

Irena P. Arsić*
University of Nis
Faculty of Philosophy
Department for Serbian and Comparative Literature

Pregledni rad
UDC 061.2(=163.41)(497.5 Dubrovnik)
316.752(=163.41)
930(497.5)''19''
Priljeno 13. 1. 2017.

THE CULTURE OF CATHOLIC SERBS FROM DUBROVNIK IN CONTEMPORARY CROATIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY

Contemporary dealing with intellectual movement of Catholic Serbs in Dubrovnik in the Croatian historiography can be traced from the nineties of the last century through the works of three historians, Ivo Banac, Stjepan Ćosić and Nikola Tolja.

In this paper the views expressed by Croatian historians about the cultural movement of the Catholic Serbs in Dubrovnik will be discussed.

Keywords: Dubrovnik, Catholic Serbs, Ivo Banac, Stjepan Ćosić, Nikola Tolja

Serb-Catholics from Dubrovnik, especially their cultural and, in general, their intellectual activity, is discussed periodically both in Serbian and Croatian historiography from different, usually national standpoints. However, not even in such a seemingly clearly identified starting points, one cannot determine in advance the extent of interest, nor even have a hint of concrete dismissal that historiography offers for one of the more sensitive issues in the cultural history of the two close nations. As for the contemporary historiography, for example, although it would not be expected, the cultural activities of Serbs from Dubrovnik were more frequent topic in Croatian historiography, while Serbian history of the first decades of the 21st century, had not much interest in the Catholic Serbs from Dubrovnik.

Contemporary dealing with intellectual Serb-Catholic movement from Dubrovnik in Croatian historiography can be traced from the nineties of the last century through the works of three distinguished historians Ivo Banac, Stjepan Ćosić and Nikola Tolja.

* irena.arsic@filfak.ni.ac.rs

Ivo Banac from Dubrovnik (Dubrovnik, 1947), historian, publicist and engaged intellectual in his influential text *The Confessional 'Rule' and the Dubrovnik Exception: The Origins of the 'Serb-Catholic' Circle in Nineteenth Century Dalmatia* (BANAC 1983: 448-474; BANAC 1990: 179-210), from year 1983 credited himself the precedence in dealing with the theme of Dubrovnik Catholic Serbs in the post-war period¹. On this occasion he states the texts that deal only with this issue, by authors such as Vinko Foretić and Stijepo Obad (FORETIĆ 1966: 167); OBAD 1969: 66), from the sixties of the last century, while the work of Serbian historian Kosta Milutinović and Nikola Tolja from Dubrovnik he considered unfounded (BANAC 1990: 179)².

However, it doesn't seem that Banac study in this way loses its significance, as he tries to determine the genesis of this intellectual movement and examines the occurrence of violation of Croatian-Serbian religious „rule“ by which it is considered that religious affiliation is decisive in shaping the national definition. In this way, the historian seeks to explain „Dubrovnik's exception“ in this rule, which would mean „the preference“ of Dubrovnik intellectuals for Serbian national ideology. It's „acceptance“, however, as he admits, he cannot explain (BANAC 1990: 180).

Results of his research have been reduced to a few specific social and cultural factors, as well as the activities of three key figures of the time.

The main causes of this movement are, according to Ivo Banac, at first the complete neglect of Dubrovnik within the Austrian Empire, within which a cult atmosphere „of Dubrovnik's golden past“ is developed, which could not find its proper dismissal not even in the Croatian Illyrian revival phase, in which the tradition of the old town had a special place (BANAC 1990: 181-182). In this state of lethargy, the view was aimed at restoring the statehood of Serbia, whose national ideology, according to the Banac, was „extremely assimilating and based on

¹ In this way Banac neglects, besides older, two very important enclosures to this issue: foreword to the book *Izabrani članci Antuna Fabrisa*, that was written by Henrik Barić from Dubrovnik (BARIĆ 1940), as well as the text of Jorjo Tadić from Hvar *Sablasti kruže Jugoslavijom*, published posthumously in year 1971 (TADIĆ 1971).

² Milutinović after his book *Dalmacija i Vojvodina (1760-1914)* (MILUTINOVIĆ 1973), printed also extremely important study „O pokretu Srba katolika u Dalmaciji, Dubrovniku i Boki Kotorskoj 1848-1914“ (MILUTINOVIĆ 1989: 60-89), while Tolja, who will be mentioned hereinafter, has also continued the work at this subject.

modern theories“ (BANAC 1990: 182). Those new theories, as the author considers presented „inverted forms of exclusivism“ (BANAC 1990: 182) and were prevailing opinions among the first Slavic philologists, Jozef Dobovskog, Jernej Kopitar, Jan Kolar, Pavel Jozef Šafarik, Franc Miklošič, which is being disclosed in their intellectual, scientific and lecturing activities across Europe, Vuk’s linguistic reform, as well as the action of Polish intellectuals in engaging forces against Russian influence in the Balkans.

As for the individual whose activity in the genesis of the Serb-Catholic movement, is the most important, the first is the young Orthodox priest, Đorđe Nikolajević, who is followed by the intellectual but also social and even political engagement of two individuals from Dubrovnik, an aristocrat and European intellectual, Medo Pucić and Matija Ban, active and versatile intellectual during the half century of his life in Serbia.

One cannot overlook that the role of Đorđe Nikolajević, twenty one year old man from Srem, with his modest education as a seminarian from Karlovci, and with exceptional national sentiment and diplomatic sense, has been unexpected and unpredictable. Well, again, he is given the amazing „honour“ to initiate a movement whose undisputed characteristic was the intellectual one since it included the very core of Dubrovnik intelligence of its time. However, his connection with Russian consul in Dubrovnik, a Serb, Jeremija Gagić, a person of undoubtable and long lasting impact in the city, was mentioned, through whom Nikolajević, met other other notable personalities, Vuk Karadžić, before anyone else.

It must be noted that in the research sense the biography of the first Dubrovnik secular priest is very well illustrated, with emphasis on his important tasks: those that are related to the introduction of the first Serbian school, the wise leadership of the Serbian Orthodox Church Community during very delicate and even dangerous times of European revolutionary year 1848, through activities related to the construction of the Orthodox church, as well as to the editing of the first newspaper in Dalmatia printed in the national language „Srpsko-dalmatinski magazin“. In all of this, Nikolajević’s edition of Serbian written documents from Dubrovnik archives especially stands out, as well as the articles in the periodicals that are related, so to speak, to the Serbian character of Dubrovnik’s old literature. On this occasion, Nikolajević’s secret oper-

ations within the plan of the Serbian government for the release of the Turks were pointed out, which meant an action throughout the Balkans, which led to his final persecution from Dubrovnik, in year 1858.

The role of Medo Pucić, landlord, poet, publicist, historian and political activist, in the study of Ivo Banac, is undeveloped and, considering its influence, insufficiently presented. Regarding the genesis of Pucić's Serbian national sentiment, Banac states the impact of the Italian romantic nationalism and ideas of Šafarik, Kolar and Vuk Karadžić, with characteristic mental-psychological characterization of personality of the young nobleman as „impressive, but also being a proselyte liable to impressions“ (BANAC 1990: 182). In terms of his activities, Banac mentions only the series of articles on Slovenian topics in the Trieste newspaper „Favilla“ and verses from the cycle „Bosanske davorije“ that he deems „the first unambiguous expression of national sentiment of one Catholic from Dubrovnik“ (BANAC 1990: 182).

In this way, Medo Pucić, who was considered the most influential person from Dubrovnik of his time, remains unclear as prominent Catholic Serb, which he undoubtedly was. In this way, Banac deprives us from the opportunity to discern one of the two key figures (the other is, of course, Ivan Stojanović) of the cultural circle of Catholic Serbs in Dubrovnik, from his perspective, not only as a historian, but also as a person from Dubrovnik who knows all the members of the old families.

The most space is left for extensive biography and activities of Matija Ban, an individual of incredible energy and incredible odium both in Croatian and Serbian cultural historiography. Having the unrepresentative, although Dubrovnik's origin, Ban has continued his career in Turkey, where he got familiar with contemporary tendencies of the Slavic nations, which, with the idea of Serbia as the Yugoslavian centre, remained significant during his long life. Those ideas led him to Belgrade in year 1846, where he remained for the next half-century working continually for national benefit, as he believed, the most varied jobs in the field of social activities, but also political and in the field of culture, and as one of the most important playwrights of that time. Although his results are still visible in Serbian culture (raising the magnificent Temple of Saint Sava in Belgrade, among other things, it was his idea), he remained misunderstood by his contemporaries, while the scholars of his legacy were always noticing some unworthy motives or inappropriate attitudes in his appearance (ARSIC 2005: 61-72). The reasons are

different – Serbian environment hasn't not always understood a citizen of Dubrovnik who didn't care for dynastic and political changes, but who cared for the interest of the nation, while in his plays and other literary attempts often did not want to accept his sometimes cruel didactic tone.

Ivo Banac uses Matija Ban and his (none) acceptance in Belgrade to document his thesis about the positive attitude of Serbian (Orthodox) intelligence on the occasion of Serbian-Croatian religious rule while defining the national identity.

In that way, Ivo Banac widely followed Ban's political actions in Serbia and in the Balkans, as well as well-developed political and cultural activities in Dubrovnik itself, which referred to the establishment and editing of the first and then the other periodicals in the City. Ban, in fact, was with Medo Pucić and Ivan August Kaznačić, not only the editor, but also a major contributor to Dubrovnik magazine in the second half of the 19th century, in which he presented his versatile Yugoslav and Pan-Slavic ideas, recommending various possibilities for their realization, as the introduction of a common language and common literature.

Nevertheless, Matija Ban, like Medo Pucić, consistently expressed its Serbian sentiment, that did not mind the Catholic religion, which Ivo Banac considers, in accordance with the principle that the Serbs are the solely Orthodox while the Croats are exclusively Catholic, as a „Dubrovnik's exception.“

Time-limited study, to the period until year 1848 caused the modern Croatian historian Stjepan Ćosić (Makarska, 1964) to monitor only the occurrence of Catholic Serbs from Dubrovnik, in his book *Dubrovnik nakon pada republike*, in the chapter „Roots of Serb catholic 'ideology'“, like in the next one „Dubrovnik 1848“.

Ćosić followed completely the results from Banac's research, and when it comes to the instigators and the leaders of that time, in the opinion of this historian they are among the three engaged intellectuals of that time- Đorđe Nikolajević, Medo Pucić and Matija Ban. In this trinity he also finds differences in relation to the views and activities of Serbian intellectuals from Belgrade, as well as in relation to the official Serbian Orthodox Church. On this occasion he also defines views that range from those politically close to the idea of the association of Dubrovnik and Dalmatia to Croatia, to a complete turnaround in the idea of Serbia as a gathering centre of the Balkan Slavs.

Furthermore, Ćosić followed Banac also in particular interpretation of the essence of the Catholic Serbs, that is, their „distinction“ from Serbian integrators, followers of Vuk Karadžić and *Načertanije* of Ilija Garašanin. Ćosić explains that by the fact that the ideology of the Catholic Serbs was not based on mere unsubstantiated appropriation of Dubrovnik for the Serbian cause and Serbia, but also constituted a special scientific interpretation of the earlier history, particularly on the basis of the work of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, as well as on the selective presentation of the Dubrovnik archival tradition in the context of Serbian history. He called them, too, „Illyrians with the Serbian national consciousness“ since, in the Ćosić’s opinion they were close to Illyrians, so their performance hasn’t been understood as the contradiction to the revival efforts in Zagreb (ĆOSIĆ 1999: 335).

In case he did not present in this history the original views about the Catholic Serbs in Dubrovnik, Ćosić further developed this theme in his two subsequent writings, where he dealt with it in a more concrete way.

In the introductory part of the text, titled *Poezija dubrovačkih Srba katolika* (ĆOSIĆ 2015: 62-89) Ćosić at first chronologically determines the engagement of the Catholic Serbs in Dubrovnik during an entire century, from year 1848 to the end of the first half of the 20th century, which is considerably longer period than the one that has been previously cited, which has originated as the result of the author’s subsequent research. In fact, although the initial year may move to earlier period, taking into account the work of Đ. Nikolajević who arrived in Dubrovnik in year 1830, with year 1950 and with the death of the most engaged representatives of the Catholic Serbs, this movement really goes out.

In this study Ćosić provides biographical and literary portraits of several Dubrovnik citizens who were engaged in literary work. His idea has been to quote the verses with monographic notes that illustrate the political and national ideas of the most important intellectual citizens of Dubrovnik. These are, at first, Medo Pucić and Matija Ban, and Ljudevit Vuličević as well as Dubrovnik Serbs from the younger generation, Luko Zore and Uroš Trojanović.

Along with a portrait of Medo Pucić are listed verses from the cycle „Bosanske davorije“, excerpts from the epic *Karađurđica* as well as the song „Srbi na Kosovu“ and „Poma“.

„Bosanske davorije” with a famous verse:

„Mladi Srbi, bud' mo mi,
Braća jedne misli svi,
Misli sloge, misli slave,
Misli ljubve bratske prave,
U nas gleda narod sav!“

written in the early period of Medo Pucić's creativity in year 1841, Ćosić considers as a proof that young Dubrovnik nobleman from Europe, where he studied, returned with the already formed ideas about his own Serbian sentiment and Serbia as the pivot of unification of the South Slavs (ĆOSIĆ 2015: 72). This period is followed by Pucić's stay in Belgrade, which has been an inspiration, as historian considers, for his epic *Karađurđevka*, created in the period 1847-1850. In this poetic work, Serbian history is being sung as a national eschatology immortalized in the vision of the great Balkan state under the Serbian leadership. Of course, as Pucić believes, the prominence of Dubrovnik is poetically stated in this process, as the fairy's havens that have kept for centuries the spirit of the freedom and enabled the continuity of Serbian culture (ĆOSIĆ 2015: 72) under the Turkish yoke.

Serbian academic youth from Dubrovnik especially loved Pucić's song „Poma“ with the allegory of the unsuccessful alien influence in Serbian coast, as evidenced by one of its members, Serbian literary historian from Dubrovnik, Petar Kolendić, while the song „Srbin na Kosovu,“ was first published in the first issue of the Dubrovnik journal „Slovinac“ in year 1878 in Cyrillic script.

Matija Ban is represented by four of his contributions in verse: „Dubrovačka narodna pjesma“ („Serbian Dubrovnik Hymn“), „Materi srbskoj“, „Ustanovitelji narodne vojske, knezu Mihajlu, prilikom predaje turskih gradova god. 1867“ and „Žalosna popijevka nad Medom Pucićem sa Dunaja“.

Ćosić says that this is only a selection from Ban's reveilles and occasional poems of patriotic and nationalistic content scattered in a number of magazines. „Dubrovačka narodna pjesma“ was written in year 1848 for members of the National Guard and was published as a leaflet. Ćosić says this song, while ignoring Medo Pucić and his own advertising of Serb sentiment since year 1841, for the first time publicly states the Serbian national identity by one of Dubrovnik citizens, through verses: „I am a Serb, a son of an old / Dubrovnik. (ĆOSIĆ 2015: 75). „The song „Materi srbskoj,“ that was published in year 1851 in „Dubrovnik the flower of national literature“, Ćosić saw as a brief pre-

sentation of the main identity premise of the Catholic Serb ideology- „we're all Serbs who speak Serbian dialect, of eastern or western church, Christian or Turkish faith“ (ĆOSIĆ 2015: 73).

„Glas iz Dubrovnika braći Hrvatima. Pjesma“, was published in year 1879, by an anonymous author, and according to Ćosić's opinion, meant the beginning of heated debates in the Dubrovnik periodicals about belonging, that is „Serbian „or“ Croatian” belonging of Dubrovnik, in which was included, usually under the pseudonym editor of „Slovinac“ and „Srđ“, Luko Zore, one of the leading Catholic Serbs. In this review was published his poem „Sveti Srđu, ne daj grđu“, which was published in the first issue of magazine „Srđ“ which stands for a call for unity around the old values of the City as they were interpreted within their ideology by the Serbs from Dubrovnik.

Eulogy, „Nad grobom Dum Ivana Stojanovića“, was sung by an anonymous author to the most influential among the Serbian youth from Dubrovnik and the favourite, according to Ćosić, a Serb from Dubrovnik – dum Ivan Stojanović. Since he was a Catholic priest, canon, erudite writer and Dubrovnik patriot, historian argued that Stojanović was the embodiment of the ideas that were proclaimed by the Serbs of Dubrovnik (ĆOSIĆ 2015: 80).

Unfortunate but talented Uroš Trojanović, one of the involuntary participants of so called Dubrovnik affair was presented with portrait and his song „Bokeška noć“, which was stated as the reason for action taken by the authorities in Vienna, as well as the song „Srpska zora“.

As the songs without the authors or with the aforementioned collective characteristic, Serbian youth from Dubrovnik and Serbs from Dubrovnik, Ćosić here printed mostly songs in the name of death of famous Serbs from Dubrovnik „Nad grobom pravniku Uroša Trojanovića“, „Svome uredniku Antunu Fabrisu *Dubrovnik i Srđ*“, „O smrti Antuna Fabrisa žalosna pjesma“ and „Valtazaru Bogišiću“... when it comes to the prose in this selection only Ljudevit Vulićević was represented with an extract from the short story „Mojoj mati“.

His interest for the Catholic Serbs, Stjepan Ćosić also expressed in his monographic study about Lujo Vojnović (ĆOSIĆ 2012: 13-175), who did not impose as the subject to Croatian historians nor Serbian, even though he created very diverse and equally important work. Using the rich material from the Croatian State Archives, Ćosić compiled a biography of this unusual but extraordinary intellectual, lawyer, diplomat,

historian and writer, whose work marked his time throughout the Balkans, while occupying significant political and other functions at court of Cetinje, Serbian and Bulgarian court, and being actively included in the diplomatic struggle during and after World War I, as engaged and important representative of the Serbian government. In Dubrovnik style, which was evidently always accepted unkindly in the Balkans, his political involvement was aided through numerous historical works published in many languages of the world. However, despite such a turbulent social activities, the main preoccupation of Lujo Vojnović was an old Dubrovnik, to which he dedicated his most beautiful historical and poetic pages, while to preservation of its specific spirit he dedicated his entire life. It was a constant of his life, along with another, which is also emphasized by Stjepan Ćosić, that the Lujo Vojnović was distinct and consistent Catholic Serb. In all of this, almost anecdotal is the fact that Lujo Vojnović, along with many other citizens of Dubrovnik who had similar efforts and desires, submitted his request for an autonomy of Dubrovnik within the new country after the Second World War even to – Josip Broz Tito (ĆOSIĆ 2012: 158).

Nikola Tolja from Dubrovnik (Imotica, 1938) is left for the end of this review of Croatian historians, and he could have been the first. In fact, his doctoral study *Književno značenje dubrovačkog časopisa „Srđ“*³ greatly improved the view of engagement of Serbs from Dubrovnik and was created in the eighties of the last century. However, its first edition was only printed as a contribution to a complex study *Dubrovački Srbi katolici – istine i zablude*, which was published in Dubrovnik itself as a copyright edition, in year 2011.

Extensive study on over 800 pages of large format is created, quite obviously based on a comprehensive insight into Dubrovnik and Dalmatian periodicals, following day by day, political, social and cultural business of Serbs from Dubrovnik. Of course, besides periodicals, while writing this voluminous book, the historian used a number of other texts, at first the author works by Serbs from Dubrovnik, and numerous writings from their archives. In addition, Tolja has referred, in different ways, to his predecessors who have also written on this topic⁴.

³ Dissertation of Nikola Tolja was cited by the manuscript (TOLJA dis.), while in year 2011, only extract was printed (TOLJA 1989)

⁴ It should be mentioned that Nikola Tolja while reading the text of the majority of Serbian, including those from Dubrovnik, was categorical and unscientifically motivated in their disqualification.

The entire decades-long work is divided into several chapters, where in the initial ones Tolja at first tries to point to the causes and historical circumstances that influenced the emergence and spread of Serb-Catholic movement in Dubrovnik, among which he gives a significant place to a kind of Dubrovnik's particularism in unfavourable conditions under Austria, as well as to the importance of Serbia as an independent state in the Balkans. The Serb-Catholic movement in Dubrovnik Tolja thoroughly studied by exposing its social structure and abundance, then national, political, cultural and economic character. In his work Tolja is so precise that it gives the individual and specific names of intellectuals of Catholic Serbs, and there are over 160, which is a unique case so far. In fact, until now there have been attempts to list the names of the Catholic Serbs, but Tolja, certainly, is trying to draw up a final list, while specifying the criteria he used.

Tolja stated in details his criteria for the classification of Dubrovnik citizens among the Catholic Serbs. At first place there are those who led the movement, or those who have personally or collectively declared themselves as Catholic Serbs. Then there are those who have signed collective messages of support – congratulations, which were published, as well as those who presented themselves in the same way in public pronouncements. Tolja also confirmed that a particular person is a member of this circle through frequent polemics, often on national themes in „Dubrovnik“ and „Crvena Hrvatska“ where the participants were determined in national and confessable manner – or, they did not react negatively when they were qualified like that by someone else. And, finally, since in Dubrovnik during the last decades of the 19th and early 20th century existed a clear division in the institutions, associations and diverse societies, Tolja believed that those who were either in the administration or members, as well as donors of Serbian Reading Room, Serbian Singing society „Sloga“, Serbian civic music, Charitable fund Serbian woman from Dubrovnik, Dubrovnik working society, Serbian dawn, Matice Srpske, Serbian gymnastics society „Dušan Silni“, were Serbs, of Catholic or Orthodox confessions (TOLJA 2011: 379-381).

Nikola Tolja in his detailed study, especially singled out intellectuals among Catholic Serbs in Dubrovnik, after which he stated their full name, except in cases where, according to his explanation, they were the heirs of certain individuals, with the same surname, who now live in

Dubrovnik, where he only stated the name and the initial of last name⁵, however, with clear source in Dubrovnik periodicals.

Tolja refers to the arguments from the literature that being a Catholic Serb in Dubrovnik was considered as a sign of wisdom and good taste, and that Dubrovnik intelligence in the era from the mid-19th to the early decades of the 20th century considered themselves predominantly as Catholic Serbs. According to the social structure, Tolja divides Dubrovnik's intelligence who belong to the circle of Catholic Serbs to the one originally aristocratic, then bourgeois intelligentsia of secular and spiritual direction, and clergy, as well as high school and student youth, noting that the Catholic Serbs were found also in the craft and labour stock, or among the peasantry, which would mean that they were not limited, as previously claimed in Croatian historiography, only to the city of Dubrovnik, but they were also living in Konavle, Župa, Cavtat, and Pelješac (TOLJA 2011: 364-376).

As for the „noble intelligence,“ Tolja claims that number of noble families whose members have not declared themselves as Catholic Serbs is very small. He also believes that the noblemen from Dubrovnik of that time harboured the collective aristocracy awareness of belonging to a special „sub-group of Serbian catholic circle“ (TOLJA 2011: 365). The leader of this group was Orsat (Medo) Pucić, while the author lists as the Catholic Serbs also his relatives Mata and Mata Neron, while he debates with Serbian historians and publicists who mentioned as Catholic Serb also the long-time mayor of Dubrovnik – Rafo Pucić and Medo's brother, philosopher and politician – Niko Veliki Pucić.

Then Tolja states, according to the families, Catholic Serbs from Dubrovnik who presented nobility: Bona (Bunić): Luko, Mavro, Jozo, Miho, Nikola, Ljubica; Kaboga (Kabužić) Maroje, Getaldi Ivan; Đorđi (Đurđević) Marinko; Gradi (Gradić): Nikša Matov, Baldo; Goce – Baselji (Gučetić – Baselji): Melko, Melko jr., Luko, Baldo; Frano Gundulić; Ohmučević – Bizaro Lujo and Elena; Pucić: Medo, Mato Neron, Mato; Natali: Mato, Jero; Saraka: Nikša, Ivo, Rudolf; Sorgo (Sorkočević) Herman (TOLJA 2011: 364-366).

The civil intelligence at that time, presented the basis of the movement, according to Tolja's opinion, due to its size and agility. It was

⁵ This nonscientific method, author defends by fresh memories from the war in the nineties of the last century.

mostly made out of the humanistic intelligentsia, while the technical was made out of only a few sea captains. Members of this circle occupied the most prominent positions in the city of Dubrovnik as the „municipal councillors and influential Serbian politicians, prominent scientists, collaborators, owners, issuers, chief editors, journalists and staff of Serbian newspapers and magazines, board members and presidents of Serbian institutions in Dubrovnik, professors of Gymnasium...” (TOLJA 2011: 364-366). Some of them permanently or temporarily resided outside the city, but they were actively involved in the movement. Civil intelligence members were: Lujo Vojnović, Valtazar Bogišić, Matija Ban, Pero Budmani, Marko Car, Lujo Adamović Marko Murat, Ivo Džaja, Branko Džaja, Petar Kolendić, Milan Rešetar, Stjepo Kobasica, Josip Bersa, Henrik Barić, Antun Fabris, Vlaho Matijević, Stjepo Knežević, Luko Zore, Antonio Vučetić, Stjepan Kastrapeli, Mirko Kastrapeli, Matej Šarić, Vlaho Šarić, Ivo Rubricius, Niko Lepeš, Baldo Podić, Vid Vuletić Vukasović, Vice Adamović, Kristo Dominković, Mato Gracić, Miše Vaketi, Antun Puljezi, Jero Puljezi, Stjepo Lucijanović, Mato Zglav, Vicko Tripković, Jozo Katić, Stjepan Carević, Rudolf Sardelić, Antun Zipfel, Domo Depolo, Jozo Flori, Frano Bibica sr., Frano Bibica jr., Cvijeto Job, Job Đildo, Ćiril Job, Benvenuto Job, Antun Višić, Paskoje Job, Anton Jakšić, Petar Reljić, Miho Papi, Papi Ivo, Mato Marinović, Božo Banac, Pero Banac, Mišo Kolin, Antonije Stražičić, Baldo Kosić, Niko Svilokos, Božo Cvjetković, Sabo Jelić, Antun Pasarić, Frano Kulišić, Božo Hope, Antun Benusi „and dozens of others“ (TOLJA 2011: 366-368).

As for the Catholic Serbs among the Catholic clergy, there Tolja leaves a larger number of incomplete names, while with the well-known dum Ivan Stojanović, Petar Franasović, Andro Murat, Ljudevit Vuličević he states also the Catholic Serbs among the Dubrovnik Franciscans in such number and with such impact that caused certain conflicts in the very church circles at that time (TOLJA 2011: 369-370).

Among the priests, about whom there were doubts whether they belong to Catholic Serbs, Tolja states: Antun Kazali, Mato Vodopić, Đuro Pulić, Stjepo Skurla, Lovro Kukuljica, Niko Đivanović, Ivan Fabris, with a note that even he, in his earlier writings, cited these individuals among the Serbs.

Writing about the weakening and extinguishing of the intellectual Serb-Catholic movement in Dubrovnik, Tolja, ultimately, pays special

attention to the fight against clericalism and cleric nationalism. A special part is the study about the journal „Srđ“.

The book of Dubrovnik historian *Dubrovački Srbi katolici, istine i zablude*, besides the basic, in author's opinion structured meaning, with which we agree or not, also one other meaning, ancillary and not less useful. Namely, thorough this study of Nikola Tolja about Catholic Serbs from Dubrovnik we have obtained, among other things, measurable and reliable research material for further, deeper, more considered studying of this topic.

Contemporary Croatian historiography tends to deal with the issue of Catholic Serbs from Dubrovnik in a serious, research and argumentative way. Of course, due to the peculiarities of this theme, which is still one of the most sensitive issues in science, the interpretations of the correctly observed phenomena and other facts, often are tailored by the daily political interests and complied with strictly national attitudes. That does not threaten the way of understanding of this issue, particularly in case of professional public, which has learned in the Balkan conditions to seek the truth also „between the lines“.

The special meaning of contemporary Croatian historiography is found in the invitation to the Serbian Ragusa science to investigate and answer some of the important issues related to the activities of the Serbs in Dubrovnik within institutions and cultural public in Serbia, which has remained unanswered still.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ARSIĆ 2005: Арсић, Ирена. „Матија Бан и покушај оснивања Друштва св. Саве“. *Братство* IX, (2005): 61-72.
- BANAC 1983: Банас, Иво. „The Confessional ‘Rule’ and the Dubrovnik Exception: The Origins of the ‘Serb-Catholic’ Circle in Nineteenth Century Dalmatia“. *Slavic Review* (Urbana, Illinois), 42 (1983), no. 3:, 448-474.
- BANAC 1990: Банас, Иво. „Vjersko ‘pravilo’ i dubrovačka iznimka: Geneza dubrovačkog kruga ‘Srba katolika’“. *Dubrovnik* 1 (1990), 1-2: 179 -210.
- BARIĆ 1940: Барић, Хенрик. *Изабрани чланци Антуна Фабриса*. Београд: Српска књижевна задруга, 1940.
- ĆOSIĆ 1999: Ћосић, Стјепан. *Dubrovnik nakon pada Republike (1808-1848)*. Dubrovnik: Zavod za povijesne znanosti HAZU, 1999.
- ĆOSIĆ 2012: Ћосић, Стјепан. „Лујо Војновић“, in: ЋOSIĆ, Стјепан, GRIJAK, Zoran. *Figure politike*. Zagreb: Hrvatski državni arhiv, 2012: 13-175.
- ĆOSIĆ 2015: Ћосић, Стјепан. „, Poezija dubrovačkih Srba katolika“. *Povijest u stihovima*, 3 (2015): 62-89.

- FORETIĆ 1966: Foretić, Vinko. „Prva faza hrvatskog narodnog preporoda u Dalmaciji (do sredine 19. stoljeća)“. *Kolo*. 1966, 8-10, 167.
- MILUTINOVIĆ 1973: Milutinović, Kosta. *Dalmacija i Vojvodina (1760-1914)*. Novi Sad: Institut za izučavanje istorije Vojvodine, 1973.
- MILUTINOVIĆ 1989: Милутиновић, Коста. „О покрету Срба католика у Далмацији, Дубровнику и Боки Которској 1848-1914“. *Зборник о Србима у Хрватској*, 1, (1989), 60-89.
- OBAD 1969: Obad, Stjepo. „Nacionalno pitanje u Dalmaciji 1848-1849“. *Jugoslavenski istorijski časopis* (1969), 4.
- TADIĆ 1971: Tadić, Jorjo. „Sablasti kruže Jugoslavijom“. *Istorijski časopis* XVIII (1971): 45-52.
- TOLJA 1989: Tolja, Nikola. „Dubrovački časopis 'Srđ' (1902-1908)“. *Dubrovnik*, 1989, 5-6: 131-144.
- TOLJA 2011: Tolja, Nikola. *Dubrovački Srbi katolici, istine i zablude*. Dubrovnik: sopstveno izdanje, 2011.
- TOLJA dis: Tolja, Nikola. *Književno značenje dubrovačkog časopisa „Srđ“ (1902-1908)*, dis.

Ирена П. Арсић

КУЛТУРА ДУБРОВАЧКИХ СРБА КАТОЛИКА У САВРЕМЕНОЈ ХРВАТСКОЈ ИСТОРИОГРАФИЈИ

Резиме

Савремено бављење интелектуалним покретом дубровачких Срба католика у хрватској историографији може се пратити од деведесетих година прошлог века у радовима тројице историчара Ива Банца, Стјепана Ћосића и Николе Тоља.

У овом раду биће разматрани ставови који су хрватски историчари исказали о културном покрету Срба католика у Дубровнику.

Кључне речи: Дубровник, Срби католици, Иво Банац, Стјепан Ћосић, Никола Тоља