

15 National Movements against Nation States

Bohemia and Lombardy between the Habsburg Monarchy, the German Confederation, and Piedmont-Sardinia

Axel Körner

I Philosophy of History and Nationalism

Nineteenth-century philosophy of history described the emergence of nation states as a natural, universal, and therefore inescapable stage in the development of humankind.¹ Advocates of this view attached a particular semantic quality to the temporality of this development, which understood the nation state to be modern, and other forms of states as relics of the past and barriers against progress. This concept of historical time was informed by a strong bias in favour of historical and allegedly civilised nations, dividing the world into nations that had gained the right to form independent states and others that had to be assimilated into more worthy nations or were to be kept under imperial domination.

While the identification of nationality as a natural right goes back to the eighteenth century, Johann Gottfried Herder did not conclude from this position that nations had to form states, or that nation states were more natural than other forms of state.² In the twentieth century legal theorists and politicians interpreted national self-determination in terms of independent statehood as the foundation of a new world order.³ This new concept did little to solve the problem of colonialism; and many of the new states that were founded on Wilsonian principles continued to suppress the rights of their own national minorities.⁴ Moreover, the

¹ A precondition for this process was to link nationality to statehood, as it occurred during the French Revolution. See R. Brubaker, *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992), p. 35.

² F. M. Barnard, *Herder on Nationality, Humanity, and History* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2003), p. 9.

³ Contrary to popular belief, self-determination was not spelled out in President Wilson's Fourteen Points of January 1918, but included in a speech to Congress four weeks later: E. Manela, *The Wilsonian Moment. Self-Determination and the Intellectual Origins of Anticolonial Nationalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 40.

⁴ On the failure of liberal anti-colonialism see Manela, *The Wilsonian Moment*, p. 137. The writer and journalist Joseph Roth is one of the early observers of the new forms of

weaker and less lucky among these new independent nation states were soon dominated (and sometimes extinguished) by a small number of bigger powers.

Many historians tend to read the nineteenth-century notion of progress towards independent nation states as a process of modernisation, accepting its supposedly natural foundations. Like nineteenth-century nationalists, they assume that social groups that identify themselves in terms of nationality automatically aspired to independent statehood. This scheme privileges ethnic origins and common language over other forms of political organisation based on civic consensus, dynastic loyalty, or a sense of territorial legitimacy associated with historical borders. Any alternative to the emergence of ethnocentric nation states is thought to contradict the laws of historical progress.

If we look at the Habsburg monarchy in 1848 these philosophical elaborations on the logic of nation states are not helpful. In 1848 radical democrats, national liberals, Young – and Old Hegelians, as well as Karl Marx's early followers, all agreed in condemning the Habsburg monarchy as a reactionary relic of past times, symbolised by common comparisons between the Austrian and the Chinese Empires, separated by a wall from the rest of humanity.⁵ Meanwhile, a majority of the kingdoms, duchies, and principalities that formed the Austrian Empire, as well as many of the nationalities that populated these lands, voiced growing concern over the political rhetoric that gave rise to the quest for nation states. Instead of asking for separate statehood, they articulated their critique of the Restoration regime in terms of demands for political representation and the recognition of their national rights within a reformed Empire. For some political thinkers and publicists this took the novel form of federal arrangements within the empire, understood as an alternative to previous forms of imperial rule, but also to the prospect of centralised nation states.

In 1848 we find different examples of these ideas in Lombardy and Bohemia, two territories of the Habsburg monarchy that share important features of economic and civil development. In the context of a history of 1848 political thought it seems remarkable that most national movements

suppression in Central Europe. See J. Roth *Reisen in die Ukraine und nach Russland*, (J. Bürger, ed.), (Munich: Beck, 2015), p. 10.

⁵ Among the most eloquent rejections of alternatives to the nation state were those by Marx and Engels. See for instance F. Engels, 'Der Anfang vom Ende Österreichs', 27 January 1848, in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works*, 50 vols. (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1975–2004) [subsequently *MECW*], vol. IV (Berlin: Dietz, 1972), pp. 504–10. On the China metaphor, K. Marx, 'Die Revolution in China und Europa', 20 May 1853 in *MECW*, vol. IX (Berlin: Dietz, 1960), pp. 95–102, 97. For further analysis see E. Hanisch, *Der kranke Mann an der Donau. Marx und Engels über Österreich* (Vienna: Europaverlag, 1978), p. 31.

emerging under Habsburg rule during the so-called Restoration period did not consider independent national statehood to be a political objective, but (if they considered it at all) as a last resort, despite the powerful association of 1848 as the 'springtime of peoples'. For some of these movements independent statehood came to form part of their political programmes only once the revolutions had been defeated; others hesitated to contemplate this idea until the empire's collapse during the First World War.

Contrary to the assumptions of nineteenth-century philosophers of history and later generations of historians working under their spell, not all national movements automatically aspired to become independent nation states, especially in Central Europe. For many of them the concept of empire as represented by the Austrian *Kaiserstaat* acquired a new semantic content around 1848.⁶ National movements in the region had a clear understanding of the risks involved in transforming the political map of Europe into one dominated by nation states. Based in particular on the observation of Magyarisation in Hungary since 1841, these movements knew that nation states were unlikely to tolerate cultural or linguistic diversity within their territories, that ethnic minorities would be forced to amalgamate with the majority. Moreover, they realised that small nation states would live under a constant threat of being dominated by larger powers, especially by Germany and Russia. The fears associated with the formation of independent nation states among the empire's less powerful, mostly Slavonic-speaking minorities became increasingly apparent during and after the Revolutions of 1848, when they took account of the effects of ever more aggressive forms of German and Magyar nationalism.

From the point of view of standard accounts of the Italian Risorgimento it might seem provocative to argue that the formation of centralised nation states also aroused fears and resentment among sections of the Italian national movement, in this case concerning the expansionist aims of Piedmont-Sardinia. The point of comparing these two different cases here is that Slavonic and Italian populations coexisted under the same Habsburg monarchy; that both witnessed revolutions in 1848; and that in both cases nationalism was a significant catalyst for unrest. While the formation of an

⁶ The idea that as a consequence of nationalism empire had lost its significance is therefore misleading, at least for the Slavonic minorities. For this line of argument see for instance G. Schödl, 'Jenseits von Bürgergesellschaft und nationalem Staat. Die Völker Ostmitteleuropas 1848/49' in W. Hardtwig (ed.) *Revolution in Deutschland und Europa 1848/49* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), pp. 207–39, 215. For a more positive perspective on Empire see P. M. Judson, *The Habsburg Empire. A New History* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016).

Italian nation state under the House of Savoy did not involve the same risks as linguistic and cultural assimilation within a Hungarian or German nation state, there was a distinct and widespread feeling in Lombardy, most prominently expressed by the political theorist and protagonist of 1848 Carlo Cattaneo, that the region's submission under Piedmont would destroy a historically rooted notion of civic identity that had been largely compatible with Habsburg rule, but was doomed to vanish under the autocratic centralism of the Piedmontese monarchy and an emerging Italian nation state.

II 'Kaiserstaat' and 'Landespatriotismus' in Bohemia

The House of Habsburg had ruled the Lands of the Bohemian Crown since the sixteenth century, consisting of the Kingdom of Bohemia, the Margraviate of Moravia, and the Duchy of Silesia, which is the small part of Silesia the Habsburgs were able to retain during the eighteenth-century wars with Prussia. These territories were also referred to as the Bohemian or Czech lands, reflecting the fact that the Czech language has no separate word for Bohemia. It was thanks to the crown of St Wenceslas that the Habsburgs formed part of the electoral college of the Holy Roman Empire, which ratified the Habsburg succession to the imperial title.⁷ Following Napoleonic pressure the Holy Roman Empire ceased to exist and the Lands of the Bohemian Crown became crown-lands of the new Austrian Empire, which had been created in 1804.⁸ As former territories of the Holy Roman Empire, after 1815 they also formed part of the German Confederation, the empire's official successor created at the Congress of Vienna.⁹

Linguistic issues are key to addressing questions of nationality and empire in Bohemia. The Bohemian Lands included a majority of Czech speakers, a large proportion of German speakers, a small group of Polish speakers as well as a few speakers of other Slavonic languages and dialects. Members of these different linguistic groups lived in urban as well as in

⁷ On Bohemia's historical position within the Empire see P. H. Wilson, *Heart of Europe. A History of the Holy Roman Empire* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016), p. 207.

⁸ R. J. W. Evans, 'Communicating empire: the Habsburgs and their critics, 1700–1919 (The Prothero Lecture)' in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*. Sixth Series, XIX (2009), 117–38.

⁹ On the complications arising in 1848 from Bohemia's membership of the German Confederation see J. Kořalka, 'Prag – Frankfurt im Frühjahr 1848: Österreich zwischen Grossdeutschum und Austroslawismus' in H. Lutz and H. Rumpler (eds.), *Österreich und die deutsche Frage im 19. Und 20. Jahrhundert* (Vienna: Verlag für Geschichte und Politik Wien, 1982), pp. 117–39.

rural areas and thus were distributed, with some regional differences, over of the crown's three territories. Bilingualism was relatively widespread beyond the better-educated classes, but only since the end of the eighteenth century did Czech re-emerge as a language of literature, science, and polite conversation, supported by enlightened circles of German speakers who associated the use of Czech with the ancient origins of their lands and demands for greater independence from Viennese rule. The revival of Czech was helped by educational reforms introduced under Maria Theresa, making the literacy rate in Bohemia the highest in Europe, with slightly higher rates among Czech than German speakers.¹⁰ This trend also explains Bohemia's surprising number of university students of peasant origin.¹¹ Support for the use of Czech in daily life also came from the arts and literature. Under Joseph II alone, more than 300 plays in Czech reached the stage.¹² The *Matice Česká*, which supported the publication of Czech books, had 4,500 subscribers by 1847, many of them native speakers of German.¹³ One of the reasons why over the centuries Czech had been pushed aside by German was a feeling that the language no longer allowed to adequately reflect modern thought and recent developments in science. Some supporters of the Czech linguistic revival even opposed the language's adaptation to modern standards, preferring instead to preserve the language of the seventeenth century. The historian František Palacký and the over seventy scholars who regularly contributed to his journal, *Časopis Českého Museum*, made a major contribution to reversing this trend. By 1838 the journal had 1,000 subscribers and many more readers using it in public libraries.¹⁴ It would be wrong to describe the periodical

¹⁰ J. Havránek, 'The Education of Czechs and Slovaks under foreign domination, 1850–1918' in J. Havránek, *University, Historiography, Society, Politics. Selected Studies* (J. Pešek, ed.), pp. 43–65, 44. For a general overview of the Czech revival see H. LeCaine Agnew, *Origins of the Czech National Renaissance* (Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh University Press, 1994).

¹¹ M. Hroch, *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe. A Comparative Analysis of the Social Composition of Patriotic Groups among the Smaller European Nations* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000), p. 57. For a critical account of the role of peasants in the Czech revival around 1848 see P. Heumos, *Agrarische Interessen und nationale Politik in Böhmen 1848–1889* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1979), pp. 1–21.

¹² C. Thienen-Adlerflycht, *Graf Leo Thun im Vormärz. Grundlagen des böhmischen Konservatismus im Kaisertum Österreich* (Graz-Vienna-Cologne: Böhlau, 1967), p. 155. On Joseph's role see also R. Evans, 'Joseph II and nationality in the Habsburg lands' in *Austria, Hungary, and the Habsburgs. Central Europe c. 1683–1867* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 134–46.

¹³ J. Havránek, 'Bohemian Spring 1848: Conflict of loyalties and its picture in historiography' in A. Körner (ed.), *1848 – A European Revolution? International Ideas and National Memories of 1848* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000), pp. 124–39, 124.

¹⁴ For Palacký's role see J. Kofalka, *František Palacký (1798–1876), Der Historiker der Tschechen im österreichischen Vielvölkerstaat* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen

exclusively in terms of its contribution to the Czech national revival.¹⁵ It was strongly supported by the Bohemian nobility and committed to the idea of asserting the historical rights of a kingdom that included Czech and German speakers. Instead of replacing one language with another, their idea was to achieve equality between Bohemia's two linguistic communities within a reformed empire.

The spread of bilingualism, a differentiated use of the country's two main languages according to circumstances, as well as the hybridity of national identity in ethnically mixed territories, make it problematic to provide exact figures for the proportion of Czech and German speakers in Bohemia. Although in some parts of the Bohemian lands, and among large sections of the population, a sense of national belonging was a relatively straightforward question, among the nobility not even genealogical research is able to clearly distinguish between families of German or Slavic origin.¹⁶ These difficulties notwithstanding, most researchers would estimate that in 1850, of Bohemia's 7.9 million inhabitants, about 63 per cent can be considered Czechs and 36 per cent Germans.¹⁷ Both communities included members of different social classes, with German speakers being active in mining as well as in crafts and industry since the Middle Ages, making it problematic to describe them as a 'foreign ruling class'.¹⁸ Despite a certain resurgence of Protestantism as part of the Czech national revival, the kingdom's population was predominantly Catholic, with a strong Jewish minority that included German as well as Czech speakers.¹⁹ Beyond traditional, religiously motivated anti-Judaism, there was a noticeable tendency within the Czech national movement to see the Jews of Bohemia as a separate nationality. Anti-Semitic riots in the early 1840s pushed some Bohemian Jews to take a pro-German position during the

Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2007), p. 179. On Palacký's earliest efforts to widen the vocabulary see, G. J. Morava, *Franz Palacký. Eine frühe Vision von Mitteleuropa* (Vienna: ÖBV, 1990), p. 32. For an example of the systematic introduction of new vocabulary, which continued beyond the 1840s, see J. J. Čejka, 'Sbírka slov a způsobu mluvení ze starých rukopisů lekářských' in *Časopis Českého Muzeu*, 22 (1848), 273–75.

¹⁵ See for instance Hroch, who does not seem to differentiate between Czech nationalism and Bohemian Landes patriotism, *Social Preconditions*, p. 45.

¹⁶ R. Krueger, *Czech, German, and Noble. Status and National Identity in Habsburg Bohemia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), p. 31.

¹⁷ Havránek, 'Education of Czechs and Slovaks', p. 43.

¹⁸ See Hroch, *Social Preconditions*, p. 44. For an overview of occupational structures see P. Horská, 'Obyvatelstvo českých zemí podle povolání' in L. Fialová et al, *Dějiny obyvatelstva českých zemí* (Prague: Mladá Fronta, 1996), pp. 227–63. On the relationship between class and nationality also S. Z. Pech, *The Czech Revolution of 1848* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1969), pp. 17–21.

¹⁹ For a statistical overview see J. Havránek, 'Die Juden zwischen Tschechen und Deutschen in Prag' in *University, Historiography, Society, Politics*, 377–87.

subsequent debates on the territorial aspirations of the Frankfurt Parliament, because compared to a Czech dominated Bohemia they considered a German nation state to offer more security to Jews.²⁰

These constitutional and demographic explanations are necessary to shed light on the relationship between the political concepts of national belonging, statehood, and empire in Bohemia in 1848.²¹ As briefly mentioned in the introduction, the Czechs offer the striking example of a national movement that did not attempt to establish an independent nation state or to break away from the empire during the revolution. In this respect Czech nationalism in 1848 is closely related to the political movements of the empire's other nationalities, notably the different Slavonic-speaking minorities in Hungary, which saw the institution of the empire as a life-saving protection against their annihilation under a Hungarian nation state. Because in 1848 the Czech revival was able to look back at a considerable period of historical and institutional consolidation within the empire, but also because Bohemia itself was a multinational state, the example serves to challenge simplistic assumptions that take a connection between nationalism and quests for independent statehood for granted.

When evaluating 1848 nationalism in the Habsburg Empire, it is important to look beyond the two most famous examples of the German and Hungarian Revolutions, both of which fundamentally questioned the persistence of an Austrian Empire on the political map of Europe. The Hungarian and the German national movements gained considerable publicity and support abroad, with political commentators keen to reduce the Habsburgs' relationship with their subject populations to the idea of a *Völkergefängnis*, a prison of nationalities. Karl Marx's and Friedrich Engels's description of Austria as a 'European China' and the immense popularity of Lajos Kossuth in England are different examples of this trend,

²⁰ For the debate in the 1840s see for instance 'Das Judenthum und die böhmische Literatur', *Jahrbücher für slavische Literatur, Kunst und Wissenschaft* V/1 (1847), pp. 8–12. For the rare example of a critical reflection on the connection between anti-Semitism and Czech nationalism see H. LeCaine Agnew, 'Czechs, Germans, Bohemians? Images of self and other in Bohemia to 1848' in N. M. Wingfield (ed.), *Creating the Other. Ethnic Conflict and Nationalism in Habsburg Central Europe* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2003), pp. 56–77, 70. For later developments see also N. M. Wingfield, *Flag Wars and Stone Saints. How the Bohemian Lands became Czech* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2007), pp. 3, 101. Some modern authors still treat Jews as a separate ethnicity in Bohemia, J. Štaif, 'The image of the other in the nineteenth century. Historical scholarship in the Bohemian lands' in Wingfield (ed.), *Creating the Other*, 81–102, 82.

²¹ For a recent regional overview of political thought around 1848 see B. Trencsényi, M. Janowski, M. Baar, M. Falina, and M. Kopeček, *A History of Modern Political Thought in East Central Europe*. Vol.1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 236–76.

which still mark historiographical accounts of 1848. However, Magyar and German speakers represented only minorities within their respective parts of the empire; and their political aspirations were hardly representative of the majority of the empire's populations, who shared different levels of loyalty towards the House of Habsburg as well as to their respective crown-lands. Many of them put their fate into the hands of a reformed empire. They were fully aware of two things: that living in ethnically mixed territories, squeezed in between much more powerful states, made the prospect of ever forming their own independent nation states highly unlikely; and that any of Europe's larger emerging nation states would leave little or no space within their borders to allow these minorities to fulfil their cultural and linguistic aspirations. Confronted with this situation, only an empire that paid explicit reference to its multinational character offered these nationalities a future. It was this concept of an empire reformed along federal lines, in order to take account of its national and linguistic diversity, that inspired political thinkers in 1848. Czechs and Germans in Bohemia were at the forefront of these debates.

The political ideas of the historian František Palacký, *otec národa* (father of the [Czech] nation) as well as *spiritus rector* of its national movement, constitute the most significant contribution to efforts of reconciling a growing sense of ethnic identity with the legacies of a multinational kingdom that forms part of a multinational empire. Meanwhile, Palacký was only the most recent and prominent representative of these debates in Bohemia. His historical and constitutional concepts formed part of a much broader discussion on the future of the Bohemian lands, which had started during the decades before the revolution and included significant contributions by both Czech and German speakers, who shared a strong sense of identification with the history of their crown-lands as an ethnically mixed territory.

Due to a strong sense of dynastic loyalty, *Landespatritismus* was largely compatible with identification with the Austrian *Kaiserstaat*, a concept of *Staatspatritismus* not much different from that of the sovereign territorial states in the German Confederation.²² That Bohemian *Landespatritismus* also appealed to German speakers is reflected in the fact that in 1848, of the many thousand German speakers in Prague, not more than three took part in the elections to the Frankfurt parliament.²³

²² For a discussion of these concepts see J. Kořalka, 'Welche Nationsvorstellungen gab es 1848 in Mitteleuropa?' in R. Jaworski and R. Luft (eds.), *1848/49. Revolutionen in Ostmitteleuropa* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1996), pp. 29–44.

²³ J. Havránek, 'The development of Czech nationalism' in *University, Historiography, Society, Politics*, 391–418, 400.

In Bohemia only twenty out of the sixty-eight districts held elections to the Frankfurt parliament.²⁴ As Austrian and Bohemian patriots, Germans in Prague felt overwhelmingly unconcerned by the events in Frankfurt. For this reason German speakers in other ethnically mixed parts of the empire, for instance in Tyrol, criticised the *Deutsch-Böhmen*, requesting support for the formation of a German nation state to include the territories of the Habsburg monarchy.²⁵ Many German speakers in Bohemia fully supported Czech demands for the recognition of their linguistic rights, also because the same policy would protect the rights of German speakers in the Czech-speaking districts of Bohemia.²⁶

These debates also demonstrate that Bohemian *Landespatritismus* cannot be reduced to a purely aristocratic and feudal legacy.²⁷ The concept of an ethnically mixed Bohemia within a multinational empire represented a reality for most inhabitants of the region, for which it was difficult to envisage alternatives. Its conservation therefore appealed well beyond the nobility, even though debates were often dominated by demands for the recognition of the kingdom's Czech element.²⁸ This is not to deny that these debates also led to political tensions along ethnic or linguistic lines, which further increased during the revolution, but these were usually fuelled by extremists on both sides rather than the majority, and they often originated from Vienna.²⁹

²⁴ J. Havránek, 'Böhmen im Frühjahr 1848 – Vorbild der nationalen Problematik in Europa für das folgende Jahrhundert' in *University, Historiography, Society, Politics*, 419–32, 428. For Silesia and Moravia the quota was higher.

²⁵ *Wie die Tiroler dem Aufruf der boehm. Deputation geantwortet haben. Von dem Vereine der Deutschen aus Böhmen, Mähren, Schlesien und Steiermark zur Aufrechterhaltung ihrer Nationalität*. [gedruckt bei L. Sommer (vorm. Strauß)], British Library: Austrian Revolution Broadsides 1848–1849. 1899.m.19/147.

²⁶ Havránek, 'Böhmen im Frühjahr 1848', 420 f. See also *Wahl-Manifest der Deutschen aus Böhmen, Mähren und Schlesien zur Aufrechterhaltung ihrer Nationalität*, British Library: Austrian Revolution, Broadsides 1848–1849, 1899.m.19/181.

²⁷ For a rather narrow Marxist approach to the Czech national question in 1848 see J. Polišenský, *Aristocrats and the Crowd in the Revolutionary Year 1848. A Contribution to the History of Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Austria* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1980).

²⁸ As Havránek has argued, in 1848 the Czech national movement freed itself from the interference of the conservative aristocracy, which opposed social change and used *Landespatritismus* only as a way to hold off Austrian centralism. 'Development of Czech nationalism', 405.

²⁹ For an example of anti-Czech propaganda from Vienna see T. Scheibe, *Die Rebellen auf dem Schutthaufen in Prag. Haben sie capitulirt? Heiliger Kreuzzug der Wiener gegen die Slavischen Meuchelmörder* (Vienna: Fridrich, n.d. British Library: Austrian Revolution Broadsides 1848–1849) 1899. m.19/195. There is an interesting parallel to the role of nationalist organisations later in the nineteenth century, see P. M. Judson, *Guardians of the Nation. Activists on the Language Frontiers of Imperial Austria* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007). J. King, *Budweisers into Czechs and Germans. A Local History of Bohemian Politics, 1848–1948* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005).

Reactions to a pamphlet published by Joseph Mathias Graf von Thun three years before the revolution show that the constitutional demands that emerged in 1848 had their origins in the pre-March period and were part of a much wider debate on identity issues in Bohemia.³⁰ Head of the family's Thun-Klösterle line, the author was also president of the Bohemian Museum, one of the country's principal academic and cultural organisations.³¹ Adopting a tone that some Czech nationalists rejected as patronising, the principal point of Thun's pamphlet was not his passionate support for the Czechs' cultural and linguistic revival, which at that time was almost uncontroversial among the Bohemian elites, but his polemic against those German-nationalist scaremongers who tried to discredit this largely cultural movement as an aggressive form of Russian-sponsored Pan-Slavism.³² One of the people Thun had in mind was the recently deceased Joseph Leonhard Knoll, a former professor of History and rector of Charles University Prague, who since the early 1830s had published various warnings against the 'tschechische Gefahr' (the Czech threat).³³ Seeing the future of the empire as exclusively German, Knoll was one of Palacký's most outspoken opponents. Unlike Knoll, Thun firmly rejected demands for the Germanisation of Czechs and insisted that Bohemia includes two linguistic communities of equal natural rights: 'Children of the same mother, albeit of different fathers, we are all Bohemians; not imposed toleration but love binds us together.'³⁴ The same idea also informed his understanding of the Austrian Empire:

not a federation of states, but of peoples ... Only if it recognises its different nationalities will the Empire find support; only as part of this powerful Empire Bohemia will be able to guard its nationality.³⁵

Thun's idea of Bohemia shows explicit influences of Bernard Bolzano's teachings, at a time when many of the philosopher's works were still suppressed. For Bolzano, the principal voice of the late Austrian Enlightenment, not ethnic origin, but allegiance to the country in which people live and grow up formed the basis of true patriotism, especially where several peoples were united in one state.

³⁰ J. M. von Thun, *Der Slavismus in Böhmen. Besprochen von Jos. Math. Grafen v. Thun* (Prague: J. G. Calve'sche Buchhandlung, 1845).

³¹ The literature on the institution and its periodical is huge. For a recent discussion in English see Krueger, *Status and National Identity*, p. 61.

³² Thun, *Der Slavismus in Böhmen*, pp. 5, 7, 11.

³³ For biographical information see the obituary in *Moravia*, 5/19 (7 March 1842), 73–75.

³⁴ Thun, *Der Slavismus in Böhmen*, pp. 6, 11. ³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

Love and embrace one another as equal children of one, the One Fatherland ... Bohemia, as unhappy as it is now, could elevate itself to the happiest country in Europe.³⁶

In the interest of equality, each constituency 'shall learn the other's language', starting from academic institutions to spread all over the Bohemian lands.³⁷ Many of Bolzano's followers shared an interest in Leibniz's doctrine of cosmic harmony. Originally drafted in 1810, Thun translated Bolzano's ideas into the modern language of the post-Napoleonic age.

A particularly influential response to Thun's pamphlet was printed by the Leipzig-based publisher of the *Jahrbücher für Slavische Literatur, Kunst und Wissenschaft*, which advocated a mostly cultural form of pan-Slavism.³⁸ Like Thun, the anonymous author rejected demands for the assimilation of Czechs. References in the text suggest that the author's main target was the radical democratic nationalism of Young Germany.³⁹ Their agitations were supported by some Austrian exiles, but were certainly not representative of the position of most Bohemian German speakers. Moreover, Young Germany never assumed a clear organisational structure; and for many it remained principally a literary movement.⁴⁰ What united them was a loose association with Young Hegelianism and their opposition to the political structures of the Vienna settlement. The poets Alfred Meissner and Moritz Hartmann identified with Young Germany, but at least prior to 1848 they viewed the Czech national revival with sympathy.⁴¹

Thun's anonymous respondent advocated the political recognition of the Austrian state's Slavic elements. The author wanted to be acknowledged not as Bohemian, but as a Czech within the Austrian federation of peoples, challenging traditional notions of Bohemian

³⁶ B. Bolzano, *Was ist Vaterland und Vaterlandsiebe? In einer Rede an die akademische Jugend im Jahre 1810* (Prague: E.W., 1850), p. 3. Here we find an interesting parallel to Metternich's political thought. While he actively promoted national literature, culture and music, and the use of national languages, he strongly rejected the modish idea of removing historical borders in order to establish new states based on nationality, which would immediately turn against one another. See in particular the new study by W. Siemann, *Metternich. Stratege und Visionär. Eine Biographie* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 2016).

³⁷ Bolzano, *Was ist Vaterland und Vaterlandsiebe*, p. 11.

³⁸ Anon., *Worte eines Česchen veranlasst durch die Graf Jos. Math. v. Thun'sche Broschüre: Der Slavismus in Böhmen* (Leipzig: Expedition der slavischen Jahrbücher, 1845). As for the text's long-term relevance see O. Bauer, *Die Nationalitätenfrage und die Sozialdemokratie* (Vienna: Verlag der Wiener Volksbuchhandlung Ignaz Brand, 1907).

³⁹ Anon., *Worte eines Česchen*, pp. 13, 18.

⁴⁰ H. Rumpel, *Eine Chance für Mitteleuropa. Bürgerliche Emanzipation und Staatsverfall in der Habsburgermonarchie* (Vienna: Ueberreuther, 1997), p. 270.

⁴¹ Morava, *Franz Palacký*, p. 108.

Landespatriotismus.⁴² Slavs accounted for more than half of the empire's population, the author argued, of which 7 million use the Czech language. In order to survive Austria had to recognise this fact. Meanwhile, the author saw Magyarisation, not German nationalism, as the empire's principal threat.⁴³ Unlike the Magyars, the Czechs support the empire, because a departure of Hungary and Bohemia from the empire would separate Czechs from 3 million Slovaks, whom they saw as a brother-nation.⁴⁴ It was for this reason that Austro-Slavism, unlike Hungarian nationalism, was not necessarily controversial in imperial circles, a position supported by many members of the Bohemian aristocracy, who saw it as a way to protect themselves from Viennese centralism while maintaining the constitutional structure of the *Kaiserstaat*.

Despite the pamphlet's self-confident emphasis on the empire's Slavic element, it abstained from anti-German resentment. Thun received more critical reactions from those Czechs, who supported an openly aggressive approach to the assertion of their rights and rejected the idea of different linguistic communities living peacefully together. In addition to taking issue with Thun's benevolent support of the Czech revival, considered inappropriate in the light of their cultural and historical achievements, another anonymous contributor to the debate denied any feeling of attachment to the Bohemian crown. Denouncing the reactionary elements behind the concept of *Landespatriotismus*, the author fought for what he calls a 'universal pan-Slavic nationality'.⁴⁵ If Czechs and Germans in Bohemia were to become one, as Thun (in the tradition of Bolzano) envisions, Germans would have to be assimilated to Czechs, strictly following the example set by the policy of Magyarisation in Hungary.⁴⁶ Moreover, the author polemically rejects the widespread cosmopolitanism of Bohemia's social elites by questioning the cultural values of a people that teaches its own children the languages of 'French decadence' and 'English foolishness'.⁴⁷ Instead of demanding equality between Bohemia's two language groups, the author assumes a hierarchy

⁴² Anon., *Worte eines Česchen*, p. 16. ⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

⁴⁴ Křen, however, suggests that Czechs increasingly sought to distance themselves from close association with the Slovaks: *Die Konfliktgemeinschaft*, p. 85. Also see Rumppler, *Eine Chance für Mitteleuropa*, p. 182.

⁴⁵ Anon., *J. M. Graf Thun und der Slawismus in Böhmen* (Leipzig: Wilh. Engelmann, 1845), p. 11.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 14. Also Bernard Bolzano was critical of cosmopolitanism, but without turning it into an insult against other peoples: *Was ist Vaterland und Vaterlandsliebe?*, p. 10. On Bohemia's aristocratic cosmopolitanism see also Krueger, *Czech, German, and Noble*, pp. 3, 25.

of nationalities within the borders of the kingdom that puts the Czechs at the top. He takes a position that certainly was not shared by a majority of Czech speakers at the time, but points to tensions that would mark language conflicts throughout the second half of the nineteenth century.⁴⁸ At the time even the organisations of German nationalists fully recognised the equality of the two language groups.⁴⁹

Although the anonymous pamphlet firmly rejects the idea that Germans might have contributed to the Slavs' revival, its author does not hesitate publishing his own contribution to the debate in Leipzig, a hotbed of pan-Slavism nurtured by anti-Austrian sentiment within the German Confederation. Moreover, the author's arguments show clear echoes of Herder's *Geschichte der Europäischen Völker* when praising the Slavs' industrious and peaceful nature. These references suggest that the main arguments of Herder's famous 'Slavenkapitel' had developed a dynamic of their own that was no longer directly associated with the philosopher from Weimar. The author adds to Herder by proposing an argument about the Slavs' spirit of freedom and democracy, an idea present also in Palacký's *Geschichte von Böhmen* and another indicator that his anti-German argument heavily relied on German-language sources.⁵⁰

Despite its aggressive anti-Bohemian and anti-German rhetoric, any specific evidence for policies of assimilation in the pamphlet referred not to examples of German nationalism, but to the fate of the Slovaks in Upper Hungary, demonstrating the widespread awareness of Magyarisation during the 1840s.⁵¹ Two years earlier, in 1843, Thun's cousin Leo had published a short book on the situation of the Slovaks in Hungary.⁵² A friend of Alexis de Tocqueville, Leo Thun was prefect

⁴⁸ See also J. Křen, *Die Konfliktgemeinschaft. Tschechen und Deutsche 1780–1918* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1996), p. 82.

⁴⁹ F. Palacký, 'Die Prager Ereignisse, bis Anfang Mai 1848' in *Gedenklblätter. Auswahl von Denkschriften, Aufsätzen und Briefen aus den letzten fünfzig Jahren als Beitrag zur Zeitgeschichte* (Prague: Tempsky, 1874), pp. 163–65. *Stenographischer Bericht über die Verhandlungen der am 28. August 1848 in Teplitz im Namen deutscher Städte, Gemeinden und konstitutioneller Vereine Böhmens zusammengekommenen Vertrauensmänner*, 29 August 1848 (Leitmeritz: Medau, 1848), p. 8.

⁵⁰ On Palacký and Herder see Křen, *Die Konfliktgemeinschaft*, p. 82. On diversions from Herder's classical description see M. Baár, *Historians and Nationalism. East-Central Europe in the Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 110, 203. On the idea of the Czechs' 'natural' democratic spirit see also Wingfield, *Flag Wars and Stone Saints*, p. 5. Thomas G. Masaryk went beyond Herder's Slavenkapitel when arguing for the profound impact of the German's philosophy on Palacký's idea of humanity: *Palacký's Idee des Böhmisches Volkes* (Prague: JUC, 1898), p. 22.

⁵¹ On the new wave of Magyarisation starting in 1840 see C. A. Macartney, *Hungary. A Short History* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1962), p. 148.

⁵² L. Graf von Thun, *Die Stellung der Slowaken in Ungarn* (Prague: Calve'sche Buchhandlung, 1843).

(*Kreiskommissar*) in Bohemia, became governor of Bohemia in 1848, and then 'imperial Minister for Culture and Education, with a mission to apply the enlightened principles of Bernard Bolzano'.⁵³ Leo Thun's small volume contributed to a debate triggered by his earlier book on Bohemian literature, published in 1842.⁵⁴ Although he deplores the Germans' lack of interest in the Czech revival,⁵⁵ his principal opponents were not aggressive German nationalists in Bohemia, but, again, the advocates of Magyarisation in Hungary, who for their part were fearful that the Czech revival might inspire the Slovaks to assert their natural rights too. Replying to his critics, Thun positioned himself directly against the agitations of Ferenc Pulszky, a fierce proponent of aggressive Magyarisation, who openly denied the Slavonic languages any future in Hungary and was among the first to propose population transfers for minorities unwilling to assimilate.⁵⁶

Czech and Bohemian concern for Hungary's Slavic populations explains why in 1848 the Czechs showed themselves reluctant to support the Hungarian Revolution and tended to sympathise with the Croats and Josip Jelačić's mission to save the empire. While a protagonist of the Czech revival like Palacký retained an affectionate relationship with many Hungarians, the anti-Hungarian attitude of many Czech nationalists opposed them directly to the German supporters of Kossuth, whose backing of the Hungarian Revolution was driven by anti-Austrian sentiments and their hopes to form part of a greater German (*großdeutsch*) nation state. The conflict evoked by the revival of the empire's Slavonic languages points to two very different concepts of

⁵³ Thienen-Adlerflycht, *Graf Leo Thun im Vormärz*, pp. 141–46, 153, 162. B. Mazohl-Wallnig, 'Der Einfluß Bolzanos und der Bolzanisten auf die österreichische Universitätsreform der Jahre 1848/49' in H. Rumpler (ed.), *Bernard Bolzano und die Politik. Staat, Nation und Religion als Herausforderung für die Philosophie im Kontext von Spätaufklärung, Frühnationalismus und Restauration* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2000), pp. 221–46. For an excellent introduction to Bolzano's philosophy see R. Haller, 'Bolzano und die Österreichische Philosophie' in *Ibid.*, pp. 353–69. In English, W. M. Johnston, *The Austrian Mind. An Intellectual History 1848–1938* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), pp. 275–81. Having lost his chair in Prague in 1820, at the time when Thun engaged with Bolzano he was still considered highly controversial, see P. Krivský, 'Das Entstehen, die Herausgabe und das Projekt der 2. Ausgabe von Bolzanos Lehrbuch der Religionswissenschaft' in C. Christian (ed.), *Bernard Bolzano. Leben und Wirkung* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1981), pp. 63–83, 75.

⁵⁴ L. Graf von Thun, *Über den gegenwärtigen Zustand der böhmischen Literatur und ihre Bedeutung* (Prague: Kronberger und Řivnač, 1842).

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 47.

⁵⁶ 'Die böhmische Sprache hat in Ungarn keine Zukunft . . . So glaube ich doch, dass, wenn in einem Slaven in Ungarn das Gefühl seiner česchen Herkunft erwacht . . . dann für ihn nichts übrig bleibe, als mit Palacký und Schaffarik dahinauszuwandern.' 'Ferenc Pulszky to Leo Thun, 2ter Brief. An Graf Leo Thun', 24 March 1842, in Thun, *Die Stellung der Slowaken in Ungarn*, pp. 2–7, 5.

state in Bohemia and Hungary: on the one side, in Bohemia, the idea of a state that includes different ethnic or linguistic groups held together by a sense of loyalty to their ancient kingdom; and, across the border to Hungary, a policy of Magyarisation, based on the belief in the superiority of one ethnic group over a majority of other nationalities. Even in Hungary itself, many members of the political elite were concerned over these developments, a policy the great Hungarian reformer Count István Széchenyi considered 'unchristian and politically unwise'.⁵⁷

Like most supporters of the Czech revival, Leo Thun abstained from translating his enthusiasm for Europe's 7.8 million Slavs into a political and universalist pan-Slavism, describing, instead, the diversity of the monarchy's peoples as the Austrian Empire's greatest asset.⁵⁸ It was this idea of empire that Palacký revived and popularised. Palacký was not only the most influential historian of Bohemia and of the Czechs, but also their most prominent political thinker. As in the case of Leo Thun, Palacký's thought was heavily influenced by Bernard Bolzano.⁵⁹ As secretary of the Royal Bohemian Society of Sciences from 1839 to 1844, editor of Bohemia's principal academic journal, and secretary of the Bohemian National Museum from 1841, Palacký's career demonstrates how already prior to 1848 a proud supporter of the Czech national revival could ascend to the highest ranks of Bohemian society. More than anybody, Palacký contributed to debates on the relationship between German and Czech speakers in Bohemia, and on the kingdom's future relationship with the Austrian Empire.

Since the 1820s Palacký had created the foundations of a modern Bohemian historiography aimed at fostering the historic rights of the Bohemian lands within the Austrian Empire. As the official historiographer of the Bohemian Estates (with a stipend from 1831, officially appointed from 1838), without ever assuming a university position, Palacký enjoyed the support of the mentor of the Czech revival, Josef Dobrovsky, and of the counts Franz and Kaspar Sternberg.⁶⁰ His commission resulted in a monumental *History of Bohemia until 1526*, published in five volumes from 1836 to 1867, with the revised Czech edition completed in 1876, just a month before his death.⁶¹ He was the first scholar to use scientific methods of research to reveal the role of the

⁵⁷ Quoted in Macartney, *Hungary*, p. 148.

⁵⁸ Thun, *Über den gegenwärtigen Zustand der böhmischen Literatur*, pp. 66, 72–9, 81. and *Die Stellung der Slowaken in Ungarn*, p. 62.

⁵⁹ J. Kořalka, 'František Palacký und die böhmischen Bolzanisten' in Rumpler (ed.), *Bernard Bolzano*, pp. 201–20.

⁶⁰ On Kaspar Sternberg in particular, see Krueger, *Czech, German, and Noble*, p. 17.

⁶¹ Zacek, *Palacký*, pp. 35–9, 60.

Czech and particularly the Hussite elements in Bohemian history. Palacký combined Bohemian *Landespatriotismus* with the spiritual and political leadership of the Czech national movement. Although his ideas were not uncontroversial, he enjoyed a remarkable academic recognition, reflected in the international response to his *History of Bohemia* as well as regular invitations to contribute to encyclopaedias such as the German *Brockhaus*. Although after 1848 his writings in Czech gained more weight, he developed much of his constitutional and historical thought in the period leading to the revolution through publications in German, including the first volumes of the *History of Bohemia*.⁶² He continued using German for much of his correspondence, not just with members of the elites, who would have struggled to maintain political and academic exchanges in Czech, but also in thirty-five years of regular correspondence with his wife.

That two linguistic communities constituted Bohemia's political nation was a fact for Palacký; and despite his efforts to advance the use of Czech in public and academic life, he had no intention of extinguishing the use of German in Bohemia or to question the role of German speakers as an inalienable part of the kingdom. Especially in his earlier writings, nation is often discussed as a political concept, referring to a Bohemian nation to include Czech and German speakers. Only after 1848, and when writing in Czech, did *národ* (nation) become an ethnic concept. In the first volume of his *History of Bohemia*, covering the period up to the twelfth century, he distinguished between Slavic and increasingly dominant Germanic influences. They partly retained their original character, and were partly amalgamated into Bohemian elements.⁶³ Politically most relevant for the context in which he was writing was his depiction of Bohemia as a sovereign and unitary state, including Moravia.⁶⁴ The unitary approach to the two distinct crown-lands of Bohemia and Moravia would become a key demand of the Czech national movement in 1848.⁶⁵ For Palacký and his huge following among both language communities, fighting for the historical rights of the Bohemian crown within a (reformed) Austrian Empire was perfectly compatible with leading the Czech national movement.

Reflecting his career's connection between historical scholarship and politics, a fundamental element of Palacký's thought was informed by his

⁶² On his discovery of the Czech language, see Morava, *Franz Palacký*, p. 21.

⁶³ F. Palacký, *Geschichte von Böhmen. Größtenteils nach Urkunden und Handschriften*. Band I (Prague: Kronberger und Weber, 1836), IX.

⁶⁴ Palacký, *Geschichte von Böhmen*, Band II/1, p. 8.

⁶⁵ On differences between the national movement in Bohemia and Moravia, M. Řezník, *Formování Moderního Národa* (Prague: Triton, 2003), p. 147.

work on the medieval origins of the Bohemian kingdom. While romantic historicism often drew on mythical origins and ethnic primordialism, Palacký approached the history of Bohemia from the perspective of a constitutional and diplomatic historian, using methodologies only recently established by Savigny and Ranke, based on the collection and philological analysis of archival documents. While the works of the French liberals Guizot and Thierry taught him to think about nations in terms of civilisations, from a methodological point of view Palacký was strongly influenced by Georg Heinrich Pertz, editor of the famous *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*.⁶⁶ Palacký's interest in document-based historiography is important in the context of debates over his position on the 'discovery' in 1817 and 1818 of manuscripts mistakenly dated to the ninth century and employed to prove the early medieval origins of an independent Czech literary culture.⁶⁷ A crucial step in his endeavour to write a document-based history of the Bohemian kingdom was an official archival expedition to Italy, which attracted much public attention in Bohemia and Austria and resulted in a rich collection of documentary evidence on the kingdom's medieval history, including chronicles and papal *regesta* from the Vatican Archives and Libraries, as well as a huge amount of material from Florence, the Ambrosian Library in Milan, as well as the archives and the St Mark's Library in Venice.⁶⁸ In the Vatican Archives alone Palacký went through about 45,000 documents. He travelled in an official mission for the Bohemian Estates, with the direct support of the imperial government, including Metternich's famous opponent, Count Kolowrat.

The research Palacký undertook in Italy stood in direct relationship to his work on the second volume of the *History of Bohemia*. Already the first volume had received remarkable international praise, but also criticism. His principal opponent on the German-nationalist side, the above-mentioned Leonhard Knoll, interpreted Palacký's emphasis of the Czech element in Bohemian history as '*Teutschenhaß*' (hatred of Germans), and compared his alleged political intentions to those of O'Connell's Irish repeal movement, accusing the Czechs of wishing to destroy the Habsburg monarchy in favour of a universalist Slavic-Russian state. Knoll profoundly misunderstood Palacký as well as the intentions of those more radical Czechs around Karel Havlíček, who took

⁶⁶ Kořalka, *František Palacký*, pp. 181, 184, 237.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 148 f, 201 f. Baár, *Historians and Nationalism*, p. 181.

⁶⁸ His main motive was to shed light on the period 1198 to 1248. F. Palacký, *Literarische Reise nach Italien im Jahre 1837. Aufsuchung von Quellen der Böhmisches und mährischen Geschichte* (Prague: Kronberger's Witwe und Weber, 1838), p. 4. For a detailed account of his mission see also Kořalka, *František Palacký*, p. 183.

inspiration from comparisons with Ireland, but at no point advocated Bohemia's separation from Vienna.⁶⁹ The Austrian authorities did not share Knoll's extremist interpretation of Palacký's intentions and Kaspar Sternberg firmly rejected any of his accusations. Until censorship was lifted in 1848 there were occasionally tensions over Palacký's *History* in government circles, but mostly on religious or theological grounds, which for the Czechs were difficult to separate from issues of nationality. As Palacký himself reported, the censors frequently accepted the justifications he presented in his replies.⁷⁰ During his work on volume II of the *History* the head of the Polizei- und Zensurhofstelle in Vienna, Count Sedlnitzky warned Palacký of: 'a spirit of hostility to the ruling religion' – at the time a sensitive issue anywhere in Europe – but also that 'in a state where many nations are united under one sceptre . . . it cannot be allowed that one nationality attack, disparage, or undermine the others'.⁷¹

The case led to a row with several officials on different levels of the administration, but the changes Palacký had to concede remained relatively minor. During those debates even Metternich lent Palacký support.⁷²

As for the German-nationalist tone of some of the criticism he received, Palacký described these as *Knolliaden*, for which there was little space in scholarly debate.⁷³ When, shortly before the revolution, Palacký travelled across several German states he noticed that this kind of negative propaganda had done little to damage his reputation.⁷⁴ Apart from Knoll, another 'teutomaniac' opponent of Palacký was the nationalist journalist Franz Schuselka. As early as 1845 he had proclaimed that the Slavonic-speaking population of the Bohemian lands had 'to be absorbed into the German element'.⁷⁵ Later in Frankfurt he belonged to the radical democratic Donnersberg group. Like Knoll, Schuselka's polemic against Palacký was fuelled by his vision of a greater Germany to include large chunks of Bohemian, Danish, and Italian territory. Although Knoll eventually received a chair at the University in Vienna, the imperial government would have been the last to support a form of German nationalism that put the future of the *Kaiserstaat* at risk. Palacký was keen to present the first volume of his *History* to Emperor Ferdinand on

⁶⁹ Rumppler, *Eine Chance für Mitteleuropa*, p. 187. On the moderate tone of the Czech repeal movement see Pech, *The Czech Revolution of 1848*, pp. 45, 48.

⁷⁰ F. Palacký, 'Zwei Censur-Gutachten (1834.1839)' in *Gedenkbücher*, pp. 103–4.

⁷¹ Zacek, *Palacký*, p. 62, for the quote p. 64. ⁷² Kořalka, *František Palacký*, p. 231.

⁷³ Palacký, 'Eine Knolliade' (1844) in *Gedenkbücher*, pp. 129–31.

⁷⁴ Kořalka, *František Palacký*, p. 250.

⁷⁵ Quoted in A. Klíma, *Češi a Němci v revoluci 1848–49* (Prague: Univerzita Karlova, 1994), pp. 16, 136.

the occasion of his coronation as king of Bohemia. Unfortunately, it only appeared two months after the occasion. Positive responses to the volume included personal letters received from Ludwig I of Bavaria and Friedrich August II of Saxony. At home the government decided that all higher civil servants in Bohemia should be given free copies of the work, while the imperial family was keen that the archdukes too would be sent their own copies.⁷⁶

A more direct contribution to political thought in Bohemia was a series of talks on the kingdom's constitutional history Palacký gave to the Bohemian estates at the residence of Prince Karl Schwarzenberg.⁷⁷ This circle of aristocrats was made up of the same men who financed Palacký's research and his efforts to collect documents on the history of Bohemia. Opposed to imperial interference in the kingdom, the estates were keen to assert the rights granted to them in the constitution of 1627, the so-called '*Verneuerte Landesordnung*'.⁷⁸ While some progress in this direction had been made under Leopold II, during the Napoleonic period and under Franz II/I the estates had lost much of their traditional role, a process that undermined the autonomy of the Bohemian lands within the empire. Some of the estates' concerns resembled the situation in Hungary during the reform era; but where Hungary's opposition to Vienna went hand in hand with the increasing suppression of the population's Slavonic-speaking majority, the Bohemian estates received much of their renewed pride from the Czech revival and the idea that the Bohemian nation was constituted by two tribes, Slavic and German. The estates used the arguments brought forward by Palacký in a number of documents and petitions to the central administration. In May 1845 a delegation of the diet headed by Josef Mathias Thun met the emperor and members of the government, without resolving the conflicts. Part of what the estates wanted to achieve was self-rule or *Selbstverwaltung* within the empire: not the empire's abolition but a more immediate role for the diet within the structures of governance, going beyond mere consultation. In many respects these demands resembled the arguments brought forward by local elites elsewhere in the monarchy, including in Lombardy. These tensions notwithstanding, Palacký received generous support from the imperial family for his research. In order to keep the empire's German

⁷⁶ Kořalka, *František Palacký*, p. 174. ⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 238.

⁷⁸ On these attempts also R. Melville, *Adel und Revolution in Böhmen. Strukturwandel von Herrschaft und Gesellschaft in Österreich um die Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Mainz: Zabern, 1998), p. 66. For a recent evaluation of the constitution of 1627 see K. Malý, 'Die Böhmisches Konföderationsakte und die Verneuerte Landesordnung – zwei böhmische Verfassungsgestaltungen zu Beginn des 17. Jahrhunderts', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Germanistische Abteilung*, 122/1 (2005), 285–300.

element in check, the Habsburgs recognised the need to foster the role of the empire's non-German constituents. In May 1847 the emperor made Palacký a member of the new Imperial Academy of Science.⁷⁹

Palacký's meetings with the estates also resulted in a memorandum in which the historian outlined the challenges to the Bohemian constitution since 1627 and his views on the future role of the aristocracy.⁸⁰ For Palacký, the aristocracy had to endorse the modern principle of nationality, understood here as a Bohemian nationality to include German and Czech speakers. The principle of nationality, for Palacký, had emerged from the growing role of public opinion in challenging the centralising tendencies of the absolutist state. Palacký recognised in the aristocracy the 'natural product of any societal order'. As its function within the feudal economy had been superseded by technological advances, it had to use its societal prestige to take the lead in representing the Bohemian nation within the empire. Again, the aim here was not to replace the empire with a new nation state, but to readjust the relationship between the state and public opinion by acknowledging the historic rights of the empire's constituent parts.

As a contribution to the articulation of *Landespatritismus*, Palacký's memorandum closely followed the principal arguments laid out in his *History of Bohemia*. It distinguished between the region's Slavonic origins up to the thirteenth century – a time when social hierarchies were allegedly unknown – and a period of feudalism up to the seventeenth century. Feudalism was followed by the emergence of the absolutist state as a centralising force, lasting to the time of writing. Palacký did not see these past two hundred years of centralisation as entirely negative. Possibly influenced by the French liberal school, he acknowledged the connection between centralisation and civilisation, but argued that over time these forces had resulted in an excessive restriction of the estates, undermining the character of the state's constituent parts to the point that it provoked public opinion to act against it. As an important new force in world history, public opinion expressed itself through nationality to form a counterweight to centralisation. Therefore it was the aristocracy's new role to embrace the principle of nationality. Part of this struggle was to reach equality between the two tribes that constituted the Bohemian nation.

⁷⁹ Kořalka, *František Palacký*, pp. 249, 252.

⁸⁰ Palacký, 'Denkschrift über die Veränderungen der böhmischen Landesverfassung (1846)' in *Gedenkbücher*, pp. 135–42. For a commentary see M. Otáhal, 'František Palacký und die tschechischen Liberalen' in Jaworski and Luft (eds.), *1848/49*, pp. 47–56. On the constitutional development since the seventeenth century also R. J. W. Evans, 'The Habsburg monarchy and Bohemia, 1526–1848', in Evans, *Austria, Hungary, and the Habsburgs*, pp. 74–98, 85.

Palacký was no friend of revolutions as a driving force of historical change. In a letter of 5 March 1848 he described the events in Paris as a 'great catastrophe'.⁸¹ Therefore he was relieved when the first assemblies in Prague, following the events in Palermo, Paris, and Milan, remained calm and were conducted with a sense of respect for the government as well as a desire to preserve the amicable relationship between the two linguistic communities. Unlike later historians, who usually describe the famous meeting at the Wenzelsbad as the beginning of the Revolution in Prague, Palacký saw the event as being perfectly in line with previous public gatherings at this location.⁸² When he interrupted his scholarly work for twelve months in March 1848 it was not to become a politician in the modern sense of the word, but to moderate the process of change, setting out his long-term ideas for the future of the Czech nation within the Bohemian kingdom, the empire, and Europe as a whole.

Despite the moderate nature of Palacký's liberalism, the debate over the Czechs' place within the empire led to tensions with the estates. While they shared Palacký's view that Bohemia could not form part of the new German nation state emerging in Frankfurt, the conflict between Czechs and Germans over the issue increasingly assumed a constitutional significance that affected the liberals' views on political representation. The estates understood the general commotion to mean that Bohemia, represented by its estates, would finally reassert its rights within the empire. For the liberals, however, the promise of a constitution in March 1848 meant that the seventeenth-century statutes were no longer valid. As a consequence, they demanded the election of an assembly representing the people of Bohemia, though not necessarily based on universal suffrage.⁸³ For Palacký's former supporters around Count Joseph Mathias Thun this interpretation of the events was difficult to accept, showing for the first time a rift between the aristocratic Landespatritismus of the past decades and the moderate liberalism emerging as a direct consequence of the revolution.

Even more significant for the wider history of the revolution were Palacký's differences with the Frankfurt Parliament.⁸⁴ Having received an invitation to join the Committee of Fifty in charge of preparing

⁸¹ Palacký to his wife, 5 March 1848, in F. Palacký, *Briefe an Therese* (Dresden: Thelem, 2003), p. 390.

⁸² Palacký to his wife, 13 March 1848, in Palacký, *Briefe an Therese*, p. 392.

⁸³ F. Palacký, 'Eine verunglückte Erklärung (1848)' in *Gedenklätter*, pp. 147–48. The document of 2 April 1848 outlined the basic principles for the election of an assembly, which Thun refused to sign.

⁸⁴ F. Palacký, 'Eine Stimme über Oesterreichs Anschluss an Deutschland (1848)' in *Gedenklätter*, pp. 148–55.

parliamentary elections, the historian used his famous reply of 10 April 1848 to explain why Bohemia could not join the German national movement in transforming the hitherto existing *Fürstenbund* (federation of princes) into a federation of the German people. Palacký rejoiced in the initiative of Germany's national movement to create a nation state and recognised that his invitation revoked previously expressed accusations that his work was directed against the interests of the German nation. Meanwhile, as '*Böhme slawischen Stammes*' (a Bohemian of the Slavonic tribe), he was not German; and for the same reason Bohemia cannot form part of a German nation state.⁸⁵ Reiterating the main arguments of his *History*, he explained that while the rulers of Bohemia formed part of the German Federation of Princes, the Bohemian people had always formed an entity apart. The kingdom's connection with the Holy Roman Empire (and with the German Confederation thereafter) did not affect the Bohemian people, because the Holy Roman Emperor had no legislative or judicial powers over Bohemia.⁸⁶ Therefore Bohemia could continue to form part of a federation of princes, but not merge with a different people into one nation state. The basis on which the Kingdom of Bohemia formed part of the Austrian Empire was different from relations within the Holy Roman Empire or the emerging German nation state. Modelled on the ancient relationship between the Habsburg possessions, Palacký describes the Austrian Empire as a free community of equal peoples and religions. This viewpoint led him to pronounce his most significant justification of the Austrian Empire, which would remain valid for the rest of the century: the formation of a German nation state to include Austria would fatally weaken a state whose 'survival, integrity and strength' not only serves the Czechs but Europe as a whole. The empire existed in the interest of 'humanity and civilisation'; 'if it didn't already exist, one would have to create it in the interest of Europe and humanity'.⁸⁷ For Palacký, Austria's *raison d'être* was to guarantee the natural rights of its peoples, nationalities, and religions, on an equal basis. Instead, Frankfurt's demands would divide the European map into peoples that ruled and those that served ('*herrschende*' and '*dienstbare Völker*').⁸⁸ Not Frankfurt, but Vienna has 'the ability and the vocation' to offer his people 'peace, freedom and

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 149.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 150. For a modern explanation see Wilson, *Heart of Europe*, p. 208.

⁸⁷ Palacký, 'Eine Stimme über Oesterreichs', pp. 151–52.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 153. In this context it comes as no surprise that he sees an independent Hungary as the natural consequence of Vienna's submission to Frankfurt. But a Hungary that requests all of its peoples to be Magyars first and for all cannot be 'in the interest of humanity'. *Ibid.*, p. 154.

rights'.⁸⁹ Palacký put forward exactly the same view at the Prague Slavic Congress in June 1848, leading to significant tensions with delegates of some of the other nationalities.⁹⁰

While it would be problematic to present a politician's letter to a foreign parliamentary committee as evidence for a broader constitutional debate in Bohemia, the attention it received noticeably shaped the discussion over Bohemia's place in the empire. Within two days it was published in full in the *Constitutionelle Blatt für Böhmen*, followed two days later by a Czech translation in Havlíček's *Národní Noviny*.⁹¹ Prague's provisional government, of which Palacký formed part, officially endorsed the letter. Most of the opposition to his position came from radical democratic forces in Germany and from those German nationalists in Austria who had replaced loyalty to the Habsburgs with adherence to the emerging German nation state. Their main argument was that the Czechs did not constitute a nation, that their alleged hatred against Germans was driven by fanatics, and that Bohemia constituted a German land that now had to join the German Empire. In Bohemia, however, the response to the letter was overwhelmingly positive, including among large sections of German speakers and the aristocracy. Statistics from the election to the German parliament, cited above, reflect this mood. In Vienna too Palacký's vision of the empire appealed to supporters of the monarchy, which still represented the huge majority of public opinion. The promise of a constitution had greatly boosted a feeling of allegiance to the *Kaiserstaat*, reflected in countless broadsides and pamphlets published over the following weeks. The fact that the new imperial government under von Pillersdorf offered Palacký the position of minister of education shows the respect he enjoyed in imperial circles, but also the importance attributed to the Czech cause. The main reason why he rejected the offer was the open question of Austria's future relationship to Germany.

Supporters of the Hungarian Revolution, German nationalists included, accused Palacký of allegedly planning a pan-Slavic plot. Meanwhile, after the Prague uprising in June 1848 the radical wing of the Czech national movement also turned against him, arguing that his reactionary attitude had made him into an instrument of the military.⁹² Parts of the Bohemian nobility as well started to question the political consequences of Palacký's ideas. After having been kidnapped by radical students, Leo Thun turned against all groups of Czech nationalists,

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 153.

⁹⁰ For details see Z. Tobolka and V. Zacek (eds.), *Slovanský Sjezd v Praze 1848: Sbirka Dokumentů* (Prague: Slov. Úst., [1952]).

⁹¹ Kořalka, *Palacký*, p. 274. ⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 292.

though this did not protect him from being removed from his position as governor.⁹³ Despite an increasingly poisonous climate, Palacký knew the large majority of Czech liberals behind him and many delegates of the other groupings in the Reichstag, including numerous German speakers, sympathised with his efforts to save the empire through a new constitutional set-up. In October 1848, within days of the final uprisings in Vienna, Palacký was made an honorary citizen of Prague. At no point did he abandon his faith in the future of a reformed Austrian Empire.

Meanwhile, the context in which he presented his support for the empire changed. Over the summer of 1848 Palacký abandoned his concerns over the ancient rights of the Bohemian crown to invest his energies into the empire's constitutional transformation on the basis of equal rights of all nationalities. It was not the empire's historic crownlands, but its nationalities that were to form the principal basis of a federalist reform. The main forum for his ideas became Austria's new imperial diet. The constitution it drafted reflected many of Palacký's ideas, but before being ratified it was replaced by a constitution granted by the new Emperor Franz Joseph I, marking the end of the revolutionary process and the beginning of Austria's neo-Absolutist era. The revolution's remaining legacy was the recognition of civic rights (in the form of the *Grundrechtspatent*), the emancipation of the peasants, and the recognition of equal rights for the empire's nationalities.⁹⁴ This was a greater achievement than most historians of the revolution are prepared to admit. In the case of Piedmont the granting of a constitution from above – with all its democratic limitations – is still celebrated as a great achievement. The Austrian constitution of March 1849 – replacing the document produced by the elected Reichstag and equally limited in its democratic scope – is brandished as an '*oktroyierte Verfassung*'.

The shift in Palacký's political thought was also reflected in his subsequent scholarly work. There had been some disappointment among supporters of the Czech revival that he wrote the first volumes of his *Geschichte von Böhmen* in German, although he had always planned to publish a Czech version at a later stage. When progress on the *History* took longer than planned he decided to anticipate the publication of the first Czech volumes before the last volume of the German version had appeared. Translated by the poet and folklorist Karel Jaromír Erben,

⁹³ Krueger, *Czech, German, and Noble*, p. 212.

⁹⁴ On the peasant question see Rumpler, *Eine Chance für Mitteleuropa*, p. 283; for a less enthusiastic take, see P. Heumos, 'Die Bauernbefreiung in den Böhmisches Ländern 1848. Anmerkungen zu den ökonomischen, sozialen und politischen Verhältnissen der Agrargesellschaft' in Jaworski and Luft (eds.), *1848/49*, pp. 221–37.

but with a new introduction, the Czech version of volume one reached Prague book shops in March 1848.⁹⁵ There was a noticeable change in the title of the Czech edition. What in German had been the *History of Bohemia* became the *History of the Czech Nation in Bohemia and Moravia* (*Dějiny národu českého v Čechách a v Moravě*). As mentioned earlier, the Czech language makes no distinction between Czech and Bohemian, because there is only one word for both concepts. The new title therefore left a certain ambiguity as to the relationship between Czechs and Germans in Bohemia. Whereas previously the term nation/*národ* was often used in relation to the population of Bohemia as a whole, it now referred to its Slavic population, though without suggesting that German speakers did not belong to the kingdom. In many of his documents and speeches dating from the events of 1848–49 Palacký continued to apply the term ‘nation’ with reference to the Kingdom of Bohemia as a political nation,⁹⁶ but in his *History*, *národ* changed from a political into an ethnic concept. Moreover, the work’s new title made an assumption regarding the connection between the two crown-lands of Bohemia and Moravia (and by implication, Silesia), precisely because ethnically there was no difference between the Czechs on both sides of the border. But rather than seeing this move as simply an expansionist concept of ethnic nationalism, it also reflected the old connection between the lands of the Bohemian crown.⁹⁷

After 1850, Palacký switched to writing his *History* in Czech, so that the remaining volumes had to be translated into German. While tensions between Czech and German elements had always been an important (and not entirely negative) element of Palacký’s understanding of Bohemian history, the experience of the revolution motivated him to assign much more immediate significance to the kingdom’s two linguistic groups that had to be reflected in its political and constitutional set-up. This move notwithstanding, for him it remained unthinkable to translate nationalism into demands for a separate Bohemian nation state, cut off from the empire. Asserting the kingdom’s constitutional rights and giving political recognition to its two major linguistic communities in no way challenged the institution of empire. Palacký’s confrontation with Frankfurt and the differences with German nationalists made the need for an Austrian *Kaiserstaat* only more obvious – ‘in the interest of Europe, in the interest of humanity’.⁹⁸

⁹⁵ Zacek, *Palacký*, p. 56.

⁹⁶ See for instance F. Palacký, ‘Proclamation der Böhmen an die Mährer (1848)’ in *Gedenkbücher*, pp. 156–63.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 158. ⁹⁸ Palacký, ‘Eine Stimme über Oesterreich’, 153.

III Carlo Cattaneo and Lombardy in 1848

During the summer of 1847 Palacký had returned with his family to Italy. In Milan he became aware of the changing political climate and noticed the strong anti-Austrian sentiment that accompanied the celebrations for the appointment of the new archbishop, who was of Italian origin.⁹⁹ In comparison, the opposition of the Bohemian estates and the demands for equal use of Czech and German seemed modest. After Metternich's resignation he expected the situation in Lombardy to calm down and the anti-Austrian sentiment to recede. He was to be proved wrong.

Comparable to Palacký's position in Bohemia, Carlo Cattaneo was among Milan's most influential political theorists, a frequent commentator on international events for a number of widely read periodicals, and a leading protagonist of the 1848 Revolution in Lombardy. A forthright opponent of Piedmontese intervention in Northern Italy, he was proud of his Lombard roots, considering his native region among the culturally most advanced in Europe.¹⁰⁰ When Lombardy was annexed by the Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia, a decade after the failed revolution and giving way to Italy's political unification, Cattaneo decided to stay in Swiss exile. Reflecting on the prospects of civil progress in Lombardy, Cattaneo considered Northern and Central Europe as well as American political institutions his most important points of reference. Contrary to these countries, he perceived Piedmont as an autocratic monarchy with no tradition of civil society.

Cattaneo's comparative approach to the study of civil society raises questions over the reduction of 1848 to the issue of national revolutions, erupting from a desire to constitute independent national states. There are a number of similarities between Cattaneo's response to the revolution and the political ideas discussed during 1848 in other parts of the Habsburg Empire, notably in Bohemia. This includes Cattaneo's critical attitude to the formation of an Italian nation state at the same time when the empire's Slavonic-speaking populations expressed their fear of being assimilated into the emerging nation states of Germany and Hungary. Moreover, Cattaneo's insistence on the historical grounding of civic identity had parallels in the emphasis on historical state rights and *Landespatritismus* in the empire's other crown-lands. Finally, there is his interest in federal solutions to the transformation of Europe's political map, at a time when the Empire's nationalities discussed Austria's federalisation.

⁹⁹ Palacký to his wife, 20 March 1848, in Palacký, *Briefe an Therese*, p. 394.

¹⁰⁰ G. Armani, *Carlo Cattaneo. Il Padre del Federalismo Italiano* (Milan: Garzanti, 1997), p. 84.

Since the 1840s, and especially after the election of Pope Pius IX in 1846, the national idea had gained considerable ground among Italians, but few protagonists of the revolutions were in a position to imagine themselves as forming part of a political nation beyond the relatively loose concept of a confederate league between the Italian states under their then governing rulers. Many of those participating in protests prior to the revolution fought for the recognition of constitutional rights within the existing framework of states and hoped to create new channels of political and economic participation for the rising middle classes, similar to the demands of the middle classes elsewhere in Europe. In the case of Lombardy, these demands were fuelled by economic grievances and tensions with the Austrian authorities. *Albertismo*, the idea of Lombardy's union with Piedmont, had gained ground during the months of crisis leading to the Milanese Revolution, but the reluctance of many revolutionaries to accept submission under Piedmont reflects their long experience of participation in local administration under Habsburg rule, as well as a strong sense of regional identity they did not wish to sacrifice for an uncertain future under the Savoy.

Cattaneo's belief in the regional roots of civic and economic progress was not a purely theoretical position, but reflected his experience of Lombardy's agricultural and commercial development during the Restoration period, sustained through the educational and administrative reforms of the Austrian government.¹⁰¹ Local elites co-operated with this process while also pushing for greater autonomy from Vienna in the form of self-government. While they rejected the constitutional concept of the Habsburgs' Lombardo-Venetian kingdom, compared to almost all other Italian states after 1814 Austrian rule offered an exceptional level of local participation in public life.¹⁰² Richard Cobden, who met Cattaneo in 1847, commented on some of the Habsburgs' progressive policies in

¹⁰¹ K. R. Greenfield, *Economics and Liberalism in the Risorgimento: A Study of Nationalism in Lombardy, 1814–1848* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press 1964), p. 35; R. Pichler, *Die Wirtschaft der Lombardei als Teil Österreichs: Wirtschaftspolitik, Außenhandel und industrielle Interessen* (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1996). For a recent discussion of Greenfield see J. A. Davis, 'A missing encounter: Rosario Romeo's place in international historiography' in S. Bottari (ed.), *Rosario Romeo e il Risorgimento in Sicilia. Bilancio Storiografico e Prospettive di Ricerca* (Soveria Mannelli: Rubbettino, 2002), pp. 15–24, 21 f.

¹⁰² B. Mazohl-Wallnig, *Österreichischer Verwaltungsstaat und Administrative Eliten im Königreich Lombardo-Venetien, 1815–1859* (Mainz: von Zabern, 1993), p. 93; on the concept of monarchy, p. 311. Also M. Meriggi, *Gli Stati Italiani Prima dell'Unità* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 2011), p. 157. More critical as to claims of autonomy is N. Raponi, *Politica e Amministrazione in Lombardia agli Esordi dell'Unità. Il Programma dei Moderati* (Milan: Giuffrè, 1967), p. 9.

Italy.¹⁰³ Even Mazzini had to admit that ‘the provinces of the Lombard-Venetian Kingdom are less unhappy and better run than any of the other Italian states. You see some signs of progress that you simply cannot find in the Papal States or elsewhere’.¹⁰⁴ During the 1820s and 1830s the Austrian monarchy’s Italian territories were marked by a noticeable absence of unrest, which cannot be explained by political suppression alone. David Laven might be exaggerating only slightly when arguing that “‘the black legend” of oppressive Austrian rule was the invention of patriotic propagandists who paid scant regard to reality’.¹⁰⁵ More characteristic for the region than active oppression was the government’s failure to respond to the economic downturn during the second half of the 1840s, resulting in famine, unemployment, and protests in the region’s urban centres. However, despite frustration at Ferdinand’s rule, this criticism was usually not translated into open challenges to authority; and discontent rarely led to open demands for separation from Austria. Self-government or the formation of a federation of Italian states, as discussed by the neo-Guelphs, did not necessarily mean the end of Habsburg rule. A famous myth has it that the first performance of Giuseppe Verdi’s *Nabucco* at Milan’s Teatro alla Scala in 1842, including the so-called chorus of the Hebrew slaves, was understood as a reference to demands for liberation from Habsburg oppression, but this story was invented many decades later, after unification, and no contemporary source of reception from Italy or abroad makes any reference to such nationalist readings of the opera.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰³ R. Cobden, ‘Milan, 4 June 1847’, in M. Taylor (ed.), *The European Diaries of Richard Cobden, 1846–1849* (Aldershot: Scholar Press, 1994), p. 137.

¹⁰⁴ G. Mazzini, ‘Pamphlet on the affairs of Italy’, quoted in S. Mastellone, ‘I prodromi del 1848. Mazzini e il dibattito sul tipo di rivoluzione (1843–1847)’ in F. Livorsi (ed.), *Libertà e Stato nel 1848–49. Idee Politiche e Costituzionali* (Milan: Giuffrè, 2001), pp. 57–69, 64.

¹⁰⁵ D. Laven, ‘The age of restoration’ in J. A. Davis (ed.), *Italy in the Nineteenth Century, 1796–1900* (The Short Oxford History of Italy) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 51–73, 59. Also D. Laven, *Venice and Venetia under the Habsburgs, 1815–1835* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp. 1–26, and D. Laven and L. Parker, ‘Foreign rule? Transnational, national and local perspectives on Venice and Venetia within the ‘multinational’ Empire’, *Modern Italy* 19/1 (2014), 5–19. In particular the situation in the penitentiary system was often exaggerated; Thienen-Adlerflycht, *Graf Leo Thun im Vormärz*, p. 149.

¹⁰⁶ R. Parker, ‘*Arpa d’or dei fatidici vati*’. *The Verdian Patriotic Chorus in the 1840s* (Parma: Istituto Nazionale di Studi Verdiani, 1997). Also M. A. Smart, ‘Liberty on (and off) the barricades: Verdi’s Risorgimento fantasies’ in A. Russell Ascoli and K. von Henneberg (eds.), *Making and Remaking Italy. The Cultivation of National Identity around the Risorgimento* (Oxford: Berg, 2001), pp. 103–18. A. Körner, ‘Oper, Politik und nationale Bewegung. Mythen um das Werk Giuseppe Verdis’ in H. Siegrist and T. Höpel (eds.), *Kunst und Gesellschaft im Modernen Europa* (Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag, 2017), pp. 99–110.

Attitudes towards the Austrian administration deteriorated early in 1848, after the Revolution in Palermo and when news of the Revolution in Paris spread through Europe. While several Italian states responded by granting their subjects constitutions, Austria seemed committed to suppressing unrest. Within days of the Revolution in Vienna and Buda, Milan got its own Revolution, which after only five days resulted in the departure of the Austrian troops under the Bohemian field marshal Radetzky.¹⁰⁷ Despite the early success of the revolution, Milan's citizenry remained divided between Gabrio Casati's *Albertisti*, who aimed for Piedmontese intervention, and the War Council under Cattaneo, who vehemently opposed the union with Piedmont.¹⁰⁸ In the countryside, parts of the population remained pro-Austrian, and as late as June 1848 peasants were said to have greeted Austrian troops passing through their villages with 'Viva Radetzky', showing similarities with the attitude of Slavonic-speaking minorities elsewhere in the Empire.¹⁰⁹

Although Cattaneo had been an outspoken critic of the Habsburg administration in Lombardy since the 1830s, during the months prior to the revolution he warned against an escalation of protests, aware that the militarisation of the conflict would make the movement completely dependent on Piedmont, thereby destroying any hopes for regional reform of the Habsburg government.¹¹⁰ His opposition to a violent overthrow of Habsburg rule and an alliance with Piedmont led to serious tensions with other sections of the national movement. Once discontent turned into open revolt, Cattaneo became one of the revolution's major strategists, but he was still not prepared to sacrifice the ideals of liberty and self-government for new forms of domination in the form of Lombardy's submission under the Savoy monarchy.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁷ For a brief account of Radetzky's role see A. Sked, *Radetzky. Imperial Victor and Military Genius* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2011), pp. 133–48. On the impact of events in Lombardy on the rest of the monarchy see Rumpler, *Eine Chance für Mitteleuropa*, p. 289 f.

¹⁰⁸ On these tensions see Meriggi, *Il Regno Lombardo-Veneto*, p. 332.

¹⁰⁹ A. Sked, *The Survival of the Habsburg Empire. Radetzky, the Imperial Army and the Class War, 1848* (London: Longman, 1979), p. 187. C. Dipper, 'Revolutionäre Bewegungen auf dem Lande: Deutschland, Frankreich, Italien' in D. Dowe, H.-G. Haupt, D. Langewiesche (eds.), *Europa 1848. Revolution und Reform* (Bonn: Dietz, 1998), pp. 555–85, 576.

¹¹⁰ See for instance Cattaneo's position on the tobacco boycott, della Peruta, *Milano nel Risorgimento*, p. 133.

¹¹¹ F. Sabetti, *Civilization and Self-Government. The Political Thought of Carlo Cattaneo* (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2010), p. 35. Also M. Thom, 'Unity and confederation in the Italian Risorgimento. The case of Carlo Cattaneo' in S. Berger, M. Donovan and K. Passmore (eds.), *Writing National Histories. Western Europe since 1800* (London: Routledge, 1999), pp. 69–81. J. Steinberg 'Carlo Cattaneo and the Swiss idea of liberty' in Bayly and Biagini (eds.), *Giuseppe Mazzini*, pp. 211–35. For a study of Cattaneo's political thought in transnational perspective, also see A. Körner, *America in Italy*.

Cattaneo was not alone in opposing Lombardy's union with Piedmont. When the provisional government organised a plebiscite to this effect, republicans (including Mazzini) protested with an open letter to the *Giornale Ufficiale*.¹¹² Looking back at the events after the revolution's defeat, Cattaneo recognised that it was the war against Austria that had caused the liberals to abandon their constitutional principles. Suddenly, 'the war seemed to dominate all their thinking. They saw reactionaries and barbarians only in Austria, without noticing reactionaries and barbarians here in Italy', by which he meant Piedmont.¹¹³ His critical attitude towards Piedmont shows that Italian nationalism was less of a driving force behind Cattaneo's political thought than his keen interest in political representation, constitutional rights, and self-government, which for Cattaneo had to be realised within historically constituted political units not dissimilar to the 'small-state republicanism' outlined in Rousseau's *Social Contract*. His emphasis on the connection between republicanism and self-government distinguished Cattaneo's political thought from the moderates' emerging concept of representative government.¹¹⁴

In the context of a history of political thought in 1848 perhaps the most surprising aspect of Cattaneo's ideas was the fact that he considered his vision of civil society compatible with the imperial setting and the administrative tradition of a reformed Habsburg monarchy. Not unlike Palacký, he described Austria as 'a cosmopolitan entity' that allowed its peoples to live within the empire 'according to their own traditions'.¹¹⁵ As a student of Austrian civil law, he was intimately familiar with the Habsburg administrative system. Like Giovan Pietro Vieusseux, the publisher of the influential Florentine periodical *Antologia*, Cattaneo had long believed in the possibility of Austria assuming a liberal and modernising role in Northern Italy.¹¹⁶ As a consequence, much of his

The United States in the Political Thought and Imagination of the Risorgimento, 1763–1865 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2017), pp. 121–38.

¹¹² *Giornale Ufficiale*, 21 May 1848, quoted in *Le Assemblee del Risorgimento*, vol. I, pp. 200–2.

¹¹³ C. Cattaneo, 'Dell'insurrezione di Milano nel 1848 e della successiva guerra. Memorie' in Cattaneo, *Il 1848 in Italia* (Turin: Einaudi, 1972), 11–283, 144.

¹¹⁴ Ideas of political representation among the Piedmontese moderates mostly emerged after 1848; M. Isabella, 'Aristocratic liberalism and Risorgimento: Cesare Balbo and Piedmontese political thought after 1848', *History of European Ideas* 39/6 (2013), 835–57; R. Romani, 'Reluctant revolutionaries: Moderate liberalism in the kingdom of Sardinia, 1849–1859', *The Historical Journal* 55/1 (2012), 45–73. Also M. Meriggi, 'Liberali / Liberalismo' in A. M. Banti et al (eds.), *Atlante Culturale del Risorgimento. Lessico del Linguaggio Politico dal Settecento all'Unità* (Rome/Bari: Laterza, 2011), pp. 101–14.

¹¹⁵ Cattaneo, 'Dell'insurrezione di Milano', pp. 20 and 38.

¹¹⁶ E. Sestan, *La Firenze di Vieusseux e di Caponi* (Florence: Olschki, 1986), p. 19.

journalistic and political activity prior to 1848 concentrated on the rights of an independent Lombardy within the empire.¹¹⁷ When in 1848 Cattaneo began to openly denounce the Viennese system of government, he still identified the problems in Milan as a temporary moment of crisis, insisting that the current climate did not question in principle the Habsburgs' tradition of imperial rule.

Cattaneo's interest in the reform of the Habsburg administration is perhaps best explained by his negative assessment of the prospects for Lombardy's possible convergence with the other states of the Italian peninsula. Compared to the legacies of enlightened absolutism in the Habsburg monarchy he considered Piedmont autocratic and backward. Faced with the possibility of Lombardy's imminent annexation by Piedmont, he emphasised the extent to which a centralised monarchy contradicted Italy's own historical experiences. He wrote in the aftermath of Milan's failed insurrection:

every institution in Italy has had republican roots for three thousand years. Crowns never brought any glory. Rome, Etruria, Magna Grecia, the League of Pontida, Venice, Genoa, Amalfi, Pisa, Florence acquired all glory and power on the basis of Republican rule¹¹⁸

Like Sismondi, Cattaneo took the view that republicanism best reflected Italy's civic traditions, recognising in its medieval and early modern republics a past that could be explored for the country's constitutional future.¹¹⁹ The main target of Cattaneo's republicanism, however, became Piedmont's expansionist ambition. While the House of Savoy constituted Europe's longest reigning dynasty, Piedmont shared little with the peninsula's constitutional history, leading Cattaneo to suggest that a federal Italy did not need Piedmont: 'without Piedmont it will still count 20 million people. There is no need for Piedmont.'¹²⁰

In his appreciation of Austrian principles of multinational rule Cattaneo was not alone. The Sicilian patriot Gioacchino Ventura praised the legal tradition of Habsburg rule in similar terms:

What forms the Austrian Empire's strength? Perhaps the fact that it counts some twenty million inhabitants? No. It is the fact that these are organised into five or six

¹¹⁷ Thom, 'Unity and confederation in the Italian Risorgimento', 71. Armani, *Carlo Cattaneo*, 23, 42–6, 60. Compare also Metternich's view on the future role of the Lombardo-Venetian Kingdom: Siemann, *Metternich*, p. 615.

¹¹⁸ Cattaneo, 'Dell'insurrezione di Milano', 103.

¹¹⁹ A. Lyttelton, 'Sismondi, the republic and liberty: between Italy and England, the city and the nation', *Journal of Modern Italian Studies* 17/2 (2012), 167–82.

¹²⁰ Cattaneo, 'Dell'insurrezione di Milano', 281.

separate peoples with different Kingdoms, their own institutions, laws, their own governments, that they are united under one sceptre only in a political sense.¹²¹

In the context of the Italian Revolutions of 1848 it seems remarkable to find some of Italy's most prolific supporters of the revolution praising the Austrian model. The economist and statesman Stefano Jacini went so far as to call Maria Theresa's 1755 reform of the local administration Lombardy's Magna Carta. After Napoleon's defeat Franz I revived the same principles of governance almost without any changes.¹²² Cattaneo's criticism of Piedmont was shared by different fractions of Italy's revolutionary movement. Carlo Pisacane was convinced that Piedmont's suppression of free thought was worse than the situation in Austria.¹²³ Also Giuseppe Ferrari, in an article for the *Revue Indépendante* of January 1848, argued that Piedmont was more reactionary than Austrian-ruled Lombardy.¹²⁴ Several years earlier, in an article for the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, he had used similar terms to target the reactionary ideology behind Piedmont's aristocratic liberalism.¹²⁵

What aroused Cattaneo's interest in the Austrian monarchy was not only the tradition of local participation in government, but the concept of a federal alternative to centralised nation states. When looking for possibilities of reforming the Austrian system of government according to federal principles, Cattaneo rediscovered the constitution of the Holy Roman Empire: 'Within its borders all Christian peoples counted as equal, as they did within the Church and within the heraldic brotherhood of the Crusades.'¹²⁶ Cattaneo's interest in the Holy Roman Empire as a federal model reflected a tradition of legal thought going back to Montesquieu, Benjamin Franklin, and the legal historians of the

¹²¹ G. Ventura, *La Questione Sicula nel 1848 Sciolta nel vero Interesse della Sicilia, di Napoli e dell'Italia* (Rome: Zampi, 1848), p. 37. On Ventura see E. Guccione, 'Il costituzionalismo in Sicilia nel 1848' in Livorsi (ed.), *Libertà e Stato nel 1848-49*, pp. 179-98, 186.

¹²² N. Raponi, *Politica e Amministrazione in Lombardia agli esordi dell'Unità. Il Programma dei Moderati* (Milan: Giuffrè, 1967), p. 36. Based on the works of Franco Valsecchi and Carlo Capra, Cristof Dipper argues for the crucial role of Viennese administrators in the interaction between Lombard Enlightenment and administrative reforms, C. Dipper, 'Die Mailänder Aufklärung und der Reformstaat. Ein Beitrag zur Berichtigung der Urteile des Publikums über das Verhältnis der politischen Theorie zum administrativen Handeln' in F. Jung and T. Kroll (eds.), *Italien in Europa. Die Zirkulation der Ideen im Zeitalter der Aufklärung* (Paderborn: Fink, 2014), pp. 15-36.

¹²³ C. Pisacane, *Guerra combattuta in Italia negli anni 1848-49*. Narrazione (Genoa: Pavese Editore, 1851), p. 184. N. Rosselli, *Carlo Pisacane nel Risorgimento Italiano* (Turin: Einaudi, 1977), p. 53.

¹²⁴ G. Ferrari, 'La révolution et les réformes en Italie' in *Revue Indépendante*, XIII, 10 January 1848, 85-119.

¹²⁵ Candeloro, *Storia dell'Italia moderna*, vol. II, p. 385.

¹²⁶ Cattaneo, 'Dell'insurrezione di Milano', 282.

Göttingen School.¹²⁷ Jacques-Vincent de la Croix, an early commentator on the American constitution, described the German constitution as ‘the most essential example to follow in every one of its aspects, because it is the centre around which the interests of all the principal states of Europe gravitate’.¹²⁸ Therefore, when Cattaneo looked at the Holy Roman Empire as a model for the reorganisation of Lombardy’s position within the Austrian Empire, he consulted the same sources that had influenced the fathers of the American constitution several decades earlier. Francesco Saverio Salfi, writing in 1821, had taken the German Confederation as a model for the federalisation of Italy. In Salfi’s view, by preserving its present sovereigns, the imperial model presented the advantage of a much looser structure compared to the United States or the Swiss constitutions.¹²⁹

On 17 March 1848 Cattaneo received news of the uprisings in Vienna, one day before Revolution broke out in Milan. That night Cattaneo still set his hopes on a federal transformation of the Empire, writing an article – never published – advocating a free Lombardy within the structures of a federal Austria, an idea very close to the concepts discussed in Pest and Prague.¹³⁰ Only the events of the following days moved Cattaneo to reconsider the future of Lombardy as part of an Italian Federal Republic, but with a clear vote against a monarchical solution or the annexation by Piedmont. The course the revolution then took was diametrically opposed to Cattaneo’s ideas. He was not prepared to follow the Milanese *Albertini* in seeking an alliance with Piedmont and declined nominations to the Piedmontese Parliament or the Constituent Assembly in Tuscany. He also rejected an offer to become minister of finance in Mazzini’s Roman Republic. According to his deep-seated federalist convictions, political office had to emerge out of local civic experience, which made any political engagement in cities as far afield as Florence or Rome impossible.¹³¹

¹²⁷ J. Overhoff, ‘Benjamin Franklin, student of the Holy Roman Empire: his summer journey to Germany in 1766 and his interest in the empire’s federal constitution’, *German Studies Review*, 34/2 (2011), 277–86.

¹²⁸ J.-V. de la Croix [Delacroix], *Constitutions des Principaux États de l’Europe et des États-Unis de l’Amérique*, 4 vols. (Paris: Buisson, 1791–2), vol. I, p. 89.

¹²⁹ On Salfi see E. Morelli, ‘The United States constitution viewed by nineteenth-century Italian democrats’ in Noether (ed.), *The American Constitution*, pp. 99–118, 101.

¹³⁰ The piece was to form part of the programme for a new newspaper, *Il Cisalpino*. Della Peruta, *Milano nel Risorgimento*, p. 167. See also Thom, ‘Unity and confederation in the Italian Risorgimento’, 71 and A. Gili, *Carlo Cattaneo (1801–1869): Un ‘Italiano Svizzero’* (Castagnola: Casa Carlo Cattaneo, 2001), p. 81.

¹³¹ Armani, *Carlo Cattaneo*, p. 33 f. On Cattaneo’s differences with Mazzini see also Sabetti, *Civilization and Self-Government*, p. 6.

The distinction between representative- and self-government had been central to de Tocqueville's analysis of American democracy. In order to develop his idea of federal self-government the United States offered Cattaneo an important point of reference. Among his most detailed discussions of the United States is his essay 'Di alcuni Stati Moderni', published in 1842 in *Il Politecnico*.¹³² While full of admiration for the phenomenal economic and technological development of the United States, he is also aware of the country's very specific conditions, where immigration offered the opportunity for continuous economic expansion. Cattaneo shared de Tocqueville's belief in the relationship between political institutions and cultural-historical traditions. A shared vision of civic traditions – rather than nationality or common language – formed the basis of political community. For Cattaneo, the United States had to split from the British motherland (with whom it shared a language) due to a different understanding of public affairs. The fathers of the American Republic formed a federation between the secessionist states on the basis of their common understanding of economic and political values. Therefore, the political nation, not language or ethnicity, was at the origin of American statehood. 'Whatever the commonality of thoughts and feelings a language creates between families and communities, a parliament united in London will never satisfy America.'¹³³ This insight had clear implications for his understanding of the Italian peninsula:

Laws discussed in Naples will never resuscitate neighbouring Sicily . . . This is the reason why there is a federal law, or the law of peoples, which stands alongside the laws of the nation and the laws of mankind.¹³⁴

Placing Cattaneo's thought on American political institutions within the wider context of his writings on Lombardy and the Habsburgs, he makes an argument against centralised (as opposed to federalised) empires, advocating federal structures on the basis of convergent political and cultural values. In an attempt to connect his Italian experiences to his understanding of American political institutions, he retains the idea of diversity among members of the same federation, leading Giuseppe Armani to describe Cattaneo's federalism as '*poli-centrismo culturale*', rooted in a concept of progress based on the diversity of experiences,

¹³² C. Cattaneo, 'Di alcuni stati moderni' (1842), in G. Salvemini and E. Sestan (eds.) *Scritti Storici e Geografici*, 3 vols. (Florence: Le Monnier, 1957), vol. I, pp. 255–301. Another important piece on the United States and the issue of federalism is C. Cattaneo, 'Notizia sulla questione delle tariffe daziarie negli Stati Uniti d'America desunta da documenti ufficiali' (1833), in A. Bertolino (ed.) *Scritti economici*, 3 vols. (Florence: Le Monnier, 1956), vol. I, pp. 11–55.

¹³³ C. Cattaneo, 'Il numero e la volontà', in *Stati Uniti d'Italia*, 141–161, 149, 159.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*

which in turn generate innovation in culture, science, technology, and social organisation.¹³⁵ As Cattaneo concluded in an essay of 1844 for *Politecnico*:

a people is more civilised the more numerous the principles it incorporates . . . Its history is the eternal contrast between diverse principles, which the nation tends to absorb and unify.¹³⁶

The defeat of the revolution and the advent of neo-absolutism under Emperor Franz Joseph I took the idea of a reformed Austrian Empire off the table and obliged Cattaneo to reconsider federalism as a structure for the Italian states. As outlined in the *Corollarii* of his book on 1848, the future freedom of Italy was to depend on a federation of independent states, each of which had to guarantee civic rights to its people. The Napoleonic period had shown that unification and centralisation undermined freedom, defined as more than the absence of foreign interference in Italy's internal affairs. The sovereignty and freedom of Italy's individual states, understood as a cluster of 'political families', were now to form the basis of national independence.¹³⁷

Throughout his life, comments on American political institutions constituted a crucial point of reference for Cattaneo's federalism (and for federalism as a condition of political liberty), but without offering much in terms of detail about how these institutions work. Passing references to the United States in his analysis of 1848 illustrate this point: 'Each Italian state has to remain sovereign and free in its own right. . . . This is what the wisdom of America teaches us.'¹³⁸

According to Filippo Sabetti the main aim of these references to the United States was to show that there existed an alternative to the European model of the unitary state; to provide empirical evidence that society can govern itself; and to propagate a new political science focused on society's institutions of self-government.¹³⁹ References to the United States also helped Cattaneo to assess his experience of the war against Austria, in which Lombardy handed itself over to the king of Piedmont, a state that 'had a stronger intention to suppress peoples than to free them'.¹⁴⁰ For Cattaneo, the inclination of the Milanese elites towards the Piedmontese monarchy shows the limitations of their understanding of freedom. Fearful of republican radicalisation and popular sovereignty,

¹³⁵ Armani, *Carlo Cattaneo*, p. 70.

¹³⁶ Cattaneo, 'Considerazioni sul principio della filosofia', in N. Bobbio (ed.) *Scritti Filosofici* (Florence: Le Monnier, 1960), vol. I, pp. 143–70, 157.

¹³⁷ Cattaneo, 'Dell'insurrezione di Milano', 271. ¹³⁸ Ibid.

¹³⁹ Sabetti, 'Cattaneo e il modello americano', 346, also 350.

¹⁴⁰ Cattaneo, 'Dell'insurrezione di Milano', 198.

the Revolution in Milan had surrendered to monarchical absolutism only to then be crushed by Austrian troops.¹⁴¹

Compared to the United States, Switzerland was much closer to Italy's civic tradition, constituting the example most frequently quoted in Cattaneo's writings. He had visited the country for the first time aged twenty and also translated a German history of Switzerland into Italian.¹⁴² Cattaneo's critical stance towards Piedmont was reciprocated in the cantons ever since in 1834 European refugees in Geneva, supported by the local population, had attempted to cross the border into Savoy to start off a European revolution.¹⁴³ Later, as a consequence of his long exile in Lugano, Cattaneo acquired excellent insights into Switzerland's civic institutions and the country's constitution.¹⁴⁴ What he gained from these insights was the idea of self-governing independent cities, quite different from a federalism of regions or territorial states.¹⁴⁵ Apart from Switzerland, Cattaneo's federalism also reflected the emphasis on municipal traditions among certain French historians, in particular Auguste Thierry, who also influenced Palacký. For Thierry, France's ancient Gallo-Roman cities, rebelling against the feudal structures around them, were the heroic ancestors of the Third Estate that came to life during the French Revolution.¹⁴⁶ For Thierry they played a role comparable to Palacký's idealised description of Bohemia's early Slavs. Meanwhile, where Palacký demanded further integration between the relatively large lands of the Bohemian crown, Cattaneo favoured political representation based on small administrative units. Here he seems to have followed the constitutional thought of the Piedmontese historian Carlo Botta. Cautioning his readers that Lombardy would be too big to form a centralised political unit, Botta offered the historic examples of Lucca or San Marino to argue that the

¹⁴¹ The context explains Cattaneo's later request for a national army based on conscription, following the Swiss or American models: C. Cattaneo, 'Prefazione', *Il Politecnico. Repertorio mensile di studj applicati alla prosperità e coltura sociale*, IX (1860), 5–24, 7.

¹⁴² Armani, *Carlo Cattaneo*, 13, 28, 30. C. Moos, 'Cattaneo e il modello elvetico', in Colombo, della Peruta and Lacaito (eds.), *Carlo Cattaneo*, 325–44.

¹⁴³ F. Walter, *Histoire de la Suisse, vol. IV, La Création de la Suisse Moderne (1830–1930)* (Neuchâtel: Alphil-Presses Universitaires Suisses, 2011), 37.

¹⁴⁴ Sabetti, *Civilization and Self-Government*, p. 158. On Cattaneo's Swiss connections see in particular Gili, *Carlo Cattaneo*. Armani, *Carlo Cattaneo*, p.128.

¹⁴⁵ Bobbio, 'Introduzione', 37. Martin Thom, 'City, region and nation: Carlo Cattaneo and the making of Italy', *Citizenship Studies*, 3/2 (1999), 187–201.

¹⁴⁶ Thom, 'Unity and confederation in the Italian Risorgimento', 73. Similar ideas were reflected in the works of Alessandro Manzoni, who had met Thierry in Paris and applied some of his theories to his writings on the relationship between Lombard and Italian history.

unit of government had to be small.¹⁴⁷ Likewise, in his contributions to the debate on the railway connecting Milan and Venice, Cattaneo argued that the point of projecting railways was not to build the most direct connections, but to take account of a region's historical development, its web of urban centres and their respective economic activities.¹⁴⁸ Instead of direct tracks between Milan and Venice, for Cattaneo the project had to connect the cities of Brescia, Verona, Vicenza, and Padua. Passengers moving between these urban centres were to constitute the basis for securing revenue. The aim of railway development was not to build prestigious fast lines, but to take account of civil society's spatial development.

Cattaneo's federalism continued to animate debate among Italian Democrats for decades. One of his most influential commentators, Alberto Mario, opined that federalism was not antithetical to political unity: 'everything that is federal in Switzerland and America constitutes political unity.'¹⁴⁹ Contrary to Cattaneo, however, for Mario federalism did not mean 'the federation of governments, as in ancient Germany', but 'the federation of peoples.'¹⁵⁰ What we find here is Mario's belated attempt to reconcile Cattaneo's legacy with Mazzini's political thought.¹⁵¹

IV Empires against Nation States

Czech nationalism offers the example of a movement that grew wary of assimilation into a German nation state, but resisted any temptation of fighting for its own separate nation state. Clashing with the Frankfurt Parliament over attempts to incorporate the Bohemian lands into an emerging German Reich, the Czech national movement was keen to strengthen the Czech element in Bohemia's public life and otherwise to preserve the Habsburg Empire as a multinational alternative to a Europe of nation states. Despite growing tensions with sections of Bohemia's German-speaking population, at no point in 1848 did the Czech national movement turn against the principle of Habsburg rule. The case of Lombardy is slightly different in so far as resentment over Habsburg rule was ripe in 1848. Meanwhile, many revolutionaries rejected the

¹⁴⁷ C. Botta, 'Proposizione ai Lombardi di una maniera di Governo Libero', in *Saitta, Alle Origini del Risorgimento*, vol. I, 3–171, 71.

¹⁴⁸ Armani, *Carlo Cattaneo*, p. 56.

¹⁴⁹ A. Mario, 'La Nostra Via' (1872), in P. L. Bagatin (ed.) *La Repubblica e l'ideale. Antologia degli Scritti* (Lendinara: Tipografia Litografia Lendinarese, 1984), 85–87.

¹⁵⁰ Mario, 'Cattaneo', *Ibid.*, 87–101.

¹⁵¹ Mario, 'Mazzini and Cattaneo' (1880), *Ibid.*, 76–79.

idea of being absorbed by Piedmont, a state widely considered as even more reactionary than Austria. When federal solutions to the Italian question became increasingly unlikely, Cattaneo, the most famous protagonist of Milan's *Cinque Giornate*, preferred staying in Swiss exile to domination under the Savoy. Both examples illustrate the range of political thought in Habsburg Europe during the Revolutions of 1848, but they also point to the fact that the springtime of peoples did not necessarily mean advocating the formation of nation states.