



VLADISLAV B. SOTIROVIĆ

Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania
Mykolo Romerio universitetas, Lietuva

THE IDEA OF A GREATER (UNITED) CROATIA BY PAVAO RITTER VITEZOVIĆ: AN EARLY-MODERN MODEL OF THE NATIONAL IDENTITY AND CREATION OF THE NATIONAL STATE OF THE CROATO-SLAVS

Pavao Ritterio Vitezovičiaus Didžiosios (Jungtinės) Kroatijos idėja:
ankstyvasis modernus nacionalinės tapatybės modelis
ir nacionalinės kroatų-slavų valstybės kūrimas

SANTRAUKA

Straipsnyje nagrinėjamas kroatų didiko publicisto ir istoriko Pavao Ritterio Vitezovičiaus (1652–1713) „Didžiosios Kroatijos“ modelis. Daugelis istorikų tyrinėjo Vitezovičiaus politines mintis ir jo išplėtotą vieningos Pietų Slavų valstybės, kaip platesnio vieningo Slavų pasaulio dalies, ideologinę sistemą. Pasak vylaujančio mokslininkų požiūrio, Vitezovičius buvo „jugoslavizmo“ (suvienytos Pietų Slavų tautinės valstybės) ir netgi vieningo slavizmo, vieningo slavų kultūrinio ir politinio abipusiškumo idėjos pirmtakas. Jo amžininkų tekstuose siūlomas alternatyvus būdas apibrėžti modernių Pietų Slavų etninių valstybių sienas. Vitezovičius siekė kurti kroatų nacionalinę valstybę remiantis pastangomis konsoliduoti kroatų „etnines teritorijas“ ir „etnolingvistines linijas“. Šios tapatybės sampratos analizė atskleidžia, kaip buvo suprastos numatytos ankstyvosios modernios kroatų etninės valstybės sienos. Ji apima plačias teritorijas nuo Adrijos jūros iki Maskvos ir nuo Baltijos jūros iki Juodosios jūros. Vitezovičiaus požiūris į lietuvius ir Lenkijos-Lietuvos Sąjungą liudija, kad argumentas, kuriuo grindžiami jo reikalavimai Kroatijos tautinei valstybei, paremtas etnolingvistine giminyste.

KEY WORDS: Croatia, Croats, Slavs, Lithuania, Lithuanians, national identity, Balkans.

RAKTAŽODŽIAI: Kroatija, kroatai, slavai, Lietuva, lietuviai, tautinė tapatybė, Balkanai.

SUMMARY

The paper will examine the model for the creation of a 'Greater Croatia' designed by the Croatian nobleman, publicist and historian Pavao Ritter Vitezović (1652–1713). Many historians have viewed Vitezović's political thought and his developed ideological framework of a united South Slavic state as part of a wider pan-Slavic world. According to the prevailing notion, Vitezović was a precursor of the idea of 'Yugoslavism' (a united Southern Slav nation state) and even 'Pan-Slavism', a pan-Slavic cultural and political reciprocity. Yet a closer look at Vitezović and his contemporaries' writings suggests an alternative model for outlining the borders of modern ethnic states among the Southern Slavs. Vitezović argued for the creation of a Croat national state, based on the integration of the Croat 'ethnic territories' and their consolidation along ethno-linguistic lines. The analysis of Vitezović's understanding of nationhood explains how the borders of an envisioned early modern Croat ethnic state had been perceived as including vast territories from the Adriatic Sea to Moscow and from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea. In this respect Vitezović's views on the Lithuanians and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth will show that the argument used to substantiate his claims for a Croatian nation state was based on an ethno-linguistic kinship.

AN IDEOLOGICAL CONCEPT OF THE PAN CROATIANISM AND A GREATER (UNITED) CROATIA

A Croatian nobleman of ethnic German origin from Senj, Pavao Ritter Vitezović (1652–1713), was the person who transformed old Dalmatian Pan-Slavic idea into the ideological concept of Pan-Croatianism that included all Slavic population into the membership of the Croatian nationality. Dalmatian, and especially Ragusian (Dubrovnik) humanists, in the 16th century accepted the old domestic popular tradition that all Slavs originated in fact in the Balkans and the south Danubian region. It means that according to this tradition, the South Slavs are autochthonous inhabitants at both the Balkan Peninsula and its neighboring south Danubian region. More precisely, the entire Slavonic population had its progenitors in the ancient Balkan Illyrians, Macedonians and Thracians. Principally, the ancient Illyrians were considered as the real ancestors of the South, Eastern and Western Slavs who have been living in the central and west-

ern territories of the Balkans. Consequently, according to this belief, the forefathers of present-day Eastern and Western Slavs emigrated from the Balkans and nearby Danubian lands and settled themselves on the wide territory of Europe from the Elbe River on the West to the Volga River on the East.¹ However, the South Slavs remained in the Balkans – the peninsula that was considered as the motherland of all Slavonic people (*Istorija naroda Jugoslavije* 1960: 224–227). Subsequently, all famous historical actors who originated in the Balkans were appropriated as members of the Slavdom: Alexander the Great and his father Philip II of Macedonia, Aristotle, St. Jerome (Hieronymus), Diocletian, Constantine the Great, SS. Cyril and Methodius, etc.² On the territory of present-day Serbia, for instance, eighteen Roman Emperors of the Illyrian (Slavic?) origin were born among whom Constantin the Great became most famous.

P. R. Vitezović, “*plemeniti i hrabreni gospn hërvatski i senski vlastelin*” (“noble and brave gentleman and feudal lord from Senj”) (Bogišić 1970: 143), a Senj’s delegate to the Hungarian feudal Parliament (Diet) in Sopron, a representative of the Croatian feudal Parliament (Sabor) at the Imperial Court in Vienna, developed its ideology of Pan-Croatianism in the following writings: *Kronika, aliti szpomen vszega szvieta vikov* (“Chronicle, or a Remembrance of all the Times of the World”), Zagreb, 1696; *Anagrammaton, Sive Lauras auxiliatoribus Ungariae liber secundus* (“The Second Book of Anagrams, or a Laurel to the Helpers of Hungary”), Vienna, 1689; *Croatia rediviva: Regnante Leopoldo Magno Caesare* (“Revived Croatia”), Zagreb, 1700; and in *Stemmatographia, sive Armorum Illyricorum delineatio, descriptio et restitutio* (“Stemmatography, or the Delineation, Description, and Restoration of the Illyrian Coat of Arms”), Vienna, 1701. Nevertheless, the fundamental political purpose of these four works was to indicate to the Habsburg Emperor Leopold I (1658–1705) the “Croatian” historical lands that should be united under the Habsburg imperial crown, but not to be divided between three Balkan superpowers: the Republic of San Marco (Venice), the Ottoman Sultanate and the Habsburg Monarchy (Bratulić 1994: 74; *Istorija naroda Jugoslavije* 1960: 948–949). Especially his *Croatia rediviva...* was a political protest against the Austro-Ottoman Peace Treaty of Sremski Karlovci (Karlowitz), which, according to Vitezović, deprived Croatia of her alleged ancient historical and ethnical territories (Ritter 1700; Šišić 1934: 44).

According to the Peace Treaty of Sremski Karlovci, the border between the Habsburg Monarchy and the Ottoman Sultanate was fixed on the Morish and Tisa Rivers. Therefore, Transylvania and Hungary became now parts of the Habsburg Monarchy, the Banat of Temeshvar of the Ottoman Sultanate while the region of Srem (Sirmium) was divided between these two empires. The state border of the Habsburg Monarchy became moved from the Kupa River to the Una River (in the present-day Bosnia) and to the Mt. Velebit in Dalmatia. However, the European peace was established next year when on June 13th the Russian Empire and the Ottoman Sultanate signed a bilateral treaty in Istanbul (Constantinople) that was valid for the next thirty years. According to this treaty, Russia got Azov, stopped to pay annual tribute to the Tatar Han, received a right to freely visit the Christian holy places in Palestine and to have its own diplomatic representative in Istanbul (Dimić 1999: 266–267).

P. R. Vitezović clearly pointed out in his *Kronika...* that entire ex-Roman province of *Illyricum* should be understood as a land populated by the Slavs (Vitezovich 1696: 6). However, he implied the term *Illyricum* to the entire Balkan Peninsula that was settled by the Slavs including and the Albanians who were (wrongly) considered as direct descendents of the ancient Illyrians. Moreover, taking into consideration the fact that the South Slavic (Roman Catholic) Renaissance authors mainly (wrongly) applied the name Illyrians and Illyricum to the Croats and Croatia, Vitezović in fact called all descendents (the Slavs and Albanians) of

the Illyrians as Croats. Thus, the main portion of the Balkans, from the Istrian Peninsula and the Adriatic Sea to the Black Sea, the Danube River and the Aegean Sea belonged exclusively to the Croatia. Vitezović stressed that the idea of Illyrian-Slavic nationhood, or the Croatia, was based on linguistic unity and community for the simple reason that all of these territories and their inhabitants spoke and wrote “szlavni nas (i.e., the Croatian) *Illyrski aliti Szlovenski jezik*” (“our glorious Illyrian or Slavic language”) (Vitezovich 1696: 199; Blažević 2000, see map on p. 225).

A Roman province of *Illyricum* was established during the time of the Roman Emperor Augustus’ conquering the Western Balkans in the years of 35 B.C. – A.D. 9. During the time of the Emperor Constantine I (Great), one of (four) imperial *Praefecturae* (the largest administrative-territorial units of the Roman Empire) was the *Illyricum* which covered almost the whole Balkans (except present-day Bulgaria and the European Turkey) and the parts of the present-day Hungary and Austria. The *Praefectura Illyricum* was divided into the following *dioceses*: Achaia, Thessalia, Macedonia, Dacia, Moesia Prima, Epirus Vetus, Epirus Nova, Praevalitana, Dalmatia, Pannonia Prima, Pannonia Secunda, Savia, Noricum Ripense and Noricum Mediterraneum (Westermann 1985: 38–39, 42–43). It partially covered the territories of modern Austria, Slovenia and Hungary, but covered all present-day Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Serbia, Montenegro, Greece (without the West Thrace) and Albania. Nevertheless, in his *Anagrammaton...* Vitezović included the entire territory of the Bal-

kans and a part of the South-East Europe into the *Illyricum* that was later described in his *Croatia redioiva...* as the South Croatia (Ritter 1689; Ritter 1700).

P. R. Vitezović actually divided the whole world into six ethnolinguistic, historical, cultural and geographical areas, civilizations and cultures as they are:

I) *Germania*, which embraced the whole German-speaking world: the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation, headed by Austria, the Kingdom of Sweden (Sweden, Norway, Finland), Denmark, East Prussia, Curonian Isthmus (Kuršių Neria) with the Curonian Bay or the Courish Lagoon (Kuršių Marios), Memel (Klaipėda). However, *Angliae regnum* (Scotland, England, Wales, and Ireland) was included into Germania as well.

II) *Italia cum parte Graeciae* (Italy with the part of Greece) referred to the Apennine Peninsula, Corsica, Sardinia, Sicily, Attica, Peloponnesus (Morea) and the main number of the Aegean and the Ionian Islands, Malta and Crete.

III) *Illyricum* that was the whole Balkans (except Attica and Peloponnesus with the adjoining islands), Wallachia (Dacia and Cumania), Transylvania and Hungary.

IV) *Hispania*, which was composed by Spain and Portugal and their European possessions and overseas colonies in Africa, Asia, Latin America with Florida and California.

V) *Sarmatia* that was composed by the territories of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (the Republic of Two Nations) with Moldavia and Muscovy (i.e., the Russian Empire).

VI) *Gallia* that was France (Ritter 1689: 69–117).

A real ideological source for such division of the whole world was the Slavic idea which decisively influenced Vitezović who recognized that all Slavs belonged to a single ethnolinguistic community. Nevertheless, he metamorphosed this idea of Pan-Slavism eleven years later into the idea of a Pan-Croatianism and a Greater Croatia. In fact, Vitezović claimed that all Slavs are the Balkan Illyrians who were autochthonous inhabitants of Illyricum. However, for him it was clear that ancient Illyrians were modern Croats and ancestors of all Slavs. This ideology of Croatian-Slavic ethnogenesis Vitezović developed in his work *Croatia rediviva*... that was an outline for more ambitious general history of the Croats and Croatia, i.e. the entire Slavic population. In this work Vitezović divided total territory of ethnic, historical and linguistic Croatia into two parts: I) *Croatia Septemtrionalis* (the North Croatia), and II) *Croatia Meridionalis* (the South Croatia). The boundary between them was the Danube River. Northern Croatia encompassed the entire territories of Bohemia, Moravia, Lusatia (Łužica or Łużyca in the East Saxony and the South Brandenburg) (*The Sorbs in Germany* 1998: 5), Hungary, Transylvania, Wallachia, Muscovy, Poland and Lithuania (Ritter 1700: 109). The people who were living in the North Croatia were divided into two groups: the North-West Croats, called the *Venedicos* (Wends) and the North-East Croats, named as the *Sarmaticos* (Sarmatians). The Wends consisted of the Czechs, Moravians, and Sorbs (Sorabi, who lived in Lusatia), whereas the Sarmatians who were living in Muscovy, Poland and Lithuania (Ritter 1700: 10), i.e., were the

Rus', Poles and Lithuanians.

P. R. Vitezović found that the ancestors of all North Croats (Wends and Sarmatians) were the White Croats (*Belohrobatoi*, from the Byzantine historical sources) who lived in the early Middle Ages around the upper Dniester River and the upper Vistula River, i.e., Galicia and Little Poland (Engel 1979: 10–11; Westermann 1985: 50–51, 54–55; Macan 1992: 15–16; Klaić 1971: 18–22). A traditional name from the sources for White Croatia was a *Greater Croatia* or an *Ancient Croatia* (Ćorović 1993: 34; Klaić 1971: 21). At the time of Vitezović's writing of *Croatia rediviva*... this territory was integral part of the Republic of the Two Nations (the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth).

The South Croatia, or Illyricum (the Balkans), was subdivided by Vitezović into two parts: *Croatia Alba* (White Croatia), and *Croatia Rubra* (Red Croatia). Croatia Alba was composed by *Croatia Maritima* (central and maritime Montenegro, Dalmatia and the East Istria), *Croatia Mediterranea* (Croatia proper and Bosnia-Herzegovina), *Croatia Alpestris* (Slovenia and the West Istria) and *Croatia Interamnia* (Slavonia with a part of Pannonia). Croatia Rubra consisted of Serbia, the North-East Montenegro, Bulgaria, Macedonia, Epirus, Albania, Thessaly and Thrace (Vitezović's Odrysia) (Ritter 1700: 32). Therefore, there have been Vitezović's "*limites totius Croatiae*" ("borders of whole Croatia") that was settled by ethnolinguistic Croats (Vitezović 1699; Ritter 1699; Vitezović 1997: 188–215; Perković 1995: 225–236). However, Vitezović recognized the reality that his Greater (United) Croatia and a Pan-Croatian national identity was not a unified in whole. In the other words, he acknowl-

edged differences in borders, names, emblems, and customs: “*cum propriis tamen singularum limitibus etymo, Insignibus, rebusque ac magis memorabilibus populi moribus*” (Ritter 1700: 32; Ritter 1701). After all, he believed that these distinctions were of lesser importance than the common Croatian nationhood of all of these people and lands. His apotheosis

of the common Croat name especially for all South Slavs (the ancient Balkan Illyrians) with regional and historic differences was expressed in Vitezović’s heraldic manual *Stemmatographia...* where he presented all “Croatian” historical and ethnolinguistic lands in the South-East Europe, like Serbia, Bulgaria, Romania, etc. (Ritter 1701; Banac 1993: 223–227).

THE SOURCES OF IDEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND OF P. R. VITEZOVIĆ’S PAN-CROATIANISM

The ideological background of P. R. Vitezović’s Pan-Croatianism lies undoubtedly in the 16th–17th centuries developed Pan-Slavic idea, which is presented in the first part of this article. Vitezović accepted the main point of this idea – all Slavs constitute a single ethnolinguistic community of kinship.³

The basic elements of this assumption he found in the well-known and widely-read East Slavonic *Povest’ vremennyh let* or *Nestor’s Chronicle* (“Primary Chronicle” – a compilation from the early 12th century, containing both oral and earlier written material), which main ideological construction, i.e., tradition of the three Slavic progenitors – brothers Czech, Lech and Rus’, who originated in the Balkans and Pannonian Plain around the Danube River (*Povest’ vremennyh let* 1884: 4; Conte 1986: 14–15). This source became further developed in the various medieval Dalmatian, Czech and Polish chronicles and Renaissance-Baroque Slavic histories written by the South Slavic authors, especially by those living in Dalmatia.

Constructing his own ideology of a Pan-Croatianism, P. R. Vitezović, on the first place, used information from the

next four historical sources relating to the early history of the Slavs, their origin, ethnogenesis and their settlement at the Balkans:

1) Already mentioned above *Povest’ vremennyh let*.

2) *Letopis Popa Dukljanina* or *Barski rodoslov* (“Chronicle of the Priest from Dioclea” or “Bar’s Genealogy”). This is a mid-12th century chronicle, possibly originally written in the Slavic language, but surviving only in its Latin translation. The only survived copy of this manuscript can be found in the Manuscript Collection of Library of Vatican under the signature: Vat. Lat. 6958. The main part of this chronicle is based on oral tradition. It is the most detailed source for the early history of Montenegro and Herzegovina and important source on history of Bosnia, Croatia and Macedonia.

3) *Historia Salonitana* (“History of Split”). This is the most important, but biased historical source for the history of Dalmatian city of Split from the 7th to the 13th centuries. There is as well an expanded version of this work from the 16th century that is known as *Historia*

Salonitana maior by Thomas the Archdeacon of Split who died in 1268.

4) *De Administrando Imperio* ("On governing of the state"). This unfinished work is dealing with the foreign policy of the Byzantium, diplomatic techniques, and sketches of the neighbouring Slavic and non-Slavic people. It is written by a Byzantine Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, 913–959.

P. R. Vitezović, became ideologically influenced and by three specific South Slavic authors who were the principal South Slavic champions of a Pan-Slavic national and linguistic reciprocity: Vinko Pribojević, Mavro Orbin, and Juraj Križanić. In addition to them, a Central European writer, Georg Horn – the 17th century author who wrote in 1666 the so-called *Georgii Horni, sive Historia imperiorum et regnorum, a conditio orbe ad nostra tempora* – left as well a distinct ideological impression on Vitezović.

Surprisingly, P. R. Vitezović in his work reconciled, on one hand, the legend from *Povest' vremennyh let* and information from *Historia Salonitana* that the Croats (called in this latter work as the Curetes) were living in the Balkans in the first century B.C. with, on other hand, the information about the Croat settlement in the Balkans that he found in Porphyrogenitus' *De Administrando Imperio*. Actually, for Vitezović the most interesting part of Porphyrogenitus' work was the chapter № 30 where the Byzantine Emperor pointed out that the Balkan Croats lived in former time "on the other side of Bavaria, where the White Croats can be found today" (Klaić 1972: 3). Vitezović from this information derived a conclusion that the Croats lived out from the Balkans too, and consequently he divid-

ed all Croats (from the Balkans and outside the Balkans) into "Transdanubian" and "Cisdanubian" Croats. Furthermore, combining information from *Povest' vremennyh let* and those from Orbin's *Il Regno degli Slavi*, Vitezović concluded firstly that the brothers Czech, Lech and Rus' (i.e., the Czechs, Moravians, Poles, Russians and entire population of Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth including and Lithuanians) were not only the natives of Illyricum (i.e., Croatia, according to him), but as well that all of them were actually ethnolinguistic Croats. He used Porphyrogenitus' text to claim and that the Serbs were of the Croat origin for the reason that the Emperor wrote that the Croats bordered themselves with the Slavic Serbs "who are called Croats" (Klaić 1972: 3; see as well, Moravcsic 1949; Bury 1906). Finally, the name "Red Croatia" (*Croatia Rubea*) from *Letopis Popa Dukljanina* (*Ljetopis Popa Dukljanina* 1967, 196), which was related to the mediaeval Montenegro (called Duklja or Dioclea, Doclea), Herzegovina and the North Albania, Vitezović extended to the whole territory of the East Balkans populated by the Slavs (i.e., Illyrians or Croats in his opinion); whereas the name "White Croatia" (*Croatia Alba*) from the same source (*Ljetopis Popa Dukljanina* 1967, 194–195) that was related to the East Adriatic littoral, he extended to the whole portion of the West Balkans.

From the sentence "*Clarius Constant. Porphirogenitus Imper. ...qui Sarmatas Belochrobatos, id est Albos, sive magnos, aut terram multam possidentes, appellat*" is clear that Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus' *De Administrando Imperio* served to Vitezović to claim that all Western and Eastern Slavs, i.e., the Czechs, Sorbs,

Moravians and all inhabitants of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Russia, originated in *Belohrobatoi* (White Croats) who are also called by Vitezović as the Sarmatians.

The author of *Croatia rediviva...* accepted an old idea of the Sarmatian origin of the Slavs, especially of the Poles, by reading at his lifetime very popular following four publications:

1) The Polish historian Matthew Miehowita's *Tractatus de duabus Sarmatiis Asiana et Europeana* ("Treatise about two Sarmatias – Asian and European"), Cracow, 1517, for whom ancient Sarmatians were contemporary Russians.

2) The Polish poet Ian Kohanowski (1530–1584).

3) The Polish historian Martinu Kromer's, *De origine et rebus gestis Poloniarum* (Basel, 1555), who supported the idea of ethnic and linguistic Sarmatian-Slavic symbiosis telling that the Slavic Sarmatians came to the Central and South-East Europe from "Asian Sarmatia" (north from the Black Sea) (Cromer 1555; Cy-narski 1968, 6–17).

4) The Polish historian Matthew Strykowski's *Kronika Polska, Litewska, Żmudzka i wszystkiej Rusi* ("Chronicle of Poland, Lithuania, Żemaitija/Samogitia, and all the lands of Rus"), Königsberg, 1582. Vitezović became particularly affected with Strykowski's association of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (the GDL) with the "Polish Sarmatian Empire".

P. R. Vitezović accepted from these four works of the Polish Renaissance authors the notion that "European Sarmatia" encompassed Poland, Lithuania, Byelorussia, and Ukraine, i.e. the lands under the sceptre of the "Polish" Jagellonian royal dynasty, which was, in fact,

of the Lithuanian origin (Bumblauskas 2007: 172–179; Zinkevičius 2013: 162–167).

The ideological principles that guided M. Strykowski's chronicle undoubtedly strengthened both Pan-Slavic ideology and the ideology of Sarmatism that dominated Poland at the second half of the 16th century and the first half of the 17th century, consolidating at the same time a Polish position within the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (Kiaupa et al. 2000: 292–293). The "Sarmatian myth" was transformed by the Poles from a geographic term to the ethnic dimension and became finally political program under the motto: *Polonia caput ac Regina totius Sarmatiae* (Conte 1986: 301).

P. R. Vitezović, in general, accepted old writings about the Slavs, or at least the peoples whom he believed to be the Slavs. For that reason, he accepted the Polish "Sarmatian ideology" based on the writings of the ancient Greek and Roman historians and geographers (for instance, Strabo 63 B.C. – 23 A.D., Ptolemy 100–168) who divided the territory of contemporary Poland into two parts: *Germania* (the West Poland) and *Sarmatia* (the East Poland) (Conte 1986: 292). Ptolemy named the whole territory of the Central and the East Europe as *Sarmatia* (Sulimirski 1945: 26). It should be emphasized that the Roman Empire succeeded to establish between the years of 16 B.C. and 9 A.D. three new provinces – *Raetia*, *Noricum* and *Pannonia* – and to firm its own position along the Danube, only after the military victories over two Sarmatian peoples: Roxolanes and Iazyges. However, both of them were occupying the Roman province of Moesia Inferior (that is today Bulgaria) from 69 B.C. The region of Pannonia and the North-East Bal-

kans (i.e. "Hungary and Bulgaria") are considered in *Povest' vremennyh let* as birth-places of the three brothers – Slavic progenitors (*Povest' vremennyh let* 1884: 4). For Vitezović, it was quite logical to conclude that the Slavic progenitors from *Povest' vremennyh let* originated in Pan-nonian-Danubian-Balkan Sarmatians, who are mentioned in the Roman annals.

The Strykowski's chronicle strengthened the idea of Pan-Slavism in the eyes of J. Križanić, but in the eyes of P. R. Vitezović this Pan-Slavic ideology was converted into the Pan-Croatian one. Furthermore, Vitezović was familiar with the theory of the Sarmatian origin of all Slavs that was developed in 1606 in the short history *De slowinis seu Sarmatis* written by Dalmatian historian, inventor, philosopher and lexicographer from Šibenik – Faust Vrančić. The next step used by Vitezović was to identify Porphyrogenitus' "White Croats" with the *Slavi Vandali* (the Vandalic Slavs), whose were divided in *Georgii Horni, sive Historia imperiorum et regnorum, a conditio orbe*

ad nostra tempora (1666) into *Venedicos* (the Wends) and *Sarmaticos* (the Sarmatians).⁴ Finally, Vitezović was influenced at the great extent by the works of Juraj Križanić and Martin Cromer with regard to the Pan-Slavic unity and reciprocity, but he rejected their teaching that all Slavs originated in *Rus'* (Cromer 1555; Križanić 1661–1667; Križanić 1859).⁵ In sum, combining the works of Strykowski, Vrančić, Križanić, Cromer and Horn, Pavao Ritter Vitezović effectively claimed all Western, Southern and Eastern Slavs to be of the Croat ethnolinguistic origin.

Ultimately, in dealing with the Balkan Croatia, he accepted an idea of the Croatian 17th-century historian from Dalmatia – Ivan Lučić – who divided a whole Croatia into three provinces: *Maritima*, *Mediterranea*, and *Interamnensis sive Savia*. However, Vitezović added additional two provinces of the Balkan Croatia: *Citerior* (Istria and Slovenia) and *Ulterior* (Serbia). These were further divided into "županije" (counties) and "comitatus" (judicial districts) (Vitezović 1997: 195).

POLITICAL PURPOSE OF VITEZOVIĆ'S WRITINGS

The ultimate political purpose of P. Vitezović's works, based on his ideological construction, was of a triple nature.

First of all, he tried to refute the Venetian claims on the territory of Dalmatia, the Istrian Peninsula, the Dalmatian Islands and Boka Kotorska (Cattaro Gulf in the present-day Montenegro) that rose during the Great Vienna War 1683–1699 in which the Republic of St. Marco successfully fought the Ottoman Sultanate in a coalition with the Habsburg Empire [Banac 1984, 73]. The war clearly marked

the beginning of irreversible decline of the Ottoman power which consequently opened the so-called Eastern Question or the question of destiny of the Ottoman Sultanate in Europe.

A state of the Ottoman dynasty reached its heyday in the mid-16th century when it occupied and annexed most of the Arab world, most of Hungary with Transylvania, Srem and Slavonia, Azerbaijan, Georgia and many of the islands in the East Mediterranean Sea. The Sultanate also inflicted several heavy naval

defeats on Spain, Genoa and Venice. After the fall in 1521 of a strongest Hungarian military fortress of Belgrade, known as a Gate of Hungary, a way to the Central Europe became fully open to the Ottoman army. Subsequently, a biggest part of historical Hungary became occupied up to 1544 including and the biggest portion of the present-day Croatia. After the Mohács Battle in 1526 Hungarian, Bohemian and Croatian nobility elected the Habsburg Emperor as their new ruler and protector.

The Hungarian and Croatian feudal aristocracy hope to reconquer their historical territories from the Ottomans backed by the Habsburg rulers. Therefore, any kind of revived Hungary or Croatia was possible only within the borders of the Habsburg Monarchy after the military defeat of the Ottoman Sultanate. The House of Habsburgs before 1526 had their family domains only in the region of Alps: the Upper and Lower Austria, Styria, Carinthia, Carniola, Gorizia and Tyrol. However, the invitation to the Habsburg dynasty to become the Hungarian-Croatian king in 1526 change dramatically the territorial base of their rule as the Habsburgs started to claim all historical lands of the pre-1526 Kingdom of Hungary including and Croatia-Slavonia and the lands of the Kingdom of Bohemia together with Bohemia itself, Moravia, Silesia and Lusatia (Magocsi 2002: 62). Subsequently, after 1526 the geopolitical aims of the Habsburgs coincided with those of the Hungarian and the Croatian nobility.

An example of the Spanish Reconquista from 1492 gave a great impetus to the Christian Central European nobility

in their struggle against Asiatic-Islamic "infedels" who occupied their feudal domains and destroyed their medieval independent states. The European possessions of the Sultanate reached its maximum extent as late as 1676 and in 1683 the Ottomans were enough strong to launch a decisive war for the heartland of the Central Europe by putting Vienna under the siege for two months (Bideleux, Jeffries: 1999, 82). However, it was the last attempt by the Sultanate to penetrate deeper into Europe – an attempt which became not only a total military fiasco but much more seriously, the beginning of the final end of the Ottoman state. In 1699, the Sultanate lost all of its Central European possessions opening the doors to the Habsburg Monarchy and Venice to divide between themselves conquered territories from the Sultanate. At such circumstances, it was for the Croatian nobility of the fundamental importance which lands from the Ottoman Sultanate are going to be included into the Habsburg Monarchy as they could count only these territories to be united with the rest of the Habsburg-ruled Croatia into a separate administrative-territorial province under the name of Croatia. In the other words, all South Slavic lands left outside the Habsburg Monarchy were lost for united Croatia.

As a result of the Venetian military victory over the Ottoman Sultanate at the end of the Great Vienna War, the officials of the Republic of St. Marco required considerable territorial enlargement of their possessions on the East Adriatic littoral at the expense of both the Ottoman Sultanate and the South Slavs. These territorial demands had

been based on the Venetian state-historical and ethnolinguistic rights on the lands and people of the East Adriatic seacoast. It was pointed out in the Venetian territorial claims that *Signorina* ruled Istria, Dalmatia and the Adriatic Islands since the year of 1000, strengthening her realm by the further territorial annexations in 1409, 1420, 1433, and 1669.⁶ Further, according to the opinion of the Venetian authorities, the majority of population of the East Adriatic littoral were the Italian-speaking inhabitants, whose wish, natural rights and interest were to be liberated from the Ottoman sway and governed by the Italian-speaking Venice. Due to their military victories over the Ottomans and well-organized propaganda network, the Venetians extended their Dalmatian possessions according to the Peace Treaty of Sremski Karlovci that was signed with the Ottoman Sultanate on January 26th, 1699. However, the treaty was revised on April 15th, 1701 in the Venetian favour by acquisition of whole Peloponnesus/Morea, some islands, the city of Herzeg Novi, part of Boka Kotorska, the mouth of the Neretva River and continental Dalmatia up to the Dinaric Range (*Istorija naroda Jugoslavije* 1960: 777–778; Dimić 1999: 266).

P. R. Vitezović tried to negate Venetian territorial claims on the South Slavic Adriatic littoral, which was considered by him as a Croatian state-historical and ethnolinguistic territory, which was at the same time a part of the lands of the Hungarian Royal Crown inherited in 1526 by the Habsburg Monarchy. He was actually protesting against the articles of the 1699 Habsburg-Ottoman peace treaty requiring its revision for the sake to in-

clude into the Habsburg Monarchy all “Croatian” lands. For that purpose, Vitezović based Croatian territorial claims primarily on state-historical rights – *iura municipalia* – (at that time of the feudal order, society and values the only justifiable rights in international relations), but combining them to the certain degree as well with the Croatian ethnolinguistic rights. Subsequently, for instance, the whole territory of Adriatic Dalmatia was appropriated to Croats by Vitezović for the reason that the Croatian King Peter Krešimir IV (1058–1075) included this region into the Croatian mediaeval state (Fine 1994: 278–279; Klaić 1971: 105–111; Macan 1992: 36–41): “*Cresimirus Croatorū Rex Adriaticum Mare suae appropriabat jurisdictioni*” (Ritter 1700, 13).

P. R. Vitezović’s writings were especially directed against pro-Venetian texts of the famous historian and doctor of law from Dalmatian city of Trogir – Ivan Lučić (Lucius Joannes 1604–1679) – who is traditionally considered as a founder of the Croatian scientific historiography. Lučić’s most important work – *De Regno Dalmatiae et Croatiae libri six* (“The Kingdom of Dalmatia and Croatia in Six Volumes”), Amsterdam, 1668 – that includes many narrative sources, genealogical tables and historical-geographical maps, tells the truth that Dalmatia in former time was a separate territory from the state of Croatia and in fact the Venetian possession. However, Vitezović, due to his Croato-centric point of view, used every opportunity to accuse Lučić (Lucius) of Dalmatocentric and pro-Venetian, attitude, a subject to which he devoted a whole work under the title *Officiae Ioannis Lucii de Regno Dalmatiae et Croatiae Refutatae* (“Ref-

utation of Lučić's Kingdom of Dalmatia and Croatia") written in 1706. For this purpose, Vitezović referred to the Priest from Doclea who wrote in his chronicle that a synonym for *Croatia Alba* (White Croatia) is *Dalmatia Inferior* (Lower Dalmatia), while a synonym for *Croatia Rubra* (Red Croatia) is *Dalmatia Superior* (Upper Dalmatia) (*Ljetopis Popa Dukljanina* 1967: 194–196). Clearly, for both the Priest from Doclea and Pavao Ritter Vitezović, Croatia and Dalmatia were the same territories, just with two names.

Second of all, P. R. Vitezović's political aim was to put all "Croatian" Balkan territories under the sceptre of the Habsburg Emperor Leopold I. The regions in question, which remained outside the borders of Croatia and the Habsburg Monarchy after the Peace Treaty of Sremski Karlovci in 1699, became the object not only of Vitezović's Croatocentric, but as well as of the Habsburg imperial desires. For instance, during the first peace treaty negotiations between the Habsburg Monarchy and the Ottoman Sultanate in 1689, the Habsburg diplomatic representatives steadily demanded that the eastern frontier of the Habsburg Monarchy had to follow the Morava River (in Serbia). It means that Bosnia-Herzegovina, Srem, Croatia, Slavonia and the West Serbia had unconditionally to be part of the Habsburg Monarchy (Stoye 1994: 71–72).

Unsatisfied with the newly established borders accorded by the Peace Treaty of Sremski Karlovci in January 1699 (Weigl 1699), the Croatian representative in the Habsburg Monarchy's commission for demarcation, a cartographer and historian Pavao Ritter Vitezović,

presented his memorandum, printed under the headline *Croatia rediviva...i.e.*, his view of the "real historical borders and territory of Croatia" (Marković 1987: 71–99; Fürst-Bjeliš 2000: 211–214; Kovačević 1973) to the Habsburg Emperor Leopold I, urging him to liberate and annex to the Habsburg Monarchy all Cisdanubian "Croatian" territories, what was actually the whole Balkans without Central and South Greece. Surely, Vitezović's political plan presented to Leopold I fitted to the Habsburg's plans of the future Habsburg foreign policy. Thus, already in the late 1700, after submission of manifesto *Croatia rediviva...* to the Habsburg authorities, the Habsburg Emperor officially invited Vitezović to visit him in Vienna "since certain and important reasons make your presence in order to provide some information urgently required, also bring all letters and documents delineating and defining borderlines and demarcations of our said Kingdom of Croatia you have on your person..." (Klaić 1914: 105).

The fact is that Leopold I Habsburg, as the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation, the King of Hungary and the King of Croatia, started to frequently express the Habsburg hereditary claims on Dalmatia, at the expense of Venice, exactly after the conversation with Vitezović in Vienna. Vitezović himself confirmed that his manifesto was accepted at the Viennese imperial court with full attention: "the Viennese are applauding my *Prodromus in Croatiam Redivivam* I have sent them..." (*Lettere del Cavaliere Ritter* 1700).

P. R. Vitezović based his claims on these "Croatian" territories on two prin-

ciples of legitimisation: 1. State-historic rights of Croatia; and 2. The Croatian/Illyrian form of the local place-names as the most reliable marker of the national character (Simpson 1991: 94; Blažević 2000: 228–229). A *Croatia Meridionalis* (the South Croatia) was designed by Vitezović to join the Habsburg Empire, and as a consequence, the whole Balkan Croatia (*Illyria*) would be politically united under the Habsburg administration. P. R. Vitezović attempted to institute the piece of evidence that historical borders of the Kingdom of Croatia were considerably larger than those Croatia's borders established in his time. Beside the far-reaching consequences of the future annexation of Dalmatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina to Croatia, which were according to Vitezović the integral parts of a united historical (but as well and ethnolinguistic) Croatia, Pavao Ritter Vitezović in fact formulated with his works a political program that would have a significant impact on the 19th-century Croatian national revival, officially named as the *Illyrian Movement* (Fürst-Bjeliš 2000: 211–214; Perković 1995: 225–236). Shortly, Vitezović protested against geographical, historical-administrative and ecclesiastical division of "historic" Croatia according to the 1699 peace treaty between the Habsburg Monarchy, the Republic of St. Marco and the Ottoman Sultanate.

Third of all, It can be understood that according to Pavao Ritter Vitezović, the second and final phase of a total "Croatian" historical-ethnolinguistic unification under the Habsburg government should be realized by the Habsburg occupation and annexation of the Polish-

Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Russian Empire (according to Vitezović, Croatian *Sarmatia*). It should be pointed out that Bohemia, Moravia and Lusatia, which were considered by Vitezović as Croatian *Venedia*, already were parts of the Habsburg Monarchy. A historic Bohemia became integral part of the Habsburg Monarchy in 1526, while Lusatia, which was a part of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation, was ruled by the members of the Habsburg dynasty as the German Emperors already from 1438 onward (Bérenger 1994: 80–98; Kann 1990: 7; Johnson 1996: 60). Therefore, the final step of a Pan-Croatian political unification should be annexation of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Russia into the Habsburg Monarchy.

As the matter of fact, this phase of a Pan-Croatian unification started to be realized by the First (1772) and the Third (1795) partition of Poland and Lithuania when Galicia was incorporated into the Habsburg Monarchy in addition to Bukovina (Bukowina) that became included into the Habsburg domains in 1775 (Hammond MCMLXXXIV: 24; Westermann 1985: 115; Kiaupa et al. 2000: 340–358). With partitions of Poland and Lithuania and annexation of Bukovina⁷, the parts of the territory of a Transdanubian *Croatia Septemtrionalis* – "White/Greater Croatia",⁸ became politically united by personal union (i.e., by the Habsburg ruler) with the parts of a Cisdanubian *Croatia Meridionalis* – "Croatia Alba" or the West Balkans.

Finally, P. R. Vitezović's writings had clear (geo)political purpose being in direct coordination with the Habsburg for-

eign policy direction at the time. It is known fact that the Habsburgs laid their territorial claims in the Central and South-East Europe on the historical rights of the Hungarian Royal Crown. As the Habsburgs were elected in 1526 by the Hungarian nobility as the Kings of Hungary, accordingly, all pre-1526 Hungarian lands are inherited by the Habsburgs. Nevertheless, it was wrongly understood that Walachia, Moldavia, Bulgaria and the Serb-populated lands at the Balkans were part of historical Hungary too and therefore have to be liberated from the Ottoman Sultanate and included into the Habsburg Monarchy.

Basically, Vitezović's idea was to ideologically pave the road to creation of a united Croatia with the help of the Habsburg foreign policy as all South Slavs and their lands were already before the Great Vienna War considered by Vienna to be within the Habsburg sphere of interest. As the Hungarian Royal Crown enjoyed even from 1102 heredi-

tary rights on Croatia, the Habsburgs claimed from 1526 all "Croatian" territories as hereditary lands of the Habsburg Monarchy. Subsequently, Vitezović had the only duty to "prove" that all South Slavs are ethnolinguistic Croats. He started in 1682 to urge the Habsburg authorities to actively work on the realization of their foreign policy based on arbitrary understood "hereditary rights" of the Hungarian Royal Crown by sending the poetical letter to the Habsburg Emperor Leopold I in which he reminded the Emperor that Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia have to be annexed by the Habsburg Monarchy from the Ottoman Sultanate and the Republic of Venice as these provinces were parts of the pre-1526 Kingdom of Hungary (Dimić 1999: 75). After the Great Vienna War, he continues to urge the Emperor with the new writings on his duty to liberate all "hereditary lands" of the Kingdom of Hungary, but now under the name of revived Croatia (*Croatia rediviva*).

THE GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA IN VITEZOVIĆ'S ANTHROPOLOGICAL-POLITICAL IDEOLOGY

One of the most significant questions of our interest, which needs satisfactory answer, is: Why P. R. Vitezović considered Lithuania as a Croato-Slavonic land, and therefore, Lithuania's inhabitants as the Croato-Slavs?

The most possible and realistic answers to this question are:

1) Because of historical development of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which brought the ethnic Lithuanians into very closer cultural relations with the Slavs

(the Eastern and the Western) that resulted in the graduate process of Slavization of Lithuania's cultural life and Lithuania's ruling class. This historical fact influenced Vitezović to conclude that all (or majority) inhabitants of Lithuania were of the Slavic, i.e. the Croat origin.

2) Because of pro-Slavic and pro-Polish historical sources and writings related to the affairs of the common Polish-Lithuanian state which were read and used by Vitezović. Consequently, a

Croatian nobleman got impression that the entire territory of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was settled by the Slavic population and that their common spoken and written language was Slavic.

It will be presented in the next paragraphs the most remarkable historical facts in connection with this problem and offered hypothetical answers to the formulated question.

In several letters written by the Lithuanian Grand Duke Gediminas (1316–1341) from 1322 to 1324 he named himself as *lethphanorum ruthenorumque rex* ("King of the Lithuanians and Ruthenians"⁹), although he did not have in reality a title of the king. However, it clearly shows that he was a ruler of the Slavic subjects. When the Grand Duchy of Lithuania during the time of Gediminas extended its state borders towards the east and the south-east, i.e. when the territories populated by the Slavic people became incorporated into the 14th-century Lithuania, the country became multi-ethnic, multilingual and multiconfessional medieval state in which gradually the Slavs significantly outnumbered the ethnic Lithuanians: for instance, there were 70% of the Slavs and 30% of the Lithuanians in the mid-16th century on the territory of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (Kapleris, Meištas 2013: 123). Furthermore, in the following centuries, as Lithuania was extending her borders far to the east, south-east and south-west, making more profound contacts with her Slavic neighbours and even including them into her state's borders, the Lithuanian language acquired significant and numerous Slavic borrowings.

The conflict with the Polish Kingdom over Galicia, Volynia and Podolia in the 14th–15th centuries ended in the sharing of these three provinces, mainly populated by the Slavs, between Poland and Lithuania (Kojelavičius 1650/1669: 489–513). It is known that nearly 150 Slavisms entered Lithuanian language, either from the side of the East Slavs or from the Poles, before the 17th century (for instance, words like *angelas*, *bažničia*, *gavėnia*, *kalėdos*, *krikštas*, *velykos*, etc). A number of the Slavic borrowings in the Lithuanian language appreciably increased during the time of J. Križanić and P. R. Vitezović – for both of whom the language was a crucial indicator of the national identification.

The Slavic population (for example, tradesmen from Rus' lands) was living in Lithuania's capital Vilnius from the time of the Lithuanian Grand Duke Algirdas (1345–1377), who declared in 1358 that all "lands of Rus'" should belong to Lithuania (Kiaupa et al. 2000: 110). J. Križanić, who was travelling across the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and was living in Vilnius for several months in a Dominican monastery, became familiar with ethnically and religiously heterogeneous situation within the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, with number of Slavic population in Lithuania and Vilnius and with often usage for the official purposes of the Slavic language within the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which in general became a Lithuanian-Slavic state.

An influence of the Slavic tradition, culture, and especially vernacular, within the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, have been

particularly strong in the area of writings (literal-administrative language). In the first half of the 15th century the Old Slavonic language was used in Lithuania as one of the three written languages alongside with the Latin and the German. The so-called Old Church Slavonic language was used in Lithuania in relations with the Russian duchies, the Tartars in Crimea and in internal life of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. For instance, during the time of the Grand Duke of Lithuania, Vytautas the Great 1390–1430, a state-official Slavonic language (Old Church Slavonic) was used for writing of the first annals of the Lithuanian Grand Dukes (*Chronicle of the Lithuanian Grand Dukes*, 1429–1430, with *Shorter Compilation of Lithuanian Chronicles* added around 1446). Furthermore, Christianisation of Lithuania from 1387 established strong prerequisites for the usage of the Polish language for the official purposes in the next centuries.

In a period of the Lithuanian history after the death of Vytautas the Great, in the official domestic civic life, in addition to the Lithuanian and the East Slavic language (spoken in the cities) were used as well as the German, Latin and the Polish (spread in the second half of the 15th century). In the Renaissance time, there were many texts and books in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania printed in the Old East Slavonic or the Polish language (as well as in the Lithuanian). It is a fact that on the territory of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the first half of the 16th century the first books were printed in two Slavonic languages: the Old East Slavonic and the Polish. The printing of the

so-called *Brasta Bible* in the Polish language in 1563 shows clearly that a sphere of influence of the Polish (i.e. Slavic) language within the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was significantly spreading on. At that time, the Lithuanian rulers, court and nobility (magnates) already used overwhelmingly the Polish language in a public life within the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. It is paradoxically, but true, that the Lithuanian aristocracy and ruling political elite, which tried to defend Lithuania's state (political) independence from the Kingdom of Poland, accepted both the Polish culture and the Polish language, which became an official language of their communication with a Polish-Lithuanian ruler and the Polish political elite. Shortly, Lithuanian magnates did not become defenders of the Lithuanian language, as they were defenders of the Lithuanian independent statehood. Subsequently, spoken Polish language became very serious competitor to the Lithuanian language (vernacular) within the Grand Duchy of Lithuania that finally led to the gradual, but inevitable, Polonization, i.e. Slavization, of Lithuania's cultural life.¹⁰ Literary and linguistic developments within the Republic of Two Nations (Poland-Lithuania) helped to accelerate the Polonization of the ethnic Lithuanian, Russian, Byelorussian and Ukrainian aristocratic circles (Kamiński 1980; Kamiński 1983: 14–45; Maczak 1992: 194; Bideleux, Jeffries 1999: 129).

For Lithuania's ruling elite the notion of "nation" was not connected with the language (spoken or written) or ethnicity as it was in the case of Križanić and

Vitezović for whom spoken and written language was crucial national identifier. Contrary to these two Croatian intellectuals, for Lithuania's magnates the "nation" (*natio*) was connected to the statehood and social strata belonging, but not to the language or ethnicity. Therefore, for example, during the conclusion of the Lublin Union with Poland in 1569 the ruling elites of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, composed by the ethnic Lithuanians and the ethnic Slavs, who spoke and wrote in the Polish language, called themselves Lithuanians what means actually *natio Lithuanica* (Lithuania's "political nation"), i.e. the aristocracy who lived within the state borders of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.¹¹ In this respect, the most influential champion and ideologist of *natio Lithuanica* was Mykolas Lietuvis (Vaclovas Mikolajaitis/Michalo Lituanus), a Lithuanian aristocrat from Maišiagala, who developed his theory about "political nation" of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in his historic treatise *De Moribus Tartarorum, Lithuanorum et Moschorum* ("On the Customs of the Tartars, Lithuanians and Muscovites"), written in the Latin in 1550 (incomplete text of this treatise was printed in 1615). It is a matter of fact that after the Lublin Union of 1569 the Poles became the senior partners in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth till its final dismemberment in 1795 (Wandycz 1997: 72–78, 88–93, 102–107). The Lithuanian nobility, i.e. *natio Lithuanica*, became assimilated or Polonized to such extent that the term "Polish" represented joint Lithuanian and Polish interests. In fact, Polish and Lithuanian ethnically different groups of aristocracy identified

themselves with one cultural tradition and as a united "political nation" (Davies 1981: 115–159; Johnson 1996, 52).

The ethnolinguistic structure of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the following centuries was changing in the favour of the ethnic Slavs. Thus, at the time of the Lublin Union in 1569, the ethnic Lithuanians constituted around one-third of the total Lithuania's population (approximately 3.000.000 people were living at that time within the whole territory of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania). However, at the same time 2/3 of the population of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania were ethnic Slavs who lived in the Eastern and South-Eastern provinces annexed by the Grand Dukes of Lithuania, i.e. the former duchies of Polotsk, Vitebsk, Volynia, Kiev and Smolensk (Kiaupa et al. 2000: 162). We have to keep in mind as well the fact that the Slavic territories, ruled by the Lithuanians till the Lublin Union of 1569, were approximately ten times bigger than Lithuania proper (Samalavičius 1995: 42).

After 1569, a linguistic polarization within the Grand Duchy of Lithuania remained. There were still two basic spoken languages – the Lithuanian and the Slavic – and two bureaucratic languages – the Old Slavic and the Latin (Bidleux, Jeffries 1999: 122). However, in the West Belarus and the West Ukraine after 1569, the educated, middle, and administrative classes and the landowning gentry became predominantly the Polish-speaking social strata. The spreading of the Polish language in both written and spoken forms in Lithuania was going through the Lithuania's landowning and political aristocracy who have been in

most frequent contacts with their Polish counterparts, through the Polish priests, monks and the Polish intellectuals.

Especially the 17th century, a century of J. Križanić and P. R. Vitezović, was a period of expansion of the Polish language in the public life in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Moreover, at the first year of realm of Friedrich August II Saxon (1697–1706/1709–1733) in 1697 the Polish language officially eliminated the Old East Slavonic language from public offices in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania – *coaequatio iurium* (Šapoka 1936: 371–374; Kiaupa et al. 2000: 265). In the late 17th century, both magnates and gentry of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania knew Polish and used it. There was formed, even, the so-called Lithuanian type of the Polish language. On the same territories of the Polish Kingdom and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania through which J. Križanić travelled, the urban centres were as well Polonized (i.e. got Slavic feature). The lower classes and the rural population of serfs were the Eastern Slavs. Even Lithuania's capital Vilnius or Ukrainian L'viv, a political-cultural centre of Galicia, became the "Polish", i.e. the Slavic, that the Polish-speakers regarded them as essentially Poles even at the beginning of the 20th century (Johnson 1996, 52).

The Polish historiography during the last two centuries created an image that a federal state of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth after 1569 was actually only the Polish one. Certainly, cultural-linguistic Polonization spread faster, but in the sphere of politics and social life the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was as well, gradually, but certainly becom-

ing the "Polish" for the reason that people from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania did not oppose in high degree the appropriation of the Polish language and culture (Kiaupa et al. 2000, 362). According to Robert Bideleux and Ian Jeffries, "since Lithuanian [language] is directly related to the Slavonic languages, and since an old form of Byelorussian (not Lithuanian) was the official language of the grand duchy [of Lithuania], the Lithuanian nobility probably felt some degree of cultural kinship with their Polish counterparts... Indeed, the Lithuanian nobility gradually became thoroughly 'polonized'" (Bideleux, Jeffries 1999: 122)... "with the ironic result that Polish [language] eventually became more widely used among the Lithuanian than among the Polish nobility in the future Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth" (Davies 1982: 20–21).

Because of right belief that the Lithuanian language is closely related to Slavonic languages (the standpoint favoured by our-days contemporary linguistics) and because of the Polonization (Slavization) of upper strata of the Lithuanian society, Pavao Ritter Vitezović at the end of the 17th century considered all (or at least overwhelming majority) inhabitants of Lithuania as the Slavs (i.e. the Croats) and Lithuania as the Slavic (i.e. the Croatian) country.

As a result of the Polonization of the vast territories of the East-Central Europe from 1569 to 1795 many Poles considered these lands as the Polish linguistic and cultural space. It became a common attitude of modern western historians of non-Polish origin to describe the Republic of Two Nations as an exclu-

sively the Polish one, due to the great scope of the Polonization of the Lithuanian society and culture. For example, Alan Palmer is in opinion that the ethnic Lithuanians were readily assimilated by the Poles: the greatest of the Polish dynasties, the Jagiellonian one (1386–1572) was in fact of the Lithuanian origin, and Vilnius (Wilno) was a city, despite of its Lithuanian foundation, a symbol of the Polish-Lithuanian cultural union (Palmer 1970: 4). Such impression had and Juraj Križanić who passed across the whole Ukraine, main part of Belarus and who spent some time in Vilnius as well becoming a member of estate circle of the Dominican Order in Lithuania's capital. At the turn of the 18th century, the members of *natio Lithuanica* and the Lithuanian middle class society faced the real danger of denationalisation through the process of Polonization. Ultimately, it should not be forgotten that overwhelming majority of 7,5 milion of total population of the Republic of Two Nations (*Rzeczpospolita Obojga Narodow*), i.e. the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (established by the Lublin Union in 1569) were the ethnic Slavs; the fact which induced P. R. Vitezović to consider the whole Republic as exclusively the Slavic state and, according to his Croatocentric theory, to understand the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth as in fact the Croatian ethnolinguistic territory.

A pro-Polish viewpoint of Stanislaw Orzechowski and especially of Martinu Kromer (Martin Cromer) about the Polish-Lithuanian relationships, Lithuania's incorporation into the Polish Kingdom after 1569, and the Polonization of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, became one

of the most significant sources about the ethnolinguistic situation within the borders of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth for both Križanić and Vitezović. In his *Razgowori ob wladatelistwu* (1661–1667), J. Križanić frequently cited Martinu Kromer, the author of a history of Poland under the title *De origine et rebus gestis Poloniarum* (Basel, 1555), who saw Lithuania as an ordinary province of Poland. Particularly it has been Križanić who was acquainted with quite number of the Polish and other authors who wrote on "Slavic matters" and who considered the whole territory of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth as exclusively Slavic country.

As a consequence, J. Križanić became acquainted with the work *Bellum Prutenum* ("The Prussian War") written in 1515 by the poet Jan Vislicius who presented the Lithuanian history as a part of the Slavic one. Vislicius viewed the future development of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania only within a united "Polish Sarmatian Empire". After the Lublin Union of 1569, the Polish doctrine of *Sarmatism*, which proclaimed Lithuania, Samogitia (Žemaitia) and the Russian duchies as integral parts of the Polish state, became popular on the territory of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania as a result of firm contacts of Lithuania's nobles (ethnic Lithuanians and ethnic Slavs) with Poland, the Polish culture and the Polish state ideology. It is quite sure that J. Križanić and P. R. Vitezović were familiar with the Polish doctrine of Sarmatism and especially Križanić with the influence of this doctrine among noble circles within the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. However, the line of reasoning of the Sarmatian

doctrine presented the territory of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania as the Slavic one; a viewpoint that was accepted by Vitezović and even served him to name total population of the Kingdom of Poland, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Muscovite Russia as *Sarmaticos*, which belonged to his *Croatia Septemtrionalis*.

Finally, if we know that Križanić's writings about the "Slavic matters",

based very much on his personal experience about the Polonization of Lithuania, were one of the most significant sources for Vitezović, it is not surprisingly that Pavao Ritter Vitezović interpolated the whole territory of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania into the Slavic lands, and furthermore, according to his ideological doctrine into a Greater Croatia.

Endnotes

- ¹ About the western borders of Slavic extension in the early Middle Ages, see in (Engel 1979: 36).
- ² About the idea of Pan-Slavic ethnolinguistic kinship in Dalmatia and Croatia, see in (Sotirović 2014).
- ³ Ideology, from a pure geopolitical perspective, as social phenomena is in essence a scope of meanings that practically "serves to create and/or to maintain relationships of domination and subordination, through symbolic forms such as texts, landscapes and spaces" (Clope et al. 2009: 358). Therefore, it can be interpreted that P. R. Vitezović's ideological concept of Pan-Croatianism was founded on a geopolitical idea of subordination of all Slavic people and their lands to the Croat national interest for the creation of a nation-state. A nation-state is a form of political organization that involves a framework of different institutions which has to govern the inhabitants within a particularly defined (state) territory. A nation-state, at any case, claims allegiance and legitimacy from its own inhabitants likewise from the other states, but on the fundamental basis that the Government of the nation-state represents a group of people living on its controlled territory that they are defined in cultural, ethnolinguistic and political terms as a "nation".

- ⁴ About the problem of the homeland of the Venetae, see in (Darden 1997: 430–435)
- ⁵ About the Slavic origin, see in (Gołąb 1991).
- ⁶ About the Venetian territorial expansion in the Balkans, see in (Difnik 1986: 330–338; Westermann 1985: 63, 94).
- ⁷ Bukovina was in the second half of the 15th century a vassal territory of the Polish-Lithuanian united state.
- ⁸ According to P. R. Vitezović's ideological construction, this territory was a motherland of the Czechs, Moravians, Sorbs, Poles, Lithuanians and Rus'.
- ⁹ A meaning of the ethnonym „Ruthenians“ is very disputed among the historians and ethnologists. Undoubtedly, it labels the East European Slavs in whole or in part.
- ¹⁰ For a more extensive treatment of the Polish-Lithuanian relationships, see in (Davies 1981).
- ¹¹ About differences between the feudal-time "political" and Romanticism-time "linguistic" conceptions of "nation", see in (Hutchinson, Smith 1994; Johnson 1996: 45–62, 136–148; Bideleux, Jeffries 1999: 153–161; Guibernau, Rex 1999; Hobsbawm 2000).

TBC