross, M. 1974. "Jaroslav Šidak, Studije iz hrvatske povijesti XIX stoljeća, izd. Institut za hrvatsku povijest Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, *Rasprave i članci* 2, Zagreb, 1973, str. 401., recenzija, prikaz slučaja" [Jaroslav Šidak, Studies in Croatian History of the 19th Century, ed. Institute of Croatian History, University of Zagreb, Discussions and articles 2, Zagreb, 1973, pp. 401, review, case report]. *Časopis za suvremenu povijest*, 6, 1, 127–133.
- Gross, M., Szabo, A. 1992. *Prema hrvatskome građanskom društvu: Društveni razvoj u civilnoj Hrvatskoj i Slavoniji šezdesetih i sedamdesetih godina 19. stoljeća* [Towards Croatian Civil Society: Social Development in Civil Croatia and Slavonia in the Sixties and Seventies of the 19th Century]. Zagreb: Globus.
- Haselsteiner, H. 1997. *Ogledi o modernizaciji u Srednjoj Europi*, [Essays on Modernization in Central Europe]. Zagreb: Naklada Naprijed.
- Horvat, J. 1990. *Ante Starčević: kulturno-povijesna slika* [Ante Starčević: Cultural and Historical Image]. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske.
- Horvat, R. 1930. "Ban Ivan Mažuranić. O 40-godišnjici smrti njegove" [Ban Ivan Mažuranić. On the 40th Anniversary of His Death]. *Hrvatsko kolo*, II, 41–48.
- Ivan Mažuranić. Izabrani politički spisi* [Ivan Mažuranić. Selected Political Writings]. 1999. Tihomir Cipek (ed.). Zagreb: Golden marketing – Narodne novine.
- Ivan Mažuranić. Proza, Sabrana djela Ivana Mažuranića* [Ivan Mažuranić Prose, Collected Works of Ivan Mažuranić]. 1979a. Vol. III. Milorad Živančević (ed.). Zagreb: Sveučilišna naklada Liber – Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske.
- Ivan Mažuranić. Pisma Govori, Sabrana djela Ivana Mažuranića* [Ivan Mažuranić Letters Speeches, Collected Works of Ivan Mažuranić]. 1979b. Vol. IV. Milorad Živančević (ed.). Zagreb: Sveučilišna naklada Liber – Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske.
- Kale, E. 1989. "Francuska revolucija i novo doba" [The French Revolution and the New Age]. *Politička misao*, 26, 3, 66–79.
- Markus, T. 1994. "Demonizacija Habsburške monarhije kao metoda historijskih istraživanja" [The Demonization of the Habsburg Monarchy as a Method of Historical Research]. *Časopis za suvremenu povijest*, 26, 1, 81–98.
- Markus, T. 1998. "Dokumenti o hrvatskom pokretu iz 1849. godine" [Documents on the Croatian Movement from 1849]. *Časopis za suvremenu povijest*, 30, 3, 577–595.
- Marx, K.; Engels, F. 1959. *Werke*, Bd. 5, Inst. für Marxismus-Lennismus beim ZK der SED. Berlin: Dietz-Verlag.
- Memoiren des Grafen Adam Orssich de Szlavetich* [Memoirs of Count Adam Orssich de Szlavetich]. 1869. Arhiv za povjestnicu jugoslavensku X, Zagreb.
- Miletić, J. 2019. "Jezična (ne)ravnopravnost u službenim spisima SFRJ-e desetljeće nakon Deklaracije o nazivu i položaju hrvatskog književnog jezika" [(Language (In)equality in Official Records of SFRY Decade after Declarations of the Name and Position of the Croatian Literary Language)]. In Rafaela Božić, Sandra Hadžihalilović, Josip Lisac (eds.), *Zadarski filološki dani 7: Zbornik radova s Međunarodnoga znanstvenog skupa Zadarski filološki dani 7 održanoga u Zadru i Biogradu na moru 22. i 23. rujna 2017.* (pp. 65–77). Zadar: Sveučilište

- u Zadru, Odjel za kroatistiku, Odjel za rusistiku.
- Miletić, J. 2020. "Comparison of Ivan Mažuranić's Political Writings with the Declaration on the Name and Status of the Croatian Literary Language". In Munir Mujić (ed.), *Sarajevski filološki susreti 5: Zbornik radova (knjiga 1)* (pp. 226–241). Sarajevo: Bosansko filološko društvo.
- Miletić, J. 2022. *Hrvatski jezik u izobrazbi stručnjaka iz obrazovnog područja ekonomije, trgovine i poslovne administracije* [Croatian Language in the Training of Experts in the Educational Field of Economics, Trade and Business Administration]. Zadar: Sveučilište u Zadru.
- Nujić, P. 2011. "Francuska revolucija za vrijeme druge godine republike" [The French Revolution During the Second Year of the Republic]. *Essehist*, 3, 3, 32–38.
- Nikčević, V. 1986. "Jezikoslovni ogledi Ivana Mažuranića (Uz 150. godišnjicu hrvatskoga narodnog preporoda)" [Linguistic Essays by Ivan Mažuranić (On the Occasion of the 150th Anniversary of the Croatian National Revival)]. *Forum*, 25, book LI, 114–144.
- Pavličević, D. 1999. "Ivan Mažuranić – život, politički pogledi, državnička djelatnost" [Ivan Mažuranić – Life, Political Views, Statesmanship]. Dragutin Pavličević (ed.), *Ivan Mažuranić Izabrani politički spisi* (pp. 7–56). Zagreb: Golden marketing – Narodne novine.
- Pisma od plemenite čete Horvatov u Budim za pohodit svetu krunu odlazećih, Ispivana po G. K. U Zagrebu. Prit. slovim plem. od Trattnera* [A Poem by the Noble Crew of Croats Visiting the Holy Crown in Budim, Written by G. K. In Zagreb. Printed by Trattner]. 1790.
- Protrka Štimec, M. 2017. "Prirodno pravo u Smrti Smail-Age Čengića: Mažuranićev 'Fuit Tyrannus'" [Natural Right in the Death of Smail-Aga Čengić: Mažuranić's »Fuit Tyrannus«]. *Umjetnost riječi*, 61, 3–4, 181–199.
- Rodin, D. 1989. "Pet obilježja francuske revolucije" [Five Characteristics of the French Revolution]. *Politička misao*, 26, 3, 6–22.
- Smičiklas, T. 1878. *Poviest hrvatska II* [Croatian History]. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Szabo, A. 2014. *Ban Ivan Mažuranić - graditelj moderne Hrvatske. U povodu 200. obljetnice rođenja (1814.-2014.)* [Ban Ivan Mažuranić - Builder of Modern Croatia. On the Occasion of the 200th Anniversary of His Birth (1814–2014)]. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Sunajko, G. 2008. "Filozofija politike francuskih enciklopedista i njezin utjecaj na Francusku revoluciju" [Political Philosophy of French Encyclopaedists and Its Influence on the French Revolution]. *Studia lexicographica*, 2, 1 (2), 25–50.
- Šidak, J. 1990. *Hrvatski narodni preporod, Ilirski pokret, II izdanje* [Croatian National Revival, Illyrian Movement, II edition]. Zagreb: Školska knjiga – Stvarnost.
- Šidak, J. 1973. "Studije iz hrvatske povijesti XIX stoljeća" [Studies in Croatian History of the 19th Century]. *Rasprave i članci 2*. Zagreb: Sveučilište u Zagrebu – Institut za hrvatsku povijest.
- Švoger, V. 2013. *Ban Josip Jelačić u očima svojih suvremenika, Zbornik Odsjeka za povijest Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* [Ban Josip Jelačić in the Eyes of His Contemporaries, Proceedings of the History Department of the Institute of Historical and Social Sciences of

the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts], 31, 247–271.
Vile, M. J. C. 1967. *Constitutionalism and the Separation of Powers*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Voltaire. 2003. *Filozofska pisma, I* [Philosophical Letters]. Zagreb: Demetra.
Živančević, M. 1988. *Ivan Mažuranić*. Novi Sad – Zagreb: Matica srpska – Globus.

UTJECAJ IDEJA FRANCUSKE GRAĐANSKE REVOLUCIJE NA IVANA MAŽURANIĆA

Sažetak

Francuska građanska revolucija kulminacija je brojnih idejnih i političkih sučeljavanja različitih grupacija sa starim društvenim poretkom (*ancien régime*), inspiriranih primarno filozofijom politike francuskih prosvjetitelja i enciklopedista, koji u svojim tekstovima prezentiraju načela nove konstitucionalne države (Sunajko 2008). Različiti su ponuđeni ustavni modeli težili ujedinjenju slobodnih ljudi u zajednicu koja bi bila sposobna zadovoljiti načelo slobode kao osnovno i neotuđivo ljudsko pravo (Rodin, 1989). Odjek je Francuske građanske revolucije u Hrvatskoj, neposredno nakon njenoga izbijanja, bio zanemariv, čak i osjetno manji nego u ostatku Habsburške Monarhije, u kojoj je također bio minoran, a značio je slobodu samo za plemstvo. Proći će gotovo šest desetljeća od početka Francuske građanske revolucije dok se u Hrvatskoj ne stvori pogodna preporodna klima, a na hrvatskoj političkoj sceni ne pojavi velika politička figura koja će je znati adekvatno valorizirati. Riječ je o književniku i budućem banu pučaninu Ivanu Mažuraniću. U radu se analizira utjecaj ideja Francuske građanske revolucije na njegovo stvaralaštvo. Posebna je pozornost usmjerena na njegove političke spise nastale u revolucionarnoj 1848. godini *Hrvati Mađarom* i *Manifest naroda hrvatsko-slavonskog*, koje stvara nadahnut upravo idejama Francuske građanske revolucije te se nakon toga u potpunosti okreće politici. Bio je to svojevrсни odgovor na mađarske hegemonističke zahtjeve prema Hrvatima i ostalim nemađarskim narodima iz ožujka i travnja 1848. godine, u kojima su se Mađari pozivali isključivo na povijesno pravo. Mažuranić se u skladu s idejama Francuske građanske revolucije i aktualnim nazorima hrvatskih preporoditelja poziva i na prirodna prava naroda. Zagovara slobodu i ravnopravnost Hrvata te njihovih temeljnih povijesnih i prirodnih nacionalnih prava, u što uključuje i pravo na ravnopravnost hrvatskoga jezika. Štoviše, zalaže se za jezičnu ravnopravnost svih naroda u okviru Habsburške Monarhije. Kao istinski kršćanin, u osudi feudalnoga društvenog poretka uspijeva pomiriti motive kršćanstva i slobodarske ideje Francuske građanske revolucije.

Ključne riječi: Francuska građanska revolucija, Ivan Mažuranić, jezična ravnopravnost, političke ideje, politički spisi