

Suzana Coha

University in Zagreb

scoha@ffzg.hr

ORCID: 0000-0002-7802-0584

POZNAŃSKIE STUDIA SLAWISTYCZNE

NR 25 (2023)

DOI: 10.14746/pss.2023.25.4

Data przesłania tekstu do redakcji: 12.06.2023

Data przyjęcia tekstu do druku: 30.06.2023

Representation of the Croatian National Revival and Romanticism in Croatian Literary Historiography

ABSTRACT: Coha Suzana, *Representation of the Croatian National Revival and Romanticism in Croatian Literary Historiography*, "Poznańskie Studia Slawistyczne" 25. Poznań 2023. Wydawnictwo "Poznańskie Studia Polonistyczne," Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, pp. 91–110. ISSN 2084-3011.

The paper presents poetically and politically conditioned changes in the interpretation of the literature of the Croatian National Revival period as "Romantic". It indicates that these phenomena should necessarily be viewed in mutual (inter) action. It states that the Croatian National Revival, as a period that is most frequently demarcated by the years 1835 and 1848–49 in the so-called general historiography, is a necessary framework for the periodisation and understanding of the history of Croatian literature too. This framework does not exclude the necessity of including the concept of Romanticism in the study of Croatian literature of this period, which was strongly influenced by Romantic trends. And consequently it is a stage in a longer period of manifestation of Romantic features in Croatian culture and literature of the 19th century.

KEYWORDS: Croatian literary historiography; periodisation of literature; Croatian National Revival; Romanticism; intrinsic and extrinsic approaches to literary history

1. From the Croatian National Revival or Illyrianism to conditional Romanticism

The reason why “the Romantic nature” of the literature of the Croatian National Revival was *suggested* in Croatian literary historiography, as stated by Aleksandar Flaker, and *contested* at the same time (Flaker, 1968, 10), is a consequence of a historical course of events that started in the Croatian National Revival. This movement for national integration was also named “Illyrian” (cf., e.g., Gross, 1981, 180–188; Stančić, 1985, 2; Šidak et al., 19902; Rapacka, 2002, 78–84) and was temporally demarcated by the years 1835 and 1848–49 in the so-called general historiography (cf. Gross, 1981, 188; Stančić, 1985, 2). The concept of Romanticism, which was pertinent in a simultaneous European context, was not unknown in the culture of the Revival period, however, the literature of the Revival was not especially preoccupied or did not identify with it (cf. Barac, 1954, 150–152) although it *received* and *returned* “reflexes of Romanticism, partly in correlation with literatures in other languages, partly by its own initiative” (Tomasović, 1988, 76). When in the second half of the 19th century certain phenomena in the literature of the Revival period were recognised as Romantic, they were not only compared to their European counterparts, but attention was also drawn to their Croatian modifications and specificities (cf. Barac, 1954, 152; Coha, 2015, 51–52). In the earliest synthesis of the literature of the Revival period, there was no mention of Romanticism as a period of Croatian literary history (cf. Milčetić, 1878; Šurmin, 1903; 1904), and when the term (with the additional determinant “Croatian”) was introduced into the periodisation of Croatian literature, it was explicitly used as a name for politically defined decades following the Revival, i.e. a name describing Croatian literature in the 1850s and 1860s, without explaining the poetic reasons for this determinant (cf. Ježić, 1993², 219–245 [1944¹]).

Focus on relations between Romanticism and the Croatian National Revival, or Illyrianism,¹ temporally determined by the years 1835 and

1 Although there are examples in Croatian literary historiography that the period and / or phenomenon of Illyrian movement or Illyrianism is more prominently separated from the period and / or phenomenon of the Croatian National

1849,² was put by Antun Barac in his book *Hrvatska književnost od Preporoda do stvaranja Jugoslavije. Knjiga 1. Književnost ilirizma (Croatian Literature from the Revival to the Foundation of Yugoslavia. Book I. Literature of Illyrianism)*, a fundamental book of modern Croatian literary historiography dedicated to the history of the so called modern (post/Revival) Croatian literature. Flaker highlighted it as an example of the aforementioned simultaneous *suggestion* and *contestation* of the Romantic nature of literature in the Revival period (cf. Flaker, 1968, 10). Contrasting it and European literatures of the same time, Barac stated that “the literature of the Revival period” was mostly created “in the age of European Romanticism, receiving therefore a significant number of its features”, noting that “Croatian Romanticism” not even temporally coincides with “either Russian, or French, or German Romanticism” (Barac, 1954, 149). On the other hand, not reducing Romanticism fully to the framework of the Revival movement, Barac stated that in Croatian literature some “features of Romanticism can already be noticed in the works of writers of the second decade of the 19th century” (Barac, 1954, 149), i.e., “the beginnings of Croatian Romanticism may be placed at least two decades prior to 1835” (Barac, 1954, 150).

Barac’s judgements, which had a greater far-reaching impact in Croatian literary historiography than the fact that he presented the literature of the Revival period as integrated into the Romantic context, indicated a distinction between these two complexes. Declaring specific socio-political circumstances and a specific literary tradition (non-existence of a mature middle class and absence of classicism) to be the starting point for differentiating literature of the Revival from the assumed paradigmatic *Romantic* literatures, Barac used the following

Revival (cf. Coha, 2015, 28–39), Barac does not insist on their distinction, but rather implies that they are mutually integrated and connected. As such, they are also presented in: Gross, 1981, 183–184; 188; Stančić, 1985; Šidak et al., 1990²; Rapacka, 2002, 78–84.

2 The reason why Barac defined literature of the Croatian National Revival as a period demarcated by these years is that throughout this period a literary supplement in the first newspaper in the Croatian language in Zagreb, *Danica* [“Morning Star”], launched by the leader of the Croatian National Revival Ljudevit Gaj, was published.

oppositions: a *standard* attitude of European Romanticisms towards the East as a realm of exotics vs. a specific Croatian attitude towards the East, which is a consequence of its border (and marginal) vis-à-vis the West position; European Romantic individualism vs. imperative of national collectivism in the Revival; *typical* Romantic pessimism and melancholy vs. optimism of the National Revival; anti-conventional subversion of *typical* European Romanticisms vs. a didactic and moralising mission of Croatian Illyrianism and / or Revival that codifies ethical conventions; a *typical* European Romantic cosmopolitanism vs. Illyrian (Croatian and South/Slavic) ethnic exclusivism; introvert and contemplative feature of *typical* Romantics who often turn to the subconscious vs. extrovert populism of authors of the Revival (cf. Barac, 1954, 150–151).³

A structure of differentiations conceived in such a way between *our* (as *atypical*) and *other* (*typical*) Romanticisms was largely confirmed and additionally elaborated by Ivo Frangeš in his paper *Evropski romantizam i hrvatski narodni preporod* (*European Romanticism and the Croatian National Revival*), published in 1966 in the triple issue of the magazine *Kolo*, which was explicitly dedicated to the 130th anniversary of “the Croatian National Revival”. Proceeding from Barac’s tenets on the differences between *Illyrianism* and *European Romanticism* (cf. Frangeš, 1966, 201–202), Frangeš first deviated from them to some extent, pointing to Romantic marks in literary views of individual Revival writers and to the reflections of Romantic poetics in their works (cf. Frangeš, 1966, 203–205). However, Frangeš thereafter returned to Barac’s emphasis in argumentation, drawing attention to some specificities of literature in the Revival vis-à-vis *typical Romantic* features (engagement on enlightening the people, optimism, exclusivism and utilitarianism; experiences of nature subordinated to patriotic feelings; absence of *Weltschmerz* and Romantic irony; representing women in a way adapted to national needs) (cf. Frangeš, 1966, 205–213).⁴

3 Related to this also cf. Coha, 2008, 416–417; 2015, 52–53.

4 Related to this also cf. Coha, 2015, 53–54.

2. Romanticism: between (politically purposeful) literary immanentism and self-explanatory context of the Croatian National Revival

Frangješ's aforementioned paper can be read together with a paper by Miroslav Šicel entitled *Književni problemi u doba hrvatskog narodnog preporoda* (*Literary Problems in the Age of the Croatian National Revival*), published in the same commemorative triple issue of *Kolo*, as the beginning of a trend that inaugurated a new understanding of the concept of "Romanticism" in Croatian literary historiography. According to this new understanding, term Romanticism was inherent to the so-called *intrinsic* or *immanent* approaches in literary history, whereas the concepts of "Croatian National Revival", "Illyrian movement" and "Illyrianism" were interpreted as the indications of *extrinsic*, classic positivist historicism,⁵ from which Croatian literary science tried to distance itself at least declaratively in the second half of the 20th century, certainly under the impression of general trends in literary science, and as a consequence of specific positioning in Croatia's and Yugoslavia's cultural policy sphere of the time.⁶ Confirming Barac's theses on the *atypicality* of Croatian Romanticism, these texts simultaneously pointed to the possibility or need for a change in the periodisation paradigm confirmed in the works of Milčetić, Šurmin and Barac, in which the terms "Croatian National Revival" or "Illyrianism" functioned as pivotal. On the basis of argumentation presented by Frangješ and Šicel, one can discern the influence of the principles identical to the ones advocated by René Wellek and Austin Warren in their influential book *Theory of Literature* (1949¹), according to whom "the literary period should be established by purely literary criteria" (Wellek, Warren, 1982, 264).

Disregarding the fact that the concept of Romanticism, although not applied to the Revival period, but to a subsequent period, and presented

5 For a distinction between the so-called intrinsic or immanent approaches in literary history, and classical positivist, "extrinsic" literary historicism inherited from the 19th century, cf. Wellek, Warren, 1982, 71–269; Dukić, 2009, 137–138; Oraić Tolić, 2022, 15.

6 Related to this cf. e.g., Dukić, 2009; Coha, 2015, 62–74; Oraić Tolić, 2022.

without poetical arguments and additionally determined by the attribute “Croatian”, as a designator of a period appeared already in the book *Hrvatska književnost od početka do danas* (*Croatian Literature from its Beginnings to the Present-Day*) by Slavko Ježić (1944¹), Frangeš stated that it is “significant” that “Romanticism” as a “special period in Croatian literary history” did not distinguish itself in earlier literary historiography, including Barac (Frangeš, 1966, 201). Although he invoked Gustave Lanson (1857–1934), who advocated studying literature in a broader social and cultural context, Frangeš did so emphasising the importance of differentiating between whether “the content of Croatian literary history is always a history of literature (i.e. the art of literature), or, is often a political and cultural history, with special consideration for a point of view of literature, i.e. literary history” (Frangeš, 1966, 200). Similarly, Šicel also failed to comment on Ježić’s (unexplained but explicit) use of the term “Croatian Romanticism” as the signifier of a period in the history of Croatian literature, although he referred to his treatment of literature in the Revival period in the chrestomathy *Ilirska antologija* (*Illyrian Anthology*) (1934) and subsequently in *Hrvatska književnost od početka do danas*, for the purpose of illustrating the statement that “almost all” studies of the Revival period departed from “the understanding of literature of the period as an exclusive expression of social-political and national will and aspirations”, and in this process “the artistic, literary criterion remained neglected, or at least insufficiently applied” (Šicel, 1966, 259).

Thus, both Frangeš’s and Šicel’s texts insist on literary history sensitive to specific *artistic* literary qualities and present this as an opportunity to open discussion on (at least conditional) Romanticism of literature during the Revival period. It is somewhat of a paradox that their explicit drawing of attention to specific artistic *literary* features appears to be (implicitly) politically motivated. Regarding the time of their creation and publication, in which official politics and culture supported the interpretation of the Croatian National Revival and its “Illyrian” (South-Slavic) orientation as a basis for future (at the time current) Yugoslav unity, shifting the focus from *political* (*Revival, Illyrian, South-Slavic*) to *purely literary*, albeit *partial* and *atypical Romantic* features, can be interpreted as a significant (political) gesture of (re)constructing the exclusive tradition of Croatian literature and its (re)contextualisation

from the set Yugoslav (political) context into an alternative European (cultural) context.⁷

Like Frangeš, Šicel also stayed on Barac's track, invoking his thesis on the need to distinguish study of "literatures of big European nations and literatures of small nations" (Šicel, 1966, 259), and tried to resolve the problem of *atypicality* of Croatian Romanticism in a way that he divided the period of "*literature of Illyrianism*" which, as he stated, was customarily demarcated by the years 1835 and 1849 (Šicel, 1966, 258), into two sections. Regarding the first one, which he places in the 1830s, he stated that it was just a *preparation* "for true literary activity" (Šicel, 1966, 262), and he linked the second, in the 1840s, to subsequent decades all the way until the mid-1870s. He emphasised the intertwinement of the elements of "classicism, European Romanticism and sentimentalism" as a "common feature" of the latter period (Šicel, 1966, 271). Consequently, he proposed that it would be better to speak of the period of "classicist Romanticism" instead of "the literature of Illyrianism" and "literature of the 50s and 60s,"⁸ which "literally do not mean anything and are

7 The possibility of such an interpretation imposes itself even more if the aforementioned texts by Šicel and Frangeš are considered in the context of the whole anniversary event for which they were written and in the context of other contributions published in the same anniversary issue of *Kolo*. The celebration of the Revival discussed here was the 130th anniversary of changing the name of Gaj's periodical from "Croatian-Slavonian-Dalmatian" to "Illyrian". The anniversary defined in such a manner was interpreted as the anniversary of the "introduction of Shtokavian [language] and the Illyrian name most closely connected to it, into Croatian literature" (Šidak, 1966, 137), which were considered the basis not only for the Croatian but also the Yugoslav cultural community. In this light, contributions that point to the link of the Croatian National Revival or Illyrianism with explicit or implied current Yugoslav unity using some ambivalent tones are of interest, e.g. criticising a disregard of Kajkavian and Chakavian literary tradition in the Revival; pointing to the differences between the Illyrian concept and the linguistic concept of Vuk Stefanović Karadžić; to Croatian linguistic options from the Revival period that are alternative to the Illyrian; to the centuries-long continuity of *Croatian Illyrianism* or (South)Slavism or emphasising the need for differentiating Illyrianism of the Revival as South Slavism, from Yugoslavdom, a state policy that materialised in the 20th century. Related to this cf. also Coha, 2015, 39–43.

8 Such a division was justified by two books by Barac *Hrvatska književnost od Preporoda do stvaranja Jugoslavije* (cf. Barac, 1954; 1960).

a forceful abolition of a literary process" (Šicel, 1966, 271). Thus, Šicel separated the period of conditional Romanticism (in his own words, of "classicist Romanticism") from the first stage of the Revival literature, and linked it to another one, which he then connected to the literature of the 1850s and 1860s, including even the first half of the 1870s.

Šicel's opening of the literature of the Revival period to the literature of the third quarter of the 19th century can be compared to the periodisation advocated in the chrestomathy in two volumes entitled *Hrvatski narodni preporod. Ilirska knjiga* (*Croatian National Revival. Illyrian Book*) edited by Jakša Ravlić, published in 1965 (130th anniversary of Gaj's launching the newspaper "Novine horvatske" (*Croatian Newspaper*) and its literary supplement "Danica horvatska, slavonska i dalmatinska" (*Croatian, Slavonian and Dalmatian Morning Star*), where the Revival period is also called "the Illyrian movement" and stretched to 1874 (cf. Ravlić, 1965, 7). Indicating as a matter of principle and without going into details Romanticism as a "movement" to which "the Croatian National Revival also belonged" (Ravlić, 1965, 19), Ravlić's chrestomathy nevertheless presupposes frameworks and criteria of periodisation that are different from those suggested by Šicel. Segmented into several epochs, this chrestomathy links the period of the Croatian National Revival fully, rather than just partially, as in Šicel's text, to the period until 1874. Moreover, a "preparatory period", which began in the late 18th century, was also indicated as part of the Croatian National Revival or the Illyrian movement in Ravlić's chrestomathy. This period was also in Barac's book (cf. Barac, 1954, 7–12; 16–26) implied as an important but different period, more separated from the Revival than connected to it, and it was treated with special attention in the first part of Šurmin's synthesis entitled *Hrvatski preporod* (*The Croatian Revival*) (1903). Unlike Šicel, who links literature of the Revival period to the literature in the subsequent decades until the 1870s and invokes reasons which, using the terms employed by Wellek and Warren, could be called *intrinsic*, Ravlić bases this link on *extrinsic* arguments. He highlights the year 1874 as the upper limit of the Revival, when the central cultural institution of the Revival Matica ilirska (Matrix Illyrica) changed its name to Matica hrvatska (Matrix Croatica). This is interpreted as a symbolic sign "that the Illyrian name vanished and the national name prevailed" (Ravlić, 1965, 7).

The same year 1966, when Frangeš's and Šicel's paper were published in *Kolo*, Šicel also published the book *Pregled novije hrvatske književnosti* ("An Overview of Modern Croatian Literature"), in which he makes a similar remark as the one in the paper *Književni problemi u doba hrvatskog narodnog preporoda*, namely that an attempt was made to avoid "the terminology that is explicitly historical" (Šicel, 1966a, 6). However, the term "Illyrianism", which was also used by Barac, was retained in this book to designate Croatian literature of the 1830s and the 1840s (cf. Šicel, 1966a, 9–36). The literature of the period after the Revival, which was earlier described using the terms "Croatian Romanticism from absolutism to the Settlement" (Ježić, 1993², 219–245) or "literature of the 50s and the 60s" (Barac, 1960), was extended to August Šenoa's death (1881), by Šicel under the name "[f]rom Illyrianism towards Realism" (cf. Šicel 1966a, 37–72).

3. The National Revival as immanentism

A. Flaker was sceptical of Šicel's term "classicist Romanticism", highlighting that it is difficult to transfer terms such as classicism, sentimentalism and Romanticism from "more developed European literatures" to the literature of the Revival, even in a "contaminated, and consequently contradictory form" (Flaker, 1968, 31). Flaker divided the period between the years 1836 and 1865 in two units not denying that in that time Croatian literature "segments different stylistic procedures of European stylistic formations, from classicism over sentimentalism to Romanticism", subordinating them to "the national function of literature", which inevitably modifies them (Flaker, 1968, 31). He called the time span from the mid-1830s to the end of the 1840s "a period of the *literature of the National Revival*", and still conditionally linked the time span between the early 1850s and the mid-1860s to Romanticism, calling it the period of "*national pseudo-Romanticism*" (Flaker, 1968, 32). The latter period largely overlaps with the period that Ježić named "Croatian Romanticism between absolutism and the Settlement". However, as demonstrated in the case of Ravlić and Šicel, the logic of periodisation in Ježić's and Flaker's texts is characterised by diametrically opposed methodological positions. While Ježić's logic, as unproblematic,

is conditioned by *extrinsic* reasons (introduction of neo-absolutism or Bach's absolutism in the early 1850s and the 1868 Croatian-Hungarian Settlement), Flaker's logic insists on intrinsicity. In his view and fully in line with the recommendations given by Wellek and Warren, "the periodisation of literary history cannot proceed either from periodisation of history or cultural history, but must, primarily, be based on identifying essential phenomena within the process of literary history itself" (Flaker, 1968, 27). Bearing this in mind, it may seem contradictory that Flaker, excluding the possibility for even a conditional application of the term Romanticism to the period of Croatian literature from the mid-1830s to the end of the 1840s, opted for the term of, at first sight, extrinsic provenance ("*literature of the National Revival*"). Moreover, the umbrella name of "[l]iterature serving the function of constituting a modern Croatian nation" (Flaker, 1968, 29), by means of which he connected the period from the mid-1830s to the mid-1860s, was also seemingly extrinsic to literature. On the other hand, Flaker attempted to argue in their favour using as much as possible reasons that are *intrinsic* to literature. Invoking a quote from Miroslav Krleža's essay *O Kranjčevičevoj lirici* (*On Kranjčević's Lyrics*) (1932), in which he emphasised literature and its *social basis* as being interdependent, Flaker introduced the term "*social function* of literature" (Flaker, 1968, 29) as a mediator between these phenomena, being under the influence of the concepts developed within the framework of Russian Formalism and the Prague School, as can be sensed from his explication. Setting the year 1836 as the beginning of a period of Croatian literature that "*serves the function of constituting a modern Croatian nation*" (Flaker, 1968, 29) and striving to remain in the field of "the process of literary history itself" (Flaker, 1968, 27), he explained that at that time "the new-Shtokavian speech was accepted in literature as a basis for the development of a standard language and the creation of national unity" (Flaker, 1968, 29–30). Also, he justified the year 1865 as the upper limit of the period using the fact that Šenoa published his paper *Naša književnost* (*Our Literature*) that year, where he "observed a crisis in Croatian literature and announced his proto-Realist, albeit still undeveloped programme" (Flaker, 1968, 34). Flaker implied that he named the period "*literature of the National Revival*" as a separate unit within the period of Croatian literature "*serving the function of constituting a modern Croatian*

nation” by intrinsic criteria too, saying that the literature of this period had “the character of a revival” as compared to “Renaissance-Baroque tradition of Croatian literature” (Flaker, 1968, 32).

4. The Croatian National Revival, Illyrian Movement or Illyrianism... Romanticism...?

Accepting Flaker's criticism of his own term of “classicist Romanticism” and at the same time levelling criticism at Flaker's terms of “*literature serving the function of constituting a modern Croatian nation*”; “*literature of the National Revival*” and “*literature of national pseudo-Romanticism*”, Šicel agreed to the proposal to merge the period between 1836 and 1865 and suggested a new name for it, “*a period of integration of heterogeneous styles*” (Šicel, 1971, 275–277). He did this in his paper *Prilog problematici romantizma u hrvatskoj književnosti* (“Contribution to the Issue of Romanticism in Croatian Literature”). Šicel's term “*a period of integration of heterogeneous styles*” did not gain ground in Croatian literary history, however the presentation of Croatian literature from the mid-1830s to the mid-1860s as one unit did. Still, this period continued to be called the “Croatian National Revival” or “Illyrianism”. An example for this is the fourth book in the influential series *Povijest hrvatske književnosti* (“History of Croatian Literature”) (1974–78) by Milorad Živančević and Ivo Frangeš (1975) divided in two parts: *Illyrianism* focused on the literature from the 1830s to the mid-1860s, and *Realism* described the period starting with the beginning of Šenoa's domination in Croatian literary and cultural life. In this book, Živančević, who authored a chapter on *Illyrianism*, suggested that the pivotal part of the period in question must be viewed with respect to classicism, the Enlightenment, sentimentalism and (pre)Romanticism in the “European context” (cf. Živančević, Frangeš, 1975, 185–214). With regard to the literature of the 1850s and the 1860s, he stated that it was “an organic continuation and end of the literature of Illyrianism”, but also “a prediction of a new literature at the turn from Romanticism to Realism” (Živančević, Frangeš, 1975, 43).

Šicel later emphasised the need for viewing Croatian literature from 1835 to 1865 as a whole in a collection of papers *Riznica ilirska* (“The Illyrian

Treasury”), published in 1985 (on the 150th anniversary of the launch of Gaj’s periodical). The leading article of this chrestomathy emphasises that “everything created in the newly adopted standard language from the first, relatively weak lyrics that were completely subordinated to the social and political moment of the time, to aesthetically valuable creations by Vraz, Ivan Mažuranić, Preradović and a number of other creators” necessarily must be understood as an “*inseparable organic whole*, a unique literary process that lasts uninterrupted from 1835 [...] to 1865” (Šicel, 1985, 11). This is on the trail of the thesis about the need to base literary historiography on arguments intrinsic to literature, which Šicel advocated in his papers on the literature of the Revival period in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Highlighting the attribute “Illyrian” in the title of this chrestomathy and entitling its foreword “Croatian National and Literary Revival” could be a result of the fact that the period of the Croatian National Revival was too firmly accepted in Croatian culture as a constituent of national literature. Therefore, concepts inherent to the so-called “general literature” (cf. Wellek, Warren, 1982, 49), turned out to be not only insufficient, but also symbolically insufficiently strong to designate this period.

The chrestomathy *Riznica ilirska* comprises texts from the mid-1810s to the mid-1850s. To some extent, this betrays the standpoint emphasised at its beginning, that the launch of *Danica horvatska, slavonska i dalmatinska* (1835) “marked the beginning of the Croatian National and literary Revival, or the Illyrian movement” (Šicel, 1985, 5). The subtitle “1835–1985” is in line with this, explicitly stressing the jubilee symbolism of the edition. However, the book content divided into three periods, namely from 1813 to 1835; from 1836 to 1841; and from 1842 to 1855, does not coincide with the aforementioned jubilee intoned announcements. Its opening in 1813 (when Bishop of Zagreb Maksimilijan Vrhovac invited priests in his diocese to collect books and heritage of oral literature), which Milčetić already emphasised as the limit year of the *first beginnings of the movement* (Milčetić, 1878, 8), derives from the fact that, regardless of how the beginning of the Revival is set, political and poetic processes that dominantly determined it could not be explained without presenting their genesis, which goes back to the early decades of the 19th century and even the late 18th

century (cf. Coha, 2023). Therefore, the period prior to the 1830s, although it became customary to pinpoint the beginning of the Croatian National Revival in the 1830s, was taken into consideration in a broader or narrower scope and to a smaller or greater extent by all the authors of earlier syntheses of literary history of this period, from Milčetić, Šurmin or Ježić to Barac, Ravlić or Živančević. With the exception of 1835–36, two other turning points highlighted in the contents of *Riznica ilirska* (1841–42 and 1855) deviate from earlier segmentations of the Revival period (by Milčetić, Šurmin, Ježić, Barac), which indicates two tendencies. The first is an attempt at following the reasons that are *intrinsic* to literature: in 1842, the *Kolo* magazine was launched, which is considered to be a sign of the evident separation of a part of Croatian writers from the predominantly political-utilitarian line of literature in the Revival period, as emphasised by Šicel (1985, 20). The second tendency is prolongation of the Revival period after 1848–49, as it became customary to define the limits of this period in the so-called general, and in earlier literary historiography (Milčetić, Šurmin, Ježić, Barac). The fact that selecting texts in *Riznica ilirska* Šicel did not support the upper limit explicitly mentioned in the foreword, (i.e. 1865) could be a symptom of the fact that the limits of the Revival period are relative, as of any other period in (literary) history. For, as Jacques Le Goff states, “history is never immobile” (Le Goff, 2015, 104). Literary history very much confirms this fact: the literature of two periods is never divided by sharp cuts, but by gradual transitions. Albeit he did not abandon the idea of intrinsic approach to the literature in the Revival period, Šicel seems to be less exclusive in that sense in *Riznica ilirska* than he was in the papers advocating the terms *classicist Romanticism* or *a period of integration of heterogeneous styles*. Striving to keep a specific literary perspective, he distinguishes *literary* and *national Revival* in *Riznica ilirska*, but emphasises their coordination and relation of cause and effect, as well as the fact that both *grew out of* the “*Illyrian movement*” (Šicel, 1985, 24).

Šicel retained this *poetic-political* perspective in the chrestomathy *Programski spisi hrvatskog narodnog preporoda* (*Programmatic Writings of the Croatian National Revival*) (1997), where he collected writings from the 1815–1865 period. Continuing the concept of separating “*national* (political) *Revival*” from “*Renaissance of Croatian literature – literary Revival*”

(Šicel, 1985, 24), in this book Šicel lay emphasis on the separation of the concept of “Illyrianism” and “Illyrian movement” from the concept of the “Croatian National Revival.” He described “*Illyrianism*” as one of the “terminological labels for Revival movements” (Šicel, 1997, 9). Of the “Illyrian movement” he states that “in the period between 1830–35 and 1849” it was “primarily a *political* movement, which used literature only as a means in the struggle to achieve its goals” (Šicel, 1997, 9). Of the Croatian National Revival, he states that it lasted up to the 60s and the emergence of A. Šenoa “in the sense of a historical movement that was supposed to bring about a modern civil type of national state” (Šicel, 1997, 9). Thereby, he used the name “Croatian National Revival”, a concept extrinsic to literature, to the entire period in respect of which he earlier suggested determinants intrinsic to literature, namely *classicist Romanticism* or a *period of integration of heterogeneous styles*. This shift vis-à-vis his interpretations from the late 1960s and early 1970s can be interpreted in two ways. First, the chrestomathy *Programski spisi hrvatskog narodnog preporoda* collects, as its title suggests, non-fiction texts, of not only meta-literary, but also of broader literary cultural, cultural, linguistic and political topics, and it is assumed that it is not necessary, and occasionally not even possible, to verify their Romantic poetics. Second, the book appeared at a time when the South-Slavic cultural framework immanent to the Revival was no longer promoted as a politically protected anticipation of Yugoslavdom. Thus, may be that Šicel’s shift is connected with the then prevailing political and cultural trends of separation of the Illyrian (as having undoubtedly South-Slavic orientation, but *temporary*) from the fundamental (*final*) Croatian basis of national identity.

5. Croatian literary Romanticism or Romanticism in Croatian literature?

The syntagm *Croatian National and literary Revival* used by Šicel in *Riznica ilirska* was previously highlighted in the title of a chrestomathy edited by Dubravko Jelčić in 1978. In the introduction to this chrestomathy, Jelčić speaks of the phenomenon of Romanticism claiming

it appeared “in a specific form certainly” in Croatian literature of the first half of the 19th century and that it coincides “in its first stage” with the period of “the Croatian National and literary Revival” (Jelčić, 1978, 5). As other literary historians mentioned with the exception of Flaker and Tomasović, Jelčić too legitimised the Romantic nature of literature of the Revival period using a method *via negationem*, which can be interpreted as a form of (auto)exoticism,⁹ i.e. pointing to the elements by which this literature differed from other presumed exemplary Romantic literatures. He concluded that it is better to speak of “*Croatian literary Romanticism*” than of “*Romanticism in Croatian literature*” (Jelčić, 1978, 31). The term *Croatian literary Romanticism* would later be used by Jelčić in the title of an anthology published in 2002 (*Hrvatski književni romantizam*). Although the introductory text of this anthology is almost identical, only slightly expanded introductory text of the chrestomathy *Hrvatski narodni i književni preporod*, the scope of the subsequent chrestomathy (from 2002) was significantly expanded in relation to the former (from 1978). In *Hrvatski narodni i književni preporod*, Jelčić restricted his selection of texts to the time up to the early 1850s, rather than, as he specified in *Hrvatski književni romantizam*, to the literature “from the early 1830s to the early 1870s” (Jelčić, 2002, 83). In *Hrvatski književni romantizam*, he included authors characteristic (also) of the period prior to 1850, as well as those that marked primarily the second half of the 19th century, from the 1850s and 1860s to the mature, the so-called Šenoa age, including its end. In other words, whereas he limited himself in the older chrestomathy, as he wrote himself, to the first (Revival) stage of Romanticism in Croatian literature (cf. Jelčić, 1978, 5), he included the subsequent, post-Revival “stage” in the younger one.

In *Povijest hrvatske književnosti* (*History of Croatian Literature*) published in 1987, I. Frangeš uses the terms *pre-Romanticism* and *Romanticism* as designators of periodisation in addition to *rationalism*, *Illyrianism* and *absolutism* (cf. Frangeš, 1987, 112–174). Such terminology signals that efforts by modern Croatian literary science to legitimise itself using approaches *immanent* to literature bore fruit and that the concept of

9 Related to this cf. Coha, 2015, 60.

Romanticism (which also implied the awareness of pre-Romanticism) became operable in it, if not as self-sufficient, then as self-explanatory. However, a text by Mirko Tomasović entitled *Romantičarska obilježja u hrvatskoj preporodnoj književnosti* (*Romantic Features in Croatian Literature of the Revival Period*), published one year after Frangeš's *Povijest hrvatske književnosti*, confirms that the acceptance of this *self-explanatory nature* did not remove the sense of an unresolved issue of interpreting Romanticism in the history of Croatian literature by using arguments intrinsic to literature. Tomasović's text pleads for the change in the "terminological determination" of Croatian literature of the 1830s and 1840s (cf. Tomasović, 1988, 75). He does so using a thesis that Romantic features of literature of the Revival period unquestionably fit into the fold of European Romanticism, which is proven by invoking the processes "immanent to literary procedure and sensibility" (Tomasović, 1988, 77). Reminding that this was the issue he dealt with since the 1970s (Tomasović, 2002, 13) in the book *Domorodstvo i europejstvo* ("Patriotism and Europeanism") published the same year as Jelčić's chrestomathy *Hrvatski književni romantizam*, Tomasović continues to elaborate the thesis on Croatian Romanticism as a component of European Romanticism in his paper entitled *Razdoblje romantizma u hrvatskoj književnosti*. Emphasising his intrinsic position "on literature from the standpoint of literature" (Tomasović, 2002, 16), he emphasises a certain pre-Romantic tradition and continuation of Romanticism in Croatian literature until the early 1880s, i.e. the end of the so-called Šenoa age (cf. Tomasović, 2002, 17). Thus, Tomasović's period "of Romanticism in Croatian literature" (Tomasović, 2002, 11) chronologically coincides with the period that Jelčić names *Croatian literary Romanticism* (Jelčić, 2002). Although the two of them give answers with a different emphasis, Jelčić insisting on its special nature, and Tomasović on its comparability to other European Romanticisms, both repeat the questions inherited from tradition (since Barac): Is Romanticism in Croatian literature very *different from* or more *like* assumed typical Romanticisms? In doing so, both escalate these issues, treating more explicitly Romanticism as a sign of Croatian culture belonging to European culture than this could be done in the late 1960s and later, during the second half of the 20th century. This is a significant reflection of trends in culture in Croatian

society that was in socio-political transition in the late 20th and the early 21st centuries.¹⁰

6. The Croatian National Revival as part of the period of domination of Romantic features in Croatian culture and literature

If one considers the features of 19th century Croatian literature, referred to by all the descriptions of literary history analysed here, one can conclude the following: A statement by Fernand Braudel whereby it is impossible to make sharp cuts in history is confirmed (cf. Le Goff, 2015, 106). The same is true of Le Goff's statement that "objective" and unbiased periodisation is impossible (Le Goff, 2015, 11). However, one should not discard Le Goff's thesis either saying that "in a long duration, there is room for a period" (Le Goff, 2015, 106). If we agree with Le Goff's suggestions on the need to take into consideration the "prevailing thought" of a certain period (Le Goff, 2015, 66), or with Wellek and Warren's note that in addition to necessary caution in the periodisation of literary history, one should not downplay how stakeholders in certain *movements* interpreted themselves (cf. Wellek, Warren, 1982, 263–264), then we could accept the following: Croatian literature presented itself as the Revival literature (one that should *wake up* its own sleeping or dead nation, as was spoken and written then in the spirit of Romantic cultural nationalism¹¹) in the time between the launch of Gaj's periodical (1835) and the crushing of revolutionary, and the consequent suppression of movements in the Habsburg Monarchy that aspired to national identification (1848–49). As a political but also a literary "movement", as defined by Wellek and Warren (Wellek, Warren, 1982, 264), the Croatian National Revival is a stage of a lengthier period, during which Romantic features appeared in 19th century Croatian culture and literature. Also,

¹⁰ Related to this cf. also Coha, 2015, 54–61.

¹¹ Related to the notion of awakening a sleeping nation cf. e.g. Wehler, 2005, 8. Related to the concept of Romantic cultural nationalism of which such notions were characteristic, cf. e.g. Katunarić, 2003, 140.

even if one cannot speak of an *ideal* type of Romanticism in Croatian literature – especially if one knows that the idea of an ideal or abstract type of Romanticism or any other literary period that would be practically or historically materialised was called into question a long time ago (cf. e.g. Lovejoy, 1924; Wellek, Warren, 1982, 265; Day, 2007, 181)¹² – it is beyond doubt that pre-Romanticism and Romanticism as *systems* “of literary norms, standards, and conventions, whose introduction, spread, diversification, integration, and disappearance can be traced” (Wellek, Warren, 1982, 265) influenced Croatian literature and more broadly Croatian culture from the early to the late 19th century, including inter alia (literary) culture and literature of the 1830s and 1840s, which perceived themselves as being part of the National Revival.

References

- Barac, A. (1954). *Hrvatska književnost od Preporoda do stvaranja Jugoslavije. Knjiga I. Književnost ilirizma*. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.
- Barac, A. (1960). *Hrvatska književnost od Preporoda do stvaranja Jugoslavije. Knjiga II. Književnost pedesetih i šezdesetih godina*. Ed. V. Barac. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.
- Coha, S. (2008). *Mitom stvorena i mitotvorbena ideologija hrvatskoga narodnog preporoda, ilirizma i romantizma. (Čitanje odabranih tekstova preporodnoga razdoblja)*. In: *Romantizam i pitanja modernoga subjekta*. Ed. J. Užarević. Zagreb: Disput, pp. 377–426.
- Coha, S. (2015). *Medij, kultura, nacija. Poetika i politika Gajeve* Danice. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, Filozofski fakultet.
- Coha, S. (2023). *Prikazi hrvatskoga narodnog preporoda i „pripremnoga preporodnog razdoblja“ u hrvatskoj književnoj historiografiji*. In: *Dani Hvarskog kazališta. Hrvatski narodni preporod i njegovo naslijeđe*. Eds. B. Senker, L. Ljubić,

¹² Although it is known that Lovejoy’s and Wellek’s explanation of Romanticism were “a thesis and antithesis” (Shureteh, 2013, 6) (Lovejoy promotes the idea of “discrimination of Romanticisms”, criticised by Wellek), both of them reject the idea of an static “ideal” concept of Romanticism that could be fully realised anywhere. On the polemic Wellek – Lovejoy and on the possibilities of the reconciling of their concepts cf. Shureteh, 2013.

- V. Glunčić-Bužančić. Zagreb–Split: Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Književni krug Split, pp. 22–37.
- Day, A. (2007). *Romanticism*. London–New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Dukić, D. (2009). *Kultura – zapostavljen pojam u počecima moderne hrvatske znanosti o književnosti*, „Umjetnost riječi“, no. 3–4, LIII, pp. 137–152.
- Flaker, A. (1968). *Književne poredbe*. Zagreb: Naprijed.
- Frangeš, I. (1966). *Evropski romantizam i hrvatski narodni preporod*, “Kolo,” no. 8/9/10, 4, pp. 200–214.
- Frangeš, I. (1987). *Povijest hrvatske književnosti*. Zagreb, Ljubljana: Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske, Cankarjeva založba.
- Gross, M. (1981). *O integraciji hrvatske nacije*. In: *Društveni razvoj u Hrvatskoj (od 16. stoljeća do početka 20. stoljeća)*. Ed. M. Gross. Zagreb: Sveučilišna naklada Liber, pp. 175–190.
- Jelčić, D. (1978). *Hrvatski narodni i književni preporod*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Jelčić, D. (2002). *Hrvatski književni romantizam*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Ježić, S. (1934). *Ilirska antologija. Književni dokumenti hrvatskog preporoda*. Zagreb: Minerva nakladna knjižara d. d.
- Ježić, S. (1993²). *Hrvatska književnost od početka do danas 1100–1941*. Zagreb: Grafički zavod Hrvatske.
- Katunarić, V. (2003). *Sporna zajednica. Novije teorije o naciji i nacionalizmu*. Zagreb: Naklada Jesenski i Turk, Hrvatsko sociološko društvo.
- Le Goff, J. (2015). *Treba li povijest zaista dijeliti na razdoblja?* Trans. G.V. Popović. Zagreb: TIM press d.o.o.
- Lovejoy, A. O. (1924). *On the Discrimination of Romanticisms*, “Publications of the Modern Language Association of America,” no. 39, pp. 229–253. <https://doi.org/10.2307/457184>
- Milčetić, I. (1878). *Hrvati od Gaja do godine 1850. Kulturno-istorijski i književni pregled*. Zagreb: Dionička tiskara.
- Oraić Tolić, D. (2022). *Zagrebačka stilistička škola. Zlatno doba hrvatske znanosti o književnosti*. Zagreb: Ljevak.
- Rapačka, J. (2002). *Leksikon hrvatskih tradicija*. Trans. D. Blažina. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Ravlić, J. (1965). *Hrvatski narodni preporod. Ilirska knjiga. I.; II*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, Zora.
- Shureteh, H. (2013). *Romanticism Debated*, “Canadian Social Science,” no. 4, vol. 9, pp. 1–6.
- Stančić, N. (ed.) (1985). *Hrvatski narodni preporod. 1790–1848. Hrvatska u vrijeme Ilirskog pokreta*. Zagreb, Ljubljana: Povijesni muzej Hrvatske, Muzej za umjetnost i obrt, Muzej grada Zagreba, Delo, Globus.
- Šicel, M. (1966). *Književni problemi u doba hrvatskog narodnog preporoda*, “Kolo,” no. 8/9/10, 4, pp. 258–271.
- Šicel, M. (1966a). *Pregled novije hrvatske književnosti*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.

- Šicel, M. (1971). *Prilog problematici romantizma u hrvatskoj književnosti*. In: *Stvaraoci i razdoblja u novijoj hrvatskoj književnosti. Analize i sinteze*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, pp. 267–278.
- Šicel, M. (ed.) (1985). *Riznica ilirska. 1835–1985*. Zagreb, Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba, Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske.
- Šicel, M. (ed.) (1997). *Programski spisi hrvatskog narodnog preporoda*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Šidak, J. (1966). *Hrvatski narodni preporod – ideje i problemi*. “Kolo,” no. 8/9/10, 4, pp. 137–157.
- Šidak, J., Foretić, V., Grabovac, J., Karaman, I., Strčić, P., Valentić, M. (1990²). *Hrvatski narodni preporod. Ilirski pokret*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga, Stvarnost.
- Šurmin, Đ. (1903). *Hrvatski preporod. I. Od godine 1790. do 1836*. Zagreb: Dionička tiskara.
- Šurmin, Đ. (1904). *Hrvatski preporod. II. Od godine 1836. do 1843*. Zagreb: Dionička tiskara.
- Tomasović, M. (1988). *Romantičarska obilježja u hrvatskoj preporodnoj književnosti*. In: *Tradicija i kontekst. Komparativističko-kroatističke teme*. Zagreb: August Cesa-rec, pp. 75–92.
- Tomasović, M. (2002). *Razdoblje romantizma u hrvatskoj književnosti*. In: *Domorodstvo i europaštvo. Rasprave i refleksije o hrvatskoj književnosti XIX. i XX. stoljeća*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, pp. 11–22.
- Wehler, H.-U. (2005). *Nacionalizam. Povijest, oblici, posljedice*. Zagreb: Naklada Jeksenski i Turk.
- Wellek, R., Warren, A. (1982). *Theory of Literature*. Harmondsworth etc.: Penguin Books.
- Živančević, M., Frangeš, I. (1975). *Povijest hrvatske književnosti. Knjiga 4. Ilirizam. Realizam*. Zagreb: Liber, Mladost.

- **SUZANA COHA** is an Associate Professor in the Department of Croatian Language and Literature, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb. She published the following books: *Medij, kultura, nacija – poetika i politika Gajeve Danice (Medium, Culture, Nation – Poetics and Politics of Gaj's Danica, 2015)* and *Ljudevit Gaj – karizmatični i kontroverzni predvodnik hrvatskoga narodnog preporoda (Ljudevit Gaj – Charismatic and Controversial Leader of the Croatian National Revival, 2022)*. She regularly publishes scientific papers on modern Croatian literature and culture.