

Iskra Iveljić

The Role of Education in Modernizing Croatia in the 2nd Half of the 19th Century

Historians are usually cautious scientists, careful not to simplify, sceptical of too many generalizations and attentive to render the losers' as well as the winners' versions. Following this path I would like to hint at a dilemma to which I cannot offer an unambiguous answer. Yet, I deem it quite important that a historian stays well-aware of the intricacies and entanglements of the modernization theory.

When we discuss the modernization issue in the context of European history, we are putting forward the Western European model/s and influences. Is it not a way to project our present in the past? In this way, the search for pioneers of modernization turns into the search for glorious ancestors and thus into inventing our own tradition, to quote the famous phrase of E. J. Hobsbawm. We are often keen on identifying our modern predecessors as early in the history as possible and visualize modernization as a firm axis that connects our past, present and future. This inevitably leads to simplification and reduction of the past reality because we tend to identify and stress merely the processes, events or personalities that bear significance to our own time, making the rest of the past a foreign country.¹ We revisit and repossess the past, only to subordinate it to our present. Self-aggrandizement is inherent to that method and it often manifests itself as overstressing of the importance of one's own nation.² A good example is the interpretation of the Habsburg Monarchy, which was after 1918 often written from the point of view of a particular nation or state. In other words, to deal with my own nation and state, Croatian historiography sees Croatian history as a centre, thus turning the Monarchy into its mere frame. Recently, the Habsburg

1 See David Lowenthal, *The Past is a Foreign Country* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

2 Literature on this topic is abundant. I point to a rather personal article by Ferenc Glatz, "Staat-Nation-Geschichtsschreibung", in E. Busek.-G. Stourzh (eds.), *Nationale Vielfalt und gemeinsames Erbe in Mitteleuropa* (Munich-Vienna, 1990), pp. 129-137.

legacy has been partly reinterpreted³ and thematized in the light of the broadened European Union⁴.

Current political situation also plays a big role. The recent enlargement of the EU has led to westernization of history, visible in the tendency to represent the European history and identity as homogenous and Western Europe as the nucleus of the whole European civilization. Many authors have warned against this tendency. Wolfgang Schmale asserts that historians have constructed common European structural elements even for the periods in which no common European consciousness existed.⁵ Andreas Kappeler pleads for a greater apprehension of the importance of Eastern Europe, and Gerald Stourzh ironically comments that Europe does have its East⁶, just to mention some. A number of other authors share these views.⁷

Still, this inevitable contamination of the past through elements of the present does not mean that we should refrain from constructing bridges between the past and the present.

*

Efforts of the reform elites during the Enlightenment to use education as an instrument of progress are well known. Their general goals, such as dissemination of knowledge and literacy were meant to change their recipients inwardly, helping them to become better people and proper members of society. However, educational reforms launched in the Habsburg Monarchy during enlightened

3 See Gary Cohen, "Nationalist Politics and the Dynamics of State and Civil Society in the Habsburg Monarchy 1867-1914", *Central European History*, Vol. 40, 2007; David Godsey, *Aristocratic Redoubt. The Austro-Hungarian Foreign Office on the Eve of the First World War* (Indiana: Purdue University Press/West Lafayette, 1999). Others saw the fin de siècle crises of identities as more intense in central European cities like Vienna, or even as a hint of postmodern era. Jacques Le Rider, *Das Ende der Illusion. Die Wiener Moderne und die Krisen der Identität* [German translation of *Modernité viennoise et crises d'identité*] (Vienna, 1990); Jean-Francois Lyotard, *Das postmoderne Wissen* [German translation of *La condition postmoderne*] (Vienna, 1986).

4 Emil Brix, "Kakaniens Beitrag zur Erweiterung der Europäischen Union", in Catherine Bosshart-Pfluger et al. (eds.), *Nation und Nationalismus in Europa. Kulturelle Konstruktion von Identitäten. Festschrift für Urs Altermatt*, (Stuttgart-Vienna, 2002), pp. 783-800.

5 Wolfgang Schmale, *Geschichte Europas* (Vienna-Köln-Weimar, 2001), pp. 13-15.

6 Andreas Kappeler, "Die Bedeutung der Geschichte Osteuropas für ein gesamteuropäisches Geschichtsverständnis", in Gerald Stourzh (ed.), *Annäherungen an eine europäische Geschichtsschreibung* (Vienna, 2002), pp. 43-55. Gerald Stourzh, "Statt eines Vorworts: Europa, aber wo liegt es?", in Gerald Stourzh (ed.), *Annäherungen an eine europäische Geschichtsschreibung* (Vienna, 2002).

7 Norman Davies, *Europe - A History.*, 2. ed. (London, 1997); Dan Diner, *Das Jahrhundert verstehen. Eine universalhistorische Deutung* (Munich, 1999); E. J. Hobsbawm, "Die merkwürdige Geschichte Europas", in *Wieviel Geschichte braucht die Zukunft?*, German translation (Munich-Vienna: Carl Hanser Verlag, 1998); Emil Brix, "Was bringt der Osten dem Westen? Der kulturell-zivilisatorische Beitrag Mittel- und Osteuropas für Europa", in *Enzyklopädie des Europäischen Ostens* (Klagenfurt-Vienna-Ljubljana-Tuzla-Sarajevo, 2001), pp. 45-53.

absolutism did not encompass Croatia (and Hungary) to the same extent as Austrian lands, so their practical results were rather meagre. Nevertheless, the impetus towards secularization and the attitude that all children were entitled to at least primary schooling regardless of their social, ethnic and confessional status as well as gender, was a novelty. Of course, the same kind of education was not on hand for all. According to *Ratio educationum* of 1777, there were several categories of primary schools, the ones in the country lasted only one year and provided pupils solely with basic skills of learning, writing, counting and religious education. Most of the children did not attend school at all. The major problems were poverty, lack of school buildings, educated teachers and textbooks. Another impediment was the traditional understanding of education, which did not allow introduction of new teaching methods and was still based upon the primarily disciplinary role. In the country schools children of various ages were all gathered in a single class, they did not have textbooks and learning aids, and were mostly learning by heart, because little or no attention at all was paid to explanatory methods. Since discipline and obedience were important goals, physical punishment was regular. No wonder that few educated teachers avoided country schools, where priests, retired soldiers or any available literate person took their place.⁸ The situation in the town schools was better, but still far from satisfactory.

The school practice in Croatia was in discrepancy with the evolution of contemporary pedagogical ideas. The Enlightenment changed the attitude towards children, and in the Habsburg Monarchy, the influence of German enlightened philanthropists was felt. They promoted education in accordance with the principles of humanity and children's nature. Children should not be suffocated through excess authority, teaching process must conform to children's age and it must have an amusing side in order to stimulate children's interest and curiosity. The result was also seen in children's literature.⁹ The reform ideas that promoted the new image of middle-class family and its values were subject to an inherent criticism of nobility. Since noblemen and priests were then still major social forces, the reform ideas were not very welcome in the late 18th century Croatia.

Even though new school-orders were introduced at the beginning of 19th century (1806 *Ratio educationis* for Hungary), major reform impetus took

8 Syntehtical overview in Jaroslav Šidak, "Jedno stoljeće u razvoju hrvatskog školstva (1773-1874)", *Zbornik za historiju školstva i prosvjete*, 9, 1975, pp. 37-48. Basic documents: Antun Cuvaj, *Grada za povijest školstva Kraljevina Hrvatske i Slavonije od najstarijih vremena do danas*, vol. VII-X (Zagreb, 1911-1913).

9 One of the most popular books was *Robinson der Jüngere* by Johann Heinrich Campe, and the journal *Kinderfreund* by Christian Felix Weisse. Even though a Kajkavian translation of Campe's book was published in Croatia (Anton Vranić, *Mlaisi Robinzon* (Zagreb, 1796)) the translation of Weisse's journal (Juraj Dijanić, *Horvatzki detce priatel* (Zagreb, 1796)) never came out of print.

place during the national revival («preporod») in the 1830s and 1840s. The role of education in the land where over 90% of population were peasants was tremendously important. Furthermore, heterogeneity of Croatian lands, especially the non-existence of the language standard, turned education into primary means to construct the modern nation. In the late 1830s and 1840s, a lot was debated in the Croatian Sabor, among the priests and individual followers of the «preporod» as to how to improve the school system. These debates were often stirred by those in Hungary, resulting in *Systema scholarum elementarium* (1845) which made elementary schooling obligatory and prolonged the duration of country schools.

Major secondary schools were six-years “gymnasiums” in Zagreb, Varaždin, Rijeka, Osijek, Karlovac and Požega, four of which belonged to Franciscans, who often took over the former Jesuit institutions. “Gymnasiums” were elite schools with classical and humanistic curriculum, which provided their pupils rather with general knowledge than skills needed to exercise practical jobs. During the reign of Joseph II, German language was introduced, but after his death Latin regained its status. Yet, another language was being imposed since 1791 – namely Hungarian, which in 1827 became an obligatory subject. Already in the late 18th century, the majority of secondary school pupils came from the middle class, and about a quarter of them from peasantry. Noblemen still prevailed in Zagreb and Varaždin. Apart from secondary schools, there were a couple of vocational schools, such as nautical school in Rijeka, but in general there were too few of them.

The highest school was the Zagreb Academy, originally a Jesuit institution. Though it was granted privileges held by universities in 1669, higher Jesuit authorities hindered the bestowal of academic titles and honours, probably in an attempt to prevent competition to their other academies in the Monarchy. The Academy was secularized during the reign of Maria Theresa, becoming *Regia scientiarum academia*, offering courses in philosophy, law and theology. The social structure of the Academy students during the «preporod» shows the prevalence of middle-class over nobility. For example, in 1791-1830, 49% of 2191 philosophy students were of middle-class and 33% of peasant origin, but in the period 1826-30, the percentage of the first category amounted to 62%. Despite these facts one should not jump to conclusions of a rush oncoming of middle-class society, since 63% of philosophy students chose to become priests.¹⁰ From

10 Jaroslav Šidak, “Regia Scientiarum Academia”, in *Spomenica u povodu proslave 300. godišnjice Sveučilišta u Zagrebu*, Vol. 1 (Zagreb, 1969), p. 66; Lelja Dobronič, *Zagrebačka akademija/ Academia zagrabienis: visokoškolski studiji u Zagrebu 1633.-1874.* (Zagreb, 2004). It is interesting that the social structure of Caranthian students at the Vienna university in 1804-1849 shows that sons of peasants made up 29%. Alojz Cindrič, “Vpliv dunajske univerze na oblikovanje slovenskega izobraženstva: statistična slika študentov s Kranjske na dunajski univerzi med leti 1804 in 1917 – študijske smeri, krajevni in socialni izvor”, in Peter Vodopivec (ed.), *Slovenci v Evropi (O nekaterih vidikih slovenske povezanosti s sosedi in Evropo)* (Ljubljana, 2002), pp. 17-34. Hereafter Alojz Cindrič, “Vpliv dunajske univerze”.

1830-1848, the Academy had 184 to 213 students yearly, mostly of philosophy (147 to 173), whereas the number of law students varied from 35 to 48.

Therefore the stage was set for a major education reform, which was articulated by the Sabor committee in 1849, upon the ideas of Austrians Franz Exner and Herman Bonitz. The reform suggested changes on all levels – primary, secondary, and high. Its goal was to spur the establishment of more primary schools, with Croatian as the teaching language (in accordance with the conclusion of the Croatian Sabor of 1847), with educated teachers, and to enrich curriculum with new subjects. Furthermore, new types of secondary schools were foreseen, such as real and civic schools («realke» and «građanske škole»), as well as various vocational schools (nautical, commercial, agronomic, etc.). The foundation of a modern university in Zagreb was also proposed. Even though the 1849 reform was not implemented due to the break-down of the 1848 movement in the whole Monarchy, Croatian liberal intelligentsia had by 1848/49 developed clear notions of educational reforms that should be undertaken, as well as the necessity of giving them a national character. So, the course was set on modernization and national integration.

In the 1850s, the neo-absolutistic regime laid the foundations of modern primary school system. The regime seriously insisted on children attending schools, but even then only a third of them did so.¹¹ The secondary schools were reformed into eight-year schools, the course on philosophy being taken from the Academy to the Zagreb “gymnasium”. Since the course of theology was already moved from the Academy during the reign of Joseph II, in the 1850s the Academy offered solely the law course. In 1854 German was introduced as the teaching language. The neo-absolutistic reforms were articulated in the Vienna centre (“modernization from above”) and were coupled with a new wave of Germanization, which made the regime unpopular. Only later, in the 1870s, did ban Ivan Mažuranić admit that there was an important reform side to neo-absolutism.

The proper educational take-off in Croatia took place only in the 1860s and 1870s. It was visible in the founding of the Teachers’ Association (“Hrvatski književno-pedagoški zbor”), periodicals, children’s books and journals in Croatian¹², development of pedagogical science¹³, founding of a modern

11 Mirjana Gross, *Počeci moderne Hrvatske* (Zagreb, 1985).

12 The first Croatian children’s book was *Mali tobolac* (1850) compiled by Ivan Filipović, a liberal teacher who also founded the first journal *Bosiljak* (1864). Until 1918 there were 16 journals for children and youth. It is interesting that too few of them were published in Slavonia. Towards the end of the century, specialized journals appeared, e. g. for young merchants and artisans. Štefka Batinić, *Zabava i pouka dobroj djeci i mladeži* (Zagreb, 2004), p. 16.

First picture-books in Croatian were published in 1880s, but with illustrations of foreign authors. Again, among illustrators there were Germans, Czechs, even Americans but no Hungarians. Štefka Batinić-Berislav Majhut, *Od slikovnjaka do Vragobe* (Zagreb, 2001), p. 67.

13 In 1876 Franjo Marković began with lectures on pedagogy at the Faculty of Philosophy. Đuro Arnold and Stjepan Basariček further developed this field, the latter one being the first Croatian theoretician.

University in Zagreb and a major elementary-school reform launched in 1874 by the government of the ban Ivan Mažuranić.

Teachers' Association founded in 1871 became the forum of liberal teachers, who stubbornly lobbied for a substantial school reform. The reform could not take place in the 1860s, since during the major part of that decade the elites of the Monarchy were preoccupied with settling of the state structure. Even when this had been decided upon in 1867, the immediate postdualistic regime in Croatia controlled by the Hungarian government was not keen on modernization of Croatia but its pacification. Only after a compromise had been reached between the National Liberal Party ("Narodna liberalna stranka") and the Hungarian government in 1873, the new ban Mažuranić was able to articulate reforms limited to Croatian autonomous affairs, one of them being education.

Mažuranić's reform of primary education was a great step towards secularization, even though it was in this respect more moderate than its model - the Austrian law of 1869 (*Reichsschulgesetz*). This moderateness is understandable given the immense influence of the Catholic Church in Croatia. Another major difference was that primary schooling in Croatia lasted not eight but five years. The 1874 reform also meant that teachers became civil servants, which was an improvement in their material and social status. Yet, primary beneficiaries were peasant children and girls, who now attended school in greater percentage than before. In one respect the Mažuranić reform was even a small step ahead of its model - namely in the compulsory status of gymnastics classes not just for boys but for girls as well. Moreover, women teachers got the right to equal salary as their men colleagues! Unfortunately, during ban Karoly Khuen Héderváry (1883-1903) wages of women teachers were again lower, and they were banned to a kind of celibacy since only unmarried women could be teachers. In the Sabor, the Mažuranić reform was strongly attacked by its Serbian members (even though the reform allowed the Cyrillic script for Serbian pupils) who denied the Croatian Sabor the right to pass bills that would encompass Serbian schools and pupils as well.¹⁴ The issue at stake was Serbian autonomy in Croatia. This clearly shows the national role of education.

The effects of the Mažuranić reform were seen in the 1880s. In 1869, 85% of population was illiterate, in 1880, 73% of men and 83% of women were illiterate, but in 1884/5, 75% of eligible children attended school, compared to 55% in 1871/2. Of course, the percentages for towns were different, as 94% of eligible children in Zagreb attended elementary school in 1884. The latter fact was satisfactory regarding Croatian conditions, but in Austrian lands as early as in 1860 almost all children attended school except in Carniola (71.9 %) and a Styrian district Bruck (86.5%).¹⁵

14 Mirjana Gross, "Zakon o osnovnim školama 1874. i srpsko pravoslavno školstvo", in *Zbornik radova o povijesti i kulturi srpskog naroda u SR Hrvatskoj*, Vol. 1 (Zagreb, 1988), pp. 75-118.

15 Helmut Engelbrecht, *Geschichte des österreichischen Bildungswesens. Erziehung und Unterricht auf dem Boden Österreichs, Von 1848 bis zum Ende der Monarchie*, Vol. 4 (Vienna, 1984), p. 117.

The educational reforms changed the everyday life of teachers and pupils through new schoolbooks, methods, looser disciplinary measures and more teaching means. It is interesting that in all the above-mentioned aspects, the liberal reforms were very often conveyed through the Central European filter. In the 1870s, schoolbooks were still translated from German, the most influential pedagogical theoretician was J. Friedrich Herbart and empiricist Friedrich Dittes, the director of the Viennese *Pedagogium* who exerted huge influence on liberal teachers in Croatia. Dittes took part in the general assembly of the Teachers' Association in 1871, he was personally acquainted with prominent teachers, and he became *persona non grata* for the opponents of secularization (including liberal priests, such as Franjo Rački and J.J. Strossmayer). Yet, Croatian followers of Dittes did not implement his criticism towards national issue. At this point I would like to stress that we often speak of the Western European models and ideas without taking into consideration the modifications they went through in practice. Our goals should be to identify models, explain their modifications and their carriers and analyse their reception and results.

Not just ideas were imported from the Western and Central Europe, even the teaching means and the school banks were of Austrian, German, Czech and Slovene¹⁶ origin until late in the 19th century.¹⁷ Needless to say, a number of teachers came from these lands to Croatia as well, exerting influence not only on their pupils, but on colleagues as well.¹⁸ The Czech teachers were especially influential and prominent Croatian teachers contributed to the Prague journal *Slavjanski pedagog*. One should immediately notice the absence of Hungarian influences at least in civil Croatia. The Croatian School Museum founded at the beginning of the 20th century did not have a single teaching means from Hungary!¹⁹ The reason was clearly of political and national origin.

Even the history textbooks were largely translated from German in the 1870s, but novelty was that they were done by renowned historians, such as Vjekoslav Klaić. Klaić did not mechanically translate, he added information on Croatian history, but he also provided better supplementary material, such as illustrations, chronologies or lists of kings.²⁰ Klaić and other history teachers also began writing

16 Popular author of geographical atlantes was Blaž Kozenn.

17 Iskra Iveljić, "Modernisierung Kroatiens in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts. Europäische Vorbilder und kroatische Besonderheiten", in C. Zach-F. Solomon et al. (eds.) *Vorbild „Europa“ und die Modernisierung im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (München, 2009).

18 Probably the most known Slovenian teacher was Janez Trdina, Czechs were Vjenceslav Mařík and his wife, Anton Truhelka, Stjepan Novotný – the founder of the first pedagogical journal *Napredak* ("Progress") in 1859, and Marija Jambrišak - one of the most prominent women teachers. She studied at the Viennese *Pedagogium* upon personal invitation of F. Dittes who was impressed by her liberal ideas exposed at the general assembly of Teachers' Association in 1871.

19 *Hrvatski školski muzej: Njegov postanak i uređenje* (Zagreb, 1902); Elizabeta Serdar (ed.), *Hrvatski školski muzej 1901.-2001* (Zagreb, 2001).

20 Klaić did so in translating E. Hannak's, *Lehrbuch der Geschichte des Altertums für die unteren Klassen der Mittelschulen* (Vienna, 1870); V. Klaić, *Poviest staroga vieka za niže razrede srednjih učilišta* (Zagreb, 1877).

Croatian history schoolbooks,²¹ this being largely due to the founding of the modern Croatian historiography by Ivan Kukuljević and Franjo Rački.²² Klaić, who studied in Vienna, used methods and ideas of Western authors, which he combined with that of Slavic ones in order to put Croatian history in the broader European context. According to Klaić, Croats, as a branch of populous and important Slavic peoples, deserved a prominent place among European nations. Of course, Klaić was not the only one to promote such European discourse, it was widely spread at least since 1848. Liberal reforms and national integration were seen as a part of (Western) European civilization. The past was interpreted as the time of serfdom, slavery, of medieval darkness in which only bats could prosper, while the present was a brief transition to an era of liberty, progress and humanity. Since 1848 the liberals were repeating on and on that Croatia had to make up for its not keeping abreast with European progress. (This discourse is still present nowadays). The conservatives of all colours, especially priests, were sceptical of progress and tried to stress the importance of authentic and autochthonous Croatian position and heritage. Yet, the dividing line between Croatian liberals and conservatives was often blurred and vague. Liberal priests, such as Franjo Rački and Josip Juraj Strossmayer (who fought consistently for the founding of the University and Academy) sided with the conservatives in the battle against secularization, which they saw as a result of intrigues and antichristian conspiracy of Jews and masons.²³ On the other hand, priests accepted the liberal Mažuranić reform *via facti*, which meant that there would be no «Kulturkampf» in Croatia. The Zagreb archbishop finally called upon priests to do so.

Even among liberals there were big differences – the National Liberal Party was keen on following the path of the Western European reforms, whereas «pravaši» (followers of the Party of Right i.e. party of Croatian State Right) insisted on the importance of establishing an independent Croatia, reforms being the secondary question. The third stream was pro-Hungarian, and because of its political and national orientation it was ostracized from the grand national narrative for a long time. Yet, among the so called unionists (adherents of the unconditional union with Hungary) there were also liberals, but they thought that major reforms should be carried out in cooperation with Hungary.

The liberal and conservative fronts were also vague in the attitude towards children. Since the abstract notion of children is socially constructed, children's

21 Ivan Hoić, Franjo (František) Kořinec, Ljudevit Tomšić, Stjepan Srkulj. See Charles Jelavich, *South Slav Nationalisms. Textbooks and Yugoslav Union before 1914* (Ohio: State Un. Press, 1990); Croatian edition: *Južnoslavenski nacionalizmi*, (Zagreb, 1992).

22 There is a certain dilemma among historians as to who is the founding father of modern history writing. While stressing the important impetus provided by Kukuljević, one has to underline that Rački was the first to apply the modern method of critical approach to historical sources. During his stay in Rome he got acquainted with the methods applied in editing *Monumenta Germaniae historica*. Mirjana Gross, *Franjo Rački. Vijek i djelovanje*, (Zagreb, 2004), p. 506.

23 Letter of F. Rački to J.J. Strossmayer 11th April and 28th August 1874. Ferdo Šišić (ed.), *Korespondencija Rački-Strossmayer*, Vol. 1 (Zagreb, 1928).

characters indicate socially preferable and acceptable conduct.²⁴ Croatian children's literature remained very tendentious and moralizing until the turn of the century. This is not surprising since it was mostly written by teachers, who promoted the conception of a universal didactical publication, aimed at various age groups of children and youth as well as adults, since in the country the young were more literate than their parents. It is important to stress that this conception was shared by liberal and conservative teachers.²⁵ Both of them were keen on protecting innocent and helpless children, seen as physically and psychically frail creatures, who therefore had to rely on their parents, teachers or other authorities to remain on the right side and develop their proper identity. The image of children in Croatian literature was accordingly stereotypic, turning children's characters into paradigms of proper and moral life. At the turn of the century, critical voices were raised. One of them belonged to Jelica Belović-Bernadzikowska who promptly reacted to Heinrich Wolgast's *Das Elend unserer Jugendliteratur* (1896), and pleaded against didactical tendentiousness.²⁶ From the beginning of the 20th century, children's literature made steps in this direction, its authors were writers (Ivana Brlić-Mažuranić, Jagoda Truhelka, Marija Horvat, Vladimir Nazor) eager to produce an artistically relevant book and not to be crusaders of pedagogical conservatism. In their works, children's characters partake in articulation of their identities, enjoy certain autonomy and have a central position in the narrative discourse.²⁷

At the turn of the century, Croatian education was more differentiated particularly on the secondary level, with more "real" ("realke") and vocational schools, but also with two more "gymnasiums" (in Senj and Bjelovar). The number of pupils in secondary schools was growing since the 1860s. In 1857, there were 988 pupils in "gymnasiums" and 200 in "real" schools, in 1880, the numbers were 2129 and 269, respectively. The confessional structure shows underrepresentation of Orthodox pupils (in 1877, around 10%) overrepresentation of Catholic, Greek-Orthodox and Jewish pupils. The latter amounted to 21% in real schools in 1877!²⁸ The social structure shows that in 1870s most pupils came from ranks of merchants and artisans (40% in "gymnasiums", 56% in "real" schools), intellectual professions and peasantry, the latter being represented among the pupils of "gymnasiums" with 20%.

24 Karin Lesnik-Oberstein, *Children's Literature. Criticism and the Fictional Child* (Oxford, 1994), pp. 9-10.

25 One can compare articles in *Smilje* the journal of liberal teachers of the Teachers' Association with *Bršljan* (1873), edited by the group of conservative teachers gathered around *Školski prijatelj*.

26 Jelica Belović-Bernadzikowska, "Naša omladinska literatura, *Školski vjesnik*, Vol. IV., No., 7-8, 1897, pp. 9, 17.

27 Dubravka Zima, "Djetinjstvo i stereotipi: Slika djeteta u hrvatskome dječjem romanu 20. stoljeća", in D. Oraić-Tolić et al. (eds.), *Kulturni stereotipi* (Zagreb, 2006), p. 255.

28 Agneza Szabo, "Društvena struktura polaznika srednjih škola u civilnoj Hrvatskoj i Slavoniji 1850-1881", *Historijski zbornik*, Vol. 61, 1988, pp. 155-180.

In the 1890s, a new hybrid type of secondary school was introduced – the “real gymnasium” (“realna gimnazija”), which combined the general curriculum with practical goals of “real” schools. The case of a “real gymnasium” is an interesting one. In Croatia they were often unjustly praised as Croatian specialty, but on the contrary to Austrian lands, where this type of schools did not turn to be successful, in Croatia it survived in the form of public schools.

The Zagreb University, founded in 1874, was entangled between the unfulfilled ambition to be the academic centre of South Slavs and a more narrow one, that of a national *alma mater*. Strossmayer and Rački envisioned the University as an academic mediator between the Western and South-Eastern Europe. The same mission in the field of science was assigned to the Yugoslav Academy of Arts and Sciences. The Yugoslav mission of the Zagreb University turned out to be an illusion, since the majority of students came from Croatia and Slavonia. Until 1918, the university was not even able to completely fulfil its national goal. Though its role in modernization and national integration was important, it was limited through non-acknowledgment of its academic titles in the Austrian part of the Monarchy, which meant that students from Dalmatia and Istria would not attend it.²⁹ The same argument probably impeded Slovenian students to study law in Zagreb. The University offered studies in theology, law and philosophy. Despite the fact that the latter studies were being broadened with some courses in natural sciences (which were rather attractive and 36% of students studied them), the academic range was still rather traditional, without technical and some natural sciences, as well as medicine. Therefore, a great number of students had to study abroad. For example at the turn of the century, almost 100 students from all Croatian lands (mostly Dalmatia) were matriculated yearly at the Vienna University; in the winter semester 1909/10, out of 837 students with Serbian or Croatian as mother tongue, 312 were citizens of Croatia and Slavonia in all Austrian universities.³⁰ The number of technical intelligentsia rose significantly towards the turn of the century. In Austrian technical colleges in 1909/10, out of altogether 238 students with Serbian or Croatian as mother tongue, 116 came from Croatia and Slavonia³¹ and from 1815 to 1906, just in Vienna technical college there were about 700 students from various Croatian lands, almost 40%

29 At the Faculty of Philosophy 1874-1914 6% of students came from Dalmatia and only 1% from Istria. There were more students from Slovenia (25) than from Istria! Tihana Luetić, *Studenti Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu 1874.-1914.*, Master's thesis (Zagreb: Faculty of Philosophy, 2005).

30 145 came from Bosnia and Herzegovina and 127 from Serbia. These statistics do not encompass Dalmatia and Istria since they were part of Cisleithania. Gary Cohen, “The Politics to Advanced Education in Late Imperial Austria”. As a working paper available at: URL: cas.unm.edu/publications/papers.html.

31 31 were from Bosnia and Herzegovina and 10 from Serbia. Ebd.

of them from Dalmatia, but only 14% from Slavonia.³² The Prague University³³ became a magnet as well, because of political reasons. Italian universities in Padua³⁴ and Bologna remained attractive to Istrian and Dalmatian students, and the university in Budapest was despite political reasons (often just because of them) still the *alma mater* of many students from Slavonia, but Croatia as well. Even a concise comparison of *peregrinatio academica* among the students from Slovenia, Croatia and Serbia shows that the University of Vienna was even more important and attractive to students from Slovenia than Croatia, because they lacked their own university, whereas Serbian students, who were in that respect in the same position as Slovenes, tended to study more often on the German and Russian universities or in Paris than their Croatian or Slovene counterparts.³⁵ I would very much agree with Lj. Trgovčević's argument that South Slavic students from dependent countries tended to study within the state their country was a part of.³⁶ So, Slovene and Croatian students mostly studied within the Monarchy. Of course, one must mention that since Serbia did not have a proper university,

32 Social structure is known just for half of them, but it amazingly puts sons of merchants in the first place with 24%. Report by Maja Brkljačić, as a part of the project "Croats in Vienna 1790-1918", led by N. Budak and H. Heppner, unpublished manuscript.

33 Up to 1895 the number of students from Croatia in Prague did not exceed 3 per year, and they mostly studied at the German university. After that time it began to rise, and the majority attended the Czech university, but apart from 1908 and 1909, the years of student exodus from Zagreb, it usually did not amount to more than 20 per year. From 1882-1918 the total number was 444. The prevalence of law was evident (290 students), on the second place is philosophy (91) and on the third medicine (63). Different is the structure of altogether 57 doctors until 1918, 35 were doctors of law, 21 of medicine and just 1 of philosophy. There were 9 women doctors, 8 of medicine and 1 of philosophy. One should note the exodus of Slavic students from Austrian and Hungarian universities after the fall of the Monarchy, many of them coming to the Czech university in Prague (1918-1921 103 doctors, among them 95 of medicine). Therefore also a rather big number of Orthodox doctors of medicine. Whereas the social structure of doctors at both the German and Czech university until 1921 was similar (civil servants 25%, agriculture 23%, trade, banking and traffic 17%, craft & industry 10%, liberal professions 10%) the regional one differed: at the Czech university 58% of students were from Croatia and Slavonia, 34% from Dalmatia, 8% from Istria, at the German one 39% from Croatia-Slavonia, 48% from Dalmatia and 12% from Istria. Damir Agičić, *Hrvatsko-češki odnosi na prijelazu iz XIX. u XX. stoljeće* (Zagreb, 2000), pp. 134-135; D. Agičić, "Hrvatski doktori u Pragu 1882.-1921", *Časopis za suvremenu povijest*, Vol. 27, No. 1, 1995, pp. 137-154.; D. Agičić, *Hrvatski studenti na češkom sveučilištu u Pragu 1882.-1918*, *Časopis za suvremenu povijest*, Vol. 30, 1998, pp. 291-315.

34 Stjepo Obad, "Studenti Dalmati all'Università di Padova", *Atti, Centro di ricerche storiche - Rovigno*, Vol. 31, 2001, pp. 469-478.

35 Alojz Cindrič, "Vpliv dunajske univerze"; Irena Gantar-Godina, "Slovene Students in Central and Eastern Europe up to 1918", *Dve domovini [Two Homelands]*, Vol. 7, 1996, pp. 249-260; Ljubinka Trgovčević, "Serbian Intellectuals in Foreign Universities in the 19th Century", in Karady, Victor et al. (eds.), *L'insegnement des Elites en Europe Centrale (19-20e siecles)*. (Krakow, 1999), pp. 159-173; Ljubinka Trgovčević, "Obrazovanje i modernizacija. Osnove za poređenja u okviru jugoistočne Europe", in Fleck, Hans-Georg et al. (eds.), *Dijalog povjesničara-istoričara*, Vol. 2 (Zagreb, 2000), pp. 117-133. Hereafter Ljubinka Trgovčević, "Obrazovanje i modernizacija".

36 Ljubinka Trgovčević, "Obrazovanje i modernizacija", p. 127.

grants were awarded for various universities abroad. However, I would like to point out that the pattern of Croatian students studying abroad is more differentiated, with Vienna, Graz, Budapest, Prague, Innsbruck, Krakow, but also Bologna, Padua, German universities or Paris as destinations.³⁷ If we also take into account that the Catholic clergy and artists were often educated outside the Habsburg Monarchy, the picture is more diversified. It should also be stressed that a broad spectre of Croatian elite was educated on various foreign institutions – diplomats, officers, merchants, engineers, architects, agronomists, etc. Many of them were in contact with contemporary ideas and tendencies during their formative years, and were eager to apply them in their homeland. However, the notion of the elite being intellectually profiled abroad and becoming a kind of “Kulturträger” in their homeland might be somewhat misleading. Not few of them strove to combine achievements of the Western and Central Europe with specific traits of their country. Others were able to reach high levels in art or science, which made them much more than pure epigones of foreign tendencies. This brings me to another dilemma, namely that of centre – semi-periphery and periphery. With no ambitions to start up a debate, I would just put forward my humble opinion that, at least art and culture in the broadest sense of the word do not easily submit to such hierarchization. Recently, much has been debated on multiple encoding of identities.³⁸

At the turn of the century, the number of students in Zagreb rose significantly. From 1874/5 (290 students) to 1887/8 (438), there was a steady growth. A period of stagnation followed, ending in 1896/7. From that year there was a rapid growth of 100 students per year, with a climax in 1907/8 with 1464 students. This remained the quantitative apex for the whole period until 1918. The year 1907/8 was marked by the student exodus out of political reasons, and after that the numbers revolved around 1000 students. The law study prevailed (in 1874-1879, 65% of students), yet at the beginning of 20th century the percentage of philosophy students rose (in 1904-1909 to 30%) because of new courses. Most students (39% in 1884-1899) came from what statistics call “intellectual professions” (including different categories,

37 Unfortunately, there are no thorough studies on Croatian students abroad except for Vienna, Graz or Prague. See D. Agičić, op. cit.; Harald Heppner, “Die Rolle und Bedeutung der Grazer Universität für die Studentenschaft aus Südosteuropa 1867-1914”, in R. G. Plaschka-K. Mack (eds.), *Wegenetz europäischen Geistes*, Vol. 1 (Vienna, 1983), pp. 286-293; H. Heppner, “Studenti iz Istre na Sveučilištu u Grazu 1884-1914”, *Radovi Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest*, Vol. 23, 1990, pp. 139-148; Gustav Otruba, “Die Universitäten in der Hochschulorganisation der Donaumonarchie”, in *Student und Hochschule im 19. Jahrhundert. Studien und Materialien* (Göttingen, 1975); Gary Cohen, “Die Studenten der Wiener Universität von 1860 bis 1900”, in *Wegenetz*, op. cit., Vol. 2, pp. 290-316.

38 Moritz Csáky, “Gedächtnis, Erinnerung und die Konstruktion von Identität”, in Catherine Bosshart-Pfluger et al. (eds.), *Nation und Nationalismus in Europa. Kulturelle Konstruktion von Identitäten. Festschrift für Urs Altermatt*, (Stuttgart-Vienna, 2002), pp. 25-49; Moritz Csáky-Klaus Zeyringer (eds.), *Ambivalenz des kulturellen Erbes. Vielfachkodierung des historischen Gedächtnisses. Paradigma: Zentraleuropa* (Innsbruck-Vienna-Munich 2000).

such as civil servants, lawyers, doctors, etc.), agriculture was represented with 28%, craft and industry with 15% and trade and banking with 6%.³⁹

Interesting is that the political situation is reflected on the regional and ethnic origin of students. The policy of ban Khuen Héderváry towards the Serbs in Croatia clearly had consequences on the academic life, at least at the Faculty of Philosophy. Namely, until the 1880s the percentage of its Orthodox students was 5-10%, in 1885/6 21% and in 1900/1 it amounted to 26%! Furthermore, regarding the regional background it should be pointed out that 17% students came from the Strymian county and 12% from Lika-Krbava, to compare with Zagreb, which was represented with 16% and the Zagreb county with 14%.⁴⁰

University soon became a political arena. Paradoxically the students at that time were to a large extent followers of *pravaštvo*, thus being fierce opponents of the National Party of the bishop Strossmayer. Towards the end of the 19th century, students became even more politicized. On the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the University in 1884, they drafted a declaration in which they sharply criticized the pro-Hungarian regime. The rector refused to obey the ban and undertake a second investigation, and was therefore suspended from his duty. This unique offence of academic autonomy aroused interest outside Croatia. But nothing could stop students. During the emperor's visit in 1895 they burned down the Hungarian flag. Since many students were thrown out of the Zagreb University, they continued their studies in Vienna and Prague, where they came under the influence of T.G. Masaryk⁴¹ and became known as "progressive youth" ("napredna omladina") because of their liberal-democratic ideas. At the beginning of the 20th century, students were followers of various parties and ideologies, from clerical to radical nationalistic youth.⁴² Even though university teachers were civil servants, they often enticed the political atmosphere. Because of their oppositional political activities, the dean of the Faculty of Philosophy, Đuro Šurmin, was in 1908 retired by decree, and professor of history Gavro Manojlović was suspended. This was followed by demonstrations, a temporary suspension of lectures and a great exodus of students to Vienna, Graz and Prague, but this time also to Belgrade. The students were welcomed by Istrian, Dalmatian and Slovene members of the *Reichsrat*, at the very same time as the German emperor visited Vienna, which gave the whole affair an international dimension.

39 Jaroslav Šidak, "Sveučilište do kraja prvog svjetskog rata", in: *Spomenica, op.cit.*, pp. 116-117.

40 This percentage of Orthodox does not include Bulgarian students. Percentage from Tihana Luetić, *Studenti Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu 1874.-1914., Master's thesis* (Zagreb: Faculty of Philosophy, 2005), p. 69, pp. 80-84. The interpretation is mine. At the whole university, the number of Orthodox students was growing until 1899 when their percentage reached 19% and remained steady. The percentage of Catholic students dropped from 86% in 1874/5-1879/80 to 77% in 1894/5-1899/1900.

41 Arnold Suppan, "Bildungspolitische Emanzipation und gesellschaftliche Modernisierung. Die südslavischen Studenten an der tschechischen Universität um die Jahrhundertwende und der Einfluss Professor Masaryks", in *Wegenetz, op. cit.*, Vol. 2, 1987.

42 Mirjana Gross, "Studentski pokret 1875-1914", in *Spomenica, op. cit.*, pp. 451-483.

Moreover, the greater Austrian circle around the heir Francis Ferdinand used it to criticize the Hungarian government.

Perhaps the best test paper of modernization is women's education. In the last decade of the 19th century, it was much improved; in 1894-5 girls in Zagreb attended primary school even in a slightly greater percentage than boys.⁴³ Moreover, a public lyceum for girls was founded in Zagreb in 1892, and in 1895 women were allowed to become irregular students of philosophy. Very soon, in 1901, they could obtain a regular status. In the Central European context, women in Croatia did not fare badly, since women students were allowed to study philosophy in Vienna in 1897, in Baden in 1899, in Hungary in 1895 and in Prussia only in 1908.

Girls and women grabbed the chance, from 1892 to 1901, 852 of them attended the Zagreb lyceum and in 1895-1914, 158 of them studied at the Faculty of Philosophy.⁴⁴ The social and confessional structure of the pupils of lyceum is interesting – a third of them were daughters of public and private employees, and more than a fifth of merchants and artisans. As expected, Jewish girls were overrepresented yet the percentage (16%) is surprisingly big, as well as the underrepresentation (12%) of Orthodox pupils.⁴⁵ The structure of philosophy students was different, in 1874-1914, 12% were daughters of teachers and professors, 11% of merchants and artisans, 10% of privateers and owners; 59% of women students were Catholic, 35% Orthodox, 3% Protestants and 3% Jews.⁴⁶ A higher percentage of Orthodox students stems from the influx of Bulgarian students who often came to Zagreb as the first academic step towards the Western and Central Europe.

By the beginning of the 20th century, the educational system produced first women doctors of philosophy, the very first one being a historian,⁴⁷ and allowed the practice of women doctors who obtained their degree abroad in Vienna or Zurich⁴⁸. In 1918/19; there were altogether 208 women students, 108 of whom studied medicine.⁴⁹ The issue of women education shows that underdevelopment

43 Dinko Župan, *Pučko školstvo u vrijeme banovanja Ivana Mažuranića*, Master's thesis, (Zagreb: Faculty of Philosophy, 2002), p. 77. D. Župan, "Uzor djevojke": obrazovanje žena u Banskoj Hrvatskoj tijekom druge polovice 19. stoljeća", *Časopis za suvremenu povijest*, No. 2, 2001, pp. 435-452.

44 Ida Ograjšek Gorenjak, *Otvaranje privremenog ženskog liceja i položaj građanskih žena u Hrvatskoj na kraju 19. stoljeća* (Zagreb: Master's thesis, Faculty of Philosophy, 2005); Tihana Luetić, "Prve studentice Mudroslovnog fakulteta kr. Sveučilišta Franje Josipa I. u Zagrebu", *Povijesni prilozi*, Vol. 21, 2002, pp. 199-206.

45 In 1910 in Croatia and Slavonia 72% of inhabitants were Catholic, 25% Orthodox, 2% Protestant and 1% were Jews.

46 Ida Ograjšek Gorenjak, *Otvaranje*, op. cit., p. 129.

47 It was Milica Bogdanović, with the doctoral thesis *Car Julije Apostat prema kršćanstvu*, defended in 1906. Luetić, *Prve studentice*, op. cit., p. 196.

48 The first doctor of medicine was Milica Šviglin Čavov (promoted in 1893), but she did not practice medicine in Croatia. The first to do so was in 1906 Karola Maier Milobar.

49 Jaroslav Šidak, *Sveučilište do kraja prvog svjetskog rata*, in *Spomenica*, op. cit., p. 115; Igor Karaman, "Socijalna i regionalna obilježja studenata na zagebačkim visokoškolskim

is often unjustly used as a stereotype explanation. In other words, in spite of Croatia's underdevelopment, women were offered education opportunities that existed in more developed countries. This does not refer just to Croatia, since women were allowed at universities in Greece in 1890, Turkey in 1894, and Bulgaria in 1901 (but up to 1918 they made up 25% of all students in Sofia). Moreover, the regulation regarding the status of women students was rather vague in Serbia, not expressly forbidding them to become students, which led to a number of women students in 1890s.⁵⁰

At the turn of the century, Croatian initiatives became more numerous, and foreign influences were not mediated via the Central Europe, but were sometimes taken directly from the source. For example, Croatian teachers went to Sweden to get acquainted with slöjd, and to attend gymnastic courses in Stockholm. All in all, education was more precisely adapted to the needs of the modern middle-class society and its economy, with a rather propulsive enrolment in technical colleges.

I would like to end with a success story. By the beginning of the 20th century, the educational system produced first women doctors of philosophy, following the suit of more developed countries and thus showing that the European mission could (at least partly) be fulfilled in an underdeveloped country. The liberalisation of education can be illustrated by the example of a certain Danica Vlah, born in Kastav near Rijeka. Her educational path shows that social emancipation was available even to women of lower status. Danica was an orphan, who attended women's lyceum in Zagreb and obtained doctoral degree in Vienna with the thesis on Pavao Ritter Vitezović. To be honest, she might have used some charms of her sex to obtain the degree, since she barely passed all 5 strict exams and the report of her supervisor Milan Rešetar was rather critical of her work. Perhaps the committee at the Vienna University exercised political correctness without knowing of it.⁵¹

To conclude with, at the turn of the century Croatia followed the pattern manifest in the Habsburg Monarchy which might be called «Drang nach Bildung». It was visible in the growth of the number of pupils and students, which lead even to a certain discrepancy between state and society, since, at least Cisleithanian governments sometimes unsuccessfully tried to slow down this trend. On the eve of the World War I, Austria had the highest enrolment rate (relative to the total number of inhabitants) of all major European countries, surpassing

ustanovama", in *Hrvatska na pragu modernizacije (1750-1918)* (Zagreb, 2009), pp. 129-145.

50 Trgovčević, *Obrazovanje*, op.cit. pp.129-130.

51 Danica Vlah matriculated at the Vienna University in the winter term 1905/6, and she studied there until the summer term of 1909 Slavic philology, ancient history and history of Eastern Europe. Evidently, she was not a good student. She barely passed all of her five strict exams (the so called rigorosa) and the report by professor Milan Rešetar on her doctoral thesis was not flattering. Archives of the Vienna University, Rigorosenprotokolle, Ph 59.21, ad 2908.

in that respect France by 30% and England by 75%.⁵² The role of education in modernization was immense. For a variety of social, national or confessional groups of both sexes it became a means of emancipation, and for political parties an essential agenda in the political arena. In general, education provided a much more successful picture of modernization than economy or politics, yet in the Monarchy it was also an instrument of preserving and promoting its cultural polyphony and multilayered (re)structuring of identities.

CONCLUSION

The article deals with the modernization of school system in Croatia and the importance of education in the social, political and cultural context. The very first reforms were articulated during the enlightened absolutism, yet they were not so deeply implemented in Croatia as in Austria. Despite significant efforts in 1830s, reforms of primary and secondary schools began in the 1850s. The proper educational take-off in Croatia took place only in the 1860s and 1870s. It was visible in the founding of the Teachers' Association, periodicals, children's books and journals in Croatian, the development of pedagogical science, founding of a modern University in Zagreb and major elementary-school reform launched in 1874 by the government of the ban Ivan Mažuranić. The educational reforms were very often conveyed through the Central European filter and they brought about changes in everyday life of teachers and pupils through new schoolbooks, methods, looser disciplinary measures and more teaching means.

The Zagreb University, founded in 1874, was entangled between the unfulfilled ambition to be the academic centre of South Slavs and a more narrow one, that of a national *alma mater*. The number of its students rose significantly at the turn of the century, but still many students studied abroad. At the same time they became even more politicized.

In the late 19th century, education was differentiated, Croatian initiatives became more numerous, and foreign influences were not mediated via the Central Europe, but were sometimes taken directly from the source.

52 Gary Cohen, "The Politics to Advanced Education", op. cit.